



"Let this radicalize you rather than lead you to despair."

Conservatism has unfortunately come to maintain a stronghold over society, so much so that even those with identities that consistent conservatives notoriously advocate the genocide of have taken it upon themselves to sew divide within their communities, such that many marginalized individuals

wind up fighting themselves and their allies as opposed to conservatism, turning into conservatives in the process to do so.

Statism is a fairly obvious symptom of this, as for quite a while there has been an overwhelmingly harmful tendency for marginalized individuals to throw themselves and their allies under the bus in order to appease conservatives, under the hopes that this would somehow make their own identities become accepted faster. This can be seen in numerous ways, such as the conservative ideas of transitory statism (more colloquially known as “left-unity”), liberal reformism, and populism, all of which smokescreen the true antidote to conservatism, pushing it ever more distant. [The state is itself a form of conservatism](#), so any advocacy of its existence to any degree would inevitably be a conservative advocacy.

But the tendency for self-destructiveness among marginalized identities goes even deeper than that, as

even among more specific identities it can be observed the degree at which conservative appeasements have driven many queer communities into disarray and exclusionism; ranging from more overtly counteracted ideologies like transmedicalism and TERFism to the consistent conservative persecution of radqueer communities (i.e. MAPs/YAPs, zoos, etc), which somehow manages to go without any large counter-movement even among most queer communities.

Conservative appeasements have intoxicated communities even further than that however, as it is also a common tendency among radqueer communities- the same ones facing constant persecution from consistent conservatives in every direction- to *also* divide each other with conservative appeasements such as anti-contact stances and exclusionism against other radqueers.

The conservative mindset is a very encapsulating one,

as so many who suffer under it inflict ever more damage upon themselves in betraying their fellow queers to it under the vague hopes that conservatism would go easier on their own identity.

This, of course, never actually happens, with the only result occurring from this being that conservatism becomes ever more empowered due to there being less vigilant and militant opposition, meanwhile those who have been thrown under the bus are left in the dark, with no reliable path towards liberation as many of their former allies have turned into conservatives, thus causing a domino effect where their former allies have led by example, thus those in the dark with no knowledge of the true antidote to conservatism follow in their former allies' footsteps and throw each other further under the bus in hopes that this will somehow reduce their persecution.

The end result is precisely what can be generally observed about many marginalized identities after

this happens for so long: some are inconsistently persecuted, some are consistently persecuted, and genocide advocacy of all of them is widespread to varying degrees, even amongst themselves, as conservatism has continually had success in driving division into their opposition such that no united force can be formed among them to abolish conservatism.

The solution

Ultimately, conservatism wins out, and marginalized individuals are pushed further into the dark with many advocating genociding each other. The solution seems like it would be a fairly simple one: to stop throwing each other under the bus and fight conservatives instead; but unfortunately the mass disunity among marginalized communities makes this far more complicated in practice than on paper, as conservative appeasements have come to dictate an overwhelming influence within said communities.

Thus a more specific and direct solution is needed to

target the root of the conservative identity-exclusionism; a way to unify all marginalized identities under a singular binding rigid cohesive ideology; one that neither bends nor folds to appease conservatives and instead places itself on the front lines as the direct antidote to conservatism, advocating the complete and total abolition of every last one of its forms, by any means necessary (provided no compromises or sacrifices are made; there would be no exceptions for 'necessary evils' as the stance would be in favor of complete and total liberation).

This antidote can be found, not in conservative reformist ideologies like liberalism, nor in conservative appeasement ideologies like state socialism (colloquially, 'tankieism'), nor in any big-tent ideologies like "libertarianism", but instead in a standpoint in which anti-conservatism is used as the sole starting point from which all stances are derived, the sole guiding metric, and the sole binding principle of the ideology, encapsulating its entirety in every single position it has.

This ideology consisting solely of anti-conservative totality is called “Consistent Progressivism”, and advocates stances of complete and total liberation for all marginalized identities, regardless of ‘ickiness’. Only through a consistent platform of complete liberation for all with no conservative appeasements or statism to be found and a rigid analysis of conservatism along with [how to identify it](#) can actual liberation be achieved. However, for this to happen it is required that marginalized identities stop attacking each other so that they can come together to unify under this ideology; no queers are to be left behind.

This analysis of such a unity does have a [historical precedent](#) as division hasn’t always been this widespread; [Hakim Bey](#) is a good example of an icon of what used to be known as the “pederasty” movement, which was essentially the most direct form of proto-progressivism prior to Consistent Progressivism. Persecuted by the consistent

conservatives under the [pink triangle](#), the pederasty movement sought to liberate paras and maintained an alliance with other queers (as can be observed at [Stonewall](#) and the [queer movements formed after](#)), but dissipated as appeasement to conservatives became a more general practice, with queers starting to try to separate themselves from each other, isolating their fellow queers for the sake of trying to rush themselves to being accepted by those following an ideology that advocates their genocide. Since then, there have been countless queer spaces that have fallen into the trap of conservative appeasements, with conservative identity-exclusionism being present in just about every one of them.

A case for liberation

It should be obvious enough by now that persecuting other queers and trying to rely on the existence of the state will in no way do anything towards achieving liberation; however it is painfully obvious that the principles of liberation had been forgotten long ago

with how many queers are left helpless in the dark to be persecuted by conservatives with nowhere to turn, having to constantly closet themselves in order to assimilate for “friends” of any kind who would persecute them for their identity being “icky” or “problematic” at the drop of a hat.

Thus a new case must be made- a radical uncompromising one for total liberation through progressivism where all queers are free to identify however they want and feel, free of persecution and the state, in an egalitarian decentralized stateless society where all are held to the same standard of non-hierarchical organization, anti-discrimination, and respect of identity.

1: [Family Abolition](#)

MAP/YAP and AAM/AAY liberation as well as general youth liberation as a whole would be a good starting point, and is fairly easy to establish when an understanding of [family abolitionism](#) is prior

established, as the family institution is a slavery institution that perpetuates patriarchal ageist ableist eugenicist dynamics where individuals are forced into the institution as soon as they exist, are prohibited from exiting until they have reached an arbitrary existence time criteria above which they can be viewed as having basic autonomy by the state, and are forced under the hierarchical rule of the “parental” authorities present there, who view the individuals that have been forced into the institution as more adjacent to slave clay that is to be molded than actual beings with free will or autonomy of any kind.

Consanguinity can also be established through the same premises; incest as a concept is only able to be opposed so long as the [family institution](#) continues in existence for there to be a dynamic to be opposed; the concept would be impossible to identify without the dynamics of the [family institution](#), thus rendering there nothing to be opposed. Eugenicism tends to be the most-often used grounding for the family

institution, and all anti-incest stances can be easily found to derive from that conservatives want to prevent “bad genes”.

This necessitates neurodivergent and disabled liberation as well, as they tend to be viewed as disposable beings by conservatives and disregarded entirely as the product of the aforementioned “bad genes”, having what conservatives refer to as “mental illness” as though they’re inherently diseased beings for not falling under what conservatives would call a “normal” mentality, all of which are concepts which can only be maintained through the [family institution](#).

A proper understanding of the abolition of the family institution alone would liberate many radqueers (two forms of which are predicated on the persecution of individuals with gaps in existence time, otherwise referred to as the form of conservatism known as ‘ageism’), as the family institution alone is the form of conservatism responsible for perpetuating many of

the most overarching and influential forms of conservatism that branch off of it, second only to the state.

2: Necro & Zoo Liberation

That being said, many forms of conservatism do exist with no direct connection to that of the family institution other than that the family institution makes them worse, with some examples of such persecution of radqueers being through anti-necrophilia and anti-zoophilia stances, both of which conservatives ground on the same faulty “[insert identity] can’t consent” playing card they use for the slavery of the family institution, but with different contradictory outlinings this time since it’s no longer required for autonomy revocation.

As far as anti-necros are concerned, any stance they’d have against necrophilia can fairly easily be negated by that they’d be stuck in the position considering that if their belief is that necrophilia is to be opposed because the dead being in question did not opt-in

(which isn't even guaranteed as they could have did so beforehand), it would mean there exists no possible action at all that can be done with the being beyond that point as they would be rendered permanently incapable of opting-in to anything ever, at least until resurrection technology comes about.

There are no special exceptions for romantic or sexual relations; if those are to be opposed on the "can't consent" grounds, so is any other action done with a dead being at all, as they are not opting-in to anything when they're deceased. And as mentioned before, the "can't consent" grounding doesn't even consistently land considering how individuals can opt-in to allow future actions to be done with them prior to dying, negating the "can't consent" fallacy used by anti-necros.

The fallacy is even faultier for anti-zoos, and can be refuted among several layers of premises; the first

layer being that to have any stance at all against zoophilia by the “can’t consent” fallacy first requires answering the question of if animals have rights; if the individual positing the “can’t consent” fallacy does not support animal rights, everything they say against zoophilia beyond that point can be disregarded, as if animals have no rights then it shouldn’t matter whether they “can’t consent” or not, as it wouldn’t be regarded anyway by the anti-zoo’s principle applied consistently and animals would be viewed merely as objects or tools rather than autonomous beings, with any action whatsoever done to them being permissible regardless of the thoughts or input of the animal.

The second layer, which is reached only if the anti-zoo does indeed believe in animal rights (as anything they’d say would be incoherent if they didn’t), would then be to question whether or not the anti-zoo is a vegan; unless they have strictly medical reasons requiring them to eat meat, they can be

pretty quickly shown to be inconsistent on their animal rights position if they accept animal murder but condemn what would be less than that if their fallacy were to hold consistently, especially regarding the conservative conditions in which the animal meat is produced; the consistent anti-zoo must be in favor of animal rights, as well as a vegan who would be opposed to pets, farming, or animal herding of any kind, as anything less than this would render anything they have to say as incoherent as they have failed to follow the premises required to be accepted for them to argue for their stance.

The third and final layer for refuting the anti-zoo, reached only after they've been shown consistent enough to get this far (many of them won't), would be to establish that animals can join VSRs; the criteria for "consent" is the communication of a desire, and though animals cannot communicate via speech, speech is not the only form of communication available to individuals; movement is what can be

used to communicate if speech is not an available means of communication to a given being, and animals can certainly move. Animals may be ““mute””, but they are not [amputees](#); their desires can be deduced through their movements; if a given animal is being flirted with, their movements can be used to deduct whether they accept or deny the advancements. If the advancements are denied, animals can move away from the being that is flirting, or in more aggressive cases even move to attempt to scratch or bite them, giving very clear indicators that they do not opt-in.

If they make no attempts to move away or any sounds (i.e. whimpering) that would imply dissatisfaction, provided they are not being physically inhibited from doing so, it would then be safe to assume prima facie that they are in approval of the advancements until they indicate otherwise, which animals will very quickly and overtly do if it becomes the case that they no longer approve.

This can be observed for a vast multitude of actions engaged in with animals beyond merely romantic and sexual relations, for example, eating food; animals will give obvious indicators if they do not want to be fed (i.e. they will not open their mouth or will actively move away from the food). These universal body language indicators are forms of non-verbal communication, which can be used by any autonomous being when speech is not available to them.

If the anti-zoo were to deny the validity of these indicators on any grounds, the logical conclusion of their stance would then be to bar any interaction between animals and other beings, as by their premises it would be impossible to know the stance of the animal as the animal cannot communicate verbally. The *reductio ad absurdum* of this stance being the barring of interaction of any individuals that can speak and any that can't, as animals are not the

only non-verbal beings that exist; essentially segregating the entirety of society into the verbal and non-verbal.

Furthermore, the anti-zoo is left with no stance whatsoever if it is the animal themselves that initiates the interaction, as any argument that they “can’t consent” immediately axiomatically falls apart if it is the animal that makes the advancement as opposed to the nonanimal-identified being. (This stance works equally well for any “[insert identity] can’t consent” fallacy used against any para other than necrophilia!)

3: Bodily Autonomy

With liberation principles established for what are colloquially known as the “Big 3” paras, a fundamental principle should be established that makes any liberation possible at all in that an established groundings for total bodily autonomy is required.

All individuals must be free to do anything they wish

upon their own bodies, which is something inhibited by conservatism through the family institution, as individuals are forced to be bound together if one happens to reproduce, with their only option in conservative society (if they happen to be benevolent and desire not to be forced to be a slave owner at all) being to surrender their offspring to the state, where they are subject to become someone else's slave.

It is a very commonplace tendency among inconsistent conservatives to think that merely being pro-abortion solves this problem, and while abortion is indeed a right guaranteed by progressivism, it does not alone solve the problem when it coexists in a society where the family institution is prevalent.

Inconsistent conservatives engage in populism on abortion rights as a band-aid solution to the overarching problem of the slavery that is the family institution- inversely, those who insist on a pro-life (or pro-life adjacent, i.e. evictionist) stance fail to

realize that it is the continued existence of the family institution that *encourages* abortions, as in a society where the only two viable alternatives to not getting an abortion are being a slave owner or outsourcing slavery, getting an abortion would be just about the most ethical choice in that regard, and that's without even accounting for the many economic penalties faced by those with no initial intention of being a slave owner, pushing them closer towards abortions as both the only ethical way out as well as the only viable way out for their own life.

The abolition of the family institution would be unique in that it is the *true* pro-choice position, as not only are abortions readily available and defended, but 'choice' is also available externally as reproduction no longer would turn people into slave owners, as all relations as a whole would have to be VSRs, making there far less reasons incentivizing individuals to want to get an abortion, considering slavery would be abolished and they would no longer have anything

tethering them to their offspring unless they and their offspring opt-in to join a VSR.

With the abolition of the family institution and the enshrining of bodily autonomy would also come the abolition of circumcision on mute amputees, as no authority to perform such an act would exist any longer without the dynamics of the family institution; the decision on whether or not to be circumcised would be made solely by the individual undergoing the surgery; any “parental” authority or input on anything whatsoever would be abolished as no longer would there exist any slave owners that individuals must first seek the approval of- individuals would be self-autonomous beings with progressivism as the only guiding principle, free of any external authority dictating how they want someone else’s body to look like.

Also central to total bodily autonomy is the advocacy of free love and total sexual liberation; liberation of

radqueers (i.e. MAPs/YAPs, AAMs/AAYs, zoos, necros, incest, etc) is highlighted because radqueers have been thrown under the bus repeatedly by conservative appeasements, but ultimately the liberation of all sexualities is what is advocated, with the explicit inclusion of paras to emphasize that as much as possible; all relations between all individuals of all attractions that can possibly be achieved through the VSR model are to be promoted and defended, as there would exist a right to free love- to love whomever one wants and freely express any attractions they happen to have through the structure of VSRs.

4: Freedom of Identity

To achieve any of this, conservative purity doctrines must be abolished, as it is through them that any persecution can be perpetuated to begin with; as at the fundamental root of all forms of conservatism exists a doctrine that there are identities that are to be treated as “lesser” than other identities; the

offshoot effects of the many manifestations of this doctrine leads to a widespread phenomenon which can be called “purity culture”, in which conservatives, in an attempt to justify the many arbitrary identities they’ve selected to be “pure”, start to point out random empirical traits about those with the conservative “pure” identities and posit them as if they’re somehow the reasoning behind making them “pure”, which in turn stigmatizes both the “subhumans” as well as many former “pures” who would now be considered “subhumans” due to being “degenerates” on the conservative worldview, with the arbitrary empirical traits being selected as “degenerate” always being ones that help to make people happy and provide them with pleasure.

Conservative purity culture doctrines extend not only to arbitrary traits of identities however, but also to arbitrary identities themselves, as those holding the identities are the targets of who conservatives are viewing as “subhuman” in the hopes that this will

somehow erase their identity from existence. This translates into the creation and enforcement of a wide variety of norms that can only exist through social constructs, the most common among them being race, existence time (“age”), and gender norms: predetermined roles for people to play in society based on that conservatives have decided that different skin colors, different lengths of how long one has existed for, and different gender identities are some of many random things determining whether or not one is a “subhuman”.

If you just so happen to look or identify the “wrong” way, your fate in a conservative society is to be either directly genocided or to face constant persecution for being a “degenerate”; attempts to wipe your identity from existence will be seen coming from every direction, as your existence will be banned from healthcare as well as participation in general activities and be viewed as a “weird” or “problematic” subhuman outcast from society.

This view amplifies tenfold if conservatives think you haven't existed long enough, as not only are you banned from healthcare and activities but your existence will also be banned from being in spaces as a whole in general: you will be completely barred from most forms of media, social interaction, and even movement without the approval of your slave owner; you'd need *their* "consent" for *you* to engage in literally any action.

If you haven't existed long enough in conservative society, you are viewed as a slave. You are viewed as clay with no other purpose to existing than to be forcefully molded into whatever your master wants you to be, and are viewed as expendable and disposable, and to be disposed of should you ever defect from that.

The abolition of purity culture is therefore the complete and total abolition of these arbitrary social

constructs and all of the norms built around them; it is in that sense the abolition of race, age, gender, and all other social constructs, as their meaning would be liberated from the stronghold of conservatives and transformed into a colorful palette of labels with which individuals can freely identify with; none are assigned to anybody at birth, and none have any effect whatsoever on your place in society; they would be merely fun little tidbits about yourself that are only attached to you so long as you identify with them.

This liberationist freedom of identity concept can be identified as “[transidentities](#)”/“[TransIDs](#)”, which you can apply to any aspect of yourself; any way, shape, or form you choose to identify with would be a TransID of your own- it is your identity and an intrinsic part of you for you to customize completely, whether at will or through an emotional state of dysphoria with other identities; whatever the reason, your TransIDs would be yours to decide (or not decide

and simply follow what you might view as a natural identity; again, this is entirely up to you).

TransIDs are the logical conclusion of freedom of identity advocated by progressivism, as they consist of every single aspect of your identity being up to your own determination; transgender is the most common TransID, but your TransID consists of every aspect of your identity, inclusive of but not limited to gender identity.

Race, age, and all other social constructs would be dethroned from their conservative stronghold pedestals with their social norms abolished, transforming the concepts into liberatory TransIDs with their sole meaning being determined by the unique reasons of those identifying with them, rather than external conservative impositions.

A progressive society would have no purity doctrines and all identities would be viewed as equals, held to the same standard of mutual respect for the identities of each other and the egalitarian anti-discrimination principles of progressivism. There would be no slavery nor eugenicism, and all individuals regardless of their identity, sexuality, mentality, and existence time would have total bodily autonomy and freedom of identity; there would be no family institutions or conservative relations of any kind, as all relations would be progressive ones through VSRs (Voluntary Social Relations) which require that all involved have explicitly opted-in to join, remain there only so long as they find it satisfies their desires, are not under any coercion or authority so long as they're there, and are free to exit at any point in time unchallenged by anything.

VSRs would be the universal model for all relations in society in regards to everything, open for any to join by consensus of those already there, and open for any

to create, with the only exceptions to the latter two being conservatives and mute amputees, as conservatism will destroy the relation, and mute amputees, though not prohibited from joining like how conservatives are, are assumed to not be joining until they can indicate otherwise through communication and thus no longer be a mute amputee, as the sole defining factor making one a mute amputee is the lack of communication of any kind, which requires *both* inability for speech *and* inability for movement of any kind.

It is important to emphasize that nothing *stops* mute amputees from joining VSRs; mute amputees have the exact same rights and standards as everyone else and are to be treated equally to them; it is simply because of their lack of communication that no one would ever know if a mute amputee is opting-in to join a VSR, thus it would *prima facie* be assumed that they are not until they demonstrate otherwise and thus communicate, thus making them no longer a

mute amputee.

VSRs are the baseline from which all relations would exist in progressivism, and would foster healthy relations for all individuals of all identities and paras, inclusive of the aforementioned “Big 3” as well as incest and all other marginalized sexualities and identities; the *only* people completely banned from entering VSRs by anything are conservatives.

6: Pro(gressive)-Contact

With this established, it bears addressing another concept that has sparked division among queer communities, in particular radqueer ones, about that of contact stances, as conservative appeasements have led to a large (at least, proportionally to most of the rest of the movement) tendency of inconsistent conservatives to advocate the persecution not of the sexuality, but of those with the sexuality that engage in sexual actions of any kind, referred to as “contact”.

There exist three factions of this conflict:

“anti-contacts” (those who seek to bar contact as they view it as harmful for whatever their reasons may be), “neutral-contacts” and/or “complicated-contacts” (those who appear indecisive on whether contact should be permitted or not), and “pro-contacts” (those who acknowledge contact as permissible).

The progressive stance on this would appear obvious enough; anti-contacts are conservatives so they can be knocked off straight away as anti-contactism is predicated on a premise that attraction is fine but doing anything on that attraction is suddenly prohibited, even if it's through VSRs.

That is a contradictory stance that only exists due to a very long succession of conservative appeasements; anti-contacts seek approval from conservatives by trying to water down their identity to an “I just feel this way but I won't do anything about it” stance, failing to acknowledge that just like the rest of the

queers they threw under the bus, conservatism will want to genocide them too for even being associated with the identity to begin with. Anti-contactism can effectively be summarized as “persecute the action, instead of the attraction”, with the premises they use for being against the action being exactly the same as those of the rest of the conservatives.

Neutral/Complicated-Contactism is a lot more varied, as it can consist of either conservatism through a watered-down anti-contact stance masquerading as “[centrist](#)”, or as a purely semantical standpoint rendering them to be progressives in-denial; like the rest of the centrist stances, it has no objective cohesive baseline and is simply an incoherency of clustered justifications for why contact might be permissible but also might not; it is not intrinsically conservative but it works to smokescreen conservatives by letting them hide behind “centrism” as though there exists a third option between conservatism and progressivism, [which can be shown](#)

[not to be the case by the law of the excluded middle.](#)

So are progressives pro-contact then? Well, it would seem like that's the case by logical deduction if it is the only option left, but this would be where the semantics of neutral/complicated-contactism would come back, as some progressives in-denial among them reject pro-contactism for the reason that they view it as permitting genuine rape (sexual relations with an autonomous living being who did not communicate opting-in to said relation and/or made it explicit that they are rejecting the advancements and thus opting-out).

While the vast majority of pro-contacts are anti-rape, a small minority of pro-rape stances, fringe as they may be, do exist, and they tend to also use the "pro-contact" label. They tend to justify it on the grounds that the trauma that comes from rape only exists due to that sex is placed on a purity pedestal in society and that sex being destigmatized and normalized would make rape much more of a minor inconvenience than a major event.

Though there are points to be found here, this ultimately does not render rape permissible, as it is not merely the mental effects of it that make it something to be opposed (though they certainly do not help) but that rape is an action incompatible with the VSR model; the rapist viewed those they are raping as not deserving of bodily autonomy and thus “subhuman”; rape is a conservative concept.

Even in progressivism, where sex is destigmatized completely, public nudity is welcomed and encouraged, and anyone can have sexual relations with anyone, this all still has to happen through a progressive model to remain progressive in the first place, and that model is that of the VSR.

Rape can effectively be described as a form of conservatism, (though, that being said it's not exactly possible to be conservative to conservatives) as it is the dynamic of one's identity being placed above the identity of another and thus able to dictate how their

body is used without their input; it's a relation that not all involved have opted-in to, and thus it is incompatible with the progressive VSR model.

Therefore, progressives are pro-contact by definition, but anti-rape; this is a stance that can be identified as “pro(gressive)-contact”: progressives are pro-contact, but only through progressivism, and the only contact progressives oppose is conservative contact.

Identity fakeclaiming as a form of conservatism

With these principles of liberation established as fundamental core principles of Consistent Progressivism, it bears going up the line to address further divisions among queer communities, particularly the prevalence of identity fakeclaimers (individuals who believe a certain mind criteria or action is required to identify in a specific way).

This is another way that conservative appeasements have splintered queer communities, as some have

decided to throw each other under the bus in a different way by resorting to eugenicist stances against freedom of identity in an attempt to establish faulty objective definitions of their identities in the hopes that this will cause them to be accepted by conservatives.

This is evident most commonly through TERFs (“Trans-Exclusionary Radical ‘Feminists’”; conservative identity-exclusionism against transfems from women’s liberation), SWERFs (“Sex Worker Exclusionary Radical ‘Feminists’”; conservative identity-exclusionism against sex workers from women’s liberation), Transmedicalists (colloquially, ‘truscums’; conservative identity-exclusionists who think gender dysphoria is a strict requirement for being transgender), and Endophobia (a form of conservatism in which the “subhuman” criteria is attached to [endogenic system plurality](#), who endophobes do not view as valid).

All of these are forms of conservatism, as are all other forms of identity fakeclaiming and exclusionism, as they require rejecting the stance of freedom of identity to exist. Like anti-contactism, stances like these only come about through conservative appeasements, in the hope that distancing themselves from “those other weird/problematic queers” will help their own identity become accepted by conservatism, an ideology which has its sole defining feature as the persecution of “subhuman” identities.

Non-dysphoric transfems (along with trans beings in general), sex workers, and endogenic systems are all betrayed due to conservative infiltration of queer movements to turn the movements exclusionist so that they are fighting each other instead of conservatism; and bizarrely, the consensus argument used by almost every exclusionist is that inclusion of all queers would somehow *harm* the movement; that actually accounting for everyone would somehow

damage a movement that seeks all liberation.

This form of conservative exploitative selfishness driven by purity culture encouraging queer individuals to focus solely on the liberation of their own specific identity to the extent where they put that above the queer liberationist movement as a whole, viewing other identities as lesser than their own, and are willing to sacrifice the entire movement if it means their specific identity will be accepted by conservatives- which they won't anyway (the [AOGNJ](#) already tried that; it didn't end well for them) comes only as the militant spirit of queers dies down and no singular cohesive ideology can be found anymore; individuals lose their sense of unity and start to splinter from liberation into different unrelated directions that wind up leading them out of the cause entirely, turning them against the only beings who'd fight for their right to exist.

Ultimately, everyone ends up throwing each other under the bus, and as a result, everyone becomes lost in the dark awaiting their impending genocide by the conservatives. Consistent Progressivism is the path out of this; abolishing all of the conservative appeasement ideologies that have come about after a long chain of queers attacking each other, in favor of one singular cohesive rigid militant uncompromising ideology in which all queers can come together to unite against all forms of conservatism, accept each other's identities, and advocate an egalitarian stateless society of VSRs and TransIDs; a society of Consistent Progressivism would be open and welcoming of anyone and everyone who is not a conservative.

As far as how to get to this point, it is first important not to attack other queers and to always avoid the three forms of counterproductive praxis: transitory statism/"left-unity", pacifism, and compromise.

The state is a form of conservatism, pacifism is the death of all ideologies it touches, and compromise (along with the acceptance of prior two as praxis) is how the condition of queers got to where it is now; Consistent Progressives refuse to appease conservatives in any way, shape, or form; Consistent Progressives reject the notion that a form of conservatism (the state) can abolish conservatism, and Consistent Progressives approve of the use of any means necessary to abolish conservatism so long as it doesn't involve the prior two; this means progressives are not chained to the restrictions of pacifist praxis.

Progressivism is a radically queer anarchist ideology of militant queer unity against conservatism. As far as what steps can be taken to abolish conservatism? Call out conservatives explicitly; join and spread the word of Consistent Progressive communities, and form VSRs to liberate individuals from the family institution; polycules are an example of

currently-existing VSRs that are heavily hindered and fringe due to existing within a conservative society; create more polycules along with other kinds of VSRs and go off the grid with them- counter-economize your progressivism and practice mutual aid with fellow progressives!

Most importantly however, never give an inch to conservatives. Or a centimeter, for that matter. Attack conservatives explicitly, consistently, and always, to as much of a length as possible; *never* allow the conservative mindset to infiltrate your praxis, never allow conservative “friendships” (true friends don’t persecute friends’ identities) and convert them to progressivism if you want them to be a genuine friend, and call out conservatism explicitly and directly whenever even a hint of it is spotted.

It is also important to deprogram language, as conservatives maintain a stronghold over that; don’t let conservatives push around buzzwords like “age of

[insert concept]” and “family”; call them what they actually are: the conservative concepts of an existence time criteria for autonomy, and a slavery institution.

Most importantly of all, always double-down on pride in any queer that gets pedo-slammed; the “pedo” label is by far the strongest asset conservatives have at their disposal, as not wanting to be seen as anything even adjacent to a “pedo” is one of the main roots behind so many queers throwing each other under the bus, as conservatism has had by far the most success at fostering a conservative mentality of mob fear mongering against anyone even slightly associated with the “pedo” label, to such an extent that it surpasses genuine rape and literal murder.

The mentality of queer cowardice needs to die and the militant spirit of queer liberation needs to be revived through the ideology of Consistent Progressivism; if you or any of your fellow queers get

pedo-slammed, Consistent Progressives should be trusted to rush to their defense, double-down because the label is one of many queer identities to be liberated, and then counterattack the pedo-slammer for being MAPhobic/YAPhobic, thus being a conservative.

If the hate mob mentality directed at the “pedo” label was redirected to the “conservative” one, that would be the definitive surefire way towards a Consistent Progressive society, as instead of people rushing towards conservatism, they’d be rushing towards liberation instead, and in turn, freeing themselves from the chains of conservatism.

To summarize, let's throw all conservatives into a woodchipper. Liberation is non-negotiable.

