



Introductory (Establishing Definitions)

Progressivism is a standpoint that forbids conservatism, with conservatism being properly defined as *“a broad category of ideas that believe that people should be discriminated against because of their race, gender identity, pronouns, sexual identity, or anything else regarding their identity that does not harm others; that some humans based on some arbitrary characteristics such as some aspect of*

themselves that they were born with, or some physical, sexual, personal, or in general pleasure they happen to have (provided it doesn't involve harming people) can be "lesser" humans than other humans, and therefore that these "subhumans" should be persecuted for the sake of "conserving" a collectivist identity, typically being a preferred race, culture, or gender".

In short, conservatism can be properly defined as a synonym of bigotry, prejudice, and discrimination, aimed at individuals for their identity.

[It can be firmly established through the law of the excluded middle that there exists no middle ground between conservatism and the negation of conservatism \(progressivism\),](#) but though there does exist a strict binary between the two mutually exclusive stances of

progressivism and conservatism, because of the fact that conservatism is itself a superset category of various linked positions (progressivism only has one position, being the universal negation of all of them, thus making it static), this means that not all conservatives are necessarily consistent; conservatism is not a universally static stance like progressivism.

Consistent vs Inconsistent

This is why it is necessary to make a distinction between *inconsistent* and *consistent* conservatism, as not all conservatives are necessarily equal in extremity. Consistent conservatism can indeed be identified as a static stance, as it is essentially taking discrimination to its logical conclusion of wanting the genocide and/or slavery of a given identity group.

Inconsistent conservatism on the other hand is

a lot more variable, as it encompasses a far wider range of positions than progressivism (which is static because the only position is the universal negation of conservatism) **and consistent conservatism** (which is static because the only position is the advocacy of genocide and/or slavery of an identity group).

The root of conservatism

What links all forms of conservatism together to begin with is the belief in the separation of humans by identity into two groups, being “pure” and “subhuman”. This belief in “pure” and “subhuman” personal identity groups (whether explicit or implicit) is at the root of all forms of conservatism in general; the “pure” identities are always seen as superior in some way to the “subhuman” ones, who are seen as lesser and inferior.

This would be the root that connects all forms of conservatism, but where they differ is on

which specific identities are to be considered “pure” and “subhuman”. (i.e., in racism the “subhumans” are usually black people, for sexism it’s women, for homophobia it’s gay people, for transphobia it’s trans people, and so on.) This variation factor is why many different forms of conservatism exist, because whose identity specifically is to be considered “subhuman” differs for each of them.

What makes one “inconsistent”?

And there are many conservatives that because of their inconsistencies not only have yet to take their discrimination to its logical conclusion of genocide/slavery advocacy, but in fact hold their inconsistently applied positions simultaneously with a different position that would be considered progressive (though they are still negated from being considered progressive themselves due to holding conservative positions at all).

(A couple things worth noting is that if a non-consistent conservative position is held on its own with no progressive positions, the individual would be considered merely a conservative, as there is neither a consistent nor inconsistent modifier able to be applied here, as *consistent* conservatism is used to refer to those positions being taken to their logical conclusion of genocide/slavery, which they are not here, and *inconsistent* conservatism is used to refer to holding a non-consistently applied conservative position simultaneously with a progressive one, which is also not happening here. Likewise, if a *consistent* conservative position is held simultaneously with a progressive one, the progressive one would not negate the consistent conservatism and would instead place them in a position similar to that of the [AOGNJ](#) where they are essentially simultaneously a person targeted by the consistent conservatives while also supporting them, thus placing them in a suicidal-esque position.)

Refuting Liberalism

A good example of one of such inconsistent conservative ideologies is liberalism; there is a very common fallacy that the actual binary is between conservatism and *liberalism*, but this is a false dichotomy. It is true that liberals do tend to seem as though they support *some* progressive positions, such as anti-racism, gay marriage, and trans rights (on occasion), but there exist multiple contradictions in liberal

policies that derail any hopes they have of being the true antidote to conservatism.

In the first place, liberals are statist. They support the enforcement of this “progressivism” using a form of conservatism, that being the government. They use the sloppy and slow centralized police and military instead of vastly more efficient decentralized progressive militia forces, community organizations, and the people themselves defending against the existence of conservatism.

In doing this, they also use government legislation to outlaw the use of these more efficient means of anti-conservatism in order to lock people into only being able to use the government forces, which they need to do because otherwise no one would rely on the inefficient centrally planned forces when better forces are available to use.

Lastly, because of the fact that there is centralism, no one opts-in to join the government forces out of confidence that the government will successfully abolish conservatism, so instead coercion is used, not only to force people in, but to maintain the government's forces as well. This is most obvious through the government being able to draft people, but is also present by the government's use of theft upon progressives ("taxation"), which they then use to give to the people in their forces to create artificial incentives to stay there. People are there not of their own belief that it helps progressivism, but to receive artificial benefits from the government.

That alone would be enough to refute all forms of liberalism; whether it be social, classical,

neoclassical, or any other form of liberalism (with the one exception of [radical](#)), they all fundamentally require the form of conservatism that is the state, which already negates them from being considered progressives, as [statist](#) [“progressivism” is a contradiction.](#)

It could have stopped right there, but it gets worse when you look at what else is being advocated by liberals, especially modern ones. It is very common to see liberals coming to the support of the existence of gender binaries as opposed to gender [accelerationism/abolition](#), ageism & the family institution as opposed to [VSRs](#), and government “open” borders as opposed to [border abolition](#) (though other conservatives are a lot worse with all of these).

Not only that, but liberalism has its own conservative purity doctrine called the “social contract”, wherein somehow everyone

magically agrees to the usage of the government as their only means to fight conservatism via the “consent of the governed”, despite the fact that there is no actual contract; no single progressive has ever signed this “social contract”, yet under liberalism they are forced to abide by it anyway.

Liberals are also staunch advocates of gun control, a conservative policy that can arguably be considered a *consistent* conservative policy, as it essentially reduces progressives to a state similar to that of [pacifism](#) while conservatives, because the entire logical conclusion of their viewpoint is to genocide people, would already have guns as well as means to get guns regardless of if the government is helping them or not, which it likely would be anyway by the nature of the state as institutionalized conservatism whereas many progressives are often preferring to simply live their lives in

peace rather than go blazing conservative hunting like the Novelists.

The worst case scenario for gun control is exactly this; conservatives are empowered while progressives are reduced to pseudo-[pacifism](#) and the progressives get genocided. The best case scenario is that progressives turn into Novelists and have means to get guns anyway because they need to liberate people, thus rendering liberal gun control entirely useless. This makes gun control a redundant policy at best, and genocidal at worst. The most consistent conservatives to exist yet, being the original Nazis, [were also advocates of gun control](#) as taking away guns from the Jewish people made them easier to genocide as there was less means of defense.

With all of this established it merits asking:

Why do liberals even seem as though they support the few progressive policies they do appear to advocate when they have this many contradictions with them in their thesis?

There are two possible answers to this question. The first and more optimistic of them is that they are simply misguided and have yet to learn about genuine progressivism, thus making them choose, according to the knowledge available to them, the closest ideology to progressivism they can find, in which case they are good faith inconsistent conservatives and there exists value in making an effort to convert them to progressivism.

The second and more realistic/likely answer is that they know exactly what they are doing and are merely populists. They use the bait-and-switch tactic of politicians to make themselves appear as though they are

“progressive” by using progressive-sounding rhetoric to lure people into supporting them and creating the false pretense that *they* are the antidote to conservatism in order to gain majority support so that they can get political power and enter the government.

They choose the inconsistent conservative route because supporting progressivism would mean political power is abolished entirely and there's no one to rule over as there are only free progressives, and supporting consistent conservatism would place them in competition with the many other consistent conservatives that already exist and are out for political power themselves, as well as push those seeking liberation towards progressivism; inconsistent conservatism is the easiest route they can take because there is less competition and political power is still maintained because of that conservatism exists at all.

The latter answer can be shown to be more likely when it is observed what liberals do once they gain political power; *even at that point* you never see them talk about gender acceleration/abolition, family abolition, border abolition, radqueer liberation, or the state as a form of conservatism; what they do instead is take progressive aesthetics and slap them onto government extensions. The only thing that changes about the centralized police vehicles, government buildings, corporatism, compulsory schools, and institutions in general is that they're now stylized with rainbow flags.



Other than that, gender binaries, the family institution, compulsory schooling, and oppression remains; conservatism is still enforced, just that what's enforcing it now looks nicer. It is also common to see liberals make concessions to other conservatives in order to maintain their political power; the few "progressive" positions that are there would be quick to disappear if liberals determine that even what little there is would be harmful to their power maintenance in a government where everyone else is already moving towards more consistent conservatism; this is evident enough with American liberals ceding their "open borders" positions to appease the consistent conservatives, who only attack them anyway because they too want political power.

Thus it can be firmly established that liberalism *is not and cannot possibly be* the antidote to conservatism; liberalism is inconsistent

conservatism that uses “progressive” populism to gain power. The **true** antidote to conservatism is consistent progressivism, which seeks to abolish conservatism entirely, not merely paint it in rainbow.

Inconsistent “progressivism”?

With that being established, it is worth clarifying why “consistent” is used as a modifier term for progressivism. It makes sense to use for conservatism because conservatism is a very broad range of positions, but progressivism only has one position, therefore it makes far less sense to use for progressivism.

Which is correct, there is only *one* progressivism, that being consistent progressivism/Noveltism. The reason that “consistent” is even used as a modifier term at all is to distinguish from people like liberals, who will often wrongly call themselves

“progressives” as part of their populism.

For this reason, “consistent” is used as a modifier term for progressivism, not to imply that liberals are somehow “inconsistent progressives”, but to place as much emphasis as possible on the fact that they are not progressives at all; progressivism is a static position, being the universal negation of all forms of conservatism. Holding any conservative stances at all immediately contradicts progressivism and makes one a conservative, and liberals hold *vast* amounts of conservative stances, which long negates any hope liberalism would have of being considered progressive. To call anything that has a static position of being merely the negation of something else “inconsistent” would be illogical; there is no “inconsistent progressivism” because progressivism is not variable.

There is another common fallacy that conservatism somehow has anything to do with conservation and progressivism is modernism, which, while false as conservation and modernism have nothing to do with the actual definitions, the former even being used as a smokescreen, there is a microscopic amount of merit to these claims.

That being an observation of how history has happened to play out, *empirically*, it has turned out to be the case numerous times in history that conservatism, even consistent conservatism, has won out. This is what merits pointing out the difference between *empirical* conservatism or progressivism and *intrinsic* conservatism or progressivism, because when many conservatives talk about how they want

“traditions”, they technically aren’t wrong (though that has nothing to do with the definition), because history has been *empirically* conservative.

What it means for something to be *empirically* conservative or progressive is that it just so happens to by coincidence be the case that it tends towards conservatism or progressivism, but it is not static to either; it can be either without being a contradiction.

A good example of something else that is empirically conservative other than history itself is religion; religion is conservative not because it has an inherent linking to conservatism, but because it just so happens to be that the vast majority of people who follow religion happen to be conservative. Despite this, it is not contradictory to be a religious progressive, it’s just *very, very* rare. (Although the few religious progressives that

do exist very often deviate from their religious doctrines such as the Bible, and [for good reason](#), but that's away from the point.)

Something that is only empirically conservative or progressive is only that way as of right now, but it wouldn't be contradictory for it to be the other way around. This is the loophole conservatives are using when they often talk about wanting "traditions"; history is empirically conservative and they want those empirical conservative aspects of history to be brought back. Make no mistake though; "tradition" is not the fundamental of conservatism as it is still just a loophole smokescreen; the fundamental of conservatism is bigotry.

On the other hand, for something to be *intrinsically* conservative or progressive, it would mean that it cannot be separated. It would be a contradiction for something that is intrinsically conservative to suddenly be

progressive, for example, because that thing either cannot exist without conservatism or is a form of conservatism itself. The four horsemen of conservatism, being racism, sexism, homophobia, and transphobia, are good examples of things that are intrinsically conservative because they are forms of conservatism in themselves. The state is another example, as it cannot exist without conservatism.

If something is intrinsically conservative, it cannot possibly be progressive as it is impossible to separate it from conservatism, and vice versa. This is what falsifies the “tradition” fallacy, because history is only *empirically* conservative; it is not *intrinsically* conservative. If & when consistent progressivism wins out, history would start being progressive from that point on, and eventually progressivism would become

tradition.

This is the critical reason why the “tradition” smokescreen falls, as it only works so long as conservatism maintains its grip on society. When it is abolished, history would not be conservative any longer.

Refuting Pacifism

Another example of something that can be empirically conservative or progressive is pacifism, though the reason for this is very unorthodox.

Pacifism is a standpoint on praxis forbidding any and all use of violence/force. Because of this, pacifism takes a very unique stance of essentially guaranteeing victory to the opposite of whichever standpoint practices it.

This is because both progressivism and

conservatism fundamentally require the use of violence in order to be maintained, albeit for different reasons.

Progressivism needs violence to liberate people; progressive violence is used against conservatives to hunt them down and stop them from oppressing people so that people may live freely and identify in whatever way suits them.

Conservatism also needs violence, but for a different reason; conservative violence is used to oppress people and engage in slavery and genocides against identity groups; fundamentally, conservative violence is the kind used for acts of coercion.

Pacifism however, universally rejects the use of violence by both, which severely handicaps both conservatism and progressivism if either

of them engage in pacifism.

Progressives are handicapped because if they cannot use liberatory violence, they are stuck having to combat conservatism using nonviolent means, which very quickly dissolves at the obvious realization that conservatives will have no problem using violence, which they also need to use, to oppress, enslave, and genocide people.

Conservatives would also be handicapped by pacifism, because if they cannot use violence, their goals of oppressing, enslaving, and genociding people are left impossible to achieve, because they require violence to invoke. At most they'd be able to do emotional damage, but this is very quickly countered by the fact that progressives would not be handicapped and would be able to roll over the conservatives to liberate people.

This essentially renders both progressivism and conservatism to get rolled over by the other if they are using pacifism and their opposite is not. [And because ideologies in general can only be progressive or conservative](#), this is what gives pacifism the unique status of being a praxis that is the death of any ideology that practices it. Neither conservatism nor progressivism escape their inevitable fate of death if they employ pacifism as their praxis. However, it benefits them to have their opposite be pacifist, as it means they're easy to roll over. Pacifism is the praxis equivalent of a hot potato; you shouldn't want it, but if your rival has it then it benefits you greatly.

The conservative war against human happiness

There is also something empirically conservative that doesn't get talked about

nearly as much as it should, being just how often conservatives will spew nonsense about how random things turn people into “degenerates”. Common examples of such include alcohol, drugs, pornography, and prostitution, which probably come up as something typically associated with libertinism (which is usually progressive).

But it goes far beyond that, often including sexual relations with more than one person, with someone not identifying as a different gender, and without the permission from the government (“marriage”).

Conservatives will sometimes even call certain aesthetics or food “degenerate”, despite the fact that these things often contribute very minimally to one’s overall lifestyle. The strangest part is that all of this (with the exception of the homophobia, transphobia, and

compulsory monogamy) isn't even intrinsically conservative either; this is all empirical.

Conservatives can be observed empirically to have a sort of hyperfixation on waging war against anything humans do that happens to give them pleasure. It isn't particularly hard to see how they get to this either, as happy humans are usually almost always tending towards progressivism, and thus away from conservative "purity" doctrines.

But it is very noticeable just how many things conservatives happen to attack for the sole reason that it might turn people "impure"; if humans are happy it is very likely because they have turned away from conservative "purity" and are enjoying their lives, much to the dismay of the conservatives.