

PC WORLD

The Will to Powerlessness

by Allen Mendenhall

September 05, 2011



F. Nietzsche

The news abounds with references to "rights," "diversity," and "justice." But what do these terms signify? Allegations of Libyan "rights" abuses were powerful enough to justify a more widespread and large-scale Western version of what Gaddafi did—namely, demolishing an

existing government and then oppressing and killing a lot of people.

In more local news, one of my alma maters has received over \$19,000 for a "diversity initiative" program. It's unclear what a diversity initiative program is, because university spokespeople have explained it in vague terms about "providing ongoing assistance and guidance to newly admitted international students," "supporting travel," "developing leadership and community service," "promoting team building and unity," and "assisting in breaking down barriers in communication." In short, a diversity initiative is so vague that it can mean anything—hence nothing—at all.

"Justice" is another matter. Families of 9/11 victims recently told reporters that justice has not been served because no one has produced a public timetable for trying suspects at Guantanamo Bay. Family members lamented everything from "the years I've got left" to see justice done, to looking "pretty weak" for not bringing "these people" to trial, to sending a "terrible message" to people of the "free world" and to "those who are out to harm us." Still, these cries don't do much to clarify what is meant by "justice."

If we can't settle on the above terms' meanings, perhaps we can glean insights about their *purpose*—that is, why people employ them and their intended effects.

In his recent [article](#) about politically correct orthodoxy on university

"Today's slave morality emanates from the left-wing priestly caste of secular humanists who defend

recalled accusing a colleague of embodying what Nietzsche called "slave morality." Nietzsche's slave morality is tied to Christianity, Platonism, and Enlightenment idealism: philosophies that celebrate weakness and mildness as virtues, champion mankind's unremitting progression, and emphasize self-negation at the expense of self-actualization. Slave morality is, in short, sickly.

others' interests
at their own
expense."

Aristocratic morality, by contrast, is virile and noble—so much that envious slaves seek to undercut it. Nietzsche used the French word *ressentiment* to refer to slaves' contempt for the aristocracy. Slaves convince aristocrats that it is virtuous to deny the self and to pity others. Slaves use pathos to bring about a revolt in morals: the outright reversal of good and bad, valued and devalued. As a result, aristocrats actively seek to minimize their power through self-sacrifice and compassion: bad things that slaves recast as good. Eventually, with the help of the priestly caste—made up of those who belong among aristocrats but force aristocrats to internalize guilt and shame—slaves succeed in redefining morality as immorality. Aristocrats exhaust their power by suppressing it in the pursuit of what they think is goodness. At length, aristocrats become indistinguishable from slaves, and selflessness becomes the dominant criterion for determining what's good.

Writing in the 1880s, Nietzsche depicted Jews and Christians as quintessential slaves. The analogy is now dated, for today's slave morality emanates from the left-wing priestly caste of secular humanists who defend others' interests at their own expense. Who are these priestly figures? People such as John Kerry and Bill Clinton and Nancy Pelosi and Warren Buffett and Garrison Keillor and Ben Bernanke and Michael Moore and Oprah and all those screeching dimwits on *The View*. They promote egalitarianism, which sucks the life out of culture and transforms aristocrats into servants of compassion. They have exalted multiculturalism over their own heritage, have imposed oppressive systems on themselves and other aristocrats, and have catapulted an inexperienced, underequipped, indecisive, conniving, awkward, sinister, spiteful man—Barack Obama—to the US presidency.

Professor Gottfried wrote this about his colleague:

Despite his screaming about Christian sentimentalists, this fellow was always going on and on about the "marginalized." Although a self-proclaimed free thinker, he was the incarnation of what Nietzsche rightly or wrongly despised as Christian silliness.

It seems this colleague was invested in what Derridean postmodernists call "recontextualization," the remaking and reshaping of meaning—in this case, the application of Christian vocabularies to secular causes. Slave morality at its best.

The failure of the aristocratic class—what's left of it—to distinguish the moral from the immoral, the good from the bad, has created a society that determines public policy and (mis)educates its citizens based on indefinable concepts with no direct relation to the phenomenal world. Diversity and multicultural mania, besides signifying nothing, have made us slaves of false virtues, enablers of cultural and economic regression, and perpetrators of self-imposed discipline and denial.

By recycling mantras about the disenfranchised, the Western world in general and the United States in particular have caused the men of *ressentiment* to become super-enfranchised. By obsessing over the disempowered, aristocrats have disempowered themselves. "Rights." "Diversity." "Justice." Count the number of times you see these words in the mainstream press this week. Consider why and for whom they're conveyed. And then ask yourself: Are we not all slaves yet?

Copyright 2011 TakiMag.com and the author. This copy is for your personal, noncommercial use only. You can order reprints for distribution by contacting us at editors@takimag.com.

Like  and 2 others liked this.

Add New Comment

Required: Please login below to comment.

Type your comment here.

Post as ...

Showing 15 comments


Sort by [Oldest first](#) [Subscribe by email](#) [Subscribe by RSS](#)



Pugs Fugly 2 days ago

Excellent article.

Equality can only lead to mediocrity.

 [Ri Jacobs and 7 more liked this](#) Like Reply



The Misanthropologist 2 days ago

You are only as free as your mind, so remove the shackles.

As for the article, it seems to portray the secular humanists' motivations for their preposterous philanthropic pursuits as genuine, thus viewing them appallingly superficially. The modern "aristocrats", which are not really aristocrats, but rather those endowed with large sums of money and media exposure, have simply risen to their positions from the cultural degeneration fostered by Enlightenment philosophy. They act only in self-interest, and their disingenuous philanthropic endeavours give the media the means to construct positive images for them. And the media needs figures of supposed benevolence, because otherwise the ordinary simpletons would...