



Reprising “Discourse Theory” in Light of the Dominant Narrative on COVID

November 1, 2021

*And this is a system of lies. Really, they say you are free, but de facto, they force you.
We are living in a society of lies. And this was communism. Communism was
substantially, intrinsically, a system of lies. And so, we are witnessing here today with
these COVID measures, and pandemic measures, which are elaborated and implemented
. . . So, in such a manner, in such a one-sided manner, that is evident that such measures
are very similar to a dictatorial society.*

Bishop Athanasius Schneider
Crisis Magazine [Interview](#), October 2021

Discourse Theory is a line of effort (LOE) associated with the **Semantic Marxism** line of operation (LOO) used in mass line narratives that support political warfare efforts. *Unconstrained Analytics Inc* first introduced *Discourse Theory* before COVID19 in “[Warning on Racism](#)” in November 2019. From the beginning, *Discourse Theory* has played an influential role in the COVID19 enforcement narratives used to control the everyday lives of everyone. A reintroduction of *Discourse Theory* is in order. This article is a reprise of 2019 followed by an assessment of *Discourse Theory* in light of the COVID19 narratives. Because *Discourse Theory* instantiates Marxist mass line narratives, the article will conclude with an example of how dialectical narratives work.

[Before Going On](#)

Krzysztof Karoń is a social media presence in Poland. He seems to have popularized Marek Jan Chodakiewicz’s more scholarly 1999 [Ciemnogrod? O Prawicy I Lewicy](#) (*The Ignoranceville? On the Left and the Right*). Before doing so, a review of Karoń’s eight-minute lecture on **Teoria Dyskursu** (*Discourse Theory*) sets the tone.

Watch >> [DISCOURSE THEORY](#) << Watch

PART 1: Discourse Theory as Assessed in “Warning on Racism”

As discussed in “Warning on Racism,” *Discourse Theory* was identified as a tool that would be used to support Marxist “hate speech” narratives. The objective of hate speech is to suppress speech and publication “in advance of [their] actual expression” through intimidation that anticipates violence. As such, hate speech imposes **prior restraint** on those on the wrong side of Marcuse’s [repressive tolerance](#). How does Hate Speech work?

Hate Speech is a Marxist Construct. Alongside Marcuse’s repressive tolerance, Jürgen Habermas, second-generation Frankfurt School, developed *Discourse Theory* in [The Theory of Communicative Action](#). *Discourse Theory* builds on manufactured dialectical contrasts between “discussion” and “discourse.” Borrowing from Krzysztof Karoń’s 2016 lecture on [Semantic Marxism – Discourse Theory](#), “discussion” is the exchange of ideas based on facts that seek to describe what is real in the context of subjective interpretations that, upon verification, can be said to be objectively true. *Discourse* denies objective knowledge of the real, thereby denying objective verification criteria on questions concerning the truth or falsity of claims. For Habermas, this is not a problem. Cutting through Habermas’ pretentious dialectical narrative, Karoń explains:

- When we translate into normal language, it means that the truth is what – during the **discourse** – is being presented as the truth and accepted as truth by all its participants. Because the condition for truth is the **consensus**, as it is easy to guess, the reference point for the argumentation supporting different positions cannot really be reality. It’s the power of persuasion that becomes the reference point. [Karoń]

Discourse Theory is a part of a larger strategy to impose the pseudo-real on the real. Habermas’ argument hinges on a tortured construction of “consensus” that, as with discourse and discussion, positions it in a contrived dialectical contrast with “compromise” that allows “consensus” to masquerade as “compromise” for the benefit of the larger audience:

“And so, this was reminding me when we, in this so-called pandemic time, the news, the official news that are all the same from morning, to evening continuously brainwashing the people with **excessive news**. And this news was all the same. There was not a possibility of an alternative news even to prove if these numbers, which we are told to us, are really true or not . . . And when someone raised a question of possible doubts, which is always legitimate in a democratic society, and then you were labeled as a **conspiracy theorist**. And so, all you were labeled as the **enemy of your neighbor**, or you are labeled as an **enemy of health**. And in the Soviet times, when someone raised doubts about the official narrative of the ideology in the news and so on, he was labeled as **enemy of the people**. And now, we are for witnessing evermore the vaccine mandate, forced in some way, it is a very cunning way.” - Bishop [Athanasius Schneider](#), *Crisis Magazine Interview*, October 2021

- **Consensus** in the understanding that **Discourse Theory** does not mean the agreement of all the parties with their elaborated positions, but the *abandonment* of the previous position and the acceptance of the common position as *one’s own*. Consensus doesn’t so much mean

acceptance as *affirmation* of the elaborated negotiating position. The prerequisite of the very adherence to the *discourse* is the renunciation of convictions about the objective legitimacy of one's own position. [Karoń]

Discourse Theory narratives focus on the dialectical negation of individuals, entities, and ideas already targeted for destruction through "consensus." It's a pure "might makes right" power play by those capable of imposing it through mass line narratives. "It is logical, because if one is convinced of [one's own]

legitimacy, then the goal of participating in the

discourse will be to justify the validity of one's own position, rather than to strive for acceptance, or even affirmation of the common position, which isn't the same as one's own position." [Karoń]

Under Habermas' *Discourse* regime, "anyone who represents a precise position that he would like to defend is opposing the idea of agreement and consensus and becomes the sower of **discord, conflict,** and **hate** [putting him] in the position of the **ENEMY OF CONSENSUS.**" [Karoń] Hence, the justification for hate in hate speech narratives is that "consensus" is opposed. In form, it operates through

[Dialogue in a Period of Praxis](#).

Ju-Jitsu them at their own game? Recognizing it as a "testimony to the dominance of Cultural Marxism," Karoń warns those who mindlessly engage in *Discourse Theory* narratives that, even if they are in the opposition, they are still adopting Marxist messaging schemes that will ultimately co-opt them. Karoń concludes:

- I'll stubbornly reiterate: if anyone uses the notion of 'discourse' instead of 'discussion' or agrees to participate in a *discourse* and not a *discussion*, then he should realize that he is waiving the right to have precise convictions or to buttress himself with the knowledge of reality as an argument justifying those convictions. [Karoń]

In other words, you cannot defend the real in the pseudoreal – it's rigged that way. Expressed in popular terms, to respond to blue pill narratives in the blue pill narrative renders one a blue pill player ("The Matrix Explains Political Warfare Realities," [Part 1](#), [Part 2](#) & [Part 3](#)). Hence, when people respond to Marxist attack narratives in the narrative by "Ju Jitsuing them at their own game," they are not only co-opted by them, they reify them in the process as well.

Discourse Theory manifests itself in controlled opposition formulas designated as hate speech. In "Warning on Racism," the hate speech platform is [Critical Race Theory](#). Returning to Marcuse, "Repressive Tolerance" targets everything about America for destruction (dialectical negation) while "Discourse Theory" suppresses dissent. As noted in *Black's Law Dictionary*, "**prior restraint** on speech and publication are the most serious and least tolerable infringement on **First Amendment Rights.**" As such, hate speech regimes are intentional direct assaults on the First Amendment and related free speech protections. They have already achieved *de facto* enforcement and, as such, superseded the First Amendment.

CONSENSUS IS NOT A COMPROMISE, or acceptance of an agreed-upon position which partially takes into account different views of the parties. **CONSENSUS** is an **AFFIRMATION** of the agreed-upon position, and therefore demands the change of one's position.

The American public is generally unfamiliar with active measures. Following the string, from Bishop Athanasius Schneider, who recognizes communist dictatorship patterns, to COVID responses, to Josef Pieper, who explains the role of excessive information, to Yuri Bezmenov, who identifies these efforts as demoralization efforts.

Raised in the Soviet Union and Bishop of Astrakhan, Bishop Schneider speaks of similarities between Soviet rule and actions taken in the name of COVID:

*“Yes, the control. Because in a communist dictatorship, with their controls. All the day, night, I mean there were secret services, and there were in the social media only one-minded news presented to you distorted of course. Never know the alternative of having another opinion. And so, in every school and even in the companies or factories and so on, there were commissions on communist ideology. So, they had to maintain the ideology in public life continuously. And so, this was reminding me when we, in this so-called pandemic time, the news, the official news that are all the same from the morning to evening, continuously brainwashing the people with **excessive news**. And this news was all the same.” - Athanasius Schneider, Crisis Magazine, 2021.*

Josef Pieper on the role overwhelming people with data plays in an active measures campaign:

*“It is entirely possible that the true and authentic reality is being drowned out by the countless **superficial information bits** noisily and breathlessly presented in propaganda fashion. Consequently, one may be entirely knowledgeable about a thousand details and nevertheless, because of ignorance regarding the core of the matter, remain without basic insight . . . Arnold Gehlen labeled it “a fundamental ignorance, created by technology and nourished by information” . . . Something far more discouraging is readily conceivable: the place of authentic reality is taken over by fictitious reality; my perception is indeed still directed toward an object, but now it is pseudoreality, deceptively appearing as being real, so much so that it becomes **almost impossible any more to discern the truth**.” - Josef Pieper, Abuse of Language – Abuse of Power, 1992 (Munich 1974).*

Former KGB Active Measures agent Yuri Bezmenov identifies this as a demoralization campaign:

*“**They are contaminated**. They are programmed to think and react to certain stimuli in a certain pattern. You cannot change their mind, even if you expose them to authentic information. Even if you prove that white is white and black is black, you still cannot change the basic perception and the logic of behavior. In other words, these people, the process of demoralization is complete and irreversible.” - Yuri Bezmenov, Deception was My Job, 1984*

PART 2: Discourse Theory in the context of COVID19 narratives

“I found from many observations that our liberals are incapable of allowing anyone to have his own convictions and immediately answer their opponents with abuse or something worse.” (today, we call this gaslighting)

Fyodor Dostoyevsky
The Idiot, 1869

Leading up to COVID19, in “[Warning on Racism](#),” in 2019, *Unconstrained Analytics, Inc* introduced a concept from *Semantic Marxism* called *Discourse Theory*. In March 2020, “[Narrative Dominance in COVID19 Reporting](#)” and “[Formation a COVID19 Red Team](#)” cautioned that while COVID19 narratives seem severable from COVID19, they shared an alarming number of parallels to Marxist mass line enforcement narratives.

Published a week before the 2020 election, “[U.S. Domestic Security Estimate – October 2020](#)” [just word search COVID] validated the January 2019 “Estimate of the Situation” found in Part II of January 2019’s [Re-Remembering the Mis-Remembered Left](#). *ReRemembering* explained the role narratives play in Marxist mass line movements. What did the October 2020 assessment validate? That:

- The 2019 Estimate was correct that Marxism is narrative-driven;
- “Warning on Racism” accurately warned that the 2020 election cycle would be dominated by Marxist mass line narratives centered on Critical Race Theory;
- “Narrative Dominance in COVID19” functioned as a mass line enforcement narrative and did so so effectively that it served as the controlling narrative providing top-cover for other Marxist mass line efforts.

COVID19 narratives control speech. They control lives. They justify naked assaults on economic, civil, medical, human, and constitutional rights. They continue to do so even as peer-reviewed science shows signs of overtaking COVID narratives. (See, for example; *Life Site News* “[The myth of asymptomatic COVID transmission doomed America’s pandemic response.](#)”) *Discourse Theory* is one of the arrows in the *Institute for Social Research’s* (the Frankfurt School) *Semantic Marxism* quiver used to dominate societies. As with Marx, the Frankfurt School is unabashedly dialectical in its orientation to Marxism. Its operational design executes along [Hegel’s triadic formula](#) based on the interplay between

- 1) the dialectic,
- 2) claims of science that position “science” in support of metaphysical claims above modern notions of science based on peer review, falsifiability, etc., and
- 3) that the state is god.

In short, the dominant narratives on COVID19 sound more accurate than *bona fide* peer-reviewed scientific claims. Why? Because 1) the government says so and 2) *Discourse Theory* stifles dissent. Designating it the “Platonic Nightmare,” *Discourse Theory* achieves what Josef Pieper meant when saying the [abuse of language](#) leads to abuse of power. Returning to the Frankfurt School, its mission

remains faithful to Marx's true vision of Marxism: the dialectically nihilization of Western society through a systematic process of **ruthless criticism**:

- **“If we have no business with the construction of the future** or with organizing it for all time, there can still be no doubt about the task confronting us at present: the **ruthless criticism of the existing order**, ruthless in that it will shrink neither from its own discoveries nor from conflict with the powers that be.” ([Marx's Letter to Ruge](#), 1843)

Intersectionality is a pure expression of Marx's ruthless criticism. Marx's **critical philosophy**, the Frankfurt School's **critical theory**, **Black Lives Matter's** intersectionality line of effort designated as **critical race theory** are all pure forms of Marx's dialectically negating criticism. To not recognize this is to be lost. In fact, the Frankfurt School's motto, “*aufheben der kultur*” (negate the culture), is the expression that fixes Marx in Hegel. Embedded in that motto is the Hegelian notion of “*aufheben*.” Today, *aufhaben der kultur* finds its best contemporary expression in the infamous “[Cancel Culture](#).”

***This raises the question:** Do mainstream and social media communications on COVID19 constitute an information effort directed at the American public along Discourse Theory lines imposed as mass line enforcement narratives?*

From a political warfare perspective, a case can be made that they are; that they share all the attributes of an active measures effort that combines *Discourse Theory* with Gaslighting in the form of *ad hominem* attacks masquerading as “fact-checking.” From the start, mainstream and social media imposed *Discourse Theory* notions of “consensus” on all communications associated with COVID19 through deplatforming and naked censorship. To review:

- 1) *Discourse Theory* is part of a known Marxist information operation process;
- 2) This process is Marxist in design and supports mass line enforcement narratives;
- 3) *Discourse Theory* notions of “consensus” are an identifiable element of COVID19 narratives that serve to isolate and deprive citizens of their rights and freedoms in a systematic way.

Part 3: Did Vatican II serve as the Discourse Theory prototype?

This question is raised because Habermas goes there. The principal focus of this writing is Habermas' Discourse Theory – a very lethal arrow in the Semantic Marxism quiver. Yet, lest we forget, Habermas is intensely dialectical in his Marxist vision, and the objective of Discourse Theory is the implementation of that Marxism. While threat analysts submissively obey the rule, not always stated, to suspend threat analysis at religion's door, Marxism has recognized faith as a threat and has targeted it from the beginning. As stated in [ReRemembering](#), the interfaith movement has COMINTERN roots. (And lest we forget, the Taliban just defeated America because threat analysts were forbidden to address the clearly articulated Islamic law drivers to jihad.) In a book co-authored by Habermas and Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger promoted by Ignatius Press, the question worth asking is what, if anything, was being signaled between the two? The banter between Habermas and Ratzinger is dialectical, operates at the initiate language level, and runs along a common understanding of the Hegelian dialectic, which then serves as the common reference point. The following assessment will explore this concept in greater detail.

So, was Vatican II the prototype for *Discourse Theory*? It's an interesting question that may not be as speculative as it sounds. Consider, it was well known at Vatican II that microphones were often

turned off, meetings were shifted at the last minute, and discussions were tabled. As became apparent, the voices that were silenced tended to be the same as those disfavored by Vatican II's elite staff theologians, called *periti*. These *periti* dominated Council networks while orchestrating the illusion of a consensus along [Nouvelle théologie](#) lines. The tactics used at Vatican II bear the tell-tale signs of Habermas' *Discourse Theory*. Additionally, there was a *periti* nexus to Habermas: Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger was a *Nouvelle théologie peritus* at Vatican II.

In 2005, Habermas co-authored a book with Ratzinger titled [The Dialectics of Secularization: Reason and Religion](#) published in the U.S. by the Jesuit-run *Ignatius Press*. Nothing in the book would lead the reader to recognize that Habermas was a prominent Marxist. In *Dialectics of Secularization*, Ratzinger agreed with Habermas on the dialectical nature of the relation between church and state. From Habermas:

- “Philosophy had indeed transformed the original religious meaning of these terms, but without emptying them through a process of deflation and exhaustion. One such translation that salvages the substance of a term is the translation of the **concept** of ‘man in the image of God’ into that of the identical dignity of all men that deserves unconditional respect. This goes beyond the borders of one particular religious fellowship and makes the substance of biblical **concepts** accessible to a general public that also includes those who have other faiths and those who have none.” [Habermas, *The Dialectics of Secularization*, 45]

It's essential to recognize that Habermas' language is defined by an initiate language that is itself dialectically determined. It needs unpacking:

- For the non-initiated, a better way to understand “the dialectics of secularization” might be by restating it as “the dialectics of negating (destroying) what gets in the way of secularizing previously faithful societies.”
- Habermas' “Philosophy transformed the original meaning without emptying them through a process of deflation and exhaustion” refers to negation expressed in terms of “*aufheben*.” Relying on an inaccurate yet popular understanding of the Hegelian dialectic:
 - **THESIS** could be: “The concept of ‘man in the image of God.’”
 - **ANTITHESIS** could be: “Into that of the identical dignity of all men.”
 - And **SYNTHESIS** would be: “[This] makes the substance of biblical concepts accessible to a general public that also includes those who have other faiths and those who have none.”

According to romanticized notions of “*aufheben*,” “man in the image of God” is uplifted and preserved by this process. Discerning Christians and Jews, however, recognize that the phrase has been emptied of its meaning - or nihilized.

- Regarding phrases like “translation of the **concept** of ‘man in the image of God’” or “makes the substance of biblical **concepts** accessible”:
 - When terms like “**concept**” are used in dialectical writings, does “**concept**” hold to its non-initiate (conventional) meaning, or, instead, does it take on its initiate sense? For initiates, “**concept**” can mean the **movement** of logical thinking in its self-comprehension. When dialectically constructed, “**concept**” breaks down into three **movements: universality, particularity, and individuality?**

- On “the identical dignity of all men that deserves unconditional respect,” this language resonates with the “universal brotherhood of man” narratives.

Ratzinger understands and engages in the initiate dialogue he enjoys with Habermas. Not only does he recognize the dialectical form, but he also signals agreement with Habermas through that initiate form. For Ratzinger:

- “I am in broad agreement with Jurgen Habermas’ remarks about a post-secular society, about the willingness to learn from each other, and about self-limitation on both sides. We have seen that there exists pathologies in religion that are extremely dangerous and that make it necessary to see the divine light of reason as a ‘controlling organ.’ Religion must continually allow itself to be purified and structured by reason.” [Ratzinger, *The Dialectics of Secularization*, 77]

Of course, when religion “allows itself to be purified and structured by reason” through ongoing processes that position the Church in a binary relationship with the state ([Dialogue in a Period of Praxis](#)), it’s the state that does the purification. Ratzinger reprises the Hegelian notion of state when imbuing it with a “divine light” that empowers it to be the “controlling organ” over religion. It’s very German. The “divine light” that ‘continually purifies’ religion resonates with Hegel’s concept of spirit or *geist*. Hegel’s spirit has an immanentizing influence that recognizes that in today’s spirit, the “Zeitgeist” is truer than yesterday’s precisely because, as the spirit moves history forward, today’s truth is more valid than yesterday’s.

In another book by Ignatius Press, Ratzinger seemingly signals acceptance of this concept of spirit when saying that “basically, the word ‘world’ means the spirit of the modern era. [Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, [Principles of Catholic Theology](#), 382] The Jesuit Hans Urs von Balthasar, a close confidant of Ratzinger’s as well as being a trusted theologian, likewise signaled a sympathetic vision of spirit:

- “If things were otherwise, where would the Holy Spirit remain in history? According to Christ’s promise, he will lead us into all the truth. He will do this until the end of the world, and without repeating himself. He will illuminate new depths of revelation from century to century.” [Hans Urs von Balthasar, [Razing the Bastions: On the Church in this Age](#), 271]

Slippery language indeed. But do initiates understand it? To understand what makes this language alarming, one must interpret what is said along initiate lines. Yet, if the initiate construction prevails, then the Eternal Word is to be understood as moving history forward on a path to perfection through a continuous process of negation that Ratzinger calls “purification.”

But, if such a construction were followed, wouldn’t the Eternal Word cease to be transcendent? Yes. Both Ratzinger and Habermas speak the language of negation – and they both know it. For initiates, the initiate form of a communication defines the meaning of what is said and fills the empty spaces where public articulation demands opacity. So, when Ratzinger asserts that “religion must continually allow itself to be purified,” he necessarily means purified along dialectical lines, which includes its suppression by the state, given his agreement with Habermas. Habermas understood this.

Should we really be surprised by this? No! In 1982, Ratzinger declared his agreement with Balthasar on the need to demolish the Church:

- “The fact is, as **Hans Urs von Balthasar** pointed out as early as 1952, the ‘**demolition of the bastions** is a long-overdue task . . . *She must demolish longstanding bastions* and trust solely the shield of faith’.” [Ratzinger, [Principles](#), 391]

What did Balthasar mean by this? Balthasar’s call for the destruction of the Church is based on the notion that at 2000 years old, it should have already been negated:

- “In terms of the history of religion, each year the Church spends on earth is another proof she will the sooner die; no religion on earth lives much longer than two thousand years. And seen psychologically, it is impossible, even in an individual, for a consciousness burdened with so much (and ever-increasing) tradition to maintain the freshness and carefreeness of the first youthful Christianity.” [Balthasar, [Razing the Bastions](#), 393 - 405]

Suppose this dialectical understanding of Ratzinger’s comments holds up. In that case, it suggests that the demolition process may have progressed to the point where Francis’ actual razing of the Church constitutes a continuation of Ratzinger’s mission, not a break from it. When Catholics seek refuge from vaccinations derived from aborted fetuses only to find no relief from Francis in the face of state power, Ratzinger’s amicable agreement with Habermas ceases to be just an interesting linguistic debate. Indeed very few contest the role *Discourse Theory* plays under Francis’ leadership. And nobody ever accused him of being conservative.

Semantic Marxism attacks are not limited to civil and governmental spheres. Rather, they attack all spheres of communication, especially, as Gramsci declared, the religious. The exchange between Habermas and Ratzinger provides a helpful insight into the role initiate language plays in dialectical discourse and is provided to round out the discussion on Habermas’ and *Discourse Theory*. If *Discourse Theory* was prototyped at Vatican II, then *Semantic Marxism* has been operational since at least the 1960s.

Conclusion

“***It must be in the water.***” We hear so many things that seem unrelated to each other and dread where the country, the world, communities, including faith communities, are headed. This dread compounds as it gives way to depression and hopelessness when these seemingly unrelated phenomena seem to be converging on a point as if planned.

It’s overwhelming. It’s supposed to be. The problem isn’t just that it’s not actually in the water; it’s that we conduct ourselves as if it was. There is design to what we are experiencing that includes the inculcated sense that we’ve been rendered helpless, passive participants in our own destruction. There is design to much that we’ve witnessed that has brought us to this point. In fact, “it” is designed to take us to the brink of complete national, cultural, and religious collapse while leaving us in a state of utter demoralization.

Discourse Theory is one of the tools Marxism uses to bring us to that end. *Discourse Theory* activities are weaved into command and control narratives executed through political warfare regimes that ensure mass line enforcement.

 **Andy Ngô**  
@MrAndyNgo

An antifa group protests in Brisbane, Australia over the weekend calling for stricter government action on Covid-19.



0:44 471.4K views

From **Snake & Stars**

3:44 PM · Oct 17, 2021 · Twitter for iPhone



APPLICATION – *Marxism* >> *Critical Theory* >> *Intersectionality* >> in BLM Mass Line Attack

-- There is **NOTHING** theoretical about it!



As "Warning on Racism" demonstrated, *Discourse Theory* was integrated into critical race theory narratives used to attack the population in the months leading up to the election. As just explained, it plays a controlling role in the enforcement of COVID19 narratives that increasingly reveal themselves to be naked attacks on civil, human, religious, and constitutional rights. Finally,

Habermas' collaboration with Ratzinger was included to provide an example of how initiate language drives a secondary discussion, suggests that *Discourse Theory* may have been prototyped in the 1960s, and validates concern that churches, at least at institutional levels, may be sleeping with wolves. Surely, pre-established amicable openness to *Semantic Marxism* processes goes a long way to explaining Francis.

A Warning on the dangers of responding to dialectical attacks from within the dialectic; when doing so, one reifies the narrative the dialectical attack it seeks to instantiate. *Discourse Theory* is an arrow in the *Semantic Marxism* quiver. *Semantic Marxism* tools are dialectical in form and execution. To counter Marxist attack narratives, one must attack the reasons for the narrative while defending what it targets; for example, false science claims used to justify the suspension of rights to supersede the Constitutional basis of governance.

“In my studies of communist societies, I came to the conclusion that the purpose of communist propaganda was not to persuade or convince, not to inform, but to humiliate; and therefore, the less it corresponded to reality, the better. When people are forced to remain silent when they are being told the obvious lies, or even worse when they are forced to repeat the lies themselves, they lose once and for all the sense of probity. To assent to obvious lies is . . . in some small way to become evil oneself. One’s standing to resist anything is thus eroded and even destroyed. A society of emasculated liars is easy to control. I think if you examine political correctness, it has the same effect and is intended to.”

Theodore Dalrymple (Anthony Daniels),
Frontpage Magazine Interview, 2005