

# Decoding “White Supremacy Culture” Verbiage. Part II

We are continuing with analysis of the “woke” dogma.

Part I can be found [here](#).

**“Defensiveness”** – When people often in power, are dismissive of new ideas solely for fear they might shake things up. The defensiveness of people in power created an oppressive culture.

The organizational structure is set up and much energy spent trying to prevent abuse and protect power as it exists rather than to facilitate the best out of each person or to clarify who has power and how they are expected to use it. Because of either/or thinking (see below), criticism of those with power is viewed as threatening and inappropriate (or rude).

People respond to new or challenging ideas with defensiveness, making it very difficult to raise these ideas.

A lot of energy in the organization is spent trying to make sure that people’s feelings aren’t getting hurt or working around defensive people.

The defensiveness of people in power creates an oppressive culture.

As before, this is about power. In our culture, defensiveness is defined as “the quality of being anxious to challenge or avoid criticism”. But is also “behavior intended to defend or protect”. Being accused of “defensiveness” should humble anyone, make people shut up and not speak up or fight for what they think is right. The latter part of the above definition is being cast aside. Defend yourself – and become an instant pariah, the “oppressor”. When you cannot respond to attacks, he who attacks you comes out a winner. Lose few battles and lose you position on the totem pole of life. Are those new socialist ideas winning everywhere? Not really. The “white man” is in the way. In our society a boss of any caliber must deflect attacks on his turf. This is pure human nature.

Of course, no one thinks kindly of criticism. Not every critique is wrong, but every instance is painful and hurtful to someone. In politics, disarming your opponent is everything. Accusing “white supremacy culture” of being defensive should neutralize those “in power”. They want us to waste time by timidly explaining and apologizing for our decisions instead of making them. This is happening right now, all around us.

This entire matter is about not capitulating in front of advancing adversaries;

not giving into their propaganda of every shape and form. And yea, screw them and their bright ideas. It is our future and our own right to make decisions they are after. Now is not the time to be polite, now is the time to be right.

**“Quantity over quality”** – Being results-oriented and diminishing an otherwise-sound process if it doesn’t produce measurable results. It also goes hand-in-hand with “discomfort with emotions and feelings”

All resources of organization are directed toward producing measurable goals. Things that can be measured are more highly valued than things that cannot, for example numbers of people attending a meeting, newsletter circulation, money spent are valued more than quality of relationships, democratic decision-making, ability to constructively deal with conflict.

Little or no value attached to process; if it can’t be measured, it has no value.

Discomfort with emotion and feelings.

No understanding that when there is a conflict between content (the agenda of the meeting) and process (people’s need to be heard or engaged), content will prevail (for example, you may get through the agenda, but if you haven’t paid attention to people’s need to be heard, the decisions made at the meeting are undermined and/or disregarded).

So, here’s another crime we casually commit. Instead developing, building and producing, let’s just do quality talk. Talk is cheap, but in their book it must have the same value. Talk pays your salary, no? What, you disagree? This is the material world and we are the material boys and girls. We know how to evaluate measurable results. We do assign some value to discussions, but must not allow ourselves get entangled in endless discussions of “democratic decision-making”. They want to reverse this process.

On the surface all this sounds like “rank and file” of any organization should be heard – which isn’t a bad idea. But we know deep down, let’s talk, talk, and talk. They demand justice for the colored people. Who cares if production stops? You should hear the grievances first. The ideology launches itself at attracting people hurt by the capitalist order of doing things; at those who have an ax to grind. Someone hurt your feelings? We want you! “Workers of the world, unite!” This isn’t about the quality of the goods produced. This is about introducing racial conflict into the workplace. It will lead to negotiations of sorts, and with some skill those with “discomfort with emotion and feelings” will be dictating their will to those in charge. It’s about diversity and exclusivity (the code words for a racially-divided workplace). Those demands must be part of any deals.

This is what is so dangerous about their slogans. Find something to accuse the

society of. Open these wounds. Drive a wedge in. Ignite the fire. A dangerous hogwash begins to permeate our society.

**“Worship of the written word”** – This idea patronizes documentation and writing skills rather than the “ability to relate to others. It also leads to teaching that there is “only one right” way to do something.

If it’s not in a memo, it doesn’t exist.

The organization does not take into account or value other ways in which information gets shared.

Those with strong documentation and writing skills are more highly valued, even in organizations where ability to relate to others is key to the mission. Office rumors, intrigues’ plots whispered in your ear and writings on the office’s bathroom walls. These are all viable alternatives when it comes to learning what is going on around the workplace. Carefully divulge what you know and be part of the “in-crowd”. This is how the information is shared in today’s world. Got it? We are being facetious, of course.

In reality, they want to make it into a power struggle yet again. Find the people who know how to do the work and pit them against the rest of the group. Don’t let others on the secrets of influence. Damn the manuals, they dilute the power of few. Following the written communications within your organization now equates to worship of the false gods. We need influencers in the workplace, the more the better. They can tell mission stories, beat the drums, sing and dance; relate to others and lead by example. Does it sound to you like mayhem in the workplace? Nah, that’s great. Just don’t read those emails. Having “living documents” (we read about them elsewhere) is a much better alternative to memos and manuals. You can always alter them, to suit the current momentum and office politics. Follow the party line, comrades.

They want to divide and conquer. Whether spelled out or not, this is also about diversity (as in racial diversity). The ideologists suggest rejection of established order of things, in every way they can find. They do it by playing the racial card. The aim is to create an alternate reality and drag their confused revolutionary followers with them.

The same applies to every other point of the doctrine they push, whether we mention it out or not. It’s maddening.

Our culture values people who can put their thoughts and goals down “on paper” succinctly and cohesively. This way ideas and rules of the game can be quickly shared. Anything to the contrary goes against the grain of our technologically advanced society. In times when you rarely see people this might be the only way

to relate to them. Got something to say? Text it in, email it or don't bother us, we are busy. If you cannot, maybe you shouldn't be working here. This is simple enough for all to understand?

**“Paternalism”** – When those already in power think they're the only ones who can or should make decisions. “Those in power often don't think it is important or necessary to understand the viewpoint or experience of those for whom they are making decisions for.”

Decision-making is clear to those with power and unclear to those without it. Those with power think they are capable of making decisions for and in the interests of those without power.

Those with power often don't think it is important or necessary to understand the viewpoint or experience of those for whom they are making decisions.

Those without power understand they do not have it and understand who does.

Those without power do not really know how decisions get made and who makes what decisions, and yet they are completely familiar with the impact of those decisions on them.

The squeal here is to include everyone in the decision-making process. Being a decision maker is an art. It is much like commanding a platoon of soldiers on a battlefield. You know your men and the circumstances you are in. You calculate the fallout of the steps you are about to take. The experience helps you come up with a solution to a problem. As a commander you can hear if you want what your men think, but the ultimate decision is always yours. At times, a decision-maker doesn't have to explain himself to others. It's never simple.

Yet again, our progressive “Woke” friends want to destroy the existing order of things. They want to have a say in that decision-making process. In their dictionary “Paternalism” is an element of “Capitalism”; they conveniently forget that “Capitalism” puts bread in their mouths. They desire to brush it off, to unseat those who are above them and take their place. If you bring race into this (and they do), then “White Supremacists” are guilty of not listening to the people of color; the proletariat, the working class; the paternalistic bosses decline to share power. The “Awoken” intend to juxtapose decision-makers and the rest of the workforce. This is how classic revolutions begin. At some point, they start seeking sympathy of our black citizens, to oppose the “White Oppressors”, even where no oppression even remotely exists. They grab at every reason they can come up with. These people want to revolt against the society we live in. This is what they are teaching to children. Need we say more?

End of Part II.