

Copyright © 2025 by Tiago Sousa

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the author.

First edition

The Selfish Manifesto

Tiago Sousa

Part I - The Lies

The Lie Of Common Truth

Throughout your life, you've been fed a multitude of lies - some incomplete, others entirely false - that have shaped how you see the world, how you think, and how you act.

Common Truth refers to the collection of lies that society promotes and accepts as fact. These lies are everywhere. They are the things that no one bothers to question, the foundational beliefs that shape our modern perception of reality. To challenge these Common Truths is often seen as heresy, delusion, or something laughable. They are dogmas, accepted by even the most secular, scientific, and open-minded societies.

What makes these Common Truths particularly insidious is their subtlety. They're often difficult to deconstruct, hidden beneath layers of deeply ingrained beliefs and assumptions. But deconstructing them is essential if you want to separate Truth from Common Truth.

Common Truth is built upon two fundamental assumptions. By recognizing these assumptions, you can begin to distinguish between what is actually true and what society has conditioned you to believe.

The Assumption Of Information

Assumption: *In the 21st century, we live in the age of information, with vast records of history, scientific studies, and research readily available. Almost any topic can be explored through books, documentaries, and online databases. While some data may be limited or outdated, there is generally enough high-quality information for anyone to seek*

and understand the truth.

It's so subtle. It's so sneaky, so obvious. There is such an incredible amount of data and information out there, and most of it is free. You can find centuries-old books online. You can find scientific studies. You can find so much documentation and so much data on so many topics. Surely, only a very recent, niche, obscure topic is difficult to find information about. This is what most people believe.

The key issue is that most real-life events are never recorded. The vast majority of data from the real world is not documented. The small amount of data that is recorded represents only a tiny fraction of what actually occurs. We often assume that this small sample is enough to make reliable conclusions about the world. But that assumption is highly problematic.

Take the example of crime statistics. A crime may occur, but for it to be documented, it needs to be reported to the police, entered into their systems, and then made available for research. However, this process is riddled with gaps. Not every crime is reported. Not every report is properly recorded or stored. Even if it is, it's often in private databases that are inaccessible to the public or researchers. And even when crime data is available, it's subject to potential errors: data can be lost, servers can go down, or certain incidents may be deliberately censored.

Every process that turns raw data into analysis passes through multiple fragile stages: collection, recording, storage, and interpretation. At each step, errors, omissions, and biases can enter. Some events are never recorded. Some data is lost, misfiled, or locked behind closed systems. Even accessible data may already be filtered or distorted

by the time it reaches analysts.

By the time we see statistics or conclusions, we are often looking at a distorted version of reality, shaped more by the process than by the truth. Technical failures, institutional incentives, and human error all degrade the fidelity of the original data.

To treat data as neutral or absolute is naive. We must always consider what might have been lost, distorted, or excluded before the data ever reached us.

Now, consider other examples. How often do we encounter events in our daily lives that go unnoticed or unrecorded? When you're at the mall, how many interactions between employees and customers are not captured in any formal way? Or when you're stuck in traffic, how many small events, like someone cutting you off, never make it into any report or study? These seemingly trivial moments are part of reality, yet they go completely undocumented.

Even more significant experiences are often left out of formal records. Many areas of life, due to their subjective or non-quantifiable nature, are never systematically studied or recorded. People's personal feelings, the subtleties of social interactions, the nuances of workplace dynamics—all of these are rarely captured in any meaningful way. Some topics simply haven't been studied at all, leaving entire aspects of life unexamined.

The data we do have is incomplete, fragmented, and often biased. It doesn't reflect the full scope of reality. When we rely on this limited data to draw conclusions, we risk missing the bigger picture. The true complexity of human experience is far richer than the small sample of data we

have, and it's important to recognize that much of what shapes our world remains undocumented.

Each step in recording and synthesizing data and information contains many assumptions and a large margin for error. Each time someone attempts to summarize, simplify, or generalize reality, a subset of reality is ignored.

And let's be honest—how much effort do you really put into analyzing the information you get, say, from a textbook? Do you take the time to cross-check it with other textbooks to confirm its accuracy? Do you ever go as far as conducting the study yourself? Or even look at the primary data the textbook is based on?

Most of the time, not even a PhD-level university professor does this. And certainly not the peer reviewers. Often, their approach comes down to simple cross-referencing. When experts review a paper, their main method of determining its validity is whether it aligns with the conclusions found in most other papers.

Society has become too inclined toward rationalism, developing an excessive faith in data that is often fallible, incomplete, and biased, and collected by people we don't know, in contexts we don't understand. And in the process, we lose something essential: trust in direct experience.

Now, this isn't a free pass to dismiss every piece of information that comes your way. Recorded data can be useful—it often is—but it should always be approached with a strong sense of skepticism. The problem arises when we treat secondary data with dogmatic certainty, instead of questioning it, challenging it, and recognizing its limitations.

The Assumption Of Authority

Assumption: *Generally speaking, you can trust experts on any given topic. If a person has a Phd on a topic and has been doing research on it for decades, that means their knowledge of that topic is quite profound. It might suffer from flaws here and there due to a lack of funds or data, but such knowledge is trustworthy. Experts are people who are deeply passionate about their field and want to discover the truth about it by reading various studies and conducting experiments themselves.*

This assumption pisses me off. It's an idealistic view of how humans work and how knowledge is constructed. This view is extremely sanitized and has been explored by various authors such as Thomas Kuhn and Feyerabend.

By creating a stark distinction between academic institutions and corporate organizations, we deceive ourselves. At the end of the day, institutions are businesses too. Most researchers don't get to study what they want, with the tools they need, or the time they require. Research isn't conducted with the open-minded, skeptical attitude we like to imagine. In reality, politicians and business leaders dictate what gets researched. If a topic isn't profitable, it likely won't be explored. If it's considered too "woo," it won't be touched. If it contradicts the agenda of politicians in education, it won't be studied. And if it's too new or too novel, it probably won't get attention.

Research often involves red tape—more than we'd like to admit—at both the funding and academic levels. Researchers are often required to follow rigid procedures to ensure their methods are deemed "valid". While this makes sense in theory, it can hinder scientific progress.

For example, a researcher may have access to 10 databases for their project, but only 1 or 2 are considered valid. Determining which data sources are valid often depends on whether they come from trusted institutions like government agencies or universities.

This doesn't mean the other databases are unreliable. In fact, all 10 could be equally truthful, yet only a few are eligible for study. Independent researchers who collect and share data in public databases based on first-hand experience often see their work dismissed, not because it's flawed, but because it lacks formal credentials or is seen as biased.

You must understand that research, unfortunately, relies a lot on the genetic fallacy and the appeal to authority fallacy. How research is conducted in academia is philosophically problematic. It goes so far in preventing bias and error and woo that it excludes valuable methods, and valuable data by accident.

Kuhn has also explored the concept of Normal Science. This is essentially the groupthink phenomenon. There is a stage, during the evolution of science, where experts agree on a topic. They have conducted so many experiments and analysed so much data that they have settled on a conclusion. And whenever something new emerges that contradicts that conclusion, those anomalies are shrugged off.

- "Oh, this study was based on an insufficient sample size."
- "Whoever collected this data used the wrong method."
- "This paper was sent to us by whom? Some nobody

on ResearchGate?”

- ”This study has already been debunked by at least 10 other studies.”
- ”For this study to be right, the entire field of X would have to be wrong.”
- ”The literature review and theoretical justification section of this study is quite poor.”

When scientists/researchers/scholars reach a point of agreement, their tribalistic nature takes over. Truth has been settled, and the excuses to ignore new data or new information, or new experiments are endless. Endless excuses to keep the science in its current state. Normalcy is something emotionally priceless to humans. Anything abnormal is immediately rejected.

Finally, let’s consider the identity of the researcher as part of the problem. Do you really think there’s a 50/50 gender split in fields like gender studies, women’s studies, sociology, and anthropology? The truth is, when people choose a field, they often do it with an agenda in mind. They select a discipline because it serves them in some way. That finance professor? They’re not totally objective about finance. A woman with a degree in women’s studies isn’t objective about women. Someone with a degree in gender studies was likely drawn to that field for personal reasons, too. People derive value from their areas of study—whether that value is monetary, emotional, or connected to their identity and ideology.

It’s become a bit of a cliché to say the humanities are less scientific than STEM fields, but there’s a lot of truth to it. The closer a field is tied to our understanding of who we are, what society is, and how the world should be, the

more likely it is to be subtly shaped by ideological assumptions. These assumptions are often shared among those in the field. And if someone doesn't align with those presuppositions, they likely wouldn't even enter that field in the first place.

This isn't to say that research in these fields is wrong, but it can certainly be biased toward certain narratives. Even fields like mathematics, which seem like they should be free from ideological influence, can fall prey to biases. There's no shortage of debates in fields like mathematics, philosophy, geology, and cosmology. Every discipline is subject to the influence of competing paradigms. You might have two major, conflicting paradigms within a field, or one dominant paradigm that everyone adheres to. If your research doesn't fit into that prevailing paradigm, you'll face pushback. Your funding might be cut, and you could even lose your job.

The enterprise of science is extremely corrupt. And there is no surprise here. Every human activity contains some level of corruption. It can be obvious corruption, like when politicians steal money, or it can be subtle, difficult to detect corruption, like when a researcher refuses to include a certain database or a certain method in their experiment. Intellectual authorities aren't authorities. The only authority that exists is direct contact with reality. That is the only authority you should put your trust in.

Allow me to conclude this section with an example.

I recently watched a video on YouTube about the causes of anger in young men. It featured a woman who claimed to be an expert on men's mental health. I only managed to listen to her for a minute:

"Men's primary sense of self-worth is based on their perceived status compared to their competition. If a man earns less than his peers, that triggers a sense of failure, and that's where the anger begins. It's all about how they see themselves in relation to the competition. If they toned down their competitive instincts, they'd feel less anger."

In just sixty seconds, she managed to say something so staggeringly stupid, I immediately stopped watching.

So let me get this straight: if I, as a young man, struggle with anger issues, it's because I'm too competitive? That if I feel like I'm falling behind, that's the root of my anger?

By that logic, if I took a trip to Bangladesh, my anger would vanish. Because compared to the poverty and hardship around me, I'd be doing great, so I should feel fine, right?

No. That's not how it works. I'm convinced this woman has never spoken to a single young man in her entire life. I doubt she has a son, or a younger brother, or even a nephew. She sounded like someone who has spent her entire career behind a desk, reading paper after paper, writing paper after paper, and doing zero empirical investigation.

Do you want to know what actually generates anger in young men?

Injustice. Betrayal. Lack of appreciation.

If I get convicted of a crime I didn't commit, I'll be furious.

If my girlfriend cheats on me, I'll be enraged.

If I spend years working hard, getting educated, putting in overtime, and still get passed over for a promotion, I'll be

angry.

That's not "competition". That's being kicked in the teeth by life, repeatedly, while being told it's somehow your fault for caring too much about status.

Maybe competition plays a role for some men in some contexts. But to claim it's the main cause of male anger? What the fuck are you talking about?

This is exactly why you can't trust "authority figures". Many of them recycle theories, push ideologies, and rely on abstract models that aren't tested in real life. And the problem doesn't stop with them.

Now imagine this woman's papers being read by thousands of college students. Imagine her textbooks shaping the minds of future therapists and psychologists. Imagine how far and wide that detached, baseless worldview will spread.

The only real authority is direct experience. Never trust humans who claim to be experts.

Observe The Lie Of Common Truth

- Look into how many scientific papers are accepted through peer review.
- Research the common reasons why so many papers are rejected.
- Investigate how many studies are ever empirically replicated or verified.
- Examine the political leanings of major academic institutions.
- Read about cases where experts were fired or silenced

for challenging prevailing methodologies, paradigms, or narratives in their field.

- Check the level of detail in large datasets and statistics—notice how much is generalized or missing.
- Look into documented cases of corruption within scientific journals.
- Reflect on how few events in your everyday life are ever officially recorded or studied.
- Talk to people. Ask them what they believe on various topics, and notice how often their opinions come not from research or firsthand experience, but from passive absorption of cultural norms.
- Watch how people react when you question mainstream beliefs. Observe the ridicule, the defensiveness, the discomfort with critical thinking.
- Notice how certain topics are completely absent from academic research or public conversation.
- Pay attention to how reductive and overly mathematical many studies are. See how they reduce human complexity to statistics and overlook rich, subjective experience.
- Read *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* by Thomas Kuhn.

The Lie Of Culture

You trust your culture. Everything you do in your life is culture. You are a fish in an ocean of culture, and you don't even notice how much culture has shaped you.

It doesn't matter which culture you are from. All cultures instill in people wrong ideas about reality. Here, I present the three major assumptions that comprise the Lie of Culture.

Don't. Trust. Your. Culture.

The Assumption Of Defect

Assumption: *Society isn't perfect, but most people seem to have a general sense of what it means to be a functional, healthy human being. So, if you're failing badly in some area of your life, most likely, it's your fault, that something is wrong with you. You're expected to work on yourself, improve, and correct whatever is broken.*

Even as I write this, I can feel how intuitive this assumption feels. It feels about right, doesn't it?

Let's say you are struggling with money, one of the major areas of life. If you have a lot less money than the average person, and for a very long time, that likely means you are doing something wrong. It's natural to struggle with money during short periods in our lives, but if you have been struggling for a very long time, it's an indication that you are doing something wrong. It's as though you are defective in some way.

But really, is that truly how life works? Of course, taking

responsibility and assuming agency is important, but if you aren't obtaining the results you desire out of life, is it truly rational to assume most of the blame and exclude the faults in your society?

If we are being truthful, as opposed to pragmatic, we must acknowledge that society imposes many restrictions on us. Our resources are limited. Our life circumstances, many of them outside our control. Our looks are outside our control. An internal locus of control is important, according to self-help gurus, but is it correct?

Society is a complex system. It contains so many variables, and so many of them are indeed outside our control. So, on the topic of control alone, any reasonable person would accept that realistically, our agency is limited.

On the topic of defect, who dictates what is a real defect, and an arbitrary one? Is autism a defect? Is social awkwardness a defect? Is an impulsive personality a defect?

Most people would define "defect" as something like this:

"A defect is a negative personality trait, or a pattern of behaviors, which an individual exhibits frequently, and that produces bad results. A defect goes against common understandings of healthy behaviors, healthy thought patterns, and healthy interactions with others."

Most people would assume a "defect" relates to normal conceptions of health, which in itself is a poor definition as it merely contrasts with its opposite, and it relates to bad results. Bullshit.

Here is the real definition of defect:

"A defect is anything that sets you apart from normalcy. It is any trait or behavior which deviates too much from what is normal in your culture".

In a tribe, health is irrelevant. The truth is irrelevant. What's relevant is whether you are part of the tribe, and the more you conform to it, the less defective you are perceived as. That's it.

Normalcy is something sacred in society. To be strange, abnormal, is to be defective.

And if you are suffering in one area of life, that does not necessarily mean that you are defective. It doesn't mean that you haven't been making the necessary sacrifices to gain the results you want, nor does it mean that there is something intrinsically wrong with you. All it means is there is an incompatibility between you and the culture you are in. Were you to be transported instantly to an even slightly different culture, more compatible with your character and your skills, you would succeed. Intelligence, character, skill, they all matter far less than geography. And geography matters less than psychological development.

If you are at stage Yellow (from Spiral Dynamics) and you live in a stage Orange society, you will suffer. If you are an atheist in a Muslim society, you will suffer. If you are a traditionalist in a secular, liberal society, you will suffer. If you are at stage Green in a stage Blue society, you will suffer. And if you are a healthy, stage Blue Christian, in a toxic, capitalistic, dogmatic, authoritarian, stage Green city, you will also suffer.

Your suffering is no indication of defect whatsoever. It is

only an indication of a gap between you and the expected standard in your tribe.

The Assumption Of Reciprocity

Assumption: *Our society is largely built on reciprocity. The more you give, the more you receive. The harder you work, the more you earn. The kinder you are to others, the more kindness you'll receive in return. This simple principle can resolve many of life's challenges. If you're struggling in any area, it may be a sign that you're not being reciprocal enough. If people dislike you, it could mean you haven't treated them well. Ultimately, you tend to get the money you deserve, the relationships you deserve, and the life you work for.*

This assumption puts a lot of focus on reciprocity. Let me tell you: reciprocity doesn't mean jack shit in society. Being nice to others doesn't mean they will be nice to you. Working hard and smart doesn't mean you will earn the money you deserve.

Humans don't value reciprocity that much. What they value is survival. If you interact with someone in such a way that they extract value from you, they will be grateful for it. It's not about "niceness" or "merit" or any fantasy like that. Reality is brutal. Society is brutal. It all comes down to survival.

Is your work, your service, providing a lot of survival value to someone else? If so, you will earn a lot of money. The more value people extract from you, the more they will reward you. It's not about "working hard" or "getting along with others". It's all about survival value.

When people take a 1 second glance at you, they instantly assess how much value they can extract from you. If their assessment is negative, it's over. Move on from that person. Move on from that person you are attracted to, or that employer, or whoever it is. It's all about value.

You can be a horrible human being, lack ethics, you can be a selfish son of a bitch, but if people get to extract survival out of you, your life will be dandy.

If you are wealthy, people will reward you for it. They will reward you with attention, love, relationships, and opportunities. If people perceive you as low value, they don't do jack shit for you.

Human survival is key. If you are exceptionally popular, wealthy, or attractive, that signals how much your existence can aid in other people's survival.

Kindness, meritocracy, reciprocity, cooperation, the golden rule, these don't mean anything.

Most humans are extremely unconscious. They are so unconscious that they can't even believe they are unconscious. Their prime directive is to seek immediate survival value. Not truth. Not justice. Not cooperation. Not "the greater good". They care about survival value. Their survival value.

The Assumption Of Fairness

Assumption: *Most of the time, society is fair. Most laws are fair. Most trials are fair. Most punishments people receive - be it official, legal punishments, or social punishments - tend to be fair. And the opposite is also true. When*

someone succeeds in something, when they gain prestige in something, it's usually through fair means, and the reward is fair. Yes, every once in a while, society fails and a criminal doesn't get the sentence they deserve - or the other way around, someone innocent is punished - but most of the time, society is quite fair. People are fair in the way they treat others.

Absolutely not. Fairness isn't a foundational value in society. This does go back to the Assumption of Defect. Because if someone is identified as "defective" and they receive a harsh punishment for it, by definition, people deem that as fair. But that's not fair at all.

Society is built on hierarchies and power structures. In many cases, power, not fairness, determines how a person is treated. The more power someone holds, the better the treatment they receive. While public backlash can target powerful individuals, it rarely strips them of their position. Meanwhile, those lower in the hierarchy often remain overlooked and disadvantaged. Power doesn't just mean money or politics—it includes status, popularity, and influence. Society functions through these invisible rankings. A small group earns most of the money, captures most of the attention, and commands most of the compassion. The rest are left with scraps. This follows the Pareto Distribution: a few have a lot, many have little, and some have nothing. And it's not about merit. It's about systems, perception, and our tendency to idolize those at the top.

Not just power, but Modern Religion¹ is also a major element that dictates what is "fair". The more one conforms

¹The concept of Modern Religion will be covered in a future section.

to their society's Religion, the better treatment they will receive. Fairness is almost irrelevant here. Adherence to the status quo is what matters. If you deviate too much from the status quo, that alone is perceived as a transgression. For that, you shall receive painful repercussions. But if you commit actual transgressions (e.g., ruin someone's life by committing defamation, censor them, remove their liberty, or fire them for political reasons, arrest them for being a "heretic"), then you shall receive little to no backlash. The action itself doesn't matter. Intent, action, result, they don't matter. What matters is adherence to the Common Truth, adherence to Culture, and adherence to the Modern Religion.

Observe The Lie Of Culture

- Think back to your childhood. Remember the foolish decisions you made just to fit in with your culture.
- Reflect on the things your culture once taught you—things you later discovered were false through direct experience.
- Observe how your culture treats those who are strange or abnormal in even the most superficial ways.
- Notice how transactional people are in everyday interactions.
- Talk to your coworkers. Ask about their past jobs and why they were fired, let go, or excluded from certain projects.
- Have a conversation with someone earning minimum wage. Ask about their routine, tasks, treatment by employers and customers, and weekly hours.

- Speak with high earners. Ask how they reached their positions. Don't rely on a single story—look at patterns across many people.
- Talk to someone from a low-income background. Ask about the challenges they've faced because of it.
- Observe how tribal people are—whether in school, college, or the workplace.
- Speak with someone who has struggled with addiction or mental illness.
- Speak with someone living with a disability.
- Speak with someone who has traveled extensively and experienced different cultures.
- Speak with someone from a different culture or religion. Ask what they think about their own culture—and yours.

The Lie Of Arrogance

The word "arrogance" tastes bad, doesn't it? Arrogance, Pride, Narcissism, Selfishness. Bad, evil words.

Society sure loves to demonize these concepts. And that's the peak of irony. Because demonizing a concept as a concept is quite different from demonizing its actual manifestation in the world.

Society doesn't hate arrogance at all. It worships it. It might be difficult to find someone out there who openly says, "I love narcissistic people", but the things people say and the way they behave in the world often don't match.

Here, I shall deconstruct society's problematic, hypocritical, self-righteous definitions and interpretations of "narcissism" and "humility".

The Assumption Of Narcissism

Assumption: *Selfishness, narcissism, and arrogance are not just moral flaws—they are practical liabilities. These traits warp your perception of reality, causing you to act in ways that are unethical, delusional, and ultimately self-defeating. While they may offer short-term gains, they tend to generate long-term consequences: damaged relationships, poor decision-making, and social isolation. These aren't just bad traits—they're serious defects of character. If you notice them in yourself, it's your responsibility to confront and correct them.*

It is likely that Donald J. Trump, the current president of the United States of America, has Narcissistic Personality Disorder. The mere fact that this is even a subject of de-

bate among psychologists is enough to prove he has strong narcissistic traits.

You might argue something along the lines of:

"Who cares? Trump is just an isolated example. For most people, it's bad to be narcissistic. These are indeed bad traits for someone to have."

I don't think you understand. Trump is the president of the United States of America. He is either the most powerful man on Earth, or the second (if we consider Putin the most powerful). One would expect that if society truly hates narcissism, people like this man would be rare among positions of power. And in positions of extreme power, in a secular democracy, would be even rarer.

Let's assume Trump's case doesn't convince you. That this is a mere anomaly. Go on YouTube and watch celebrity interviews. Watch at least 10 interviews with different celebrities. Listen to their words. Look at the way they dress. Listen to the way they speak about themselves. And listen to what they think about society and politics. You don't have to go out of your way to find particularly obnoxious celebrities. Pick a few from your favorite movies and some of your favorite musicians.

Celebrities are the most entitled, narcissistic, arrogant creatures on the fucking planet. They live in bubbles and befriend other elites, and they speak as though they understand the struggles of the middle class or the poor. They speak as though their status is in some way an indicator of their intelligence or increased perception of how the world works. And they use their platforms to promote their Modern Religion. They use their popularity

to comment on world events, as though every single celebrity out there is a political scientist, sociologist, and psychologist all in one. They are arrogant in every possible way. Not all celebrities are like this, but most of them are. Most celebrities are loud, obnoxious, and extremely narcissistic human beings.

And the fans love them. TV reporters love them. Everyone loves them. Everyone validates them.

Still not convinced? Perhaps you think that narcissism is merely an aftereffect of becoming successful and popular.

Do some research. Look up the traits that narcissistic people have, and how those traits correlate with success in areas of life.

Narcissistic people tend to appear attractive in the dating market and in general. They tend to promote themselves and their skills quite well in the job market. They tend to be confident, good-looking, and extroverted. And narcissistic individuals have the advantage of diminished empathy, so they suffer less from others' suffering.

In many ways, narcissism can be beneficial. But does that mean more is always better? Of course not. Excessive narcissism can create serious problems over time. Still, I believe it's better to lean slightly toward narcissism than to suppress it entirely. The idea that narcissism is inherently bad is a flawed, black-and-white view.

The Assumption Of Humility

Assumption: *Being humble helps you build stronger, more authentic relationships. It shows respect and makes people*

feel valued. Instead of bragging or trying to impress, letting your actions speak for themselves builds real respect and trust. As for intellectual humility, it's about staying open to new ideas and being willing to change your mind when presented with new information. It's not about being weak—it's about being strong enough to grow and learn. Intellectual humility opens the door for deeper conversations, better understanding, and a more meaningful exchange of ideas.

Aw. So cute. So fluffy and nice.

And complete bullshit.

Much like the case of narcissism, society says certain things about humility, but the way it responds to it is the opposite. Society might SAY that narcissism is bad. It might SAY that humility is good. But humility will be used to fuck you in the ass.

In the job market, humility is often used against you. It's a tool to downplay your accomplishments, to justify paying you less, and to keep you from recognizing your value. It convinces you to sell yourself short. The same thing happens in social settings. Sure, if you're humble, people might see you as a nice guy rather than an arrogant jerk—but nice guys are usually overlooked. People may like you, but they won't remember you. They won't care much about what you say or do.

Narcissism, for all its flaws, at least offers visibility. In social circles, it can give you a certain kind of leverage. It puts you in a position where your voice carries more weight, where people pay attention when you speak. It can make you more attractive, more engaging. People are drawn to

confidence. Even if it borders on arrogance. Because it makes you seem interesting, entertaining, and worth noticing. And that, frankly, can get you a lot further than being humble, quiet, and forgettable.

Intellectually, humility serves fuck you in the ass. It serves as a gaslighting mechanism. You must understand that not everyone's opinion on a topic is equally valid. Say you are a lawyer, and you are speaking with someone who is not a lawyer, on the topic of how the law works. During the conversation, the other person says they disagree with you. Here, you can be humble and say something like this:

"I understand your position. I may disagree with you, but I respect your opinion."

Or, you can be arrogant and say something like this:

"Nope, you're wrong. You're just wrong on this topic."

You would expect that people don't hold strong opinions on topics they don't understand. But that is very often the case. Topics that people have done zero research about, have zero education about, have zero experience on, they can still form strong opinions on them. Whereas you might actually be an expert on that topic, or at the very least have direct experience with it, and you still hold your convictions in too flimsy a manner. People will weaponize humility to shut down inconvenient truths and dissenting voices.

Yes, it's bad to be arrogant on a topic you don't dominate. And it's good to restrain yourself in that manner. But don't let yourself be excessively humble on topics you do understand. If you are too intellectually arrogant, that will put people off, but that's about it. Whereas if you

are too intellectually humble, you are allowing other people's (wrong) opinions to overwrite yours. You are allowing others to gaslight you, mislead you, and invalidate your knowledge and experience.

Excess humility is a huge liability. It's something that will bite you in the ass. Don't strive to be humble. Avoid it. Err on the side of arrogance, if need be.

"You should be humble and open-minded to other opinions."

Shut the fuck up.

Observe The Lie Of Arrogance

- Watch how insufferable most Hollywood celebrities are. Watch how they act in interviews and on their social media. Observe how they receive little to no criticism for their arrogance.
- Observe celebrities giving their rags-to-riches story. Notice how little acknowledgement they give to luck, and how much they credit their own talent.
- Watch how much confidence "tech bros" display in interviews.
- Observe your boss or manager.
- Speak with other managers. Low-ranking managers don't count—talk to those with actual power and decision-making authority.
- Think back to your high school days. What were the popular kids like? How did they behave?
- Look up studies on job interviews. How do social skills and confidence stack up against experience and qualifications?

- Look up why women are often attracted to narcissistic men.
- In groups of friends, observe how often the most humble member is also the least noticed or influential.
- Think of the people you deeply admire. How many of them would you describe as "humble"? Would humility even make your top ten traits?
- Think back to how many times in your life you have benefited from being humble.

The Lie Of Morality

You overestimate people's ability to distinguish right from wrong. Not only that, you overestimate your notions of morality. It might be tempting to believe that you are an evolved human being, and that those around you are also evolved, and that most people's sense of ethics is good enough. But that's wrong. Most people have a pisspoor sense of ethics. Ethics, for most people, comes down to - and I know I'm being repetitive - normalcy. Whatever they have been exposed to, whatever is common in their life, to them, that's good. What is unusual is evil. That's people's prime directive when it comes to ethics. It's that, and also their survival. The more someone assists in their human survival, the more they consider it "good". The more it harms their survival, the more they consider it "evil".

Let's explore this.

The Assumption Of Righteousness

Assumption: *There are concepts that most people universally agree are morally good. Generosity, compassion, equality, justice, tolerance, peace, freedom. These concepts are almost always aligned with morality.*

At first glance, this seems to be true. But this assumption is flawed for two main reasons.

The first reason is that, while people may say they value these traits, they don't always fully embody them. What they actually value is when these concepts are applied in a selective, convenient manner.

Take compassion, for example. Compassion is often re-

garded as universally good, right? Surely, you can't have too much compassion for others.

But in reality, people treat compassion as a limited resource. They even consider it morally wrong to show excessive compassion toward certain groups. So, whom shouldn't you show compassion toward? Those who don't align with your identity or tribe.

The philosopher Leo Gura touches on this idea:

"If you are too compassionate, if your sense of empathy is much higher than everyone around you, you will be attacked. You will be demonized. You will be called a demon. And you will be burned at the stake." (I don't recall the exact quote; this is a paraphrase of his original message.)

Completely right.

Compassion, as a universal value, is an illusion. It's used strategically, only in circumstances that align with personal or ideological interests.

- As a feminist, you can't have compassion for men.
- As a Christian, you can't have compassion for atheists.
- As a nationalist, you can't have compassion for immigrants.
- As a progressive, you can't have compassion for conservatives.
- As a judge, you can't have compassion for criminals.
- As a vegan, you can't have compassion for meat eaters.
- As a neurotypical, you can't have compassion for the neurodivergent.

There are strict boundaries around who deserves compassion. Cross these lines, and you'll face consequences.

The second reason this assumption is wrong is that, even when these values are applied holistically, they can sometimes be harmful.

Take freedom, for instance. While freedom is undeniably valuable, it cannot be granted without limits. If everyone had infinite freedom, someone's freedom would inevitably infringe upon someone else's. Absolute freedom is a fallacy. Using "freedom" as a blanket moral argument to justify certain actions is flawed. Freedom doesn't always equate to what's best for society as a whole.

The same applies to equality. This world is filled with asymmetries, and forcing equality in every domain is not only unrealistic but could also be harmful. People can't all earn the same salary. Not everyone can work the same hours. Not every criminal should receive the same prison sentence. Enforcing equality in every aspect of life can undermine meritocracy and lead to greater injustices elsewhere.

Striving for uniform equality in every situation can often do more harm than good.

So don't take these noble principles for granted. They aren't as righteous as you believe them to be.

The Assumption Of Evil

Assumption: *There are concepts that most people universally agree are morally bad. Greed, cruelty, discrimination, injustice, intolerance, violence, oppression. These concepts*

are almost always aligned with immorality.

A few weeks ago, I was called a neonazi on LinkedIn. I'm not kidding. I'm not exaggerating.

All I did was post something along the lines of:

"I don't think it's fair to call Elon Musk and all his fans Nazis. There's a large margin for criticizing Musk for his political actions, and room for differing opinions. But accusing someone of being a Nazi is a horrific accusation. I don't think he is a Nazi. And claiming that anyone who supports him is also a Nazi, that's crazy. It's defamation, and it's unfair to say something like that."

For this post, I received responses from people saying:

"I don't feel comfortable being associated with people *like you*. I have zero tolerance for neonazi apologetics, so I'm going to block you."

I lost a few LinkedIn connections that day. I was publicly defamed, flat-out accused of being a neonazi on a public platform. I simply expressed that I wasn't convinced he was a Nazi. And for that, I received righteous justice. Meanwhile, the people who didn't even know me or care about my opinion had no issue attacking me and dragging my character through the mud in such an aggressive manner.

Words like fascist, bigot, sexist, racist, neonazi, oppression, discrimination, violence, cruelty—these words have lost their meaning to me. If someone genuinely believes that publicly defaming me isn't cruel, and that my actions somehow amount to "promoting fascism" or "oppression," then their definition of those words is absurdly broad,

overly generous, and stripped of any real meaning.

What is oppression in the year 2025? Saying things people disagree with.

Discrimination, is it bad? Nope. Discrimination is quite good if you apply it selectively. Select a target, a group of people you consider your enemies (e.g., men, immigrants, some race, some religion, some identity, criminals, some demographic), and if you discriminate against that group, your tribe will support you.

Inequality? People celebrate inequality. People worship inequality. Inequality is an essential aspect of our society. Many people, when they see hobos living in the streets, think that's fair. They think those people deserve that lifestyle. Some people believe that the top 1% richest people deserve 90% of the wealth.

To most people, "justice" is merely an instrumental concept. They ONLY care about justice when it serves THEM.

If people's sense of morality is reductive, their sense of what constitutes evil is infantile.

Observe The Lie Of Morality

- Look up stories and statistics of innocent men who were convicted of rape.
- Watch true crime documentaries.
- Watch some videos on Larry Lawton's YouTube channel. Listen to his stories about prison, crime, and justice.
- Listen to the podcast "Triggernometry" on YouTube.

Hear the stories of people whose careers were cancelled, and why.

- Observe how people behave on social media. Notice the volume of hate speech and how selectively it is tolerated.
- Research prison sentences for various crimes. Reflect on whether the punishments are proportional.
- Notice how often celebrities are publicly defamed, sometimes without evidence.
- Observe how news propaganda organizations often present allegations as though they were confirmed facts.
- Watch how politicians attack their opponents' character rather than their policies, and how they vilify those in opposing parties.
- Observe how common it has become to dig up something someone said years ago and use it to morally discredit them today.
- Listen to how often people use moral language when discussing politics, world events, or those they dislike.
- Observe how little tolerance people have for ethical frameworks that differ from their own.
- Browse Reddit and notice how rigid, reductive, and dogmatic people's moral perspectives are.
- Observe how quickly people form harsh moral judgments about issues they barely understand.
- Notice how often dissent is met not with discussion, but with personal attacks and character assassination.

The Multiple Lies Of Modern Religions

Modern Religions have little to do with traditional ones like Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism, or Judaism, which I refer to as "old religions". The key difference is that Modern Religions are secular and materialistic, while old religions are spiritual. Still, both are belief systems rooted in dogma.

Here are the three main features of a Modern Religion:

1 - A Compelling Grand Narrative

A grand narrative is an overarching explanation for how society functions, especially in the context of Modern Religions, where it focuses on human interaction at a sociological level. It's not just about the individual, but about interpreting the world through the lens of collective systems and structures. While such narratives can offer useful insights, they also risk distorting reality. When you adopt one lens and ignore others, your view becomes exaggerated, and you begin to draw connections that don't truly exist. Grand narratives are also difficult to challenge: refuting one part doesn't dismantle the whole. They're so broad and self-reinforcing that they can seem consistent with reality, even when they aren't.

2 - Sexy Advertising

After presenting a grand narrative, the Modern Religion offers solutions. It promises justice, hope, and a path to a better society. It gives you tools to act on the world—to fix what's broken and create a fairer future. At the very least, it offers the comfort of meaning. And as an individual, you adopt it expecting some form of survival value—whether

social, moral, or material.

3 - Horrible Results

Lastly, the Modern Religion creates more problems than it solves. It amplifies suffering, both individually and collectively. And paradoxically, this increased suffering is then interpreted through the grand narrative itself, making the belief system feel even more convincing. The problems you once identified in your personal life and in society now seem bigger, more urgent, more real. And so, your faith in the ideology deepens.

Let's now explore the two Modern Religions that are destroying the secular world.

The Lies Of Late-Stage Capitalism

Capitalism is the oldest Modern Religion. At this point, many people have become aware of its issues, so I won't bother getting into too much detail deconstructing it.

It's easy to see how toxic capitalism has become. Despite major advancements in technology and automation, most people still work long hours and have little free time. For many, their profession has become their identity.

With today's levels of productivity—far beyond what we had 50 years ago—you'd expect people to work less and earn more. But the opposite has happened. The cliché that boomers had it easy is largely true. Millennials have faced far more economic pressure, and Zoomers have it even worse. Despite being one of the most educated generations, most Zoomers can't even afford to buy a home.

Instead of investigating these systemic problems, society

often responds with: "Just work harder." The belief is that if you try more, study more, and grind harder, you'll succeed. And if you're not succeeding, it's your fault. You're either not trying hard enough or you're simply not generating enough value.

It's not just the politicians who are to blame. It's not just the self-help gurus who profit by gaslighting the poor and desperate. The real fault lies with us. We, who tolerate this system. We, who pretend this lifestyle is healthy and normal. We are the ones who sustain the pyramid scheme.

There are people with Master's degrees who still can't land a white-collar job. People with decades of experience are turned away for being "overqualified". Creative, hard-working individuals with business ideas, but no access to capital. People who once had good jobs and decent salaries, only to watch their wages stagnate as inflation soared.

The proposed solutions to these people are preposterous.

- "Just learn to code."
- "Just change to a better-paying industry."
- "Just start a side hustle."
- "Just learn to invest."

People are being exploited—working themselves to exhaustion—and you're coming at me with simplistic advice? What the fuck are you talking about?

This obsession with work isn't just naive, it's outright gaslighting. People like Ben Shapiro have built entire careers lying to the poor, telling them their suffering is a personal failure.

We're bombarded with this absurd checklist of survival: learn tech skills, master AI tools, start a side hustle, optimize your LinkedIn, polish your CV, ace your job interviews, pay for overpriced courses, and take an expensive college degree—just for the chance to be seen in the job market.

Don't tell me this is how society is supposed to work. Don't pretend these expensive, time-wasting hoops are absolutely necessary. People shouldn't have to send out 100 resumes just to be ghosted by 99 companies and rejected by the one that replies. That's not "competition". That's a rigged game.

The Lies Of The Woke Religion

Some call it Neomaxism. Others call it Postmodernism. I call it the Woke Religion.

Wokeness is a modern belief system rooted in philosophical schools of thought developed by French nerds like Derrida and Foucault. Some elements of these philosophies are genuinely sophisticated. They delve into moral relativism, the nature of truth, the idea that truth is constructed rather than discovered, the presence of power structures in society, and even the broader definition of art.

The Woke Religion evolved from these ideas by focusing on social injustices, such as racism, sexism, homophobia, and other forms of discrimination. At its origin, it was a movement to challenge society's blind spots, power imbalances, and systemic corruption.

So what's the problem?

The problem is that this framework has turned into dogma. What began as a valuable lens for analyzing social issues has become a rigid worldview. You can no longer take off the lens. It's fused to your vision. Every event is now interpreted through the same binary of oppressor vs. oppressed.

If a black man is sent to prison, it's *because racism*, not a consequence of his actions.

If a woman doesn't get a promotion, it's *because patriarchy*, and not a matter of performance or merit.

If someone dislikes a movie with an LGBT character, *they a bigot*, and not someone with valid criticism of the story.

This isn't just a theory anymore. It's become a religion, with sins, heretics, and unquestionable doctrine.

This has become cynical beyond belief. And retarded beyond belief.

Another major issue with this Religion is that it preaches fighting fire with fire. It turns blacks against whites, women against men, LGBT against straight. Its primary strategy is to divide and conquer. Everything is filtered through the binary of oppressed vs. oppressor, and from there, further subdivided into competing victim hierarchies. Some groups are awarded more "oppression points" than others, creating a hypocritical hierarchy of compassion.

In this system, your personality doesn't matter. Your actions don't matter. All that matters is your skin color, your gender, and your sexual orientation. Reality is inverted—up is down, and down is up.

And it's not just antiwoke edgelord types like myself who see this. More and more people are waking up to the madness: James Lindsay, Douglas Murray, Piers Morgan, even Dr. Phil. And because this Religion is being questioned, it has grown more defensive than ever. The more you push back, the harder it pushes back in return.

Even if you feel drawn to this Modern Religion, say, because you're LGBT, don't fall for it. It doesn't actually serve you. It offers no real empowerment. It strips you of individuality and replaces it with a demographic label. It isolates you from people who might otherwise be your allies or friends, all because they fall outside your assigned category.

This Modern Religion deserves zero consideration. Don't even waste energy fighting it. It has too much cultural momentum to be stopped now. Instead, learn to navigate around it. Refuse to be pulled into endless culture wars and tribal conflicts.

Observe The Multiple Lies Of Modern Religions

- Watch videos of Oprah, the billionaire celebrity, commenting on the unfairness of capitalism.
- Watch multimillionaire Hollywood celebrities—living in mansions, secluded in elite bubbles—talk about immigration policies. Notice how those who live behind tall walls and private gates call anyone who discusses immigration control policies "racist".
- Watch interviews with Taylor Swift, a billionaire celebrity, where she claims that simply being a woman places her in the oppressed class, while the

average man working a regular or minimum-wage job is considered part of the privileged class and is protected by the patriarchy.

- Watch videos of the multimillionaire Hollywood celebrity Amandla Stenberg, in which she claims she is oppressed because she is black, and that Star Wars fans are racist for not liking her show.
- Observe Greta Thunberg as she criticizes the patriarchy for its environmental negligence. Then, unlike Greta, actually do some research: look into how many Environmental, Social, and Governance laws are passed each year. Investigate the extensive efforts by governments and corporations to address climate change and pollution.
- Compare today's purchasing power with that of 20 years ago.
- Look up graphs that show the divergence between average worker productivity and average wages over time.
- Watch Apple's marketing videos—this is a company that runs factories in China and exploits workers to the death - literally - while those same videos preach about Diversity, Inclusion, Equity, and Sustainability.
- Log into X for 2 minutes.
- Log into BlueSky for 2 minutes.
- Scroll through Reddit for 2 minutes. I suggest having a bucket nearby.
- Look up why Gen Z is "entitled".
- Join an activist group. It doesn't matter which cause. It can be a feminist group, or a veganism group, or a group of anti-war protestors. Observe their actions. Listen to the things they say and

believe.

- Look up how much money self-help gurus make.
- Notice how many people work very hard, for long hours, and are broke.
- Notice how many people have a lot of formal education, and are broke.
- Speak with someone who has been homeless at some point in their life.
- Watch videos and documentaries of what it is like to work as a police officer. And research how much money they make.
- Do research on what happens to money during recessions and depressions. Notice how the top 1% always become richer during those periods.
- Watch CNN, MSNBC, and Fox News. Again, bucket.
- Look up why Piers Morgan was fired from Good Morning Britain.
- Speak with a relative of yours who you know subscribes to a Modern Religion. Observe how dogmatic, assertive, emotional, and moralistic they become when their Religion is questioned.

Part II - Unleash Yourself

Take Back The Truth

Principle: Trust Your Lived Experiences

Reality doesn't exist in a database. It doesn't exist in a textbook. It doesn't exist between the ears of a scholar. It exists - it manifests itself - through sensory perception. You perceive reality through your senses. That is reality.

If you experienced something in the past, or are experiencing it right now, that's reality. That's not your opinion. That's not your belief system. It's reality. Yes, your senses can be flawed, and your perception can be incomplete or even biased in some way. But even then, a lived experience remains the closest approximation to truth, as it's the most direct way we encounter reality.

The moment someone tries to refute or downplay something you have experienced, stop engaging with them. Don't let others gaslight you. It doesn't matter even if they are the world's leading expert on the topic. Don't concede to anyone who tries to invalidate the reality you have experienced.

Principle: Trust Your Intuition

Right after direct experience comes intuition. Intuition is something strange. It's a kind of sense within you, almost like a vibe. Often, you can't even explain it. It doesn't manifest as logical, language-based reasoning, but more like a feeling. This feeling can be reliable. There will be times in your life when, for some reason, you feel compelled to make one decision over another. You don't quite know why,

and it's not something you could even justify or present an argument for. But it's a sense that guides you away from one path or pushes you toward another, without you fully understanding the "why". This sense can sometimes be confused with ego or emotional impulses, so it's important to be cautious. However, intuition is a powerful tool that, when honed, should be trusted.

Principle: Be Intellectually Arrogant

You should be able to stand in front of a large crowd and confidently say: "Yes. You are all wrong."

It's better to err on the side of excessive closed-mindedness than to let yourself be manipulated, gaslit, or misled.

If you have a strong conviction about something, don't let it go too easily. Don't surrender your belief just because you're trying to be mentally flexible or charitable toward someone else's opinion. If you know something to be true, then it's true. It's not just your opinion, and it's not up for debate.

And when you hold a belief with strong conviction, be extremely skeptical of the arguments and evidence presented to challenge it. Just because your stance is rare or unconventional, it doesn't diminish its truth. Even if your belief seems bizarre to most, stand firm in it. Be intellectually arrogant.

Take Back Your Power

Principle: Use Your Leverage

Life is full of conflict—not just with people, but with systems. For instance, do you want a high-paying job? You conflict with Capitalism, which wants to pay you as little as possible.

You can try persuasion or compromise, but those are weak tools when a conflict runs deep. When the stakes are high, people don't respond to empathy or truth—they respond to power.

Here are some examples of leverage:

- "You live under my roof."
- "Do it or you're fired."
- "Good luck replacing me. I know this business inside out."
- "You need a cybersecurity expert. Pay more or I'll walk."
- "Take the plea or find another lawyer."
- "I'm the hottest girlfriend you've had. You better treat me right or I'm gone."
- "You owe me money. Help me now, or I'm done helping you."
- "Hire me or try your luck with overpriced amateurs."

These examples are harsh, but they show how people act when survival or self-interest is on the line. They reveal a truth: to win, you need leverage—money, skills, knowledge, legal control, physical attraction, or even social influence; whatever gives you power in the situation. Often, you don't

even need to say it, as people intuitively know what you are doing, what you are hinting at. Be subtle.

Also, remember to think like an economist: understand what people want, what it's worth, and how much of it is out there. Then, position yourself accordingly.

Principle: Grow A Fucking Pair

We all end up in situations we hate—soul-crushing jobs, toxic relationships, or lives that feel like slow death. Sometimes, it's just a rough patch. But other times, it's because we've gone soft. We've grown scared of losing that job, that partner, that routine. Scared we won't find anything better. And so the years slip by, and life gets worse, because you're spending 8 hours a day doing something you hate, or stuck with someone who treats you like shit. All because you're a fucking pussy.

Grow a fucking pair and walk away. Bite that bullet. It won't be easy. Applying to jobs sucks. The fear of failure or homelessness is real. But risk is the price of freedom. If you want out of a bad life, you have to be willing to gamble.

Principle: Be Exceptionally Confident

Confidence is your armor in a world that constantly tests you. You need to walk into a room full of investors, look them in the eye, and tell them your business idea and vision—not as a possibility, not as a hope, but as something that *will* happen.

Be exceptionally confident. Never show weakness. Even if things are falling apart behind the scenes, you project

calm, certainty, and strength. Confidence is about having a deep, unshakable belief that whatever comes your way, you'll handle it. If you're stuck in a hole, you won't stay there. You'll claw your way out, brick by brick.

Confidence has three major advantages:

First, it gives you personal strength. It allows you to move through the world with power.

Second, it gives you the courage to take risks. Because you trust yourself to survive the fall.

And third, people trust confident individuals. They follow them. They invest in them. They want to be around them. Faith is something magnetic.

Don't underestimate the power of self-confidence.

Principle: Bite Your Tongue

Sometimes, life just fucking sucks. But restraint is a virtue. You need to learn how to endure temporary pain without making it worse. Never act on emotional impulse. Don't tell your boss to fuck off. Don't get into a fight. Don't make a snap decision you'll regret later.

When you're pissed off, or overwhelmed, say nothing. Do nothing. Just shut the fuck up and keep your composure.

- Someone tries to provoke you? Don't take the bait. Don't argue with them.
- Your boss threatens to fire you? Stay calm. Don't get defensive.
- Your wife slaps you in the face? Stand still.

Life contains many shitty situations, shitty individuals, and shitty conflicts. Learn to suck it up. Develop a high pain tolerance.

Principle: Avoid Depending On Others

Don't surrender your power. Once someone gains leverage over you, they're likely to use it. And there's no telling when they'll stop holding it over your head. Every time you depend on someone, you hand them a piece of control over your life.

- Rely on your sugar daddy to pay the bills? Bad idea.
- Found a company with your brother? Bad idea.
- Have your neighbors take care of your child? Bad idea.
- Borrow money from your family? Bad idea.
- Rely on that friend for rides to work? Bad idea.
- Rely on government subsidies to survive? Terrible idea.

Depend on others only in rare, unavoidable circumstances. And even then, plan to regain your independence as fast as possible.

Principle: Be Greedy

There's no escaping the religion of Capitalism. You might as well learn to play the game. Prioritize your finances. Never settle for mediocrity when it comes to money. Learn the skills that make you valuable. Demand what you're worth.

In job interviews, always negotiate. Never accept the first offer. Don't take low-paying jobs unless you have no choice. And even then, have a plan to move up fast.

To survive in this world, your finances must be sharp. Don't tolerate a mediocre job, a mediocre salary, or a stagnant bank account. Be greedy.

Principle: Be Selfish With Your Resources

Time, money, and energy—these are your most valuable assets. Don't waste them on people who drain you. Often, it's those closest to you—friends, family, loved ones—who come asking, expecting, demanding.

It's okay to help. But help carefully. Be strategic, not naive. Don't fall into the trap of idiotically generous or blindly compassionate behavior. Your resources are limited, and your goals come first.

Only give when you're 100% sure it won't set you back or pull you off course.

Principle: Avoid The Danger Zone

Being selfish doesn't mean you can do or say whatever you want without consequences. Don't be a fucking idiot.

Every situation has what I call a danger zone. This is a line you don't cross. It's where the odds of a good outcome drop to near zero, and the chances of blowback skyrocket.

Sure, some things are obvious: don't commit crimes, don't rob banks, don't assault people, don't harass women. But

part of the danger zone is subtle. It shows up in everyday life, and if you're not careful, it'll wreck your reputation, career, and relationships.

- You're having lunch with coworkers and your manager. Want to drop a politically incorrect joke? Bad idea.
- You're at a modern business conference surrounded by wokies. Want to share your opinion on this or that policy? Bad idea.
- You're with friends, and you've got a joke about people with disabilities—but one of them has a parent in a wheelchair. Bad idea.
- You're on LinkedIn, being bombarded by woke propaganda daily. Want to share your opinion on it? Not worth it. Trust me on this one.
- You're 21 years old, and there's this 17-year-old girl who - **NOPE NOPE NOPE**.

Know the environment you're in. Read the room. Right now, in Germany, people are getting arrested over "hateful" social media posts. That's how real the danger zone is.

Take Back Your Influence

Principle: Own The Narrative

In any conflict, controlling the narrative is key. One person might accuse you of being abusive, while you feel wronged. Others will form opinions, but they'll only have partial truths.

Don't waste time explaining yourself or debating who's right or wrong. Avoid admitting fault in ways that weaken your position, like "I made a mistake, but she did this too". This allows others to twist the narrative. Acknowledge your role when necessary, but don't let anyone distort the facts. Stand by your version of events.

Own the narrative. Don't let others misrepresent the facts or gaslight you. Their version isn't as valid as yours. If you don't control the narrative, the other person will—and they'll win by sheer stubbornness. Be equally stubborn. Stand your ground and refuse to let anyone distort the truth.

Also, avoid vague phrases like "I think" or "in my opinion". Be direct: "I did X," "She did Y," "Z happened". This keeps the narrative clear and objective, leaving no room for distortion.

Principle: Be Sophisticated

Humans are animals who hate the fact that they are animals. Our animal traits are seen as disgusting, reprehensible, and immoral by society.

In the 21st century, the image of a healthy, moral man is

asexual, immune to anger, never raises his voice, innocent, and formal. Our society demonizes displays of sex and anger, especially in men. Even an act as trivial as saying "shit" is frowned upon, because it is an explicit form of transgression.

Decorum and self-restraint are fundamental to living in society. The less sophisticated you are, the less power you will hold in life.

Principle: Be Extremely Shallow

People are unbelievably, incredibly, instinctively, relentlessly, impressively, extraordinarily shallow. Unfortunately.

Your body, your clothes, your face, your posture, your tone of voice—these matter far more than what you say. Your appearance makes up 99% of the impression you leave. So optimize it. Sharpen it. Master your appearance.

Principle: Be Machiavellian

Don't see people as people. See them as tools or obstacles. Be cold, calculated, and pragmatic in how you interact with others. Of course, this doesn't apply to every single individual in your life. Don't look at your children and think: "What's the survival value I can extract from these creatures?" Don't turn into a sociopath.

But for 99% of the people you'll deal with in life, this mindset will serve you well.

Don't try too hard to reason with others. Don't share too much. Don't see people as allies. Don't trust others. Don't

waste energy getting emotionally involved in someone else's story.

Ask yourself: "What's my goal in this situation?" Then act in a way that moves you toward it. Give others what they need, so they'll give you what you want. Keep your emotions in check. Be detached. Be strategic. Be pragmatic.

Principle: Don't Be Negative

Depression, stress, anger, complaining, criticizing, these are all states and behaviors people find repulsive. You can be negative in private or with your therapist, but not in front of others.

No one cares about your suffering. Don't vent. Don't cry. Don't complain. And don't preach, don't criticize, don't insult, don't attack even if you're 100% right. Even if you're following your principles. Even if you're justified in your anger over an unfair situation, don't show it.

Negativity only serves as a social repellent. No matter how justified you feel, keep your negative energy to yourself.

Principle: Give Them The Bullshit

People crave pleasant illusions and despise inconvenient truths. Honesty is overrated.

Treat most interactions like a job interview. The person who gets the job isn't the most honest candidate—it's the one who tells the most compelling story, sells themselves best, and out-bullshits the competition.

Give people a huge pile of bullshit, and they will give you power in return.

Euphemisms, exaggerations, promises, even lies, it's all fair game.

Principle: Be Selfish With Your Words

Don't overexplain yourself or overshare information.

Take Back Your Soul

Principle: Don't Bend Over Backwards

Many of us tend to bend over backwards in various areas of life, whether it's staying late at work due to "company culture" or taking on more expenses than a partner in a relationship. This behavior isn't limited to the insecure or meek; we all do it. The reasons for bending over backwards usually come down to two factors.

Avoiding problems and conflicts

The first reason involves situations like dealing with an immature relative who doesn't help with chores. To avoid arguments, you take on more tasks, thinking it's a reasonable compromise. However, this just leads to the other person becoming lazier, and you becoming increasingly resentful and overwhelmed. This doesn't solve the issue; it only delays it.

Seeking something in return

The second reason is based on the Assumption of Reciprocity, so we think sacrificing ourselves will lead to something in return. For example, staying late at work to increase your chances of promotion seems logical, but employers don't care about these sacrifices in reality. Even high performers can be overlooked or fired, proving that personal sacrifices go unappreciated most of the time.

It is simply not worth bending over backwards for others.

Principle: Be Selfish With Your Mental Energy

Most conflicts are unnecessary. People will provoke, bait, and try to drag you into their level of stupidity. You gain nothing by engaging with them. Engaging with them is nothing more than rolling in the mud with fools. These conflicts serve only to distract you from your life goals and lower your consciousness. Don't do it.

Don't let retards live rent-free in your head. By allowing yourself to be upset by their actions or attitudes, by dwelling on something that irritates you, you are wasting mental energy on something that doesn't serve you.

If you keep having recurring thoughts about a past conflict with a moron, observe it. Catch that thought. Let it go.

Principle: Be Selfish With Your Happiness

Notice how often your happiness depends on external things: people, outcomes, and approval. Catch yourself in those moments, and let them go. This isn't easy. We're wired to seek satisfaction through others and outside conditions. It's an addiction. But like any addiction, its grip can weaken through practice, discipline, and awareness.

Make it a lifelong commitment to reclaim your happiness. Don't let anyone hold it hostage, like a terrorist with demands. Learn to generate joy on your own, with what you already have. Be fiercely self-reliant. Your happiness belongs to you. Guard it like your life depends on it.

Principle: Be Evil

You probably think of yourself as a "good person". But where did that identity come from? Did you build it yourself through critical thinking and alignment with your own principles? Or did you inherit it passively, by conforming to your culture, your peers, or the dogmas of the Modern Religion?

The identity of being "good" is a trap. It limits you. It stops you from doing what you want, not because your actions violate your values, but because they violate what you've been taught is acceptable. You reject desire, instinct, even honesty—not out of principle, but out of fear of being "bad."

Drop it. Don't be a good person. Be evil.

Allow yourself to think evil thoughts. Say the wrong thing. Break the rules. Be an evil motherfucker. Not for the sake of chaos, but to free yourself from inherited guilt. Reject the morality you didn't choose.

And here's the irony: by doing this, by discarding the borrowed script, you'll become more authentic and more ethical on your own terms. You'll live a fuller life. You'll stop performing and start acting from truth.

Principle: Be Selfish Right Now

If you are already a selfish bastard, kudos to you. You are ahead of the curve. But if you are reading this document for the first time and are still learning how to apply these principles, studying them isn't enough. You will need to remind yourself daily that you want to be selfish. Remind

yourself that being selfish is essential.

"I just need to bend over backwards today, this week, to finish this project at work, then I'll be selfish".

"I'll just help my family with these annoying errands. Next month, I'll try to train myself to be more selfish."

"Tomorrow is my girlfriend's birthday. It would be wrong to end the relationship today. I'll do it some other time."

Stop with the excuses. Drop it.

You must be selfish **TODAY**.

You're stuck in the rat race. Your life is busy, loud, and stupid. You're constantly moving, constantly doing, but never arriving. You grind through tasks, chase goals, and still feel like you're not productive enough.

This endless motion keeps you distracted. It kills reflection. You never stop long enough to ask: "Is this the life I want?"

Be selfish **TODAY**.

Part III - Become a Selfish Egoist

I wrote this during a rough mental period in my life. I was struggling, not just with myself, but with life. I couldn't understand how society actually worked, or why people behaved the way they did. Everything felt off, as if I had been living under an illusion.

That's when I came across the philosophy of Selfish Egoism by Max Stirner. His book "The Ego and Its Own" is chaotic, sarcastic, and often incoherent. But it gave me something valuable: a new lens. And through that lens, everything started to make more sense.

The problem I ran into, though, was the lack of practical material. Like many philosophical texts, Stirner's work is abstract and impractical. The principles I outline in this document - I didn't get them from books. I derived them myself. They're not just techniques; they're fundamental lessons I have learned through experience, suffering, introspection, and hard analysis.

I've come to realise that humans are inherently selfish. Radically selfish. And most are in denial about it. Especially the loudest ones. The political activists, the moral crusaders, the righteous voices on social media. Underneath the slogans and posturing, they're nothing but self-serving.

At the core of every human action is selfishness. Not always malicious. But always present. There's no logic in pretending otherwise. We are wired this way. Demonizing selfishness is like demonizing hunger, it won't make it go away.

What I advocate is conscious selfishness. Mature selfishness. The kind that starts with knowing yourself deeply,

understanding your desires clearly, and owning them unapologetically, without dressing them up in moral theater or fake virtue.

I wrote this to explore a nuanced, realistic, and ultimately healthy form of selfishness. These principles aren't absolute. They won't apply to every situation. But they're fundamental. They serve as anchors. And when you're lost in confusion or indecision, they can bring clarity.

I used to think people were complicated. That they were unpredictable, incoherent, and impossible to please. But I've realized that the lens I was using to view the world was completely broken. Distorted by Culture. Warped by ideas that made no sense in the real world. I believed idiotic things, taught to me by institutions and moral systems, that didn't match my lived experience. That mismatch caused me confusion, anger, and deep frustration.

But people aren't that complicated. There are a few core ideas that explain most human behavior, individually and collectively. Once you grasp them, the chaos begins to make sense. That's what this document aims to capture.

But this isn't about injecting more ideology into your skull. Quite the opposite. I see Selfish Egoism not as a belief system to adopt, but as the default state. This is you, stripped of bullshit. You, minus Culture. Minus the Common Truth. Minus the morality theater. This is the starting point: you.

To live a fulfilling life, authenticity is non-negotiable. But selfishness alone isn't enough. We do live in a society. We have to coexist. That means learning how to balance your self-interest with the minimum structure needed to survive

and connect with others.

These principles are vague on purpose. They aren't commandments. They aren't meant to be taken literally. You have to use your head. Your intuition. Learn how to apply them to your life.

Take the principle "Be Intellectually Arrogant". I don't mean that in some naive, absolutist way. My version of intellectual arrogance means trusting your judgment when it's earned. It's grounded in competence, clarity, and experience. It doesn't mean being idiotically self-confident. It doesn't mean rejecting evidence or shutting off your critical thinking just to cling to the narratives you want to believe.

Every principle in this manifesto has that same caveat. You can't follow them blindly. You have to reflect, adapt, and test them against your lived experience. There is no one-size-fits-all.

Selfish Egoism isn't for fools. It's not for immature, reactive people looking for excuses to be even more impulsive or cruel. It's for those who want to self-actualize. It's for those who have a mature sense of identity and want to deepen it.

Most people think that being evolved means having a small ego. That sounds noble. But it's wrong. A truly evolved person is somewhat narcissistic. In the sense that they know who they are, they have a grounded, stable view of themselves and how the world works. They don't pretend all perspectives are equal. They don't flatter bullshit.

Because there's too much noise out there. Too many garbage ideas are being dressed up as compassion or

progress. It's hard enough just to understand what's happening, let alone make sense of it.

My version of Selfish Egoism cuts through that noise. It's not about arrogance for the sake of ego. It's about building independence—mental, emotional, and social. It's about freeing yourself from the delusions of Culture and taking back your agency. That's what this is really about.

Most people do little to no critical thinking. Most people think whatever those around them think. Most people say and do whatever those around them say and do. It's shocking. It never ceases to shock me how little people bother to question things. How intellectually lazy they are. If I were to give you a single principle to follow, it would be: "Think For Yourself".

Think for yourself. Act for yourself. Believe in yourself. Always yourself. Always your goals, always your future, your resources, your principles. The only person who can ever teach you about life, who can ever guide you through life, is yourself.

I invite you to become a Selfish Egoist. Don't take the red pill; take the black pill. See the bullshit around you. See the stupidity, the evil, the arrogance, the self-righteousness, the dishonesty around you. And transcend all of that by becoming radically independent.

I invite you to become a powerful and authentic human being.

"Freedom isn't granted; it is taken." - Max Stirner