

MANIFESTO

on

HUMAN AUTHENTICITY AND DECENCY

Against False Aesthetics, and in Defense of Restraint

I: ABOUT ARTIFICIAL GROOMING NORMS AND THE COSMETIC HARASSMENT OF WOMEN

In the modern world, few deceptions are more entrenched or more quietly cruel than the idea that human beauty is something innate, visible, or equitable. We pretend to admire the human form, but only after it has been filtered, painted, plucked, shaven, perfumed, deodorized, costumed, and lit. What we call "beauty" is, in truth, a cultural hallucination supported by industry and upheld by coercion, quite often self-inflicted for conformance.

No animal is subjected to this artifice. The dolphin does not brush its skin; the cheetah does not contour its face; the swan wears no jewels. Their elegance is intrinsic, not imposed. But the human animal, especially the human female, is told from infancy that her value lies not in her mind, nor her action, but in the curation of her surface. That is not nature. That is harassment.

The injustice is not merely visual, but moral and economic. The average woman is expected to:

- Spend vast sums on products meant to hide age, reshape features, or emulate mythical standards;

- Dedicate daily time to laborious rituals—painting, shaving, masking, concealing, scenting;
- Endure judgment for non-compliance, and be told she disrespects others if she presents herself unadorned.

Meanwhile, many men spend three minutes grooming, and sometime less, never look in a mirror, and are praised for "authenticity." The asymmetry is grotesque.

I do not wear makeup. I do not shave for display. I wear clothes until there is more hole than thread. My dogs groom themselves better than I. They know no gendered decorum, and none would ever attempt to mate with another outside the rare window of mutual readiness. They do not subjugate, deceive, or posture. They are, in many ways, more morally aligned than the modern human.

This is not a manifesto of primitivism. It is a call for honesty.

Let us stop pretending that cultural beauty is natural.

Let us stop equating respect with artificial polish.

Let us stop burdening women with the cost of their own societal approval.

If we cannot even depict our true faces without offending modern sensibilities, then we are not evolved. We are censored by our own fictions.

To be seen as we are—unpainted, unshaped, and unashamed—would be a revolution.

II: INSTINCT AND DECENCY — A DEFENSE OF MORAL CLARITY IN HUMAN RELATIONS

There is instinct, and there is decency. To confuse them is to degrade both.

Human beings, like all mammals, are subject to natural attraction—driven by biology, informed by form, and shaped by unchosen rituals of nature. Men are often drawn to youth and secondary sexual traits; women may be drawn to strength, or stability, or sometimes the exact opposite. These instincts are not shameful. They are not culture's invention. They are part of what we are.

What defines our humanity, however, is not what we feel, but how we act. Between impulse and behavior stands the force that makes civilization possible: decency.

In every school, on every field, there are thousands—millions—of coaches, teachers, mentors. Many of them feel attraction to the vitality, or promise of those they teach. They would be lying to deny it. Yet only a few betray that trust. The overwhelming majority uphold their moral dignity—not by denying instinct, but by mastering it.

Likewise, in the lives of husbands and wives, how many chances arise for betrayal within the small circle of family and friends? Temptation is everywhere. But many remain faithful—not because they are unfeeling, but because they are decent. They value loyalty above appetite. They do not lie about what they feel—but they govern it.

This is what we must recover: a culture that does not deny desire, but neither idolizes it; a culture that elevates self-restraint as a virtue, not a repression.

Today's society attempts to rewrite instinct through ideology. It tells men not only to control their desire—which is right—but to pretend they do not feel it at all—which is dishonest. It tells women they must conceal their age, erase their bodies, and wear the appearance of youth—but then condemns men who respond to that illusion.

This is a culture of contradiction, not morality.

We must return to moral realism:

- Acknowledge desire.
- Elevate decency.
- Reject hypocrisy.

Let women be what they are, not what they are pressured to appear. Let men feel what they feel, without being shamed for it—but with the full moral obligation to govern themselves.

When everyone is honest about nature and faithful to conscience, then justice is possible.

This is not the law of instinct. It is the law of decency.

Civilization is not the absence of instinct, but the mastery of it.

III: ON INSTINCT, THOUGHT, AND THE BOUNDARY OF JUSTICE

There is a widespread confusion in the moral imagination of modern society: that thoughts are actions, that instincts are choices, and that goodness can be judged from the interior alone.

This is false.

One may have the instinct of a killer, or of a thief, and yet never kill or steal. Another may kill or steal without ever having felt a deep instinct to do so. And yet, it is the second who is punished, while the first—who perhaps struggled heroically with darker impulses—is left free. There is a cruel irony in this, and also a crucial truth: we are not our instincts; we are what we do with them.

Thoughts, urges, and even passions—however disordered—are not crimes. They are signals, sometimes warnings, sometimes temptations, but not yet deeds. To confuse instinct with guilt is to criminalize the condition of being human.

But neither does innocence reside in lack of impulse. A man who never felt the urge to steal does not prove virtue by abstaining from theft. A woman who never once wished to harm cannot claim moral superiority for her peace. Ethics begins only when struggle begins—when there is something to overcome.

I myself am a peaceful person, but I have a short temper. When I lose it, I know I am capable of violence. That knowledge is not shameful—it is essential. I know my fault; therefore, I prepare for it. I must avoid direct confrontation, I prefer the written word. I protect others from my own weakness by admitting it exists.

It is only by facing our own darkness that we can truly walk in the light.

Modern culture would prefer we wear masks—deny instinct, hide emotion, and speak in slogans. But no mask ever made a person moral. Only self-knowledge can do that.

Γνῶθι σεαυτόν— Know thyself. And then act justly.

IV: ON PREJUDICE AND THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THOUGHT AND HARM

There is another form of judgment that modern societies struggle to address: prejudice—the pre-judgment of others before understanding them. It is ubiquitous, contradictory, and often invisible to its host. One may declare love for one group while expressing hatred for another, without realizing the logical failure in holding both positions. Prejudice has no internal boundary: it attaches itself to race, language, culture, age, sex, wealth, even music and cuisine.

And yet, it is crucial to distinguish between prejudice as thought and prejudice as harm.

Prejudice, while often foolish and based in ignorance, is not itself a moral violation. It is a mental condition—a filter through which people see the world. What matters, ethically, is not the filter but the behavior it produces.

Modern culture, in its moral fervor, often seeks to eradicate prejudice by silencing thought rather than confronting harmful action. But this is misguided. People do not become just by denying their internal biases. They become just by refusing to act on them unjustly.

A person may harbor suspicion, discomfort, even dislike toward a group—yet still treat every individual from that group with fairness and respect. Another may proclaim universal tolerance, yet humiliate and mistreat others behind closed doors.

It is not the thought that counts. It is the deed.

A society that criminalizes thought, or demands ideological conformity, will eventually turn on its own citizens. A society that tolerates thought, but enforces

justice in action, can live in peace.

Let us strive not to perfect each other's inner worlds, but to build a world in which outward behavior is governed by fairness, restraint, and dignity.

Prejudice may be a flaw of the mind. But mistreating another on the basis of that prejudice is a failure of the soul.