

# AN INTERESTING CONVERSATION IN AN INTERESTING PLACE

---

## I. AN INTERESTING CONVERSATION

Recently, a sub unaffiliated with ours featured a small discussion about yours truly, the Marxist Anti-Imperialist Collective (MAC) and its associated subreddits. The content and results of this discussion are incredibly interesting, so I felt it appropriate to share them here. However, I would like to make this clear: *under absolutely no circumstance is the reader invited to partake in the discussion mentioned.* This is against Reddit's site rules. Anybody who does this will be banned from the MAC's related subs.

With that said, the discussion took place on GenZhou, the educational arm of GenZedong, one of the largest left subs on Reddit. The topic regarded Marxist-Leninist "YouTubers" and how Marxists-Leninists online tend not to have "party lines" in the way that actual Marxist-Leninist parties do. This prompted one user to correct them, saying that /r/EuropeanSocialists follows a line as a real ML party would<sup>i</sup> (it is true!). Another user replied to this, saying:

[/r/EuropeanSocialists](#) certainly does seem to have a party line. However, it's one that holds

that LGBT people are comparable to paedophiles and arose due to bourgeois decadence, so they really shouldn't be promoted or defended.<sup>ii</sup>

We'll ignore the accusations for the time being. What we are interested in is one particular user's response, which is currently tagged as "*controversial*", meaning the comment has a fairly even ratio of likes-to-dislikes. The comment goes:

LGBT people are comparable to pedophiles, whether you like it or not. Both are biologically normal variations from cis-het individuals with sexual preferences deviating from the empirical norm. Whether that acknowledgement of physical reality makes you uncomfortable and whether you reject that reality for emotional reasons isn't relevant, that's simply how it is.

You are putting ideological faith over material reality. Your ideas are based on personal morality rather than science. If you treat sexual preference for pre-pubescent children different from sexual preferences for the same gender or for non-human animals/objects, just because your ideology says that's expedient, you are no longer a Marxist as your position has become anti-scientific and inconsistent.<sup>iii</sup>

One might wonder: "is this a *homophobe* from MAC, pushing the usual message about homosexuality being comparable to pedophilia?" No, not at all. In fact, the person commenting is actually a *self-asserted pedophile* trying to plead his case.

You are basing your arguments on personal morality/ideology instead of science. **Claiming children can't give consent is a moral, ideological argument without scientific basis.**

Pedophilia isn't harmful to children. You are conflating sexual preference with rape. **You can support pedophiles but oppose child rape.**

**Having sex with children has been normal throughout history just like homosexuality. Animals do it, too.** Child psychologists have never found any actual evidence of loving, consensual intercourse harming children and **any alleged psychological harm probably stems from stigmatization and victimization by people opposed to the act.**

**Being a pedophile is morally equivalent to being a homosexual: It's not a choice, it can't be cured, it's simply the way it is. Hating pedophiles is morally equivalent to hating homosexuals:** Your repulsion against someone's sexual preferences isn't an argument.

Why is that important? Because **you support gay-rights and any argument used against pedophiles can (and is) being used against homosexuals and is equally invalid.**<sup>iv</sup>

These arguments are quite familiar, are they not? I have asserted before that pedophiles are *automatically justified* by the acceptance of homosexuality, because no argument can be made for homosexuality that does not also indirectly justify pedophilia without the use of arbitrarily conceived moral arguments. Read my article *Liberalism and Family Degeneration*, and you will

see what I wrote about this phenomenon. I claimed that there is no argument about homosexuality which does not implicitly justify pedophilia, thus, whenever the pedophile hears the homosexual defend himself, *he sees his greatest potential ally*, no matter how harshly the homosexual rejects this friendship and insists sincerely they are different. And now, we have a pedophile telling us the same thing!

Of course, it is necessary to ask: is this user putting on a show, “playing the part” of the pedophile in order to prove a point about homosexuality? *Maybe*, but I do not think that he is, because in response to the user showing him a quote from one of our moderators calling homosexuality “degeneration”, the supposed pedophile wrote:

Oh, okay, so you found a bunch of conservative losers who are mods on that sub. Why do people feel the need to talk about gay rights or racism or whatever in a socialist forum at all? Sure, complain about anti-LGBT bullshit all you want and criticize them for it. Meanwhile, there are far more important things going on for which they should be supported.<sup>v</sup>

This leads one to believe that he is being serious about his support for both homosexuality and pedophilia.

In short, this is a firsthand example of what the pedophile thinks about homosexuality. Is it not precisely what we have been saying? And we have been hounded at every turn for saying it.

Let us now turn to the user he was arguing with, a common detractor of ours who we shall kindly refer to as “the chondrichthyes”. The chondrichthyes, struggling to figure out what sets him apart from the pedophile, writes:

The simple fact that they are both "variations from a norm" does not make them the same. Paedophilia is harmful to children, obviously, while homosexuality is not.

I treat them as different because they are different. If a child is raped by a paedophile, they will suffer for much of their life due to the trauma. If two men have sex with each other, nobody is harmed. Unless you're gonna make the claim that raping a child and having sex with someone of the same gender are morally equatable?<sup>vi</sup>

He says this as if a real pedophile didn't just write multiple paragraphs to him claiming that raping children and having sex with people of the same gender are morally equitable. In other words, the chondrichthyes *has been backed into a corner*, his argument has completely fallen apart, and now he resorts to merely repeating: “Yeah, but do you *really* believe that?”

What is important about the chondrichthyes' argument is not that it does not convince us. What does our opinion matter? We are mere observers. What is important is that *it does not convince the pedophile*, who knows first-hand what his own psychology entails.

The pedophile is clearly skeptical of the claim that he and the homosexual are actually that different, and instead of being convinced by the explanations given from the pro-LGBT fellow, he has only been *reinforced – nearly every single argument he used to justify pedophilia was merely repeated back to him to justify homosexuality*, with the caveat: “Do you really think they’re equitable?”

What is the fruit of this argument? It leaves the poor chondrichthyes beaten into submission:

Yeah fine I get it, not acting on your  
paedophilia is fine.<sup>vii</sup>

That is the fruit of the “pro-LGBT, but anti-P” position that we have been criticizing some time.

This whole conversation occurs on the same forum whose moderators advocate forming mobs of transgenders to execute proletarians of imperialized countries for being “transphobic”.<sup>viii</sup> These people, who say pedophilia is “fine” as long as you do not act on it, are willing to kill people over their beliefs in sexuality. The pedophile is already on their side – is it anything more than a matter of time before they realize they are on his? That he is their closest ally, and that they share a common enemy? The reader may think what they’d like of that.

## II. RESPONDING TO CLAIMS

We should also address some claims that were asserted by the chondrichthyes during the discussion which concern the MAC in general, F. Kuqe (“Albanian Bolsheviki”) and J. Volker (“Frogsknecht”) in particular. He says:

Their head mod, Albanian Bolsheviki, and another mod Frogsknecht... I do have some other disgusting things they say.<sup>ix</sup>

For Kuqe, he says:

Here's the head mod of Euro Socialists saying homosexuality is "sexual degeneration":

- Homosexuals will follow up and say to us that it is reactionary opposing sexual degeneration which was there from the time of slavery, and he will proceed to tell us that capitalism and feudalism are "backwards" towards slave society. He will then proceed to tell us that the imperialist parasitism is more progressive (this imperialism parasitism which breeds the acceptange and mass producing of these behaviors) than industrial capitalism, and he will then proceed to tell us that virtually all advanced socialist societies were "backwards" on this single issue, while the Yanks and their satelites are progressive!<sup>x</sup>

That is what Kuqe, an Albanian proletarian whose family grew up in Socialist Albania, said to “disgust” this Westerner.

But the chondrichthyes spends more time on Volker:

Here's frogsknecht with an absolute howler in the most absurd essay I've ever seen, saying literally everyone on Earth needs to have children for the species to continue, and the very existence of being gay is due to pornography.<sup>xi</sup>

What I actually say that is that homosexuality *in most cases* arises out of the “sex object” in *prostitution*, and that pornography is simply an extension of prostitution. But no matter, it's close enough. However, that “everyone on earth must have a child for the species to continue” – I mean, isn't this a given? If you do not have children, you die out. In a hundred years, what part of the human species will still be living? Those whose ancestors reproduced. Who will be extinct? Those whose ancestors did not reproduce.

That is “the most absurd” thing the chondrichthyes has “ever seen”.

Now, what is interesting is when, attacking us, he sarcastically says:

It's not like we see any other animals exhibiting homosexuality.

What must the pedophile think when he sees the “animals do it” argument to justify LGBT? He's already said:



Having sex with children has been normal throughout history just like homosexuality. Animals do it, too.

So when he hears “animals practiced homosexuality, therefore it is okay,” he thinks, “See? He already agrees with me. Give it some time and he’ll come around to my position too.”

The chondrichthyes then quotes:

- What is pedophilia? It is intercourse with a child who cannot reasonably reproduce, and further, cannot reasonably be expected to raise and parent children, for they have not even completed their own psychological and biological development. The act of intercourse with children can only happen in the mind that sees sexual intercourse as a matter first and foremost of pleasure, and only secondarily for reproduction.

But this is apparently wrong. The chondrichthyes argues:

To Frog, paedophilia isn't wrong due to the trauma it would cause the child, it is wrong because they cannot reproduce themselves yet and the principal reason for sex is reproduction.<sup>xii</sup>

So, is sex that does not traumatize the child fine? According to our friend here, it is perfectly fine to have sex with a child *as long as it does not traumatize them*.

How does the chondrichthyes handle this glaring fact? He will try to excuse himself from this obvious conclusion by arguing that “sex will always traumatize the child, so the argument is invalid.” Ultimately, this is an admission that “it is fine to have sex with a child if it does not traumatize them, but it will always traumatize them.” And where will it go from here? The pedophile merely needs to repeat what he said earlier:

Child psychologists have never found any actual evidence of loving, consensual intercourse harming children and any alleged psychological harm probably stems from stigmatization and victimization by people opposed to the act.

And the debate will devolve into the homosexual and pedophile going back and forth saying, “No it doesn’t,” “Yes it does.” Any homosexuals who *believe* what the “child psychologists” have “discovered” is at once won to the cause of pedophilia.

How *effective* of an argument is that?

In conclusion, I reviewed this conversation entirely for the reader’s sake. I am not inviting a feud between subs or a personal debate among users, and again, *do not under any circumstances comment on the threads involved or you will be banned from all MAC-related forums*. But there is certainly something to be learned from this conversation.

J. VOLKER

Update: after a couple days, the moderators have taken down the pedophile's comments in the original thread here:

[https://www.reddit.com/r/GenZhou/comments/q0mxpp/im\\_confused\\_about\\_mlyoutubers/](https://www.reddit.com/r/GenZhou/comments/q0mxpp/im_confused_about_mlyoutubers/)

Luckily, I have archived the conversation we are interested in here:

[https://archive.org/details/images\\_20211008](https://archive.org/details/images_20211008)

The following links have been adjusted for the archived sources.

---

<sup>i</sup> Image 1.

<sup>ii</sup> Image 1.

<sup>iii</sup> Image 1.

<sup>iv</sup> Image 2.

<sup>v</sup> Image 2.

<sup>vi</sup> Image 3.

<sup>vii</sup> Image 4.

<sup>viii</sup> Image 6. This one is still up:

[https://www.reddit.com/r/GenZhou/comments/q1stbu/thoughts\\_on\\_reuropeansocialists\\_subreddit/hfh0rwg/](https://www.reddit.com/r/GenZhou/comments/q1stbu/thoughts_on_reuropeansocialists_subreddit/hfh0rwg/)

<sup>ix</sup> Image 3.

<sup>x</sup> Image 3.

<sup>xi</sup> Image 3.

<sup>xii</sup> Image 5.