



▣ [CLICK HERE FOR ADVERTISEMENT RATES](#)



## Why Elites And Psychopaths Are Useless To Society

0 0 0 0

by [Larry Diffey](#) , [May 16, 2014](#)

new-world-order elites

*This article was written by Brandon Smith and originally published at [Alt-Market.com](#)*

The ultimate and final goal of evil is to obscure and destroy our very conception of evil itself, to change the inherent moral fiber of all humanity until people can no longer recognize what is right and what is wrong. Evil is not a wisp of theological myth or a simplistic explanation for the aberrant behaviors of the criminal underbelly; rather, it is a tangible and ever present force in our world. It exists in each and every one of us. All men do battle with this force for the entirety of our lives in the hope that when we leave this Earth, we will leave it better and not worse.

When evil manifests among organized groups of people in the halls of power, power by itself is not always considered the greatest prize. The true prize is to mold society until it reflects the psychopathy that rots at the core of their being. That is to say, the elites, the oligarchy, the mad philosopher kings want to make us just like they are: proudly soulless. Only then can they rule, because only then will they be totally unopposed.

The problem is humanity is not only hardwired with a dark side; we are also hardwired with a conscience — at least, most of us are.

The vast studies of psychiatrist Carl Gustav Jung prove an in-depth and intricate inborn set of principles common to every person, regardless of time or place of birth and regardless of environmental circumstances. In some circles we refer to this as “natural law.” All people are born with a shared moral compass that is often expressed in various religious works throughout the ages. It is a universal voice, or guide, that we can choose to listen to or to ignore. Organized psychopaths have struggled with the existence of this inborn compass for centuries.

They have tried using force and fear. They have tried abusing our natural inclinations toward family and tribalism. They have tried corrupting the very religious institutions that are supposed to reinforce our consciences and teach us nobility. They have tried psychotropic substances and medications to paralyze our emotional center and make us malleable. They have tried everything, and they have failed so far. How

do I know they have failed? Because you are able to read this article today.

Two methods remain prominent in the arsenal of elites.

### **Convince Good People To Do Evil In The Name Of ‘Good’**

This strategy is still effective, depending on the scenario encountered. Elitists are very fond of presenting mind games to the public (in TV, cinema, books, etc.), which I call “no-win scenarios.” These games are hypothetical dilemmas that require the participant or viewer to make a forced choice with only two options: The participant can strictly follow his conscience, which usually means assured destruction for himself and others; or he can bend or break the rules of conscience in order to save lives and achieve a “greater good.”

Watch the propaganda tsunami in the show “24,” for example, and tally how many times the hero is faced with a no-win scenario. Then tally how many times he ignores his moral imperative in order to succeed. The message being sent is clear: Solid morality is not logical. Morality is a luxury for those who do not have to concern themselves with immediate survival. In other words, the world needs bad men to fight other bad men.

Of course, real life is not television; and there has never been nor will there ever be a legitimate example of a no-win scenario. There are no dilemmas that require good people to knowingly sacrifice conscience or destroy innocent lives in order to succeed. There are no dilemmas with only two available solutions. All social dilemmas are fluid, which means that solutions are shifting, but infinite. Just because you cannot see the way out does not mean the way out does not exist. To fight monsters, we do not need to become monsters. Survival is meaningless unless we can prove ourselves worthy of life. This does not mean one should not fight back against evil. On the contrary, one should always fight back. But if we fight without a code of principles and honor, then we will have lost before the battle begins.

### **Convince Good People That There Is No Such Thing As ‘Evil’ People**

Any action, no matter how horrifying, can be rationalized by the intellectual mind or the mathematical mind. This is why we are born with an emotional and empathic side to our natures. Those who embrace evil often seek to soften their image through the use of cold rationalization. They appeal to our desire to feel logically responsible and to boost our intelligent self-image.

Some people might argue that the machinations of evil are self-evident, and that philosophical examinations such as this are unnecessary. They would say that there is no need to reassert that the works of psychopathy and elitism are fundamentally destructive, but they would be wrong. I was recently sifting through some mainstream articles when I came across this jewel entitled [“Why Psychopaths Are More Successful.”](#)

The article summarizes the theories behind a new “science self-help book” entitled *The Good Psychopath’s Guide To Success*. Co-author and Oxford psychology professor, Kevin Dutton, states that he “wanted to debunk the myth that all psychopaths are bad.” He wrote:

“I’d done research with the special forces, with surgeons, with top hedge fund managers and barristers. Almost all of them had psychopathic traits, but they’d harnessed them in ways to make them better at what they do.”

Now, three important questions need to be asked of Dutton. First, what exactly is his definition of success? Second, if such people are “better” at what they do because of their psychopathic traits, who exactly are they “better” than? Is he suggesting that a non-psychopath could not be just as good a surgeon? Wouldn’t it be preferable to be good surgeon *without* psychopathy, one who still cares about the well-being of his patients rather than just his own success? And third, if a person can be accomplished in a field without abandoning his conscience as a psychopath does, what good is psychopathy to anyone?

You see, elitist academics like Dutton are not interested in answering such questions in an honest way because their goal is not necessarily to outline a legitimate argument for the usefulness of psychopaths.

What they really want is to make psychopathy a morally acceptable ideal in the mainstream.

Dutton does this by asserting the false notion that there are such things as good psychopaths and bad psychopaths, thereby creating a superficial dichotomy he essentially pulled from thin air. Dutton cites several character traits *he* defines as being common to good psychopaths.

**Psychopath Volume Control:** Dutton argues that a good psychopath has the ability to turn up or turn down his level of perceived empathy in order to avoid burning bridges with those around him. What Dutton fails to mention (or just doesn't understand) is that this "volume control" is very common to the average psychopath. In fact, psychopaths tend to be quite adept at reading the emotional states of others and adapting to their moods to appear more human. This is how psychopaths end up in marriages, with families and in positions of respect in a community. This is how psychopaths become leaders. Catastrophes arise, however, when the psychopath decides he is comfortable enough that he no longer needs to hide his inability to feel conscience or remorse. There is nothing special or good about a morally bankrupt person who happens to be good at disguise.

**Fearlessness:** Dutton's claim that psychopaths are fearless is simply absurd and is not based in any practical psychology that I know of. Psychopaths are afraid all of the time. What they fear most is losing what they believe belongs to them. This could be money, power or even unlucky people caught in their web. This fear might drive them to take risks in order to accomplish certain goals. But let's be clear: Only those who take risks because they *love* what they do have truly overcome fear. Psychopaths are incapable of true love.

**Lack Of Empathy:** This is the root of the movement toward rationalized moral relativism — the argument that empathy gets in the way of success and sometimes gets in the way of the "greater good." Dutton claims that lack of empathy gives the psychopath focus, making him skilled in high-pressure situations. In a hostage situation, he says, he would much rather have a psychopath as his negotiator. Of course, he does not consider that his captors would likely be the same kinds of psychopaths he so praises in his book.

One would conclude by reading Dutton's position that high-pressure jobs require a lack of empathy. And of course, the jobs with the highest pressure are those in political and military leadership. The philosophy of applying positive assumptions to psychopathic qualities is the highest dream of the elite. If you and I could be convinced to see their gruesome behavior as fully necessary to the greater good, then they will have ascended to a place beyond accountability. They become like the old gods of Olympus, dealing death and destruction above the judgment of mere mortals; and we will have handed them that godhood.

**Self-Confidence:** I think Dutton is confused over the difference between confidence and narcissism. The average psychopath is often self-obsessed, which means he is willing to do anything to get what he wants. This drive might be impressive, but it is not a product of the kind of self-awareness required to gain real self-confidence. A parasitic tick is not necessarily self-confident when he digs into the flesh of a dog; all he knows is that he desperately wants the blood underneath.

## **A Kingdom Of Psychopaths**

In his collected writings entitled "The Undiscovered Self," Jung theorized according to his work with hundreds of patients that some 10 percent of the human population at any given time has latent psychopathic characteristics, with a much smaller percentage living as full-fledged psychopaths. He surmised that this latent psychopathy will often stay hidden or unconscious for most people, unless their social environment becomes unstable enough to bring out their darker side.

The purges in the early days of communist Russia and Stalinism, for example, brought out the very worst in many normally harmless citizens. Neighbor turned against neighbor, and betrayal for personal gain became the norm. The collectivist hive became an incubator for psychopaths. What Dutton's psychopathic success theory does not take into account is the fact that America, and much of the world today, is becoming a breeding ground for morally bankrupt people. That is to say, our society is now designed by psychopaths for psychopaths, and only psychopaths could succeed in such an environment. We are all

being encouraged to become more psychopathic, more evil, in order to survive and thrive.

The destruction unleashed by the psychopathy of elitism far outweighs any potential benefits that might arise from their uncompromising brand of ingenuity. Anything these freaks of the psyche might accomplish can be accomplished with far less physical and moral cost by those with self-discipline and a love of their fellow man. I would be willing to wager any power monger that if he and his miscreant organizations were to disappear, humanity would leap forward in strides never before seen. Ultimately, those who embrace evil and those who elevate psychopathy are not the key to the betterment of the world; they are obstacles to the betterment of the world.

Categories: [all-oathkeeper-posts](#), [oathkeeper-articles](#)

## About Author



[Larry Diffey](#)