

# Non-white Fragility

by [Nikos Akritas](#) (February 2025)



When he became close to God (Wardell Milan, 2019)

**The lexicon of the woke** is ever expanding and protean. For example, *whiteness*, which in normal parlance pertains to colour is not subject to such constraints for woke activists. *Whiteness* is, according to the enlightened, also a mind-set.

People who are white don't just share a skin colour but certain qualities too.

Those qualities, according to wokeistas, basically boil down to being *racist*. This disorder is inescapable for whites, they are born with it. This is because *white* also no longer pertains purely to colour. It is now a synonym for *racist*, *bigot*, *evil* (depending on the context used).<sup>[1]</sup> Its expanded use is predicated on its original reference to colour—to white people; being those possessing white skin, which of course also means they have *white minds*.

And here we come to the crux of it. *Whiteness* is the result of having a *white mind*. All white people have *white minds*. But *non-whites*, and thinking *whites*, beware. For the corollary is not that *non-whites* have *non-white minds*. Non-whites, in similar fashion to arguments around trans-identity, can have *white minds*. Unlike trans, there is no self-identification, the woke decide. Possessing a mind that does not match an individual's skin colour is, though, a possibility only afforded to non-whites.

So some non-whites can have *white minds*. But how to identify these *white minds* if skin colour is not an indicator? As already alluded to, *white minds* are racist minds; minds that cannot escape their biological reality. To have a *white mind* (all white people) is to be racist. And those non-whites who have *white minds* partake in *whiteness*. *Whiteness* is, therefore, racism and all the concepts that underpin that racism.

The woke world view is that Western societies are inherently unfair, racist societies—basically *white*. Therefore everything upon which the West is built is inherently racist, because it upholds a *white system*. This illustrates how Enlightenment concepts such as rationality, equality, liberty and individual rights are also racist—I mean *white*. Because, of course, these concepts originated with white men and came to fruition in

white societies—I mean racist men and racist societies. The whole edifice, therefore, must be destroyed.

Objecting to all of this is purely a consequence of *white fragility*. For according to woke reasoning, being white, or partaking in *whiteness*, you either recognise you are racist or are, to borrow a concept from psychoanalytic theory, *in denial*. Damned if you do and damned if you don't. To be in denial is to refuse to perceive painful facts exist.[\[2\]](#) It is a defence mechanism.

Another defence mechanism in the repertoire of psychoanalytic theory is *projection*. Projection is when “unwanted feelings are displaced onto another person. A common form of projection occurs when an individual, threatened by his own angry feelings, accuses another of harbouring hostile thoughts.”[\[3\]](#)

Here we have two defence mechanisms, *denial* and *projection*, both coping strategies for stress or anxiety. When accusations of *white fragility* are bandied about, which coping strategy is really at play? Is it a denial of ‘facts’ or a projection of anger?

Is it a fact that the West, the only part of the world to engage in rigorous debate against slavery and eventually stamp it out, is inherently racist? Is it a fact that the principles of individual and equal rights and the concepts of rationality and objectivity originate with, reinforce and ensure the continuity of racism? Or is it that anger, emanating from anxiety of low self-esteem, has been projected onto the West due to its dominance over the last few centuries?

If the intellectually impoverished concept of *white fragility* is indeed the projection of anger against a dominant culture where does that anger stem from if the ‘dominant culture’ actually encourages and enables all peoples to share in its fruits? Encourages participation and benefit in a view of humanity where, regardless of skin colour, ethnicity or

religion, everyone is protected by the same laws and afforded the same rights and opportunities. Could the anger itself emanate from denial, the very defence mechanism wokeristas accuse others of?

What might that denial be? Could it be the culture railed against has indeed struck upon something no other has in human history? Concepts of fairness, justice, equality, individual rights and freedom of truly universal application; not judging people by their skin colour but by their actions; the responsibility for such actions not projected onto others sharing the same skin colour but, through respect for individual human rights, are considered individual responsibility.

Could it be that this culture has discovered some genuinely objective truths about the world? Resulting in scientific advances which provide an unprecedented standard of living; possesses a philosophical, literary and artistic tradition which seeks to understand the human condition via a common humanity, not seeking to reinforce divisions between people; that has developed systems of governance, social organisation and wealth creation delivering a standard of living envied the world over.

Refusing to see oneself as having a place in such a society is to see it as 'other,' existentially different, alien and, ultimately, not worthy of emulation. But given this wealth, not just material but intellectual and spiritual, why would one dismiss it as unworthy? Is this, essentially, resentment of a culture for its success? Resentment of its awe-inspiring achievements and the arduousness of emulating them? Failing to take one's place in such a culture results from either rejection or failure.

The plethora of *non-whites* succeeding in the Western world only demonstrates it is not a world which discriminates according to colour, ethnicity or religion. Western culture is

one of openness. Individuals discriminate not businesses, organizations or countries; unless of course one can point to the discriminatory rules, laws and practises of any of these—which, in such societies, can be discussed, debated and changed. Perceived discrimination or ‘feelings’ of discrimination are not necessarily grounded in fact.

Those feelings might, however, be grounded in low self-esteem. The feelings of low or non-achievement when comparisons of the culture one chooses to identify with do not measure up to that which has been designated evil. And so, any achievement in the distant past of any culture considered *white* is deemed a *stolen legacy* (whites created nothing good, they ‘stole’ the achievements of non-white peoples); where those civilizations are judged not by their philosophical, literary, artistic and scientific achievements but by practices judged abhorrent today; where a *non-white* culture, being of even more ancient provenance than its white counterparts (although also guilty of those abhorrent practices), is *appropriated* wholesale and painted as a veritable Garden of Eden—although, confusingly, pride is taken in its military conquests[4].

In addition, the idea of attempting to explain phenomena devoid of metaphysical speculation, begun over 2,500 years ago and found to be of value once again during the Renaissance and Enlightenment periods, is not, ultimately, epistemological but an underhand scheme to reinforce a *white world system*. The stamping out of slavery was not genuinely out of concern for fellow human beings but an attempt to ruin others’ economies. The study of other societies, the deciphering of long lost languages and the translation of foreign texts does not stem from an openness to, and appreciation of, other cultures but a sinister strategy to gain dominance over others. The language and framing of human rights is part of a conspiracy to sustain that dominance and expressing concerns over the environment are really, at root, attempts to stop other countries developing.

The woke seek to deny or discredit the achievements of Western civilizations purely because they are associated with *white* people. Failing to discredit these achievements, they smear them with abhorrent claims, the argument being any particular 'achievement' is not to be celebrated or worthy of emulation due to its association with *whiteness*. Hence, any achievements made by white people are either not really due to them or not to be celebrated by association with an odious (*white*) culture.

But even wokeness is embedded in Western concepts and so tainted with *whiteness*. Just as the Romantic Movement sought utopian escape from rational Europe and Communists object to the capitalist West, their opposition to Western ideas were/are, in themselves, Western ideas. Their conception, growth, development and expression originate and are rooted in *whiteness*. It is testament to Western liberalism that such views can be expressed, 'debated' and considered at all. For this is just one of the strengths of liberalism, which the woke attempt to use against it – the very concept of free speech: to disagree and oppose, in recognition that nobody is infallible.

Given outright rejection of *whiteness* and by association everything Western, past and present (this would include wokeness), what are the alternatives for society? What *non-white* models of knowledge construction, economic policy and social organization should be adopted? If rationalism, logic, individual rights and free speech are to be shunned where are the *non-white* alternatives? Those claiming whites, or indeed those tainted with whiteness, disagreeing with them are guilty of *white fragility* expose their own fragility; and are unable to offer anything of *non-white* provenance which compares.

They are in denial that their very own ideas stem from a tradition and culture which values knowledge to the extent everything is open to question and all ideas are given due consideration (even, at times, illogical, nonsensical and

divisive ones). They are in denial that not only do their own ideas come from a culture they describe as *white* but that they require this culture in which to thrive, as a parasite requires its host. They are in denial that nothing has ever come close to the achievements in sheer volume, richness and depth of Western societies; societies they choose to see as *white* but which themselves respect universal human rights.

Whichever defence mechanism the woke and their associates choose to employ, consciously or not, it is steeped in the fragility of an inferiority complex. But the divisions are of their own making, their enemies only existing by virtue of their own pathologies.

---

[\[1\]](#) Claiming such insults are not terms of abuse but points of fact and seeking to gaslight those at the receiving end, causing them to question all their assumptions and the actual reality of the situation, is analogous to situations of domestic abuse – where the abuser seeks to convince the victim they have their best interests at heart and the perceived abuse is all in their head.

[\[2\]](#) Definitions taken from the Encyclopaedia Britannica online (retrieved 19 October 2024). By using the Encyclopaedia Britannica, rather than Wikipedia, I am fully aware I am using a vetted source valuing rigorous analysis and therefore favouring a method of gathering knowledge which is accused of upholding a white world view.

[\[3\]](#) Encyclopaedia Britannica online (retrieved 19 October 2024).

[\[4\]](#) I am, of course, referring to claims of ancient Egypt being a Black Civilization.

## [Table of Contents](#)

[Nikos Akritas](#) has worked as a teacher in the Middle East,

Central Asia and the UK.

**Follow NER on Twitter [@NERIconoclast](https://twitter.com/NERIconoclast)**