Prejudice And A Modern Nullification

The prejudice [1] is in regard to a living person, with the nullification being of his voluminous writings, written over a period of some fourteen years (2012-2026) [2], who has asserted that he has, as a result of experiences - a pathei-mathos [3] - abandoned the extremist beliefs and activities of his past.

This nullification, a rejection and a dismissal, has two primary causes. (α) The belief or allegation that those writings are a deception by someone who "lies through his teeth" [4] is deceitful [5] and still a neo-nazi, and (β) the belief or allegation that they are a "disingenuous sinister trick" and part of a "Sinister Game that advises 'not trust what people say about their experiences, their 'achievements', and themselves" [6] by a person who allegedly has for decades been involved with what has been termed, in academia, as "a new religious movement" [7] and as "an esoteric Satanist cosmology, practice, and movement"; [8] with the person in question once described by an antifascist group as "the most evil Nazi in Britain." Sometimes, individuals believe or promote both causes.

In practical terms, this means and has meant that all those all those post-2012 writings can be rejected and have been rejected without any study, discussion, comment or consideration of them because the author has already been prejudicially judged. This often public rejection is either a deliberate one or a result of a use by others of fallacies such as ad populum and appeal to authority. [9] Deliberate, due to a belief in, for example, certain political causes or ideologies such as the broad, decentralised movement termed 'antifascism' which includes opposition to National Socialism and to those who are described as or alleged to be 'neo-nazis' and/or 'racists'.

The beliefs and allegations that are the basis for the rejection and dismal of that assertion by Myatt of his rejection of extremism, and thus of those post-2012 writings, are and have been and will probably continue to be widely spread for many years by means such as the Internet, leading to those writings, and the philosophy of pathei-mathos derived from them, being either ignored in academia or (as has occurred) considered in terms of those beliefs and allegations. Hence, given the prevalence of those beliefs and allegations, and the apparent zeal of persons and 'policy groups' propagating them, there is unlikely to be, for perhaps fifty years or more, any scholarly unbiased research using primary sources into Myatt's adult life, his rejection of extremism, and his philosophy of pathei-mathos.

Rufus Malisius
November 2026

°°°

[1] Prejudice is "a judgement formed before due examination or consideration; a premature or hasty judgement; a prejudgement; preconceived opinion not based on reason or actual experience; bias, partiality; unreasoned dislike, hostility; an unreasoning preference or objection; a preliminary or anticipatory judgement; a feeling, favourable or unfavourable, towards any person or thing, prior to or not based on actual experience; a prepossession; a bias or leaning to one side; an unreasoning predilection or objection." Oxford English Dictionary, second edition, Oxford University Press, 1989, volume 12 (Poi-Que)

[2] A selection of these post-2012 writings is currently (November 2026) available at https://davidmyatt.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/11/myatt-selected-works.pdf

[3] The person in question, David Myatt, has defined pathei-mathos in one of post-2012 writings as "learning from adversary, or wisdom arises from (personal) suffering; or personal experience is the genesis of true learning." Glossary of The Philosophy of Pathei-Mathos, *The Numinous Way Of Pathei-Mathos*, seventh edition, 2022, ISBN 9781484096642

[4] The statement was made by the CEO of a British antifascist organization in a March 2022 interview

with journalist Justin Ling.

[5] It is "impossible to accept any statement of his as based on honesty..." Filip Lindström, *Across the Abyss: Heideggerian impact on the Occult Longtermism of the Order of Nine Angles*, MA Thesis 2025.

[6] Andrew Palella, *Toward the Galactic Imperium: The Order of Nine Angles, Cosmic Accelerationism, and the Occult Politics of Neo-Fascism*, 2024, Journal for the Study of Radicalism.

[7] Shanon Shah, Jane Cooper & Suzanne Newcombe, *Occult Beliefs and the Far Right: The Case of the Order of Nine Angles,* 2023, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/1057610X.2023.2195065

[8] Daveed Gartenstein-Ross & Emelie Chace-Donahue, *The Order of Nine Angles: Cosmology, Practice & Movement*, 2023, https://doi.org/10.1080/1057610X.2023.2186737

[9] The Fallacy of Ad Populum is when a person either 'follows the crowd' and believes or claims that because so many others have claimed or believe something it is probably true, or when they are convinced, usually emotively, by a propagandist or politician or by some populist speaker that something is true or that someone or some many are guilty or culpable.

The Fallacy of Appeal to Authority, also known as the fallacy of Argumentum ad Verecundiam, is somewhat misunderstood in this age of the Internet. It is not only citing or quoting a person or persons who is/are regarded, by the person citing or quoting or by others, as an authority or 'expert' on a subject but also citing or quoting the opinion given by some institution, or 'policy/advisory group' or similar, on a subject, regardless of whether or not the 'expert' or institution or whatever has their opinion published by some means or some medium regarded as 'mainstream', academic, or 'respectable' or authoritative.

The crux of the fallacy is a reliance by someone or by some others on who or what is regarded in a particular society as an authority on or as having a detailed or 'expert' knowledge of a subject or subjects. The corollary of the appeal to authority is personal research by scholarly means of a subject using primary sources.

In the matter of authorship of contemporary written or printed material, a primary source is "a text or an item which a person had confirmed they had written, or which two or more accredited forensic linguists were of the opinion, through for a example a comparison with the known works that person had confirmed they had written, that that person had indeed written the text or the item in question. A common fallacy is the assumption that certain published, often printed, material – such as the text of an interview – are primary sources whereas, unless verified by certain means they are secondary sources. Hence, an interview with an individual printed in a newspaper or magazine is a secondary source, often judged to be hearsay, unless and until the interviewee and/or the interviewer affirms (for example in a Court of Law) that it is or was a true and accurate account of what that interviewee said, or, if a recording was made, unless or until that recording has been verified as authentic by the person interviewed and/or verified as untampered with by an agreed expert (for example one appointed by the Police or similar authority) with a history of testimony in Courts of Law." *Myatt And The Convenience Of Conjecture*, 2026, https://davidmyatt.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/myatt-and-the-convenience-of-conjecture.pdf

---

Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-ND 4.0) license