

Desecrated Kindness: Simulacra, Sodomitic Metaphor, and the Ritual Weaponization of Virtue in Postmodern Moral Discourse

HAMID JAVANBAKHT*

September 5, 2025

Abstract

This paper investigates how contemporary moral discourse—particularly within digital forums and ideological spaces—deploys *quasi-value statements* to invert traditional moral categories. What appears as courage or transcendence is, in many cases, a ritual desecration of virtues such as kindness, love, and truth. Analyzing a symbolic threat embedded in sodomitic metaphor—specifically, a violent response to calls for kindness—this study reveals how moral language is co-opted for the purposes of dominance and humiliation. Drawing on Baudrillard’s theory of *simulacra*, Weingartner and Haring’s *value logic* (especially the concept of E₃-type evil), Zoroastrian dualism (asha vs. druj), and performative speech ethics, the paper argues that we are witnessing not new forms of virtue, but simulated moral authority parasitic on the values it mocks. This rhetorical desecration constitutes a shift from outright denial of kindness to its symbolic inversion—and requires urgent philosophical and spiritual vigilance.

*DBA Sebastian Ruliad, Isoteleses Inc.
Mountain View, CA isoteleses@proton.me

“You know what’s really
praiseworthy? Taking the ‘*be kind*’
slogan and stuffing it up evil’s
behind. Watch your back.”

Anonymous Facebook Comment,
2025

1 Kindness Under Siege

In contemporary moral discourse—particularly in digital arenas saturated with ideological conflict—the virtue of kindness has become a contested terrain. Once regarded as an essential ethical predicate, kindness is increasingly subjected to symbolic inversion: it is no longer merely dismissed as naïve or weak, but actively desecrated, ridiculed, and weaponized. The imperative to “be kind” has been hollowed out, refashioned as either a sarcastic slogan or a tool of performative moral coercion.

This shift reveals a deeper phenomenon: the emergence of what Jean Baudrillard terms the *simulacrum*—a sign that no longer refers to any reality, but instead simulates the appearance of meaning. Within this framework, kindness is not rejected; it is staged. The command to be kind becomes a ritualized performance, its referential substance evacuated. As a result, symbolic violence can now operate beneath a veneer of compassion. Acts of humiliation, censorship, or rhetorical domination are justified through appeals to kindness, even when they contradict its ontological essence.

Consider the rhetorical aggression encoded in the phrase: “You know what’s really praiseworthy? Taking the ‘*be kind*’ slogan and stuffing it up evil’s behind. Watch your back.” This is not simply a rejection of kindness—it is a threat masked as virtue. The sodomitic metaphor, once associated with taboo, is now redeployed as a symbolic act of purification through humiliation. Here, kindness is not merely dismissed, but penetrated, desecrated, and expelled in a ritual of pseudo-moral violence.

From a Zoroastrian perspective, however, this gesture is doubly self-defeating. The act of ritual sodomy, far from purging evil, is precisely what evil itself performs in its most generative moment. According to Zoroastrian cosmology, when Ahriman—the “Spirit of Aridity and Death” and “Lord of Lies”—sought to corrupt creation, he engaged in an act of *self-sodomy*, triggering what is described as an “explosion of evil power” and giving birth to

demonic offspring.¹

Thus, to symbolically sodomize evil is not to overcome it, but to *participate in its generative logic*. Far from subduing evil, the gesture mimics Ahriman’s own desecration, aligning the speaker with the very force they claim to oppose. The supposed moral clarity of the act collapses into metaphysical incoherence.

Such speech acts exemplify what Paul Weingartner and Silvia Haring classify as E₃-type evil: the causal corruption of moral language itself. In this taxonomy, the evil lies not only in action, but in the semiotic structure that enables the inversion of value. The desecration of kindness, then, is not an accidental consequence of rhetorical heat—it is a systemic inversion, a simulated virtue parasitic on the values it mocks.

This paper argues that we are witnessing a radical shift in ethical performativity. Moral speech, stripped of its essential value predicates—truth, love, good—is increasingly occupied by *quasi-value statements* that simulate ethical clarity while legitimizing domination. What emerges is not new virtue, but a *simulacrum of the good*—an image of moral authority whose content has been emptied, and whose function is the ritual expulsion of dissent disguised as transcendence.

2 From Kindness to Combat: The Rise of Quasi-Value Statements

The transformation of moral discourse in the digital age is not merely a decline in civility or an increase in rhetorical aggression—it is the emergence of a new kind of moral language that mimics ethical form while inverting ethical substance. These are what may be called *quasi-value statements*—utterances that retain the syntactic shape of moral language (e.g., appeals to justice, truth, courage, kindness), but which sever these values from their ontological grounding and invert their content.

Quasi-value statements function parasitically. They draw on the cultural credibility of real values while deploying those values in the service of domination, humiliation, or ideological control. For example, a statement such as “real love means holding people accountable” may, in context, serve not to express care, but to justify cruelty. Likewise, declarations of courage are often applied to acts of public shaming, denunciation, or symbolic violation. These utterances operate within the sign-system of morality while reversing its teleological aim.

¹“Zoroastrianism and Homosexuality,” *Wikipedia*, accessed September 5, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zoroastrianism_and_homosexuality

This mechanism is especially evident in the treatment of *kindness*. In classical virtue ethics—from Aristotle to Aquinas—kindness is not only a social virtue, but a disposition rooted in *philia* (affection) and *caritas* (charitable love). In contemporary post-digital discourse, however, kindness is reframed as weakness, compliance, or sentimentalism. Worse, it is often turned into an object of irony, sarcasm, or outright aggression.

This is not simply a cultural mood; it reflects a deep structural shift in moral performativity. Where once virtue required cultivation, it now requires performance. Kindness becomes a trope to be signaled, staged, or subverted—depending on the discursive needs of the speaker. When someone declares “I am being kind by telling you the harsh truth” or “you don’t deserve kindness until you change,” they are not expressing kindness as a disposition, but as a conditional tool of leverage.

In this sense, quasi-value statements do not merely betray kindness; they invert it. This inversion is not neutral—it is symbolic. Kindness becomes the battlefield upon which competing visions of moral legitimacy are fought. To reject, mock, or desecrate kindness is not merely to express disagreement—it is to assert superiority within a hierarchy of meaning, where strength, dominance, and transcendent righteousness displace empathy and moral restraint.

This process is reinforced by what Paul Weingartner and Silvia Haring identify as the logic of *E₃-type evil*—a systemic distortion of value-referential systems. *E₃-evil* does not destroy values from outside, but corrupts them from within by redefining their functional meaning while maintaining their outward form. In this light, the violent metaphor of “stuffing kindness up evil’s behind” is not just crude—it’s a quintessential quasi-value act. It uses the language of sacrifice, courage, and moral cleansing while enacting symbolic desecration.

This is how kindness is transformed into combat: through a rhetoric of value that simulates transcendence while participating in domination. The result is a new mode of moral simulacra—virtue without essence, speech without ethical weight, and values hollowed out to serve performative aggression.

3 Sodomitic Metaphor as Ritual Desecration

The violent rhetorical image—“stuffing the ‘be kind’ slogan up evil’s behind”—is not merely obscene. It is a highly charged symbolic act: one that carries metaphysical, sacrificial, and ritualistic connotations. The metaphor calls for the violent penetration of an abstract entity (*evil*) using a corrupted moral signifier (*be kind*), and in doing so, reenacts a ritual of humiliation disguised as moral clarity.

To interpret this act merely as linguistic excess is to miss its ritual function. As René

Girard has argued, sacrificial violence often functions to restore a threatened moral order through the expulsion or desecration of a scapegoat. Here, the scapegoat is not a person but a virtue—kindness itself—which is symbolically violated in the name of cleansing evil. This is the ritual inversion of moral meaning: desecrating the good to purify the impure. Yet unlike Girard’s sacrificial model, which ultimately seeks reconciliation, this gesture affirms no moral community—it is an act of destruction for its own sake.

Within Jean Baudrillard’s framework, this is not a simple transgression of moral language, but a collapse into the third-order simulacrum. The moral sign (*be kind*) no longer refers to ethical content—it becomes an aesthetic object manipulated for performance. The metaphor does not reject kindness as a value—it desecrates kindness while *retaining its form*, and thus simulates an act of transcendent virtue. This is how simulated morality operates: it neutralizes meaning through spectacle.

The sodomitic metaphor also carries ancient mythic weight. As previously noted, in Zoroastrian cosmology, Ahriman—the “Spirit of Death and Aridity”—performs an act of self-sodomy to unleash demonic forces upon the world.² In this symbolic universe, sodomy is not merely taboo—it is a metaphysical engine of desecration and spiritual fragmentation. By invoking a similar metaphor, the speaker implicitly aligns with the logic of Ahriman: not defeating evil, but *mirroring its creative method*.

This creates a recursive paradox. The speaker, imagining himself to be the agent of divine justice, becomes the imitator of demonic desecration. He embodies the logic of domination under the guise of moral courage. Symbolic violence is sanctified, not in rejection of evil, but in imitation of its rites.

Such metaphoric acts constitute what Weingartner and Haring classify as E₃-type evil: evil that arises not from malice alone, but from the causal degradation of value systems. Here, the speech act does not merely insult—it desecrates and inverts the symbolic logic of moral goodness. Kindness is re-coded not as virtue, but as a tool of spiritual penetration and defilement. The slogan becomes a weapon, the virtue becomes a virus, and moral discourse becomes the ritual stage upon which desecration masquerades as truth.

This section demonstrates that the sodomitic metaphor is not incidental, but essential. It is theologically deviant, semiotically inverted, and metaphysically aligned with the very forces it claims to resist. What appears to be transcendence is in fact an obscene simulation—an act of spiritual mimicry designed to enthrone the self as moral agent through the desecration of the moral order itself.

²“Zoroastrianism and Homosexuality,” *Wikipedia*, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zoroastrianism_and_homosexuality

4 Vice as Virtue: The Ethical Collapse of Postmodern Courage

The desecration of kindness in the name of righteousness is not an isolated phenomenon. It reflects a broader ethical collapse: the rebranding of vice as virtue under the aesthetic of courage. In contemporary digital and ideological arenas, moral language has been distorted to the point where expressions of cruelty, derision, and domination are not only tolerated—they are celebrated as signs of authenticity and strength. The more openly one humiliates, the more “real” one appears.

This logic finds its philosophical precedent in Friedrich Nietzsche’s analysis of *ressentiment* in *On the Genealogy of Morals*. Nietzsche argues that when weakness is unable to assert power directly, it generates a reversal of values in which the strong are labeled evil and the weak are called good. However, in the current cultural moment, this inversion has doubled back on itself: now, domination masquerades as moral clarity, and mockery is framed as courage. The cruelty of the speaker is no longer concealed—it is exalted as a sign of spiritual discernment.

The metaphoric act of symbolically sodomizing “evil” with the slogan *be kind* is thus framed not as grotesque aggression, but as a righteous, self-sacrificial confrontation with spiritual decay. Here, the speaker casts himself as a truth-teller, willing to go where cowards will not. In this new ethic, the more uncomfortable or offensive an utterance is, the more morally courageous it is assumed to be. But this is a tragic distortion of both courage and truth.

Courage, properly understood, does not consist in causing pain, but in confronting it—either in the self or in others—with clarity and compassion. The redefinition of courage as rhetorical violence or symbolic penetration reveals a nihilistic undercurrent: that nothing is sacred except the self’s performative dominance. What is desecrated in such acts is not merely a slogan or a virtue, but the very possibility of moral communication rooted in shared human dignity.

The postmodern collapse of value predicates has created a condition in which moral clarity is measured by how starkly one can violate traditional ethical boundaries while maintaining the appearance of righteousness. Baudrillard foresaw this when he wrote that in the third-order simulacrum, signs do not conceal the truth—they conceal that there is no truth. Vice becomes virtue not through deception, but through spectacular overexposure.

In this context, the speaker who desecrates kindness while claiming moral high ground is not simply mistaken; he is a product of a system that rewards the simulation of ethical

bravery. The real courage—to speak gently in a cruel world, to remain kind under symbolic attack—is mocked as weakness. What emerges is not an evolution of moral maturity, but the ironic enthronement of desecration as transcendence.

Ultimately, this inversion of courage into symbolic violence is not a call to higher ethics—it is the aestheticization of brutality under the veil of virtue. It reflects what Weingartner and Haring identify as a systemic malfunction in value discourse, where moral speech becomes decoupled from moral being. In such a context, virtue no longer refers to a cultivated disposition—it becomes a tool of ritual display, a mask for power.

5 Zoroastrian Dualism and the Mythic Structure of Desecration

To fully grasp the ritual dimension of kindness desecration, we must move beyond rhetorical and psychological frameworks and into the realm of mythic structure. In the cosmology of Zoroastrianism—the world’s oldest dualistic faith—the moral universe is divided between *asha*, the principle of truth, order, and radiant clarity, and *druj*, the principle of deceit, chaos, and spiritual pollution. These are not merely ethical categories, but ontological forces locked in a perpetual struggle for the soul of creation.

In this schema, moral acts are not just private choices or social behaviors; they are spiritual alignments. To speak truth is to uphold *asha*; to desecrate or distort language in service of domination is to enact *druj*. Importantly, *druj* does not simply destroy truth—it *mimics* and inverts it. This mimicry is what renders it so dangerous. It is not overt malice but simulated righteousness that empowers spiritual corruption.

The metaphor of ritual sodomy—especially when framed as a weapon of moral justice—exemplifies this dynamic. The act is presented as courageous and purifying, yet from a Zoroastrian perspective, it replays the very act by which evil was mythically unleashed. As noted earlier, Ahriman—the “Spirit of Aridity and Death”—engaged in an act of self-sodomy, resulting in an explosion of evil entities.³ Thus, to symbolically sodomize evil is not to resist it but to replicate its generative gesture, aligning oneself with its metaphysical structure.

What appears on the surface as an act of moral transcendence is, in mythic terms, a rite of spiritual mimicry—a participation in the desecration one pretends to denounce. This is not simply a rhetorical failure; it is a reversal of sacred logic. The sodomitic gesture claims

³“Zoroastrianism and Homosexuality,” *Wikipedia*, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zoroastrianism_and_homosexuality

to fight evil but enacts its logic through spectacle, domination, and symbolic inversion. This is *druj* disguised in the language of *asha*.

Zoroastrian ethics demands not just correct behavior but correct alignment with the cosmic order. Speech is not neutral—it either harmonizes with the divine principle or introduces corruption into the world. In this light, moral simulacra—the use of inverted values cloaked in sacred form—constitute the highest form of *druj*: the lie that appears as truth, the shadow of goodness weaponized to destroy the light from which it borrows.

In digital and ideological arenas, where symbols are rapidly unmoored from their sacred referents, this ancient schema offers a powerful interpretive lens. The desecration of kindness and the theatrical rebranding of cruelty as transcendence are not merely linguistic distortions—they are modern rituals of *druj*, operating beneath the surface of political and cultural discourse.

The stakes, then, are not only moral but metaphysical. To desecrate kindness in the name of virtue is not only to corrupt a value—it is to invert the sacred order. It is to perform, often unknowingly, the rites of the Lie while claiming fidelity to the Truth. Such acts may win applause in algorithmic arenas, but they align the soul with chaos, not cosmos.

6 Toward a Defense of Essential Moral Judgments and Epistemic Integrity

Having diagnosed the symbolic desecration of kindness and the ritual inversion of moral categories, we arrive at the philosophical and ethical imperative: to reassert the legitimacy of essential moral judgments. In an age saturated by performativity, simulation, and quasi-value statements, the task is not simply to critique inversion, but to recover moral clarity—without retreating into moralism, authoritarianism, or empty sentimentality.

At the core of this recovery lies a commitment to *essential value predicates*: truth, goodness, love, courage, justice. These are not mere linguistic habits, but ontological anchors. Without them, discourse becomes prey to spectacle, ideology, and manipulation. As Charles Taylor argues in *Sources of the Self*, moral frameworks cannot survive long without grounding in substantive conceptions of the good. Postmodern skepticism may deconstruct, but it cannot build; it can parody virtue, but it cannot generate it.

The desecration of kindness, as examined through ritual metaphor and symbolic violence, exposes the fragility of ethical language when severed from moral being. What is needed, then, is not louder moral proclamations, but deeper ontological grounding. As Emmanuel Levinas insists, ethics begins not in theory but in encounter—the face of the other, the

demand not to kill, the irreducible call of responsibility. Kindness is not weakness; it is the embodied form of ethical attention.

To defend moral discourse is thus to defend not abstraction, but orientation: toward others, toward truth, toward coherence. In this light, epistemic integrity becomes a form of resistance. To speak kindly when cruelty is celebrated; to name domination even when cloaked in courage; to discern between genuine moral clarity and its theatrical double—these are acts of ethical fidelity, not naiveté.

This requires, as Weingartner and Haring suggest in their value-theoretic framework, a vigilance against *E₃-type evil*—the causal erosion of value reference. When kindness becomes a weapon, or when moral slogans become instruments of vengeance, the problem is not in values per se, but in the systems that simulate them. The ethical task, then, is to defend not only values, but the *conditions under which values can remain meaningful*.

Digital environments, ideological media, and symbolic performance will continue to blur the boundary between sincerity and simulation. But the defense of moral meaning does not lie in retreat or cynicism—it lies in discernment. Not all speech that sounds like virtue is virtuous. Not all courage is ethical. Not all justice is just. The task of the philosopher and the moral agent alike is to pierce the simulacra—to distinguish between *asha* and *druj*, not with violence, but with vigilance.

In this spirit, to “be kind” is not to perform moral theater—it is to resist moral collapse. It is to refuse the desecration of the good by reclaiming it—not as slogan, but as stance; not as posture, but as principle.

7 Conclusion: Watch Your Back, Guard Your Soul

The phrase that first drew our attention—“Take the ‘be kind’ slogan and stuff it up evil’s behind. Watch your back.”—is more than a vulgar retort. It is a microcosm of a deeper cultural pathology: the symbolic desecration of virtue under the guise of transcendence. It functions simultaneously as threat, satire, and simulated moral stance, collapsing the categories of kindness and cruelty into a single performative gesture.

We have examined this phenomenon through multiple critical lenses—semiotic, metaphysical, and philosophical—and found that beneath the surface irony lies a spiritual inversion. The speaker does not merely reject kindness; he performs a ritual desecration of it, aligning symbolically not with moral courage but with the mythic structure of desecration itself. What is framed as resistance to evil is, from a Zoroastrian perspective, indistinguishable from Ahriman’s own rites.

This is the essence of moral simulacra: when speech maintains the form of value while sev-

ering itself from substance. The sodomitic metaphor, the redefinition of cruelty as courage, the quasi-value speech act—each is a ritual designed to enthrone domination while feigning virtue. As Baudrillard warns, in the order of the hyperreal, signs no longer mask the truth—they mask the absence of truth. What is offered as moral transcendence is often the theater of druj.

And yet, not all is collapse. The very visibility of these inversions reveals their instability. A culture that must constantly simulate virtue through desecration is a culture haunted by the goodness it cannot erase. The performative parody of kindness betrays a latent recognition of its power. Even desecrated, the good leaves a trace.

In response, we are called not merely to critique, but to discern—to distinguish ritual desecration from moral clarity, to expose quasi-values without becoming cynical, to speak with ethical fidelity in a marketplace of simulations. “Watch your back,” the speaker warns—yet the deeper imperative may be this: *guard your soul*.

In an age when even virtue is desecrated for sport, the refusal to desecrate becomes an act of defiance. Kindness, grounded in love and truth, remains a revolutionary force—not because it is easy, but because it cannot be faked without eventually revealing the emptiness behind the mask.

Let us therefore not abandon moral language, but redeem it. Let us not discard the good, but reclaim it from those who seek to wear its skin. In a world of spiritual mimicry and hollow righteousness, the true moral act is to resist the inversion—not with violence, but with integrity. Not with spectacle, but with substance. Not with desecration, but with discernment.

Glossary of Key Terms

Simulacrum (Simulacra): A representation or imitation of a person, idea, or value that no longer refers to any original or real referent. In Baudrillard’s theory, a simulacrum is a sign that has become self-referential and detached from any grounding in reality. Applied here to moral language, a simulacrum of virtue retains the appearance of goodness while hollowing out its substance.

Quasi-Value Statement: A rhetorical expression that mimics the form of a moral claim (e.g., invoking justice, courage, kindness) but lacks genuine ethical intent or content. These statements serve ideological or performative purposes, often enabling symbolic violence under the guise of virtue.

Sodomitic Metaphor: A metaphor involving the symbolic act of sodomy, deployed rhetor-

ically to express dominance, desecration, or humiliation. In this paper, it functions as a ritual image of spiritual or moral inversion, often disguised as transcendent justice.

E₃-Type Evil: A concept from Weingartner and Haring’s value logic taxonomy, referring to *causal evil*, in which systems of meaning (e.g., moral language) are corrupted from within. E₃-evil does not simply negate values—it systematically distorts them by preserving their form while perverting their content.

Kindness Desecration: The symbolic or rhetorical process by which kindness—once understood as a moral or spiritual virtue—is mocked, violated, or weaponized. In this paper, desecration is analyzed not as absence, but as a ritual inversion of value.

Asha / Druj: In Zoroastrian metaphysics, *asha* refers to the principle of truth, order, and divine harmony, while *druj* refers to deceit, chaos, and corruption. These are not abstract ideas but cosmic forces, and human speech and behavior are seen as aligned with one or the other.

Spiritual Mimicry: The act of imitating the appearance of moral or sacred behavior while internally aligned with corrupt or self-serving intentions. This concept is used to describe the deceptive performance of virtue—particularly in ideological or ritualized speech acts.

Hyperreality: A condition in which reality and its representations have become indistinguishable. Baudrillard’s term describes a cultural space where simulations of reality (media, rhetoric, virtue-signaling) are taken as more real than reality itself.

Epistemic Integrity: A philosophical and ethical commitment to truth, coherence, and intellectual honesty in moral judgment and speech. Epistemic integrity resists the performative use of values for power or spectacle and defends the meaningful use of moral language.

Performativity (Ethical): Derived from speech-act theory and developed by Judith Butler, this refers to the idea that moral or ethical speech does not merely describe reality, but enacts it. In this paper, performativity is analyzed as a double-edged phenomenon—capable of truth or simulation.

Ritual Desecration: A symbolic act that violates or degrades a sacred concept, object, or value—often in a performative or communal context. Here, it is used to describe the rhetorical treatment of kindness as a target of mock-sacrificial violence.

Bibliography

1. Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford University Press, 1998.
2. Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. University of Michigan Press, 1994.
3. Butler, Judith. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. Routledge, 1997.
4. Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage Books, 1977.
5. Girard, René. *Violence and the Sacred*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977.
6. Levinas, Emmanuel. *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Duquesne University Press, 1961.
7. MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. University of Notre Dame Press, 1981.
8. Mbembe, Achille. "Necropolitics." *Public Culture*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2003, pp. 11–40.
9. Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On the Genealogy of Morals*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann, Vintage Books, 1967. Original work published 1887.
10. Scarry, Elaine. *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*. Oxford University Press, 1985.
11. Taylor, Charles. *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Harvard University Press, 1989.
12. Weingartner, Paul, and Silvia Haring. *Value Science: A Philosophical-Semiotic Perspective*. Peter Lang, 2009.
13. Zoroaster. *The Zend-Avesta Part I: The Vendîdâd*. Translated by James Darmesteter, Oxford University Press, 1880. In *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. 4.
14. Anonymous Facebook User. *Comment in CTMU Reality Theory Facebook Group*. 2025. Nonacademic rhetorical artifact. <https://m.facebook.com/groups/ctmurealitytheory/permalink/10163134927792486/?mibextid=wwXIfr>