

# The Occult Veil of Legitimacy

Pathological Entitlement, Trauma Symbols, and the Grammar of Harm-Preserving Power

**Author:** Kibavuidi Nsiangani

**Affiliation:** Université Simon Kimbangu, Kinshasa - Head of Department

## Abstract

ORCID:0009-00  
04-9484-3435

DOI:

USK Journal of  
Health and  
Psychology

Received:  
22-01-2026

Approved:  
24-02-2026

Publication:  
21-03-2026

There are forms of power that survive not because they are invisible, but because they are staged so well that people begin to doubt their own perception. Harm appears. Victims speak. Witnesses feel the distortion almost immediately. Yet the language surrounding the event shifts with chilling speed. Injury becomes complex. Domination becomes governance. Cruelty becomes a necessity. Protest becomes instability. The harmed are asked to explain themselves, moderate themselves, discipline themselves, and, eventually, blame themselves. This article offers a theory-building integrative analysis. It does not present a new single dataset or claim to establish causal closure across all domains. It proceeds through historical-functional translation, cross-domain synthesis, and structured comparison of symbolic, discursive, and institutional patterns. Harmful systems preserve legitimacy through a stable grammar of inversion: harm is normalized, victims are displaced, elites are insulated, language is neutralized, dissent is stigmatized, and trauma-coded symbols are mobilized to regulate fear, memory, and moral attention. At the center of this grammar lies pathological entitlement, understood not merely as a personality structure but as a generative and selective principle. Under favorable institutional conditions, it engineers the symbolic, narrative, and administrative conditions required for its own reproduction, elevates tolerance thresholds, punishes reciprocity, and preferentially retains actors adapted to asymmetry, impunity, and moral reversal. Trauma symbols and weaponized fragility form a crucial enforcement layer within this system. Real suffering and real vulnerability remain morally central, but under legitimacy pressure they can also be mobilized to suspend inquiry, redirect causality away from beneficiaries, and recode accountability as aggression. Exposure therefore does not necessarily weaken harmful systems. It often intensifies them through institutional gaslighting, shame discipline, selective disclosure, procedural fog, plausible deniability, and ironic deniability. A further claim concerns symbolic excess. Where plausible deniability alone would already suffice, the repeated reappearance of inversion-coded, sacrificial, humiliating, grotesque, or child-targeted symbolic repertoires indicates surplus-signaling: a recurrent attraction to domination, desensitization, and boundary exemption rather than mere concealment. Its broader contribution is to show that this grammar travels across domains too often studied in isolation, including sexual violence, warfare, propaganda, elite patronage, academic gatekeeping, and political discourse. What appears as an occult aura of untouchable power resolves into a repeatable architecture of symbols, shields, incentives, and behavioral scripts, with varying intensity and scale.

**Keywords:** pathological entitlement; harm-preserving legitimacy; moral inversion; trauma symbols; weaponized fragility; institutional gaslighting; semantic neutralization; collective victimhood, plausible deniability; DARVO.

# 1. Introduction: The Pattern People Sense but Cannot Name

There are moments in social life when the false note arrives before the explanation. Something has happened, sometimes brutally, sometimes quietly, sometimes in a form so stylized that the act itself already seems wrapped in excuse. A person has been violated, a population has been humiliated, a truth has been buried beneath ceremony, or a structure of exploitation has been renamed as reform, development, order, professionalism, or peace. The surrounding institutions continue to function. The language remains composed. The powerful do not appear frightened. Yet a perceptive observer feels, almost at once, that the scene has been rearranged. What should have been morally central begins drifting toward the margins. Harm remains present, but interpretation is being managed.

That managed drift deserves more attention than it usually receives. Public attention is often captured by the event itself, the scandal, the abuse, the war, the speech, the revelation, the outrage. Another process unfolds around the event, and this second process may be even more decisive. Responsibility is softened, deferred, or redistributed. The harmed are interrogated more intensely than the actors who benefited. Language is drained of force at the moment force is most needed. Criticism is recoded as hysteria, obsession, divisiveness, hatred, ingratitude, or paranoia. Trauma enters the frame in ways that begin to dictate what may no longer be asked. Irony loosens the burden of ownership. Ambiguity expands until discomfort itself becomes embarrassing.

What emerges is not simple denial, but a structural transformation of the field of perception.

Many people recognize this pattern in fragments, even if they do not possess a stable vocabulary for it. They encounter it when victims are blamed for violence committed against them, when colonial or imperial domination is redescribed as civilization or development, when military destruction acquires antiseptic administrative names, when prestige institutions shield predatory actors through ambiguity and delay, when academic systems present asymmetry as neutrality, or when memory of real collective trauma is mobilized in ways that suppress present accountability. In each case the experience is similar. Something morally basic has been inverted, and the inversion is being protected by language, symbolism, and procedure.

The analysis begins from that experience of inversion and seeks conceptual precision. Systems generating predictable harm while preserving legitimacy tend to converge on a stable grammar. Harm is normalized. Victims are displaced or blamed. Elites receive insulation. Language is neutralized. Dissent is stigmatized. Trauma-coded symbols are mobilized to regulate fear, memory, and moral attention. Once exposure threatens the arrangement, a further maintenance layer comes into force through institutional gaslighting, systematic denial, procedural fog, selective disclosure, shame discipline, and irony as shield. The deeper result reaches beyond concealment of wrongdoing. Perception itself is retrained. Witnesses learn what is dangerous to name. Victims learn how quickly clarity can be turned against them. Bystanders learn that moral recognition carries social cost.

At the psychological center of this grammar lies pathological entitlement. The term refers here to more than arrogance or self importance. It names a structure of expectation in which exemption, deference, asymmetry, and impunity are experienced as deserved. Once such a structure is established, criticism feels abusive, accountability feels persecutory, vulnerability becomes instrumental, and the suffering of others appears either irrelevant or secretly justified. Pathological entitlement therefore exceeds the level of individual disposition. Under favorable institutional conditions it becomes historically consequential because it helps engineer the symbolic, narrative, and administrative conditions required for its own reproduction. It rewards moral asymmetry, punishes reciprocity, elevates tolerance thresholds, and preferentially retains actors adapted to impunity.

This helps explain why earlier societies so often described certain behavioral clusters in dramatically moral language. They used figures of cult, cabal, devilry, inversion, sacrificial corruption, hidden wickedness clothed in prestige, or ritualized desecration to name what appeared to them as a reversal of the ordinary moral order. They were naming cruelty where restraint should have appeared, manipulation where sincerity should have appeared, fascination with transgression where shame should have appeared, and symbolic intimacy with domination where fear or disgust should have appeared. Modern systems prefer cleaner words. They speak of expertise, resilience, development, security, civility, innovation, governance, performance, irony, and complexity. The vocabulary changes while the behavioral pattern remains disturbingly familiar. One of the central moves of this article is therefore translational. It asks how older symbolic

languages of inversion can be reread through a modern framework centered on entitlement, moral reversal, symbolic intimidation, sadistic display, and insulation from accountability.

Modern vocabularies did not simply become more refined. They also became more sanitizing. The substitution of clinical, administrative, or respectable language lowers the moral temperature of recognition and helps modern institutions distance themselves from the very behaviors older societies named in more charged terms. A conduct pattern once associated with corruption, desecration, predation, or inversion can be redescribed as governance, complexity, resilience, or professionalism. The dual language is part of the veil itself. It allows societies to condemn one register of conduct while normalizing the same conduct under a more acceptable idiom. The article's concern lies there, in the mechanics of translation, buffering, and moral rearrangement, rather than in proving a continuous occult organization or adjudicating supernatural efficacy.

The title follows from that problem. The occult veil refers here to a social condition in which power acquires aura through mystification, symbolic intimidation, ambiguity, prestige, and fear-coded regulation of interpretation. Such systems often appear larger than they are because they depend on more than force. They depend on the enlargement of the atmosphere. Harm comes to seem too sacred, too technical, too politically dangerous, or too emotionally charged to name directly. In that setting, even the visible becomes difficult to interpret without cost. Where plausible deniability would already suffice, the repeated recurrence of inversion coded, sacrificial,

humiliating, grotesque, or child-targeted symbolic repertoires becomes analytically revealing. Concealment alone does not explain that persistence. It points instead to attraction, to domination being rehearsed, stylized, and normalized beyond what secrecy strictly requires.

The framework developed here travels across domains that are too often studied in isolation: sexual violence, wartime euphemism, propaganda, academic gatekeeping, elite patronage, and political discourse shaped by sacredized memory or fear coded moral tokens. Their declared doctrines may differ sharply. Their operative method is often far closer than their vocabularies suggest. Harmful arrangements are preserved by repeatedly disciplining moral perception. The article formalizes that grammar, reinterprets older symbolic languages of inversion through a modern explanatory framework, and argues that pathological entitlement becomes historically consequential when it helps build and stabilize the institutional conditions of its own reproduction. The analysis proceeds through historical functional translation, cross-domain synthesis, and theory guided reading of symbolic, discursive, and institutional patterns.

The argument unfolds in seven stages. It first develops the translation from diabolical inversion to pathological entitlement. It then formalizes the grammar of harm-preserving legitimacy. From there it examines trauma symbols and weaponized fragility before turning to the enforcement layer through which institutions survive exposure. A set of anchor cases then demonstrates cross-domain transfer, after which the article outlines predictions and falsification conditions. The conclusion returns to the psychological stakes of the

argument. Systems relying on mystification often appear larger than they are because they depend on emotional enlargement and systematic management of interpretation. Analysis changes that scale. The harm remains grave. The aura becomes thinner. The reader should leave this article no less serious about domination, but far less impressed by its theater.

## 2. Literature Review and Conceptual Gap

This paper stands at the intersection of several literatures that are usually kept apart. One body of work examines psychological entitlement, narcissistic and dark-trait structures, and processes of moral disengagement. Another studies institutional betrayal, DARVO, and gaslighting as mechanisms through which injury is denied, reframed, or turned back against the harmed. A third focuses on collective victimhood, trauma memory, and the political uses of suffering. A fourth examines euphemism, legitimation, and the administrative neutralization of violence in war, empire, and institutional life. Each of these literatures isolates a crucial part of the problem. None, by itself, sufficiently explains how harmful systems preserve legitimacy through the coordinated management of perception, symbolism, emotion, and procedure. What remains underdeveloped across these literatures is a portable framework linking entitlement, moral inversion, trauma-symbol politics, semantic neutralization, and institutional enforcement within the same grammar of legitimacy preservation [1–9].

The literature on entitlement and dark personality traits already establishes

several elements central to this article. Psychological entitlement research shows that some actors experience exemption, deference, and superior treatment as deserved rather than negotiated. Work on dark traits and moral disengagement extends that picture by showing how asymmetry, exploitation, and reduced moral inhibition can be stabilized within personality structures rather than appearing as accidental deviations. Yet this literature tends to remain focused on individuals, interpersonal settings, or bounded organizational outcomes. It does not fully address the question pursued here: how such structures become historically consequential when they are translated into symbolic repertoires, narrative permissions, and institutional protections that outlast any one actor [1–3]

The literature on institutional betrayal, DARVO, and gaslighting contributes a second set of indispensable mechanisms. Here the emphasis shifts from the entitled actor alone to the social management of challenge. Denial, attack, and reversal of victim and offender clarify how accountability can be recoded as aggression. Work on institutional betrayal and organizational gaslighting further shows that the destabilization of lived perception can be enacted not only by individuals but by systems that protect themselves through discrediting, procedural delay, and narrative control. This literature is especially strong in showing how exposure can intensify the architecture of protection rather than weaken it. Even so, it has generally remained closer to trauma, abuse, organizations, and communication than to the broader political and historical question of how whole legitimacy orders preserve harm while keeping moral recognition unstable [4–8]

A third literature concerns collective victimhood, trauma memory, and the political uses of suffering. Social and political psychology has long shown that victimhood can become a durable group lens that shapes identity, moral reasoning, solidarity, and conflict behavior. More recent work goes further by treating victimhood as a variable political claim rather than a fixed social essence. In the Israeli case, for example, scholarship has argued both that collective victimhood is deeply embedded in public culture and that state elites deploy victim claims strategically and selectively across conflict settings rather than uniformly. This line of work is highly relevant because it demonstrates that trauma is not only remembered: It can also be activated, scaled, and administered as part of statecraft. The same general problem appears elsewhere in different registers, including white victimhood narratives in South Africa, where Afrikaner grievance has been analyzed as a discursive attempt to restore legitimacy and belonging under conditions of perceived status threat [8–10].

A fourth literature addresses euphemism, legitimation, and the administrative masking of violence. Here the emphasis falls on how domination is moralized, neutralized, or buffered through language. That elites lie seems banal, and this is part of the architecture this study describes. In addition, and what is of interest to the framework, is that harmful arrangements become governable when they are narrated in softened, procedural, or redemptive terms. The historical archive makes this especially clear in colonial and geopolitical settings. The Vatican's 2023 statement on the so-called doctrine of discovery explicitly acknowledged that several fifteenth-century papal bulls were linked to political questions, failed to reflect the equal dignity

and rights of Indigenous peoples, and were manipulated by competing colonial powers to justify immoral acts. Official United States documents on Guatemala in 1953 framed the Arbenz government as a Moscow-influenced threat to hemispheric security and Caribbean security, revealing how anti-communist language could authorize intervention while masking material and political interests. Similar official framing appears in U.S. records on Chile, where the prominence of pro-Soviet forces in the Allende coalition was emphasized, and in Panama, where drug trafficking and non-cooperation in counter-narcotics became central public justifications within a wider confrontation shaped by domestic and strategic pressures. These cases show that symbolic legitimation, victim framing, security language, and procedural masking are not confined to occult or interpersonal domains. They also structure political relations and imperial conduct [11–15].

Taken together, these literatures provide many of the article's raw materials, but not yet an integrated framework. The existing scholarship explains entitlement without fully theorizing its symbolic afterlives, explains victimhood without always linking it to broader grammars of legitimation, explains euphemism without consistently tying it to trauma-symbol politics, and explains gaslighting without extending it fully into cross-domain structures of moral inversion. The present article addresses that gap by formalizing a portable grammar of harm-preserving legitimacy. It argues that under conditions of predictable harm and legitimacy stress, a recurrent sequence tends to appear: normalization of injury, displacement of victims, insulation of elites, semantic neutralization, stigmatization of dissent, deployment of trauma symbols, and enforcement through gaslighting, shame,

managed disclosure, and ironic deniability. It also proposes a historical-functional translation through which older symbolic languages of inversion can be reread alongside modern sanitized vocabularies without collapsing the difference between them [1, 4, 7–8, 11]

The article proceeds through historical-functional translation, structured comparison, and cross-domain synthesis of symbolic, discursive, institutional, and psychological patterns. Its strongest scope lies in settings where harm is visible enough to generate legitimacy pressure, where institutions still seek moral recognition rather than relying on brute force alone, where symbolic and procedural resources are available for buffering, and where dissent carries reputational cost. Within those conditions, the article's contribution is threefold. It formalizes a grammar of harm-preserving legitimacy. It relocates pathological entitlement from the level of personality alone to the level of institutional reproduction and selection. It clarifies how trauma symbols, symbolic excess, and modern neutralized vocabularies participate in the maintenance of power across domains that are usually studied separately.

### 2.1 Analytic strategy and scope conditions

This paper is theory-building and integrative rather than a causal-closure paper. It does not claim to establish a single exhaustive causal chain for every case discussed, nor does it treat recurrence across domains as proof of identical origin, motive, or organization. Its analytic aim is to identify a recurrent grammar through which harmful arrangements preserve legitimacy under conditions of visibility, contestation, and moral pressure. The argument proceeds through

historical-functional translation, structured comparison, and cross-domain synthesis of symbolic, discursive, psychological, and institutional patterns.

The cases used in later sections should therefore be read as illustrative anchor cases rather than exhaustive evidentiary case studies. They are selected to show transferability of the grammar across domains commonly studied in isolation, not to close empirical debate on every historical instance. Likewise, symbolic materials are treated here as functional indicators of orientation, atmosphere, and social encoding, not as proof of hidden metaphysical continuity or of a single covert lineage linking all cases. The framework identifies recurrent functional isomorphisms, not identical motives, identical organizations, or identical historical origins. It is strongest where visible harm generates legitimacy stress, where institutions still seek moral recognition, and where buffering through language, symbolism, procedure, and prestige remains available.

### **3. From Diabolical Inversion to Pathological Entitlement**

Earlier societies did not always possess the vocabulary of personality theory, institutional sociology, or political psychology. Yet, they were not blind, and repeatedly encountered forms of conduct that seemed to overturn the ordinary moral order with such coldness, theatricality, and fascination that ordinary ethical language felt insufficient. Hence the recurrence of terms linked to inversion, corruption,

hidden wickedness, sacrificial appetite, polluted ritual, false innocence, or devilry. These expressions were often dramatic, sometimes excessive, sometimes entangled with theology and fear. Yet they also carried observational force. They marked the point at which domination ceased to appear merely brutal and began to appear morally uncanny.

That uncanniness remains central. A great deal of cruelty can still be interpreted through familiar terms such as greed, anger, revenge, or opportunism. Some configurations of behavior provoke a different recognition. The observer confronts injury fused with display, ambiguity, mockery, symbolic overcoding, and a striking absence of proportion between suffering and response. Pain is inflicted, stylized, recoded, aestheticized, or wrapped in a theater of superiority. Ordinary moral expectations begin to fail. Shame gives way to performance. Restraint gives way to appetite. Exposure, instead of weakening the actor, becomes one more occasion for inversion, attack, or spectacle.

This article translates that older intuition into a contemporary framework centered on pathological entitlement. The term refers here to more than vanity, pride, or ordinary selfishness. It names a structure of expectation in which asymmetry is experienced as rightful, exemption as deserved, deference as natural, and accountability as an intolerable insult. Pathological entitlement reorganizes the moral field before any visible conflict begins. The entitled actor does not simply want more. Limits are experienced as injuries, contradiction as aggression, and equal treatment as an unacceptable lowering of status. From this foundation, a coherent chain of downstream behaviors follows. This mechanism is the core object

of analysis, instead of a purely superficial interpretation that “older symbolic languages and modern psychological vocabularies are identical”.

Criticism becomes cruelty because scrutiny appears abusive to a self that experiences immunity as normal. The suffering of others loses moral weight and becomes secondary, exaggerated, instrumental, or secretly deserved. Vulnerability itself can be appropriated and turned into shield or weapon. The entitled actor may present as injured, misunderstood, attacked, humiliated, or unfairly burdened, not because vulnerability is false in every instance, but because any challenge to asymmetry is experienced as intolerable desecration. Moral inversion follows with regularity. The harmed are recoded as aggressors. The accuser becomes dangerous. Refusal to submit becomes the real offense.

Earlier figures of inversion were therefore naming more than superstition. They were registering the collapse of ordinary reciprocity. They were trying to describe forms of conduct that did not merely violate norms, but reversed the emotional direction of moral life itself. Cruelty was shielded by innocence. Predation hid behind refinement. Domination clothed itself in sacredness, beauty, civilization, transcendence, or necessity. The older symbolic languages, even where they became metaphysically charged, often tracked a recurring convergence of entitlement, insulation, transgressive fascination, and immunity from remorse.

Modern societies did not merely develop finer analytic vocabularies. They also developed strong incentives to replace morally charged vocabularies with sanitized ones. This substitution lowers the

emotional temperature of recognition. It helps modern institutions distance themselves from association with corruption, inversion, desecration, predation, or devilry, even where the underlying behavioral structure remains strikingly similar. The vocabulary changes. The conduct pattern often does not. What older languages named through images of inversion can be redescribed in modern settings as governance, resilience, performance, security, development, complexity, professionalism, or innovation. This dual language belongs to the veil itself. It allows societies to condemn one register of conduct rhetorically while normalizing the same conduct behaviorally under cleaner terms.

The modern advantage lies in translation, not dismissal. Research on psychological entitlement, dark personality traits, and moral disengagement provides vocabulary for phenomena that earlier observers encoded through devils, cults, or sacrificial corruption [1–3]. The older language preserved experiential accuracy even where explanatory categories remained imprecise. What changes now is the precision of the mechanism. Entitlement authorizes asymmetry. Moral disengagement weakens inner brakes. Symbolic fascination adds theatrical form. Institutional protection converts the whole cluster into a durable pattern.

Occult fascination enters the argument at this point, as a visible, consequential, and increasingly predictable system, and not on the level of metaphysical efficacy. Indeed, fascination with inversion imagery, sacrificial atmospheres, grotesque sovereignty, ritualized humiliation, sexual coercion, child devouring motifs, monstrous threshold figures, and performative transgression appears repeatedly across

settings in which domination is being staged, normalized, or aestheticized. That fascination can be aesthetic, ideological, strategic, affective, or several of these at once.

Once it converges with incentives such as intimidation, control, prestige, desensitization, and group bonding, it begins to shape conduct in ways that are visible, consequential, and increasingly predictable.

Its persistence where plausible deniability would already suffice is especially revealing. Such ornament does not usually return so insistently without social or psychological function. The recurrence suggests more than concealment alone and may indicate attraction, desensitization, or domination display. Domination is being rehearsed, stylized, and enjoyed. Boundary violation becomes part of the aura. Desensitization becomes part of the training. The symbolic repertoire functions as surplus signaling, a repeated display of exemption, transgression, and superiority that exceeds what concealment alone would require.

Systems organized around entitlement do more than protect already malignant actors. They progressively select for personalities adapted to impunity, asymmetry, and moral inversion, while disfavoring empathic, reciprocal, or truth-preserving actors. Pathological entitlement therefore operates not only as a trait carried into institutions, but as a principle of institutional selection. Environments built around insulation, prestige, ambiguity, and managed impunity predictably retain those most fluent in those conditions and shed those most resistant to them.

The continuity lies in repertoire, coding, and behavioral pattern. Across myth,

monumental religion, sacrificial traditions, and modern prestige culture, one finds the same motifs returning with striking regularity: coercive sexuality, violated innocence, sacrificial logic, child consumption, grotesque nonhuman forms, ritualized terror, symbolic mastery over the vulnerable, and ambiguity about whether the image is warning against evil, domesticating it, glorifying it, or drawing power from it. These forms place the vulnerable body at the center of power's imagination. They return, again and again, to domination, humiliation, and asymmetry. They suggest that those above are permitted to cross boundaries that bind ordinary people. In that sense, the symbolic repertoire can function as a heuristic indicator of orientation, especially where it recurs together with insulation, humiliation, asymmetry, and evasion of accountability. Some forms of power do not merely harm; they stage exemption from the moral world binding others. This pattern can be observed across colonial discourse, elite political speech in Congo, and selective invocations of "international law," where universality is professed most strongly at the moment application becomes visibly asymmetric.

This staging of exemption recurs across changing legitimating idioms. Colonial domination rarely named itself as domination; it appeared as tutelage, civilization, pacification, reform, or development, thereby converting predation into a civilizing duty. In the Congolese context, the same structure can be seen in elite speech and administrative reasoning that rendered African suffering morally secondary to order, extraction, or external design. The pattern survives in selective invocations of "international law," where universality is often professed most loudly at the very moment application becomes

visibly asymmetric. In such cases, legal and civilizational language do not merely justify harm after the fact; they help stage the superior actor as if already exempt from the standards binding everyone else.

At this level, very different traditions can be seen condensing the same underlying intuition into different names. Across later polemical, theological, and interpretive traditions, figures such as Seth, Apep, Nkadia Mpemba, Mpimpa, Satan, or the Devil have often been made to carry a recognizable pattern: invasion, deception, theft, predation, violation, abuse, and destruction concealed beneath a claim to order, superiority, protection, or moral standing.

The concern here is not to litigate whether such beings exist, nor to determine what participants in every cultic or esoteric milieu literally believe. Instead, the focus is on the mechanics that made such figures intelligible, durable, and reusable. They condensed a social intuition that keeps returning: some forms of power devour while presenting themselves as rightful.

This symbolic stability helps explain why some environments feel not merely violent but uncanny. The observer is reacting not only to harm, but to harm fused with fascination, display, and exemption. Sadism appears here as one of the points at which reciprocity based models of social behavior begin to fail.

The primary reason is that everyday assumptions about shame, empathy, and restraint become unreliable guides once cruelty is fused with pleasure, display, and exemption. When cruelty is fused with pleasure, when exposure intensifies aggression rather than limiting it, and when humiliating asymmetry is stylized rather

than concealed, analysis must move beyond ordinary interpersonal intuition toward a framework centered on entitlement, symbolic domination, desensitization, and prestige protected inversion.

At that point the occult veil loses some of its grandeur. What first appears as remote dark power begins to look more familiar in structure, even if no less dangerous in effect. The pattern depends on superiority, theater, ambiguity, and insulation. It depends on the cultivation of awe around actors who place themselves above the moral scale binding others. This dependence is also a weakness. The more such systems require symbolic inflation, the more clearly they reveal that the aura is part of the machinery. Once the machinery becomes visible, fear changes shape. The harm remains grave. The mystique begins to thin.

## **4. The Grammar of Harm-Preserving Legitimacy**

Once pathological entitlement is placed at the center of the analysis, a broader pattern comes into view. Harm-preserving systems do not survive through force alone, secrecy alone, or ideology alone. They survive by repeatedly reorganizing moral perception in predictable ways. This reorganization is neither random nor merely rhetorical. It follows a grammar. The same moves recur across institutions, historical settings, and symbolic vocabularies. What first appears as a series of separate scandals begins to resolve into a stable sequence through which harmful arrangements are normalized, buffered, and preserved. One of the deepest functions of harm-preserving legitimacy is to retrain witnesses, victims, and bystanders so that harm becomes

difficult to recognize, dangerous to name, and socially costly to pursue.

The first move is normalization. Harm is rendered ordinary, regrettable, inevitable, functional, or too structurally embedded to merit interruption. Sometimes this is achieved through repetition. Sometimes through procedural language, strategic abstraction, or appeals to complexity. The result remains the same. What should appear intolerable is made to seem routine. Once routine is established, urgency weakens and shock begins to dissolve. Normalization is therefore an achievement of discourse, repetition, and institutional framing rather than a passive condition. In war, for example, euphemistic language has long helped recode civilian suffering into administratively tolerable categories, with “collateral damage” serving as one of the clearest examples of moral displacement through language.

The second move is displacement of the victim. Causality shifts downward. The harmed party becomes too emotional, too provocative, too damaged, too resentful, too dependent, too backward, too unstable, too attached to grievance, too unprofessional, too divisive, or too incapable of adaptation. The original harm is denied, morally rerouted. The system substitutes the question “what was done?”, “what is wrong with the person or group naming what was done?”. This transfer is highly efficient. Once responsibility has been moved onto the harmed, the beneficiary order regains innocence without relinquishing advantage. In conflict research, collective victimhood has been shown to become a durable interpretive lens through which suffering is remembered, identity is stabilized, and present responsibility is reframed. Its relevance to this pattern is immediate.

The third move is insulation of elites and institutions. Status is converted into procedural patience, presumptions of complexity, interpretive generosity, and delayed accountability. The more prestige an actor or institution holds, the more likely allegations are to be framed as tragic misunderstandings, regrettable deviations, or complicated matters requiring calm, nuance, process, and distance. Hierarchy thereby acquires moral cushioning. What would immediately discredit an ordinary person becomes survivable, negotiable, or forgettable when attached to prestige. This logic is especially visible in the sociology of elite cultural institutions, where private museums and related patronage structures can function as instruments through which wealth is translated into legitimacy both within the art world and beyond it.

The fourth move is semantic neutralization. Words that would otherwise trigger moral recognition are replaced by terms that soften, abstract, aestheticize, or professionalize the act. Domination becomes order. Extraction becomes development. Abuse becomes misunderstanding. Civilian death becomes collateral damage. Humiliation becomes discipline. Censorship becomes moderation. Propaganda becomes communication strategy. Language does not merely accompany power. It redistributes moral weight. It inserts a buffer between act and recognition. The more successful that buffer becomes, the less the system depends on direct coercion. Colonial discourse provides a classic precedent. The language of the civilizing mission and pacification repeatedly transformed domination into duty and coercion into order.

The fifth move is stigmatization of dissent. Once harm has been normalized, victims displaced, elites insulated, and language

softened, criticism itself must be recoded as the new disturbance. The critic becomes shrill, obsessive, hateful, paranoid, divisive, unserious, crude, anti-intellectual, politically motivated, or incapable of understanding complexity. Shame enters here as a technology of discipline. It warns observers that recognition carries cost. It teaches the audience that one may see the pattern, but naming it threatens one's own standing. Stigma performs what law and force cannot always perform efficiently. It narrows the field of sayable truth. In institutional betrayal research, this logic appears clearly in DARVO sequences, where denial, attack, and reversal of victim and offender convert accountability claims into signs of alleged aggression or instability on the part of the harmed.

The sixth move is trauma-symbol deployment. A system under pressure often mobilizes emotionally charged symbols, sacred memories, existential threats, moral monopolies, or images of absolute danger in order to interrupt inquiry and reorganize attention. The symbol may take the form of terrorism, civilization, sacred victimhood, public innocence, social fragility, national peril, or the specter of chaos. The vocabulary changes with the context. The function remains strikingly stable. Fear intensifies. Causal analysis contracts. Certain questions begin to feel indecent, dangerous, or morally disqualifying. Trauma is therefore not only remembered; under certain conditions, it is also administered. Research on self-perceived collective victimhood is especially useful here because it shows how trauma can become socially organized, politically mobilized, and identity-forming far beyond the original wound itself.

The seventh move, most visible under exposure, is maintenance through

enforcement. At this stage the system no longer relies only on euphemism or status. It turns to gaslighting, shame discipline, selective disclosure, ironic deniability, procedural fog, and the controlled exhaustion of those who continue to insist on moral clarity. Exposure becomes one more terrain of management. The question is no longer simply what happened, but who will be broken, ridiculed, isolated, or discredited first in the struggle over interpretation. Recent work on organizational and platform gaslighting strengthens this point by showing that institutions can strategically destabilize public confidence in lived experience while presenting themselves as neutral arbiters of order or safety.

Taken together, these moves form a stable grammar of harm-preserving legitimacy. Their order may vary. Their emphasis may shift. Their symbolic packaging may differ dramatically from one setting to another. The structure remains recognizable. Harm is normalized so that it may continue. Victims are displaced so that responsibility moves downward. Elites are insulated so that hierarchy survives. Language is neutralized so that recognition weakens. Dissent is stigmatized so that truth becomes socially expensive. Trauma symbols are deployed so that fear and reverence narrow inquiry. Enforcement mechanisms activate so that exposure itself can be absorbed into the system's self-protection.

Differences in doctrine, symbolism, or institutional setting tend to draw attention first. The more durable continuity lies in method. Harmful arrangements are preserved by repeatedly disciplining moral perception. From rape culture to warfare, from propaganda to academia, from colonial discourse to elite patronage, the pattern travels with unsettling ease. The language

changes. The uniforms change. The architecture changes. The mood changes. The grammar remains. Research on knowledge hiding in academia, including work linking dark trait profiles and psychological entitlement to epistemic withholding, supports precisely this kind of transfer across domains usually treated as separate.

Once the grammar becomes visible, the occult veil contracts further. What first appeared as boundless power begins to reveal its dependence on repetition, coding, rhetoric, shield activation, and emotional management. The system is no less dangerous for that. It does, however, return to human scale. Fear thrives when domination appears metaphysically enlarged. Understanding begins when one sees how much labor is required to keep that enlargement in place.

## 5. Trauma Symbols and Weaponized Fragility

Power does not rely on argument alone. It also relies on emotional regulators: images, memories, sacred wounds, fears, and moral tokens capable of reorganizing perception more quickly than evidence or reasoning. Harm-preserving systems become especially effective when they can mobilize trauma symbols. These symbols are not decorative additions to ideology. They function as active devices. They intensify fear, narrow inquiry, redistribute sympathy, and shape the emotional terms under which judgment becomes possible. They influence which forms of hesitation appear legitimate, which forms of anger appear acceptable, and which questions begin to seem morally suspect before they are fully stated.

Trauma symbols therefore require careful treatment. Real suffering exists. Real historical wounds exist. Real collective memories of humiliation, massacre, dispossession,

persecution, and vulnerability exist. The issue is neither denial nor flattening nor mockery. The issue is that genuine trauma can also be administered politically. It can be ritualized, curated, elevated, and reintroduced into present disputes in ways that suspend scrutiny, redirect causality, and reorganize moral scale. At that point memory no longer functions only as remembrance. It begins to function as governance. Research on collective victimhood is especially useful here because it shows how a sense of shared victimization can become a stable lens shaping identity, moral reasoning, and political behavior. In such settings, victimhood can also deflect criticism and secure outside support, especially where the group is perceived as weaker or more endangered [8–10].

The symbolic token varies from one setting to another. In one case the decisive symbol is terrorism. In another, civilization under threat. Elsewhere the work is done by sacred innocence, public fragility, historical victimhood, social extinction, or the specter of chaos. The vocabulary shifts. The structural effect remains strikingly stable. Fear grows. Complexity is invoked selectively. Certain questions become indecent. Certain comparisons become forbidden. Present harms are minimized because the symbolic field has already been occupied by a larger and more emotionally dominant moral drama. Trauma symbols do not merely express meaning. They discipline the horizon of what may still be thought. This logic is not confined to one ideology or one conflict, but instead, it belongs to the broader grammar through which legitimacy is protected by enlarging some wounds while shrinking others.

This also helps explain why collective trauma and minority status can become shields in some contexts. The shield works because it fuses moral authority with emotional urgency. The actor or institution protected by such symbolism appears not merely powerful, but endangered. Scrutiny can then be recoded as aggression, accountability as cruelty, and structural criticism as insensitivity to suffering. Once that reversal is in place,

beneficiary invisibility deepens. The protected party continues to act, benefit, or dominate, yet public attention remains fixed on its wound, its fear, or its threatened innocence. Moral energy is absorbed upward. Responsibility is displaced downward. Collective victimhood does not erase power. Under certain conditions, it reorganizes how power is perceived and morally processed.

The same field of symbolism contains a more excessive element. Administrative buffering and plausible deniability often suffice. Where they already suffice, the continued recurrence of inversion-coded symbolic repertoires suggests more than concealment. It suggests attraction. The repeated return of sacrificial, humiliating, grotesque, or child-targeted imagery points toward desensitization, domination, and the symbolic rehearsal of exemption. In such cases the repertoire functions as surplus signaling. It stages what the system is drawn to, even where staging is not strictly required for concealment.

A related structure appears at the interpersonal level in what this article terms weaponized fragility. The distinction here must remain precise. Not all fragility is manipulative. Not every cry, collapse, fear reaction, or display of pain should be treated with suspicion. Genuine vulnerability is real, and moral seriousness requires that it be protected rather than mocked. Some patterns of fragility, however, function quite clearly as shields. They arise together with attack, denial, blame relocation, reversal of victim and offender, or rapid activation of institutional defenses. In such cases the display of injury does not open a space for truth. It closes it. Fragility becomes a mechanism for lowering defenses, evading accountability, and recoding challenge as abuse.

DARVO becomes especially useful at this point. Jennifer Freyd's formulation, deny, attack, and reverse victim and offender, captures the patterned inversion through which accountability is transformed into aggression and the harmed party becomes the alleged source of harm. Freyd also makes

explicit that institutions can enact DARVO collectively, a point that becomes essential once private manipulation scales into public protection [4–5].

The pattern becomes especially visible when emotional display and aggressive redirection appear together. The actor weeps, trembles, panics, or invokes injury. At the same time, the harmed party is accused of cruelty, disloyalty, hysteria, persecution, or emotional violence. Visible weakness then performs two functions at once. It disarms observers trained to equate vulnerability with innocence, and it authorizes retaliation by making accountability itself appear sadistic. Under certain conditions, weakness becomes shield and weapon simultaneously. That fusion belongs among the most powerful mechanisms in the wider grammar of harm-preserving legitimacy. Research on gaslighting and power dynamics supports this point more broadly by showing that gaslighting is deeply entangled with asymmetry and can function as a covert way of undermining another person's confidence in their own perception [19].

The connection with institutional gaslighting becomes clear here. Trauma symbols and weaponized fragility both alter the emotional field before the argument is even heard. They do not merely persuade. They precondition perception. They guide where fear should flow, where sympathy should settle, and where doubt should be directed. Under legitimacy stress their force increases. As evidence accumulates, as victims speak with greater coherence, and as patterns become harder to dismiss, the system intensifies not only denial but emotional management. The symbolic cost of inquiry rises. Contemporary work on platform gaslighting extends this logic beyond interpersonal abuse, showing how official communications can produce destabilization, mistrust, and interpretive confusion while the platform retains a posture of neutrality [18].

The affective atmosphere surrounding such systems often becomes uncanny for exactly this reason. Moral scale has been distorted.

The vulnerable are not simply protected. They are sometimes theatrically enthroned. The powerful are not simply shielded. They are shielded through symbols of weakness, injury, innocence, or historical wound. The result is disorientation. Ordinary expectations fail. One expects the injured to receive care and the aggressor to receive scrutiny. Instead, injury is mobilized to preserve domination. Weakness operates as command. Trauma functions not only as memory, but as strategy. Research on systemic gaslighting in racism and institutions makes the same movement visible at a broader level. Gaslighting can be embedded historically and structurally rather than enacted only by isolated personalities.

Once that structure becomes visible, the emotional effect changes. The pattern no longer appears psychologically unfathomable or metaphysically deep. It appears structured, repeatable, and, in a grim sense, ordinary. Trauma symbols lose some of their force once their regulatory function is recognized. Weaponized fragility loses some of its force once weakness is seen operating together with attack, reversal, and shield activation. The harm remains serious. The spell of awe weakens. Fear gives way to sharper discrimination, and sharper discrimination restores the possibility of response.

## **6. The Enforcement Layer: Institutional Gaslighting, Shame Discipline, Managed Disclosure, and Ironic Deniability**

A harmful system does not become fragile the moment it is exposed. Exposure often activates a second layer of protection aimed not only at denying the act, but at destabilizing the interpretation of the act. Once harm becomes visible, the system must reorganize the emotional and cognitive environment around that visibility.

It must exhaust, confuse, embarrass, isolate, and recode. What follows exposure is often more than rebuttal. It becomes a struggle over whether reality itself will remain publicly legible.

Harm-preserving power does more than justify existing abuse; it raises tolerance thresholds by anesthetizing language, redistributing sympathy, and rewarding interpretive compliance.

Institutional gaslighting occupies a central place in this process. At the interpersonal level, gaslighting already involves the strategic destabilization of another person's confidence in their own perception. At the institutional level, the same pattern expands in scale and sophistication. The question is no longer only whether a person will doubt what they saw, felt, or understood. The question becomes whether an entire audience can be trained to experience moral clarity as overreaction, pattern recognition as paranoia, and memory as distortion. Institutional gaslighting therefore does not simply reject an accusation. It rearranges the interpretive frame within which accusations are judged. Recent work now conceptualizes organizational gaslighting as a strategic communication risk involving power, narrative control, discrediting, delegitimization, and normalization through internal culture [7].

This rearrangement often follows a recognizable path. The event is softened, fragmented, or recoded as misunderstanding. Those raising concern are then characterized as unstable, emotional, vindictive, political, or incapable of nuance. The institution eventually presents itself as the injured party, unfairly maligned, unfairly pressured, unfairly misunderstood, unfairly denied the time and respect required for proper process.

The original harm recedes while reputational injury to the institution becomes newly central. Wrongdoing is denied and on top of this denial, a reversal is staged in which the harmed appear dangerous and the powerful appear wounded. Work on whistleblower trauma and institutional betrayal supports this pattern directly, describing unified fronts of denial and betrayal that intensify trauma after reporting misconduct [6].

Shame discipline deepens this reversal. Shame is one of the least expensive and most effective instruments available to systems seeking to preserve legitimacy. It turns truth into a social hazard. Victims, witnesses, and critics learn that naming the pattern may cost more than enduring it. One may be called obsessive, bitter, hateful, naïve, conspiratorial, divisive, humorless, anti-intellectual, or emotionally unregulated. Shame acts in advance. It narrows speech before censorship is formally required. Recognition itself becomes risky. DARVO remains useful here for exactly that reason. Denial and reversal do not simply dispute facts. They punish interpretation.

Disclosure itself soon becomes a terrain of management. The issue is no longer simply whether hidden facts will surface, but how they will surface, when, through whom, under what narrative frame, and with what surrounding noise. This is where managed disclosure, selective leakage, and constrained whistleblowing enter the picture. Some revelations rupture systems. Others merely ventilate them. Some leaks deepen public understanding. Others release enough pressure to preserve the broader arrangement. Exposure should therefore not be treated as the simple opposite of concealment. Under certain conditions it becomes one more instrument

within the ecology of control, especially when revelation is timed, filtered, narrowed, or symbolically detached from the underlying structure. Scholarship on whistleblowing and national security communication supports this narrower point by showing that disclosure is politically mediated rather than automatically emancipatory.

None of this diminishes the courage or necessity of whistleblowing. It sharpens the problem. Whistleblowers often confront not only the original harm, but the retaliatory architecture built to neutralize what they reveal. Institutional betrayal acquires much of its force here. The individual who reports abuse, corruption, coercion, or fraud expects, at minimum, that evidence will retain some force. Instead, they may encounter a unified front of denial, procedural delay, reputational isolation, and moral inversion. The message is devastatingly clear: reality is negotiable, hierarchy is not. Ahern's account of whistleblower trauma is particularly useful because it links retaliation, betrayal, and gaslighting so directly.

Irony provides another protective layer, especially in environments that depend on deniable transgression. Harmful content may circulate through jokes, aesthetic play, exaggerated postures, memes, performances, and ironic framing. The content remains while the burden of ownership weakens. Critics are then placed in an impossible position. A serious response can be recoded as humorlessness, paranoia, or incapacity for nuance. Silence, on the other hand, leaves the content free to circulate, normalize, recruit, and desensitize. Irony is therefore not a decorative side issue. It functions as a shield technology. It allows systems and actors to test boundaries, transmit contempt, and

preserve plausible deniability at the same time. Recent work on coded extremist communication and humor shows exactly this dynamic: irony and humor can hide exclusionary or hateful content in plain sight while complicating moderation and critique [20].

The same logic extends to repeated appeals to performance, play, or exaggeration in elite and transgressive environments. Performance can place the act in motion while withholding full ownership of its meaning. The observer is left suspended between interpretations. Was this serious, merely symbolic, critique, celebration, parody, ritual, experimentation, or provocation? That uncertainty is not always accidental: it can itself serve the mechanism. Ambiguity lowers sanction risk while preserving emotional and symbolic effect. Performance does not merely display power. It can provide cover for it.

The cumulative result is an uneven moral distribution. Innocence is concentrated upward. Risk, shame, proof burdens, and disposability are concentrated downward. Reciprocity begins to erode under that asymmetry. One set of actors retains exemption, opacity, and symbolic innocence, while others retain exposure, sanctionability, and the burden of demonstration. The system begins to look less like a sequence of isolated evasions and more like a machinery for the managed destruction of reciprocity.

Taken together, institutional gaslighting, shame discipline, managed disclosure, and ironic deniability form the maintenance architecture of the veil. They become especially visible when earlier protective layers begin to fail, when euphemism no longer reassures, when symbols are no longer enough, when patterns have become

too visible, when victims have become too coherent, or when evidence has begun to accumulate across cases. At that point denial alone is no longer sufficient. Public confidence in perception itself must be destabilized. Platform research now extends this logic into digital governance, showing how users can experience official moderation discourse as a form of gaslighting when corporate narratives diverge sharply from lived experience [18].

Once this enforcement layer becomes visible, the system loses some of its theatrical grandeur. Gaslighting, shaming, controlled leaks, procedural fog, and irony reveal that the appearance of invulnerability depends on constant defensive labor. The system no longer appears simply powerful. It appears busy, guarded, and dependent on scripts, shields, and rehearsed evasions. The occult veil contracts again. What once felt unreachable begins to look strained by the very effort required to remain untouchable. Fear changes shape at that moment. Mystery gives way to mechanism. Response becomes easier to imagine.

## 7. Anchor Illustrations and Cross-Domain Transfer

The framework developed so far would remain too abstract if it could not travel. Its explanatory force becomes clearer when the same grammar appears across domains that are usually treated as separate. The purpose of the cases gathered here is therefore limited and precise. They do not function as exhaustive historical dossiers, nor as claims of identical motive, identical organization, or identical scale. They serve as anchor

illustrations. Each one shows, in a different register, how harmful arrangements preserve legitimacy through a recurrent sequence: injury is softened or normalized, victims are repositioned, elites are buffered, language is cleaned, dissent is stigmatized, and exposure is absorbed into a new protective layer.

Once these cases are placed side by side, a broader pattern comes into view. The language varies. The institutional setting varies. The symbolic repertoire varies. Yet the operational sequence returns with unsettling regularity. A complaint becomes a disturbance. A beneficiary center becomes difficult to name. A shield of innocence, complexity, or historical wound enters the frame. Moral recognition weakens just as evidence becomes sharper. In that movement, harm is not simply denied. It is reorganized.

### **7.1. DARVO and institutional betrayal**

A first anchor appears in DARVO and institutional betrayal. At the interpersonal level, the sequence is already stark: denial, attack, and reversal of victim and offender. Its broader relevance appears once the same movement is repeated by institutions. A person reports abuse, coercion, or structural wrongdoing. The institution does not merely contest the allegation. It slowly recenters itself. The complaint is reframed as excess, instability, disloyalty, reputational sabotage, or procedural impropriety. The person who names the harm begins to appear more dangerous than the conduct that produced the complaint.

This pattern becomes especially clear in settings where institutions speak in the language of neutrality, professionalism, or due process. A university, church, firm,

media organization, or bureaucracy may respond to a credible allegation through delay, fragmentation of responsibility, internal review, and symbolic patience. These gestures often appear reasonable in isolation. Taken together, they may produce a different effect: the institution acquires moral time, while the harmed party acquires suspicion. The initial injury drifts outward, and the act of naming it begins to look like the real disruption.

Seen in this light, DARVO exceeds the scale of interpersonal manipulation. It becomes one of the clearest operational templates of harm-preserving legitimacy. A system protects itself by redistributing emotional weight, procedural burden, and moral doubt. The harmed are asked to remain calm, coherent, measured, and patient under conditions that are already asymmetrical. The institution, by contrast, is allowed opacity, delay, interpretive generosity, and reputational cushioning. Such arrangements do not merely fail accountability. They recode accountability as aggression.

### **7.2. Family separation, state procedure, and administrative insulation**

A second anchor appears in cases where family destruction or institutional abuse is carried out under the cover of procedural legitimacy. In such settings, harm often takes administrative form. Decisions are justified through files, reports, assessments, risk language, and official neutrality. Yet for those subjected to the process, the structure may feel unmistakably violent. Families are divided, accusations circulate, defenses are narrowed, and evidence becomes difficult to access or contest. The resulting distress is then read back as proof of instability.

This kind of case is especially revealing because it shows how the grammar operates without dramatic ideology or openly transgressive symbolism. Bureaucratic calm performs much of the work. The system appears composed, methodical, and rational, while those harmed are pushed into positions that can easily be read as emotional, disorganized, or unreliable. Procedure does not merely organize action here. It also redistributes credibility.

Within this arrangement, the burden of reconstruction falls almost entirely on the injured party. They must recover missing links, challenge opaque decisions, infer motives, and prove coherence under conditions designed to exhaust them. Administrative complexity becomes a shield. The center of decision remains buffered by forms, intermediaries, and authorized language. As a result, public attention is drawn less toward the structure that produced the injury and more toward the distressed reactions of those living under its consequences.

### **7.3. Colonial violence, moral inversion, and historical buffering**

A third anchor appears in colonial and postcolonial settings, where domination repeatedly acquires acceptable names. This pattern can be observed in the long history of imperial discourse, where predation was narrated as tutelage, civilization, pacification, reform, or development. Under such conditions, the destructive act entered public consciousness already softened. Extraction became stewardship. Occupation became order. Resistance became backwardness, irrationality, or danger.

The Kongo case offers a particularly clear structure for reading this grammar. When

an African political order rejects the commodification of human beings, yet external power continues to impose trafficking or domination, the immediate violence is only one layer of the problem. A second layer appears later, in the historiographic and ideological rearrangement of responsibility. The external aggressor is distanced from full ownership, while the colonized world is recoded as the natural site of the evil in question. The beneficiary center then reappears in the historical imagination as conflicted, progressive, or eventually redemptive.

This movement belongs to the wider grammar of inversion. Domination is followed by narrative laundering. The victims inherit backwardness, disorder, or guilt. The beneficiary order inherits complexity, ambiguity, and eventual moral refinement. Once that transformation is complete, history itself begins to function as a shield. The harmed are left defending both the fact of the injury and the right to name who structured it.

The same pattern continues beyond formal colonial rule. In postcolonial settings, external asymmetry often travels through development language, security language, donor language, governance language, and technical expertise. Harm does not disappear in such arrangements. It is displaced into neutral vocabularies and redistributed across institutions, intermediaries, and local brokers. The underlying asymmetry remains, yet its moral visibility weakens.

### **7.4. Destroyed Black communities and the politics of fabricated innocence**

A fourth anchor appears in the destruction of prosperous Black communities such as Tulsa and Rosewood. These cases remain analytically important because they reveal the full sequence in compressed form: fabricated pretext, organized violence, narrative reversal, and long-term moral distortion. A community is first rendered dangerous through rumor, fantasy, racial panic, or symbolic accusation. Violence then appears as reaction, protection, or restoration of order. Afterward, public memory is reorganized so that the destroyed community appears suspect and the attacking order appears fearful, defensive, or tragically compelled.

This sequence demonstrates how invented threat and trauma-coded symbolism can prepare the moral field in advance. Once the target has been associated with violation, danger, or contamination, the destruction of that target can be received as understandable rather than criminal. The community's prosperity, autonomy, or dignity then becomes difficult to remember without also inheriting the hostile frame placed around it.

Long after the event, the inversion continues. Structural violence is absorbed into narratives of necessity, local panic, regrettable conflict, or racial complexity. The deeper crime concerns not only the destruction itself, but the rearrangement of moral memory through which that destruction remains partially shielded.

### **7.5. Contemporary geopolitics, selective universality, and the staging of innocence**

A fifth anchor appears in current geopolitical discourse, where claims of defense, law, humanitarian concern, or civilizational threat repeatedly reorganize

how aggression is perceived. Here the grammar becomes highly visible because legality and morality are invoked most intensely where application has already become unequal. The superior actor presents itself as endangered, restrained, or reluctantly compelled. The weaker or targeted actor becomes the principal site of danger, even under conditions of material asymmetry.

The DRC provides one reading of this structure, especially where external powers, regional proxies, armed actors, and international discourse interact in ways that blur ownership while preserving asymmetry. The point does not depend on claiming one single author behind every event. The pattern becomes legible through distributed insulation: funding, diplomatic cover, selective outrage, technical language, humanitarian posture, and moral displacement. Critique directed upward is then recoded as simplification, hostility, or illegitimate anger.

A similar structure can be observed in discourse surrounding Iran and other heavily targeted states. Acts of aggression are framed through anticipatory defense, existential necessity, or civilizational risk. Civilian infrastructure may fall within the radius of force, yet the moral current is redirected toward the alleged threat posed by the target itself. Retaliation by the weaker party is then read as proof of aggression, while prior domination remains buffered by law-like rhetoric, strategic terminology, and repetitive appeals to necessity.

Across these cases, universality remains verbally intact while application becomes visibly selective. Law is professed most solemnly where symmetry is least credible. This pattern does not eliminate the reality

of danger or conflict. It reorganizes how danger is distributed and how conflict is morally interpreted.

### **7.6. Cross-domain transfer and the contraction of the veil**

Placed side by side, these anchor illustrations make transfer difficult to dismiss. The same grammar that appears in interpersonal abuse and institutional betrayal reappears in colonial discourse, racial violence, geopolitical framing, academic gatekeeping, elite patronage, and administrative harm. Differences in doctrine, scale, and symbolism remain real. The operative method remains strikingly close. Injury is softened or normalized. Victims are displaced. Beneficiaries are buffered. Language is cleaned. Dissent is stigmatized. Exposure triggers new shields rather than transparent reckoning.

By this stage, the occult veil contracts further. The reader is no longer facing a scattered collection of isolated scandals, nor a mystical field of untouchable exceptions. A repeated social technology begins to emerge. Harm is managed. Perception is trained. Vulnerability is recoded. Prestige is activated. Memory is weaponized. Critique is punished. Once that recurrent sequence has been seen across unlike settings, one of the strongest supports of fear begins to weaken. The system remains dangerous, but its singularity becomes less persuasive. It starts to look patterned, labor-intensive, and dependent on continuous symbolic maintenance.

That change in scale is one of the main stakes of the framework. A power that appears boundless often depends on repetition, insulation, symbolic inflation, and narrative control. Once those mechanisms are named, the atmosphere

shifts. The harm remains grave. The aura becomes thinner.

## **8. Predictions and Falsification Conditions**

A framework of this kind acquires force when it can fail in clear ways. The present argument does not rest only on interpretive force, historical suggestiveness, or conceptual elegance. It also generates expectations. If the grammar described in this article is real, it should leave recurring traces in language, timing, institutional response, symbolic deployment, and cross-domain repetition. If those traces do not appear, the framework weakens. Prediction and possible disconfirmation therefore belong to the discipline of the argument itself.

The first prediction concerns semantic drift under legitimacy pressure. As scrutiny intensifies, systems preserving harmful arrangements should move away from morally explicit language and toward technocratic, therapeutic, aesthetic, or procedural vocabulary. Harm should increasingly be reframed as complexity, misunderstanding, security, development, performance, context, moderation, resilience, or professionalism. Moral clarity should decline where legitimacy costs rise. As arrangements become harder to justify openly, semantic neutralization should intensify. Historical work on euphemism in war and empire, including the long use of terms such as collateral damage, civilizing mission, and pacification, supports that expectation [11–12].

The second prediction concerns accountability latency. The greater the

prestige, opacity, and symbolic insulation surrounding an institution or actor, the longer the delay between a credible allegation and a meaningful consequence should become. Such delay may take the form of procedural patience, calls for nuance, internal review, reputational buffering, or fragmentation of responsibility. The underlying pattern remains measurable. Systems with stronger insulation should absorb exposure more effectively and for longer periods. The sociology of elite cultural institutions, especially work on private museums as instruments of self-legitimation, provides a credible structural anchor for this expectation [16].

The third prediction concerns trauma-symbol deployment. Under rising scrutiny, one should observe greater reliance on emotionally charged symbols, sacred injuries, existential threats, innocence claims, historical wounds, or moral monopoly tokens that narrow inquiry and reorganize public sympathy. Symbolic escalation should accompany interpretive contraction. Fear should rise as causal clarity falls. Research on collective victimhood supports this expectation by showing how shared trauma can become politically mobilized, identity-forming, and morally regulatory in conflict settings [8–10].

The fourth prediction concerns weaponized fragility. Where vulnerability functions as shield, distress displays should repeatedly appear together with attack, blame relocation, moral reversal, or rapid activation of institutional defense. The pattern should not consist of fragility alone, but of fragility fused with accountability escape. Cases of weaponized fragility should therefore display clustered indicators rather than isolated emotion. DARVO research is

especially useful here because it already formalizes the sequence of denial, attack, and victim-offender reversal in ways that can be observed across interpersonal and institutional settings [4–5].

The fifth prediction concerns the enforcement layer. As evidence accumulates, systems preserving legitimacy under harm should increasingly rely on institutional gaslighting, reputational shaming, managed disclosure, selective leakage, ironic deniability, and procedural exhaustion. Exposure should not simply produce transparency. It should trigger a struggle over interpretation in which public confidence in lived perception becomes one of the principal battlegrounds. Emerging work on organizational and platform gaslighting, together with scholarship on whistleblower trauma and institutional betrayal, lends support to this expectation [6–7, 18].

The sixth prediction concerns cross-domain transfer. If the framework is genuinely structural, the same grammar should appear across domains that are not directly connected by doctrine or organization. Recognizable parallels should appear in sexual violence and its denial scripts, in warfare and euphemistic moral buffering, in colonial discourse, in prestige culture, in academic gatekeeping, and in political communication shaped by trauma-coded symbols. The greater the recurrence across unlike settings, the stronger the claim that the grammar is systemic rather than local. Existing research on dark-triad traits and knowledge hiding in academia, together with work on elite patronage, already points in that direction [3, 16–17].

These predictions also make falsification possible. The framework weakens if any combination of the following are true:

- scrutiny does not correlate with semantic neutralization,
- opacity and prestige show no relationship to accountability delay.
- trauma symbols do not intensify under legitimacy stress, or if such symbols have no discernible effect on narrowing inquiry,
- fragility in contested settings is not systematically paired with attack, reversal, deflection, or shield activation,
- exposure reliably produces transparent reckoning rather than managed interpretation. It weakens,
- finally, if the same grammar does not recur across multiple institutional domains.

Those conditions prevent the framework from being diluted into mood, metaphor, or total explanation. On the other hand, a clear distinction is made that not every euphemism hides atrocity, not every trauma claim is manipulative, not every display of weakness is strategic, and not every prestige institution is corrupt. Still, under conditions of predictable harm combined with legitimacy stress, one should repeatedly find a specific cluster of adaptive moves: normalization, displacement, insulation, semantic neutralization, dissent stigma, trauma-symbol deployment, and enforcement through interpretive destabilization. The framework stands or falls on patterned recurrence.

A feared system often appears limitless because its operations feel too diffuse, too symbolic, too emotionally charged, or too contradictory to map. However, prediction alters that relation. Dread gives way to expectation. The observer knows what to watch for next. Even though the system does not become smaller in consequence, it does

become smaller in mystery. And that reduction of mystery belongs to the first conditions of demystification.

## 9. Discussion and Conclusion: Shrinking the Veil

The argument developed in this article has moved through successive layers of clarification. It began from a familiar but often underdescribed pattern: harm appears, yet its meaning is immediately contested, softened, redistributed, or symbolically overwhelmed. From there, the analysis located the psychological center of that pattern in pathological entitlement, traced the recurrent grammar through which harmful systems preserve legitimacy, examined the role of trauma symbols and weaponized fragility, and then described the enforcement layer that activates when exposure threatens the arrangement. Across these stages, one conclusion has steadily come into view. What first appears as an obscure and nearly untouchable field of power is sustained not by mystery alone, but by repetition, coding, symbolic inflation, and rigorous management of perception.

Demystification belongs to the argument at this point not as rhetorical flourish, but as analytic consequence. Harm-preserving systems often depend on appearing larger than they are. They cultivate distance, awe, and a sense of interpretive danger. They encourage the impression that what one is facing is too old, too powerful, too sacred, too technical, too prestigious, too traumatic, or too volatile to confront directly. Fear enters here not only in response to the original harm, but also in response to the

act of naming it. One fears naming it incorrectly, appearing socially crude, standing alone, violating a moral taboo, or attacking those already coded as wounded. Research on collective victimhood, institutional gaslighting, and prestige-backed legitimation helps show how these responses are socially organized rather than merely private reactions [8, 16, 18].

Once the grammar becomes visible, that emotional architecture begins to shift. Harm does not become less serious. Cruelty does not become less cruel. Domination does not become less consequential. The aura changes. One begins to see how much labor is required to produce the appearance of invulnerability. Euphemism must be repeated. Victims must be displaced again and again. Trauma symbols must be reactivated. Dissent must be shamed. Disclosure must be managed. Institutions must gaslight. Irony must remain available as shield. Prestige must be continuously converted into innocence. What first appeared sovereign begins to look dependent on maintenance, choreography, and managed interpretation. Work on coded extremist communication, ironic deniability, and platform gaslighting reinforces this point from different angles. What appears spontaneous, diffuse, or ungraspable often rests on sustained communicative labor.

This also clarifies the place of occultism, grotesque imagery, sacrificial repertoires, and inversion symbolism within the argument. The article has not treated every symbol as evidence of a continuous hidden organization, nor every recurrence as proof of one surviving cultic chain. The emphasis has fallen elsewhere. Child devouring, coercive sexuality, violated innocence, monstrous threshold figures, humiliating asymmetry, sacrificial atmospheres, ironic

transgression, and theatrical ambiguity repeatedly gather around settings in which power seeks to dramatize exemption from ordinary human scale. Such imagery becomes analytically meaningful not because it proves metaphysical continuity, but because it condenses orientation. It points toward domination, threshold crossing, desensitization, and immunity from ordinary moral restraint. Joined to prestige and institutional insulation, that repertoire ceases to be decorative. It becomes part of the system's style of rule. Classical and medieval materials are significant at that level, as recurring symbolic condensations of patterned fascination.

The broader contribution of the article lies in showing that the same grammar travels across domains while preserving its core operations. In rape culture, it protects perpetrators through denial, victim blame, and emotional reversal. In warfare, it converts civilian devastation into sanitized necessity. In propaganda, it weaponizes fear, trauma, and simplification in order to police interpretation. In academia, it converts prestige into epistemic asymmetry and presents selective exclusion as rigor. In patronage systems, it translates wealth into symbolic innocence. The details vary. The structure remains strikingly stable. Harm is normalized. Victims are displaced. Elites are insulated. Language is neutralized. Dissent is stigmatized. Trauma symbols narrow inquiry. Exposure triggers enforcement. That recurrence across unlike settings gives the framework its explanatory force.

The article also has limits, and those limits belong to its rigor. It has not claimed that every trauma narrative is manipulative, that every symbolic transgression is sinister, that every prestigious institution is corrupt, or that every display of vulnerability is

strategic. It has identified a cluster of patterned convergences that become visible under legitimacy stress. Isolated symbols, gestures, or isolated phrases are not the object of analysis. However, the predictive variable is the repeated fusion of harm, insulation, inversion, symbolic regulation, and interpretive discipline. The framework is designed to be applied to such patterned convergences rather than to detached signs taken in isolation.

Its predictive value follows from that restraint. If the framework is sound, future cases of legitimacy preserving harm should continue to display the same sequence. Systems under pressure should intensify euphemism, activate symbolic fear or innocence, redirect sympathy upward, discredit critics, and absorb exposure into managed interpretation. Where that cluster appears repeatedly, the analyst can proceed with greater confidence. Where it fails to appear, the framework requires revision, narrowing, or abandonment. The article therefore offers neither total explanation nor moral theater. It offers a reproducible and transparent pattern recognition model for conditions under which ordinary moral language has been neutralized and accountability has been made difficult to sustain.

The deepest implication is psychological as much as political. Fear often survives by remaining larger than its object. An institution, ideology, network, or symbolic order becomes terrifying not only because of what it does, but because it appears unreachable, limitless, and wrapped in meanings too dense to confront. The occult veil works through that enlargement: it magnifies the object. It the observer by training them to feel small before an architecture of symbols, procedures, wounds, prestige, and ambiguity. Analysis

performs a correction of scale. It returns the object to proportion. It reveals the mechanisms, the shields, the habits, the scripts, and the dependencies. Once proportion returns, one further conclusion becomes difficult to avoid. Systems that rely so heavily on mystification are rarely as sovereign as they appear.

That insight does not abolish danger. It restores the possibility of response. One no longer faces an infinite darkness. One faces a grammar. One no longer confronts a force beyond naming. One confronts patterned domination sustained by entitlement, symbolism, prestige, and managed perception. That shift allows people to resist more effectively what they can map. One of the key strengths of the occult veil is, exposure is more effective when the mechanism can be named. and no longer mistaken for sacred inevitability.

One of the first conditions of freedom lies there, not in innocence, comfort, or the fantasy that domination has disappeared, but in the refusal to let power retain its false grandeur.

## References

### Core theoretical and empirical framework

Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3(3), 193-209. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0303\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0303_3)

Campbell, W. K., Bonacci, A. M., Shelton, J., Exline, J. J., & Bushman, B. J. (2004). Psychological entitlement: Interpersonal consequences and validation of a self-report measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 83(1), 29-45. <https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa830104>

Freyd, J. J. (1997). Violations of power, adaptive blindness, and betrayal trauma theory. *Feminism & Psychology*, 7(1), 22-32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353597071004>

Harsey, S. J., & Freyd, J. J. (2020). Deny, attack, and reverse victim and offender (DARVO): What is the influence on perceived perpetrator and victim credibility? *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 29(8), 897-916. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2020.1774695>

Harsey, S. J., Adams-Clark, A. A., & Freyd, J. J. (2024). Associations between defensive victim-blaming responses (DARVO), rape myth acceptance, and sexual harassment. *PLOS ONE*, 19(12), e0313642. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0313642>

Ahern, K. (2018). Institutional betrayal and gaslighting: Why whistle-blowers are so traumatized. *The Journal of Perinatal & Neonatal Nursing*, 32(1), 59-65. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JPN.0000000000000306>

Erzikova, E., Bowen, S. A., Ivanitskaya, L., Kee, K., & West, M. B. (2025). Beyond interpersonal abuse: Conceptualizing organizational gaslighting as a strategic communication risk. *Mediascapes Journal*, 26(2), 170-200.

Bar-Tal, D., Chernyak-Hai, L., Schori, N., & Gundar, A. (2009). A sense of self-perceived collective victimhood in intractable conflicts. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 91(874), 229-258. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383109990221>

Markiewicz, T., & Sharvit, K. (2021). When victimhood goes to war? Israel and victim claims. *Political Psychology*, 42(1), 111-126. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12690>

Knoetze, H. M. (2020). Romanticising the "Boer": Narratives of white victimhood in South African popular culture. *Journal of Literary Studies*, 36(4), 48-69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02564718.2020.1822601>

Karim, D. N. (2022). Linking dark triad traits, psychological entitlement, and knowledge hiding behavior. *Heliyon*, 8(7), e09815. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09815>

## Historical, political, and institutional legitimation

Rockel, S., & Halpern, R. (Eds.). (2009). *Inventing collateral damage: Civilian casualties, war, and empire*. Between the Lines.

Dicastery for Culture and Education, & Dicastery for Promoting Integral Human Development. (2023). *Joint statement on the "Doctrine of Discovery"*. Holy See Press Office, 30 March.

United States Department of State, Office of the Historian. (1953). Memorandum for the record. In *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1952-1954, Guatemala* (Document 51).

United States Department of State, Office of the Historian. (1970). Action in support of U.S. posture towards Chile. In *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1976, Volume XXI: Chile, 1969-1973* (Document 155).

National Security Archive. (2026, January 16). *Imperial prerogative: How the Panama invasion and the "Barr Doctrine" set the stage for the Maduro "snatch" operation.*

Kolbe, K. (2024). The art of (self)legitimization: How private museums help their founders claim legitimacy as elite actors. *Socio-Economic Review*, 22(3), 1119-1140.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mwad051>

## Epistemic, communicative, and platform enforcement

Zhang, Z., Takahashi, Y., & Rezwan, R. B. (2025). Knowledge hiding and social exchange theory: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1516815.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1516815>

Divon, T., Are, C., & Briggs, P. (2025). Platform gaslighting: A user-centric insight into social media corporate communications of content moderation. *Platforms & Society*, 2, 1-17.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/29768624241303109>

Graves, C. G., & Samp, J. A. (2021). The power to gaslight. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 38(11), 3378-3386.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075211026975>

Farrand, B., & Klausen, J. (2023). "Is this a hate speech?" The difficulty in combating

radicalisation in coded communications on social media platforms. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 29, 229-248.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10610-023-09543-z>

## Symbolic, religious, and interpretive materials

Eilberg-Schwartz, H. (1990). *The savage in Judaism: An anthropology of Israelite religion and ancient Judaism*. Indiana University Press.

Weir, A., & Jerman, J. (1986). *Images of lust: Sexual carvings on medieval churches*. Batsford.

## Prior works by the author

*(Complete publication details as needed before final submission.)*

Nsiangani, K. (2010). *Pan-Africanism Reimagined*. RAEST.

Nsiangani, K. (2014). *The Dark Tetrad Traits of Empire*. RAEST.

Nsiangani, K. (2016). *From Mvemba Nzinga to Modern Puppets*. *USK Journal of Health and Psychology*.

Nsiangani, K. (2025). *The Colonized Mind: A Clinical Framework*. *USK Journal of Psychology*.

## Annex A. Plausible Deniability as the Administrative Veil

Plausible deniability is often described too narrowly, as though it were only a legal defense, an intelligence tactic, or a convenient after-the-fact excuse. In reality, its function is broader and more corrosive. It operates as a semantic and administrative veil. Harm does not disappear. Responsibility does not disappear. What disappears is the clean moral line between the act and the beneficiary center. The event remains visible, sometimes painfully visible. Yet ownership is dispersed across layers of procedure, delegation, interpretation, complexity, and delay. Consequently, moral charge loses force before it reaches the point where meaningful accountability might have begun.

This is why plausible deniability belongs inside the present framework. It is one of the most refined instruments through which harm-preserving systems preserve legitimacy under pressure. Once scrutiny rises, the system no longer relies only on euphemism or prestige. It relies on fragmentation. One actor authorized, another implemented, another interpreted, another reviewed, another expressed regret, another announced reform, and still another insisted that the situation was too complex for crude moral judgment. Thus the arrangement survives because no single point appears to carry the entire burden of ownership. Administrative diffusion becomes ethical insulation. Work on organizational gaslighting and institutional betrayal reinforces this point by showing how institutions can preserve themselves by destabilizing interpretation rather than directly contesting every fact (Ahern, 2018; Erzikova et al., 2025).

Colonial administration offers one of the clearest large-scale expressions of this mechanism, alongside modern “democratic invasions”. Domination was repeatedly

narrated as burden, tutelage, order, civilization, pacification, reform, mission, and improvement. Extraction could therefore continue while appearing morally buffered by language. Violence became discipline. Occupation became stewardship. Cultural destruction became uplift. Indigenous resistance became disorder, backwardness, fanaticism, or ingratitude. Colonial rule did not preserve itself by force alone. It also preserved itself by ensuring that force entered public understanding through softened and moralized vocabularies. This pattern is consistent with scholarship on the “civilizing mission” as a central ideological element of modern imperialism rather than a mere retrospective label.

The same logic survives beyond formal colonialism. Postcolonial arrangements often preserve asymmetry through development language, governance language, anti-corruption language, resilience language, capacity-building language, and reform language. This does not mean that every use of such terms is fraudulent. It means that they can function as buffers when they systematically detach suffering from beneficiaries and relocate burden onto institutional weakness, local incapacity, cultural deficiency, or insufficient adaptation. Consequently, postcolonial harm can appear as technical failure rather than structured asymmetry. The center remains insulated while the periphery is instructed to become more responsible. This is the postcolonial administrative mutation of the older civilizing script.

This administrative veil is strongest when local brokerage enters the process. A donor does not speak alone. A ministry translates. A consultant frames. An expert indexes. A foundation convenes. A media outlet normalizes. An influencer moralizes. A think

tank supplies vocabulary. At that point, domination no longer requires one visible author. It is socially distributed. The arrangement becomes harder to confront not because it is hidden absolutely, but because its visible parts are narratively fragmented and morally buffered. The system can then admit harm in fragments while refusing ownership in structure. That is why plausible deniability links naturally to legitimacy brokerage and collaborator ecologies..

The emotional effect of plausible deniability is profound. Victims and critics are forced into a punishing burden of reconstruction. They must connect actors, layers, timescales, contracts, narratives, and institutions in order to recover a truth that the system has already dissolved administratively. By contrast, the beneficiary center needs only one defense: complexity. Complexity, in such cases, does not function as explanation alone. It functions as anesthesia. It slows moral judgment, weakens outrage, and converts structural violence into something that feels too dispersed to name directly. This logic also appears in whistleblower research, where what traumatizes many whistleblowers is usually not merely limited to the original wrongdoing, but pertains instead to the institutional machinery that turns truth into an exhausting burden of proof.

This is why plausible deniability should be understood as one of the administrative forms of the occult veil. The veil does not work only through symbols of dread, prestige, ritualized transgression, or trauma-coded moral tokens. It also works through files, committees, reforms, reviews, consultations, procedural delay, and selective acknowledgment. In each case, the result is similar. The act remains. The

injured remain. The consequences remain. Yet the moral current is interrupted before it can strike the center with full force.

Once this mechanism is recognized, however, its aura begins to diminish. Plausible deniability no longer appears as sophisticated mystery. It begins to look like patterned moral diffusion. The center is protected not because it is innocent, and not because the event is unknowable, but because narrative architecture has been built to absorb charge. That realization matters. It returns colonial and postcolonial domination to human scale. It shows that what appears untouchable often depends on paperwork, buffer language, distributed authorship, and managed interpretation. In other words, the administrative veil shrinks by the same method as the symbolic veil: once the grammar is visible, fear loses one of its oldest supports. Read this way, plausible deniability is one of the administrative cores of this argument.

## Le voile occulte de la légitimité

### Entitlement pathologique, symboles traumatiques et grammaire du pouvoir qui préserve le mal

#### Résumé synthétique

Cet article soutient que certaines formes de pouvoir ne survivent pas parce qu'elles sont invisibles, mais parce qu'elles sont si bien mises en scène qu'elles finissent par désorganiser la perception morale. Le mal demeure visible, les victimes parlent, les témoins sentent la distorsion, pourtant l'interprétation bascule rapidement : le préjudice devient complexe, la domination devient gouvernance, la cruauté devient nécessité, et la contestation devient menace ou instabilité.

L'argument central est que les systèmes nuisibles préservent leur légitimité grâce à une **grammaire stable d'inversion morale**. Cette grammaire repose sur plusieurs opérations récurrentes : normalisation du préjudice, déplacement ou culpabilisation des victimes, isolation des élites, neutralisation sémantique, stigmatisation de la dissidence, mobilisation de symboles traumatiques, puis activation d'un second niveau de défense par le gaslighting institutionnel, la honte, le brouillard procédural, le déni plausible et le déni ironique.

Au cœur de cette architecture se trouve l'**entitlement pathologique**, conçu non seulement comme un trait de personnalité, mais comme un principe générateur et sélectif. Dans des conditions institutionnelles favorables, il produit les récits, les symboles, les procédures et les protections nécessaires à sa propre reproduction. Il élève les seuils de tolérance au mal, punit la réciprocité, et favorise les acteurs adaptés à l'asymétrie, à l'impunité et au renversement moral.

L'article montre également que les **symboles traumatiques** et la **fragilité instrumentalisée** peuvent fonctionner comme des technologies de protection. La souffrance réelle demeure moralement centrale, mais sous pression de légitimité, elle peut aussi être mobilisée pour suspendre l'enquête, détourner la causalité loin des bénéficiaires, et recoder la demande de responsabilité en agression. Dans ce cadre, l'exposition du système ne le fragilise pas forcément. Elle peut au contraire activer des mécanismes plus sophistiqués de brouillage, de honte et de discipline interprétative.

Une autre thèse importante concerne le **signalement excédentaire**. Lorsque le simple déni plausible suffirait déjà, la réapparition répétée de répertoires symboliques d'inversion, de sacrifice, d'humiliation, de grotesque ou de ciblage de l'enfance indique souvent autre chose que la simple dissimulation. Elle signale une attirance récurrente pour la domination, la désensibilisation et l'exemption des limites ordinaires.

La contribution majeure de l'article est de montrer que cette grammaire ne se limite pas à un seul domaine. Elle circule entre des espaces souvent étudiés séparément : violences sexuelles, guerre, propagande, patronage des élites, gatekeeping académique, discours politique et usages

stratégiques de la mémoire traumatique. Ainsi, ce qui apparaît d'abord comme une aura obscure de pouvoir intouchable se révèle être une **architecture répétable de symboles, d'écrans, d'incitations et de scripts comportementaux**.

En définitive, l'article cherche à **réduire l'aura de mystère du pouvoir nuisible**. Il ne nie ni la gravité du mal ni la réalité de la domination, mais il montre que leur apparente toute-puissance dépend d'un travail constant de mise en scène, de traduction, de protection et de gestion des perceptions. Dès que cette grammaire devient visible, le voile se rétrécit, la peur change de forme, et la possibilité de réponse devient plus nette.

## **Mots-clés**

Entitlement pathologique ; légitimité qui préserve le mal ; inversion morale ; symboles traumatiques ; fragilité instrumentalisée ; gaslighting institutionnel ; neutralisation sémantique ; victimité collective ; déni plausible ; DARVO.