

# Epochs, Evolution, Nationalism, and Synthesis: What Gives Anarchists The Best Chance At Reaching AnCapistan?

Various historians, philosophers and political scientists (Kuhn, Hegel, Marx, Fukuyama, etc...) have noticed an interesting series of historical patterns that repeatedly pop up over the course of human events. And that is that humans move, collectively, in stages, shift from one societal set of thoughts to others. But one thing that I have noticed with my 20/20 vision is that while these epochs produce largely different outcomes, at their core, they are similar enough, if not even practically the same. Or at least based on some understood premises that allow the shift to be made from one epoch to the next. For instance, going from a geocentric model of the universe to a heliocentric model of the universe doesn't work in either case if the world is flat, and we live in a snow globe, right? Both sets of premises are based on the idea that we live on a round planet, and that things *are* moving. The change in epoch wasn't so drastic as to move us from a round, moving universe to a stationary, flat one. That's too big of a leap.

Same with politics and economics. Marx correctly labeled the historical progression of various economic systems, and with the advent of capitalism, we see the previous systems just made more efficient. They aren't *radically* different. Before the invention of fiat money, we used silver, copper, and gold coins. Before using money, we simply traded our goods. But each new "epoch" in economics just took a previous premise as true, and then made it better. And just like we use fiat money now, we are moving faster and faster into the realm of digital currencies, with things like bitcoin, litecoin, and ethereum breaking all sorts of milestones. Still money. Still fiat, effectively. Sure, it's not paper. But it's still based on a subjective and perceived value of itself that everyone respects, and it is used for trade. Politics works the same. No matter which political system we've had, the premise was this – human behavior can be, and should be, regulated. No matter how wrong these premises are, literally every form of external government – i.e. the state – has operated on this foundational premise. Monarchies, democracies, republics and communism. This idea is not unfamiliar to anarchists. It's why we label any form of government which isn't self-government "statist." This is because, ultimately, they are. So just because most of the world has moved to democracy, it doesn't mean we've moved to the "end of history" as the famous political scientist Francis Fukuyama once proclaimed.

It may even be that life itself works in much the same way, for the individual. And as I wrote about in part 1 of this series, people aren't going to be willing to jump through rings of fire to something so radically different from what they know now to get to ancapistan. It doesn't fulfill their hierarchy of needs. It takes away their sense of stability, and perhaps even a part of a sense of their very identity. We need some epochs to come our way first before we can reach ancapistan. And I think of ancapistan *is* the goal. At least for me, it is.

As I've said before, this blog is dedicated to mapping out the ins and outs of what ancapistan looks like. But one area that I and many other anarchist philosophers have neglected, is how we get from where we are now to where we want to go. And I think anarchists, particularly of the right variety (individualist, libertarian, capitalist, etc...) ignore this on purpose. We're not immune to cognitive dissonance, or implicit bias with our views. We can have our ideals, and we're determined to get there *straight away*, from a to z. But I believe we can be a little too naïve about the next, necessary steps.

Let me ask you something, and be honest – As an anarchist, which is worse? Political Globalism, or Political Nationalism? Not economic globalism/nationalism. Not cultural globalism/nationalism. Political. Which is worse? Correct me if I'm wrong in this assumption, but does this question make you uncomfortable? Are you squirming in your chair right now? “How do I get out of answering this?” you may be wondering. Well, let me help. I'll ask a different question. What gives an individual a better chance at freedom? Living under a federal system of government, like in the United States? Or under a confederation of states, like the Confederacy, prior to the U.S. adopting the constitution?

If your answer is the latter (and it should be, as an anarchist friend recently wrote to me on Twitter “decentralization to the point of individualism”), and this is true, it stands to reason then that federal system is worse for individual liberty than a confederate. Or at the least, it is probably easier to attain greater levels of liberty the smaller forms of government we have. This was the whole idea behind the American experiment, anyway, right? This was a major point of contention between Jefferson, Brutus and the Anti-Federalists as they debated the Federalists, no?

Having worked through that, let me pose this question again: Which is worse? Political Globalism (think bigger governments over greater swaths of territory – that dreaded “one-world” government, for example) or Political Nationalism? If we're being honest with ourselves, the answer is obvious. Political Globalism is worse than political nationalism. Political nationalism allows a greater chance for the individual to find *some* semblance of liberty than within a political globalist sphere. The smaller the leviathan, the bigger the individual. As anarchists, we are acutely aware of this. When the individual is his own government, their individuality is much more radiant.

But here's the problem with that: As I stated in the beginning of this article, and have alluded to in both part 1 and 2 of this series, people will not be willing to jump from the statism we have now, with multicultural nation-states, and international governing bodies and regulatory agencies, to straight anarchy right away. The shift is too stark, and represents too great a leap for mankind to latch onto. History proves this idea time and again. Instead, we would need something smaller, something more palatable first, that keeps some basic premises similar to what people already understand, while simultaneously introducing smaller and smaller forms of government, until at last we

abandon it completely because we've transitioned far enough for people to have understood that we don't need any government at all. But as much as Anarchists loathe to admit, the fact remains, the majority of any given population simply is not ready to make that jump. There are too many cultural, ethnic, and political barriers in the way.

So I am proposing something different. You're probably asking "did 3PA just become a Nationalist Publication?" Bear with me here, and allow me to explain. But the short answer is...

Nope.

At least not in the way that you think. (And even if, is that so bad if it gets us close to true anarchy? Watching individual nations take back their own sovereignty is not a bad thing. And it won't be long after that people begin to see how what applies to nations applies to them, in this regard, especially when you take into consideration modern events and contexts. The individual person, like an individual society and culture, are all sovereign. Brexit was a great example of this. Seeing Merkel come out and say that Germany "could no longer rely" on the U.S. and Russia, while not meant necessarily as a national sovereign idea, is an interesting statement.) <— Digression - let me get back to my main point.

It is my belief that the Western Identity, a philosophical identity, is under attack. Can anyone honestly dispute this? Western ideals in the form of an appreciation for and a fostering of honest scientific discovery, philosophical debate with an emphasis on reason, honest questioning of societal dogma, progress based on merit and nothing else, a love and encouragement for the arts, discipline, traditional masculinity and femininity, a voluntary sense of obligation to family, our children, and seeing them raised well, and egalitarianism are all under attack daily. Whether it is the destruction of the family (not even the traditional family, anymore. Family life, period, is under attack and seen as "oppressive"), belligerent SJWs telling us that the pillars of western identity are tyrannical, or radical feminists claiming that men being masculine (man's biological imperative, science tells us) is somehow "toxic," or any other host of ridiculous claims made by these and similar groups, it is easy to see that my claim here is not without merit. No, it is, in fact, true that the very foundations of the Western Identity are under attack constantly, and I think that, regardless of your race, gender, religion, or whatever identity you claim, we can agree (I hope) that the West, as an institution, should be protected. Its ideas, legacy, history, and people should and must have a place in this world, especially if we are to finally attain our ancapistan. And if you do believe that, allow me to introduce to you a new type of anarchy. One based on both ideals, but also a basic understanding of human history, human psychology, that has as its stated goal the attaining of a true anarchist society. It is a philosophy that understands deeply the sentiment made by F.A. Hayek when he stated "Paradoxical as it may appear, it is probably true that a successful free society will always in large measure be a tradition-bound society."

Anarchy doesn't need to be redefined. The pillars are stable. What it needs is a new foundation, those very foundations that allowed the philosophy of Anarchy and Liberty to appear on the world stage in the first place. The Pillars are strong. The Foundation is crumbling. Notice that nothing I said was "racial." That isn't to say that biodiversity doesn't exist; it does. It is a very real thing. But more important than that is the fight to keep the western identity alive, regardless of race. That said, what I am about to introduce to you does have some things to say about racial identity, especially in the West. And if that, or anything from the previous paragraph appeals to you, then let me introduce to you a new form of Anarchy that I have been wrestling with for months now.

Welcome to Alt-Anarchy, or Anarcho-Culturalism.

So what is it? Well, I will be revealing more and more pieces of the philosophy in the coming months, but how about a basic idea? If these ideals are palatable to you, you may be an adherent of Alt-Anarchy:

Alt-Anarchy, or Anarcho-Culturalism, is a form of anarchy that posits that an anarchistic society is possible, but only if it applies a working understanding of human history and basic human psychology to the belief. Like many historians and philosophers before it, AA's (or AC's) believes that politics move in epochs, each epoch similar in premise to the one before it, but taking politics in a slightly different direction. AA's see that progression inevitably headed towards Political Globalization, and the destruction of western liberal identity is paramount for this to succeed. Once that destruction happens, the leviathan will be ripe for its final evolution, allowing it to cover the globe completely. Some cultures and people are willingly accepting of this, others are being used as tools to further this goal, and other cultures are among its first set of victims, precisely because those cultures represent this enemy's biggest threat. This is why we see the kinds of attacks we have been seeing in the last few decades, all having at their source the same interested parties. Alt-Anarchy does not necessarily see Western Culture as superior, but merely worth protecting. Those not of Western Culture are encouraged to adapt Alt-Anarchy to their cultures, especially if there are significant overlaps with Western Thinking. AA's understand that, as difficult as it sounds, disdain for global governance may take the form of an implicit support for national sovereignty instead. The eventual dismantling of the E.U., for instance, would be a good thing for the peoples of Europe. Relating to the previous points, Alt-Anarchy posits that the ideal of anarchy is largely a "white" idea. What that means is that, historically speaking, it really has only been "white" philosophers and theorists who have believed it was something worth achieving, and it has been largely only popular in Western Cultures. Congruent to that, it will likely only be achieved at all in the Western world, which adds another reason why we should concentrate in the West. Non-Western peoples of all nationalities – emphasis placed on the peoples of Eastern Europe, India, Iran, China and their relatives, especially (which will be explained in future posts) who wish to adopt the

same liberty-based ideals for themselves are encouraged to join us. This is not an exclusionary philosophy, just one based on some hard realities. Alt-Anarchy believes markets are the peoples' best means of attaining the quality of life they perceive is best for them. In other words, an Alt-Anarchy is an advocate of capitalism, and all that it entails. Alt-Anarchy is anti-socialist, anti-communist, anti-authoritarian. It views the marketplace of ideas through debates, discussion, argumentation, and philosophical dialogue as the best venue for a given society to determine its values, not in the courthouses or legislative buildings of governments. Using the law as a "teaching mechanism" is not only immoral and unjust, it illustrates a fundamental misunderstanding of human nature – a man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still. Let people be free – free to experiment, try new things, and not be weighed down with cumbersome legislation meant to dissuade innovation and progress. Alt-Anarchy is open to debate, and not to be boxed in, forging allies in other realms of anarchy. Transhumanists, individualists, libertarians, capitalists, or primitivists will always find allies and friends within the AA philosophy, and might already be adherents to those ideas while also being AAs, and vice versa. Other, non-mentioned varieties of anarchist thought are not necessarily excluded unless they seek to impose their will on others via force. For these types, Alt-Anarchy loudly opposes. Alt-Anarchy proposes that some cultures are worth protecting, worth defending, even over other cultures, especially if there are foreign cultures trying to impose their will on host cultures. According to the U.N. definition, this is a characteristic of genocide. Alt-Anarchy believes this to be the case as well. Cultures which willingly utilize murder, theft, or other abuses of liberty are contrary not only the ideals set forth by Alt-Anarchy, but of all reasonable people in the world. Paul Joseph Watson correctly observed "some cultures are better than others." That said, cultures can, and should, evolve, and get better. Alt-Anarchy does not shy away from this truth, and instead of concentrating on putting down other cultures, would rather concentrate on its own, fostering its own, teaching its own, bettering its own, and letting that be an example to all other people who wish to similarly progress as well. And Alt-Anarchy encourages this as well. The more the merrier.

I think that about sums it up, although I may have unintentionally forgotten some points about this philosophy. That said, in the upcoming weeks and months, I will be fleshing this idea out more and more, with more articles geared towards describing not only the one pillar I haven't discussed yet, but also the steps on the foundation. I will be talking about why those are important and necessary for success. I will also be describing further the progression after this political nationalism over political globalism is achieved. The aim is to always foster and protect the smallest minority, the individual. But to do that, we might sometimes have to band together. Anarchists of any variety understand this, and this is why we seek out like-minded friends to talk philosophy with. The old adage is true, even within anarchy – there is strength in numbers. And ultimately, if the goal is to create a real anarchist society, we must have great numbers. I think one thing that I will add is another idea some might find more controversial, but I hope you will still ponder on it a bit, even if

you discard it in the end.

I think that the belief in fostering and protection the individual is the paramount reason people become anarchists. But there seems to be an aversion to joining collectively. I find this to be somewhat odd, considering there is nothing in the history of the word to suggest that becoming part of a “collective” is necessarily bad. So long as there is no violation of the Non-Aggression Principle, the act is voluntary, and no abuses of liberty occur within that movement, or to others outside of it, what is the issue? Aside from strict anarchist-individualists, I can’t honestly say I really understand the problem of accepting an identity that places you firmly within a given group. The irony is that even claiming the mantle of “anarchist” does this very thing. And based on the etymology of the word “anarchy”, the word was always described in a political sense, never in a societal sense. Anarchy means no ruler, or no leader. Such as a society that has no kings, or politicians. The anarchy of late middle ages and renaissance very much had a “collective” component to it, and this continued all the way until the 19th and 20th centuries, especially as some of the first “modern” anarchists were socialists. There is nothing wrong with banding together under a common identity to fight off and defend against intrusion. Banding together doesn’t necessarily mean socialism, thank the gods.

Alt-Anarchy is not an “anti-collective” society, to repeat. However, if the collective sees itself as more important than the individual, then it does. But if the society’s sole purpose for existence is to foster, sustain, and protect individuals, then there is no problem. Just don’t violate my liberty, k? Pretty simple, I think.