

Bye-Bye Stefan Molyneux – A Brief Introduction Into the “Connection” Between Anarchy and the Alt-Right

So yesterday, Stefan Molyneux, a staple of political and analytical thought for many libertarians and anarchists, has decided that with it being the current year, it was time for him to come out.

The bravery!

But yes, Molyneux has left his childish days behind him. He is no longer a libertarian or an anarchist, but rather, he has embraced the all-powerful call of the Milos, the Paul Joseph Watsons, and left his once egalitarian ways for greener pastures with the alt-right! [/sarcasm]

Given Stefan’s videos during this election cycle, this really should come as no surprise. And, frankly, I’m not going to fault him for it. We are all on different paths with different stop-offs, all trying to get at some semblance of truth.

But one question I hear constantly from people deals with compatibility between Libertarian Anarchy and Alt-Righters, or if there even is one to begin with. After all, before this election cycle, one could have easily confused Paul Joseph Watson for a libertarian, or Alex Jones, whom PJW works for. Stefan, for years, has applied the label to himself, and for the most part, justifiably so.

So are alt-righters and libertarian anarchists (AKA – Anarcho-Capitalists, Market-Anarchists – i.e. – actual anarchists) compatible in thought? In a word, no. But there is some nuance that is worth exploring. Keep in mind, this post isn’t meant to be comprehensive, but a rather brief introduction into any possible intersection between the two belief systems, if there is one, and to explore how deep that association goes and when and where it ends.

One thing I’ve noticed that LAs (Libertarian Anarchists) and ARs (Alt-Righters) *can* agree on is their general support of capitalism, and free-market principles and ideas.

Out of all the alt-right supporters or blogs I’ve read, many of these kinds of people consider themselves to be red pill masculine, and a part of that means doing what needs to be done in order to get paid, to put it bluntly. That’s not an all-encompassing definition, or even a part of it. That’s a blog for another day. But a large portion of ARs come from a red-pill mindset, and this means, generally, being friendly to free-market capitalism, competition, and getting paid. Certainly nothing wrong with that.

And while that is a *major* cause for alignment, there is a pretty big departure for our camps, culturally, after that.

From a social and cultural perspective, that difference is driven primarily, at least from what I can tell, our views regarding egalitarianism. Egalitarianism fits very well within an LA perspective. After all, if we are all equal, then none should be above another. Any form of government – be it a constitutional republic, or communism – has as its basis that some people are fit to rule, while the majority are fit to be ruled. There is an inherent disconnect between egalitarianism, and statism of any kind, to the point where people who call themselves egalitarian and in the same breath tell us who they are voting for elicits a wince, if not outright jaw-dropping as we try to comprehend the cognitive dissonance.

The AR doesn't have this problem. How do they get around it? It's simple...they get rid of egalitarianism entirely. Once you get rid of egalitarianism completely, just about any other form of government is open to you. But, in order to pinpoint what kind of government the ARs are looking for, you have to understand the "Dark Enlightenment," and neo-reactionism. These are traditionalist belief systems that advocate for the return of the traditional family, and traditional values (these are usually backed by Judeo-Christian religious principles). These are smaller units of government to be sure, one that even the most ardent of LAs don't really have any problem supporting. So where's the disconnect? The disconnect, and the basis for the Dark Enlightenment and Neo-Reactionary thinking, comes in support for a return to monarchy of some kind, which fits perfectly within an anti-democratic and anti-egalitarian premises of the AR. The Wiki entry for "Dark Enlightenment," (A play on "The Enlightenment," which produced much of the West's primary basis and foundations for egalitarianism in the public and social spheres) reads "The Dark Enlightenment, or the neoreactionary movement (also simply neoreaction; abbreviated NRx by proponents), is an anti-democratic, and reactionary movement that broadly rejects egalitarianism and Whig historiography. The movement favors a return to older societal constructs and forms of government, including support for monarchism and traditional gender roles, coupled with libertarian or otherwise conservative approach to economics. Some critics have labeled the movement as "neo-fascist."

As far as the neo-fascist label goes, some ARs I am aware of proudly wear that label. It isn't a negative, but has simply been presented that way en masse via propaganda.

So due to this difference in egalitarianism, and its foundation within LA philosophy, it seems to be an insurmountable obstacle regarding an intersection between LA philosophy and AR philosophy. We may agree on economics, but on society, we likely aren't going to find common ground, strictly philosophically speaking.

Applying this to the 2016 American Elections, the AR has enthusiastically supported Donald Trump. His "real" talk, outside the political mainstream mentality, and his intent to "build walls, kick out muslims, etc..." has resulted in an almost fanatical type of backing. And while the backing of any politician or political person is an immediate cause for pause in LAs, for NRs, the support they show would be the equivalent had conservatives seen Ted

Cruz nominated, or Libertarians within the Republican party seen Ron Paul nominated. Donald Trump represents everything the red-pilled NRs view as important in a person. And with race often a significant factor for the NR, Trumps bluntness concerning race relations is seen as refreshing, if not factually correct.

Granted, I believe much of what the NR views Trump as, and what he actually is are not as close as they believe, but from their perspective, it's easy to see the support. Many memes have been created with Trump as a Victorian Era General, with him, Vladimir Putin, and Rodrigo Duterte (The President of Philippine) as some sort of AR trinity of manliness and straight talk. And while the majority of people see those figures are somewhat dangerous, the AR view them as heroes, and icons of AR masculinity and belief. And all of it is founded within the ideas of the Dark Enlightenment and Neo-Reactionism. It really is a fascinating group with many complex layers of thought.

Now you might be thinking, "You seem to be presenting the AR in a positive light, or friendly light," and while that is somewhat true, it's not because I am ideologically aligned. I just don't like to crap on ideologies where I know we can find worthwhile allies in, even if there are fundamental differences. And believe me, there are *fundamental* differences, as I've explained. And I'll even go deeper.

For LAs, our support of the free-market is often rooted in our belief of egalitarianism. People are equal, and they are equally capable of determining value for themselves, and of entering into negotiation regarding what they see as valuable – time and work for pay, money for product or service, etc...This is an important basis for our support of the free-market. The free-market, in its natural state, is an egalitarian entity. It respects nobody. Certainly not one above another.

But with the AR, and their explicit denial of egalitarianism, it raises the possibility of an eventual eradication of the free-market, if you take the belief system to its logical conclusion. For the time being, they support free-markets, and that's good enough for me. But for LAs, our support of the free-market is rooted in our egalitarian beliefs. It's foundational to it, and we recognize that you cannot have the free-market without accepting its egalitarian nature.

In any case, this is why I said our philosophies are not compatible. Those foundational difference will ultimately lead to diametrically opposed trains of thought. And while we may currently view the free-market as a good, the LA views it as necessarily so. The AR, if it is to remain consistent with its own beliefs, will eventually abandon it. It has to, on the basis of its own philosophy. If people are not equal, they are not capable of going into negotiation of valuables on an equal footing.

Instead, I would advocate for LAs to align themselves with the AR movement, insofar as

they are still supporting the free-market. When that necessarily changes, our support is withdrawn. Socially, insofar as those social beliefs instill a desire to use a political system to enforce those beliefs, we are going to be far apart. I know many traditionalists who are LAs, but simply don't advocate a government machine to enforce those ideals on people. Traditionalism doesn't negate egalitarianism. Government does that. But as the AR rises in power and influence, and attempts to force those beliefs on a populace, the LA will oppose them just as they do any other government based political system. Consider them friends at a distance, friends you invite to your party, but keep a close eye on in case they turn the stereo on too loud and it's uncomfortable for everyone else. J

For further info on the alt-right, or popular alt-right leaning or supporting people and congruent philosophies, consider reading from these sources:

Twitter:

Paul Joseph Watson – <https://twitter.com/PrisonPlanet>

Mike Cernovich – <https://twitter.com/Cernovich>

Wife With a Purpose – <https://twitter.com/apurposefulwife>

Return of Kings – <https://twitter.com/ReturnOfKings>

Blogs:

<http://www.returnofkings.com/>

www.wallstreetplayboys.com

Going to any of the aforementioned twitter accounts or blogs, you are bound to find many other sources too, some better than others. Also, head over to my blogs I read post for more red-pill themed blogs. It is fairly common to see AR thought in those blogs as well.

P.S. –

Just so people are aware, I generally try to be more considerate of philosophies if I find them logical, at least within their own context. So I try to give them the benefit of the doubt, and try not to interpret their beliefs, but present them as accurately as I can. With philosophies I don't respect, I do not give the same regard. 3rd wave feminism, SJW-ism, statism generally, or any leftist ideology, are my typical victims. So if this brief introduction into AR thought seems polite, it is because I am more likely to align myself with them than some far left group. I am *not*, however, an AR. I am an ardent anarcho-capitalist, trans-humanist (<- which might also preclude me from accepting some other AR beliefs), and agorist (<- support for black markets might also keep me out of their philosophy).

Voluntarism probably does as well, as free association *seems* to go against traditionalist values. I'll need some AR people to help me with that one, as nothing seems *explicit* regarding that.