

## **Saving American Liberty Conference Talks**

James Lindsay

Dallas, TX

August 22–23

## Talk 1 (Opening Talk) – Stakeholderism and the Post-America Movement

### Introduce the Conference: Saving American Liberty

Michael O'Fallon and I (James Lindsay)

Welcome!

As you all know, I often get asked on social media who would follow me

I always say, “All the best people!”

And here you are!

All the best people are in Dallas, Texas, this weekend, here with us

American Liberty—in fact, America itself—is at risk.

You might think that President Trump's election has saved us from disaster, but no

We're closer to disaster than we've ever been

President Trump and his election represented an opportunity to save American Liberty

There was a growing movement that was effective, and it was behind Trump

Saving America and American Liberty would always be our job, though

Now that movement has been hijacked/derailed, is being poisoned and scattered

There's no big, organized program (no “side”) to place our hope in

We have to do something different

As usual, that starts with understanding what's happening

This conference is ultimately about the big-picture threat to American liberty we all sense around us, coming from both Left and Right

Mike's going to talk about a model of political economy called “Integralism” (and Neo-Integralism) that's every bit as important to understand as Communism and Fascism

Integralism the *conceptual model* meant to replace American Liberty

Integration of church, state, and economy into a single object meant to serve man

Three legs of the stool: public, private, and faith

Integralism, Left and Right – and they're not so different

I'm going to talk about other things, mostly Woke, which is something like the initial basis for the value system for these new Integralist projects

First, in this talk, to set Mike up and establish a through line

I'll give you the tool of its implementation: stakeholderism and the stakeholder economy

Form of elitism posing as populism

Bannon: “populist nationalism or populist socialism”

The stakeholder economy incorporates in the name of “the people” or “the *Volk*”

but is centrally controlled and state-religious

Connection to Woke?

Woke gives the neo-religious model that allows the implementation of the system through enforced values

Global concern: break America, China and Islam take over control of most of the world

The West dies

Post-America movement will cause this catastrophe while claiming to prevent it.

## With that, **Stakeholderism and the Post-America Movement**

For those of you who were here last year, here's something amusing:

I started off talking about the Vice President last year, and I will again this year  
Different Vice President, though!

Open with JD Vance clip (Clip 1-1: VanceStakeholderism –  
<https://x.com/jasonahart/status/1953491575989772760>)

What is “post-liberalism”?

It's time, apparently, to move “beyond” liberalism to some “next” thing

That's progressive (not conservative)

Vance points to the public-private partnership aspect of our economy

Is he describing it? For it? Against it?

Good question.

(Clip 1-2: VanceSeizeInstitutions –  
<https://x.com/ConceptualJames/status/1873405981679649075>)

For the concept, against the particular implementation

About “post-liberalism”: Marx quote to understand the “post-” in “post-liberal” (*EPM*)

“Communism as the positive transcendence of private property as human self-estrangement, and therefore as the real appropriation of the human essence by and for man; communism therefore as the complete return of man to himself as a social (i.e., human) being—a return accomplished consciously and embracing the entire wealth of previous development.”

I frequently discuss this quote and focus on the first two parts

Today, we're focusing on the third part

This is post-liberalism: “...and embracing the entire wealth of previous development.”

Not *anti*-liberal; *post*-liberal

*Going beyond* liberal (and liberal means free – and America)

Marx's idea is that capitalism must serve its purpose and then we all must move on

Post-liberalism means liberalism has served its purpose, so we need to move on

The Left believes this as core and fundamental doctrine, as we know

The Right is also giving up on liberalism, so freedom, so America

Post-liberalism is a post-America movement

The goal is to keep the house that freedom built while getting rid of the freedom that built it

They offer a new idea for a new America with a different or better kind of “freedom”

Being free to do what the state (not necessity or interest) requires you to do

State as incorporation of the “general will,” generally or “common good”

Rousseau's freedom by relinquishing freedom

Hobbes's freedom by creating a civic monster to control us

Post-liberals think this will work *better*

(rather than cutting our legs out from under us)

The results of freedom come from freedom, though, not otherwise

View: We got everything from liberalism we can, and now it's time to move *forward*

Just look at the People's Republic of China...

Or, view: Too much freedom was always the problem

Just look at the People's Republic of China...

To conclude Marx's paragraph: "Communism [as such] is the riddle of history solved, and it knows itself to be this solution."

What he means is that Communism (as such) answers the question of how we can be as free from labor as pre-civilized people while retaining the benefits of civilization

The other riddle is *how can this be made to work*

No adequate answer to this has yet been found

But look at the People's Republic of China...

Post-liberalism is the latest attempt to answer that question

...by taking a look at the People's Republic of China

The "post-" in "post-liberal" means:

Going beyond the thing while allegedly keeping the benefits of the thing

Dialectics – *aufheben* – *transformational*

Same "post-" as in "post-truth" or "postmodern"

But this isn't just about Communism

This can be done by "Left" and "Right" movements with the same big-picture goals of a new system

(Clip 1-3 – GreeneObamaTransformation – Source clips:

<https://x.com/ConceptualJames/status/1951456258944643466/video/1> and

<https://x.com/ConceptualJames/status/1948404618444013856/video/1>)

A fundamental transformation of America, i.e., post-America

Ultimately, this conference is about the "post-liberal" movements, which is—or are—also the post-America movement(s)

Why "post-America"?

Well, we can start with "fundamental transformation of America"

Into something else that is beyond America while keeping the benefits of America

But! The political, economic, philosophical, and epistemological foundations of liberalism were first codified (not invented or discovered) in the American Experiment

To give up on the American *tradition* while trying to keep its benefits is

Post-American

Liberty is at threat from a pair of post-America movements that slice like scissors

Left and Right

If you love America and its promise, we have to understand and stop these scissors that will cut us off from our heritage and way of life

Thus, we're here to start laying understanding necessary to Save American Liberty

So how is this supposed to work? What's the model both post-America movements use to destroy American liberty?

The Stakeholder Economy

From his bio in his book *Stakeholder Capitalism*:

"Professor Klaus Schwab is the founder and executive chairman of the World Economic Forum. In 1971, he first published *Modern Enterprise Management in Mechanical Engineering*. In the book, he argues that a company must serve not only shareholders but all stakeholders to achieve long-term growth and prosperity. To promote the stakeholder concept, he founded the World Economic Forum the same year."

Notice the *purpose* of the WEF is to promote the "stakeholder concept"

The “new” model, which we’re facing now, is Stakeholderism  
Represent “all stakeholders,” not just shareholders, for the greater/common good  
Or, the Stakeholder Economy  
Or, Stakeholder Post-liberalism (Left and Right)  
Or, Some alternative names:  
Greater-Good Economy (Left)  
Common-Good Economy (Right)  
People’s Economy  
Done in the name of the people, who are “stakeholders”  
In German: *Volkisch* Economy  
The China Model (21<sup>st</sup> Century Communism)  
Elitist (or vanguard) sociocultural engineering through a captured economy

### Stakeholderism—the China Model

#### Explain Stakeholderism

What is a Stakeholder?

WHO are the Stakeholders? (everyone, so “the people,” “Volk,” etc.)

But that’s not practicable, so the experts who represent their interests

Why is this a scam?

Socioeconomic Elite Theory

Unelected, unaccountable elitists decide what’s good for everyone

And how everything must run

Once you have it, you can’t get rid of it, and it can change however it needs to

Right and Left don’t really matter

Compare: ESG

Who defines what good E, S, and G policy are?

What would stop redefinitions, new letters, etc.?

Social credit enforcement

### How it’s enforced in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: Social credit

ESG is a social credit score for corporate activity

The China Model runs on social credit

From DigiChina (<https://digichina.stanford.edu/work/planning-outline-for-the-construction-of-a-social-credit-system-2014-2020/>):

“A social credit system is an important component part of the Socialist market economy system and the social governance system. ... Its inherent requirements are establishing the idea of a sincerity culture, and carrying forward sincerity and traditional virtues. It uses encouragement to keep trust and constraints against breaking trust as incentive mechanisms, and its objective is raising the honest mentality and credit levels of the entire society.

Accelerating the construction of a social credit system is an important basis for comprehensively implementing the scientific development view and building a harmonious Socialist society. It is an important method to perfect the Socialist market economy system, accelerating and innovating social governance, and it has an important significance for strengthening the sincerity consciousness of the members of society, forging a desirable credit environment, raising the overall competitiveness of the country and stimulating the development of society and the progress of civilization.”

### Compare against shareholder model

The idea here is that if you want a stake, you literally buy one (private sector)  
You put economic skin in the game to claim a stake in the program  
You're not just a "stakeholder" because the system in which that program is  
embedded affects you  
Your stake is pushed through your vote for elected reps (public sector)

Ultimately, the Stakeholder Economy is a form of integrated (totalizing) Progressive Elitism

Basic idea: elitists will establish a value system, and the state and economy (public-private) will  
operate accordingly

Historical development is telling

Klaus Schwab and the World Economic Forum are usually credited with the Stakeholder  
concept, but that's inaccurate – not just because he likely got it from Kissinger  
The model predates Schwab not just in concept but in legal implementation

First legal implementation in Nazi Germany in 1937

Nazi Shareholder Act (or German Corporation Law)

Demanded corporate "coordination" with the Nazi Party in the name of the *Volk*  
State, Party, and "*Volk*" interests are put ahead of other corporate interests  
Like profit (for owners and shareholders)  
Party-in-action represents the *Volk*, who do not represent themselves

Explicitly established the "stakeholder economy" model

Nazi Party, German State, and *Volk* became the primary stakeholders

Established direct collaboration between corporations and Party

Incorporated the Nazi *Führerprinzip* (leader principle) into corporate structure

Corporate board leaders (~CEOs) given dictatorial control

Plus having to answer to the Party

(G score)

Shareholder interests are explicitly sidelined under the above two principles

Corporations were required to prioritize the *Volk* community as dictated by Nazi Party

(S score)

Nazi Party given power (as key stakeholders) to intervene in corporate decision-making

Large industries (relevant to war priorities) were effectively nationalized

Private ownership under strong state management

Dividends, profits, etc., were often capped and/or redirected to the state

Access to resources/capital highly restricted; production quotas, and price controls

All in line with State agendas, as the representatives of the *Volk*

So, the Nazi (or Fascist) state incorporates the *Volk* (Hegel)

The *Volk* are the allegedly real stakeholders of the economy

Unwieldy! Not real!

The Nazi (or Fascist) state represents them as stakeholders *in their name*

Hence, People's Economy or *Volkisch* Economy as alternative names

It's a post-capitalist (or post-free enterprise), so post-liberal economic model

State + Economy + Values (located in the *Volk* and the Party's vision for it)

So what about the CCP?

21<sup>st</sup> Century Communist model

Incorporated exactly this corporate management model in the 1980s  
Deng Xiaoping: One Country, Two Systems (Communism and (Nazi) *Stakeholderism*)  
This is the “China Model” today

Being reproduced in the West under ESG  
A big lie we’ve all swallowed (one of the biggest of our times!)  
“China rose from poverty by incorporating capitalism, hip-hip-hurray!”

FALSE

China rose by incorporating *Stakeholder Capitalism*  
That is, Stakeholderism, or Nazi Economic Fascism

This allows us to tell an important story about the evolution of Communist theory  
Another historical dimension – 21<sup>st</sup> Century Communism model and its development

Marx saw Communism as post-liberal, and socialism is a transition stage to get there  
As we’ll discuss later (and here in the workshop last year!) this model proved to be a failure in both regards.

[Apply and briefly explain graphic(s) from last year: 5-stage graphic (Images 1-1–3)]

Capitalism doesn’t become socialism, feudalism does  
Feudalism hasn’t and can’t solve the problem of production, capitalism does  
What you need is a state economy that can produce

Through limited and controlled public-private ownership  
...aligned to a particular state-endorsed values system

And that’s called Fascism

Not to talk about it too much yet (later!), but what Hitler and Mussolini  
knew about this model is that it requires a cohesive worldview (which  
they learned from Marxism)

But both West and East studiously rejected Fascism and seem allergic to it  
(for different reasons)

They needed a softer Fascism that feels more like capitalism (West) or socialism (East)

What would that look like?

Just look at the People’s Republic of China...

Or Klaus Schwab’s “Stakeholder Capitalism” and ESG

So that’s the method to bring people into the program of integrated state, “church” (values: here, socialist), and economic activity and to train them to participate in it correctly.

There’s no freedom.

Adopting such a system in America would be very post-American, indeed.

So now that we have an idea of the model of implementation, Mike is going to introduce the Neo-Integralist framework that works as its operating system

**(5.75 pages)**

## Talk 2 – Left and Right with Society in the Balance

So far, I've introduced the Stakeholder Economy model

And Mike has talked about the big picture

This is all happening on both Left *and* Right

In fact, it almost has to work on both (scissors) in case one isn't enough

The dialectic, you know

If we're going to talk about these things on Left and Right,

we need to get our heads around Left and Right, as concepts

This is a very fraught subject

These words mean a lot to a lot of people

Original meaning comes from the French Revolution

Left: Revolutionaries, radicals, Jacobins, transformative change

Right: Monarchists, conservatives, supporters of the Old Regime

What we see from radicals today (on the Right) has both of those elements, though

Transformative change + monarchy and state church ("return")

Because we're American, some people think Left means tyranny (statism or even socialism) and Right means liberty (and free enterprise)

There are good reasons to think that way, but there's a problem

The revolutionaries (Left) in the French Revolution wanted maximum statism

(Some, but not all, were proto/early socialists)

They also aligned with some aspects of liberalism (rights of man)

The conservatives (Right) in the French Revolution wanted to conserve the current system

In America, the current system is classically liberal

Which is anti-statist, pro-property rights, pro-individual rights, etc.

In fact, Americanism is anti-monarchy and anti-State Church

Being "conservative" in America means conserving the classical liberal tradition as a tradition

There are in a very broad way clearly two different approaches to statism (or even socialism), not just in mechanism but in vision and organization

One self-identifies as Left (and anti-Rightist)

The other self-identifies as Right (and anti-Leftist)

We should take that self-identity seriously

Plus, there are other good reasons to think those identifications are also right

Something other than "Left" and "Right" is happening on the extremes

So, let's talk about Left and Right

I see two, maybe three, dimensions that are pertinent, and they overlap with each other a lot

Traditionalism (Right) versus Anti-traditionalism (Left)

Radical Egalitarianism (Left) versus Rigid Hierarchicalism (Right)

But, a complication!

Organic/Natural Hierarchy vs. Enforced

Expanding Tolerance (Left) versus Restricting/Contracting/Limiting Tolerance (Right)

Tradition on the Right is seen as a limiting principle on what we should tolerate



When that principle starts failing, an enforced hierarchy is introduced to restore it

These variables overlap a bit

Traditionalism versus Anti-traditionalism is fairly straightforward

Tradition defines the limits of tolerance

Kind of like a “cultural comfort zone”

Tradition gives a structure in which hierarchy can develop and seem legitimate

Tradition is a kind of accrual of wisdom by a culture over time

Works over time: tradition lasts

Fails eventually: tradition discarded

Conservatives are partly right that tradition is an epistemological force

But it's a weak one because tradition can be arbitrary or wrong

Left recognizes that tradition can be arbitrary or wrong

And is restrictive, both rightly sometimes and wrongly at other times

They are therefore anti-traditional on principle

(Liberals are ambivalent to tradition on principle, not anti-)

Thus throw out epistemological baby with the bathwater

Often arbitrarily or even flatly wrongly

(Liberals vet traditions against other principles or evidence)

Tolerance versus Restriction is pretty straightforward

But co-constituted with traditionalism (as we just discussed)

And tolerance is the axis of a breaking point into Reaction

When tradition as a limiting principle on tolerance fails, it summons force

Reaction is a wholesale rejection of tolerance that expanded too far

Into a rejection of the underlying system that allowed it

Hierarchy is another matter, though

Because of reality and social construction

Views toward hierarchy are not straightforward, however, because of reality and construction

Remember: Hierarchy is one side of the question of egalitarianism

There's the question of what makes a hierarchy legitimate

Easy to understand that the Left's general answer is “nothing” in the ideal

Radical egalitarianism = no hierarchy

But, hierarchy is an inevitable result (cannot be avoided)

Leftism therefore is based on a fundamentally failed idea

So, adherence to Leftism in the meantime creates an artificial hierarchy

Favors people who claim to want to destroy hierarchy

By putting themselves at the top of a new one

Dictatorship of the Proletariat (or Antiracists)

There are two other answers, though—thus the split on the “Right”

Hierarchy as the organic result of merit (organic)

Hierarchy as an established tradition or construct (constructed/enforced)

Even these aren't quite the same thing!

From tradition: traditionalist

From construction: pseudo-traditionalist (by forced “traditions”)

Anti-hierarchicalism, aka radical egalitarianism (Leftism), demands expanding tolerance

It requires tolerating people being higher and lower in the hierarchy than they deserve

Breaking down tradition (on principle) facilitates this project

Nearly the whole conceptual strategy of Leftism is contained within this observation

Most important:

Left = radical egalitarianism primarily and anti-traditionalism (as a method) secondarily

NB: Another word for radical egalitarianism is “equity”

Communists call the state of radical egalitarianism “(social) justice”

Right = traditionalism primarily and *accepting* hierarchy secondarily

Three NBs:

- 1) There’s a key mismatch here because of the priorities of each being opposite  
Causes difficulty in understanding one another
- 2) Accepting hierarchy implies a dimension of *submission*  
We’ll come back to this shortly
- 3) The complication that hierarchy can be organic or artificial matters a lot  
Right-wing disposition is generally organic until force is required  
Then Reaction takes over

Traditionalism versus Conventionalism

Two more seemingly overlapping ideas are traditionalism and conventionalism

Traditionalism refers to adhering to tradition as a guide

Conventionalism refers to maintaining tradition—or something—as a convention

Or, when hijacked by Reaction, enforcing a convention on a people

Likely pseudo-traditional (simulacrum of real traditions, forced)

Reaction is conventionalism posing as traditionalism

Usually with pseudo-tradition in place of real tradition

This is where authoritarianism tends to enter the chat

Back in the 80s, a Leftist named Bob Altemeyer gave a bad characterization of authoritarianism and its traits, but it works as a basis for making a good one

Full disclosure: Yes, Altemeyer based his work partially on Theodor Adorno’s

*The Authoritarian Personality*, and Adorno was an opportunistic Critical Theorist

That is, Marxist Leftist

Altemeyer wrongly conflated being right-wing with authoritarianism

Caused people to think authoritarianism is a right-wing thing only

As was Adorno’s aim

Caused us to miss Leftist rising authoritarianism for decades

We can pull that out of his framework and reconceptualize, though

Altemeyer identifies three characteristics of authoritarian personalities (my edits)

(Image2-1 – AltemeyerModel)

1) Authoritarian conventionalism

People adopt the *conventions* pushed by leaders they perceive as legitimate and consider them as defining of society and duty

2) Authoritarian aggression

People enforce the conventions perceived to be legitimate with aggression, including violence, demonization, outgrouping, ostracization, and purges (of the insufficiently conventional)

3) Authoritarian submission

People submit to the conventions themselves and expect others to as well

Note: Key trait of authoritarianism is submission

Rudolf Hess: “Don’t you see, we SS men were not supposed to think about these things; it never even occurred to us... We were all so trained

to obey orders without even thinking that the thought of disobeying an order would simply never have occurred to anybody.”

This model obviously has plenty of room for left-wing authoritarianism under its enforced hierarchy it claims as a means to its allegedly radically egalitarian ends

Equity regime

Altemeyer actually characterizes his conventionalism in terms of *tradition*

But this is a conflation

Tradition is a norm; convention is more like a policy

Convention could attach to real tradition or fake pseudo-tradition

So what I see on the radical (or Woke) Right is

Rigid artificial hierarchicalism with

Strong *pseudo*-traditionalism (and rejection of tolerance)

They force adherence to invented/fake traditions

Trad in pastiche

What I see on the radical (or Woke) Left is

Rigid artificial hierarchicalism promoting a subverted hierarchy

Strong anti-traditionalism (demand for liberating tolerance)

They call this queering, sometimes

Selfhood and political disposition – really briefly (I wrote a long essay about this, “Man with Three Faces”)

Self-defined self (Left)

Tolerance is a demand of self-definition

Tradition is a restriction on self-definition

So is reality...

Including social reality

So hierarchy (and duty) restrict self-definition too

(Marx: men make history but not on conditions of their choosing)

Received self (Right)

Tradition defines the self that is received

So can reality

Hierarchy and duty give parameters for receiving and knowing the self

Tolerance is set within limits of small, cautious changes from tradition

Imagine these when they go extreme...

Left: Self-definition with no limits

Liberation (from tradition, restriction, *civilization*, and even reality)

Liberation from false self into “true self”

Marxism (etc.) provides a narrative about what that true self is

Variations on the Rousseauian “noble savage”

“The Greater Good”

Right: Reception with neither thinking (reason) nor deviation (tolerance)

Obedient Man (or, Obeisant Man)

Conventionalism

Forcing people to receive a traditional or pseudo-trad self

In the name of “The Common Good”

So why do these go wrong?

Because things aren’t perfect—or ideal

So things are going wrong (at least for some people)

And we can imagine something better—at least vaguely or in principle  
 Even if it's just “negative better” (so, “not that”)  
 So now we get another variable to consider—another dimension to the story  
 Reality versus Imagination  
 You've probably heard the Woke use the term “re-imagine” a lot  
 There's a reason  
 They can imagine *the idea of* a “better” world  
 Romanticism  
 Romanticized past-future hybrids, usually  
 Rousseau: “savages made to live in cities”  
 Marx: The global commune  
 Hitler: romantic notions of the Aryan past and future Reich  
 More nostalgic  
 Haywood: “Politics of future-past”  
 Thus, progressivism  
 Progressive: Forging an idealized “future-past”  
 Woke Left: Left-wing progressives  
 Woke Right: Right-wing progressives  
 Negative betterness  
 Likely cannot actually imagine what it looks like  
 Can imagine what it *doesn't* include  
 Birth of the Critical Theory  
 Herbert Marcuse (*Essay on Liberation*):  
 “Negative thinking draws whatever force it may have from its empirical basis: the actual human condition in the given society, and the ‘given’ possibilities to transcend this condition, to enlarge the realm of freedom. In this sense, negative thinking is by virtue of its own internal concepts ‘positive’: oriented toward, and comprehending a future which is ‘contained’ in the present.”  
 Politics of future past... just need to be liberated...  
 Critical Theory is a result of an attachment to idealism  
 They can imagine the idea of a better world without various problematics  
 Left: Forms of restriction and oppression  
 Points toward “liberation”  
 Right: Disorder born of tolerance and freedom  
 Points toward “obeisance” (obedience) and conventionalism  
 Both actually point toward “recollection”  
 Remembering who we “really” are and re-collecting ourselves as such  
 Realism versus Idealism (and/or Romanticism)  
 Another dimension  
 Compare the “political compass”  
 Left and Right; Authority and Liberty  
 My model is different  
 Left and Right; Realism versus Idealism  
 Realism is the proposition that objective reality exists apart from our perceptions or minds  
 “Reality exists” (Objective, thus not subject to subjective influences)  
 “We have to deal with reality as it is”

(Philosophical) idealism posits that reality is fundamentally mental or spiritual, with the material world existing only as a manifestation of consciousness or ideas

“Reality is an image” (an imperfect image, in fact)

(Subjective, thus subject to subjective influences)

“We can create reality” (Idealism → Constructivism pipeline)

Change the perception, change “reality”

Mass projects to change perception (totalitarianism)

Ideal: “True/higher reality” is perfect, the reality we deal with is therefore perfectible

Force Subjective into Objective (dialectic)

True reality is located in the Form of the Divine Mind

Or a future perfected state of reality that we must manifest

World-builders

NB: This isn’t the same as the colloquial use of the word “ideal,” which often means “optimal”

Ideal: Off in the imaginary realm of Forms; not subject to reality; best you can imagine

Optimal: Maximal within reality and its constraints; subject to reality; best we can do

Always subject to trade-offs (as optimization theory in math teaches, e.g.)

Compare idealism: No trade-offs are relevant because reality isn’t relevant

Horseshoe Theory variation: Scales (or Balance) of Society

Imagine a picture of a balance or a set of scales (Image2-2 Scales)

Crossbar with two pans

Crossbar: Realism

Has a Left and a Right, also a center (moderate positions exist)

Can lean toward or away from traditionalism, egalitarianism, hierarchy

Cannot lean toward equity or perfect hierarchy (both idealist)

Can have various perspectives on role of state / size of government

Can vary in views of what is and isn’t tolerable

Has objective standards to use to help resolve disputes

Evidence, reason, blind justice, market (for ownership)

Political authority gets distributed accordingly

Takes responsibility because reality is real

Therefore holds up the whole apparatus, including pans

“Luxury beliefs” in the pans

At the ends of the bar are two chains that descend to two pans

Slide into idealism

Why? Ultimately reality cannot accommodate a more extreme position

Idealism is limitless in this regard

Idealism tends towards totalitarianism because the ideal can be imagined (even if just in negative) and perfect

Just needs more people to believe in it

Necessitating more force and coercion (enforced tribalism)

Group most important, then reality irrelevant, then reality in the way

Left: remake through education and reeducation

Belonging: through matching Leftist consensus

Right: remake through obedience and punishment

Belonging: through accepting Rightist hierarchy

Chains are the slides into post-liberalism

Left pan and a Right pan, no center (no moderate positions)

From a pan, the whole apparatus outside their pan exists to uphold the other pan

Or complicit in the other pan and its existence

Idealism is a realm of purity and corruption

Winning means breaking the entire apparatus to destroy the other pan

Through wild agitation (swinging) your pan

Requires taking down the crossbar

Breaking it and filling pans

As idealism fails to persuade realists, the idealists radicalize

Way back: literally to come back to reality (and humble yourself before it)

Your imagination (idealist conceptions, theory) are not bigger than reality

You are not God

You do not have access to the Divine Mind

You have general revelation (Nature, Society) for sure

You have special revelation if you believe

Horseshoe metaphor has the advantage of showing radical Left and Right closer together

That's fine, and it's a worthy metaphor

Using a liberty/authority vertical dimension

I'm thinking of things in terms of two essential kinds of politics

Realist politics (on the crossbar)

Subject to reality, including social and political realities

Accommodates many positions all constrained by reality

Including middle and mixed perspectives

Settles disputes through appeals to objective and fair standards

Idealist politics (in the pans)

Not subject to reality; tries to enforce a political reality

Accommodates only one position (in the pan) based on a dominant idealistic worldview

Politics is the struggle to assert dominance for worldviews

All other positions are competitors

Consolidate power in one view on your own side

Recognize rivals (other pan) as enemy

Recognize those not with you as against you

Ignorance is ok if corrected

Punished after correction w/o change

Settles disputes through force

Denies objective standards to appeal to

Force is all that's left

In other language

There are two political spectra

One Realist; One Idealist

Realist one accommodates many positions

Idealist one accommodates two rivals

No center

Center cannot hold as we get pulled into idealism

Moderate, balanced, objective views require realism

But are they really Idealists?

Marxists deny it, but Marx still held out for a "transcendent" Communism

Ideal Man in Ideal Society (socialist man in socialist society)

(EPM): “Man, much as he may therefore be a particular individual (and it is precisely his particularity which makes him an individual, and a real individual social being), is just as much the totality—the ideal totality—the subjective existence of imagined and experienced society for itself; just as he exists also in the real world both as awareness and real enjoyment of social existence, and as a totality of human manifestation of life.”

But yes!

Herbert Marcuse hid it in “utopian” conceptions (*Essay on Liberation*):

From the very opening: “Up to now, it has been one of the principal tenets of the critical theory of society (and particularly Marxian theory) to refrain from what might be reasonably called utopian speculation [...for fear of losing its scientific character]. ... I believe that this restrictive conception must be revised, and that the revision is suggested, and even necessitated, by the actual evolution of contemporary societies. The dynamic of their productivity deprives ‘utopia’ of its traditional unreal content: what is denounced as ‘utopian’ is no longer that which has ‘no place’ and cannot have any place in the historical universe, but rather that which is blocked from coming about by the power of the established societies.”

Revives utopianism (idealism); blames established society for blocking it  
Mussolini (*Doctrine of Fascism*):

“Like all sound political conceptions, Fascism is action and it is thought; action in which doctrine is immanent, and doctrine arising from a given system of historical forces in which it is inserted, and working on them from within. It has therefore a form correlated to contingencies of time and space; but it has also an ideal content which makes it an expression of truth in the higher region of the history of thought.”

Adolf Hitler (*Mein Kampf*):

“Whenever a strong political power has existed in Germany, economic life has always progressed. Whenever the economic system has become the only substance of our people’s life, it smothered the virtues of idealism, and the state collapsed and carried the economic benefits with it into the ground. If we ask ourselves what forces preserve a state, we can lump them all in one category: the ability and willingness of an individual to sacrifice himself for the whole. These virtues have nothing at all to do with economics. We can see this from the simple fact that man never sacrifices himself for economics. People don’t die for business, but for ideals.”

(He goes on for a long time about this next one—a couple of pages)

“The surrender of one’s own life for the existence of the community is the height of all self-sacrifice. Only in this way can we assure that what we have built is not destroyed by Nature or human hands. Our German language has a word that precisely and splendidly describes that principle: *Pflichterfüllung* or performance of duty. That means service to the common good of the community ahead of personal self interests. The fundamental spirit that creates this action is what we call idealism. It is the opposite of egotism or selfishness. It means exclusively the individual’s ability to sacrifice himself for the community, for his fellow-men.”

“True idealism is the subordination of one’s self, of the individual’s interest and life to the community; which is in accordance with the ultimate will of Nature. This is the first essential element for the development of any kind of organization.”

And concludes based on this assessment

“When self-interest threatens to replace idealism, we notice an immediate weakening in the force that maintains the community. When the community breaks, so falls civilization. Once we let self-interest become the ruler of a people, the bonds of social

order are broken. When man focuses on chasing his own happiness, he falls from Heaven straight to Hell. Future generations do not remember the men who pursued their own self-interests, but they glorify the heroes who sacrifice their own happiness. The most extreme contrast to the Aryan is the Jew.”

One more comment, looking at Right and Left on a deeper level

Not just in practice (rigid hierarchy vs. egalitarianism), Right and Left are different projects

Yes, Woke Right is “Right Hand of the Left,” and Reaction to the Left, but it’s also big different

Ultimately, huge battle between bad philosophical visions rooted in speculations about

State of Nature

What is man like without civilization?

A kind of idealist contemplation on the Form of Man

The Politics of Future-Past

Left: Integrating Rousseau

Right: Fleeing Hobbes

Somewhere: What about Locke?

Left: Integrating Jean-Jacques Rousseau

State of Nature: Free noble savage not constrained by civilization

Conflict: But we like civilization and are soft

Synthesis/Solution: “Savages made to live in cities”

Marx: “...a return accomplished consciously and embracing the entire wealth of previous development.”

(Tribal, now global) Communists who retain all the benefits of production

Leftists look back to the Romantic notions of humanity (past) from Rousseau

And try to integrate it into “Future-Past” (dialectic)

Right: Fleeing Thomas Hobbes

State of Nature: Brutish, conflict, nasty, short, primitive, bad to awful (savage savage)

Anarchy, war (all against all), self-destruction arising from equality and rivalry

So man creates “Leviathan” (church-state-economy) to tame himself

(Or, to *flee from* himself)

Enables civilization

If Leviathan is too weak (not controlling enough, too tolerant)

Collapse to State of Nature

E.g., *Mad Max*

Need strong Leviathan

Conflict: Strong Leviathan is controlling (limits freedom)

Find freedom within Leviathan (fake freedom as duty)

Synthesis/Solution: “Prudent” Leviathan

Run by “virtuous” tyrants

What about Locke?

Locke also had a rather silly State of Nature view that is sometimes said to be the basis of classical liberalism

Free rational individuals who meet and contractually work together

Ideal: No bonds except those chosen (at least in the critique of Locke)

This is obviously not correct either

What do?

State of Nature arguments are mostly silly (and very 18<sup>th</sup>–19<sup>th</sup> c.)

They’re a kind of idealist thinking in that they imagine “primordial” man



We're all born into a web of familial and societal connections  
And must balance these with individual interests and drives  
I suggest recognizing virtue in both received (traditional) self and self-defined self  
And tempering both against realism (discovered self)

Tonight, we'll come back after dinner to look at how these projects went haywire in the 20<sup>th</sup> century!

**9.2 Pages**

### Talk 3 – Woke (Left and Right) in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century

What is Woke (without relying on “critical consciousness” or anything late 20<sup>th</sup> c. / 21<sup>st</sup> c.)?

Sociognosticism (Image3-1 – Sociognosticism)

My group (identity politics) should be in charge but the existing power structure keeps us out (oppressed)

Why should “your group” be in charge?

Because we understand what it really means to be human

We will restore people’s humanity, which they are alienated from

In the “20<sup>th</sup> c.” context of this talk:

Woke Left: Communism (esp., Marx and the Industrial Communism of Eastern Marxism)

Woke Right: Fascism (Mussolini) and National Socialism (Hitler)

Understand Woke Right as *Reaction* to Woke Left of the same type

Main purpose of this talk is to explain why these are woke

AND to explain how Woke Right arises from Woke Left as Reaction

Using Fascism as a response to Communism as a model

This will help us understand the Woke Right of our day

2 NBs:

Being a little fast/loose with “20<sup>th</sup> c.” in this talk and “21<sup>st</sup> c.” in the next

Talking about when these ideas had prominence and effect

Ideas were developed in the 50–70 years before that, mostly

Like a fungus fruiting

“20<sup>th</sup> c.” here is actually more like 1850–1950

So Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Mao (I know... he’s later but definitely 20<sup>th</sup> c.)

Communism 1.0 and 2.0

“21<sup>st</sup> c.” here is more like 1960–present

Western Marxism, Critical Theory, Postmodernism, “Wokism”

“China Model” 1980s–present

Could also have done some work to lay out “Woke” in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, and even before (all within the European tradition) – Rousseau, Jacobins, de Maistre, Juan Donoso Cortes, Louis de Bonald, Hegel et al..

Back to Sociognosticism – covered this in depth before, so I’ll be lighter here

Sociognosticism is short for “Sociological Gnosticism” or “Social Gnosticism”

Refers to the Gnostic belief structures with the Social sphere of life replacing spiritual

Gnostic: Man is actually spiritual, material world is fallen, we must transcend

Sociognostic: Man is actually social, material conditions are a prison we must transcend

Marx: Man is a social being who has been alienated from that by private property, and Communism is the “complete return of man to himself as a social, i.e., human, being.”

Queer Theory: Man is intrinsically queer but is alienated from his true queer nature by having been socialized and “straightened out” by a cisheteronormative society enforced by homophobia and transphobia

CRT: Same but with race.

Mussolini: Man is a historic being whose being and existence are found in his bonds to his state, and he achieves his highest expression through the Fascist state, allowing it to reach a higher level of civilization

Hitler: Man is a historic but evolutionary being with intrinsic racial characteristics, which, when embraced, purified, and amplified, can enable him to reach a higher level of civilization

Short, short, short version of “Gnostic”

Man’s true nature is other than it actually appears, but this is hidden from us

This alienates us from our own being thus our true inheritance

There are powers that benefit from hiding this secret from us

So they arrange or architect the world or system to keep us ignorant

The system they arrange produces a false consciousness

But we can “wake up” to our true nature

And with that hidden knowledge save ourselves

Liberate ourselves from the prison of existence or Being

Repeat:

Old Gnostics: We’re really spiritual (or God) and demonic forces are hiding this from us

Sociognostics: We were fully human, but evil power-elites are locking us out of our inheritance by forcing us to play by their bogus, self-serving rules

Left: We were truly social(ist), but we’re alienated now

Right: We were the inheritors of a great society, but we have been alienated from it (usually by too much tolerance, so corruption)

Old-school Gnosticism can run one of two ways, big picture

Individual spiritual quest to liberate self from the system

Collectivist (cult) spiritual quest to liberate humanity (through conversion)

Seek to awaken a collective consciousness for the evolution of man

Sociognosticism really only runs one of these ways, meaningfully

Collectivist (cult) socio-spiritual quest to liberate humanity (through conversion)

Summon a collective consciousness to overthrow the system

Because it is intrinsically organized around social (group) dynamics

Sociognosticism produces class warfare

Classes alienating classes; illegitimate elites oppressing and alienating people from their rightful inheritance

Quote *Communist Manifesto*: “The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.”

So new “Woke” (sociognostic) elites must bring liberation

Quote *Communist Manifesto*: “In what relation do the Communists stand to the proletarians as a whole? ... The Communists, therefore, are on the one hand, practically, the most advanced and resolute section of the working-class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others; on the other hand, theoretically, they have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement.”

They do this by leading the revolution from their “advanced” position

Quote *Communist Manifesto*: “The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all other proletarian parties: formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of the bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat.”

They really mean it; now note “chains” (Sociognostic):

Quote *Communist Manifesto*: “The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working Men of All Countries, Unite!”

Alienation and Estrangement is at the heart of this view of self and society

The common theme is that society could be ideal (or moving toward the ideal)

But we’ve been alienated from who we are by false rule and false belief

Alienation by the “Alienating Force” (Demiurge/Demon) *is* the Gnostic disposition

If that Alienating Force is spiritual, like a false god or demon, Gnosticism

If that Alienating Force is sociopolitical structure, Sociognosticism

It’s not just about oppression

That—in *any* form—is just the conflict at the basis of the alienation

In Communism, Man is alienated by the bourgeois class from his social nature

Queer Theory: Man is alienated from his queer nature by straight-normativity

CRT: Man is alienated from his antiracist nature by race/racism and white supremacy

In Fascism, Man is alienated by Leftist demands for tolerance from his inheritance in society

“It was our society until we had to tolerate outsiders and/or the intolerable”

Darryl Cooper: “Fascism is merely what happens when normal people realize that the left will never stop until they’re forced to.” (Image3-2 – CooperFascism)

Of course, it’s not what “normal people” do; it’s Reaction

Fascism is derivative to Communism in this way

Communism plus liberal weakness against it is the alienating force that alienates

They feel they’re losing their heritage and societal inheritance

And will fight back like no one else will, collectively

The sense of estrangement and suffering as such is what “wakes” them up

They wake up to a collective consciousness that overthrows the Alienating Force

But actually *becomes* it (Iron Law of Woke Projection never misses)

Summon collective consciousness by attaching alienation *by class* to individual identity

Marx, taking directly from Hegel (*EPM*):

“Supersession as an objective movement of retracting the alienation into self.”

Meaning: Adopting class identity by learning to identify with your class through class alienation by the dominant groups (Social Demiurge).

Identity politics is directly downstream from this collective consciousness

So this answers the question: How is Communism “Woke”?

Obviously, it requires us to look at what we call “Woke” today and to generalize

Result: “Woke up” as Sociognostics who have adopted a “Woke” consciousness

In place of the constructed and imposed false consciousness of dominant sociopolitical groups

So how is Fascism “Woke”?

They “Woke up” by retracting their alienation into themselves as the dispossessed inheritors of faltering society and accepting the premise that class warfare is being waged so it has to be waged by class

(Clip 3-1 – PetersonRogan2018 – From:

<https://x.com/ConceptualJames/status/1949308264258347133/video/1>)

The story of these Woke ideologies in the 20<sup>th</sup> century is ultimately a battle of worldviews and their attendant idealist mythologies

Left: Radical egalitarian utopia awaits the overthrow of the unjust systems of domination  
Integrating and sublating Rousseau to achieve the Communist utopia

Right: Perfected nation (various definitions) and culture awaits overthrow of corruption  
Fleeing Hobbes to achieve the Fascist super-state (Super Leviathan and superman)

The battle must be one of *worldviews*

Hitler (MK): “At a time when one side, armed with all the weapons of a World-Concept, even though it is absolutely criminal, prepares for the attack on an existing order, the other side can successfully resist only if it covers itself in the form of a new, and in our case political, faith, and exchanges the catchwords of a weak and cowardly defense for the battle-cry of a bold and brutal attack.”

Political faith is required to battle political faith, so says Reaction

(Clip 3-2 – YoramFaiths –

<https://x.com/shootingsoul/status/1921041797460930939/video/1>)

Mussolini (*DoF*): “Anti-individualistic, the Fascist conception of life stresses the importance of the State and accepts the individual only in so far as his interests coincide with those of the State, which stands for the conscience and the universal will of man as a historic entity. It is opposed to classical liberalism which arose as a reaction to absolutism and exhausted its historical function when the State became the expression of the conscience and will of the people. Liberalism denied the State in the name of the individual; Fascism reasserts the rights of the State as expressing the real essence of the individual.”

These are collectivist religions of the State, then  
Battle of totalizing worldviews

Carl Schmitt and *Political Theology*

This religious conception of the state runs deep, though

It’s not just the state as religion (or “Idolatry of the State”)

The state is regarded as a theological object

Carl Schmitt wrote a book in 1922 called *Political Theology*

Crown Jurist of the Third Reich

Judicial/legal/political theorist who justified the Nazi state apparatus

Saw himself as 20<sup>th</sup> c. Thomas Hobbes

Fully embracing the idea of the Leviathan as the escape from Savage Savages  
Church and State as one

Decisionism and Leadership

Political Theology

Politics and statecraft are secular theology

Not just as a replication of theological structure on Earth

They are the theology of the secular realm and operate as a theology

Joseph de Maistre

State is divinely sanctioned and legitimate because it's the state  
 Sovereign is like a vicar of God  
 Second half of this book is significantly about de Maistre  
 Liberalism (Rule of Law, normativism) is like political Deism  
 Start the machine, let it run (Nature or normativism (Rule of Law))  
 Divine hand is nowhere to be seen  
 Liberalism is thus missing the essential characteristic of politics  
 Politics as political theology  
 Sovereign performing secular miracles  
 Miracles are a suspension of the Natural order by Sovereign God  
 Decision is an overriding of the normative order by political sovereign  
 Decision, thus leadership, in the sovereign is a political miracle  
 Decisionism and Leadership justifying the *Führerprinzip*  
 Affirmed in 1933 "Legal Basis of the Total State"  
 Right-wing Leninism quote (Image3-3 – Right-wing Leninism)  
 Tracy Strong's foreword: "This points to the second element in Schmitt's conception of secularisation. The French revolution is the historically concrete manifestation of revolutionary myth, the myth of the creative power of the democratically equal populace. This is the basis of Schmitt's criticism of Rousseau, that the 'general will' is substituted for the human will of a sovereign. To these understandings, it was necessary to oppose a myth of a hierarchically ordered and unified people, which the exceptional acts of the sovereign would instantiate. **One might think of this as a kind of right-wing Leninism**, where the Party is replaced by the *Volk* and the sovereign becomes the Party-in-action. The sovereign is the action of 'us' against 'them'—friends versus enemies. This confrontation, however, must take place at the metaphysical level—that of one faith against another. For this reason the confrontation is one of 'political theology.'"

These worldviews are all totalitarian, though (to enforce their idealism)

Mussolini, unlike the others, had the courtesy of saying so *explicitly* in foundational documents:  
 Mussolini (*DoF*) (Image3-4 – CooperFascismAgain): "The Fascist conception of life is a religious one, in which man is viewed in his immanent relation to a higher law, endowed with an objective will transcending the individual and raising him to conscious membership of a spiritual society."  
 Mussolini (*DoF*): "The Fascist conception of the State is all embracing; outside of it no human or spiritual values can exist, much less have value. Thus understood, Fascism, is totalitarian, and the Fascist State—a synthesis and a unit inclusive of all values—interprets, develops, and potentates the whole life of a people."  
 Mussolini (*DoF*): "The Fascist State, as a higher and more powerful expression of personality, is a force, but a spiritual one. It sums up all the manifestations of the moral and intellectual life of man. ... Fascism, in short, is not only a law-giver and a founder of institutions, but an educator and a promoter of spiritual life. It aims at refashioning not only the forms of life but their content—man, his character, and his faith. To achieve this propose it enforces discipline and uses authority, entering into the soul and ruling with undisputed sway."  
 Schmitt ("Legal Basis"): "However, recognition of the diversity of organic life would immediately lead to an unfortunate pluralistic fragmentation of the German people along religious, ethnic, class, and interest lines if a strong state did not elevate and secure the whole of political unity above all diversity. Every political unity requires a unifying,

internal logic for its institutions and norms. It needs a unified concern that shapes all areas of public life. In this sense, too, there is no normal state that is not totalitarian.”

Schmitt (“Legal Basis”): “The strength of the National Socialist state lies in the fact that it is dominated and permeated from top to bottom and in every atom of its existence by the idea of leadership. This principle, through which the movement has grown great, must be implemented at all times, both in state administration and in the various areas of self-government, taking into account, of course, the modifications required by the particular nature of the matter. However, it would not be permissible to exempt any important area of public life from the rule of the *Führer* principle.”

Schmitt (“Legal Basis”): “The organizational implementation of the *Führer* principle requires, first of all, that all methods inherent in liberal-democratic thinking be eliminated.”

Belonging through obedience (“duty”) enforced by punishment

Rudolf Hess: “Don’t you see, we SS men were not supposed to think about these things; it never even occurred to us... We were all so trained to obey orders without even thinking that the thought of disobeying an order would simply never have occurred to anybody.”

Post-liberalism

Totalitarian means *in total*, as in touching every part of life

NB: So we have religions of the State: Public and Religion combined into State Religion

Economy is designed to *serve the (people through) the State*

(Gets what an economy is upside-down)

Public + Private + Religion

{Public + Religion} controls Private

Something like Stakeholder Economy

Explicit in Nazi Shareholder Act (1937)

Explicit in Mussolini’s Fascist Corporatism

Implementation through “Dictatorship of the Proletariat,” “Party-in-action,” “Fascism as corporatism,” and eventually stakeholder model

Intrinsic Sociognostic Elite Theory

Elite Theory where the elites are Sociognostics

Rigged artificial hierarchy based on the ideology

Implemented and enforced through stakeholderism

Fascism works somewhat better because it only co-opts the profit motive (individual success) while Communism abolishes it

Basic architecture of Communism

Communism holds a radically egalitarian vision for society

Radical equity vision

Socialist equity

“Actual equality” (*fakticheskoye ravenstvo*)

Seeks to achieve it by imposing it on people to transform them into socialists

Breaking the cycle of socialization and replacing it with a new one

“Seize the means of production”

Means of production of man through economic/material determinism

Transform humans into “species-being” socialists

Believes man is fundamentally socialist and alienated from his true nature by private property

Therefore by individualism



Therefore by liberalism, common sense, etc.

Workers (proletariat) will awaken to sociognostic class consciousness to overthrow bourgeoisie

Communists will lead them in this project

Leaders of the Communist Party will lead the Communists in leading them

Huge scam

Doesn't work!

Basic architecture of Fascism as Reaction ([Image3-5 – FascismAsReaction](#))

Fascism doesn't bubble up of its own accord—it is *Reaction*

Fascism begins as an embrace of collectivism and socialism and a rejection of Marxism

Rejects radical egalitarianism (equity), internationalism, and tolerance

Replaces them with duty, rigid hierarchy, nationalism, and strict intolerance

Schmitt praised Nazis for being willing to treat unequal things unequally

Only thinks Marxism gets the tactics and collectivism right

Also rejects liberalism as weak, decadent, lax, disordered

Sees the only basis for a communal society in “traditional” communal bonds

State, nation, ethnicity, religion, culture

This is the missing ingredient the Marxists reject

Seeks to oppose Marxism while leading man into a rigidly hierarchical communal society

Man's true nature is as a member of the state, nation, ethnicity (*Volk*), religion, culture

Focuses on advancing the collective through heroism and leadership

Sees themselves as the would-be inheritors of a great society that is slipping away

Sees man as fundamentally belonging to the tribe (nation) and alienated from his true nation as nationalist-man by the excesses of tolerance

Individualism and liberalism are therefore repressed in the name of national cohesion and identity

They're the dispossessed elites of the system that *should be*

According to their nationalistic identity structure

Only rightful (“heritage”) people can be citizens

German: *Volksgemeinschaft* (“people's community,” ethnic)

(Clip 3-3 – AuronHeritageAmerican – <https://x.com/ConceptualJames/status/1957802439182049611/video/1>)

Seek to re-establish a rigid system that benefits those who deserve it

Intolerant of interlopers, contaminants, and individuals as individuals

Will resurrect the system that should be for the people who deserve it

People will have to learn to love the state, nation, race, etc.

Idolatry of the State

Long summary: How did Woke (Sociognosticism) manifest in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century?

Broadly, in three *worldviews*: Communism, Fascism, and National Socialism

Idolatries of the State / Political Theologies

NB: Theology of Marxism

Fascism and National Socialism as state-theologies in Reaction

Modernist terms are modernist: *material* production (as opposed to social production)

Marx (18<sup>th</sup> Brumaire): “Men make their own history, but they do not make it as they please; they do not make it under self-selected circumstances, but under circumstances existing already, given and transmitted from the past. The tradition of all dead generations weighs like a nightmare on the brains of the living.”

These ideologies see man as “historical,” the product of “historical conditions”



Mussolini (*DoF*): “Outside history man is a nonentity.”

What produces man?

Marx: Material conditions (economics) and social conditions

“Seize the means of (economic) production”

Goal: Communist “Social Man” who has transcended individuality

Next level of human society

Mussolini: The State

“Seize the means of (Fascist individual) production”

Goal: Fascist superman who is a hero for his State

Next level of human society

Hitler: Race and leadership

“Seize the means of (racial) production”

Goal: Racial superman who can lead and rule as a superior being

Next level of human society

But each is answering the question “what produces man, and how can we control it?”

And mass produce it (20<sup>th</sup> century characteristic)

And transcend individuality in favor of group and human advancement

Next-order level of development of human society

Which is collectivist and transcendent of the current limits

(Progressivism!)

Liberalism isn’t just caught in the crossfire; it’s a main target

Heard it from Mussolini, Hitler, Schmitt; know it from Marx, Lenin, Mao, etc.

Communism

Attacks Liberalism for failing, then in the name of Reaction (which it provokes)

Mao (“Combat Liberalism”): “We stand for active ideological struggle because it is the weapon for ensuring unity within the Party and the revolutionary organizations in the interest of our fight. Every Communist and revolutionary should take up this weapon. But liberalism rejects ideological struggle and stands for unprincipled peace, thus giving rise to a decadent, Philistine attitude and bringing about political degeneration in certain units and individuals in the Party and the revolutionary organizations.”

Industrial Marxism/Communism (point is all about production)

Industrial Communism existed to prove it could produce (it couldn’t)

And to mechanically produce socialist man

Breaks everything

Fascism as Reaction (takes on energy of Communism and redirects it – “we can make it work”)

Unlikely to happen on its own

Happens as a reaction to Communist breaking everything and refusing to stop

Fanaticism and friend-enemy mentality of Communism generates Reaction

“Reverse” fanaticism and friend-enemy mentality of Fascism

Blames Liberalism for failing to restrain Communism

Hitler blamed the entirety of Germany’s plight after WWI on internal weakness

Believed Germany would have won if everyone fully backed the cause

Liberals were too weak, pluralistic, and reasonable

Marxists (for him: Jews) sowed “internationalist” views and diluted the racial cause by being a part of a pluralist society

Schmitt again (“Legal Basis”): “The organizational implementation of the *Führer* principle requires, first of all, that all methods inherent in liberal-democratic thinking be eliminated.”

Mussolini (*DoF*): “Fascism is definitely and absolutely opposed to the doctrines of liberalism, both in the political and the economic sphere.”

Socialism isn't the problem – it being Leftist is the problem

(Clip 3-4 – Carl Benjamin Woke Left –  
<https://x.com/ConceptualJames/status/1920321876645249044>)

Requires some other relationship (kinship, national identity) in the right-wing halo to make the sharing part work, allegedly

(Clip 3-5 – AusPillNatSoc – Source clip:  
<https://x.com/ConceptualJames/status/1922303452626948560>)

Fascism (hyper-stakeholderism) is a political model that's meant to solve this

National Socialism is a racial-political model meant to solve this

MAIN POINT is Fascism *as Reaction*

Reaction to Marxism

Mussolini explicitly says in *Doctrine of Fascism* that Fascism developed from socialism with a rejection of Marxism (Bolshevism) and its emphasis on economic class conflict

What binds people isn't economic conditions

It's (national) identity (including *Volkisch*, i.e., ethnic-national)

Hitler (allegedly) explained the entirety of National Socialism was derived from Marxism

Hitler famously told Hermann Rauschning (former Nazi turned critic) that National Socialism was derived from Marxism

Source: Rauschning's book, *Conversations with Hitler* (also published as  
Recounts discussions with Hitler in the early 1930s

Hitler reportedly said that National Socialism took elements from Marxism but adapted them to reject class struggle in favor of racial unity and nationalism

In some sense, Woke means believing freedom (+responsibility) means slavery, so we need liberation from freedom

Woke Left (Communism): Freedom makes us individuals, chains us to slavery as work

Woke Right (Fascists): Freedom allows degeneracy (toward Hobbes's Savage Savages)

State therefore completes freedom (through duty and collective advancement)

Final summary:

Woke means Sociognostic (alienated idealist) awakening

Woke Left: Sociognostic awakening to class consciousness that transcends borders

Equity/actual equality (radical egalitarianism)

Anti-traditionalist

Erects totalitarian system to force this into being

Woke Right: Sociognostic awakening to *Volk* consciousness in reaction

Rigidly hierarchical

To enforce pseudo-traditionalism

Erects totalitarian system to force this into being

Retract alienation into self to assume a collective identity

Big point is Fascism as Reaction

Reaction not just against Marxism but extending to the existing society

If Marxism is “Woke,” Fascism is reverse-Woke

In the Woke Right today, which we’ll turn to next, this dialectic is obvious

Bad old days: Racism

Woke: Operationalized reverse racism

Woke Right: Operationalized reverse–reverse racism

Tomorrow afternoon, we’ll move forward into our time to discuss Woke, Left and Right, in the “21<sup>st</sup> c.”

**9.2 pages**

## Talk 4 – Woke (Left and Right) in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

Flow from previous lecture

What is Woke? (start by revisiting previous lecture; update for the three big changes)

Sociognostic awakening through turning alienation into class identity

What is Woke Left? (postmodern neo-marxist evolution of Marxism)

Sociognostic awakening to intersectional class identity (universalist)

What is Woke Right? (Reaction to Woke Left; postmodern neo-fascism)

Sociognostic awakening to “heritage” class identity (tribalist)

Absorbs the energy of Woke Left (of its time) and reverses it

Radical egalitarianism → Rigid enforced hierarchicalism

Equity → party-sanctioned hierarchy

Anti-traditional → Strictly pseudo-traditional

Liberating tolerance → Repressive intolerance

Otherwise accepts all of the Woke Left’s assumptions/framing

In particular, post-liberalism

Three big changes between “20<sup>th</sup> c.” and “21<sup>st</sup> c.” models (Image4-1 – 3Developments)

Modernism → Postmodernism

Evolution of Western Marxism to Identity Marxism/Maoism

Development of the “China Model” (Stakeholderism as the implement)

FIRST: Key theoretical movement in between: Postmodernism

Post-truth – allows Woke to fully detach from objectivity and truth

Same “post-” as in post-liberal

Liberal cares about truth; post-liberal doesn’t

It cares about narratives, images, and stories instead

“Truth” is local, contingent, and a way of enforcing social power

Believes it can build upon the rock of truth after it grinds that rock to sand

(Move beyond the thing while keeping the benefit of the thing)

Material production → social construction

Product of our conditions → products of our brainwashing (socialization)

Reality itself becomes less important than how people think about reality (simulation)

Interpretation becomes primary

Class consciousness → Critical consciousness

So: Woke means having critical consciousness

(Clip 4-1 – Carl Benjamin Critical Consciousness –

<https://x.com/ConceptualJames/status/1958232328074887188/video/1>)

Critical consciousness is post-modern Sociognostic awakening

Key fact postmodernists don’t fully understand

Some ideas are actually *right*

(subtle argument here is that truth matters but power is still necessary to do something with truths) – power is a matter of being a steward of the truth

Every deviation from truth, however, catches up to you eventually

All power fails against the truth eventually

“How wide is this room?”

Reality is still out there, and as the Chuck Norris joke goes

Reality doesn’t sleep. It waits.

Eventually, reality is the thing you run into when you think you can construct your way around reality

(Clip 4-2 – AARescuePomo –

<https://x.com/ConceptualJames/status/1956769485269938457/video/1>)

Why does the Woke Right embrace postmodernism?

Absorb the energy and assumptions of their enemies as reaction

They're not *just* postmodernist; have a more sophisticated argument

Accepting the Left is correct in its description of postmodernism

So postmodernism (post-truth) is simply "reality" today

Mostly because of our technology

World of images, propaganda, social media

If we really live in postmodernity, they insist, we must be postmodernist

If you can't beat the post-truth, join them in being post-truth

Create our own world of images, propaganda, social enforcement

Social constructivism

Reality is waiting...

Necessity of postmodernity to "5<sup>th</sup> generation warfare"

If we're combatants in a postmodernist information war

We have to fight with postmodernist information weapons

If we want to win

Cult of "winning"

Ends (winning) justify the means

Hitler (MK): "As I have said before, it requires a trusting soul to honor the rules of the game, when he is faced with an opponent who sees the rules only as a masquerade for his own benefit and then the instant he no longer finds those rules give him advantage, he throws them overboard."

Conservatives are losers

Adopts the Leftist framing that everything really is power

Social constructivism, again

Turns "reverse-critical"

E.g., Woke Right reverse–reverse racism

So, the Woke Right absorbs and embraces the postmodernist turn

SECOND: Key activist development: Evolution of Marxism to Identity-based neo-Marxism

In addition to the material to structural transformation, Woke Left went from class to identity

Think of it as viral or parasitical evolution

Class conflict couldn't attach directly in upwardly mobile free enterprise

Marx himself said that the form of conflict changes with history

As free enterprise "stabilized the workers" and made them "conservative"

History progressed, so to speak

"Capitalism" → "Advanced Capitalism" (as Marcuse had it)

Marx (CM): "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight."

Doesn't matter where the line is so long as there's a dividing line

Marxism/Woke isn't oppressor vs. oppressed

It's an operating system that runs through oppressor  
vs. oppressed

Marxist mind virus (societal parasite) had to evolve to attach to Western  
receptors

Identity: Race, sex, sexuality, the manufactured contrivance of "gender"

Geopolitical status: Colonizer versus colonized, First vs. Third world

The blend of these: Indigenous (repackaged Soviet *korenizatsiya*)

Had to find sites of stratification and conflict Westerners are sensitive to

Marxism → Identity Marxism (through Cultural Marxism)

Needed postmodern deconstruction and cultural relativity to really  
work

Woke Right rejects this interpretation more or less completely (blames liberalism instead)

(Clip 4-3 – AABlameLiberalism –

<https://x.com/ConceptualJames/status/1956810169519857737/video/1>)

(Clip 4-4 – CarlBenjaminBlameLiberalism –

<https://x.com/ConceptualJames/status/1958188483446542458/video/1>)

But they embrace

Marxism as analysis and tools (dialectic, with "different solutions")

(Clip 4-5 – AAMarxistTools –

<https://x.com/ConceptualJames/status/1961426968009646464/video/1>)

Already saw this from Carl Benjamin too

Identity political framing; reverse direction

So they embrace Marxist thinking, dialectics, and critical theory (against liberalism)

But they deny that Western Marxism evolved through the 20<sup>th</sup> century so they can do  
blame liberalism and traditional conservatism (postwar consensus)

Note about systemic thinking and this "postwar consensus"

Woke believes it is the "system" that holds down the oppressed

The Sociognostically alienated and estranged, not actually oppressed

Woke Left has systemic racism, cisheteronormativity, systemic sexism, etc.

We're very familiar with all this

Mixes truth and lie

You can be racist (or whatever) without being racist because you support "the system"

Justifies attacking left Liberals and traditional conservatives as "*Fascists*"

Woke Right has the "postwar consensus"

This is a vast systemic power explanation that a system was set up after WWII to  
establish an "open society" and to exclude the "true Right" (or "Strong Gods," R.R.

Reno) from political discourse

(Add Academic Agent Clip –

<https://x.com/ConceptualJames/status/1960013074095845456>)

Justifies attacking classical liberals and traditional conservatives as crypto-  
Commies

Explains all the Nazi revisionism

Blames "neocons" and "Boomer" (conservatives) for everything

Anti-tyranny becomes its own tyranny (dialectic of freedom)

Key developmental arena: Education theory through Critical Pedagogy

Stop trying to arrange conditions of *material* production to make man

Move to the socialization of man (education)

Especially children

Like Hitler (MK): “A personal spirit of nationalism and a sense of social justice must be combined in the hearts of the youth. If that is done properly, someday a nation of citizens will arise that will be committed to one another and forged together by a common love and a common pride, unshakable and indestructible forever.”

The forge in which these two changes were integrated was in no small part in education theory  
(Some in activism, no doubt, particularly intersectionality)

Especially feminists (deconstruction of gender)

Intersectionality (neo-Maoism) all passed through feminism

Favors “outsider knowledges” and “marginalized perspectives”

Woke epistemology

Completely personalizes Marxist radicalization (generative method)

Allows tapping Western individualism as a receptor rather than a repellent

Critical constructivism (Kincheloe)

First full and proper articulation of the “Woke” worldview in this evolved state

Fusion of postmodernism (constructivism) with Critical Theory

Postmodern neo-Marxism

Critical Pedagogy is all derived, however, from Liberation Theology

Liberation Theology (KGB invention) is a Church-first Church-Socialism hybrid

It’s roughly a kind of early Left neo-Integralist model

Comes from Paulo Freire

Worked with Dom Helder Camara (Red Bishop of Recife)

Formerly the Green Priest...

Integralist turned Marxist

...so that gives us Woke Left

What’s Woke Right?

Reaction to all of that – just like how Fascism reacted to Marxism

Absorb its energy

Adopt its assumptions and framing

Reverse the direction

Same energy, other direction

Still attack the mainstream part of society

Liberalism is the problem; other side is the excuse

So, you get: People who act like the (Woke) Left in the name of the Right

“Right-hand of the Left” – useful turn of phrase

Right-wing post-liberals (Right-wing post-Americans)

Not exactly Leftists because they’re hierarchical and pseudo-traditional

Adopted the Leftist operating system but not its conclusions

People think this is new, but it’s the Alt Right returning to make its move

What happened to the Alt Right, anyway?

We’re ten years behind, not at the cutting edge

Is it really fascist (or neo-fascist)?

Sometimes, yes, explicitly, but not always

Or at least it doesn’t think it is

More accurate to say that the logical conclusion of post-liberalism is totalitarianism

Left post-liberalism: Some kind of Communism

Right post-liberalism: Some kind of Fascism  
And they've "mated"  
Abandoning realism (in the name of realpolitik)  
Sliding down the chain of idealism toward the pans  
Not a lot of brakes on that slide  
Still fleeing Hobbes because of the press of Rousseau  
Concerning: Law of Intolerant Factions  
The most intolerant faction that is tolerated will eventually become dominant  
Here, that's undoubtedly National Socialism  
NETTR / NEOTR (Charles Haywood)  
Friend-enemy distinction (Schmitt)  
Schmittian Elite Theorists (themselves as new elites)  
"Dark Elves"

Who are these people?

Data collected by the Network Contagion Research Institute (NCRI) show

Young men

Too online

I'd add that they get most of their information from influencers and social media sources

YouTube, TikTok, Instagram reels, and (maybe especially) X

Fake News Alt-Media replacing Fake News Media

Strong reasons to believe this is being pushed heavily on purpose (an op)

Not likely to be organic

Message to conservative parents

By the grace of God, your daughters avoided going trans, and your sons are at risk of getting pulled into Fascism and National Socialism by similar influences (same energy, other direction)

Message to young conservatives, especially men

This never works out. We remember as heroes not the people who participate in these kinds of movements but the rare few who stand up against them and reject them. These influencers are using you, and the quality of your future is at stake.

Postmodern traditionalists (pseudo-traditionalists, or "Trad")

"Trad" movement is not traditionalism

It's LARP traditionalism (ultimately postmodern traditionalist performativity)

The traditions are largely made-up and romanticized

If not downright fake (pastiche, cosplay, Instagram imagery)

This is the pseudo-traditionalism discussed previously

Because the traditions aren't real, conventionalism is required to get adherence

Starts with elitist capture

Proceeds through increasing enforcement

Litmus tests for being a "real conservative"

Thus, pseudo-traditionalist virtue signaling

"Based" queering

Concept of postmodernist (ironic) performativity as political posturing, statement, test ultimately comes from Queer Theory

Specifically Judith Butler

One of the architects of Queer Theory



“Drag is life; life is drag”  
 And a prime feminist vector who fused (critical) feminism and postmodernism  
 (Gender) performativity and politics of ironic parody  
 Woke Right is doing “Trad performativity” (pseudo-traditionalism)  
 Woke Right is basically Leftists in drag they call “Trad”  
 Queering is the logical extension of this practice  
 Transgression that dissolves the boundaries of sensemaking  
 Thus “Queer” displays empower the transgressives (Queer Activists)  
 Cult of transgression  
 I am not joking about the being Leftists in drag they call “Trad”  
 “Based,” as they use it, is the “Queer” of the Woke Right  
 They’re “Right-identifying Leftists” like transwomen are “trans-identifying men”  
 Woke Right obviously rejects Queer in its literal expression  
 “...anyone who is or feels marginalized as a result of their sexual practices.” (Halperin)  
 Is “based” instead  
 Short history of the word “based” as slang  
 Refers to freebasing cocaine (and being completely spun)  
 Started getting used to refer to people bucking the Woke narrative  
 Started meaning being based in reality and principle against social  
 pressure  
 Never lost its subcultural meaning of transgressing Woke and polite  
 liberal society  
 Two meanings now  
 Older people: Based in reality and principle against pressure  
 Younger people: Transgressive of Left and Liberal norms  
 Queer energy, other direction  
 Establishes a “cult of transgression” around the concept of being “based”  
 Same kind of gateway to radicalism as Queer but in pseudo-traditionalist ways  
 Woke Right is doing “trad” Queer Theory  
 But it’s still Queer Theory (disrupting norms for political power)  
 Removes breaks from slide into (idealist) Reaction  
 There’s a feedback loop here with the young, too-online thing (this is their culture)  
  
 This is the extreme version of favoring “outsider knowledges” and “marginalized perspectives”  
 Just asking questions!  
 ...because “you’re not allowed to talk about this” (outsider/marginalized views)  
 Excluded by the “postwar consensus”  
 Elevating the European counterrevolutionary and Fascist thinkers – even Hitler  
 Even embracing Marx, Critical Theory, postmodernism...  
 Critiques, framing, but “not solutions” (except the stakeholder economy model)  
  
 Marcus Carlson hoax  
 Explain briefly  
 Embrace Critical Theory  
 Stephen Wolfe: “I am not conservative because I agree in part with the “critical”  
 methodology of the left, but come to different conclusions and valuations.”  
 (Image4-2 – SWolfe)  
 Embrace Marx’s analysis but not his conclusions  
 Is that possible?

Who are these people?

Dispossessed (alienated) “heritage” citizens who have been estranged from their inheritance through too much tolerance, which they blame on liberals, including traditionalist conservatives, for allowing Communism

Same exact pattern of alienation and estrangement retracted into the self for collective power politics

Is the logical conclusion of liberalism (with traditional conservatism) Communism?

No!

Communism is the logical conclusion of liberalism in the same way cancer is the culmination of human life

Marxism needed far longer to infiltrate, seduce, and subvert liberal systems than it did feudal or religious ones (which also don’t have Communism as logical endpoints)

Marxism (like a virus) evolved into Woke specifically to do this

Individual liberty does not transform into tyranny

But, like anything else, it can be subverted

Only through a twisted dialectical argument (operating system of the Left again)

Freedom becomes unfreedom necessitating more unfreedom to recover

Reason becomes unreason necessitating more unreason to recover

More direct just to blame subversion

By... idealists, mostly

Woke Left – Postmodern Neo-Marxism (feat. Critical Pedagogy)

Post-America Leftism

Woke Right – Postmodern Neo-Fascism in Reaction

Reaction → Post-liberalism (post-America Rightism)

Dialectical Scissors

Notice every argument is “either full ‘Based Trad’ or you support transing kids”

Total polarization to cut out the *realists*

So what is the Woke Right for?

Losing, mostly.

They’ll take the unexpected win if they can get it, but the dog doesn’t expect to catch the car

Main purposes of the Woke Right

Become the negative stereotypes the Left accused conservatives of

So those negative stereotypes can be used against conservatives, MAGA, Trump

Fracture and scatter the MAGA coalition and undermine Trump’s chances

Fracture, polarize, and balkanize America further

Prevent and sabotage the matriculation of women, minorities, Jews, etc., to MAGA

It’s a very ugly purity campaign (at best)

Meant to sabotage the first truly pro-America movement in decades

I said at the start we might believe Trump’s election might save us

Woke Right exists mainly to make sure that doesn’t happen

Sow narratives among American conservatives that hurt American and aid our global enemies

China, Russia, Iran, Qatar – have you noticed the bots?

Create the pretext for a “right-wing” stakeholder system (and social credit system)

Measures and enforces the “Trad” performance standards and stakeholder governance

That brings us to how they could possibly get any of this. This is a free country!

Direct possibility: force (coup and tyranny)

Indirect possibility: Pseudo-traditionalist Stakeholderism

More likely

Mixed possibility: Fragment and balkanize the country and install it regionally

THIRD: Key practical development: 21<sup>st</sup> Century Communism (hybrid model – stakeholder economy)

This is how it can be practically implemented at scale

Problem of productive forces could not be solved by Communism

Semi-Fascist stakeholder model becomes the missing link

Marx’s six-stage historicism condensed down to five (Image4-3 – ModFiveStageHistory)

Replacing Capitalism/Socialism becomes Stakeholderism

Explain this using the diagram(s)

Fundamental disjunction in the six-stage model

Capitalism won’t go socialist

Feudalism will but cannot unleash productive forces

Productive forces require profit motive

Two historical paths, “East” and “West”

Feudal (3) → Socialist (5): FAIL

Feudal (3) → Capitalist (4): WON’T GO SOCIALIST

But look what Reaction provides...

Socialism that can produce is called (economic) Fascism

Individuals can make profit so long as its to the benefit of the state

Profit→productivity (experiment has been run in every Communist state)

Socialism can easily be transformed to a Stakeholder model

China model (state owns capital but compliant people can use it)

Communism with economic Fascism inside

Free enterprise can be captured by the Stakeholder model

ESG, Stakeholder Capitalism, Sustainable Development Agenda,

Accountable Capitalism, Inclusive Capitalism, etc.

Semi-Fascism with either Communism or Fascism inside

Then society can all move from Stakeholderism (4’) to Communism (5’), or whatever

State equipped with a religious values system (Church) running the economy

Woke (whatever) is the values content for the “Church” function

Neo-integralism in full conceptual generality

Doesn’t matter if we get Woke Left Stakeholderism or Woke Right Stakeholderism

Both post-liberal (seek to go beyond freedom while retaining benefits of freedom, aka productivity)

“Freedom, but without the freedom”

Both post-America (seek to go beyond America while retaining the benefits of America)

Both running the same system with slightly different architecture and different inputs

ESG as an example:

E: Left pushes Degrowth; Right ignores

S: Left does “actual equality”; Right does nationalist duty  
(perhaps *Volkisch*, i.e., ethnonationalist)  
Balkanization (divide and conquer)  
G: Left does managerial control; Right does “leader principle”  
These are hybridized  
Large powerful countries like America can be broken up (balkanization)  
Left can have its stakeholder system in its regions  
Right can have its stakeholder systems in their regions (plural)  
Civil War in a bottle  
This region is pro-whatever-race; that is anti-same-race  
Long term result is damage and reunifying under new banner  
Stakeholderist, China-style control  
End of America  
True post-American world order begins  
“Multi-polar world”

I’ll close with this pair of quotes

Adrian Vermeule (Harvard professor, Integralist, post-liberal): “The issue isn’t ‘post-liberalism or not?’ The only issue is ‘which postliberalism?’”

Robin DiAngelo (Woke Race-Maoist): “The question is not ‘did racism take place?’ but ‘how did racism manifest in this situation?’”

This evening, we’ll come back to talk about why America rejects all this and start answering the question the Woke Right wants to corner the market on soon:

What is an American?

**8.3 pages**

## Talk 5 – What Is an American? (Or, The Foundations of American Liberty)

Americans are citizens of the greatest, freest, most prosperous, and most righteous nation that has ever existed on the Earth.

What is a nation? (Some other answers)

(Clip 5-1 – VanceNation – <https://x.com/amconmag/status/1813775880071823395/video/1>)

Stalin, *Marxism and the National Question*

“A nation is a historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture.”

Mussolini (*Doctrine of Fascism*)

“Fascism is therefore opposed to that form of democracy which equates a nation to the majority, lowering it to the level of the largest number; but it is the purest form of democracy if the nation be considered as it should be from the point of view of quality rather than quantity, as an idea, the mightiest because the most ethical, the most coherent, the truest, expressing itself in a people as the conscience and will of the few, if not, indeed, of one, and ending to express itself in the conscience and the will of the mass, of the whole group ethnically molded by natural and historical conditions into a nation, advancing, as one conscience and one will, along the self same line of development and spiritual formation. Not a race, nor a geographically defined region, but a people, historically perpetuating itself; a multitude unified by an idea and imbued with the will to live, the will to power, self-consciousness, personality. In so far as it is embodied in a State, this higher personality becomes a nation. It is not the nation which generates the State; that is an antiquated naturalistic concept which afforded a basis for 19<sup>th</sup> century publicity in favor of national governments. Rather is it the State which creates the nation, conferring volition and therefore real life on a people made aware of their moral unity.”

Hitler expressed the same idea, calling the State the “being that makes the nation possible”

Hitler (MK) – state is the *Volk* (a people defined by race and ethnicity tied to a historical national process)

“A state may be described as a model of its kind if it serves the vital needs of the race it represents and if by its own existence the state actually keeps this national race alive. How this nation is viewed by the rest of the world does not matter; that is not a criterion for its success. It is not the task of the state to create abilities but simply to clear the road for those abilities that already exist within its people. On the other hand, a state may be called bad no matter how high its cultural level if it condemns those who carry the cultural ability to destruction by allowing the corruption of its racial make-up. The state, in practice, destroys the essential element needed for the survival of this culture. This culture is not the creation of the state, but is the fruit of a culture-building race protected by its unification as a state.”

“Unfortunately our German nationality no longer has a unified racial core and the process of fusing the various original races has not progressed to a point where we can talk about the formation of a new race. On the contrary, the various poisonings of blood which have afflicted our political body, especially since the Thirty Years’ War, have rotted not only our blood, but our national soul.”

(Clip 5-2 – AuronAmerican – <https://x.com/ConceptualJames/status/1957802439182049611/video/1>)

## *Volksgemeinschaft*

### Paperwork Americans (Image5-1 – AuronPaperwork)

“That is one kind of naturalization, by birth within an extended territory and there is another possibility for later naturalization, by paperwork. ...

“The whole process of acquiring citizenship is pretty much like joining an automobile club. A person sends in his application, it is checked and approved, and one fine day, he is informed on a slip of paper that he has become a citizen. The information is even put in a humorous and joking manner. The applicant who was previously a Zulu or Kaffir is notified: “By these presented, you are now become a German Citizen.” This magic trick is accomplished by the signature of a State official. What Heaven could not attempt, one of these [alchemical magician] officials can do with a scribble of his hand. One scratch of the pen and a Mongolian...is suddenly turned into a real “German.” No attention is paid to the race of one of these new “citizens”.”

“MacIntyre”: “[Representative Delia Ramirez of Illinois is] part of a growing class of politicians who treat their American citizenship as a formality. Many are first-generation immigrants. Ramirez isn’t even that. She was born to an illegal immigrant mother who crossed the border while pregnant and secured birthright citizenship for her daughter. On paper, Ramirez is American. In every other way, she is not. ...

“That idea holds that America is defined not by a shared heritage or culture, but by a set of abstract principles. According to this view, anyone who completes the paperwork and swears an oath is just as American as someone whose ancestors fought in the Revolutionary War. ...

“Paperwork without allegiance: Ramirez herself is not an immigrant. She was born under current understanding of the 14th Amendment. Her mother, in violation of U.S. law, crossed the border while pregnant. No agreement to any American proposition was required. Ramirez acquired the legal status of an American and the constitutional right to reject the nation that gave it to her. There is no ideological connection, cultural tie, or apparent love of country. Only the paperwork remains.”

Hitler’s solution: “One becomes a State Subject by simply being born in the State. State Subject status does not entitle its possessor to hold public office or to be politically active, such as participating in elections, either actively or passively, nor running for office or voting. The race and original nationality of every State Subject must be proven. The State Subject is free at any time to relinquish his Subject status and become a citizen of whichever country is his own.”

“MacIntyre’s” solution: “Paperwork alone does not make someone American. The people exploiting our system understand this. They aren’t confused. They’re mocking us. And unless we find the courage to act, they will keep doing it. Send them back. Every last one.”

Schmitt explains: “We are looking for a bond that is more reliable, more vibrant, and deeper than the deceptive bond to the perishable letters of a thousand legal paragraphs. Where else could it lie but in ourselves and our own nature? Here too, given the inseparable connection between the rule of law, the civil service, and

judicial independence, all questions and answers lead to the requirement of a kind of sameness without which a totalitarian state cannot survive for a single day.”

How is America different?

America is based on an idea

Individual sovereignty and self-government create prosperity

The idea that this works is called the American Dream

Belief in the American Dream is the article of faith in America

The American covenant is keeping your end of the promise that you might earn the blessings of Liberty

It's time for an Old Testament–style prophet-call back to our covenant that we may be able to secure for ourselves and our posterity—genetic and otherwise—the blessings of Liberty promised by the American Dream

What is an American?

Two questions here:

Legal and socio-spiritual

Legal: An American is a citizen of the United States of America

Sociospiritual: An American is a citizen who upholds this believes in and upholds covenant

Upholding and participating in this covenant *is* the American common culture

It is participating in and continuing the American tradition

Isn't that “Anglo-Protestant” as Samuel Huntington said in *Who Are We?*

Yes, and...

That tradition came to the New World as settlers to try an experiment in making a covenant with Liberty

In order to secure Her Blessings for themselves and their posterity

Religious liberty and freedom of conscience and from kings were key parts of that tradition

The Church-State will not interfere

Especially in matters of conscience and belief

Going against or seeking to fundamentally transform this covenant and tradition is socio-spiritually *un-American* to the core

If we had a new “House Un-American Activities Committee”...

Test isn't “heritage” or any other arbitrary test

Socio-spiritual commitment isn't arbitrary

Test is willingness to accept one's role in this covenantal relationship

Or declared opposition to it

Bad news for the post-liberal post-American movements...

So, what is an American?

Realism (but! How can we know reality is real?)

Not idealism

Reality is real and we can know something about it

We come to know what we know by checking against reality and applying reason

Reality is objective to us, not a matter of subjective perception (idealism → constructivism)

We covered this in the second lecture, yesterday  
This puts us in greater, though imperfect, alignment with truth  
We do better the better we can align with truth  
Truth always wins in the end  
We need to love the truth  
We need to fear the truth  
The truth is what lays low all error and humiliates all those who are in error

But facts are facts, and without interpretation of the facts, we have nothing  
And thus all is interpretation, right?  
Subjectivist view is inescapable, right?  
How do we compare interpretations of our observations?

### Common Sense

Sense (perception) and sense-making are common to all  
This is part of what makes us human  
We can perceive the world with some degree of accuracy for ourselves  
We have our own reason as a sense-making apparatus to interpret it  
We can also compare our interpretations to arrive at the best possible ones  
Requires believing that truth is correspondence to reality  
Philosophy of science has spent centuries on this

How can we judge models of reality (“interpretations”)?  
Requires believing we can know something about knowing things  
A strong model comes from the anonymous YouTuber “King Crocoduck”  
“Big-Four Operational Criteria” he calls them  
Predictive Accuracy/Precision  
Applicable/faithful to navigating the world  
Explanatory Efficiency  
Parsimony (no extraneous “moving parts”)  
Optimal Flexibility  
Accountability and willingness to revise assumptions  
Upon identifying contradictions  
Rational Coherence  
Internally consistent, lacking contradictions

What about the process?

Also requires believing we can know something about knowing things  
The best articulation I know of comes from Jonathan Rauch

*Kindly Inquisitors* and *The Constitution of Knowledge*

Two key principles:

No special authority (no arbitrary elites)

Information is not judged as true because of its source

(Can be regarded as false or likely false, though!)

(*Ad hominem* is usually but not always a fallacy)

E.g., bad faith, conflicts of interest

No final say (no final/ultimate authority)

Any question can be revisited with new or further information

(Similar to Optimal Flexibility criterion above)

Therefore, all (epistemological) authority is contingent, provisional, and earned

Bedrock: Reality is real and objective (not subjective, same for everyone)



Scientific universality → approximate objectivity (which is common sense)

If a bunch of people observe the same thing and come up with roughly the same description, we can be reasonably certain it's as real as real gets

Thomas Jefferson effectively believed in this

On the question of whether America was susceptible to political dominance by a faction that would then take power and dispose of liberty

Jefferson said “no,” as long as there's enough liberty

(We are testing this hypothesis now)

Threat: Friend-enemy distinction (Communism and Fascism)

His thought: Free people will form enough factions and maintain enough critics of each to keep the debate alive and counter one another

Relevance to stakeholder model: if you want to be a stakeholder, buy a stake

## We Are Not God

Where is (elite) authority to be found?

One answer: God (alone)

Another answer: In me and people who agree with me

American answer: Not in man (and maybe in God), so not in you or people who agree with you

Humble yourself!

Believing in freedom of conscience, speech, etc., requires tremendous humility

The American answer to who has the right to rule over others (or declare truths) is...

Not one of us beyond what we can earn and demonstrate before our fellow men

Leading them to voluntarily follow us for as long as they will

No special authority; no final say

Because of our belief in reality and common sense, anyone can be a challenger to claims of authority

That we deem them “self-evident truths” that our rights are inherent and unalienable comes from this idea

Our system of divided powers, representative democracy, etc., is also built on this idea

Compare

Monarchical model: The king and nobility have expert authority

Cf. Joseph de Maistre, Carl Schmitt

European conservative model is un-American

Soviet model: The Soviet (governing council) has expert authority

Determined by alignment with Communist Party goals and theory

Fascist model: The Fascist State and its leader (“the one”) has expert authority

Determined by alignment with Fascist Party/State goals and theory

Nazi model: The National Socialist Party and State (*Führer*) has expert authority

Determined by alignment with Nazi Party/State goals and theory

Codified in the *Führerprinzip* (leader principle)

The leader (at each level) has authority, literally

Stakeholder model: The Stakeholder Group has expert authority

Determined by alignment with governing council goals and theory

## Individual Sovereignty (cf. Schmitt?)

In America, the individual is sovereign over his own life and own affairs

The government has a few specific roles about keeping the peace, national security, resolving disputes (courts), establishing and enforcing the laws, etc.

Let's recall Carl Schmitt

**"Sovereign is he who decides on the exception."**

Two meanings, remember:

*When* is it exception (to the normative order)

*What to do* about the exception (to restore the normative order)

Allegedly... (who could force restoration?)

Schmitt locates this power uniquely in the state executive

Uses it to justify the *Führerprinzip* for the Nazis in 1933

America: It is the *individual* who decides on the exception

If *you* have a problem, *you* can act to solve it

Fosters independence, responsibility, consideration

Principle unlocks the blessings of Liberty

Rule of Law (none above the law) becomes his binding

Standing required for a suit

Injury against people's rights (liberty, person, property)

Courts adjudicate (or bring settlement)

Distributes decisionism with accountability instead of centralizing it

Principle of individual sovereignty is part and parcel with another principle

Limited Government (actual distributism in principle) – Foundation of prosperity, wealth, and abundance

That is, the Blessings of Liberty

The promise of the American Idea for those who keep its covenant

And put faith in the American Dream

Knowing faith without works is dead

Charlie Munger: **"Show me the incentive, and I'll show you the outcome."**

Benefits: Independent, first-party activity to solve problems

Problems are local, so locals seek solutions

My problem is *my problem*, so I'm most motivated to solve it

Might need expert consultants, might not

My priorities/incentives (which the state doesn't have) with *my problem*

Want it solved

Responsibility: solve problems rather than letting them fester

Want it solved *now* or ASAP

Efficiency: quickest available route to a solution

Want it solved as cheaply as possible

Economy: cheapest available route to a solution

Want it solved well

(With other incentives): Ingenuity, innovation, quality

Don't want to have to wait for some third party

Independence: Internal locus of control, ingenuity

Add a profit motive (problems are often shared)

Incentives multiplier

My solutions to *my problem* scale to local solutions to local problems

Can scale further

Incentivizes producing a reasonable surplus (but not more)

Taps economies of scale (actual expertise)

Taps law of comparative advantage (optimal allocation of talent)

Produces abundance (reasonable surpluses but not more)

- Prosperity follows
  - Creates wealth
    - Stored capacity to solve problems
    - Get back a reasonable return on what we put in
    - Just deserts – equity
  - Emphasizes correspondence to truth
    - Whoever is solving problems better (closer to truth) wins
- Government lacks all of these intrinsic incentives because it is a third-party actor
  - This is *structural* – government lacks the incentives to do these things well
  - Independence is replaced by dependency (external locus of control)
  - Ingenuity and innovation collapse (don't necessarily die)
    - Formulaic, bad-fit solutions to problems
  - Efficiency and economy become matters of (weak) policy
    - Hotbed of graft and corruption
      - Third party: Contracts in corrupt ways
  - Equity becomes a forced-egalitarian nightmare
    - Governments don't create wealth but redistribute it
      - Zero-sum or negative sum (due to waste, fraud, inefficiency, etc.)
    - Socialist drain on the system – motivation killer
      - Justice goes along with truth here
    - Susceptible to Communist subversion
    - Threatens to trigger Reaction
  - No profit motive to multiply any of these incentives
    - Remember: Profit motive is the generator of productivity
- This problem plagues all models of centralization
  - Collapsed the Soviet and Communist systems
  - Would prove unsustainable in the Fascist systems (largely based on plunder)
  - Stakeholder system cannot escape it either
- Economy emerges on the set of base rules, which modify incentive structures for ownership and trade
  - Economy is and cannot be the handmaiden of the state
    - State cannot *create* an economy; it can only *interfere* in an economy
      - Sometimes necessary or desirable
        - Incurs tradeoffs (as above)
          - Cf. Big Four principle of “optimal flexibility”
  - Economic statism (e.g., stakeholder model) runs a tradeoff against the fruits of a free economy, re: independence, innovation, responsibility, efficiency, economy, equity, for other ends, including security but also control

Exclusion (private property) – establishes a common-sense stakeholder claim

The foundation of American prosperity and wealth isn't just in government non-interference

It's also in our secured right to private property (both against government and one another)

What Makes private property “private”?

- A simple doctrine called the *fundamental right to exclude*
  - Compare: Woke Left “inclusion” (“inclusive capitalism...”)
  - My property is *mine* and I can exclude you from it
    - Your property is *yours* and you can exclude me from it
  - We each set the terms of exchange of our property for ourselves
    - Neither of us has to participate in the exchange

Thus, we'll only exchange when both of us think we benefit  
This is the foundation for building all wealth and surplus (abundance)  
This way to prosperity and abundance  
Wealth is the accrual of value – accrued potential to solve problems for self, others, society  
If we both exchange our own property and feel like we left with greater value, then  
Wealth was *created* (positive-sum game)  
Things I can produce therefore become reservoirs of potential positive-sum exchange  
I'm therefore incentivized to produce them to surplus and sell them at a profit  
Only profit guaranteed by private property encourages me to make a surplus  
Profit is maximized when I'm more efficient and economical in production  
So my surpluses should also not be excessive (to the needs of others)  
I'm incentivized to innovate to increase these variables  
Investment (hard work), innovation, efficiency, economy, abundance  
If I do well (as a good and faithful servant), I can earn a profit and secure for myself  
more of the Blessings of Liberty—true equity (just deserts)  
Securing the right to private property, thus the profit motive, solves the problem of production  
The results are abundance, surplus, wealth, and prosperity *in society*

Why do we secure rights to life, liberty, and private (exclusive) property?

Having them protected protects our souls  
That's what they're really after, you know...  
Right to life: They cannot kill you  
Right to liberty: They cannot jail you  
Right to property: They cannot alienate you from the fruits of your efforts and talents  
(All subject to legal cause and due process of law)

What do these have to do with your soul?

If they can deprive you of these, then they can compel your belief  
Then they can control your spiritual life  
They can compel your belief  
Maybe in the right faith, values, God  
Maybe in the wrong ones  
But it's not you  
They can transform who you are  
Or compel you to compromise yourself  
Or end or make an example of you to others, if not  
They can interfere with your covenant with God, if He exists  
And with your covenant with Liberty,

How do Americans respond to such a threat to ourselves and our souls, even in the name of our own good?

Article I, Section 3, Tennessee State Constitution

“That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience; that no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship or to maintain any minister against his consent; that no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that no preference shall ever be given, by law, to any religious establishment or mode of worship.”

And if they try to make us compromise, what would we say?

Article I, Section 2, Tennessee State Constitution

“That government being instituted for the common benefit, the doctrine of nonresistance against arbitrary power and oppression is absurd, slavish, and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind.”

That is, we reject it.

That’s what an American is.

An American is a citizen of the United States of America. Spiritually, an American also holds the foundational American belief that self-government is possible and opens the door to greater prosperity. An American has faith in the American Dream and keeps his or her end of the covenant that makes it possible, and more than a dream, and uses his American liberty to pursue that Dream and the Blessings of Liberty that are held in promise for the faithful and responsible citizens who sacrifice for them. An American is a classical liberal in the regards presented here who will fight and die, if necessary, to protect his God-given right to hold this faith, keep this covenant, and pursue this Dream—the returned promise of the Blessings of Liberty—against any post-liberal interference, Left or Right.

Thus, Americans are citizens of the greatest, freest, most prosperous, and most righteous nation that has ever existed on the Earth.

So, what is an American?

Americans are a faithful people with regard to the Blessings of Liberty, but it’s a covenant we must participate in. As in the Old Testament book of Numbers, we can wander the desert and complain about how much better it was in captivity, or we can accept the burden of the trek to the Promised Land.

This is a call back to faith in America.

**8.6 pages**