

THE WARRIOR CLASS

ESTABLISHING A REVOLUTIONARY PERSPECTIVE

BY

RICHARD R. SLOMON

JUNE, 1975

THE WARRIOR CLASS

The libertarian movement is in its infancy in the world of violent turmoil, or mounting chaos and victorious evil. North American libertarians who presently constitute almost the entire body of the movement are generally naïve as to the nature of the evil which they presently face. There seems to be the assumption that the USA could be libertarian in spite of the overwhelming march to collectivism taking place in the rest of the world. Many libertarians are seemingly unmoved or paralyzed by the enormous forces for statism and collectivism which are spreading their evil cancer in all areas of this society.

In spite of this blatant threat there are those who cling to the ridiculous belief that rational argument alone will triumph over the cacophonous fugue of collectivist indoctrination. Those individuals are blind! While these myopic “Theoreticians” attempt to lead us down the long (and wrong) road of “cultural re-education,” we see impending gun-control legislation and campus socialist mini-states simultaneously indoctrinating millions of future collectivists while disarming the remaining producers. All of this takes place in a catastrophic context of entire nations falling into the net of totalitarian slavery, and the horrifying anguish of tens of thousands of desperate refugees fleeing for their very lives before the stream-roller of communism. When, if not now, have the criminal atrocities of the collectivist dictators and the costly blunders of the statist bureaucrats ever been more blatantly self-evident than now?

Assuming that the truth is self-evident to the masses, this should be the moment of a great awakening. The facts are there – so why isn’t the truth coming across?

Because the majority, including many libertarians, are living in a fool’s paradise. The difference between the masses of individuals who live in the vague and anxious never-never land of the A-C* culture and libertarians is that the latter know (or should know) better. But in fact they (libertarians) tend to avoid or rationalize away the awful truth that present conditions require organizing and making worldwide struggle or face the awesome possibility of slavery.

My last editorial briefly described ten preconditions for bringing about a successful revolution not only in the United States but in other parts of the world. Although many libertarians tend to cringe when they hear the words “revolution,” “struggle,” “fight” and “confrontation,” there are in increasing number for whom these terms are worthy of discussion. It is to these individuals that I am making my appeal to organize now before it is too late! I fully expect the others to join-in eventually when the narrowness of the options becomes clearer to them. In any case, I see no real alternative except to begin organizing now for a long-term struggle on a world-wide scale against the forces of altruist-collectivism in general and statism in particular.

The situation facing libertarians is exceedingly grim but paradoxically the acuteness of the situation constitutes an element in our favor. Libertarianism in the present A-C context is regarded as an “extremist” position and it is only under extreme stress that any number of individuals will be willing to seek “extreme” solutions to the problem. Naturally this means that we face extremists on the opposing side who tend to be mass-produced in an A-C context. But then, this has always been the case. The fact that the entire world may well become one socialist slave state before the end of the

century is a condition which must be planned for and used to our advantage. The immaturity of the present movement, which is to be expected for its stage of development, in dealing with the long-term future is characterized in the prevailing tendency of many libertarians to want to create Galt's Gulch in the woods or to stock-up on freeze dried food and gold sovereigns.

Though these measures are worthy, they should be relatively peripheral in the minds of libertarians concerned for the future. The real question is not how do we retreat into the woods and hope the government will be too enfeebled by economic collapse to come and get us, but how we are to take the offensive. Contrary to the beliefs of many libertarians, economic collapse is not imminent, social chaos is not around the corner, and the capacity of the government to intrude in our rural redoubts is increasing and not withering.

Looking at conditions objectively, what the United States and the entire world faces is a plunge into collectivized totalitarianism. We are not facing the "Dark Ages" within the next quarter-century. The dramatic fall of the curtain on civilization as portrayed in Atlas Shrugged will not come all at once – elements of this collapse will afflict different areas at varying rates. "Islands" of prosperity may exist for decades. In fact, new breakthroughs in technology may create enough wealth to temporarily stave-off the consequences of even the worst forms of bureaucratic waste and depredation.

What is likeliest to occur in the next quarter century is a Soviet take-over of the world. The fall of South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos to communist military invasion and the powerful communist political movements in Portugal and Italy are not anomalies but indicators of what is to come. The fact is that most of the world is already socialist and actively hates the United States.

Historically, the United States lost the opportunity to decide the future of the world in 1945. If the opportunity has persisted in ever-diminishing quantities since that time, it no longer exists now. No real chance exists either for a mass ideological revival of the American population, with tens of millions of the younger generation indoctrinated in sublimated forms of "soft-core" socialism. Even if this were possible, the U.S. has already given-up too many strategic options to the Soviets. In a few years, from a military-strategic point of view, it will be all over for the United States. This does not mean an all-out thermonuclear war is necessarily in the offing. Even thermonuclear war, when considering the various scenarios which could take place, does not necessarily mean inevitable doom for mankind.

Assuming that the set of economic, social and political conditions taking place in Italy and the United Kingdom will become characteristic of the United States and the rest of Western Europe in ten to fifteen years; what kind of strategy should the libertarian movement take? Assuming further, that the USSR is destined to rule militarily in the next quarter-century but without outright military occupation, what kind of strategic choices should be made now?

Perhaps libertarians might begin by changing their attitudes from one of 'dark-ages' syndrome to one of optimistic desperation. They might start by making what might be called a reasonable worst-case assumption as to the future state of the world. We might start with the assumption that the world is going authoritarian and "socialist" but that is not going to necessarily bring about a massive shrug by the atlases of the world or the chaotic reign of the mob. Collectivist dictatorships have far fewer scruples about

shooting looters than “free world” democracies and “order” not chaos is the characteristic of authoritarian regimes. Thus, running-away will not do any good or assure oneself of greater freedom and security in a world generally organized against anti-authoritarians. If “running away” to found Galt’s Gulch is not the answer, neither is making a last desperate stand the answer. If libertarians get involved in any kind of “shoot-out” with the authorities it should take place under optimal conditions with the opportunity for eventual victory.

Thus with this attitude, libertarians can psychologically step-back from the twin precipices of the Randian dark ages syndrome or the ridiculous Rothbardian euphoria that the world is inchoately moving toward freedom. More to the point, we can start splashing cold water on the implicit assumptions held (and acted upon) by many leading libertarian elements that representative democracy will permit our rise through totally peaceful means. Perhaps also, the energies of those who have tried, with enormous imagination to start a “new country project” (Minerva and Abaco) might be channeled into a long-term, disciplined strategy to bring about a world-wide movement to free many “old countries” as well as forming new free states.

A libertarian “revolution” does not have to adopt the forms used by authoritarian collectivists; however, libertarians must not blind themselves to the methods and conditions which have led to the “successes” of collectivism. The libertarian movement and its revolutionary struggle must acquire a form which is appropriate to its particular requirements. Thus in partially free (e.g. where human rights are not wholly violated) representative democracies such as the United States, the movement should proceed largely without violence. In countries where even vestigial property rights and other “civil liberties” are denied, and political or cultural opposition is suppressed, libertarians should seek to organize retaliatory-force movements. The objective in these cases would be the overthrow of the State by force. Although the bulk of the activities growing out of the libertarian movement are and will continue to be spontaneous, decentralized and often disorganized; the attempt to bring about the fall and the replacement of coercive governments will require ideological comprehensiveness, long-range and coherent planning, discipline, hierarchical authority, the ability and the willingness to use retaliatory-force, the formulation of social and political programs of reform which will be comprehensible and desirable to masses of individuals and the ability to effect transitions from each stage of the struggle without compromising moral purity.

This portion of the “revolution” requires control since by its very nature the use of retaliatory force must result from a deliberate and purposeful use of force to arrest the initiation of force. Although all spheres of the movement will eventually be engulfed by the violent struggle against the State, since we can only expect the cruelest and most violent forms of repression under the Soviet imperial system; the machinery for carrying out the struggle will be the organized and armed forces.

Armed struggle is not spontaneous and it is not appealing to the productive individuals. But within the movement there are and there will be individuals whose chosen profession is that of Warrior. These individuals do not differ essentially from the Creator personality. Both Warrior and Creator hold moral identity as the core of existence. Each recognizes his or her work as an expression of moral integrity and the concretizing of moral self-validation.

The work of the Warrior, however, absolutely requires the ethical and epistemological willingness to place the achievement of the mission above corporeal existence. Performance of military tasks require not merely facing hazards, which courageous Creators face in many occupations, but the destruction of sentient who are actively seeking the destruction of the Warrior.

In performing duty the Warrior must be willing to give-up sovereignty over his or her life. The ability to command total obedience requires the reciprocal willingness to obey commands. More importantly from an epistemological point of view, the Warrior does not fight primarily to defend himself or herself from the enemy or even comrades in arms, but to carry-out the mission, that is – to actualize a professional ethic and thus realizing in the concrete an internal moral self-identity. The ultimate selfishness of the Warrior is fighting for a coherent set of values consistent with reality can only be served by a total ascription to the overall purpose of the mission – preserving (or bringing about the rise) of the free State. A Warrior cannot defend values unless they are his or her own but the moral self-identify of the professional Warrior is based on abstracted values which are embodied by the free society being defended.

In essence, the free Warrior fights to protect the right to life, self-ownership and property of the citizens of the free State. A Warrior by the very reality of his or her profession must be prepared to trade his or her life to defend property. A Creator by definition would never be willing to trade existence for the defense of property. Thus, warfare is not merely a hazardous occupation, it is an occupation in which one must be willing to die for what is right.

Perhaps the second-order epistemological cleavage between the Creator and Warrior can be best expressed by saying that whereas the Creator might in the most desperate of circumstances die defending his or her property, the Creator would never willingly place himself or herself in that position. By contrast a Warrior not only would willingly place himself or herself in such a position but would have to in order to be a Warrior in the first place. And this is what divides the Warrior Class from the Creator Class – a division which by the nature of warfare cannot be arbitrarily laid aside without sacrificing congruency with reality.

Thus, this division and its ramifications must be understood by libertarian ideologues before entering the coming struggle. It means that the Creator Class which is the overwhelming dominant element in the present stage must accept the task of nurturing the Warrior Class to bring about the rise of a libertarian society. Since revolution is warfare it will be fought by the Warrior Class with the voluntary support of the Creator Class.

*Editor: Altruist-Collectivist