

To those who identify or have been identified with the Dissident Right or Classical Liberalism,

As has already been implied, the following letter is addressed not only to those who explicitly identify with the Dissident or Alternative Right nor those who are explicit adherents to the revival of Liberalism as a self-consciously Right-of-Center ideology. Rather it is intended for these and any who fairly or unfairly have strayed far enough from the publicly approved orthodoxies that as far as the common criteria themselves are concerned, they might as well belong to the "Alt-Right." In other words it is intended for those who are genuinely opposed to political correctness and opposed to global internationalism as it has come to exist at least in one form or another. More specifically, it is addressed to those who oppose these things particularly if they understand themselves to be politically oriented against both Progressivism and Neoconservatism. In case there is any doubt I mean to include among its recipients the Manosphere (consisting of the MGTOW, MRA, Right-wing PUA and Incel communities), White Nationalists (including race realists more generally), Neoreactionaries, the Alt-lite (including the Skeptic community), Right-wing Populists, Paleolibertarians (including Ron Paul Libertarians and Austro-Libertarians more generally) and finally the Paleoconservatives. In other words this letter is addressed to the Alt-Right so-called.

There has been a palpable wave of pessimism that has swept over the collective members belonging to the aggregate of persuasions outlined above. In a sense this pessimism is understandable. It is a crash following the exuberant high that began with the Presidential candidacy of Donald Trump and ended with the events that took place at Charlottesville. These events were followed by an increasingly intensified wave of online censorship as well as the seemingly irretrievable loss of the label "Alt-Right" as a designation for anything other than the most vulgar and abrasive manifestations of Neo-Fascism. More fatally, however, the events of Charlottesville and the subsequent infamy surrounding them have allowed the mainstream media to drive a wedge between the race realist proper of the Dissident Right and the various adjuncts which are perhaps marginally more socially acceptable. Most nefariously, the cultural elites have managed to effect this division in such a way as to leave many in these groups convinced that it was the attempt at unity itself which was the initial problem. To the thinking of the more Centrist of these, the problem with unity is that it will inevitably involve them in a case of guilt by association which will not only be a practical hindrance but will serve to fundamentally distort their beliefs by a conflation with any groups comparable to or Rightward of American Renaissance. The disdain for unity held by the identitarians, on the other hand, may be more complicated. Most identitarians are themselves probably wary of being publicly associated, for example, with someone like Andrew Anglin. They are themselves, therefore, not immune to the phenomenon of "punching Rightward" – of which they generally find themselves being the victims at the hands of the Alt-lite, Centrists and Classical Liberals. A second concern of the identitarians is that involvement in the wider Populist movement will tie them up with a premature engagement in the realm of politics before the war of ideas has been won. A third concern is that the ideas of the New Right are at risk of being qualitatively infected by the presence of non-White Nationalist adjuncts. Still, there is a fourth reason which for perhaps obvious reasons is less often stated which is that in the moment of trial, the various adjuncts of the Alt-Right were the first to throw the Alt-Right under the proverbial bus. It is unfortunate that this most understandable motive is the least explicit of the four seeing that, if it were to become explicit, it might contain within itself the remedy by which the general chaos and confusion in the world as it exists to the Right of Jordan Peterson might be cured.

The mistaken assumption of this perspective common to both the Alt-Right and its former adjuncts is that the primary purpose of the media has been to tarnish through caricature and exaggerated association. To a certain extent, of course, this is their aim but the opportunity to pursue this aim is a happy but secondary consequence of the establishment's true aim which is not to tarnish but to divide. Very few people who know anything about Jordan Peterson seriously believe that he is a Nazi and those who do would persist in that belief regardless of the company that he keeps. The most lasting effect and the most likely motivation for calling Jordan Peterson anything other than a Liberal is that it is the most reliable way of ensuring that he will sever himself from any potential allies who are themselves anything other than Liberals. It was not only Peterson who jumped at this opportunity to demonstrate his distance but Steve Bannon, Milo Yiannopoulos and Rebel Media as if those most eager to co-opt the utilitarian momentum of the broader Alternative Right had suddenly decided that it had outlived its usefulness. The abuse of the term "Alt-Right" proved to be a two-edged sword, whose killing blow consisted not only of provoking this reaction from the Centrists but also indirectly of provoking the reaction to the reaction from the Alt-Right. Naturally, when the Alt-Right saw its potential allies fleeing in all directions the response of its leadership was to dismiss these adjuncts of having never really been their allies in the first place, thereby subjecting the term "Alt-Right" to what amounted to little more than definitional arbitration.

This strategy was able to work because the Centrists only perceived the attempt to confound their cause with that of White Nationalism and because the White Nationalists themselves were so fixated by the betrayal that that perception resulted in. The distinction between "Alt-lite" and "Alt-Right" was precisely the outcome desired by the establishment.

In a sense the previously mentioned view that the time for activism had not yet arrived is correct in the sense that this strategy of division was only possible because the pressure of persecution was not yet felt as keenly as it would have to be in order for the Right to be united by it. In this regard the media overplayed its hand in terms of its efforts at censorship because after two years of intensification, the effect has been to reopen the eyes of the Right to the need for collaboration and potentially for redefinition.

Yet there is a very important problem that needs to be overcome if this opportunity is to bear desirable fruit. This problem is in a word that of "definitional pollution." The eternal question of dissident movements in general is how to satisfy the need for collaboration without maneuvering the collaborators into strategically adjusting how they define themselves, in their minds completely defeating their respective purposes – or worse, going the way of the Conservative Movement of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century and being disintegrated into the establishment entirely. There is, of course, a device that was devised precisely to solve this problem. It is called an "alliance." Any attempt at ideological re-unification should therefore be such that its terms of cooperation are analogous to those agreed upon in an alliance. That is, terms which are scrupulously minimalistic while at the same time absolute in terms of their exclusionary power. In other words an arrangement defined largely by what it is not rather than by what it is, more or less dispensing with any kind of "positive vision" which is just as well seeing that there has scarcely been a positive vision in history which hasn't ended in a sea of blood.

Which partners in this case should be invited to such an alliance? The same seven that were outlined in the opening paragraph of this letter. Namely, the Manosphere (including MGTOW, MRAs and Neomascularity), White Nationalists (including race realists in general), the Neoreactionaries, the Alt-lite

(including the Skeptics), Right-wing Populists, Paleolibertarians (including Austro-Libertarians and Ron Paul Libertarians), and the Paleoconservatives. Who should not be included in this alliance? Anyone who does not belong to any one of these groups. For example, most Neoconservatives should not be considered allies but in the case of those exceptions who are it is because they belong to one of these groups in addition to their being Neoconservatives. Someone like Tucker Carlson is a desirable ally because he is a Populist despite the fact that he may have some Neoconservative tendencies. As for the terms of the proposed alliance, they are really quite simple. Do not accuse anyone who fits these criteria of not being welcome on the Right or deal with them as being persona non grata on the Right even if they themselves do not agree to the terms of the alliance. Additionally, recognize the existence of an ideological category transcending but containing all of the seven categories – a kind of meta-ideology if you will. You might call it something like the “True Right” but since I originally conceived of the idea I have preferred a different term – “the Parthenon of the Right.” A great anti-Cathedral comprised of several constituent parts. In this “Parthenon of the Right” one can punch Right and can even attack one’s fellow congregants. What is not permitted is refusing to recognize them as true Parthenoneans when in fact they really are or denying that the Parthenon itself exists. Nevertheless, even these sins will not get one excommunicated. In order for that to happen, one must cease to belong convincingly to at least one of the recognized groups, in which case one’s ideological exclusion takes place automatically regardless of one’s manners or intentions. Since it would seem that the lines have failed to draw themselves organically, it stands to reason that they must be drawn systematically. This is my proposal as to where and how they should be drawn.

This letter will end on a positive note. While I mentioned at the beginning that the recent wave of pessimism is partly justified, it is in terms of the big picture not justified, given where things have come in relation to where they were fairly recently. To be a Conservative in 2010 meant to be a Neoconservative and to not even pretend to be anything else. In 2010 the chief Paleoconservative publication was a relatively low-key magazine published in Rockford, Illinois. At that time, when I would watch videos of Jared Taylor or Paul Gottfried on the internet, it felt like an obscure and niche interest and the idea of a US President being elected on Donald Trump’s 2016 platform was unthinkable. In 2019, by contrast, what used to be called Paleoconservatism is now simply Conservatism as it exists on Youtube and the channels advocating it often dwarf the subscribership of Chronicles Magazine at its highest. Whatever the level of public awareness that now exists of Jared Taylor and Paul Gottfried, watching them, let alone watching Richard Spencer, no longer feels anything like an exercise in antiquarian obscurity. Whatever one thinks of Trump, all he may have had to do to serve his purpose was to get elected on the platform that he did run on. The real point here is that though few may have attended the funeral when the ashes of Paleoconservatism were scattered, a beast nevertheless rose from those ashes. The only way that that beast can grow into a force capable of contending with the reigning god of Cultural Marxism is for its handlers to cease fighting over which one of them gets to control it.

Yours Sincerely,

Right Ruminations