



AGAINST THE ELITE?

Posted on February 1, 2023 by Aristarch



In the current times of confusion, there are many words that are often heard but little understood and therefore frequently misused. "Fascist," "communist," "racist" fall easily from lips, while the meaning of these words is as varied as the opinions that need to use them. Words are indeed power, because they are extensions of ideas. In other words, the confusion is with ideas, not with dictionary definitions.

But then confusion is the paradigm of our age, in that everyone is looking for "solutions," for all manner of problems. But these solutions are, in turn, answers to stupid questions—and this has led to the great evil of our age—relentless social engineering by "experts" who claim to have all the answers, so that science is always "settled," so that the minds of people are governed by "facts" affirmed by the media and their "fact-checkers." In other words, Googling has created a very peculiar manner of subservience: deference to figures of authority ("look it up" is the catch-phrase of the day). And this is also the great error of the right today, which consistently fails to distinguish the true role and nature of power and therefore it can get no further than protest, as proven yet again by the events in Brazil (and previously the January 6th events). Protests without an understanding of how to actually wield power leads to the full entrenchment of tyranny, where the protestors are cast in the role of chaos which must be defeated.

The use of the term, "the elite" is also a case in point. Whenever this word is used, out come photos of Klaus Schwab, Bill Gates, George Soros, and the various tech billionaires, along with the obligatory mention of "the Bilderberg Group," "the Club of Rome," "the Rothschilds," "Davos," or "the Tavistock Institute," and the like. Of course, no one bothers to explain why all these constitute the "elite." If it is all about money and political influence, then, sure, these people and organizations can be called the "elite." But if we go that route, how do we then differentiate between "the elite" and "the plutocrats?" If we are asked to loathe "the elite," we march right along with the Marxists who say the same thing. But then we are also asked to hate Marxism and fight the creep of communism that is taking over western society. So, is populism and or nationalism Marxist, or is it something else? No one really explains what this "else" could be. And there is no point in mentioning "capitalism," where there is even more confusion, since Bill Gates and the like are real capitalists, as is China. If we are asked to be "for" capitalism, suddenly we are in league with those that we are also supposed to hate.

In all this murk, there is little clarity. But perhaps we can move towards the light by realizing a few basic things.

First, all political ideas must have a grounding in morality. Without morality there is only tyranny. And more politics cannot substitute for morality (that is what the Left is good at). In other words, society cannot sustain itself for centuries on end without knowing what it actually believes in. Here, words such as "democracy" and "freedom" are eagerly tossed about as substitutes for belief and therefore morality. The fact is Western society is failing-apart because it has nothing it truly believes in, since freedom, and its correlate democracy, does not mean more LGBTQ+ rights. Freedom can only come with morality. Immorality and amorality are methods of disruption, expressions of personal devastation; they cannot be universalized as structures for society, let alone civilization. The moral ground of the West was once Christianity. But now in the largely atheistic West, freedom is suddenly in short supply. Why? Many naively still think that the right government in power will bring more freedom. But what if in a morals-free society, governments can only rubber-stamp chaos?

Second, disgruntlement is not populism or even nationalism; it is simply a demand for more bread-and-circuses; the looking-after needs. The *vox populi* means the "voice of the people"—it does not mean the many *voices* of the people. Nor does "freedom" mean the expression of disgruntlement, which in fact is a process of psycho-therapy; to get something off your chest to feel better—and social media is excellent for that, in that it is the virtual shrink's couch, where you can say what you "feel," find others who will give you affirmation, and you're good to go. The question that the right needs to answer is—what does it seek to build? Rather, what *can* it actually build? Notice here the success of the other side, which is merrily moving along with all that "build back better" stuff. In other words, what world can the right offer that can actually counter the world being imposed by Schwab and Co?

Third, there is endless confusion about the terms, "the elite" and "the plutocrats." Let's be clear—Soros and his ilk are *not* the elite. They are plutocrats; that is, a eugenicist faction of the rich, which has successfully taken charge of the West. (To be clear, not all of the rich are eugenicists and against us, which again dismantles the Marxist struggle against all "the elite"). Our struggle is against this eugenicist plutocracy. But to be successful in defeating it—and defeat it we must if we are to remain human—we must clearly define who and what we are. It cannot all boil down to some class struggle, wherein workers/people of the world unite to throw off Schwab's chains. We all know where all that led. And besides, the plutocrats will always have more resources than us, which means that we shall never get beyond confrontation-mode, however emotionally satisfying that may be.

Fourth, it isn't about the money. Too many people get sidetracked with explanations that seek to convince us that Bill Gates does what he does because he needs the money. Let's not be naive; when

you reach the financial echelon of Gates and all the rest, money itself becomes meaningless, because it is no longer about acquiring more of it. These plutocrats already control all the money of the West; that is a given. They hardly *need* money. Rather, their motivations are mythic—and that is the true allure for these plutocrats. They are in it to be gods—and all that that status implies—immortality via technology. That is a heady, age-old quest, as old as Gilgamesh. Can we actually stop people wanting to be gods with political means?

The Elite

Historically and traditionally, the elite were the best that humanity produced, people who sought to bring beauty, the good and truth into the world—and in the process they created culture. You know, the cathedrals, the symphonies, the *Mona Lisa*, the *Divine Comedy*—all that demiurgic devising which gave a glimpse of the transcendent to the world. In fact, the elite were closely attuned to the transcendent, hence the necessity of royal blood-lines, and all those tales of knights errant and heroes of yore.

We must finally understand that our struggle is not about a new political order, for that is the folly of revolution, which only legitimizes tyranny (as Americans are slowly finding out with the final outcome of their revolution of 1776—Wokism); for all revolutions lead to a dead-end. Rather, our struggle is about preserving those structures that yield the good, the beautiful, and the true. Where does the right, then, belong? With revolution or with its opposite, which is heroism? The outcomes of both are very different.

The knights of old fought against the wicked, the false and the ugly (and now the West worships this anti-trinity as the new Golden Calf). The valiant feats of heroes defeated disorder and routed evil, and always at the cost of great personal sacrifice, even self-immolation. This was known as heroism, the purpose of which was not personal glory (that was a consequence of individual action)—but the pursuit of an ideal—the defeat of chaos. This is *kleos* in Homer, this is *tir* for Beowulf, this is *tirr* for the Vikings—a high ideal, the transcendent—which determined the course of valor, fueled by courage and virtue.

All this is to say is that we need the real elite, the valor of heroes, to counter the dystopias being dreamt-up by the plutocrats. We need people of means and wealth who value the good, the beautiful and the true and who pursue the transcendent. Otherwise, we are simply being revolutionaries, and we will therefore succeed only in replacing one tyranny with another.

Ask yourself this important question: why is it that all cultural institutions belong to those we call the left? Why is the right missing in action when it comes to high culture (museums, art galleries, concert halls, orchestras, film and even literature)? Everyone complains about Wikipedia, for example, but where is the rightwing repository of images of art, buildings and historical and cultural artifacts? Why is the cultural memory of the West held by the left? (A few exceptions here and there are rather pointless in the vast abandonment of high culture by the right).

So, let's start, at least, by not mislabeling plutocrats as the elite, for they can never be heroes, as they are incapable of creating beauty, let alone bringing the good and the true into the world. And we truly need the elite, latter-day knights errant, to defeat them. Without such an elite, we will always be misled onto the roller-coaster of revolution, or the never-ending entertainment of bread-and-circuses.

Aristarch writes whenever something catches his eye and the Muse grabs him by the throat.

Featured: "Beowulf's Final Fight with the Dragon," illustration by Lynd Ward, published in 1939.

