

Carlsbad 1819

Like another Chouannerie

T.A. Jackson confirms: Carlsbad is a liberal

July 14, 2018 by Nulle Terre Sans Seigneur

Friendly Whale Shark Jackson

@TAJackson20



Neoabsolutism once described N. T. Carlsbad as a "classical liberal." I was baffled by that assesment at the time, but reading now ll'm starting to get it. From this here: thermidormag.com/temptations-of...

Carlsbad's anti-socialist killshot is basically liberalism.txt

2:07 AM · Jul 12, 2018



[Read the full conversation on Twitter](#)

♡ 12 💬 Reply ↗ Share

[Read 1 reply](#)

It is official; T.A. Jackson now confirms: Carlsbad is a liberal.

One more crippling bombshell hit the already beleaguered Carlsbad 1819 blog when IDC confirmed that the Carlsbad 1819 readership has dropped yet again, now down to less than a fraction of 1 percent of all newsreaders. Coming close on the heels of a recent T.A. Jackson survey which plainly states that Carlsbad 1819 has lost more readership, this news serves to reinforce what we've known all along. Carlsbad 1819 is collapsing in complete disarray, as fittingly exemplified by falling dead last in the recent #frogtwitter poll.

You don't need to be a Kreskin to predict Carlsbad 1819's future. The hand writing is on the wall: Carlsbad 1819 faces a bleak future. In fact there won't be any future at all for Carlsbad 1819 because Carlsbad 1819 is a liberal blog. Things are looking very bad for Carlsbad 1819. As many of us are already aware, Carlsbad 1819 continues to lose readership. Red ink flows like a river of blood.

Thermidor Magazine is the most endangered of them all, having lost 93% of its readership. The sudden and unpleasant departure of long time Thermidor Magazine editor P.T. Carlo only serves to underscore the point more clearly. There can no longer be any doubt: Thermidor Magazine is dying.

Due to the troubles of West Coast Reactionaries, abysmal sales and so on, West Coast Reactionaries went out of business and was taken over by Thermidor Magazine who publish another troubled magazine. Now Thermidor Magazine is also dead, its corpse turned over to yet another charnel house.

...

Now.

I was actually somewhat wary about including that quote precisely because I knew someone would spin it into "wait carlsbad u be sayin slavery is bad???" or "u be sayin we'z atomized individuals n shiet???"

Neoabsolutists of all people are extremely sensitive to this, and their talents for grasping at straws are quite formidable, since the whole framework is based on the idea that you are obligated to take it up the ass by omnipotent and arbitrary rulers because

\$REASONS_DERIVED_FROM_EARLY_MODERN_INTERNATIONAL_LAW. Baronies are literally liberalism.

One day I ought to get around to discussing John of Legnano (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_of_Legnano)'s *Tractatus de bello* (1360) as a scholastic corrective to all the nonsense that Grotius, Pufendorf, Vattel and others ended up writing on this subject, thus crippling the minds of most of the white race in the process, but as usual — *that's for another blog post, comrade.*

There are two aspects that are swept aside by the anachronistic knee-jerk reaction of acting incredulous as to how one could care about the individual in the presence of soulless bugman capitalism.

First, Brownson is making a point similar to Donoso Cortes, which boils down to the fact that socialism is inconsistent with its own premises by using means that contradict its stated ends. And by defining freedom as "independence from all the accidents of time and space," he is underlining that true freedom is an unattainable archetype. The promise is liberation from exigency and from class exploitation, the

result is a more purer and refined subjection than ever before. Subjection to *ourselves*, which is ultimately the Janus-faced nature of self-government: it combines the Luciferian/Thelemic maxim of “do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the law” with the despotism of majorities inherent in the same maxim: namely, your own unrestrained passions now become obligatory for all to respect. Hence: “Is he not a slave who is chained to nature for his own good, *or to a social organization which does not exist...?*”

Secondly, and more pertinently, Brownson was writing this in 1848-9.

To illustrate what is wrong with the socialist promise, we should first return to the suppositions of its liberal ancestor. And if you were to try and find a contender for “everything wrong with liberalism in one quotation,” you could hardly do better than Johann Georg August Wirth (https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Johann_Georg_August_Wirth) (1798-1848), organizer of the Hambach Festival and all-around pest.

The speech that Wirth gave at Hambach in 1832 includes, in all its jaw-dropping glory:

The country that speaks our language, the country where our hope resides, where our love delights, where our joys thrive, where the secret of all our sympathies and all our longing rests, this beautiful land is being ravaged and plundered, torn and enervated, gagged and disgraced. Rich in all the resources of nature, it should be the home of joy and contentment for all its children; yet, its blood sucked by 34 kings, it is the domicile of hunger, misery, and poverty for the majority of its residents. Germany, great, rich, powerful Germany, should assume first place in the society of European states, yet robbed by traitorous families of aristocrats, it has been struck from the list of European realms and abandoned to mockery from abroad.

Here we have the class enemy who must be vanquished. “The bourgeoisie are the first socialists,” as Saint-Bonnet reminded us.

Appointed by nature to be the guardian of light, liberty, and international legal order in Europe, German energy is actually being used for the very opposite purpose of suppressing the liberty of every people and founding an eternal empire of darkness, slavery, and raw force. Thus the poverty of our fatherland is simultaneously the curse for all of Europe. Spain, Italy, Hungary, and Poland are witnesses to this. Spain has been robbed by the Holy Alliance – which had its support exclusively in Germany – of a governmental constitution built on enlightenment, humanity, and reason, as well as of its patriotic Cortes, and has been taken back under the blade of fanatic priests and aristocrats and, indeed, of nonsense and cruelty. **Hungary and Italy are being robbed of their nationality by Austria with help from German forces and kept in slavery and darkness. Poland has been repeatedly betrayed by German powers, and now also owes the loss of its freedom and fatherland in our time to a German king.** The cause of the unspeakable suffering of the European nations lies entirely in the fact that the dukes of Austria and the electors of Brandenburg have seized the greater part of Germany for themselves and, under the titles Emperor of Austria and King of Prussia, not only rule their own countries – acquired through the methodical plundering of Germany – **in an oriental manner and use their powers to suppress the freedom and the popular sovereignty of European nations**, but also use their predominance over the smaller countries of Germany to make the powers of those countries serve the system of princely autocracy and despotic force.

Where do you begin with something as brazen and clear as this? “Appointed by nature” — to spread AIDS — and hence Brownson’s “enslaves us to nature and society,” for it is a very wicked and fallen nature, indeed. The Holy Alliance plays its typical typecast role of the time as source of all woes, actually

not unlike how the name of the Koch Brothers is frequently thrown around by American liberals for scapegoat in nearly anything.

And note “robbed of their nationality and kept in slavery and darkness” — you will not find today’s liberals very concerned about this, because the class-leveling ends of national states have been accomplished, and it is now time to move on to higher goals, like gay liberation.

The popular sovereignty in question is also “the whims or caprices of other men to create or to destroy,” per Brownson. This is made even more obvious by the following:

Every time there is a movement of a people aiming at the achievement of liberty and a reasonable governmental institution, the kings of Prussia and Austria are attached to Russia by a similarity of aims, convictions, and interests, and so arises that fearful alliance that has always found a way to kill the liberty of the peoples. The major power in this dark alliance always consists of German forces, since Russia would be powerless without the alliance with Prussia and Austria, and would fall to ruin from domestic disruption. **As gigantic, therefore, as the power of the absolutist alliance may be, its end will come at the moment in Germany when reason has also attained political victory, i.e. at the moment when public affairs are no longer managed according to the despotic will of an individual, no longer according to the interests of an extended aristocratic family branching out all over Europe, but rather according to the will of society itself and according to the needs of the people.**

The whims or caprices of other men to create or to destroy now amplified to the “will of society itself,” which denies the possibility of liberty while claiming loudly to affirm it. The individual “can make no advance toward his destiny but in proportion as he secures the cooperation of his race.”

And what is his destiny?

According to Wirth:

At the moment when German popular sovereignty is assigned its proper right, at that moment the most heartfelt confederation of nations is formed, for the people loves, while kings hate, the people defends, where kings persecute, the people grants what it aspires to achieve itself wholeheartedly, **and what it holds most dear are freedom, enlightenment, nationality, and popular sovereignty, for a fraternal nation as well: the German people therefore also grants these great, invaluable goods to its brethren in Poland, Hungary, Italy, and Spain. When, therefore, German money and German blood no longer submits to orders from the dukes of Austria and the electors of Brandenburg, but rather to the decree of the people, then Poland, Hungary, and Italy will be free,** because Russia will then have lapsed into powerlessness, and no other power will be around that could be used for crusades against the liberty of the peoples.

Frankly, no actual alt-right writer could have written a better manifesto of the alt-right than this. Why, we could fully justifiably say that Wirth and his fellow liberals were fighting royal globalism. And once we say this, where does that leave us? Staring into the depths of hell, that’s where.

Either way, the past is complicated, and though we can point fingers and sneer, this only works in retrospect.

In retrospect, Wirth was catastrophically, horribly wrong. But at the time, it seemed plausible. Actually it *still* seems plausible to most Europeans some 180 or so years later, since sans a few anachronistic emphases on nationality that have been obsoleted in favor of liberating the planet in general, it is still the

operational framework of modern political thought.

Following the literal-minded politique path of focusing on liberalism's skepticism of authority by in response affirming Bodinian absolutism as a metaphysical prerogative, misses the point of liberalism as a historical phenomenon. Moreover, this is not a singularly liberal trait. Sir Robert Filmer's defense of Anglican royal supremacy wasn't primarily responding to Roundheads, but rather to Catholic theologians.

This entry was posted in [Liberalism](#), [Monarchy](#), [Socialism](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#).

3 thoughts on "T.A. Jackson confirms: Carlsbad is a liberal"

1. Michael Rothblatt says:

[July 14, 2018 at 1:46 pm](#)

>Would living in Salazar's Estado Novo be more conducive to the virtues than contemporary Canada?

Estado Novo, without question, but...

"Truly I tell you, this poor widow has put in more than all the others. For they all contributed out of their surplus, but she out of her poverty has put in all she had."

those that live virtuously in contemporary Canada have something of an achievement. Majority of those that lived virtuously in Estado Novo were "hobbits" merely going with the flow, 'cause had they truly been virtuous Estado Novo would not have fallen. But I do not know what neotyrranists consider a virtue to be? Doing something because you're compelled to do so, no matter how good is not virtuous. Being robbed does not count as a good work of charity, even if robbers give all that money to the needy. But Saint Gregory of Nyssa said it better:

"...there is in us the principle of all excellence, all virtue and wisdom, and every higher thing that we conceive: but pre-eminent among all is the fact that we are free from necessity, and not in bondage to any natural power, but have decision in our own power as we please; for virtue is a voluntary thing, subject to no dominion: that which is the result of compulsion and force cannot be virtue."

[Reply](#)

2. Pingback: [T.A. Jackson confirms: Carlsbad is a liberal | Reaction Times](#)

3. Kali says:

[July 15, 2018 at 4:11 am](#)

You can make this much simpler if you went for the jugular here and made a formal critique of RF(reactionaryfuture).

You obviously cite his work from time to time(the use of high-low vs the middle). The important part, which was critiqued a long long time ago, was RF's reliance on system-determinism.

Without going into essay-levels of details: Who exactly is the sovereign of America?

Here is Adam saying the sovereign is the

president(https://www.reddit.com/r/GABlog/comments/6tuxfa/formalism_all_the_way_down/dlwjz5k/):

“How could I not recognize HRC or Obama as sovereign? My dissent (I would even want a better word) from their actions would involve seeking to clarify their imperatives, which would be imprecise and contradictory since they would be marked by limited and divided power.”

Here is RF saying the sovereign is the judiciary(<https://reactionaryfuture.wordpress.com/2016/07/07/judiciary-as-sovereign/>):

“Once the judiciary is captured, then a funneling effect can be put into effect in which all exceptions within a democratic system can be decided in your favor, because let us face it, the judiciary is the de facto sovereign in a democratic system once all the fluff, noise and nonsense is tuned out.”

Then there were the other guys, who thought the banks were the sovereign, wall street was the sovereign, the deep state CIA/intelligence agencies were the sovereign. Is the ZOG sovereigns of america? You can make a lot of people ‘sovereign of america’ by simply stating that they are able to use power without any impediment.

Here is Different_T on RF’s use of the high-low vs middle, with relation to Jouvenel and his findings:

“de Jouvenel’s use of this model is quite explicit. When he models something as HLvM, he actually means the sovereign entity allying with the lowest class of the society who have little to no Power outside of their individual energy against the established “intermediaries” that do have traditional or inherited Power. You completely blow up the model to apply to nearly every instance of conflict and are then forced to re-interpret ever shifting highs, lows, and middles based on your personal interpretation of the “winner.”

For instance, if you looked at American politics through the currently popularized lense of “Trump vs. the Establishment,” who is the high, low, middle? Is Trump the high allying with middle-american low against the “establishment?” Or is the “establishment” the high allying with the “low” of progressive liberals and neo-cons against the middle of “Trump and the deplorables?” We already know the answer: it depends on who you percieve as “winning.””

I don’t know if you are being clear about this. But are you taking word for word what liberals said as having been their true intentions? If they are actually telling the truth; where has it exactly led us?

Here is cyborg_nomade on this(<https://antinomiaimediata.wordpress.com/2017/04/05/on-matters-anthropologic/>):

“no liberalism needs to be so naive to the point of ignoring that society has purchase upon individuals, their choices and their values. but such criticism fails to the extent that it believes liberalism is an honest lie, a lie the liberal believes.

liberalism is rather an occultation, a camouflage. it is a social justification – an ideology, in its strictest sense – to push forward the autonomy of the instrumental. all liberalism ends up in private property. whatever justification is used is dispensable. it is important to understand that this doesn’t mean that liberalism considers that society is made up by individuals through a contract, or that the state comes after (secondary) property as a right, rather than the fact of possession (primary property) – this (possession vs property) is an important Proudhonian distinction.

it may be a good moment to talk a little about Proudhon, who was arguably the first one to argue that “property is theft”, i.e., that the social body is hurt by liberalism. in such uncovering argument, he already prefigured cybernetics with his “justice as balance between property and community”. later

in life he offered a new justification for property as the instrument for human self-improvement. every uncovering brings together a new cover, you see. so, for 21st century mutualism, after yet another uncovering, liberalism needs not extend any further than “property makes us rich” – arguably Adam Smith’s original argument in the Wealth of Nations. which is itself little more than a monkey-friendly version of Land’s “capital is self-propelling”.

but no, there is no anthropological error here. there is a very conscious camouflage. liberalism presents an ugly reality in a form palatable for humans. Locke used God, Hobbes used mechanics, Rousseau used the general will (and thus fucked it up considerably through demotic regulation of property), Smith used wealth, Stuart Mill used happiness, Bentham used utility, Rawls used fairness, Hayek used information, Land uses intelligence. every new term is a tool to keep monkeys sharp and hungry and hailing Moloch to the singularity.”

Or in the words of Jouvenel:

“But the struggle to magnify itself is of Power’s essence, and the kings of other days were forever striving, at intervals which became ever shorter, to extract grants in aid, not only from the clergy, but from the nobility and commonalty as well..... When the people upset the Power of kings, it was, so they thought, of just these burdens [taxation and conscription] that they were ridding themselves. It was the burdens of taxation and, above all, military conscription which they hated. That being so, it is not a little surprising to see these burdens grow heavier under an up-to-date regime, and most surprising of all to see conscription instituted, not by absolute monarchy, but as the result of its fall...”

Reply.

Website Built with WordPress.com.