

# There is No Traditionalist Libertarian; There is No Moralistic Anarchist

By Postliterate

Source: <https://medium.com/@postliterate/there-is-no-traditionalist-libertarian-there-is-no-moralistic-anarchist-b9858832bb6>

The clash between members of The Satanic Temple and fundamentalist Christians, as documented by Channel 5 → <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1AmOqQOOPn8> (formerly All Gas No Breaks), represents a clash of fundamental moral axioms which form the backbone of philosophical, political, and even cultural theory today. The two fundamental axioms at play in many ways represent the right and left wings of contemporary politics, and as such represent authoritarian and libertarian convictions, respectively.

The fundamentalist Christian view is that of the staunch moralist. It holds that humans are fundamentally dangerous and immoral beasts who need to manually learn moral values in order to live a life beyond that of a wild animal. As such, God, morality, or other abstractions must be fervently invoked in order to sway the populace towards goodness. Subsequently, they must always warn of the potential for the return of an onslaught of terrible, immoral inclinations in every person; in their view, these inclinations are the “natural state” of humanity and as such must be continually fought against. “Good values”, “tradition”, and a million other weapons are employed to ensure people remain on the “right path.”

The view of mainstream Satanists, and of The Satanic Temple, is of the staunch amoralist. It holds that humans will always hold personal moral inclinations and that these inclinations cause an individual to act in certain ways regardless of the abstractions he chooses to latch on to. In their view,

humans are not fundamentally evil and as such do not need prescriptions such as Christianity to teach them right and wrong; rather the opposite is true: each human will develop his idea of right or wrong independently of such, and merely employs Christianity later as a tool for his own benefit (if he is so empowered). To some, it even holds true that prescriptions such as Christianity do little more than pervert the inherent moral truths each individual already holds to be true, by allowing him to justify them in the name of larger causes (regardless of if they cause suffering in the world). The amoralist does not necessarily hold that every human's personal morality is correct as such, but that to attempt to change it is futile.

The latter view may seem familiar to any person of more libertarian or anarchist tendencies. It is the view these political philosophies already hold about economic and political life, but merely extended to the realm of social life as well. It is thus impossible to be a libertarian or anarchist without believing in the latter axiom — which to some takes the name of “social progressivism.” The so-called “anarcho”-capitalism of Rothbard or of Hoppe crumbles under the weight of its own contradictions when it is forced to confront its social views and basic philosophical assumptions which underpin them.

This is, to me, what Matty Thomas means when he states in *The Relevance of Max Stirner to Anarcho-Communists*:

“Anarchists who wish to demolish the authority of the state and of capital but want to leave the authority of fixed ideas like morality, humanity, rights, or altruism intact only go halfway. For the egoist, these spooks can be even more vicious than the more visible forms of authority.”

Thomas calls them “egoists,” I call them amoralists. The concept is the same: one cannot believe in leaving people as they are — a fundamental belief of libertarianism and anarchism — without naturally applying the

same to the realm of social politics. The clash of the Satanists and the Christians is the clash of the left and right wing, the clash of anarchy and authority, the clash of amoralism and moralism.