

# On Anarcho-Monarchism

By W. J. Whitman

I am an anarcho-monarchist! I also regard myself as a libertarian, a localist, a distributist, a paleo-conservative, a Jeffersonian democrat, and a federalist. And I know that you are thinking that this is a quite absurd position to hold, but please let me explain.

Representative “democracy” is the worst form of government. Classical medievalist monarchy is clearly superior to modern “democracy.” I am an **anarcho-monarchist**. I am an **anarchist** insofar as I believe that anarchism (i.e. government through voluntary associations and interactions) is the best possible system and the ideal to which we ought to strive; yet I am a **monarchist** insofar as I hold that monarchy is the best form of statist government. I would prefer no state whatsoever; but if we must have states, then let them all be hereditary monarchies like those of medieval times.

In classical monarchy, the rulers were chosen by heredity. They naturally inherited their positions. Thus, the rulers became a separate class unto themselves, allowing them to be neutral towards the other classes. When monarchs were called upon to make decisions that would bring class conflicts to a resolution (proletarian vs. capitalist conflicts, etc.), the monarch was free to make his decision entirely on the basis of his own rational judgment of justice. This is not the case in modern *democracy*, where we have representatives that are elected to an office within the centralized state. In order to become a congressman or president in a **representative democracy**, you must first campaign for votes. With large states like the United States, it costs a lot of money to campaign. The campaign must be funded largely by the wealthy class in order for the politicians to get elected. This guarantees that the politicians will definitely be indebted to their contributors when they get in office. Thus, the congressmen and presidents in representative democracies tend to be the representatives of the particular special interest groups that helped them get elected. In other words, representative democracy is **not** really democratic at all—the representatives do not end up representing the people. Instead, they represent their contributors. Democracy, properly translated, is “people’s-power,” implying that the people have absolute control over how the government works. True democracy can only work on a small-scale, locally,

in an extremely decentralized system. I support local **direct democracy**, but I oppose representative democracy within large centralized states.

The old Russian monarchy was a far more democratic system than any so-called “democracy” of modern times. Most of the decisions that affected the masses were made locally, in the *volost* (i.e. the local district), where everyone had a chance to voice their objections and cast their vote. Under the Russian monarchy, most decisions were made locally, within the *obshchina* and *mir* (i.e. within the local communes and villages). The old Russian monarchist system was a system of local **direct democracy**. As a general rule, the people had no interactions with *the state*. The local villages and districts were federated into a larger body under the monarchy, and the monarch was the arbiter between the various local communities—his job was to prevent class conflicts and local feuds from becoming civil wars. Under the Russian monarchy, there were no direct taxes. Taxes were collected from the villages, rather than from the people individually. The people worked land that was collectively owned (although they also had private property), and taxes were taken out of the excess produce of the community. This meant that there was no redistribution of property between the various special interest groups and classes within Russian society.

Wars were minor events throughout most of history. Wars happened, and they were terrible events. However, there was relative peace throughout most of history. There was no such thing as “total war” in medieval times. All of the medieval monarchies were linked together through family bonds. Royalty married into royalty, creating bonds between the various monarchies. Thus, king Such-and-such and king So-and-so were more likely to seek to reconcile their differences and reach a reasonable resolution through peaceful diplomatic means. Why? Because king Such-and-such was the father of king So-and-so’s wife! A serious war between the two nations would endanger his own daughter! The relative peace of the Christian medieval period was the result of the family ties between the various monarchies. The royal families were all linked together through a vast web of family ties.

Monarchism went bad when the traditional hereditary monarchist ideology was abandoned. After the Enlightenment and the French Revolution, the ideas of **liberal democracy**

and **egalitarianism** became very prominent throughout Europe. These two ideas laid the groundwork for Marx and the totalitarian communists. By the early 1900s, many of the world's *constitutional* monarchies were supplanted by *democratic absolute* monarchies. Rather than having hereditary monarchs by birth, people started electing monarchs. Hitler and Stalin, for example, were democratically elected dictators. And since the monarch was chosen by the people, it was assumed that the people no longer needed to create a constitution to keep the monarch in check. Moreover, elected monarchs were bound to be indebted to the special interest groups that helped the campaign to get them elected, so the monarch was no longer a neutral mediator between the various classes. The *democratically-elected monarch* became the representative of special interest groups. Historically, the power of the monarch was limited. There were no absolute monarchs in medieval times. The first “absolute monarchs” (totalitarian dictators) were Napoleon Bonaparte (1769-1821), who came to power with the *coup d'état* of the French Revolution, and Peter the Great (1672-1725) whose tyrannical reign marked the beginning of the end of old Russia. In England, a powerful parliament was put in place alongside the monarchy, and “democracy” was so elevated that the monarch lost all of his powers; ultimately meaning that the special interest groups were able to take control of the government. The people would no longer have a neutral mediator between the classes, as the members of parliament were elected; and, as I said above, elected representatives **only** represent the parties that contribute to the funding of their campaigns. Thus, the demon of democracy degraded Russia, England, and France—and those three peoples who were historically so magnificent and cultured became corrupt, ignorant, and enslaved.

Under democracy, the family ties between the ruling classes of the various nations were eliminated. This allowed for **total war**. Hitler could invade Poland and have his soldiers ruthlessly murder everyone without having to worry about whether his kinfolk would become unintended casualties in the crossfire. Moreover, in most democracies there is no single person that can be held accountable for military decisions, making it impossible for any anti-war movements to do any good. In a democracy, any number of people can start a war. For example, in our country the president can start a war all by himself. Likewise, Congress can start a war without the president's consent. Yet, there is no single person that has the authority to end the war. This makes it very difficult to end a conflict without seeing to it that the opposing

government is totally abolished, thereby causing the territory of the opposing government to fall into utter chaos. This further requires democratic governments to stay in the region after the war would naturally have ended: they now have to stay and establish a new government, fight off rebel forces to prevent terrorists and radicals from taking over the region, etc. A democratic war always ends in the utter annihilation of one of the warring states and the winning state must rebuild upon its ruins in order to create relative stability in the region. **Total war** is a natural consequence of democracy. Democratic nations are naturally less peaceful than monarchies. Additionally, the democratic ideology presupposes that the *people* (citizens/civilians) are identical to the *government*. This is why democratic nations have almost always targeted civilians as well as soldiers. For example, in WWII the United States bombed Nagasaki and Hiroshima with the intention of killing millions of innocent civilians. There was no military target in either city. The same goes for the English and German practice of randomly dropping bombs on cities and villages with the intent of killing civilians. Israel indulges in the bombing of schools, churches, and mosques under these same democratic assumptions today. Thus, we can define **liberal democracy** as a system of government in which ruthless and merciless *total war* is guaranteed. Both World Wars were the direct result of the existence of democratic states.

The flipside of democracy is **egalitarianism**, the idea that everyone has to be equal (even if that means killing people and using coercive taxation in order to redistribute property). **Democracy** and **egalitarianism** go hand-in-hand. The democratic idea of “one person, one vote” was based on the egalitarian notion that all people should be equal. It is held that everyone should equally have a say in government, regardless of whether or not they are qualified. In this democratic/egalitarian framework, there is no place for the classical idea of **aristocracy**. Rather than the people letting the experts make decisions (**aristocracy**), all of the people get to vote (**democracy**); but the vast majority of the people are not qualified to make important decisions. Under aristocracy, the economists and experts on money would determine the nation’s monetary policy; the experienced military leaders would make military decisions, etc. Since these people were the experts, they made the decisions—and the people trusted their judgments. **Aristocracy** is when the **power** to make important decisions is given to those people who are most **worthy** to make such decisions—it is when those who have displayed *excellence* in a certain field are allowed to *determine policies* regarding that field: **aristos** [excellence] + **kratos** [power] =

*aristokratia* [aristocracy]. The classical hereditary monarchies were **not** absolute monarchies. The monarch did not make all the decisions. **The old monarchies were aristocratic**, so that certain decisions were to be made by experts rather than by the monarch himself.

Democracy, on the other hand, is anti-aristocratic. Under democracy, all such decisions are made by politicians. All of the most important decisions respecting national security and defense are made by politicians who have usually never served in the military. All of the economic decisions are made by politicians that have no knowledge of economics. Thus, **liberal democracy** can be defined as that system of government which seeks to ensure that all decisions are made by those who are least qualified to make them!

I would like to see us embrace a totally voluntary society, but I am willing to settle for a freer society during the transition; and I happen to hold that the freest society would be something totally antithetical to the American system—a *totally* free society would exist in the form of federal anarchy, a relatively free state would be organized as an aristocratic hereditary monarchy. And I believe that the arguments above constitute a fair and sufficient justification for holding to the anarcho-monarchist position.