

## Collectivists Hate Individuality, Tribalism And ‘Fast And Furious 7’?

0 0 0 0

[May 15, 2015](#)



*This article was written by Brandon Smith and originally published at [Alt-Market.com](#)*

Sometimes in the liberty movement — with discussions of potential collapse, war, revolution, social destabilization, etc. — it is easy to get so caught up in the peripheral conflict between the elites and the citizenry that we forget what the whole thing is really about. That is to say, we tend to overlook the very core of the conflict that is shaping our epoch.

Some would say that it is a simple matter of good versus evil. I don't necessarily disagree, but good and evil are not defined methodologies; rather, they are inherent archetypes — facts born in the minds and hearts of all men. It's a gift of comprehension from something greater than ourselves. They are felt, rather than defined, and attempts by institutions (religious, scientific, legal or otherwise) to force morality away from intuitive reason and into a realm of artificial hierarchical and mathematical standards tend to lead only to even more imbalance, destruction, innocent deaths and general immorality.

There have been many nightmare regimes throughout history that have claimed to understand and obey moral “laws” and standards while at the same time having no personal or spiritual connection to those standards. In other words, some of the most heinous acts of immorality are often stamped with the approval of supposedly moral social and governmental institutions.

This is why a person who calls himself a moral Christian, a moral Muslim, a moral atheist, a moral legislator, a moral conservative, a moral liberal, a moral social justice warrior, etc. is not necessarily a person who ultimately acts with moral conviction. It is not enough for one to memorize and follow the code of a belief system or legal system blindly. One must also *understand* the tenets of inborn natural law and of the human soul that make those codes meaningful (if they have retained any meaning), or he will eventually fall prey to the vicious calamities of dogma and the collective shadow.

If I were to examine the core methodologies that are at odds in our society today, I would have to say that the whole fight comes down not only to good versus evil, but to collectivism versus individualism. The

same demands of understanding also apply to this dichotomy.

Nearly all human beings naturally gravitate toward social structures. This is not under debate. The best of us seek to work with others for the betterment of our own position in terms of survival and success, but also the betterment of our species as a whole, if possible. Beyond this, people often find solace and a sense of epiphany when discovering connections to others; the act of recognition and shared experience that is in itself a religious experience. This is what I would call “community,” as opposed to “collectivism.”

Collectivism is a bastardization and manipulation of the inherent desire most people have to build connections to those around them. It takes the concept of community to the extreme end of the spectrum, and in the process, removes all that was originally good about it. In a collectivist system, individualism becomes a threat and a detriment to the functionality of society. In a community, individualism is seen as a valuable resource that brings a diversity of ideas, skills and unique views, making the group stronger. Collectivism believes the hive mind is more efficient. Community believes voluntary action and individual achievement makes society healthier in the long run.

Our culture in general today is being bombarded with messages that aggrandize collectivism and stigmatize community and individualism. This is not by mere chance; it is in fact a program of indoctrination. I came across a rather strange and in some ways hilarious example of this while sifting through the propaganda platform known as Reuters.

As most liberty movement activists are well aware, Reuters is a longtime haven for Fabian socialists who despise honest reporting (to them media is a means of controlling the populace, not informing it) and who consistently inject concepts of collectivist (i.e., globalist) ideology into their articles.

The Reuters opinion piece linked [here](#) and written by Lynn Stuart Parramore presents itself as a kind of social examination of film and its reflection of the decline of American civilization. Rather oddly, the film chosen as a litmus test was “Fast And Furious 7.” Yes, that’s right. The “Fast and Furious” franchise apparently contains social commentary so disturbing to Reuters’ contributing “cultural theorists” that they felt compelled to write a short thesis on it.

First, I would like to point out that when I first read the article the original [title](#) was ““Fast decline of postwar America & furious desire to cling to ‘family.’”

It appears that Reuters has since “amended” the title to stand out a little less as a collectivist expose. Just to be clear, I have no interest in discussing the content of the “Furious 7” film. My commentary will focus not on the film but on Reuters’ commentary regarding the film...if that makes sense to you.

So what about the newest Furious film has the collectivists so concerned? As the article states, “something alarming lurks at the heart of ‘Furious 7.’” The film’s depiction of America as an economically wounded nation in which good men cannot find a means to make an honest and adequate living doesn’t seem to bother them as much as the response of the main characters to such circumstances. The article almost revels in the postwar degradation of American living standards, outlining how fiscal decline has led to the disruption of the American family and posits that the golden era of the 1950’s economic boom is a relic, erased by the rise of a severe “haves and have-nots” division in the American class sphere. This is, of course, a decidedly simplistic view that appeals more to Marxists than to anyone with true knowledge of the breakdown of the U.S.

Reuters takes issue with “Furious 7” because of what it refers to as the “1950’s fantasy” narrative it clings to, in which the heroes long for a return to the middle-class dream, turning away from the corrupt structure of the system and reverting to the “tribalism” of families and posses. The “myth of the posse,” they state, “ignores the interconnectedness of the broader society” and “the idea of a common culture of citizenship recedes into the background, as does faith in a society based on shared principles of justice.”

I find this conclusion rather fascinating in its collectivist bias. We are led to believe by Parramore’s article that it is the “Ayn Randian” code of contemporary economics and market efficiency that has led America astray. To put it simply, the free market did this to us.

This is the great lie promoted ad nauseam by collectivists today — collectivists who would like to divert blame for economic failure on more individualistic market ideals. The reality is that America has NOT supported free market methods for at least a century. The advent of parasitic central banking as an economic core in the Federal Reserve and constant government intervention and regulation that have only destroyed small business rather than kept large businesses in check has caused the very negative financial environment that Parramore at least recognizes as the source of our ills. Corporations themselves exist only because of government regulatory license, after all, but you won't ever catch Reuters criticizing that.

It was collectivism and the rise of the statist model that bled America dry, not free-market methods that have not existed in this country for more than 100 years. The delusion that free markets are the problem was the same delusion that helped bring down Occupy Wall Street; the movement failed in part because its foundational philosophy was built on disinformation that rang false with otherwise sympathetic people.

So an action movie presents a competing model to collectivism, because collectivism has always been the problem, despite what Reuters has to say. That model is a return to classic human community in the form of family and "tribalism" where regular individuals matter, a point the Reuters article subtly mocks as a "fantasy." But here we find the collectivists using the kind of rhetoric one would come to expect from social Marxists. The article continues:

***"When the personal posse replaces civic spirit, and the us-against-them mentality prevails, monsters can breed..."***

***"This is what is now happening in many corners of the world, where neglected groups have formed posses positively bloodthirsty in their quest to assert that they matter on the global stage to show they are not just victims of a rigged game..."***

I'm not exactly sure what "bloodthirsty groups" Parramore is referring to as "posses," but I suspect this is a reference to the rise of ISIS, among others. And here we find the Fabian socialist-style propaganda at play.

You see, the Fabian ideology is the driving force behind globalization — the same globalization that triggered the vast downward slide in American prosperity; the same globalization that has generated anger and dissension among the downtrodden and poverty-stricken; the same globalization that has created artificial economic interdependency among nations and the domino effect of fiscal crisis around the globe; and the same globalization that has led to the predominance of covert agencies, covert agencies which have been funding "bloodthirsty posses" like ISIS for decades. And the source philosophy behind globalization has always been collectivism — the "interconnectedness of broader society" that Parramore proclaims as lost in the pages of the "Furious 7" screenplay.

Parramore ends with a stark warning to us all:

***"... a return to tribal instincts and the letting go of the broader common bonds and the welfare of the greater human family has a dark side. It is ultimately a dangerous road to travel."***

Those of us who support the idea of localized community (i.e., tribalism) and the value of the individual over the arbitrary collective are, supposedly, playing with fire; and we should be scared, very scared. We would not want to be labeled as "bloodthirsty monsters" hell-bent on disturbing the tranquility of the "greater human family." Oh, boy.

When I read this kind of agenda-based garbage, I am reminded of the insanity of slightly more open social Marxists, such as feminists, who have through dishonorable tactics conjured an atmosphere of collective and legal pressure designed not to present a better argument, but to make all opposing arguments a sin against the group. That is to say, social Marxists do not have a better argument, so their only option is to make rational counterarguments socially taboo or even illegal.

If you want to know where social Marxism (collectivism) is headed, this is it: the labeling of individualistic philosophies as dangerous thought crimes and tribal communities as time bombs waiting to explode in the face of the wider global village. They desperately hope to conquer the world by dictating

not only national boundaries and civil liberties, but the very moral code by which society and individuals function. They wish to bypass natural law with fear, fear that the collective will find you abhorrent and barbaric if you do not believe exactly as they believe. Individualism will one day be the new misogyny.

Think of it this way: If an undoubtedly forgettable movie like “Furious 7” can’t even portray a fictional step away from the abyss of collectivist cultism without a prophecy of doom from Reuters, then is anyone really safe from these lunatics?

Categories: [All](#), [Economy](#), [Featured](#)