

Peer Review

Review of: "Neoreaction, Accelerationism, Entrepreneurship"

Dirk Nabers¹

1. International Political Sociology, Christian-Albrechts-Universität Kiel, Germany

The article is short and concise. As far as I understand it, it examines the connections between neoreactionism, accelerationism, and entrepreneurship. The central thesis is that neoreactionaries are pursuing a corporatisation of the state, in which the president acts as CEO and citizens become customers. If governance is inadequate, citizens could theoretically 'exit' and move to another state.

However, it is argued that this vision is problematic: Drawing on Deleuze and Guattari's concept of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation, it is shown that capitalist competition does not lead to diversity, but to hegemonic corporations (Microsoft, Google, Amazon). In a neoreactionary world, hegemonic corporate states would emerge, making an 'exit' practically impossible.

What I don't quite understand is whether, in the end, 'entrepreneurship' in the sense of Peter Thiel is seriously proposed as a solution, or whether the goal here is actually formulated as innovation without direct competition, creating new corporate states and promoting political-economic diversity.

Overall, the connection between neoreactionism and accelerationist theory through Deleuze and Guattari's de-/reterritorialisation is analytically productive, while the reference to biological macroevolution as an analogy for economic diversity is a little unconventional. The proposed solution (Thiel's entrepreneurship), which I hope I am not misunderstanding, remains theoretically underdetermined and seems like an *ad hoc* turn of phrase. The concept of 'genuine repetition' is only hinted at and not elaborated upon, while the epistemological bridge between biology and political economy is completely missing.

Furthermore, the romanticisation of entrepreneurship as an antidote to hegemony ignores the fact that Thiel's company shares (PayPal, Facebook, Palantir) themselves have contributed to hegemonic structures. I see a performative contradiction here.

Furthermore, I believe that the text jumps back and forth between descriptive representation (neoreactionism), immanent criticism (hegemony problem), and normative intervention (entrepreneurship) without clear transitions. The central tension is not resolved: How can entrepreneurship prevent hegemony when it has historically produced it?

In my view, the following aspects could also be included: Nick Srnicek and Alex Williams' '*left-wing*' accelerationism (#Accelerate Manifesto) is cited, but not systematically incorporated. Their critique of right-wing accelerationism (à la Nick Land) is completely absent.

Furthermore, the debate about Land's 'Unconditional Accelerationism' vs. 'Left Accelerationism' (Avanessian, Shaviro, Noys) is ignored. If one thinks further about accelerationism, Benjamin Noys' concept of the 'Accelerationist Trap' should be taken into account. It states that the acceleration of capitalist logic does not transcend it, but rather reinforces it.

Mark Fisher's critique of capitalist realism ('There Is No Alternative') would be relevant to the impossibility of 'exit', and finally, the biopolitical dimension is completely absent, even though corporate states would be classic biopolitical regimes. The text thus leaves it unclear whether it argues *within* or *against* accelerationism. Is entrepreneurship an accelerationist strategy or its overcoming?

In this respect, my judgment is ambivalent: The article identifies a real problem in the neoreactionary logic of hegemony, but offers a theoretically immature and perhaps politically naive solution. The invocation of entrepreneurship as a remedy seems like a relapse into liberal ideology, which is precisely what accelerationist and postcolonial criticism would deconstruct.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.