

# Anarchy and lawlessness



picture from: <http://keepcalmbegeek.blogspot.se/>

These concepts are often seen as related and as blights upon our civilization. But I feel they are actually the future we should be trying to head towards. Lets start by looking at the '-archy' coming from the Greek word 'Archon' meaning 'first' and implying 'leader'. A leader used to be the one who showed the way so that others could follow in their footsteps. As most of you will know the age of such leadership has passed. Our goals and paths have become very varied and leadership is no longer based on being the first one to figure out how to do something. With the speed of information sharing such a leader would lose his or her unique position within days because of modern media.

Modern leadership is no longer based on a leader being visionary and seeing new ways, but on '-cracy'. This is derived from the Greek word 'Kratos' meaning power or strength. These days it is no longer the person with the new idea, but the one with the means to get things done who is in control. In theory many nations are democracies and are thus controlled by the power of the 'Demos' meaning 'common people'. Democracy thus implies the people have the power to get things done. Whenever a person tries to do anything however, they will have to navigate a maze of laws and acts, which ultimately limit the power of the people. So how can such a reality be reconciled with the principle of democracy? This can only be understood by understanding government.

Prehistoric humans lived in small communities and competed with each other for space in the same ecological niche. To guide these competitive efforts people sought for distinguishing characteristics such as cultural beliefs, race and language to define the difference between friend and foe. These thoughts gave rise to super-personal entities. These super-personal structures still exist today as gangs, clubs nations and religions. These super-personal entities serve a single purpose; to enhance the competitive strength of that group over other groups. This was achieved by codifying behaviour. Compliance led to inclusion and lack of compliance to exclusion. So our behaviour made us either a part of or an enemy to that group. Such codified behaviour could arise bottom up. In these cases what a majority of people judged to be morally right became in accordance to the law and what a majority of people judged to be immoral became against the law. Actually a very democratic process. The super-personal structures however also started to govern to serve their own interests or the interests of the people who did the governing leading to acts. These are generally not based on

moral judgements of the people being governed, but on what is judged as being beneficial for the government under those circumstances. I use government here in a broad sense, not limited to national governments, but also including the bodies governing religious groups, clubs and gangs.

Government is thus in the best case a symbiotic being providing those governed with a competitive advantage and in the worst case a parasitic structure self perpetuating by leaching of those governed. If we as humanity continue to move towards a more inclusive society. A society in which equal rights will be shared by all and people will co-exist as brothers rather than as enemies the potential competitive benefits will decrease. Also since government discrimination is now in many places illegal the government has lost it's unifying and codifying purpose of dividing men into allies and enemies. The governments of our time are outdated structures keeping alive differences and conflicts which no longer have to exist.

An anarchist does by definition not commit him- or herself to obeying another person or institution unless they themselves choose to. They take responsibility for their own actions. To be self guiding requires an acute sense of morality, otherwise it would be impossible to make coherent decisions. If the anarchist shares a common social environment with other people their sense of morality will be similar to that of any other member of that group. An anarchist will therefore naturally act in accordance with the law, but not necessarily in accordance with acts of the government.

We can therefore expect an anarchist to refrain from immoral acts such as theft and violence and to act in a law abiding manner. By the development and internalization of moral standards the need for an external system of law and punishment becomes less necessary since people can become increasingly self guiding. When it comes to acts which a religion or nation has forged for it's own interests, such as taxes, levies, fines or conscription an anarchist will decide for him- or herself to act in accordance or not. An anarchist can thus by a government be seen as a threat, but should not be seen as such by it's fellow man. A person who believes in obedience to their government can easily be turned into an enemy to his fellow man by the act of conscription and belief that any person not part of their particular government is a competitor at best or an enemy at worst.

In present day society almost all new 'laws' which are being passed are actually acts since almost all moral judgements have been codified long ago. The acts do not exist to serve the people, but the government and are anti-democratic since they take away freedom and power from the people. If we truly believe that democracy is possible we have to believe that people are able to make correct judgements by themselves. We should not rely on the government showing us the way and definitely not submit to governing by punishing those who do not obey. This is tyranny, slavery and terrorism, not democracy. It is not allowed to any man anymore to claim ownership over another human being, but governments are still based on this principle.

The governments 'right' to govern us is based on the super-personal entity perceiving us as being a part of itself. Just like a person can govern their own arms or legs. But if democracy truly exists, should a person not be able to choose to be included in such a group? By what right does any super-personal entity claim any of us as their property? Certainly not by my moral standards! We have now come to an age in which there is in many places freedom of religion. I believe the next step of the emancipation of mankind should be freedom of government.

2015.12.12  
Star Hawk Dreamer