

Autostatism
An Appeal to Reason
Insula Qui

Introduction

Libertarians spend most of their time arguing about why libertarianism works and why it is best for everyone to be a libertarian. This is not a work that aims to do that. This is not a work that is intended to make you agree with libertarianism and the goals of liberty. This is not a work that intends to change your mind about politics at all, you should still remain a conservative, communist or whatever you believe in right now after reading this. The following work is simply an appeal to reason, the humble plea that you recognize that the way you think is irrational. That the way in which you want to implement your beliefs goes contrary to the purpose of actually implementing those beliefs. This work is supposed to convince you that there is a better way to do things and that there is a way in which you can achieve everything you want to achieve.

Table of Contents

No Power Without Politics

Ignorance is Bliss

Making Taxation Not Theft

All Against the State

Rational and Powerless

A Universal Utopia

The System of the Autostates

No Power Without Politics

All the problems of oppression in the entirety of human history are derived from the absence of the rule of law. Everyone who has ever been oppressed has been oppressed only because they had insufficient protection by the state or from the state. If all people were truly equal under the law, the only oppression that could exist is the oppression of ones own failures, the oppression that is fundamentally a part of everyone's life as we are not divine entities, but rather merely human. This is the oppression of not being able to do everything and the oppressive structure of not being an absolutely perfect entity. This is an unsolvable oppression, every oppression that can be solved can be solved with the current state being replaced by one consistent law instead of a political system.

And any political system goes fundamentally against any system of consistent law because a political system needs the rulers or ruling entity to have special power, the people who run politics must be people who are in a privileged position as otherwise they would be unable to decide anything and implement their decisions. They need to have powers that other people don't and as such they must be above the law in some

way or another, no matter how we may try to twist this, we must acknowledge that those people who control the state are always above the law. And the political entity itself is the thing that creates law in a political system, since it creates law it must be an inherently privileged entity, something above everything else in society. The state must by necessity be a secular god as long as the state exists, if it were not there would be no justification for why it has power. There has to be something special about the state for there to be a justifiable system of state-rule.

Thus there are only two solutions to this, first that there is something truly special about the state and about politicians that warrants them this privileged position and that enables them to have positions above and beyond what everyone else in society has. Or it could be that politics as a system is inherently flawed and creates unjust structures of power without having any special merits. The problem then becomes that we need to prove that the state does warrant this special position in society or we must, for the sake of consistency, favour the complete eradication of the political system. This is the question which has plagued western thinkers for centuries. This may be an ultimatum most people are not willing to accept, but this is an

ultimatum that we must accept if we are going to ever try to figure out the truth. We must either follow statism and say that the state is indeed special and that the state does deserve the exceptional power that it has, or we must reject statism and simply admit that there's nothing special about the state that would warrant it being in a special position in our society.

Rejecting statism does not infer being a libertarian or an anarchist, but simply admitting that people can organize without the state. This is because the state is only the social provider and enforcer of law that holds a territory monopoly, to get rid of the state we only need to get rid of this monopoly. We can have conservative societies and communities without there being a state that coerces people into remaining in those societies. We can have democratic or republican societies in which the state has no privileged position but is merely relegated to giving resolutions which the people themselves have chosen to follow. These organizations must be completely new and separate from the current states as with the current state the state is in charge of law and claims territory that it rightfully controls. There is no law beyond the state other than supernational law that has been agreed to by many states and as

such the state is in a position of special privilege and necessarily coerces the people within the state.

What we must accept, in one way or another, is that the desirable duties of the state have to be delegated to some other entities in society and that whatever good the state does it can do without having special power. This is because the good things the state does are desirable and not objectionable, people feel as these are socially necessary duties and thus will seek out entities that fulfil these socially necessary duties, there is no need to hallow the state as the only position which can provide for these necessities and we must acknowledge that these necessities can be provided without the state. And it's precisely because these are so necessary that they can be delegated to other forms of organization that do not command a special, privileged position over the rest of the society. These are organizations that fall into the same category as any other voluntary organization, whether it be a church or a butcher shop.

If the state is necessary for enforcing a good standard of conduct in public, then some entity that has no special power can enforce this conduct as long as it is socially accepted as an authority. If the state is necessary to ensure an egalitarian

distribution of resources, then some other entity that cannot enforce this distribution can provide it as it is necessary for the society to function. If the state is necessary for providing police, then the police can be provided without the state as they are necessary and thus accepted by the society as a reasonable demand and something people willingly contribute to. These structures of organizations do not have to be businesses or communal organizations or anything of that nature, they can be any number of distinct forms that we have not yet seen due to the state having power over these social duties. The organization of these structures will be talked about in the last chapter, but this is not to advocate for any sort of libertarianism or anarchism, but rather simply to say that what is necessary will be provided. This is not due to the magic of the invisible hand or the power of the community, this is simply an issue of what is reasonable to some being reasonable to a sizeable amount of people. When something is reasonable to a majority of people, it will have a place in society as people want to achieve it.

So now we have to either demonstrate that the state is a special and worthwhile agent within a society or to counter this and showcase that the state is precisely nothing of any distinct

value and the state is an undesirable part of society and something without any special merit. This is not a debate of whether we can provide alternatives to the state or what system is better, but rather about if the state in itself has the special merits to warrant it commanding a special position over society. We need to find something special within the state that demonstrates how the state is beyond individuals and how the state is something larger than any other method of organization. If the state is inherently unjust it will not matter what replaces the state, but only that the state is replaced in one manner or another, that the state is subsumed by something better than the state, something that is not inherently unjust and something that is not inherently oppressive. Any alternative that conforms to basic decency is better than the state if the state cannot conform to basic decency. If the state is by necessity something that demands more than it is worth, then there can be nothing that can be worse than the state as long as they do not demand this excess.

The first explanation for why the state is in a special position is some supposed social contract between the state and the general populace. This implies that there has been a contractual relation which puts the state in charge of

determining the safety of the society and that the state has to provide for the people insofar as the people need what the state provides. In exchange, the state holds the ability to collect taxes in order to provide what is necessary and the state holds this privileged position over society because it is necessary for there to be such a privileged position to enforce the security in society. Since there is this social contract, the entirety of the society is bound to the state by virtue of the contract and the state can decree what it has to decree in order to function and there can be no objection to the state itself as the people are bound to the state by this contract.

But here's the problem with this, no one actually agreed to the social contract and if presented to people, no sane person would agree to it. If the social contract meant that the state is in charge of determining what the public needs, how many taxes are to be collected and how the state will provide services, people would not give the state this power. This social contract is a ludicrous agreement that no person in their sane mind would accept unless coerced to do so, in which case it would not be a valid contract at all. We could now say that all people agree to the social contract by virtue of being born and as such they are bound to it, but children are unable to accept contracts

until well after they are born, there is still no capacity for them to accept this social contract.

We can now say that whenever a person receives anything from society or the state, such as schooling or policing, as the manifestation of the social contract that they are tied to the social contract. And since society is interconnected and the state is prevalent in all parts of society, these people are then bound to the social contract as they have received benefits from society and the state and thus have to give back to society and the state. But this too is nonsensical, these benefits are at best paid for by the taxes that are demanded of people, the people already filled their end of the bargain and as such the state only fills its own end and doesn't obligate the people to be tied to that state. Both sides have completed their obligation and there should be no further expectation of additional services rendered by any side in this exchange. Thus there is no lasting contract between the state and the population as the population has already gotten what it has paid for from the state.

Then there is also the notion that due to staying in the territory of the state the person consents to that state, since a concrete state rules over concrete territory one needs the permission of that concrete state to remain in the territory of

that state and thus each person needs to follow the rules set by the state. But this assumes that the state has a valid claim to the land, the state would need to form a social contract to have claim to this territory first, so the territory itself cannot be what creates the social contract. It could be that the contract can create territory for the state, but this territory cannot be considered to be the cause of the social contract without resulting in contradiction.

Then there is the idea that there is some form of implicit consent as people live under the state without toppling the state, thus as long as there is no revolution there is a social contract between the people and the state. This is also flawed as people are not freed from the state when they explicitly revoke consent, when they refuse to accept the state they do not become free from the state, thus the state cannot be implicitly consented to as even an explicit lack of consent cannot defeat the state.

Now we need to address the topic that the constitution of the state binds the land, the people and the state into a cohesive political unit and cannot ever be revoked. But this makes no sense, people have no authority to leave land they do not themselves own to the state and not everyone personally agreed

to the constitution. Furthermore, when parents agree to something, they cannot agree to it for every generation to come, those following generations must themselves agree to have the state have control over them. And there are barely any states that do not violate their constitutions, at least inasmuch as these constitutions provide protections for the people within the territory of the state. These states are not following the constitution so the people within the state are not bound to the state as the constitution itself does not bind the state. This argument is as dysfunctional as the rest.

Then there is the idea that the state has a social contract as it is the manifestation of society into a joint-stock venture where each person is entitled to a certain portion of common property shared by the entire society. As such the state is an agent that simply manages this common property for the common prosperity and that the people whose property it is hold the right over the common property and command the state. The state only manages the commons and expects contributions to the commons thus being delegated to just this managerial position. This logic would be sound, however, the problem lies that people cannot sell their share in the commons and as such do not really own a share but rather simply an

obligation to the state. If people do not want to retain their ownership over a certain share of the commons they are still forced to retain their ownership over the commons, this can't be a joint stock company that manages the commons as it commands people to be a part of this joint stock company.

Then there is also the idea that the state is the manifestation of human nature, that humans by nature create the state and as such the state is the natural guardian of human society. That the state is just as much a part of social organization as law is and since it holds a special place in human psychology it holds a special place in human politics. This creates the hallowed role of the state as humans hallow some role of the state and create the form of organization embodied within the state. But the mere existence of people who challenge the state proves this otherwise. The state may have a special role to people who hallow it, but the rest of us have no special regard for the state and as such we should not be forced to be under political rule. It is demonstrably not a part of fundamental human societies to have the state be in such a privileged position if we are able to psychologically go against the state.

There is also the concept that the state is a necessary evil, it holds this special position because something needs to hold this

special position or otherwise the society would be in chaos. But this is true only insofar as the state is necessary, however, there can be alternatives to the state, there can be social organization that does not require the state. Implying that the state is a necessary evil is ignoring the possibility that instead of a political system we could have other systems. Systems based on the true rule of law and systems that organize without the state on the principles of voluntary consent and social organization that is truly by the people and for the people. The state is an unnecessary evil, so there is no need to assume that the state deserves special privileges because it is necessary. Some form of social organization is necessary, but to assume that this ought to be the state is just tremendously uncreative.

Finally there is the concept that the state is the avatar of the nation and that each nation must be embodied in their own state, that the state is justified as the state is an entity that represents and protects the nation. The state is as such what represents the common spirit of the nation and a warden of that nation, the state keeps the nation together and institutionalizes the interests of the nation. This is a sensible ideal and the most cohesive justification for the state, however, we need to then realize that the definition of a nation is very flexible. There are

thousands of cultures in what we would consider one nation and there are thousands of distinct groups within even insular cultures, there are no grand nations with massive amounts of territory as we may imagine. This logic may be used to justify extremely tiny states that are as decentralized as possible, but cannot possibly excuse giant nation-states.

There is no logic by which we can create a rational justification for the type of states that we have right now, there is nothing that would logically put them in a privileged position over the rest of the society. Why do they then exist? When they do not have these privileged positions it would be logical that there would already be no states. States exist only because we have not yet gotten rid of them! We cannot use primitive societies as justifications for states either, this is for two reasons. First, the concept of the state used to be wholly different, the king didn't demand obedience or a special status in society when it comes to making law, the king was mainly a caretaker of society and not someone who could arbitrarily dictate society. This is because monarchy most likely grew out of the institution of family as the heads of the families of the ruling elite became monarchs and treated their domain in a familial manner. The king was not a dictator but rather an

arbitrator and a protector from foreign invasion, there was more to medieval monarchy, but the state was nowhere near the type of state we see in the modern world. Furthermore, the fact that primitive societies needed a state does not mean that we still need a state, it could be that human development is not ready for statelessness until we achieve increased mobility, computation and communication technology to reduce transaction costs that the state otherwise would reduce. We have achieved giant progress when it comes to technology so we should be completely able to be stateless in the current state of the world.

The question of how to go about the abolition of the state is a completely different one and one that I do not tackle here. This is a question that is irrelevant as long as our goal is the abolition of the state, the practical details must always conform to the scenario at hand and we need to be able to rid ourselves of the state in one way or another, how that is to be done is a problem for the future. But what we need to admit is that the state is an entity that is neither productive or just, the state is an agent that demands privilege without any merit to derive that privilege from, the state is only a disruptor of society and not a valuable asset. We need to get rid of the state if we are to ever

achieve a fair and just society, no matter what you believe in, it is important to acknowledge that the state itself is a problem and that the state itself will prevent you from being able to find justice and peace.

Ignorance is Bliss

What others do among themselves is none of your personal concern, this is not an issue of morality, but simple economics as people do not impose costs on other people when they do something among themselves. There might be a social cost in the form of missed opportunities and additional morality, but this is a cost that comes with every social metastructure. And although this is an overplayed and trite libertarian topic, it is also true and this is necessary to understand. I do not mean this is the sense that a lot of libertarians do. I do not think that not interfering in the lives of others implies support for drug use and hedonism in unlimited degrees, rather simply the important thing for everyone is to put their own society and interest first. There is no reason for why you need to lord over people who do not want to be better. There is no reason why you need to impose your standards of conduct on other people who lack these same standards. Letting people be awful people is not a detriment to you, having others be awful is not something that you have any control over and having others be decent is something that is not necessary for your well-being unless they are personally connected to you.

This is not to say that we should all accept degeneracy and decadence or intolerance and hate from our neighbours. We should hold other people within our societies to a higher code of conduct, but we also need to remove ourselves from the affairs of completely incompatible people. When some people want to practice lives that go contrary to what you deem as best for them, this is none of your own problem if you have any problems with your own neighbours and yourself. You, your family and your community should be of the utmost concern instead of people who are far away and cannot possibly ever infringe upon your personal life. This does not imply that everyone everywhere should be a libertarian with a live and let live attitude, but rather that it is pointless for you to involve yourself in things that do not require your involvement. It is unnecessary and detrimental if you take over the responsibility of the locals to determine what is best for the locals. It is irresponsible to act as if everyone has to be up to honourable standards of conduct in every way.

It is futile to try to ensure compliance from people who have completely different base values, the best we can do is ignore what goes on outside of our own communities and only focus on making our own lives better. And this is because we

will not make our own lives better by trying to improve others when they do not want to be improved. When others are not willing to improve themselves, it is not our duty to force them to become better people according to our standards of what it means to have them be better people. This is at least unless these people actively intrude in your life and pose a problem for you as they are actively present and it becomes impossible to ignore their alien and unagreeable ways. There needs to be a degree of physical separation between different kinds of people in order to maintain a sense of society that can actually function based off of ignorance when it comes to the affairs of others.

As long as other people do not willingly break your ignorance and try to make you comply with them, on principle this favour should be reciprocated. This is the only way we all can retain our principles and this is the way we can completely avoid conflict. We can have a community which does not allow heterosexuals to participate in that community and holds a land area exclusively dedicated to homosexuality. This will be repugnant to every Christian or everyone with any sense of traditional morality, however we need to realize that this means that those people who want to advance homosexuality will not

be present in the societies of Christians and societies that embody traditional moral values. This is good for both the homosexuals as they do not need to put up with moralism and for the people who do not stand for the advancement of the homosexual agenda. This can be done with any and all groups that are in conflict, we can all become mutually ignorant of the doings of everyone else as these doings will completely be separated from what we ourselves do.

The only objection people have to this is that there is a need to keep values in society and to ensure that society does not take turns that are unacceptable. But there is no one cohesive society where both conservative Christians and homosexuals need to cohabit. There is a complete separation between the societies that are oriented around the church and the teachings of the church and of the people who go against the teachings of that church. There is no problem with retaining proper and good values in society if we can exclude everyone who does not want to retain these values within the society. All people would be much better off if they could simply remain absolutely ignorant of whatever everyone else was doing and of the repugnant acts of those who are disagreeable to us.

In one strike we can peacefully remove the people who we do not agree with from our societies and do this in a mutual fashion where everyone can find themselves surrounded by only those who are agreeable to them. Christians can have a nice neighbourhood where everyone goes to church on sundays and where gay people are unheard of and gay people can have their own societies without anyone telling them that what they are doing is wrong. No matter what conflicting groups this is applied to it results in mutual benefit by simply leaving the other groups alone. This can be done for all groups: communists and capitalists, nazis and liberals, libertarians and conservatives. All conflicts would be rendered meaningless as the conflicts would be relegated to the realm of ignorance. And in this case ignorance really is mutual bliss.

With how much political events have made everyone divided and that have made people completely tired of one another based on fundamental conflicts, this should be a perfect solution. This separation and decentralization is the answer to the problems we face with social cohesion and conflict, we are not all supposed to be united but rather deeply separated. We are not supposed to come together as great nations but rather

go apart so we can remain sane and we can remain with our principles and without violent repression.

There are still people who desire control and who only function based on control, these are parasites who want to feed off the lifeblood of some group and thus both hate that group and want that group to remain firmly in their grasp. This sort of parasitism is the greatest opposition to political separation as that would exclude the various parasites from the societies where they are unwanted, this parasitism and incessant demand for resources that are wholly unearned must result in obstacles when we try to achieve this sort of peaceful separation, the parasites depend on having antagonistic groups in society to feed off of and the parasites rely on having those groups be weak so that they cannot resist the parasites.

And anyone who opposes this sort of separation must themselves be a parasite, they cannot provide what they need for themselves and they are not satisfied with societies organized to their own liking, the people who will attempt to prevent separation must be ignored. The people who are against the possibility that they may not be able to continue being parasites are people that we should not allow to influence us as they only want others to provide for them. These cannot

survive on their own and can only survive if supplied by others, who they are not willing to give anything back to. Normal people can easily accept that they can have their ideal state of being, but these are not normal people, these are subnormal in every single way. These are people who we should not and can not trust when it comes to how we organize ourselves and our societies as they are unhealthy parts of any society.

For the rest of us who just want to be able to live our lives in such a fashion that is suitable for us, separation seems like the only possible solution that does not involve the extermination of one group or another. Without this separation there will always be a high amount of friction in society and there will always be a lot of problems. This may seem utopian, and to a degree it is, but this does not mean that it is not the ideal to strive for and it does not mean that this is not the most reasonable solution to our issues. There is no need to control the lives of others or want to liberate the people who do not want to be liberated.

This does not imply an end to healthy discourse but rather an end to unhealthy coexistence that has been taking shape over the past few centuries, people with drastically different values having to coexist in same societies is not the only way

to facilitate necessary discourse in order to advance the world. When we want to live in a peaceful manner we must be able to live in an agreeable environment. Conflict and strife should not be a part of life at home and in our communities, if we are not allowed to separate the only possible result is conflict and strife. The only solution is to ignore everyone who wants to live life in a way that you do not agree with, and that becomes impossible only once they involve themselves in your communities. This does permit for every disagreeable activity under the sun, but it also means that these activities will not invade your own life.

There is still the problem of the nationalist dream of giant united nations who form bonds based on their common culture and heritage. But nations do not need to be singular political units, there is no need to have nations institutionalized to increase strife within the nation. The nation is better sustained when it is separated as if it is perfectly separate in organization, it has no internal conflict as there is no friction within society. The friction only appears once different groups with different interests and values involve themselves in the affairs of all other people. The only way to have lasting national stability is to give up the dream of the nation being a cohesive political

entity and face the reality that cohesive political entities have internal struggles.

There is still the desire to show everyone the light and have a universal state of being where all people can be happy under the most perfect system of governance. But there is no perfect system of governance for everyone, people have different interests and people have different values and personalities, people need different things from the government and the government cannot provide these things properly. There is no way in which there can be a universal state that can actually please the people within that state. There will always be people who feel themselves to have been shirked by the government as they are simply incompatible with that government.

Furthermore, this would be thoroughly undemocratic as it removes all democracy on a large scale, but when we look at why democracy is supposedly good, this sort of separation fulfils all the roles of democracy better. When people have local units of governance they have much more control over their own governments than they would with centralized government, this sort of localism is really giving power to the people. Without having a government that can impose the beliefs on other onto people with differing beliefs, there would

be a much greater degree of freedom and liberty by necessity. If there was no way for others to make you live their way of life or accept their way of life, there would be much more room for dialogue.

And separation does not mean never interacting, there can still be interaction between separate groups, both economic and intellectual. There is no need why when communities are only governed locally according to their own principles they cannot do business or debate with communities that hold wildly different opinions. When these people are not forced to live together they will not magically become more antagonistic than they were before. Hopefully free trade and co-operation would be possible on a large scale even when people are not forced to share units of governance.

There is still the final concern of oppression and human rights abuses in other societies. But here we need to understand that it is not our duty to involve ourselves in the strife of others, they themselves are responsible for figuring their problems out. More likely than not, any outsider would be unable to understand their situation and how to solve it and would use brute force tactics against situations that may be very fickle. It may seem cruel and unhumanitarian to let suffering people

remain suffering, but it is vital to ensure that we don't make their lives worse. Whenever someone tries to defeat oppression and tyranny without themselves being at stake, they end up doing more harm than good.

Furthermore, a lot of what we may perceive as oppression may not be such from the standpoint of people who hold radically different viewpoints. Any outsider would say that the amish are oppressed because they are not allowed to use advanced technology if they did not know the social context that results in the amish worldview. These differences in behaviour and attitudes may seem foreign and repressive, however, these are none of our concern as we are not responsible for everyone in the world. Our duty lies at what is reprehensible in our own lives and creating lives without things that we find reprehensible. It would be literally impossible to solve all the problems in the world and most of the suffering that exists has no bearing on our actual lives. And again, there is no way in which we can actually help others find sustainable solutions for their problems from an outside perspective. There is nothing we can do and there is nothing we should do, other societies which are incompatible with ours may be tragic and

horrible, but they are not something that we can do anything about and they are not something that we need to fix.

The greatest problem is our struggle against the state and our struggle to be able to self-actualize in a meaningful way without requiring the consent of the state and without being subject to the whims of the political system. We need to get to a point where we can focus internally and we can use our energy so we can improve things, we cannot think about things that are minute details when confronted with the disorder and injustice in the world. We must move beyond this sort of universal concern even though it may be hard, we must focus on our local communities and we must be able to peacefully separate from disagreeable groups of people.

Making Taxation Not Theft

When the state holds no inherent right over the people within the state, it must follow that taxation is money that is forcefully appropriated and as such taxation must be theft. Taxation is thus a great injustice as it is right now and thus we must abolish taxation if we want to justly allocate resources. But here we run into a problem, taxation provides for many things and most people do not want everything to be done by private companies. I would posit that everything does not have to be done by private companies in order to abolish taxation, the important part is that we can have ownership structures that do not require taxation.

We do not need the government to extract funds from the population to accomplish undertakings that require vast amounts of money and access to the property of various people. It is completely unnecessary to use structures of force to avoid the rise of capitalism in all areas of the economy. Some people are drawn to this ideal of private companies providing everything, but it is certainly not a value everyone shares. But to replace the government we do not need to have private companies provide all services but rather we need to

structure any possible alternative to organization that does not require the involvement of the state in the way that we organize. We need to establish institutions that can take care of projects that formerly needed the state. However, here we run into a problem, no matter what institutions they are, they cannot expect to extract money from the entirety of society without the ability to use force. There will be a problem with people just not paying for some projects.

Thus we must establish some structure of property that can ensure that everyone pays their fair share without using force as the government does, the only way to do this cohesively is in one of two ways. First, redefining property in a consensual way so that the property is partially owned by the whole of society and the owner of that property agrees to contribute his share to the society. The second is to establish voluntary, consensual relations that impose upon people certain material obligations towards their society which create the sort of development we would expect to see in a society. Both of these solutions boil down to one single thing, establishing a structure of property relations in which all parties agree to contribute to certain necessary undertakings.

This seems to be impossible on a large scale and it is, but we have to remember that we do not need to do this on a large scale but rather within small communities in which the organizational structures are necessary. For larger problems we only need to ensure the co-operation of smaller organizational structures. Thus, the only requirement is to have this be a necessity for entering the community, having to give up some degree of property for access to that community must also be a fair bargain. If the community provides less than another community for the same degree of obligation, it must lose the population of that community in one way or another. In this way you can create an alternative system of taxation that is based on consent. And certainly there will be communities which impose no such obligation and function on individualistic principles only. Insofar as this is the preference of individuals, it ought to be respected.

This may seem to be an argument that can be applied to the state, after all by not leaving the jurisdiction of a government have you not likewise accepted the taxation imposed by that government? But here we run into a problem, the government never got the consent of anyone it taxes, the government never actually asked people if it could have their money that the state

needs to use for different purposes. The state assumes consent even though that consent was never given, and so does every other state. Furthermore, in the localism that would appear if there was this sort of radical decentralization based on different worldviews which can separate different people into different communities, there would be many more choices than there are right now.

However, what we must concede is that the state could be ethical, but only if it allowed for people to revoke consent and if it did not claim areas that are not populated by anyone. If these conditions were met people would have an actual choice when it comes to interacting with the state. The people under the state who do not want to move must also be given the opportunity to secede as the state has not previously received their consent. All people should be given the chance to separate themselves from a disagreeable political body. If they are not given the opportunity to leave a governmental entity that they think is tyrannical, they must be repressed inherently by that entity. If the state simply allowed for secession, required consent and did not claim land where there is no one who can consent to the state, there would be nothing wrong with the state.

But the state would then become a fundamentally different entity, it would become an autostate, which I will address in the last chapter of this treatise. Since the state is not yet an autostate we cannot assume that the logic that justifies collecting money on a voluntary basis can be applicable to the state as it is currently, we must admit that there are voluntary alternatives to the state that can manage to organize property in such a fashion that they are not coercive entities. But it may still not be apparent how the lack of coercion must be an inherently good thing, taxation might be theft but taxation is still very useful. If providing for the poor and building schools requires theft, then so be it.

But this ignores how dangerous it is to give any person within society the power to steal without being held in check by having to obtain the consent of the population he is getting money from. When people can just exploit without having to pay for the consequences they will always exploit as much as they possibly can, when taxes can be collected without consent, taxes will be used for things that the tax collectors could not have gotten consent for. When taxes need to be allocated to projects only if the people who pay the taxes agree, then they

will be allocated to projects that are actually good for people who pay the taxes.

Furthermore, when the state has control over resources it has control over the lives of the people who have to pay the state, the state will always control the lives of the citizenry if it can collect taxes with no recourse. This taxation must be eliminated if we ever want to achieve any semblance of freedom and fairness. The state achieving this power to control society will only result in the state being benefited from controlling society. Functionally, the state has a license to steal from millions of people and then is not held accountable for what it does with the money it has collected for itself.

With establishing societies where the contributions are based on actual explicit consent instead of assumed consent, we can establish actually beneficial ventures and we can establish a system where all people are prosperous and no people are oppressed. Whenever there are people who suffer under statism, there are people who would be better off without the involvement of the state in their lives. It should be a fundamental human right to be able to separate yourself from entities that require your money with no guarantee that they

will spend that money in a way that will have good consequences.

This means that even though the state cannot be trusted with the social responsibility that taxation is supposed to foster, there is no need to get rid of the benefits of taxation. The only thing that is necessary is to restructure the system of collecting money on a collective basis. The only possibility for group voluntary contributions is not coercing that group for voluntary contributions, this may seem difficult for some, but it is quite simple when we consider the actual logistics. The most pertinent issue is the free rider problem, what happens when people don't pay and still get the benefits, the solution to this is the ancient principle "he who does not work shall not eat". The only thing necessary is that the people who do not pay are excluded from the benefits created by the people who do, there are still objections to this but they are all too technical for the work at hand.

Simply excluding people not suited to receive rewards from receiving rewards is everything needed for a fair community where everyone contributes and receives what they contribute. We can organize voluntarily and we can also organize group action by voluntary means, it may be convenient to tax, but we

must understand that when people have direct control over their money and there is no state who forces everyone to pay and dictates where the money goes, there will be better results. This is simply human nature and the fact that people work better under a system of voluntary interaction and beneficial governance than they do when they are coerced. And we need to reiterate that the alternative is indeed coercion, being forcefully separated from your money is nothing other than coercive and it is forceful as the tax payer has no power to revoke consent from taxation.

This community based voluntary action could accomplish everything taxation accomplishes, but in a much better way, there would be no need to worry about the costs of collecting contributions as there is no real reason or way to evade these community contributions. Thus if the community has completely optional membership and everyone pays for the community projects, the result is that what used to be taxation now becomes a fee for participating in society. Proponents of taxation often exemplify the state as the collector of these fees, but we must realize that that doesn't even hold up at face value, this is because the money collected by the state goes to the

state and not to the community, the state has to still decide where that money is allocated to.

This does not imply direct democracy as many would expect, having control over your money is not the ability to vote what happens with your money. A completely voluntary contribution that goes towards providing certain services is still a completely voluntary contribution and the control exercised is the choice of whether to contribute to the community or not to contribute to the community. When someone does not contribute they just lose access to all the benefits the community pays for and will more likely than not also be ostracized from the community by those who do pay for the benefits. In the same way you can not pay your water bill and not get water and not pay for your electricity and not get electricity, you could abstain from funding your community and thus lack that community.

But it may still seem alien that it's possible to voluntarily pay for all services, even if the entire community pays for them, people would not pay for the services that are no use to them and as such some necessary things may not be provided by the community. But in this case people are not paying for these services because they are directly bad towards them, they

do not make their own lives any better and they should be able to abstain from paying what makes them worse off. To force people to pay for things that do not increase their own quality of life is paramount to a partial slavery as people will have to work not for themselves, but for other people. And insofar as these people will have to pay benefits for others that they themselves do not receive, they are functionally slaves to those who receive the benefits that they pay for.

This may be overly radical and uncouth but it is vital to acknowledge that there is no peaceful taxation and that taxation is a giant injustice instead of a social good or a necessary evil. Taxation is something that should be abolished due to the very nature of it, if not for the consequences of taxation. And we can see what taxation has brought; ever expanding governments redistributing wealth to the ruling elite. The people who run the government will always seek favours to themselves and when they have access to the money of their citizens they will spend it in such a way that makes them better off, the only people with enough sway to make the politicians better off are people who have incredible amounts of money or groups who have incredible amounts of money.

This is why there are endless unnecessary wars and corporate bailouts and whatever else only gives money to people who profiteer off what the government does. The government officials are simply paid off to lobby for the purposes that the people who pay them desire, when the industry that produces military goods needs to make money, the government will start a war for them. When bankers want to gamble with your money, the government will give them free money if they fail and leave your children with the debt for the bankers. If the homosexual and transsexual lobby wants to get privileges and if they have funding, you will have to bake them wedding cakes and call them their chosen pronouns or you will be punished for not violating the law. When the Christian lobby gets power, there will be no access to abortion and it will be classified as murder. All of these people can do all of these things if they have enough money to persuade the government to do these things.

And the government is not responsible for anyone since it has the power of taxation and no one can revoke their consent for what the government does. Furthermore, the government can use an almost unlimited degree of force due to the nature of the state, there is nothing that can stop the state from violating

any right as there is no one with more power than the state. This is unless there is a concentrated and highly motivated drive to revoke consent and either bankrupt or topple the state with withdrawing consent and defending yourself. There is still a possibility that there is no clear advantage to voluntary contributions other than the ethical one and if we only had a government that was properly organized there would be no problem with corruption and force as the government would never do such a thing.

But we need to think of another thing, currently it is said that government officials work for the people, the tax-payers, since they pay their salaries, but we need to realize that the people work for the government officials because they pay their salaries. No great mass of people decided to hire any government official other than the politicians elected and with politicians we all know the amount of corruption and manipulation that takes place. If people could well and truly have a government that works for them, we can imagine that the services the government provides would be better. The only way to have the government work for the people is if the government needs to obtain revenue from actually doing something that people are willing to pay for.

If this was true, the military could no longer be spent to fight useless wars that result in nothing positive, people will not have to lose their lives and the lives of their husbands, sons or daughters in wars. There would be an immediate end to all war that does not benefit the people who will have to pay for that war, the military would become a purely defensive organization. There could be no war without the popular consent of the people and as such there will be an end to a tremendous amount of useless loss of life. No one could intrude upon your values and try to police what you say, what you think and how you act in the name of political correctness, if there is any such policing it will only happen when people are willing to pay to shut others down.

If you live in a reasonable community, as any person who favours such freedom would, there would be no threat of losing your jobs or being penalized by the government for naughty thoughts. As far as the people are peaceful and not violent, there would be no way in which they could be suppressed from holding their principles and their beliefs, there could be no intrusive state that polices what people can say and do. This would put an end to all institutional political correctness and the constant fear of the thought police actually judging you for

your principles and not your actions. And this applies to leftists as well as rightists, when the right gets in power again, there will be similar judgement of leftist sentiments as there currently is of rightist sentiments.

There would also not be a fear of the police as the police would not be in any higher authority than the people who hired them, the people would actually be the bosses of the police and not the other way around, the justice system would actually bring justice. This is simply the case because the ones paying are paying for real justice and not to maintain their power as is the case with the government, the state gains nothing from justice but gains a lot from having force and being able to become invaluable and ingrain itself into the fabric of society. There would be real justice and there would be real peace, the police would once again be people who are truly upstanding and who do work for and not against the communities that they police.

Roads would have to be properly maintained lest the people who are in charge of maintaining the roads find themselves without any jobs and fully responsible for their low responsiveness when it comes to fixing essential utilities. The question should not be how roads can be built, but why roads

are not maintained properly right now. Crises when it comes to water and other necessities caused by the government would be giant embarrassments instead of inconveniences people put up with for the sake of putting up with them. No duty that the government has gotten for itself can be left unaccounted for as the government would actually bear the costs of their failure instead of that cost being pushed onto the taxpayers. When someone fails at their job, the answer is not to give them more money, when people fail at their job the only proper response is to fire those people, and we need to do precisely that, we need to get the ability to properly fire government officials so that they can be accountable and that the people who pay their salaries no longer work for the sake of the state.

All Against the State

When the state forces groups who should separate coexist, coerces everyone and is also not necessary no matter what our ideals are, the most rational position becomes a complete and total opposition to the state, but this opposition is not from any certain ideology, but rather an aideological opposition not tied to any frame of political thinking, this is the crux of autostatism. There is no need to adopt any consistent libertarian or anarchist philosophy to oppose the state, but the state is inherently an entity of ill in the world and can be replaced by better functioning entities. This means that the struggle against the state is not an insular issue, it should be shared by everyone from the most ardent national socialist to the most revolutionary communist. This is as long as these people want to actually get for themselves a life that they can appreciate and be properly in charge of.

If all these people want is to rule others regardless of the feasibility of this rule, then these people should prefer the state, however, it is more than likely that being able to live in a society that caters to personal needs is more beneficial than being able to live in a society that opposes you but has a way in

which there is potential to gain power, this means that as long as there are goals beyond the domination of the world and the nation, the best starting point would be the ability to form a society that serves as a refuge when contrasted with the rest of the world. Having a small area in which the society which you prefer to be implemented over a large area can be implemented in a small area is better than having nothing. This is the simple fact that having something is better than being absolutely deprived of every chance to implement the system that you think should be implemented. Furthermore, when you are right about the fact that your principles create unparalleled prosperity, every person in their right minds would adopt the principles you espouse, having the ability to first form a region where you can implement the social order that you would like to see can by itself demonstrate the efficacy of that order.

When any society collapses and others do not, the costs are internalized within the society that collapsed and not spread across the entirety of society. No such separate entity can cause any harm to the people who are not part of that particular entity and as such we would all be guarded against the troubles created by other people. When we are only responsible for our own mistakes, it would be much easier to demonstrate how we

can successfully implement any type of society that can properly function and can function beyond how much other societies can. Every person with every belief would find themselves in control of their own destiny. In most cases what this actually means is that local unions based on principles would be widespread and would replace the state and not that some radical political spheres would dominate. There would be local self-government to the greatest degree and this governance would be done by moderates instead of the most extreme political radicals. These political radicals would still be free to implement their own society, provided it doesn't disturb the established order present within the societies of other people, if it does disturb the established order and does so outside the realms of desirability, it must do so with force. It must be trying to become another state instead of remaining an autostate.

And we should also oppose the state engaging in disruptions over our lives, if we acknowledge that disruptions that grow out of a lack of state are wrong, we must also acknowledge that the same disruptions caused by the state are wrong. What we need to support, as a united whole, is the ability to form societies in which we are able to actually create

the conditions that we find favourable to ourselves without the intrusions of outside forces. We need to create the societies in which we personally can prosper and not societies in which we can rule over others. When we cannot demonstrate the merit of our ideas even if we have the full ability to establish completely our ideal society, our ideas have no merit. This is not even considering that all people are fundamentally different.

Since different people have different personalities, values and other characteristics, it is impossible to ever properly rehabilitate a large mass of people into one political system, autonomy becomes vital if we want any chance of actually living in a society that is peaceful to an extent beyond just that which can be artificially manufactured. There is no proper way in which to integrate extremely different people who often have antagonistic natures into one political system in which any of them can actually have meaningful success in their own lives. The only sensible solution that conforms to the basic standards of reason is complete separation by people who can become self-governing in the most radical sense and have different structures of governance.

There are still the nationalist and universalist dreams of having great united masses of land under one political system in order to facilitate strength and stability, but this has never actually worked. All large political unions are unstable due to the problems I have discussed properly, if you want to implement nationalist or universalist systems, it's either going to be in unstable unions, not at all or in small areas of land. Nationalism in the sense of controlling an entire nation is not compatible in itself with any sort of political success or rationality, however nationalism as in greatly valuing your nation and doing anything in order to ensure the prosperity within that nation is very tenable. One can be a nationalist and not desire to usurp the political system of an entire nation if that person is a nationalist in the proper sense and not in the sense of total dominance over a particular nation.

Furthermore, the fight to separate goes beyond theoretical issues, in practical reality the democratic systems are in decay due to the immense conflict and radical opposition of the people within those democracies. In short, we all hate one another due to the way in which we differ in our preference for governance over the countries that exist at the present moment, since we differ when it comes to political decisions and since

political decisions can affect the lives of everyone, there is bound to be vast amounts of conflict. Civil wars and internal division is the result of any cohesive political system, thus to create unity and put our differences aside we need to bring about the end to political systems as we know them in order to facilitate any sort of end to internal conflict. In a somewhat ironic fashion it becomes necessary to separate in order to remain united and a lack of separation will only create internal division.

When people would be allowed to go apart and govern themselves, most political conflict that exists right now would stop mattering and people of very different ideologies and principles could bring about a greater amount of dialogue and even a reliance on one another through economic dealings. People who are far removed from one another due to the fact that they pose a political threat to the other person would no longer have that barrier when it comes to cohabitation and dialogue. This can only make sense, when people no longer are threatening to other people, they will be more likely to not be threatened by other people and could actually engage in more productive relations with those people.

Thus we must unite in order to separate, our struggles are all against the state and that should be our one unitary goal, the state is an oppressive entity upon all mankind, no matter what system one would prefer, the state still needs to be abolished. The only people who the state benefits are those who are currently within the state in positions of power, for the rest of us the state is at best a nuisance. It should be a common human struggle for basic rights and decency to try to defeat the state and to try to get over this hurdle in human advancement and development. Defeating the state will not create an instant utopia where everyone has untold prosperity, defeating the state would greatly increase the living conditions of all people as they would no longer be bound by an entity that directly has power over them and uses that power for the sole benefit of itself. If we want to achieve social good, we cannot do that through the state but only in spite of the state and outside of the state, the state by necessity is an agency of evil and against everyone.

The question only becomes if we should side with those in power or those who are ruled since the state is as oppressive by nature no matter what system it functions under. Should we meekly accept whatever the political order decides or should

we assert our decency and act like real, living humans instead of going against our natures in order to defend the state. Basic human decency requires that we abandon the drive to defend those who go against our best wishes and it requires that we are able to defeat the current system, because the current system is not working. We have hitherto unseen amounts of taxation and state control, only a few economies are in periods of stable growth, the entire world political order is teetering on the verge of collapse. We are on the verge of some collapse or another only rivalling the collapse of the roman empire, the entire current order might seem to be dominant, but it is unsustainable.

The current order has no value in itself and it cannot preserve itself via any other methods than ever increasing oppression, the only thing that we will see is increasing state power if we do not take it as our cause to defeat the state, we will not see the state increase power in the ways we want it to. Most people have an idealistic view of their perfect government which is totally functional, however, this has never existed and will never exist. There will never be precisely the form of state that can work, there will never be a state that respects its constitution, there will never be a state that will

provide for the welfare of all its citizens, there will never be a state where the powers are completely separated, there will never be a state that acts as a perfect and selfless manifestation of the nation. This utopia that we seek does not exist within the state, there is no success to be had within the state. The state is antiquated and has to end.

It is much more likely that we can have what we ourselves want if we manage to defeat the state rather than have any statist order that is to our own personal liking, there is borderline no possibility that any state will ever do what we want the state to do. There is no possibility that the state in itself will provide what we think the state is supposed to provide. There may be small symbolic victories that ease the turmoil, but these only serve so as to mask the entire system in which the state operates and which distinctly seeks to empower itself at the expense of everyone else. There is no recourse to have against the parts of the state that are not up for election and the elected officials of are barely responsible to the population, the elected officials are more subject to the other forces operating within the state. There is no such possibility as someone who fixes the state or someone who finally implements the right ideas, this is purely a fantasy that will

never happen in reality. The only way the state ever changes is by sweeping movements and revolutions, but this is only insofar as the previous order is unable to defend itself.

Even though these sorts of movements have an ability to affect the state, they will not be able to change the nature of the state, the state will always still be an agency of force and there will never be a state that functions precisely as we want it to. The notion of a state as a collection of benevolent technocrats is pure fiction, the state is comprised of people as flawed, if not more, than anyone else. Furthermore, politicians are unreliable and everyone knows that they cannot be trusted. Thus the notion that the state can ever be benign is completely contradicted by history and current reality. This is the reason that it is important to understand that the sweeping movements once they have gone through the political system become corrupted and their radicalism turns into another form of statism that is like every other form of statism. The state will never be consistently radical since the state will always be in opposition to anything that challenges state power.

There will never be a perfect socialist state, there will never be a perfect libertarian state, this is all an illusion that is used to facilitate a continuation of the belief within the great myth of

the state. The state is not the ally of anyone and the state is only a great beast that serves as a purely malevolent entity in conflict with the entirety of mankind, there is nothing of any worth within the state and we should never assume that the state will ever function in such a way so that anyone outside the state could benefit from the state. The state is the only entity that is the universal enemy of all mankind, every major atrocity, all corruption and all subversion can be traced to the state in one form or another. Most every great tragedy in history is caused by the state, every civilizational collapse has been at least facilitated by the actions taken by the state. What the left and the right see as the great tragedies in the modern age are all tragedies that in one form or another are caused by the state.

And this is hard for many to understand, it is easy to think that since the state is against you, it must be on the side of the other people who are against you, but those people think that the state is on the side where you are. Everyone sees the state as antagonistic or contradictory to their own principles in one form or another, there are no people who the state actually sides with and it is incredibly naive to presume that the state even is on the side of any member in society. All the illusions

about the benevolent state and the great benefactor to mankind that is the state should be done away with in the shortest order, the only solution to the state is a universal resistance of all people affirming their own dignity.

Rational and Powerless

A lot of people might instinctively agree with most of the rationale presented above, but stumble upon the concept that people should give up power and that it is in any way reasonable to not have that power. It must seem very normal and desirable that there are institutions that do have a large degree of power since it seems as if there is a necessity for power, furthermore, the personal desire for power may further enforce this idea that to have a rational system of organization, it has to be based around power. The hardest thing to give up is power since power is so built into the way we see the world, it becomes personally and socially threatening to talk about the abolition of power as it is so completely outside the acceptable paradigm that it is completely unheard of.

Power in itself is not problematic, although power is a manifestation of injustice by necessity, provided that power was not a manifestation of injustice there would be no need for it to be abolished. However, even though there is no problem with entities who are powerful because they are powerful, the powerful entity is the injustice from which this power stems. And we must separate power and influence, the ability to

influence the actions of others is distinct from having the power to tell people what to do. And that power must necessarily be unjust as the only reason why there would be a need for telling people what to do is if those people first do not want to do it. The reason power exists is that some people force others to do things that those people do not either want to do or do not benefit from. And from the ability to make people do what is in opposition to their interests comes the problem of power.

Power is not a benign entity as if it were benign it would cease being power. It really can't be conceived that being forced to go against your own best interest really is in your best interest. No matter if the argument is that people are just too dumb to decide what they will do, or that people cannot be trusted to reliably do some things, people are still denied their own interest. When people are denied their interest it becomes impossible to say that they are really acting in their own interest due to power as they are acting only to appease the power to avert personal punishment. And to say that this power is in support of these people as it threatens them with punishment and coerces them into certain patterns of behaviour is to ignore everything that constitutes power.

There is still the notion that some people should be subject to power in order to benefit other people, that some people really do need to be restrained and restricted so the others can benefit from them. These people may be the rich or any other perceived oppressor class who is seen as rightly deserving to have some factor of their own wealth taken away in order to benefit the victim class that they supposedly oppress. But this is a very narrow view and it ignores the fact that humans do not operate with the intention to oppress someone, it is not the matter whether people are actually oppressive or whether people are actually oppressed but rather what should be done about it. And here I would suppose that as long as there has been no coercion on the side of the oppressor class, responding with coercion is not an answer. However when the oppressor class actually uses direct coercion they create a structure of power and this is our enemy, it is not that they are an oppressor class by necessity but rather the fact that they have power which is at the root of the problem within the oppressor class, if the oppressor class had no power there would be no reason to form structures of power.

Here we might also say that economic inequality is in itself coercive and that it is just to use coercive methods on the rich,

but here we are struck with another issue, if the rich coerce the poor economically, why does it become right to coerce them in any other way than through the economy? When someone commits an injustice through the economy why is it then just to go beyond the economy to take money from them without their consent, the proper course of action seems to just be establishing rules of conduct within the communities that are distinct and with these rules restricting all economic exploitation. And here we avert both exploitation and power structures and can form a completely peaceful method of defeating the oppressive structures.

We can then say that due to past oppression this is unjust, but we must realize that this oppression is wholly relative, everyone “oppresses” everyone else in some way or another, it is counter productive to worry about past oppression when we have the entirety of the future to build ourselves up. If we focus on the ways in which we were wronged in the past we lose the ability to focus on the ways in which we can improve our future, we need to improve our future to get back what we lost in past oppression. This may be seen as immoral and cruel and this is not be the most pleasant thing, but it is the only solution that we have for dealing with unrepaired past offences without

dragging ourselves down in the present. Instead of persecuting the rich, the poor could separate and form their own capital stores through hard work and determination. Instead of persecuting the white man, black people could focus on building up their own communities and separating entirely from white influences within a framework of black power. This is vital for the advancement of all peoples and this is important when we consider how we can make the people we care about better off.

It is a nice fiction to be able to think that there is a possibility to ever come to a proper consensus how much people were deprived of in the past and that they should be repaired, however, having this be a strategy that actually works only serves to create conflict and not resolution. If we aim to create conflict then we could focus on past ills, however, if we want to actually resolve what has been wrong in the past we must focus entirely on how we can improve the future. And the future is in our own hands. No matter how desperate it may seem, we cannot put off responsibility over our own destiny. As such we should refrain from having power over anyone other than ourselves and fully focusing on our own advancement.

It is also hard to give up the coercive power of the state as it is extremely enticing given that we want to achieve the things that we want to achieve not only in our lives but also affect a positive change in the world. The state is seemingly a good entity that we can seemingly deputize in order to create the change that we want to see in the world. But again the state is not a great entity of wisdom and altruism but rather as much of a selfish and corrupt entity as any other and even worse than most every other way of organization. This means that if we try to affect change through the state we get change only seemingly without actionable good results and we get change only insofar as that change benefits the state. The state will always corrupt good intentions in order to create an increase in state power and state domination.

Furthermore, there are no people who have the sort of wisdom required to manage the lives of millions of people so even if the state was perfectly rational and benevolent, it could not manage any area of land, if that area is significant due to the sheer amount of people. In the pre-modern era there could have been a case made as the economic and personal actions were much simpler and the amount of people were much lesser so that the state can accurately govern within reason. But in the

modern era the state is well past an operable size. Furthermore, the state is always expanding and trying to get more influence internationally as that creates even more power within the state. The state as such is an enemy of all people even including those who are outside that state as long as the state tries to control them alongside its citizens. The state is always an entity of injustice and it will become more unjust if it is able to do so. There is no justice within a statist system as the state is by nature antithetical to the pursuit of justice.

Furthermore, not wanting to give up the power of the state as it would be a detriment to personal gain is not a moral position to hold. The fact that you benefit from the injustice of the state should never be an excuse for why there ought to be the injustice of the state and why it is acceptable that the state is unjust. The fact that there are groups who benefit from the state and you are a part of that group only indicates how the state is greatly unjust and is detrimental to other groups and chooses favourites based on semi-arbitrary categories. The fact that you benefit from the state is only indicative of the state being detrimental to your fellow man. If we are to have any sort of human compassion we should further oppose the state

because it benefits some people at the expense of others and not laud the state for doing so because we think it's righteous.

There is also the notion that without the state the collective of humanity would lose control in one way or another, the notion that power is necessary to maintain any sort of order in society and without power there can be no order is very pervasive. It is insisted that humans must do some degree of things against their own will if they wish to be able to maintain social relations within the wider society. This means that the state is necessary as it retains a monopoly on violence and as it ensures that society is protected against all ills that could threaten it. This is a commonly held position and probably the greatest justification for the state if we compare the popularity of different justifications, this is a very human thing to think and it is reasonable that a lot of people think this way. However, this does not mean that the point itself is reasonable.

The notion that some degree of despotism is necessary in order to keep a fully functioning society is based on a myth that there is some sort of violent animal nature in man waiting to be unleashed, however, there is no such thing and there is no real proclivity towards extreme violence within human society. When we look at the way in which people interact regularly,

instances of violence are extremely sparse, however, when we look at the state most everything it does hinges on violence. We can now say that it is necessary that some things hinge on violence and the state is a proper channel to consolidate this in order to protect the people from excessive violence as there is a control over the ideal state which is formed by the people and that this control is far greater than the control anyone would have if this violence was not consolidated.

To say that violence is a fundamental factor within upholding society is to say that there can be no human society without it being upheld by great amounts of violence, the necessity of power implies a necessity for domination. There is still a reasonable objection to be made, the state should be reduced as much as possible, but the institutions of defence need to be controlled by the state as to hold a singular, consistent standard of law across the entirety of society. But this is untrue, the state could be replaced by any other entity that holds a singular, consistent standard of law across one singular society, there is no need to use coercion to maintain a solid law as a basis of human interaction. This same solid law can be upheld by the autostate and by voluntary organization

which differs from the state as it is not inherently violent and coercive.

Furthermore, there is also the issue of there being some myth that people have control over the state that governs them and as such the state is preferable to any other form of organization that would manage law. But this is also untrue as the state has no responsibility to the people governed by the state, but rather the people who are governed have an imagined duty to the state. If the state had a duty to the people, the state would not need to hold power and would act as any other voluntary entity that serves some needs and purposes. Since the state does not do this and instead opts to coerce people through taxation instead of upholding society as a servant to people and since the state cannot be gotten rid of by revoking consent, it can only be inferred that the people under a state have only an obligation to that state and any rationale that would invert this relation is based on nothing more than an idealistic myth. The state is not a servant of the people but rather the people are the servants of the state.

The only important factor when it comes to these structures of power is that they can hold at bay some of the more detestable human urges, they can stop people from killing,

stealing and acting in otherwise destructive manners. But the fault in this reasoning is that there is nothing which would infer that this needs be exclusive to power and that there are no other ways in which humans can be restricted in order to make the quality of life for the society better. One can police and incentivize actions without having it be tainted by the systems of force and compulsion, this is for two reasons. First, when someone acts in a coercive manner they are attempting to create a system of power, when we oppose systems of power then we must also oppose the coercive actions of people. Thus we can consistently favour people who go against coercion without being caught in a contradiction.

Secondly, when entities promote behaviours in a completely voluntary manner there is always an option to opt out of the program and as such there is no compulsion used and no system of power created. This only creates good behaviour without first requiring that there is some system of power to create that behaviour and it can actually create a method of organization that is beneficial to all parties. When there is no power used it means that all parties within the scenario are benefited by the services rendered by the other parties when it comes to those transactions. This means that in a completely

voluntary manner there is an improvement in the quality of life for everyone within a given society as they are incentivized to be better than they were before and thus incentivized to be better as individuals and as social actors. Furthermore, within voluntary transactions that do not form power relations, there is an actual control exercised by both of the parties and in a sense they serve each other through purely their own will and they are completely subject to reasonable debate and can always withdraw their consent. Without power there can be true control over your own life and everyone can share in this and control what they themselves do. The problem here is simply that with structures of power there is no need to be beneficial to anyone, which leads to relations of subservience and exploitation.

A Universal Utopia

For there to be any hope of a utopia we need to accept autostatism, not only can autostatism provide a utopia, it can provide a utopia for all. This is because when people themselves choose which forms of governance they are under, they will choose forms of governance that go beyond that which is pragmatic in the modern democratic state. Thus people can achieve the political systems which they themselves most favour and are not restricted by arbitrary restrictions within the context where no person can have what they truly want and society must be based on compromise. When the society has no requirement to be based on compromise, that society will be able to accommodate the most radical wishes of the people within that society and can actually conform to what the people actually want instead of what the people have to choose when presented with a system where they must compromise with people who share radically different ideas.

When there is no such need for civilizational compromise there can be smaller scale utopias instead of larger scale states, autostatism can offer everyone a fully consistent organizational system based on their own ideals instead of their own desire to

have the least bad option and to keep the worst at bay in a democracy. Since people cannot achieve the utopia that they would ideally want, they will be subject to discomfort within political systems that are not completely based on voluntary interaction and separation. This will create a universal discomfort with the political system as all people are forced to abandon their values and have them be replaced with ideas that no one actually thinks are good and proper. When people need to defer to ideas that are respected by no one but held by most people due to the impossibility of radicalism and consistency within democratic systems, there can be no successful system. This is simply because a successful system requires that there would be a society that is not based on compromise but rather a society that is based on definitively true concepts.

Definitive truth does not stem from compromise or agreement but rather eternal values and values that go beyond that which we may encounter in our everyday lives. Whether these eternal principles be equality, liberty or tradition is irrelevant, there are multiple principles around which one can construct their view of the world. What matters is that the view of the world is constructed around principles and not a barely cohesive combination of different policy proposals. This means

that the utopianist plans each person holds can be materialized insofar as these people are in control of the system of governance that rules over them. These utopianist plans must be abandoned in favour of feasible plans when it comes to the state of the political world. This may be seen as good, but the separation of utopianists and pragmatists would be positive nonetheless.

This is not a guarantee of the manifestation of any utopia, but simply that the realization of coherent principles will create societies that function according to what they can realistically perform. These utopias may be completely fake and could fail at any junction as they could be constructed around principles that make societies untenable, this does not mean that the utopia cannot be manifested within the autostatist system. This is unless the utopia involves global or national domination. And finally, since all political structures require some form of compromise or another as to prevent wide scale revolt, there must be compromise even within dictatorial and autocratic governance structures.

This means that it is logically impossible to achieve any form of utopia when it resorts to the use of state power and a utopia can only be achieved by the co-operation of a wide

reach of people sharing the goal of building that utopia from the ground up. If these conditions are not met, there can be no utopian structures when it comes to any system. And if people are allowed to build their ideal society from the bottom up, they will create a society which conforms to their ideals and their views of what the utopian solution would be. This is a form of organization in which anarcho-capitalists and national socialists could co-exist and be secluded completely without any antagonism. They may find the view of the other side completely reprehensible but they would not serve as a threat to one another and would allow each other to peacefully coexist.

This creates the autostatist ideal, that is the system where each person can put into practice their utopia if they are supported by other persons within society. If they are not supported by other persons, they must remain with their secluded ideals and cannot attain their utopia. However, insofar as the people hold onto principles that are shared by a sufficient amount of people, they will no longer require the consent of dissenters in order to create their own perfect system of governance. This is because the dissenters cannot enforce their dissent as anything other than simple disagreement with some

matters that they themselves will not be affected by in any way, dissent must become wholly rational as there is nothing more to dissent than simple disagreement.

Thus whilst the state cannot offer anything other than a less bad version of the current system of governance, there can be a radical change towards the direction of a perceived utopia under a system that respects each persons right to associate with whatever entity that they find proper and just. When all people are guaranteed this right to seek justice instead of tolerating the injustice of the state, they have the right to secure for themselves what they themselves deem to be decent. This is the main difference between more conventional libertarian and anarchist thought and the system of autostatism, anarchism and a libertarian social order are both ideals in themselves, they have value judgements embedded in their philosophy. Autostatism does not prescribe any ideal for any person, it acknowledges the freedom of all people even insofar as they prefer to follow authority and pursue collective action or do whatever they find that they ought to do in order to secure their own quality of life.

There is no need for all people to share one utopia and there is no one system of organization that can fulfil the needs of all

persons, from various basic judgements we can say that there are superior and inferior systems when it comes to organization, but this implies that these basic judgements are shared by all. This is not the case as people value different things, libertarians value efficiency, anarchists value not being restricted, but autostatism is not predicated on the valuation of any goal but rather the valuation of the ability for each person to seek their own goal. As such autostatism is apolitical and only a strategy with which each person can guarantee for themselves their own personal utopia and the ability to separate from the people who would infringe on his own utopian society. Autostatism is then the strategy with which people can provide for themselves a utopia and thus the strategy that leads to the universal utopia based on interactions that are mutually agreed upon. There are no value judgements to say how people ought to organize but only the judgement that people ought to organize. Autostatism is not prescriptive but purely a logical doctrine with which to criticize the state from the perspective of all parties.

The universal utopia is not some scenario where there is no governance or where there is such a degree of abundance that everyone is provided for irrespective of their personal values

and merits. The universal utopia is the growth by all peoples and the ability to create whatever system is the most beneficial for the needs of any certain group. But furthermore, this universal utopia goes so far as to accommodate people who do not seek a radical utopia and who want to practice sensible local governance. Thus these people who want to just live their lives and delegate those things they see fit to the government to handle, they are able to do so. Autostatism is not against governance or against democracy, autostatism is purely against involition and the coercive pressure to do things that have not previously been rightfully delegated to the party who wishes to do those things. Autostatism is a return to true law that is not based on some central legislative body but law that is born from the normative value judgements of people who congregate under one system and eternal values as seen by people who seek after those values that go beyond the human span of existence.

Autostatism does not say that there can not be democracy, there cannot be government pensions, there can not be militaries, autostatism simply states that each person has a fundamental right to opt out of democracy, opt out of government pensions and opt out of militaries. A royalist

should not be forced under a democratic system of organization, a libertarian should not be forced to pay for the pension of people who he has never met, a pacifist should not be forced to pay for the military. It may seem as if this would create an immense disorder, but that too is not true. This is because autostatism has no restriction even on different entities co-operating in a purely voluntary manner, autostatism has no restrictions based on any moral judgement. The only thing that autostatism holds as a value is the right for each person to practice self-ownership, collective autonomy, local autonomy or autonomy over whatever group that person wants to associate with. Every ideological position is compatible with autostatism as long as it allows for the system of autostatism to flourish and does not intend to create empire or to enforce coercively some rules on other collectives of people.

This does not mean that murder can be legal within a collective or that all norms of common decency ought to be abolished, rather this only means that there cannot be any universal norms of common decency as these become watered down the more universal they become. There can be theories of universal and eternal law and morality, but these are only theories and not in themselves the reality. These theories retain

their value, however, they are completely meaningless if not applied and the best possibility to apply them is on a small and decentralized scale. Any person who thinks that their theories on what is right and proper will be ever accepted on a scale wide enough that this would not be better supplanted by an autostatist system is a person who is either a narcissist or woefully naive. Autostatism is the only way in which any utopian idea can get properly implemented and in which all peoples can attain that which they themselves most desire.

This is unless these people take political centralization as their ultimate ideal, the globalists and imperialists are unable to ever be compatible with the system of the autostate as peaceful discourse will never build a global state or an empire. Thus those who are stuck wanting nothing more than power are the people who can have no place within the autostatist system, however, this would seem to detract from the universal utopia. But having a universal utopia is a principle that goes so far as to have a utopia as long as all persons involved allow for other utopias to exist. If people start prohibiting the formation of structures that they themselves do not favour or asserting the supremacy of their desires over the actuality of the desires of

the autonomous peoples, they are denying the right of others to determine on such a scale that they see fit.

Thus autostatism as a strategy has a simple social contract that needs to be formulated between all parties, that is giving up the right to demand anything in order to be allowed everything. This does not mean that people are allowed to demand things, but rather that people are allowed anything which does not require force. And good ideas do not require force, when there is merit in a system of thought that system will not have to be enforced upon unwilling people. The only reason why anyone would ever need to use force to advance themselves is if they are too deficient to improve themselves via legitimate ways so they resort to using force in order to improve their status and improve their power within society. But force is only conducive to raising those who themselves cannot raise themselves and thus putting down those who do have this rightful merit. Force is the tool of the weak and if allowed to flourish will only lead to the domination of the people who cannot actually demonstrate that others ought to follow them.

The people who most favour force as a principle are the people who are the most maladjusted, those who cannot let

others have their own ideals realized are people whose ideals are only to compensate their own lack of personal quality. This needs to be realized in order to truly see how we can and should get rid of these parasitic individuals and how ideas that require a massive amount of force to implement should not be ideas that are taken seriously. Every idea that can promise a benefit should not promise that benefit only at the expense of someone else, to say that someone will need to pay for the success of some other persons is to say that the success of those persons is only possible when some other people work for them. And this is exactly what redistributive strategies are, no matter if wealth is redistributed from the poor or the rich, redistribution is making people work for other people so that these other people can prosper. When people are allowed to revoke consent they will not be subject to this and they will be able to work for themselves.

For everyone who has the capacity to support themselves if provided favourable conditions, redistribution should only be seen as an insult to their own abilities as they do not need redistributive programs in order to secure their own well-being. For anyone who has any worth in themselves, what should be truly important is getting rid of the bondage caused by the

current system and not creating additional systems of bondage, anyone who has anything of value to offer should not complain about not having enough but rather not being allowed to procure what he ought to have. What is necessary is not additional restriction but the ability for each person to foster a society which treats them in a manner that is righteous beyond that which is immediately satisfying. Thus the urges that may be appealing could be related to an immediate gain in wealth, but fulfilling these urges is of no importance if there is no way to secure a perpetual state of having your potential not be restricted by institutions that are antagonistic to the self.

The System of the Autostates

The last thing that we need to tackle is the form of the alternative organization proposed herein, it is all fine and good to talk about a system in which every person can choose their own system of governance but without it being constructed itself and demonstrated to be feasible, this becomes quite useless. We can construct a vague image of the alternative society from what we gather from the general principles, but it is important to further construct this system as a rational system and not a figment of an imagination. And this is fairly possible and the system of the autostates could easily be implemented were it not for the coercive powers of the state.

The traditional axis of societal organization ranges from totalitarianism to anarchism or libertarianism, in one end you have the state ordering the organization of society, in the other you have each individual determining their own lives completely. Other systems of governance are placed in the middle to demonstrate the degree to which they allow for the individual to make their own choices instead of having the state rule their lives. Autostatism moves outside this axis of societal organization as it is significantly more radical than libertarians

and anarchists in allowing each person to make their own choices, in essence, autostatism provides for and encourages people to practice systems of governance that are totalitarian if they so wish. If people do not wish to be governed by a totalitarian government, autostatism sees the totalitarian government as inherently immoral, but this is only true because of the involition involved and not the totalitarianism. Independence, freedom, equality and efficiency are not values inherently seen as good and proper by autostatism, these are things that individuals should take care of in their own personal lives and these are things that are moral values. There is no place for values that are based on concrete moral judgements within autostatism aside from the valuation that there ought not to be any involition when it comes to political systems. This is not a moral valuation that is predicated upon any one moral perspective but rather exists as different moral perspectives are irreconcilable within political systems that use involition. Thus the value judgement of autostatism caters to all value judgements without making any value judgement itself, the fundamental value of autostatism is that each person should be able to hold and exercise their values to the degree they are willing to do so.

Autostatism also avoids the fallacies of libertarian strategy and anarchist philosophy by not assuming that all people want to live under perfect freedom in which only they themselves are in charge of their own lives. Autostatism recognizes that the vast majority of people prefer governance over no governance and are willing to have less freedom in exchange for more order and stability in their own communities. Thus autostatism allows for any form of governance provided that it does not impose itself on those unwilling to be governed in such a fashion. Autostatism is the ultimate manifestation of local democracy as autostatism allows for localism to such a degree that each local community would be completely self-governing provided that it had the actual consent of the community.

If you think that it would be hard to get consent for the sort of governance you yourself want, then it must be because people do not want to be governed as you may think they ought to be, however, autostatism does not discriminate based on what people think but rather what people do and demonstrate that they do. When people demonstrate that they want to be governed in a certain manner then they ought to be governed in that manner in which they want to be governed, this should be basic human interaction and not some oppressive system where

people are oppressed if others do not want to adopt their systems of governance. If you want your system to be adopted, it must have a credible promise of producing some sort of value and if it does have that promise, it will get adopted under the autostatist system where the people can voluntarily follow the systems that they feel are the best to follow with no person mattering more than the consent of the people who are being governed.

Thus the concepts that ought to lie at the heart of democracy find their ultimate manifestation in autostatism, the consent of the governed and every other democratic principle is better represented under autostatism than it is under democracy. Autostatism is the ultimate form of democracy which allows people to “vote” to end democracy and which allows people to truly have the power as no state can claim the people to themselves. Autostatism reduces the state to a voluntarily agreed upon covenant in which all participants take certain responsibilities and fulfil these responsibilities under penalty of pre-determined measures that are to be taken against the people who violate established rules.

From this perspective if one is to advocate for a system where the people actually have the power, they cannot favour

the state or any conventional democracy as it is necessary that the state goes against the power of the people. The only way in which people can have true power is under a regime of unbarred exit and secession from the state, there is no liberty when the state has a claim on its citizenry. In any proper society without coercion the government is subject to the people and not the people who are dominated by the state, there is no freedom or justice when the state is in control of the population as the state is not responsible to anyone. The state must have claim on territory so the state must always bar exit and secession and be an enemy of the people that it dominates, no matter what anyone believes in, the state ought to be an enemy.

Not only can the state not provide liberty, the state also cannot provide order, the state must dominate the people and thus subvert the natural order and replace it with an order of domination. The dominance hierarchies of the state only serve so as to eliminate the natural hierarchies within human society, the state is an enemy to the liberty of the people and the order of the society. Thus if we want liberty or if we want order, deferring to the state is a great error. The system of governance that can provide either must only be established with the

consent of the people who will be ruled by that system and not done out of the will of the state acting as an agent of coercion.

The autostate is the system of consistent governance executed in a voluntary manner, autostatism is a system that favours the establishment of autostates instead of the state. Autostates are autonomously formed states, states that only exist with the continuous and maintained consent of the governed, autostates are self-government taken to the fullest extent where each person has the right to associate with one government or another. Each autostate functions as a government but a government that provides a service to the people it governs and not a government who dominates a group of people. Autostatism is subjecting the government to the role of a servant and having the state no longer be a master. Autostatism removes the teeth from the beast of the state.

And an autostate is not formed out of a vague social contract or a tacit consent, the distinction between a state and an autostate is that autostates can only be formed explicitly and with the consent of everyone governed. This means that the autostate cannot exist if the people who will be governed by it do not accept the autostate as their just government. Autostatism is in a way both anti-statist and not libertarian or

anarchist, autostatism is a fully consistent position that does recognize the value of governance while opposing the state. It may be true that a fascist government is needed to ensure the health of the people, it may be true that a communist government is needed to protect against imperialism, it may be true that there ought to not be any government and only a system of natural law. No other system than autostatism can recognize the possibility that no matter what may be necessary, it ought to be the people who themselves organically create political structures.

Fascism does not require a state by necessity, totalitarianism is fully possible when people can revoke their consent and leave the totalitarian system if it turns out that it is too oppressive. When people do not have the choice to exit the totalitarian government, it could be that totalitarianism will strive to work against the people and not for the people as the ideal theory would suggest. With communism it could be true that a united working class will lead to unimaginable prosperity if only lead in the right manner, if the working class are coerced into communism, they may never be properly lead as the coercive power has the workers duty bound to them. The communist system would only benefit the workers if it had to

strive to attract workers and not only conquer vast areas of land through a violent revolution. Communism has led to starvation in the past precisely because there was no way to opt out of communism. Anarcho-capitalism may be completely right and governance may be an objective detriment, however, people ought to have the right to opt into governance if they disagree and if the system without governance deteriorates into chaos.

Any system while implemented coercively loses the best aspects of that system, all systems are improved if they need to be properly and fully responsible to the people who are under the system and not only responsible to themselves. Such systems which are not responsible to the people and which cannot be dissipated if the people revoke their consent will only grow oppressive and detrimental. There can be no just and proper governance when the people are not able to exercise their own autonomy and leave the systems of unjust and improper governance. When a government becomes more of a burden than a benefit, it ought to be the sovereign right of people to shed off the shackles that have been imposed onto them by this coercive system, if we maintain a need for a state

this requires a revolution which will lead into another coercive system.

There is no victory if we concede the necessity of statism in governance, all governance will then be for the state and not for the people under the state. No matter what we may posit as an ideal government, it will be reduced to the state exercising its own power through the shell that we have constructed, the state is an agent of evil as it cannot hold power without coercive control. The abolition of the state and the implementation of voluntary governance ought to be the most important thing no matter if we aim to establish a society based on equality, tradition or liberty. The system of the autostates is fundamentally the system where the state must demonstrate its own value in order to achieve legitimacy, while doing so the state loses its status as a state and becomes an autostate.

The terminology used to demonstrate this entire process may be undeveloped and could use better semantics, this does not invalidate the fundamental point I am trying to describe. There are still many criticisms there are to be had when it comes to autostatism as a system and these are all important things to address. The first and possible most important is how to ensure that this doesn't result in political chaos with the

perpetual formation and dissolution of the autostates. This is fairly simple, when autostates are formed they are formed out of the will of the people, it is useless to assume that they will be formed in such a fashion that they will become detrimental by necessity. This is because the formation and formalization of political systems requires a lot of effort to properly implement. Free exit is still required to maintain political systems in such a way that they do not become overbearing, but the creation of political systems is a vast investment no matter what the circumstances are.

A political system must remain operational once created and due to the investment it is only in the interest of the people who invested into the system that it does remain operational. Thus there is no reason to expect perpetual chaos within these systems as there will not be a perpetual formation of political systems due to how this is extremely heavy on resources. And this could be another criticism, the creation of new systems is incredibly cost intensive so it may seem as if it would be impossible to start new systems within the framework of autostatism and how it would only be a giant detriment for the entirety of society to rework the political system from the ground up. But this is in itself a faulty premise as it doesn't

account for the costs of the current system, in most states 40 percent or more of the total revenue in the economy is used by the state for purposes that are often wasteful and contrary to the interests of the population. It would be impossible to imagine autostates ever growing to such a point where they collect over a third of all revenue, do not benefit the populace and are still maintained. And due to the investment required for creating autostates, we may see this is a one time fee, with opportunity cost provided. When the autostates are created and this political system is established, if everyone were to optimally organize themselves within political units, there would be an optimal organization that would require no additional investment. The only additional costs within autostates are those when people misalign their political systems and must fix them.

These are also the costs that are already present within all democratic systems and these are the costs that are always present when there is a switch from one policy to another. No one would say that the change in policies is by necessity a bad thing as people would have to pay for the changing of policies, this is necessary spending as otherwise the parasitic policies adopted in the past would be sustained into the present. The faults of monetary costs in autostatism are as present as the

faults in democracy, the costs in autostatism are just more visible to the people than those within traditional states. Furthermore, it can be said that due to autostatism not allowing for redistribution, it essentially goes against all types of socialism in one way or another. It becomes impossible to seize the means of production and the only socialist scheme it can allow is mutual aid, which is supposedly not sufficient for modern workers.

But this is not true, by the same logic autostatism also disallows all capitalist schemes as these are supposedly the embodiments of the redistribution of wealth from the workers to the capitalists. In reality autostatism simply requires that all systems can only function insofar as they are beneficial to the people within those systems, if the workers create their own communes, a generalized exit from the capitalist system could cause the capitalists to surrender their wealth so they would be allowed to eat. Autostatism thus only creates a system in which persuasion has power over bloodshed and which minimizes the violence in political society.

And as a final thing, the last concern is that autostates would revert into modern states and as such autostatism is just a fantasy, but this too is unbacked by reality. The sovereign

right for states to rule is constructed wholly ideologically, people must accept that the state has an innate right to rule over the people in order for the state to rule over the people, if this is not so, the state cannot form as no one would enforce the decrees of the state. This means that autostatism will only revert to statism if the ideological foundations of society change as if the state would become seen as without a right to rule, it will never truly be able to function as the modern state does. No matter how much force the former autostate can use, when it doesn't get the population to accept its rule ideologically, it is unable to become a state due to the nature of what it means to be a state. The state is a complex system of various people fulfilling various functions, without all these systems being properly interlinked, the state will be dysfunctional.

Autostatism does work insofar as people do not view the state as having a right to rule beyond the services it offers and the people under the state willingly accept. When the state requires consent, it will no longer be a state. When the autostate goes over the boundaries established, it will become a state and ought to be dissolved. This must be the case if we want to ever achieve anything.