

On Anarchy IV

Anarchy is the absence of rulers. In my opinion, rulers are initiators of aggression. Aggression is an uninvited boundary crossing, or trespass. But this begs the question: what counts as a boundary? This comes down to one's theory of property. This seems to me to be the greatest schism within anarchist thought. Left anarchists oppose the theory of property that justifies absentee ownership. Right anarchists oppose the theory of property that justifies the seizure of absentee-owned property. All anarchists agree that rulers are unjustified, but every school of anarchist thought seems to have their own theory of property. Left anarchists no less so than right anarchists. What are we to do? Is the demand for others to adopt our theory of property compatible with the spirit of anarchism? Or would that spirit be better served through peaceful negotiation and mutually-beneficial cooperation? Methinks the latter. What do you think? And that's today's two cents.

Skyler.