

Temporary is Still Worthwhile

The statist excuse for rejecting anarchy is that it would only be temporary. Some evil moron will always try to set himself up as Ruler, and idiot followers will let him. Until he comes along, those idiots will keep looking for someone to push them around. "*It's human nature,*" the statist says.

So what if it is?

Do you not bother with anything "temporary"?

Well, *everything* is temporary.

Each individual life is always temporary.

Life will always end in death, so does that mean living isn't worthwhile?

Anarchy is life.

Even if anarchy is always temporary, replaced by the next dumb idea until that idea inevitably fails and anarchy happens again, does that mean it's wrong? That it was pointless? Never!

Establishing a State is *always* the wrong thing to do. It's always stupid and will always lead to bad things. And ***it will always fail***. When it does, don't beg for a new State. Enjoy the liberty until the short-sighted idiots around you set up their next failure-to-come. Temporary liberty is still better than never getting a taste.