

The Voting Franchise

Guest post by Entito Sovrano.

I have no interest in being 'represented' in the heteronomous halls of power. Neither do I care for the silly 'struggle' for 'representation' that we are told occurred within the past few hundred years. Further, I do not care for the mythical 'rights' that have supposedly been given to me and are a product of this 'struggle' for them.

The expansion of the voting 'franchise' has been one of the worst events to occur for those who wish to gain real freedom and autonomy in their lives. People were told that such an expansion would supposedly liberate everyone, giving all people a new power over their own lives that would lead to a greater, more equitable and happier society for all. It is clear that such promises were completely empty and deluded.

In this story of a great struggle for representation, one is constantly reminded of the many people – now long deceased – who risked their lives and even died for the 'right to vote' amongst many other 'rights'. Indeed, there is the common suggestion that one's own ancestors participated in this struggle thereby adding a personal, familial and ultimately an emotional element in support of the expansion of 'the franchise'. This is partly where the conception of 'duty' derives from in respect to voting and to being a 'good citizen'. To abstain from the political process is thus viewed as an act of disrespect towards one's own ancestors who apparently fought tooth and nail for these supposedly precious 'rights' that one may never have even asked for; the dictatorship of the past strikes again.

All the expansion of 'rights' has done is to completely stifle the development of truly independent and voluntary social organisations, communities and associations. In the 19th Century, there were many movements which strove to provide the kinds of social support which 'states' attempt to provide today. So-called 'social-security' has chained individuals into a system which destroys their own autonomy and breeds false assumptions and expectations of the incumbent paradigm. Thus we see the development of the coercive and heteronomous 'welfare state' (and all that entails) whilst voluntary supportive associations are minimal or non-existent.

What the expansion of 'the franchise' really means is the inclusion of a great many more individuals who will have their pockets picked (and will advocate for the pockets of many others to be picked). 'No taxation without representation' is the common saying that encapsulates this reality. One's inclusion into 'the franchise' means that one must accept the aggressive preferences of others (political policy) in return for being allowed to advocate one's own preferred forms of aggression against others. By this method the theft-based paradigm is expanded and envelops the lives of all considered to be a part of it.

Another by-product of this development is the popular idea that somehow 'states' exist to serve 'the people'. This is particularly worrisome because it strongly 'legitimises' such an organisation in the minds of most people because they view it as a 'service' and not as a system of mass theft and plunder that uses them as mere resources. Indeed, a key power-word term used in relation to the practitioners of heteronomy (politicians) is 'public service' and such practitioners are referred to as 'public servants'. What a sickening term derived from the completely backwards assumption that the masters are really servants whilst being supposedly answerable to their slaves.

Whilst the rhetoric of the advocates of the system claims otherwise, the fact of the matter is that any 'benefits' that an individual may receive from the social security system are not driven by a real sense of care for the individual, but the desire to pacify him. By keeping him suitably comfortable he is far less likely to question the incumbent paradigm and seek emancipation from it. Further, those agents of heteronomy that seek his vote in the expanded 'franchise' will happily promise him these gifts. Of course, this system is completely unsustainable; we can already see that as the economies of the world become more unstable by the week, the system is faltering and the violent reality of the heteronomous society becomes greatly apparent, even for those with their heads buried deep in their pillows of public purse pacification.

So, away I say with 'rights'! Away with 'struggles' for comfier chains in an expanded usurpation of both the self and others. It is time to for a whole new project for a whole new paradigm; a struggle out of chains, not into new ones.