

Anarchy, By Definition, Is Voluntary

In light of a conversation on Twitter today, I wanted to make this point.

Anarchy means “no rulers.” This is key.

It is key because if your brand of anarchy requires you to dismantle, or take, or otherwise forcefully remove from me that which I voluntarily acquired as mine (i.e. – property) (and regardless of whether or not you see it that way – your p.o.v. is irrelevant) without my approval, you have placed yourself and your philosophy above me as a person. I am now a serf, and you are my ruler.

So any brand of anarchy that claims that moniker, while simultaneously attempting to take your stuff, via force, is unequivocally anti-anarchy. These ideas are diametrically opposed on a basic and fundamental level. No amount of logical twists and turns will make this anything other than what it is. You can be against property. That’s fine. But as soon as you make a violent move against me, or seek to take my property without my permission, you are destroying the very foundation of what it means to be an anarchist.

Which brings me to my next, congruent point – anarchy without voluntarism or voluntarism is not anarchy. Again, if you do anything to me without my permission, you are placing yourself and your desires above me. You have sought to make yourself a ruler over me. This is no anarchy. And there are no two ways about it. Voluntary interaction is a cornerstone of the anarchist philosophy, necessarily.

Anarchy, in order to be anarchy, requires voluntary interactions, and egalitarianism (in the form of rights). These are necessary and sufficient conditions in order to meet the demands of anarchy.

Remember – anarchy = no rulers. No rulers = everything is voluntary, by matter of definition, fact, and necessity.