

On Anarchy II

Anarchy is the absence of something, the absence of a ruler, an initiator of aggression. By definition, aggression is a trespass, an uninvited invasion of the body or property of the victim. The burden of justification is on the initiator of aggression, on the ruler, to show why he should be allowed to initiate aggression against others. It's easier to justify aggression used in retaliation to the aggression of another than it is to justify the initiation of aggression (self-defense and estoppel are two rational justifications). Why should someone be allowed to trespass, and not others? I believe this question is unanswerable. I've yet to hear a non-fallacious answer to that question, which strongly suggests to me that the only reason anybody is not an anarchist is because they adhere to a lie. Once that lie is discovered, they experience cognitive dissonance, which sooner or later results in the removal of their adherence to the lie and their becoming an anarchist. Anybody not directly initiating aggression is mostly anarchist anyway, they just don't know it thanks to that single lie. Remove the lie, and the problem's solved! Of course, that's anything but simple. And that's today's two cents.

Skyler.