

# From One Extreme To The Next

Thomas Kuhn called the eras dominated by a prevailing scientific thought epochs. Hegel called the moving from one historical era and movement into another the same. During the movement from one time into another, there is debate, discussion, argumentation presented, and evidence offered. But always, a revolution takes place. Often times it is heralded by violence, or itself is violent. Scientific epochs throughout human history have been dominated by religious beliefs, and when those beliefs and theories conflicted, violence arose. Thankfully nowadays, that is largely done away with. Unfortunately however, historical and societal/political/religious epochs still seem to be preceded with or are themselves violent in nature. It seems to be the natural conclusion to varying amounts of time in debate and discussion. These revolutions start amicably enough, with both sides presenting the best of their ideas for consideration, and rebuttals given. But once both sides have settled in on their side, violence inevitably breaks out. World War II, the rise of the Nazi's, the rise of Marxism and Marx's heirs (Lenin, Stalin, Mao, Hitler, Mussolini, etc...), the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, India-Pakistan conflict, China-Tibet/Hong Kong/Taiwan, the rise of American diplomacy through "freedom delivery," and the war on terror, and many more are all examples of these nation-state/idea epoch revolutions. Even localized version of this abound - The war on drugs, the war on poverty and the rise of private prisons for profit, in the United States alone, for instance.

Even as the ideas between the statist and anti-statist are exchanged, those who advocate for more government continue to have the jackboot thug on their side, and no give and take is truly present.

What's an anarchist to do?

Historical anarchism's call to action is a call to arms. In other words, revolution. Of the violent variety.

Here at the 3 Pillars of Anarchy, (And Everything-Voluntary, I assume) this is not the preferred method, of course. But I worry that violence, due to human nature, will end up (as it always has) being the conclusion. Violence abounds in virtually every country, right now. Elections spawn partisan bickering. That bickering turns to hate. And that hate turns to violence. Hence why I want to abolish elections and the state to begin with. But given the proximity of people with differing opinions and ideas, it seems as if violence was coming regardless.

So what do we do?