

Why “Archation”?

Why create and use the word “archation”? Why not just say “aggression”?

Because aggression is part of it, but not the whole of it. There is also theft or other violations of property.

Archation is anything you don’t have a right to do. Anything that someone looking to rule you might feel entitled to do to you.

As you can see, aggression doesn’t cover it all.

Some people have tried to tell me that theft is aggression. I don’t believe it is, partly because others have argued against this, and I see their point. You can steal without resorting to physical force, which is what aggression is to me. You can defraud. You can peacefully trespass. Those are violations of property rights, but not very “aggressive” ones. You still have no right to do them. It is still archation.

Many people try to justify government by saying it isn’t aggression because you could leave, or they’ll resort to the silly “consent of the governed” thing. I guess I am not governed because I don’t consent. Right? I might be murdered for my rejection of being governed, but I am not governed. I might do some things that those who govern– those who archate– want me to do. But that’s not being governed. If I hand over some money to a mugger because I have weighed the costs of complying or not complying and found compliance to be the smart choice this time, then he has archated. If I choose to comply with a particular “law” because I have weighed the options and decided that complying is the smarter choice in this moment, I have been archated against.

You have no right to initiate force or violate property rights. You have no right to govern, murder, rob, rape, trespass, defraud, or kidnap. Those acts are all the same, ethically. You have no right to archate.