

Anarchy Is Order: A Defense of a Stateless Society

Taylor LeBaron

October 17, 2017

Abstract

There exists a common misconception of the term and concept of “anarchism.” The term anarchism alone, when used in a group of devout statist (those who affirm absolute political authority) will no doubt warrant the statist to take the defensive side of the conversation, bringing with their defensive response(s) a preconceived notion of the acceptance and advancement of amoral behavior and criminal acts, and the condoning and praise of violence.

The focus of this paper is threefold. First, there will be an inquiry into the political theory of anarchism and the subsequent hyphenated subset anarchies within the general realm of anarchism. This paper will grant the reader a general philosophical and political understanding of theory and implementation of a stateless society. Second, the psychology of authority will be challenged in the hopes of bringing to light the inherent contradictions existing within statism and hierarchical authority. This will include the examination of operant conditioning, which enables subjects to unquestionably accept authority and government as legitimate, by denial of individual sovereignty. This paper will demonstrate that government is synonymous with civil war, while anarchism is synonymous with social order. Finally, the notion of society and religion will be examined. The contrasting elements (politics and religion) of one's worldview will draw an inference of probability of the compatibility of a stateless society and the Evangelical Christian doctrine.

F. Scott Fitzgerald: “The test of first rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in the mind at the same time, and still retain the ability to function.”

Anarchy. The origins of the word are most ancient, yet these origins are ever so greatly ignored. The very mention of the word will no doubt make people uncomfortable due to the grave misrepresentation of the term. The word anarchy has become, by means of cunning propaganda, a euphemism for the destruction of property, the condoning of violence and even murder, and the most severe degree of lawlessness and chaos. Many Americans recall the line from the famous Batman film: “Introduce a little anarchy. Upset the established order, and everything becomes chaos. I'm an agent of chaos.” (BATMAN FILM).

The etymology of anarchy is far less intimidating. Anarchy is Greek in its origin: *anarchia*. This Greek word is a combination of the suffix “a,” meaning not, without, or negation and *arkhi*, meaning ruler or leader. Therefore, anarchy most unequivocally means “without ruler.” Anarchy is the negation of rulers, not the negation of morals. (Carter, 2012) The corporate media conglomerate’s hyperbole and propaganda of current events, in relation to anarchy, is contemptible. The word anarchy is most often paralleled with the 1992 Los Angeles race riots and current events surrounding Ferguson, Missouri; Baltimore, Maryland, and most recently, St. Louis, Missouri. The events in these cities were a concentration of the few, in which property belonging to the government and sovereign individuals was destroyed. As has been defined, anarchy is one without ruler. However, the aforementioned events are the antithesis of this

definition and are in direct opposition to the moral precepts of anarchy. For it is not the actual destruction of property, the threat thereof, or outright intimidation that is most prevalent in the For it is not the actual destruction of property, the threat thereof, or the outright intimidation that most impedes upon one's natural rights. It is the act of ruling another person.

Perhaps one of the most striking aspects of the rejection of anarchism is the clear delineation between those who possess intelligence and those who possess ignorance. Anarchism, as will be further understood, is necessarily the systematic investigation into all aspects of knowable reality and thus the inquiry into the legitimacy of all propositions. The emotional hyperbole of the ignorant man is continuously propagated by outrageous stories of anarchism being comprised solely of violence and mayhem. The greatest form of violence or destructive element in any society is not that of anarchism, which promotes individual thought, and thus cognitive liberty. Rather, it is the presence of unmitigated, unquestioned allegiance to authority. (Cahm, 1989) Ignorance is the greatest peril to humanity. As Voltaire said: "Those who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities." Anarchy strives to combat this ignorance by means of individual sovereignty and the negation of class supremacy.

The masses of society will always be the negation of the individual, a self-sacrifice for the promotion of commonality. Ralph Waldo Emerson had a profound view of the concept of the masses of society: "Masses are rude, lame, unmade, pernicious in their demands and influence, and need not to be flattered but to be schooled. I wish not to concede anything to them, but to tame, drill, divide, and break them up, and draw individuals out of them."(Emerson, 2012)

Having a loose basis of the macro meaning of anarchy, one must ask, “What is anarchism?” The suffix “ism” implies an ideology that is a collection of mutually held precepts and dicta surrounding a particular group. However, anarchism is perhaps the most difficult ideology to define beyond the aforementioned baseline meaning because it is not any one singular ideology, rather is analogous to an ecosystem comprised of what seems an infinite number of theories that are either agreeable or in complete opposition. Just as there is a left and a right in most political theories, anarchism also has a left and a right. The separation is largely held within the economic conditions of the stateless society, thereby contrasting altruism and individualism. The most striking delineations between the threshold are the subsets known as “Individualist-Anarchism” and “Anarcho-Communism.” Wherein, the contrast lies between the common ownership of society as the telos and the essence of the individual or ego as the telos of society. (Heywood, 1992)

Thus the ecosystem of anarchism has a beginning separation of individualism and collectivism, much as the earth’s ecosystem begins with living and nonliving. Within the realm of individualism exist, but is not in any way limited to, the themes of ultra-liberalism, extreme individualism, sovereign individualism, civil disobedience, atomism, egoism, contract-based obligations, market mechanism, and private property. These may be called anarcho-capitalism. The collectivism realm reflects, but is not limited to, ultra-socialism, extreme collectivism, common humanity, social revolution, class politics, mutualism, social duty, communal organization, and common ownership. These may be called anarcho-communism. (Heywood, 1992)

One must not accept the false conception of anarchy. To do so is necessarily to become a tyrant, for anarchy has become synonymous with civil war. Anarchy is necessarily the negation of governments, while governments are the negation of individuals. Should not mankind fear the destruction of the individual more than the destruction of the master? Civil war is not the absence of the State, but the plurality of the State and the inherent discord among the governing classes. If one is to point to any event in which man openly oppresses, coerces, and slaughters others, there is no doubt a government behind the mayhem.

The notion of no rulers, no authority, and no laws is foreign to many. Perhaps the most prevalent and ignorant inquiries of the devout statist when confronted with anarchism is “Who will build the roads?” “Who will put out the fires?” The reality of these questions changes not with the absence of the state. The people build the roads, the entrepreneurs build the roads. The original anti-fire services were conducted by private individuals. Oftentimes, those willing to combat fires would negotiate with the owner of the property on how much he was to be paid for the services rendered--while the property was burning. (Chisholm, 1910) The art of humanity is reason. Man will create what he needs. No government grants the ability to build a road, stop a thief, or put out a fire. Man and man’s entrepreneurship and innate moral social duty, whether derived by Kantian thought or rational self interest, will serve the needs of mankind, not government.

Why is government not the best choice? Why is the very notion of anarchism so intimidating, so radical? The United States of America will be used to describe the inherent absurdities of power, authority, government, laws, and the methods of enforcement of those laws. The choice of American government is not used as a means of condemnation of America, but rather to provide a different perspective on what it ubiquitously regarded as the freest and best country ever to have existed. The Fourth of July is a major holiday within the country. Americans rejoice in the thoughts of liberty, freedom, independence, and opportunity. To question the necessity of the state for the application of freedom, liberty, and autonomy is analogous to questioning the necessity of Santa Claus for Christmas.

What is celebrated on the Fourth of July is not pure freedom, but rather the residual freedom from what a group of radicals did more than 200 years ago. The document that is celebrated and revered is the Declaration of Independence. This document, in essence, stated explicitly the nullification of the British Crown's authority over the colonist. The propagators of the document formally negated the sovereignty of the government and affirmed the sovereignty of the individual. Some of the men whom we celebrate and whom we are taught to respect were some of the worst men by means of their character and amorality. Some of these men whom we celebrate and revere were really, at their base, tax cheats, traitors, terrorist, killers, and reprehensible men. Some. Do not forget the events of Lexington when King George sent his "law enforcers" to have the colonists relinquish their weapons. The colonist shot and killed many of these law enforcers in what has become known as the "shot heard around the world." How many people would support such actions today? The United States government has gone so far as to make an arbitrary attempt to insulate itself from such an event if it occurs. The Smith Act,

signed into federal law in 1940, prohibits anyone from advocating for the *violent* overthrow of the U.S. government. (Kurland, 2001)

What if the circumstances that brought on the Declaration of Independence happened once more today? What if a group of questionable intellectuals, displeased with the President and wanting to change the laws, pleaded for freedom? If the President failed to comply, what if the people subverted the authorities by a bloody and violent revolution? I think the vast majority of Americans would strongly oppose such an idea. The question is why. What changed between then and now? Certainly, the totality of morality and divine acts has not changed in such a short time span.

The etiology of contrast in perception this is twofold, composed of what is known as operant conditioning and cognitive dissonance. The most profound and detrimental contemporary issue facing society today is cognitive dissonance. This concept gives birth to the totality of the ontology of one's worldview. That is, truth is known as the ego defines. Truth is what the consciousness innately accepts. Once this paramount facet of the worldview is formed, our innate method of truth is to affirm what corresponds to our convictions and reject the contrapositive. The inherent display of confirmation bias smashes the desire to ascertain knowledge. This creates a place of retreat or a safety net in the mind. The person will block all intellectual and critical thought due to self-defined dicta of what is unquestionable. Many are contempt of new data; few are willing to investigate. (Festinger, 1957)

When one's worldview is predetermined and conditioned for a particular outcome--that is, nonconsensual *per se*--it is called operant conditioning. Behavioral scientist B.F. Skinner was perhaps the greatest proponent and advocate of this form of control and even eugenics. Skinner

famously said, “Give me a child, and I will shape him into anything.” He said this to show the degree of certainty held within the doctrine of operant conditioning. (Skinner, 1974)

While the unabridged psychology of both operant conditioning and cognitive dissonance is far beyond the scope of this paper, there must be a baseline common understanding. When civilians speak of the government’s actions, such as going to war, most often this is articulated as “*We* are going to war with Iran.” Where does the explicate unity--the *we*--come from? After all, you did not choose the action, nor will you be participating. Somewhere along our existence, we were instilled with this sense of what is commonly called “patriotism.” More accurately, this is operant conditioning. Man is taught that the highest virtue of his existence is obedience to authority, and conversely the greatest sin is disobedience or the questioning of authority. (Churchill, 2004) Recall this wisdom, usually attributed to Voltaire: “To learn who rules over you, simply find out who you are not allowed to criticize.”

The vast majority of the American population is incapable of articulating an original response to a political prompt. In asking why a person pays taxes, the response is commonly a variation of, “It is my civic duty” or “to pay for the roads, schools, police, and parks.” That sounds quite nice, even overtly righteous and noble. However, the occulted reason that one pays taxes is not to be a good citizen. It is to avoid being captured by men with guns and incarcerated for a period of time. The question itself matters little. The result will commonly be reflexive response to stimuli, an integral element to operant conditioning. (Skinner, 1974)

Think of all the special groups and organizations that promote change and social justice. The majority of such factions, even the most radical such as Communists of America, act within the confines of the imposed law(s) and remain obedient to government in perpetuity. The

Declaration of Independence and the actions thereof were inherently outside the confines of the law. It can be said that those who oppose the overthrow of governments oppose the founding method of America. One's hypocrisy is most prevalent when one condemns revolution yet reveres Patrick Henry. If a 2 percent taxation resulted in violent revolution, why has not a 40 percent increase resulted in anything, but letters of disgust and talking heads commenting on televisions? (Kurland, 2001)

The Declaration of Independence makes an unprecedentedly explicit statement that man is endowed with inalienable rights. These rights are God/nature granted. This means that no government, person, law, or other faction can usurp the rights of life, liberty, and property (pursuit of happiness). This being so, if the State says prayer in school is illegal, one is not obligated to comply, for that is the contravening of the liberty of that individual's ability to connect the God. (Kurland, 2001)

If one wants to point to the Founding Fathers for the necessity of government, then perhaps one ought to examine to totality of the men, their lives, and their worldview, and not merely to a government-sanctioned history book. Thomas Jefferson felt that "rightful liberty is unobstructed action according to our will within limits drawn around us by the equal rights of others. I do not add 'within the limits of the law' because law is often but the tyrant's will, and always so when it violates the rights of the individual." (Smith, 1995)

Samuel Adams, the greatest organizer of the Declaration of Independence, told those in opposition to resistance: "If ye love wealth better than liberty, the tranquility of servitude better than the animating contest of freedom, go home from us in peace. We ask not your counsels or

arms. Crouch down and lick the hands which feed you. May your chains set lightly upon you, and may posterity forget that ye were our countrymen.” (Kurland, 2001)

Government has one right, one power, and that is to create criminals. The criminal is created with the passage of laws, and man who otherwise hurts no other man’s innate rights is captured and confined, sometimes for for nonviolent and debatable acts. The term criminal carries negative connotations. When someone is deemed a felon or a criminal, that person may be in peril of social stigma, may be faced with unequal opportunities, and may be labeled as amoral or of substandard character. In contrast to the labels often given to the “criminal,” the “law-abiding citizen” is merely a euphemism for a morally correct and righteous person.

The reigns of Stalin and Hitler both garnered law-abiding citizens. While the actions of these political ideals were objectionable, those who complied with their dogma were merely being law-abiding citizens.

The problem with authority is blindly accepting the correctness and righteousness of the authority. America condemns the Nazi internment camps of Germany, yet committed the same actions, albeit on a much smaller scale, during the 1860s. Most people believe that Minnesota was first a territory and then became a state during the westward expansion of the country. However, what is today known as Hennepin County, Minnesota, was a major internment camp for the Dakota Indian Tribe. Many Indians were tortured and murdered for failure to comply with “American law.” However, the area we now call Minnesota once belongs to this tribe. The state of Minnesota was named from a phrase within the Dakota Indian Tribe, which was native to the landmass before American invasion. The Minnesota River got its name from two words in the

Dakota language: Mní and sóta, which together mean “clear blue water.” (Derounian-Stodola, 2009)

This example is one of an infinite series of omitted historical details, replaced with more palatable variations. Most will pass over such objectionable history, due to the aforementioned concept of cognitive dissonance. The psychology of the statist, when confronted with the notion of anarchism, is a crucial observation. If I say to a friend that X is equal to Y and that friend flatly dismisses the idea as false, then comes across another person who affirms that X is equal to Y, then all of a sudden the friend accepts what was a short time ago utterly reprehensible. (Festinger, 1957)

Perhaps the best possible explanation of this oddity is man’s desire to be within the majority and to be accepted, hence the term “sheeple.” Rousseau articulated this quite well: “[The] savage lives within himself, while social man lives constantly outside himself, and only knows how to live in the opinion of others, so that he seems to receive the consciousness of his own existence merely from the judgment of others concerning him.” The savage is man without government, the social man with government. (Ryan, 2012)

The direction of cattle is changed when the cows are continuously prodded, As with human thought, continual exposure brings change in thought. Cognitive dissonance is equal to a man complaining to a friend about having to pay property taxes, and the friend says “It’s the law. You have to obey.”

Then the man in discord over taxes asks, “Well, if the law says to kill all red-haired people, would you obey?”

“Oh, no. Of course not,” you reply.

Ask that person who made the decision not to comply with that law. That person will say, “I did.” I ask “So did you trump the law?” The sputtering and confusion that results is the empirical evidence of cognitive dissonance.

The greatest real-life televised example of the problem of both operant conditioning and cognitive dissonance occurred in 2011 during a CNN commentary during the Republican Presidential Debates. The issue of foreign policy, as it pertains to war, was approached, with regard to the bombing of 9/11. Ron Paul quoted primary-source material from the party responsible, and brought to the table that America was attacked for failure to leave a sovereign nation, the perpetual military occupancy in territory which did not ask nor want such. Mr. Paul was not condemning America per se, but rather the forcing of policy and government instituted by force. The crowd booed Mr. Paul, and Rick Santorum, responded with the utterly absurd notion that America was attacked because “the terrorists hated freedom and opportunity.” Mr. Santorum was labeled a patriotic man, Mr. Paul as an anti-American traitor, because operant conditioning leads us to condemn those who question the righteousness of our country and we develop the inability to accept a contradiction of our ascribed worldview and perception of reality.

Authority and the problems of the appeal to authority have been scientifically studied and empirically proven in two separate studies, the Milgram Experiment and the Stanford Prison Experiment. The former was an academic study into the compliance with authority and how far someone would go when complying with general authority. The latter was an academic study that examined the psychological effects of authority, such as how morality and treatment of others changed when one was in the position of authority.

Stanley Milgram was a psychologist at Yale University. In 1961, Milgram conducted a series of experiments that measured various elements to determine the obedience to authority figures or perceived authority figures. The experiments were inherently controversial since they were begun a few months after the trial of a well-known Nazi. Milgram wanted to see if perhaps the actions committed by this particular Nazi were not because the man was inherently evil, but because he obeyed an authority and obeyed the law. The study was significant because it was comprised of three people: the scientist (authority), the volunteer (test subject/teacher), and a false volunteer (learner). The false volunteer pretended to be a volunteer but was, in fact, involved in the research. The volunteer/teacher was to obey the scientist/authority and the false volunteer/learner was to receive the instruction or stimuli from the volunteer/teacher. (Lunt, 2009)

The volunteer/teacher would read pairs of words aloud and then ask the false volunteer/learner a series of questions and recite a few response options. The volunteer/learner would press a button to indicate the correct answer. If the volunteer/learner chose the incorrect response, the volunteer/teacher was to produce an electric shock as a form of punishment to the learner, with the voltage level increasing with each additional incorrect response. The volunteer/teacher would knowingly be shocking the learner. At some point during the ever-increasing voltage, the false volunteer/learner would respond as if in severe pain and even mimic breathing problems and heart failure. The volunteer/teacher could refuse to continue. After all, the volunteer/teacher truly believes that the false volunteer/learner is being shocked and is in pain. If the volunteer/teacher refused to continue inflicting the perceived pain, the scientist/authority would implore the volunteer/teacher to continue, up to four times, increasing

in the degree of authority within the response, ending with, “You have no other choice. You must go on.” If the teacher still resisted, the experiment was concluded. (Lunt, 2009)

The essence of these experiments is frightening. People will commit horrendous acts under the command of authority. These non-militant volunteers/teachers thought that the person being shocked needed to be shocked so that some end result could be observed. The volunteers acted, in large, under the authority of the scientist. The common rationale of the volunteers/teachers/ behavior was, “He is a scientist. He knows what he is doing. A scientist would not have me do anything wrong in a research study.” The overwhelming majority of those who volunteered in the experiment gave a perceived electric shock to a presumably innocent person, up to a lethal 450 volts. (Lunt, 2009)

The Milgram Experiment clearly demonstrates that people will commit evil and contemptible acts if the behavior is condoned by a perceived level of authority. The implications of this can be seen within all forms of statism.

The second physiological test is known as the Stanford Prison Experiment. This experiment was led by Philip Zimbardo. The goal was to observe the physiological effects of those in positions of authority and those in positions of control. Participants were volunteers and were told that they would be participating in a prison simulation experiment. The whole experiment consisted of 24 people who were divided into two groups. Half the participants were to be play the role of prison guard, while the other half were to play the role of prisoner. The results and ensuing behavior were shocking.

The participants were all of median standing in terms of cognitive abilities and upbringing, and all those who participated were deemed to be psychologically fit and sound

people. The subjects who were in the prisoner role quickly lost their sense of self-identity and complied with whatever orders they were given. The psychological breakdown occurred in a matter for a few days. The subjects labeled as prisoners quickly became a collective entity instead of individuals, a set of blank and depersonalized subjects who were quite disoriented and disillusioned about their existence. (Zimbardo, 2004)

Those who played the guard roles or the roles of authority had a sudden change in demeanor from the start of the experiment. Those in the guard role quickly understood that they had power, though the power they perceived to hold was most illegitimate. However, the illegitimacy of this pseudo-power, was quickly forgotten. The guards were also deemed to be average and sound citizens. However, they quickly became authoritative, oppressive, and even abusive. Many guards, upon realizing that they had the power and thus could inflict force upon the prisoners without consequence or rebellion, took power and authority to the extreme. The records of the experiment dictate that many of the 12 guards, by means of coercion and psychological warfare, had the prisoners willingly saying the most derogatory and self-deprecating statements. Those in the authority position quickly went from seeing themselves as equal to the prisoners to seeing the prisoners as animals and treating them as such.

The methods of punishment inflicted upon the prisoners were quite real and comparable to what occurs in contemporary jails and prisons. The guards punished those who talked back, resisted, or did not perform to a degree of perfection by taking their mattresses away, refusing to dispose of human waste, and denying clothing items. The prisoners attempted a revolt against the guards because, by this time, they had disassociated from reality and were no longer aware that they were part of an experiment. The revolt failed because the guards went to drastic measures of

assaulting the prisoners with fire extinguishers. The prisoners were severely punished and segregated after their attempted revolt. The guards then implement uniforms for the prisoners, which increased their tendency to act and move in unison. Due to the severity of the guards' abuse of authority and subsequent abuse of the prisoners, the experiment was halted prematurely. Noticeably, those who were in guard, or authoritative, positions were genuinely upset that the experiment ended prematurely. (Zimbardo, 2004)

Many have since criticised the totality of the experiment due to the known and unknown negative psychological trauma incurred. Many have, in hindsight, condemned this whole trial as dangerous. The experiment demonstrated, by way of the guards, the inherent tyranny that is incurred when one individual is labeled superior and another inferior. The experiment created a systematic dehumanization and degradation of the group assumed to be inferior and a self-exaltation in the group assumed to be superior. For those in the prisoner role, the chaos and significance of cognitive dissonance could be readily observed. The cognitive deterioration of the prisoner was quickly observed when they were faced with contradictions of reality, and this led, in many ways, to literal insanity and psychosis of several of the prisoners. (Zimbardo, 2004)

The Stanford and Milgram Experiments have their rightful place within the concept of authority. One may apply the two studies and draw many parallels between the slave and slave owner in the former American institution of slavery and the physiological and operant conditioning of those deemed slaves and those who feel that it is their God-given right to control another human. For one to be a slave, one must consent, and believe that one is a slave. While Aristotle propagated a now-heavily rejected theory of "natural born slave," Aristotle still made the annotation that the slave is willing to be treated as such, and therefore is. The human will can

most certainly be subverted, and is often subverted by means of illegitimate authority or governments. (Ryan, 2012)

There is a commonly asserted belief that democracy and voting are the best forms of governing. While the United States of America was technically founded as a democratic republic, democratic methods are most often employed. At the roots of the theory of anarchism is the assertion of the stateless society. The stateless society and truest application of anarchism is the negation of all forms of hierarchy and coercion. All procedures that inhibit, impede, or otherwise contravene the individual's sovereignty are in direct opposition with the common theme of anarchism. Democracy is a cunning and baffling form of coercion, one in which the majority contravenes the minority's individual natural rights and does so by means of coercion. Consider the notion of our country writing a law that dictates that incandescent light bulbs are illegal and the sale or possession of such is a crime punishable by incarceration. Consider that the proposed law is approved through the bureaucratic measures of proposal and litigation, and this law becomes the law of the land by a 51 percent vote that imposes the law on the other 49 percent of the country who opposed the law. The will of the majority is thus imposed on the minority. The failure to comply with this new law by the nonconsenting minority will result in hefty consequences. This is how democracy fails.

Furthermore, if I go to a shooting range with three other people, and upon finishing there raise the issue of who will pay the range fees. The democratic solution would be to vote. However, voters can band together to form a majority and, much like that of today's politics and collectively by a majority vote. They could vote that I should pay the fees. Again, the will of the majority has been imposed upon the minority. The realization that power in voting and other

aspects of democratic governments, no matter if direct democracy or elected-representative-democracy, can be corrosive or even corrupted by money and bribery, concluding in a falsified result.

The other great area of concern with statism, say Constitutional Republic, is the excessive usage of emotional hyperbole in its appeal. Within statism exists a plethora of rituals and symbols that are implemented and designed to prey upon the emotions and intellect of the individual. In the United States, every President is “sworn in.” This is a ritual of tradition wherein the incoming President affirms his or her allegiance to the country’s precepts, such as the Constitution. However nice these rituals may make one feel, they do not negate the lack of implementation. Former President Barrack Obama swore to uphold the United States Constitution and swore to man's highest power--God. This oath and ritual did not stop Obama from ignoring Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution, that delegates the power to levy war to Congress. This brings about what has been termed the “Stockholm Syndrome,” which is simply the inability to recognize the tyranny of rulers, to love an abuser. Many other factors of similar nature occur, most often subliminally. Government buildings such as park offices, court houses, police stations, and post offices are anointed with flags that have been given an unconscious positive meaning, invoking a sense of patriotism or admiration and dedication to a nation. The buildings belonging to the government could merely have a sign stating, “This is a government-owned building.”

Authority is most often involuntarily implicit, and quite dangerously explicit. Take this 1988 experiment into account for the act of involuntary implicit power: A study was conducted in which a woman, dressed in casual attire, would stand on the edge of a fountain in New York.

When this woman asked people passing by at random to toss a nickel into the fountain, she obtained a 43 percent rate of compliance. The next week, the same woman conducted this trial once more, only this time she was wearing a nondescript uniform, one that bore no rank. This time, she obtained a 77 percent rate of compliance. The assumed reason was an implied sense of authority and obligation to comply. (Carter, 2012)

Governments attest reverence of the culture of the particular nation, but they do not always demonstrate that reverence. For example, they may openly condemn the killing of children before they are born. However, mortality has not genuinely penetrated their souls, for the rulers of the state are in reality most apathetic. We hear nothing in their scornful rhetoric in regard to the thousands of innocent lives taken by means of warfare overseas. For that which the state will term "collateral damage" are the burnt and damaged persons of the world,. The state has no prayers for them.

One must push away the innate desire of patriotism and devotion to authority and examine the objective facts with the unaltered prism of objective reality. Aristotle dicta is that authority is moral and legitimate if, and only if, founded on the consent of the people. (Ryan, 2012). This notion of consent to authority leads to a massive contradiction. The idea is commonly accepted that a government is legitimized by the voluntary consent of the people. However, how is this genuinely achieved and achieved in an absolute manner, that is, consent by all parties? When one is born in the United States, one is by law registered and numbered by means of a Social Security Number. That baby never will have the opportunity to make a choice of consent. That baby has unknowingly accepted a country of origin and thus the laws of that land. (Churchill, 2004)

Recently in New York, a man of the Christian faith, who owned a bakery was asked to bake a cake for a homosexual marriage. The proprietor did not consent, because, to do so would go against his own moral precepts. The business was his, and as such he was able to make such a decision. Despite this man's right to refuse to commit an act that would contravene his worldview, the state is actively making an attempt to coerce this man and seek retribution. The reality is that consent is irrelevant when statism is present.

This notion of consent and legitimate authority leads to the delineation of what has been ubiquitously coined “church and state.” The very assertion of an existing opposition between religion and statism is ironic, for the State is most certainly a religion and those who claim a form of solipsism or atheism nevertheless submit to the State because the State is indeed their god, and statism, their religion. The term Christian Anarchist may provoke a horrified response and may even be considered a non-sequitur term. Perhaps, however, the aim would be to assert the best reasons for the rejection that hierarchy and statism is parallel to Christianity. (Eller, 1987)

Much of the early eras documented in the Old Testament of the Bible can be summarized as a history of persons with no ruler other than God. God is man's sole authority and governor, even to the extent that man is free to choose to obey or disobey. St. Augustine, a well-accepted authority on the history of Christian thought, wrote about to what degree, if any, a Christian should have his life focused on eternity and eternal life as opposed to being involved and concerned with the nature of earthly politics. St. Augustine went as far as to question whether, in the absence of a Christian ruler, there was a corresponding negation of the duty to obey the government. (Ryan, 2012)

St. Augustine asserted with his work *Two Cities* that perhaps the most righteous form of a government was, precisely, one without a ruler *per se*. This was based upon the observation of Augustine that the state would inherently become illegitimate and tyrannical with division, coersion, quarrels, and general discord and ungodliness. The rationale was simply that a form of hierarchy necessitates mutual distrust, of which it follows a mutual negation of communal cooperation for preemptive reasons, which leads to civil war. The solution, according to St. Augustine, was to have small city syndicates where discords could be handled in proportion without the corruptibility of the expansion of power. This is analogous to the household where many reside and inevitably clashes occur, though the ability to live in and retain peace and tranquility remains prominent. (Ryan, 2012)

If one examines the Bible in the full unmitigated context, and as is ubiquitously said when closely examining a profound written work, “look at the text, what does the text say,” one can read and ascertain the duality of the terms “king” and “kingdom.” This is not to mean that Jesus is such a powerful King that He merely outranks all other kings. Jesus transcends kingships, Jesus is the Un-King, That is not to say that Jesus is not a King. Rather, He is far deeper and far more holistic than a mere king. Unking negates kingship, not by mere antithesis, but by concept. (Eller, 1970)

The concept of obedience is inherently dualistic in nature, requiring stimuli and response, or a speaker, and a listener. This is analogous to the enlightened and the ignorant. Authoritativeness (traditional kingship) is solely contingent upon obedience. Primacy of virtue is unquestioning compliance. This is where the notion of un-king arises, for Jesus is so much more

than mere authority and obedience, that is would be blasphemous to say He is merely a king.
(Eller,1970)

When one reads text of any kind, one does so by means of the prism of their conditioned cognition and reflex to stimuli. The average person has been conditioned to read through the prism of authoritative . However when the text of the Bible is read without the inherent belief in worldly authorities and governments many things can be understood.

Most often propagated in defense of Christian-Anarchism is Acts chapter 5, where in the general sentiment of civil disobedience is divinely orchestrated, and even required. In particular Acts 5:29 were Peter says “We (Christians) ought to obey God, rather than man. However, there is a greater need to refute the common arguments that are employed against the notion of Christian Anarchism. Romans chapter 13 is often is to assert the necessity and divine order of government states, when Paul calls for follows to “submit to the governing authorities”. There are a few factors that are often overlooked with using this to assert the legitimacy of earth government. The preceding chapter is often not brought into account by which Paul advocates the teachings of Jesus that is to not seek vengeance, to feed and cloth the enemy, governing authorities if one is to logically connect chapter 12 and 13 would necessarily fit the aforementioned enemy, that must be overcome by righteous acts, even to “turn the other cheek”, this is to give a particular precept that is in opposition to the general theory of government and submission thereof.

Furthermore the mere need for Paul to plead with the people to not use means of violence and revolt, implies a degree of illegitimacy and illusionary power. The understanding of man to “turn the other cheek” is not submission to any government or state authority, rather is a sign of salvation and the decision of man to willingly consent to following Jesus. The non-christian is not bound to this notion of non-retaliation when human rationale clearly dictates such. Just as the non-christian, would be correct to revolt and rebel against the governing authorities, the Christian is bound to turn the other cheek when faced with adversity.

There exist a disparity with the accuracy of the word “instituted” in reference to governments, many scholars have claimed inaccuracy of the translation, and a better translation would be the english word “restrained”, which if this be the case, man ought leave the government and judgment to God, and not try to usurp God’s job. (Christoyannopoulos, 2011)

The second popular defense of statism is Mark 12:13-17, where Jesus is put into a situation in which he is asked to pick a side, in regard to money and state. Jesus is quite clever in his response “render unto Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God’s”. The coinage of Caesars was by its very nature ungodly, for the origin of it was not directly from God, rather the regime of Caesar. It may also be noted the explicit delineation of Caesar and God, denoting two entities, and no implication of anything of Caesars is to go to God, but God to God, Caesar to caesar. Later on within the new testament in the book of St. Matthew 12:24, these is explicitly a contradiction to the devout statist who desires to use the word in Mark 12:13-17 as rationality for statism. One may not serve God and anything else. One may only serve one God one master, “ye cannot serve God and mammon”. Dorothy Day, offered another great analysis “If we rendered

unto God all the things that belong to God, there would be nothing left for Caesar”

(Christoyannopoulos, 2011)

There exist two kingdoms, one is the kingdom of earth and the other the kingdom of God. When man rejects the kingdom of earth for the kingdom of God, one is no longer bound to the submission of the kingdom of the earth, rather is bound to the kingdom of God exclusively.

Many reject the notion of Christianity and Anarchism as a plausible theory. The basis for their rejection is not unfounded per se, as the unofficial motto of anarchy is “no gods no masters”, the implied acceptance of Christianity is for some to imply a form of hierarchy. This can be applied to on two points. The fact (for the Christian) is that we are all children of God, and thus are equal by design. The philosophical counterpoint to this is the clear delineation between the contrasting branches of philosophy. Christianity or religion and God, is clearly under the branch of metaphysics. Politics and government is within the branch of axiology, that encompasses aesthetics and perceptions of good, and beauty. As was in mentioned in the beginning of this paper, true intellect of a man is shown when man has the ability to hold two opposing ideas and retain his sanity.

The Christian anarchist believes in a stateless society, however accepts the precept held by anarcho-capitalist, Non-Aggression Principle or NAP. The Christian anarchist is opposed to harming another, theft, or otherwise impeding on another's God given rights. Alex Comfort once

said “Obedience in modern societies is more often a hideous vice than a christian virtue” (Carter, 2012)

One issue that is often raised within anarchism is the issue of morality and how such works. I would articulate this issue as follows. As a whole the subjective-objective distinction of morality follows from a wrong presumption that objectivity and subjectivity might somehow be mutually distinct categories (when, in fact, such a thing is impossible).

To say that subjectivity and objectivity are mutually exclusive produces a context of understanding where objectivity cannot even be known to exist. This ultimately leads down a path of extreme subjective relativism and makes things like postmodernism and nihilism appear as if they are not absurd.

Basically, because there is no such thing as knowledge without the subjective sense by which ideas are known, the only rational conclusion is to understand that objectivity is a quality of subjective experience that exists when knowledge is being experienced under a collection of particular conditions. The quick and simple description of those descriptions are: (1) coherent validity with respect to all dimensions of thought and thereby formal expression; and (2) correspondent validity to a fully coherent thought with respect to the scope of phenomenal (empirical) causes one needs to existentially qualify a well-understood concept with some external event.

Becoming aware of what qualifies perfect coherence and perfect correspondence generally requires much training, thus objectivity is mostly associated with what can be understood according to some experimental apparatus but this is not actually a necessary condition.

With such an understanding about morality and the apprehension of morality as it pertains to a knowable reality, one can truly appreciate anarchism as the ideal society, the society of highest virtue, morality, and knowledge.

The root of the theory of anarchism is the retentions of the freedom inherent with the state of nature. The ideal of anarchism is in opposition to hobbesian theory, that states that the absence of government, will end in civil war. Hobbes, however proposes an authoritarian government to manage the factions of which he claims end in strife. Hobbes offers, no solution as to who is to control the government. Anarchism is about equality and solidarity, authority is control, domination, abuse, and tyranny. Rousseau, implicates the notion of the evils of the state “Man was born free, and everywhere he is in chains” that is the chains of the state. (Ryan, 2012)

Government requires war and prisons, capitalism requires slavery and repression. Anarchy is, by comparison, humane. The ideal application of anarchy is the syndicalist, this would entail this dissolvment of all bureaucratic entities run by the federal government, thereby negating the conception of the state. The monetary caste system would be abandoned in favor of a medium of

exchange not run on fiat monies, rather units of exchange for units of production. The nullification of all state run entities would follow in suit. (Cahm, 1989)

Anarchism is the most simplest yet most complex political ideology, that is greatly passed over as invalid. Anarchy is the spontaneous self ordering of society, without hierarchical control, and monetary divisions. Anarchy is synonymous, with affirmation of people, as is synonymous with individual liberty as is synonymous, with sovereignty of each as is synonymous with equality as is synonymous with solidarity, as is synonymous to social order, of which can be concluded that anarchy is order.

In stark contrast government is synonymous to denial of the people, as is synonymous to affirmation of political authority, as is synonymous to individual subordination, as is synonymous to class supremacy, as is synonymous to inequality, as is synonymous to antagonism, as is synonymous to civil war, of which it may be concluded that government is civil war.

Bibliography

Cahm, Caroline. *Kropotkin: And the Rise of Revolutionary Anarchism 1872-1886*. New York: Cambridge University, 1989.

Carter, April. *The political theory of anarchism*. London: Routledge, 2012.

Chisholm, Hugh. *The Encyclopedia Britannica: A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, Literature and General Information*. 11th ed. 32 vols. New York: The Encyclopedia Britannica Co., 1910.

Christoyannopoulos, Alexandre. *Christian Anarchism: A Political Commentary on the Gospel*, Abridged Edition. Exeter, England: Imprint Academic, 2011.

Churchill, Ward. *On the Justice of Roosting Chickens: Reflections on the Consequences of U.S. Imperial Arrogance and Criminality*. Edinburgh: AK Press, 2004.

Derounian-Stodola, Kathryn Zabelle. *The War in Words: Reading the Dakota Conflict Through the Captivity Literature*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009.

Eller, Vernard. *Christian Anarchy: Jesus' Primacy over the Powers*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B.

Erdmans, 1987.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *The conduct of life*. LaVergne, TN: Nabu Public Domain Reprints, 2012.

Festinger, Lou. *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press,
1957.

Heywood, Andrew. *Political theory: an introduction*. London: Macmillan, 1992.

Kurland, Philip B. *The Founders' Constitution*. 5 vols. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2001.

Lunt, Peter K. *Stanley Milgram: understanding obedience and its implications*. New York:
Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Ryan, Alan. *On Politics: A History of Political Thought from Herodotus to the Present*. New
York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2012.

Smith, James Morton. *The republic of letters: Thomas Jefferson and James Madison 1776-1826*.
3 vols. New York London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1995.

Skinner, B. F. *Science and human behavior: B.F. Skinner*. New York: Macmillan, 1974

Zimbardo, Philip G. *Quiet Rage the Stanford Prison Experiment*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, 2004.