

A stateless society –
would anarchy work?



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Anarchists argue for a stateless society. Do you agree this would be a good thing or is it dangerous considering what happens to stateless individuals in the modern world? A Stateless Society – Would Anarchy Really Work?

Throughout the world, the majority of modern societies live within harmonious social boundaries that allow citizens to interact with each other inside the limitations of the law, although acknowledging usually infrequent breaches. Without these laws, many people believe a state of disorder would ensue, collapsing the economy and destroying their livelihood.

The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) World Factbook therefore defines anarchy as “ a condition of lawlessness or political disorder brought about by the absence of governmental authority’ (CIA, 2013, p. L). However, in a boldly different definition, Webster dictionary has one characterization claiming it to be “ a utopian society of individuals who enjoy complete freedom without government” (Webster Dictionary, n. D). There are many that believe that this form of anarchy is the way forward through society, removing the restrictions placed upon humanity that would allow total freedom from governmental oppression.

Although anarchy has never been recognized at national level as a political ideology, could anarchism be the way forward, perhaps simply needing a chance to prove its worth.

Early societies have shown an ability to live with little or no government, with many tribes in isolated areas of Africa and South America continuing such methods of unceremonious law and order still today (Masters, 1976, pp. 197-233). Even though there are recognized leaders and elders who make final

decisions regarding the tribe, the hierarchy structure that rules them is starkly different from the government of today (Masters, 2009).

These entire tribes, rarely consisting of more than 500 people, barely the size of many towns today, made it considerably easier to maintain a peaceful domain, and punish those that break laws. In Australia, as of June 2012, the population was 22.7 million (ABS, 2012, p.

L), which makes it significantly more complex to manage wrongdoings.

Without productive law enforcement, who could be relied upon to uphold the laws and restrictions of states? From the viewpoint of anarchy, we should not need such protection, as there should be no one to be protected from.

The Anarchist Response to Crime states: “anarchist societies have little violent crime because there is no underground economy, poverty, or social injustice to breed violent behavior” (Scott of the Insurgency Culture Collective, Bibb but it is unrealistic to assume that because there is no driving motivator (such as wealth or personal gain) that crime will be eradicated (those with mental health issues I. E.

Schizophrenia commit crimes prompted by inner demons and personality traits of the disease, and therefore could not be controlled) Johnston, 2004].

Anarchists admit that humans have a darker side to their nature, evidently shown wrought the presence of crime, but believe that it is learned from previous generations (Martin, 2006, p. L), and is something that could be eliminated if the current generation were to make it happen. It is feasible to believe that a parent teaching a child to commit crime can more than likely

expect that the child will grow who has been seen using children of ‘martyrs’ (children whose fathers’ who have died for the al-Qaeda cause) as front-line defended (Webb, 2012).

Anarchism has been linked by some to terrorism, as anarchist activities in the late 19th and early 20th century were particularly bloody in their disposal of the Heads of State of five countries (France, United States, Italy, Spain and Austria), among other destructive endeavours (Oneness, 2013, up. 31-32).

Modern anarchists claim they ‘despise’ terrorism and the methods it employs (majority of today’s anarchist are against violence) [Azalea, 2014]; but it is hard to overlook several obvious similarities between the two.

Meghan Ideas stated that “the modern Salamis terrorist is a descendant of the anarchist, except that there is a central ‘office’, al-Qaeda, which either controls them or at least inspires them” (Ideas, 2007, p. 6). Even with the differences such as the control aspect of al Qaeda and the fact that terrorists target indiscriminately (whereas anarchy is normally government/authority targeted) separating these ideologies, they make for minor discrepancies in the minds of those who believe anarchy will result in a civilization similar to that which breeds terrorism.

It is easy to see why citizens who are not well informed on either topic could assume that they are extremely similar, and anarchism will therefore result in an uncontrolled government situation similar to that of Iraq or Pakistan. Although they are quite different, it stands to highlight the fact that there is an extremely violent side to human nature that is controlled by attempts to please God, or another higher power.

It is consequently extremely unlikely that anarchism would be able to deter these views, preventing terrorists' violent attempts to seize power.

Another viewpoint of anarchy is that the market should be free, removing government intervention and allowing citizens to interact freely, choosing what to trade and who to trade with. Paid work would not be abolished, and the choice would still be available to those who would prefer to work for benefits, but poverty would not be the only alternative to those who wish not to be paid (Centre for a Stateless Society, 2014). An anarchist society would also seek to only provide for what citizens chose to consume, not what advertising and government authorities want societies to consume.

Peter Corruption claimed it was necessary to “study the needs of mankind, and the means of satisfying them with the least possible waste of human energy’ (Corruption and Shasta, 1995, p. 175). Anarchists do not desire the abolition of work in its entirety, as it is still acknowledged that schools/homes need to be built and food grown etc. , it is the notion of wage labor, where the individuals' freedom and ability to learn is restricted by a superior, that is disputed (How could an anarchist economy function? 2014).

The possibilities of an anarchist economy seem utopian, and many anarchists have acknowledged this (infusion.

Org, 2014). The prospect of not living in poverty for choosing not to work seems unbelievable, and it can be said that many individuals use their free time already to pursue their interests and freely express themselves (United Nations Human Rights Committee, s. 9, 1966). In Australia, freedom is a

privilege that has been enjoyed for many years and peaceful protests and expression of ideas is accepted and often encouraged.

The idea that a country as large as Australia and many other modern states could operate without an economy or a government is foreign and implausible to many individuals as it cannot be vividly never been a ruling ideology, and notable anarchists themselves recognize that an economy under anarchy cannot be predicted due to the fact that the economy will be made of the ideas of the masses.

These ideas cannot possibly be predicted until they are given the chance to be enacted; however the risk that an anarchist economy may collapse such a large country is far too prudent to be ignored.

A final viewpoint on the possibility of an anarchist society is that they believe all citizens should be politically equal, and that any forms of inequality are equivalent to oppression (Heywood, 2007, p. 107). The main issue with this is that people could become less inclined to further themselves (educationally, mentally, and physically) if their opinion is of the same merit as someone younger/less educated etc.

In today's society, stateless individuals are viewed as outcasts and have little ability to input in the outcome of societal changes, making it difficult for citizens to believe their opinions could all be equally valued if anarchy was implemented. From a liberalism point of view, everybody is born equal (in terms of 'moral' equality) but it is recognized that social equality could be detrimental to societal progression (Heywood, 2007, p. 107). Anarchists claim that history is filled with man battling against their fellow man to steal <https://assignbuster.com/a-stateless-society-would-anarchy-work/>

ideas and that we ourselves are the only ones responsible for being held back (anarchism. T, 2014), but even if everyone was equal the input of ideas would still not be equivalent.

There will always be those that cannot and will not be forced to contribute to society and the lack of laws and rules that 'govern' anarchy would ensure that although civilization would eventually progress, there would still be those who reap the rewards of those who work harder to ensure the benefit of all. Although it is possible to see the privileges and rewards that could be reaped from an anarchist society, there is too much left in the unknown.

The stateless individual of today is cast from society as irrelevant and they are often viewed as those who seek to cause trouble and destruction (such as terrorists). It is impractical to believe that modern states are completely oppressed by their governments, when the government has so often ensured the stability and progression of both the social and economic aspects of life.

It is true that there are certain aspects of anarchism that could be beneficial, such as further citizen input into societal changes, but the majority of ideas that are put forward by anarchists would likely result in a dangerous and collapsed culture.