



REJECT ALL MANIFESTATIONS OF SLAVERY.
REJECT ALL FORMS OF CONSERVATISM.



"You are OUR slave for not having existed long enough and you obey OUR authority."



In the family institution, you are enslaved by "parents" if you haven't existed long enough. You are reduced to a "subhuman".



EMBRACE PROGRESSIVISM.

Where you are a slave to no one, nor forced into any institution, instead being free to opt-in to voluntary social relations with other individuals, none of whom hold any position of rulership or authority over anyone else in the relation.



There are no subhumans, only humans.
<https://tinyurl.com/abolish-families>



"You are MY slave for not having existed long enough and you obey MY authority."



In "public services", you are enslaved by the government if you haven't existed long enough. You are reduced to a "subhuman".



1. The family institution is a slavery institution

The family institution can be firmly established to be a form of conservatism, as it is [an institution of slavery](#). Upon the instant they exist, individuals are forced under the hierarchical ruling of the family institution to be enslaved under ruling authorities (whether it be several through the "nuclear" or "extended" models, or only one) who are granted the power to complete and total control over every aspect of the lives, identities, and actions of these individuals who never even chose to enter the institution nor are permitted to opt-out, on the basis of their existence time in that they have not existed long enough (as determined arbitrarily by the state) to have basic autonomy.

The glaring conservatism evident within such an institution would be several multitudes of grounds already for such an institution to be abolished in favor of a progressive VSR model, especially considering any institution predicated on any form of conservatism, let alone to this degree of consistency, would only ever incentivize more of it, which can be evident through the glaring widespread infringements on individual identities perpetuated by the family institution and the wider conservative war against human happiness as a whole (after all, every second spent towards expression of identity is a second not spent towards helping to uphold the conservative regime, and is in fact going against it as conservatives already have “pure” classes of identity planned out). **What conservatives fail to realize is that mass suppression of individual identities *doesn't actually make the identities go away*, as that is simply not something possible to do to begin with as identity is intrinsically connected to and inseparable from individual preferences; identity is a part of each individual.**

2. The family institution leading to depression

What happens instead is that the mass suppression that conservatism generates through its forms (being the

state and subsequently the family institution) creates an extremely hostile environment and larger society in which individuals live in fear of expressing their identity as they would be persecuted for doing so, which is increased tenfold if said individual has not existed long enough, as they would suffer from widespread discrimination through identity-phobia(s) conservatism on top of the conservatism of being enslaved under the family institution, which would be incentivized through the power dynamics it perpetuates to also be on-board with the many identity-phobias, ultimately fostering an environment where individuals are pelted every day not only with being enslaved, but also (with what is essentially adding insult to injury) having their identities be persecuted by that same institution enslaving them, which for individuals on the lower end of resilience can & often does result in mass depression or suicides.

Heteronormativity and cisnormativity would be some examples of conservative societal dynamics that the family institution helps to perpetuate, which can be seen evidently enough when individuals are told every day that their only purpose in existing up until they reach

arbitrary existence time point (“age”) x is to obey the every command of their rulers, while said rulers are simultaneously persecuting them for identifying in a way that deviates from their “purity” standards.

3. The family institution & purity culture

“Purity” is a very recurring theme among all forms of conservatism in general, as it completes their worldview that identities can be “subhuman”; where there is a belief that some individuals due to identity are to be treated as “lesser”, the inverted can be found that there exist beings who are to be praised to high heavens as “pure” due to falling in line with the conservative “purity” criteria for identity. Except for that this specific criteria is entirely arbitrary and depends on the specific form of **conservatism** (i.e. for homophobia the “subhumans” are gay people, for transphobia it’s trans people, for sexism it’s those identifying as women, for racism it’s POCs, etc). However, even with the criteria for “purity” itself being arbitrary, there are still common traits found among varying conservatives with which it is easy to derive a sense of expectation for individuals (even if they’re considered “pure”) to adhere to arbitrary societal norms perpetuated by conservatism

to create an artificial illusion that it is the adherence to these norms that allows the arbitrarily-determined “pure” people to demonstrate “purity”.

These common traits can be observed through the conservative war against human happiness, as what can routinely be easily noticed among all of the things that conservatives attack for supposedly being “degenerate” is that they all work to the benefit of making people happy; they’re engaged with in the first place for the fact that they generate pleasure for individuals, which enrages conservatives. In a conservative society it is obvious enough that people would want some sort of means of escaping from that their very existence is being persecuted, but the conservative disdain for happiness goes beyond even that, as it is common to see infighting among conservatives attacking *each other* for being too “degenerate”.

Why this happens becomes obvious enough once it’s figured out what qualifies as “degenerate” on their viewpoint anyway: human happiness does not align with the conservative regime. Which, when looking at a

worldview that's arbitrarily determining people's identities to make them "subhuman" would be obvious enough, but even the "pure" ones would not be safe from the conservative anti-pleasure campaigns, instead being forced into a life of centrally planned barebones subsistence that would be specifically engineered to keep every remaining individual as miserable as possible while they're there to keep them from being happy and thus turning "degenerate".

4. The family institution & eugenicism

This would be enough on it's own, but it translates into a grueling situation when viewed through the all-encapsulating lense of the family institution, which would be a form of conservatism from which many other forms of conservatism are perpetuated, but among all of them being **ageism** (the form of conservatism in which the "purity" and "subhuman" criterion is set by how long someone has existed), as those not having reached the conservative existence criteria are not viewed as humans or having autonomy of any kind, instead being viewed as modifiable slaves to be molded into the image of another person; those not having existed long enough

are viewed more analogously to clay than actual people in the family institution: a tool to be used, commanded, and molded into whatever the molder wants it to be.

Paired with conservative purity culture that exists even among those who *have* existed long enough and there is essentially a sense of hyper-purity expectations for the individuals being viewed as clay, as conservatives are taking an active extra step to ensure any and all possibilities of “degeneracy” are completely nonexistent for the clay individuals, which can be seen not only through the countless age restrictions on anything & everything, but also through the active prohibition of tools that would help these individuals find pleasure or identity expression, such as books, healthcare, consumables, relations, & general media.

In a conservative society, individuals under the existence criteria are completely banned from identity healthcare, “degenerate” books, pleasurable consumables, platonic & non-platonic relations with anyone, and producing or viewing “degenerate” media, among many other things. This conservatism works both ways, as even individuals

who have existed long enough are also prohibited from viewing or producing media depicting those who haven't; there is essentially an effort to gaslight individuals under the existence criteria as though no “degenerate” media can ever be made of them or viewed by them.

The conservative view of these individuals as more resembling clay than people also gives way to another form of conservatism, as among the many [already refuted](#) arguments commonly made for the family institution is an appeal-to-nature fallacy, typically held up with pseudo-science relating to “mental maturity” and “biology”. Conservatives use this to uphold their purity culture tenfold when it comes to the family institution, resulting in what is essentially a eugenicist viewpoint on sexual relations with these individuals in that they are to be entirely prohibited.

This eugenicism extends not only to those under the existence criteria, but to the family institution as a whole, as eugenicist “science” is the typical means by which individuals in the family institution are viewed to even be connected in the first place. This results in a viewpoint

from the family institution not only prohibiting any sexual relations with individuals not having passed the existence criteria, but also even among those who have who happen to share the same family institution, done for the sake of genetic “purity”.

Of course, this begs the question of who would be considered “subhuman” through the stigmatization of incest, with the answer (other than those engaging in incest, of course) typically being neurodivergent and disabled individuals, who conservatives attack for being “genetically impure”. The conservative worldview of those under the existence criteria to be analogous to clay essentially places neurodivergent and disabled people in the position of being viewed as incorrectly molded clay that is to be disposed of, along with the rest of whoever else a given conservative views as “subhuman”.

5. The family institution & compulsory schooling

There is only one form of conservatism that encapsulates and influences more than the family institution, and it is the very form of conservatism

perpetuating the family institution, that being the government. It is the government that returns escaped slaves back to their slavery institution, and makes the lives of slaves who manage to escape without being caught as miserable as possible by having age restrictions at every corner, essentially making it seem such that even if those under the existence criteria escape the family institution, they would have nowhere to go and no safe space to be welcomed at, as all the public places they could go to are mandated by the government to not allow entry or aid of any kind to those under the existence criteria, with said all-encapsulating existence criteria being arbitrarily determined by the government in the first place.

There is *one* public place they can go though, although none of them actually choose to go there; quite the contrary in fact as the government mandates that they go there with the choice of which one of them to go to being left to the family institution as the slaves have no say in the matter, that being schooling. The educational institution is one step removed from the family institution, as it is what the family institution is

mandated by the government to send their slaves to; though the slave owners usually don't mind this because they still get to choose which school their slave is sent off to, and all of them are conservative as they fall in line with the state at minimum, and actively uphold identity persecution at maximum. They also are given the choice of using the family institution as schooling itself under the fallacious label of "homeschooling".

Along with that once they actually get in, there is hardly a focus on ensuring people are actually educated at all, and much more of a focus on making sure the individuals forced to attend know how to be at the beck-and-call of authority, with the "teachers" there taking a lot more of a position adjacent to the parental rulership of the family institution, though still superseded by it. The individuals forced to attend have no say over the what the curriculum is, are forced to obey the every command of the school authorities (unless overruled by the family institution or the state), and are collectively grouped together into one singular method of taking in the curriculum, leaving behind the great many individuals who would learn more efficiently using other methods.

Conservatism generates a culture around this compulsory schooling as though it is the only form of education, ridiculing those who manage to escape from it as being without “an education” or that they “should be in school instead of doing x” and persecuting them further even after they’ve reached the existence criteria by making it harder for them to begin production and even viewing them as adjacent to those who have not reached the existence criteria (though still higher than them) as though they should have “stayed in/went back to school”, while in the background intending by “school” to mean the conservative educational institution individuals are mandated to participate in that doesn’t even educate people.

6. The family institution & the patriarchy

The state along with the rest of the conservative culture makes it harder for individuals above the existence time criteria who don’t have “an education” to begin production, but those who have not yet reached it are prohibited from it outright, as the conservative view is

that they should be with the family institution, and the only time they shouldn't is when they're in "school" instead; these individuals are reduced to the status of clay under conservatism, which is even more evident when it's viewed how the family institution influences economics, in that the state prohibits the slaves entirely from doing any sort of trade or production, and bans a large number of products from being traded to them such to prevent "degeneracy".

Slaves are banned outright from participating in the economy in any way, but slave owners certainly aren't, though time they spend in the economy is time they don't spend ruling over their slaves, as such the government steps in to minimize the time they spend in the economy through the patriarchy by disincentivizing AFAB birthgivers (along with AFABs in general, trans people, non-binary people, etc) from entering it at all by encouraging lower wages for them at businesses, restricting & regulating the things the government "permits" them to trade to prevent their identity expression which conservatives call "degeneracy", restricting their healthcare to dictate how they use their

own bodies, and creating a culture where rather than entering the economy, they are encouraged to be “housewives” instead so that they can constantly rule over the slaves in the family institution.

7. The family institution roleplayed by the state

Inconsistent conservatives will often try to loophole around this by reversing the dynamic and placing AFABs (or even gay people for the even more inconsistent ones) at the top of the family institution’s hierarchy, not realizing that the hierarchy still remains no matter who is placed on top of it. There are some inconsistent conservatives who go even bolder and appear as though they’d be against the family institution, only for what they propose to replace it being nearly identical to the family institution, except that instead of the eugenicist-upheld “parental” authority in charge, it would now be the government directly, without the parental proxy.

Nothing else would change about the actual family institution dynamics (except for *maybe* the eugenicism

would be gone), just a change of who the ruling authority is. Arbitrary existence time criterias (““age limits””) would remain, and those under them would still be slaves, just who specifically the slave owners are would be different. It should be obvious enough, but this is *not* what family abolitionism is about.

8. The solution to the family institution

Abolishing the family institution does not mean replacing one ruling “parental” authority with another one; it means the complete and total destruction of the conservative dynamics by which the family institution exists, that the family institution is upheld by, and that the family institution perpetuates, in favor of a society where progressivism is all-encapsulating instead of conservatism, and the relations promoted through that follow the structure of [VSRs](#) (Voluntary Social Relations), which require that every single individual involved has explicitly chosen of their own volition to opt-in, is free to opt-out at any point and with no challenge, and remains there only so long as they find the relation suits their pleasure and desires.

These relations would come to replace not only the family institution, but all conservative relations as a whole and would become the universal basis for relations in general, with other examples of where they'd be implemented being production and education. Compulsory schooling would also be abolished (along with the patriarchy, eugenicism, "purity" culture, and all other forms of conservatism), and education would be overhauled drastically in favor of the VSR model, where school attendance is optional, the school being attended is chosen solely by those who want to attend it, the hierarchical conservative authority model schools are built off of and use would be gone, and those attending the school would control the curriculum. This would be a structure built through a bottom-up model of progressivism as opposed to the top-down model of conservatism.

Overall, VSRs would be progressive relations instead of conservative ones, which means there would be no government, all individuals could freely identify & express their identity in any way, shape, or form they

want, and no individuals would be unable to enter VSRs except for conservatives and mute amputees.

9. What is a “mute amputee”?

Conservatives would not be able to enter as they would not exist and if they did, they would seek to destroy the relation, and mute amputees would not be able to enter as it would be impossible to know whether they opted-in or not.

A “mute amputee” can in the first place be properly defined as any individual entirely incapable of communication or movement of any kind; in this sense they are “mute” (as they can’t communicate), and in a similar position to that of an “amputee” (as they cannot move).

There would not be anything *prohibiting* a mute amputee from entering a VSR, moreso that if they can’t communicate in any way, no one has any way of knowing whether they are opting-in to join VSRs or not, so until communication with them would be possible it would be

assumed that they aren't, as that is how they would start out; they would not be forced into a relation with anybody at the instant they exist like how the family institution does, they would start and stay a free individual equal to everyone else as there are no "subhumans".

"Communication" is not limited to speech either, though speech is the most common and direct form of communication; "communication" consists of anything an individual can do to make another individual known of something the first one wants to express (examples of non-speech communication would be hand-signals, writing, body language, braille, etc). This is what makes movement relevant, as it is what can be fell-back on if speech is not available as a means of communication for an individual; if an individual can neither speak nor move in any way, they are a mute amputee.

Though mute amputees technically cannot enter VSRs (only because no one would ever know whether they entered in the first place), this does not give any justification whatsoever to reduce them in the way the

family institution reduces those under their existence time criteria. Progressivism does not have existence time criterias for anything, and mute amputees are still equal beings to everyone else; they are not to be treated differently or lesser in any way to everyone else.

With that being said, they'd objectively have a lot easier of a time once they aren't mute amputees anymore, and there would be a very rigidly limited number of things individuals could do with mute amputees to help this happen, with all of these things required to be non-coercive and cease as soon as the mute amputee gains communication and is able to communicate their desire for said action to cease.

These things would include the providing of sustenance (food and water), *actual* (as in, with the intention of them actually learning) education on how to move and how to communicate, and sentimental expression. These actions would also not be exclusionary; they could be performed by anyone and everyone as there would not exist any exclusive "rights" to perform these actions that anyone has; they would be freely available to the progressive

community.

As soon as mute amputees are able to communicate in any way, they would no longer be considered mute amputees and would then be able to enter VSRs, as it would be knowable that they're actually choosing to enter them.

Family Abolition Summary

The family institution is overall not only a conservative institution of slavery, but a form of conservatism from which a vast multitude of other forms of conservatism branch off, and it should be undeniably evident that it's complete and total abolition and replacement with VSRs would be vastly superior to the conservative model.

(This sub-article is an appendix to another consistent progressivism sub-article, "[Abolish Families](#)".)