



What is anarchism/progressivism?

Anarchism is a commonly obscured ideology, especially among mainstream politics. If you aren't a knowledgeable scholar on progressivism, or have yet to at least dip your toes within some form of genuine anarchist theory, it very well may likely be the case that conservative media culture has distorted or attempted to distort your definition of what "anarchy" is to something along the lines of "chaos" or "no rules".

In a society where conservatism is very widespread, conservatism needs to keep the common thought of anarchism rewired to this,

for the specific reason that anarchism is, in actuality, the *only* antidote to conservatism. To firmly establish why this is the case, it has to be established: what even *is* anarchism? And, more broadly, what is *progressivism*?

Properly understood, progressivism can be defined as *a standpoint forbidding a broad category of ideas that believe that people should be discriminated against because of their race, gender identity, pronouns, sexual identity, or anything else that isn't aggressing on others; that some humans based on some arbitrary characteristics such as some aspect of themselves that they were born with, or some physical, sexual, personal, or in general pleasure they happen to have (provided it doesn't involve aggressing on people) can be "lesser" humans than other humans, and therefore that these "subhumans" should be persecuted for the sake of "conserving" a collectivist identity, typically being a preferred race, culture, or gender.*

Or, in simplistic terms, it is a viewpoint forbidding bigotry/prejudice/discrimination, all of which can be broadly simplified to the single label of “conservatism”. Anarchism then, is subsequently a consistent form of progressivism, forbidding all forms of conservatism and extending to that specific form that works as a vehicle to very heavily amplify all of the other ones: [the state](#).

Among anarchists it is commonly debated as to whether the label is referring to the prohibition of rulers or the prohibition of hierarchies, but [properly understood](#) it would actually be the case that the two are not mutually exclusive, and can be synthesized to form more broadly a prohibition of all forms of conservatism while *primarily but not exclusively* targeting the state, as conservatism would meet the criteria for both.

But this tends to raise the following questions of “what would a progressive/anarchist society look like”, and “how would such societies

defend against the far more powerful conservative militaries?”.

To answer, it has to be understood what the structure of a progressive society would look like. But to understand this, it has to be contrasted with the specific form of conservatism that is statism; it has to be contrasted with its antithesis.

What defines the “state”/“government”?

It is a common fallacy that the state is merely a passive governing body of sorts; that it is the entity which provides security within the society. However, a proper analysis of the government would show that this is far from being the case. What is actually the case is that the state is [a form of conservatism](#), and it is specifically the one that amplifies all of the other ones.

The government is an institution that appears to encapsulate the society, but in actuality is made up of a *very* microscopic portion of the

population. Any institution as small as the government is would never be able to exert an all-encompassing authority over any society using raw force and violence alone; they would be trivially outnumbered by the masses of people rising up against them as they are essentially going to war with an entire population using their microscopic size.

Instead, it is the case that the state exerts its power through coerced public opinion; there is a critical mass of the population that the state needs to be aligned with it in order for it to continue to exist, and they are indeed aligned with it as of right now in the current society.

This phenomenon is called the “conservative mindset”, which is essentially the mindset at the root of statism and more broadly conservatism as a whole, stating that forms of bigotry and discrimination like the state are not to be opposed; that all of the conservatism they spew is true and that subhumans truly do exist, determined by whatever prejudices a particular

conservative might have against different identity groups.

The acceptance of the conservative mindset is the only means by which the state can continue to exist, as it needs this acceptance of what it's doing among the critical mass of the population in order to keep itself from being immediately overrun due to the dynamics within which the state exists, said dynamics being a small minority of conservatives trying to exert authority over the far larger mass of people not in their group, reducing them to a subhuman status.

With the state established firmly as a form of conservatism, it can then be gone into detail about the specific nature of the state.

Obviously, said nature would be conservative, as the state being a form of conservatism, as well as a body exerting an artificial authority, places the state in a constant perpetual condition of being the means with which conservatives can exert their bigotry onto the

society, as that is fundamentally what the state is truly existing to do.

But what specifically is meant by 'exerting'? The nature of the state as both conservative in itself and incentivizing more conservatism comes from the specific characteristic that defines the state, being that it is a central planner. The state is not a body floating in the void, but rather an institution made up of two types of people: eager consistent conservatives who know exactly what they're doing and are fixated on harming, torturing, and ending the lives of as many people they view as "subhuman" as possible, and inconsistent conservatives who can see the consistent ones are clearly a problem, but lack the knowledge of progressivism to tell them that conservatism will never be abolished using conservatism.

These two groups make up the state, which itself can be defined as a *centralized hierarchical organization claiming "legal jurisdiction/authority" over a given region*. It is

a central planner, as it is a centralized body claiming some right to “authority” over a region, as though it has some jurisdiction to dictate what happens there. To enforce this, the government will use its extensions of police and military forces, and will also deploy the use of corporatism to influence public opinion by having corporate structures promote the rule of the state while falsely acting as though they themselves are not merely another extension of it.

Conservative Central Planning

There is one distinct characteristic about the government inherent to when it enforces anything it wants to do, that being that when it is enforcing anything, it does so through central planning. The state obtains the resources used to motivate people to act for it using methods of extraction via theft hidden under the euphemism of “taxation”. It forces progressives to surrender resources they would have otherwise used towards their own means

of fighting conservatism to the state, which then uses said resources to continue amplifying conservatism.

Among amplifying conservatism is channeling those stolen resources to its police and military, which it then sends out to enforce said conservatism on individuals breaking from the conservative mindset, in the hopes of either 1, dragging them back to it through solitary confinement to break down their motivation and willpower until they feel hopeless to do anything against conservatism as they feel trapped under the delusion that the state is too strong and conservatism is too widespread to effectively combat, when it is actually the case that the people very massively outnumber the state, and it is only through their continued acceptance of the conservative mindset that the state can continue to exist in the first place, or 2, eliminating them as a threat to conservatism outright and killing them before they can start a revolt.

The state tries to hide this intrinsic purpose of its extensions under the guise that they are “protecting and serving society” in some form, but there exist multiple problems with this thesis even if it is ignored that it isn’t the case in the first place.

The first of which being that because the state is a central planner, it is extracting its resources not through voluntary contribution, mutual aid, or sharing, but through extortion; it is threatening people to surrender resources they produced. However, when resources are attained through doing this, there cannot be calculation of how to efficiently use these resources to “serve society”, as they have no way of knowing when they’re being inefficient.

This is because the state is lacking crucial signals of quality indicators that would be provided had resources been attained non-coercively by their loss of said contribution of resources on the condition that their quality fails to be adequate. Instead, because the state

obtains resources coercively, it continues to obtain resources whether it does a good job at serving society or not, and thus is shielded from the signals that would show them when they aren't, making it impossible for them to know what kind of a job they're doing because whether said job is good or bad they are still at a gain.

This inefficiency of central planning, which factors into what some may call the “economic calculation problem”, is not the only inherent disadvantage of centralism, though it is a major factor in terms of conservatives ‘producing’ anything in general. Not only are they, to quote a *specific individual*, “groping in the dark” when they want to engage in anything they want to do, but because of the specific structure they use to do it, they have a crucial weak point in any conflict against progressives.

This being that conservative structures are stratified and centralized, in terms of the conservative forces (being the military and police), because they are commanded by a central planner, this concentrates all direction over the society within the state. The state is the single body upon which all influence is planted; it is the one above all else. Structures of rulership and hierarchy predicated on conservatism such as the state have this as a critical weak point, because it means that there is a single obvious target that its foes would have to attack, that being the giant central body controlling everything.

In essence, this results in a structure organized in such a way that because of the existence of centralized power, all that needs to be done to take over the society is to defeat the distributor, that being the state.

Something unique about centralism is that this problem is evident in every form of statism;

monarchist and autocratic states suffer from it the most, but even democratic societies do not escape the problems of centralism, and in fact, open themselves to some unique ones of their own.

A progressive critique of democracy

Democratic societies have a problem inherent to all forms of statism significantly increased, that being the incentive conservatives have, especially consistent ones, to do everything possible to attempt to gain control over the government due to the mass amount of power doing such would grant them being multiplied tenfold.

Democracy is unique as the door is left wide open for this to happen by the underlying principle of the society being rule by the majority (at least in a pure democracy that is; most existing democracies are specifically representative democracies, which essentially can be described as oligarchies with a

majoritarian mask).

The reason having majority rule or “rule of the people” (as they describe it) as the underlying principle is bad is because it’s the principle put there *instead of* progressivism. What this essentially means is that the standard of the society is based not around the principles of liberation through progressivism, but by the completely arbitrarily decided opinions of whoever happens to be within the majority of the society. When “rule of the people” is talked about in reference to democracy, it should always be questioned: *what specifically are the people ‘ruling’ over?* The answer inevitably always will turn out to be other people.

Once the underlying standard is set to be something entirely arbitrary with the vague principle of “rule of the people” (over other people) in a society where conservatives exist to uphold statism, that can only spell the road for disaster as it did in Weimar Germany where [Adolf Hitler, the flagship consistent](#)

conservative idol, was democratically elected.

What makes progressivism efficient?

The problems of centralism start from its inherent nature of conservatism, moving on to it being incapable of doing economic calculation to do anything efficiently, and continue with the incentive structures promoted by a centralized dynamic to only further make the baseline conservatism required for statism to exist more consistent the longer statism continues on.

Which then brings us to progressivism, necessitating *decentralization*, and thus anarchism. What specifically would this look like?

Well, from the start, the two most important problems of centralism are nowhere to be found in decentralization, being that statism is

both a form of conservatism as well as incentivizing its consistency, as progressivism is the negation of conservatism, and as such conservatism would not exist in a progressive society.

Even beyond that however, if you imagine a scenario in which there's a specific progressive region but conservatism still exists elsewhere (which would inevitably be the case in the transition to progressivism anyway), there exist a multitude of advantages the progressive society would have over the conservative ones.

The first being that they can do calculation; instead of extracting resources through theft, resources are obtained through voluntary contribution from progressives, which need not include a middle-man either; "resources" could well include eager volunteers and mutual-aiders contributing to produce resources such as food through syndicates, cooperatives, etc, and sharing those amongst the society, perhaps through trade or

community centers, which operate on voluntary contribution and thus have the signals needed to know how well they're doing at helping grow the society.

The society would also be more interconnected instead of isolated, establishing more connections and relations among your fellow progressives, many of which may become close and reliable friends and neighbors, incentivizing a sense of care and responsibility not just among the community for each other, but for the individual as well, as they are the most critical in setting such a process into motion; social relations in progressivism would be exclusively done through [VSRs](#), as such, every individual who opts-in has an incentive to make sure their desires are satisfied in order to keep the relation intact such that no one finds it to not suit their happiness and opts-out.

What would a progressive defense structure look like?

As far as defense goes, this would be handled in a multitude of ways, taking a bottom-up layer approach of sorts as opposed to the top-down centralized militaries of conservatism.

The layer starts at the bottom with the population itself, which is made up of individuals; they are fundamental in maintaining their own desires and happiness to ensure their own wellbeing, and as such would be strongly promoted and educated on individual methods of both offensive and defensive strategies to combat conservatism to ensure progressivism does not get overrun by the Hitlerites. This could take on many forms, the most common likely being the deployment of firearms, though some may prefer a more close-combat approach. Every individual would be promoted to ensure they at least have some means of combatting conservatism for when the occasion arises when they need to do so.

The second layer is the community; horizontally organizing with your fellow progressives to ensure a sort of collective force is maintained, which can take the form of mutual defense pacts in which individuals agree to have each others backs in combatting conservatism, or just entire communities as a whole coming together to voluntarily decide how to best optimize the might of individuals against conservatism. Something that should be emphasized here is that this must be done *voluntarily*; if any democratic process is to take place it must be through the form of a consensus, that is, a total unanimous agreement; if an individual desires not to follow along with the collectively decided upon method of combatting conservatism they would be correct to opt-out of the VSR and use their own method if individuals in the VSR insist on going forward, as forcing the individual to follow with the collective method would be antithetical to progressivism as the individual is now being viewed as subhuman and forced to use a method they are desiring

not to use.

The third layer takes the form of decentralized anti-conservative militias, the predicted likely choice of organization among the communities as they are efficiently allocating resources; it would very well likely be the case that they would come to organize into horizontal progressive militias that would in essence act as the most visible line of defense within the society. This would be because there would be numerous of them within several communities, none of which holding any position of authority over another and thus leaving no central body for conservatives to take over. The best strategic part about decentralization would be this specifically; it entirely removes the central distributor problem of centralism as there is no one-body controlling the society, but rather a vast array of horizontal interconnected organizations, organized into by the local communities, which themselves are made up of by the population.

These militias would not hold any sense of authority or jurisdiction over the society or population either; their sole purpose of existing is to maintain anti-conservatism; outside of the maintenance of progressivism they would not hold any power over the society itself, and would be made up of the mass population in it anyway.

In contrast to centralism, if hypothetically conservatives were to overtake one militia somehow, all it would strategically mean is that that one specific militia is now outnumbered by the rest of the society, just as the state would be if the population it rules over went progressive.

That one militia would very quickly be overrun by all the rest of them, along with community organizations and individuals who have stayed within their own types of specific organization.

As opposed to statism, where defeating the government means you now control the

society, defeating one militia doesn't strategically mean anything as there are still *many more*, upheld by communities with a *vastly larger* number of individuals, all united not under some "national identity" perpetuated by the state, but by progressivism.

As such, in any war between a truly progressive society and a conservative one, the progressives would win out *every time*.

These are the benefits of decentralization.