



In analyzing [the state as a form of conservatism](#), a true progressive must therefore conclude obviously that abolishing conservatism requires abolishing statism. “BUT...”, a utopian ‘progressive’ might respond, “wouldn’t this just mean you have anarchy?”. Well, yes. True progressivism necessitates anarchism. But what is also true is that anarchism and “anarchy” as a whole has a wide amalgamation of meanings and connotations, some of them contradictory. Though all of them share the common theme of “abolish the government”, a proper elaboration on what is meant by “anarchy” is still required to have an accurate understanding and view of the workings of the truly

free-from-all-conservatism progressive society that would be anarchy.

It would make the most sense to start with some definitions of *what anarchy is not*. The conservative mindset has made it such that one of the common connotations associated with the word “anarchy” is a sort of mad-max chaos society where there is no order of any kind and everything seemingly bursts into flames. “Anarchy is when there’s no rules” would be the consensus theme here. Even Google’s first definition of the word lists it as “[a state of disorder due to absence or nonrecognition of authority or other controlling systems](#)”, essentially reaffirming the conservative viewpoint that anyone claiming to be an anarchist must therefore be supporting a chaos-induced “lawless anarchy” because that’s what’s being repeated across countless outlets of conservatism. However, this couldn’t be further from the case.

A grand total of 0 actual anarchists associate anarchism with total “do-whatever-you-wantism”, and this portrayal of anarchism in terms of a political ideology is one of the most hazardous tools of

conservatism, used to invoke a sense of fear into the logical conclusion of the total antidote to the conservative mindset, making people believe that conservatism can't possibly be abolished because all that would happen is a "power vacuum" during which a chaos cycle happens, leading to the re-acceptance of the conservative mindset which plants the seeds for a new government to form to allow conservatives to enforce their bigotry on society once again until we're right back where we started.

This "chaos theory" of anarchism ranges from a simple misunderstanding of words from those who don't know any better to outright absurdities from those who care enough to expand on it, still being ignorant about what anarchism means while coming to the conclusion that things the government is supposedly 'supposed to do', such as prevent murders, exploitation, and discrimination (despite the government itself being an institution that relies on the existence of all three of these in order to exist) cannot possibly be done in the absence of the government, very blatantly disregarding that not only can these things be done but they can actually be done *better* than the government does, through decentralized means such as community

organizations, mutual aid, counter-economics, anti-conservative militias, etc.

With an established refutation of what is false among common connotations of anarchism, (countless documents exist going into more detail on this

specifically so it's senseless to keep this as the focus) **there can now be a proper analysis of *what anarchy is*. Among anarchist spaces there exist two widely accepted definitions of the word, the first being a total “absence of rulership”, (colloquially, ‘no rulers’) and the second being a total “absence of hierarchy” (colloquially, ‘no hierarchies’). Though this doesn’t apply to every single anarchist, it tends to be the case that the defining characteristics of anarchists who use each definition is that the former usually tend towards an individualist philosophy whilst the latter usually tend towards a more collectivist or communal philosophy, though this is heavily varied.**

Proponents of these definitions are tending to come into conflict with each other often, as the aforementioned individualists who identify anarchy with “no rulersism” are tending to dislike the vagueness of the collectivists who identify anarchy with “no hierarchyism”. The collectivists are usually responding by clarifying that “no hierarchies” refer to

specifically *unjust* hierarchies, (to differentiate it with, say, a hierarchy of pencil quality) of which the two most common citation examples include the state and what they identify as “capitalism”.

There is usually a conflict that arises here between proponents of these two definitions, not at the first citation but at the second, as there exists a school of thought called “anarcho-capitalism”, proponents of which usually fall into the “no rulers” camp and thus find themselves at conflict with the “no unjust hierarchies” camp, as proponents of this definition (though this occasionally happens with the “no rulers” one as well) define the word “capitalism” in such a way that by their definition “capitalism” is an unjust hierarchy, and therefore the name “anarcho-capitalism” is a contradiction in terms. Similar things happen from the other side of the conflict, as anarcho-capitalists and occasionally proponents of the “no rulers” definition in general define the word “communism” as well as its synonym, “socialism” in such a way that it is an impossibility to exist without state enforcement or a central planner, thus scrutinizing another school of thought, namely, “anarcho-communism” as a contradiction in terms by their definitions.

Anarcho-communists tend to view an anarcho-capitalist society as a contradiction, believing it would immediately turn into what they usually describe as a “corporate neofeudalist state”, and anarcho-capitalists tend to view an anarcho-communist society as a contradiction, believing they would just resurrect the USSR in order to engage in centralism.

And they’d both be correct- if their definitions were. However, both schools of thought regularly misunderstand what the other supports, being too caught up in semantical attacks against societies that no rational individual would ever advocate for, believing that the other school of thought supports said society when in actuality they do not. This all stems from the fact that both anarcho-capitalism and anarcho-communism (as well as most other anarchist schools of thought but these two most prominently) define the words “capitalism” and “communism” in wildly different and incompatible ways, to an extent that there’s an immediate sense of hostility towards anyone supporting a society involving these words as they’re immediately associated with something that is to be opposed.

To an anarcho-capitalist, all that the word “capitalism” is referring to is a *network of voluntary exchanges of goods and services*; i.e., the “free(d) market”. The existence of trade is all that the word “capitalism” means from the perspective of an anarcho-capitalist, but from the perspective of an anarcho-communist, you’d get a vastly different story. Though there is no universal consensus definition of “capitalism” among anarcho-communists, nearly all of them share the common theme that it’s characterized by a *concentration of power through wealth in the hands of a minority class of individuals controlling the “means of production”*, whom anarcho-communists refer to as “capitalists”. (On occasion an anarcho-communist may still hold a contention with the “trade exists” definition if said trade is the only way to acquire resources, but anarcho-capitalists do not advocate that this is the case either; they are very much in support of alternative means such as mutual aid; trading is just the usually preferred option.)

There is a very clear distinction between these two definitions; anarchism’s “anti-capitalism” is pretty firmly against the latter definition of ‘plutocratic dictatorship’ rather than the former one of ‘trade

exists'; if "anti-capitalism" meant being against the former, it would render agorism, mutualism, left-wing market anarchism, and many other anarchist schools of thought that accept trade while rejecting "capitalism" (all of which are forms of anarcho-capitalism on anarcho-capitalist definitions) to not actually be anarchist ideologies, which rarely any anarchist goes to the extent of doing.

But this is not understood by the majority of anarcho-communists, who, using their predecided definition of "capitalism", look at someone identifying with a label like "anarcho-capitalism" and immediately see them as an enemy because their label includes a word that anarcho-communists identify with the 'plutocratic dictatorship' definition rather than the 'trade exists' definition that those identifying with the label use.

Similar considerations apply to the word "communism", which anarcho-communists tend to identify as a "*stateless, classless society in which resources are shared amongst individuals in accordance to their need*", while anarcho-capitalists identify the word with "*a society in which a*

government central planner prohibits the trade of anything, instead forcing everything to be subject to redistribution”.

These two definitions are vastly different to the point of being mutually exclusive, yet are what the word is assumed to mean among the two schools of thought, generating artificial hostility among anarcho-capitalists towards anarcho-communists.

Roderick Long described the phenomenon occurring here as an ‘anti-concept’, that is, a scenario in which both parties critique each other using terminology concealing a multitude of contradictory definitions: “By ‘capitalism’ most people mean neither the ‘free market’ simpliciter, nor the ‘prevailing neo-mercantilist system’ simpliciter, rather what most people mean by ‘capitalism’ is ‘this free market system that currently prevails in the western world’. In short, the term ‘capitalism’ as generally used conceals an assumption that the prevailing system is a free market. And since the prevailing system is in fact largely one of government favoritism towards business, the ordinary use of the term carries with it the assumption that the free market is government favoritism towards business. And similar considerations apply to the term ‘socialism’. Most

people don't mean by 'socialism' anything so precise as 'state ownership of the means of production'; instead they really mean something more like 'the opposite of capitalism'. Then if 'capitalism' is a package-deal term, so is 'socialism' — it conveys opposition to the free market, and opposition to neo-mercantilism, as though these were one and the same."

Of course, this doesn't necessitate that every single individual identifying with the label is to be trusted; genuine "anarcho"-communists/capitalists, that is, individuals who are "*anarchist*" in name only do indeed exist, namely left-unitarians for the anarcho-communists and Hoppeans for the anarcho-capitalists, but it is important to make a distinction to know whether one is talking to a genuine anarcho-communist or an "anarcho"-communist left-unity supporter who seeks unity with conservatives who have historically killed off anarchists in the aftermath of said unity, and likewise if one is talking to a genuine anarcho-capitalist or an "anarcho"-capitalist Hoppean who seeks to make people think that the antidote to conservatism would actually generate more of it somehow. As Roderick Long explains,

“defenders of the free market are often accused of being apologists for big business and shills for the corporate elite. Is this a fair charge? No and yes. Emphatically no—because corporate power and the free market are actually antithetical; genuine competition is big business’s worst nightmare. But also, in all too many cases, yes—because although liberty and plutocracy cannot coexist, simultaneous advocacy of both is all too possible.”

This is ultimately a case-by-case basis as “anarchist” infiltrators are very prevalent, but there is a case to be made for *genuine* anarcho-communists and anarcho-capitalists to come together along with all other anarchist schools of thought, and the first step towards doing so would be to look past semantics. *“But ‘capitalism’ isn’t just ‘markets and trade!’”/“But ‘communism’ isn’t voluntary, it’s forced collectivization!”* is what opponents of unity will tend to say to this, to which the only proper response would be simply to let anarchist schools of thought have their definitions and respect that they’re different than what you may define these words as. This need not require any softening of principles either; “anti-capitalism” can very well be maintained so long as it’s clarified that it doesn’t apply to people who

support “trade exists” that choose to call themselves ‘capitalists’.

The second step towards unity would be to synthesize the two common definitions of “anarchism”, as “no rulers” and “no hierarchy” aren’t exactly mutually exclusive. Aside from that both necessitate the abolition of the state and corporatism (the anarcho-capitalist label for what anarcho-communists describe “capitalism” as), they both can be synthesized towards a number of different issues as well, such as the prohibition of discrimination, exploitation, genocide, and bigotry, all of which are correlaries of each other.

Therefore a new and proper definition for the term “anarchism” ought be brought about to bring together these two perspectives, namely, “*the absence of conservatism*” (colloquially, “no conservatism”). Not only does “no conservatism” incorporate both definitions (conservatism is rooted in a hierarchy of “pures” over “subhumans”, and any individual perpetuating the continued existence of conservatism fundamentally seeks to be a ruler over the identities of other individuals), but it brings with it an amalgamation of studies from queer theory to more

properly identify forms of rulership and hierarchy that proto (non-queer) anarchism merely glances over, thus expanding the grounds of liberation that anarchism without adjectives brings about.

At the point that anarchism becomes identified with consistent anti-conservatism, it becomes simply a synonym of progressivism, at which point it becomes Noveltism. And it is a synthesis of anarchism and Noveltism that not only would bring anarchists of all schools of thought together, but would create a new grounds for a firm synthesis of anarchist theory with different schools of thought providing various innovations of ways to combat conservatism as well as a wide blueprint for the post-conservatism pan-anarchist society that would be built within which different societies try their different models of anarchy and co-exist with each other, engaged in trade and mutual aid to help each other grow by aiding each other with resources and providing mutual defense fronts against any forms of conservatism that may try to arise, alongside the many decentralized militias, community organizations, and whatnot that would also be devoted to this purpose.

Ultimately, not only must true progressivism necessitate anarchism, but true anarchism must necessitate progressivism.