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Chapter 1

Introduction

[Material such as this, in italics in square brackets, are notes on what I am doing which are not necessarily intended to be retained in the final version.]

My aim in writing this book is to change the way you, the reader, see the world, and to change how you feel about the world.

The way I propose to go about this is by allowing you to see the world through my own minds eye, and, in some measure, to feel about it as I do.

The book is therefore intended not just as an intellectual exercise, but rather as a kind of artistic performance. We talk of a man “singing his heart out” and this is the kind of thing I have in mind. The artist engages his whole being in the
Part I

Past
Chapter 2

Autobiographical Sketch

The autobiographical material here serves several purposes.

Firstly it explains some of the view I hold by describing how I came to hold those views.

Secondly it illustrates how some of the philosophical ideas here discussed here have worked out for me, in my life.

Thirdly it illustrates some of the ideas about human nature which have contributed to my conception of the future.

2.1 First Doubts

At the age of 11 I was sent to grammar school as a boarder. On Sundays, attendance at a church service was compulsory, and this usually involved sitting through a sermon. Naturally I tried to understand what the Vicar was telling me, and since God was often mentioned, this made me wonder about who or what God might be.

I had great difficulty figuring this out, the things we were told about God really didn’t make a lot of sense to me. I tried out a few ideas, about what kind of thing God might be, but none of them worked. None of them accounted plausibly for the attributes which God was supposed to have.

I don’t recall any of the detail, or how long it took me to conclude my cogitations, but by the beginning of my second year, when called upon to make a decision about whether to be “confirmed” in my faith, I then quite definitely did not believe in the existence of God, and therefore declined.

In this process, I have no recollection of consulting any book or person, I don’t think it occurred to me to seek advice. I wasn’t hard to figure out what they would have said. The problem was whether I could make sense of the idea of God, and if not, then the question of his existence did not arise, he was a nonsense. I didn’t take seriously the idea that He might be too mysterious for me to understand (but still very real). It would have been OK for him to have complicated corners that I couldn’t get my head around, so long as the basic idea made some kind of sense.

The greatest stumbling block in my giving up the search for meaning and settling for disbelief was the huge number of people, very respectable and important people, who professed belief in God. Was it possible that they were all wrong? Well I decided they were.

So this eleven or twelve year old boy, after a bit of a tussle, preferred his own untutored judgement to that of about half a world of his betters. This is symptomatic of a character trait, independence of mind, and a disrespect for authority, which makes me by nature rather than by conviction, a kind of anarchist.

This isn’t the whole of it, and I will touch upon other aspects in time, but I just want to use this to make a couple of points here. Firstly, I don’t imagine that many other people are the same, so my ideas about how I would like the world to be are unlikely to be widely shared. Secondly, this isn’t the kind of difference you can get over with an enlightening conversation. It’s a fundamental character trait. It’s con-
ceivable (if improbable) that I might persuade someone that the idea of God makes no sense, and hence that he cannot exist. But to persuade someone who looks to his betters for answers in these matters that he should instead just think it through and come to his own conclusions? Not much hope.

Now this was a bit of naive philosophising. There was no scholarship involved. I did not study the literature, examine the arguments, sift out the good from the bad and determine the true answer. Nor have I ever since been inclined to pay much attention to arguments about whether God exists or not. The idea of God didn’t make sense to me, you can’t even begin to argue about whether he exists until you can make sense of the idea.
Chapter 3
Evolution

Various different kinds of evolution are considered here, of which the two headline cases are “Darwinian evolution” and “cultural evolution”. Evolution is used here very generally to speak of processes of incremental change which may result in the creation of order from chaos, and are sometimes considered to defy the second law of thermodynamics.

3.1 Evolution and Thermodynamics

The second law of thermodynamics asserts that the entropy of any isolated system never decreases.

Though biological evolution is not normally observable in closed systems it may be thought to involve violation of the second law of thermodynamics. This is because entropy is like disorganisation, and evolution leads to more complex and organised forms of life.

However, the observational evidence for and the practical applications of thermodynamics are consistent with it not being impossible for entropy to decrease but rather extremely improbable. A simple thought experiment may be used to illustrate this.

Consider gas in a closed container, notionally divided into two halves. If we hypothesise a starting position in which all the molecules of the gas happen to be in one half of the container, then we would expect to see the gas immediately distribute across the whole container, and we would never expect again to see the gas again all in the same half. However, if you take the state of the gas in the chamber at some subsequent time and reverse the direction of every molecule, keeping the speed the same, then the gas would indeed change from being fully distributed to being confined (momentarily) in one half of the chamber.

3.2 Biological Evolution

The purpose of this thread is to give an account of how the process of biological evolution has itself evolved since the beginning of life on Earth, and to speculate about how it is likely to evolve further in the future.

The stages which we consider are as follows:
1. chemical evolution
2. autocatalytic sets
3. the cell membrane
4. the nucleus
5. sexual reproduction
6. multicellular organisms

Sources? [1]

3.2. **BIOLOGICAL EVOLUTION**

7. central nervous system

8. memory

9. imitation

10. social hierarchy

### 3.2.1 Chemical Evolution

Let us assume here that life evolved on earth without benefit of organic materials from external sources or divine intervention.

In the process of the evolution of life on Earth there must have been a first self-replicating entity. Let us assume also that that was a molecule, since we know of self replicating molecules which are simpler than any self replicating collection of molecules. Of course such a molecule will only be self-replicating in an appropriate medium, which includes the necessary parts for constructing the replica.

If this is how it happened then there was a moment at which there existed a medium (“soup”) in which life could spontaneously appear, and prior to that there will probably have been a history of media which gradually transformed into that special medium in which a self-replicating entity might form. It is probable that this formation event would have been highly improbable, but that once such an entity is formed, the probability of further similar entities being form immediately increases radically.

The “evolution” of the medium up to the point of formation of the self-replicating entity is what we call here “chemical evolution” and that subsequently will be biological evolution (or initially a mix of the two).

### 3.2.2 Autocatalytic Sets

### 3.2.3 The Cell

Prokaryote

### 3.2.4 The nucleus

Eukaryote

\[http://wikpedia.org/wiki/Prokaryote\]

\[http://wikpedia.org/wiki/Eukaryote\]
Chapter 4

Rationality

I am a sceptic first by nature, but also by conviction. These scepticisms have a pervasive influence on the weltanschauung which underlies this work.

In what do these scepticisms consist?

My natural scepticism is a reluctance to take things on authority. As I have grown older this has become more severe, and has become particularly severe in relation to academic philosophy. My concerns about academic philosophy were for a period so severe that they were a source of great puzzlement to me as well as representing a serious impediment to my own philosophical endeavours. Fortunately I eventually came to believe that I understood why philosophy is as it appears to me to be. Since this has an important impact on the views I present here, this story will have to be told.

Scepticism is not usually merely a harsher than usual critique of received wisdom. It has here also the following elements.

Firstly there are some elementary observations about knowledge and the impossibility of absolutely certain knowledge, and also the impossibility of absolutely compelling grounds for any course of action. The presence of the world “absolutely” makes these observations somewhat academic, but they nevertheless form an important epistemological starting point.

Possible subsections:

1.

2.
Chapter 5

Society

5.1 State of Nature

It is usual in the presentation of political philosophy to base arguments on premises about human nature or about human society prior to the emergence of the state, state of nature theories. Very often these premises are either implausible or incredible. They sometimes seem to be mere rationalisations of views held by the philosopher for which rational grounds are lacking. Sometimes the substance of the premises is little more than that man naturally is either vicious (and in need of government to hold him in check) or virtuous (and has been corrupted by some aspect of “civilisation”). Since Darwin’s theory of evolution was published it has been used to underpin such claims.

The resulting philosophy may nevertheless be influential. There may be many readers who have similar sympathies who will not be deterred by flaws in the rationale. Political philosophy of this kind can be enormously influential and can impact (indeed, terminate) the lives of millions.

The political philosophy we present here is necessarily of the same ilk, at least to the extent that it consists in the presentation of ideas about how matters might better be arranged which are underpinned by theories about how things are.

There is no question that my own ideas about the future are influenced by a conception of human nature, particularly of what might be called his social nature, and that no convincing presentation of these ideas can be made without exposing this background. I propose to lay bare their genesis, to reveal as conspicuously as I can the way in which I came to my views and the considerations which persuade me of their merits.

Sometimes political philosophy is presented as if it consisted of deductive arguments from appropriate premises. This is not the case here.
Part II

Present
Part III

Future
5.2 What is Anarchism?

The main purpose of this section is to locate the usage I make in this book of the term *anarchism* relative to its other principle uses in the history of ideas.

The word *anarchy* come from the Greek *anarkhia* meaning “without a leader”.

It has been used in modern times for political theories, doctrines or movements which either advocate the abolition of government or of the state, or more generally of compulsion or coercion.

Anarchism is distinguished from libertarian doctrines, which see a minimal state as necessary for the protection of individual liberties, by its uncompromising nature. The distinction is made stark by the use of the term “minarchist” for the most radical libertarians who nevertheless feel the need for some minimal state.

The main tradition of anarchist thought has also been closely aligned with socialism in seeking not only liberty but equality. Though there are many strands to anarchist thought, there is a sufficient coherence between these strands for there to be a perceptible movement of movements, and for some anarchists to downplay the differences by talk of “anarchy without adjectives”.

Radical libertarian capitalists, who wish to abolish government but retain the free-market capitalist economy, are called “anarcho-capitalists” but are not accepted as anarchists by many of the social anarchists.

The “anarchism” here espoused will likewise be rejected by many present anarchists. It falls in some respects between the social anarchists and the anarcho-capitalists.

Its distinguished most conspicuously by being conceived in terms of the minimisation of coercion (by any party) rather than in terms of the abolition of state or government, allowing that the discontinuation of coercion by the state would suffice. It shares with anarcho-capitalism the retention of the existing free-markets in labour and capital, but anticipates radical transformations in the way those markets work, and a greatly shifted balance between for-profit and non-profit entities.

5.3 Coercion and The State

I’d like to explain here why, in aiming to minimise coercion rather than insisting on the abolition of the state, I still consider this to be a radical anarchism.

I propose to do this by some comparisons.

The purest anarchist theory holds that social disorder is caused by the coercion exercised by the state rather than the latter being necessary to limit the former. The idea is that if the state is abolished, there will no longer be an reason for antisocial behaviour on the part of individuals. That may or may not be so, but I’m afraid that I don’t believe, however little reason there may be for it, that antisocial behaviour will ever entirely disappear. Furthermore, I’m not inclined to think that violence on the part of individuals is any more acceptable than violence on the part of the state. If some violence does persist, and there is no state to deal with its perpetrators, then others will, and violent crime will yield violent retribution and vigilante justice.

In my view we should seek to minimise coercion, and adopt the best institutions for that purpose. Allowing violent restraint and possible incarceration of those who would otherwise continue to commit greater violence serves to reduce the overall level and is therefore consistent with a full-blooded anarchist position.

In fact, it seems to me unlikely that in the kind of society which I am proposing the government would ever entirely disappear, and that the government would continue to exercise some minimal coercion. The kind of minimal policing which is desirable to minimise coercion could be undertaken by some non-governmental organisation, allowing for the abolition of the state. However, it seems to me that there would be no advantage in taking this final step, and the resulting society would suffer no less coercion and would in no substantive sense be more fully anarchic.

In anarcho-capitalism, it is envisaged that private protection agencies would serve instead of the state for this kind of purpose, and that individuals would purchase protection policies from such agencies. It seems to me however that this role, if not undertaken by the state would be better done by not-for-profit agencies which would be funded by voluntary
contributions and which would supply the service to all without charge. The difference between this and state which does nothing more is purely nominal.

For many anarchists the state is synonymous with coercion. A body which used no coercion would be for them, by definition, not a state. So relative to such anarchists the difference between proposing abolition of the state, and proposing that the state relinquish coercion is purely verbal. Residual coercion will in either case be justified if it palpably serves to reduce un-sanctioned coercion. Whether we call the body which exercises this coercion a “state” or not is not important.

5.4 Anarchism and Equality

The great challenge for social anarchists is how to realise a reasonable distribution of wealth without coercion. The difficulty of this is made more apparent by the contrast in performance between the socialist command economies and the free-market economies.

Social anarchists do not want command economies and seek collaborative organisation of production. But it is hard to see how this can work without the free market. Once we have free markets we will get differential income and will need redistributive taxation to realise equality.

It seems inevitable that an efficient economic system will result in differential incomes, and doubtful that any wholly voluntary mechanism will yield equality, particularly not where total wealth is comfortably above subsistence levels.

Our anarchism does not seek to deliver economic equality, seeking a sufficiency for all but admitting wide individual variations in wealth. A major part of the innovation required to realise our anarchistic utopia concerns the ways in which the important functions now funded by compulsory taxation could be funded by entirely voluntary means.
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