



NAZBOL
MANIFESTO
PART III

CHAPTER III : THE FREEDOM PROBLEM

Originally I wanted to name this chapter "the problem with freedom" or "the problem of freedom", but it was hard to decide which one to choose, because it will be kinda about both.

I have to admit that I was never fan of Freedom in the first place. To me "Freedom" always was just something that a fat American yells while he is shooting into the air with his AR-15 while munching on a hamburger from McDonald's at the same time. I agree with people who see it only as American trade mark which they use to sell you yet another war. I always saw man's worth as the amount of his will he can force upon others. So I could be biased.

But lately I realized that there is much more to my disgust with Freedom, than just my personal biases. I realized that Freedom has a fundamental problem and that's why even the people who are trying to sell it to you always fail to deliver. What do I mean? What fundamental problem? The problem is that the concept of Freedom is logically inconsistent.

One of the most important things that a scientific theory must have is inner logical consistency. In mathematics it's even more important - inner logical consistency and logical consistency with the rest of mathematics is the only aspect that mathematical theorems are judged by. I know that the concept of Freedom is philosophy and not a scientific or mathematical theory, but I see no reason why we shouldn't judge philosophical concepts as harshly as science.

And what logical inconsistency is that? It is the fact that in a world with limited resources (in other words in the real world) you simply cannot have a political system that would be truly free. As one wise anonymous poster said: "You are always slave to something". Why is that? Well, let's examine various proposed "free" political systems and see if those would really bring Freedom.

The first political system that has followers who can't shut up about Freedom is anarcho-capitalism. But would anarcho-capitalism really be a system of freedom? Of course not. It would be a system where all the power would be in the hands of corporations and regular people would have no chance for justice under this system. They present anarcho-capitalism as a system where all contracts are made freely, where everything is about choice, but that is a complete lie. If you are a working class person with low education and you can't find a different job position for yourself anywhere else, then of course that you will "agree" and sign an exploitative contract in order to feed your family. If the choice is between being exploited worker and starvation for your and your family, then it's no real choice. Anarcho-capitalism is a lie.

Okay, but what about other kinds of anarchism? Many of them claim that they will erase all hierarchical structures between human beings, including the hierarchy

between employers and employees. Well, first of all we would have to believe that this is really possible and I'm not really convinced of that. Secondly, even if it was possible, then such system would not really be free either. If you erased the police for example, then who would deal with crimes? Many of the anarchists claim that it would be the people, the community itself. But that is nothing but a mob rule. You would live in a society where the police, judge and executioner would all be the community itself, and therefore your innocence or guilt would be decided merely by will of the masses. Not only this is a pure savage mob rule, but also such system could be manipulated for people's personal gain. People with advanced ability of manipulation could simply convince the masses of anything they would want and so their will would become the will of the masses. Eventually such people would gain so much power that they would become a new state. Alternatively people would be so sick of crime that they would start to organize militias for defense against crime. In these militias a hierarchy would eventually form (naturally by certain members being more competent than others, or by manipulation, or as a result of power struggle within, between fractions after some kind of schism or so on) and eventually such militia would become a new state with a military leader in power.

As we can see all kind of anarchism are extremely unjust, don't really work and eventually lead to a creation of a new state anyway. Anarchism is a nonsense that only cringy 15 years olds dream of. In reality it would not bring real Freedom. And if anarchy can't work, it means that absolute freedom is impossible.

But, I hear you say, what about limited freedom? There are many political systems that offer limited freedom. So even if absolute freedom is impossible, limited freedom should be the way to go. Again I have to use words of random anonymous poster who said: "The freedom is either absolute, or it doesn't exist." You might think that is a silly motto and that in practice surely everybody would choose limited freedom over no freedom, but I want to show you that sometimes you might not be able tell the difference. If the freedom isn't absolute, it means that in some ways you are free and in some ways you are unfree. In other words some things are still forbidden even tho they should not be forbidden from the freedom lover point of view. But you might think that having few things forbidden is still better than having many things forbidden. Well, sometimes yes, but sometimes not really. If you are one of the people who gets imprisoned for doing something that is banned (even tho it should not be), you don't really care whatever the system that imprisoned you is a system of limited freedom or no freedom. The result is the same. The people who really behave freely will end up the same way in both systems. No difference. Maybe you think that solution is simply not to break any rules in the limited freedom system, but you have to understand that laws change all the time. What has been legal yesterday must not be legal tomorrow. You never know when you will end up on the wrong side of the red line. And constantly updating your behavior to conform with the laws is sheepish and it will make you demotivated, depressed and sometimes can lead to cognitive dissonance.

So I think I have provided a lot of evidence of the fact that the concept of Freedom is logically inconsistent and that no such a thing can really exist in the real world.

But the people who regularly use it as an argument will continue to do so, because freedom is not their real goal, it is just a bait to lure you into their ideological side, so they can put a lot of other nonsense into your head together with it. Libertarians are the prime example. They don't actually care about people being free, they care only about their twisted form of freedom, which basically just means the freedom to exploit their workers and sell products of their work to clueless normies in order to make a lot of money. It's all about money, not about freedom. Don't trust people who promise you freedom. They are definitely trying to sell you some bullshit. Every time I hear the freedom argument used in a political debate, I completely disregard everything that person has said and consider his whole argument to be automatically invalid.