

A note to the reader about Morality Defined:

There will be many people who will swear vehemently at times that what you are about to read is wrong. They will demand that you proclaim obedience to their god, government, or personal guns. I implore you to read this work in its entirety. Do not stop until you have completed it. And before you go around telling people about it and how much they need to read it or why it is complete garbage, please sleep on the ideas first and give them a few days worth of serious consideration.

Real change doesn't come at the end of a gun barrel. It occurs because one individual deems the change necessary in his or her mind before acting it out.

Morality Defined

By Jim Limber Davis

Copyright 2015 Jim Limber Davis

Smashwords Edition

~*~

Thank you for downloading this ebook. You are welcome to share it with your friends. This book may be reproduced, copied and distributed for non commercial purposes, provided the book remains in its complete original form. If you enjoyed this book, please consider donating to the author's website, www.JimLimberDavis.com. While the goal of this work is to teach the individual how to be his or her own leader, please remember that such endeavors are further encourage with financial rewards.

Table of Contents

[Chapter 01](#)

Morality Defined

[Chapter 02](#)

Morality Expanded

[Chapter 03](#)

Morality and Liberty

[Chapter 04](#)

Anarchy, Voluntaryism, and Government (Again)

[Chapter 05](#)

A-holes, Brutalists, and Jerks

[Final Remarks](#)

Chapter 01

Morality Defined

Morality, we all talk about it in various ways. It means a lot of things to a lot of different people. It's invoked in political debate and used to do both good and evil by religious organizations, governments, and individuals alike. But what is it in definition?

Most dictionary entries and reference materials define morality as some kind of understanding between what is right and what is wrong. Others will take it a step further and explain in simple terms that morality is the understanding of what is right and wrong for the preservation of humanity in some roundabout way. But almost every definition of morality appeals to the idea that someone must interpret or instinctively know the differences between right and wrong; that there must be some kind of an authority, God or government for example to look to for approval.

In fact, many of us are even guilty of chastising others for not understanding what is right from wrong. We get into long drawn out conversations where some end up in verbal or physical fights. History even shows how different interpretations of morality lead to war between various cultures. And grudges are held for generations because of what we teach as morality; but no more.

Well, I wish it was no more. Even among the most brilliant minds in the liberty communities of thought, of yesteryear and today, there is much debate as to the foundation and definition of morality. As I've refined this idea to what it is currently, I've been met with ridicule by many. Often that ridicule has been condescending in language and supposed wisdom suggesting I'm just not quite there yet. "Don't worry kid. You'll eventually figure out that all morality is subjective."

The truth is that everything is subjective because everything is open to interpretation because of all sorts of things like 'X,' 'Y,' and 'Z' which we cannot control. After quite a bit of thinking on my own that ran parallel with my thoughts on liberty, which you can read in my eBook *Liberty Defined*, I crafted this understanding of morality.

A lot of research went into understanding this concept. Not the kind of research where I would sit down in a library or test a hypothesis. What I did was strip down every moral and immoral act I could think of to its base concept, of why it was right and why it was wrong. I even compiled a list of things that were neither right nor wrong. What I didn't do was take the time to read what others had to say about morality's foundation, its definition. I merely whittled down as many actions as I could to their core of right, wrong, and indifferent.

People I discussed my ideas with did everything from constructively try to criticize me to openly and destructively attempt to chastise me, because I refused to think on the matters of what others already had to say on the subject. "More than a billion people have had a chance to think about this. If they haven't thought about it yet, what makes you so certain you'll find something new?!"

I stand by my decision. I find that it is easier to formulate an idea free of others' intervention than to struggle with their thought processes sometimes. Often their processes leave much open for interpretation. The writer's who've tackled this subject, in my experience, seem to

struggle to pack as much information into each book as they possibly can and forget to explain certain aspects of their idea; hoping or believing the reader will understand.

I have no intention of doing that here. In fact you can take everything you think you know about morality and throw it out the window. Forget it. Let it go. If you've studied "Objective Morality" on the internet, in a class room, or think you've figured out the gist of it on your own, throw it all away for now. You can come back to it and reclaim it after you're done reading this book if you so choose.

For now, let's get started.

Morality is not a subjective idea beyond the concept of your life having importance, meaning, value, or even purpose if you say it does. There are two kinds of people in the world; those who value their own lives and those who do not; but I'm willing to wager a hefty sum that most, upwards of 99 percent, do value their own lives in some fashion.

It doesn't matter what either group is called. If you value your life then you hold onto some kind of moral code. This moral code actually equates to three parts identified as immoral, moral, and amoral. The fact is that you are a moral being if you value your own life. This is why.

If you value your own life you will likely try to use your greatest resource to communicate this idea with others; your mind, which is your ability to reason. This is important because the base foundation of all morality is the individual's survival. This tactic of reasoning with other sentient beings, for the time being humans but will later be expanded to other sentient creatures such as E.T.s, is purely a defense mechanism.

It is designed to protect ourselves individually from one another who recognize sentience in others and reasoning; specifically the idea that others also place value on their lives as you do with yours. The ultimate goal behind this is individual preservation from others capable of reasoning. However, when enough individual's take this idea to heart they begin the process of recognizing property rights, consent, and a new well of resources for their own individual survival that may or may not be directly used. The more minds that have chosen to not utilize fear and unwarranted acts of aggression to profit off others, without first being the target of such actions by those they are targeting for their own immediate gains, are now freed greatly

from having to worry about some sentient creatures capable of reasoning but choosing not to. This allows them to now focus on the dangers of non-sentient creatures, the unreasoning creatures, and the destructive turmoil of the Earth and universe she is a part of.

In other words, when we, sentient creatures, have taught one another that our individual survival has the potential to be dramatically increased when we take to heart this idea, there will be the potential for more minds to create solutions to other problems that threaten our individual survival and our survival as a species. While this larger goal is not the first goal of morality, it is a secondary goal when the first goal is realized by enough individuals. It might be fair to suggest that this collective understanding is actually the foundation of all societies.

Because the goal is individual survival which later translates into the species' survival, that creates a clear dual objective to maintain for this idea. Again, the goal is to preserve individual sentient life from the unwarranted interactions from other sentient life which may impede and or halt the affected individual from maintaining and or improving the quality of his or her life through peaceful and honest means. That makes morality objective if the individual values his or her life at all. Now, many will be quick to point out that suicide is counter to this. I will actually cover that in a later chapter. But for now, morality is objective because its goal is to preserve sentient life from unwarranted intervention from other sentient life so that each sentient life form may refine it's time, intellect, and labor as it sees fit to benefit or destroy its life without intending to violate the lives of others.

Usually it is about here that people will begin telling me that morality is still subjective because it doesn't classify what is actually right and wrong. And typically they would be right about that. However, the definition of morality I gave is actually amoral. It is also about this point where many will protest even louder about the ideas of "objective morality" and how I've completely misinterpreted that concept. Perhaps it's time for a change in definition or a return to the sentiment of the idea behind morality which has been corrupted by thousands of years of appealing to authorities comprised of fear, guilt, and coercion.

Recall that I asked, at the beginning of this chapter, for the reader to forget everything he or she knows about morality. Do not try to associate the researched phrase of "objective morality." Instead take the definition of morality I've presented and associate it with the word 'objective' as defined by most dictionaries; which states in some fashion this: efforts or

actions designed to attain or acquire a specific purpose, target, goal, or achievement. In the case of morality it is the preservation of the individual's life and the peaceful rejection of unwarranted interactions with other sentient, reasoning capable, individuals or beings.

This is the absolute base neutral foundation of all morality. Without it there cannot exist morality or immorality. So any action between sentient life forms that prevent and or halt another's ability to peacefully and honestly maintain and or improve the quality of their lives outside of the realm of self defense violates that amoral foundation. Any violation of this foundation is immoral; but what about moral?

Chapter 02

Morality Expanded

Now that we know that morality is a defense mechanism utilized by sentient creatures capable of reasoning, we need to understand the remainder of the idea. Morality's root, its foundation, is amoral. Anything that doesn't violate this is at the very least amoral. Anything that contradicts or comes into conflict with this foundation then becomes immoral. In other words, anything that rejects the consent of the individual to be interacted with becomes a violation of this amoral foundation, thus is immoral.

That's very simple and easy to understand. If all people in a location believe their lives have value, regardless of whether or not they believe other sentient lives have value, they are moral creatures if they try to protect their lives from others capable of reasoning with peaceful

language and actions which do not intentionally put their life in danger. This is very important.

If one individual who believes his life has value attacks another who also believes his life has value, then who makes the judgment as to which life is more valuable for the purpose of self preservation? No one can because that value is subjective. Because each values their life more than the other no fair or just test can be crafted to prove superiority over the other.

Instead, each must at the very least respect one another in terms of having life that may benefit each other later in a time of crisis where that respect is remembered and two thinking minds may be more productive in problem solving than one. This is where the protection of the individual life comes into play concerning the amoral foundation of morality. It is also this same issue of value in life which causes the, often violent, quarrels in how to preserve life that is the subjective nature of the positive side of amorality, of morality; keeping in mind that immorality is the negative side.

So now what about things which are moral?

This is where the complications come into play. This is where people begin to really get into a twist about subjectivity, things open for interpretation. That doesn't even matter anymore. All of the 'what ifs' concerning various scenarios shouldn't even be considered.

The scenario doesn't matter provided the idea put into action to aid another doesn't justify anything which violates that amoral foundation. Morality, not amorality but morality, is simply the voluntary choosing to refine your time, intellect, and labor to help another without asking for any compensation, payment, or recognition while not violating the amoral foundation of rejecting unwarranted acts of intervention. Such acts that are moral in the sense of promoting general well being and maintaining and or improving the lives of others with your refined three natural resources are often the subject of debate. These acts include feeding the hungry, sheltering the homeless, clothing the naked, etc.

(On occasion it may be necessary to intervene in violent altercations. That will be done pending your ability to think critically, assess the situation, and act accordingly; all the while considering the possibility of your actions being considered unjust violations of consent to being interacted with if your judgments are wrong and help is not required or is unjust.)

These things are often what we consider ethics. Ethics defined by the various dictionaries relay them as: a branch of philosophy explaining the purpose particular human conduct, which holds the idea of respect in high regard to specific actions, has which promotes the general well being of humanity, society, culture, etc. Ethics in short are about doing good deeds to create a positive frame of mind that is conducive of a happy environment for human beings and promoting the general well being of each other in everyday common interactions.

Such things would include helping others by donating possessions, your time, labor, and intellect, and performing deeds that do not ask for anything in return. Ultimately, regardless of self proclaimed altruistic ulterior motives, people know that there is a possibility that any action they perform may come back to aid them one day; regardless of who that action is performed by. It's often recognition of one's quality of character that generates this kind of sentiment; by engaging these actions to create your own character of high quality or by aiding someone who is of high quality of character. It's a little bit of a self fulfilling prophecy.

These actions, these ethics, these morals, these positive acts that encourage the peaceful and honest perpetuation of humanity are truly a set of ideas put into actions which separates us from so many other species and kinds of life. The lesser acts of promotion of the sentient creature's well being include and are typically revolved around taking the time to consider the emotional states of others before interacting with them. Being friendly, respectful of their personal space, willing to engage in critical thinking skills to acknowledge the existence of others as a courtesy to them, and 'breaking the ice' in conversation to help make them feel comfortable are just a few things that ethics are all about. Primarily these are considerations in relation to the respect of each other's consent to being interacted with.

These smaller, lesser acts are ethics. The larger acts which involve refining your time, intellect, and labor to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, heal the sick over longer periods of time than ethics would ask of you, and to intervene directly to save a life are the morals people get into a twist about and fight over. These are the things that religions and governments are founded on and typically justify utilizing unwarranted coercive measures to create good behavior in those they claim jurisdiction over.

And that leads to a dark side of ethics and morals. Specifically the two main culprits are guilt and rule of law.

Let's start with guilt. Guilt is often and jokingly explained as a magical feeling that helps the individual make the right choices. But what are the right choices? This is a matter of subjectivity. There are no right choices per se.

So long as a choice doesn't violate the amoral foundation of morality, then the choice is right, correct, and not in conflict with the idea of rejecting unwarranted acts of interaction between sentient beings. In other words, if your actions are not directly responsible with intent for hindering or halting completely the ability of another to refine his or her three natural resources, time, intellect, and labor, then your actions are not immoral or moral. They are merely amoral provided that you are fully aware of their results and are not intending to inhibit others in any way; also that you are willing to course correct your actions and make amends should you learn that your actions are inhibiting others unintentionally.

Now, there are a lot of possible scenarios that can play out here. It would be folly to try and learn every single possibility. The most effective solution to understanding is to develop the critical thinking skills to assess each scenario. And the litmus test for such would be the amoral foundation of morality.

Again, so long as no actions are intentionally designed to hinder or halt the abilities of another outside of the realm of self defense to refine his or her three natural resources with respect to the property of each individual involved in your actions, then no immoral act has been committed. And this is where guilt comes into play. People make excuses that bad things will happen to them if they do not do 'X' when 'Y' or 'Z' happens to another.

Should I find a motorist on the side of the road in need of aid for whatever reason short of my interference, I am under no obligation to refine my time, intellect, or labor to aid that individual. In fact many will berate me for this and I will scoff at them justly.

Trying to make me feel bad for not lending aid is an act of aggression. It is an act designed to make me feel bad, less than pleasant, unhappy, distraught, or uncomfortable in order to agree to comply with demands. In short it is a minor form of extortion. It is what guilt is all about. However, the violent consequence of extortion demands is replaced with negative or untrustworthy thoughts of me by others who may have witnessed or hear about my refusal to aid another; this despite the fact that I may or may not have been responsible for the

individual's current state of affairs in question. It would be just to make me feel this way if I was responsible for the predicament the motorist was in. Seeing as how I'm not in this particular scenario, what other reasoning do the users of guilt tripping tactics have now?

They have none. They will eventually try to get me to see the reasoning behind aiding the motorist as I've previously laid out concerning the possible return in what we could call good karma. However, as I'm not responsible for the motorist's current situation, I cannot be held responsible by being called out as a hypocrite in ideology; in the practice of using amorality to defend myself against their unwarranted interactions into my life as they will undoubtedly use to defend themselves against mine.

It would be ethical, specifically moral, for me to aid the motorist, but not immoral if I choose otherwise. It is immoral for others to berate me and guilt-trip me. It would be immoral for me to help the motorist after the motorist declines my offers. But in no way in this scenario am I justly responsible for committing an immoral act that is in conflict with the base amoral foundation.

This misunderstanding about morality doesn't end here. It becomes entrenched in our daily lives. In many states and nations around the world, the refusal to stop and aid someone in need is actually against the law. It is meant to be a gesture of good will enforced by a violent edict; but where is the motivation in that to do a genuinely good deed, and act of genuine morality beyond mere ethics?

This is the problem with rule of law funded by taxation, by extortion. Essentially the law enforcer becomes the unwarranted aggressor in the same way the guilt tripper is an unwarranted aggressor for someone not partied to any interaction with a struggling individual in need of aid. Such laws do more than just escalate the aggressive nature of the idea of guilt. In addition to adding violent reprisal to not conforming, it blurs the lines between morality and immorality. It justifies a little violation of that amoral foundation to encourage a little positive morality which is an immoral act; the violation of consent to being interacted with. The violation of course being the rejection of respect of that individual's belief that his life is valuable just the same as the law enforcer believes his is, but would not tolerate the situation being reversed without that uniform and crowd of supporters and apathetic pushovers. Of course that doesn't equal out at all.

The entire point of amorality is to reason with other sentient life capable of reasoning in order to preserve your own life by respecting theirs in return; regardless of how much more valuable you believe your life to be over theirs when they have committed no act to violate your consent to being interacted with.

Any act that is in conflict with the amoral foundation is thus immoral and negates all moral acts done by the aggressor. This is further complicated by the unnecessary duress placed on the individual to perform the moral act at bayonet or guilt point by the aggressor. To add insult to injury in this entire situation, the unwarranted duress often alters the otherwise happy or neutral mindset of the now coerced individual. That is the absolute opposite of ethical.

That mindset is more likely guaranteed to change from happy to something else that is a lesser level of happiness; if not change to a strong negative emotion which is counter-productive to peaceful interactions. Essentially this is the same effect that pretty much all of us have when we suddenly find ourselves in the presence of a police officer while driving.

He shows up behind us or pulls out in front of us or just happens to be sitting on the side of the road. We know that he or she may at any moment without warning determine we have done something wrong! And that something wrong is completely at the arbitrary jurisdiction of the officer in question. We have to comply with the mandates of that officer; or face the potential of that officer escalating the amount of unwarranted duress he or she is willing to utilize to enforce whatever law is on the books that day.

Remember, many laws start out in the beginning as a means to prevent that which is immoral. Even if all laws were based on the punishment of acts that are committed by violating the consent of the individual to be interacted with, the laws would still be immoral to enforce based on one piece of information. Are the laws upheld by government enforced by the practice of taxation?

If they are, then no matter what the noble intent of the laws being enforced are they are all based on immoral acts. Taxation is not a voluntary act. It is an act that is coerced upon people to comply with or face the possibility of further fines for noncompliance; and later the escalation of threats to physical violence used to kidnap the individual to face a judge paid

with those taxes and locked in a jail cell paid for with those taxes. The worst part is that if the victim refusing to pay these taxes resists while attempting to remain living honestly and peacefully in the vicinity of his or her home, then law enforcement are authorized and will use deadly force to gain the compliance of their targets justifying their acts of murder as self defense. How twisted is that logic?

This is how the justification of a little violation of consent to being interacted with leads to greater atrocities. Just a little immoral act leads to much more severe immoral acts. If there is justification of violating consent outside of the realm of your own immediate self defense then there is no respect for consent; thus there is a problem. This failure to understand and properly abide by amorality is the problem. It makes hypocrites out of everyone who supports government that is not voluntary in participation if they find value in their own lives.

Remember that any individual who values their life and attempts to reason with others to peacefully create and not take, hinder, or stop them from doing the same then become hypocrites in their support for government that is not voluntary and utilizes the practice of taxation.

So there you have it. You now have all that you need to understand the basics of immorality, amorality, and morality. The remainder of this work will go into further detail concerning some of the more popular scenarios that we all encounter one way or another in our daily lives.

Chapter 03

Morality and Liberty

Without morality we cannot have liberty in the abundance in which we crave it. In my book *Liberty Defined* I discussed the foundation of liberty, but I did not fully explain its roots in morality. In a nutshell, I explained liberty as the refining of your three natural resources, your time, intellect, and labor, to peacefully and honestly maintain and or improve the quality of your life. This is important. While it can easily stand alone, the idea that connects liberty to morality is still very strong and important for the growth of Humanity, of all sentient species in time.

As I've explained, morality is a defense mechanism between human beings, between sentient creatures, who wish to protect themselves against the actions of other sentient beings which may hinder or outright prevent another sentient creature's ability to peacefully and honestly maintain and or improve the quality of its life. Liberty is an extension of that idea. It is that idea put into practice as a means to set boundaries between reason capable sentient beings which recognize similarities in ideology; that we value our lives individual and recognize that each other recognizes their lives too.

Because most of us place value of some kind onto our own individual lives, it is paramount to recognize this concept in relation to others. It is paramount that we understand the reason behind it and associate it with others who do the same. When we do this, we recognize that the preservation of our individual lives tends to work much better when we are not attacking one another for resources to maintain and or improve the quality of our lives. It is unfortunate that such negative things happen and that they will continue to happen. However, with a strong understanding of morality's foundation and some patience to explain it to others, we can reduce the seemingly necessity of war over such things and work together to save not only our own lives but those who cannot do for themselves.

Again, this is about having more minds to potentially problem solve than to have fewer minds; thus the greatest resources available to us as sentient creatures capable of reasoning are time, intellect, and labor. And to acquire more of these resources it is imperative that we protect sentient life; only extinguishing it when such a life refuses to listen to reason during its intentional violations of consent of others to be interacted with to the profit of the violator; and with extra caution in doing so if the violator also values his or her life, as an act of mercy.

The amoral foundation of morality is about rejecting the unwarranted acts of aggression and coercion between sentient creatures. This enables sentient creatures, which hold on to and recognize this idea, to focus refining their three natural resources on developing solutions to the other dangers of the universe that range from wild predators to supernova events and black holes. But sometimes this understanding of morality is lost in our debates about what is a guaranteed protection beneath this idea of morality.

There are no guaranteed protections beneath this definition of morality other than the right to life and peace. That's it. You have no rights beneath this code of morality other than to exist peacefully with others who value their lives and recognize that you value your life just the same and the peace free from unwarranted aggression and coercion from others akin in ideology to provide for yourself. You do not have a right to water, food, medicine, technology, roads, education, or anything else.

That's correct! You read that correctly. You do not have any rights except that to life and an existence free from unwarranted acts of coercion and aggression from others who also uphold morality as I have defined here. That does not mean you will be guaranteed to be denied access to such things. It simply means that you do not have the right to such things by way of commanding others outside of completely voluntary and duress free interactions of your doing.

However, you're not alone in that right to life being all you have. That right grants you exclusive rights to a specific kind of property, your three natural resources, time, intellect, and labor. In fact that property is you!

By refining your three natural resources to create, you are by extension creating that which is necessary to maintain and or improve the quality of your life. You are giving value to otherwise common objects. You are creating wealth. If you've read Liberty Defined then you already know that wealth is any good, service, or idea which is useful in the satisfaction of any combination of the four basic necessities of life; sustenance, shelter, security, and happiness.

By doing this you are creating property out of your natural resources and or in combination with other resources not actively being claimed; or are being traded to you by another in a

voluntary fashion that respects consent. So your right to life grants you property rights and now a new concept as well.

Consent. In order to trade with others or simply interact you must also recognize the moral foundation others uphold; you must respect their right to life and the property they claim ownership over which becomes consent. Consent is a very basic set of boundaries that will vary from individual to individual. It becomes the first communicated step in relationship building between two individuals, regardless of romantic interests, friendship, business, or chance meetings. Of course this is after recognizing that one another places value on their lives respectively. And we recognize this by way of their actions concerning us or judging their responses to our actions concerning them.

This respect for consent and everything that has led up to it thus far can fairly be called the Nonaggression Principle. In other words, respecting another individual's right to life based on the amoral foundation of morality is nonaggression. It is the basis and default standard for the protection of life in the absence of another system. This nonaggression principle (NAP) isn't the law of the jungle or survival of the fittest. It is the basis of the law of man, of moral man; which should be understood as 'amoral man.'

People who support government often say that the NAP is just survival of the fittest, the law of the jungle because it is about utilizing force and coercion in retaliation to survive against those who commit such acts first. And when aggressors get away with their actions then, "what's the difference?!" What they do not realize is that government, rule of law as we currently understand it, is merely a perversion of a combination of the NAP and the law of the jungle. The NAP by expansion in consideration is based on the belief that human life, sentient life, should be protected from other sentient life so that the sentient life may focus its resources on survival against that which is not sentient to our knowledge for both short term and long term peaceful gains centered on the creation of real wealth.

The law of the jungle is naught but survival of the fittest; that which can take more, faster, and easier from others without necessarily having to rely upon working together with those taken from without respect for the value the victims place on their own lives. Such a law is less about the preservation of life in the long run and the creation of real wealth we associate with it and more about the preservation of the lives which can help sustain its own, by confiscation

without warrant and, in the short term, by creation of that which will aid in the short term process typically.

By abiding by the NAP two things are occurring. The first is the protection of liberty to exist peacefully which gives Humanity, and ultimately all sentient life recognizing amorality as I defined, an advantage over other species which do not.

The second is a reinforcement of this protection by setting examples of voluntary interactions which have the potential to yield tremendous peaceful and honest profits. It stems from respect of consent to being interacted with. Essentially it is the upholding of the NAP in conjunction with how polite and willing (simple ethics) people are to negotiate with emotions in consideration with others. Successful interactions generate trust. Trust generates respect. Respect eventually generates authority. And that authority is power. This is how foundation of character, of reputation.

That is the basis of all sentient interactions that are founded on the amoral definition I've given in this work. It pretty much works the same way for every interaction. Not much really changes save for the failure of an individual to thoroughly recognize the emotional states of others they wish to interact with or to control their own emotional states and logical faculties to present themselves in as an appealing fashion as possible; and to communicate as clearly as possible.

And that is the largest problem with this process. People forget or fail to recognize that they do not have a right to anything else other than their own lives. The best case scenario for self ownership that can be made is to present the argument that if you and I can agree to respect the value we place on our own individuals that we won't try to intentionally hinder our abilities to maintain and or improve the quality of our lives on our own merits. But so many have never understood this or forgotten it and become complacent in the idea that they have a right to interact with other people.

They force their way into interactions with them as is the case with diner bar sit-ins for service by blacks at white establishments during the 1960s in the United States or using legal action to force Islamic or Christian bakers to produce pro-homosexual treats in the United States in the

recent years, 2012-2015. Such things are violations of the amoral foundation that pretty much all groups ultimately agree on.

The reasons the bakers or diner owners refuse service do not matter. It's of no concern of ours regardless of how trivial the reasons may seem. The actions of the diner owners and the bakers are amoral. They don't have to provide service or even a reason as to why they wish to refuse service.

Until the diner owners or bakers as individuals begin to assault the abilities of potential patrons' abilities to maintain and or improve the quality of their lives through peaceful and honest means, then the potential patrons have no recourse or just ground to make any demands of the bakers or diner owners. They cannot justly coerce any kind of interaction until it is in their self defense. However, when those bakers or diner owners vote to make laws to enforce their views on others, then that is when the game changes.

And this kind of altercation between demanding patrons and goods and service providers is often falsely seen as a right to eat, be happy, to live. WRONG!

Again, no one who follows the amoral foundation can justly claim a right to the property, to the refinement of another's time, intellect, and labor, for their own profit without consent from their target chosen for interaction. And as I've stated before, almost everyone follows this amoral foundation, at least in consideration of their own individual lives. The only just recourse those who are denied service can take is that of another purveyor of goods and services.

Of course this kind of interaction also has another darker side. This darker side is all about how one chooses to maintain and or improve the quality of his or her life. Just as the diner owner and the baker can make the decision to not serve others because they believe it benefits their lives to deny service based on generalized and or fickle ideas, so too may one take their own life and still be well within the bounds of the definition of amorality.

It is not a contradiction or in conflict with the foundation of amorality because the definition of amorality is about the preservation of the individual's life to be maintained and or improved without hindrance from other sentient creatures. If the individual wishes to

maintain his or her life or improve its quality by committing suicide, then who are you and I to stop them or argue with them?

Perhaps the individual is in pain and the termination of his or her life is all that they can see which will improve it by stopping the pain! Whatever the case may be, it is of no consequence to the amoral code to not stop them. If you believe there is another solution then you are welcomed to try and peacefully present it. But to utilize guilt or other threats of violence and coercion to stop their act of suicide is in itself a violation of that amoral foundation.

Unless their act of suicide is going to directly place others at risk during the event itself, then there is no justifiable reason to stop them. An example of this would be hanging versus putting a bullet through their skull in a reasonably crowded area. Another would be jumping off a high building where there is known traffic, foot or otherwise, below. Also, there is a difference between strapping a bomb to your chest and putting a bullet in your head pending the population density and strength of the explosives in both choices.

No matter what the choice is people tend to believe that it remains okay to violate someone's consent to being interacted with if it somehow serves the noble purpose of aiding the greater good, or at least some good idea. And so here we come again to the arguments about government and no government.

Every example presented in this chapter is guilty of being falsely implemented into society's code of 'ethics and morals' which are used to uphold the noble intent of government. But here's a kicker if there ever was one:

It is the amoral foundation of morality that creates society, so I argue. It is this amoral foundation which brings us together by our individual recognition of one another's right to life based on our individual beliefs that our individual lives have value. That is the definitive center of every society regardless of language, religion, geography, rituals, history, or genetics.

Every group of people that can be considered a society holds this amoral foundation to be their center and differs only on how to protect themselves against all others differing in appearance, language, religion, geography, rituals, history, and genetics; and how to best implement the positive side of amorality. Because these individuals seek to protect themselves as individuals from one another with all the aforementioned similarities, they

come together as a society or group in order to protect themselves against those who differ in the aforementioned groups. But the kicker doesn't stop there.

This idea that people 'must come together' leads to the greater good concept. That recognizes the understanding of protecting the ability of the whole to survive before the individual. With consideration given to the fact that not everyone will agree entirely on how to best achieve this, that scares a lot of people because everyone's mindset, intellectual security, and train of thought is a little different. Often the pathways to protecting the whole of a group or society or even our sentient species are wrought with ignoring the concept of protecting the individual from one another. This noble concept to force individuals to come together completely ignores the basis of its foundation; the protection of the individual.

If the individuals of any society or group are not respecting the consent of the individuals individually one hundred percent of the time, then there are violations of the amoral foundation of which they all agree on, provided they all find value in their own lives and want that respected in any way. Failure to recognize this concept in others while demanding it should be recognized in you is hypocritical. That can easily work counter to the survival of the whole in addition to merely slowing down the progress of problem solving existing problems now pushed back in order to correct new problems created by the mass rejection of consent that is the core of 'for the greater good' philosophy. At the end of the day the whole is not guaranteed to survive if it is consuming the individuals which comprise it.

And this greater good leads to social contracts which so many people adhere to, demanding that sacrifices must be made. Essentially their arguments state that some of us are worth more than others. As we cannot know the value each of us places on one another without actually discussing this in one on one interaction for voluntary exchanges, the whole idea of the greater good of society being protected through social obligations, beyond recognizing each finds value in their own existence, is immoral.

Additionally, such demands of any social contract that is appealing to the survival of the whole over the individual not only violates that amoral foundation, but also is dependent upon placing the right individual or set of rules for all to follow in unwarranted violent acts; rules which choose winners and losers outside of the control of the individual. It's a one-two

sucker punch of the violation of your consent to be interacted with and makes all who support it a hypocrite if they value their own lives.

However, this can be turned around on me. Some might suggest that it's okay if the individual agreeing to such terms believe that he or she is not asking anyone to do anything he or she is not first willing to do. That's great that such individuals are willing to make sacrifices for the whole. Not everyone is; and such a display of noble intent to encourage others is nothing short of trying to guilt trip those who disagree. That's a violation of the NAP by attempting to induce negative feelings in order to gain someone's compliance for something you want them to do for you or another in some way without first being a victim of your guilt target's unwarranted act of aggression against you. It's a form of peer pressure on a one-on-one level.

That is the underlying problem with the social contract idea. To make matters worse, proponents of the social contract often refuse to debate the issue fully and declare that those who dislike it should leave. This is a failure of not understanding amorality or the refusal to recognize it in favor of peer pressure or lack of critical thinking skills. Ultimately the failure to recognize amorality and up hold it is the reason why government, why rule of law, seems so appealing.

Chapter 04

Anarchy, Voluntaryism, and Government

At this point a lot of this will seem repetitive. And I don't write this exclusively for those who do a lot of thinking on their own, are quick to pick up ideas, or are already well founded in the

understanding of liberty and anarchy and voluntaryism. I write for anyone willing to take the time to read for the purpose of further self development.

And so it comes to government once again. Just as is the case with wanting to encourage good moral-not amoral-behavior, people justify little acts of immorality that violate the amoral foundation that is the core of their existence with other human beings; eventually with other sentient beings. Again, if the individual values his or her life and doesn't see how others could value their own lives in similar aspects then to reject the value others have given their own lives is to make a hypocrite out of themselves; to put their actions in conflict with their own belief that their life is valuable and deserves the respect of others.

By respecting the value others place on their lives equally to one's own, the value becomes recognized commonly. This extension proceeds further onto property directly created and claimed by the individual refining his or her three natural resources to produce a new piece of wealth. This claim must first be on something that is not already commonly recognized by another and or others leaving it open to be claimed. This is often known as homesteading.

Today there is not much which is not already claimed in some fashion. When we finally take to the stars the difficulties of our forefathers who settled various lands on this planet will be rekindled and we will begin to understand with greater regularity how to homestead and utilize such negotiations with others. I can tell you that it is not much different than finding a piece of trash on the ground in a commonly shared space. If you find something then it is yours until another can prove with reasoning that he or she holds a greater claim to it, perhaps by losing it on a trip or it being stolen.

These little troubles in life are such things that fuel the seemingly necessary justifications for violating consent to provide some common means to exercise reason and logic. This common means is about rule of law. This rule of law is far too often founded on another immoral act; taxation.

Taxation, as I've previously explained in *Liberty Defined*, is not voluntary. Often people will say, "Well you can just leave if you don't like it." But that is not honest. Sure we can leave, but leaving is akin to succumbing to bully tactics. It is nothing short of using unwarranted coercion to gain compliance in behavior; behavior that is obedience to that entity which can

efficiently inflict enough violence or terror of violence to control the wealth necessary for life's maintenance. That's not really much evolved from survival of the fittest when you think about.

And that's not a strawman argument either, an argument that twists the logic, either intentionally or innocently, in order to create an easier target to then attack and claim victory over in debate. If it were truly a voluntary act then those demanding payment for services rendered wouldn't be demanding the payment for services after providing the services under laws enforced with unwarranted violence that state they are the only ones with legal authority to provide such services. That is the crux of most government provided services.

To make matters worse, proponents of this social contract idea will also insist that you work within the system imposed upon you to affect changes. In many nations today there is some form of voting. If not then the answer is clear, violent revolution is probably necessary sooner than later.

However, if voting or some form of republican government exists, then to engage in such a system also works against you upholding your amoral foundation, albeit a tiny amount. I state this because voting gives credibility to the initiators of violence to coerce your conformity. Even if the vote is to exclusively end or limit a practice of the violent entity claiming jurisdiction over you without your duress free voluntary consent, you are still choosing to play by the rules it sets. These rules include continuing to tax the populace to pay for those 'bread and circus' traditions, the few pennies necessary to provide ballots, ink, counters, and so on.

The choice to not vote is different in terms of affecting a change still funded by taxation. This change doesn't involve the continuation of direct threats to affect change. Voting has plenty of this negativity; and it is entirely possible in the United States that it may become separated from its noble sentiment further. Some in Washington D.C. have joked about making it a mandatory practice meaning negative consequences for nonparticipation as it is currently for not having healthcare. How's that for the current stupidity in Washington D.C.?

These issues that government is supposed to handle are all based on the noble intent of what is morally right. Remember, amoral is simply the respect of the right to life others have. Ethics are the maintenance of emotional states and interactions that promote positive

emotional states in others throughout your interactions with them. Morality is even further on the positive side of the amoral foundation which suggests we promote and actively defend those who cannot necessarily do for themselves.

And to violate consent, to disrespect the property rights of those who value their lives, in order to coerce them to produce moral actions is the noblest foundation of government.

So what answer will there be for an alternative to such a society that demands government?

That's where anarchy and voluntaryism come into play. Essentially these two ideas are one in the same. I use them both because anarchy has been given such a bad rap over the years. Both are about the preservation of human life as a group by respecting one another's right to life based on our mutual agreement on the amoral foundation I've explained in this book.

Personally I prefer voluntaryism as it doesn't have as much of a chaotic undertone to it that pop culture and government rhetoric has affiliated with anarchy over the years. So when we all respect one another's right to life by practicing the NAP as explained, we are protecting ourselves from one another, we are protecting liberty, and encouraging life by not destroying the possibilities of what can be created by others in order to maintain our own. With a devotion to this idea and a voluntarily taught and learned emphasis on building moral quality of characters instead of living life with an amoral quality of character we would do more than encourage the maintenance of life but actively pursue the growth of it by refining our time, intellect, and labor to aid existing life in its maintenance without asking it to necessarily return the favor directly.

However, the later is not a guarantee on the return while an amoral interaction that generates a necessity for a predetermined amount of exchange is. The amoral foundation encourages more of a production of wealth to exchange, therefore encouraging all parties involved in such transactions to produce something of value to others. This encouragement of wealth production actually does more to aid, I would argue, than the moral encouragement based on the idea of selfless giving to inspire.

People like to suggest that money is somehow vile and evil. It is not. It is simply a means of exchange that has become the crux of many amoral interactions. It encourages the production of real wealth which satisfies one or more of the four basics of life and can now be

exchanged with a much greater speed than ever before. This production and return on real wealth generates encouragement to produce more and more real wealth which satisfies sustenance, shelter, security, and happiness. Ultimately when this process is unfettered it gains the potential to make such charitable giving less necessary as real wealth will be abundantly available with so many competitors seeking their market niche.

It may seem sad to many, but the amoral foundation is one in which we all too often default to because we feel uncomfortable giving with the uncertainty brought on by many factors; including but not limited to people acting homeless and poor, panhandlers seeking their next alcoholic or drug fix, corruption, outright dishonesty, or we simply do not believe in giving what is rightfully ours through our own peaceful and honest creation.

Amoral encouragement doesn't necessarily always recognize the suffering of others as important to its own. It is enough to recognize that others also believe their lives are important and have value, if not to others at least to them. Amorality is more akin to the philosophy of self reliance pending the possibility of interacting with others to form temporary and long term alliances of mutually beneficial interactions. We might call these contracts that range from employment for a few dollars an hour for work completed to making an exchange of not doing 'X' with the river that flows through your property so that it might be used by the next property owner or owners whose property it also flows through. The possibilities are endless; but make no mistake, they are there for us to find provided we keep in mind the amoral foundation of morality, of liberty, that we all ultimately share because we value our own lives individually.

This is the foundation of anarchy, of voluntaryism. This is the default of liberty when people routinely consider the amoral foundation of morality. Government, religions, wars, and poverty at the hands of legislation from violence appointed rulers or leadership is a result of not understanding and or routinely considering the amoral foundation of morality daily, hourly, or minute by minute. Government is unnecessary for amoral men, so those great thinkers of yesteryear have stated.

It is why the idea of men being angels would not need government while also making government work perfectly when they cannot as being less than angels. "But who will do 'X' all the time," is presented in the face of such arguments. It doesn't matter who will do 'X' so

long as 'X' is done by voluntary cooperation and the respect of consent of all involved in the completion of 'X' and those it affects.

This is even true of protecting those who cannot protect themselves, such as children, the sick, and even the elderly. However, in these cases there is something unique. Protecting and caring for children is a very large reason for many who support government.

How will children be protected from abusive parents if not for a centralized rule of law? It is extremely unfortunate that people suffer at the hands of other people. It is, arguably, even more unfortunate that children are suffering at the hands of other people, namely adults, who should know better. Sadly bad things will happen in this world.

“But Jim, you’re making the case for people to just get away with things. Have you no heart? Why can’t you see that government or some kind of centralized authority is necessary to at least protect the children?”

I don’t really care if you think I have a heart or do not. If you feel you need to intervene into the lives of others where children are being abused, hurt, or whatever, then go do so. Be forewarned though that you do not have the moral authority to do anything violent unless aggressed against first. It is a very fine line to walk. You must be your own judge of what you can or cannot amorally or morally do concerning the intervention of saving another life that cannot entirely be reasoned with.

This is where people will chastise me the most; and I’m okay with that. I’m okay with that because I understand that I cannot save everyone. I cannot stop all the bad things in the world. But what I can do is to stop that which I feel justified in stopping and does not violate my amoral foundation while continuing to write on the subjects akin to what you are currently reading. In other words, I don’t have to associate with those who do immoral acts; this while preparing to defend myself against them should they reject my right to consent.

And it is for that set of reasons why we must continually refine our critical thinking skills so that we may face each situation we are presented with without hesitation that might cause us to stumble when we should react perfectly to save another.

This is why voluntary interactions which respect consent wholly, one hundred percent of the time, are the logical and only compatible choice with amorality which many sentient beings struggle to abide by when after giving value to their own lives. In addition to voluntary interactions, anarchy and voluntaryism are about rejecting unwarranted coercive rulers, but still maintaining rules that originate from the respect of one's right to life as I have thus far explained.

It's the reason why we don't need law enforcement at every grocery store or retail outlet we visit. We understand that the underlying premise of why we can regularly enter such establishments with clockwork efficiency is because we will ultimately respect the consent of the owner of such establishment and interact voluntarily and peacefully to make exchanges. By doing this we are ensuring that the business owner will be able to compensate his or her suppliers who in turn will do the same and continue providing goods and services for us to choose from and utilize.

No government regulation is necessary for such things. Yes, mistakes and bad things done with intent will happen. What will also happen is the removal of power that stems from real authority. Remember that real authority comes from respect. That respect is generated from a variety of numerous interactions which were built on trust. That trust was built upon a variety of numerous interactions that proved to all parties involved that one another also believed his or her life has value and recognized that idea in others too.

This recognition, this trust, this respect, this authority, this power...it all takes many different forms. What is the same about it is that we all use it as a form of currency of one another's characters, reputations. It tells us who is worthy of interacting with pending certain amounts of caution. And with this goes the responsibility of the individual to make these assessments for each and every interaction he or she engages with in order to protect themselves without violating the consent of others to be interacted with in order to coerce their actions to aid your defense.

Government and its supporters would have us believe otherwise. We are told we need to be protected; but protected from whom and what?

Government and its supporters tell us that we need to be protected from the ‘what ifs’ others are capable of without actually telling us the whole truth. The whole truth is that none are guaranteed to do ‘X’ which will require government to exist. So the logic for government is that it must exist on the foundation that ‘X’ will happen. So in order to protect us against ‘X’ government must do ‘Y’ and ‘Z’ to us without our absolute consent.

That becomes a violation of the amoral foundation that many, If not all, government supporters hold on to. That makes them hypocrites in their beliefs or logic. So by justifying that, they then have to back track in order to protect themselves. They back track and get belligerent many times in the process.

Such a process comprised of legalities imposed without true voluntary consent leads to a skewing of understanding in time between morality and legality. This skewing of the ideas then translates into the justification of greater violations of consent, often starting with minor deceptions such as fractional reserve banking. This cheap credit available to the violently governing entity now makes possible the wars in which the common individual dies in. All of this is based on a corrupted understanding of amorality as not be as good as morality but at least equal to immorality.

By allowing this, government supporters lose traction for their cause creating more dissenters through the more frequent violations of consent to being interacted with; all of which will eventually be recognize by various individuals and their various corrupted interpretations of morality based on amorality which they typically do not understand. And when they are not belligerent they utilize multiple logical fallacies in order to justify their positions. Not all government supporters do this. Many liberty minded individuals who are self proclaimed anarchists and the like do this too. However, the problem is not a symptom of the groups and their labels.

I find it to be a symptom of people being victims of critical thinking skills that don’t take into consideration the emotions and thoughts others have as they dictate others to do for them. In other words, people are afraid of being routed out in public as being wrong. This happens a lot on the internet where people are quick to judge and sling mud at one another.

This is another failure of people to recognize, if not completely understand, the amoral foundation of morality. So in the end we are often left with a lot of people who twist the idea of the NAP and the rules of engagement set by rule of law via government to protect themselves. Sometimes, they do this to entertain themselves or profit because they recognize that others aren't catching on to them. And these people are among the most dangerous in a society that is lacking in critical thinking skills because it is dependent on an authority based on unwarranted coercion and violence.

Chapter 05

A-holes, Brutalists, and Jerks

We all know someone who is just a really bitter individual, takes a hard knock approach to life, or chooses to present him or herself as this hardnosed realist with strong or aggressive language. People succumb to such moods and mindsets for a variety of reasons. They cling to an idea, emotion, or a personal experience and let it fester until it has permeated their entire thought process. They are absolutely closed minded to all differing possibilities and don't want to negotiate. In fact, many of these people decide to not recognize the value in life; not yours, not theirs, not anything's, but mostly it's a combination of cherry picked lives that they find valuable, primarily their own.

Unfortunately many of these people happen to support philosophies that are in conflict with their belief that their life is valuable and fail to give the same consideration to others who do not wish to be interacted with. Often when confronted with this acknowledgment the individual then claims they do not mind, therefore it is okay to do the same to others. In fact I

would venture to say that these individuals seem to relish in the border line adherence to the amoral foundation.

Most of these contradictions or conflicts can be rooted into subjectivity arguments. These are comprised of their own personal interpretation of an idea that does not come with any litmus test of leaving everything to appeal to the authority capable of dealing the most violence and destruction in place of logical arguments based on amorality. Typically these come from people who support government or some kind of authority that is allowed to violate your consent to being interacted with or governed at all. A lot of these individuals end up being politicians and hard core political party people.

I used to be one but didn't like the fact that my opponents would point out my contradictions. I hated that. So I withdrew. I began to evaluate much of my support for the Republican Party and in the process found that it was no better than the Democratic Party in the United States. Of course the Libertarian Party still violates the consent of the individual to be governed but as a more benevolent ruler; still a violator of consent though.

But what about when these people are not necessarily government supporters? What happens when these people are common thugs, gang members, or just survival of the fittest style liberty minded individuals?!

Well, the same thing that happens when supporters of government challenge you. You have to adapt to each situation. Few will be the same. The sad truth is that there are people in this world who will do bad things because they can and or because they don't know any better; because they don't understand amorality.

A lot of these people are just trying to gain some authority. They want recognition and respect but go about earning it the same way governments and thugs do. They justify using what they call 'tough' language mixed with some logic. They make their own brand of 'tough love.' These people often have a fair understanding of the NAP and the fact that we have very limited rights, often only one right or none unless we can take it with some kind of violent force; but never simply defend it because they do not understand how to define it.

What the vast majority of these individuals I've encountered cannot do is to actually explain where rights come from as I've done in this work, without appealing to some authority such as

God or the man with the gun. They seem to almost praise and worship the use of violence as a means to bolster their cases. And yes, I can make those arguments too. But violence isn't everything.

The purpose of valuing your life is about preserving it; and preserving your life doesn't always require the use of violence as I've demonstrated throughout this work. Reasoning with other sentient creatures has been, is, and will likely be the preferred method for a long time by those who genuinely seek peace, if not until sentience is wiped from the universe.

Unfortunately there are going to be a whole lot of reasons why people do things that make others uncomfortable without warrant. Some of the worst offenders are the self proclaimed liberty minded individuals. These fellows like to ride the thin line of the NAP.

They goad others into fights with aggressive language and then clobber the individual who escalated the aggression to defend himself with violence against the minor aggressive actions of the original aggressor. It's akin to this situation:

A fellow sits on the porch of his home on his ten square meter piece of land situated against a very busy side walk. Most pedestrians are courteous and stay on the side walk. There is a fence and ample trash receptacles along the side walk. Few people drop anything on the man's property. Despite this, while sitting there he hoots and hollers at people daring them to set foot on his land. He taunts them with foul language, sleight of hand comments, and tones that suggest aggressiveness on the verge of violent action. Eventually someone challenges him and he reveals a gun he was hiding behind his back. He shoots the trespasser who set foot on his property screaming several obscenities in retaliation to the now clearly armed fellow who is appearing in a seemingly defensive position with his gun still on his porch. The fellow on the property shoots the trespasser and then claims self defense.

Of course this situation can turn out different if one of the victims of this land owner calls him out by seeing the gun in hand hidden behind his back. It could also turn out differently if a pedestrian who is the victim of such simply pulls out a gun and shoots the land owner without warning after any number of instances of being targeted by him. But for now, I'll stick with the first.

And that is how far too many people act in this world creating unnecessary duress and complications. I recognize that it is a very simple story; but it is a story rooted in the complexities of our daily interactions, the little snide remarks people make that we are taught to take as a grain of salt. These little encounters built up over time are what give credibility to those people who want to ban everything and let government be in control. Of course this is despite the fact that such things are very much grey area with darker taints of negativity.

They are still borderline violations of the NAP. They are still actions designed to disrupt the individual's ability to peacefully and honestly maintain and or improve the quality of his or her life; and they can be shown that they are intended to degrade the target's quality of life by inducing duress. This is the negative equivalent of ethics; of which we tend to waiver on in consideration of proper punishments. No matter, they are enough to be considered violations of the NAP. Sadly, until enough people understand the definition of amorality, such justified actions in retaliation will not be tolerated.

If a bully picks on a kid with words and condescending tones for weeks on end, who is to suggest that the victim shall not escalate the situation and hurt or kill the bully as reason has failed up to that point? Does it make a difference if the bully and victim are children or adults? What matters here is that compromising on principle a little by rejecting escalating violence against a bully only condones the actions of the bully in time. Each scenario will differ, but the outcome, when reason is rejected by the bully, is almost always the same; an escalation of tactics to violence, to death if necessary.

But this kind of mindset isn't limited of disrupters of the peace, like the aforementioned examples. No. The same thing happens when we are subjected to the teachings of ideas before we have any semblance of critical thinking skills; before we understand how to piece together facts, find them, and formulate ideas in whole on our own, or have succumb to some situation which has removed our critical thinking abilities.

Specifically what I'm talking about is contractual obligations agreed to voluntarily with or without intention to deceive the individual agreeing to them. This happens a lot. In fact this happens more frequently with children coming of legal age than anyone else it seems; apart from the elderly who are not as sharp as they might have once been.

These kinds of people prey on voluntary interactions and it is terribly unfortunate. These are a little different from other direct violations of consent. It's difficult to know whether or not someone is entirely in control of their mental faculties. Even among children it can be difficult to know for certain; and age doesn't constitute a fair assessment of critical thinking skills. Just because someone turns eighteen or twenty-one doesn't mean they are suddenly ready for life outside of a guardian's care. It also doesn't mean that an individual cannot understand just being they are seven years old.

This just ends up being the luck of the draw for most people; although it doesn't have to be this way. If some kind of obligation is required to be made in a specific amount of time for a specific amount of time, then it is probably a bad idea that doesn't allow for much contemplation on the subject in question. It's not entirely fair to say one way or another if such a scam is immoral or not since we cannot always know how astute some people are. We each have to make our own judgment calls on the spot every day.

I hold this position because the interaction is still voluntary. Unless the individual offering the agreement is holding the potential signer of that contract at gun point or in a state of duress to gain compliance then nothing is immoral. Yet, the social contract perpetuators do just this to those capable of critical thinking who refuse agreement.

Additionally, this idea of immoral agreements holds true for elderly, children, and sentient creatures of all ages. There could be a case made for children in relation to education, such as the reciting of the Pledge of Allegiance in the United States. How many children really understand that? How many children really question it? And how many children actually take that statement of obedience seriously?

There could be moral cases made against the teachers for not teaching the full extent of critical thinking skills available at the time to each of their students. That would be the extent of the case and nothing more. However, it would be difficult to prosecute that in the sense that we don't know everything the instant it is realized by anyone else.

So it wouldn't actually be just or fair to do that. Instead it is up to the parents or guardian of children to teach them as best they know how; and if that includes sending them to a school

then all is fine. What is not fine, moral, or just is to threaten the parents to force them to send their kids to a school. Here comes the moral problem again.

It is important to teach children how to maintain and improve the quality of their lives. You could argue that it is moral. It is arguably amoral to provide for them until they can speak and comprehend and think critically to a reasonable level (but determined by whom?) and jettison them off your property.

I stand by that statement because by the time most children can speak well enough to communicate they have begun developing critical thinking skills. Now the amoral thing to do is not hinder their ability to maintain and or improve the quality of their lives. In order to ensure this you as the parent would likely need to see to it that they understand the basics on amorality, morality, and immorality and then follow that up with the rest of liberty and the NAP alongside basic survival skills for the current aspect of societal affairs.

The moral thing to do is to do the basics of the amoral thing and provide additional love and support. It becomes reinforcement so they will lead by your example in the future, which sets the stage for a domino effect on the moral side of the amoral foundation. There is a lot of grey area concerning those without reasoning capabilities. I am very well aware of this.

For the time being, it is enough to take these concepts and apply them to those we know who can reason and value their own lives. That is what is important and a great first step to creating the kind of change that most of us want to see in the world.

And it is that noble idea which I endorse wholeheartedly. I want there to be a positive change in the world and I have started with myself. I don't write ideas like these and then go out with intention to act differently. When I do act differently I stop myself and reevaluate; and I never act hypocritically with intent to harm others, although if I hinder myself there is no victim to prosecute as many laws are written to do for current vices such some recreational drug use.

I understand that there will be conflict in the world. This conflict will almost always stem from individuals failing to recognize the state of mind of those they interact with and to control their own by flexing their cranial muscles to learn how to think critically in order to vigilantly remember amorality in relation to others.

But at the end of the day, liberty cannot exist when destruction is valued higher than creation.

Surprise Chapter

Animal Morality

I didn't include this brief chapter in the table of contents for a reason. It's a topic which is often hotter than human on human morality because animals don't seem to be able to fight back against RPGs, machine guns and napalm. However, people often associate morality with harming other creatures and we must remember that without our technology we wouldn't be necessarily faring as well as we are. The bears, lions, and other carnivorous predators would do us in fairly quickly, hence the likely million years plus struggle to refine our technology and ideas enough to dominate as we currently do. And that includes the concept of morality; which is a construct of sentient creatures also able to communicate their ideas. Morality is a form of technology.

This isn't to suggest that sentient creatures who cannot speak or communicate to us are not worthy of treatment that respects their right to life, provided they find value in their life. The truth is that unless animals can relay to us that they value their lives and are willing to reason and negotiate with us, then we cannot aptly and universally apply an amoral philosophy to them in time as we know we can towards our own children who will in time understand and be able to communicate their own self worth to us.

However, this doesn't mean we should just take it upon ourselves to have carte blanche authority to slaughter for sport any animals we desire. It is perfectly okay and in accordance to the foundation of amorality to not aid non-sentient creatures. What the amoral foundation might suggest is that if we look after the creatures, which all serve a purpose in nature concerning the balance of their habitats, by not destroying them for sport when not useful as food sources, then they may have other value; educational, esthetic, or individual enjoyment of simply being looked at.

Unfortunately, even if a means to fit non-sentient creatures into the philosophy of amorality were devised, then we could not simply just force people to protect them anymore than we can force people to protect others and not be retaliated against for violations of consent to being interacted with. If we wish to protect animals then we must utilize the methods in place derived from amorality between us, between sentient beings we are aware of.

What this means is that we should utilize our property rights to protect animals and other life that we find value in. If we wish to protect elephants on the African plains then we ought to purchase or homestead some property and guard it against poachers. The same holds true for rainforests, grasslands, and oceans.

It's not all fine and noble to use taxes and unwarranted force against others because they are engaging in a destructive act that does not immediately or even remotely immediately threaten your life. Yes, some actions could lead to chain events that will eventually have the possibility of affecting you negatively; but nothing is a guarantee. If you feel so badly about plastic in the oceans then go clean them up. Go start a campaign to raise funds to pay a group to go clean it up and raise awareness about it. But do not demand others pay a fee, fine, or tax for doing something to something that no one specifically holds a legitimate claim over.

Educate people through voluntary campaigns about how keeping the ocean clean will enable the algae to continue producing two-thirds of Earth's oxygen and provide food for us long into the future. But mostly importantly, keep in mind that there will be people out there who just don't care. Target them with your campaigns directly; or others who are willing to go clean up after them. Until you can absolutely prove that 'X' will be the result of certain habits, then you won't have much of a case to assault those individuals for dropping a pint of oil in an ocean. I'm not saying go and pollute, just understand worse things happen by the Earth's own doing than one individual's stupidity.

Now, if there is a river that flows through your property and is polluted by another property owner upstream, then you can take some kind of action. This is how you work through the process of amorality. You can negotiate with that individual. If the individual does not negotiate or seek to reason then you can seek alternative solutions.

Perhaps purchasing the land from him, getting together as land owners down river from him and pleading your case, or if private arbitration is available seek it out. The last resort should be to deprive the polluting land owner of his or her property until it can be proven without any shadow of a doubt that such individual completely and totally rejected reason for correcting his actions on his own.

Of course, the first land owner could also set up a system of filters or implement other devices that we do not fathom yet. There is always a choice; but this does not mean we have to cater to the individual's who seek to reject reason while demanding we respect his or her life. Simply based on the fact that such a polluting individual rejects reason while demanding respect shows the hypocrisy in his or her logic.

At that point and with overwhelming evidence the use of violence to remove the individual from his or her land is not entirely out of question. To many this might seem nothing short of government in the hands of private mobs. In reality it would be much more difficult for private entities to confiscate someone's land as multiple entities to protect and prosecute offenders in private arbitration would exist to appeal with. Their reputations and businesses would be on the line since no taxation would be available to prop them up in the case of a loss, as is the situation with the U.S. Post Office, Freddy Mac, Fannie Mae, and other government run 'businesses.'

Final Remarks

Thank you for reading this work. I hope this helps you to understand the world and your liberty that much more. Remember to be the change in the world that you wish to see. This may seem like such silly advice, but it is the most peaceful way to affect a change.

Others will mimic your behavior and learn by it. Children especially will do this. We don't just need to leave a better world for our children; we should also leave better children for our world.

The world is what we make it and if we are apathetic to the hypocritical immorality others are guilty of, then we do ourselves a disservice. We do not have to tolerate their behaviors. If we speak out against them and look for courage in ourselves first, then we can inspire others.

I didn't write this book or Liberty Defined in a single night or single attempts individually. I wrote both multiple times each before I was satisfied with the end results. And what you have before you is a culmination of my desire to affect a change in the world by writing down my thoughts for you and others to read in the only true sanctuary you have; your mind.

If we cannot be secure there then where can we be secure?

Once again, thank you!

If you've found this work to be helpful, please visit me at www.JimLimberDavis.com and donate. From there, you can find links to my social media outlets and other content I produce and give away for free, as well as paid works.

~~~