

Only one movement in history is considered to be among both the greatest intellectual achievements and the greatest historical events: the founding of the United States. No other nation was founded with both good political principles and sound governance. Those foundational principles are rarely referenced- let alone understood- by contemporary politicians. Abstract concepts are inextricably linked to concrete actions and vice versa, so it's necessary to sort out these concepts in order to properly evaluate government. The sole purpose of government should be to protect individual rights because only this role satisfies the necessities of individual life.

Politics actually comes later down the line in the chain of philosophy, so it's necessary to clarify the predecessors to a political conclusion. On metaphysics and epistemology: reality exists as an absolute and people are able to perceive and interpret it (contrary to Plato's cave). Additionally, only individuals are able to observe, understand, and act relative to reality (no collective consciousness). Given these facts, the ethical responsibility of people is to be rational: to reckon with reality. To be rational is to determine personal values which come from intrinsic motivation and will lead to your happiness (in the Aristotelian sense); this would mean not living by dragging others down or dragging yourself down for the sake of others.

Then comes the political derivations of these ethical conclusions. Individual rights appear when morality enters a social context, and they're meant to protect the individual's ability to live their life. People live when they think and when they act, and the only thing which could stop this ability is force. Rights act to permit moral (rational and individualistic) people to pursue their lives, and rights impose a negative obligation on people to not intervene in others lives with force. Therefore it's necessary for the use of force to be ridded from a society: this is the role of government; thus the police, courts, and military would be the few necessary government institutions.

The right to life includes the right to property. The first cannot exist without the later. If you plant a crop, but your neighbor can steal it all as soon as you harvest it, you have lost your ability to live. This same principle applies to all other cases of property, from financial derivatives to intellectual property. The use of force used to steal property ought to be eliminated by the government in the same way it is when dealing with physical violence: by ending the offense, determining the violation, and punishing the aggressor. It is also important to make clear that fraud is equivalent to robbery. If I have paid five dollars for two dozen eggs but I am delivered one dozen, then my money is being stolen.

Most would argue that the government has the role of promoting general welfare. This view purposefully obfuscates the strict distinction between consensually helping others and the use of government force to do so. It also generally is produced from a viewpoint which doesn't accept the ability of people to think rationally and pursue their own life, as well as the responsibility for the

negative consequences which accompany failing to be rational. It falsely supposes the incapability of the individual, which is why a charismatic leader who will legislate your life tends to accompany it. “General welfare” is such a purposefully broad term that it can be used to justify *any* action by the state. Any focus besides individual rights- whether that be god, the reich, the proletariat, or ‘the good/will of the people-’ will inevitably end tragically, the only question is how quickly. There is effectively no difference between the ideologies preached in the Soviet Union from those in Nazi Germany. Both advocate sacrifice of individual choice for some higher power, in one case ‘the proletariat’ and in the other the ‘aryan race.’ Both are equally evil for their destruction of the individual. When something supersedes the individual, he will be sacrificed to its cause.

Briefly I’ll explain the application of this political philosophy in the United States. Nearly all government regulations and regulatory agencies would be eliminated. This would include eliminating all executive bureaucracy roles except the military departments, the Department of the Treasury, the department of Justice, and all of the health services except those intended for dealing with widespread contagion. The United States Federal government owns nearly 1/3 of all land in the country ([source](#)). If I had the choice, it would only own the land under the capitol building (and military bases and a little more). All unnecessary property would be sold at auction- which maybe could support federal spending for years. Enormous government programs like medicare, medicaid, and social security would be incrementally eliminated, probably over the course of about forty years. All foreign aid would be eliminated. Federal, state, and local government spending accounts for nearly half of US gdp ([source](#) - I’ve extrapolated for spending since COVID). This means that the US is effectively already in a very large part socialist. Ideally, total government spending would be about 5% of GDP. On a state and local level, government would be similarly gutted. Zoning laws would be eliminated. Like the federal government, only roles which directly relate to dealing with the use of force would exist, most importantly police and courts.

Though I advocate this philosophy and form of government because of its rational principled basis, not its great prospects, I think it’s nice to explore the potential results of its implementation. I am interested in urban design and I very often see sad pictures of American cities with winding highways and enormous parking lots. The car may have become relatively popular without government regulations, requirements, and buildings regarding transportation, but very likely we wouldn’t have the urban hellscape which exist today due to requirements for single family zoning ([source](#)). I can’t claim to know exactly the outcome of eliminating zoning regulations and privatizing roads, but I can at least say it would be possible to build beautiful neighborhoods like Beacon Hill of Boston or most American downtowns, whereas with current regulations, none new are popping up. Beauty and government are really antonyms, but aesthetics are not the only thing government harms. Take the

FDA for example, which regulates what drugs can come to market as one aspect of its current job. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have died because it was *illegal* for them to access life-saving drugs which had already been created ([source](#)). Likely millions have died because of the misincentive structure the FDA created. A company has no incentive to create a risky but high potential drug because it almost surely will never come to market, even though it may have the potential to save many lives. Countless other government regulations have and do cause loss of life and happiness because they did or do outlaw consensual interactions. As Ron Swanson simply puts it: “Whatever happened to ‘Hey, I have some apples, would you like to buy them?’ ‘Yes, thank you!’ That’s as complicated as it should be to open a business in this country.” ([source](#)) Consensual relationships should never be illegal.

It’s remarkable how positively this philosophy reflects the outcomes of countries. In 100 years, the fishing village of Hong Kong became one of the richest cities on earth because of its unparalleled degree of freedom. Until the 1990s, India had an extensive system of government bureaucracy which restricted economic freedoms. Since then it has worked to tear down the ‘License Raj’ in favor of a capitalist system, and its GDP per capita has gone from \$300 to \$2000 ([source](#)). Chile used to be under control of a collectivist rights-violating government, it then began to better recognize and protect individuals, and now has the highest standard of living in South America ([source](#)). The opposite is true as well. Venezuela was once a free and capitalist country, one of the richest in the world, but the Maduro regime ushered in nationalization of liberty for the supposed intention of helping ‘the people.’ Those people have in two generations been brought from prosperity to poverty. The stark difference seen from the sky at night on the Korean peninsula represents tremendous suffering of the poor authoritarian north and widespread wealth of the south ([source](#) 7). The suffering faced in authoritarian countries cannot be justified because it accomplishes some higher goal because there is no higher goal. The starvation which North Koreans face is unimaginable, but it could be solved in two weeks if the Juche government was replaced by one like which exists in America.

The tremendous progress the world has undergone in the last four centuries was not inevitable, and under different paradigms, would not have occurred. Since the dawn of time, there has been conflict between the rational and irrational, Aristotelian and Platonic. If the Aristotelian hadn’t prevail in the enlightenment, we would probably all still be using hand tools to toil the soil of our king land. If the rational had taken full stage just after ancient Greece, there could’ve been men on the moon by the year 1000. Centuries have been wasted without meaning on irrational wars and other activities. It’s vital to recognize what facilitates this prosperity and understand why it does; that is: governments acting only to protect individual rights because each individual is the sovereign ruler only of their own life. I don’t attach much personally to politics, and it isn’t much of a bother to me if the country heads

in the exact opposite direction I'd like it to, because I feel pain and pleasure as one person, my soul does not track the soul of our nation. I do, though really like to learn, and hate when people talk flippantly about serious things (unless they are being funny). I dislike bland politicians who have founded their political beliefs on anything other than rational consideration. Most politicians talk and act for political maneuvering, so I dislike most politicians. Ultimately I would hope that politicians discard the evil method of realpolitik and to return to the principled arguments this country was founded upon. It would absolutely be beneficial to the country and the people, but more importantly, it would be correct.