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Introduction

Classical philosopher Plato once argued that the human soul is unsatisfied by carnal needs and desires of the body but only truly gains through the pursuit of knowledge. Flattery, for example, serves no purpose to the soul but simply for the delight of the receiver as a pleasure of the body. One must ask henceforth, however, what is knowledge; the age-old question that plagued Socrates throughout most of his life in Plato’s works? Knowledge is, simply, justified experience but not in the way one figures as only justifiable. A justified experience must survive the constant evaluation and reevaluation to remain Knowledge, and must also be applicable in the same way to others’ evaluations and reevaluations. Knowledge also has ability to be perfect, i.e. Perfect Knowledge, as a pinnacle of humanity’s scientific exploration of its surroundings, including spatial and spiritual realms of existence. What is important here is the specific notion of scientific evaluation: theory, hypothesis, and all the functions of testing, to include methods. This Knowledge acquired by scientific study and corroboration of evaluation differs from perceptual knowledge because of perceptual knowledges culpability and attachment to the infallible Self, meaning that knowledge gained by the Self and only the Self succeeds in the rational test of that singular individual and survives through self-repetition; perceptual knowledge fails the test of consistent reproduction of outside testers. If one individual, per say, found that the equation $1 + 1 = 2$ were to be fallible and susceptible to failure, under the evaluation and reevaluation of the hypothesis, the collective perception of humankind has failed in its attempt to gain Perfect Knowledge but must also evaluate and reevaluate the failure to keep consistent the finding of the refuter. Perfect Knowledge, therefore, is infallible and inculpable to the scientific tests of the tester and is the goal of humankind in its quest for Knowledge as a Perfect Truth. A Perfect Truth is synonymous with Perfect Knowledge simply because of the
infallibility and inculpability of both; a Perfect Truth only maintains its status until proven otherwise, which is why perceptual knowledge does not lie within the realm of Perfect Knowledge, unless the single being lives spatially alone and the one only delineates perceptual knowledge versus Perfect Knowledge through their own testing, of which may not be either proven or refuted by another, i.e. holding Perfection centered on the being, alone.

The Politics of the City versus Bare Life (zoē) are the systems of society and the State of Nature that conflict with each other, as the Politics of the City speak to the elongated preservation of life, subsequently counterbalancing against the inevitability of Death, while Bare Life embraces the balance of both, in a natural state. The Sovereign of the City, protects those that wish protection from the eventualities of Death and seek out, in their own interest, ways to subvert it. Politics of the City and, subsequently, “[t]he state enables humans to overcome the situation of insecurity that pervades the state of nature. It facilitates collective action by bringing people under one rule.”¹ This preservation is the implication of the society’s preference over that of the State of Nature for humankind. Institutions of Politics take humans out of the State of Nature, then, to reduce the Fear of Death by the capacity of the state / City / institutions.

Family is a source of Politics, as there are hierarchies, authority, and good and evil, moral and immoral, within the governing system—which also contains its set of familial laws, outside of the state of nature, giving security to those within the system.

Religion is also a source, as the sovereignty of God or a god—or many—rules and governs over humankind, to which one may be punished for transgressions against the Sovereign for committing sins (evils). The balance system of the State of Nature no longer is the Sovereign of

¹ Dubreuil
the individual but the deities that govern, willing the life or death of individuals. The laws of religion, then, become their own system of governance, by which humans live outside the state of nature. Locke argues that God’s will and law resides within the state of nature, to which he is not completely wrong—God is included in the state of nature by creating it but the system excludes the god that created it by the sovereignty not lying with God (though the system could be changed by any time by God) but with the system that was created, in the sense of how humans are governed in the state of nature. In a sense, God’s perfect system—the consistent balance of Life & Death—is self-regulating and God’s approach is akin to state vis-à-vis economy ‘Laissez-faire’.

Humans, however, may choose / be forced to leave the City to return to the State of Nature by leaving the capacity of the state (the Sovereign) or becoming separated from society or the community. Politics do not exist in the State of Nature, as they reside within the City, of where the state has capacity to govern. One does not commit to being the subject of Politics unless willing to, through contract, under the need for protection against Death, and this also applies to animals that subject themselves to the rule of Politics, such as pack animals.

**Bounded Rationality & Overcoming Death**

Akin to how hunters began to migrate from smaller, individual game to Wooly Mammoths, a human system of communal survival, with the perception of cooperative security as achieving individually unsurmountable odds, took shape to overcome the eventuality and inevitability of Death. Rousseau even stated that, in reference to collective action, “…it is impossible to conceive how man, by his own powers alone, without the assistance of
communication, and the spur of necessity, could have got over so great an interval”² The development of Bounded Rationality—the thought that many individuals may overcome odds that are, individually, unachievable—helped citizens within the State of Nature leave and create society or the City, to include the norm of familial connectivity, as family ties are stronger than communal.

Humans, then, overcome death by creating structures, hierarchies, and communities that seek to undermine the balance of the system, to prolong life, and, through the creation of these human systems, create Good and Evil, moral and immoral boundaries for those to fall within to counteract the possibility of harm, pain, and suffering, which lead to Death. The natural law of Life & Death, Order Itself and Chaos Itself begins to cripple under the pressures of human life smothering the counterbalancing Death and the Yin & Yang perfect structure becomes imperfect.

All within the State of Nature are equal, in that they all may live and die, and that these all, through the conceptualization of their possible violent deaths from others or starvation but overarchingly the permanence of Death, combine common interests of survival—as equals to overcome the starvation or beast that seeks to claim them. What takes these equals out of the State of Nature, however, is when one or many decide that they are politically unequal to their common animal kin and that the permanent Death is vulnerable to the strength of the many. The foraging bands turned social hierarchies became subject to human law above that of nature.³ This human / positive law, or Politics of the City—created through the need of survival and, subsequently, Bounded Rationality—gave humankind the ability to surpass its pre-sociopolitical animal counterparts in the natural system of the State of Nature, defeating the ‘nasty, brutish, and

---

² Jean-Jacques Rousseau. 17
³ Dubreuil
short’ expectancy of natural life and creating humankind’s own self-determination of Life and Death, to the point of state / institutional capacity to provide for its citizens, stolen from their natural state of existence.

**Life**

*Republican Security Theory*

The focal point of Republican Security theory addresses human ‘political arrangements’ for the benefit of security, but particularly against violence and violent power.\(^4\) Daniel Deudney, in *Bounding Power: Republican Security Theory from the Polis to the Global Village*, deduces that security results from the presence of restraints on violent power…imposed by the material context or in socially constructed limits provided by political practices and structures.\(^5\) In a different manner of approaching the importance of Life to individuals, Deudney corroborates the necessity of Political Evolution but comes to a different conclusion on the particular reasoning centered on the aspect of only Life and not the function that permanent Death plays into the need for social constructs such as the City. Political Evolution derives, however, from the human understanding of the Natural system and overcomes it through the extension of Self and, to achieve this extension, the Bounded Rationality of institutional protections.

\(^4\) Deudney, Daniel
\(^5\) Id.
Death

Fear

The fear of death overrides the ‘perfect freedom’ of the State of Nature--because one cannot be free if they fear constantly—but is a perfect freedom from sovereign authority, except from the sovereign system of Order & Chaos that is Life and Death within the State of Nature; the sovereignty maintains itself without the input of an entity / system / being above the Natural system. This Natural system puts into place the theme of “more formidable enemies, and against which man is not provided with the same means of defence; I mean natural infirmities, infancy, old age, and sickness of every kind, melancholy proofs of our weakness….” Human weakness, susceptibility to death, and the permanence of Death then, drive the will to better predict moments of potential death and create the sensation of fear—predicated on the notion that humans have knowledge of the concept of death. Human babies, not knowing death, may only fear pain, much akin to how one may not fear a killer in the house if one does not know of the killer’s existence, unless the conceptualization of a potentiality of a killer is created (constructed). The conceptual knowledge of what death is, but moreover what is unknown about death, spurs, then, the human fear of it; the ability to cease existence, without the reservation that we may survive after death due to God or an entity outside the Natural system’s intervention or will, is maddening. With survival, as, “…his only concern, he must exercise those faculties most, which are most serviceable in attacking and in defending, whether to subdue his prey, or to prevent his becoming that of other animals….”

---

6 Rousseau. 8
7 Id. 12
All animals know harm and that the fear of extreme harm/pain (to include being killed) which is the fear for them that drives in the State of Nature. Human knowledge of death, as a concept, not in Death Itself, lives in the State of Nature because of prey and predator, kill or be killed, and Life versus Death that drive the system of nature, such as one observing a plant bloom, while the one next to it dies or other animals dying from becoming prey to their natural predators, e.g. death from another animal or starvation. “…one animal never passes unmoved by the dead carcass of another animal of the same species: there are even some who bestow a kind of sepulture upon their dead fellows….”8 Conceptual knowledge of not just pain but of Political (permanent) Death, separates man from beast within the State of Nature and allows for humanity to leave the State of Nature, and these conceptualizations cause a need to surmount Political Death, in its non-insurmountable forms. One may argue, however, that animals through the caring of their young understand the extension of Self but one must also understand that within the animal kingdom, the line between State of Nature and the City is not easily transgressed. The line between State of Nature and the City depicts itself within animal social groupings, such as wolf packs that overcome individuality to as a group survive, and with creatures such as certain spiders that sacrifice themselves for the ensured survival of their extension of self. What truly gives humanity an out from this line of delineation, then, is the pivotal role of the abstraction to the Natural system that lives outside of the system while also being able to act in it, living in a state of exception.9

---

8 Rousseau 30
9 Giorgio Agamben.
Rousseau, however, argues that death is predictable on a mass level and that most threats are knowable to humans, and so humans do not fear these things, when measured against the individual strength:

…that nothing is more fearful than man in a state of nature, that he is always in a tremble, and ready to fly at the first motion he perceives, at the first noise that strikes his ears. This, indeed, may be very true in regard to objects with which he is not acquainted; and I make no doubt of his being terrified at every new sight that presents itself, as often as he cannot distinguish the physical good and evil which he may expect from it, nor compare his forces with the dangers he has to encounter; circumstances that seldom occur in a state of nature, where all things proceed in so uniform a manner, and the face of the earth is not liable to those sudden and continual changes…

How may one, however, measure the amount of venom in a snake that one may not see, or even if one can see, identify, and come to know it as an aggressor, can one know at what threshold it will strike? Can one sleep through the suddenness, invisibility, and unpredictability of nighttime, which is fundamentally why humans became more day-walkers and not nocturnal creatures? The uniformity of Nature lies not within the threats, because the threats are never completely predictable, but within the Natural system: Life & Death, which is perfectly predictable. From this predictability, one may note that through death, there is created life (energy is neither created nor destroyed), and through life, there is pain and suffering, pleasure and happiness, ending with death.

The ‘after-life’; The Void as Chaos

The knowable death, if humans were to be presumed rational creatures, would not instill fear into the lives of humankind and death would be an acceptable occurrence, which is reflected in some cultures. There is, moreover, a sense of comfortability in some of older age about dying or a feeling of a full life. Death for these two groups is seemingly equivocal to those who fear

10 Rousseau. 7
Death above all else because of the difference between acceptance of mortality of humankind versus the notion that the end is an occurrence that indiscriminately takes. What would not be rational, however, would to accept the permanence of death without resigning oneself to a larger picture or entity, as there would effectively be no consequential point to life, particularly if one’s death contributed nothing to a greater whole. The unknowable Political Death that constrains humankind from truly embracing the inevitability of death is—without continuance of higher beings, a cyclical system, or an extension of Self—a nothingness of Chaos which humans fear: The Void. The Void essentially is the nonexistence of after-life and supreme permanence of Death for the individual, which is unavoidable by humankind alone, and because of its nonexistence, is unknowable to humans. The Void being nothingness and unknowable, then, is the real injury of the soul or, essentially, its true death and separation from the cycle of Nature. While the pain and fear of normal death seems to be the driving force behind the human drive to create government and evade the State of Nature that seeks to do harm, the fear is embedded in the unknowable force that seeks to destroy that which longs to continue and be whole by Perfect Knowledge: the soul. If one dies and the soul is not recycled into Nature, stemming from beliefs of reincarnation or integration, post-death, then death becomes permanent and the individual has no form of continuance or no meaning in life. The implication, therefore, is that individuals without extensions of Self experience a destruction of the soul and truly die, exemplifying the true pain and fear of Death.

What is separable, then, is death of individuals or death of the body and the true Death of the soul. These two phenomena are different not simply because of the implication that follows as the death that can be overcome versus an everlasting destruction of the individual through the elimination of the soul but the means of arrival through living within Politics and the removal of
self from said Politics, specifically the overtaking of Politics by bios, explained later in the work. The fear of permanent death of the soul drives the creation of the Politics of Infinity through the Bounded Rationality to surmount the impossibilities of overcoming Death and, consequently, Politics from individuals’ will imposing their extension of Self onto that which makes them infinite. Politics surround and intertwine entities of religion, nationalism, and even familial structures once they are used to extend the individual from the permanence of Death into a possible continual political space for the soul. The state as a form of extension of nationality and even as political representation of individuals, being protectorates from the State of Nature, create institutional protections to allow for individuals to exhume themselves out of the State of Nature and become a part of the City or Politics, separating themselves from pure bios (the State of Nature). There is, however, the inherent ability for humans to remove themselves from the City and reenter into the State of Nature, returning to the later explained ‘bare life’ of Giorgio Agamben; one who holds the ability to willingly enter a state of being must inherently have the ability to leave said state of being.

**Politics of Infinity & Death**

What separates humankind from Death, to include Political Death (permanent dissolution of one’s individual being), is the Politics of Infinity or the notion of Self-continuation through Politics that are temporally infinite. This concept of the Politics of Infinity extends the individual through three basic human constructs: Religion, Nationalism, and, tied together, honor / family / community. While these three constructs are not exhaustive, depending on cultural differences between societies, nor do they hold for every individual—one may elect to cast aside these elements and, therefore, revoke their own sense of continuance—these constructs are basic means of interconnecting the Politics of Infinity and the human need / want for them, even if one chooses of their own volition to resist against these structures of power.
Religion

Religion is a form of power structure that surrenders humanness to an outside force which has the ability to actively or passively act on humankind. While religions are broad in their practices and even individual interpretation or participation, all share in commonality an abstraction to system: the balance of Life & Death in the State of Nature. Through this removed status from the infinitesimal cycle within the State of Nature the abstraction of the entity—whether tangible or a concept—allows for humankind to solve the problem of permanent, Political Death particularly in the entity’s ability to or even willingness to intervene in the cycle.

Nationalism

Nationalism as a political function allows for the individual to be extended by the “Imagined Community\(^{11}\) that the individual politically shapes and defines through its interaction within it and exertion of political power on it. The Imagined Community, by becoming a political projection of Self onto the conceptualization of group identity, creates the possibility of overcoming Political Death by the individual always being a portion of the political identity of the group. Benedict Anderson, in *Imagined Communities*, portrays the Imagined Communities of nation as something individuals are *willing* to die for and that these ‘limited imaginings’ give individuals common political meaning / identity across time and space.

Honor & Family

Seemingly honor and family exist outside of oneself but it, in fact, continues as an extension from the individual, preserving the self through continuation of the social construct and blood line. Community and ethnicity, then, is also an extension of self that can be traced to

\(^{11}\) Benedict Anderson. *Imagined Communities.*
the commonality between groups which is influenced by and keeps alive the individual. Honor is specifically interesting as an extension of Self because one lives within and, consequently, is extended by the code of society, living—and dying—to reinforce the social construct of morality and values, becoming a social investment to the continuation of said constructs. When an individual violates code of honor, they take themselves out of the society or are cast out and become *homo sacer*, and, moreover, have the potential to politically cease to be: Political Death.

*Death*

Death is not inherently evil, as it is a part of the process or cyclical nature of existence and not non-existence but a differing form of existence that was an original form, such as the death of a star creating other stars and other life. It is, therefore, a balance to the event of life and death that sustained by the Natural system. Death, as individuals come to understand it, is not the terrifying end-all to one’s existence with the extension of the Self that overcomes Political Death. The soul, therefore, lives on and continues into the human institution that is the will toward a Perfect Knowledge.

*State of Nature*

The State of Nature, being a natural state of things—as denoted in its namesake—is, as Locke argues, “...what state all men are naturally in, and that is a state of perfect freedom to order their actions and dispose of their possessions and persons as they think fit, within the bounds of the law of nature, without asking leave, or depending upon the will of any other man.”¹² This state of natural being, then, allows the individual, removed from the bounds of society and its laws, the ability to conduct life as they see fit, without over binding regard to

---

¹² John Locke. 99
others. The perfect freedom in the State of Nature, in essence, allows freedom from any living sovereign, to include religion, familial institutions, or political hierarchies. This state, however, is not perfect freedom from the system of nature, as Nature’s laws still applies to those that live within its bounds. This, therefore, gives way to the natural human fear of death; to them, since there is no entity or institution after death, the event is the end of existence for the individual. No memory or tradition carries on for the dead and so, by this logic, death of the individual is of the most fright to those who live. A drive of humankind, then, is to exist as long as possible and avoid death where it can, which eventually leads to where humans are today, in societies with politics and structure that ensures the survival of the multitude, as they (the societies) have capacity to provide.

*State of Nature: Literature Review*

Humans in the state of nature, according to John Locke, are inherently equal; “no one having more than another,”¹³ and, “…there being nothing more evident than that creatures of the same species and rank, promiscuously born to all the same advantages of nature, and the use of the same faculties, should also be equal one amongst another without subordination or subjections…”¹⁴ This Lockean notion is predicated on the fact that though one may be stronger in one aspect of nature, such as brute strength, other individuals may equalize through other talent areas, leveling out the playing field of survival among the species. The state of natural equality, then, “…has a law of nature to govern it, which obliges every one; and the reason, which is that law, teaches all mankind who will but consult it, that, being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty, or possessions,”¹⁵ to which

---

¹³ Locke 99-100
¹⁴ Id. 100
¹⁵ Id. 101
a natural peace occurs and sets a precedence of inner-species respect, sharing in their communal sense of living in a natural state. One within this peaceful state of nature,

“… is bound to preserve himself, and not to quit his station willfully, so, by the like reason, when his own preservation comes not in competition, ought he, as much as he can, to preserve the rest of mankind, and may not, unless it be to do justice on an offender, take away or impair the life, the liberty, health, limb, or goods of another,”\(^\text{16}\) and, “…sharing all in one community of nature, there cannot be supposed any such subordination among us, that may authorize us to destroy one another, as if we were made for one another’s uses, as the inferior ranks of creatures are for ours”\(^\text{17}\).

Through the Lockean ideal, humans are not able to subject themselves to the will of other humans, as they do not allow for the ‘life, the liberty, health, limb, or goods’ of the subjected individual within the State of Nature and, as a citizen of the Natural State, this does not convey individual interest—to be subject to another’s will and not benefit equally from it. A sort of contract of willingness, then, must be established for those subjected to be rightfully subjected to the authority of another within the State of Nature and, “…the lord and Master of them all should by any manifest declaration of his will set one above another, and confer on him, by an evident and clear appointment, an undoubted right to dominion and sovereignty.” \(^\text{18}\)

Locke also argues that humans must obey the law of nature and that the ability to carry out punishment accompanies all rightful individuals (those who obey the law of nature) provided by God, insomuch,

…that all men may be restrained from invading others’ rights, and from doing hurt to one another, and the law of nature be observed, which willeth the peace and preservation of all mankind, the execution of the law of nature is in that state put into every man’s hand, whereby every one has a right to punish the transgressors of that law to such a degree as may hinder its violation. For the law of nature would, as all other laws that concern men in this world, be in vain if there were

\(^{16}\) Id. 103
\(^{17}\) Id. 101-2
\(^{18}\) Id. 100
nobody that, in the state of nature, had a power to execute that law, and thereby preserve the innocent and restrain offenders.\textsuperscript{19}

\ldots it is that every man in the state of nature has a power to kill a murderer, both to deter others from doing the like injury, which no reparation can compensate\ldots the common rule and measure God hath given to mankind, hath, by the unjust violence and slaughter he hath committed upon one, declared war against all mankind, and therefore may be destroyed as a lion or a tiger\ldots with whom men can have no society nor security.\textsuperscript{20}

In this, Locke uses God’s Laws as the law of nature, surmising that morality has a staunch position within the State of Nature, and that humans must follow it or be declared committing of injury, subsequently punished by the law-abiding, to collectively ensure security of the whole, humankind—preventing chaos.

Thomas Hobbe’s State of Nature, however, depicts the natural state of humans is chaotic and painful, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau would point out, “Hobbes would have it that man is naturally void of fear, and always intent upon attacking and fighting.”\textsuperscript{21} One may visualize a Hobbesian State of Nature as a modern-day post-apocalyptic Anarchy film or the ‘Wild West,’ in which no lives were guaranteed by institutional safety, and that, “…man is by nature concerned with things that will further him individually, whether or not this holds for society at large as well.”\textsuperscript{22} The guarantee for individual furtherance, then, is a contract between citizen and Sovereign, created to give the Sovereign authority over the individual and the individual safety from other individuals or sovereigns.

Rousseau’s argument is that man is more fit to survive in a state of nature than in society, as society makes one soft and disease-prone, and cannot so easily defeat the enemies that mean to do harm, as easily as one who is savage—residing in the state of nature. Protection from the Sovereign, then, allows readily allows more death than the State of Nature that hardens the

\textsuperscript{19} Locke 103
\textsuperscript{20} Id. 105
\textsuperscript{21} Rousseau 7
\textsuperscript{22} Thomas Hobbes. 2
individual and also escapes the disease of the City. The contradictory ‘suppositions’ in the State of Nature are to ‘be robust and dependent.’ The supposition of human strength within the State of Nature versus outside of it shows that one is able to overcome death on their own better than with society, and as such, a self-interested human may wish to reside outside of the family or the system, fore, “[n]ature treats them exactly in the same manner that Sparta treated the children of her citizens; those who come well formed into the world she renders strong and robust, and destroys all the rest….” The human within the State of Nature, according to Rousseau, is also destitute of every species of knowledge, experiences no passions but those of this last kind; his desires never extend beyond his physical wants; he knows no goods but food, a female, and rest; he fears no evil but pain, and hunger; I say pain, and not death; for no animal, merely as such, will ever know what it is to die, and the knowledge of death, and of its terrors, is one of the first acquisitions made by man, in consequence of his deviating from the animal state.

But as such, humans know no evil because he is ‘destitute of every species of knowledge’ and because the human does not know, they cannot commit evil. A child cannot commit an evil if they do not know what evil is, even if it inflicts harm upon another individual. Rousseau, however, contradicts himself by saying that “…one animal never passes unmoved by the dead carcass of another animal of the same species: there are even some who bestow a kind of sepulture upon their dead fellows….” In this, animals must know the concept of Death, and as such, have knowledge of it, so one may surmise that humans also have these experiences and conceptualizations. Human exceptionalism within the State of Nature, then, does not exist insofar as humankind remains within it and conceptualizes nothing being beyond the Natural system.

---

23 Jean-Jacques Rousseau. 29
24 Id. 6
25 Id. 16
26 Id. 30
Structures, Hierarchy, & Community

As described by Benoît Dubreuil in, Human Evolution and the Origins of Hierarchies, “cognitive abilities…create[d] new possibilities in terms of social organization that indirectly paved the way for the resurgence of hierarchies among humans”\textsuperscript{27} as their “enhanced ability to coordinate conflicting perspectives on objects and concepts” “[made] it possible to collectively attribute conventional statuses to particular individuals so they can then speak on behalf of the group.”\textsuperscript{28} These given statuses, then, allowed for the formulation of a “most significant turning point between nonstate and state societies[,] occur[ing] when an individual is authorized to delegate to others the power to sanction normative transgressions.”\textsuperscript{29} This Sovereign then uses their contractual authority to protect the citizens from the State of Nature, akin to how a Mother or Father protects their young from death, prolonging its life. As such, the equality that humans inherently seek ultimately lead them to subjecting themselves under one common rule,\textsuperscript{30} retaining the equality of the State of Nature, but is undermined by the inequalities within the political system, in the ability to sanction and promote norm following,\textsuperscript{31} such as economic ability or political power.

These hierarchies provide capacity to the Sovereign, for it to extend its reach to the smallest outskirts of its territorial society, while delegating authority to those with their respective powers. In capitalism, the Sovereign dictates the delegated authority of rich because they (the rich) control the smaller cogs through economic norms. If, essentially, corruption is a systemic power of the rich, then the poor / middle-class will reciprocate this norm, in order to

\textsuperscript{27} Dubreuil
\textsuperscript{28} Id.
\textsuperscript{29} Id.
\textsuperscript{30} Id.
\textsuperscript{31} Id.
survive / not challenge the norm set by the economically powerful, among other reasons. This has an indirect implication for the State of Nature because of the control extended upon citizens, and their Fear of Death is reduced to the amount of protection given by the norms of the system and the Sovereign. The Sovereign, then, has power over Life and Death and allows some death in order to protect the majority, replacing the sovereignty of the State of Nature: the system.

Community, though—subtracting the inner workings of family—simulates the existence of equality between individual parties based on the protection for the group, by the group, and serves as an example of a system that counteracts the State of Nature through institutional norms and not sovereign power. Group rule provides to counteract the Fear of Death that holds over the individual but seeks to maintain equality of the individuals in order to not subject them to the will of one, who may distinguish those who allowed to die and those needed to live, creating the aforementioned inequalities.

Locke also states that sovereigns of the international community are within the state of nature, so it does exist as a state of human being. This, however, is discounting the modern fact that many states now follow the sovereignty of the international system, in which the Sovereign of the system is the institutions and norms that hold those within its capacity from acting outside of its law—though, with this, there are those that still reside in the international State of Nature by refusing to adhere to these set norms, submitting to the Sovereign, under contract.

Without these systems to govern individuals, the State of Nature would hold its sovereignty over the citizen, meaning that the unmitigated Fear of Death and Pursuit of Life would control every aspect of them (the individual) and, as Rousseau states, “…how could this

32 (Locke 107).
situation engage men to cultivate the earth, as long as it was not parceled out among them, that is, as long as a state of nature subsisted?"\textsuperscript{33} The State of Nature, against the structures, hierarchies, and communities of humankind, attempts to maintain the commonality of resources, not given to any one and subject to the use of all that can work it, while also excluding those who cannot use it or obtain it from other players within the natural state.

\textit{Sovereignty}

\textit{Agamben’s Sovereignty}

Modern democracies are the indistinguishability of the biopolitical horizon that has created an overstep of the sovereign, becoming a totalitarian state instead of one of democracy, through the interference of what they (the sovereign) are not sovereign over: Life Itself. Modern democracies cage the citizens, encamping them, to protect them from the loss of freedom but, instead, create a Martial Law (state of exception) for those that are outside of it but also included. Homo Sacer is bare life that participates in juridical-political order (participates in politics) under the condition that it is subject to the power of death (sovereignty). Therefore, the biopolitical horizon between zoē and bios is becoming indeterminate in the fact that they may both be killed. Those within the city may moreover be killed because they, theoretically and in some fashion, participate in the order and give power to the sovereign who commands/wields the power of death and violence.

Democracies, ruled by the will and sovereignty of the ‘One’ (E pluribus Unum), takes control of both bare life and politics, and the political nature of bare life and those that live

\textsuperscript{33} (Rousseau 18).
political lives become hostages of the state of exception, where emergency has become the rule, living within the sovereign sphere, in which they are permitted to be killed but not sacrificed. Moreover, because the, “sovereign traces the threshold” (the state of exception), “the state of exception opens the space in which the determination of a certain juridical order and particular territory first becomes possible; the state of exception is unlocalizable,”\textsuperscript{34} a.k.a. uncontrollable. Through this, the sovereign has total power to grant the unlocalizable a “permanent and visible localization,”\textsuperscript{35} which one may equate to concentration camps. Therefore, through Agamben’s writings, one may determine that in the sphere of sovereignty—where the biopolitical horizon is blurred so much that the bios and zoē are indistinguishable—encamps the citizens to protect the freedoms and may kill but not sacrifice anyone. This depicts the horror of a concept of E pluribus Unum, in that the ‘One’ may confine and kill the many, much like Hitler did to the Jewish or mentally ill populations, for the benefit—and under the will—of the ‘One’: the sovereign. In this, the ‘One’ control and kill Homo Sacer, with impunity, by which the determination of within and without, inclusion and exclusion are indeterminate, thereby laying to rest the possibility of thriving democracies, of which may explode at any moment.

The implications for us, today, is that more and more zoē is taken into politics, such as sex/sexual orientation, gender, and ethnicity. This fact is disturbing, because biopolitics are definitionally, “the form/way of living proper to an individual or group and community founded on good and evil, just and unjust….\textsuperscript{36}” How can the sovereign say, rightly, that being a certain ethnicity or sex is unjust and therefore, the bare life or Homo Sacer must be killed? Are we all encamped by the sovereign, to save us from ourselves but killed, nonetheless, selectively, until

\textsuperscript{34} Giorgio Agamben. Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life.
\textsuperscript{35} Id.
\textsuperscript{36} Id.
only the ‘desirables’ remain, much like Hitler’s selected Aryan race? That, in and of itself, is unjust by nature, and cannot constitute as order, but chaos, seeding the destruction of democracy, much akin to the destruction of democratic Germany.

The States

Anderson’s Imagined Communities (Micro Political Evolutions)

Communities over time evolved into imagined communities through the extraterritoriality of nationalism as an extension of the Self by language and information sharing. The micro political evolutions from individuals roaming toward hunter-gatherer societies and, eventually, the state have institutionally protected individuals from death, as Deudney portrays, but also the Political Death, whether through intentional group furtherance or the welfare state that directly attempts to uphold the lives of its citizenry.

International Law (Macro Political Evolutions)

To help depict the possibility of Political Evolutions, a case study of international interaction and, therefore, law may be useful to contemporary visualization of institutional growth from Bounded Rationality to overcome death and Political Death. The equivalencies between the apparent micro and macro form of political evolution stem from the necessity of positive law to protect against the State of Nature, as explained in subsequent paragraphs.

International law, as one may see through observations of its practice and institutionalization, is problematic in the sense that no entity claims sovereignty over the states
that generate legislation (*juris generative*), adjudicate disputes, and enforce the law. These sovereign states, therefore, retain their natural power and, subsequently, their freedoms from the violence of the law that, normally, states exact. This natural power and the ability for contemporary states to act seemingly and relatively unfettered, for the self-centered interest of the individual state, has led writers like Goldsmith & Posner down an ideological trap of unadulterated Realist thought, insofar that they (the writers and political scientists) see nothing in the construction of international law as both a form of power but also a surrender of it to the sense of community: the international community.

The modern idea of sovereignty established by Treaty of Westphalia (1648), in the European context, separated states into autonomous entities that no longer answered to supranational Church rule and into entities where kings of territories held sole sovereign power and, with that, self-determination that is inherent to the right of the individual (the state / nation), according to their natural power, and, consequently, the responsibility of *salus populi*. The power vacuum left by the devolution of Church sovereign power allowed the European states the opportunity to seize again the individual liberty, which changed the sociopolitical structure of the international system into a seemingly simulated macro-level State of Nature.

What is important to identify, therefore, is how this level of individual sovereign power has influenced the current theoretical structure of international system: a Communal Leviathan, i.e. a system of governance that centers the sovereignty on not one individual but the collective

---


of individuals, all the while recognizing the sovereign and natural power of the individual to conduct themselves as they see fit, with only the reprisal of the group to fear; one must also respect the power structure and hierarchies within this system to fully comprehend the conduct of each state, in regards to coherence and non-coherence to international law, as well as which states would be considered originating consenters or joining consenters. To examine the contemporary structure and properly project a theory of a Communal Leviathan, one must establish the assumptions necessary to all political theory in preparation to create a sustainable thesis and, subsequently, normative arguments, thereafter. The thesis arrived to and present, therefore, is that sovereign states within the international community surrender their absolute sovereignty, through social compact with other states, to create an international community that dictates for itself the laws that are to be upheld by the individuals (states) within it—as any commune—to protect all individuals from the systematic chaos of the State of Nature. The Leviathan, then, is the international community that can legislate, adjudicate, and enforce international law, who suffers the same limitations as any government—be that capacity, will, or politics, and that the Communal Leviathan is an imperative to the continual operation of international law as a systematic form of quelling, toward individual freedoms of the states by which states could carry out the full extent of a Hobbesian State of Nature.

Assumptions

The main assumption of the theory of the Communal Leviathan is the equivalency between human individuals and state individuals in regards to the inherent sovereignty that they

---

40 John Rawls on John Locke & Governmental Legitimacy. p. 122-155. This difference is important to distinguish if only for the fact that originating consenters build the current regime to their specifications and joining consenters establish themselves within the system for one reason or another. It is also important to distinguish expressed consent of these individual actors between the tacit consent of other revisionist actors to determine why certain states differentiate themselves from the communal sense of internationality.
possess through the laws of nature and (some deem) Divine Law.\textsuperscript{41} Timothy Endicott, in the introduction of ‘The Logic of Freedom and Power’ explains this sovereignty as having three characteristics:

- Absolute power within a community, and
- Absolute independence externally, and
- Full power as a legal person in international law.\textsuperscript{42}

Sovereignty, however, is registered into a state level definition by Jean L. Cohen as,

> Internally, sovereignty involves supremacy: a claim to unified, comprehensive, supreme, exclusive, and direct authority within a territory over its inhabitants constructed as members of a polity. The correlative external dimension involves a claim to autonomy from outside powers. External sovereignty entails independence and impermeability of the territorial state to jurisdictional claims or political control by foreign authorities.\textsuperscript{43}

One must come to a proper conclusion Cohen’s definition of sovereignty (as it knowingly was only applied to states) can also be applicable to pre-sociopolitical juridical individual humans, as the before mentioned definition allows for the replacement of state into individual and can be exchanged indiscriminately. Individual humans, in this sense, are inherently sovereign of themselves and only surrender such natural power to escape the Hobbesian State of Nature and / or the lawlessness of Nature Itself: the laws of Life and Death. States, themselves, are the same in the sense that state / national death is feared above all else.\textsuperscript{44} In this, one must exact that both individual

\textsuperscript{41} Besson, Samantha, and John Tasioulas. 2010. Philosophy of International Law. Oxford University Press.
\textsuperscript{42} Id.
\textsuperscript{43} Id.
\textsuperscript{44} This fear of state / national death is based on the symbiosis of Laurence D. Cooper’s Eros in Plato, Rousseau, and Nietzsche and Benedict Anderson’s Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, to the regard that states, as much as individual humans, fear the possibility of the finite existence and that it is this fear of finite death that couples with the politics of infinity that is the nation / nationalism and, subsequently, gives birth to the necessity of the state. In this case, it produces the Communal Leviathan, in order to protect against such a State of Nature.
human and individual state is synonymous in their natural power of sovereignty. This equivalency of sovereignty between the two, therefore, allows one to make the distinction that a group of individuals (state and human) that follow the same cultural patterns are, in a sense, a community or society. For states, this cultural pattern—especially with the onset of globalization and the exponentially increasing speed of communication\textsuperscript{45}—created what political scientists refer to as the *international community*, which has no form of conventional centralized constitution or government, thereby giving rise to the term *international anarchy*.

This international anarchy is viewed as a system in which states, without fear of reprisal, act within their interests and compete for power and finite resources within the world. It is, however, prudent to visualize to congruencies between the State of Nature and Anarchy, in the sense that neither state (status) invokes the power of sovereignty over others and this structure of the system allows for individuals to exercise their own absolute power within their given territory: the individual’s body. The problem with viewing the world as such, however, is that the unabashed power of the state is hindered or redirected by some entity that is not itself, to a place that is not, perhaps, its intended destination or interest. Therein, one may find that community is a form of governance that can exert its power over the individual.

This redirection or hindrance is seen in the form of what one would call contracts or, in the general international law context, Customary International Law and International Treaty Law. The latter law devise is consistent with the recognition of the

\textsuperscript{45} Synonymous with the increase of internet usage and the subsequent spreads of soft power.
equal sovereign rights of the individual but also its *conditio sine qua non* of legal personality.\(^{46}\) This legal personality is a recognition and protection of individual sovereignty that is coveted by each state as a recognition of membership to the community and, as such, the affordances that are consequently allowed it (the state / individual). The former law devise, conversely, is a contract law that regards to the recognition of an enforcing social group; specifically, the social group constructs the customs that forms that law that governs them, through many differing means such as established practice / interaction, law creation with general community consent: *jus cogens*\(^{47}\), e.g. the Geneva Conventions, or communal consistent course of conduct.

These contractual laws are put into place through a cyclical process that is depicted by Harold Koh’s Transnational Legal Process. This three-phased cycle of law generation or *juris generative* includes, two or more actor’s interaction, law creation (a guidance for future interactions, and the phase of interpretation / review. This assumption of law generation has center in the necessity of law as an institutional protection of the individual from the State of Nature, which is in line with the creation and necessity of government as a sociopolitical legal construct, through a Social Contract, that lifts the individual from the same State of Nature. Law, therefore, is a legal tool of the sociopolitical juridical (legal) construct to protect the individuals from the Hobbesian state (status of being).

---


International legal personality is the requisite to the “possibility of acting within a given legal situation,” and in this case, the ability to come into contract with another equal legal personality: international treaties.

\(^{47}\) Universally applicable customary rules or ‘Compelling Law.’
To synergize these assumptions, the concept of individual sovereignty within the context of community allows for the creation / generation of law that becomes its own form of Leviathan to which one may prescribe itself to and, consequently, surrenders itself, in part only, to the will of the community as a unified cultural entity. This is to say that if international law only incorporated international treaty law that recognizes the individual by individuals, then the title of international anarchy would fit perfectly; governance by any means would fall short and be wholly rejected as an infringement of individual rights, and this is an argument made by certain individuals in the discourse of state sovereignty and its apparent violations. Customary International Law, however, has given the international system of interaction a different element that provides the entrance of community under cultural normalization, acceptance, and even the separation from that identity, such as apparent ‘Rogue States’.48

*Counter Arguments*

Realists like Hans Morgenthau, Jack L. Goldsmith and Eric A. Posner equate the international system of international law is ineffective (Morgenthau), power-centric, based on state rational choice theory, and a façade for power acquisition. Scholars such as Robert McCorquodale believe, though, that transnational law retains power over general international law and that the world elite’s influences give sway to the contemporary political and legal foray that is transnational law49. Andreas Paulus states that the sense of

---

48 States that George W. Bush labeled as existing outside / outliers of international law / community, e.g. North Korea.
international community is an ‘Americanized’ notion and “reflects and justifies [a] position of preeminence." Hedley Bull, moreover, dismisses the domestic analogy of the “experience of individual men in domestic society to the experience of states, per which the need of individual men to stand in awe of a common power to live in peace is a ground for holding that states must do the same.”

Firstly, what the realists do and do not seem to understand is that the system of international law and the governance of the community suffers from the same capacity issues of domestic governments in the sense that the enforcement of the law is limited by the ability / power of the Leviathan. The Communal Leviathan, therefore, is only as effective and ineffective as that of a domestic state.

Secondly, transnational law is subject to the purview of the Communal Leviathan, as transnational law resides within the political confines of the sovereign, i.e. it is placed within the jurisdiction of the community, being from within it or being a conglomerate of many beings within it, such as multi-national corporations or NGOs.

Thirdly, the ‘Americanized’ notion of international community is rebuked by the United States own ambivalence toward monist incorporations of international law but on more of a dualist approach, seen in the rejection of the League of Nations and other international conventions within domestic law. What may be more appropriate, given that some less developed countries’ feelings of disenfranchisement with the current political system and the power that certain states have over them, is that this ‘community’ view is

50 Id.
that of either Western or Global North powers, who seek to keep less powerful states
within a system of check.

Lastly, Hedley Bull’s argument of a lack of correlation between the domestic,
individual perspective and the international one, known as the domestic analogy\textsuperscript{52}, falls
short, itself, fore states, like individuals may live within a Hobbesian State of Nature and,
according to republican security theory—which “[arises] from the intersection of human
corporeal vulnerability and the fundamental value of life as a prerequisite for all other
ends…” by which “…security-from-violence the primary (but not sole) purpose of
political association.” This republican security theory vindicates the Hobbesian need for
states to exit the State of Nature, as state-life based insofar as the aforementioned
argument of the intertwining of the politics of infinity and imagined communities\textsuperscript{54}.

The scholar Daniel Deudney also describes the ‘liberty of ancients,’ subjugating
individuals to the authority of community, as a contrast to the ‘liberty of moderns,’ which
allows the freedom of the individual from the collective, i.e. sovereignty. This distinction
is important to depict because of the confusability between the subjugation of the
sovereign state to the community versus the freedom of the state, as a sovereign
individual, giving rise to a domestic analogy of the United States’ governmental
structure.

\textit{Theory}

\textsuperscript{52} Id.

\textsuperscript{53} Deudney, Daniel H. 2010. \textit{Bounding Power: Republican Security Theory from the Polis to the Global Village.}
Princeton University Press.
\textsuperscript{54} See previous footnotes.
Per scholar Hans Kelsen, states come into the international community by “particular international law, i.e. by a treaty to which the state is a contracting party.” Kelsen, moreover, agrees that the ‘decentralized authority characteristic’ of general international law is it coercive authority and that “…resorts to reprisals may be acting as an organ of the international community constituted by international law.” This depicts enforcement, but more specifically the ‘enforcement action’, as an extension of the decentralized power of general international law in “reaction against a violation of international law.” What is important from this, then, is the fact that states, as individuals or a collective—through unilateral or multilateral countermeasures—may act as the arm of the community or Communal Leviathan and enforce the law. The obligation of enforcement and compliance, therefore, derives itself not only from republican security theory or as an attempt to centralize power with the strongest states but, as Thomas M. Franck states, as a recognition that, “the obligation to comply is owed by [nations, or those who govern them] to the community of states as the reciprocal of the community’s validation of the nation’s statehood,” or sovereignty. This reciprocity, then, depicts the nature of the community as having power through individual sovereignty or natural power, instead of the ‘liberty of ancients,’ where the mob has control over individual states, without regard for the individual, natural rights. The check and balance of communal power and state individual power is an important aspect of the Communal Leviathan as is this aspect important to the founding of the United States’ political structure of federalism. Where these two (international system and domestic) differ is the formalized centralization of power under a general constitution that holds

56 Id.
57 Id.
58 Id.
sovereignty over the states. The Constitution of the United States, however, does draw similarities in the fact that the powers of federal government are given by the consent of the States that fall under it, through contract, to which the similarity could be drawn to the social compact of general international law, through joining consent, labeled by Hans Kelsen as states joining through participation, before mentioned in the previous paragraph’s quotation.

Where a theory of international federalism falls short, however, is the lack of a formal constitution, by which the United Nations Charter deems itself as not a constitution for the community and, consequently, dethroning the possibility of the United Nations becoming a world government. The importance of the Constitution of the United States sets itself apart from the Communal Leviathan in that it is an actual centralized form of power that states must abide by. The difference of language, here, is difficult because of how closely similar these two systems of political structures are. The difference of the language, however, shows that while individual (international) states may have an obligation to the community to follow the laws of the community, States (domestic) have a hardline obligation to the upholding of the Constitution. Maybe, however, this is due to capacity issues of the international community and depicts the strength of U.S. federalism. While it may be said that the ‘living’ Constitution has similarities to the fluidity of general international law, it is important to see that the two systems are different in practice, as the Communal Leviathan of states adjudicates, legislates, and executes their law, while the federal system has a physical governing body over the states. The Communal Leviathan, then, is the coagulation of individuals with power of individuals and groups as a determinant of power as opposed to equal, individual States (domestic) who have only collective political power but not adjudication; even though States are divided into circuits, these courts do
not hold political power over the others, as opposed the political powers held by adjudicating international state individuals.

*Conclusion to International Law*\(^5^9\)

With the identification of individual sovereignty, but more specifically the domestic analogy that may be made between international state individuals and human individuals, one must believe that international anarchy existed in the historical context of the world. In doing so, however, one must also conclude that individuals, to escape the uncertainties of the State of Nature—presented by Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and others—evolved through the context of sociopolitical structures that removed uncertainty, validated by republican security theory or social contract theory, itself.

Through Social Compact and, perhaps, a form of Social Contract, individual states have created a Communal Leviathan through international law that seeks to protect the survival of the state (and its interests) while leaving to it the autonomy / sovereignty / freedom of a seemingly anarchical system. This seemingly anarchical system confuses scholars into the thought process that states only regard themselves in the rational decision-making / policy making of the contemporary world but, in actuality, serve as a dual purpose of serving the individual interest of the state and, also, the politics that surround the fluidity of the Leviathan, i.e. states, as status quo states or revisionists, comply with international law or become objectors to some certain aspects, giving the law that is central to the Leviathan its political characteristic that is inherent to all law. By complying or objecting, though, states validate the existence of the Communal Leviathan that gives them the power of individual sovereignty, which is a check and balance against both the

---

\(^5^9\) See Figures 1.1 & 1.2 for visual depiction of assumptions.
Leviathan and the individual state, revealing the need for no one power being exclusively over the other.

Because international law centers on the cyclical nature of law, as depicted by Harold Koh, one must see that the reoccurring interactions between individual states and the necessity for peaceful / productive future meetings allows for the creation of specific values and customs that form community but, more specifically, a community centered on law, with equal regard for the natural rights of individuals. While this, again, is seemingly a form of anarchy, the ability for the community to adjudicate, legislate, and execute the law is a clear form of Communal Leviathan that rebukes the notion of international anarchy.

Sovereign states, therefore, surrender some portion of their inherent sovereign rights to the community—specifically, the ability / power to conduct themselves as they see fit and to their interests, solely—by which the international community acts as the governing force in place of formalized government that one may see in a federalist system.

The Communal Leviathan, then, is a sociopolitical system that seeks to balance the individual freedom of those who reside within it and the power that it must coerce or commit violence against the same communal citizens. The Communal Leviathan, plainly, is consistent with how one views a street community / gated community, who polices itself through individual or group interactions, interprets the politics of law and creates or revises new norms / customs (such as mowing lawns to a certain length and keeping the bushes tidy), and even adjudicate disputes between others by overt or covert countermeasures (to include unilateral and multilateral) that are also seen on the international scale. The international community, therefore, is a form of society that is equivalent to both historical and contemporary sociopolitical
structures that humans have today and will continue to be so until, from a political Darwinist perspective, a new, more well-functioning political system comes about.

**Political Evolution: Conclusion**

**Perfect Freedom or Imperfect Freedom: Anarchy**

Freedom is overarchingly and inherently important to those who align with anarchism and view it as the fundamental pinnacle of human sociopolitical institutions. Where anarchism becomes vulnerable, however, is the concept of freedom that derives from the dissolution of the state. In any government, there is an importance of hearing the individual voice as providing freedom of Politics. This freedom, however, is relative to the individual and constrained by the General Will or Particular Will of those within the institution. Anarchists are correct in portraying the state as an institution that conducts violence against its citizenry, from which it holds the monopoly on violence through the legitimacy of the same that it commits violence against. What anarchist do not delineate between is the difference of Perfect Freedom and the Imperfect Freedom. The latter freedom is the ability for the individual to act without reprisal from a superior entity, such as the state or even a constructed morality, but fails the individual by allowing them Political Death within the State of Nature. The reversion to a State of Nature detracts the freedom of the individual by making them succumb to the fear of Political Death and, therefore, restraining the freedom sought by dissolving government and / or state. If one were to examine the implications of removing institutional protections from the individual and reinforcing the Natural system by stripping Bounded Rationality, humans would recreate the sociopolitical institutions and, subsequently, the state to over time increasingly sustain life—

---

60 See Figure 2.1 for a visual depiction.
concurrent with Republican Security theory—and to prevent Political Death. The death of the state, then, is both dangerous and irrational to those within its sociopolitical context.

Perfect Freedom, however, differs in that it maintains the institutions of the citizens, fully relieving them from the State of Nature and creating a system of Self-governance or Self-law that removes from others the ability to commit violence not by an outside entity but the individual will. Monopolies on violence or violence holistically, therefore, do not occur in the Perfect State of Freedom that is indicative of Political Evolution. Individuals maintain the ability to act without imposition from outside actors but also retain institutional protections for the well-being of the whole of humanity, integrating individuals into society by adapting institutions around the Self-governance of the individual, allowing for the Political Evolution of the institution to be fluid to the addition of new sociopolitical inputs.

**Definition & Thesis**

Political Evolution, definitionally, is the creation and subsequent increasing of political institutions over time that, in some sociopolitical context, exhume individuals from the Imperfect Freedom within the State of Nature and replace it with restricted freedoms that allow for Politics, the continuation of Self and the Politics of Infinity. Political Evolution, then, culminates into the retraction of zoe and bios from Politics into discernable political horizons that allow for the individual to freely exist within a sociopolitical context, without the exertion of violence from forces outside of the Self.

**Purpose (Why does it occur?) & Needs (What purpose does it serve (who?)**

The purpose of Political Evolution is to reconfigure institutional structures into more efficient means of combatting Political Death and, potentially, the Natural system through the
preservation of the individual outside of the system, by allowing the individual to exist beyond its physical Self and preserving political existence of the soul. The true end goal of human society and, specifically, the individual human through Political Evolution, then, is a Perfect State of Being, where Knowledge transcends the importance of Perception for humanity and life and death (to include Political Death) do not exist. While this may be an end goal for humanity, one cannot say that there is an appropriate or fix way to this outcome, as it important that humanity reaches these incremental levels together and what ways that are conducive to their preexisting sociopolitical context, to not create political disruptions such as the death of the state that some anarchists would promote. This places emphasis on the importance of the temporal aspect in Political Evolution, which portrays the culture-counterculture ebbs and flows of political change and, furthermore, allows for political decay.61

*Constrained Projection*

Humans have an inherent right to be justly governed, as governments can exist and function to institutionalize and protect the rights of the citizen from enemies foreign / domestic and systemic / institutional. These rights are more prominent in democracies, as individuals can exercise political power, and the power that the government has derives from the institutions that are upheld by societal want or need. Governments, by this logic, have the consent of the people to govern over them in a fashion that allows citizens freedom of access and ability. But what happens when those that are governed over are oppressed without just rationale, as in the case of the African-Americans claim to freedom by the dictation of the Declaration of Independence and other institutional means, as they too were seen (eventually) as men? These nations have, then

---

the inherent right of revolution or inciting political change, as the justice of the multitude does not protect the Rule of Law, nor can those who exert power be persuaded of the injustices that they create or perpetuate, minimalizing violence against individuals within a form of Political Evolution. It must be noted, then, that Political Evolutions may take the form of forced change, such as the French Revolution or the American Revolution, to choose more contemporary depictions. Western liberal democracy, however, is a violence to politically weaker individuals because of its globally contextual ties to capitalism; liberal democracy is upheld by liberal market economy through its control over the majority: the working class. Only the middle class survives and somewhat thrives in liberal democracy & Liberal Market Economies because of the political power of this group, especially when one views its ability to resist (exert political power against elite control of the state) liberal democracy violence. Social Democratic and Conservative models of Coordinated Market Economies allow for those most disenfranchised by the capitalist system of survival to have political power as work horses of industry, contrary to liberal market economies relying on the middle class for innovation and strength, regarding the Darwinist survival of the economically fittest businesses / firms. Those on the bottom of capitalisms hierarchy will always need more security from the state, if one is to believe Republican Security Theory, and therefore will always require a welfare state, whereas subsequent ascensions above the working class need / want less a welfare state due to their own ability to cope with the struggles of capitalism. The state in its classical and modern form, then, is a violence against the individual and cannot be the end-all of human sociopolitical institution as some scholars would come to believe. Important to progression along the line of Political Evolution is the subtraction of bios out of biopolitics. Bios, as the basis of perceptive knowledge
built from the pleasant and painful, disrupts that which is Perfect Knowledge and, consequently, the arrival to the pinnacle of human potential to transcend Death.
Assumptions

If Individual Entity = Individual Entity

Political theorists’ idea of individual equality (e.g., John Locke) & Modern idea of European Sovereignty established by Treaty of Westphalia (1648)

both retain the inherent right of individual sovereignty,

Assumptions (cont.)

Then it may be said that many Individual Entities constitute a community/society as much as many

If Without government = 

Then Without government = 
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Bios as fundamental to the individual in order to sustain life.

Biopolitical Power at its peak and the biopolitical horizon blurs the lines between zoë and bios.

Bios and Zoë is removed from Politics, serving as the Politics of Infinity, allowing for individuals to overcome Political Death.
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