
PRIVATE INTELLIGENCE REPORT

THE
SOVEREIGN
MANIFESTO

How to Escape The Cultural Matrix:
The 8 Deadly Myths That Conspire to Enslave You

BY DAVID MACGREGOR

All Rights Reserved - Copyright 2005

The Sovereign Manifesto: Published by SovereignLife.com

Disclosure. *Unlike a typical "Manifesto", which is a statement of things to be "done", The Sovereign Manifesto is a statement of things to be "undone" - in particular, certain cultural myths that can lock individuals into a particular "slave mindset". The ideas contained in this report may be considered by many to be heretical, revolutionary, radical, or even dangerous - and certainly capable of changing the existing social order as we know it. But like all ideas, their power is only realised when they are put into action - by individual people.*

The 8 Deadly Myths That Conspire to Enslave You

Have you ever asked yourself the question: "Why are things the way they are?" Have you ever got angry at the status quo - the stupidity, the injustice and the inertia? More importantly, have you ever tried to take off your cultural spectacles and view the world anew?

It's certainly hard to do, if not near impossible for most people. And there's a good reason why.

Our view of the world, and our relationship to it, is shaped by the world **as it is** - not how it **could** be. It is shaped by our genes, our family environment, our education, and the culture we grow up within - whatever nation or ethnicity. We are the product of the given, the existent - the accepted norm. Our traditional thinking is therefore a product of our past.

But imagine you were a visiting **alien** from another planet - looking at the behaviour of humans and pondering on the meaning of it all. Your *alien* self would not be hidebound by earthly history, traditions, morality, politics, economics or education - but instead be free to view things as they really are, and see where we've gone wrong, and where we could do better.

Trouble is, even **imagining** ourselves as alien is fraught with difficulties, because we find it extraordinarily difficult to think outside the square we have been born into.

It's all evolution's fault.

Evolution is that slow process of adapting, biologically, to our surroundings. And adapt we certainly do - over millennia! Evolution has always been measured in millions of years - not in the span of a human lifetime.

And that worked okay for our ancestors, whose lives and environment hardly changed one bit during their own, usually short, existence. For most of recorded history people have been born, grown up, worked, lived, played and died in a virtually unchanged world - often without even leaving the geographical area they were born in.

But, unlike animals which have to adapt to their environment, humans can **change** their environment through the use of their minds. With the advent of the Renaissance, the rise of science, and the consequent industrial revolution, man's mind and life was liberated to an extent hitherto unimaginable. New ideas. New inventions. New ways of doing things. And all of a sudden, after a somnambulant gestation period, it appeared that humankind was rising from the primordial swamp to stake a claim to the earth, and its future - stepping into the driving seat, instead of being a passive passenger.

Evolution was to be given a jolt.

Within a matter of just a couple of hundred years, the very nature of human society had changed forever. What's more, the pace of change picked up speed and drew mankind into a vortex of societal upheaval. Now, it is accepted we will see and experience enormous changes during our own lives. We no longer expect to stay in the same job, or even the same career. We no longer expect to be doing the same thing in ten year's time, nor even living in the same place. And sadly, for some, we don't even expect to be with the same partner.

When it comes to humans, evolution has given way to **revolution**.

Just to put this into context, cast your mind back to 1995. Can you remember what you were doing then? Chances are you were **not** logging on to the internet, buying and selling via eBay, or booking your next holiday online. The changes the internet has wrought in our lives, in that short time, have been enormous.

Back in 1995, I used to get the morning newspaper delivered daily. Now I read up on the news online. Not only that, I can now read news and commentary from around the world, and not from just the established news sources. Our access to information has been revolutionised by the internet. Back then I used to buy CDs and play them on my stereo. Now I can download music by the track and store and play them on my diminutive iPod. Back then I used to work at a *normal* career. Now I work exclusively on the internet.

The advent of the internet is just one example of how things can change over a very short timeframe.

Technological progress is daunting. Whereas industrial and technological change would previously take generations, now - as is apparent in China - we are witnessing the phenomena of virtually instant industrial and information revolutions combined.

You can see this working everywhere - from the increasing sophistication of your home entertainment system, to the computer you bought two years ago - which is now virtually obsolete. More for less. Fast replacing slow. Global replacing local.

No one can seriously doubt the exponential growth and advancement in technology. The problem is that while our technology is surging ahead, our social and **moral** systems are still effectively in prehistory.

We're like children playing with adult toys. We know how to send email, download music, create a video, browse a blog, buy and sell on eBay, and send text messages to kingdom come - but we haven't figured out how to live fully human lives and get on with each other in an ever-shrinking global village.

Our technology is from the world of science fiction, but our social order is from the world of cave men. Our ethical, social and economic thinking is in a time warp. We have the technical capacity to traverse space, but the morality to nuke ourselves into oblivion.

Why is this?

Our whole evolutionary history has been based on slow, incremental change - change so slow that our earlier ancestors never had to deal with any **real** change at all. And their social and ethical norms and forms were designed to work in that reality.

But the world has been transformed. Each of us now faces change as a constant. Change is everywhere. Change is the order of the day. And unless we can come up with some new ways of thinking and acting in response to this, then our inability to change the fundamentals of our means of social organisation could bring about our own eventual downfall.

This point in time has sometimes been called the "nuclear threshold". The nuclear threshold is that moment in history when our intellectual prowess meets our moral capacity to use it wisely. We are smart enough to develop nuclear technology, but do we have the ethical and social frameworks to stop it from destroying us?

The 20th Century saw huge social upheavals - and the deaths of millions of people in the pursuit of various utopian social experiments. The most disastrous of these were **Fascism** and **Marxism** - both totalitarian ideologies. The outward forms of these dangerous ideas were defeated: fascism by force of arms, in World War II, and Marxism by the contradictions inherent in the economic ideas themselves, as witnessed by the demise of the Soviet Union.

There are only a couple of communist countries left - Cuba, which apparently exists on the the pure charisma of its leader, and North Korea, which is in the grip of permanent famine and paranoia. China, while calling itself communist, is in fact not that at all. It is just an authoritarian regime, a ghost of its former communist self.

Yes, the outward forms of these ideologies have largely disappeared, but the **thinking** that brought them into existence in the first place certainly has not. The philosophical themes of fascism and communism are alive and well on planet earth - and are woven into the very social order we now inhabit.

Prior to the rise of the secular west, Christianity was the pre-eminent philosophy - and the source of political power. And we have largely forgotten what a dark time in history that was. But it wasn't called the *Dark Ages* for nothing!

With the rise of science and consequent technology, the political power of the Church declined - and has been doing so ever since. But today, we are witnessing a return of the religiously inspired political order - in the form of **Islam**.

Islam is a religion of **literal** belief. It is a complete code of conduct. It can best be likened to Christian fundamentalism - a total belief in the *Word of God*. Ostensibly, both Christianity and Islam are listening to the same god - God, or Allah, take your pick - but Islam has put *God* back on the global political agenda in a way that Christianity no longer can.

The forces of social stagnation, of non-evolution, are mustering and regrouping for a counter attack. The ideologies of totalitarian philosophy, statism and religious fundamentalism are intent on stopping humankind from moving forward.

There is much at stake - the very future of the human race in fact - and the reactionary social forces know this, and intend to do all they can to stop humankind from taking the next revolutionary step.

What are their tools of trade? What is their modus operandi? What is their agenda?

The last question is easy to answer. Their agenda is **control**. Control over society. Control over all forms of social organisation and progress. Control over **you**.

They have only one known **enemy** - the individual thinking person. The person who thinks outside the square, has independent means, and refuses to simply accept what he or she is told. And the only way for them to defeat this enemy is to take pre-emptive control of the levers of power - the power to influence an individual's mind. before it matures.

What, exactly, are those power levers, their *tools of trade*?

They are **ideas**. Yes, each lever of power is an idea - an idea that is inculcated into each individual from birth, via family, religion, society and nation. When all these ideas are combined, they form a cultural **matrix** of force, fraud and fallacy - a near-perfect, total means of individual and societal control.

So, what exactly are these power-lever ideas? What sort of ideas can be so powerful as to render the believer an effective automaton - a willing participant in the slave-order society?

These ideas are in fact **Eight Deadly Myths** that support the current system of *power and control*. They act together in order to prevent the emergence of true individual freedom. They are myths precisely because each one **fails** to deliver on the promise implicit in its *declared* purpose - to make life better.

1. The External Authority Myth

There is no valid, absolute **external** authority over your life - whether family, friends, church, society, nation, or cosmic Big Brother. Each individual human is a sovereign being, an autonomous self-owner - and no one has the right to one moment of your life - or to force you to do anything against your will. And yet, this is precisely the nature of most social systems and societies throughout history - an attempt to set up such external authorities, as a means of control.

Like most myths, it can be explained by looking at history, and understanding how our past has shaped our present. And so it is with the concept of *external authority*, which is ingrained into us as children - in relation to our parents - and as we grow up into the big wide world. But perhaps the main perpetrator of this external authority idea is **organised religion**.

We first learn of *god* or *gods* via religion. If you were brought up in a western country, chances are you were brought up to believe in the Christian God. If you were brought up in India, you would have been taught to believe in the Hindu Gods. And if you were brought up in the Middle East, you would have been brought up to believe in the Muslim God - Allah. And there are plenty of other gods that humans can also choose to believe in. Just take your pick.

The task of teaching you about God falls on **organised** religion. Religion is the hierarchical structure that preserves the stories and moral imperatives of each particular god. If you are a Jew, then Moses was the link between God and man, when he brought down the stone tablets from Mount Sinai. If you are a Christian, then Jesus Christ was that link. But the essential point is that the story is the official property of each respective religion - the ultimate guardian of the faith.

In Christianity, prior to the Reformation, the only way to approach God was via the intermediary function of the priesthood. Martin Luther challenged this and gave birth to Protestantism - which allowed believers supposedly direct access to God, via God's Word - the Bible. Of course this access had to be moderated by teachers and pastors - those who had the knowledge to **interpret** God's Word. Interpreting it yourself was (and is) considered far too dangerous!

The Protestant Reformation was essentially a response to a technological advancement - the printing press. Before the advent of the printing press the very few books that existed were hand written and copied - as was the Bible. This limitation meant the Bible was not readily available to ordinary folk. The printing press changed that - and changed the form of Christianity as a consequence.

But what if you'd never seen the Bible, or the Koran, or any of the other religious writings? Just imagine if you were brought up in a family that had no belief in a god. What would you believe in? Would it matter? Well, there is a good chance that you would believe in nothing supernatural at all. Then again you may, as an adult, come into contact with others who do believe in a god, and decide to investigate. In this way an adult can convert to a religious belief that was not previously held. But belief by societal osmosis is much more powerful and persistent.

The essential point is that without religion, there would be no organised systems of spiritual belief in any sort of god. That wouldn't stop people believing in stuff of course! People are creative in every sort of way - including the beliefs they hold. You could believe in your ancestors, or in fairies, demons, animals, aliens, or any number of possible god-substitutes.

But all of this misses the point. When you seek such a *god*, you are seeking something *out there*. You are placing your centre of spiritual gravity **outside** yourself - and exposing yourself to the influence of **others**. And this is the key, the willingness to abdicate your own moral authority and thinking processes, in favour of ready-made solutions and guidance from others.

Some people believe in an intensely **personal** god. This type of belief is likely to have the greatest impact on one's life - but also threatens to undermine the idea of *one god for all*. But there are believers who posit a **remote** god. They are usually called **deists**. To these believers, their god is not actually involved in human affairs at all - but stands aloof, simply watching from afar. In this belief system God does not intervene in human affairs, but is just like a spectator - possibly cheering, or booing, from the sidelines.

In many ways, the deist's position is much closer to reality. For if God is remote and not involved in the daily grind of human life, then life is something quite separate - something that actually goes on without the influence of a god at all. In the deist's world view we are, for all practical purposes, alone.

And so we are, each one of us, utterly alone in this universe. The whole fabric of organised religion is an attempt to cover up this unsettling fact - to suggest there is some supreme authority over our lives, other than ourselves.

The truth is, God is not **out** there at all. God is very much **within**. And we have this on good authority - as Jesus Christ said so himself. In fact, it's possible to render the historical story of Jesus in exactly these terms. Here was a man who challenged all earthly authority - and in particular the authority of the existing religious order. He held himself above such things, and acted as if he was a god, capable of judging and evaluating all things in the light of his own understanding. It was this godlikeness that brought the wrath of the priestly class against him.

The story of Jesus shows he was a truly autonomous individual. He taught that God was not to be found with the priestly class, or inside the temple, but was within a man's own being.

The external authority myth hides a very important fact from you. You are, in essence, your own god. And when you wake up to that fact, you will find your whole view of life, and the world around you, changes.

2. The State Education Myth

Education is the process of learning. If you've ever enjoyed learning, then you will have discovered the nature of **true** education - which is learning about that which you have a passion to know about.

Education should not be a chore or a bore, but a delight. And if you've ever voluntarily taken a course in any subject you are fascinated with - then you know this truth for yourself.

Education is about expanding one's mind and horizons. It's about discovering the world as it really is. It's about learning how to use your mind to achieve your desired objectives. Education is also about creating a sense of life - a comprehensive world view.

From a societal point of view, education is also about inculcating the values and traditions of society - as a means of preserving the existing social order. This function of education is paramount for many people - as it is a way of controlling the future. And because of that, education has always been the preserve of the existing power elite. First the church, and more recently the state.

The state insists on controlling education, on moulding the minds of the young, precisely in order to control the thinking of its citizens and to ensure there is no challenge to its assumed role. What's more, the state controls even *private* education by defining what is to be taught (the curricula), and how. It not only creates the content of all education, but the process by which it is taught - often to disastrous effects.

Just take one example - the teaching of that most basic of skills, reading. Because the state is a monolithic organisation, when it determines how something should be taught, there is no room for disagreement. What's worse, the method becomes a *one size fits all* policy which takes no account of differences between individuals.

In the case of learning to read, there has been a *war of ideas* for some time, between those who believe reading should be taught by the *whole word* method, and those who believe it should be taught by the phonics method.

The *whole word* method relies on the student's ability to memorise whole words, and to guess such words from the context of their use. On the other hand, teaching by phonics involves teaching children to understand the actual sounds of the letters - the vowels and the consonants - and their constituent combined sounds. This is the

building block approach to teaching reading - where you lay a logical foundation on which to build vocabulary and understanding.

Interestingly, the veracity or otherwise of each method is easily proven - and always comes down on the side of phonics. However, there is a huge vested interest in the *whole word* method - and trying to change the state's teaching methods is virtually impossible.

But one can evaluate both these methods by looking at their foundational principles - and come to a valid conclusion. The *whole word* method actually runs counter to the way the human mind works. It is essentially a pictographic way of learning - seeing the words as pictures (whole words with meaning). And as a result, a child has to learn literally thousands of such picture-words. Overload.

On the other hand, the phonic method uses a building block approach by having just 26 components - the letters of the alphabet. By learning these correctly, and how to pronounce the various combinations of such letters, the mind is being used efficiently. In other words, phonics corresponds with the way the mind actually works.

So why on earth would any state want to employ a teaching methodology that dumbs down its children by making learning to read such a difficult task? The answer is simple - the inertia and ineffectiveness of state bureaucracy makes responding to such an issue almost impossible.

At its core, **state** education is a complete travesty of the idea of education, and is largely a means of social engineering and propaganda. The desired end product is a pliant population, one that doesn't think too much, doesn't ask too many questions, and in particular, doesn't question authority. It's an education for slaves.

The only alternative is for parents to be given the **freedom** to choose the means of educating their own children - in any form whatsoever, and without interference and regulation by the state. In other words, a total free market in education.

3. The Equality Myth

Nobody is equal. The only equality is that everyone has an equal right to their own life, and a right to pursue their own goals. The constant political attempts to *create* equality are forever doomed to failure.

You know it, and I know it. You only have to look around you, talk to people, travel the world, and you will soon discover the huge differences between individuals. Whether in the areas of skills, intelligence, talent, emotional stability, intellectual sharpness, physical fitness, lifestyle habits, endurance, honesty or any other number of distinguishing characteristics displayed by humans. The blunt fact is that people are decidedly different - unequal.

Humans are equal in **one** thing only - the right to their own life. In other words, the only equality that can be rightfully defined and defended is the equality of action - the ability of people to freely act in their own interest, to achieve their own objectives, without impinging on the equally important interests of others.

In the same way that individuals are not equal - nor are cultures, societies or nations. The idea that we are all the same is simply wrongheaded - and can only lead to absurd social policies. And so it has.

Just take one example. The demand for "equal rights" produces some very bizarre attitudes and outcomes. And these demands are commonly accepted as legitimate. You have people demanding the right to a job, the right to an education, the right to healthcare. These demands are based on the assumption we are all equal, and therefore entitled to whatever we perceive others may have (a job, education or healthcare etc.).

But there can be no right which imposes a **unchosen** obligation on another. I cannot claim the right to a job, without demanding that someone, who has worked hard to create their own opportunity, be forced to employ me. I cannot claim the right to an education without demanding that someone else devotes their time to educating me. And I cannot claim a right to healthcare without demanding that some doctor or nurse give up their time to attend to me.

In every case, these demands for equality are exposed as demands on the life of someone else. One person's right cannot result in another person's enslavement. A legitimate right cannot negate someone else's rights. And that's exactly what happens when bogus equality and entitlement become ascendent in society.

There is just **one** right - the right to your own life, and the right to be able to take action to sustain your own life in the manner you determine. The push for equality has created a monster - a behemoth of a state, intent on righting all the wrongs of nature - and doing so using force of arms to take from some and give to others.

Freedom means being able to retain just that **one** right - the right to your own life and the consequent right to act in your own interests.

4. The Victimhood Myth

Freedom is a two-edged sword. If you want to be free, you also have take full **responsibility** for your own life.

Modern society, with its socialist foundations, is making a virtue out of being a **victim**. In other words, someone whose life has been inextricably altered (for the worse) by someone, or something else. Someone who is **not** in control of his or her own life.

You see it everywhere. Some careless person buys a cup of coffee, then spills it and scolds themselves. Nothing that unusual, except in this case the person feels aggrieved and sues the coffee shop. What's worse, is the totally over-the-top settlements that juries often award in such cases.

Here, something as simple as an individual taking responsibility for his own actions is inverted into a case of someone being victimised by a coffee seller!

The same victimhood mentality extends far into the social order. People without jobs claim to be victims of government or corporate policy. People without good health claim to be victims of some conspiratorial industrial coverup. People on low wages claim to be victims of cut-throat capitalism and rich people - and all demand compensation in the form of other people's money.

Of course, there are legitimate cases of being wronged, of being a victim - and in a property protecting society this would be covered by the ability to claim damages from the perpetrator - where it is demonstrably their fault. But the victim mentality hardly recognises that fault can ever lie with one's self. The victim mentality is actually a revolt against personal responsibility - and therefore a revolt against freedom itself.

One of the core ideas of socialism, as an ideology, is this very victimhood mentality. It looks for causes beyond the individual concerned. Thus, today's blacks in Africa are victims of previous colonialism - even though they were born after the fact. Today's poor are victims of grasping capitalist selfishness, because those with money don't want to share their hard-earned wealth (at the point of a gun) with others. Women are victims of a male-dominated society. Murderers are victims of bad childhoods. And child molesters are victims of child molestation themselves when young.

I'm not saying you can't be at the blunt end of someone else's *stick*, but what I am saying is that a belief in victimhood undermines your capacity, as an individual, to overcome adversity. If you see yourself as a victim, then you are helpless against the tide of life. If you see yourself as a victim then you are at the mercy of those powerful *others* - those who for some reason are **not** victims, but manage to victimise you.

This applies to even when you are a **genuine** victim - like being raped on your way home from an evening out, minding your business. True, in a cut and dried case like this, when a person is the victim of someone else's brutality - the perpetrator should be forced to make restitution. However, even in such a situation, it does not benefit the victim to dwell on their victimhood. It is much better to rise above the event and move on with life, than to allow it to consume one's sense of worth and being.

Victimhood is a road to **servitude** - both to your own emotions and to the emotional game-playing and power plays of others. It's an admission that you are not in control of your own life. A society that elevates victimhood to some sort of cult status is doomed.

Freedom means **self responsibility**. It means you are responsible for your life and what you make of it. The truth is you can become whatever you want to be, overcome whatever you choose, and nothing in your past should be used as an excuse for your failure to achieve what you want in the future.

Victimhood is the negation of your personal power. It is a false mindset that saps your inner strength and strengthens those *others*, who supposedly victimise you. By asserting your responsibility for everything in your life, you also free yourself to be able to determine the course of your own future.

5. The Democracy Myth

Democracy is held up as the beacon of the free world - its badge of honour. Our politicians are more inclined to talk about the virtues of a *democratic* society, rather than a **free** one. It's the new religion of the secular state. Democracy is not a means to any particular end, but an end in itself.

But just what **is** democracy?

It's the idea that the **majority** is right. It's the idea that morality can be decided by the counting of heads. It's the idea that one man's vote is as good as another's.

Historically, democracy is seen as a natural progression from Theocracy or Monarchy. Apart from the early democracy of Greece, human experience has largely be shaped by the rule of Church or King. So, shifting the balance of power to the ordinary person in the street was seen as a move in the right direction.

At first, only male property owners were granted a vote. This was on the assumption they had proven their social responsibility, and had the best interests of society at heart. Later the franchise was extended to all men. And even later, to women also.

Now we have the strange situation of a system for electing a government, which will give anyone 18 years or over the right to vote - while in many cases not allowing the same person to drink at the local pub! If someone can't be trusted to drink alcohol sensibly, why should they be more sensible when voting? The very idea that people are equally capable of voting sensibly is absurdity of the first order!

Democracy is about creating an **illusion** of *people power*. Under the banner of democracy we are encouraged to think we actually have some sort of say in the running of things. Governments will even extend this illusion by holding consultative meetings, to give people a chance to air their opinions on whatever is of concern at the moment.

We are exhorted to vote. We are told it is our duty. "If you don't vote, you can't complain" goes the slogan. When the truth is actually the opposite. Voting is a necessary subterfuge, to create an illusion of legitimacy to what the government gets up to. And what do they get up to? Well, they steal your money via taxation; control your business via regulation; proscribe your actions on your own property; give your money to others at home and abroad - without any consideration as to whether you approve or not; wage wars and send your sons and daughters off to be killed - for purposes hidden from your view. The depressing list goes on.

The important point is that democracy is used as a front for shoddy, dubious, and downright immoral public policy. If you don't like it, you're told to exercise your rights by voting for someone you **do** approve of - at the next election. Meanwhile, it's business as usual. Trouble is, in this rigged game, no matter who you vote for, you get more of the same. Arthur or Martha - your choice!

The myth of democracy is that it is claimed you are free to control your own future, via the democratic process. When, even a moment's consideration shows this to be an complete and utter lie. You are not free. Your freedom is at the behest of the majority. In this topsy-turvy world, the majority is somehow right. If they vote to trample on your property rights - who are you to complain?

The whole political process is a gigantic **fraud**. And democracy is just a system for fooling people into thinking they have some say in the running of their own lives. Nothing could be further from the truth - for democracy is just another word for the *tyranny of the majority*. Voting is a waste of time - and only perpetrates and legitimises the problem.

There is only one moral alternative, and that's the full implementation of property rights - where your life and property are sacrosanct (as is everyone else's), and all social interaction has to take account of this fact. Under such a social organisation, there would be no need for voting at all. What would you vote on? Maybe *Big Brother* would do it!

A society based on property rights law would function by contract, not voting. You, as an individual would have full rights to your life, and the results of your productive efforts. That principle alone lays the foundation for a free society.

Democracy is but a smokescreen on the road to freedom.

6. The Nation State Myth

The nation state is nothing more than cover for a sophisticated **protection racket** - a cleverly conceived *illusion* which imposes its world view on all of us, and demands we pay tribute. Learning how such states actually got started uncovers their criminal origins.

Imagine a small village, a few hundred years ago. The people are peace-loving and diligent. They work hard. They plant their crops and till the ground. And their reward is that at each harvest, the ground gives up its bounty and feeds them.

Imagine another group of individuals. These people are too lazy to do their own work, and realise that for very little effort they can simply ride into that village and steal the product of its effort - its harvest crop.

Such an event would be a catastrophe. And it was. However, these marauding gangs of thugs and thieves were not only immoral, but smart. It didn't take them long to realise that instead of riding around the country looking for villages to plunder, they could simply stay put in one village - and offer them protection from other marauders. For a price of course - the cost of their own luxurious upkeep.

In this way, villages grew into towns, towns into cities, and cities into kingdoms - while the *governing class* evolved from their marauding gang roots to a ruling elite. This could even turn into a hereditary "monarchy", where a chief passed on the leadership to his heirs.

Over the centuries this form of social order developed into competing villages, tribes and even cities - each the mini-fiefdom of some head honcho. Those with ambition saw the opportunity to amass more power and wealth by attacking and subduing other villages and towns. Gradually greater areas came under monopolistic control. Boundaries became drawn. And so the nation state was born - but largely a fiction bought about by people's fears, and sustained by the power of violence.

By definition, the state is that entity which has a **monopoly** on the use of *legal* violence, within a specific geographical area. A state is not like a business. A business cannot use force to find customers - although it will often cosy up in bed with the state in order to be granted some monopoly status of its own. However, left to its own devices, a business can only rely on voluntary agreement and mutual satisfaction as the basis for its existence. If people do not like a particular product or service, then a business cannot hold a gun to the head of the recalcitrant customer. Not so the state!

The amount of control exerted by a particular state depends on many factors - not least the driving ideology of the ruling class. In Marxist states, the control was complete and total. You couldn't even own your own property - let alone a business. All business was run by the state. In Fascist states, they'd let you own property, including a business, but would retain the right to control both.

In our modern, democratic, welfare states, you're allowed just enough freedom to be productive. Just enough control over your property so as not to provoke open revolt. And just enough of your own money to stop you from rioting in the streets.

It's a fine balancing act. The modern nation state is a topdown hierarchical organisation that has proven to be incompetent at even those things that most people deem to be the responsibility of the state. Things like education, healthcare, roads, public services, policing, courts and national defence.

No one bothers to ask the question, "If we can't trust the state to grow our food and run our supermarkets, why should we trust them with educating our children, or keeping our communities safe?"

And this is the lesson of history. States are incompetent and inefficient, yet we rarely sit up and even notice. We calmly hand over up to half our income in return for a completely shoddy service - a service we would never tolerate from our local supermarket or McDonalds. This is how well we have been indoctrinated to the idea of the state as lord and master - and benefactor.

While the state poses as the keeper of order, no one points out they are in fact the perpetrators of **disorder**. While the state poses as champion of the poor, no one points out that the poor are likely so, precisely because of the state's economic policies. While the state puffs its chest while declaring it is keeping us safe and secure, no one notices that they are the instigators of war and rampant insecurity.

Just ask yourself, if it were not for the existence of states, would the millions killed last century have remained alive? If it were not for states, would we now be told we are in constant danger from terrorists?

The state, far from being a protector, is actually an **aggressor** - on a massive scale. It's just that it has brainwashed the entire human race into thinking there is no alternative.

The nation state, while having some evolutionary function, is now an outmoded and dangerous idea. It is the source of all war and economic deprivation. It's a prison camp that claims ownership over you - simply because you were born in a certain place.

The nation state is also the source of the poisonous ideology of **nationalism** - which when linked with religion, is a potent force for evil. Witness again all the wars of the 20th Century.

Fortunately, the nation state as a means of social organisation is in terminal decline - and much of the troubles in this present world are the result of a rear guard action by such states, as they fight to maintain their grip on power.

The fact is, topdown hierarchical control systems are proving incapable of dealing with an increasingly complex world. This can be seen in many, if not all, functions of government. None more so than the *war on terror*, where existing states are trying to fight an *old world* war - using military equipment and strategies designed for a bygone era. All against an enemy who is fighting an **asymmetrical** war, adapting and changing day by day.

The military might of the most powerful nation on earth has been shown to be ineffective against this new type of warfare. And in so doing, is proving its incapacity to

defend us - the clients of such a state.

Being able to defend its citizens is one of the prime reasons given for needing a state in the first place - so if it is seen to fail at that, then one can only guess at the consequences.

Any future organisational model for free and prosperous societies will be more like a dynamic **business** than politics. Certainly it will not be an hierarchical authority structure, and most likely will have severely cut down powers from the states we know now. Its operational principles will have to be voluntary co-operation and contractual agreements.

There are many precedents for non-coercive order. Just consider the internet itself, a virtual anarchy (absence of government), and yet things get done, businesses thrive, and self-organising mechanisms are developed.

Another precedent for non-coercive order is the way apartment complexes are run - by a communal body called a *body corporate*. To buy or rent in one of these complexes, you have to agree to the body corporate rules. But the essential point is you have to agree voluntarily. And if you don't like it, you can leave. Not so the state. The state offers no 'opt-out' mechanism, no right of secession.

The myth of the nation state is dangerous precisely because it blinds us to **other** possible ways of organising ourselves. It is an arbitrary, artificial arrangement. It assumes that without the firm monopolistic hand of authority over a specific territory, we would all descend into chaos - and so uses fear to maintain its grip on power.

As to the alternatives, there are many possible scenarios - the most likely of which are the rise of contractual city states or micro nations - with freedom of movement and open markets in all the areas currently reserved for the existing monopolised nation states. But whatever evolves will be precisely that - an evolution, not a topdown imposed solution.

Humans have enormous natural capacities to organise themselves for mutual benefit. The nation state model of such organisation is an idea whose time has passed.

7. The Shortage of Money Myth

You've no doubt heard the slogan - *the rich get richer, while the poor get poorer*. And you've probably heard it said that someone can only become rich at the expense of someone else becoming poor. And to be sure, that is why being rich is usually treated with suspicion - as if being rich is an admission of having ripped off someone else.

This idea is also contained in the *one sized economic pie* theory, which suggests there is only so much wealth in the world, and if someone takes 50% of it, then there is only 50% left.

The essence of socialist economic theory is just that - the belief in **static** wealth. But nothing could be further from the truth. Wealth, far from being static, is truly dynamic, and capable of increasing indefinitely. The short-sighted view of wealth completely misunderstands how wealth is actually created - and is not something pre-existent.

Consider the following: Silicon is derived from sand, of which there is copious quantities around the world. You could say that sand, as a raw commodity, has little real value - except for sunning oneself at the beach. However, when a human mind created the idea of a microchip, and created that technology out of sand, then suddenly something which was not wealth before, became **new** wealth.

Another example is oil. This nasty black stuff has been around for ages, and it certainly wasn't worth \$50, \$60 or \$70 a barrel (or whatever it is now) back then. Why not? Because oil had no value until some human mind developed a use for oil. At that point oil became a form of wealth - precisely because it was brought into being by creative human action.

It's the same with all wealth. And in the same way, things we take for granted now as virtually worthless, could some day be deemed valuable - if someone works out a way to turn that raw material into something of value.

The true picture of wealth is that it is an ever-expanding pie, and therefore it is possible for everyone to benefit from it, with no losers at all. Money is a reflection of wealth, a tool to enable such wealth to be exchanged - a means of facilitating the division of labour.

How do you get money? You get it by **creating** some form of value, something which someone else is prepared to pay for. The evidence for this is all around us, but because it's so common, we fail to see the wood for the trees.

If I have a particular skill or knowledge, say creating delicious food, then I can find a ready market for my knowledge and skill - because other people value good food and will happily pay for it. I might turn my skill into money in a number of ways. I could simply seek employment as a chef for an existing restaurant - where the owner pays me a salary for the time I put in. I could start my own restaurant and be in business for myself. Or I may even develop a range of nutritious food products and decide to manufacture these and sell them around the world.

In each case, I am turning my own skill and knowledge into money - virtually right out of thin air. If I create a magnificent wedding cake, that process does not diminish the wealth of the world. On the contrary, it adds to the wealth - and in so doing, adds to the very supply of money available.

Money is a **tool** of freedom, as it allows you more choices in your own life. Just imagine, if you can think of something innovative - something which will better the lives of others, and therefore be in demand - then you can create that thing (product or service), and offer it to others in return for money. Money itself is arguably one of man's greatest inventions, because it allows value to be exchanged between people, by making possible the division of labour.

The division of labour is that process which allows me to just be a chef, and to earn the money I require for the purchase of whatever other things I may I need. In this way, you can be a car mechanic, or a software engineer, and other people can be whatever they want - and in totality this allows us to trade with each other - sharing in an ever-expanding economic pie.

If you want a picture of a world without the division of labour, then just imagine yourself as a *Robinson Crusoe* figure, alone on a desert island. In such a situation you would have to physically create everything you need (apart from any food and other raw materials you may find in your natural surroundings). You'd have become your own carpenter, your own clothes maker, your own vegetable grower, your own farmer, and even your own entertainer!

Money is the oil for the division of labour *machine*. Money is the tool of your own increasing freedom. Money is not a static, limited thing, but a dynamic capacity to enable the constant creation and exchange of **new** wealth.

The myth that money is in short supply, that there is only so much wealth in the world, is an idea that has horrendous social consequences. It gives rise to various totalitarian ideologies, in the attempt to equalise, to share the limited wealth that supposedly exists.

The truth is almost stranger than fiction. We are the creators of money, by the use of our creative minds and consequent actions to bring our ideas to fruition. As Ayn Rand said in her novel *Atlas Shrugged* - "Wealth is the product of man's capacity to think."

We are not limited in our thinking. Nor are we limited in the amount of wealth we can create. Money is but a reflection of that fact. But there is **one** limiting factor on our creativity in this regard - and that's the impact of the state on the very money system itself. No discussion of money is complete without mentioning the role the state plays as **controller** and **manipulator** of the money system.

The *shortage of money myth* is bolstered by the existence of its corollary - the myth that the state must issue and control money - whether directly or by proxy, via monopoly status granted to other entities. And by the use of fiat money - money without intrinsic value - the state has been able to loot the emerging wealth of potentially free people via the stealth tax known as **inflation**.

Money is indeed a tool of freedom, and getting the state out of the money business is an essential prerequisite to allowing it to fulfill its purpose.

8. The Self Sacrifice Myth

There is one myth which underpins all the others - a **super-myth** if you will. It is the idea that the highest moral action involves self sacrifice. This idea is preached by all external authorities - whether family, society, church or state. For some reason, we have elevated the idea of self sacrifice to the embodiment of what is considered the *good*.

To ensure no misunderstanding, let's define self sacrifice before going any further. Self sacrifice is when you give up something of greater value (to you) for something of lesser value. For example, if I offered you my \$10 note for your \$100 one, then in giving it to me you would be sacrificing your own self interest. You would be accepting something less in return for something more. On the other hand, if I was your brother and that money was meant to keep me from starving, then such a transaction would not be a self sacrifice - unless you valued your \$100 more than you valued your brother.

It's possible to see where this moral idea may have come from - in the evolutionary need to grant higher importance to the preservation of the species, rather than one individual life. So, at its root the idea of self sacrifice is one of the collective versus the individual.

Here is not the place to get into examples of what is and what is not self sacrifice, suffice to say that you being asked to give up an evening at the cinema, in favour of visiting your best friend in hospital - is **not** self sacrifice, unless you actually value the movie more than your best friend!

Self sacrifice is the morality of **altruism** - the belief that your life is inherently of less value than someone else's, and that you have a moral **duty** to satisfy such a person's needs above your own. This sense of moral duty is played to high heaven by organised religion and the state. In fact, one could argue that self sacrifice is a pivotal element in all religions. Certainly, the state has no qualms about invoking this sacred mantra - and does so frequently.

Just take one example. Most wars of the last couple of hundred years have been fought by conscripting unwilling young men to fight. This form of compulsory servitude is justified on the grounds that the individual must be prepared to sacrifice his life for the greater good - in this case, the security of the nation state. In both World War I and II, the whole public psyche was whipped up to a frenzy in order to ensure compliance with this idea. So much so, that it took a brave lad indeed to become a conscientious objector, not to mention his willingness to spend time in jail.

There is one question that is never asked, when people are being told to make sacrifices in this way - to sacrifice their own interests or life, for the benefit of others. And that is this: **who** collects the sacrifices? If someone is sacrificing something, then someone else is gaining that which has been sacrificed. And if altruism is the moral high ground, what morality is the receiver of sacrifices operating under?

Applying this question in such situations, where one is being asked to commit an act of self sacrifice, provides an illustrative example of why the powers-that-be have a great interest in perpetrating this particular morality.

Just ask yourself this one question. Why is your life inherently worth less than someone else's? Why should you consider it *good* to sacrifice your life in favour of another's? More importantly, why should you consider your life to be worth less than the group of lives - the collective?

But there is an even more damning indictment of this whole false morality - and that is people simply don't go along with it! They may be cajoled, bullied, and even forced - but the number of people who will willingly walk away to their own *slaughter* is surprisingly small. In other words, in the real world this pseudo morality gets a short shift.

But the power of this morality cannot be underestimated, because even while people are constantly acting in their own interests (selfishly), the organs of external authority have one further weapon. **Guilt.**

Even though they, the non-sacrificers, cannot actually get people to voluntarily sacrifice their lives in favour of more *worthwhile* goals - forcing such people to do so is not their only option. Guilt can be even more effective in the hands of the would-be power-seeker. If you can create a sense of guilt in someone, you can manipulate him. If you can create a sense of guilt in a whole society, you can manipulate it.

Of course, the power of guilt is well known, and has been applied by church, king and state down through the ages.

To free yourself from the idea that you are simply a sacrificial animal, for the benefit of higher causes, or better people, you need to realise that your life is your own highest value - the supreme value, as far as you are concerned. And you need to shrug off the guilt that the sacrifice-demanders are constantly trying to lay on your shoulders.

Bad Ideas Have Bad Consequences

These eight myths, as explained, all represent fallacious ideas, ideas that have wrought negative consequences - and in many cases been responsible for the destruction of millions of human lives, not to mention billions of destroyed or unrealised wealth. They are perpetrated by the society's organs of external authority, which seek to maintain and enforce the existing social order - an order where they are the prime beneficiaries.

Think of these myths as similar to **drugs** - which alter your state of awareness, your concept of reality, and which are highly addictive. Just like drugs, you can get hooked, and not even know you have a problem. The more myths you accept and believe, the more you are bound by the **cultural matrix**. Conversely, the more myths you can offload and reject, the more you are capable of setting yourself free.

To the extent you can pry yourself away from each or any of these myths, you can free yourself to think **for** yourself. And if you can exorcise **all** these myths from your mind, you are well on the way to becoming an autonomous person - a true **sovereign individual**.

Ridding oneself of one or more of these myths is no easy task however, as it requires a willingness to evaluate the source of one's own ideas, and to do so with an objective and enquiring mind. It then requires a willingness to abandon those ideas which are patently false, and which do more harm than good. And ultimately, these bad ideas need to be replaced by good ideas - new ideas which can create the fertile ground for freedom, prosperity and happiness on this earth.

The big question is - where to **start**?

You certainly cannot change this from within the organisations that disseminate these myths. You cannot change the society, the church, the state or the world. You cannot infiltrate them in the hope of creating the required change. You cannot vote in the change via the political process. You can only change **yourself**. And this is good news, because - unlike the other options - this is actually doable in your own lifetime!

Changing yourself, your thinking and your circumstances, is not nearly as hard as trying to change the whole world. And it's just as well. Not only that, but a changed world requires changed individuals first - so it's a matter of getting the order right.

Fortunately, one does not have to reinvent the wheel to begin this process. There is a wealth of information that can assist you in moving towards a life of more practical freedom. In fact, I have put together an introductory *Freedom Information Package* which explores these ideas and lays out a strategy for bucking the system and starting out on your own personal freedom road. It is part two of the **Sovereign Manifesto**.

The *Freedom Information Package* is **free**. You just need to ask for it. And to do that, simply **CLICK HERE** and scroll down the page to complete the online form.

I look forward to seeing you again soon.

Yours in Freedom

David MacGregor
www.sovereignlife.com

P.S. Please feel free to pass this report on to others, no strings attached. And if you're more capitalist inclined, I've developed a system where you can give this report away to others for **free** - and make **money** for yourself in the process. If you'd like to know more about how you can distribute this book for free, and earn money while you're at it - please **CLICK HERE** to learn more about our exclusive Affiliate

Programme.

About the Author

*David MacGregor operates a private online community called **SovereignLife**. It is designed as a haven for individualists, freedom seekers and would-be sovereign individuals, a place to meet, discuss and learn the strategies necessary to break free of the system and live life on one's own terms. It's an oasis of freedom in a world drowning in totalitarianism. He also publishes a weekly e-letter called **The SovereignLife Report** - which seeks to alert people to the dangers of just letting things drift. David has been living "outside the box" now since 2000, when he uprooted himself from his home country, in favour of the life of an "internationalist". His passion is to seek out those of like mind, inspire those who may be searching for something better, and offer a ray of hope in an otherwise oppressive world.*
