

Anatomy Of The State: A Critical Review

Attikuppam Umapathi

Assistant Professor, Political Science,
City University, Mogadishu, Somalia

Abstract: *This paper is an attempt to critically review the book Anatomy of the State by Murray N. Rothbard, which centers on the concept of the state. As the title suggests, the book is an attempt to understand how state as an institution has structured or designed itself into a leviathan organization with the power to control everything that falls within its territorial domain. State positions itself above everything, and monopolizes the power to punish, which in turn helps it to further its potential to remain supreme. And state is present everywhere ... all the time ... in varying ranges. State identifies itself with all individuals, groups, religions, institutions, and time-honored ideals to heighten its persistence and to perpetuate the servitude of the rest. It creates and collapses some institutions, and collaborates with other institutions to serve its purpose i.e., to spread its tentacles further and further. It punishes (sometimes even kills) its people for 'conspiring' against it, and protects and honors those who support it. State masquerades itself as a protector of people, and cloaks its tyranny as a necessary trusteeship. State develops networks and builds mazes like organizational and ideological structures that makes the people to predicate on particular grounds that are useful to the state. Different theories in support of state like social-contract, divine rights etc. usually present state in a positive note, primarily to make the people believe that a stateless condition is anarchical. The notion that a stateless situation is anarchical i.e., anarchy as a beginning of the doomsday, is usually widely spread by the state to embellish the consequences of its absence. Thus, state takes all the steps that are necessary for its presence and preservation. Rothbard's Anatomy of the State vividly presents the strategies adopted by state in different circumstances, and in different aspects to add more and more power to its arsenal.*

Keywords: *Appropriation, Economic Means, Monopoly of Violence, Parasitism, Political Means, Social Power, Social-contract, Sovereignty, State Power, State.*

I. INTRODUCTION

State as the highest institution, in varying forms, has millenniums of years of history. Though the form and domain of the state has been in continuous transformation, its presence, and its domination as the supreme arbiter, or highest authority has never been challenged. Different interpretations regarding the emergence of the state like social-contract theory, force theory, divine rights theory, and evolutionary theory etc. point to one conclusion – the inevitability of state. Hence, it may sound commonsensical to believe that the existence of state as an institution is something that human beings as social beings cannot plausibly avoid. Though different theories attribute different ranges of powers to the state, and usually expect to limit the state apparatus to certain areas of human life only, the state seems to transcend all these

limitations to subjugate people at any given time. All most all theories, with reference to state, point to the 'fact' that states are mutually constituted institutions and that people can get away with the states if they wish. But the same theories also point to the *fact* that state is a necessary evil and it is impossible to abolish state. Even ideas like anarchism, or Marxist concepts of withering away of the state etc. refrain from claiming a complete disappearance of the state. This makes us to infer that state is there all the time regardless of time, place and circumstance. State may disappear once in a while during times of revolution or war but it will be back to its dominant status as soon as the conditions settle down. In fact, it is the resurgence of state that bring normalcy during the times of revolution or war.

Theoretical assumptions that human beings can overthrow the state apparatus if they find it arbitrary seems to carry no

weight at all as history points to the undisputable fact that human beings have never been out from the control of some form of state. And examples for people coming together to overthrow the state are very rare to find except during revolutions (for brief periods) which are mostly carried out to change the form of the state rather than to abolish it. Hence, it can be conveniently concluded that state is an everlasting institution, briefly punctuated by revolutions once in a while (p-47). As we arrive at the thought of the inevitability of the state we come across many questions like what a state is, and how it relates itself to different individuals, groups or institutions. The assumption (could be reality to some extent) that state is a result of mutual constitution of people and that it can be exterminated at their will sounds reasonable in theory. But in practice, state is neither the result of the mutual constitution of the human beings at any particular time nor has it been exterminated by them so far. This places state not only above all the other institutions but above all mutual constitution or social-contract (at least in practice, and let us forget about theoretical possibilities for a while). And to summarize; 'state is inevitable, not exterminable, and omnipotent – at least in its presence'. Now that we accept the inevitability and domination of state in all spheres, and at all stages, let us now turn to what a state is, how it has emerged, and how it manages to stay above all individuals, groups, institutions or society in general.

II. ANATOMY OF THE STATE

The birth or emergence of a state is explained in different ways by different theories. State, according to social-contract theory, is an outcome of the mutual constitution of its inhabitants i.e., it is a result of general-will of the people. According to evolutionary theory, state emerged or consolidated itself in a phase wise manner starting from primordial forms of clans or kinships to the modern states of monstrous proportions. The divine rights theory of state, according to the ruling kings, and their supporting classes, is a result of god's-will or trusteeship bequeathed on a particular individual or family to rein over the populace for their protection. Yet another theory that defines the emergence of state in a more or less realistic manner is force theory which defines state as a result of conquest, war, aggression, exploitation, marauding, and parasitism by force on the larger masses. Rothbard's example of the emergence of state seems to fit quite well with the force theory. To cite the example quoted by Rothbard, *"one method of the birth of a State may be illustrated as follows: in the hills of southern Ruritania, a bandit group manages to obtain physical control over the territory, and finally the bandit chieftain proclaims himself 'King of the sovereign and independent government of South Ruritania'; and, if he and his men have the force to maintain this rule for a while, lo and behold! A new State has joined the 'family of nations', and the former bandit leaders have been transformed into the lawful nobility of the realm"* (pp. 16-17). As simple as that. And the newly emerged state reshapes itself according to its own requirements in the name of its people, by using force in the initial phases of consolidation, and subsequently by developing different state centered

hegemonic ideas that subjugate the people in varying degrees at various levels. The longer it manages to protect itself the more and more 'legitimate' it becomes. Consequently, all the institutions, ideas, values, conventions, laws, decisions, and force it employs becomes *natural*, and human life in that particular state becomes a derivative of that particular state agreeing or disagreeing with something. To cite the example of this particular state, Ruritania, which has emerged by force, monopolization of the force and violence becomes its first and foremost act to protect itself from the rebellion of the people. Hence, according to Rothbard, *"the state is that organization in society which attempts to maintain a monopoly of the use of force and violence in a given territorial area; in particular, it is the only organization in society that obtains its revenue not by voluntary contribution or payment for 'services' rendered but by coercion"* (p-11). State can be said to be in competition with the private individuals in competition for the resources. State usually tries to gain over private individuals and private sector – by identifying itself with 'broader society' in the name of 'democracy' (p-9).

State masquerades people by identifying itself with different words and ideas that camouflages its intentions. This identification – we are the government – makes individuals think that they are part of the state, and that the acts of state are more or less endorsed or decided by them. But there seems to be a lot of difference between the term 'we-are-the-government', and the 'government-of-state'. The idea that we-are-the-government inherently implies that all the decisions are taken by the people, hence, all decisions of the state or government stands to be non-coercive, and all our obligations to the state are voluntary i.e., we decide to raise or pay taxes on our own, we decide to punish ourselves by identifying with the state, and we execute ourselves for our treason against our state, we do everything on our own, and nothing is done by the state. This makes every act of state an act of our own; we decided to fight world wars, we decided to bomb ourselves, and we decided to holocaust ourselves. Therefore, everything that a state does can be perceived as voluntarily actions of individuals. But this does not seem to be the reality in reality. The understanding that we-are-the-government seem to be in conflict with reality i.e., with the government-of-few. Hence, this 'broader' term "we" is used by government i.e., by the government-of-few as a reference source for all its decisions. This 'we' helps 'us' (the state) to protect 'ourselves' (the state) from ourselves (the people). Hence, we (the people) are not 'we' (the state or government). Then, who are 'we' (state)? 'We' (state) are 'we' (state by few), and therefore, 'we' (state) are different from ourselves (the people) (pp. 9-10). Hence, according to Rothbard, *"no organicist metaphor, no irrelevant bromide that 'we are all part of one another', must be permitted to obscure this basic fact"* (p-11) and we are not the government or the state. This makes state a separate entity. If state is a separate entity, then what is it?

III. STATE POWER AS PREDATOR OF SOCIAL POWER

Historically, state power seems to be in race with social power. Social power is a result of peaceful cooperation among the individuals or groups who continuously engage with the

nature to produce goods for their survival and generation of wealth. State power, on the contrary, is the power of the state to appropriate the socially produced wealth, through different means like war, taxation, confiscation, force, seizure etc. *"Social power is man's power over nature and state power is the coercive and parasitic seizure of this production"* (pp. 53-54). Thus, *"social power is man's power over nature and state power is power over man"* (p-54). Human beings, by mixing their labor with nature, produce wealth that is required for their survival. This wealth is produced in a peaceful manner by a mutual process of give and take. This produced wealth is exchanged for other similarly produced wealth by others that results in extra utilities or different utilities that an individual may think is necessary. The concept of private property, according to Locke, is a result of human beings mixing their labor with the nature, and those who labor, in coordination with nature, produce wealth, which turns into property of the individuals who produced it. This property-right is recognized by all human beings as a produce of particular individuals or groups, and is mutually accepted by all the individuals or groups surrounding this produce as property of certain individual because of her labor. This mutual identification of property as a labor of specific individual avoids human beings from fighting for the production, and avoids the prevalence of jungle law. Normal production mechanism takes this path, and it is the *only* path to *produce* something (pp. 13-15).

Wealth, according to Franz Oppenheimer, is acquired by two methods; one method is by employing *economic means* and the other method is by employing *political means*. The former method i.e., acquisition of wealth by economic means, is done by human beings by generation of wealth, by mixing their labor with nature, and mutually recognizing this wealth as property of those who have generated it. The later method i.e., acquisition of wealth by political means, is done by state by appropriating the already produced wealth (produced by employing economic means by individuals) by using force, confiscation, taxation, war, and other politically structured and defended means. Wealth acquired by employing economic means is a natural way whereas wealth acquired by employing political means is exploitation of the labor of others, usually done by state or its subordinate institutions or groups on behalf of the state. The political means of acquisition of wealth is parasitic in nature as those who are involved in its acquisition do not actually produce it but rob it from others who have produced it. This method, inherently involves a dual disadvantage; one – a section of people (in the name of state) are not producing anything, and two – this section is robbing the product of others through parasitism (in the name of state) thus reducing the total wealth that is generated by others (pp. 14-15). Hence, *"state is the 'organization of political means; it is the systematization of the predatory process over a given territory" – 15.*

State uses egalitarian cloak to induce guilt among the individuals who strive for wealth, and the idea of individual private property is under consistent pressure in the name of public good put through different 'egalitarian' arguments like socialism, trusteeship, redistribution, progressive taxation etc. Resistance to these methods is usually considered as profit seeking, exploitation, materialism, capitalism, self-interest etc. The wealth that the state 'legally' appropriates through these

methods are put to 'public use', and sometimes used to strengthen the security of the 'people' (state) (pp. 27-28). This parasitic section (state) is continuously afraid of its existence as its lifeline of plundering, looting, and warring may end any time due to the rebellion or non-compliance of the individuals or groups who actually produce the wealth. Therefore, to avoid this insecurity or danger to its existence, state establishes a lifeline with certain systematic features that are made to be conceived as 'legal' and 'legitimate'. These legal and legitimate mechanisms of the state artifice its nature and helps it to parasite *peacefully* in a continuous manner.

The origin of state, according to Rothbard, is not at all consistent with social-contract, but is a result of continuous time-honored methods like looting, warring, killing, plundering, conquest, seizure, and cordoning off etc. so as to preserve, and monopolize its parasitism. Eventually, the state domesticates its prey (people who really produce) in order to ensure itself a continuous extraction of produce, and adopts more peaceful methods like taxation – with occasional minimal redistribution to ensure the survival of its prey. All these methods are monopolized by the state with additional fearsome features of monopolized 'legal' punishment and murder to protect 'us' (state) from ourselves (people) (pp. 15-16). To quote Albert Jay Nock *"the state claims and exercises monopoly of crime ... it forbids private murder, but itself organizes murder on a colossal scale. It punishes private theft, but itself lays unscrupulous hands on anything it wants, whether the property of citizens or of alien"* (quoted in footnotes (p-16)). How has state, with all these violent features, been persisting for millenniums? Why the majority (masses) has not been able to abolish the state (state by few)?

IV. PERSISTENCE OF THE STATE

To preserve its monopoly, state adopts and follows many time-honored values. As soon as the state monopolizes its parasitism and violence, its next project is to sustain these qualities from rebellion of its prey (people), or to address and control the dissent among its prey. To make sure that the parasitism continues without any interruption, the state establishes some form of 'legitimate' mechanisms that should camouflage the state's real agenda (preying), and present the state to its prey as a protector (not as a predator). Different 'legitimate' functional structures like bureaucracy, representation, policing, courts, contracts, laws etc. are designed by state to continue its predation. These mechanisms protect the state (minority) from its prey (masses) (pp. 18-19). Nevertheless, establishment of these 'legitimate' mechanisms alone is not going to protect the state from the masses. Therefore, the state has to establish an opinion among the people that the state is there for them, and that it is inevitable to be ruled by a state. This process requires 'ideas' that support the necessity of the state and its time-honored forms. These ideas have to be shaped into ideologies with 'voluntary' supporters defending these ideologies (often with their lives) whenever required. These ideas are usually manufactured by 'intellectuals', and these ideas are promoted as reasons for the existence of the state. 'Ideas' or theoretical propositions like

social-contract, Leviathan, general-will, and state as mother of all institutions etc. are made to sound reasonable.

The larger public, who are usually made to believe to be lacking intellectual caliber to digest these aspects are usually made to follow these ideas, and are disciplined with these ideas that usually manufacture chauvinistic positions like nationalism, socialism, democracy etc. State tags these manufactured ideologies to different sections, classes, races, gender etc. identities to make sure that the people fight among themselves, but not the state. This makes sure that the dissent or rebellion of the masses are limited to particular color and shape of the state, but not extended to its existence. Hence, the works of intellectuals are quite important to the state, and so is their alliance. Therefore, intellectuals are made to join or identify themselves with the state through different recognitions, positions, promotions, and pays and perks. An intellectual may be allowed to be critical of the state in a contextual manner but is ensured all the time that she is never against the existence of the state; even concepts like withering away of the state seem to make us believe that some 'slim' form of state is bound to hang around. This alliance of ideologies between the state and the 'intellectuals' develops a *language* with specific state centric vocabulary that is used to control the masses (pp. 19-20). State also finds alliance in the form of religion and its related institutions. Religion tames the prey, make them passive, disciplined, non-violent, and good listeners, learner and seekers of 'facts' (and fiction as well). Different intangible, undecipherable, and unprovable ideas like guilt, duty, obedience, piousness, sin, contentment etc. dogmas that the religion uses to domesticate the people are adopted by the state as 'naturally' and 'universally-accepted' values. Hence, religion as a magic wand, is protected by the state in the name of faith, religious freedom, conscience, values etc. and is shielded from rational criticism in the name of blasphemy. This domestication helps the state to guide its prey in a particular direction, and religion acts as blinkers which the state uses to destine its prey to the farmhouse (p-23).

State also instills fear among the people by citing the threat from anarchy, violence, lawlessness, jungle law etc. and claims itself to be the *only* protector of human lives and communities from decaying. The state is presented, and promoted as a larger family or community in which the people are constituted to be its inhabitants. Since the state identifies itself with a particular territory, in which individuals hold a piece of land, it is generally made to identify itself with the property of the people. Hence, an attack on its territorial limits is made to be conceived by people as an attack on their personal lands – though the individual might be hundreds or thousands of miles away from the border. A fight for monopoly of parasitism and violence among the states is presented as a threat to the land and property of the individuals and these individuals are made to lineup in defense of the state's actions. To people, the results of a war, or winning or losing of 'their' state or 'alien' state may not make any difference as it is a fight for the rights of the state for parasitism. Nonetheless, the individuals, who are usually made to believe that their present contentment is the best possible outcome in a given circumstance, usually try to protect 'their' state from 'alien' states or internal collapse. This makes the

individuals residing in a state to think that any war or rebellion that challenges the position of 'their' state is a war that should be considered as 'us' versus 'theirs'. Thus, the prey is made to defend its predator (pp. 23-24).

To identify itself with the masses, the state uses the weapon of tradition; the longer the tradition of state or government the more weight it commands among the masses. Different 'positive' aspects like knowledge, wisdom, perfection etc. are usually attributed to the tradition of the state. This tradition, which is followed by vast masses, due to its longevity of its subjugating capacity, acts as a fort of resistance against new ideas. Apparently, all new ideas are tend to originate from a small minority of individuals. Ideas questioning the purpose and existence of the state are usually projected as anarchist, and are made to be condemned by the masses citing the opposition of these ideas to tradition, history, dynasty etc. Selective examples of failure of new ideas are propagated among the masses to make them resist and despise new ideas that question the existence of state. Similarly, new ideas that strengthen the state such as effective taxation or defense mechanism, or surveillance, or adding additional layers of bureaucracy, or added wealth and power to the state are made to be lauded by the masses. All these self-centered quality (power) control mechanisms of the state makes the masses go hysterical in defending their state. This process fulfills the inception of reactionary foundations laid on the hearts, minds, and shoulders of the masses. This fulfills the process of making the masses to shoulder and defend a particular palanquin – the state. Thus, individuals are bound to follow their predecessors or preceding generations, and any deviation by a particular individual or group of individuals is generally considered as an act of rebellious, or unwanted militancy. Hence, people are bound to follow the majority opinion, which usually, is manufactured to coincide with different state masqueraded concepts like 'natural law, law of the land, common good, national interest, general-will, public opinion, just society' and so on and so forth. These things make the individuals to listen to their brothers and sisters, and to look for the established (by state) knowledge and wisdom of their ancestors (earlier forms of state) (pp. 25-27).

Sometimes, and in most of the times in recent times, state uses 'science' to defend its decisions. This science based knowledge or reasoning helps the state in two ways; first – it forms an unquestionable defense mechanism against the rationality or thinking of the masses, and second – it subjugates the mass rationality by depreciating it to mere intuition. The state uses all its functional structures to generate facts supporting its arguments. Different methods like statistics, scientific breakthroughs, institutional data, government records etc. are used to support its arguments. And this apparently makes the people to believe that their understanding of surroundings are not based on any empirical facts. This cloaks the way state functions and how it understands things and makes certain things completely undecipherable to the masses. Nonetheless, the masses are made to feel that the state with all its scientific approach, proven rationality, and long sustained credibility – must be right. For example, the state can form a 'rational' defense mechanism around an institutionalized plundering and redistribution in the name of Keynesian multiplier effect, but

can forbid applying the same rationality to a Robin Hood. Thus, the state monopolizes 'rationality', and contradicts the 'irrationality' of the masses (pp. 27-29).

The exclusive sovereign power that the state claims and controls through violence acts as a launching ground to all its activities. And sovereignty is defended as a compulsory component of any state. Describing sovereignty, Jouvenel says that, *"many writers on theories of sovereignty have worked out one ... of these restrictive devices. But in the end every single such theory has, sooner or later, lost its original purpose, and come to act merely as a springboard to power, by providing it with the powerful aid of an invisible sovereign with whom it could in time successfully identify itself" (p-31)*. The powers of the state are systematically increased by citing the legitimate process of representation, democracy etc. and these institutions are presented as neutral to all the parties – all the parties of the state and all the parties of the public. Different 'checks and balances' and 'constitutionally recognized' rights etc. are cited by the state as an example of how limited it is, and how submissive it is to the people. The checks and balances are made to make the people feel that the state is inherently limited, and is continuously restricting its responsibility to 'unavoidable' aspects only. The 'constitutionality' of a law, endorsed by an 'independent' judiciary is often cited as a reference to how contented the state is in assessing its power requirements. But the very basic aspect that all these checks and balance end up in supporting some 'minimal' laws that nonetheless end up adding power to the state, is completely forgotten (pp. 30-34).

The checks and balances that the state creates acts as a cushion against the seizure of its space by people in times of turmoil, dissent, and rebellion. These checks and balances are used by state to expand its horizon whenever the citizens are passive, or whenever 'we' (state) are at war with 'others' (state). The checks and balances mechanism works 'effectively' whenever the people are vigilant against the expansion of state power, and is usually cited as a reference to how balanced the state apparatus is, or how minimal or powerless its institutions are in creating laws that are against the people. Similarly, another form of control that a state 'imposes' on itself is the concept of federation. In a technical sense, the state powers (federal) is checked by the states in a federation i.e., the powers of the center are checked by the regional governments. This argument sounds weak in its reason that these regional states are in fact acting in opposition or acting as a check to the federal government. Irrespective of whether it is a federation, unitary form of government, autonomous or completely independent state, people still are under some form of state – and this has become inevitable. Therefore, the 'autonomy' from the state is not extended to the individual domain where an individual can tax herself, exonerate herself, or to call herself a sovereign and independent identity in rejecting the laws of the others i.e., the states. Certainly the individual is not independent, and the autonomy is not extended up to her; it is extended to a point where the state feels that the extended autonomy is giving the state power, control, legitimacy, and acceptable levels of sovereignty i.e., the recognized predation in one form or another, and at one level or another level (pp. 39-41).

V. FRIENDS AND FOES OF THE STATE

Death to a state may come in two ways; one – war and, two – revolution. Hence, state fears these two problems, and is usually prepared to defend itself when faced with these problems. War as an external threat is countered by the state by mobilizing people to defend it. This is usually done by projecting the war as 'us' versus 'them' issue, and people are made to feel that it is their responsibility to defend themselves. Different state saving tactics like compulsory conscription, higher taxes, appropriation of private wealth to meet the war expenses, expanding the powers of the state in the name of emergency, glorifying the war in the name of 'honor', 'independency' etc. are used by the state to defend itself from the aggression of other states. The power of the state is usually at its peak during the war times. Hence, war is an opportunity to the state. Large scale destruction may take place, production may plunge, casualties may compound, and peace may perish, but the state strengthens itself by escalating all these things. It is the states that fight, not the people. It is difficult to find an example where a community of people have congregated, and mutually willed to fight another community – even in the primordial states. It is the representatives of the state, otherwise it is the drivers of the state who drive the state to war, and they do consider it as an opportunity to expand the domain of the state – both externally and internally. State expands (may contract as well) externally in times of war by conquest that gets it new territories, and expands internally by expanding its control over its people by citing emergency. Hence war, for a state, is a harvest to reap (if managed well). The other threat, revolution, is caused by its own people. To counter this threat, state deploys multiple ideologies, emotions, mechanisms, and usually presents a bleak future for the people for failing to defend the present form of the state. State is ready to cite examples of failed revolutions and the damage that such revolutions have caused. State usually presents its mechanisms as functionally designed and as automatically upgradable according to the changing socio-economic and political requirements. Overthrowing this well-established system, usually is made to be perceived by people as killing the golden goose. This presentation motivates the already domesticated masses to remain in safe hands (chains) – the state. Extra layers of protection in the form of laws with severe punishments for acts of treason or conspiracy against the state are 'legitimately' enacted and implemented rigorously to protect the 'people' (state) from 'anarchy'. (pp. 44-46). State finds its enemies and allies from other states. It is not feasible for two or more states to claim monopoly of parasitism and violence over a particular piece of land. Hence, states have to decide their boundaries in a precise and acceptable manner to all the states involved.

Though territory brings additional power and new set of prey, states cannot continuously fight for these resources as war may drain the states of all the resources and their respective people's capacity to produce surplus for the state. This trouble enables the states to adopt to a new alliance among the enemies i.e., states in general. Enmity is usually limited to particular occasions and particular contexts, and during the rest of the times territorial states are supposed to work as friends. The friendship among the states, apart from

recognizing other states, is extended to other forms of cooperation in the fields of trade, commerce, production, exchange, alliance, and mutually recognized needs to develop the state and make it closer to the 'people'. This process usually involves recognizing the best systems and practices, and tuning one's own state to these practices of democracy, bureaucracy, judiciary etc. States cooperate among themselves and agree to limit the war to state apparatus only, and strictly stick to the principle of not causing any damage to the civilians (prey) as this may leave the warring parties with nothing to predate on. State makes sure that the production chain and the supply of surplus to the state should not stop at any cost. Even enemy states are made to assist in this regard, and trade, commerce, exchange of people among the enemy states are made normal so as to ensure a smooth generation of wealth that the state appropriates subsequently. International laws, international treaties protecting certain 'rights' of the states or their prey are designed to regulate (not to end) the competition for predating (in a relatively peaceful manner). Hence, international peace is not aimed at peace for the people (though it results in some inherent peace quite often) but is aimed at a guaranteed and peaceful predation that is considered as acceptable or unavoidable by the people (prey) across all the states (pp. 47-52).

VI. SUMMARY

Rothbard's *Anatomy of the State* is an attempt to critically understand the emergence of the most powerful entity – state. Though the work seems to take anarchical path in its attempt to look at the anatomy of the state, its analysis sounds rational all the time. State, as Rothbard understands, can be said to be the result of the force and violence that it monopolizes. Theories like social-contract, divine rights etc. add different cloaks of legitimacy to the existence of the state. It is true that people more or less endorse a particular state, in a particular form, which more or less constitutes to some kind of social-contract, but it is also true that the state is already there all the time and people's consent or social-contract is nothing but an endorsement or rejection of a particular state. This rejection or acceptance cannot be called as a general-will that is mutually

constituted by all the inhabitants of that state. The general-will, as Rousseau defines it, is a newly formed will among the free individuals regarding the formation of a state or highest authority to bring order among the people. But in practice, justifying the existing state by citing social-contract theories is nothing but defending the existing structures by masquerading them in the name of social-contract. Normal law making in the modern states, to some extent, replicate the general-will aspect in the social-contract. But they do not quite often deal with the question of formation or dismantling of the state. Hence, Rothbard's persuasive argument that state is the result of monopolization of force and violence sounds reasonable. His explanations regarding how state protects itself, how it persists, how it forms alliance with other institutions or groups or states, how it endorses specific ideologies, how it 'rationalizes' things by taking the help of science etc. are highly verifiable to the practices of present states. All revolutions, wars, democratic changes, social-contracts, ideologies, mutual constitution of the human beings etc. seem to end up with one final position – endorsing some form of state. Rothbard's analysis that state predates on the society sounds true when we take the examples of the modern states, where survival or heightening the power of the state, is taken as primary goal of why state is created. As Rothbard presents, state does not produce, it predates on the producers, and its power gaining process itself is a predation on the social power of the society. Though the books does not give any alternatives to the institution of state, its anatomy of the state fits the structures of all modern states.

REFERENCES

- [1] Rothbard, M, N. (2009). *Anatomy of the State*. Alabama. Ludwig von Mises Institute Publications.