

Have some questions for us?

Aren't you too optimistic about people?

On the contrary, it is the statist who is too optimistic about people. He believes that you can give some guys all the guns and the power to make laws, and those guys will just serve "the people's" interests like good saps. As we can see, it doesn't work! And it can't work.

Has anarchy ever existed in history?

Yes, there have been many anarchic societies, especially primitive ones. Remember that we started without States! Anarchy is the default. More modern examples include medieval Iceland and Ireland (which both lasted for more than 300 years with success), modern Somalia (for approximately 15 years, during which the infrastructure and wealth grew rapidly), the Old West (which was actually a pretty peaceful place, relatively speaking), Labrador, and others.

Wouldn't we just get another State eventually?

If everyone still believes in the State, sure. That is why we need to help people understand that Market Anarchy is our only long-term chance for freedom. But if the ideal of freedom dominates, no. Only the State can create and maintain monopolies, and the State is the biggest monopoly of all.

But we can't possibly eliminate the State!

Any mass movement has to start somewhere. People must have said the same thing to those who tried to curtail the rights of kings, or tried to stop modern slavery. Both were long, arduous processes, spanning multiple generations. We are realists and do not expect the state to fall within our lifetime and be replaced by an anarchist Utopia. But we are also realist enough to seek to explain our ideal to others and build a community of like-minded individuals. We hope you will be one of them.



Major Market Anarchist sites on the Internet:

www.simplyanarchy.com - A directory of Market Anarchist studies, papers and articles on a wide variety of topics.
tolfa.us - The On Line Freedom Academy, where you can get a free course on Market Anarchic principles.
www.strike-the-root.com - The biggest daily collection of news and articles about Market Anarchy on the Internet.
www.anti-state.com - "market anarchism online"

Market Anarchy for Americans

*Created as a voluntary, coordinated effort between
Francois Tremblay and David Pearson.*



Isn't America great?

You probably believe there are some great things about the United States of America. The fact that you are allowed to speak your mind. The fact that it gives opportunities to everyone. The fact that you can govern yourself the way you want, not the way anyone else wants. Whatever you believe is great about America, keep it in mind for now.

For now, I just want to point out to you a few problems with this concept of the United States of America...

Five little problems

1. What does it mean?

What exactly does it mean to say "America is good"? Is the piece of land good? Land cannot be "good." Does it mean the people that live on it are good? Is everyone that lives on a piece of land "good"? Does it mean the government? Is that small group of elected incompetents "good"? Do their actions reflect justice or morality in any way, or do they reflect their own interests as leaders with all the guns? Or are we talking about something else entirely? I think I know the answer to that, but for now I'll let you think about it...

2. The "United States Constitution" is a contract between dead people.

The Constitution was signed by fifty-five rich white landowners, all of whom are long deceased. A person is not bound to a contract that he did not sign, regardless of whether his ancestors signed it or not. If the Constitution is a contract based on consent, then it can only apply to those people who actually consented to being governed by the Constitution: those people are now long dead!

3. You've never signed the Constitution or consented to it.

Let's be honest for a second. If you had to sign a contract saying that you approve of everything the United States government does, and pledge to give up to half your income to it, would you do it? Especially if you had local alternatives? Probably not!

You probably only vote or participate in politics because you believe things can be changed. But that's what everyone thinks, even your opponents. Can you imagine how much time and resources are wasted in political activism and election campaigns? All of it based on protecting a fraud.

What contract binds you to obey and finance the War on Drugs, gun control, the welfare state, the EPA, the FDA, public schools, or taxation itself? What contract have you signed that requires you to surrender up to half your income every year in exchange for these things? None.

And it won't work to simply say that "you live here, therefore you consent." You do not fall under a legal contract just because you're in one place or another. That's simply not how contracts are made. Also, being somewhere definitely does not mean you agree with whatever happens in that place. If you go to a man's home, and you see him beating his wife, you wouldn't feel less scandalized if he told you "you came here, so you consent to everything I do." That's nonsense! Finally, the argument assumes that the government owns all the land. If that's true, then there's no freedom at all, and we might as well live in a Communist country.

4. Arbitrary state borders.

Who decided what New Hampshire was? Who decided what Virginia was? Those were borders of colonies drawn by the British. The ratification of the Constitution was based on arbitrary borders drawn by British bureaucrats. It wasn't based on anyone's consent: just majority votes inside those imaginary borders.

5. The War of Northern Aggression.

The Constitution says it's based on consent (remember "We the people of the United States..."). But the War of Northern Aggression proved that this was a fraud! (by the way, it can't be a "Civil War," since the United States was entirely made up)

More than 650,000 people died because some states wanted to leave the Union and the federal government refused to relinquish all that territory and money. While the issue of slavery was certainly involved, Lincoln himself admitted that his fundamental goal was to politically enslave the South:

"My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that."

— Abraham Lincoln, Letter to Horace Greeley,
August 22, 1862.

It was the bloodiest war in "American" history, and like all other wars, it was based on a fraud. The only thing that Lincoln was protecting was his own power and the power of his illegitimate government.

"The principle, on which the war was waged by the North, was simply this: **That men may rightfully be compelled to submit to, and support, a government that they do not want;** and that resistance, on their part, makes them traitors and criminals. **No principle, that is possible to be named, can be more self-evidently false than this; or more self-evidently fatal to all political freedom.**"

—Lysander Spooner

The "United States of America" is a fantasy perpetuated by the ruling class (those who make the laws and stay above the laws, while imposing them on us) to exploit us. Why else would it pretend to "protect" us with our "consent," while suppressing anyone who wants to protect themselves differently? If government "services" are so obviously necessary to everyone, why do they need to be paid by force?



The State vs. Society

Democracy cannot survive without coercion.

The fact that neither the British nor the American Empire would accept secession, and had to force people into accepting a government they did not want, is just a fact of democracy.

"**You can not be a democrat unless you are prepared to kill.** An entirely pacifist democracy might work for small homogenous groups, but not for large States with hundreds of millions of inhabitants. A large democratic State, with no armed forces, would be overwhelmed by secession."

—Lea Brilmayer,

"Secession and self-determination: a territorial interpretation,"
Yale Journal of International Law

All governments are based on coercion.

Historically, governments are not founded on consent. All governments, without exception, start as a way to extract tribute from a defeated or subservient people (if you'd like to learn more on this, see *The State*, by Franz Oppenheimer). We see this in the way the British Empire treated the "Americans," as a colony meant to generate revenue, and then in how the American Empire treated the South, as a potential loss of revenue and power.

You're just anti-American!

I am not against the "United States of America," any more than I am against Lex Luthor or the Grinch. They are all fictional entities. The only difference is that those who believe in the fiction of the "United States" extort, kidnap and kill people like you and me every day.

Remember when I asked what you thought was great about the "United States of America"? I think that if you look carefully, you will see that most of your answers are about the society you live in, not government or arbitrary borders. The freedom you enjoy exists because other people respect it. The opportunities exist because other people provide them. In short, you live in a society where people live based on these principles. That is what "America is good" really means!

"**Society is joint action and cooperation** in which each participant sees the other partner's success as a means for the attainment of his own."

—Ludwig von Mises

Government is the enemy of society

Are you free to govern yourself? Not under government. You are free to vote, but the ruling class will never give you real choices, and has no incentive to do so. They set the rules of the game and expect you to cheer for your favourite team like a good working class drone.

The net result of democracy is that we all have to fight each other to get the laws we want before others do the same to us. Whatever your position is on religion, abortion, homosexuality, guns, censorship, the environment, you can be sure that there are millions of people who want to force you to see it their way. And as long as democracy exists, it will always be this way!

"Everyone wants to live at the expense of the state. They forget that **the state wants to live at the expense of everyone.**"

—Frederic Bastiat



What is the solution?

Freedom means living in the way you want, in peace with others, without the need for coercion or violence. Because it imposes ruling class values on everyone and violently suppresses anyone who wants to live otherwise, government itself is the opposite of freedom. To live free, we must first

follow the examples of the revolutionaries and fight against government- but without replacing it with another coercive government!

In short, the only viable solution is Market Anarchy.



What is Market Anarchy?

Market Anarchy lets everyone live the way they want, according to their own values.

Everyone has different value systems, and all that the state does is impose a monopolizing law on everyone, making everyone fight each other to be able to live a certain way. In a Market Anarchy, everyone would be free to live the way they want. If you want to live in a commune, that's fine. If you want to be protected by a big corporation because it's cheaper, that's fine. If you want to live in a close-knit community, then do it.

We can solve our differences like adults.

In statism, we delegate the state to threaten (pass laws) and kidnap (arrest) people for us. In a Market Anarchy, we solve our differences like adults, by settling differences in advance, through arbitration or contract.

We can live in incredible prosperity.

The state always crushes the poor, the least powerful, the small businesses (that generate 90% of jobs), in favour of the wealthy, the powerful, and the big businesses. State violence is win-lose, and it's us, the ones without political power, who always lose. It is a universal fact of history that the working class, the masses, always have the most to win from freedom.

We can stop crime better.

Whatever agency you decide to use would have strong incentives to deliver real services, preventing and solving crimes. People would get arrested because they break the agreements between themselves and their agencies or chosen communities, not because they go against the ruling class. We would have the power to decide what kind of laws we are ready to spend our resources on.

