

Part 5: Ending the Discussion

How does understanding these things help the situation?

If, by this point, you have not successfully perked the interest of your subject to pursue these topics on his own, it may be helpful to explain the long term vision for the propagation of market anarchy and market anarchist ideas throughout society. Explain to your subject the self-destructive nature of collectivist societies. Explain that as society will be rebuilt, it is essential that the ideas of market anarchy be present, or else society will be restructured around the same false moral concepts. The more people spreading these ideas throughout society, the more they will be used to reconstruct society in a different manner.

Personal freedom in relationships

Broaching this important topic may seem difficult, as many people don't like to reconsider personal relationships which they have held for many years. However difficult, it is essential in order to become an autonomous individual. Personal freedom means taking control of the relationships you participate in on a daily basis. Explain how to look for passive aggressive behaviours, and the invocation of false moral concepts by people in everyday interactions.

This conversation as example of voluntary interaction

Another method which can be used to explain the nature of voluntary relationships is to ask your subject how he has felt throughout his discussion with you. If you have demonstrated your strong positive emotions towards market anarchy, he will be more likely to feel positive as well. He will agree that this conversation was meaningful and beneficial to him.

How do your other relationships feel?

After experiencing the positive feelings of having a mutually beneficial interaction, ask your subject to look at the facts of his other relationships, and determine if they are mutually beneficial. Being honest with one's emotions towards a person is the best way to determine if that person is benefiting you or not. If you think of a person and you don't feel excited to see them or talk with them, then this is probably not someone you should focus your energies on.

A final note

Remember to have fun throughout this process! Choosing to approach someone about the topic of market anarchy is not meant to be laborious, difficult, or painful. Don't be discouraged by negative reactions, of which you will receive plenty. However, in the experience of the authors, you will be pleasantly surprised at how well you will be received by some, especially after a bit of practice doing this.

Links

www.marketanarchy.com/pamphlets/
www.simplyanarchy.com
www.graveyardofthegods.com/forum



A Short Guide to Market Anarchy Deconversions

Created as a voluntary, coordinated effort between Andrew Greve, Aaron Kinney, and Francois Tremblay

This pamphlet is a tool to be used by market anarchists in their interactions with collectivists of all sorts. The purpose of the pamphlet is to provide an overarching strategy to aid in performing efficient market anarchist deconversions.

Part 1: Introduction

First, remember that you should always be arguing from morality, as you have the superior moral position, and morality is easier to argue than efficacy. To you, M.A. should not only stand for Market Anarchy, but should also stand for Moral Anarchy, insofar as anarchy is the only moral system of social organization.

There are as many approaches to market anarchy as there are people, so keep an open eye for an "in" - an opportunity for you to start a discussion which will lead to the desired topic of market anarchy. Here are a few ways to look for an "in":

Find a common value

In casual interaction, our values are expressed at almost every corner. Remember, a discussion about market anarchy does not have to focus on social organizational values at all times. If you witness an interaction to which you have the same reaction as your subject, such as witnessing an adult striking a child, this is a great place to start a discussion about values. Another common place to start is to find a government program which your subject finds unfavorable, and express your agreement with his views. A good approach to getting to the root of the issue, which is the immorality of the state, is to ask your subject questions about why he finds such programs unfavorable. For example; if your subject is not fond of the War on Drugs, ask him why.

Empathy

Is the person you're talking to able to empathize with others? Does he react negatively to instances of coercion? Does he react positively to instances of voluntarism? Don't be afraid to display your strong feelings towards someone else's actions during a discussion. Many times, people are afraid to strongly voice their feelings about a coercive interaction, due to their desire to conform. You can help break this trend in others by

expressing yourself to the utmost. Speak up, and show your emotions as you feel necessary. You'll be surprised how easily you can bring out the same emotions in others. Once people see that you aren't afraid to express yourself, they will want to express themselves as well.

Personal Relationships

Are you treated as an individual with unique interests, needs, and values? Remember that by engaging someone in conversation, that you are beginning a relationship with that person. The type of relationship which will result is to be determined, but be mindful of this person's individuality. Don't treat a potential market anarchist candidate as a total loss the first time he does not understand something. Also take note of this person's consideration of your values. If you are not being treated as you feel you deserve, do not feel an obligation to continue a conversation.

Part 2: The Initial Approach

Asking questions - Why? How?

The most effective way to break down a person's barriers to rational thought is to question his premises. Wait until the collectivist presents a statement, and then challenge its premises with questions. If they posit a false concept, or a non-existent "right," question it. The goal of this questioning is to expose their constructs as having no validity as moral principles or agents.

If a person posits, "[False moral concept X] is good," the best way to expose the hollowness of such a statement is to simply question it. A good response might be, "What exactly do you mean when you say 'America'?"

When the statement, "America is good," is questioned, a typical retort might be the statement, "People in America are good." A good response to this would be to continue to question the premises of the statement by asking something such as, "Do you mean all people?"

If a person says, "Everyone has a right to housing," you can ask things like, "Whose house do they have a right to?" or, "How will they get that house?"

If a person says, "Everyone has a right to health care," you can ask, "Does this right include getting health care for free?" or, "Who pays for it?"

A person who is legitimated interested in these topics will admit, sometimes grudgingly, that their original position of "[False moral concept X] is good," doesn't mean as much as they thought it did.

Knowing when to give up!

If your subject is unable to admit that there is no such thing as the "French culture" or "black people" (in terms of moral agency), then your efforts are best spent with someone else. Such a person is merely being unresponsive and wasting your time. Don't play into their game, as you will get nowhere with them in the end. It is pointless to move on to other arguments if your subject is unable to clearly see the meaninglessness of arguing in terms of false moral concepts.

If you successfully challenge the person's premises, and get them to admit that their concepts were false, then you are ready to move on to Section 3.



Part 3: The Big Guns

At this point in the discussion, you have broken down the initial barriers and are about to present substance. This will give the subject something to ask about, or in some cases complain about. Whatever he presents to you, you should have the automatic, knee-jerk, instinctual reaction: check for projections. A projection is when a person presents an objection that in fact applies to his own side. For example:

“Without government, how do we deal with criminals? We’ll just be at anyone’s mercy!”

At this point in the discussion, you don’t have to present how an M.A. answers the criminality problem (as well as redefines it). You will do that when you present the M.A. model. Right now all you need to do is think “projection” and see that it is indeed a projection; the state obviously does not solve crime, more state makes more criminals, and the state itself is the biggest criminal element of all. Also remember that any problem that already exists, exists with the state, and therefore the state cannot be its answer!

Here are three of the many arguments you can use at this point to prove anarchy:

Burden of Proof

Everything you see around you is made by individuals coming together. People talk about the roads as being something the state has to do. That’s their big example. But individuals make roads, not states. People have to make a nice flat rock path, they have to lay down asphalt, and they have to roll it all out. People do this- people like you and me. And people can own and administer them. We already have private roads right now and they are in better shape, and give better service, than state roads. Unlike state roads, private roads are accountable to their customers. The state took over and now people believe that we need the state to have roads. But we don’t need the state. It’s up to the person who believes that to prove it. Until then, anarchy is all we need.

Moral Razor

For a principle to be true, it has to apply to everyone equally. Otherwise it’s just a personal opinion or a preference, like preferring chocolate ice cream over strawberry ice cream. I like certain kinds of ice creams, and you like others, but I’m immoral if I kill you and you are immoral if you kill me. Well, in the system we live in, the state follows rules different from ours. The police and army are allowed to have guns, but they’re allowed to tell us we can’t have guns. But everyone can need to defend

himself. We’re not allowed to steal, but the state is allowed to steal from us with taxes. They don’t call it stealing, obviously, but that’s what it is. You would never agree to pay taxes if you could choose, at least not to finance the state as it is.

The Geometric Argument

Imagine you have three people on a desert island, and they are fishing to survive. If two of them decide to beat up the third and take all his fish, is that okay?” “What if they vote and the two vote in favour of taking his fish?” “Okay. What if they are ten on the island, and they decide that one guy should give up his fish to feed some other guys, and if he doesn’t they’ll beat him up?” “Okay. What if they are a hundred?” “What if they are a thousand people on the island? Is it okay now to beat some of them up and take their fish? Is it morally right?” “What if they are a million?” “Well, that’s what the state does today with millions of people. Just because there are more people around does not make it right to steal and jail people for refusing to follow the state’s laws.

After explaining an argument or two, the kind of questions you get will help you determine whether your subject is receptive, or if he is still thinking in propaganda terms. If he asks questions like “Then who will build roads?”, you can see that the person is actually considering what you’re saying, and trying to come to grasp with its implications. But if he asks questions like “But who would take care of the poor?”, which betray statist propaganda, you might want to give him some material and get out of the way, unless you have plenty of time. There is little more frustrating than going in circles against a wall of propaganda.



Part 4: Presenting the Model

After proving anarchy, and answering the basic objections, you need to inspire and inflame your subject’s mind by presenting the M.A. model as a superior, and especially more moral, alternative to today’s system. You are best able to adapt your subject’s context to this model, but there are a few points you should go through regardless of the context:

1. M.A. means everyone is allowed to live the way they want, according to their value system. Everyone has different value systems, and all that statism does is impose the ruling class value system over everyone, creating social warfare. In an M.A., there would be no more need for social warfare because 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 community in a certain way, then do it.

2. Everyone would contract with an agency, corporation, community, commune, whatever you desire. People would be free to trade for the services they want, and not trade for those they don’t want, in the way they want.

3. We can solve our differences like adults. In statism, we delegate the state to threaten and kidnap (arrest) people for us. In an M.A., we have to solve our differences like adults, by settling differences in advance, through arbitration.

4. We can live in incredible prosperity. The smaller the government, the more prosperity we see in a country. The state always crushes the poor, the least powerful, the small businesses (that generate 90% of jobs), in favour of the wealthy, the powerful, the big businesses. The state bans whole markets, creates tremendous crime (War on Drugs), makes others inefficient by monopolies, takes away our constantly inflating paper money. If the state takes away just 2% of the economy a year (a low estimate indeed), that means it takes away half of our prosperity every 35 years. We can’t take any chances with our society.

5. We can be happier and safer. Being free to live the way we want means that we can seek our own happiness instead of fighting against everyone else for that freedom. It also means that we are safe in our own freedom. If we take down the ruling class monopoly over the justice and police, we will have real justice, moral justice, efficient justice, and a more moral and efficient police, because they would be accountable to our demand for security and safety.

6. Crimes would still be solved. Whatever agency you are part of would have an incentive to give you a real service, to prevent and solve crimes. But people would get arrested because they break the agreements between us and our agencies, not because they go against the ruling class. I don’t care what you do in your own home, as long as you don’t attack me. We have to treat each other like adults.

7. M.A. is the only system we have that can effectively lower war, crime, and poverty. People do not want to live in war, crime and poverty, but the state exploits these things in order to maintain its power.

- Currently, the state can do war for its own profit and that of its corporate interests by stealing our money (taxes) to buy weapons and enslaving people (draft). In a M.A., agencies would have to bear the full cost of wars, and would have no reason to. Corporations don’t declare war against each other because violence is inefficient.

- Currently, the state is the biggest criminal organization of all, because they are not accountable to anyone. In an M.A., all agencies would be accountable to their customers and to each other.

- Currently, the state uses the welfare class to prop up its legitimacy and power. In an M.A., there would be no reason to keep people in poverty. Even the greediest CEO does not want a market that is too poor to buy his products. Henry Ford paid his employees twice the average at the time so they could afford to buy his cars and be his best customers.

- State violence is win-lose, and it’s us, the “common people”, who always lose. Prosperity is win-win, especially for us. The least powerful always have the most to win from freedom.