

# Hallucinate Hard Enough and Government Doesn't Look Like a Failure

I asked a Right-statist what “not failing” would look like to him.

His main concern is the protection of everyone's property (“handling crime”) and things “too big” for an individual to do on his own. And he wants it all to be done “efficiently”. So, I guess, as long as a state does those things it is not failing in his view.

But...

The primary violator of everyone's property is government; much worse than freelance criminals. More on that when we discuss crime below. Also, if political government exists, I want it to be as inefficient as possible. *Efficient* government would be a nightmare for the people, plus it can trick them into tolerating it longer. It's the worst-case scenario.

Roads: First, I'll say I don't *know* how things would work out in a free society, the best I can do is come up with voluntary solutions I can think of. The actual way it works out could be much different.

Who would build the roads? The same contractors who build them now. Who would pay the contractors? The same people who pay them now- you and me. How would they be paid? Not through taxation.

One possibility- businesses would want roads so you could get to their doors. Those roads would also have to pass by your house to be of any use to them. You'd pay for the roads when you use the business, so toll booths would be unnecessary.

The difference between “managing a project” and government is the same as between sex and rape: consent. The structure can be the same, but it's a totally different act.

As far as agreeing where the road should go. Keep the roads which already exist. But new ones? Often a new development will lay out and build the new roads, then hand them over to government when they're done. Just skip that last step.

If a big project is actually wanted, people will chip in. Those who don't value it don't have to. If they then decide to use it after it's finished, they'll have to pay a user fee or chip in as though they were there from the beginning. Any project that can't get enough voluntary funding to survive needs to die anyway.

Traffic lights (and other traffic signals) make travel more dangerous. Maybe a few informational signs would be good, but most of that stuff needs to go away.

And that's assuming roads would still be as necessary in a free society. They might not, since flying vehicles would become more common (and most likely, affordable).

Crime: Cops now steal more property than freelance thieves, and have for several years running. Even *before* you factor in fines or the taxation which funds police. And that's only one small piece of the whole.

If "we" are paying government employees to deter crime, we are getting screwed.

Police don't protect or defend you or your property. *Warren v. District of Columbia* settled that question.

When inmates are asked what they fear most, it is never the risk of being arrested- it is armed intended targets. The job of defending yourself and your property has *always* been yours, even if you imagined you had hired someone else to do it instead. If you want to hire someone, I wouldn't stop you. Just don't make me pay for it on your behalf and if your employees harm an innocent during the commission of their "protection", let them be held fully accountable (and you, as well, because you are their employer).

I don't want government courts judging criminals. It's a conflict of interest any time government is one of the parties. Do they recuse themselves in that case? Nope.

Justice isn't about punishment (revenge), it is about restitution. Incarceration prevents restitution and robs the victim *again*. Prison is a racket. My dad worked in prisons- they are totally illegitimate and only serve to train criminals to view themselves as apart from society and give them more excuses to target "others". They also operate as Criminal University. If someone is too dangerous to be walking free, let his next intended victim (or a bystander) kill him and solve the problem. Prison only makes things worse.

Again, "*Would each person [protect] their own property?*" If you aren't **already** doing this you're failing your responsibility.

*"Who guards my stuff when I want to go fishing or to play cards with friends?"* Security systems, neighbors you've built a relationship with, etc. The cops don't do that *now*, why worry that they wouldn't be there to *continue* to not do it in the future?

If you'd rather have "pros" protect you, go ahead. Just leave the rest of us out of it. As long as I'm allowed to opt out and not pay for them on your behalf, what you do won't violate me.

Government is an automatic failure, from top to bottom, front to back, side to side, and beginning to end. A free society couldn't possibly fail any harder. At this point, clinging to The State because you can't think how the alternative would work is just a mental problem.