

Holding on to Collectivized Security

Editor's Pick. Written by Shawn Gregory.

As an anarchist, I am accustomed to getting grief from conservatives, progressives, and Statists of other stripes, but among libertarians, I occasionally get significant grief from those with whom should otherwise be on much friendlier terms: minarchists. Generally speaking, there are two types of minarchists. The first kind of minarchist sees the State as an essential part of a functioning society, albeit a dangerous part, (i.e. a necessary evil). To this kind of minarchist, the key to a successfully governed society is a well constructed constitution that restrains the State from overstepping its bounds. When a minarchist of this variety objects to my anarchist inclinations, I am not the least bit surprised. (For a refutation of this brand of minarchism, read the U.S. Constitution, and then read *any* modern legislation.) The second kind of minarchist would love to dispense with the State but can not see a way to provide certain essential functions without it. More often than not, the one essential function that keeps him or her from full fledged anarchy is security. "How," they ask, "can you defend against an invasion from a foreign army without having a State run army in place beforehand?"

Read the full thing at WeeбуlTree.com »