

**A Critique by Ron Avery**  
**Written 10/1/11 of**  
**“Liberty 101 – An Introduction to Liberty”**  
[Youtube video](#)  
**At Freedom Frenzy**  
**with Stefan Molyneux – Apostle of Anarchy**

Molyneux opens with his maxim that we learn very young that “people should not initiate force and aggression” and that we all have “property rights” and when we put that at the center of society we find that “government does not fit” because it is a “monopoly on the initiation of force and theft.” He agrees that we can use force to stop some already commenced aggression. But how would one put these ideas learned very young at the center of society without the creation of a government that would maintain a society where no one can take other people’s things and initiate force and aggression? Molyneux actually describes the rise of, and sole purpose of, lawful government without knowing it. For nothing goes to the center of society without becoming some kind of acknowledged principles that are written down and followed as the ideology a certain society wants to organize around. This process of writing down things that people consent to or give a tacit agreement to is called the constitution of lawful government if it is to protect the property of each citizen. It is impossible to make a lawful government that has the purpose of harming the property of any individual citizen consisting of their life, liberty and possessions.

Molyneux seems to believe that government is the only possible entity that can initiate force or violence and in this context he equates slavery with any kind of government as the same kind of evil. Molyneux cannot perceive of a lawful government in comparison to an unlawful government and he has convinced himself that all governments are evil. Government, in fact, rises as a result of evil in the world as an organized means to curtail it and punish it. And he has actually stated the very reason for the rise of lawful government which is to prevent theft and violence. And by definition anarchy is not a tool to do that.

Molyneux wants to create a free society where in we forget about all things except the moral argument that we cannot allow people the legal right and obligation to initiate the use of force as if government were created to do that in the first place. He says if we create government we create a fundamental immorality at the core of our society. I ask you, what people on earth ever organized a government for the sole purpose of harming them? Governments are formed to protect people and their property but over time these governments become corrupted and begin to harm the people instead of protect them. One is the rise of lawful government and the other is the fall of lawful government into unlawful dissolved government which is anarchy.

Molyneux also equates bad law in unlawful governments with all law of any government or lawful governments. He equates national environmental policy or state desires by statutes, which are unlawful, with those laws that the state uses to protect your home at night from vandals.

Molyneux is asked, “how would people protect their property if they were unable to or resolve contract disputes without government?” He answers with an example; “Ebay,” which he says “is the world’s largest employer.” Ebay is an example of how all would be

taken care of in a lawless environment. He says Ebay organizes itself by reputation. If one buys an Ipad and it is not shipped by the seller, the buyer can complain. And after so many others complain, eventually no one buys from the criminal. Here then he says we have no need of lawyers, courts, suing for breach of contract etc. Oh! How are the harmed individuals taken care of? This is no answer to the question. His real answer is; forget about justice. This is not much different if at all from eventually “what goes around comes around,” a famous quote from the infamous serial killer, Charlie Manson.

Then Molyneux brings up something called the “Marriage market” as an example of how we don’t need government. The government does not tell you who to marry or how long to stay married or when to get divorced. People just go out and find one another. He says there is no government force involved. But what does that have to do with government? Just because the government does not tell us who to marry does not mean there is no need for lawful government. The government does not tell us what to eat at lunch but that too does not mean we do not ever need a lawful government for the protection of our property. He even refers to marriage and dating as a “market” as if it were started by a company for profit. Then Molyneux refers to this freedom in dating and marriage as anarchy. He says the people love the anarchy of dating. Oh? Who would refer to marriage and dating as anarchy? He attaches anything nice to the word anarchy without discretion. Apple pie is anarchy. Ice cream is anarchy and poop in your pants is government.

Marriage is anything but anarchy. The total experience of anarchy is anything but marriage and dating. Who really would enjoy anarchy on a date? This would be where your date gets into the car with anyone while out with you. This would also be where any number of other guys come and drag your date out of your car and have her. That is anarchy in dating. And anarchy in marriage would be where your wife can fool around with whom ever and there is nothing you can do about it. This is like unto Hosea’s marriage to a harlot. Oh the joy of anarchy! But Molyneux says we all love anarchy in our day to day lives but we don’t like it when it is extended into realms we are not familiar with. So Molyneux completely avoided answering the question of how one would protect their property with his examples of the protection he enjoys from a government and a government that I would call dissolved and unlawful. If he cannot perceive the source of the joy and protection in some realms he gets from an unlawful government, how can he conceive of the freedom he could enjoy from a lawful government?

Molyneux is caught and corrected when he tries to shift the question of how anarchy solves the problem of violence by saying that the question assumes that it is taken care of under government. But the interviewer says, no that was not the question and asked again, how does anarchy deal with problems in interpersonal relationships? Molyneux replies, anarchy would deal with theft by getting rid of government which steals half our money in taxation. But I ask how does anarchy even get rid of an unlawful government? Molyneux says that under a “free system” there would be more incentive. I would like to ask what he thinks he is implying when he uses the word “system?” A system is an organizing mechanism. What is an organizing mechanism related to a society called? It is called a government.

So then Molyneux says you could buy insurance to keep from getting things stolen. Does this sound like something that only springs from anarchy? This is what we do now

living under an unlawful government. Do we feel secure in our property as a result of that anarchical program? Or he says we could have high technology make our products voice activated. He is simply not dealing with the questions of violence like armed robbery and bands of roaming thugs under anarchy. He says again in terms of theft, getting rid of institutional theft, puts us way ahead of the game. But how does anarchy end institutional theft? There is no moral authority that springs from anarchy that gives it power against unlawful governments. In fact, one form of anarchy is unlawful government. Unchecked violence and laws that violate the law or lawlessness creates the same condition that is perceived under real anarchy.

The condition of living under an unlawful government is just one form of anarchy. Anarchy is the absence of law and lawful government to enforce it, not the absence of unlawful government and its unchecked violence against the people. Then Molyneux suggests that hiring insurance companies to take care of pollution would help the environment and that these guys would run around and make sure our neighbors don't pollute our air or pay us a bunch of money and the company would figure out how to do that. And by what authority would this band of criminals run around stopping others from polluting air? Who would determine for us what pollution is and who is doing it? How many different bands of criminals would one be dealing with on the same issues? Just because I can hire a band of criminals to help me does not prevent others from hiring bigger bands of criminals to stop me from cooking out or having a fire in my fire place. This is an absurd proposition. It is hard to take Molyneux seriously at this point. He has not improved his argument one bit from several years ago and he had nothing back then.

Then he says that the government is not interested in making sure you are not robbed but they just need to justify their existence by filling out forms related to your harm. Again, why can he not see that this is the act of an unlawful government and that unlawful governments don't protect property? When he sees the acts of an unlawful dissolved government he presumes that all governments do the same from their inception. This is as stupid as saying because a person died in the care of a doctor that all doctors are crooks and criminals, or, because one doctor was a crook we need to get rid of all doctors on the planet and live free from disease because disease and death comes from doctors. Then he asserts that "voluntary webs of entrepreneurial problem solving" is the way things get done in society. He has not demonstrated knowledge of how that takes place. As Larken Rose says Molyneux sounds intellectual. I agree that he has a vocabulary and a nice accent but I cannot find any sound thinking or argument in the midst of all that to alter the definition of anarchy from the absence of government or law to a system of free people with their property and freedom protected.

When asked how parenting is done, he says that he explains and gives reasons to his 2 ½ year-old daughter why she should not run up and down the aisle in the restaurant. But he also says he does not prevent her from doing so, because he wants her to think, not just act because he says so. I find this to be a very dangerous method of instructing your toddlers as he may not be able to explain all the reasons she should not run into the street in time to prevent her from doing so. He says he does not discipline at all. I have known these kinds of people and I have seen what happens to the child. I recall the humorous scene in Planes Trains and Automobiles where the kid runs up and down the aisle. Many people say; "he that spares the rod spoils the child." In fact, the scripture does not say that but is more condemning than commonly understood: "He that spareth his rod hateth his

son: but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes.” Proverbs 13:24. If you hate your children you will not chasten them to keep them from harming themselves when they are not old enough to think for themselves and 2 ½ years-old is way too young to discern the merits of sitting at the table as opposed to running through the isles of the restaurant being free.

Molyneux is asked how do people organize to protect their property from the effects of government. He replies that there are two things; first when people learn that the use of force does not solve social problems they will just end it. When people learn something is immoral they just quit like with slavery everywhere but in America where there was bloodshed, Brazil just quit. He continued that slavery was completely statist phenomenon and the state went out and captured the slaves and sold them and once the people learned it was immoral they just stopped. That is totally incorrect. Why does Molyneux not call slavery a market as he erroneously did in when referring to marriage and dating? If anything grew out of the market place it was slavery. What would abolish this very lucrative evil business? Those in the slave trade did not just quit capturing and buying and selling slaves because they saw the error of their ways. They stopped because those that profited from the slave market were forced to stop by laws passed in various nations including England and the United States. Many in the trade were arrested and their ships impounded and the slave trade began to be too dangerous to continue.

Molyneux continues that just as slavery was immoral and wrong and people quit doing slavery, they will do the same when shown that government is harmful and immoral and that it is not even good for those that hold the whip and the sword. He says we need to take the whip and the sword out of the hand of government. He then condemns the words of Thomas Jefferson by saying that his statement that all men are created equal and therefore we need government was a contradiction. Molyneux simply cannot understand anything related to government and he misuses the term statist all the time. The definition of statist is one who believes that government owns the property. But he has changed the definition to mean one who believes that lawful government can exist. Therefore, Molyneux would call me a statist, but I do not believe that a lawful government can own the property. Rather, I know that people own the property and lawful governments are created to protect the property that belongs to each and every citizen.

I do agree with Molyneux that a sound moral argument is irresistible and irrefutable and powerful. The problem is that Molyneux does not espouse a sound moral argument for the abolition of lawful government. He has an argument for the abolition of unlawful government but he does not see it as so but uses that argument against all government both lawful and unlawful. He asserts that it does not matter what the consequences of doing the right thing is, you just have to do it. I would agree with him if one knows what the right thing is. He acts as if he has presented a sound compelling moral argument and he has not come close to such a thing.

Now the second thing he says we need to do to protect our property from government is to raise our kids not to be afraid of authority. Oh? What about real authority rather than dissolved authority? If we abuse kids and raise them with force and harshness then we make them easy to be owned by the statist. We should raise our kids without harsh words or violence and teach them to think.

Molyneux is asked, how would anarchists defend America from a violent neighboring tyrant if all Americans embraced it? We would contract with some kind of an organization to provide some kind of defense. I add, Maybe Black Water! Molyneux blows off the question by saying he is not an expert in military stuff but if he were trying to sell this stuff. I say, well yeah, he is trying to sell anarchy without knowing what it is or how it would work or do anything. Then Molyneux says nuclear powered nations don't get harmed or attacked. Oh yeah. How can he prove that? Molyneux then says we could keep a half-dozen or so nukes and we're OK. I say, Pakistan has Nukes and we routinely send Drones over their land and kill their citizens and our citizens there. Then Molyneux reveals the product that anarchy produces by saying that an aggressor wants to take over a developed farm not an undeveloped wilderness and this is what they would see in an anarchical system with no taxes and no development. He compares the lack of a tax structure to that of the absence of developed farms with domesticated cattle to slaughter. Then he gives an example of an effective defense to a powerful nation like the United States in Afghanistan and Iraq. He continues that these two nations are effectively resisting the force of America because they are an anarchical structure rather than a taxing governmental structure. He ends by saying it is unsustainable to invade a nation without a state. I say, that is no prevention of attack. In fact, Afghanistan and Iraq were invaded because they did not have WMD or a strong central government and little means of defending themselves. It is no defense to become weak and defenseless merely because you can endure their unlawful attacks forever because that is all you can do. So we can all see how we can live free in the future under anarchy. We can be totally undeveloped peasants fighting off unseen attacks from drones and helicopters in our adobe huts.

Molyneux also says that when the entrepreneurial powers are unleashed there would be all kinds of weapons developed once the power is taken from the state. This is absurd on its face. Vast defensive systems have never been a hallmark of anarchy or disarray or absence of lawful government. Wait a minute, now Molyneux says that we could maintain a few nukes for \$300,000,000 a year and that would be only one dollar for everyone in America. But how would we collect that? There are no taxes! No authority to collect the one dollar tax to maintain our defenses! Molyneux has no mental discipline and no clear doctrine of what anarchy or government is. He just wants every body to just quit being bad and calls that doctrine anarchy. His definition of anarchy is really the desire to not be involved in violence or theft. That's a nice person but that is not a description of anarchy. Much would be avoided if Molyneux merely stuck to the common definition of anarchy which is the absence of governmental authority or law and the resulting disorder and confusion. Molyneux is trying to redefine two terms; government as groundless immoral force and anarchy as a free society. This will not happen as anarchy does not produce a free society and all governments are not merely the exercise of groundless immoral force.

A caller brings up the idea that Tahiti could have been an anarchical place before Westerners set foot there. But Molyneux says he does not think primitive societies are philosophically anarchical because they had strong tribal governments. He says anarchy is the future not the past, meaning that we have never lived in this new and wonderful place we are on the way to by better philosophy.

The caller again says that he thinks anarchy is an individual thing and that he does not think anarchy can be organized. And he is correct. Once anarchy is organized it becomes a government and no longer anarchy by definition. Otherwise, anarchy would be a government where property is protected which is now called and has always been called lawful government, not anarchy. The caller adds that he thinks it all gets down to human nature and implies that government, again, is of necessity because of the wickedness of man. And Molyneux says that the reality is that there is no such thing as *human nature*, that we learn how to think by how we are raised. Human nature, he says, adapts to situations that begins in the womb. This is a form of situational ethics, social relativity and humanism. He says you should raise your children in peace rather than violence. And we can assume from earlier parts of this broadcast that he means that teaching respect for the father's authority and lawful authority is violence while no discipline at all is peace.

He continues, that to have a free society we must breed a people who can look at a free society and are capable of perceiving the win-win experience of anarchy and this will come not from government down but from the family up. This smacks of Nazi ideology where superior breeding is advocated. How about some anarchy youth camps? The kids could learn non-aggression and market dating and marriage. That will surely fix tyrants!

They refer to Molyneux as the "constructor" of the "Unified Field Theory of Anarchy." When asked what he thought was the shortcomings of anarchy, he said, it is not a perfect system, and even if we were able to raise all our kids to not think of violence there would be wackos and the brain injured. He merely says with statism the problems are there forever and they get worse and worse but with anarchy the problems fix themselves. This also means that if we reject anarchy we are wackos.

When Molyneux was asked if he thought anarchy was like Darwinism, he said no, that it is more cooperative with win-win situations and revealed his Austrian economic background and anarchical capitalists designation and said that the state is a 6000 year old institution and he asked, what other science do we have that is 6000 years old still in use? Molyneux implies that he sees no advance in the principles of government in 6000 years and that the Code of Hammurabi is like that of the Declaration of Independence or that the work of John Locke is the same as the work of Plato. Is it not true that what we have is a science that has been growing over 6000 years called the principles of lawful government? Where as, what Molyneux suggests is that we should throw all of that knowledge out and ignore the lessons of that and pretend that want of government produces peace. If we are all so prone to anarchy, why is it that anarchy has not sprung up and grown into a real field of study lasting over 6000 years? But we are just now hearing about the wonderful benefits of something that has never been spoken of well for eons.

The female host says she thinks that people would become ambivalent about crime that did not affect them personally. But Molyneux replies, "Would you not care if there was a rapist in the neighborhood?" You might care but what could you do about it? He says lets presume that's a problem in a "free society." He uses this term "free society" as if calling anarchy and no organized means of defense is a "free society." I think he is implying that all problems are worth dealing with because you live in a free society. You should want to live like they do in Iraq just to be free. He asks her how is ambivalence solved in a statist society? She replies that it doesn't. But, I say under a lawful government the neighbor can call the police and the police can come over and increase patrols in her neighborhood and investigate the crime for years and find the killer and

arrest them, try them and punish the guilty rapist. This cannot happen under anarchy. Molyneux says that the statist must make the case that violation of the universal moral law of non-aggression results in something better in the end. This is non-sense as lawful government does not violate the universal moral law of non-aggression and in fact is constructed in its observation and its sole purpose is to prevent that violation in society. She says it is not dealt with in statism or in anarchy either.

Molyneux says we know we are going to get war and bad currency and imprisonment and violence all around the world in all governments and it has been so since the beginning of time and it will be so until the end of time, hence, there has got to be a huge amount of advantage the state can achieve that anarchy cannot. He says a quarter of a billion people were murdered by their own governments in the 20<sup>th</sup> century alone. So, just because you have roads and bridges does not mean you can pave them with blood. So to kill that many people you have to prove a lot of advantages. Then the male host suggests that we should ask everyone if they think the cost of government is so cheap that it is worth living under it rather than individual liberty. But the question does not make a critical distinction between lawful and unlawful governments.

When Molyneux was asked about what he thought about people like Ron Paul he said Paul has done a lot for education but that reforming a criminal organization will do nothing as it would be like reforming drug dealers and the Mafia. And if you rise to the top of the ranks in the Mafia you will not be able to reform it. I would agree, but that applies only to the unlawful dissolved government we have in America at this time. But logic does not apply to the right of the people to form another lawful government to defend their property. If people have the right to hire protection companies they have a right to join together in agreements to protect each others property. And that is called a government.

Molyneux ultimately says that the state is something we outgrow intellectually so now those of us who know that Molyneux has nothing to offer us as a remedy to tyranny and real anarchy, he can show that we are like children and underdeveloped mentally. The Kings tried this approach as well but it did not work. This we can call socio-political-mental evolution to the pinnacle of anarchy. I would call it sociological regression.

Molyneux ends the interview with the idea that evil in the world means we cannot have a government because it attracts evil people to obtain power they cannot have any other way. But this is also the reason governments are created as evil men will build without government as well and grow large and deadly.

If I did not think this was a healthy thing to discuss I would not have written all this. But it is important that we all address these issues because we do in fact live under a dissolved and unlawful government both at the state and federal levels. But we must not make gross errors in our attempt to free ourselves from all the snares that await us. I am opposed to secession as well as anarchy and I can back up my argument. And I have another solution to all this that has merit far beyond what I have heard thus far from any camp. I would like to have a live debate with Molyneux any time, any where in any format as this would be healthy for all.

End.