

anchorage anarchy

Issue #3

October 2003

\$1.00

Ethnicity, Skin Color and Individuality

In the united states, as in much of the rest of the world, people are frequently thought of in different ways depending on their skin color or perceived membership in this or that ethnic group. This happens for a variety of reasons. Sometimes people simply harbor a hatred for anyone who is a different color or ethnicity from themselves. Others have had a bad experience with another person and assume that all other people who share some superficial characteristic with this person will behave in a similar way. And there are people who are simply naïve and inexperienced and believe some inaccurate story that they have heard or read about people whose ancestry is unlike theirs.

Ideas, of course, lead to actions, and bigoted beliefs can result in discriminatory behaviors. These can range from some people's unwillingness to befriend, do business with, or live near people whose appearance or language they do not approve of, to physical attacks against people the assailants see as somehow alien and undeserving of the freedoms other people enjoy. While few people's prejudice is extreme enough to lead them to assault other people, great damage can be done to others when the bigotries of individuals are given a group expression through the state and the institutions it creates.

American governments have always practiced and promoted discrimination both directly and indirectly. They have legitimized, at various times, slavery, segregation, and prejudicial immigration practices. In addition, they have promoted unfair practices in the private sector by favoring businesses

that practice discrimination while disenfranchising the targets of prejudice and preventing them from setting up alternative institutions of their own. It is nearly impossible, for instance, to start up an alternative to a bigoted store in one's community if the banks refuse credit and a government monopoly of money prevents alternative financing arrangements. Over the years, government action has resulted in far more inequitable and harmful treatment of people than any bigoted individuals could ever hope to inflict.

Ethnic Preferences and Social Engineering: How Not to Fix the Problem

Many people, of all colors and ethnic groups, reject discrimination and would like to see a society free of prejudice. Unfortunately, it is common for those who seek to eradicate bigotry to share some of the outlook of those they oppose, both in their view of differences between people and in the means they favor to eliminate ethnic inequity. They tend to share an unwillingness to see others as individuals instead of members of groups and both camps favor the use of government action and coercion to promote their agendas. Until such attitudes are replaced

with a commitment to individuality and a rejection of force, efforts to create an equitable society are doomed to failure.

Whether assigning people to groups is done with the intention of discriminating against or helping someone, classifying individuals based on the color of their skin or their parentage conflicts



with the individualist idea that each person is unique. People's beliefs and behavior are not determined by such superficial traits as ethnicity or primary language, and to assume that they are can only lead to misunderstanding. Individual personalities, desires, and habits are the result of an enormous number of different influences and people shortchange others when they try to reduce them to simply a sample of a larger group.



Viewing people as representatives of some ethnic "community" instead of as individuals leads opponents of inequity to support solutions to discrimination such as affirmative action. In such schemes, diversity is seen as more important than individual merit or fitness, and in order to make the ethnic numbers look good, institutions like colleges and corporations will give people "points" for their skin color when making admission or hiring decisions. Once upon a time, "tokenism" was looked down upon as a misguided "liberal" attempt to mask systemic discrimination, but now when a law school seeks out black students as tokens representing other black people so that the resulting ethnic mix "improves" the educational environment for others, it is seen by many as virtuous. If affirmative action programs focused on improving the lot of capable individuals by eliminating discrimination in hiring and admissions decisions they would be a worthy endeavor. Instead the

emphasis is on how many tokens of how many different groups can be added to the mix to produce the right percentages to qualify as "diverse."

The problem with such programs is that when someone is helped by assigning value to physical characteristics, others are necessarily disadvantaged. Discrimination is discrimination, and when people are judged and rewarded differentially because of their ancestry, not because of something they have done or achieved, a sort of injustice has been done. And anyone who holds an individualistic or any other humanistic outlook cannot but oppose such essentially illiberal behavior.

Some defenders of ethnic preferences in hiring and university admissions claim they are justified because non-white and non-asian-descended people are poorly prepared by horrid public schools and therefore perform poorly on conventional measures of ability. Clearly this is true. But this does not justify giving preferences to less qualified people just because they have been subjected to a lousy school system pervaded by bigotry. When people of one color are expected to perform up to a certain standard in order to demonstrate their ability to do a job or complete a course of study, so should all others. Any other means of choosing workers or students are discriminatory on their face.

To avoid this line of argument, other affirmative action supporters contend that conventional means of judging academic ability, SATs and such other old standbys, do not, in fact, predict either ability or future performance. If this is true, then such testing should be thrown out for all people since it is not a useful tool for evaluating differences between people or establishing whether someone is qualified for some job or educational program. Few recommend this, however, and advocates of ethnic favoritism instead propose to "race norm" such tests, so that people of latin ancestry, for instance, do not need to attain the same score as someone who is white in order to "qualify" on the basis of some exam. This method of discriminating between people based on their ancestry is, however, no better than any other, and holds no logical water. If a certain test is not a valid means of comparing a

person of asian descent and a black american, it does not then become acceptable when used to compare individuals of the same ethnicity. Either hiring and admissions exams are valid assessment tools or they are not, and schools and employers should not pick and choose when to use them in order to promote what passes for "diversity." Doing so simply substitutes one form of discrimination for another.

Historical Inequity and Reparations

In addition to other arguments by its supporters, some of the justification for affirmative action from the start has been that it is an inequitable, but necessary, remedy for the disadvantages black people were subjected to in the past. Advocates of this position assign the blame for the problems experienced by black americans on historical discrimination and the "legacy of slavery." The thinking goes that there would be more integration and diversity today if slavery and other forms of now-outlawed discrimination had not existed in the past, and therefore the descendants of those who were once enslaved deserve special advantages now to make up for earlier mistreatment of their ancestors. Some of those who believe in this line of reasoning have taken their arguments even further, however, and propose that black american descendants of slaves should be given cash payouts as a reparation for the fact that their forbears were held in bondage.

There are a number of problems with such proposals. Most important, of course, is that none of the people who actually enslaved others are alive today, so it is not possible to obtain compensation from anyone who directly profited from slavery. Furthermore, many, if not most, americans are descended from people who never owned slaves. Recognizing the problems presented by these circumstances, those who support compensation for the descendants of slaves argue that non-black americans owe their present condition to an economic and social system created on the backs of enslaved black people, and therefore they owe something to the descendants of these slaves who generally are still less well-off than their non-black

counterparts. But this argument is based on the assumption that most americans, including millions of black people, are relatively affluent only because of the existence of slavery, an institution which ended in the united states nearly 150 years ago. Although slavery was key to the american economy for centuries in the past, attribution of the impoverished condition of some black people alive today to their ancestors' status as slaves is based on shaky ground. It is difficult to argue, whatever discrimination or other problems they encounter in making their way in the world today, that any person's state in life is "caused" by events that took place generations ago and involved other people long dead. In addition to the inadequacy of the justification underlying the call for reparations, suggestions for the implementation of a system to make amends present problems of their own. Since any attempt to force money out of millions of people individually would be impractical and likely unsuccessful, reparations activists generally call on the government to make the payouts. Of course the state has no money of its own, so reparations would



anchorage anarchy

is an occasional publication of the Bad Press,
an anti-government anarchist project.

It is edited by Joe Peacott.

Subscriptions are available for \$1 per issue.

You can reach Bad Press at:

PO Box 230332

Anchorage, AK 99523-0332

USA

email: bbrigade@world.std.com

website: world.std.com/~bbrigade


be paid out of tax revenues, which are extorted from working people of all skin colors and ethnicities. The people thus forced to payoff claimants would include black, eskimo, american indian, and asian-descended people, as well as white people, whether that is what was intended or not. Those calling for monetary compensation for the depredations of slave-holders against the ancestors of black (and many white) americans would force people, at least some of whose ancestors were slaves, to turn over their hard-earned money to make amends to other people they never harmed, and who may well be better-off economically than they are. This is nothing if not involuntary servitude.

Here again, the root problem is seeing people as group members and not as autonomous individuals. For those with this outlook, the calculus is simple: some people in the past harmed other people and therefore the descendants of the wrongdoers, or at least people of the same skin color as they were, must be forced to make amends to the descendants of the victims. Such a program would declare all white people responsible for, or at least the beneficiaries of, the hardships of all black people, without any need to produce any evidence that any of the parties forced to hand over the cash had ever done anything harmful to the recipients.

Diversity or Freedom?

In a world without ethnic discrimination, it is likely that many of our neighborhoods, workplaces, and social spaces would be far more heterogeneous than they are today. But the fact that people are not segregated in housing or occupation by color or language is not necessarily a sign that bigotry has been eliminated. It could just as well be accomplished by social planners who direct or manipulate people to live in certain places, enter specific lines of work, or pursue some course of study, while dissuading or barring others from doing so, because they are of one ethnicity or another which the experts have decided is too common or too scarce in some setting. Such meddling in people's choices may well bring about a sort of diversity, but only at the price of individual liberty.

When people are truly free to choose, which is what anarchists seek, they may decide to associate with a variety of other people, or may seek to isolate themselves among others with whom they feel more comfortable because they share an ethnic background. There is no guarantee that opening up all areas of endeavor to all comers, regardless of color or ancestry would create the "diversity" sought by many who allegedly seek to root out discrimination. Living among people who differ



from oneself in all sorts of ways may make life more interesting and satisfying for some, but will not suit everyone.

Equality of opportunity for all individuals regardless of skin color or ethnicity should be the goal of freedom-seekers. But it is far from clear that even if this was achieved, every group, occupation, or institution would be made up of various sorts of people in numbers that reflect the exact percentages of people of different ethnicities in the population of the region or city or world at large. And there is nothing necessarily wrong with this. Black people make up a higher proportion of players in the NBA than is true of American society at large, while white people are similarly overrepresented among those in the NHL. Since there is no evidence that this is the result of racism in the recruiting practices of either organization, their relative lack of “diversity” harms no one.

Anarchists and Ethnic Politics

Unfortunately, anarchists are not immune to the appeal of group-based identity politics. In the American libertarian movement today there are some who embrace the nonsense of “whiteness” theory and call for the abolition of the white “race.” Others recently organized a “people of color” conference which excluded white anarchists, while an upcoming forum in New York will present the case for a “black” anarchism. And though much is written in the anarchist press about discrimination and bigotry, all too often these writings, even those by people who reject separatism and anti-white bias, reflect the view that people fit into nice “racial” categories and that meaningful things can be said about people based on their ethnicity, without bothering to evaluate them as individuals. Such an uncritical acceptance of the ethnic politics so prevalent in this country is inconsistent with the anarchist traditions of promoting individuality and rejecting such manifestations of group think as ethnic bigotry, nationalism, separatism, and statism.

Being an anarchist and an individualist, I believe that people should be free to associate with

or avoid whomever they like. While I prefer to live, work, and socialize among people of all sorts, if others, including some anarchists, want to live or do business only with others of the same ethnicity, there is no reason they should not be free to do so, as long as they do not interfere with the equal freedom of others to live differently. The fact that libertarians tolerate such voluntary discrimination, however, does not mean we approve of it, and those of us who seek to eliminate bigotry will continue to speak out against anyone who seeks to classify and divide people based on their ethnicity.



An anarchist society would encompass people of many kinds, some of whom would continue to harbor ethnic prejudices, but the lack of a coercive apparatus by which some could disadvantage others would make it unlikely that individuals' bigotry would result in real harm to others. However, we do not yet live in a free society, and voluntary association or avoidance is not always an option. Many of the institutions we encounter today coerce people into participation in their workings and then



proceed to treat them in discriminatory ways. Such bigoted practices should be strongly opposed.

Not surprisingly, the worst offender is the state. Government obtains its lifeblood, the taxes it imposes on working people, by threat of force, and does so whatever skin color a person has, their immigration status, or the language they speak at home. Since the state robs us all indiscriminately, it should not then be free to treat people differently based on some superficial characteristic. Nor should certain other enterprises and businesspeople, such as chartered banks, landlords, and monopoly businesses, since it is difficult or impossible to avoid doing business with these entities which owe their continued existence to the state. Thus, a bank that won't loan to black people, a hospital that bars employees from speaking spanish, or a landlord that won't rent to a person from the philippines are all practicing forms of discrimination that anarchists would oppose. But so is a law school which accepts government money and discriminates against white people in its admission practices, or a state-funded university which provides dormitories segregated on the basis of skin color.

It is ironic that so many who wish to end bigotry turn to government to accomplish their goal, when getting rid of the state would be the best means of solving much of the problem. Without

government laws, regulations, and police, banks could not red-line, landlords could not deny people a home, and no one would work for a business that presumed to tell them what language they could or could not speak. In addition, universities would not be able to maintain their monopoly on training for certain lines of work, which allows them to pick and choose who they believe is worthy to pursue what career. And, perhaps most important, the loathsome public school system, which provides lousy and discriminatory education and lays the foundation for much of the inequity people face later in life, would be eliminated. As noted above, an anarchist society would not necessarily be free of people with bigoted ideas, but without a state to empower the haters, they would not be able to persecute those they dislike. If some institution in a libertarian community wished to exclude someone based on their skin color, those who felt differently would be free to create their own, non-discriminatory enterprise.

Although most of those who work for a society free of discrimination and bigotry turn to the state to fix the problem, it is, in fact, the state which allows ethnic discrimination to impoverish so many people and prevent them from improving their living conditions. Only by abolishing the state can we hope to abolish the harm caused by ethnic hatred and inequity. This is the insight that anarchists have to contribute to the debate about bigotry and its remedies.



The Masters of War

Despite the opposition of most of the world, the united states and united kingdom have subjugated, at least temporarily, the residents of iraq. Of course, as was the case in the american-led war against serbia several years back, most of the claims that were initially used to justify the invasion have proven to be false. There were no smallpox stores. The baathists had no ties to al-Qaeda. The old iraqi government had no capability to attack the united states, britain, or anybody else for that matter except some of its own subjects. It did not buy nuclear materials from niger. There is no evidence of any chemical or biological weapons program conducted by the military. In other words, the case for war was built on lies.

Once they were found out, however, the american and british governments decided that the real reason for the invasion was their desire to liberate iraqi people from an oppressive government. But, just as was done last year in afghanistan, the invaders have replaced one nasty and brutish government with another, after killing thousands of innocent people. The occupiers have declared a group of their puppets as the new government and have stifled any attempts by non-compliant iraqis to form any alternative structures that might challenge their power. They imprison 4400 people they call "security detainees," who are denied even the limited "rights" granted to official prisoners of war. American soldiers bully, harass, arrest, and kill iraqi civilians who do not obey quickly enough. They invade people's homes, tie up innocent people, and confiscate their weapons and savings. They shoot at journalists and wedding celebrants. Their kurdish allies expel arabs from their homes in villages around Kirkuk. Religious bigots are free to intimidate women into wearing head coverings and staying off the streets. American agents are rewriting the history books used in iraqi schools to reflect the occupiers' version of recent history. Corporations whose owners and managers are

friends of our rulers are making big money rebuilding a country whose businesses, utilities, and health care services were destroyed by sanctions, constant bombings, and outright war conducted for over a decade by american and british politicians. And then americans wonder why so many residents of iraq seem ungrateful and resistance to the military occupation continues.



After posing as liberators, american troops have shown their true nature. They are conquerors as surely as any other imperial military has ever been. They disarm any locals who do not demonstrate sufficient loyalty to the new regime. They intentionally kill peaceful demonstrators. They "accidentally" kill non-combatants simply going about their lives, and recently slaughtered a group of iraqi police officers trained by americans, shooting up a hospital in the process. They occupy hotels and government palaces and swim in the indoor pools of former rulers, while leaving their new subjects without adequate power, clean water, or medical care.

The "independent" american news media, in general, do their best to portray the occupiers in a positive light, while portraying the opposition as evil religious or "saddamite" zealots. No serious criticism is raised when united states troops use enriched uranium weapons that result in disease and



death among non-combatants, slaughter civilians with “misplaced” aerial bombs, or kill motorists who fail to stop when ordered to do so. And no mention is made that the united states military itself possesses vast stores of precisely the “weapons of mass destruction” whose purported possession by the former iraqi government was used to justify the invasion in the first place.

In addition to frank cheerleading for the war, the newspapers, magazines, and TV news anchors choose their language carefully in order to encourage their readers and listeners to look favorably on united states military operations, and harshly at any iraqis who resist or simply do not follow commands. Heroic american soldiers carry out raids. But iraqi “terrorists” “ambush” occupying troops. American administrators living and working in comfort in buildings confiscated from the former rulers are portrayed as do-gooders, while iraqi civilians who have started a private transportation service in Baghdad with buses the former government bought with money they stole from their subjects, are called “looters.” Iraqis trying to make a quick buck from selling oil on the black market are accused of responsibility for power shortages in Basra, while the destruction of much of iraq’s oil industry and other infrastructure during the continuous american bombing and embargo from the early nineties on is seldom mentioned. Needless to say, the reporters who were “embedded” with the

troops are only too happy to listen to whatever they are told by their masters, sometimes reporting complete lies, like the whole fairy tale about Jessica Lynch’s capture and rescue.

While news media coverage has helped convince most americans to support the war and occupation, patriotic supporters of this bloody business should consider what the reaction of the american colonists would have been had some other nation decided to “liberate” them instead of letting them do it themselves. The revolutionaries would not have rolled over and played dead had france defeated the british colonial authorities, instituted a government that they believed best suited the needs of americans, and disarmed the militias. Instead they would have fought the french occupiers, just as so many iraqis are now waging a guerrilla war against the american and british invaders.

In afghanistan, too, where the occupiers have had more time to impose their will, armed resistance to the invaders and their governors of choice continues, as do challenges to the authority of the american-backed government in Kabul. Of course, the united states and afghan governments and their devotees in the news media label resistance fighters terrorists and rival politicians warlords. But none of this alters the fact that people in afghanistan, like those in iraq, do not appreciate being murdered and bullied by americans and their afghan servants any more than they enjoyed the predations of the former tyrants.



Of course the fact that the locals in these two countries continue to demonstrate their contempt for their new masters is unlikely to deter further meddling by united states politicians in the affairs of other countries. Aroused by their recent victories, the american warlords are now making threatening noises directed at north korea, iran, and syria, and ratcheting up the economic war against cuba. It is no wonder the despots in Tehran and Pyongyang, after witnessing what happened in afghanistan and iraq, are interested in acquiring nuclear weapons. It should be obvious to any thinking person that the willingness of the american military to bomb and invade any country it feels it can defeat rather easily serves to promote the proliferation of advanced weapons among countries that rightly perceive themselves to be on the hit list of the american government.

The rulers of the united states have taken advantage of their war to launch an assault on our limited domestic freedoms as well. The government has arrogated to itself the power to monitor what we read, where we travel, and what we say in meetings. Utilizing their increased powers under the patriot act, federal agents have carried out hundreds of buggings and surveillance operations and have visited a number of libraries and mosques to snoop around. They refuse to identify prisoners accused of terrorism and deny them access to lawyers or any other semblance of "due process." People are secretly detained without charges as "material witnesses. Immigrants are being tricked into registering with government agencies and then deported. A judge recently imprisoned someone for creating an "anarchist" website with links to information on bombs, an area of study the government apparently considers its exclusive domain. While Ashcroft dismisses its critics as hysterics, the (in)justice department is seeking to expand the scope of the patriot act, even as the transportation security administration plans to implement a color-coding scheme for air travelers to advise screeners who can and can't fly and who should be harassed even more than the run-of-the-mill flyer. And this is all somehow supposed to

preserve the freedoms which "our" enemies supposedly hate.



The former despots in iraq and afghanistan were brutal murderers, who are mourned by few but their families and cronies. And it will be a welcome event when the people in korea (both north and south), iran, and syria find the wherewithal to send their own nasty rulers packing. But that is a task for the residents of these countries, not foreign invaders who will simply come in and set up new tyrannies, albeit ones friendlier to the conquerors.

The best outcome of all, in the view of this anarchist, would be for people all over the world who are oppressed and robbed by governments and their corporate buddies to throw out their rulers and not simply replace them with new, more liberal or democratic ones. Abolishing government and the principle of force in human relations in the only method of instituting and preserving individual freedom of thought, action, and association. But such an outcome requires a complete change in the way most people view the world. Until individual people everywhere come to believe that they themselves are the best, and only, ones suited to make decisions affecting their lives, interests, and activities, the world will remain mired in wars and infested by governments and rulers-in-waiting.

Alaska, the Welfare State

In 2002, for every \$1 paid by residents of Alaska to the United States government in the form of taxes, \$1.91 in federal funds was sent back to the state, more money per person than anywhere else in the country. Of course, little of this money, \$11,540 per capita, was refunded directly to the individuals from whom it was confiscated. Of the \$7,400,000,000 in federal expenditures in the state, \$3,100,000,000 took the form of grants to state and local governments, and \$1,400,000,000 went to the military, while only \$1,000,000,000 or so went to social security, veterans benefits and federal pensions. With all this federal money floating around, it is no surprise that, of approximately 300,700 non-farm Alaska jobs as of May 2003, 84,000 positions were in one branch or another of

government: 16,900 federal (excluding uniformed military); 24,800 state; and 42,300 local (including 3400 "tribal"). Government programs of various kinds play a huge role in the state economy, with non-military "public" sector jobs comprising 27% of the workforce. In Anchorage, the air force is the largest employer, while 50% of employed people in the state's second largest city, Fairbanks, work for some branch of government (military included).

And what do we get for all this federal largesse? An army that controls huge tracts of land in the city of Anchorage, which it now plans to fence off so it can more safely practice killing people. A deputy attorney-general who has denied DNA testing that might exculpate a prisoner, because she believes "the legal system needs finality." An Anchorage


DUNLAP-SHOHL 02-003
THE ANCHORAGE DAILY NEWS 7-3



ACTUALLY, IN ALASKA WE CELEBRATE JULY 4TH AS "DEPENDENCE DAY."

assembly that has nothing better to do than restrict the ability of panhandlers to take donations from drivers, while firefighters are allowed to tie up traffic at intersections while collecting money from drivers for some officially sanctioned charity. A state development agency that spent \$100,000 a month to keep a failing "private" Anchorage seafood business afloat. A public school system in Anchorage run by bureaucrats who believe failure is success, poverty is wealth, and segregation is diversity. Another school system in Fairbanks where a student whose eyes are red from studying can be expelled for refusing a piss test for drugs. Handouts to property developers in Anchorage who pay only 15% of the cost to prepare lots for building, the rest of the funds coming from those who pay property taxes. And a federal forest "service" that spent \$34,800,000,000 to generate revenue of \$1,200,000,000, subsidizing the profits of wealthy industrialists

Much of the government operations in this state are dedicated to "managing" wildlife and government-owned park lands, and, as in most areas, the bureaucrats do an abysmal job. The federal occupation of the Pribilof Islands, for instance, has resulted in so much environmental damage, that it will cost \$100,000,000 to remove the blight caused by various federal agencies which managed the fur seal trade. Regulators presume to grant monopoly rights to favored seafood processors, and prevent fishers from selling their harvest to the buyer of their choice. Biologists "manage" the fisheries by over-



GOVERNMENT FREE ZONE

NOTICE: Absolutely no activities will be permitted in this area which support or enable coercion or fraud of any kind. This includes, but is not limited to: taxation, conscription, censorship, theft, initiation of physical force, destruction of personal property, and limitations of any kind on any individual's rights to life, liberty, and property.

No police, tax collectors, military personnel, legislators, or other agents of any government are welcome without specific prior permission.

Occupants will never INITIATE aggression or violence of any kind, but will defend self and property with whatever force is necessary.



producing salmon which are then stripped of their eggs, ground-up, and disposed of in the ocean. Our parks and recreation areas are plagued with uniformed bullies who believe they know better than the rest of us how to care for and enjoy the land and animals around us and torment so-called inholders who wish to continue living on property the government wants to take. "Experts" drug, tag, collar, monitor, harass, and kill whatever animals they choose, "for their own good," of course, but then presume to regulate everyone else's encounters with other species. Government oversight of animals plants, and land has led to environmental destruction, waste and abuse of animals, good salaries for interventionist busybodies and paper-pushers, increased profits for favored corporations, and harassment of people who dare to defend their freedom to live and enjoy nature in ways of which our masters disapprove.

Another product of government action, and one unique to Alaska are the so-called "native"

corporations, which were formed years ago as part of a settlement of land claims by eskimo, indian, and aleut alaskans. While many individual share-holders in these businesses receive regular dividends, they have served primarily to aggrandize the people who run and control these operations, as well as their business associates and partners, many of whom are not alaskan, "native" or otherwise. Just as in any other corporate enterprise, the directors and officers receive inflated salaries, while regular workers are laid off when it pleases the managers. Besides owing their very existence to government decree, these corporations exploit the preferences they are granted by discriminatory federal laws to win lucrative federal contracts, and reward their "private" sector partners with generous portions of the take. Although they purport to enrich and empower people whose lives and livelihoods were wrecked by both government and private theft and abuse, "native" corporations have been no more beneficial to their customers or caring to their employees than any other government-business partnership.

While oil production, mining, fisheries, and tourism produce much real wealth, and there is a strong service sector in the alaskan economy, without federal money, and the huge military presence in the state, alaska could not exist in the form it does today. An alaska without government would mean no military, no park rangers, no government schools, and no handouts to corporations. It would also mean no permanent fund dividend and no tax-supported road building. People would be really free to live, work, and play as they choose, but they would not be able to send someone else the bill. Individual liberty requires individual responsibility. Until people decide to declare their independence from government and coercion, alaska will continue to be not a haven of freedom, but a welfare state where the limited freedoms we enjoy are not ours for the taking, but are granted to us by people and institutions that can later turn around and restrict or abolish them if they so desire.

Available from Bad Press

Against Separatism

Joe Peacott, editor

\$4 (postpaid) north america

\$5 (postpaid) everywhere else



What is Mutualism?

Richard Garner

\$1 (postpaid) u.s.a

\$1.50 (postpaid) north america

\$2.25 (postpaid) everywhere else

Regulated to Death

Anarchist Arguments Against Government Intervention in Our Lives

Jim Baker & Joe Peacott

\$4 (postpaid) u.s.a., north america

\$5 (postpaid) everywhere else

Rocking the Cradle of Liberty

A Guide to Anarchist-Connected

Historical Sites in Boston

Joe Peacott & Jerry Kaplan

\$6 (postpaid) north america

\$7 (postpaid) everywhere else

Yiddish Anarchist Bibliography

Edited by John Patten

\$12 (postpaid)

Please make checks payable to
Joe Peacott