

Voluntary doesn't mean "I agree with everything"

Consider a Netflix subscription:

- You pay a monthly fee
- Netflix gives you access to their video library
- You may not agree with particular actions of Netflix
- You may want certain shows to be added or you may not want to pay for others
- You may want a smaller monthly fee
- But you have no ownership of Netflix and no control over its choices
- However, you are free to stop paying the monthly fee
- Netflix provides easily accessible and binding ways to cancel subscription

briefly describe Tim Pool Culture War video

Tim's example is interesting because it shows the issue of opportunity costs and also highlights the difference between disagreement and consent

The person complaining about the Friday pizza could:

- a) Use speech to advocate a course of action that could reduce rents (non-coercive)
- b) Hagglng for a modification to his rent agreement
- c) Attempt to withhold rent until policy is changed (and be kicked out or have their property taken)
- d) Decide to leave the covenant society

The renter has no property interest in the covenant and is (hypothetically) free to leave and stop paying rent

But what about the property owners who started the covenant

Even a private society will do things you disagree with

- You might:
 - be on the losing side of an arbitration
 - lose property value because of neighbors' actions
 - delegate certain aspects of your ownership to a board of directors
- ...

This raises the question: what powers do "the people" legitimately have? I suggest a partial list:

- Clear rules for homesteading property, and security of private property against aggression by other society members
- To demand the fulfillment of contract terms from other society members
- To pre-emptively designate certain actions as crimes or torts and provide methods for investigation and punishment (that residents *positively* agree to before they commit crimes)
- Mutual free passage on designated freeways (to avoid private encirclement, see [Block via Kinsella](#))
- The ability to punish or expel properly convicted violators, and for members to *positively* agree to support such punishments in some ways
- Some kind of exit rules, designed to allow society members to secede and take their property, as long as they are not currently under investigation for a crime

What does a private society “owe” (think about phrasing) you?

Society must show under what agreement you entered

“Social” contracts often violate this by changing the rules over time without consent

Society must offer you terms for leaving, including property

Those terms must be part of the opt-in agreement

If terms for taking land away are not provided, the society is asserting ownership of all land in jurisdiction

Are slave contracts valid? (sources?)

How does a coercive society differ?

Opt-in is implied by location, birth, etc.

Contract terms are either not written down or are unilaterally changeable by one side

Property ownership is illusory

Contract is perpetual with no out for property and/or people