

EDITORIAL

LIBERTARIANS ARE UNITED ON the general superiority, both moral and practical, of voluntary market solutions over compulsory governmental ones; but they have long been divided over the proper scope and extent of this superiority, and in particular over the question whether it is desirable or practicable to dispense *entirely* with the state's forcible territorial monopoly on legal services.

Those libertarians known as *market anarchists*, or *anarcho-capitalists*, argue that the entire industry of protecting rights and adjudicating disputes can and should be turned over to private competition, monopoly in this field being no more justifiable than in any other. Other libertarians, known as *minarchists*, defend the legitimacy of limited government, or the minimal state, as a necessary restraint on the "freelance" use of force, and criticize market anarchist proposals as unjustified or unworkable.

The *Journal of Libertarian Studies* has been at the forefront of this debate since the beginning, inasmuch as our inaugural issue, thirty years ago, was devoted to a symposium examining philosopher Robert Nozick's claim that an anarchist legal order naturally would, and legitimately could, evolve into a monopoly state. Over the years the anarchy/minarchy debate has been discussed and developed in many ways in these pages, and no doubt it will continue to be so in the future. But in commemoration of the journal's thirtieth anniversary, it seems appropriate to devote a symposium issue specifically to the topic.

Accordingly, the present issue features a variety of perspectives on the anarchy/minarchy debate, including exchanges on the moral permissibility, the practical feasibility, and even the conceptual distinguishability of anarchy and minarchy, as well as, appropriately enough, a revisiting of Nozick's original argument.

Here's to the next thirty years of the *Journal of Libertarian Studies*!

Roderick T. Long
Auburn, Alabama

