**CHAPTER TEN: Crypto Class Theory and Free-Market Law**  
  
Class theory underlies the free market and crypto: the state versus society. Bitcoin was designed to bypass a central banking system that serves the political class at the expense of the economic one. As an enemy of the state, crypto is an ally of society.  
  
**Class Warfare and Crypto**  
  
Many people assume that anything to do with banks and finance expresses the class interests of capitalists versus the common man. The opposite is true, but the confusion is understandable. The word “capitalism” is commonly applied to crony capitalism these days—that is, an economic arrangement by which some businesses enjoy a close, mutually beneficial relationship with state officials and receive privileged treatment. A traditional “capitalist” is someone who owns and uses capital goods while remaining in society with no connection to the state; this economic arrangement is sometimes called “laissez-faire capitalism.” It is an expression of the free market and a benefit to the common man because laissez- faire capitalism acts as an engine of prosperity.  
  
Central banking and most financial institutions express crony capitalism. Laissez- faire capitalism expresses the free market. Thus a more specific statement of the class conflict is state and crony capitalism versus society and laissez-faire capitalism. In this conflict, crypto falls cleanly on the side of society. The class allegiance of crypto is evident from the remarkable parallels between its form and function and those of society. The parallels include:  
  
• The individual is the locus of power.  
  
• Both are decentralized down to the level of the individual.  
  
• Voluntaryism is the mode of operation.  
  
• Their purpose is to facilitate exchanges, especially economic ones.  
  
• Exchanges occur only if all involved consent.  
  
• Trusted third parties are unnecessary.  
  
• Privacy is preserved, if the participants wish to do so.  
  
• There is no artificial barrier to entry.  
  
• Neither has a single point of failure at which the entire system is vulnerable. • Wealth is being constantly created.  
  
• Wealth and status are based on merit, such as hard work.  
  
• Exchanges are not based on ideology or politics.  
  
• Reputations matter.  
  
• The state is the class enemy.  
  
By contrast, the form and function of the state is antithetical to crypto and the free market.  
  
• The state is the locus of power.  
  
• All power is centralized into bureaucracies.  
  
• Coercion is its mode of operation.  
  
• The state’s purpose is to maintain its own existence.  
  
• Forced transfers of wealth and power to benefit of the state.  
  
• It is the ultimate third party.  
  
• Privacy is frowned upon and undercut at every turn.  
  
• Barriers to entry are erected, sometimes amounting to prohibitions. • Those in power are the system’s point of failure.  
  
• No wealth is created.  
  
• Wealth and power are based on politics.  
  
• Wealth is accumulated through theft and privilege.  
  
• Reputation is not necessary and less important than status.  
  
• Society is the class enemy.  
  
Another litmus test of whether crypto serves the state or society is rooted in the answers to two questions about money. #1. Who issues it? Fiat is issued either by the state or by an authority controlled by the state, with competition prohibited by law. Crypto is issued by entrepreneurs who compete vigorously with each other for popular acceptance. #2. Can people choose to use the currency or not? The state requires people to accept its fiat as legal tender. Crypto leaves the decision up to individual.  
  
Perhaps the greatest threat to unregulated crypto is the state’s drive to change the form and function of crypto so that it no longer expresses and enriches society but expresses and enriches the state. The state wanted to sculpt crypto into its own image through state-issuance, regulation, and other measures so that it  
  
becomes a type of fiat crypto. This cannot be done; the blockchain cannot be centralized under a single authority. No blending of inherently antagonistic forces is possible. It is not even clear that state and free-market cryptos can co-exist.  
  
The state will keep attempting to forge a bastardized crypto, however, until it is convinced that efforts are futile. At this point, crypto will cease to be viewed as an opportunity and be seen as a danger. The very existence of free-market crypto encroaches on an irreplaceable source of state power—the issuance of money. Crypto has the ability to weaken this source of power and, perhaps, to destroy it.  
  
The features of crypto that weaken the state include:  
  
• Peer-to-peer transfers deny wealth by sidestepping central banks through which the financial flow is controlled.  
  
• The privacy of crypto hinders the state’s campaign of social control. The data from financial institutions that report on their customers are vital to the  
  
state’s ability to impose social and economic control.  
  
• Privacy also sidesteps the centralization of the state. The state can almost be defined as the centralization of power to benefit the elite.  
  
• Crypto’s existence raises the question of whether the state is necessary. If the free market can so easily assume one essential state function—the  
  
issuance and circulation of currency—then why can’t it assume others, or them all?  
  
Crypto is the money of society; it cannot and does not serve the state.  
  
**Law Enforcement as a Tool of Class Warfare**  
  
The government’s coercive taxing power necessarily creates two classes: those who create and those who consume the wealth expropriated and transferred by that power. Those who create the wealth naturally want to keep it and devote it to their own purposes. Those who wish to expropriate it look for ever more-clever ways to acquire it without inciting resistance. One of those ways is the spreading of an elaborate ideology of statism, which teaches that the people are the state and that therefore they are only paying themselves when they pay taxes. The state’s officers and the court intellectuals at universities and the news media go to great lengths to have people believe this fantastic story, including the setting up of schools. Alas, most people come to believe it.—[Sheldon Richman](https://www.fff.org/explore-freedom/article/libertarian-class-analysis/)  
  
One of the most powerful weapons the state possesses in the class warfare it wages against society is law enforcement, including legislation and the court system through which the state asserts its class privileges. Law is integral to the state’s monopoly on force and its ability to coerce the transfer of wealth from society into its own hands. Without a monopoly on law enforcement, it is difficult to imagine how the state could win the class conflict because society enjoys the enormous advantages of being productivity, innovation, and energetic.  
  
The state invests immense time and money in convincing society that law enforcement is a protection, not a threat. As a state drifts closer to totalitarianism, however, it becomes more difficult to maintain this deception because its guns— that is, the industries of law enforcement—become more visible.  
  
One of the final tools the state wields to retain legitimacy before it has to start using guns is the T.I.N.A. argument: there is no alternative. The state incites fear of a terrible enemy—terrorists, perhaps—and then assures society that armed guards at airports, surveillance cameras, and a militarized police force are necessary. Besides which, there is no alternative. Or, rather, the only alternative is terrorism. Many will believe this false choice and accept the lesser of two evils.  
  
Happily, there is an alternative: free market law.  
  
**Free-Market Law**  
  
There’s an important distinction between legislation and law. Legislation is the law that comes from political action...Law is more general in that legislation is a form of law, but law can also be the kind of law that evolves through human interaction. In England and the United States we are often referred to as ‘common law’ countries and that’s because a great deal, and in fact, the majority of our law came about through an evolutionary process that didn’t involve the action of political representatives.—[John Hasnas](https://www.libertarianism.org/media/free-thoughts/understanding-common-law)  
  
There oughta be a law. The meaning of this statement depends on the definition of “law.” The state treats the word as a synonym for legislation or statutory law, which is law that results from a political process. Any person or group who holds sufficient power can pass legislation and use law enforcement to impose it on society. This is a trickle-down, centralized model by which an upper class determines how the lower class should behave. The effect of upper class decisions flows down vertically into the lives of lower-class people. Just one danger to a top- down system is that human beings act in their own self-interest, and legislated law is likely to reflect the interests of politicians rather than those of the people upon whom it is imposed. The system is a formula for corruption and a gateway for the state to expand ever deeper into society.  
  
Can there be viable law without the state? Anarchists and advocates of limited government have debated this question for centuries, with many free-market voices concluding that law must emanate from the state in much the same manner as they believe money must. Law is a human need without which civil society is unlikely to last long. If the free market cannot provide this essential good, then anarchism fails and limited government is the most practical alternative. Society will become a junior partner to the state. The eternal struggle between Liberty and Power of which Rothbard wrote will be over, with Power declaring victory.  
  
It is useful approach to begin by defining the term “law.” Law is a more general term than “legislation,” which is merely one form of law; the general term refers  
  
to any code or set of rules that govern human interaction. “Govern” does not imply a state.  
  
The answer: “yes, it can.” For one thing, society precedes the state, which must arise out of human beings gathering to interact. Society precedes both the state and law.  
  
Another reason free-market law can exist is because it already has.  
  
A popular form of free-market law is called common or customary law. This is a set of rules based on precedents that evolve through time to resolve disputes in a specific community. It is not preemptive but reactive. When a dispute erupts, the parties go to an impartial third party or to a community assembly to have their cases heard. In a rural community, for example, if one man accuses another of stealing a farm animal, then the arbitrator assesses the case and applies a community standard that has emerged from similar cases in the past. Since the adjudicators themselves could be involved in a future community dispute, they have a vested interest in infusing the proceedings with common sense.  
  
This is grassroots law. It is decentralized law that does not have the broad application of federal statutes because it is tailored to local circumstances and standards. A fishing village would almost certainly evolve different rules of behavior than a mining town, for example. Rules governing the crypto community would differ from rules within the construction industry. As long as the purpose is to preserve peaceful interaction and to rectify breaches, there is no right or wrong to the specific content of the law.  
  
Legal scholar John Hasnas explains:  
  
Customary law is the type of law that evolves when disputes arise...Over the decades and centuries, as things evolved, the decision maker became more and more specialized and by the time you get to the Norman era in England, decisions are made by juries. Juries are still drawn from the ordinary people in the country...In our system, you don’t have the courts organized into a hierarchal fashion until the late 19th century, so it’s 1873 and 1875.  
  
Can a complex modern society function without a homogenized set of rules that are mandated? Can grassroots decentralized law work within a far larger framework than a fishing village or a rural community?  
  
The prospect has been discussed for centuries.  
  
**The First Discussion of Free-Market Law and Defense Systems**  
  
All around us are the almost unimaginable benefits of markets, cooperation, and technology, yet somehow we’re naïve if we don’t want to funnel human activity through government cattle chutes. The vast material and digital abundance we enjoy every day is provided without any state apparatus, in  
  
fact *in spite of* that apparatus. Is this private world not part of reality? Government is the artifice, and statists are the utopian dreamers who imagine that individuals acting under the magical banner of government can plan, coerce, and coordinate millions of lives.—[Jeff Deist](https://mises.org/wire/steve-bannon-dismisses-austrian-economics)  
  
The 19th-century classical liberal Gustave de Molinari respected the free market so deeply that colleagues referred to him as “the law of supply and demand made into man.” Highly praised in his day, Molinari has fallen into obscurity. His legacy should be retrieved, however, because he raised a pivotal issue. Why is security a service monopolized by the state rather than performed by a free market that provides all other services more efficiently and inexpensively?  
  
Molinari is the first explicit precursor to free-market anarchism. [Rothbard allude s](http://praxeology.net/MR-GM-PS.htm)  
  
to his 1849 essay, “The Production of Security,” as “the first presentation anywhere in human history of what is now called ‘anarcho-capitalism’ or ‘free market anarchism’.” Core to Molinari’s anarchism is his theory of how society arises.  
  
There are two ways of considering society. According to some, the development of human associations is not subject to providential, unchangeable laws. Rather, these associations, having originally been organized in a purely artificial manner by primeval legislators, can later be modified or remade by other legislators, in step with the progress of *social science*. In this system the government plays a preeminent role, because it is upon it, the custodian of the principle of authority, that the daily task of modifying and remaking society devolves.  
  
According to others, on the contrary, society is a purely natural fact. Like the earth on which it stands, society moves in accordance with general, preexisting laws. In this system, there is no such thing, strictly speaking, as social science; there is only economic science, which studies the natural organism of society and shows how this organism functions.  
  
Molinari believes men form society out of self-interest to satisfy the same “instinct of sociability” displayed by other high-order animals; sociability was built into man’s nature in much way as hunger. Society is spontaneously organized for the purpose of making broadly defined exchanges; these are the proper sphere of economic study, not of social science.  
  
Molinari presents three methods by which any good or service can be produced.  
  
• The first method is to grant a monopoly to a privileged entity. This is what happens when the state is given a monopoly on the use of force and law  
  
within a jurisdiction. Dissenting individuals are forced to obey, or they are silenced.  
  
• The second is through a collective that produces a service that is said to benefit society in general. Authority vested in a democracy is an example.  
  
This less centralized form of control is no less dangerous for a dissenting individual.  
  
• The third is free-market competition. The authority resides with individuals who are businessmen and customers. Individuals freely choose to do  
  
business or not.  
  
All services and goods should be purely economic matters, including security and defense. Like every other service that fills a human need, security is best provided by a free market in which individuals wield the ultimate power of “yes” or “no.” Molinari is the first theorist to present a cohesive argument on how free-market mechanisms can replace the so-called essential functions of the State, especially protection against aggression. [He claims](https://peacerequiresanarchy.wordpress.com/2012/06/24/gustave-de-molinaris-the-production-of-security/) the marketplace also establishes a more just society than government.  
  
This option the consumer retains of being able to buy security wherever he pleases brings about a constant emulation among all the producers, each producer striving to maintain or augment his clientele with the attraction of cheapness or of faster, more complete and better justice.  
  
If, on the contrary, the consumer is not free to buy security wherever he pleases, you forthwith see open up a large profession dedicated to arbitrariness and bad management. Justice becomes slow and costly, the police vexatious, individual liberty is no longer respected, the price of security is abusively inflated and inequitably apportioned, according to the power and influence of this or that class of consumers. The protectors engage in bitter struggles to wrest customers from one another. In a word, all the abuses inherent in monopoly or in communism crop up.  
  
In short, there ought **not** to be law; there ought to be an economic service.  
  
Molinari briefly sketches a blueprint of what the economic service of security might look like. To begin with, it would focus entirely on the protection of person and property rather than the protection of the state or a moral code. This eliminates the vast majority of laws. It also reduces the wars constantly waged over territory by nations that disregard the preferences of populations.  
  
Security would be a business—or many businesses—including private police forces and arbitration services. Prospective customers would probably ask a series of questions of a provider, including one Molinari suggests; Will “any other producer of security, offering equal guarantees...offer… this commodity on better terms?” In short, Molinari envisions a system of security providers that functions in much the same way as insurance companies do today. He concludes, “Under a regime of liberty, the natural organization of the security industry would not be different from that of other industries.”  
  
One counter-response inevitably arises; law requires consensus.  
  
**Locke on the Consensus Argument for Law**  
  
The perceived need-for-consensus problem has haunted the issue of the state versus private law and justice. Its most persuasive advocate was John Locke.  
  
The key to…an anarcho-capitalist court system is found in the concept of a “personal judiciary”. [Acting as your own judge.]…The courts’ purpose is to enable men to settle disputes so as to avoid violent resolution as well as aggression-overcompensation cycles. Regarding the courts’ decisions as legitimate is the only way for the litigants to avoid **personal judiciary** actions.—Karl T. Fielding, [“The Role of Personal Justice in Anarcho- Capitalism”](https://mises-media.s3.amazonaws.com/2_3_5_0.pdf?file=1&type=document) [Emphasis added]  
  
“Personal judiciary” is an idea Locke presents in [*Second Treatise of Government*](https://earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/locke1689a.pdf) *.* The term refers to a person’s natural right to assess his own experiences and to act upon his conclusions; this includes judging his own case. Additionally, since everyone has a right to reclaim his property from a thief, everyone can act as his own agent of restitution. If someone snatches your wallet, you have a right to grab the thief to retrieve it. The grab is an act of defensive force, not of aggression.  
  
Locke acknowledges this right, but he thinks it is unwise to exercise it. He writes:  
  
That in the state of nature every one has the executive power of the law of nature, I doubt not, but it will be objected, that it is unreasonable for men to be judges in their own cases, that self-love will make men partial to themselves and their friends: and on the other side, that ill-nature, passion and revenge will carry them too far in punishing others; and hence nothing but confusion and disorder will follow.  
  
It is unwise for men to judge their own cases because the act will produce conflict in society. Even a fair man views matters from his own perspective and self- interest; this is human nature. Moreover, he can be mistaken about the facts, including fundamental ones like the thief’s identity. In other words, even a good man lacks objectivity. People who are less honest or more emotional may be even less fair, and they may exact inappropriately harsh remedies.  
  
Locke argues that a society in which people judge their own cases will fall into “confusion and disorder.” Why? Because an unjust verdict or inappropriate remedy aggrieves the recipient who then judges *his* own case and rectifies the wrong done to him. The process can become an endless loop because the justice administered is not accepted as legitimate by both parties.  
  
Locke believes that breaking the cycle requires an unbiased judge whose assessment is widely accepted as legitimate. In crypto terms: Locke wants the decentralized justice of each man judging his own case to be centralized and placed under the authority of a trusted third party. The need for legitimacy in justice is one of the major reasons Locke advocates a limited state. And, for  
  
centuries, Locke’s approach has been used to argue against the possibility of private law and justice in civil society.  
  
But if a trusted third party is irrelevant to exercising rights like freedom of religion, shouldn’t the same be true of exercising a property right claim over goods? If crypto is stolen, shouldn’t the victim be able to reclaim his property directly by hacking back the coins?  
  
Yes, Locke would say, but there are good reasons for *not* exercising it. One-on-one remedies present danger to the victim. First, if he is mistaken about the thief’s identity, the mistake converts an act of self-defense into one of aggression for which he is liable. Second, the victim may seek more remedy than is appropriate, prompting the original aggressor to retaliate. Achieving restitution may also be dangerous or beyond the victim’s ability to achieve. And so on and so on.  
  
Judging your own case also introduces the good Samaritan problem. Bystanders will base their judgments on appearance. If they witness an attack on the street from the beginning, they know who the aggressor is, of course. Or do they? What if you witness a man grab a woman and yank her roughly to him? She screams for help. You rush to the rescue, striking the man across the face with a heavy book you are carrying. As he covers his broken nose, the released woman sprints off. Later you learn the woman is a pickpocket; the man was recovering a stolen wallet.  
  
You have facilitated a crime and injured an innocent man. And, yet, all you intended to do was to exercise a corollary principle of self-defense: the right to defend innocent people against aggression. Without this corollary, spouses could not legitimately defend each other, and parents could not protect children. You behaved in a reasonable manner, but your assessment was incorrect. The man had a right to pursue recovery from her and, now, from you.  
  
The confusion can be greater with the theft of crypto. Consider a scenario. Your account at an exchange or on your hard drive is cleaned out of coins. Through detective work, you identify the thief and seek restitution by hacking into his wallet. His exchange detects the activity and views *you* as the criminal simply because that is how it appears. The exchange calls the police and prosecutes you. Eventually, you clear your name at the cost of money, inconvenience, and embarrassment. Moreover, you do not retrieve the coins.  
  
It is often impossible for a bystander to distinguish between a victim and an aggressor through observation. This is especially true with crypto crimes. The man who reclaims his wallet can prove it is *his* wallet by showing the ID inside. It is not similarly easy to prove that coins or fiat belong to one person—a coin is a coin, a dollar is a dollar, and they do not come with certificates of ownership.  
  
Fortunately, there is one sure way to identify who is the victim.  
  
The litmus test: who owns the property in question? Ownership means having a valid title to the property. Possession is not 9/10ths of the law; title is 100%. But, again, proof of title requires a determination based on examining the evidence.  
  
If no man may invade another person's "just" property, what is our criterion of justice to be? There is no space here to elaborate on a theory of justice in property titles. Suffice it to say that the basic axiom of libertarian political theory holds that every man is a self-owner, having absolute jurisdiction over his own body...It follows then that each person justly owns whatever previously unowned resources he appropriates or "mixes his labor with." From these twin axioms—self-ownership and "homesteading"—stem the justification for the entire system of property rights titles in a free-market society. This system establishes the right of every man to his own person, the right of donation, of bequest (and, concomitantly, the right to receive the bequest or inheritance), and the right of contractual exchange of property titles.—Murray Rothbard  
  
As concepts, theft and restitution depend on the idea of property titles. In most cases, restitution is best done by a trusted third party agent or agency. As long as the third party is free-market, this presents little problem. Unlike law enforcement, a free-market agency can be hired and fired at will. This the difference between the state and society.  
  
Before proceeding to a more concrete discussion of free-market security and its relevance to crypto, another aspect of free-market security is best addressed: the prevention of crime.  
  
**Preemptive Security**  
  
Perhaps the main problem in this area is to see the importance of protection —to get people to concentrate more on locking the criminal out, and less on locking him up after he has committed a crime. Successful efforts to reduce the incidence of crime must be based upon better methods of protection. That is, we must concern ourselves with trying to prevent trespasses instead of worrying about what we will do after we have been trespassed...Men who see the necessity for protection realize that the government is not in a position to provide it, and they turn elsewhere. The best source of protection is the marketplace.—Robert LeFevre, [The Fundamentals of Liberty](https://archive.org/stream/LeFevre-TheFundamentalsOfLiberty/LeFevre-Fundamentals_of_Liberty_djvu.txt)  
  
A drawback of entrusting your security to the state is the tendency to become dependent upon it and neglect to protect yourself. If there were no police, then people would be more aggressive about preemptively securing their own safety. The situation resembles how people approach their bank accounts. Because the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insures deposits in the U.S. against bank failures, customers rarely give a second thought to the security of their accounts. This attitude or habit makes people vulnerable to losing crypto in exchanges or imprudent investments. State dependency makes them lose or never develop the  
  
habit of self-protection. Yet self-protection is as much an individual’s responsibility as his health.  
  
LeFevre highlights another drawback. Those who use the services of law  
  
enforcement are reinforcing the myth of the state’s legitimacy.  
  
Then how is justice to be obtained? LeFevre answers: preemptive defenses that avoid crime before it happens. This contrasts sharply with how most libertarian theorists approach private justice; they focus almost entirely on issues such as restitution versus retribution. These issues come into play, however, only after a rights violation occurs. Like Satoshi, LeFevre wants a system that prevents the crimes from happening in the first place.  
  
There are striking parallels between LeFevre and Satoshi. Both men want to avoid and replace a trusted third party state agency with a private alternative. LeFevre focuses on replacing traditional law enforcement, while Satoshi targets the central banking system. Their motivations are similar. LeFevre sees law enforcement as a massive failure, or far worse. Under the guise of providing justice, it oppresses individuals by regulating almost every activity short of breathing. Equally, Satoshi knows that central banks and fiat are massive failures, or far worse. Under the guise of providing financial stability and protection, they loot the wealth of individuals through mechanisms like inflation.  
  
Both men did not confront the state but avoided a need for it. LeFevre [writes](https://mises.org/library/nature-man-and-his-government), “Is government the only device we know of self-protection? No, it is not. Voluntary insurance is another device. So are private policemen, private organizations such as the American Legion, night watchmen, merchant police, the Triple A and perhaps a score of others…”  
  
Practical advantages adhere to LeFevre’s and Satoshi’s commitment to prevention. For one thing, after a crime has occurred, it can be almost impossible to make a victim whole, even in non-criminal cases of contract or straightforward torts.  
  
The state does not want people to self-protect because this breaks its trusted third party monopolies over law enforcement and banking. Or, at least, it ignores them. The state wants people to believe the police “serve and protect,” because then they accept a loss freedom as the price of security. Society’s main weapon of self- defense is to demonstrate that the state’s protection and services are unnecessary. People do not need to pay with their freedom to be safe.  
  
**A Haunting Question**  
  
The stress on prevention captures a schism within the crypto community. Prevention and avoidance are natural companions. Confrontation is not. Which approach is more effective in dealing with the state? Or can a blanket statement be made? Satoshi seemed to think so.  
  
The two attitudes are embodied in an incident between Julian Assange and Satoshi. Both of them fully understand the [freedom value of crypto](https://news.bitcoin.com/julian-assange-thanks-u-s-government-for-50000-gains-on-wikileaks-bitcoin-holdings/), but they seem to disagree on the best way to attain it.  
  
Assange tweeted in October 2017: “My deepest thanks to the U.S. government, Senator McCain, and Senator Lieberman for pushing Visa, MasterCad [sic], Paypal, AmEx, Moneybookers, et al, into erecting an illegal banking blockade against @WikiLeaks starting in 2010. It caused us to invest in Bitcoin—with > 50,000% returns.”  
  
Satoshi’s attitude is epitomized by [his response](https://www.reddit.com/r/technology/comments/2ghp54/i_am_julian_assange_ama_about_my_new_book_when/) to an earlier tweet from Assange who crows, “Bring it [bitcoin] on.” Satoshi objects. “No, don’t ‘bring it on.’ The project needs to grow gradually so the software can be strengthened along the way. I make this appeal to WikiLeaks not to try to use Bitcoin. Bitcoin is a small beta community in its infancy.” Less than a week later, on 12 December 2010, Satoshi vanished after posting the message: “WikiLeaks has kicked the hornet’s nest, and the swarm is headed towards us.” The swarm is government and, perhaps, those users who care nothing about Bitcoin as a vehicle of freedom and can dilute its potential.  
  
It is tantalizing to speculate on the software with which Satoshi wanted to strengthen Bitcoin. Protections against bad actors? A decentralized exchange for complex trading and cashing out? It is disturbing to realize that Bitcoin may have been hindered badly by becoming popularized too soon.  
  
But the main question posed here is whether Satoshi’s attitude of prevention and avoidance is the most effective approach to battling the state. If so, then those who confront the state with taunts and challenges may be weakening a primary strength of crypto: freedom through prevention, not confrontation. They may be handing an advantage back to the state and away from society. The theories and strategies nonviolent resistance offer a blueprint on how to handle the state.