

I've already discussed the "I never signed anything" argument for taxation is theft, but it's worth revisiting. I apologize if I'm getting repetitive.

I'm gonna reconstruct it like this:

- (T1) You never signed anything saying you'll give the gov money in taxes.
- (T2) If you never signed anything, then you didn't agree to it.
- (T3) If you didn't agree to it, then the gov has no right to take it.
- (T4) So, the gov has no right to take it (taxation is theft).

I'll grant you premise T1, if you say so.

But I reject both of the other premises.

T2 is false, since signing a contract is not the only way to agree to something. There are several other ways, some of them explicit (like saying that you'll do it or shaking someone's hand) and some of them implicit (like accepting food at a restaurant or accepting a ride from a taxi driver). So, the mere fact that you didn't sign anything doesn't mean you didn't agree to it.

And T3 is false, since just because you didn't agree to it, that doesn't mean the gov has no right to take it. You're assuming it's your justly owned property to begin with. But why should we accept that? You're rejecting the social contract (including taxation and our laws) as illegitimate, so why should we accept your claim to that property outside of that social contract? Because someone else agreed to give it to you? Why should we accept their claim?