
The Voluntaryist

Vol. 2, No. 6, Whole #12

"If one takes care of the means, the end will take care of itself."

December 1984

GEORGE MECKS!

By Carl Watner

In the year 1628, an English merchant by the name of Richard Chambers refused to pay tonnage on imported goods. Though the Petition of Right had been enacted some months prior, he was ordered to appear before the Privy Council. At some point in the proceedings he cried out that "the merchants are in no part of the world so screwed and wrung as in England; that in Turkey they have more encouragement." For these defiant words the Star Chamber found him guilty of contempt and ordered him to pay a fine of 2,000 pounds and "imprisoned until he made a submission that he had committed a wrong. Chambers, a sturdy Puritan, absolutely refused to sign the submission tendered to him. Instead he wrote at its foot, 'I ... do utterly abhor and detest, as most unjust and false; and never till death will acknowledge any part thereof'." Chambers languished in jail for six years before he was released.

Three hundred and fifty-one years later, a Texas businessman by the name of George Meeks was called before the Internal Revenue Service to supply information about his auto parts business, which had been incorporated as St. George Company in 1976. He filed tax returns for the company for that year, as well as 1977, in which he paid \$1,000 in taxes. In 1979 he was contacted by IRS auditors. Meeks gave them what few records he had, for the company had been disbanded in June 1977. When this information was deemed insufficient by the Internal Revenue, they subpoenaed his bank account records and demanded more information of Meeks. He then filed an affidavit with them that he had no other corporate records to furnish and that he claimed his Fifth Amendment right to remain silent.

Consequently, the Internal Revenue Service petitioned U.S. District Judge Dorwin Suttle to find George Meeks in civil contempt for his refusal to supply them with the records (which Judge Suttle had ordered him to do). Again, in a sworn affidavit to the Judge, Meeks insisted he had no further records and that he stood on his right not to incriminate himself by answering further questions. Meeks was placed in Bexar County jail November 25, 1980, until the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans ordered him released on Feb. 10, 1981. This was a result of Meeks' attorney, Rusty Guyer, filing an

appeal which pointed out that Suttle's action placed Meeks in an intolerable situation by forcing him to give evidence that might be used to bring criminal charges against him.

The government appealed the ruling of the Fifth Circuit to the Supreme Court, which refused to hear the case, alleging that it had already decided (in the government's favor) a similar suit in U.S. v. Rylander. Meeks was ordered reincarcerated on January 10, 1984, under Judge Suttle's original contempt order of August 1980. He was placed in the Federal Correctional Institution (read - concentration camp) at Bastrop, Texas, where he remains as of this writing. Meeks' attorney filed Motion for Release from Imprisonment on July 31, 1984, based upon the claim that George did not have the ability to comply with the Court's order. That appeal has not yet been decided by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Meanwhile, a Request for a Jury Trial was made to Judge Suttle at the District Court level, based on the fact that George had been incarcerated over six months. (Any person incarcerated on criminal charges longer than six months is entitled to a jury trial - at least according to the most recent Supreme Court decisions. However, George is not imprisoned on criminal charges, so this precedent may not apply in his situation.) Rather than rule on the merits of this request, Judge Suttle refused to give an opinion because the case was simultaneously on appeal to the Fifth Circuit. So George remains in jail.

Other developments in George's case are of interest. He went on a 53 day fast for the purpose of calling attention to his plight. This brought him before the Grand Jury in San Antonio one afternoon in August 1984. The following morning he was whisked away from Bastrop and eventually taken to the Bureau of Prisons' hospital facility in Springfield, Missouri, where he was pronounced sane and healthy before he was returned to Bastrop. Meeks believes that the trip was designed to get him away from the Grand Jury and the local media. He was gone for more than a month, and only spent one day with the doctors. His local supporters in San Antonio have kept his case before the radio and the press by writing letters and calling in on talk shows. Two weeks ago his supporters picketed Judge Suttle's home. When the Judge emerged from his house and saw the pickets, he immediately went back inside and called for an escort of

The Voluntaryist

Subscription Information

Published bi-monthly by The Voluntaryists, P.O. Box 5836, Baltimore, Maryland 21208. Subscriptions are \$10 per year, \$18 for two years. Overseas subscriptions, please add \$5 for extra postage (per year). Back issues \$2 per copy.

Editor: **Wendy McElroy**

Contributing Editors: **Carl Watner and
George H. Smith**

cont'd. from p. 1

federal marshalls. Newspaper articles and interviews with Meeks himself have appeared and one of the San Antonio papers recently called for his release in an editorial titled "Free George Meeks".

I have personally talked with George Meeks twice on the telephone (he is allowed to make collect outside calls from Bastrop). He remains in good spirits and has read some of the voluntaryist literature I have sent him. One of the reasons that George thinks he was audited in the first place was that he had been identified as one of the leading San Antonio tax protesters. Nearly 50 years old, George was a military veteran; an Air Force pilot for ten years including a tour of duty in Vietnam. He settled in San Antonio in 1976, starting his small auto parts company from scratch. He had been active in local Libertarian Party activities. He is also a minister of the Universal Life Church and has helped released inmates from the Bexar County jail find jobs.

In an October 1984 interview in the San Antonio LIGHT newspaper, George realized that he could be in jail for several years. (The government has cited as precedent the case of a man who was held in contempt for five years.) During his imprisonment in 1980, he was not even allowed out of jail to attend his mother's funeral. "I guess I'm prepared to stay forever," he told the reporter. "I don't have a choice. What they are trying to do is break me, but holding someone here for a long time will never achieve what three months in Bexar County Jail didn't. They really can't hurt me. The system can only hurt you as much as you allow it to."

Although George started out defending his position by reference to the U.S. Constitution and limited government, he admitted to me on the phone that he was coming closer and closer to a voluntaryist outlook. The government refers to the 5th Amendment as a privilege and not a right and it treats it as such. A privilege can be revoked at the command of the government, whereas an inherent right cannot be. I think George realizes that people should look more towards their natural rights as individuals and rely on their distrust of governmental power rather than anticipating that laws and constitutions will

secure their liberty. It is certain (and history has proven it time and again) that if we allow government to "guarantee" our rights for us, we will most likely end up losing them. Any government that is strong enough to "guarantee" rights is automatically suspect and probably already strong enough to violate them. As voluntaryists realize, the State is no less an invasive institution whether it is bound by a Constitution or not. Constitutions are window-dressing, nothing more. Just as the State incarcerated Richard Chambers in 1628, so it imprisons a George Meeks in 1984.

So what can voluntaryists do to help George Meeks? George would certainly be interested in receiving expressions of support from us (although he may not be in a position to reply to everyone). Those who wish to express their opinion about his case may write directly to Judge Suttle or the San Antonio newspapers. Those wishing to donate money to George's cause may do so in c/o The Voluntaryist. The following names and addresses are pertinent to his case:

George Meeks
FCI Unit 4-A
Box 1010
Bastrop, Texas 78602

San Antonio EXPRESS (paper)
Box 2171
San Antonio, Texas 78297

Judge D. W. Suttle
U.S. District Court
655 East Durango Blvd.
San Antonio, Texas 78206

Ronald Guyer, Attorney
422 Dwyer Avenue
San Antonio, Texas 78204

San Antonio LIGHT (paper)
Box 161
San Antonio, Texas 78291

Judge D. W. Suttle (home)
911 Eventide Drive
San Antonio, Texas 78209

Contributions to George Meeks c/o The Voluntaryist, Box 5836, Baltimore, Maryland 21208, will be held and disbursed according to instructions of George Meeks.

YOU, YOUR RIGHTS, AND THE FBI

THE FBI IS AMERICA'S NATIONAL POLICE FORCE. In theory, it has a very limited job to do - investigate federal crimes. Most crimes (assault, robbery, trespass) are state crimes; federal crimes are created by special statute and are theoretically an injury to the national government or its property. Bank robbery, weapons violations and crimes involving explosives have also been made federal crimes. When a "federal crime" is suspected, the FBI has authority to investigate. When only state crimes are suspected, the FBI has no authority. **The FBI is also the major national agency which concentrates on gathering and disseminating domestic intelligence:** information about the beliefs and activities of people the government is afraid of, or about groups that might oppose or try to overthrow American interests at home and abroad. Other intelligence gathering agencies have power similar to those of the FBI, but narrower areas of activity. For example, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) only investigates cases in which there is a charge of violation of law taxing the manufacture and sale of alcohol or tobacco. State and local police and private "security" agencies also have investigative powers, but these are geographically limited. All of these different agencies share information. Much of it is on computer and available to other law enforcement agencies in a matter of seconds.

WHERE DOES THE GOVERNMENT GET ITS INFORMATION? There are a lot of sources, but the most important one is people like you - friends, neighbors, relatives, acquaintances, co-workers of someone suspected of having "subversive" ideas or plans. Government agents can always get a certain amount of information from official sources - birth certificates, driver's licenses, credit cards, telephone records, bank statements. Even school records may be easy for them to get. But what they can't find out from such sources is what groups a person belongs to, whom she or he is close to, what her or his strong and weak points are. These things must be learned from live people close to the person under investigation. Once the government gets this kind of information, there is no control over what it is used for, or who it is shared with.

Another place information about the political beliefs and activities and personal habits of people comes from is "informers". Usually these people are not professionals who are paid to infiltrate a group. More often, the government will take advantage of a member or would-be member of a political community who is insecure or does not really belong in the community. Giving information to the government makes some people feel powerful, and for a while, it may make them think they are doing the right thing. The idea of "informers" usually makes

people very nervous. It should make everyone think about what kinds of information about us is available to strangers or people we do not know well. Anyone who suspects that someone is relaying information to the government or is cooperating with an effort to thwart the political objectives of their organization should be ready to say so. **Objective confrontation of real fears is far healthier than speculation about whether someone is or is not a spy.** We should also be aware of the possibilities of physical and electronic surveillance, as additional sources of information.

WHAT IS THE FBI LEGALLY ALLOWED TO DO? Agents of the FBI are authorized to make arrests, when warranted, to conduct searches if they have warrants or "probable cause" to serve subpoenas to federal grand juries or federal trials, and to "investigate." The FBI is not authorized to issue subpoenas. Nor are they authorized to arrest a person for refusing to cooperate with an investigation. **The FBI has absolutely no power to force anyone to answer questions,** submit fingerprints or other evidence, produce books, documents or records. It cannot force anyone to look at a photograph to see if the subject is recognized. But **remember: It may be a federal crime to make a false statement to an FBI agent.** And the only record of what you say is the one the agent reconstructs on a "Form 302" after the interview.

WHAT SHOULD I DO IF THE FBI COMES TO SEE ME? We believe the very best and safest response to the FBI is: **"I MUST TALK TO MY LAWYER BEFORE TALKING TO YOU."** If you have thought ahead and have already discussed this possibility with a lawyer, you can say, "If you have anything to ask me, please put your questions in writing and send them to my lawyer (give name and address). Often, this stops their interest in you immediately. In many, many cases, the FBI has no legitimate reason to question you, and is just hoping to get some pieces of information to fill out its profile of a certain community. Once agents learn a lawyer is involved, it's not worth their trouble. **It is important to be firm with FBI agents.** If you give any hint of wavering, they will press you harder and harder for information. Don't think that you can say a little to make them go away. They never do.

WHAT IS POLITICAL "INTELLIGENCE?" Political intelligence is the government's brand of preventive medicine. The disease the government fears is every person's right to express his or her dissatisfaction with the way government is running things, and organize to change it. **The government tries to head off criticism before it's made. If it can't do that, it tries to make persons who won't be silenced look like lunatics.** Often, it's not easy to do this because those who are dissatisfied make a lot of sense to each other and there are a lot of us. So the government has to scour around and fit

together little bits and pieces of information about its critics and opponents to make them look less reliable or less serious. "Intelligence" is anything but smart, careful information-gathering. It means instead a vacuum-cleaner approach to information. **Any and everything can be useful in the government's war against dissent.** Some information may be very personal and very embarrassing. It need not be true. Some may be quite true and something the subject is very proud of like being a socialist but it can be used to frighten a lot of people into not hearing what she/he has to say.

WHEN IS THE FBI ALLOWED TO SEARCH A HOUSE OR OFFICE? The FBI, like any other police agency, should have a warrant before making any search. Only in special circumstances are agents allowed to search without a warrant. **Never invite the FBI into your home or office. Agents have no right to enter without a warrant or an invitation.** If they say they have a warrant, ask to see it. If the warrant is for your address, insist on accompanying the agents on the search and making careful notes about where they look and what they say.

Many searches are done without a warrant because someone "consents" to it. Often FBI agents will try to get keys or permission to enter a residence or office from a landlord, superintendent or building manager; a roommate, parent, or other person with authority to permit the search. **If you have been contacted by the FBI or suspect that you are about to be, it is important to let other people with access to your living and working space know that you do not consent and do not authorize them to permit police agents of any sort to enter the premises.**

WHAT SHOULD I DO AFTER A VISIT FROM THE FBI? The first and most important thing is to let other people know. Friends, neighbors and relatives may also be visited and asked questions. They may be asked to identify pictures of you or your friends. The FBI often lies about the nature of its investigation, and may imply that you will be in a lot of trouble if you do not cooperate. You should get to people who are likely to be contacted as soon after you are visited as possible. Tell people you have no intention of cooperation, that you are communicating to the FBI only through your attorney, and that you want others contacted about you to follow a similar course of action. **You may want to stress that it is perfectly legal not to cooperate, and that refusing to talk to the FBI minimizes the danger to all concerned.** You should be ready to provide people with the name and number of a sympathetic lawyer and/or legal worker, and to spend some time talking with people about why it is important to refuse to help the FBI in its investigation. You should also warn those likely to be visited that the FBI frequently lies, not only about the purpose of its investigation, but also about what

rights people do and don't have and about the individuals under investigation.

Get in touch with a lawyer with experience in political investigations and let your community know about the visits. Keeping quiet about the FBI activity only gives them room to move and isolates people from each other.

BUT WHAT IF I REALLY DON'T KNOW ANYTHING? Nobody knows "Nothing". You know names, addresses and telephone numbers. Relations. Interests. Haunts. Where people are weak and where they are strong. When someone was out of town or away from work. This information could be used to frame someone, or to discredit him or her, or as the basis of an "anonymous" letter sent by government agents to stir up trouble within a movement or community. COINTELPRO documents reveal that pieces of information are often distorted and sensationalized, then "leaked" to the press to discredit entire movements as well as individuals. Remember: **NO PIECE OF INFORMATION IS TOTALLY USELESS TO THE GOVERNMENT, AND ONCE YOU HAVE GIVEN IT, YOU HAVE ABSOLUTELY NO CONTROL OVER HOW INFORMATION IS USED.**

Another important reason not to give out even perfectly "harmless" information is your own self respect. Almost every culture and religion has harsh words for the Judas figure, and the tattletale, "snitch" or "stoolie". People who cooperate with the FBI are often ostracized from their community because no one feels they can be trusted with anything.

(Reprinted from BASTA! The National Sanctuary Newsletter, July 1984).



NEW! NEW!

"BEARING WITNESS FOR SILENCE"

By Carl Watner

A 12,000 word pamphlet explaining the use of silence as the protector of individual rights. Based on the author's own research and experiences. \$9.95 postpaid from The Voluntaryists.



"LET SLEEPING DOGS LIE"

By Carl Watner

In a world of what appears to be "dog eat dog" many people have wondered how any sort of cooperation could ever evolve among competing individuals. Yet, all of us have noticed that cooperation among human beings can and does take place, sometimes even amidst the most bitter conflict. For example, during the trench warfare of World War I, there arose a system of "live and let live". Front line soldiers often refrained from shooting to kill their enemy, provided that their restraint was reciprocated by soldiers on the other side. The purpose of this essay is to briefly describe the conditions necessary for cooperation to evolve and to examine this one historical incident in some depth.

Robert Axelrod, a contemporary scholar of game theory and cooperation, has noted that cooperation among human beings will evolve, so long as there is at least one person who is willing to initially cooperate and another who will reciprocate. He describes the requirements for the evolution of cooperation as 1) cooperation be based on reciprocity, and 2) that the shadow of the future be sufficiently long enough to make that reciprocity stable and of value to the participants. Thus, it is possible for cooperation to get started even among small groups of discriminating individuals, as long as they have some interactions between them. The strategies they use must contain two key elements. First, they will be the first to cooperate, and second, they will discriminate (reciprocate) between those who respond to cooperation and those who do not. Axelrod labels such a strategy, TIT FOR TAT, since it cooperates on the first move, and then does whatever the other player did on his/her last move.

In one respect this strategy is representative of the libertarian nonaggression principle, that one not aggress against non-aggressors unless they first initiate aggression. In other words, under a TIT FOR TAT strategy, cooperation evolves among the participants until one of them has to react in violent self-defense, but this is never done except in response to an act of invasion initiated by an opponent. This allows a player to protect him/herself from invasion, but represents essentially a peaceful, stable strategy. The overall level of cooperation is maximized, even though each player is looking out for him/herself. The point of libertarian theory, as well as game theory, is that cooperation and mutual exchange pay off for both participants and are the most beneficial strategies. Axelrod describes this discriminating feature of TIT FOR TAT as a ratchet, because it maximizes cooperation and lessens the likelihood of defections to invasive strategies. This is essentially the explanation for the growth of cooperation even in the most unlikely situations.

World War I on the western front began in August 1914, as a war of rapid movement, but after four months of fighting this open warfare turned into nearly static trench warfare which lasted for the remainder of the war. Tony Ashworth in his study of the "the live and let live system" of trench warfare during 1914-1918, has observed that routine, normal confrontation between enemy soldiers along the trenches constituted the major part of the war, as opposed to the dramatic battles (such as Somme or Verdun). He describes the differences between the two types of fighting by noting that in the larger conflicts, one army attacked another along a considerable length of its trenches, strived to kill its opponents, capture their trenches and break through to the open ground behind their line of defense. In contrast, the routine trench warfare, with which his book deals, consisted of mostly continuous small-scale attacks, where each side aggressed in a variety of ways, but mostly remained in their trenches. It is in this latter variety of fighting that historians have noted the growth of "the live and let live system."

This cooperation among enemies was only possible because of the protracted and static nature of trench warfare. Enemy soldiers often confronted one another for relatively long lengths of time and realized that "live or let live" or "the principle of laissez faire" (as one of them described it) was one of the soundest elements of trench warfare. Not all sectors of the trenches were quiet and the elite units trained to fight for glory were certainly not acquiescent towards the enemy. However the fact remains that probably at least one third of the units in the trenches experienced some sort of tacit truce with the enemy during the war.

"Live and let live was a truce where enemies stopped fighting by agreement for a period of time: the British let the Germans live provided the Germans let them live in return." Essentially this process, which was also described as "let sleeping dogs lie", "take the thick with the thin", and "mighty glad to be alive", was a series of reciprocal exchanges among antagonists "where each diminished the other's risk of death, discomfort and injury by a deliberate restriction of aggressive activity, but only on the condition that the other required the restraint. The 'profound difference' between the quiet sector and the active sector was, therefore, the exchange of peace, according to the rules of live and let live on the former, and the exchange of aggression according to the rules of kill or be killed."

The common sense rule of everyday life, that one should not harm persons who do one no harm, found its expression in the trenches in a variety of ways. Tacit truces were always illicit and against the orders of the

high command, but nevertheless they existed for months at a time. Despite the continual circulation of new soldiers into the trenches, departing troops told new arrivals of the existence of these truces, thus making constant renegotiation with the enemy unnecessary. The tacit truces began in a number of ways. During the early part of the war, some units observed a Christmas day cease fire, which was reciprocated by the enemy. Fraternization with the enemy subjected one to court martial, but it occasionally took place. Soldiers soon recognized that meal times were a time of quiet on both sides. The simple inertia of soldiers bored by the features of constant confinement in the trenches often led to a "don't fire at us and we won't fire at you attitude."

Probably the most active form of the "live and let live" policy was the ritualization of weapons fire that evolved. Since any type of truce with the enemy was outlawed by the high command on both sides, individual units and soldiers had to circumvent the official policy of "dog eat dog" set by the generals outside of the trenches. Ritualization was based on the assumption that "if I aggress against the enemy in a way which causes him no harm, he will probably return the favor." Firing on both sides could be described as "desultory", "for there was little desire on either side to create trouble; some rounds must of course be fired, otherwise questions would follow." The ritualization feature of fighting consisted in the fact that the weapons, of whatever size, from small arms to trench-mortars and large bombs, were deliberately mis-aimed or aimed high and were only discharged at certain times of the day, and at the same time, day after day. Ritualization allowed front line commanders to send records of fighting activity to their high command, but also at the same time send a message to their opponents that they had adopted a live and let live plan. Since the enemy always knew that accurate and sporadic firing was possible, the message of weapon ritualization was clear: we have no intent to harm you.

The high command, especially among the British, was aware of this front-line attitude and did everything possible to discourage it. Field Marshall Douglas Haig of the British staff developed the tactic of trench raids to instill a more aggressive attitude among the troops of the British Expeditionary Force. Trench warfare became bureaucratized and decisions taken out of the hands of local commanders in an effort to increase the incidence of violence. It was impossible to fake a body count or ritualize a raid, although efforts were made to do so. The high command had a need to train its soldiers to hate the enemy, but basic human nature, especially after the fighting settled down to trench warfare, acted against this. One experienced soldier commented on this change of attitude: "Hatred of the enemy so strenuously fostered in training days, largely faded away in the line.

We somehow realized that individually they (the enemy) were very like ourselves, just as fed up and as anxious to be done with it all."

When this "consciousness of kind" evolved within the live and let live system, a new moral attitude developed. The enemy became not only a person one did not shoot at out of self-interest, but "someone for whom one also had fellow-feelings." The initial impetus of the live and let live system was self-interest; one did not try to kill an enemy soldier with the hopes that he would not try to kill you. If an enemy was a fellow human being, "a fellow sufferer, with whom one sympathized, then one ought not to harm him; and to act otherwise violated one's conscience." This sense of moral restraint was observed throughout the period of trench warfare and no better example can be offered than to describe what happened at the end of the war. The armistice was declared in effect at 11 o'clock on November 11, 1918. Eddie Rickenbacker, fighter ace, flew over the trenches just as the armistice went into effect:

On both sides of no-man's-land, the trenches erupted. Brown-uniformed men poured out of the American trenches, gray-green uniformed men out of the German. From my observer's seat overhead, I watched them throw their helmets in the air, discard their guns, wave their hands. Then all up and down the front, the two groups of men began edging toward each other across no-man's-land. Seconds before they had been willing to shoot each other; now they came forward. Hesitantly at first, then more quickly, each group approached the other.

Suddenly gray uniforms mixed with brown. I could see them hugging each other, dancing, jumping. Americans were passing out cigarettes and chocolate. I flew up to the French sector. There it was even more incredible. After four years of slaughter and hatred, they were not only hugging each other but kissing each other on both cheeks as well.

The idea of cooperation evolving even amidst the violence of war is encouraging. Of course, it is disheartening that individuals would follow their leaders into senseless wars and endure the pain and agony of four years in the trenches. It seems incredible that grown people would allow themselves to be governed by others in such matters. Nevertheless human nature does show a penchant for survival and respect for human life even under the most adverse circumstances.

Cooperation theory clearly shows that what happened in some of the opposing trenches during World War I was

an example of the TIT FOR TAT strategy. Under more peaceful conditions, such a strategy even has more potential because the participants know that they will have future contact with one another. In a very interesting comment about ordinary business transactions, Axelrod notes that central authority, such as government or the courts, is rarely invoked in such day-to-day dealings. "A common business attitude is expressed by a purchasing agent who said that 'if something comes up you get the other man on the telephone and deal with the problem. You don't read legalistic clauses at each other if you ever want to do business again. ... The fairness of transactions is guaranteed not by the threat of legal suit, but rather by the anticipation of mutually rewarding transactions in the future.'" He concludes that "mutual cooperation can emerge in a world of egoists without central control by starting with a cluster of individuals who rely on reciprocity." This is essentially the voluntarist message which allows individuals to peacefully interact without requiring the intervention of or even the existence of the State. It is nice to know that the voluntarist contention that peaceful cooperation is capable of evolving can be reinforced by so many different points of view, by people who "have no axes to grind". To "let sleeping dogs lie" - whether dealing with canines or enemies - thus proves itself to be the wisest strategy.

REFERENCES USED

Tony Ashworth, TRENCH WARFARE 1914-1918 THE LIVE AND LET LIVE SYSTEM, New York: Holmers & Meier Publishers, 1980.

Robert Axelrod, THE EVOLUTION OF COOPERATION, New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1984.

Douglas R. Hofstadter, "Metamagical Themes: Computer tournaments of the Prisoner's Dilemma suggest how cooperation evolves," SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, May 1983, pp. 16-26.

Edward V. Rickenbacker, RICKENBACKER, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967, p. 159.

PAUL JACOB UPDATE

Still underground, Paul and his family are being harassed by the FBI and Feds. Paul finds it increasingly difficult to find steady employment and needs our support. 14" x 17" "Paul Jacob Is Free" posters are available for \$10 each postpaid. Mail checks payable to The Paul Jacob Fund to The Voluntarists.

"WHAT I BELIEVE"

By H. L. Mencken

I believe that religion, generally speaking, has been a curse to mankind - that its modest and greatly over-estimated services on the ethical side have been more than overborne by the damage it has done to clear and honest thinking

I believe that no discovery of fact, however trivial, can be wholly useless to the race, and that no trumpeting of falsehood, however virtuous in intent, can be anything but vicious.

I believe that all government is evil, in that all government must necessarily make war upon liberty; and that the democratic form is at least as bad as any of the other forms.

I believe that an artist, fashioning his imaginary worlds out of his own agony and ecstasy, is a benefactor to all of us, but that the worst error we can commit is to mistake his imaginary worlds for the real one.

I believe that the evidence for immortality is no better than the evidence for witches, and deserves no more respect.

I believe in complete freedom of thought and speech, alike for the humblest man and the mightiest, and in the utmost freedom of conduct that is consistent with living in organized society.

I believe in the capacity of man to conquer his world, and to find out what it is made of and how it is run.

I believe in the reality of progress.

I -

But the whole thing, after all, may be put very simply. I believe that it is better to tell the truth than to lie. I believe that it is better to be free than to be a slave. And I believe that it is better to know than to be ignorant.

From: THE FORUM Sept. 1930 p. 139



GIVE A VOLUNTARYIST GIFT OR TREAT YOURSELF

- Item 1: New Subscription or Renewal to **THE VOLUNTARYIST** (add \$5 overseas).... \$10.00
- Item 2: **NEITHER BULLETS NOR BALLOTS: Essays on Voluntarism**..... 4.95
- Item 3: **A VOLUNTARY POLITICAL GOVERNMENT**, Introduction by Carl Watner..... 6.95
- Item 4: **THE POLITICS OF OBEDIENCE: The Discourse of Voluntary Servitude**..... 3.95

Order any 2 items and deduct \$1; any 3—deduct \$2; any 4—deduct \$3, etc.

Multiple copies of any item treated in the same manner. All prices postage paid to one address. Add \$1 for each additional address specified. Make checks payable to and order from The Voluntaryists. Offer ends Dec. 31, 1984.

The Voluntaryist

P.O. Box 5836 • Baltimore, Maryland 21208

FIRST CLASS — TIME VALUE