

---

# The Voluntaryist

---

Whole Number 138

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

3rd Quarter 2008

---

## A Moral Challenge

By Carl Watner

I have recently been having correspondence with my son about the morality of government taxation, and it prompted this "challenge." I maintain that taxation is theft and contrary to the universally accepted moral principles: thou shall not steal and thou shall not murder. While these two principles are found in the Ten Commandments, they are also embraced by people of non-Judeo-Christian belief. They form the basis of every civilization because without them there can be no peaceful social cooperation or voluntary exchanges between human beings.

"Once we assuage our conscience by calling something a 'necessary evil,' it begins to look more and more necessary and less and less evil."

—Sydney J. Harris

Most of the people I have spoken to over the years think that government taxation is not theft because government is a necessary social institution. The attainment of the common good requires taxes to support government. Thus, those who evade paying their proper share or those who object to how their tax money is spent (the pacifist - on war; the Catholic - on abortion; the anarchist - in general) must be threatened with force beforehand. If they refuse to pay they will ultimately have their property confiscated and sold at auction or they will find themselves imprisoned (either after a conviction for violating the tax laws or for contempt of court [for refusing to obey a judge's orders to cooperate]). If they violently refuse to cooperate with the marshals that come to take their property or arrest them, they will be subdued or killed.

These actions by government agents are "stealing" and/or "killing" by any commonly accepted definition of those terms. Aren't government employees doing the same thing as members of the criminal gang: taking property or life without the owner's consent? As Murray Rothbard (FOR A NEW LIBERTY, 1973, p. 55) once asked: Is there a way to define taxation so as to morally differentiate it from robbery?

Furthermore, consider the fact that there is a moral way to collect taxes (without force or violence):

Try rational argument and persuasion.

If government is really as necessary as most people think, then it ought to be quite simple to convince others to support it (or at least support as much of it as they believe is necessary). Instead of threatening people, educate them. Convince them. Demonstrate why they ought to contribute to government. Threatening them with force is not a way to answer their arguments against paying.

If those who refuse to pay taxes at all, or who selectively refuse to pay part of their taxes (for whatever reason), cannot be convinced, then they ought to be left alone. They ought not to be placed in jail or stolen from. Deny them whatever government services they are not willing to pay for.

And, if the supporters of government are still unable to collect enough in taxes to support the amount of government they deem necessary, then they ought to dig deeper into their own pockets. The fact that government is a "good cause" is no justification for stealing from or killing those who refuse to support it.

My challenge to people of good will is to recognize the logic and morality of my argument. The first step in universalizing the commandments against stealing and killing is to admit that taxation is theft, even if one cannot understand how government and society would function in the absence of coercive tax collection. IV

"But what reason have we more than past ages, to expect that we will be blessed with impeccable rulers? We think not any. Although it has been said that each generation grows wiser and wiser, yet we have no reason to think that they grow better and better. And therefore the probability lies upon the dark side. Does not the experience of ages teach, that men have generally exercised all the power they had given them, and even have usurped upon them, in order to accomplish their own sinister and avaricious designs, whenever they thought they could do so with impunity?"

—Consider Arms, Malichi Maynard, and Samuel Field, April 9, 1788 in Herbert J. Storing, ed., THE COMPLETE ANTI-FEDERALIST (1981), Vol. 4, Essay 26, p. 257.

# The Voluntaryist

Editor: Carl Watner

## Subscription Information

Published quarterly by The Voluntaryists, P.O. Box 275, Gramling, SC 29348. A six-issue subscription is \$20 or .07 ounce of fine gold. For overseas postage, please add \$5 or 1/3 of the regular subscription price. Single back issues are \$4 each or 1/5 of the regular subscription price. Please check the number on your mailing label to see when you should renew. THE VOLUNTARYIST is online at [www.voluntaryist.com](http://www.voluntaryist.com).

## Potpourri from the Editor's Desk

### No. 1 "The New Despotism"

[M]ore often than not in history, license has been the prelude to exercises of extreme political coercion, which shortly reaches all areas of culture. ... [V]ery commonly in ages when civil rights of one kind are in evidence - those pertaining to freedom of speech and thought, say, theater, press and forum, with obscenity and libel laws correspondingly loosened - very real constrictions of individual liberty take place in other, more vital areas: political organization, voluntary association, property and the right to hold jobs, for example. ...

There are, after all, certain freedoms that are like circuses. Their very existence, so long as they are individual and enjoyed chiefly individually as spectators, divert men's minds from the loss of other, more fundamental, social and economic and political rights.

A century ago, the liberties that now exist routinely on stage and screen, on printed page and canvas, would have been unthinkable in America - and elsewhere in the West, for that matter, save in the most clandestine and limited of settings. But so would the limitations upon economic, professional, educational, and local liberties, to which we have by now become accustomed, have seemed equally unthinkable a half century ago. We enjoy the feelings of great freedom, of protection of our civil liberties, when we attend the theater, watch television, buy paperbacks. But all the while we find ourselves living in circumstances of a spread of military, police, and bureaucratic power that cannot help but have, that manifestly does have, profoundly erosive effect upon those economic, local, and associative liberties which are by far the most vital to any free society. From the point of view of any contemporary strategist or tactician of political power, indulgence in the one kind of liberties must seem a very requisite to diminution of the other kind. We know it seemed that way to the Caesars and Napoleons of history. Such indulgence is but one more way of softening the impact of political power and of creating the illusion of

individual freedom in a society grown more centralized, collectivized, and destructive of the diversity of allegiance, the autonomy of enterprise in all spheres, and the spirit of spontaneous association that any genuinely free civilization requires.

—Robert Nisbet, "The New Despotism,"

COMMENTARY (June 1975), pp. 42-43.

### No. 2 "Go Back to Basics"

... [U]se a medical specialist only within his field of expertise.

Also keep in mind that the word 'patient' is a high falutin' substitute for the word 'customer.'

The words 'patient' and 'client' make doctors and other professionals sound more noble. But if you think of yourself as a customer, it puts you in control, with the doctor - the lawyer or other professional - a vendor who's just selling you his services. No matter how sophisticated and professional your doctor seems to be, you are the better judge of what's best for you and how well a treatment is working, not the other way around.

Many years ago, a friend on his death bed gave me some advice about doctors that has been very helpful to me. In fact, it saved me a bundle in medical fees and probably saved my life. His advice? When you realize that healing is not progressing favorably, it's time to switch doctors and try another approach.

—Tom Warren, BEATING ALZHEIMER'S: A STEP TOWARDS UNLOCKING THE MYSTERIES OF BRAIN DISEASE (1991), pp. 113-114.

### No. 3 "Books Received"

THE ANARCHISTS, Irving Louis Horowitz (ed.):

This is a 2005 re-publication of the 1964 edition, with a new introduction by the editor. Includes numerous essays by classical anarchists of all stripes. Contact Transaction Publishers, 35 Berrue Circle, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8042 or [www.transactionpub.com](http://www.transactionpub.com). ISBN 0-202-30768-9.

EXQUISITE REBEL: THE ESSAYS OF VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE - ANARCHIST, FEMINIST GENIUS, Sharon Presley and Crispin Sartwell (eds.): Emma Goldman referred to De Cleyre (1866-1912) as one of "the most gifted and brilliant anarchist women America ever produced." Contact State University of New York Press, 90 State Street # 700, Albany, NY 12207 or [www.sunypress.edu](http://www.sunypress.edu). ISBN 0-7914-6094-0.

ANARCHISM: A DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF LIBERTARIAN IDEAS, Robert Graham (ed.), Volume I: From Anarchy to Anarchism (300 CE to 1939): Published by Black Rose Books, C.P. 158, Succ. Place de Parc, Montreal, QC H2X 4A7 Canada; Tel. 1-800-565-9523 or [www.web.net/blackrosebooks](http://www.web.net/blackrosebooks). This is an interesting collection of anarchist essays from all across the spectrum, but with a conspicuous absence of individualist-anarchist materials. ▣

# Every State a Police State

By Carl Watner

*"With all [due] respect to the differences among types of government, there is not, in strict theory, any difference between the powers available to the democratic and to the totalitarian state."*

—Robert Nisbet, *"The State,"* (1985).

The following ruminations were sparked by reading a report that enemy combatants, in the War on Terror, may be detained without the constitutional protections normally afforded Americans. Any person - American citizen or foreigner - considered treasonous or a threat to the United States - may be so classified. This means that you or I could be deemed a terrorist for reading this article. (After all, our ideology certainly threatens the very existence of the state.) It is also known that President Bush has ordered, and Congress has sanctioned, the "extrajudicial killing" of enemy combatants anywhere on earth. For example, President Bush in his January 2003 State of the Union Address reported the arrest of more than 3000 terrorists, "and many others have met a different fate. Let's put it this way. They are no longer a problem." In other words, "many others" have been murdered at his direction. Whether or not such murders have taken place in the United States is not known, but they certainly could have.

Do these most recent policies by the Bush Administration make the United States of America a police state? Are they similar in nature to the actions of Nazi Germany or Stalinist Russia in imprisoning or murdering their enemies?

To answer these questions: No and Yes. No, because as I wrote in my 1993 article, "In All But Name," the United States is already a police state. Every state law, no matter how petty or important, has as its final punishment your imprisonment or death - should you decide to resist it to the bitter end. This is true of all states, everywhere, at any time.

Yes, the Bush Administration policies are similar to those of Hitler and Stalin because every state depends on its police forces to enforce its coercive edicts. If a state cannot convince its subject population to comply with its laws, it must initiate violence to enforce its will. The failure to use force will ultimately lead to the breakup of even the most monolithic state.

The reason that I argue that "every state is a police state" is that it is inherently the nature of the state to establish a compulsory monopoly of defense services over a given geographic area. Property owners who prefer no protection, or prefer to protect themselves, or prefer to hire other protective agencies are not allowed to do so. It is also in the nature of the state to obtain its revenues from taxation - a compulsory levy on the

inhabitants of its territory. Every state depends on taxation to finance itself. If you don't pay your taxes you will be imprisoned and/or your property will be confiscated.

The short and long of it is that if you don't obey state laws, the state will wreak violence on you. The anarchist insight into the nature of the state sees it as an inherently invasive institution.

All you need to know about states is that every state is a police state. Some have more edicts than others; some have fewer - but they all have laws that you must obey or suffer the consequences.

George Smith once noted that there are three primary criteria by which to measure state oppression:

To what extent do you become a criminal by peacefully going about your own business?

To what extent must you ask the government's permission to use your own property and labor or that property and labor of others whose consent you have already obtained?

To what extent does the state confiscate money from you?

[E]very policeman knows that though governments may change, the police remains.

—Leon Trotsky, *WHAT NEXT?* (NY: Pioneer Publ., 1932), p. 18.

Even the most benign states violate the rights of peaceful people to be left alone. Even if there is no income tax, there are import and excise duties, sales and use taxes, and property taxes. If you want to opt out, you can't unless you want to face the barrel-end of a gun. If you birth your children at home, the state wants to get involved. You are required to register their births. If you want to erect a building dedicated to your religion or your business you are required to get a building permit. If you want to homeschool your children you are required to report to governmental authorities.

All government, by its very nature, is coercive. To the voluntaryist, a man is still a slave who is required to submit even to the best of laws or the mildest government. Coercion is still coercion regardless of how mildly it is administered. The point is not what form of government is best, or mildest, or which form of government seems to be most protective of liberty. (Governments cannot be "protective" of liberty because they negate property rights via taxation and compulsory monopolization of services.) The question is: Wouldn't it be more moral and more practical to provide protection services and all the other myriad services that governments provide via voluntary means rather than on a coercive basis? After all, common sense and experience teach that if one takes care of the means that the end will take care of itself. The only way to avoid the police state is not having a state at all. ▢

---

# A Letter to the Home School Legal Defense Association

May 14, 2007

Suzanne Stephens, Editor  
THE HOME SCHOOL COURT REPORT  
Home School Legal Defense Association  
Box 3000  
Purcellville, VA 20134

Re: Part One, "How Safe Is the Homeschool Horizon?" THE HOME SCHOOL COURT REPORT, March/April 2007

As a member of HSLDA, I read your magazine periodically. I would like to comment on two parts of the referenced article, and offer a third - only somewhat related - point.

I am enclosing a copy of my newsletter, THE VOLUNTARYIST, as background to my comments, and although I hope whomever reads this letter will find it interesting, it may be discarded without detriment to understanding this letter. (This particular issue, No. 108, contains my correspondence with Kerry Morgan, author of REAL CHOICE, REAL FREEDOM IN AMERICAN EDUCATION.) I describe my political orientation as voluntarist. This label stems from the church taxation controversies of the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries in England and America, as well as from the 19th century controversy over government funding of schools in England. Voluntarists, of whatever era, have always come down on the side of private, consensual funding of churches, schools, and government services.

## Comment One:

In the section headlined "Why Do They Want Control?" on page 8, the answer offered by the author focuses on the fact that government officials believe homeschooling needs to be supervised, in order to insure that children get an adequate education. (As an aside, if government schools can't work in an exemplary fashion, why would anyone think they could or should supervise homeschools?) What answer does "following the money" furnish? Government supervision of homeschooling means more taxes, more employees, and more power for the government. As a voluntarist, I believe the very nature of government, as a societal institution, is to expand its domain in every way possible. As Theodore Lowi wrote in his book, INCOMPLETE CONQUEST (1981):

Every action and every agency of contemporary government must contribute to the fulfillment of its fundamental purpose, which is to maintain conquest. Conquest manifests itself in various forms of control, but in all those forms

it is the common factor tying together into one system the behavior of courts and cops, sanitation workers and senators, bureaucrats and technocrats, generals and attorney generals, pressure groups, and presidents. [p. 13]

I believe that this is the proper answer to the question. Government wants control over homeschooling because it must conquer the minds and souls of its people so they will obey its laws, pay their taxes, and accept its legitimacy.

## Comment Two:

In the section headlined "Conclusion," on page 11, the statement is made that "It seems incredible that we should have to remind legislators and local school officials what the laws says." So much for the idea that we are a government of laws and not men. People interpret the law, whether legislators, judges, police, or other bureaucrats. Laws do not interpret or enforce themselves. Given that it is the nature of government to expand its powers, is it at all surprising that HSLDA has to remind government officials what the law says? (And then fight them in court where the odds are often against HSLDA, because other government employees are empowered to decide the meaning of the law.)

## Comment Three:

Somewhere I read that homeschooling is legal in all fifty states. Whatever happened to the idea that homeschooling is a common law right of parents? Wasn't it, in fact, such a right at the start of this nation? If we depend on the government to "legalize" homeschooling, aren't we agreeing that the government has the right to control it?

You have my permission to share this letter with whomever you please, and I hope that you would give a copy to Andrea Longbottom. While I don't believe that it will change the outlook of anyone at HSLDA, my purpose in writing is to show you that there is at least one parent in the country who views these issues as I do.

I must speak out. One word of truth outweighs the world.

Sincerely,  
Carl Watner

[Author's Addendum: The same observation that government officials have to be reminded what the laws say, also applies to the federal income tax. Although I am not impressed by the argument of some patriots that the income tax is unconstitutional, is it not highly likely that the IRS would have to be reminded of what the tax laws say? And since there is no taxpayer's rights organization to protect the interest of taxpayers, is it not likely that federal agents have expanded and mis-interpreted the income tax laws in the government's favor? And even when there is a disagreement, who interprets the law: judicial officials on the government's payroll? So much for the idea that we have a government with checks and balances!] ▣

---

# Gradualism in Practice: The Danger of Compulsory National ID

By Carl Watner

Most people have probably heard at least one of the following stories. Put a frog in a pot of boiling water and he will save himself by jumping right out. Put him in a pan of cold water, and gradually increase the heat. You will soon boil him to death. Want to catch a wild hog that won't come anywhere near you? Put a little corn out for him in the woods. Do that pretty regularly until he gets used to the smell of humans and gradually accustoms himself to eating corn. Get him to follow your trail of corn right into an enclosure and you capture him easily. What is the moral of these two stories? What has this got to do with government identification programs? What has gradualism got to do with national ID?

We can begin answering these questions by noting that at the time of the American Revolution, there was little concern for the official, civil registration of births and deaths. Even in the Constitution there is no specific mention of vital statistics other than the commissioning of the federal government to conduct a census every ten years in order to determine the apportionment of congressmen among the states. At any time prior to 1900, it would probably have been impossible for a large portion of the American populace to prove that they had ever been born or that their parents were ever married, since they had no state-issued birth or marriage certificates. Before the advent of the automobile, there was certainly no such thing as a state-issued license to drive a horse and wagon. Nonetheless, today, nearly everyone has a state-issued birth certificate, and practically everyone who drives a motor vehicle has a state-issued license extending to them the "privilege" to do so. The constitutional directive for the decennial census has been expanded to such an extent that serious consideration is now being given to assigning a federal identification number to each and every citizen and resident alien in the United States. How did we in America move from the point where few of our ancestors were concerned about even having a record of their births (much less having a public official make that record) to the point where we are ready to accept a unique government number to identify us? How were we convinced to accept government numbers when our forefathers would have bristled at the thought?<sup>1</sup>

Here were some of the steps:

1639 - Massachusetts Bay Colony ordered that births and deaths should be reported to the town clerk by parents or household owners within one month of their occurrence. Connecticut and other colonies followed suit in the succeeding years.

1790 - First national census conducted in accordance with Article I, Section 2 of the US Constitution.

1842 - Massachusetts became the first state to require collection of vital statistics (births and deaths); followed by other states between 1850 and 1900.

1903 - Massachusetts and Missouri became the first states to require drivers' licenses, though Missouri had no driver examination law until 1952.

1935 - The passage of the Social Security Act "proved to be a great stimulus" to birth certification. "Many people had never considered a birth certificate to be of any importance until old age assistance, unemployment insurance, and other ramifications of the Social Security Act demonstrated to them that it was necessary to have this official proof of their existence" in order to collect benefits.

1961 - The IRS demanded that all taxpayers provide their Social Security number when paying federal taxes.

I get so frustrated when I speak at a seminar and the first question is "But is it legal?" Who *cares* if it is legal? If it's right, do it. We've raised a culture of people who want to ask permission to scratch their nose. We need to examine what is *right*, and then *do* it. ... Jesus said "Do the truth [instead of merely speaking the truth].

—Joel Salatin, "Interview," THE MONEYCHANGER (October 2006), p. 12.

1992 - Hospital enumeration-at-birth program (assigning newborns Social Security numbers) was begun.

Looking at this historical overview, it is easy to see how government gradualism has prevailed. Like the frog jumping out of boiling water, the American people would have completely rejected a national numbering system when the Constitution was adopted. When the first federal census was conducted in South Carolina, the enumeration was met with considerable resistance. Several heads of family in the Federal District for Charleston were indicted in 1791 for "refusing to render an account of their respective families." George Washington in a letter to Gouverneur Morris noted that many Americans held religious scruples against complying with the census officials, while others feared that the census was in some way connected with taxes, and hence refused to cooperate. However, now after nearly three hundred years of accepting some limited forms of government enumeration, a national ID system doesn't sound so strange.

Clearly, people soon get used to government involvement in their lives. Our government has always used the carrot and stick approach to gain cooperation. It threatens punishment for not complying with its laws; and it promises handouts for obeying. This was the exact method used by the government's Social Security Administration. First it promised that a social security number would never be used for identification purposes. Then it promised practically free payouts to the retiring elderly if they would only apply for a number. Then years later, the SSA and the IRS threatened all sorts of penalties and loss of privileges if one refused a number. By 1973, it was required that a social security number be furnished if one were to open a personal checking account. Later, one could not claim dependent exemptions unless one provided their social security numbers on one's 1040 tax form. Today, in some states, one cannot obtain a driver's license without providing a social security number. What will come next?

What comes next is compulsory, national ID. Whether administered at the state or the federal level, each and every person in the United States would be issued a government identification, and would be required to use it in order to participate in numerous activities. A true national identification card would necessarily be universal (if not issued to every newborn it would be issued to all children upon their reaching a certain age) and compulsory (it would become a crime, punishable by fine or imprisonment, to refuse to accept or use such a document). It would also be a violation of the law to have more than one card, to use the card of another person, or to hold a card in the name of an alias. A national ID would act as a domestic passport. In many countries around the world, where such cards actually exist, they are needed to rent an apartment, buy a home, apply for a job, pay one's utility and telephone bills, withdraw books from the library, or to access health care services. They could act as a surrogate driver's license, passport, voter registration card, hunting/fishing license, and draft card. With micro-chip technology, such a card would act as a complete medical, financial, tax, and travel dossier documenting where you have been, how you got there, and how you paid for the services you used. In conjunction with data reported to the Internal Revenue Service, it would enable the government to calculate how much you owed in taxes each year. National ID micro-chips could be accessed by all government agencies so the card could be used to verify that the holder had no delinquent taxes or child support, no overdue library books, no parking fines, no bounced checks, and no unpaid traffic violations. Micro-chips would also have the capability to be disabled from a central government office at the discretion of any government agency,

"instantly rendering its holder unable to travel or function in society." In short, government ID would be a license to live issued by the government. No longer would life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness be a natural, inalienable right.

If one were a conspiracy theorist, one could claim that even before the passage of the Social Security Act plans were being laid to enslave the American population by way of numbering them. While this might be true, a more reasonable explanation is found by examining the nature of government. Government, as George Washington noted is "force." It tolerates no competition within its domains: it is the sole monopolizer of police, courts, and defense services AND it collects its revenues by threatening confiscation of property or imprisonment of person if one refuses to pay its levies. As Lord Acton observed "power corrupts." When government has the power to control us, it will use every strategy at its disposal to increase the amount of taxes assessed and the ease by which they are collected. What could make this process easier than a numbering scheme for all its citizens?

"Anarchism is not a romantic fable but the hardheaded realization, based on five thousand years of experience, that we cannot entrust the management of our lives to kings, priests, politicians, generals and county commissioners."

—Edward Abbey, *A VOICE CRYING IN THE WILDERNESS* (1989), Chapter 3, p. 22.

Is it too late to resist? In one sense, yes. It is always easier to resist at the beginnings. It is also easier to refuse to cooperate if one does not accept the basic premise adopted by one's opponent. In the case of the frog, the frog would have to reject being placed in the pot of water, whether it was hot or cold. (Why else would he be placed there - other than to cook him?) The hog would have to be smart enough to refuse the bait. By rejecting the free gift of corn, the hog would have prevented himself gradually being led down the trail to capture. The American people, by accepting the principle that governments should be responsible for the census and vital statistics, have been easily led down the trail to national ID.

Although it might be hard to imagine how this assumption of government enumeration power could have been averted, there have been at least two partially successful campaigns against national ID. In the early 1900s, Mahatma Gandhi led a resistance movement against the registration of Indians in the South African Transvaal. An Englishman who lived there called the registration "the fastening of the dog's collar"



around the neck of the Indians. At a meeting in late 1906, Gandhi called the government's bill a violation of basic civil rights and urged the entire Indian community in the Transvaal to openly resist complying with such a law. Thus was born the idea of Satyagraha (non-violent resistance to unjust governmental demands), which was successfully implemented in both the Transvaal and during the Indian movement for independence from Great Britain after World War II. Forty years later, a similar, massive public protest arose in Australia when the government proposed a national ID card for all Australians.

Now that Americans are faced with a similar challenge, there are a few general observations that we ought to remember:

In a society where the people have been issued a national ID card by their government, they - the people - are no longer free because their permission to live, work, and play comes from the government.

The logical outcome of government involvement in enumeration is the type of population control described by the authors of such fictional disutopias, as *Brave New World* and *1984*. This is why national ID systems have been described as "a trademark of totalitarianism."

From the Biblical story of King David (who caused a plague by counting his people), to the Roman censuses who counted Joseph and Mary in Bethlehem, to today's call for national ID, the essential purpose behind government data-gathering has always been the same: to enhance government's control over its subject population. Government identification programs - whether the censuses of antiquity, or based upon a birth certificate, a Social Security card, a driver's license, a smart card (the programmable micro-chip), or even an implanted micro-chip or some other form of biometric recognition - are all based upon the same principle: that government has the right and necessity to track, monitor, and control the people and property within its geographic jurisdiction. Thus the primary danger of implementing a national ID system in the United States is that it delivers totalitarian power to the federal government. As political scientist, Theodore Lowi, wrote in 1981,

Every action and every agency of contemporary government ... contribute to the fulfillment of its fundamental purpose, which is to maintain conquest. Conquest manifests itself in various forms of control, but in all those forms it is the common factor tying together into one system the behavior of courts and cops, sanitation workers and senators, bureaucrats and technocrats, attorney generals, pressure groups and presidents.

Although Lowi did not include them, we might add government health departments (that issue birth certificates), government motor vehicle administrations (that issue drivers' licenses), the Immigration and

Naturalization Service (which is responsible for keeping track of aliens within the United States), and the Office of Homeland Security (which is responsible for protecting us from terrorists). If and when it comes, a national ID program will fit hand in glove with Lowi's description of the "fundamental purpose" of government "which is to maintain conquest."

In making their ultimate decision whether to accept or reject national ID, Americans need to remember two things:

First, national ID and enhanced governmental powers *always* go hand in hand.

Second, for thousand of years, people have lived, died, and prospered without government ID. If they could do it, we certainly can. Sure, it is necessary that we have food, shelter, and clothing but that doesn't mean that our government must compulsorily supply us with these things any more than it needs to furnish each of us with a national ID number. ▽

<sup>1</sup> I might also add, that they probably would have never accepted the Constitution if they had known their descendants would be paying as many taxes (both in variety and amount) as we do.

## Jesus on Taxes

This essay contains three hypotheses. The primary thesis is that, contrary to what most people have been led to believe by their church and government leaders, Jesus did not condone taxation nor endorse the concept of the nation-state when he said "render unto Caesar therefore the things which are Caesar's." If the essay succeeds in persuading some readers of that one point, (we are confident those who read it with an open mind will be persuaded) our research, writing and prayers will be vindicated.

The second hypothesis is this: Jesus taught and lived by principles diametrically opposed to government and taxes. If that is true, then those who would live their lives according to the principles Jesus taught will neither collect, receive, nor voluntarily pay taxes, nor be involved with the state in any way that can possibly be avoided.

Finally, although Jesus died of his own volition in compliance with his Father's will in order to save mankind from sin, which may be the most important fact to know about Jesus, our third hypothesis holds that it is likely and eminently logical to believe that Pontius Pilate crucified Jesus for teaching his disciples that taxation is condemned by God's commandment, Thou shalt not steal. Pilate obviously didn't kill Jesus to save mankind from sin, although Jesus died for that purpose. Did he die to save us from taxes? If, as this essay shows, taxes are sinful because they violate God's Commandment, it follows as night follows day that indeed he did.

*Excerpted from [www.jesus-on-taxes.com](http://www.jesus-on-taxes.com) (pages 8-9).*

---

## A Plea To Help Keep Us Alive (In Print And On The Web)

By Carl Watner

I think it safe to say that THE VOLUNTARYIST is one of the longest lived libertarian publications in the world. It has been published since October 1982, and first appeared on the worldwideweb courtesy of one of our subscribers, David Dreas, in late 1996. In early January 2003, Charles Gutierrez, another subscriber, acquired the domain name Voluntaryist.com. Since that time, it has served as our primary presence on the web. David, Charles, and I have all contributed large amounts of our time, money, and/or energies toward promoting voluntaryism.

The subscription base for THE VOLUNTARYIST newsletter has always hovered somewhere between 180 and 225 paid subscribers. While the revenue generated from these snail-mailed copies has always sufficed to pay expenses, it has not made it possible to widely promote voluntaryism via advertisements, conferences, or book publications. In an informal survey conducted during the first half of 2006, at least half of those subscribers receiving THE VOLUNTARYIST wanted to continue their hard copy subscription, in preference to receiving their issue via e-mail or the web.

Over the years there have been a few generous

donors to the cause. Their contributions have helped make possible and sustained some of the research that goes into the historical articles that I publish in THE VOLUNTARYIST, as well as having made possible the publication of some of my books.

So, if you want to keep voluntaryism alive via hard copy and the web, here is my pitch to you.

Send a one-time annual contribution to support our work.

You can also make your donation via our "Support Us" Page on [www.voluntaryist.com](http://www.voluntaryist.com).

Anyone sending \$ 20 or more will receive one complimentary subscription to THE VOLUNTARYIST. Anyone sending \$ 100 or more will receive an autographed copy of THE VOLUNTARYIST anthology, I MUST SPEAK OUT. If you choose to donate via PayPal on the web, your money will be directed to THE VOLUNTARYIST via Ideomotion.

Gifts to THE VOLUNTARYIST are not tax-deductible. Our efforts are bound by conscience and goodwill, not by government regulation or the political privilege of tax-exemption. I hope you find voluntaryist ideas true and send us an expression of your support. ▢

"What lies behind us and what lies before us are tiny matters compared to what lies within us."

—Ralph Waldo Emerson

---

## The Voluntaryist

---

P.O. Box 275 • Gramling, South Carolina 29348



### FIRST CLASS

Please renew your subscription if the number on your address label is within one digit of this issue's number.