
The Voluntaryist

Whole Number 154

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

3rd Quarter 2012

What Might Have Been - What Might Be

By Carl Watner

[Editor's Note: The following article is the "Introduction" to my anthology, HOMESCHOOLING: A HOPE FOR AMERICA (2010). This 258 page softcover book is available from The Voluntaryists for \$20.00 postpaid.]

The responsibility of parents for the education of their children is deeply rooted in the spirit and history of America. In his book, IS PUBLIC EDUCATION NECESSARY?, Samuel Blumenfeld points out that there was no mention of education, much less "public/government" education in either the Declaration of Independence or the federal Constitution. Even if one were to argue that education fell within the jurisdiction of the states, rather than the national government, one is hard pressed to explain why only two of the constitutions of the original thirteen colonies (Pennsylvania and North Carolina) mentioned the subject. This absence of concern for what is today deemed to be one of the most central of government functions (both on the federal and state levels) is not too hard to explain.

Education, both before and after the American Revolution, was certainly not the responsibility of governments. The educational backgrounds of the signers of the Declaration and Constitution attest to the richness and diversity of the voluntary educational environment of the time. Their schooling encompassed "every conceivable combination of parental, church, apprenticeship, school, tutorial, and self-education." As Blumenfeld observes: "George Washington was educated by his father and half-brother, Benjamin Franklin was taught to read by his father and attended a private school for writing and arithmetic," and "Thomas Jefferson studied Latin and Greek under a tutor." [1] Charles Dabney, in his book UNIVERSAL EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH, reports that "a great advance in educational enterprises of a private and ecclesiastical character followed" the years after the American Revolution. "The wealthy established private schools. Academies and colleges were started wherever a few pupils could be gathered together and teachers found. A new ideal of education was in the making," [2] In 1798, Joseph Lancaster opened his first free school in London, England, followed by its spread to New York City in 1805. [3] In short, the "men who founded the United States were educated under the freest conditions possible" and it would have been strange to most of them,

indeed, to think that government should have been a provider of education. [4]

This is our ideal, the "what might have been" for American education, and our hope for what might be. Yet, as every 21st Century reader knows, educational freedom in America has been nearly destroyed, so much so that even the validity of homeschooling has been challenged in many states. This collection of eclectic articles from THE VOLUNTARYIST, which has been published since 1982, is designed to make you think about educational freedom and political statism. It takes the following points for its main theme:

... Government schools are paid for by compulsory taxes. (Why is it assumed that the majority of parents would not willingly pay for their children's education? Why are they presumed guilty? At the very least, if taxes must be collected to pay for public schools, why not collect them only from those who refuse to educate their children and necessitate such schools?)

... Government schools depend on the coercion of compulsory attendance laws. (Why is it assumed that the majority of parents would not willingly educate their children? Why are they presumed guilty? At the very least, why not apply compulsory attendance laws only to those parents who refuse to educate their children? To teachers and state educators we ask: Do you think nobody would willingly entrust their children to you? Why do you have to collect your pupils by compulsion?) [5]

... Before the advent of government schools, parents were primarily responsible for the education of their children.

... The home has always been the main place where education occurred; and the parents were often the primary instructors of their children.

... Although restricted by every conceivable law and political regulation, it is the natural and common law right of the parents to direct the education of their children.

... Parents have a moral duty to educate their offspring. However, a child has no right to an education. (The common law held it as no offense for a parent not to educate his child.) [6]

... Government schools are designed to indoctrinate students in statolatry, in the worship of the State as the provider of all 'good' things. (A tax-supported educational system is the life-like representative of the totalitarian state.) [7]

... Someone or some institution must control the child.

(continued on page 5)

The Voluntaryist

Editor: Carl Watner

Subscription Information

Published quarterly by The Voluntaryists, P.O. Box 275, Gramling, SC 29348. A six-issue subscription is \$25. For overseas postage, please add \$5. Single back issues are \$5. Gold and silver readily accepted. Please check the number on your mailing label to see when you should renew. THE VOLUNTARYIST is online at www.voluntaryist.com. Permission to reprint granted without special request.

Schools For All

By Oscar B. Johannsen

Each individual is responsible for his own well-being. He feeds and clothes himself. Some do it better than others, but with the exception of the physically and mentally handicapped, there is no question of the individual's obligation. Even in the case of the handicapped, he must care for himself to the extent he is able. Failure to allow him to do so to the limit of his capacity leads very often to a frustrated, sick man, ill in ways more serious than the infirmity itself. Just as the individual is responsible for his own and his children's physical well-being, he is likewise responsible for his own and his children's education. The parent must pay to feed the child's stomach. He must also pay to feed the child's mind.

Had someone a hundred odd years ago persuaded people that the feeding and clothing of children was a duty of Government and this function was thereupon assumed by it, and if somebody today were to suggest that it actually devolved to the parents, objections would be raised. It would be claimed that the parents could not possibly bear the cost alone; that such action constituted an attempt to feed and clothe the children of the rich better than the rest; that this was not democratic; that this was striking the very foundations of society.

Fortunately, since no one did arise who could sell that idea to the people, the parents today do care for their children and do it reasonably well. Far from hurting society, this responsibility is necessary from the viewpoint of the children as well as the parents. It enhances the love and affection of the children and the parents; it brings happiness to the parents in the knowledge that by their efforts their children are fed and clothed; it increases the respect and love of the children, who are thereby made aware of their dependence on their parents - all of which makes for a better society.

Unfortunately, about 1830 some educators did arise who convinced many that education was a governmental

responsibility, with the result that today, for all practical purposes, primary and secondary schools are a function of local government, the cost of which is borne by taxes. That being the case, whenever the proposition arises that parents should pay for the education as well as the physical care of their children, the objection is raised that they could not possibly afford to do so.


In large measure, however, they are paying for it now because the major portion of all taxes comes from the mass of the people and not from the few with large incomes. While any one person may only pay a portion of his children's public school training, he does not stop when they graduate since his taxes continue. If the parents live the normal life span of years, no doubt they easily pay in taxes as much, if not more, as they would have paid for sending their children to private schools if public schools did not exist.

Just as no one wishes to pay for the care of someone else's children, no one really wishes to pay for their education. Instinctively, it is felt that those who brought them into the world should bear their cost. If there is validity to the argument that society should pay for children's education since well-educated children will bring about a better society, then since well-fed children will mean a healthier society, the cost of feeding them should also be society's. For that matter, if this argument holds water, since health comes first, society should pay for their physical care and only after that has been attended to, pay for their education.

Putting education back into the hands of the people concerned will force them to be sure that their children are receiving the best of that which they are capable; will require the parents to take an active interest in choosing the proper school; will help engender mutual respect and love as parents and children work at solving this problem.

Actually, when all schools are private the cost of education is the least possible. Competition forces them to be highly efficient in order to keep the costs down, so that tuition fees will be low enough to attract customers - the pupils.

There will, of course, always be orphans and children of parents who cannot afford to defray the expenses of education. They will be aided by charitable organizations and private individuals, just as they are now helped in obtaining the proper physical necessities of life. Thus, no child need be denied the benefits of private school.

[Editor's Note: These excerpts were taken from PRIVATE SCHOOLS FOR ALL, published by the Committee of One, Roselle Park, NJ. No date given, Section IV, pages 7-9.] 

My Journey to Voluntarism

By Joyce Brand

I always loved to read. I remember my mother telling her friends that I was no trouble because she could set me down with a book and I would amuse myself for hours. Maybe that was why I loved school, in spite of the regimentation, which I hated. My life was in my head, not in the stupid rules I had to follow.

My father was both a Southern Baptist minister and an officer in the US Navy, very conservative and very Republican. I adored him, so I found it very painful when I realized at the age of fifteen that I couldn't believe what he preached, no matter how hard I tried. However, I was a good little girl, so I didn't rock the boat, and I went off to a Southern Baptist university right after my seventeenth birthday.

Probably nobody was less prepared for college life than I was in 1966. It was then that I discovered Ayn Rand. It was a religion I could believe in, until I realized that worshipping Ayn Rand made no more sense than worshipping an invisible deity. Although my life took some strange turns in the next few years, I kept the basic philosophy of individualism that I learned from Ayn Rand, which included a profound contempt for politics.

After escaping from an unhappy marriage, I indulged my love of reading by going to a state university and taking a double major in English and History. I was particularly interested in how literature affected history and vice versa. I was shocked by how different the history I learned in college was from the history I had been taught in grade school. Yet even the texts in college were heavily influenced by the philosophy of the writers, which seemed to me disturbingly collectivist. In retrospect, I realize that, in spite of how much I was reading, I was never exposed to any ideas that challenged the legitimacy of the state.

I graduated Phi Beta Kappa and was accepted into the PhD program in History at the University of California at Berkeley, but I was unsure if I really wanted a life in academia, so I took a summer job in a law firm to see if law school might suit me more. I was disgusted by the legal profession and started to think about making my living in the real world of business.

I spent many years trying to find my place in the world through different careers and different relationships. Nothing seemed to suit me long term, but I learned a lot.

One of my most memorable lessons came from my job as an office equipment salesperson. I spent most of my time showing private businesses how my equipment could increase their productivity. I discovered that trying to sell to government agencies was a waste of time because bureaucrats didn't want to increase productivity and possibly lose employees. Then one day I got a call that a District Court wanted to buy some electronic

typewriters from me because the manufacturer of our newest line had a government contract. Easiest sale ever because there was no competition and they already knew they wanted the most expensive models we had. They had a budget for typewriters that they had to spend or lose, so they spent it on typewriters that actually decreased their productivity because the machines were designed for more complicated tasks than filling in forms. All I had to do was deliver the machines and teach the secretaries how to get around all the features that made filling out forms difficult. The commission was nice, but I couldn't help thinking about all the tax dollars being wasted. That was when I realized that all tax dollars were wasted in exactly the same way, propping up the power of bureaucrats for no benefit to anyone else. It's all about the perverse incentives.

Perverse incentives had a lot to do with the failure of my second marriage. My husband was a very kind person with little ambition but a history of taking responsibility for his life in difficult circumstances. He told me how his union job created the incentive for everyone to put forth minimal effort and how wrong he thought that was. Then he hurt his back and got into the worker's comp system, which gives doctors and patients incentives to continue treatments after they are no longer needed. Maybe those perverse incentives just brought out weaknesses in his character that were always there, but I can't help blaming that government program for the change in his personality. I saw the growth of an entitlement mentality and dependence happen before my eyes until I could no longer live with the man he had become.

Another job that taught me how government interferes with free enterprise business was the year I spent as a business broker. It started with my having to obtain real estate licenses in two states just to be allowed to do the job. I had always heard that real estate licenses required months of classes and most people still failed the exam on the first try, and the challenge exam was even harder. Fortunately, I didn't believe it, so I spent about thirty hours on my own studying the guide and passed both challenge exams with no problem. The ridiculous thing was that passing those exams in no way ensured that I would be able to sell real estate (or negotiate business leases) honestly and responsibly. It just meant I knew a lot of stupid and useless rules.

The real lessons came from working with small business owners who were trying to sell their businesses. Listing the business for sale meant learning everything about the business, including how the owner did or did not manage to get around all the government regulations that interfered with his ability to please enough customers to make a living at the business. Even though intrusive regulations didn't account for all the owners who were

failing, the ones who were trying most scrupulously to follow all the rules seemed to be the ones who did worst. The owners who did best were those who found ways to please customers while keeping enough money for themselves to make it all worthwhile. That mainly meant figuring out which regulations to follow and which to ignore. Unlike big businesses that can use government against would be competitors, small businesses get no benefits from government. They don't need any government to tell them to treat their customers and employees well in order to prosper.

As a corporate manager at Kelly Services, the oldest temporary help company, I learned even more about the difference between large and small business and how government affects business. My small department with twelve employees was a cost center rather than a profit center, so my job was all about achieving productivity goals at the lowest cost possible. Government regulations created the biggest costs and happy employees created the biggest productivity gains. Keeping employees happy is not about money but about respect and freedom and challenge. The problem with size is not that it is inherently bad but that it can dilute responsibility. Just a few political (rather than economic) business people at the top can create a corporate culture rife with political maneuvering and not enough focus on business goals. The more politics gain, the more business suffers. Kelly Services was once the leader of its industry, but not any more.

After a few more careers that got boring as soon as I accomplished my initial goals, I finally discovered a career that I loved and that never got boring — editing feature films — a different kind of storytelling than I had once imagined as a child. At about the same time, I got interested in the Libertarian Party. The man who recruited me insisted that the LP was not “politics as usual” but a real chance to restore freedom to America by reining in government power. I soon discovered how wrong he was when I attended the 2000 California state convention. It was just as disgusting as any other political game, in spite of the sincerity of most of the participants. I saw that it wasn't the people involved that was the problem but the perverse incentives of politicians, just like the perverse incentives of bureaucrats, no matter how well-meaning.

However, I did get a lot out of my brief time in the LP, especially from a few speeches by libertarian anarchists, like Mary Ruwart. In particular, her books *HEALING OUR WORLD* and *SHORT ANSWERS TO THE TOUGH QUESTIONS* opened my mind to the idea that government wasn't necessary at all. That started me on a reading program that emphasized writers like Frederick Bastiat, Lysander Spooner, Albert Jay Nock, Leonard E. Read, and Murray Rothbard. I found more than I would ever have time to read on websites like Lew Rockwell, Mises Institute, and

Strike the Root.

It took me a few years of fairly intensive reading between films before I fully understood the beauty and simplicity of market anarchism/anarcho-capitalism. It seemed like I spent a lot of time defending the terms before I heard the word voluntaryism, which made it all so clear. What I had always believed on some level was that all interactions between people should be voluntary and peaceful. The vision of a society based on that idea was what I had always sought. I am now very happy to be one of the organizers of Libertopia, an annual festival that brings together people who share that vision of peace, prosperity, and a voluntary society. ▣

How to Advance the Cause of Liberty

By Robert LeFevre

How can one individual assist in maximizing human well being by advancing the cause of liberty? His first task is to learn his true nature.

1. Each of us has the ability to think and act as he pleases.
2. Each of us controls his own energy. We do it wisely or foolishly, but we do it individually. We may act on the advice or the command of others. Or we may decide not to. Our own energies remain under our individual command and control.
3. It follows that I cannot make you free; I can earn my own freedom by controlling myself instead of trying to control others.
4. What steps do I take when I wish to be free?
5. I free myself from dependency on others when that dependency is created or maintained by force. Since there is no way that I can survive without the help of others, I will always be dependent to some degree. But I can depend upon the voluntary support others provide when they willingly buy my goods or services. If I have to compel them to buy my goods or services — either directly at the point of a gun, or indirectly through governmental avenues— then I am acting in a way that is counter-productive and anti-freedom.
6. Having recognized this point, I break off all relations with government.
 - a. I will make no contributions to any political campaign or political party.
 - b. I will endorse no issue and no candidate.
 - c. I will not vote.
 - d. I will de-register and refuse to participate in government sponsored proceedings of any sort.
 - e. I will not run for office, nor hold a political

- job even if asked.
- f. I will patronize those persons and firms that have the least to do with government.
 - g. If a firm or individual is heavily subsidized by the government, I will have nothing to do with it; it is an arm of the State.
 - h. I will not ask for government help, guidance, advice, money, or emolument of any kind.
 - i. I will accept no government check for Social Security, welfare, injury, pension, or for any difficulty I may be in. I will solve my own problems.
 - j. I will set my own standards in such a way that I impose on no one.
 - k. I will injure no one for any reason.
 - l. I will be as generous and helpful to others as my ability makes possible.
 - m. I will live up to every contractual agreement I voluntarily enter into.
 - n. I will, therefore, take great care to only enter into those agreements that are worthy of fulfillment.
 - o. I will be true to the highest and best within me, committing no act of theft, dishonesty or violence against any other human whatsoever.

The foregoing are the rules. How many will follow them? Predictably, very few. That is why human society is in such upheaval. What I have set forth isn't popular.

But it is factual and in harmony with the reality of man.

The fact that I do not participate in government at any level and in any way does not cause the government to cease to exist. Should you reason your way through the human morass and decide to emulate the non-participation procedure, government will surely continue.

That, in itself, should cause rejoicing. The recommendations I have set forth provide a method that will be as gradual as the dawn of intellectual integrity. That is as it should be. Any other procedure will contain a reaction, a backlash that can destroy any temporary gains.


By employing the method of logic and learning, no one is coerced into accepting an unwelcome or misunderstood objective. He advances toward freedom and a free society exactly at the speed and to the degree that he is prepared for it. That is the only way it can be done. It will not be popular because we have been nurtured on the hopes of panaceas and quick political solutions. But it is the only way that will never have to be repeated.

Today the world is sick with the greatest social disease of all. It isn't herpes or syphilis. It is, in fact, a pagan faith in the State. Around the world, terrorists are operating under the noses of various governments, often aided and abetted by those same governments.

We will move *toward* a free society, one by one. We will never achieve a free society in the sense that we can finalize the process. The price of freedom is eternal effort aimed at achieving self-control and self-mastery. We do not achieve this by controlling others. We move toward achievement when we learn to control and govern ourselves. Freedom is self-control, not license to impose on others.

It has taken me a lifetime to learn this. I am grateful that I have lived. I am even grateful that I have made mistakes, yet continued to live so that I could learn more. Man learns by trial and error. Few of us learn much of anything by success.

I am also grateful that some across this great country of America agree with at least some of my conclusions. They are out there now, quietly minding their own business, improving their own performance, raising their own standards and willfully imposing on none.

- A WAY TO BE FREE: THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF ROBERT LEFEVRE, Culver City: Pulpless.com, Inc., 1999, Vol. II, pp. 496-498. Reprinted by permission of Tom LeFevre, email dated Feb. 1, 2011. 

What Might Have Been - What Might Be

continued from page 1

(Shall we have a free society with parental control of the child's education or an authoritarian society with state-controlled education?) [8]

... If there is any hope for America as a beacon of liberty and freedom it is to be found in home education.

How does voluntaryism relate to education? Voluntaryism is the philosophic doctrine that all the affairs of mankind should be voluntary. No one has the right to force another peaceful person to act as he or she wishes. Voluntaryism comes about naturally if no one does anything to prevent it. Voluntaryism was a term that originated in the early 1800s in England to identify those who advocated voluntary, as opposed to State, support of religion. It was later extended to those who opposed the coercive collection of taxes. Ultimately, those who shared this position realized that government would probably receive little revenue if it did not threaten jail time or confiscation of property to collect its taxes. In short, voluntaryists question the legitimacy of coercive political government because it initiates violence against those who would decline its protection because they want none, or would provide their own protection, or hire some other organization to provide them with protection. Furthermore, by its monopolization of services, government violates the rights of those individuals or groups of individuals who might choose to offer competing services to those offered by the government. Many

voluntaryists see a parallel between government churches and government schools. If it is not proper to support a State church by compulsory attendance laws and coercive taxes, why should it be proper to support State schools in a similar manner? Why is one's spiritual health any less important than one's educational development? [9]

In a free society, no one owes anybody else food, shelter, clothing, medical care or spiritual or intellectual growth. Respect for individual rights means that some may have more than they need, some less, but each person is or should be secure in what is theirs. Only then, whether they have lots or little, may they be disposed to be charitable or miserly with what they have. Voluntaryism in education follows from each person's self-ownership and rightful control of their property. Parents nurture their children. Teachers, tutors and masters of apprentices offer their services. No coercive outside agency tells parents when, and where, and what and how to teach. This lack of any centralized agency directing education permits a tremendous variety of what to teach, as well as how to teach. Voluntaryism does not guarantee success, but it does allow for each family to experiment and find out what is best for them. Voluntaryism does not exhibit the one-size fits all approach of government schooling. There is nothing to prevent what works for one family to be imitated and copied, while a government monopoly almost assures us that mediocrity will rule. Parental-directed schooling, unlike government schooling, is not dominated by political considerations and compromises between competing interests and radically different constituencies.

The proper way to suppress government power in a free society is with ideas. *One* good idea by *one* thinking individual is worth any number of guns and laws aimed at forcing men to blindly take actions.

- Paul Stevens, THE FREEMAN, November 1974, p. 689.

All teaching and teachers are laden with values and beliefs. [10] Education can never be free of dogma. This is an inescapable fact of reality. Thus the question becomes: "Would one rather have a single educational monopolist deciding what is taught and how it is taught, or would one rather have each individual parent and family decide what they will teach or have taught to their children?" Family indoctrination may be just as thorough and enslaving as state indoctrination, but that situation would be far better than if "a universal education agency" were to have indoctrinated everybody in its dogma. As one advocate of diversity in indoctrination explained: if different families indoctrinate in different dogmas, "the dogmatic, indoctrinated product of one family's indoctrination will grow up to profess a different dogma

than that of another family's indoctrinated offspring. Then, in social interactions among the various indoctrinated, differences of belief and lack of universality of dogma will become apparent to all, undermining in many the felt necessity of the dogmatic beliefs they were trained to hold." The fact that no monopolist can instill its dogma on a captive audience insures that whatever dogmas are taught will clash in a manner that will make many question their beliefs and lead them to rectify their mistaken beliefs, if they come to that conclusion. But "people in a society where universal indoctrination has been practiced would be less likely to discover the inhibition on their freedom since everyone, everywhere will attest to the putatively obvious truth of everything that person believes." [11] And in a society where government directs the people's education it is a certainty that the people will be taught that voluntaryism in education is dangerous and that government education is best. Who could imagine the government criticizing itself?

Thus, it is readily apparent that the public school is a tool of the State; an idea going back at least as far as Plato. Those who direct the schools "control a character-producing institution" that is an instrument of the "ruling elite to maintain and enhance their power." [12] Public education is simply one of the primary means of molding American children into tax-paying, law-abiding American adults, who rarely question the nature and legitimacy of their own government. As Jonathan Kozol notes: "The first and primary function of the U. S. public schools is not to educate good people, but good citizens. It is the function which we call in enemy nations state indoctrination." [13] John Taylor Gatto expands on this theme calling government schools WEAPONS OF MASS INSTRUCTION:

[M]andatory public education in this country ... was useful in creating not only a harmless electorate and a servile labor force but also a virtual herd of mindless consumers. In time a great number of industrial titans came to recognize the enormous profits to be had by cultivating and tending such a herd via public education, School trains children to be employees and consumers. ... [W]ake up to what our schools really are: laboratories of experimentation on young minds, drill centers for the habits and attitudes that corporate [and political] society demand... . [I]ts real purpose is to turn them into servants. [14]

When homeschooling parents have been challenged in court for violating the state's education law, rarely are the educational achievements of their children called into question. The accomplishments of the children (whether they have met the state requirements for their grade levels or not) are usually beside the point. The welfare of the

child is not the concern of the State. The courts do not consider how well the child is educated, but only whether or not the child is receiving a government-approved education and if the appropriate rules and regulations were followed. [15] If the State were truly concerned with neglected and illiterate children, it would take corrective action to save those children its own educational system has failed to teach to read or write.

It is likely that some children receive a worse education under a government regime than they would in the absence of political laws. This is consistent with the nature of government intervention. Even from the point of view of its supporters, government action often makes conditions worse than before it interfered. If we examine the “Six Political Illusions” enunciated by James L. Payne we can begin to understand how this happens:

1. Since government has no funds of its own, “money spent on government programs must be taken from citizens who have good and useful purposes for their own funds. Therefore, all government spending programs injure these good and useful activities.”
2. Government is based on the exercise of physical force to accomplish its ends. “Its taxes and regulations rely on the threat of inflicting physical harm on those who do not cooperate.”
3. Government programs “have high overhead costs. Goods or services provided through a tax and spend system end up costing several times as much as they would if citizens obtained these goods or services directly” on the market.
4. “Money is only one factor in success. If the motivation and abilities of recipients are not suitable ... government spending will be useless, or can do more harm than good.”
5. “Government has no superior wisdom. Government officials are ordinary people, as prone to bias, intolerance, greed, and error as anyone” else.
6. Government would have us think that it is a problem-solving institution, but it cannot duplicate the “the creative actions of individuals, families, neighborhoods, groups, and businesses. Problem-solving efforts by government almost invariably impair the energy and capacity of the voluntary sphere.” [16]


It is easy to see how every one of these illusions applies to government education, and why voluntaryists are more concerned with the means than the ends. Voluntaryists understand Mahatma Gandhi’s insight that “if one takes care of the means, the end will take care of itself.” If they rely on voluntaryism and don’t use coercion to educate their children, they not only set their children a moral, non-violent example (not relying on tax funds which are forcibly collected), but they generally do at least as good, if not a much better, practical job of preparing their children for life than the State. Voluntaryism has no formal guidelines that

will dictate what kinds of education will take place in a free society. So long as the means are peaceful and respectful of self-ownership and property titles, the ends cannot be criticized from the voluntaryist perspective. This is not to imply that the only standard of judging human behavior is whether or not it is voluntary. Certainly some behavior may be irrational, vicious, immoral, religious, irreligious, (etc., etc.) but the first question the voluntaryist asks is: Is it truly voluntary? This is why the voluntaryist objects to government provision of dispute settlement, police services, schools, etc. Such services may be essential to human survival, but it is not essential that they be provided by government on a coercive basis. There is no logical, epistemological, or societal justification for forcing goods or services upon unwilling customers. The political attempts of 2009-2010 to impose universal national healthcare is just the latest government-mandated service being forced upon people (those who have to pay taxes to support other people’s medical care, and those who would prefer to make provisions for their own healthcare).

Education in a free society is the responsibility of every parent. Some parents will be irresponsible. Some will be responsible for the education of their own children. Others may choose to become responsible for the education of children that are not their own. That is the beauty of freedom. Each person must inevitably make their own choice or choose to make none at all (though indeed, they have no choice; reality will make it for them if they fail to make a choice themselves). The kind of character we develop individually goes far in determining what kind of collective society we shall have. But after all is said and done, the only thing we, individually, can do is “to present society with one improved unit.” As Albert Jay Nock put it, “Ages of experience testify that the only way society can be improved is by the individualist method; ... that is, the method of each one doing his best to improve one.” [17] This is the quiet or patient way of changing society because it concentrates upon bettering the character of men and women as individuals. As the individual units change, the improvement in society will take care of itself. In other words, if one takes care of the means, the end will take care of itself.

What better description of homeschooling could one pen?

THE VOLUNTARYIST insight into education offers a unique and seldom heard point of view about children, schooling, and the State. Many of these essays may make you fume but please let them help you think through the issues. But above all else, as Shakespeare wrote: “To thine own self be true: And it must follow, as the night the day, Thou canst not then be false to any man.”

[Footnotes may be found in the book] 

Render Not: The Case Against Taxation

by Carl Watner



In his "Introduction" to this anthology, Carl Watner argues that "taxation is no better than slavery." Government taxation is a coercive activity that introduces force and violence into otherwise peaceful relationships. That is the primary reason why voluntaryists oppose taxation. Some goods and services are essential to human survival, but voluntaryists realize that they need not be provided by the government on a coercive basis. What we oppose is the coercion involved in collecting taxes. We oppose the means and take the position that the ends never justify the means. Our opposition to taxation doesn't concern itself with whether too much money is being collected, or whether that money is being spent wastefully. Rather, the focus is on the fact that any amount of money forcefully collected is stealing. It is no more proper for government agents to seize property

than it is for you to rob your neighbor at gunpoint, even if you spend the money on something that you think will benefit your neighbor. Majority rule cannot legitimize slavery or taxation. As R. C. Hoiles, founder of the Freedom Newspapers, was always keen to point out, there is only one standard of right and wrong, and that standard applies to the lone individual, to members of a group, and to the employees of the State.

In this volume you will find articles by Robert Ringer, Auberon Herbert, Murray Rothbard, Lysander Spooner, Frank Chodorov, F. A. Harper, Vivien Kellems, Harry Browne, and Carl Watner among others. 180 pages, soft back. \$20 postpaid. Mail check, cash, money order, gold or silver to The Voluntaryist, Box 275, Gramling SC 29348.

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.