
The Voluntaryist

Whole Number 155

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

4th Quarter 2012

Are Voluntaryist Hypocrites for Using the Roads?

By Carl Watner

I have never mentioned the voluntaryist email group in *The Voluntaryist*. It has been a means of connecting with people on the web who may not care to subscribe to the hard copy newsletter. If you have not signed up, you may go to www.voluntaryist.com and access the sign-up form on the homepage. There are occasional announcements, comments, etc. that otherwise might not fit into the newsletter or else be more timely by appearing via email. This, by way of introduction, leads to a question submitted by a subscriber to the email group:

How do you respond to the interminable rejoinder, from statist, that a voluntaryist is a hypocrite insofar as he/she cannot avoid using and benefiting from services paid for by government taxation? In other words, does using the post office or driving on the highways turn us into hypocrites?

Here is my reply.

First, one must determine the definition of hypocrisy. *Wikipedia*, *The Shorter New Oxford English Dictionary*, and *Webster's Unabridged Dictionary* all introduce the elements of pretense, deception, and the false profession of belief as the key description of hypocrisy. In the words of *Wikipedia*, "an alcoholic's advocating temperance" is not "an act of hypocrisy as long as the alcoholic makes no pretense of constant sobriety." The intemperate person who supports temperance is guilty of inconsistency (his actions do not match his beliefs). However, the person who hides his cigar smoking habit from his friends, and tells them that he doesn't smoke, and that they shouldn't smoke, is a hypocrite. He is trying to pretend that he is a non-smoker when he really isn't. The voluntaryist is certainly not a hypocrite insofar as he openly acknowledges his use of government services. Neither is a slave a hypocrite for wanting his freedom, even though he eats the food supplied by his master.

Secondly, a critic may rightfully claim that the voluntaryist's use of the roads is inconsistent with his voluntaryist beliefs. The voluntaryist would certainly agree. The voluntaryist teaches that the most moral and

practical system for satisfying human wants is that based on voluntary co-operation. A consistent voluntaryist will choose not to use State services, whenever and wherever possible. When there is a practical choice – say working for the government or working for a private employer – the consistent voluntaryist would and should always choose to maintain his integrity by working for the private employer. However, sometimes there is no reasonable alternative to using government funded services, such as the roads. Then, and only then, does the voluntaryist reluctantly use something provided by taxation.

As I pointed out in my article on "The Sin of the Intellectuals" in Issue 43 of *The Voluntaryist* (April 1990),

The behavior or misbehavior of the exponents of any particular philosophy indicates more about the psychology and personality of those advocates, than proving or disproving the philosophy itself. Ideas and theories must be judged on their own merits, otherwise we are in danger of committing the *ad hominem* fallacy, of judging the message by the messenger, rather than letting the message stand by itself. [end of emailed article]

After the appearance of my email, several other subscribers offered their opinions on this topic. Here are a few of them:

From Dr. Henry Jones (Miss.)

We all benefit from what those who came before us have created. We use language given to us freely by generations that worked to create it. We benefit from roads and bridges that exist even though they were financed by stealing and killing. We use language, roads and inventions such as the wheel that we have not paid for ourselves.

There is no way to avoid this and it does not represent hypocrisy. We are only responsible for the decisions we make freely and without coercion. I am opposed to murder yet I am forced to pay money (taxes) to support the murderer-in-chief in Washington D.C.

From Larken Rose (Pa.)

Here is my "short" answer to the "using the

(continued on page 6)

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.

Something to do with the Search for Truth: How I Became a Libertarian

By Carl Watner

Walter Block has recently compiled a book of autobiographical essays by well-known limited government and free market libertarians, titled *I Chose Liberty* (2010). Mildly irked by the absence of any significant number of voluntaryists and pleased by the opportunity to discover what environmental and/or hereditary factors have influenced others, I determined to write down my own story of how I became a libertarian.

I was born June 27, 1948, into a family of upper-middle class Reformed Jews and business people. On my maternal side, my mother, from Brockton, Mass, had completed 4 years at Goucher College in Baltimore, Maryland, graduating just before I was born. Her mother came from a family of Russian Jewish immigrants turned junk peddlers and lumber yard entrepreneurs in New England. The Grossmans were the Home Depots of their day. My maternal grandfather ran his own lumber and hardware business in Brockton. On my Dad's side of the family, his father hailed from Annapolis, Maryland and he eventually moved to Baltimore, where he helped start the American Transfer Company (early 1920s), Meadowridge Memorial Park (early 1930s) and bought the Baltimore Colts football franchise (early 1950s). My father became sole owner of the transportation company after returning from the Army at the end of World War II. He was a successful businessman and an active speculator in the stock market (following the path of his father). He loved to ride horses and owned a few Thoroughbreds, which raced on the local tracks. He was a partner in an outdoor ice skating rink, held a small, limited partnership interest in Caesar's Palace in Las Vegas when it was built in 1966 and had managed to maintain ownership of the cemetery, even though my grandfather had mortgaged it to Chase Manhattan bank. Obviously, I was raised in an environment of business people.

My childhood was routine, attending public schools in the Pikesville neighborhood where my father had grown up and attending Sunday religious school at Har

Sinai, the temple which my paternal grandmother's family had helped found in the 1850s. I was a near straight-A student, but there were early signs of "trouble" to come. For example, I was hardheaded. If my mother wanted me to wear long pants because it was cold outside, I would insist on wearing Bermuda shorts. During the summer of 1957, when I was 9, I went to summer camp in Androscoggin, Maine for about two months. Was I ever homesick! When I got back to Baltimore, I got off the train and the first words out of my mouth were, "I'm never going back summer camp," and I never did. Another "battle" raged around classical dancing lessons. My family belonged to the Suburban Country Club where young teenagers were offered group lessons in ballroom dancing. I went to two classes and then point blank refused to attend any more. Dancing was simply not my "thing." What a waste of time! I married when I was 38, and my poor wife has still not gotten me to dance (yet).

Another early experience sobered me on any kind of politics. I was voted president of my 9th grade class (1962-1963). I hated doing things by committee and by the end of the year I vowed I would never hold another elective office. (And let me add, I never did, nor, in my whole life, have I ever registered to vote in any public election.)

"Tell the truth, and people will bash in your head."
- old Hungarian proverb

Family business was a continual topic of discussion in our household and around the family dining table. At a very early age, I would go into work with my father on Saturday mornings. During the summer breaks from school, I would usually work half a day, every week day. My father stayed abreast of the news by subscribing to the *Wall Street Journal*. For whatever reason, I started reading their editorials. One summer day I found an article about Ludwig von Mises, part of which I will reproduce below (I still have the original clipping!):

An Honor for a Philosopher

Of all the academic honors bestowed this month, as tradition prescribes, one struck us as particularly noteworthy. It was presented by New York University to Ludwig von Mises, the Austrian-born economist, long since U. S. citizen, now 81 years old. The citation is self-explanatory:

"For his great scholarship, his exposition of the philosophy of the free market, and his advocacy of a free society, he is here presented with our Doctorate of Law."

[I]t is interesting in an age of increasing regimentation, that it was given specifically with reference to von Mises' philosophy. For one of

his greatest contributions is his demonstration that socialism, or the planned economy by any other name, cannot provide a rational substitute for the functions of the free market. More than that: the free market and the free society are indissoluble. In this sense von Mises is the champion not merely of an economic philosophy but of the potential of Man. [June 17, 1963, p. 10]

For making it possible for me to “discover” that editorial and von Mises we can blame my father. As I recall, I went to the Enoch Pratt Free Library in downtown Baltimore and got some of Mises’ books. At least one had the imprint of the Foundation For Economic Education in Irvington-on-Hudson, New York. In my scrapbook, I have a letter signed by Bettina Bien, dated August 7, 1963, in which she sent me information about FEE, and a list of their publications.

For the next “discovery” we can blame my mother. During the summer of 1963, she gave me a copy of Ayn Rand’s *Atlas Shrugged* when I asked her for something to read. I spent several weeks engrossed in it. Between Rand and Mises, I began formulating my take on capitalism and the free market. My dad also read the newsletter started by C. V. Myers in 1967, titled *Myers Finance Review*. Like Franz Pick, Myers was a hard money - gold and silver - man, and my father followed their advice. Gold and silver were relatively cheap, but they were REAL. I remember my Dad buying gold coins from a man in Texas, quite a few years before gold ownership was legalized in 1974.

During the school year of 1964-1965, I was in the 11th grade. As a select honors student I had the opportunity to set up my own independent study program for one period each day for one full semester. What did I choose for my independent study subject? Nothing less ambitious than *Human Action*. As I read through the book, I found much of it beyond my comprehension, but some of it sunk in! It was during that school year that I concluded that high school was a waste of my time and that public schools were socialism at its worst, since they were run and funded by the local governments. If I was to attend college as my parents desired then I was determined to skip my senior year. I applied to Raymond College, a three-year-degree program, operated under the auspices of the University of the Pacific, and went to Stockton, California in the Fall of 1965. There I encountered the same teaching of collectivism that I found in my local high school. Here are my first term comments from Mr. Wagner, who taught me “Introduction to the Modern World” (I did, however, earn a “Satisfactory” in his course):

“Your case is tragic. You are obviously unusually bright and dedicated to tenacious work. You could be a brilliant scholar. Regrettably,

you are unteachable. You are so thoroughly ideology-bound that you distort all ideas and information into a support of your ideology or a subversion of it. Even the effort in this letter is being wasted for it will not be seen as an effort to release your potential but an attack on your ideology. I am sorry, Carl.”

I left Raymond College after the academic year ended in the Summer of 1966, and then enrolled in New York University, Washington Square where I attended liberal arts classes and audited the Mises graduate seminar in the Fall of 1966. That was my last and final semester of college attendance. I returned to Baltimore, traveled for a few months in South America, then lived at home and worked at American Transfer until my mother sold the company to Preston Trucking. The sale was completed in December 1973.

Everyone thinks of changing the world, but no one thinks of changing himself.

- Attributed to Leo Tolstoy

What prompted the sale of the trucking company was my father’s death in mid-June 1970. I was a capable manager but we had a union feather-bedding issue that I refused to compromise on with the Teamsters. One of our dock helpers could hardly read or write, but due to his seniority he had to work before more qualified freight handlers. (Not being able to read makes it difficult to distinguish written addresses and destinations.) When I refused to arbitrate the grievance according to the National Teamster contract, the local union initiated a walk-out August 13, 1971. The business could not operate without Teamsters, so my mother (and I) capitulated to the union demands. It was then I decided that I no longer wanted to run the business. She owned it legally and decided to offer it for sale. This was several years before trucking deregulation took place and American Transfer held valuable ICC rights to deliver freight between Baltimore and the southern parts of Maryland, so the company had significant value (including its rolling stock and freight terminal).

In the meantime, beginning with my “discovery” of von Mises, Rand and the authors and academics associated with FEE in 1963, I embarked on a quest to understand capitalism, limited government and Austrian economics. By April 1970 I had read and digested Linda and Morris Tannehill’s *The Market for Liberty*. I still have a copy of a letter I wrote Morris on April 19, 1970 in which I told him that I agreed with free market anarchism and that seeing those ideas in the full context of his book had convinced me of their correctness. “Government is [as] unnecessary as any other evil,” I wrote. In April 1971, I bought a set of

The Collected Works of Lysander Spooner. It took me a while to plow through those six volumes, but by August or September 1972, I had written an article titled “Lysander Spooner: Libertarian Pioneer,” which was published in the March 1973 issue of *Reason*. That was followed by “California Gold,” (written January 1975 and published January 1976) and “Les Economistes Libertaire” (mainly about Gustave de Molinari; written October 1975 and published January 1977) (both in *Reason*). I wrote and published my monograph, *Towards A Proprietary Theory of Justice*, in the summer of 1976.

What inspired me to read and write, become a libertarian and express my views? Certainly no one in my family or circle of friends was a free market anarchist or advocated the abandonment of coercive government, though my father never had any love for the Internal Revenue Service. One time he showed me a letter from the I.R.S., dated June 25, 1966, that his father’s estate still owed over \$ 386,000 in back taxes, even though he (my grandfather) had passed away in 1961. Although I think you could say my father was critical of government, he did have a conniption fit when I told him I was planning

It does not require many words to speak the truth.

- Chief Joseph

to refuse to report to my draft board when I received an induction notice. Neither my mother nor my father were libertarians, so if anything, it had to be my search for truth and consistency that dictated my political orientation.

Reading some of Leonard Read’s books and articles from FEE certainly focused me on the issue of intellectual integrity, of matching one’s actions to one’s rightful understanding of the world. For whatever reason, Read never moved past the limited government views in his book, *Government – An Ideal Concept* (1954). However, his article “E is for Excellence,” (*Notes from FEE*, November 1963) did strike a cord within me. It highlighted Hanford Henderson’s essay, “The Aristocratic Spirit” (*The North American Review*, March 1920), in which Henderson defines “the aristocratic spirit as the love of excellence for its own sake, or even more simply as the disinterested, passionate love of excellence.” Add “truth” to “excellence” and you are probably describing my primary motivations. My attitude, taken from Ayn Rand, was that if one was to survive and thrive, one must not only understand how the world works and what is real, but also have a standard by which to judge what is right and what is wrong.

The basic ideas presented by Murray Rothbard had a tremendous impact on me. The axioms of self-ownership and homesteading, which he identified and wrote about extensively, formed the basis of a proprietary theory of justice, a standard of right and

wrong which was independent of the determination of government courts, apologists and/or propagandists. Rose Wilder Lane’s and Bob LeFevre’s emphasis on “freedom as self-control” led me to conclude that ultimately I am responsible for what I choose to do, even if I am threatened by outside coercive actors. I came to agree with the ancient Stoic outlook that there are some actions which one cannot perform even if one is to be imprisoned or killed for not doing them. “Obeying superior orders” was no justification at the Nuremberg trials. Only those with a strong conscience and independent mind can say, “No. I will not do this. It is wrong.”

On my 13th birthday, in June 1961, my father had applied for and received my social security number. He wanted me to have one so he could put me on the payroll at American Transfer. On May 6, 1978, I wrote the Social Security Administration in Woodlawn, Maryland (a suburb of Baltimore) that I no longer had further use of the social security number they had assigned me.

I wish to formally renounce any and all right, title, interest, or claims that I may have had against the Government of the United States and/or its Social Security Administration to any benefits either due me in the past or coming due to me in the present or future.

This renunciation is based upon my personal belief that a system of retirement, disability and death benefits administered under Government compulsion is wrong.

Please acknowledge that my name has been withdrawn from your rolls.

Of course, I heard nothing from the Social Security Administration, although I still have the return postal receipt for my letter. My search for truth, consistency, and personal integrity had led me to do this. However, this was neither the beginning nor the end of my confrontations with the federal or state internal revenue departments. More on that in the next installment of this essay. ▣

If I Were King

By Leonard E. Read

[*Editor's note: This article first appeared in the Foundation for Economic Education magazine, THE FREEMAN, September 1973, pp. 547-549.*]

To imagine I were king is pure fiction, merely suggestive, for my first act would be to abdicate. Kingship is not my cup of tea.

Perhaps a better caricature of omnipotence would be a genie —as the actress in the TV show, “I Dream of Jeannie.” She simply folds her arms, makes a wish and blinks her eyes. Presto! The wish instantly becomes the reality.

The question I am pondering is this: If I possessed such power, would I use it to rid the world of all I believe

to be evil? For instance, what of these few specifics among the thousand and one forms of human behavior I deplore:

1 — War, murder, thievery, slavery?

2 — Dictatorial know-it-allness?

3 — Medicare, “social security,” and similar welfare programs?

4 — Control of prices by government and of wages by labor unions?

5 — Government in such business as mail delivery and education?

I have listed these samplings in the reverse order of their popularity or public acceptance. Nearly everyone deplores war, murder, thievery, human slavery. There is a common desire to be rid of these evils. But note how the popular attitude changes as we move down the list: common acceptance instead of rejection by the time we have reached “social security.”

The point is this: I would be applauded were I to use my magic power to do away with murder, but roundly condemned were I to eliminate government “education,” though the latter seems unprincipled and impractical to me.

The Principle of Universality

On what forms of behavior, then, would I fold my arms, make a wish, and blink my eyes? Not one, not even murder!

I aspire exclusively to those forms of power which I readily concede to all other human beings. What may they be? The power to exercise and improve my own faculties, to grow intellectually, morally, spiritually. What power will I not willingly concede to any other person and — by the same token — refuse to use myself? The power to interfere with or to control in any respect the creative activities of anyone, whoever or wherever he may be. The lack of such power simply leaves me in my place, makes a non-interfering citizen of me, forces me to attend to my own business.

Suppose I could eliminate murder and all else which seems evil to me through a simple wish. In that case, according to my principle of universality, I would have to concede that identical power of legerdemain to everyone else. What would be the result?

Everyone would direct his magic against his pet dislikes. So certain are millions of people about their panaceas for a perfect world, and so varying are their nostrums, that every societal institution would be erased from the face of the earth! Not only would murder, wars, thievery, slavery be at an end, but so would everything else — mail delivery, private or public; education, private or public; business, private or public; churches, catholic or protestant. Certainly, man and all his institutions would disappear — perhaps the entire planet!

Coercion Rampant

Return to mankind as he now exists and to the world as it is — with no genies among us. But if that power were

possessed, would it be used? Yes, and by millions of people. How can one be so certain of this? By observing what these millions do in the absence of this magic power: they resort to coercion to get their way! Unable to reform others by a blink of the eyes, they try to implant their “wisdom” by physical force — “Do as we say, or else!” They seize the police power of government and use it to serve their devious and contradictory ends — frustrated genies with guns!

If these coercionists could work their will upon others by blinking their eyes, would they do so? Of course, and with the aforementioned disastrous results. To the extent that they get their way by coercion, to that same extent is disaster inflicted upon mankind, as we can readily observe all about us.

"No man is wise enough, nor good enough, to be trusted with unlimited powers." - Caleb C. Colton
--

The Power of Good Example

Those who condemn the use of coercion must be cautious lest they condemn themselves in the process, so general is the domineering trait. One meets these persons on every hand and in all walks of life. Ever so many would rule our lives if they could; all they lack is the political power. I have learned not to argue with these self-designated miracle workers; I just don't drink tea with them.

As to those who have gained power and do in fact control our lives, what can one do in opposition beyond setting a better example? You and I can try to understand and explain why we would not wave either the magic wand or the policeman's club. We can demonstrate why it is both immoral and impractical to even hope for a free lunch or to wish that others might be carbon copies of ourselves. For anyone to hold such power over others, as I see it, is an absolute contradiction of the Cosmic Plan.

If we want “two chickens in every pot,” we must learn to raise more and better chickens with less effort. Similarly, with all the goods, services, and ideas we desire. Learn to overcome by excelling, this being the sole means to individual growth. If another's way of life is superior to mine, let him demonstrate it to the point where I can grasp the truth he perceives. Let him explain in terms I can understand. By so doing, he grows — and perhaps I will. But to coercively impose his way upon me is to stunt both his growth and mine. This attempt at lording it over others is characteristic of little folks foolishly trying to play God. I share this conclusion from the Journal Intimé of Amiel:

I have never been able to see any necessity for imposing myself upon others.

And so, if I were king, I would renounce the throne. This would free me from the baleful superstition that mine is a “Divine Right” to rule and, at the same time, leave others free to live their own lives. ▣

Are Voluntaryist Hypocrites for Using the Roads?

continued from page 1

roads” thing:

If you steal \$100 bucks from me, and decide to give me a mediocre sandwich, am I a hypocrite if I complain about the theft AND eat the sandwich? No. Duh.

Slight elaboration:

The roads should have been built via voluntary means. Nonetheless, as they are now, the roads still rightfully belong to the people who were robbed to pay for them. NOTHING belongs to “government.” It has a rightful claim on NOTHING, because everything it has, is stolen from others. Ultimately, no one gets anything from “government.” Whatever anyone receives from the state was either stolen from him, or stolen from someone else. I would say that if you're accepting more than was stolen from you personally, you are indirectly cheating OTHER extortion victims (by accepting their stolen property). But it is impossible to “cheat” the “government,” because the state has never had a rightful claim to anything.

From Ned Netterville (Tn.)

Benefiting from government services??? I should send the State a bill for using their pot-holed roads and service-less post office. For all the money I pay in gasoline taxes, I get the worst imaginable roads compared to what a private road system would deliver at a fraction of the State's graft-riven price, and USPS service stinks to high heaven compared to UPS. When I think of all the added wealth the people of America would have if government didn't confiscate and waste their money, I'm appalled. Of what benefit is a government that incites “enemies” who want to kill me because of what its covert agents and armed forces do to people in other lands--killing and maiming innocents and using that egregious behavior to deprive me of the last vestiges of my human rights in the name of--ta, ta! ha, ha!--homeland security? Government is the ultimate, over-arching example of HYPOCRISY writ large.

Further comment from the Editor:

I think it is safe to conclude that in most cases use of the roads by voluntaryists is not hypocritical according to the definition of hypocrisy. Furthermore, anyone who

attempts to use this criticism as a way to defeat voluntaryism is clearly guilty of the fallacy of *ignoratio elenchi*, known as raising an “irrelevant thesis.” The truth of voluntaryism depends upon a correct analysis of government as an invasive institute, of taxation as a coercive process, and of peaceful relations among individuals as being beneficial to all the involved parties. Whether or not voluntaryists are hypocrites has absolutely nothing to do with demonstrating whether or not these assertions are true.

If anyone has further comments, please email to voluntaryist@windstream.net or snail to Box 275, Gramling SC 29348. ☑

Books Received

A MATTER OF NO CURIOSITY by Albert Jay Nock, Edited by Charles H. Hamilton. This book consists of eleven articles and essays by Nock, including “The Origin of the State,” and “The Criminality of the State.” The idea for this book came from Michael Coughlin, who in publishing this volume “continues that distinguished tradition of the high-quality radical printer.” Whether you are a fan of Nock or one of the Remnant, you are sure to enjoy this volume. Available from Superior Letterpress Company, Box 205, Cornucopia, WI 54827. See www.superiorletterpress.com. \$ 35.00 plus shipping of \$ 4.50.

FRUITLANDS: THE ALCOTT FAMILY AND THEIR SEARCH FOR UTOPIA by Richard Francis. “This is the first definitive account of Fruitlands, one of history’s most unsuccessful - but most significant - utopian experiments. It was established in Massachusetts in 1843 by Bronson Alcott (whose ten-year-old daughter, Louisa May, future author of *LITTLE WOMEN*, was among the members) and an Englishman called Charles Lane, ...” Lane was arrested for failure to pay his poll tax and wrote a series of letters entitled *A VOLUNTARY POLITICAL GOVERNMENT*, which focused on the violent nature of all governments. These latter essays are in the “Classics” section of the voluntaryist website and are discussed in this new book. Recommended if you are interested in the New England Transcendentalists, especially Ralph Waldo Emerson or Henry David Thoreau. Published by Yale University Press. See www.yalebooks.com. for ordering information. ISBN 978-0-300-14041-5.

Open Letter to the President of the USA and the Prime Minister of India

From: Jeff Knaebel, Moral Sovereign – January 2011
[Editor's Note: Jeff Knaebel destroyed himself by self-immolation on January 25, 2011 near the ancient Buddhist site of Bairat, near Rajasthan, India. The following letter was found near his incinerated body. "Knowing that under certain conditions it is not worthwhile to live" (Aristotle, ETHICS, IV, 3) he deemed it "unconscionable and morally repugnant to live as a slave." He maintained that taxation, government enforced citizenship, and travel and domicile restrictions, were all badges of enslavement. His book-length manuscript, MESSAGE FROM A MORAL SOVEREIGN, has been published posthumously as a 320 page paperback which may be ordered from The Voluntaryists for \$20 pospaid. Also see Jeff's articles in Issues 137 (How I Became a Voluntaryist) and 147 (Declaration of Renunciation of U.S. Citizenship)]

Subject: My Final Satyagraha for Nonviolence and Freedom

For a long time the Government of the USA ("USG") has been the world's leading merchant of death and destruction. Throughout my entire lifetime of 72 years the USG has been committing horrible crimes against humanity and all life. The sustained systematic psychopathic practices of the USG have launched humanity on a path to extinction. Mahatma Gandhi said upon the atomic bombing of Hiroshima that unless we adopted a nonviolent way of life, it spelled the suicide of the human species. Daily he is being proven correct.

As a citizen-slave of the USG I have been coerced to pay taxes which are then employed in bloody wars of aggression and coercive international economic practices which exploit weaker peoples whose lives, cultures, and ecologies are destroyed in the process. While dwelling in the land of my birth I was not permitted to withdraw from citizenship and the concomitant complicity in mass murder which USG citizenship entailed. Therefore I chose to come to India, and eventually decided to renounce my USG citizenship, and to destroy my United States passport and other government identity documents at the Gandhi Samadhi, Rajghat, New Delhi on 19 June 2009.

I acted in protest of government denial of my right to exist as a natural human living with respect for all life and answering to my own conscience. By requirement of identification and travel documents and permits both the USG and the Government of India ("GOI") mark me as a piece of property to be regulated and controlled as the human equivalent of a dog on a leash. By my self-directed death I demonstrate my refusal to be the slave of either government.

To the Prime Minister of India (GOI), I refer the attached letter of 20 October 2010 from the General Counsel of The World Service Authority, which cites the violations by GOI of my human rights under the

United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and International Law.

The GOI, acting through its police and the orders of its Supreme Court, has prohibited my freedom of movement and has denied me access to shelter pursuant to threat of FIR against any person who would host me. In thus pronouncing me to be an illegal human being, the GOI has denied my right to exist. A person cannot survive without freedom of movement and shelter.

My petition for Statelessness, denied by your Supreme Court, was based upon the clear fact that to change citizenship would only be to change the name of my slave master, for the GOI engages in many life-destroying and murderous actions against its own citizens, and also seeks "Strategic Partnership" with the war criminal USG.

By my death I send my answer to the rulers of the Corporate State who value property and profit more than human life and the life of Earth herself. In refusing to live as a slave I also extend to both of you my metta-karuna (compassion and loving-kindness), for if one examines deeply he will find that the corporate master is more tightly bound than the slave, for the slaves are powerless to come out of it, while the Powers That Be have free will that they fail to exercise because of addictive enslavement to power. For the corporate rulers, the power to manipulate and control other people has become an end in itself. They will no longer control me.

My wish for you is that you come to see the intrinsic evil of the governments which you head, and resign from your official positions, understanding that the people need no institutionally imposed 'leaders.'

My campaign of Satyagraha has made it clear for all to see that under law and practice of both USG and GOI, a person striving for nonviolence at even the most rudimentary levels of non-support of killing is denied by law the right to exist. It is not by the laws of the Corporate State that humanity will find peace and justice, for such law is conceived in the womb of greed and implemented through the violence of power.

I give my life to the cause of nonviolence. I wish not to live under coercion to support the cruel inhumanity of either of your governments. I wish not to live under control of governments who possess neither the wisdom, nor the virtue, nor the right to exercise power over human life.

Only through fellow-feeling and loving-kindness can mankind survive on our small and crowded planet. We must share this Earth equally and with respect among all. I have acted out of love to try to send a warning to my fellow-men, and I send to each of you my sincere feelings of kindness and my prayers for your peace, happiness and harmony.

May peace and goodwill prevail among all men. May you both abide in well-being,

Signed – Jeff Knaebel ☐

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.