
The Voluntaryist

Whole Number 163 “If one takes care of the means, the end will take care of itself” 4th Quarter 2014

Soul Rape

By Carl Watner

The modern nation-state is predicated upon exercising control over a certain geographical territory, and depends on revenues which it generates by means of threats and/or compulsion. The English colonists, when they emigrated to New England in the early 17th Century, replicated much of the political and religious environment they had left behind. Every newborn was a British citizen, a loyal subject of the King and local colonial government; everyone was considered to be by birth a member of the local Congregational church; most white males were subject to militia duty and had to pay taxes for the support of the government and church in the parish in which they lived.

Dissenters and nonconformists, like the Baptists and Quakers who chose not to support the colonial religious establishment, founded their own churches, designated their own ministers, and paid them directly (if they were paid at all). Their refusal to sanction the Congregational establishment led to fines, confiscations of property, and often imprisonment. Many were so stubborn that “they refused to let anyone pay their taxes for them. They preferred to prove their loyalty to their principles by going to jail.” One elderly Baptist widow, Esther White, spent thirteen months in jail “because she would not pay the eight-penny tax levied on her.” [1] These resisters were not tax dodgers or cheats. They could not honestly support or attend the services of a religion they did not believe in. “Going to prison [wa]s a hard way to avoid paying taxes,” and they often complained that “the worst part of going to jail for refusing to pay their religious taxes was the ungodly company they had to associate with there.” [2]

Their opponents in the Congregational establishment shared “a universal assumption that the stability of the social order and the safety of the state demanded the religious solidarity of all people in one church.” [3] “The safety and welfare of [the] community rested on the morality and virtue of its citizens: Christianity was the best system of morality and religion ever revealed to man; therefore, the [community] should, for its own good and the good of its people, use its taxing power to see that the Christian religion was supported and promulgated.” [4]

The Congregationalists of New England believed that separation of church and state and religious voluntarism would be unworkable. Men were too depraved to voluntarily support the proper number of

churches and ministers. “In their view a good society justified taxes for support of religion just as it did for support of law, courts, highways, and public schools.” [5] They believed that “churches were necessary to give consolation to the grieving, moral order to the common people, and the fear of God to potential lawbreakers. ... They did not trust the common man to support religion voluntarily ... because ‘history taught’ that human nature is always guided more by self-interest, passion, and lust for power than by benevolence, charity and generosity. ‘The first want of man,’ John Adams said, ‘is his dinner, the second, his girl.’” The “most important check on human depravity was” the required preachings of “morality, piety, and fear of God taught in the churches” every Sunday. [6]

The analogy between the monopolistic religious establishment and the monopolistic political establishment was a well-recognized argument used against the dissenters. “Where would society be if everyone who disliked a law refused to obey it?” [7] The question of taxation to support religion was compared to taxation to support roads, courts, and police. All were “essential to the general welfare.” [8] Religion was so important “to the safety and well-being of society that no state could exist without it.” [9] As Chief Justice Theophilus Parsons of the Massachusetts Supreme Court wrote in 1810, “the distinction between liberty of conscience and worship and the right of appropriating money is material; the former is inalienable, the latter is surrendered as the price of protection.” [10] Freedom of conscience was quite distinct from the power to raise money for a public purpose. The argument in favor of exempting “a dissenter from his parish taxes ‘seems to mistake a man’s money for his conscience.’ A contribution to the support of the regular churches, Parsons reasoned, was a contribution to the welfare of the state, and a man had no more right to be exempt from supporting a church he could not attend than to be free from school taxes because he had no children.” [11] Religious taxes, like other taxes required for the support of government, were part of the necessary cost of maintaining a government that provided protection to life, liberty, and property. [12]

Defenders of religious freedom, such as Roger Williams and Thomas Jefferson, thought differently. Henry Robinson, a contemporary of Roger Williams, compared the freedom to choose one’s religion to the freedom to engage in work of one’s own choosing. If

(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, silver, and bitcoin readily accepted. Please check the number on your mailing label to see when you should renew. Permission to reprint granted without special request. THE VOLUNTARYIST is online at www.voluntaryist.com.

Potpourri from the Editor's Desk

No. 1 "Obama Care Worse Than Slavery"

"Obamacare" is really, I think, the worst thing that has happened in this nation since slavery. And it is – in a way, it is slavery, in a way because it is making all of us subservient to the government. And it was never about health care. It was about control. ... [W]hy did they want to pass it so badly? Well, as I said the other night on television, Vladimir Lenin, one of the fathers of socialism and communism, said that socialized medicine is the keystone to the establishment of a socialist state. Some people have said ... you're being paranoid. How could anybody bring up something like that? I would say, if you know anything about history, how could you not bring it up?

- Ben Carson at the Family Research Council 2013 Values Voters Summit, October 11, 2013, Omni Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C.

No. 2 "Society Contains Within Itself the Capacity to Resolve Conflicts and Create and Sustain Institutions that Further Social Co-operation"

[We do] not suppose that everyone in society is smart, enlightened, talented, educated, and peaceful. [We say] that society can deal with malevolence through the exchange economy, and in precisely the way we see today: private security companies, private production of locks and guns, private arbitration, and private insurance [as well as the myriad efforts of charities, churches, and other non-profit groups]. The free market can organize protection better than the state. Private enterprise can and does provide the police function better than the state. As Hayek argued, the state is wildly overrated as a mechanism of order keeping. The state is and has been in history a source of disorder and chaos, and the problem gets worse the more the state grows.

- Llewellyn Rockwell, "The Problem With Jail," in THE FREE MARKET, May 2007, p. 6.

No. 3 "Compulsory Citizenship"

Whether a man lives in a State that is allegedly democratic or autocratic, he will in either case be given no option as to his membership. If it were the case that men were conscripted into autocratic States, but in 'democratic' States membership was purely voluntary, the difference between the two would indeed be the

difference between servitude and freedom. But no man is ever given any alternative to 'joining' the State where he happens to be born. All States are coercive by nature, otherwise they would not be sovereign. A man without a country, that is to say, a free man, nowhere exists. It is not permitted for the simple reason that the existence of one free man would imperil the structure of obedience for all, and the existence of Power itself would be threatened. Consequently, all States, including the most 'democratic,' are based ultimately on force, and were originally created out of the spoils of war. Britain, the USA, the USSR, Albania, Belgium, China, France, Venezuela *et alii* may exist as geographical entities, but as political categories they are inseparable from the activities of war out of which they were forged, and they maintain their separate political existence only in so far as they are backed by the appropriate military force.

R. V. Sampson, THE DISCOVERY OF PEACE (1973), p. 182.

No. 4 "Books Received"

THE PROBLEM OF POLITICAL AUTHORITY by Michael Huemer. This book is subtitled: An Examination of the Right to Coerce and the Duty to Obey. Written by a libertarian professor at the University of Colorado, the book is best summarized by the following conclusions: "Authority is illusory; Society can function without a government;" and "Anarchy is attainable." (p. xxv) Published by Palgrave Macmillan (2013). ISBN: 978-1-137-28165.

TAKE ME TO YOUR GOVERNMENT by James Payne. This highly recommended 160 page anthology comprises the previously published stories of Princess Navina's visits to four places: Malvolia - where the king's one principle is to make everyone as unhappy as possible (1991), Mandaat - where all human actions must be authorized by the government (1994), Nueva Malvolia - where rulers seek the unhappiness of their subjects (1999), and Voluntaria - where there is no coercive government (2002). "Like Jonathan Swift's GULLIVER'S TRAVELS they raise provocative questions about modern governance by transporting us to imaginary countries," and like GULLIVER, PRINCESS NAVINA VISITS VOLUNTARIA is bound to become a classic in which voluntaryism outshines all other modes of human interaction. Order direct from The Voluntaryists, Box 275, Gramling, SC 29348. \$13 postpaid.

"There is nothing useful but what is just; there is no law of nature which makes one individual dependent on another; and all those laws which reason disavows, have no force. Every person brings with him into the world his [own] title to freedom."

-LeGente, found in John Christie and Dwight Dumond, GEORGE BOURNE and THE BOOK AND SLAVERY IRRECONCILABLE (1969), p. 148.

A Voluntaryist Before Age Fifteen

By Luke Marshall

I was born on November 23, 1998. In 2010, when I started 6th grade, I began to feel that the people around me lived their lives by going through the motions but never searched for any deeper meaning. Instead of fighting corruption, people fought their own personal struggles. Everyone seemed to want to fit in instead of making changes for the better. Everyone acted as robots who performed things in a mechanistic way. People did not seem to have the same sense of passion and curiosity with which I approached the world. Most people seemed to hate going to school or hated their job. I never could stand the thought of my life having no great meaning. I did not want to turn out to be another person who graduated, being bright enough to do whatever job might suit their training. I did not want to become another part of the machine. I did not know exactly what I wanted from life, but I did know what I did not want.

I was an only child in a middle-class family in the Bible belt. When I look back at my early childhood I realize I had better-than-average parents. My parents were always very supportive in what I did and always gave me attention. I spent a great deal of the time exposed to adult conversation. Naturally, I began to listen and learn about whatever it was they were talking about. Soon, I was introduced to the world of politics. I can remember hearing the adults talk about the president's decisions and this candidate or that candidate. I found politics interesting ever since I heard about it.

A little bit after I began to hear adults talk about politics I began to watch the news with my dad. My dad's favorite news personality at the time was Glenn Beck. A lot of what was on the news I did not understand, but I did look forward to Founders' Fridays with Glenn Beck. Founders' Fridays was when Glenn Beck would spend his show talking about one of the Founding Fathers.

I remembered hearing about the Founding Fathers in history class, but all of a sudden the stories told by Mr. Beck engaged my enthusiasm and passion. I almost immediately became obsessed with the Founding Fathers. Now I began to study on my own about their beliefs and the history of these men. I began reading about the political beliefs of Thomas Jefferson. This is how I uncovered my interest in classical liberalism.

My readings in classical liberalism brought me to libertarianism. I became more and more interested in limited government. When I was probably about 12 or 13, I began to read Thomas Paine and John Locke. I found their ideas so much better than that of the right wing or left wing paradigm. The Founders, who many current-day Republicans say they love, had many different views. I found limited-government libertarianism to be the only viable option to return to

being a free country. And not too long after this I found Ron Paul.

I was a libertarian before I found Ron Paul, but I also learned many things from him, such as his ideas about ending the Federal Reserve and going on the gold standard. Shortly after learning of Ron Paul, my dad told me about an "End the Fed" protest. We went to Dallas and that is where I heard some libertarians speak and got to meet many like-minded people. I began to see the passion of others in the libertarian movement. Their love of truth and desire for freedom inspired me to learn even more.

Shortly after the protest I began to read many of Ron Paul's books and eventually I ran across someone named Stefan Molyneux. I began to listen to his radio show and quickly learned about the ideas of voluntaryism. I had been a limited-government libertarian for probably about two years and I finally began to see the ideas of self-ownership and non-aggression taken to their logical conclusion. The philosophy made so much sense to me right off the bat. I began to look at our current situation in a different light. I used to think we needed to get new people in the political system so they could become advocates for smaller government. At that moment I realized the state is and always had been a structural issue. I learned the state was rooted in violence and aggression and that the state must rely on force to carry out its functions.

I began to read people such as Lysander Spooner, Murray Rothbard, and Stefan Molyneux. I have read about voluntaryism ever since. The ideas I have had for so long were finally brought to their logical conclusion. I learned that if we are to own ourselves we have to get rid of the state. If we are to have a non-aggressive society we must abolish government. Where before I saw a puzzle with a lot of missing pieces, now it seemed as if I had solved a big riddle. Soon I began to wonder how I could spread these ideas.

Soon after becoming a voluntaryist I went to a "Syria Not Our War" protest. At the protest a free-market anarchist group from Oklahoma University happened to be there. I had often felt lonely in my beliefs. Not only were there hardly any libertarians, but there were even fewer voluntaryists. Seeing the Students for a Stateless Society helped give me hope for the future. Here this group of kids went around their campus like I had at my school, spreading the ideas of non-aggression. I remember Jason Lee Bias, a member of the Oklahoma Students for a Stateless Society, stand up and give a speech in which he explained that there is no such thing as humanitarian war. His words inspired me, and ever since then I have been hell-bent on spreading the ideas of voluntaryism.

I have just recently started a website and a podcast in order to wake others up and am starting a philosophy club at my school. And since I get to decide the topics,

for the most part at the philosophy club, I will be able to talk about voluntarism. Now every chance I have to talk with others about my political beliefs, I do.

I came to learn how not be part of the machine, and that is by being what the machine hates. The machine likes the ignorant and uninspired, so I have become informed and passionate. The machine hates free-thinkers, so I have begun to think. The machine hates free people because you cannot control a free man, so I have become a free man. I have become the very thing my enemy hates. Governments hate freedom so I have become free. Now my life is dedicated to trying to help others think and become free. Hopefully, my work will contribute to the first truly free society. Even if my efforts are useless at least I will have done what was moral and can die at peace. And I can live and die knowing I did what was right.

Like I said before, the state is a structural problem. It is a machine that runs on theft and violence. It is a machine that uses the people to help it run. People have been mad about poverty, taxation, and what have you for hundreds, if not thousands, of years. Yet, no one attacks the root of all these problems. For years I had hated corporatism, taxation, war, and all the cons of the state. I became a voluntarist when I quit fighting these individual problems and realized that they all shared a common root. The moment I realized government was the crux of problem is when I became a voluntarist.

I am currently fifteen and the only regret I have is that I did not become a voluntarist sooner. I am excited to have come to these conclusions so soon in life and only have great expectations for the future. I am excited to live a life dedicated to liberty. All I ask is that my work and efforts continue to live on in the hearts of others after I die. I would not choose to live in any other time. I have seen peoples' lives change because of these ideas. I would choose nothing other than being a voluntarist. **V**

Whatcha Gonna Do?

By Gene Sharp

[Editor's Note: Gene Sharp is the doyen of nonviolent thinkers. Born in 1928, he founded the Albert Einstein Institution in 1983. Its mission, an extension of his life's work, is to advance the study of nonviolent action. His 3 volume work, *THE POLITICS OF NONVIOLENT ACTION* (1973) came to my attention shortly after *The Voluntarists* was begun in 1982. Many forms of non-electoral strategies dovetailed with the voluntarist opposition to the Libertarian Party. George Smith alluded to these alternative methods of displacing State power in his "Party Dialogue." Gene Sharp's fundamental belief is aligned with the voluntarist insight and can be traced back to Etienne de LaBoetie's *DISCOURSE OF VOLUNTARY SERVI-*

TUDE. "Every power structure relies upon the subjects' obedience to the orders of the ruler(s)."

Articles about nonviolence have appeared in *THE VOLUNTARYIST* since its inception. The major ones include:

Issue 1: Book review of Sharp's *THE POLITICS OF NONVIOLENT ACTION*

Issue 3: Book review of Sharp's *GANDHI AS A POLITICAL STRATEGIST*

Issue 9: Francis Tandy, "Methods"

Issue 26: Murray Rothbard, "The Voluntarist Insight"

Issue 27: Jerry Tinker, "The Power of Nonviolent Resistance"

Issue 125: "Voluntarist Resistance."

On December 7, 2012, Gene Sharp received the Right Livelihood Award. The following text is an excerpt from his acceptance speech delivered before the Swedish Parliament in Stockholm. The speech had no title, so I have chosen an expression from his concluding remarks to identify it. Parts of the speech were reprinted in *The Albert Einstein Institution's* December 2013 newsletter, "Nonviolent Struggle." A video presentation can be found on the worldwide web at http://www.rightlivelihood.org/sharp_speech.html.]

Violence in our world is so common and mostly accepted without question that at times it seems to be a permanent part of reality. Those of us who want the future to be different are often relegated to a role of irrelevant objectors, able only to dissent, but unable to achieve a change away from the heavy role of violence in political practice. This situation can lead us to accept that reliance on violence is inevitable and beyond our control. That conclusion is a great error.

During the past century and long before, at times, people have found another way to fight when they needed to struggle for various objectives. In those limited situations the use of violence shrank or disappeared. The violence had been replaced with nonviolent struggle.

Nonviolent struggle, or nonviolent action, includes three categories of methods. The methods of nonviolent protest are symbolic activities, such as marching and the displaying of certain colors. This technique also includes the more powerful methods of noncooperation such as social boycotts, labor strikes, economic boycotts, and political noncooperation, including civil disobedience. There are also the methods of nonviolent intervention and disruption, such as sit-ins, fasts, and the creation of new institutions.

This technique is identified by what people do, not by what they believe. Such actions have been used against diverse types of opponents, including employers, governments, and dictatorships. Rarely an individual

takes such action, but almost always it is a group; scores, hundreds, thousands, or even millions of people acting together.

Throughout the centuries people have waged this type of conflict with modest effectiveness. The past resisters have had limited knowledge and understanding of the operation of the technique. There were no guidebooks on planning strategy, nor even lists of “dos and don’ts”. Sometimes this type of conflict was used where it was not expected, for example, in Nazi-occupied Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands, elsewhere, and even in Berlin to save Jews during the Holocaust.

It was once thought that the peoples of Eastern and Central Europe would be living under Communist rule for decades, barring a Western military intervention. Now, the peoples of Poland, East Germany, the former Czechoslovakia, and other countries are recognized as having freed themselves without a war of liberation.

Perhaps most remarkable of all are the little nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Their brave guerrilla wars were fought against both Nazi and Soviet rule, and all three Baltic states had been annexed as republics of the Soviet Union. Following their own improvised methods of nonviolent protest and new strategic understanding gained from my then new book **CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE**, they exited the Soviet Union with minimal casualties.

In early 2011 the predominantly nonviolent victorious revolutions against long entrenched autocratic regimes in Tunisia and Egypt launched the "Arab Spring." The struggles were stunning in their mass mobilization, nonviolent discipline, fearlessness, and speed.

Now there is a widespread growing hunger for knowledge about nonviolent struggle, fueling an increased demand for publications and other resources. New and old books are revealing a technique of great power with insights into its history and understanding of how it operates. The Arab Spring and other developments have let the genie out of the bottle and it cannot be put back again. The knowledge of how to cast off oppression nonviolently is now known and is spreading.

The dramatic increase in media attention to our work at the Albert Einstein Institution in the wake of the Arab Spring revealed an amazing new reality. Nonviolent struggle is finally receiving the serious attention and consideration it has long deserved. Also, it should be noted that the several dozens of reporters from various countries who contacted us already had an accurate basic understanding of nonviolent struggle. None of them had the old misunderstandings that were nearly universal in past years. Long-standing misconceptions about nonviolent struggle have included that it can only be

successful against gentle opponents, that it requires a charismatic leader, that it only "works" by conversion, that in order to keep the required nonviolent discipline it is necessary that resisters believe in moral nonviolence or pacifism, that wise action requires a single strategic genius, such as Gandhi, and that violence works quickly, while nonviolent struggle takes forever.

We now know that those earlier misconceptions that limited the relevance of nonviolent struggle are false. Effective nonviolent struggle is now known to be more possible than earlier believed. Nevertheless, almost all governments retain their irrational faith in the omnipotence of violence, and therefore drag their people into disasters. However, we now know that the disasters caused by violence in political conflicts are not inevitable. My writings and those of others show that power in political conflicts is derived from identifiable sources. All of these sources are rooted in the obedience, cooperation and assistance of people and their institutions. When that cooperation and obedience are withdrawn, oppressive regimes are left without the support necessary for their continued rule.

But despite this more accurate understanding and growing recognition, challenges remain. We now know that people need to learn how to plan a wise strategy for their struggle. If the hard-won gains achieved by nonviolent struggle are not to be later stolen, as they were in Russia by the Bolsheviks in 1917 and in Iran by the Ayatollahs in 1979, it is necessary to learn how to block such efforts. It is important that the achievements and failures of nonviolent struggles be accurately documented for the historical record and not forgotten or misrepresented after the immediate crisis has passed. It is necessary to learn how to block foreign military intervention, whatever the real motive, that can derail the collapse of the oppressing regime and help it to maintain its rule. Foreign military assistance can also give the foreign forces major control of both the on-going struggle and the future society. Instead of accepting military intervention, the nonviolent struggle movement needs to intensify its self-reliant efforts to paralyze or disintegrate the oppressive regime.

Much has been learned about the nature and potential of nonviolent struggle. And there is still a lot to be learned. Many dangers remain. Major efforts are required to spread the knowledge of how to defeat those dangers and how to increase the effectiveness of nonviolent struggles. A future of domination, the rule of violence, and popular helplessness is not inevitable!

I once lived in a not-very-fancy area of Brooklyn, in New York. And when you get in a conversation with people there, it always ended, "So whatcha gonna do?" And it's not only the people of Brooklyn in that section who had that experience; that their efforts had never succeeded.

But now people around the world are not thinking, "So whatcha gonna do?" No, [now they are asking,] "What're we gonna to do?" It's a different attitude. They're learning how to do it and how to achieve, and we hopefully have played a small role in that if we want to do it in the future. We now have the knowledge needed to block that sad future, if we have the will to use it. We are at a new stage in the practice of nonviolent struggle and in the recognition of its potential. If we take wise and responsible steps in the coming years, the future will reveal achievements beyond all that we can now even imagine. **V**

Soul Rape

(continued from page 1)

the government could not designate what sort of work you should choose, why should it have the right to designate what religion you chose to follow? [13] Williams repeatedly used the terms "soul rape," "soul killing," and "soul oppression" to illustrate his belief "that being forced to affirm" or being forced to pay for something that "you do not believe can harm the soul" by weakening and deforming it. [14] This "occurs when people are forced ... to give assent to orthodoxies they don't support." [15] In her book, *LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE*, Martha Nussbaum discusses Williams' views on conscience and notes that he defined conscience as a "holy Light," a "most precious and invaluable Jewel." It is the essence of a person. Williams thought that "damage to conscience is an intrinsic wrong, a horrible desecration of what is most precious about a human life." Williams describes "Soul killing" as "the chiefest murder," and "soule or spirituall Rape" [sic] as being more abominable in the eyes of God than forcing and ravishing "the Bodies of all the Women in the World," or of blowing up Parliament or cutting the throats of kings or emperors. [16] Jefferson used the words "spiritual tyranny" to describe the violation of a person's conscience. [17] When he drafted the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom in 1777, he wrote that "...to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors, is sinful and tyrannical; that even forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion is depriving him of ...liberty" [18]

Although Williams, and Jefferson, and members of the Baptists and other dissenting sects saw "religious taxation" as "a crime against God" and a violation of one's religious scruples, none of them ever questioned the propriety of taxation as it applied to the secular realm. [19] They did not see that if it was wrong to force a man to pay for a minister whose service he did not attend, then (by the same reasoning) it would be wrong to force a man to pay for a teacher that did not teach his children. None of them ever attacked church rates as a

violation of property rights or as a confiscation of private property. To have done so would have called into question the propriety of all taxation. None of them saw taxation as a violation of the commandment prohibiting theft. What they objected to was the violation of conscience, not realizing that one's property and conscience were intimately connected. Taxation, in their mind, was okay as long as it was used for a purpose of which they approved. It was proper to them to force someone to pay for schools or roads. They saw the provision of roads, and schools, and public order as being essential to human welfare, but they did not realize that these necessary goods and services could be supplied, voluntarily, by entities other than the government. They did not see the connection between the natural right to choose one's religion and the natural right to make uncoerced choices in all other spheres of human activity. [20]

Today, voluntaryists are forced to support a political establishment, much like the dissenters of several centuries ago, who were forced to support a religious establishment. Even if one does not accept the claim that society could exist without the state, one ought to see that taxation, whether for religious or political purposes, is a violation of the conscience and property rights of those who oppose the initiatory use of force in human affairs. It is soul rape to be forced to sign a government tax form when one disbelieves in political government. It is soul rape to be forced to use government identification and a government passport for travel. It is soul rape to be forced to contribute to a political institution that one opposes in conscience. To paraphrase Jefferson, it is sinful and tyrannical to be forced to pay for and participate in something that one does not believe in. It is slavery to have all or part of your life controlled by others against your will. It is just as wrong to have your property stolen from you, for whatever the alleged purpose, as it is to be forced to attend a church, whose teachings you do not believe in; or to support a preacher with whom you disagree.

"The right to seek the truth in one's own way is one of the most important and necessary responsibilities of life." [21] As Williams would have said, to destroy this right is to destroy the soul because one is being forced to do something that one would not have willingly chosen to do. The way a man chooses to spend his money is a reflection of his personality and his conscience. To coerce a man into paying money for something he does not want or does not agree with is to demand that he surrender his property and his conscience. The common thief says, "Your money or your life." The government says, "Surrender your money and your conscience, or we will put you in jail." The voluntaryist is one of the few that sees these demands as equally unjust. Whether emanating from the thief or from the government, such a demand is robbery plain and simple. To describe

taxation as soul rape, soul oppression, and soul killing is to seek to delegitimize the State, and to take a step toward the withdrawal of the cooperation and tacit consent on which it ultimately depends.

Footnotes

[1] William G. McLoughlin, *SOUL LIBERTY: THE BAPTISTS' STRUGGLE IN NEW ENGLAND, 1630-1833*, Hanover: Brown University Press, 1991, pp. 8-9 and 170.

[2] *ibid.*, p. 176 and William G. McLoughlin, *NEW ENGLAND DISSENT 1630-1833*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971, 2 vols., p. 756.

[3] Winfred E. Garrison, "Characteristics of American Organized Religion," 25 *THE ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY* (1948), pp. 14-24 at p. 16.

[4] McLoughlin, *SOUL LIBERTY*, op. cit., pp. 175 and 202.

[5] *ibid.*, p. 231.

[6] *ibid.*, pp. 231 and 294.

[7] *ibid.*, p. 170.

[8] McLoughlin, *NEW ENGLAND DISSENT*, p. 610.

[9] *ibid.*, p. 594.

[10] *ibid.*, p. 611 (italics in the original), as summarized by Nathan Dane in his abridgement of *Barnes vs. Falmouth*.

[11] John D. Cushing, "Notes on Disestablishment in Massachusetts, 1780-1833," *THE WILLIAM AND MARY QUARTERLY*, Third Series, Vol. 26, No. 2 (April 1969), pp. 169-190 at p. 184.

[12] McLoughlin, *NEW ENGLAND DISSENT*, p. 611.

[13] Carl Watner, "'For Conscience's Sake': Voluntaryism and Religious Freedom," in Carl Watner, editor, *I MUST SPEAK OUT*, San Francisco: Fox & Wilkes, 1999, pp. 404-414 at p. 408. This article originally appeared in *THE VOLUNTARYIST* No. 55, April 1992. Both versions are available online at <http://voluntaryist.com/voluntaryist.pdf> and <http://voluntaryist.com/backissues/055.pdf>.

[14] Martha C. Nussbaum, *LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE*, New York: Basic Books, 2008, p. 54.

[15] Martha Nussbaum, "Veiled Threats," *THE NEW YORK TIMES* "Opinionator," July 11, 2010 at <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/07/11/veiled-threats> at paragraph 3. Accessed June 12, 2013.

[16] Nussbaum *LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE*, pp. 54-55. Also see Perry Miller, *ROGER WILLIAMS: HIS CONTRIBUTION TO THE AMERICAN TRADITION*, Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1953, pp. 127 and 264 (footnote 10).

[17] Thomas S. Kidd, *GOD OF LIBERTY: A RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION*, New York: Basic Books, 2010, p. 54.

[18] See Wikipedia entry, "Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom," paragraphs 5 and 6 of the actual text.

[19] McLoughlin, *NEW ENGLAND DISSENT*, p. 611.

[20] For more on this general theme, see Watner, op. cit.

[21] *ibid.*, p. 409. ▽

Sophisticated Slavery

(continued from page 8)

notice that skills and aptitudes vary greatly among his slaves. The unskilled ones will not be able to survive on the small remuneration he pays for farm work. The original concept was to save on the costs of feeding, clothing, and sheltering his slaves by paying them and letting them fend for themselves. He decides that he will not demand any tribute from slaves who can do little besides farm work. He decides to graduate the tribute demanded according to how much the slave earns. The more they earn, the greater the percentage they pay to the slave owner. He carefully crafts the rates of tribute so the slaves still have an incentive to better themselves and earn more. He calls this sliding scale a "progressive" tribute system.

The great merit of free enterprise is that it does not purport to know the answers, but rather permits people to discover them. The great evil of government is that it pretends infallibility and then imposes it.

- from *Laissez Faire Books Executive Summary of APOSTLE OF PEACE: THE RADICAL MIND OF LEONARD READ* by Gary Galles (Dec. 2013)

Soon other slave owners follow suit and the slave society reaches its ultimate level of sophistication. The slaves are formally free to do what they want to do. Formal slavery has been abolished. But essentially, they are still slaves. They must pay a tribute based on their earnings to their masters. The essence of slavery is working for the benefit of others rather than yourself, not by choice (as in supporting your family or giving to charity) but by force. To paraphrase Frederick Douglass, who escaped from slavery in 1838, a slave is someone who "toils so that another may reap the fruit."

The American Civil War resulted in the end of formal slavery. But it did not end essential slavery. In fact, over the years, essential slavery has expanded to include not just former slaves, but everyone. And everyone is a partial slave owner as well. We have, to paraphrase Abraham Lincoln, a system of slavery "of the people, by the people and for the people." The instrument of its implementation is the income tax!

Until we abolish coercive taxation, the forced taking of the fruits of the labor of those who have earned it for the benefit of those who have not, we will not have abolished the essence of slavery. Until we see the rise of another great emancipator who can educate the world to the evil of slavery down to its essential core, we will not be a truly free people!

[This article originally appeared at About.com on April 13, 1998. It can also be found at *Towards a Tax Free Canada*.] ▽

"Governments commit more crimes upon persons and property and contribute more to their insecurity than all [the] criminals put together."

- Josiah Warren quoted in William O. Reichert, *PARTISANS OF FREEDOM* (1976), p. 72

Sophisticated Slavery

By Marco den Ouden

[Editor's Note: This article is the winner of The Voluntaryist essay contest on how best to explain that taxation is theft.]

One of the by-products of the American Civil War was the abolition of slavery. Well, sort of!

The Civil War resulted in the elimination of formal slavery. However, it did not get rid of essential slavery. What does this mean? Let's go back to pre-Civil War America to find out.

The Southern U.S. states were not sophisticated slave states. Slaves were held as chattel. The plantation owner literally "owned" his slaves. They were his property. He kept them and cared for them just as he kept and cared for cattle and other domestic livestock. He housed them, fed them and clothed them, and, of course, he made them work for him. If they did not suit him, he sold them.

But suppose slavery was not abolished in the 19th Century, but rather it evolved into a more sophisticated system. How might it have changed? First a slave owner might have thought, "Hey, what if I can get the benefit of slave labor without the exorbitant cost of feeding, clothing and sheltering them?" Some slave owner may have taken the first path to sophistication by paying his slaves a nominal wage (less than it cost to keep them on the plantation) and told them, "I'm going to start paying

you for your work but you must go and find your own food and shelter. You are free to go about your own business except that you must come to the plantation to work every day. After all, I still own you."

Other slave owners notice he's saving a bundle on costs and also adopt the practice. Soon the entire society has adopted this new mode of slavery.

The slaves have so much free time on their hands that some start moonlighting. While it's still nickel and dimes, the slave owners look the other way. But after a while they notice something quite unexpected. The slaves are not the stupid, backward people they thought they were. Some used their spare time to get educated and now earn as much, if not more, off the plantation as on.

A very sophisticated slave owner puts two and two together. "My slaves can generate more wealth on their own time than working for me," he reasons. "Why don't I give them complete freedom to choose their own line of work and develop wealth in their own way. Instead of having them work on the plantation, which would underutilize their skills, I'll let them do what they are best suited for in the marketplace. I'll hire some poor white trash and slaves who can't find other work for the fields. And as for my slaves, they will give me 50% of all they earn. After all, I still own them."

If the slave owner is really sophisticated, he will

(continued on page 7)

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