
The Voluntaryist

Digital Issue 193

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

April 2020

Money Not Guns: Registration Then Confiscation

By Carl Watner

Have you ever heard of FinCEN Form 114 or Form 8938? They are both federal government designations for the forms used to report foreign financial accounts.

According to the Internal Revenue Service the purpose of Form 8938 is just as its name suggests: "Statement of Specified Foreign Financial Assets." If you are an individual taxpayer the form is to accompany your federal income tax return which you send to the IRS. Information includes your basic information, how many foreign accounts you have, and for each account the amount and types of income it has generated. The individual is also to supply the name and address of the financial institution, as well as the applicable account number(s). An individual is required to report the account if its value was more than \$ 50,000 at year's end. Penalties for failure to file max out at \$ 60,000, but criminal penalties may apply, too.

Also referred to as FBAR (Foreign Bank Account Report), FinCEN Form 114 is a form submitted to the office of Financial Crimes Enforcement Network of the United States. It is separate from the Internal Revenue Service. Its purpose is "to report a financial interest in, signature authority, or other authority over one or more financial accounts in foreign countries ... if the aggregate value of the accounts" exceeds \$10,000 at any time during the year. A "fine of not more than \$ 500,000 and imprisonment of not more than five years ... are provided for failure to file a report,"

FinCEN's parent agency is the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, which is part of the Department of the Treasury. These agencies collect financial and banking information "in order to combat domestic and international money laundering, terrorist financing and other financial crimes." All this is done in the name of promoting national security. Its enormous collection of data from banking institutions, individuals, and all other entities having foreign financial accounts outside of the United States enables them to analyze and coordinate "information with law enforcement agencies [and] regulators"

What does having this information in the hands of government agents mean? It means if Congress passes a law or gives the President the appropriate authority (which he probably already has) all foreign financial accounts may be legally confiscated, currency controls implemented, and the movement of capital in

and out of the country strictly monitored. This has been done in dozens of countries around the world, especially in times of war and peace. In the United States, World War I and World War II precipitated stringent legislation against trading with the enemy and having assets of American citizens located in enemy territory. Thus, registration information serves as a vital gateway to controlling American assets abroad or causing them to be forfeited if not voluntarily surrendered. When the government demanded that Americans turn in their gold in 1933, the government did not know who held the gold, but today they know many of those who have assets abroad. It is very easy, once registration is in place, to confiscate whatever has been registered. Gun owners and foreign account holders beware: guns are not likely to be the only property confiscated by a power-hungry government.

The ethics, or lack of them, are not in the weapons, they are in the minds of the people who pull the triggers. Weapons are neutral.

- Rick Maybury, EARLY WARNING REPORT, October 1999.

[Author's Addendum: While looking through some back issues, I came across Issue 157 of THE VOLUNTARYIST, in which I had written about FATCA, the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act, which was passed by Congress in 2010. There was not much new material there, except there were two excerpts of laws passed in Germany in the late 1930's, which I am again reproducing here. The reporting requirements of the U.S. Federal government can only lead to ultimate confiscation or control.

The decisive sign that the Nazis had turned their sights on the assets of Germans abroad was the law against economic sabotage enacted in December 1936. In part this was aimed at enticing Germans to repatriate their foreign nest-eggs: those prepared to admit they had assets abroad could keep a third of them after they handed over the remaining two-thirds to the Reichsbank, ... 'Any German national who knowingly and having as a motive acts against the law in transferring assets abroad or keeps them abroad and thereby damages the German economy is punished with death.' [Nicholas Faith, SAFETY IN NUMBERS: THE MYSTERIOUS WORLD OF SWISS BANKING,

(Continued on page 4)

The Voluntaryist

Editor: Carl Watner

Webmaster since 2011: Dave Scotese

Subscription Information

Published by The Voluntaryists, P. O. Box 275, Gramling, SC 29348. THE VOLUNTARYIST has gone on a free access "all-digital" basis since Issue 190. If you wish to contribute to our efforts then please make paypal payments to paypal@voluntaryist.com. **Please no** checks or money orders. Gold, silver, bitcoin, and cash accepted. See [Subscriptions](#) for information on hardcopy and flash drive compilations of back issues. Carl Watner grants permission to reprint his own articles without special request. Contact: editor@voluntaryist.com.

Potpourri from the Editor's Desk

No. 1 What Does Your Appearance in Court Mean?

When you walk into a courtroom, you submit to the jurisdiction of the judicial system, regardless of what you may say to the contrary. No amount of disclaimer on your part will change the fact that you are **there**. When you submit your case for judgement, you implicitly, if not explicitly, acknowledge the judicial system's **just right** to render in your case a decision by which you are bound to abide. Unless you were dragged there physically, by force, against your will, you are a voluntary participant and you exonerate the court of any deficiency of jurisdiction under which it might have suffered. Viewed in this way, any action [or appearance] in court should be preceded by a lot of soul searching.

- a letter from Sam Milam III, December 8, 1988.

No. 2 Book Received

Louis E. Carabini, author of *LIBERTY, DICTA & FORCE* (2018), founded Monex, a precious metals trading company, in 1967. He was a student of Andrew Galambos and a friend of Harry Browne. His story of "How I Became an Anarchist" can be found at <http://voluntaryist.com/how-i-became-a-voluntaryist/how-i-became-an-anarchist>. "The thrust of this book is not about changing public policies, limiting or abolishing government, 'fixing' America, or trying to change the world. Nor is this book about a crisis or the notion that if we don't do something soon, civilization will collapse. I hope to convey an appreciation of liberty as the natural common sense way to view the social world and interact within it. The inherent moral compass that guides our behavior in private matters can serve us just as well in public matters."

If anyone wants to increase the power of the state, a terrorist attack is probably the single most effective way to do so.

- Brian Martin, *RULING TACTICS* (2017), p. 109.

No. 3 "The Social Contract"

The so-called social contract is neither a contract nor is it social. A contract is a consensual agreement that presupposes a right for parties to opt out. Without the right to opt out, it is not a contract. "Social" is a friendly relationship, the antithesis of force. The "social contract" is simply a proclamation backed by physical force that all who reside within the geographical boundaries claimed by a ruler are by that fact consenting subjects to his edict. In principle, the effect is no different than that of a divine right; however, in practice the concept seems to yield far more plunder.

- Louis E. Carabini, "Individualist Anarchism," July 13, 2012.

No. 4 "Protection of Property Ultimately Depends on Human Decency"

As we have observed many times before, Rose Wilder Lane pointed out in *THE DISCOVERY OF FREEDOM* (pp. 109-110 in the 1943 edition), that the protection of our property ultimately depends upon human decency. "The only safeguards of property seem to have been possession of the property, individual honesty, and public opinion.... [C]abins were never locked on the American frontier where there was no law. The real protection of life and property, always and everywhere, is the general recognition of the brotherhood of man. How much of the time is any American within sight of a policeman? Our lives and our property are protected by the way nearly everyone feels about another person's life and property.

Along similar lines, Jeffrey Rogers Hummel has noted in Volume 4 of *THE REVIEW OF AUSTRIAN ECONOMICS* (pp. 110-111) that "Society is much more prosperous if we all cease to steal and cheat, but the single individual is better off still if everyone else behaves ethically while he or she steals and cheats whenever able to get away with it. Thus, everyone has a powerful personal incentive to free ride on other people's ethical behavior. If we all succumbed to that incentive, society would be very unpleasant."

"... A cursory glance at varying crime rates, over time and across locations, clearly indicates that the total stealing and cheating in society is far from solely a function of the resources devoted to the police and the courts. Certain neighborhoods are less safe, making an equal unit of police protection less effective, because they contain more aspiring ethical free riders. If all members of society or even a substantial fraction became ethical free riders, always stealing and cheating whenever they thought they could get away with it, the police and court system would collapse under the load." For whatever reasons, most people respect the property of others as they would have others respect their own property.

Voluntaryism: Nonviolent AND Non-political

by George H. Smith

[Editor's Note: While housecleaning, I came across this interesting letter dated December 9, 1981, written to Carl Watner. It outlines the George's view of voluntaryism even before the publication of the first issue of THE VOLUNTARYIST (October 1982).]

You raise an interesting question about the relation between voluntaryism and nonresistance. About a year ago, Wendy and I agreed that we are "pacifists" as far as all *wars* are concerned, since wars, by definition, are conflicts between governmental entities. This kind of pacifism is quite consistent with upholding the *individual* right of self-defense.

You wonder whether voluntaryism (nonviolence in seeking social change) is principled or strategic; and if the former, why it would not apply to personal relationships.

First, I do not consider voluntaryism (as we use the term) to refer to nonviolence per se; it refers instead to *nonpolitical* means of social change. I don't object to violence per se, when used in self-defense; but I do object to violence when used against innocents. It would be quite possible to have a *violent nonpolitical* act (say, an uprising to overthrow a tyrant), so there is obviously an intersection between the class of actions called "nonviolent" and the class of actions called "nonpolitical."

Thus, nothing in voluntaryism, as I use the term, implies the principle of nonresistance. Any violence against a leviathan state, however, borders on lunacy and should be rejected on pragmatic grounds. Given that violence against the American state is futile, and that political action violates libertarian principles (for reasons explained in my "Party Dialogue"), one option remains open to us: *nonviolent, nonpolitical* strategy. (As an aside most nonresistants - e.g., Gene Sharp - regard electoral politics as a form of nonviolent action; and, strictly speaking, I might agree with them.) The distinguishing mark of our voluntaryism is not just that we are nonviolent, or that we are nonpolitical, but that we are *both*. Nonviolence is a matter of necessity; nonpolitical is a matter of principle.

You say: "The complete pacifist will try to persuade the aggressor refrain from his wrong doing. This is what we voluntaryists are trying to do society wide. Is there some strategic reason why this is wrong for personal relations? For if we accept self-defensive violence in interpersonal relationships why shouldn't we apply it to society wide relationships?" First, I'm not sure if our goal is to persuade the aggressors (the State) from doing wrong. Rather, our goal is to *delegitimize State aggression*, thereby ending the

"voluntary servitude" that props it up. In this respect our goal differs from the Garrisonians, who sought a moral reform of slaveholders who would then voluntarily free their slaves. This, I think, was rightly criticized as utopian. We do not expect to convert statist from their evil ways (at least not many); we do not seek primarily to reform the ruling class. We seek instead to demystify their actions in the eyes of the ruled (no small job either, by the way). Part of this demystification would involve convincing people that, just as they have a right to use force to fend off an invader, so they have the *right* to use force to fend off the invasive actions of government. (The practicality, of course, is another issue.) The idea here is that, if a government is faced with masses of people who will not tolerate state aggression, and who will (when appropriate) resist state aggression with defensive violence, then it becomes virtually impossible for the state to function effectively.

You see, then, that my view of voluntaryism is anything but nonresistant in a principled sense. On the contrary, *it depends on teaching the right of self-defense against aggression, including governmental aggression*. The employment of Gandhian tactics then becomes solely an issue of superior strategy, both to violent action (i.e., revolution) and to nonviolent *political* action. (I think we should pin this down exactly: *Is political action a form of violent or nonviolent action?*)

I don't see how our voluntaryism - which seeks to delegitimize the State - really applies to how we treat a common criminal. It applies only if you assume that voluntaryism seeks to *convert* State aggressors, a position I have indicated my disagreement with. But if our education is aimed, not at the state aggressors, but at the *passive victims* of state aggression (the voluntary "slaves"), then there is no analogue with the thief brandishing a gun at you. After all, you already regard him as a common thief; you, the victim, have not granted him legitimacy. He controls you in virtue of superior naked force, not because of your voluntary servitude. Our brand of voluntaryism does not apply here. True, traditional pacifist principles may give you a way to deal with the thief more effectively than by fighting or surrendering, but I don't know how often this is possible. (With report after report in Los Angeles of brutal murders, perhaps I have become jaded on the practicality of nonresistance when confronted with maniac intent on killing you.)

To summarize: I think we are using the term "voluntaryist" in two different ways. You seem to use it to mean "nonresistance" in social change (and you then speculate why, if this is sound for society, it is not also sound for individuals). I, on the other hand, wish to restrict the term to *nonpolitical* means of social change, which may or may not involve resistance, depending on the circumstances. ☑

A Way Out – Victory Without Violence

By Carl Watner

[Editor's Note: This article first appeared in Issue 38 (1989). This is being reprinted in conjunction with George's letter (page 3 of this issue) because it offers my perspective after having published THE VOLUNTARYIST for eight years.]

Marshall Fritz of the Advocates for Self-Government recently loaned me a copy of John Yoder's book, titled WHAT WOULD YOU DO (If a Violent Person Threatened to Harm a Loved One)? (Scottsdale, Pa. Herald Press, 1983.) At dinner one evening, we were discussing the question of what I would do if an armed maniac came barging in and threatened to kill my son or wife. How consistently would I practice my philosophy of nonviolence? Would I view it as a departure from my principles to use violence in self-defense?

I am not sure that muscles and truth can ever really stand together. If one believes in truth, truth can stand by itself. The moment one resorts to violence, even in support of truth, it becomes clear that a certain suspicion remains as to the effectiveness, the practicality, of truth. ... [I am] one who wishes to win his victories not because he is strong, but because he is right.

- Bob LeFevre, "A Gathering of the Clan," THE REGISTER, April 26, 1981.

To answer the latter question first: Yes, I do believe violent self-defense is a departure from the principle of nonviolence, but I also view self-defense as a natural right. While I view self-protection as being within the moral jurisdiction of each and every person, I believe we would have a less violent and more peaceful, harmonious, and abundant world if people refrained from using violence, or its threat regardless of the situation. I would not criticize others who use violence, in self-defense, but I would not choose this method to defend my loved ones. The inter-connection of means and ends makes me desirous of avoiding violence in either a personal confrontation, or in supporting it in the broader social context of the State.

Now to answer the first question. My choice is not simply between acting cowardly or acting violently. I would make every attempt to react nonviolently to an attack against a loved one. Whether I could maintain the strength of will and presence of mind to do this will only be determined in an actual situation, but I would strive to achieve this. The type of nonviolence I am talking about is the nonviolence of the brave. It requires consistency and adherence in the most dangerous situations. It requires resourcefulness, the use of intellect, and creativity. This type of nonviolence comes from strength not weakness, and depends on the inner spirit and will. As Gandhi put it, nonviolence does not mean meek submission to the will or intention of the evildoer.

Just because I say, beforehand, that I would not use violence to defend my family from an attacker does not mean or imply that I would not actively and nonviolently protect them. As the LeFevre adage puts it, an ounce of protection is worth a pound of defense in an actual encounter. If my protection (security alarms, adequate lighting, dead bolts and secure doors) fails, the very last thing I would do is offer myself as a shield between the invader and the invaded. Under no circumstances could I envisage myself calling the police.

One of the main themes of the Yoder book is that there are numerous nonviolent ways of disarming the assailant: seeming to go berserk (as LeFevre once did), trying to distract the attacker with talk, offering the attacker money or sanctuary, making the attacker feel at home, disarming the attacker emotionally, etc. The violent person expects to be violently resisted, and is usually scared himself. When he does not encounter this reaction in his victims, or their defenders, his equilibrium is thrown off balance, and the initiative is placed in the hands of the nonviolent person. WHAT WOULD YOU DO? includes several true-to-life stories of missionaries and pacifists, who behaved nonviolently and successfully warded off personal danger, when faced with violent situations.

However, even if my nonviolent resistance to violence failed, it would not be a defeat for nonviolence. For there is no guarantee that violence would be successful in preserving the lives of my family. A person of integrity is more concerned with the means than the ends. Such a person would rather give up his own life, than take the life of another. As the ancient Stoics put it, we must all die some time. It is more important how we live and deport ourselves, than whether we preserve our existence temporarily. The Biblical commandment did not say, "Thou shall not kill, except in self-defense of the family or for the common good." A person simply has to have faith that "if one takes care of the means, the end will take care of itself," and then let the chips fall where they may. [V]

Money Not Guns

(Continued from page 1)

[P]ursuant to the Decree on the Registration of the Property of the Jews of April 26, 1938, all Jews were required to value all their assets (foreign and domestic) and register them if their value was in excess of RM 5,000. ["Expropriation (Aryanization) of Jewish Property," General, www.edwardvictor.com/Holocaust/expropriation]

I then asked, "Why exactly are such assets of concern to governments, and why is the 'failure to report' foreign assets a crime if it is not illegal to own them? The answer is to be found in the invasive nature of governments. Governments demand obedience," and have an insatiable appetite for revenues.] [V]

GERMANS 13:1-7

By Ned Netterville

[Editor's Note: Christian patriots often offer up Romans 13:1-7 (Render unto Caesar – in other words, the Roman authorities - what Caesar is due) as a biblical reason for paying taxes to their federal and state governments (reproduced at the end). Rarely do they realize that their argument applies equally to democratic as well as totalitarian governments. In other words, there would have been just as much reason to obey and pay the pre-World War II German authorities (the Nazis) as there would have been to pay and obey the American government under FDR. The large majority of Christian preachers in Germany supported the Third Reich, while most Christian preachers in the United States supported the Allies. Both German and American Christian religious leaders were praying to the same deity and using the same New Testament while their co-religionists were trying to kill each other.]

My Dear Brothers and Sisters,

Let every person be subject to Hitler and the governing Nazi authorities; for there is no authority except from God, and the Nazi authorities that exist have been instituted by God. Whoever resists Nazi authority resists what God has appointed, and those who resist will incur judgment. For the Nazi rulers are not a terror to good conduct but to bad. Do you wish to have no fear of the Nazi authorities? Then do what is good, and you will receive the Nazis' approval, for Hitler is God's servant for your good. But if you do what is wrong you should be afraid, for the Gestapo does not wield the sword in vain. Hitler is the servant of God to execute wrath on the wrongdoer. Therefore, one must be subject to Hitler, not only because of wrath but also because of conscience. For the same reason you also pay taxes, for the Nazis are God's servants, busy with this very thing. Pay to all what is due to them—taxes to whom taxes are due, revenue to whom revenue is due, respect to whom respect is due, honor to whom honor is due.

signed Heil Hitler, Rabbi Benjamin Roth at Sachsenhausen, Germany, January 15, 1938

This letter was sent by Rabbi Benjamin Roth to the members of his synagogue in Stuttgart from a Nazi "labor" camp shortly after he was arrested as an enemy of the state for his frequent, bold condemnation of Hitler and the Nazis. The letter was, of course, first opened and read by the prison's Gestapo censors, who were unaware of their prisoner's history of sedition, assuming he was, like most of Sachsenhausen's residents, arrested merely because he was a Jew. His letter made it past the censors and was delivered to the synagogue by mail, thanks to its Hitler-and-Nazi-flattering content.

When his letter was read to the synagogue community on the next Sabbath, it was recognized immediately by all but one member of the Rabbi's flock for the irony it spoke. It inspired many members to do exactly

the opposite of what the Rabbi's ironic words appeared to be directing them to do, knowing the opposite is what he really wanted of them. As a result, evasion of German taxes was higher among members of Rabbi Roth's synagogue than anywhere in Germany. More than a few members went to their deaths as illegal tax protesters.

The lone member who took the Rabbi's words at face value was a rather dull honey dipper, Ike K. When Ike heard the letter read, he took it to heart and joined the Nazi Party. When the Nazis discovered he was a Jew, he was made to kneel and then kicked to death by Gestapo agents.

Rabbi Roth was eventually shipped on to the Chelmo extermination camp in December, 1941, where he was among the first victims murdered in the back of a box truck with its exhaust piped into the sealed cargo area. It was the Nazis' first mass-human-extermination machine, reputedly contrived by Adolf Eichmann himself.

Roth's personal papers were kept safely hidden by members of his synagogue community until after the war. The collection reveals that when Hitler came to power in 1932, Roth undertook a study of the works of Paul the Apostle (Saul of Tarsus), who similarly had to contend with the persecution and slaughter of his Christian congregation in Rome by the Emperor Nero. Paul was beheaded by Nero in 68 CE. No doubt Roth had reflected on the striking similarities between the infamous tyrant Nero, who would douse Christians with paraffin and use them as human torches to light his evening garden parties, and Adolf Hitler, whose rapacious extermination of Jews knew no bounds to its numbers nor its savagery.

I wonder if Rabbi Roth saw in himself a reflection of the Apostle? I certainly do in his use of Paul's irony in Romans.

[Editor's Note: Below follows the current version of Romans 13:1-7 from the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV)]

Being Subject to Authorities

"13 Let every person be subject to the governing authorities; for there is no authority except from God, and those authorities that exist have been instituted by God. 2 Therefore whoever resists authority resists what God has appointed, and those who resist will incur judgment. 3 For rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to bad. Do you wish to have no fear of the authority? Then do what is good, and you will receive its approval; 4 for it is God's servant for your good. But if you do what is wrong, you should be afraid, for the authority[a] does not bear the sword in vain! It is the servant of God to execute wrath on the wrongdoer. 5 Therefore one must be subject, not only because of wrath but also because of conscience. 6 For the same reason you also pay taxes, for the authorities are God's servants, busy with this very thing. 7 Pay to all what is due them—taxes to whom taxes are due, revenue to whom revenue is due, respect to whom respect is due, honor to whom honor is due." www.biblegateway.com/passages/?search=Romans+13&version=NRSV



Slavery and National ID

Carl Watner

[Editor's Note: This article appeared as Chapter 25 of my anthology, NATIONAL IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS: ESSAYS IN OPPOSITION, Jefferson: McFarland, 2004.]

If one accepts the premise that the State owns the people (an assumption which seems to be prevalent today), rather than its opposite (that government is the agent; the people the principals), then it follows that the citizen is a slave of the government and must blindly obey. In this original contribution to this anthology, editor Carl Watner argues that when slavery was the norm every Negro was suspect. Practically everywhere in antebellum America, Negroes (off the plantation) had to prove their bona fides, either by possessing a valid pass from their master or by registering with the police and/or showing their "freedom" papers to the slave patrols. A free Negro without his certificate of freedom was considered a fugitive, apprehended, and returned to slavery. Query: If national ID were in place today, what would happen to those conscientious objectors or others who went about in public without their IDs? Isn't it likely they would be treated in just the same manner as the Negro of yesteryear?

Jim Fussell, in a review of "group classification on National ID cards," observed that in the pre-Civil War United States "'Free Passes', Freedom papers, and Deeds of manumission" functioned as ID's for the freed Negro.[1] This observation sparked my interest in the relationship between national ID and the history of slavery, and it is these two subjects which I would briefly like to comment upon in this paper.

The whole basis of chattel slavery, as it was known in the South, was the ownership of one person by another. Although some Negroes owned other blacks, for the most part slavery in the United States before the Civil War was largely along racial lines: white ownership of black people. All Negroes were presumed to be slaves, unless they could prove otherwise. The burden of proof was on the Negro. People with white skin never had to prove to anyone that they were free. In other words, the presumption was that if your skin was black, you were considered prima facie a slave, or else a runaway, or fugitive. The only way of proving that you were a free person was to show your deed of manumission (under which your owner had freed you), or some sort of certificate of freedom (often issued by the clerk of a county court) attesting to your free status.

Nearly all of the Southern states and several of the Northern states had laws which reflected this presumption. Slaves were not to leave their owner's land unless they had permission. In Connecticut, "[a]ny slave found wandering about without a pass was to be arrested as a runaway. Pennsylvania forbade

blacks to travel more than ten miles from home without a pass.... Philadelphia directed its constables to arrest Negroes found in the streets on Sunday unless they had a pass from their owners." [2] Laws were often passed requiring all free blacks to register with local officials, in and some cases to post bond for their good behavior, and to ensure they would not become a charge upon the community. The District of Columbia had a particularly egregious ordinance passed on April 14, 1821 (effective June 1, 1821). It required all free blacks in the city to register annually with the Mayor and

to enter into bond with one good and responsible free white citizen, as surety, in the penalty of twenty dollars, conditioned for the good, sober, and orderly conduct of such person or persons of color, and his or her family, for the term of one year following the date of such bond, and that such person or persons, his or her family, nor any part thereof, shall not, during the said term of one year, become chargeable to the Corporation in any manner whatsoever, and that they will not become beggars in or about the streets.

"Only after the bond was posted would the mayor issue a license to permit such free blacks to reside in the city for one year.... [F]ree Negroes were not permitted to change their places of residence until after such changes had been entered on their licenses by the registrar." [3] Similar regulations existed in such cities as Nashville, TN, Montgomery, AL, Baton Rouge, LA, Raleigh, NC, and Petersburg, VA. [4]

Roy contended that the burden of proof for the necessity of government is always on those who maintain that the state is necessary or legitimate.
- Ronn Neff in "Roy Childs on Anarchism"

As I have pointed out in other essays for this anthology, the whole premise of National ID is that the government owns the citizen, and must provide the citizenry with identification, beginning with a state-issued birth certificate. In principle, this is just the same as it was during the time of American slavery. Every Negro was presumed a slave unless the government (or his master, actually ex-master) documented that he was a free person. If a freed Negro lost his "papers," then he was automatically considered a slave. If a Negro wanted to assert his natural born freedom, including the right not to carry government papers, his existence could be quite perilous, just as it would be to an American today who refused to carry government papers proving his or her identity.

It is next to impossible to function in our statist economy without a birth certificate, a driver's license, or a social security number issued by the government. If a person should try to operate in such a manner, he

or she will surely eventually be apprehended by the authorities for “failing to register one’s birth,” for “driving without a license,” or for “failing to provide a social security number.” If, and when, a national or state ID program is implemented in the United States, the situation will be worse, because then it will undoubtedly become a crime to “fail to register” and “fail to carry one’s state or federal ID card on one’s person at all times.”

Despite the danger to themselves, historians point out that many free Negroes refused to comply with the numerous municipal registration codes or the demand that they carry papers. “Many simply never bothered to register,” “probably few carried freedom papers,” and most instinctively preferred to avoid white officials.[5] “In 1853, St. Louis authorities attempted to chase alien free Negroes out of the city and to force native free Negroes to register. Police raided well-known free Negro haunts, whipped unregistered freemen, and shipped them beyond city limits.... The raids continued for almost a year, although they ended in failure.”[6] Negroes in Virginia were no more compliant. “In Amelia County Virginia, for example, a consecutively numbered register of free Negroes kept between 1800 and 1865 listed about 150 freemen. In 1860, however, almost 200 resided in the county and many more had been born, had been manumitted, and had migrated into and out of the area during those years.”[7]

Are the colored freemen of the 19th Century trying to tell us Americans of the 21st Century something that we might do? It is surely food for thought.[8]

[Addendum: A book review, “Kidnapped Into Slavery,” in THE WALL STREET JOURNAL (October 17, 2019, p. A17) prompted me to recall it. STOLEN by Richard Bell is the story of “five free [Negro] boys kidnapped into slavery and their astonishing odyssey home.” Carol Wilson in her book, FREEDOM AT RISK: THE KIDNAPPING OF FREE BLACKS IN AMERICA, 1780-1865 (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1994) catalogs the dangers that both free blacks and slaves faced during much of the 19th century. As she writes, “all blacks were presumed to be slaves unless they could demonstrate otherwise, and providing legal proof was often impossible,” (Wilson, 7) Henry Clarke Wright, a fiery abolitionist, countered this assumption by arguing the voluntarist position in the LIBERATOR. “Every native of the United States was born free. The slave must have been kidnapped; therefore the holder of the slave is a Man-Stealer, or an accessory, or a receiver of stolen goods, or a purchaser of a human being whom he knew was stolen.” (Wilson, 98) All of this material supplements my original article.]

Footnotes

1. Jim Fussell, “Global Survey (Jo to Vi) of Group Classification on National ID Cards,” at <http://www.preventgenocide.org/prevent/removing-facilitating-factors/IDcards/survey/index2.htm>. See “USA (Pre-Civil War).”

2. Edgar J. McManus, *Black Bondage in the North* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press), 1973, p. 73 and p. 74.

3. Leonard P. Curry, *The Free Black in Urban America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1981, p. 86 and p. 301 (footnote 17) citing Washington, City Council, *Laws of the Corporation of the City of Washington* [1821] (Washington: Way and Gideon) 1821, pp. 110-111. The complete law is found at Chapter 133 of Laws Passed by the Eighteenth Council of the City of Washington, Approved April 14, 1821, Sections 1-21 (pp. 109-116). Secs. 11 and 12 (pp. 113-114) deal with change of residence regulations.

4. Ira Berlin, *Slaves Without Masters: The Free Negro in the Antebellum South* (New York: Oxford University Press paperback) 1981, pp. 319.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 327.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 330.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 328. By the time of the Civil War there was a large number of free Negroes in the United States. “There were 59,000 free Negroes in the United States at the time of the first decennial census in 1790 By [1860] the number had climbed to 488,000” Over 40% of them lived in the South. John Hope Franklin and Alfred A. Moss, Jr., *Free Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro Americans* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Fortieth Anniversary Edition), 1988, p. 137.

8. What, might we ask, are the supposed benefits of government identification and documentation? Among other things it appears that our income can be traced and taxed; our children can be tracked from birth and forced to attend public schools; and our ages and the ages of our children can be known so that all of us might be subject to the military draft in time of war. V

The Logic of Anarchy

By Carl Watner

[Editor's Note: This piece originally appeared in THE LIBERTARIAN FORUM, February 1983, page 5.]

In 1793, William Godwin wrote that “To dragoon man into the adoption of what we think right, is an intolerable tyranny.” [1] Godwin asserted that the advocate of coercion is in a logically precarious position. Coercion does not convince, nor is it any kind of argument at all. The initiation of coercion is “a tacit confession of imbecility. If he who employs coercion against me could mould me to his purposes by argument, no doubt he would. He pretends to punish me, because his argument is strong; but he really punishes me, because his argument is weak.” [2]

The presupposition that the one who initiates violence is in a morally and logically indefensible position is the epistemological bias against violence. As Godwin added, “Force is an expedient, the use of which is much to be deplored. It is contrary to the nature of the intellect, which cannot be improved by conviction and persuasion. It corrupts the man that employs it, and the man upon whom it is employed.”

Historically, man's original condition was anarchic. Government arose through conquest; through the initiation of coercion against the unwilling. Anarchism is the doctrine that the State, as a social institution, should

not exist; that mankind should be allowed to return to its natural state of no-government. Epistemologically, we must start out as anarchists, too. The advocate of the State must convince us that the positive belief in government is justified. The burden of proof is not on the anarchist to justify the absence of government. Logically, this burden of proof rests on the advocate of the State.

This point was made clear by those who argued against compulsory vaccination in late 19th Century England. They presented two independent arguments: (first), that the medical and scientific claims of the vaccinationists were wrong; and, (second), that the initiation of compulsion was wrong in and of itself. For them, the hallmark of civilization was the abandonment of legalized compulsion. As John Morley put it, “liberty, or the absence of coercion, or the leaving people to think, speak, and act as they please, is in itself a good thing. It is the object of a favourable presumption. The burden of proving it inexpedient always lies, and wholly lies, on those who wish to abridge it by coercion . . .” [4]

Without realizing it, the anti-vaccinationists hit upon the logic of anarchy. Whether their medical argument was correct or not was essentially beside the point. The epistemological bias against violence precludes the initiation of force. This prevents the existence of the State

(or legislation) which is by its very nature invasive. If those who advocate the State must rely on force in order to bring it about, then their arguments are already tainted. The anti-vaccinationists claimed that “vaccination is either good or bad. Its goodness removes the need for compulsion and its badness destroys the right to coerce those who oppose it.” [5] So for the State. It is as illogical as it is wicked. In the nature of the case, the more the government protects, the less need there is to make it compulsory. On the other hand, the less it protects, the more infamous is its compulsion. In their anxiety to coerce others, statist demonstrate their own lack of faith in the prescription which they assert affords complete protection from anarchy.

End Notes

[1] William Godwin, ENQUIRY CONCERNING POLITICAL JUSTICE (1798), Book IV, Chapter i, Paragraph 10.

[2] *ibid.*, Book VII, Chapter ii, Paragraph 9.

[3] *ibid.*, Book IV, Chapter i, Paragraph 14.

[4] John Morley, ON COMPROMISE, London: Macmillan and Co., 1888, pp. 253-254.

[5] See Joseph P. Swan, THE VACCINATION PROBLEM, London: C. W. Daniel Company, 1936, p. 317, and William White, THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION, London, E. W. Allen, 1885, p. 508. 

The Voluntaryist

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



FIRST CLASS

Or download the PDF from voluntaryist.com/backissues/193.pdf