
The Voluntaryist

Vol. 2, No. 3, Whole #9

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

Sept. 1984

METHODS

Editor's Introduction: "The Voluntaryists seek to reclaim the anti-political heritage of libertarianism." As an example of that tradition I have selected a chapter on voluntaryist "methods" written by Francis Dashwood Tandy. Tandy (1867- ?), a supporter of the individualist ideas of Benjamin Tucker, published the book, **VOLUNTARY SOCIALISM**, (from which this chapter is taken) in Denver during the Spring of 1896. The book was described in advertisements in **LIBERTY** as "a complete and systematic outline of Anarchistic philosophy and economics, written in a clear, concise, and simple style."

It's purpose, in the words of the author's Preface, was to provide a brief but lucid outline of ... Voluntaryism. It's title, although somewhat of a puzzler, is easy enough to explain. Throughout much of the 19th Century, "socialism" meant the abolition of every type of economic privilege. According to Tandy, there were two types of socialists: the State Socialist, who hoped to use the government to abolish the surplus value created by legislation (a method which he thought inherently contradictory) and the "voluntary Socialists or Anarchists", who maintained that the exercise of free competition, in such legally restricted areas as banking and tariffs (to name just two), was the only way to eradicate social evils.

Tandy has a clear grasp of the voluntaryist insight and the voluntary principle. He rejected revolutionary violence as impractical and unnecessary and saw electoral politics as just another form of institutionalized coercion. In reviewing his comments, I have changed his expression "passive" resistance to the more modern nonviolent resistance. I am proud to offer this condensed version of Chapter XIII (pp. 186-201), which I suspect represents the first and only time it has reappeared in nearly 100 years. - Carl Watner

Many and various as are the different ideas in regard to what are the best social conditions, the opinions held concerning the best methods of attaining the desired end, are no less so. That different conditions may be brought about by different means is to be expected, but that so many entirely different methods are proposed as likely to produce the same results, is indicative of the loose thinking that is prevalent upon all subjects.

A correct idea of what we wish to attain is essential before we are capable of discussing how we can best attain it. Usually a thorough understanding of the first problem is a sure guide to the solution to the second. Having seen that the abolition of the State is necessary to progress, and that private enterprise is perfectly capable of performing the duties for which the State is said to be necessary, it is now in order to discuss how this end can be achieved. One thing should be borne in mind from the start. It has been shown that the State is essentially an invasive institution. Since the person of the invader is not sacred, there is no ethical reason why we may not use any means in our power to achieve the results we desire. The State is founded in force. Therefore there is no good reason why it should not be abolished by force if necessary. The whole field is open to us. All we are bound to consider is, which method will be most likely to meet with success.

Where is the State? What is it? How are we to attack it? We see its agents around us every day. They are not the State and do not pretend to be. Where is the State from which these agents derive their authority? It only exists in men's minds. Karl Marx says: "One man is king only because other men stand in the relation of subjects to him. They, on the contrary, imagine that they are subjects because he is king." The officers of the State derive their authority simply and solely from the submission of its citizens. When it is said that the State is the main cause of our social evils, it must not be forgotten that the State is but a crude expression of the average intelligence of the community. Every law is practically inoperative that is very different from the general consensus of opinion in the community. The position of the State seldom exactly coincides with public opinion in regard to new measures, because it moves much slower than individuals. But it follows slowly in the wake of new ideas, and when it lags much behind its power is weakened. These facts are seen very plainly in prohibition States. They would be apparent to everyone, were it not for the superstition that we must obey the law because it is the law. It is said that our representatives are our servants. These servants make laws which we consider bad, yet because they are our servants, we must obey the laws they make! The State is king only because we are fools enough to stand in the relation of subjects to it. When we cease to stand in the relation of subjects to it, it will cease to be king. So that, in order to abolish the State, it is necessary to change people's ideas in regard to it. This means a long campaign of education.

The Voluntaryist

Subscription Information

Published bi-monthly by The Voluntaryists, P.O. Box 5836, Baltimore, Maryland 21208. Subscriptions are \$10 per year, \$18 for two years. Overseas subscriptions, please add \$5 for extra postage (per year).

Editor: **Wendy McElroy**

Contributing Editors: **Carl Watner and George H. Smith**

EDITORIAL

IDEAS HAVE CONSEQUENCES

One of the most significant essays of all times for radical libertarian thinkers is Henry David Thoreau's CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE. Originally delivered in 1848 as a talk on the relation of the individual to the State and the story of Thoreau's tax-resistance, it was published the following year under the title of "Resistance to Civil Government". In his essay, Thoreau deals with several themes of crucial importance to The Voluntaryists.

Thoreau not only rejected unjust laws but he also withdrew his support from the men who made them. He realized that there were a large number of people who paid obedience to the law, simply because it was the law. This class of people unquestioningly obeyed the law. As Thoreau observed, "Law never made men a whit more just; and by means of their respect for it, even the well-disposed are daily made the agents of injustice." To the extent that laws embodied justice, and only to that extent, would Thoreau obey them. Laws embodying injustice he disregarded or disobeyed.

The Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 requiring the return of slaves who had escaped from captivity was a classic example of a law which Thoreau rejected. Rather than enforce this law, Thoreau believed the Governor of Massachusetts should have resigned. By remaining in office and executing a law which embraced an injustice, the Governor subordinated his conscience to the law. Thoreau demanded that office-holders shed the mantle of their office and take personal responsibility for what they did. Lawyers, too, were part of the defensive machinery of the State. Although they should be defenders of truth and justice, Thoreau saw that "the lawyer's truth is not Truth, but consistency, or a consistent expediency...." Rather than defend the natural rights of the individual, lawyers looked to the Constitution and thereby increased the State's legitimacy. But Thoreau went further than refusing to obey unjust laws and refusing to support the agents of the State. He questioned the authority and legitimacy of the government itself. It was for no particular item in the tax bill that he refused to pay: "I simply wish to refuse allegiance to the State, to withdraw and stand aloof from it effectually." For his refusal to pay its poll tax, Sheriff Sam Staples kidnapped Thoreau and held him overnight against his will.

Thoreau exhorted all thinking people to right action in accord with their individual conscience. He realized that ideas have consequences and that the types of ideas we act on largely determine the types of results we get. Voting was nothing more than a "sort of gaming, like checkers or backgammon, with a slight moral tinge to it, a playing with right and wrong, with moral questions." The essential complaint that Thoreau had with voting was that the voter was not "vitally concerned" that right should prevail because he was willing to leave the decision to the will of the majority. When Thoreau decided not to pay his poll tax, he did not consult the majority but acted directly on his perception of the right. In contrast, had he voted on the subject of paying his taxes and allowed the majority opinion to be the one he acted upon, Thoreau, by his own standards, would have shown a disregard for achieving actually what was right. Instead of aiming at doing right, he would have aimed at fulfilling the will of the majority. Thus Thoreau considered that "even voting for the right is doing nothing for it." In short, Thoreau rejected electoral politics. He came into this world, "not chiefly to make this a good place to live in, but to live in it, be it good or bad." He believed that people should simply go about the business of living their lives, so long as they gave no practical support to the State.

Resistance to injustice and the State is clearly a matter of individual conscience. Many of us refuse to vote or engage in electoral politics as a matter of conscience. Each person has to know his or her own conscience in order to determine the right course for him or herself. Paul Jacob chose to go underground rather than surrender to the federal authorities. Carl Watner chose to go to jail rather than obey a judge's unjust order that he cooperate with the Internal Revenue Service. As Thoreau stated, "The only obligation which (any of us) have a right to assume, is to do at any time what (we) think right." "Action from principle", such as non-voting and that taken by Carl in his conscientious objection to taxation is essentially revolutionary. The question before us is the same question that was before Thoreau. "Unjust laws exist;" he wrote, "shall we be content to obey them, or shall we endeavor to amend them, and obey them until we have succeeded, or should we transgress them at once?" - Carl Watner

On a more mundane level, we would like to again apologize for the erratic and long delayed appearance of recent issues of the newsletter. Those who have not re-subscribed will be receiving at least one extra issue in an effort to show that we are serious about getting back on schedule. Although we are unable to pay, we urge all readers to submit articles which they think might be of interest to readers of The Voluntaryist.

These means are too slow to suit many who want to inaugurate a new social system at once. They cannot hasten matters a bit too much to suit me. The sooner the "new order" comes, the better I shall like it. But often "the shortest cut home is the longest way round." Ill-advised haste is disastrous. By all means let us hasten the progress of the race, but let us also use care lest our zeal upset our reason and cause us to hinder, instead of help, the re-adjustment of social forces.

A favorite method of reform, with those whose impatience with the present system is very great, is a violent revolution. If the State is purely an idea, how can we attack it with force? True, its agents use force to compel us to support it, and we might oppose them with force, but unfortunately we are not yet strong enough. As far as morality is concerned, it is of course, justifiable to meet force by force. But, as an egoist, the only morality I recognize is the highest expediency. So it would be highly immoral to attempt a revolution which would be foredoomed to failure. When a large minority have a clear idea of the nature of the State and an earnest desire to abolish it, such a revolution might be successful. But then it would be unnecessary, for people having refused to stand in the relation of subjects to it, the State would be no longer king. Till then it must inevitably be a fearful failure, no matter which side was actually successful in the battles. ...

Political methods must be condemned without even these qualifications. The ballot is only a bullet in another form. An appeal to the majority is an appeal to brute force. It is assumed that, since all men are on the average equally able to carry a musket, the side which has the largest number of adherents would probably conquer in case of war. So, instead of actually fighting over questions, it is more economical to count noses and see which side would probably win. The political method is a form of revolution, and most of the arguments directed against the latter are valid when applied to the former. The result shown at the polls indicates a certain stage of mental development in the community. As that mental development is changed, the political manifestations of it change also. So we are brought back to the original starting point. If we wish to effect the abolition of the State through politics, we must first teach people how we can get along without it. When that is done, no political action will be necessary. The people will have outgrown the State and will no longer submit to its tyranny. It may still exist and pass laws, but people will no longer obey them, for its power over them will be broken. Political action can never be successful until it is unnecessary. ...

Any one who has had any experience in practical politics must know how hopeless it is to attempt to effect any reform -- especially any reform in the direction of freedom

-- by that means. Platforms are adopted to get elected on, not to be carried out in legislation. The real position of a party depends, not upon the justness or unjustness of measures, but upon the probabilities of re-election. Scheming and "diplomacy" are the methods of the candidates for public office. Reasoning and honest conviction do not concern them in the least. ...

These facts give us a glimpse of the intricacies of politics. How can the reformer or business man who has to earn his living hope to cope with the professional politician while this is the case? The politician is in possession of the field. He is able to devote his whole time to studying the situation and to heading off any move to oust him. What can you do about it? You can give the matter a little attention after business hours and think you grasp the situation. You can vote once a year or so for a different set of thieves. If you are very enterprising you can go to the primaries and think you are spoiling the politician's little game. What do you think the politician has been doing since last election? Instead of going to primaries you might as well go to -- another place which politics more nearly resembles than anything on this earth. Perhaps better, for a spook devil would probably be an easier task-master than a politician in flesh and blood. You can do what you please, the politician is dealing from a stacked deck and has the best of the bunco game all the time.

At its very best, an election is merely an attempt to obtain the opinion of the majority upon a given subject, with the intention of making the minority submit to that opinion. This is in itself a radical wrong. The majority has no more right, under Equal Freedom, to compel the majority. When a man votes he submits to the whole business. By the act of casting his ballot, he shows that he wishes to coerce the other side, if he is in the majority. He has, consequently, no cause for complaint if he is coerced himself. He has submitted in advance to the tribunal, he must not protest if the verdict is given against him. If every individual is a sovereign, when he votes he abdicates. Since I deny the right of the majority to interfere in my affairs, it would be absurd for me to vote and thereby submit myself to the will of the majority. ...

Must we then sit still and let our enemies do as they please? By no means. Three alternatives offer themselves, active resistance, nonviolent resistance and non-resistance. The folly of the first has already been demonstrated. Non-resistance is just as bad. Unless we resist tyranny, we encourage it and become tyrants by tacitly consenting to it. But nonviolent resistance still remains. The most perfect nonviolent resistance has often been practiced by the Quakers. During the Civil War the Quakers all absolutely refused to serve in the army. In European countries they have resisted conscrip-

tion. In the same manner. What could be done about it? A few were imprisoned, but they stood firm, and finally, by nonviolent resistance, they have gained immunity from this particular form of tyranny. ...

To gain anything by political methods, it is first necessary to gain a majority of the votes cast, and even then you have to trust to the integrity of the men elected to office. But with nonviolent resistance this is unnecessary. A good strong minority is all that is needed. It has been shown that the attitude of the State is merely a crude expression of the general consensus of the opinion of its subjects. In determining this consensus, quality must be taken into consideration as well as quantity. The opinion of one determined and intelligent man may far outweigh that of twenty lukewarm followers of the opposition. "To apply this consideration to practical politics, it may be true that the majority in this country are favorable, say, to universal vaccination. It does not follow that a compulsory law embodies the will of the people; because the very man who is opposed to that law is at least ten times more anxious to gain his end than his adversaries are to gain theirs. He is ready to make far greater sacrifices to attain it. One man rather wishes for what he regards as a slight sanitary safeguard; the other is determined not to submit to a gross violation of his liberty. How differently the two are acutated! One man is willing to pay a farthing in the pound for a desirable object; the other is ready to risk property and perhaps life to defeat that object. In such cases as this it is sheer folly to pretend that counting heads is a fair indication of the forces behind." (Donisthorpe, *Law in a Free State*, pp. 123-124.) A strong, determined and intelligent minority, employing methods of nonviolent resistance, would be able to carry all before it. For the same men, being in a numerical minority, would be powerless to elect a single man to office.

Another thing must be remembered. Nonviolent resistance can never pass a law. It can only nullify laws. Consequently, it can never be used as a means of coercion and is particularly adopted to the attainment of Anarchy. All other schools of reform propose to compel people to do something. For this they must resort to force, usually by passing laws. These laws depend upon political action for their inauguration and physical violence for their enforcement. Anarchists are the only reformers who do not advocate physical violence. Tyranny must ever depend upon the weapon of tyranny, but Freedom can be inaugurated only by means of Freedom.

The first thing that is necessary, to institute the changes outlined in this book, is to convince people of the benefit to be derived from them. This means simply a campaign of education. As converts are gradually gained, nonviolent resistance will grow stronger. At first it

must be very slight, but still has its effect. Even the refusal to vote does more than is often supposed. In some States the number of persons who, from lethargy or from principle, refuse to vote is large enough to alarm the politicians. They actually talk at times of compulsory voting. This shows how much even such a small amount of nonviolent resistance is feared. As the cause gains converts and strength, this nonviolent resistance can assume a wider field. The more it is practiced greater attention will be drawn to underlying principles. Thus education and nonviolent resistance go hand in hand and help each other, step by step, towards the goal of human Freedom.

BOOKS OF INTEREST

By Carl Watner

Benjamin Ginsberg, *THE CONSEQUENCES OF CONSENT*. (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1982).

In this season of presidential campaigning, its difficult to remember the voluntaryist message that all this activity is directed more towards winning over the support of the American electorate than actually selecting a president. According to voluntaryist theory, it really doesn't make any difference whether Mondale or Reagan wins; but it is important that the people get out and vote, thus expressing their approval of our government. A number of political scientists have written books about elections which emphasize that they are political institutions which provide one of the key elements of support for the modern State. This is one of the main messages of Benjamin Ginsberg's book, *THE CONSEQUENCES OF CONSENT: Elections, Citizen Control and Popular Acquiescence*.

Ginsberg's book is all the more interesting because its author knows nothing about voluntaryism, yet his general conclusions reinforce the voluntaryist critique of voting and libertarian electoral activity. As an objective analysis of the history, character and significance of democratic electoral institutions, *THE CONSEQUENCES OF CONSENT* demonstrates that "elections are among the principal mechanisms through which contemporary governments regulate and control mass political action and maintain their own power and authority." Elections play a fundamental part of any government's search for legitimacy. According to Ginsberg, elections preserve and insulate governmental power and enable the State to effectively control threats to its own position. Voting serves as a means of controlling mass political activity while at the same time mobilizing support for the regime.

Looking at electoral institutions historically, Ginsberg concludes that governments use elections as a means of preserving their power. Throughout much of the world's

history mass political disruptions and outbursts, such as riots and revolution, have been the real threats to government. Those in power finally realized that they could channel away potentially disruptive political activity by introducing formal means of controlling such mass protests. Elections enable governments to substitute institutional mechanisms for non-electoral sanctions (such as nonviolent resistance or revolutionary violence), which might otherwise be used by a disaffected public. Political party activity turns attention away from non-electoral strategies and forces those who oppose the government to operate by the government's own rules. This is why rulers have typically conceived routine mass participation in elections to be a form of co-optation that could potentially increase popular support and diminish opposition.

By gaining the voluntary participation of people in such processes, Ginsberg demonstrates how elections serve to substitute consent for coercion. No longer do governments have to depend on force as the foundation for State power. Since State systems require the consent and cooperation of their citizens, they place an important emphasis on elections and voting. When citizens start exerting their influence by less institutionally controlled means, the vote has usually been extended to them in an effort to curb their disorders. For example, one result of the disturbances created by the Civil Rights movement was an extension of the suffrage to disenfranchised Negroes in the South.

Ginsberg provides a ready array of answers as to why people vote. "Probably the most influential among the forces helping to channel participants into the electoral arena are law, civic education, and the party system." (p. 32) It is this latter, which we, as libertarians, need to specially analyze. Ginsberg contends that political parties "have been the principal agents responsible for giving citizens the motivation and incentive to actually vote. The use of party for this purpose by authoritarian regimes is, of course, well-known. But even in the American context, party has served the state as an instrument of voter mobilization." (p. 43) Probably few political anarchists would have the incentive to get out and vote were it not for the existence of Libertarian Party candidates.

Before the advent of elections, Ginsberg observes that there existed an adversary relation between the ruler and the regimes and those over whom they ruled. This law of inverse variation between the power of the people, on the one hand, and the government, on the other, assured that as governmental power grew, social power diminished, and vice versa, that as the people took more control over their own lives, governmental power lessened. What governments did - by co-opting its opposition - by getting

their peoples to accept and participate in electoral activity -- was to sever this restriction on their power. Elections allow state power to grow without diminishing the public's seeming capacity to influence it. Elections thus become a means by which the public believes that it controls the State, when in fact, it is the State which directs the electoral process. Voters are only allowed to select leaders; they never vote on actual policy. They are only allowed to express their influence at election times, which occur infrequently. Elections limit to occasional voting what otherwise might amount to direct public intervention. Ginsberg states that democratic elections may well lessen the potential for popular influence upon government, rather than strengthening it, contrary to what governments would have us believe.

In a very important discussion of "mass participation as a source of national authority" (Chapter 5), Ginsberg refers to elections and electoral activity as legitimizing institutions. The act of voting helps convince citizens that the regime and its leaders merit their support. By involving the populace in the process of voting, government attempts to impose upon those same citizens a share of the responsibility for its subsequent policies. Regardless of whether they approve or disapprove of government policies, these citizens are more likely to support (rather than reject) officials and policies for which they can be said to be partially responsible. Thus, the simple event of an election appears to evoke positive responses towards the government which sponsors it.

Political campaigns are designed to sustain and reinforce the legitimacy of the State. This propensity to respond positively to the occurrence of an election Ginsberg calls the "democratic coronation effect". It is instilled in us during our years of public schooling. Ginsberg goes to some lengths to show that those less exposed to governmental schooling do not actually respond as favorably to electoral propaganda as those who have gone through years of civics education.

"This capacity of electoral institutions to enhance popular support and to strengthen the public's belief in its government's responsiveness is potentially quite important." (p. 182) Ginsberg highlights this when he examines the effect of electoral participation upon the State's capacity to extract resources from its citizens. In the United States, he observes, little actual force is needed to collect taxes. "America's tax system relies to a greater extent than that of most nations upon its citizens' willingness to honestly report their incomes. ... By contributing to a popular belief in governmental responsiveness, democratic elections can also contribute to the government's capacity to extract taxes and services with a minimum of force. Electoral participation, in

other words, may at least help to partially substitute popular consent for coercion as the basis for the state's capacity to govern." (pp. 183-184) People seem more willing to pay their taxes to a government which they believe allows them input into its decision-making processes.

Historically, governments have realized that there are only two ways they can sustain their power: either through consent or coercion. Since constant coercion is both expensive and engenders resistance, the State has focused on encouraging popular cooperation. Between the 15th and 18th Centuries, the questions of how to deal with popular resistance to taxation and conscription were among the chief preoccupations of European rulers. The introduction of democratic elections was one way of inducing citizens to contribute with a minimum of compulsion what the State might not have been able to take by force alone. Hence, elections and voting were one of the means by which governments moved from stages of pre-legitimacy to legitimacy.

Ginsberg shows how the popular selection of individuals for a particular office can help protect the authority of the regime - by channeling mass discontent and dissatisfaction away from government processes and institutional arrangements. The electoral vulnerability of the individual in office acts as a "safety valve" for the regime -- with the same sort of diversionary effect that monarchs sought to create by dismissing and blaming ministers for shortcomings of the regime. In the 20th Century democracies, officials can be disposed of without significant changes in the statist system. Nearly all Americans embrace the idea that what we need is the right man in office. Despite Vietnam and Watergate, we see the resilience of the idea that electoral participation means popular control over government. Even political anarchists believe that all we need is libertarians in office. This ensures us of what Ginsberg calls "the persistence of the fundamental electoral dilemma" -- the public's very belief in the possibility of such control enhances the State's power and authority and its capacity to control its citizens.

Ginsberg believes this "myth of democratic control" is fostered by governments since it enables us to simultaneously reconcile the loss of individual liberty with the expansion of governmental authority. Democratic institutions encourage citizens to believe that they can have both freedom and government, however illogical this belief may be. As Ginsberg points out, this myth is designed to assure us that governments will continue to govern. Elections and electoral activity play a very significant part in this. For example, Ginsberg writes in his "Epilogue" that "in the United States the introduction of democratic institutions, as well as the

adoption of formal constitutional guarantees of civil liberties, was prompted by the fact that the citizenry was free -- born free ... and had the capacity to remain so." The adoption of democratic governmental forms was urged by at least some of the Founding Fathers on the basis that the populace would otherwise refuse to accept the new government. "In effect, the public had to be persuaded to permit itself to be governed because it was, in fact, free to choose otherwise. Given especially the absence of national military forces and the virtual universal distribution of firearms and training in their use, the populace could not easily have been compelled to accept a government it did not desire." (pp. 245-246) When governments lack the military power or coercion to ensure their rule, their interest in obtaining their subjects' voluntary compliance is greatly increased. It is at this juncture that governments turn to elections and democratic institutions as a means of establishing and sustaining their legitimacy.

Any reader of this review will realize the import of Ginsberg's thesis for the arguments of The Voluntarists. Governments must have legitimacy if they are to exist for any length of time and electoral processes are the primary means by which modern governments survive. It is not a question of who or what is voted for, but rather the mere fact of voting which is important to the regime. This book gives truth to the voluntarist claim that voting and electoral activity reinforce governmental legitimacy, as nearly no other book can.

Postscript.

This review was sent to Professor Ginsberg in 1982 and his brief response of 22 November 1982 was as follows:

"Thank you very much for the very perceptive review of my book. I wish I had thought to use the Libertarian Party as one of the examples of the electoral myth in the United States. Here, after all, are individuals who profess to abhor the state yet continue to believe in the importance of participation in the processes used to staff the state's offices."

QUOTABLE

Bad laws therefore should not be swept away by new laws, but be suffered to fall into desuetude, which is for all parties a gradual and safe extinction of evil. The reform of laws, which it is not desirable to promote, is not to introduce a body of new enactments, but to bring legislation into contempt. Thomas Hodgskin, *THE NATURAL AND ARTIFICIAL RIGHT OF PROPERTY CONTRASTED* (1832), p. 123.

SPEAK UP! STAND UP!

The following speech was delivered by Paul Jacob via video tape at the Libertarianism and War Conference in Los Angeles, March 31-April 1, 1984. The conference was sponsored by The Voluntarists, the Society for Libertarian Life, and others. Parts of the speech have been changed or deleted for written publication.

Today, I want to talk about building a peace movement -- a peace movement composed of individuals in action. These are two things that individuals must do to build this movement: we must speak up and we must stand up.

Over three years ago at a protest in front of the U.S. Post Office in Little Rock, Arkansas, a reporter asked me what I thought about the threat of prosecution for resisting the draft. I responded that I felt the government would use the penalty mainly to silence dissent. I was right on target. Unfortunately, the government has been very successful in silencing opposition by prosecuting only those who use their freedom of speech to argue against the military draft.

For example, hundreds of thousands of young men who quietly resisted registration are under no real threat of prosecution, but Ed Hasbrouck, who spoke his conscience, sits today in the silence of a federal prison cell. And yes, "Paul Jacob Is Free" -- I've traveled from New York to California, Chicago to New Orleans and I've had a good time being free -- but the government has had far too much success in removing my voice from the high schools and colleges of my home state. And not long ago, I called a government-licensed and regulated radio station in Arkansas to voice my outrage at the Grenada invasion but was later pulled off the air because my remarks were not "patriotic" enough.

Many of us resisting the draft have tried to vocally reach out to educate those around us while the government has tried with the highest priority to silence us. Why? Because the men who control the State know they cannot conscript us to be cannon fodder, they cannot make offensive war against peaceful countries, unless the mass of people are ignorant of the true realities and the terrible consequences of such actions. And ignorance cannot long exist without an enforced silence.

More than anything, we must realize this: that the overwhelming majority of Americans are not evil, vicious war-mongers waiting for a chance to attack foreign countries. Americans, like all people, honestly and sincerely want peace. Why else would the Reagan administration be forced to use so much Orwellian doublethink? Invasions are called "rescue missions," first strike nuclear weapons like the MX are called "peacekeepers," and world

militarism is called "national defense," all because people want peace and thus to sell them on war it must be packaged like peace and advertised as peace.

I know that draft registration is a major, important issue. At issue is whether or not young men will participate in a program of slavery to further a clear policy of military aggression. Daniel Webster said long ago, "the question is nothing less than whether the most essential rights of personal liberty shall be surrendered and despotism embraced in its worst form." This is no less true because the government after past brutality must proceed cautiously with conscription by first 'testing the waters' with registration. Registration is an important step toward the ability of the government to militarize this country and, although the 'boob tube' won't point this out, we must.

Those in power would be very happy to have us ignore the link between the thousands who registered, were drafted, and died on foreign battlefields in the past, and the present registration program, military build-up and acts of war. I can't forget the words of General Wickham of the Joint Chiefs when he said recently in praise of today's soldiers, "they follow orders and they die."

Take away the weapons of war and men who are war-like will continue in violence even if they must kill with rocks, sticks, or their bare hands, but convince them to live in peace and reject aggression and all the weapons in the world will be made harmless. I'm not being naïve here, I just want to emphasize that we must not get lost in fighting this weapon or that one and lose sight of the people who stand behind the weapons. People make war and people can make peace.

I believe in education. I hope to be as vocal as possible to thus educate people. I ask you to go out and speak up at work, at home, anywhere and everywhere. We must end the silence and fight ignorance. Yet, I don't believe words will be enough -- we've got to act. We can't merely point the way, we've got to lead the way.

As Thoreau said, "How can a man be satisfied to entertain an opinion merely, and enjoy it? Is there any enjoyment in it, if his opinion is that he is aggrieved?" He went on to say, "Action from principle, the perception and performance of right changes things,...It is essentially revolutionary." If we act, then we can change our world.

If the peace movement could one day convince a majority of Americans that conscription, intervention and war are wrong, but fails to show them how to act on those convictions and thus stop these things, then what will we accomplish? The militarism would continue. The late Ayn

Rand wrote in 1967 a very powerful indictment of the draft called "The Wreckage of the Consensus". She ended the article, however, with the following note, "All of us are forced to comply with many laws that violate our rights, but so long as we advocate the repeal of such laws our compliance does not constitute sanction. Unjust laws must be fought ideologically; they cannot be fought or corrected by means of mere disobedience or futile martyrdom." (Emphasis ours.)

Urging an end to the draft and war, does not justify killing and maiming innocent people in that war. No. And history doesn't look favorably on her assertion that the draft cannot be fought physically but only intellectually. I ask you, was it Ms. Rand's ideological barbs that ended the Vietnam War or rather was it the thousands of young men who put themselves on the line by breaking the law and denying their consent to the government that played the major role in stopping the bloodshed? It was resistance, not Rand.

Thoreau said it before me, "cast your whole vote, not a strip of paper merely, but your whole influence. A minority is powerless while it conforms to the majority... but it is irresistible when it clogs by its whole weight."

We have power as individuals if we have guts enough to use it. There are those who feel we will offend people or frighten them unless we obey the law. They want us to obey the law and then work to change it. I say what is right must come before what is legal. Again listen to Thoreau, "Must the citizen ever for a moment, or in the least degree resign his conscience to the legislator? Why has every man a conscience then? I think that we should be men first and subjects afterwards." (Personally, I've found that if one tries to be a man first, it leaves no time to be a subject afterward.)

Others, in the role of apologist for the status quo, point out legal channels. Again, we can't wait forever on these "proper channels." Thoreau said these channels "take too much time and a man's life will be gone." Well, not only will our lives be used up in pleading and petitioning the government, but what about the innocent people in these foreign countries today threatened by U.S. militarism? How many of their lives "will be gone" -- taken from them? No, we can't wait. We have to act.

Those of use who know that the draft is slavery cannot register for it. We who know that war is unjustified large-scale murder must not carry a rifle in it. When we see our taxes go for torture and tyranny we must not pay them. I not only ask you to speak up and teach your principles, but also to stand up and live by them.

We can change our neighbors with words but even more so with examples. Educate, but don't fail to act. Life is short and we can't wait for freedom to be handed to us, for peace to fall from a tree, for that elusive majority of one to show up on our doorstep. We must now individually speak up and stand up.

Believe me, I know that speaking out and resisting injustice have their risks, and remember, so do silence and obedience.

It may seem that I'm asking an awful lot; asking you to teach, to build, to fight, to do all things necessary for peace and freedom to survive and flourish in America and in the world. I am. I cry out to you in the words of Thomas Paine, "O! Ye that love mankind! Freedom hath been hunted 'round the globe! O! receive the fugitive and prepare in time an asylum for mankind."

The Voluntaryist

P.O. Box 5836 • Baltimore, Maryland 21208

FIRST CLASS — TIME VALUE