
The Voluntaryist

WHOLE NUMBER 25

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

APRIL 1987

Thinkers and Groups of Individuals Who Have Contributed Significant Ideas or Major Written Materials To The Radical Libertarian Tradition

By Carl Watner

PRE-17TH CENTURY

FIRST SAMUEL OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE PRE-MONARCHIC ERA OF THE HEBREWS (circa 1300 B. C. - 1000 B. C.):

The Old Testament provides the accumulated wisdom of the ancient Hebrews and lays forth the foundations for social harmony and abundance based on personal integrity and honesty in the marketplace. Judaic monotheism emphasized self-control as the responsibility of each individual and the basic guidelines for social life were set forth in the Ten Commandments and precepts of the Noahide Law. The Twelve Tribes had no centralized State or kingship for over 200 years until they clamored for the selection of a King. Samuel, their seer, warned (see 1 Samuel 8) against the State, predicting that the kingship would bring conscription, taxation, eminent domain, and war.

ZENO (342-270 B. C.) and THE STOICS:

Zeno brought the Hebraic attitudes to the Greeks: that man should strive to cultivate the moral life and that, relatively speaking, worldly success was far less important than personal integrity and truth-seeking. When Zeno died it was noted that "He made his life a pattern to all, for he followed his own teaching." The Stoics emphasize the supreme goal of character building as the essential step for human happiness and as the prerequisite of a progressing civilization. Cicero (106-143 B.C.) in his *DE RE PUBLICA* (III, 22) set forth the idea of a higher law of eternal justice which is superior to the statutes and decrees of the State. The law is not made by man but is a product of the natural order of things and discoverable by reason. "To invalidate this law by human legislation is never morally right, nor is it permissible to restrict its operation, and to annul it wholly is impossible. Neither the senate nor the people can absolve us from our obligation to obey this law, ... It will not lay down one rule at Rome and another at Athens, ... But there will be one law, eternal and unchangeable, binding at all times upon all peoples: ..."

SARACENIC CIVILIZATION (circa 600-1400):

During the European Middle and Dark Ages, the flame of freedom was kept alive in the Middle East and Iberian peninsula by the Mohammedans. See the comments of Rose Wilder Lane in *THE DISCOVERY OF FREEDOM*.

FRANCISCO DE VITORIA (1483?-1546), BARTOLOME DE LAS CASAS (1474-1566):

These Spanish theological-jurists elucidated a proprietary theory of justice by which they denounced the violent invasion and conquest of the New World and supported the rights of the native inhabitants. Without exception they defended the doctrine that "all mankind is one" and that all men are equally free on the basis of natural law.

ETIENNE DE LA BOETIE (1530-1563):

La Boetie was a Frenchman who wrote *THE DISCOURSE ON VOLUNTARY SERVITUDE* (written circa 1550). He was one of the first to

elaborate the voluntaryist insight—that the State depends on the sanction of its victims, that the State depends on the tacit consent and cooperation of its citizens. He called for non-violent resistance, not political or military action, to topple the regime in power.

THE SEPARATISTS (circa 1608-1623):

The Separatists believed that the lesser of two evils was still evil and risked not only their lives, but those of their wives and children in migrating to new lands in search of liberty. They also proved to themselves that communism was an unworkable "vain conceit" of Plato by offering one of the only comparative and historical examples of where communism and then private ownership were practiced by the same people in the same place with the same resources. Only a system of private ownership allowed them to survive.

JOHN LILBURNE (1614-1657) and RICHARD OVERTON (circa 1620-1663):

These were the best known of the English Levellers during the English Civil War, circa 1640-1650. They based their initial support of Cromwell and the regicide of Charles I on English common law and the natural rights of the individual; but later opposed Cromwellian rule because they recognized that nothing had changed. Lilburne was known as "Freeborn John" and was more responsible than any other person in English history for establishing the right to remain silent before one's accusers.

JOHN LOCKE (1632-1704), ALGERNON SIDNEY (1622-1683), and WILLIAM MOLYNEUX (1656-1698):

Locke and Sidney epitomize the emergence of the radical Whigs in England. Authors of *TWO TREATIES ON GOVERNMENT* (1685) and *DISCOURSES CONCERNING GOVERNMENT* (1682), respectively, they began to elaborate proprietary theories of justice based on the self-ownership and homesteading axioms. Sidney lost his life under a charge of treason wherein he was accused of supporting the lawfulness of resistance to oppression. Locke's theories argued strongly for government resting on "consent of the governed." Molyneux, an Irishman and a friend of Locke, insisted on a literal interpretation of Locke's ideas on consent of the governed and proprietary justice. "To tax me without consent, is little better, if at all, than downright robbing me." (*THE CASE OF IRELAND'S BEING BOUND BY ACTS OF PARLIAMENT IN ENGLAND*, 1698.)

1700's

ADAM SMITH (1723-1790):

Smith was a leading representative of the Scottish enlightenment thinkers and author of *INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE AND CAUSES OF THE WEALTH OF NATIONS* (1776), which worked out some of the earliest theories of the free market and the natural system of liberty.

THOMAS JEFFERSON (1743-1826) and THOMAS PAINE (1737-1809):

These men represent the Freedom Philosophy of 1776, marked by the opening statement of *The Declaration of Independence*: all men are endowed with "certain unalienable rights" and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Paine, particularly, represents the view that the State is an enemy of freedom and an instrument of tyranny and oppression, as opposed to those who consider the State as indispensable to individual liberty because of its capacity to establish "law and order."

Continued On Page 7

The Voluntaryist

Editor: Carl Watner

Subscription Information

Published bi-monthly by **The Voluntaryists**, P. O. Box 1275, Gramling, SC 29348. Subscriptions are \$15 for 6 issues. Overseas subscriptions, please add \$5 (per year) for extra postage. Please check the number on your mailing label to see when you should renew. *No reminders will be sent!* Back issues \$3 each.

Potpourri From The Editor's Desk

1. "Help and Respond"

In Issue 22 of THE VOLUNTARYIST I asked for assistance. I solicited written submissions, as well as gift subscriptions to help broaden our subscriber base. While we are always in need of more first-class articles, the response has been gratifying. Charles Curley has been writing his column of "Voluntary Musings" and I look forward to more. Another subscriber was generous enough to provide \$750 for 50 "unique" gift subscriptions to THE VOLUNTARYIST. In a special twist, the donor asked that THE VOLUNTARYIST go out to the chief executives of the 50 bottom-most companies on the FORTUNE 500 list; his theory being that the executives of the 50 top companies are deluged with mail.

I'd like to thank everyone that responded in one form or another, and would again like to urge readers to submit articles, letters to the editors, cartoons for inclusion here. Please don't forget that another way to support THE VOLUNTARYIST is through the purchase of our literature. We have several books for sale, including THE POLITICS OF OBEDIENCE, A VOLUNTARY POLITICAL GOVERNMENT, DOCUMENT ON THE USE OF SILENCE, NEITHER BULLETS NOR BALLOTS and a new booklet on the contributions of businessmen to civilization. Write me for details.

2. "It's my property. I'm paying taxes on it."

The February issue of REASON Magazine cites (p. 14) a Liebenthal, Kansas woman who opposed compulsory sewer hook up. In defense of her refusal to abandon her outdoor privy, she claimed the privy was her private property and that she was paying taxes on it. It seems inconceivable to me that any property owner would defend their right of ownership by referring to the fact that they pay taxes on it. Doesn't the women understand that taxation is a violation of property rights and that private property can and does exist independently of State definition? The very fact that she is paying taxes on it is evidence that the privy is NOT hers. If she truly owned the privy she wouldn't be paying any taxes on it! This is a perfect example of how people have been brainwashed and don't understand property rights.

3. BENJAMIN R. TUCKER AND THE CHAMPIONS OF LIBERTY: A CENTENARY ANTHOLOGY

Michael E. Coughlin, Printer and Publisher (1985 Selby Avenue, St. Paul, Minn. 55104) announces completion of a centennial volume of essays honoring the 100th anniversary of the publication of LIBERTY. Your editor has contributed a chapter to the book. My essay is titled "The English Individualist as They Appear in LIBERTY." Contact the publisher for ordering information.

4. "There are no effective ... constraints on the monetary powers of the ... United States."

In an article I didn't discover until after I had penned "Hard Money in the Voluntaryist Tradition" (Issue 23), author Steven

Green analyzes "The Abrogation of Gold Clauses in 1933 and Its Relation to Current Controversies in Monetary Economics" (of all the places to be published: ECONOMIC REVIEW of the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, July 1986). Professor Green concludes that "By confiscating private gold holdings, the government put itself in a position to realize an economic capital gain (almost \$3 billion) from the devaluation and deny that capital gain to private gold owners. ... The gold clause episode strongly suggests that there are no effective constitutional constraints on the monetary powers of the federal government in the United States. ... The direct implication of this episode was that private agents could not protect the value of contractual payments from changes in the value of monetary unit by contracting in terms of gold."

"More generally, this episode firmly established that the contracts of private citizens either with each other or with the government, cannot be written in such a way as to absolutely preclude subsequent governmental interference with their execution. Contracts cannot inhibit what is deemed by the Supreme Court to be legitimate exercise of a constitutional power by the federal government and the interpretation of what is 'legitimate' obviously can change over time. Conceivably any contract could eventually be deemed to be at odds with the Supreme Court's prevailing notion of the public interest, and rational individuals should take this uncertainty into account when signing agreements."

Again, so much for living in the land "of the free."

5. "Is this advocating statism or not?"

In his essay, "The Case for a Genuine Gold Collar" (Llewellyn Rockwell and Leland Yeager, eds., THE GOLD STANDARD—An Austrian Perspective, Lexington: Lexington Books, 1985) Murray Rothbard claims that the objection to governmental redefinition of gold's value is "equivalent to complaining about the government's repealing its own price controls because repeal would constitute a governmental rather than a private action. A similar charge could be leveled at a government's denationalizing any product or operation. **It is not advocating statism to call for the government's repeal of its own interventions.**" (p. 9, emphasis added)

As I argued in Issue 17 ("Button Pushing or Abdication: Which?), wrong means will never lead toward the right end. To call for the passage of any governmental legislation is to advocate statism and reinforces the idea that governments have the power to rule over us. Voluntaryists advocate a "thorough and uncompromising disrespect for government and its laws. We should tell people, in no uncertain terms, that the decrees of government have no moral legitimacy whatever—that they are on par with decrees of the mafia." We must tell people that they have property rights regardless of what the government legislates. We wish people to look elsewhere than government for their freedom. They must come to look at the government with contemptuous indifference. This, rather than calling upon governments to dissolve themselves, is what voluntaryists call for.

6. "The Best of the Worst"

The December 15th, 1986 issue of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL offered the following "notable bloopers from the past, culled from business historians." Suppose any one of the businessmen in charge of these disastrous projects had been planners in a centralized economy. They could have coercively pushed their projects onto the public, regardless of the public's desires. In the absence of competition and free market prices, there is no way to tell how successful a project is nor to fortell what successful projects were never started because of centralization.

1917 BANKS AND BONDS

First National City Bank of New York opens its first office in Moscow one week after the October Revolution. Convinced that the Bolshevik uprising is a flash in the pan, the bank plunges heavily into Czarist bonds.

1921 A BETTER IDEA

Ford Motor Co. decides not to mess with success; it

refuses to update the Model T. General Motors, meanwhile introduces new models tailored to different economic levels and aesthetic tastes. GM triples its market share in three years and drives off with dominance of the industry, a dominance it has held since.

1945 PRICE OF PESSIMISM

Montgomery Ward forecasters predict a crushing recession after World War II and the big chain decides not to expand. Sears Roebuck & Co. planners, using their crystal ball, go the other way. Where did America wind up shopping?

1952 WHAT DOES JAPAN KNOW?

U. S. Steel Corp opens its huge new Fairless Hills steel works. Confident that the open hearth furnace will be as efficient as the new oxygen furnaces being installed by upstart European and Japanese steelmakers, U. S. Steel plows some \$500 million into the old technology.

1957 ANOTHER BETTER IDEA

Ford Motor Co. comes back. It starts production on the Edsel.

1964 AT LEAST THEY SHINE

DuPont Co., seized by a spasm of uncontrollable optimism, introduces Corfam, a synthetic leather the company spent some \$100 million developing. DuPont claims it will "do for shoes what nylon did for stockings."

7. On Revolutions

In a new book by John Galt, *DREAMS COME DUE*, Government and Economics as if Freedom Mattered (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986, \$17.95) there are a number of interesting quotations and comments. One about "revolution" reinforced the conclusions arrived at in my article, "A Plague on Both Your Houses" (Issue 21). Galt writes that "the lesson of history is that the government that springs from a revolution will invariably be worse than the one it replaced. Revolutions cannot and will not ever alter human nature. ... The examples of the perverse nature of violent revolutions are well documented. ... The cry of the French Revolution was 'Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity!' They got Robespierre and the guillotine. The Russian peasants wanted to be rid of the evil Czar. They got the communists and mass starvation."

He then goes on to dispute the claim that the American Revolution was somehow the great exception to this rule. "It was not," he says, noting that "the first American revolutionaries were, in fact, rebelling against a level of taxation and regulation that would some nonexistent in our current environment."

Then he quotes from H. L. Mencken's essay (On Government).

Politics, as hopeful men practice it in the world, consists, mainly of the delusion that a change in form is a change in substance. The American colonists, when they got rid of the Potsdam tyrant (George III), believed fondly that they were getting rid of oppressive taxes forever and setting up complete liberty. They found almost instantly that taxes were higher than ever and before many years were writhing under the Alien and Sedition Acts.

8. "On the true value of paper money"

From the dust jacket of Galt's *DREAMS COME DUE* is this statement: "Paper has a current intrinsic value of eighty dollars per ton no matter how many zeroes are printed on it!"

9. "The Natural Laws of Economics"

Galt lists ten points, very similar to "The Ten Pillars of Economic Wisdom" printed in our last issue. Two additional laws mentioned by Galt are: "What a government taxes, such as work, savings and investment, it gets less of. What a government subsidizes, such as unemployment, debt, consumption, it gets more of." And "Debt is always paid, if not by the borrower then by the lender."

10. More quotes from H. L. Mencken:

"The government consists of a gang of men exactly like you and me. They have, taking one with another, no special talent for the business of government. They have only talent for getting and holding office. Their principal device to that end is to search out groups who pant and pine for something they can't get and promise to give it to them. Nine times out of ten that promise is worth nothing. The tenth time it is made good only by looting A to satisfy B. In other words, government is a broker in pillage and every election is a sort of an advance auction sale of stolen goods.

At each election we vote in a new set of politicians, insanely assuming that they are better than the set turned out. And at each election we are, as they say in Motherland, done in."

And another:

"The deduction I propose to make from it is simply this: that a like increase would follow if the American people could only rid themselves of another and worse false assumption that still rides them—one that corrupts all their thinking about the great business of politics, and vastly augments their discontent and unhappiness—the assumption, that is, that politicians are divided into two classes, and that one of those classes is made up of good ones. I need not argue, I hope, that this assumption is almost universally held among us. Our whole politics, indeed, is based upon it, and has been based upon it since the earliest days. What is any political campaign save a concerted effort to turn out a set of politicians who are admittedly bad and put in a set who are thought to be better? The former assumption, I believe, is always sound; the latter is just as certainly false. For if experience teaches us anything at all it teaches us this: that a good politician, under democracy, is quite as unthinkable as an honest burglar. His very existence, indeed, is a standing subversion of the public good in every rational sense. He is not one who serves the common weal; he is simply one who preys upon the commonwealth. It is to the interest of all the rest of us to hold down his powers to an irreducible minimum, and to reduce his compensation to nothing; it is to his interest to augment his powers at all hazards, and to make his compensation all the traffic will bear. To argue that these aims are identical is to argue palpable nonsense. The politician, at his ideal best, never even remotely approximated in practice, is a necessary evil; at his worst he is an almost intolerable nuisance."

11. Follow what you think is right

"It is better to fail in attempting to do what you know to be right, and then to admit your failure frankly, then to succeed by way of a speciously argued compromise. At any end and every stage of the ascent of the ladder of becoming there is always that which is at that stage definitely right and that which is definitely wrong. Then, follow the right unswervingly, at whatever cost to the personality, and whatever the ignorant may think or say. There is no shame in failure save in the failure to attempt and it is better to fail a thousand times in an attempt to achieve a clearly perceived idea than to succeed in a poor, dishonest compromise." [Christian Humphreys, *CONCENTRATION AND MEDITATION*, Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1974, p. 129]

12. "It Is the Law"

Live Cleanly
Eat Wisely
Sleep Adequately
Exercise Regularly
Study Methodically
Save Systematically
Invest Judiciously

So, and only so, may you attain health, wealth and wisdom; if you have them not or retain them if you have them now.

No exceptions can, or will, occur. No half-way measures will suffice. No intentions however good, will compensate. None but those who obey these dictates may live - happily. The rest must fail in one way or another.

Continued On Page 8

Beyond The First Amendment

By Carl Watner

Freedom of the press was constitutionally recognized in the United States in 1791, with the passage of the First Amendment to the Constitution ("Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech or press"). Nevertheless, since then, there has been a continual struggle between the power of the State and those desirous of maintaining freedom of speech. In 1798, seven years after the First Amendment's ratification, the Alien and Sedition Laws mandated punishment for printed or oral publications that promoted resistance to the federal government. The idea of postal censorship originated in 1835, when Southern lawmakers attempted to forbid the mailing of abolitionist newspapers into the South. During the Civil War certain newspaper offices in Missouri, Chicago and New York City were actually seized by Northern troops and issues of papers suppressed. After the United States entered World War I, another Sedition Act was passed with the result that the government more widely interfered with the press than at any other time in American history.

Why has the American government found it impossible to respect freedom of the press? To answer this question is to go far beyond the First Amendment, because the answer is bound up in the basic issue of how all States govern. Nikolai Lenin hinted at the answer to this question, in a speech he delivered in Moscow in 1920:

Why should freedom of speech and freedom of the press be allowed? Why should a government which is doing what it believes to be right allow itself to be criticized? It would not allow opposition by lethal weapons. **Ideas are much more fatal things than guns.** Why should any man be allowed to buy a printing press and disseminate pernicious opinions calculated to embarrass the government? (emphasis added)

Lenin pointed out that ideas are more lethal than weapons, and it is upon this insight that all political control is based. State hegemony and the ability to command obedience actually grow out of ideas. It is ideology which causes most people to obey. That is why governments are so concerned about the unrestricted exposure of their people to a wide variety of ideas, particularly if those ideas question its legitimacy. It would be suicide for a State to stand idle while it was being criticized and its power base was being undercut. If the State is to remain in control, it can never reconcile itself to unrestrained freedom of the press. Whether the State is trying to retain its legitimacy or fight for its life, as in time of war, it must stifle, curtail or prohibit criticism and opposition. It does so by infringing on freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

In the struggle between State power and individual liberty, when the supporters of freedom have achieved the upper hand, they have usually depended on constitutions and bills of rights to preserve their freedom of speech and of the press. Yet, regardless how carefully constitutions have been written or rights formulated, this method of protection has never proved successful in the long run. What the supporters of government have forgotten is that there is no such thing as "limited government." The men who wrote the Declaration of Independence knew that all States have a propensity to tyrannize, but they didn't realize that written documents could never guarantee freedom. It has never been possible to create an institution of State power and then limit the exercise of its powers in any meaningful way.

Nevertheless, the addition of the Bill of Rights to the U. S. Constitution was an attempt to alert the people to the fact that their rights emanated from a source higher than the government itself. This was plainly set forth in the Ninth Amendment. The enumeration of certain specific rights in the first eight Amendments was not intended to disparage other rights retained by the people. Although the Fourth Amendment called for the security of the people in their homes and belongings, nowhere was the principle of private property embraced. Logically it was impossible for the Bill of Rights or Constitution to honor private property rights because, if private property were consistently respected, the government

would not have had the power to tax or exercise eminent domain (both being the power to take private property without the owner's consent). If the principle of private property were upheld, a government could not infringe on any property rights.

Few supporters of freedom of the press have realized that they have never addressed the principal issue. They are in company with the original advocates of the Bill of Rights, who failed to appreciate that the only dependable foundation of freedom is in the security of property rights. The question is not freedom of the press, but to what extent the State respects property and property rights. Freedom of the press means the right to own newsprint, ink, printing presses, radio and television broadcast equipment, and the buildings to house them; the right to express one's own ideas or the ideas of the people one hires, and the right to transport, distribute, and sell one's intellectual product. Every newspaper, book publisher, TV or radio station is a private enterprise, the property of an owner who is selling a manufactured product at his or her own risk.

The importance of property rights in underpinning and explaining freedom of the press is seen when it is considered how easily that freedom can be regulated or taxed out of existence. Zoning, licensing, taxing and censorship are some of the various forms that restrictions on private property in the press and media have taken. When the State examines books, plays, news reports, newspapers, motion pictures and radio programs with the purpose of suppressing those parts deemed objectionable, it is engaging in censorship. The State does not rightfully own the media with which it is interfering, and therefore should have no control over its content or dissemination. On the other hand, when private citizens or groups refuse to purchase, watch or read any particular medium, they are not practicing censorship. They are not telling the owner what he or she may display, print or offer for sale. Nor are they preventing third parties from making purchases. Every consumer has just as much right to select what he or she reads or views as to select what he or she shall buy in the market place.

Freedom of the press is simply a subset of the right of property, of the right of the creator to "express" himself by creating the product of his or her choice. The right of the creator is the right of the manufacturer, advertiser, book author, newspaper publisher, or any other productive person. Each is expressing him or her self without violating the rights of another property owner. Each creator's and productive person's right is just as important as the next. Therefore, to single out freedom of the press for special treatment is to obfuscate the basis upon which that particular freedom is based.

Viewing freedom of the press as a total property right allows it to accommodate itself to technological advances in the expression of opinion. The endless debates as to whether and how the First Amendment applies to radio and television would become instantly clear if property rights were respected in those spectrums. If broadcast frequencies were privately owned, rather than being operated under government license, then it would be apparent that each frequency owner and station owner would have the right to express whatever opinions he or she wished. The government would not be able to censor content or demand a certain amount of public programming time.

The proposed ban on cigarette advertising now before Congress is not so much an infringement on freedom of the press, as a violation of property rights: a violation of rights of those who would manufacture and then advertise their wares, as well as a violation of the rights of those who would run the advertisements. If cigarette advertising can be prohibited, then—by consistency and logic—all advertising can be outlawed. Where is the line to be drawn? If one type of ad can be banned, then all advertising can be banned at the pleasure of the legislature.

In a free society each person should be able to exercise his or her rights of property in any non-invasive way that he or she chooses. No person should be criminally punished for any utterance, no matter how offensive or dangerous its tendency, provided it is not connected with any act of invasion or material injury. If the contrary doctrine—that a man may be punished for the tendency of his expressions—is accepted, then it would only be necessary for the State to make some line of conduct criminal, as a justification for

Continued On Page 8

Voluntary Musings

A Column of Iconoclasm

By Charles Curley
"Nothing can defeat an idea
— except a better one."

— Eric Frank Russell

Reagan's Agricultural Policy The Reagan administration is missing a major bet in promoting its agricultural policies and its free market policies. The administration should be promoting a major agricultural sector which accepts no subsidies, doesn't lobby for tariff protection, and in general takes care of itself. Why aren't they using as an example of modern American free enterprise the pot growers?

Think about it. When was the last time you saw pot farmers circling the White House with their tractors demanding tariffs and subsidies? Loot at how few farmers get paid to **not** grow pot. Do you see the federal government putting pot farmers on a Payment in Kind programme?

The Reagan administration claims that the solutions to the current farm problems all involve reducing or eliminating government interference in the business. So you would think that they would be touting the one sector where people are making a living on small family farms as American heroes, veritable capitalist Stakhanovites. I mean, when was the last time Hollywood threw a concert to aid pot farmers? "Grass Roots?"

The Fairer Sex, Are They? "We British are used to women commanders in war." So cried Boudicca as she prepared a revolt against the Romans in 61 A. D. There's truth here. The British Empire was started under Elizabeth I. Her minister, Sir Frances Walsingham, started the British Secret Service. The Empire reached its height under Victoria, who reigned for over 75 years. And Britain may well have fought its last imperial battle under Queen Elizabeth II and her Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher. So much for gynolatrist prattle that the world would be safe if we only turn political power over to the women.

The Victims of the Sanctions It is quite common these days to deplore the horrors of apartheid, and your correspondent has written an issue paper for the Society of Individual Liberty on the subject of racism when it was Alabama, not South Africa, which was the home of the racial supremist. But in the current debate over South Africa, one must wonder if the cure is worse than the disease.

The first comment is that the U. S. has no business dictating to any nation how it shall conduct its affairs. Not to the South Africans, not to the Russians, not to the Cherokee.

That the United States should look with moral approbation on the South African policy toward South Africa's natives is the height of hypocrisy—and ignorance.

The hypocrisy may be found in the U. S. government's approach to American Indians in the 19th and 20th centuries. In the 19th, the American government consistently and regularly broke treaties, ravaged and pillaged the Americans and herded them on to reservations. In the 20th, it has forced onto the American Indians a cruel and insensate welfare state which has deprived them of honour and liberty and reduced them to supplicants on the steps of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Even the much vaunted War for Independence was started in part because the British prohibited the colonists from further encroachments on the Indian nations.

The ignorance of the American reproach may be found in the fact that the Afrikaners—unlike the Americans—were there first. In 1652, the Dutch East India Company started a self supporting victualing station at the Cape of Good Hope. Private farming was begun, and the settlers became "free burgers" by 1657. "Boer" in Dutch and Afrikaans means "farmer." For about 100 years, contact with blacks was minimal and fleeting as the few Bushmen withdrew before Voortrekker pioneers.

It wasn't until 1770 or so that northward moving Voortrekkers first had substantial contact with blacks, the Xhosa speaking tribes migrating southward. The two sets of migrations did not conflict.

The Blacks continued southward, and the whites veered more northward and westward. There were vast areas decimated by a black reign of terror, the "Mfecane." Into these areas the whites moved, establishing their own country. The first bloodshed was the killing of some 46 trekkers by Matabele warriors under Mzilikazi, the chief who had split that tribe off from the Zulu.

Trekkers under Peit Retief negotiated a treaty with the Zulu in 1838. Retief and his negotiators were killed in the Zulu camp. Two years later the Zulu king was deposed and his brother negotiated a new treaty with the Trekkers. This treaty established the Boer Afrikaaner republic, but it was annexed in four years by Britain. From 1806 until the Boer Wars, most of the fighting in South Africa was between the British Empire and the Trekkers or the British and the Zulus, in that order.

What are now the Black homelands are essentially the areas occupied by black tribes as they settled in South Africa at the same time the Afrikaners were also settling. In 1913, an Act of Parliament recognized some 8.9 million hectares of homelands, which were removed from white settlement. This area was expanded by some 70% in 1936. This area is some 13% of the total land area of South Africa, but does not include vast game reserves such as Kruger National Park. It does include a lot of the most fertile land in South Africa.

An additional hypocrisy comes in the failure of the American government to apply similar reproaches to the Soviet or Chinese governments. The Soviets require internal passports, work permits with geographic limitations, and other trappings of apartheid. Only they call it "Socialism," not "Separate Development." And the Soviet victims can vote for their oppressors.

No voluntaryist would accept or defend a government law on the subject of where one may work or live or own property. Such laws are execrable whether they are racial in basis or not. But to oppose a statute does not require that one endorse any old proposal against it that wanders through. Certainly a voluntaryist would abjure any proposed law on the subject.

All of that aside, what, if any, effect would the sanctions being imposed by western countries on South Africa have? The proposed sanctions are all variations on the same themes: reducing access to foreign currency, import restrictions and reduced access to foreign markets. In short, all the things which other countries elsewhere in Africa have had imposed on them by their own governments are to be imposed on South Africa by foreign governments.

Divestiture has to be the stupidest of the proposed sanctions. It is the foreign companies who have subscribed to the Sullivan Code and the EEC code of labour practice. These codes have moved blacks into positions of responsibility and authority, something that the local companies are unwilling to do. In fact the abolition of the pass laws will mean that more jobs for blacks will be needed in industry, not fewer. These jobs have been provided by the foreign investors such as Coca Cola—now gone.

Probably the countries which will be the most hurt by sanctions are the poor countries in southern Africa—Malawi, Zambia, Botswana and Mozambique. These countries all earn large amounts of their foreign exchange by exporting labour or raw material to South Africa, which must then resell the finished product to the rest of the world. Maputo, for example, might as well be considered part of South Africa for all of the cargo destined for Mozambique it receives.

Furthermore, any sanction that might actually be applied to South Africa will rapidly be ignored. False documentation may already be coming out of south African bureaucracies. For example, a mining machine destined for Zambia would have to pass through South African ports on its way. Would you like to bet on how many will get there?

South Africa has the best military south of the Sahara, in spite of an arms embargo of many years duration. For example, the new South African strike aircraft, the Cheetah, is a warmed-over Mirage F3, the result of secret deals between France, Israel and South Africa. Taiwan and South Korea have also been arms conduits to South Africa. Imagine the glee with which their merchants look forward to western sanctions.

Indeed, one beneficiary of the sanctions will be the corrupt and inefficient bureaucrats of African countries, who will find it personally very lucrative to overlook a few irregularities, and who can

be very efficient if there is money in it for them. These will occur, of course, in countries which overlooked a great number of irregularities during the Rhodesian sanctions. Remember them?

Meanwhile, South Africa is the richest country by far on the African continent, and stupid economic policies are causing famine and shortages in all of the front line states. That, coupled with the abolition of the pass laws, will make the South African cities the same sort of magnet that draws South Americans to Los Angeles and the American Southwest. There had better be jobs there for the immigrants when they get there, and if sanctions have any effect at all, they won't help.

Add to "hypocrisy" and "ignorance," "imbecility."

Ahem "Everything is negotiable except our freedom and our future," Ronald Reagan, after the Reykjavik Summit. Yeah, but is that a valid defense in tax court?

Oops, Comrade: Did you notice the fundamental error the Soviets made in the Daniloff affair? They snatched a journalist. The Soviets have snatched American diplomats before (and where is Raoul Wallenberg, while we're at it?), and have chivvied tourists with their paperwork and delays. But the press and White House, working in concert, got the Soviet Bear to disgorge its latest nibble awefully fast.

Quote: "Now, more than ever, private firms are essential for flying off the backlog and adding new capacity for future commercial satellite launches."

Elizabeth Dole
Secretary, Dept. of Transportation
18 August 1986

And it took the loss of seven lives and billions of taxpayer dollars

for them to notice.

The commercialisation of space has begun in the wake of the Challenger explosion, but it has a way to go. Martin Marietta has signed a contract with Federal Express to provide one Titan launch vehicle, and an option on another. The snag is the launch site.

There are currently two launch sites capable of taking a Titan vehicle, at Vandenberg AFB and Cape Canaveral. The Vandenberg site is useless for a geosynchronous launch because of the inclination of the launch track. This leaves Pad 40 at the Cape. This is also run by the Air Force, which has announced that it expects to launch up to six vehicles a year to meet military requirements. Civil Titan customers would have to compete with the Air Force for vehicle assembly, checkout and probably launch site facilities. Right.

Maybe there is an opportunity for a private commercial launch site. Matagordo Island, Texas, anyone?

Charles Curley is a former gold smuggler and founder of the National Committee for Monetary Reform. Mr. Curley now writes both software and books. His interests include ancient and modern history, chess, science fiction, space industrialisation and economics.

Mr. Curley was involved in politics from the 1964 campaign of Barry Goldwater until about 1972 or so, when he quit the Libertarian Party in disgust. He could say that he had quit the LP before most of its current membership had ever heard of the LP, but he won't. He has written speeches for major party Congressional candidates, and worked on local party organizations as well. He is no longer involved in politics, having better things to do, such as earning an honest living.

Mr. Curley is a native of New England, and flies the Gadsden Flag on Flag Day. An expatriate citizen of the Republic of Vermont, he now lives in the redwoods of Santa Cruz, California, where he expects his tomato patch to be raided by the Santa Cruz Air Force and the D.E.A. any day now.

The Inflation of Rights

By Sir Alfred Sherman

In this essay I wish to argue that the inflation of rights, in the sense of hypertrophy of claims on society that the state is responsible for levying, is inherently self-defeating. It is bound to generate conflicts of rights that will end by threatening social stability and freedom. ...

The lavish promise of rights beyond all possibility of fulfillment creates inflation of rights followed by defaults and devaluation of rights. It can no longer be taken for granted that the right to a decent home, education, safety, medical care, and so forth, will necessarily be honored. The more spent on education, housing, health, and social welfare, the worse conditions appear to be. People therefore feel deprived who would not have expected these rights in the first place had they not been promised.

Since there are limits to what the state can take in order to give, but none to what can be claimed from it, claims must increasingly exceed performance. Everyone ends by fighting the state for rights that can only be fulfilled at everyone else's expense. The war of every man against every man takes place through the state and therefore against the state. Hence the paradox that beyond a critical limit the more the state gives, the more it is hated. And since the state can give Peter only what it takes from Paul, it comes to be doubly hated as parsimonious giver and as prodigal taker.

Public opinion is becoming increasingly embittered against the state, whether for failing to provide what it is now believed should be provided, or for encouraging parasitism and diminishing rewards and incentives to effort. In traditional society, people are resigned to their lot. In a meritocratic society—whether merit be measured by commercial success, examinations or performance in a hierarchy—there is room for belief that distributive justice prevails, or that if it does not, it can be made to. But in a claimant society, all criteria dissolve. ...

As some intellectual underpinnings of society are eroded, others are exposed to doubt. As the welfare state comes increasingly to be questioned on both economic and ethical grounds in light of experience, the political system that gave rise to it is not escaping unquestioned. Throughout human history, the main shares in the social product have been political rents, and returns to productivi-

ty. For most of the time in most places, political rents have absorbed the greater share. Political rents can be returns to physical or spiritual coercion, or any combination of the two.

From the eighteenth century onwards, Britain and Western European society (including North American) were to be distinguished from almost all other known societies past and present by the decline in the share of the social product levied in the form of political rents by either physical or spiritual coercion. The heirs to the Whig Settlement, who shaped British thought for two centuries, took this phenomenon for granted. Their successors can no longer afford to do so.

While the share of rewards to productivity has declined in the claimant society, the political rentiers have not been the only ones with power to coerce. The unions, student mobs, and organized lumpenproletariat also exercise political influence. The new political rentiers are, for almost the first time in human history, those whose only powers of coercion have been freely given to them, the claimant electorate, composed increasingly of elderly people, unmarried mothers and unemployed, and workers whose jobs are technologically or economically obsolete—for example, miners, printers, shipbuilders, railwaymen—and who therefore can make little if any use of the strike weapon.

The productive classes and age groups find their share increasingly consumed by the non-productive and weak. So long as the decrease in their share was relative, thanks to economic expansion due to the inventiveness and initiative of a minority, the decline in relative return to effort was tolerated. But as the burdens generated by a claimancy on the part of both the welfariat and the parasitic sectors of the economy grow, and economic growth falters and is actually reversed, the rules of the game come to be questioned. ...

To recapitulate, our times have seen the postulation of new categories of what are called rights but which are in effect claims on society for material and other benefits. ... (T)hese claims can be met only by the state at the expense of other citizens. These claims thereby entail aggrandizing the state. But the hypertrophy of claimant rights at the inevitable expense of return to effort erodes criteria and expands demand beyond the possibility of fulfillment. The state become a battleground and comes to be blamed for all

Continued On Page 8

Thinkers and Groups of Individuals Who Have Contributed Significant Ideas or Major Written Materials To The Radical Libertarian Tradition

Continued From Page 1

GRANVILLE SHARP (1735-1813):

Sharp's life was inextricably bound up with seeking freedom for slaves in England. He was the primary mover behind establishing the doctrine that the common law writ of habeas corpus applied to slaves (thus preventing their masters from kidnapping and enslaving them). At the outbreak of the American Revolution, he gave up his job in the Government Ordnance Department in England because he sided with the rebels. He represents an important link in the historical chain of English liberty based on the common law.

1800's

CHARLES LANE (1800-1870):

Lane represents one of the few pre-Civil War abolitionists who eschewed electoral politics, as well as violence, in bringing about an end to slavery. His letters, *A VOLUNTARY POLITICAL GOVERNMENT*, (1843) influenced Henry David Thoreau (1817-1862) who believed that "that government is best which governs not at all." Thoreau, author of *ON THE DUTY OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE* (1848) recounts the night he spent in jail for failure to pay his taxes. His imprisonment and Lane's earlier arrest for failure to pay his taxes were probably the earliest examples of conscientious objection to taxation. Neither objected to how his taxes were being spent, but rather opposed the use of force and threat to enforce taxation, which they viewed as theft.

THOMAS HODGSKIN (1787-1869) and HERBERT SPENCER (1820-1903):

Hodgskin's *THE NATURAL AND ARTIFICIAL RIGHT OF PROPERTY CONTRASTED* (1832) presents some of the earliest 19th Century thinking to demonstrate that the State is not needed to define or protect property and property titles. He was an early opponent of State education and began writing for the laissez-faire newspaper, *THE ECONOMIST* in 1844, where he undoubtedly influenced Herbert Spencer, who was an assistant editor from 1846 to 1853. As a young man, Spencer had published *ON THE PROPER SPHERE OF GOVERNMENT* (1842-1843) and *SOCIAL STATICS* (1851). In the former he argued that if churches could exist by voluntary support, he saw no reason why the state could not; in the later he was advocated "the right to ignore the state."

FREDERIC BASTIAT (1801-1850) and GUSTAVE DE MOLINARI (1819-1912):

De Molinari and Bastiat exemplify the early to mid-19th Century French free market economists. Bastiat was author of the famous *THE LAW* (1850) in which he defines legal plunder by showing that "the law takes from some persons what belongs to them and gives it to other persons to whom it does not belong." Molinari was the first economist (1849) to suggest that all the legitimate services provided by the monopolistic State could be performed by competitive protection agencies on the free market.

LYSANDER SPOONER (1808-1887):

Spooner was probably the only constitutional lawyer in history who evolved into a non-State individualist. He authored *NO TREASON: THE CONSTITUTION OF NO AUTHORITY*, in which he points out that no office holder has ever had a power of attorney from those he claims to represent (hence he does not legally represent them) and that according to contract law and common sense the United States Constitution does not bind anyone.

BENJAMIN TUCKER (1854-1939):

Tucker was publisher of the first avowedly individualist-anarchist newspaper, *LIBERTY*, published in the English language from 1881

to 1908. His paper provided a forum for many of the chief individualist spokesmen of the late 19th Century. Tucker was a publisher of libertarian tracts, but did write *INSTEAD OF A BOOK* in 1893.

AUBERON HERBERT (1838-1906):

Herbert was at one time a member of Parliament. His experiences there demonstrated the futility of electoral politics. Herbert adopted the label 'voluntaryism' to identify his philosophy and he was also one of the leading proponents of "voluntary taxation." Many of his writings have been collected in *THE RIGHT AND WRONG OF COMPULSION BY THE STATE AND OTHER ESSAYS* (Eric Mack, editor, Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1978).

1900's

LUDWIG VON MISES (1881-1973) and MURRAY ROTHBARD (1926-): Mises, author of *HUMAN ACTION* (1949), was referred to as the dean of the free market, "Austrian" economists during most of the 20th Century. Rothbard studied under Mises, and has been a prolific writer on free market and libertarian themes. His introductory text to libertarianism, *FOR A NEW LIBERTY* (1973), and *WHAT HAS GOVERNMENT DONE TO OUR MONEY?* (1964) are two of his notable works.

AYN RAND (1905-1982):

Rand was novelist-philosopher who created the philosophy of Objectivism. Her two most successful novels capturing her ideas were *THE FOUNTAINHEAD* (1943) and *ATLAS SHRUGGED* (1957). Although she never advocated replacing the State with voluntary organizations, all her ideas lead to that conclusion.

ROBERT LEFEVRE (1911-1986) and ANDREW GALAMBOS (born circa 1910):

LeFevre was founder of Freedom School (1957); author of *THE NATURE OF MAN AND HIS GOVERNMENT* (1959), *THIS BREAD IS MINE* (1960) and numerous other books and pamphlets. Andrew Galambos taught numerous free market classes in his Free Enterprise Institute in California and, along with LeFevre, was one of the most articulate 20th Century proponents of a non-State society.

LEONARD READ (1898-1983):

Read was founder of The Foundation for Economic Education (1946) which is dedicated to explaining the benefits and operation of the free market. He consistently defended a "limited" State as the ideal form of government, but his strong emphasis on the free market and personal integrity merit his inclusion in this list. FEE can be contacted at Irvington-on-Hudson, New York 10533.

KEVIN AND PATRICIA CULLINANE and FREEDOM SCHOOL (1986):

In Freedom School, the Cullinanes trace back the non-State aspects of the Judeo-Christian tradition and show how that fundamental philosophy has been the cornerstone of all progressing civilizations. They were (to the best of my knowledge) the first to point out Samuel's prophecy about the dangers of the State and to discuss the non-State history of the Jews during their pre-monarchic era. They also show that English and American history—the migrations of the Separatists, the Declaration of Independence, and life on the frontier—depended on Judeo-Christian ideals to create actual examples of functioning voluntaryist societies. Picking up on Rose Wilder's dictum that "freedom is self-control, no more, no less," (originally emphasized at LeFevre's Freedom School) the Cullinanes have distinguished freedom (inner, spiritual self-control by which one refrains from trespass) from liberty (the absence of coercion). Thus, one's body may be violated (loss of liberty) without entailing a loss of freedom (because one's self is violated). Freedom School can be contacted in care of Freedom Country Executive Conference Center, Campobello, South Carolina 29322.

Other 20th Century thinkers and writers include: H. L. Mencken, Albert Jay Nock, Rose Wilder Lane, R. C. Hoiles, Frank Chodorov, Isabel Paterson, Robert Ringer, and Friedrich A. Hayek.

[Editor's Note: For a detailed bibliography of radical libertarian history, send \$1.00 and a SASE to THE VOLUNTARYIST.]

Freedom School Schedule - 1987

May 18 - 22
July 13 - 17

September 8 - 11
November 2 - 6

Freedom School tuition is \$350.00 per person for the five-day course. Immediate family members may come for 1/2 tuition (\$175.00), once the initial tuition is paid. Room and board for the Freedom School week is available for \$150.00 per person. Please call us at (803) 472-4111 or write: Freedom Country, Campobello, S. C. 29322, for more information.

The Inflation of Rights

Continued From Page 6

shortcomings of society. ...

Fifty years ago, Ortega y Gasset warned that mass society could saw away the branch on which it sat. Mass man—he argued—looked for satisfaction to the state. But the state could grow only at the expense of civil society, which it would deprive of spontaneity, suck dry, and destroy, after which like any parasite that destroyed its host, the state too would collapse. Our problem is how to reverse this process once begun.

(Editor's Note: These excerpts were taken from a longer article, "Can Democracy Survive an Omnilateral Conflict of Rights?" appearing in THE WORLD & I, November 1986.)

First Amendment

Continued From Page 4

prohibiting all expressions on the subject. In the war against words, there is nothing to be pitted against a person's words and thoughts except better ones. To use force against ideas is no remedy.

Freedom of the press is not the issue; nor are one's use of tobacco or one's like or dislike of smoking in question. Freedom and property rights are not secure if the rights of even one lone individual can be violated. The rights of the best man can only be as secure as the rights of the vilest. Eternal vigilance has been said to be the price of liberty. A government that is strong enough to guarantee rights (as was thought of the United States government and its Bill of Rights) is already strong enough to violate them. Efforts to institutionalize liberty by drafting bills of rights and constitutions are doomed to failure. Such measures reflect a relaxing of that constant state of awareness necessary to maintain a society of free individuals. Only by going beyond the First Amendment and realizing that freedom of the press is actually a property right can freedom of expression ever be secured.

(Editor's Note: This article may not be copied or reproduced in any form without permission from the author. It was submitted to the Philip Morris MAGAZINE Essay Contest on the First Amendment in December 1986.)

Potpourri

Continued From Page 3

Inexorable, harsh, unyielding, cruel, perhaps, but nevertheless: it is the law!

(From THE BOY SCOUT HANDBOOK, 1930, p. 502, crediting THE MAGAZINE OF WALL STREET)

13. From Tennyson's "Aenone":

*Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control,
These three alone lead life to sovereign power.
Yet, not for power, (power of herself
Would come uncall'd for) but to live by law,
Acting the law we live by without fear;
And, because right is right, to follow right
Were wisdom in the scorn of consequences.*

14. Last But Not Least

New Voluntaryist Joins The Team

William Lloyd Watner was born on January 17, 1987 at Freedom Country. Julie, Will and I are grateful for assistance from midwives Sylvia and Nancy. Many thanks to Patricia Cullinane for being so supportive. "Wattie" is named after the famed abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison and my deceased dad—Lloyd.

The Voluntaryist

P. O. Box 1275 • Gramling • South Carolina 29348



FIRST CLASS TIME VALUE

Please renew your subscription if the number on your address label is within one digit of this Issue's number