
The Voluntaryist

Whole Number 109

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

2nd Quarter 2001

All Mankind Is One

By Carl Watner

The purpose of this short article is to elaborate on Rick Maybury's comments about natural countries, found in his EARLY WARNING REPORT newsletter of January 2000. Mr. Maybury wrote that

If we define a natural country as one in which the people have a common language and cultural history, with borders [peacefully] drawn by them and their neighbors, then the world contains more than 10,000 natural countries.

This point was made in the context of a discussion about the efforts of European rulers to conquer the peoples of the world during the last five centuries. In every region where the European conquerors were successful, they created puppet regimes, and drew artificial boundaries to outline the extent of their conquests. Since the native populations resisted European domination, the world has experienced continual turmoil and warfare, as local populations have tried to rebel against those they see as oppressing them.

Mr. Maybury's definition of a "natural country" comes close to the modern anthropologist's definition of "ethnic group" found in the 1992 NEW ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA: "a group of people with a common ancestry and language, a shared cultural and historical tradition, and an identifiable territory." [Vol. 11, p. 918 - "tribe"] But what does "identifiable territory" mean? Natural borders, such as mountain ranges, seas, deserts, and rivers, define where people live and work; and consequently might fuzzily define the location of an ethnic group. But in a voluntaryist world, the only borders that would truly exist would be survey lines around private property. Then the whole world would be a free trade zone because there would be no political interferences to disrupt or inhibit exchanges among individuals. Voluntaryism occurs naturally if there is no State to interfere.

How might one determine how many natural countries there would be if there were no political boundaries? It is certainly hard to determine, but one starting point would be to ascertain the number of languages extant in the world today. Barbara and Joseph Grimes, editors of the Summer Institute of Linguistics' ETHNOLOGUE LANGUAGE FAMILY INDEX (13th edition, 1996), have listed more than 6,000 languages. Another "group of scholars has cataloged 6,703 living languages. Some are spoken by millions of people. Most are spoken by a much smaller

number of people." Based on living languages, 6000 appears to be a minimum figure. How many languages have actually disappeared because of the political conquest of one people by another is something that historians cannot answer. But given the fact that so many languages have survived, we can only conclude that Mr. Maybury's claim of more than 10,000 natural countries may be a pretty good guess.

Let us compare these numbers to the numbers of empires or nation-states which have existed throughout history. Before medieval times, there were probably fewer than twenty major imperial powers. They ranged from Sumeria and old Egypt, both dating back to at least 3000 B.C., to the Indian empires of South America, which included the Maya and Aztec civilizations that ended by the 16th Century A.D.. The modern political nation-state we are familiar with today did not begin to emerge until the 1300s. By the beginning of the Twentieth Century, there were about 50 states which made up the world community. Today, there are over 200. These numbers, referring to political countries of the world, are really meaningless accidents of history. They do nothing more than catalog the successful efforts of war-like leaders in subjugating their own and neighboring peoples into coercive political units.

To concede to minorities, either of language or religion, or to any fractions of a population the right of withdrawing from the community to which they belong, because it is their wish or their good pleasure, would be to destroy order and the stability within States and to inaugurate anarchy in international life; it would be to uphold a theory incompatible with the very idea of the State as a territorial and political unity.

—THE AALAND ISLANDS QUESTION,
League of Nations Document
B.7.21/68/106, April 16, 1921, p. 28.

A. P. D'Entreves quotes the Swiss historian Werner Kaegi, who has suggested that "nations in the modern sense would probably not have come into being in Europe but for the unifying, centralizing action of political power." For centuries, England was little more than a geographic expression. "It was hardly a nation, still less a state." [1] In other parts of the world, ethnic groups which had no natural cohesion to one another were coerced into political states. For example, take Switzerland. While there

continued on page 6

The Voluntaryist

Editor: Carl Watner

Subscription Information

Published by The Voluntaryists, P.O. Box 1275, Gramling, SC 29348. A six-issue subscription is \$20 or .07 ounce of fine gold. For overseas postage, please add \$5 or 1/3 of the regular subscription price. Single back issues are \$4 each or 1/5 of the regular subscription price. Please check the number on your mailing label to see when you should renew.

Back issues of this publication are available on microfiche from John Zube, Box 52, Berrima, NSW 2577, Australia.

Potpourri from the Editor's Desk

No. 1 "Fear of the Future"

[T]he risks of not having something can be equal or greater to the risks of having it. Indeed, one might reasonably interpret the precautionary principle to mean precisely the opposite of what most of its proponents now think. That is: Since the vast majority of scientific advances have proven of untold benefit to the human race, precaution requires that no new product be restricted until sufficient time has passed to allow meaningful consideration of its risks and benefits.

— From an editorial in THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, February 10, 2000, p. A18.

No. 2 "Some Thoughts About the Internet"

Like the telephone and telegraph, new technologies are only changes of *quantity*, not *quality*. They change the *speed* with which we can transact, and therefore possibly the *number* of transactions, but not their *nature*. Neither technology nor the Internet will make us more honest, genteel, noble, or just, nor does technology justify any innovation in morality. The quality of mankind does not change, now or ever. The moral nature of mankind's relations never changes, nor the law that governs them. Technology must accomodate morality, not *vice versa*.

Finally, I'm fed up with hearing and reading that all wealth begins and ends in the Internet. That's not just because I am a sour curmudgeon, but because it's not true. No national economy can be founded on producing "services." Hogwash. *The wealth of the world consists of things men dig out of the ground*. In the beginning *goods* must be created, for absent goods - *services* are without form and void.

— Franklin Sanders, "Is the Revolution Really Here?" in MONEYCHANGER (Box 178, Westpoint, TN 38486), February 2000, p. 11.

No. 3 "Why Does the State Persist?: Because So Few People Believe We Can Do Without It"

There were periods—not long ago as historians

measure time—when the state did not exist, and when no one was concerned that it did not exist. In those times it was the man without a family or a lord, without membership in a local community or a dominant religious group, who had no security and no opportunity, who could survive only by becoming a servant or a slave. The values of this kind of a society were different from ours; the supreme sacrifices of property and life were made for the family, lord, community, or religion, not for the state. The organizing power of such societies was less than ours; ... There was a strong sense of reciprocal obligation among those who knew each other personally, but this sense of obligation faded rapidly with distance. ...

[By the seventeenth century, the European] state had become a necessity of life. It had gained the primary loyalty of its subjects. The intensity of loyalty varied, but even those who gave only passive obedience could not conceive of a world without a state. [Thus,] Western Europe was psychologically prepared for a strengthening of the organization and an increase in the functions of the state. Policies might be attacked; governments might be overthrown; [but the state survived because] no politically important group doubted that the state had to be preserved and strengthened. For those who were skeptical about the divine right of monarchs there was the theory that the state was absolutely necessary for human welfare, ... To weaken or to destroy the state was to threaten the future of the human race. Therefore a state was entitled to take any steps to ensure its own survival, even if those steps seemed unjust or cruel.

—Joseph Strayer, ON THE MEDIEVAL ORIGINS OF THE MODERN STATE, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970, pp. 3-4, 108, and 111.

No. 4 "Ultimately It's Your Responsibility"

In an article in the Spartanburg, S.C. HERALD-JOURNAL (April 30, 2000, page C1), homeschooling parent, Lucy Anne Adams, was quoted as saying:

My husband and I have always believed that God has given responsibility to the parents for a child's education. Whether you put them in a public school or a private school or you teach them at home, what they learn is ultimately your responsibility.

After reading this, I remarked to my wife, Julie, that this seemed to imply that most parents do not consider their children's education a part of their responsibility. Julie, and her father, who happened to be here at the time, agreed that probably 95% of American parents do not consider themselves responsible for the education of their children. They both asserted that most people consider their parental obligations fulfilled when they send their children off to school at age 5 or 6. What the children are taught becomes the responsibility of the school teachers and administrators. With that attitude, it is no

surprise that we live in a totalitarian society. When you have little or no concern about the values, facts, or philosophy your children are taught, then it becomes extraordinarily easy for State propagandists to brainwash the children into believing anything they [the teachers] want.

No. 5 “Here’s a Plan to End Microsoft’s Dominance (No Lawyers Needed)”

Private entrepreneurs have developed a competitor to Windows called Gnome. “The folks at the Justice Department might be interested to know that Messrs. [Miguel] de Icaza and [Nat] Friedman [who have developed Gnome] don’t want to see Microsoft broken up. ‘It stinks,’ said Mr. Friedman says. ‘I wanted to beat them without government assistance.’”

—THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, May 15, 2000, p. B1.

No. 6 “Albert Jay Nock’s Economic Theory of Political Institutions”

There are two ways of making a living, Nock explained. One is the *economic means*, the other is the *political means*. The first consists of the application of labor to raw materials so as to bring into existence things people want, the second is the confiscation of the rightful property of others. The State is the group of people who having got hold of the machinery of compulsion, legally or otherwise, use it to better their circumstances; that is, by use of the *political means*. Nock would hasten to explain that the State consists not only of politicians, but also of those who make use of politicians to further their own ends; that would include all those we call pressure groups, lobbyists, and all those who wangle special privileges from the politicians. All the injustices that plague “advanced” societies, he maintained, are traceable to the workings of the State organizations that attach themselves to these societies.

—Frank Chodorov, OUT OF STEP (1962), pp. 147-148.

No. 7 “Visa and Voluntarism”

Edward Stringham, in an article on “Market Chosen Law” in the Winter 1998-1999 issue of THE JOURNAL OF LIBERTARIAN STUDIES, refers to the private credit card systems, such as Visa, Mastercard, Discover, and American Express, as real

world illustrations of “integration of local and non-local services.” He offers this as an example of how community defense service businesses might integrate their activities into networks of national and international protective services, without the need for any compulsory national state to provide internal and external defense for its citizens. “Markets already enable many individuals and their respective banks to interact. It is common for customers to subscribe to local services, yet these banks make arrangements with non-local systems that enable customers to use their charge cards almost” anywhere in the world. (p. 62)

No firm or individual is forced to pay taxes to a state monopoly in this realm, and these companies have discovered a way to make their cards acceptable in all civilized countries. If a customer wants to reap the benefits of Mastercard, he can choose to do so, but he is not forced to do so. Customers can pick Mastercard, a competitor, or they can eschew credit cards entirely. The individual who does not use credit cards does not hurt others; he simply cannot conduct business with certain firms. The market allows people to voluntarily conform to standards, but it does not compel anyone to do so. Although it would be difficult for all businesses to investigate each individual customer’s credit history, the credit card market solves this seemingly overwhelming task with ease. A business does not need to know a thing about a customer’s financial situation or history, except for the single fact that the customer uses a reputable credit card. The retailer relies on the credit card companies to deal with the customer’s credit, and is guaranteed payment by the credit lender. [pp. 62-63]

In short, Stringham concludes that a “variety of legal choices does not mean chaos.” If we can rely upon voluntarism to solve as complex a problem as gaining universal acceptance of credit cards throughout the world, then we ought to be able to rely upon voluntarism to solve other real-life problems that the State uses as justification for its coercive monopoly over our lives.

No. 8 “Cicero on Natural Law”

There is in fact a true law - namely, right reason - which is in accordance with nature, applies to all men, and is unchangeable and eternal. By its commands this law summons men to the performance of their duties; by its prohibitions it restrains them from doing wrong. Its commands and prohibitions always influence good men, but are without effect upon the bad. To invalidate this law by human legislation is never morally right, nor is it permissible ever to restrict its operation, and to annul it wholly is impossible. Neither the sen-

We know of no more deplorable error than that of supposing that human beings can be cemented together by statute-law. No more potent instrument for defeating this object could be devised. The statute-book is society’s worst enemy and isolation’s best friend.

—Benjamin R. Tucker in THE WORD (June 1876, p. 2).

ate nor the people can absolve us from our obligation to obey this law, and it requires no Sextus Aelius to expound and interpret it. It will not lay down one rule at Rome and another at Athens, nor will it be one rule today and another tomorrow. But there will be one law, eternal and unchangeable, binding at all times upon all peoples; and there will be, as it were, one common master and ruler of men, . . . The man who will not obey it will abandon his better self, and, in denying the true nature of a man, will thereby suffer the severest penalties, though he has escaped all other consequences which men call punishment.

— DE RE PUBLICA [THE REPUBLIC], III, xxii, quoted in Arthur L. Harding (ed.), ORIGINS OF THE NATURAL LAW TRADITION (Port Washington: Kennikut Press), 1953, pp. 23-24.

No. 9 “More Roman Stoicism”

Courage appears in its highest development in the face of tyranny and death. It is the tyrant's boast that he has men in his power: but the brave man is an exception. His rank and his property may be taken away; he may be subjected to torture; his life may be forfeited; but the soul, that is the man himself, is beyond the tyrants reach. To pain he answers ‘if I can bear it, it will be light; if I cannot bear it, it cannot be long.’ Amidst all the extremities of fire and rack men have been found who never groaned, never begged for mercy, never answered a question, and indeed laughed heartily. Of death the Stoic has no fear; not only it is not evil, but it is to be welcomed as part of the course of nature; . . .

— E. Vernon Arnold, ROMAN STOICISM (Cambridge: at the University Press) 1911, p. 308 ☐

The Virtue of Freedom

by Jacob G. Hornberger

Christmas is the perfect time of year to reflect on such things as freedom and virtue. People give presents to their friends and loved ones, donate food and clothing to the poor, and make contributions to their churches and other worthy causes. And they do it all voluntarily. No one forces them to do so.

Do you ever wonder how all this takes place in the absence of coercion? Imagine that 60 years ago in the midst of the Great Depression, in order to nurture family values, Congress had enacted a law requiring everyone to purchase a Christmas gift for other members of his immediate family. Suppose today, someone suggests that the law be repealed. It is not difficult to predict what the response would be:

Why, we can't repeal the Christmas gift law. Do you hate Christ or what? If we got rid of the law, some parents would stop buying Christmas gifts for their children. Think how many children would fall through the cracks. We can't just trust people to do the right thing. Isn't it right and moral that people give gifts

at Christmas time? Or maybe you think that Santa Claus is going to fill the void. And if we are going to get rid of the program, then it ought to be phased out instead of abruptly ended.

Ridiculous? Yet, isn't that the case with Social Security, welfare, Medicare, Medicaid, and all of the other socialistic programs that make up America's welfare-state system?

Take the crown jewel of them all—Social Security. Here, the coercive apparatus of government is used to take money from the young and productive in order to provide retirement pay to the elderly. Suggesting that Social Security be repealed, not reformed, throws advocates of the program into a fit. “How could people survive without Social Security?” they cry.

This mindset of dependency is one of the terribly destructive consequences of welfare-state programs. Social Security itself has become a political narcotic that has destroyed people's sense of self-reliance—the can-do attitude that once characterized the American people. So many people honestly believe that people would die in the streets if the program were repealed. People would no longer save for their old age. Children would no longer honor their mothers and fathers. Charities would disappear. Churches would go broke.

But there's a worse consequence of the welfare-state mentality. It has corrupted people's sense of virtue, compassion, and caring.

How in the world can government achieve or even nurture a compassionate society? Let's analyze the process step by step. Let's assume that a very poor person approaches a very rich person and asks for a Christmas gift of \$1,000. Even though the rich person knows that the poor person truly is in need, the rich person decides not to give him any money. Let's assume for argument's sake that the rich person is an uncaring, selfish, uncompassionate Scrooge.

The following November there is an election. People elect a majority of saints to the U.S. Congress. The congressional saints enact a welfare law to assist the poor. Rich people are ordered to deliver to the government \$1,000 each, and the law is enforced by the Internal Revenue Service and U.S. marshals.

Threatened with fine and imprisonment, the rich Scrooge who had turned his back on the poor man sends his \$1,000 to the IRS, which in turn delivers the money to the U.S. Treasury, which in turn gives the money to the Department of Poor People, which in turn sends a check for \$500 to the poor man. (The balance of the money, of course, is paid in government salaries and administrative costs. Hey, government officials have to live, too!)

Has the rich man now been converted into a caring, compassionate, virtuous person? It's hard to see how he has. His heart hasn't changed. The only reason he sent the money to the government was that

the government was threatening him with fines and imprisonment if he didn't do it.

Of course, we often hear statisticians arguing that the welfare state, including programs like Social Security, shows that we are a caring and compassionate people. But who exactly is the "we" they are talking about? Voters? What about people who don't vote? Do they get to claim part of the compassion mantle? What about those who voted against the congressional saints who won?

The truth is that no one is compassionate or caring simply because he lives in a welfare state. Caring and compassion can come only from the willing heart of an individual, not through participating in a society that uses government force to take money from one person in order to give it to another person.

The matter is much graver, however, than a simple corruption of the significance and meaning of virtue. The question that every Christian must ask is: By supporting the welfare state, is the Christian violating the tenets of Christianity? If so, doesn't his commitment to Christianity require him to immediately stop approving of the programs?



Recall when the young rich man approached Jesus, told him that he had followed all the commandments, and asked Jesus what else he could do. Jesus replied by telling the young man to sell everything he had and to give the proceeds to the poor. Unable to relinquish his material wealth, the young man walked away.

When Jesus was asked what the greatest commandment was, he responded by telling us to love God and our neighbor. Yet, when the young rich man turned his back on his neighbor, what was Jesus' reaction? Did he summon the Roman centurions and tell them to seize the man's wealth and give it to the poor? Did he round up the apostles in order to gang up on the young man and force him into giving his wealth to the poor?

On the contrary, Jesus simply permitted the young man to make his choice and then live with it. Isn't this what free will is all about? Each person is free to love God ... or not. He is free to love his neighbor ...

or not. If Caesar is permitted to interfere with the process by coercing people, through fines and imprisonment, into loving God or others, then what does that do to God's gift of free will?

Moreover, what about God's commandment against stealing? Simply because an act is legal it doesn't necessarily mean that the act doesn't contradict God's laws. For example, if Congress were to pass a law making it a death-penalty offense to be a Jew and then the executive branch began executing violators of the law, the action would be legal but certainly not moral.

The optimist says, "My cup runneth over, what a blessing." The pessimist says, "My cup runneth over, what a mess."

—Quoted by Rev. Denny Brake
in THE JOYFUL NEWSLETTER

Why doesn't the same principle apply to stealing? If it's wrong in the eyes of God for one person to rob another at gunpoint, why isn't it equally wrong in the eyes of God for me to use the force of the state to accomplish the same result? Can an act that is admittedly immoral be converted into a moral act simply through majority vote?

Thus, everyone who supports such socialistic programs as Social Security must ultimately grapple with the possibility that he is doing much more than simply participating in a political process and supporting a particular political philosophy. He must confront the possibility that he is doing something significantly graver than simply corrupting the meaning of virtue and compassion. He must accept the possibility that by supporting any aspect of the socialistic welfare state, he is denigrating God's great gift of free will as well as affirmatively supporting a violation of God's sacred commandment "Thou Shalt Not Steal." And the discomfort associated with such a possibility might be magnified by the question that might begin to haunt the person's conscience: "Shall I continue to support a system that violates the laws of my God or should I immediately start calling for repeal?"

Statists often suggest that if welfare-state programs (and the income tax) were repealed, private charity would dry up. Everyone, including all those who support things like Social Security, would overnight become evil, selfish, and uncaring people. Of course, that might be true. (Of course, if it is true, it's unlikely that they would elect saints to Congress to tax them to provide Social Security.) But again, isn't that what free will is all about? If a person is not free to say "No," then how can he truly be considered free?

There is no doubt that freedom is risky. Theoretically, people could use their freedom to reject God and reject their neighbor. But isn't freedom actually the best way to achieve such values as compassion

and caring. How? Freedom is the process by which people have to engage in choosing. And isn't that what strengthens what we call conscience? Should I help the poor or not? Should I worship God or not? Should I donate to that cause or not? It is in this process of choosing that virtue rises in a society.

But if a society tries a shortcut to virtue by turning to coercion, the result is exactly the opposite. Why should I help the poor if I pay my taxes every year? Isn't that the job of the government? Why should I help my parents? Don't they already receive Social Security? Virtue is stultified when conscience freezes. And conscience freezes when choices are discouraged.

This Christmas, as we celebrate the joy of the season by giving gifts to others, let us reflect upon the importance of freedom and virtue. Let's ask ourselves which is the virtuous process: taxation and welfare or voluntarily giving?

[Editor's Note: This article originally appeared in the December 1999 issue of FREEDOM DAILY, the monthly publication of The Future of Freedom Foundation, 11350 Random Hills Road # 800, Fairfax, VA 22030. It is reprinted by permission of the author, fax cover sheet dated December 21, 1999. Although it is written from a Christian perspective, the author's main points are equally applicable to non-Christians. As others have said: "No act that is forced can partake of virtue or vice." (Frank Meyer) and "No one has the right to force men to be charitable. I am not against charity, but I am against the use of force." (Robert Ringer)]

▽

All Mankind Is One

continued from page 1

might be a Swiss nationality based on membership in the Swiss State, nearly every Swiss citizen is of German, French, or Italian descent depending on his or her linguistic, cultural, and ethnic affiliations. Another example is Italy, which was an invention of politicians and foreigners. There are really no Italians, but rather Calabrians, Florentines, Venetians, Neapolitans, Bolognese, etc. This helps explain why Italians are such notorious tax-evaders and so generally unwilling to pay taxes to the Italian state: "After all if the nation doesn't really exist, why pay to support it?" [2]

Although the modern nation-state is a relatively recent phenomenon in the long sweep of history, it still resembles other political systems from which it has evolved. The nation-state is linked to the empires of the ancient worlds by the attributes that they share in common: namely, external pressure toward conquest and expansion, and internal concentration of power in the hands of political leaders. The early empires of history, as their successors today, "had no other purpose in mind than the concentration of brutal power over their own people or preferably over alien peoples." All the ancient empires relied upon "violence and the exercise of might" to expand their turf. [3]

Under today's international law, a modern state must have a permanent population, a defined territory, and a government with the capacity to enter into relations with other states, but the essential ingredient of every political state, and what distinguishes it from every other form of social organization, is its ability "to compel obedience from populations within their territories." What unites modern states from the size of China, Russia, and Canada to mini- or micro-states like Luxembourg, Switzerland, and San Marino, is their claim to "supremacy over all individuals and other associations within" their borders. "As an association the state is peculiar in several other respects: membership is compulsory for all its citizens; it claims a monopoly of the use of armed force within its borders; and its officers, who are the government of the state, claim the right to act in the name of the land and its people." [4] As Murray Rothbard once explained, every state, no matter how constrained by statute or constitution

presumes to establish a compulsory monopoly of defense (police, courts, law) service over some geographical area. So that individual property owners who prefer to subscribe to another defense company within that area are not allowed to do so. Second, it obtains its revenues by the aggression - the robbery - of taxation, a compulsory levy on the inhabitants of the area. [5]

The modern notion of the supremacy of the national state was a development that "ran counter to the conceptions that ... dominated political thought for" at least 2000 years. Even though men have always "been attached to their native soil, to the traditions of their parents," to their religions, and to their local cultures, ever since the time of the Stoics the ideal of the world as "one great city" has persisted. [6] The development of the nation-state and their artificially imposed political boundaries have stressed differences among people, rather than worldwide unity, and led directly to disruptions in society that culminated in the world wars of the 20th Century. The Nuremberg trials of the late 1940s, even though conducted by the victorious nation-states, once again reminded people that there are certain values common to humanity which not even their political leaders or nation-states could order them to violate or destroy.

Based on their views that all men, by nature, are morally equal, and on their beliefs that reason and common sense are one and the same everywhere throughout the world, certain 16th century natural law theorists came to the conclusion that "all mankind is one." They came to the defense of the natural inhabitants of the West Indies and South America during the Spanish conquest of these areas. Domingo de Soto (1494?-1560) said that "Those who are in the grace of God are not a whit better off than the sinner or pagan in what concerns natural rights." His col-

laborator, Francisco Vitoria (1483?-1546) cited the opinion of St. Thomas Aquinas: "Paganism annuls neither natural right nor human rights." [7] Humanity, in their eyes, was a single universal society entitled to the protections of common moral standards. Natural law made all men, women, and children - without distinction of frontier, race, language, religion, geographical location, or other particulars - members of a world-wide community by birth. In short, they considered all mankind as one wherever they lived.

Footnotes

[1] Alexander P. D'Entreves, *THE NOTION OF THE STATE* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1967), p. 173.

[2] Walker Connor, "From Tribe to Nation?" 13 *HISTORY OF EUROPEAN IDEAS* (1991), pp. 5-18 at p. 17.

[3] "Empire," 5 *ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES* (1953), pp. 503-504.

[4] "Political Systems," 25 *THE NEW ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA* (15th Edition, 1992), p. 1007.

[5] "Yes," in *REASON Magazine*, May 1973, pp. 19, 23-25. Also see pp. 47-48 of Carl Watner (ed.), *I MUST SPEAK OUT* (San Francisco: Fox & Wilkes, 1999).

[6] "Philosophical Schools and Doctrines," 25 *THE NEW ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA* (15th Edition, 1992), p. 597.

[7] Carl Watner, "All Mankind Is One: The Libertarian Tradition In Sixteenth Century Spain," 8 *THE JOURNAL OF LIBERTARIAN STUDIES* (1987), pp. 293-309, at p. 297 and p. 306. [V]

"Innovate, don't litigate"

—Philippe Kahn, *THE WALL ST. JOURNAL*,
March 24, 1995, A14.

Moral Ideas Tax Supported Schools Cannot Teach

continued from page 8

They cannot teach love, or charity, or faith. They are saying by their actions that men do not have faith, that men will not do what they ought to do, that men will not be charitable, and have love. So they cannot teach faith, hope, charity, and love.

They cannot teach peace because they are initiating the opposite of peace—force.

They cannot teach the single standard of rightness because they are practicing a double standard. They would not claim that any individual had a moral right to use force to make another support his ideas of education. Yet they claim by their act[ions], that the majority has a right to do so.

They cannot teach that the individual cannot transfer to the state the right to do things that he originally does not have a right to do. They cannot teach this because they are trying to do it themselves.

They cannot teach rules that should govern taxation. They are practicing that the majority can take from one and give to another, that the government need not collect taxes in proportion to the cost of the service the government renders to each individual. [R.C. had not yet come to the realization that all taxation is theft; otherwise he would not have endorsed 'rules that govern taxation'.—Ed.]

They cannot teach freedom or liberty. They are denying the freedom of the individual by ... compelling him to do something he thinks is harmful.

They cannot teach the importance of developing a conscience. They are substituting force for conscience and persuasion.

They cannot teach that there is any moral law superior to the will of man. They are using the will of the majority in place of God's will.

They cannot teach the harm of socialism and communism and Fascism. They cannot teach their harm because they are practicing them.

They cannot teach that might does not make right. They cannot teach the opposite from what they are doing.

They cannot teach that the state is the servant of the individual rather than his master. They are his master when they are saying that he must pay for an educational system [that] he thinks is out of harmony with God's laws.

They cannot teach that God's will and not that man's will or the majority's will must prevail.

They cannot teach these things any more than a robber can teach honesty.

It is little wonder that we have so much covetousness and hate when the people believe that their children can be educated in the important things in life—morals—by way of the state.

The grass roots of our trouble is that the wrong ideas are imbedded in the minds and hearts of the youth of the land. This is because the state cannot educate the youth in the value of these virtues. That is the reason that I am constantly taking the unpopular position of pointing out the great harm that comes from thinking that the youth of the land can be educated by bureaucrats paid for by compulsion.

To call anything education that cannot teach these eternal moral laws—ideas—is the worst form of fraud ever conceived in the mind of man. It is sounding brass—a tinkling cymbal. As long as we continue to pour our poisonous ideas into the youth of the land via state education it is absurd to think that they will understand these virtues and know how to live in harmony with them.

Just what moral ideas can government schools teach? I would like to know a single one that is in harmony with compulsory education. [V]

"Often the best way to win is to forget to keep score."

—Marianne Espinosa Murphy

Moral Ideas Tax Supported Schools Cannot Teach

By R. C. Hoiles

[Editor's Note: This article first appeared in the Santa Ana (CA.) REGISTER on March 14, 1947, and was reprinted in that newspaper on July 10, 1968 (p. B6). See "Nobody Cares About Hoiles; Everybody Cares About Freedom," in Whole No. 105 of THE VOLUNTARYIST for more information about the author.]

We are facing a battle of ideas.

One of the reasons we are in the trouble we are in today is that people are not taught the ideas that are in harmony with such moral laws as the Ten Commandments.

Compulsory education cannot teach these moral laws. Belief in these laws is absolutely necessary if we are to live together and develop character, peace, and material prosperity.

I want to name some moral ideas, some moral laws [that] proponents of tax-supported schools cannot teach unless people are not influenced by example and do not learn by imitating.

Here are some of them:

They cannot teach humility or meekness. They have so exalted and glorified themselves—they are so sure of their rightness—that they are willing to send the sheriff to make everyone comply [as in compulsory attendance laws]. They use force instead of

persuasion and love.

They cannot teach individual responsibility. They are denying individual responsibility by their acts.

They cannot teach a definite limited government. They know no definite limit of government excepting the arbitrary will of men. [At this time, R.C. still believed that government could be "limited"; he did not yet realize that "limited government" is a contradiction in terms.—Ed.]

They cannot teach ... government [by] consent of the governed. They are violating the consent of those who disagree with them.

They cannot teach the inalienable rights of man. They are violating the[se] inalienable rights.

They cannot teach the Ten Commandments or what robbery is. They are practicing that the majority can do what would be robbery [if] done by the individual. If they were successful in teaching what collective moral robbery is there would be no compulsory education.

They cannot teach any personal, eternal, universal rule of conduct. Their act[ion]s are in harmony with none.

They cannot teach the dignity or worth of every individual. They are practicing that the majority need not respect the dignity or worth of the individual.

They cannot teach the harm of initiating force. They are collectively initiating force via the tax collector against the individual.

continued on page 7

The Voluntaryist

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

**NOW BEING PUBLISHED
QUARTERLY**

All subscribers will receive
the full number of issues
for which they have paid.

FIRST CLASS-TIME VALUE

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