



ISSUE #7

SEPTEMBER, 2017

MAKING AN EXAMPLE PROMOTING LIBERTY, BY NON FACIES FURTUM (P. 2)

POLICING AS A PRIVATE AFFAIR, ARTICLE BY J. ALLEN BARNABY (P. 3-4)

GIVE ANARCHY A CHANCE, ARTICLE BY NOAH LEED (P. 4-7)

**COMMUNISM KILLS, PT. I: MONUMENTAL SOCIAL CLOSURE AND LEFT-PROGRESSIVE BIAS,
LIBERTARIAN SOCIOLOGY 101 COLUMN, BY RICHARD G. ELLEFRITZ, PHD (P. 7, 11)**

VIOLENCE AND POLITICS ARE INSEPARABLE, ARTICLE BY SEAN O'CEALLAIGH (P. 8)

WHY HOMESCHOOLING WORKS, BY AMELIA MORRIS (P. 8)

**RUBY RIDGE: 25 YEARS LATER. A SUMMARY FOR THE NEXT GENERATION,
ARTICLE BY JASON BOOTHE (P. 9-10)**

SO YOU WANT TO PRIVATIZE EVERYTHING?, ARTICLE BY MATTHEW DEWEY (P. 11-13)

INFLATING AWAY OUR TECHNOLOGICAL GAINS, ARTICLE BY JAMES BUTCHER (P. 13-15)

GOING ANTI-STATE AND ABANDONING POLITICS, ARTICLE BY MIKE MORRIS (P. 15, 21)

YOUR DOG, LAWFUL PLUNDER AND THE REGULATORY STATE, ARTICLE BY NICK WEBER (P. 21- 24)

WHAT IF YOU WERE A WHITE NATIONALIST?, SUBMISSION BY "ORTHO BRO" (P. 24 - 28)

**MAKING AN EXAMPLE PROMOTING
LIBERTY, ARTICLE BY NON FACIES FURTUM**

Voluntaryism is still a new ideology to many, even though its principles are simple and already nearly universally valued in many ways. It is important work to spread the word about its immense value and moral correctness, but this will not be sufficient to bring about a truly free society. When the people who do not change things and who just go through life living at the level of the least common denominator or an average life see new styles of life that work better than others, they will gradually change their ways. Until then, they will live a "path of least resistance" lifestyle. It is important for those of us who have arrived at the objective moral truth of voluntaryism to set an example of just how much freedom and respect for property rights and self-ownership can lead to a successful and joyful life.

What many voluntaryists spend most of their time doing is spreading knowledge of the arguments, reason, and evidence that support voluntaryism, non-aggression, and liberty as the most useful and morally correct principles. This is incredibly important and necessary work, but often it is not enough to get most people to change their ways, or even consider accepting the arguments. Living by example opens those around you up to new ideas, and inspires many people more than do valid logic and clear evidence.

One important aspect of living a voluntaryist lifestyle is remembering that non-aggression is not synonymous with tolerance. One of the most powerful moral tools that one has is their ability to decide with whom one spends their time. By this I mean that in the same way shop-owners can refuse to do business with people who are known to have been thieves or people who have aggressive tendencies, every individual can and ought to shun those who have...

...harmful ideas or act immorally. Make it uncomfortable to be evil, and to support evil. This can manifest itself in ways such as telling a companion that you're going to stop spending time with him if doesn't stop watching CNN, arguing diligently and impolitely with your cousin who always says "I'm just a centrist, bro." and " Obamacare saves lives!". If some attractive woman asks you out on a date wearing a "thin blue line" t-shirt, deny her.

Of course this ability to shun people with foolish or unhelpful ideologies does not preclude one from also doing positive work to support those who are actively changing things for the better in the world. If you know someone who is passionate about liberty and could inspire people with their talent for writing, speaking, or organization, encourage them to create something. Donate or volunteer with people at some sort of local charity event which would decrease dependence on the state for some people.

In general, I encourage everyone reading this to make a credible difference in their social circle by living in a way that sets an example. Inspire people with your positivity and passion for valuable social change, and do not waste your time on people who will work against you and will not listen to the reason of your arguments. Be clear with your arguments, accurate with your evidence, passionate about your lifestyle, and deliberate with how you spend your time. This will help us secure a free future.

RESILIENTWAYS.NET
RESILIENTWAYS.NET
RESILIENTWAYS.NET
RESILIENTWAYS.NET
RESILIENTWAYS.NET

**POLICING AS A PRIVATE AFFAIR, ARTICLE BY
J. ALLEN BARNABY OF THE FREE
ASSOCIATION CENTER**

Policing, the protection of person and property, can and should be handled privately for reasons both ethical and prudential. This simple truth is often hard for most to swallow, especially those looking to rationalize the various forms of centralized control they'd like to continue exerting over the entire populace within a certain geographic area.

Decentralized policing services can and should be provided by the individual landowners or users who truly find any particular protection service more valuable than its cost. The competitive pressure made possible by decentralizing decision-making aligns the incentives of security providers much more closely with those of the marginal customer relative to a centralized political system where some fraction of the population enforces their preferences upon the whole. A political process allows those holding its reins to externalize the costs of services onto unwilling dissenters who may have better options on the table in its absence.

But what about the poor, you ask? The working poor almost invariably rent homes and travel on roads owned by others. Those owners make their livings providing low-cost services to the poor and have strong incentives to pay for cost-effective crime deterrence on their properties in order to prevent damage and provide their customers relatively safe passage to and from their businesses in order to continue making their living. Insurance companies (think homeowners' and life insurance) can and would discriminate between customers who take various deterrence measures and those who don't, charging owners and individuals higher premiums depending upon their varying risk profiles. By making assets more profitable year in and year out, the benefits of

protection services become capitalized into the value of the properties themselves. We must acknowledge, however, that we do not have Utopia on the table from which to choose, so we must make a comparative judgment between centralized and decentralized provision of protection. Centralization poses grave risks of abuse, and as will be explained below, offers little relative benefit to the poor and powerless in practice.

Regime economists of course, even those espousing free market rhetoric across any number of other areas, readily object to the proposition that policing can be provided without centralizing said service by force. They teach us that policing is a prototypical "public good," and that the "optimal amount" of policing services can't be provided without some kind of forced centralization.

The first problem with this approach generally is that, while positing that decentralized decision-making might lead to the under-provision of a service, it completely ignores that centralization is even more likely to lead to an over-production in terms of cost while offering little assurance against under-production in terms of the actual service quality enjoyed by those unable to wield political power for themselves. What's worse is that those who advance this position usually offer the pretext that without centralization, the poor and ostensibly powerless would lack access to quality service, even as their proposed solution often fails to serve this very group.

The second problem with the public goods rationalization is that "prototypical" services like policing don't even obviously meet the theoretical requirements of a public good on their own terms. We're told policing is non-excludable, meaning that the cost of keeping non-payers from enjoying the benefits of the protection service prohibits the optimal level of protection from *(cont. 4)*

being provided to paying subscribers as well.

However as a practical matter, policing is clearly excludable. Among other strategies, police agencies can simply publish the properties for which they intend to defend by force, allowing even relatively short-sighted criminals to avoid their subscribers and incentivizing them to case unprotected non-payers instead. Within most political jurisdictions currently, county and city jurisdictions haphazardly perform this function already, but as we have seen above, flexible police jurisdictions determined by market demand would better serve individuals living amongst a diverse local population by most closely aligning incentives.

Private, decentralized policing is also largely rivalrous in consumption, in stark contradiction with the second requirement of a public good. While defending one house in a neighborhood from the threat of a ballistic missile would generally require defending the whole neighborhood from the same threat, thereby rendering the defense of each additional house in the neighborhood essentially cost-less once the first is adequately defended, providing a deterrent from most crimes, as well as investigation and restitution services, are generally costly to extend to each additional person or property.

It's up to those that value their freedom to resist all who would employ the mere force of arms to centralize decision-making within a privileged political class. This goes double for the seemingly fundamental State services of policing and dispute resolution. As a practical matter, subjecting service providers of all kinds to competition and holding them to principles of natural justice will place significant limits on centralization of all kinds. Such restraints also hinder the growth of political power, a force to be resisted at all costs by the true friends of man and liberty.

GIVE ANARCHY A CHANCE, ARTICLE BY NOAH LEED

Many of us were heartened by the recent story of how a human chain was formed to save nine struggling swimmers caught in a rip current off the Panama City Beach on the Florida coast. Two boys had become stranded offshore, and as other members of the family swam out to their aid, those swimmers also struggled in vain to get to shore. Others on the beach went from being onlookers to being "on duty" as they linked arms to form an eighty-person human lifeline, pulling those stranded in the current back to safety.

Words like "heroic" and "miraculous" come to mind as apt descriptions of what occurred, but there is one word most people wouldn't consider using here, a word that in fact perfectly describes how this family was saved: they were saved by anarchy. Most tend to use that word as a synonym for chaos and lack of structure or organization, but in the political sense it simply means lack of a formal or mandated authoritative hierarchy. It means self-organization rather than centrally planned organization.

It is immediately important to note that such self-organization necessarily rests on whatever moral foundation might underlie it. People will organize themselves, or not, according to the system of values they have in common. So in that sense, there is indeed an important hierarchy at play in anarchy, the hierarchy of values and morals that has evolved over the countless generations that preceded ours. Some might differ in what constitutes that foundation (using terms such as "The Enlightenment" or "Judeo-Christian") but there can be no doubt that beneficial forms of anarchy are deeply rooted in history. We don't make up values on the fly.

To be sure, this human chain didn't just magically materialize and arise spontaneously without any inputs of (*cont. 5*)

of leadership. It required someone to first have an idea for the chain, and then for that person and others to communicate the idea and to facilitate its realization by recruiting and coordinating willing volunteers. But the point is, the manifestation of this life-saving team required no pre-existing hierarchy or formal organizational structure or authority, and required no threat of punishment or other enforcement mechanisms to make it work. Those who wanted to participate simply did so, and those who didn't, didn't. Whatever minimal elements of leadership and hierarchy (i.e., non-swimmers closest to shore/stronger swimmers in deeper waters) That were needed had to arise in the moment, voluntarily and organically. And they did.

It's a shame that the word "anarchy" has never been given a chance to gain more popular use in contexts that actually reflect this true definition. As thinking adults, the moment we hear that word we are likely to not really think about what it might mean. Instead, by default, we give it the emotional weight and negative connotations that were likely loaded into our heads the few times we heard the word in common use as children: anarchy is what results when people riot, or when tornadoes tear up towns, or when nobody does the dishes (or cleans his bedroom right now!).

So we are used to seeing the word "anarchy" incorrectly thrown around to describe things like the gang-rule and barbarism that overtakes failed states like Somalia. That is not anarchy. Rarely is the word used in any but negative and unappealing contexts. Perhaps, though, the word deserves equal time in getting fair use to describe the positive voluntary social organization and human cooperation that arises almost instantaneously in group scenarios such as the Panama City Beach rescue (or, say, United Flight 93). And further, perhaps we should consider the potential negative outcomes that might have resulted if anarchy

had been suppressed in the case of this rescue, as well as in other situations.

Representative democracy is highly thought of as a way to structure the governing institutions that help order our society and address its problems. How well would a microcosm of political democracy have worked on that Panama City Beach? In the name of "fairness" we might want to consider all reasonable alternatives to the human-chain idea, and we might want to vote on which idea to deploy and on who should lead the group, and we might want to consider potential costs as well as benefits of our options, and we might want to consult or defer to authorities and experts and public servants on the details of executing the plan...after another vote, of course. But by taking time to formalize the life-saving process and make it soundly democratic, that democracy would probably have failed the nine people that anarchy managed to save.

In case anyone thinks I'm just bashing government here, imagine the utter failure that might result from assigning the task to a meeting of middle-managers mired in the typical bureaucracy of a huge corporation! Direct and efficient (and risky) action and full accountability can get stifled in the hierarchies of any large and complex organization, whether public or private, because large organizations commonly breed a certain amount of ass-kissing and ass-covering (not to mention foot-dragging, finger-pointing and thumb-sucking). It's just the nature of large organizations.

The large organization will have many structures, rules and policies that have evolved to "safely" (ass-covering, again) give guidance in most situations, but not in all. A bureaucracy is always obedient first and foremost to itself, at the risk of sacrificing those stray few who might be in situations that fall outside its rigid regulatory regimes. To best respond to certain situations -- like an entire family stuck in a rip current -- agents of larger organizations must be given (*cont.* 6)

...the freedom to decentralize, to temporarily break free from the mother-ship and reorganize organically. They must put the unique needs of the present situation above the structural and machine-like demands of the organization.

They must be given the freedom to give anarchy a chance, if that's what the situation calls for. They must be given the freedom to be human.

The group actions that arise from having the freedom to be human will be as good, or as bad, as the people of the group. Clearly the people on the beach that day were a pretty good group of people. Which is to say, they were ordinary. They performed something extraordinary because it is our nature to do so when the need arises, given a spark of determination and leadership by one or two people (which are also traits intrinsic to our nature). Is it hard to picture a group of them voluntarily banding together to solve other problems that might arise on a beach, like finding someone's lost keys, or moving a vehicle stuck in the sand? Not at all. Things like that happen all the time, without making news. Community happens.

Looking at the Panama City Beach rescue, it seems apparent that the responding authorities -- police and paramedics -- were willing to give anarchy a chance. The human chain was organized and deployed without either needing their authority or being impeded by it. Imagine an alternative scenario where lifeguards or other authorities might have insisted that only professionals attempt the rescue, and might have used their legal authority to forbid a human chain, to limit risk. A strict adherence to hierarchy and deference to authority could have been tragic. The freedom of anarchy is the freedom to act boldly and decisively and, yes, cooperatively.

One can imagine a person in an official capacity advising those treading water to keep doing so, until "official" help arrives.

Likewise, when a high-rise building is ablaze, the authorities might recommend you stay put. And 99% of the time, that is the correct advice. You should come to that conclusion yourself, on your own, for your own good. But what if you or others are convinced your situation in fact represents the outlying 1% this particular time? Will you follow the advice of authority? Will authority command that you follow, and turn that advice into a mandate? I'd say this would be a good time to pull out that old bumper sticker that reads, "Question Authority."

It's worth considering that other modes of voluntary cooperation without formal hierarchy or any kind of coercive enforcement can and do work to help solve all sorts of problems, and are of great use beyond just the urgent situations where lives would be lost without immediate action. Yet we have endured decades of a sort of political and social divisiveness that some perceive as a drowning in the figurative sense, or perhaps as only barely treading water, and we have endured it under a system that greatly depends upon coercion and force rather than voluntarism..

Our elected and appointed (figurative) "lifeguards" and our supposedly democratic institutions often appear to be failing us, don't they? Still, we keep looking and striving for the political solutions that never seem to materialize, while marginalizing voluntary action and genuine charity as obviously insufficient to meet our growing needs. This is the same kind of thinking that supposes a lack of government-paid lifeguards "obviously" leads to nine people drowning. Yet the nine people were saved, because guarding-life is something all decent humans just do. The public is served by the public, not just by official public servants.

Nobody's asking you to become an anarchist here, and this is not a call to eliminate all forms of government, or to privatize (*cont.* 7)

...everything, or to tear down "the system." It is simply an effort to show that anarchy is not the five-letter word we think it is (chaos), an effort to open some minds to the the idea that it might be in our collective best interest to allow voluntarism to work its magic whenever possible. We might be surprised at the life-saving and spirit-lifting results.

Panama City Beach shows us that anarchy in action can do wonderful things, and transform everyday beach-goers into the wonderful humans that we all have the potential to be. Let's give anarchy a chance.

COMMUNISM KILLS, PT. I: MONUMENTAL SOCIAL CLOSURE AND LEFT-PROGRESSIVE BIAS, LIBERTARIAN SOCIOLOGY 101 COLUMN, BY RICHARD G. ELLEFRITZ, PHD

What kind of biases exist? It is clear that the universe has a bias toward existence, though one might contend that the "vast emptiness of space," as Bill Nye once put it, contests this. The Earth has a bias toward life, though we might consider to that end the inevitability of death (and taxes). Within academia, and especially within the liberal arts, in which case "liberal" indicates academic *freedom* and growth rather than a clear cut Leftist political agenda, New York University social psychologist, Jonathan Haidt, among others, has documented the Left-progressive bias, noting that among its various effects have been a weeding out process of conservative scholars and a narrowing of scope of thought presented in research and in classrooms. Max Weber long ago used the phrase "social closure" to describe the phenomenon whereby a social group constructs material and symbolic boundaries that limit and exclude access to resources by competing groups. Therefore, higher education is moving away from...

academic freedom for all to academic equality for some.

Social psychologists have long studied various cognitive biases, evolutionarily inherited heuristics ingrained in much of our unreflexive, everyday thinking.

One of these heuristics is confirmation bias. This occurs when we ask questions for which we seek particular answers, or when we look for particular answers when confronted with difficult questions. Within my field of work, sociology, social closure by the Left has led to - yes, the closure happened first, right around the time Joseph McCarthy was whaling about communists infiltrating the academy, among other institutions - confirmation bias to the extent that Marxism is taught vis-à-vis the conflict paradigm.

Harkening to the adage that it is far more difficult to unlearn rather than to learn, paradigmatic thinking is related to confirmation bias in that once one becomes entrenched in a worldview any and all alternative explanations for a given phenomenon are suspect and credulous. Partly through anecdotal and experiential evidence, but also based upon years of reading texts from my field, sociologists tend to ask questions that inevitably lead to the #blameitoncapitalism meme prevalent among the Bernie-supporting, socialist-loving Left, who themselves seek out affirmations that their failed ideology is the last best hope for humanity (because Venezuela is just another example of not implementing the true version of socialism).

It is no secret that I am an anti-Marxist (and proud of it). Therefore, my bias is clear. In my experience, many contemporary sociologists self-identify as conflict theorists, which is a broad school of thought within the discipline

(cont. 11)

VIOLENCE AND POLITICS ARE INSEPARABLE,

ARTICLE BY SEAN O'CEALLAIGH

You might here some people say, "There is no place for violence in politics." This is a premise failure. Without the threat of violence, government can't exist. Politics is nothing but how which side decides to use violence to their advantage. Politics would be meaningless without the threat of violence. Exactly my every last point. Thus, politics is only effective when a threat of violence is present. Politics *is* violence, and is also the art of manipulating and bullshitting people into thinking that it is anything but advocating for violence.

How about we stop advocating for force, coercion and violence to be "free", instead of arguing all the bogus thinking, bullshit ideology and "politics"? We may want to consider the same things every decent parent teaches their kids growing up, "Live and let live, and mind your own business, *and* you can't tell others how to live their lives."

Advocating for the initiation of force, coercion and violence is the exact opposite of believing in and/or valuing freedom. It is 100% contradictory *and* self defeating before even starting the ideal. Freedom isn't, has never been and never will be, the promise of safety, security or comfort. It is the promise of the ability for each individual to choose for themselves, *or reject for themselves* a chance to be better, without hindrance or deterrence from external sources, period. Manipulate definitions and the meaning of words all you like; no one will be any better for doing so, ever. In fact it makes everyone's life infinitely worse in endless ways.

WHY HOMESCHOOLING WORKS, BY AMELIA MORRIS

I have never stepped foot in a public high school, so I can't testify as to why that system doesn't work, but I can shed light on why I believe homeschooling is a system of education that does work. I'm not saying there isn't a wrong way to do it. I have known other people who were homeschooled that grew up to have no goals, no ambition,

and no special skills. More often than not, this is a case in which a parent is focused more on indoctrination and their own ideas of what education should be. Some parents ignore the fact that a child needs to explore to expand his or her mind.

I was lucky enough to be placed in a homeschooling co-op. This is a small group of parents, usually ten to fifteen, who take it upon themselves to become teachers, allowing a child be homeschooled while at the same time gaining the student/teacher relationship, rather than just the child/parent relationship. My group met twice a week, as most parents were also working full time jobs. This gives a child the opportunity to slow down, or speed up if needed. It's an opportunity that's not usually granted in a traditional classroom setting.

Through this system, I was allowed to excel at subjects I was strong with, and slow down on subjects I was poor with. For the rest of the week, we were expected to hold ourselves to a standard. We had to learn to keep up on our own and had to have something to say about what we learned before our next class. I know that sounds impossible for a bunch of kids, but somehow we succeeded. We knew what a privilege it was to be a part of this smaller, trusting community, and I think that's what kept us from backsliding.

As far as the social aspect, which is crucial in a person's development, the average class would have three to five children. This was a perfect setting for someone like me who, even as a child, seemed to be riddled with social anxiety. There was no room for cliques or bad blood. Because of the small-scale setting, we were able to form real friendships that have lasted far beyond our school years. Both my parents (My mother taught biology and my father held art classes) and I look back on our shared homeschooling experience with a lot of great memories, and I know that should I ever have children, it's something I would want them to experience as well.

RUBY RIDGE: 25 YEARS LATER. A SUMMARY FOR THE NEXT GENERATION, ARTICLE BY JASON BOOTHE

"This was hell on earth, and we were living it. I had to crawl through my mom's blood to the pantry." - The Federal Siege at Ruby Ridge, written by Sarah and Randy Weaver about the siege of their home in 1992.

Three years before the now infamous siege of the Weaver home in Ruby Ridge, Idaho, Randy and his family were just everyday folks trying to live as free as can be, same as many of us today. They simply wanted to be left alone. The federal government had other ideas for Randy though: a snitch. And they tried to entrap him to make that idea into a reality.

Kenneth Fadley, a Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, & Firearms (ATF) informant, asked Weaver to sell him two sawed-off shotguns. The ATF claimed the barrels were cut shorter than the 18 inches mandatory by law. According to Weaver the ATF then threatened him, saying that unless he promised to infiltrate the Aryan Nation and turn informant, they would prosecute. He refused. Charges were filed in December 1990. A court date was set, then changed. A probation officer sent a letter to Weaver with yet another date. When Weaver failed to appear, a warrant was issued. A Senate Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Government Information later concluded that pretrial services incorrectly informed Weaver about the change.

What followed was an intense and extensive 18-month investigation and surveillance of the Weaver's 20 acres. David Nevin, a lawyer involved in the

court case post siege noted that, *"The marshals called in military aerial reconnaissance and had photos studied by the Defense Mapping Agency. They prowled the woods around Weaver's cabin with night-vision equipment. They had psychological profiles performed and installed \$130,000 worth of long-range solar-powered spy cameras. They intercepted the Weavers' mail. They even knew the menstrual cycle of Weaver's teenage daughter, and planned an arrest scenario around it. They actually bought a tract of land next to Weaver's where an undercover marshal was to pose as a neighbor and build a cabin in hopes of befriending Weaver and luring him away."* All this despite the fact that the ATF had initially served Weaver the warrant without encountering violence by agents pretending to be stranded nobodies with engine trouble on the side of the road that Randy stopped to help.

Nevin also noted, *"Although the marshals knew Weaver's precise location throughout this elaborate investigation, not a single marshal ever met face-to-face with Weaver. Even so, Weaver offered to surrender if conditions were met to guarantee his safety. The marshals drafted a letter of acceptance, but the U.S. attorney for Idaho abruptly ordered the negotiations to cease."*

How It Started...

Fast-forward to August 21, 1992.

14-year old Samuel Weaver and family friend Kevin Harris, 25, bound off after the dogs in hopes of getting a deer for the dinner table. What they found instead was camo clad, face

painted, suppressed automatic firearm standing over the Weaver's dog, Stryker.

What happen next is a point of great contention. A "he said/she said" if you will. The camo clad men, US Marshal's, claim they identified themselves. Kevin Harris said they didn't. Either way, shots were fired from both sides. US Marshal W.F. Deagan was killed by Kevin Harris and little Samuel was killed, shot in the back, his arm nearly severed, as he turned to run back up the hill, by U.S. Marshal Larry Cooper; though it took more than 3 years and a very persistent county sheriff to prove who killed Samuel. Harris managed to make it back to the cabin and inform Randy what happen. The Marshals retreated down the hill and called for help. Randy retrieved his son's body and placed it in a shed near the cabin.

The next day, August 22, nearly 400 federal agents from the FBI, ATF, joined the US Marshals surrounding the cabin. The Feds then altered the "rules of engagement" to include *"If any adult in the area around the cabin is observed with a weapon after the surrender announcement had been made, deadly force could and should be used to neutralize the individual."* Shoot first. Ask questions later. The rules were later determined to be "unconstitutional".

Later that second day, the family went out to the shed to say goodbye to Samuel. Randy was shot by FBI HRT sniper Lon Horiuchi in the shoulder. As he ran back to the cabin, Randy's wife Vicki, while unarmed and

holding her 10 month daughter Elisheba, was shot and killed by Horiuchi. The bullet went through her skull and traveled into Kevin Harris's arm, lodging in his chest, causing him excruciating pain and several times asking Randy to shoot him.

For the next 8 days, August 23rd-30th, the family lived on their knees and crawled around the cabin floor (through blood from Kevin, Randy, and Vicki) to keep from silhouetting themselves in the windows. The Feds sifted through and removed the contents under the cabin (in the book she co-wrote, she specifically remembers hearing them talking and moving around) and taunted the Weavers by using a loudspeaker to try convince Vicki (the Feds claimed they didn't know she was dead) to tell Randy to give up.

August 31, Randy peacefully surrendered.

The Trial and Aftermath

The FBI's incompetence continues. They claimed that shooting Randy and Vicki was justified because Horiuchi said he saw one of the suspects raise a weapon in the direction of a helicopter. But other federal officials testified at Weaver's

trial that there were no helicopters in the vicinity of the cabin at the time when Horiuchi shot.

Randy was cleared of all major charges including murder. He was found guilty of failure to appear and carrying a weapon during pre-trial release. Randy was sentenced to 18-months in prison and a \$10,000 fine. He got credit for time served and only served an additional 3 months post trial.

Randy sued the government for wrongful death of his son and wife in 1995. The government settled for \$3.1 million. One million to each of the surviving children and \$100,00 to Randy. A DOJ official told the Washington Post that *"if Weaver's suit had gone to trial in Idaho, he probably would have been awarded \$200 million."*

Kevin Harris was cleared of all charges. He sued and got a settlement for \$380,000 in 2000.

The government never admitted any wrongdoing in either settlement.

The "Ruby Ridge Task Force" report to the DOJ's Office of Professional Responsibility in June 1994 stated in its conclusion that the rules that allowed the second shot to take place (the shot that killed Vicki)

did not satisfy constitutional standards for legal use of deadly force. Despite this, Lon Horiuchi was saved from an involuntary manslaughter conviction in 1998 by U.S. District Judge Edward Lodge citing the supremacy clause of the Constitution which grants immunity to federal officers acting in the scope of their employment. Charges were officially dropped in 2001.

FBI Director Louis Freeh found 12 FBI officials guilty of "inadequate performance, improper judgment, neglect of duty and failure to exert proper managerial oversight." The heaviest penalty imposed was 15 days unpaid leave, for only four agents. As The New York Times reported, *Freeh has imposed heavier penalties for FBI agents who used their official cars to drive their children to school.* Larry Pott, the senior field agent and man the altered the "rules of engagement", received on a letter of censure.

In March 1996, the six US Marshals at Ruby Ridge, including Samuel's murder Larry Cooper, were given the agency's highest awards for their "courage".

Kill a kid, get a medal.

BURROWING OWL BAR AND LOUNGE

1791 S. 8TH STREET, COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO

(719) 434-3864

(communism kills cont.) ...often said to have its roots in the works of Marx and Engels. I discussed this in my first column in *The Front Range Voluntaryist*.

What is the difference between my own bias(es) and those of your everyday Left-progressive? Those who know their Marx will say that they are starting from first principles, i.e. that humans must work to live and that human work is contextualized by the material organization of the world. It follows, then (at least for Marxians), that one's own interests are often obfuscated by a false consciousness constructed by the ruling class; and, to say otherwise is merely the product of that very same false consciousness!

I actually agree with these premises, but not for the same reasons and to the same ends as Marxians. Yes, humans exist in a material sense, just as most of the rest of the universe, but we also are composed of subjective (e)valuations, one of which is that for most people it is better for them to control their destiny rather than it being controlled by others. Self-ownership, rather than collective ownership, follows from this, as does certainly the concept of private property rather than the abolition of property, which was one of the ultimate desires of Marx and Engels.

The social closure of academia (among other institutions, i.e. mass media) has led to a plethora of resources for Left-progressives to use to confirm their biases. Voluntaryists need to recognize this fact, because to ignore it is to ignore the reasons why we see and hear so little from this side of our opposition (Right-progressives are another story) about the mass murders, starvation, imprisonment, and general malaise of people living in full-blown socialist and communist societies.

[...To be continued in pt. 2.]

RESILIENTWAYS.NET

*BUILDING LIBERTY
COMMUNITIES...*

SO YOU WANT TO PRIVATIZE EVERYTHING?,

ARTICLE BY MATTHEW DEWEY

Ok.

Total privatization is entirely possible right now today, and can be done with no interruption in any service currently provided exclusively by the State. Privatization is a matter of planning the right company and market conditions, which necessarily require the removal of all prohibitions to entry in every market that is currently monopolized by the State.

A monopoly is a grant of exclusive privilege by the State. The goal of a monopolist is to restrict others from competition in order for the monopolist to cut production (or lower quantity and/or quality of services rendered) and raise prices.

As of right now, we have a bunch of State monopolies driving down quality and driving up prices because that is exactly what monopolies are designed to do. They deliver increasingly poorer goods or services at increasingly higher costs of production. We all know the State is bad, it's a monopoly, it's stagnant, and bloated, inefficient by nature precisely due to lack of potential competition.

The State is a territorial monopolist of ultimate decision making with the ability to unilaterally and forcefully expropriate its capital resources from current tax victims, sometimes also referred to as taxpayers. I prefer the former title as it's the more accurate description.

To fix the systematic problems caused by the State, we simply and civilly allow competition while providing retribution to the proper victims of state aggression, the tax-victims. By civilized action I simply mean those that are consistent with private property norms including the non-aggression principle.

Competition is the act of rivalry, or potential rivalry, over control of scarce resources at a particular time and place. *(Cont. next)*

Generally in civilized society, such as western culture, competition takes place under widely accepted norms, based on the concepts of private property.

The solution to the problems caused by a monopoly is as easy as introducing competition or at minimum, the potential rivalry, over scarce resources. Competition can be potential as well as *active*. A single firm can be the sole provider of a good and still sell that good at competitive prices simply because if it does not, i.e., if it cuts production and raises prices thereby increasing profits it will invite actual competition. Selling above market prices invites competitors to the market looking to profit by undercutting the higher market prices. Potential competition has the same effect as actual competition. If a firm was the only provider of a good or service but was faced with potential competition, it would charge prices in line with market prices in order to not attract actual competition looking to enter the market and undercut the firm's prices.

Planning competition is only a matter of removing restrictions on civilized action and organizing the private ownership of saleable shares, and the current stock market system can be the model of the method used to complete privatization of currently monopolized State services.

The tax victims of a certain geographical monopolist must first collectively decide to privatize. This can be done by referendum vote. Not an easy task but well worth the efforts. Capitalization plans can be specified per industry such as defense (police), fire, emergency medical, parks, garbage collection, mail delivery, sewer, water, and transportation, including roads, bridges, and tunnels. Next, a fleet of accountants can estimate a fair market value of current monopolized services as the acceptance of bids begins. Then, each industry potential competitor will be required to submit bids that include systematic and regular debt

service payments to tax victim shareholders, with definitive and possibly staggered payoffs over time. These will also be tradeable shares on competitive markets, allowing capitalization of the most successful.

When the capital resources are fairly valued, the shares are divided among the collective of tax victims, which is not an easy task, but well worth the efforts. The tax victims then vote with their shares on the proposed competitive firm bids. The chosen firms will be offered use of the capital resources at the direction of the tax victims affected.

There exists a need for a subordinate class of shares. These will be issued to current State employees of their respective specific industry. The usual rule currently used on Wall Street is that debt trumps equity. On Wall Street this means debt service (bonds) takes precedent over equity (ownership), so for privatization efforts this means that the tax victim's shares will be entitled to first liquidation rights (dibs) in the event of a company liquidation. The industry firms that accepted the debt service terms (in exchange for the use of capital resources) will be required to pay down the entire tax victim debt.

Once those debt service shares are paid, they become equity shares that will be distributed as per company by-laws to key employees possibly to further incent productive action. Also, a market can be set up to trade both sets of shares and inevitably someone will create a lucrative way to exchange the shares, much like the current derivative markets that offer a wide variety of means of private but collective ownership options to the market.

The purpose of two sets of shares is to first make a step towards acknowledging the crimes committed against tax victims and legalizing the method of trade of currently monopolized services that align with free market principles. First, that the better looking and performing industry competitors and their ideas will be rewarded in higher capitalization resources. Just like the current

stock market, if a hot IPO of a company with a popular potential business model debuts, its capitalized value is higher than those with bad business plans. The market decides the winners and losers. Second, to incent the current State employees to want to enter a competitive market situation by granting them partial ownership status for the privatized firm in which they would be helping to be profitable. Current employees could continue working on with one of the competitive firms of choice or sell shares on market.

The market takes care of the rest. A competitive market will increase quality of service while lowering the cost to the consumer.

Introducing competition through business planning utilizing currently existing models of saleable shares along with a means of providing at least a nominal restitution to the current tax victims will lead to increased quality of good or service as well as an incentive to lower the prices to consumers.

[Matthew Dewey is CEO RWDS Corp., Arbitral Tribunal at Murray's Market]

INFLATING AWAY OUR TECHNOLOGICAL GAINS, ARTICLE BY JAMES BUTCHER

Imagine being alive at the dawn of the industrial revolution, when mass produced food and textiles suddenly granted hours, or even days, of pure leisure every week for the average person. Imagine the explosion of steam power revolutionizing locomotion and thus connecting vast distances by rail to suddenly allow titanic quantities of goods and people to move across the continents. Imagine the Home Insurance Building, the world's first skyscraper, being built, suddenly tapping into another entire spatial dimension for living space. Imagine witnessing (most of us have) the internet revolution, with ramifications too staggering to even mention in one paragraph. Imagine living through the scientific breakthroughs that forever changed our view of

the world: the theory of gravity, the theory of evolution, the discovery of other planets, stars, and galaxies, atomic theory, the theory of relativity, quantum theory, and hundreds of others.

These are true paradigm shifts. These are the revolutions in human progress that marked milestones in our history ever since the enlightenment. What revolutions have occurred since the advent of the internet? Was the smartphone a revolution? Perhaps. The discovery of the Higgs Boson? Not really. 3D TV? No way. Although these are all great improvements and are highly commendable, they are not revolutionary. They are simply improvements and continuations and new spins on the most recent paradigm. Over the course of the past several years, even these relatively minor improvements have come fewer and further-between. How impressive is a slightly larger smartphone screen, slightly better visual graphics, a slightly sleeker car? Even Moore's law seems to have ground to a halt. This law, which was once very accurate for several decades, predicted that computer processor capacity would double every two years. This brought the cost of computers down tremendously to the point where a Pi Zero board costing \$5 today has more computing power than a 1977 Cray Supercomputer which cost more than a million times that.

Today, the cost of computing technology has actually been increasing in ways. Note how the cost of an iPhone increases significantly with each new release for little benefit. The same goes for nearly every other good and service in the world. Cars, homes, food, clothes, utilities, entertainment, travel, and recreation have all been getting more expensive while hardly improving at all. What could account for this disappointing outcome? For science fiction nerds like me who are obsessed with limitless progress and achievement, we could never accept this trend passively, let alone welcome it. There must be an answer.

Could we simply have reached the limit of what is possible? No. Prophecies about a "limit" have been declared and proven wrong countless times in history. Could we have reached the limit of available resources? No. There are still vast expanses of material, both concrete and *(cont. 14)*

still vast expanses of material, both concrete and abstract, in the earth and in the minds of billions of people.

Could we have reached the limit of available energy to use? No. Along with great reserves of fossil and nuclear fuels, we still live directly under a deluge of vast untapped energy from the sun, which pours about 1000 Watts per square meter over the entire surface of the earth. Could people have simply become satisfied with their condition and would rather live out the rest of their lives exactly as they do now with no more change for the better? To ask that question is to answer it. People always want to improve their condition, notwithstanding all the talk about a sustainable future, a ludicrous dream where a sustainable (fixed) population lives out eternity doing the same thing, using the same technology, century after century. Even the most hard-core proponents of sustainability want some kind of advancement in art, technology, or wealth.

Why has it stagnated? The culprit is, of course, the state. Taxes, regulations, confiscation, and monopoly privileges have always been the scourge of progress. However, the worldwide experiment in constant inflation bears special note. The explicit goal of central bankers is to cause an increase in prices of about 2% per year in order to fight the (non-threat) of the "threat of deflation."

While taking an extremely simple approach to the actual economics of the matter, let's imagine a world where falling prices of everyday goods reigned, as it did during those past times of great progress. If the supply of money stayed constant, people would be able to acquire everything they needed to sustain their standard of living with money left over. What would they spend that extra money on? After putting some of it toward extra consumption, the rest would go toward savings. No longer simply maintaining the status quo, that extra money could fund the production of more machines to increase output for less cost, or fund research and development on even more efficient machines and methods of production.

Eventually, with enough savings, new technology could be tried. This does not happen automatically. The cutting edge is expensive. This is where much of the money goes when it is freed from the task of maintaining the old ways. It does not disappear into hoards. It gets put to work blazing the trail of progress. If the prices of goods

and services never come down, how will people ever have enough saved to scale up the cutting edge to its full potential (solar panels, desalinization plants, fiber optic cable, etc.) or to finally develop the large shelf of inventions already made and developed and even prototyped to a large degree (driverless cars, augmented reality gear, genetic engineering, etc.), or to experiment with speculative new technologies (quantum computing, full immersion virtual reality, cure for cancer and aging, etc.)?

As a rule, new inventions do not deliver on their promise for increased output until after a great deal of time and effort. They may even end up being failures. Research, development, and initial capital production are extremely costly. We cannot hope to succeed in these bold pursuits if we are stuck struggling to get by on what we have now. In theory, some particularly fanatic people could cut back significantly on consumption in order to stockpile some savings, which could then be used for the purposes outlined above.

But if enough people did this, enough to have any economic impact, they would be met with increased monetary intervention to prevent the resulting fall in prices. The thrifty would be punished while the extravagant would be rewarded, and the attempt would be thwarted. But the situation is even worse. If prices never come down, but instead rise steadily (albeit slowly,) outpacing the increase in wages, all we would ever do is thoughtlessly adjust more and more to the hard times. We must simply grin and bear it as we tighten our belts, year after year, decade after decade, stoically dismantling our standard of living, until we reach bare subsistence. It would be a strange form of subsistence where we would all be living hand to mouth as in some Dickensian novel, but with the same gadgets used today. We would still travel by car, and still use smartphones, and understand that the earth is round and the sun is the center of the solar system; but, like the dark ages, life would never get any better. Only a new app, a new update to an age-old program, a new "feature" on our smartphone, a new coffee flavor at Starbucks, would dazzle us with novelty similar to how the earth-shattering industrial paradigm shifts of ages past once used to.

As I describe this nightmare, the realization that it is already descending upon us becomes apparent. There are no savings, only (*cont. 15*)

...tremendous debt. The Hyperloop, strong AI, humanoid robots, space tourism, and other breakthroughs “just around the corner” are nothing but hype. These achievements could move ever further into the future as we focus ever more on just getting the bills paid this month. But this dark scenario is not inevitable. All economic depressions and all inflationary currencies in the past ended one way or another. I am confident that the human spirit of progress will be unleashed once more as soon as this failing experiment called statism is finally scrapped.

Most people do not yet realize how much progress has slowed. They are still dazzled by the “breakthroughs” of recent years. Yet many of these are merely symptoms of increasing poverty, which have only become widespread through necessity: Netflix, Amazon, automated service, teleconferencing, etc. Once people finally wake up to how little has truly changed, and take a big step back, and realize that true revolutions in human thought and wealth have merely become something our kids learn about in textbooks, they will ask “why?” too. We must teach them that it is not due to lack of possibility, nor resources, nor energy, nor motive, nor inflation; but lack of freedom.

GOING ANTI-STATE AND ABANDONING POLITICS, ARTICLE BY MIKE MORRIS

There’s one thing I think in particular that keeps many from coming around to accepting anarchism, besides the connotations the word carries of chaos and violence, which is of course the way of the state. It isn’t necessarily our principles they question, which are quite straightforward and unambiguous. The skepticism stems largely from the viability or feasibility of having a society without a state. “*Is it even possible*”, they ask, “*to have/get to anarchism?*”, as if the impossibility, say of eliminating crime, is a good enough reason to not oppose it.

Besides, the fact the criminals exist is not a case against anarchism; criminals may well always exist. And it surely isn’t a case for the state. Indeed, what is the state *but* a criminal gang whose subsistence is based upon expropriation, caging anyone who resists, and murdering if necessary to maintain its slavery? The state, built upon aggression, is a magnet for sociopathic types

who like the idea of dominating others, whether physically as part of their police and military forces, or economically by way of rent-seeking and gaining special privileges over competitors, among other options.

That humans are the way they are doesn’t logically lend to the idea that some (members of the state) should have the exclusive right to live under another law than the law of private property, which says that every man owns his body, that just ownership of property is that which has been originally appropriated, and that invasions thereof are criminal. The libertarian can make no exceptions to these principles for the men calling themselves “the government.” They are human, too. At least as far as we know.

It is recognized that there is a state, and that it probably isn’t going anywhere in our time, or in the foreseeable centuries. This should not take away from ethics, however. I believe we can posit how the world *should* be, while recognizing that it is not the way we wish for.

How to organize society?

Everyone sees the easy state solution: monopolize goods and services and have a single, tax-funded agency to distribute these resources and control them. How to have road? Well, the state just taxes everyone and they fund the road. How to have schools? Same thing; and force the kids to attend them too. How to have security? Again, you just tax everyone and fund the compulsory security service, the police and military.

This is the only way most people can see things. Collectivizing these things that supposedly benefit “everyone” as to remedy the externality, as the mainstream economic rationale goes, is the only way to organize society. Society, however, is but an abstraction that ignores the individuals who make it up. Forgetting about the individuals within that “society” allows for legitimating tyranny over a population. This logic is dangerous as it’s an open door to endless statism, i.e., a world-government, as it justifies all resources be in the hands of a centralized agency in the name of some “common good.”

Why this jurisdiction stops at present national borders is arbitrary for the statist, who has an emotional connection and allegiance to “his” government. The consistent would see no reason why there can be many ungoverned governments, and that a superstate world-government (*cont.*)

is needed to settle this unacceptable “anarchy.”

Since this is all most anyone knows, it becomes hard to wonder (to think for once!) how things could be done in a more decentralized manner, without compelling men who don't consent to being expropriated in the name of “the common good”, in order to have all the things formerly provided monopolistically, now by the market instead. That is, how a society based on voluntary payments could function and provide us with the resources we need for our everyday survival, which are indeed essential services—too much so to have them in the hands of the state! There is the much neglected alternative of liberty in the much politicized world we've made it to.

Indeed, the first hurdle is that the above – society and the state – are inextricable concepts to the statist. Without the state, man is in a constant state of war; society and civilization come about only once man is coerced into living under political institutions. This is the essence of the Hobbesian myth, which has infected most today, that the state is necessary to exist as a peacemaker or to provide “law and order.” Anarchists would be right to simply point out that it must be considered contradictory to have an agency founded in aggressive theft and violations of property rights to come around and say “we're here to protect you.” And if they went further, that states have a history of violently-using that which they violently appropriate (expropriate).

Where are libertarian-anarchists coming from?

Philosophically, our principles are on solid ground. Building up from (1) the objective fact that man owns himself and his body (self-ownership), and that (2) thereby he has the right to the fruits of his labor (private property) which he originally appropriates (as opposed to expropriation) for himself (ground-land, natural resources), being that he must use resources to survive, we reach thus (3) a guiding principle for organizing society which is that of non-aggression (the non-aggression principle or NAP). What this says is: the initiation of violence is morally wrong, whether by private theft or harm, or publically, by calling this theft “taxation” or this harm “war.”

The idea of “voluntary” can only be conceived of with the private property ethic in mind. Violence is just and moral in defense, but it is criminal when initiatory. Violence *per se* is not condemnable; the context of who owns what

plays a decisive role in its legitimacy.

To attempt to refute any of these principles through argumentation – that humans own themselves, that private property is an absolute, axiomatic, eternal, universal principle in ethics, or the non-aggression principle – one must engage in performative contradiction, thereby accepting them. The only alternatives are absurdity: that some men may own other men (he doesn't own himself); that someone else has a better claim on the product of another man's labor than he does (that his property isn't his); or that “I may hit you but you can't hit me.” There is no slave-theft-aggression principle.

Most sane people after reasoning for a moment do not reject the idea that man owns his physical body as well as those resources which he appropriates for himself, and that therefore all human interaction should be voluntary. This is how they live every day. This reasoning changes though, not just when it comes to being consistent and applying them to the people who call themselves the government too, but when it comes to the prospects of achieving this libertarian world or how it could all work otherwise.

But whether or not we can get to liberty and whether or not everything can work in a self-governed society, without the notion of centralized militaries that coerce payment for protection or social programs to supposedly help the poor, is somewhat besides the point. We here are interested in taking *an ethical stance against aggression*, and therefore opposing the state *on principle*, despite what else follows (despite that we do believe a free society can work).

A principle is something that can be universalized, i.e., apply to everyone. This is why self-ownership, private property, and non-aggression are our consistent principles. Taking some people's stuff and giving to others (the ethic of socialism) is not a principle because it cannot be equally applied to everyone (and so much for their claim of equality anyway, right?): someone has to be the *tax-payer*, the other, a *tax-recipient*. The only principle we can hold is that *no one* steal from *no one*.

So what's the one thing?

A major factor would seem to be the pressure one knows they would experience to be one of those who challenge the way things are now; to buck the system and thus be one of the ones who

must explain in great detail how this alternative system would operate as compared to the status quo of the statist order when voicing their stance.

This is what essentially all statist do to the anarchist in an alleged refutation and dismissal of their position: *"I demand that you conceive of every possible detail of your admittedly conjectural stateless society for me, or we must keep the patently corrupt, unworkable, and evil state until you've thoroughly convinced me of your alternative."* Somehow, they make it to where the burden of proof is on *us*, when they're the ones whose proposed system is based on the ethic "I can hit you, but you don't get to hit me", i.e., that rights don't apply equally to everyone. The state may tax (steal) and murder (war), but it's criminal (and rightfully so) when you or I commit aggression.

But, as for any other criminals, *opposition to the state is a normative ethical position* to take. We are saying how things should be, not always how to get there, though this should be covered too at times. From a philosophical point, we're simply stating that we condemn aggression. There doesn't necessarily need to be any more to it than this. That the state is that entity which has the legal right (and monopolistic capability) to violate property rights, whether in our persons or our physical property and possessions, whether by raiding our homes, taxing us, or aggressing against our bodies in another way, etc., is a reason for those adherents of non-aggression to reject the concept of this institution outright as it is built on such. I submit they need not paint a detailed picture of the free society to uphold this.

I realized that when I took the plunge, however, that I wouldn't be content to just assert this position and leave it; I had to defend it to the fullest. This required an economic understanding, philosophy, history, on top of plenty of independent thought, all of which is a never ending process. But I also realize that not everyone is like that, and to expect others to be interested in the same things as myself might leave others forever disinterested in the ideas of liberty, and would be to forget about our economic principles such as value subjectivity and that each individual is unique in his desires.

Therefore, anarchism is usually left to be adopted by those who are more passionate for liberty, ideological for it, and whom are willing to take on the subject at great lengths in its defense. While one may be passionate to the point that they wish

to conceive of ways in which a stateless society might function, such as how to fund roads without coercing people into paying for them, and basing this off historical precedents or economic logic, one need not be an anarchist theoretician in order to reject aggression. This is the thesis of this piece: you can be a moral anarchist *right now*, and leave it at that if you wish. The only alternative is for once to concede that they believe some people ("the government") have a moral right to use violence against peaceful, non-violent people, while others don't.

Ways to refute it?

It would be to ignore the subjective, unique, individualistic attributes of all men, as well as the specialization of the division of labor which makes us all prosperous, to think that everyone should think and be alike, and be interested in the social sciences as many who reject the state are.

While economics can teach us that state intervention has negative effects on the economy, such as relative impoverishment, unemployment, etc., not everyone is interested in economics. And they don't have to be! Economics is indispensable for a thorough refutation of the state, but one needn't be an economist to reject it. This "dismal science", as bad economists have called it, is not for everyone anymore than guitar is.

Mainstream economists are often too stuck on hypotheticals to remember that the state is not this benevolent institution that serves the common good of man which can act as the vehicle for correcting so-called "market failures", and so they come to ask about externalities, asymmetric information, or other questions in economics and have forgotten about, or never thought of, what the state is which they advocate for under this economic rationale that it can centrally plan "monetary policy", etc.

If they would really apply consistently their theory of monopoly to the state (that monopolies are bad and inefficient), too, which is indeed defined as a coercive monopolist, they would see that monopolists of defense (the state) would mean that the quality of the service must deteriorate while the costs rise. They can escape this no less than if they were to take control of food production. Price controls work the same from apples to healthcare.

Thus if they do have principles in economics, to not hold them consistently across industries would be to invalidate them altogether.

That is, if they don't apply to defense and law too, they don't at all. Some might contend they don't at all; perhaps economics is a "bourgeois" concept, or nothing can be said to be true. But for those who do realize that there are natural laws of the universe in the social sciences, they apply to the government too, as much as the things they otherwise are willing to leave free (though basically every industry, from agriculture/food, banking, healthcare, the airlines, etc., is regulated by the state, as in, the rent-seekers have consolidated their cartels in Big Ag, Big Banking, Big Pharma, etc).

The significance of deducing a science of economics, as has been done logically to the greatest extent by economists such as Ludwig von Mises and Murray Rothbard, the latter which included ethics into his analysis (where the former was lacking) to create a system of what we now call austro-libertarianism (combining economics and libertarian philosophy), is that it can establish that man acts to achieve his highest-valued ends, what he subjectively assesses as being of the utmost utility to him (the importance he attaches to an end). And therefore, government intervention is a disutility to those actors and hurts rather than helps. If A was offering a job to B at \$10/hr., and B was willing to accept this job, to declare (by a minimum wage law) that they cannot do so, and that this must be at \$15/hr., which thereby ceases the job offer, is to hurt both parties: A, who valued his money less than what he gains in labor, and B, who values the money more than the energy spent working.

We could use economics to explain why the quality of security and justice continues to deteriorate while the price continues to rise, or why minimum wage laws cannot work any more than rent controls, or why paper-money inflation doesn't create real wealth, but usually these arguments don't suffice. Most people are scratching their heads as to why the police have gone bad, why the roads are potholed, the schools are falling apart, there's jobless men, prices are rising, etc. Besides, as I'm arguing, one needn't go to such great lengths to take a position against the idea of statism.

And aside from economics, while one might be empirical and wish to show historical examples of the private provision of all goods, including law and defense, which have all existed and precede the state as we know it, one needn't be a historian

either. History is indispensable, too, for a thorough refutation of the state, but one needn't be a historian to reject it. One could show that states killed hundreds of millions of people in the past century alone, that they've increased the amount of theft and violence in the world, that they've turned conflicts into world wars, but none of this usually suffices either. The victim of Stockholm Syndrome does not care that its master has an awful track record for abuse. Here again, the skeptic will ask you to "show me an example of a stateless society in history." While we could point out some examples, one shouldn't feel stumped here. They can, once again, uphold their ethical position against aggression.

One might philosophize all day, but it doesn't change that the issue at hand is in one's acceptance or rejection of aggression as an organizing principle. True enough, no statist are really philosophers either! They have accepted their position largely through indoctrination by the state itself, beginning early in the government schools, into higher education, and throughout life altogether. Most of them wouldn't even make the connection that the state action they advocate is an endorsement of violence.

Hardly anyone, I imagine, has given it long thought on the necessity of the state apart from the illogical minarchist who insists it must remain in order to protect private property, though this is of course a contradiction to assert a monopolist who comes into power by way of the expropriation of private property could in turn be a defender of it. For the most part, statism is the default within people. It takes convincing for them to move toward liberty.

But, how might things work?

The idea of explaining how everything might turn out in the absence of the state, with a spontaneous order emerging in place of a centrally planned one, is admittedly stepping outside the bounds of positive economics or history, though both can assist in constructions of this society, to theorize how things might work in the future. For instance, that security might be a product offered by insurance companies or volunteer militias steeped in the libertarian philosophy, or, that disputes might be arbitrated through private judges offering their services in the event of conflicts, etc. Economics can help explain how most fears of the statist are really non-problems, like unemployment, inequality.

While we do know the state is bad, we don't know everything about a future yet unfolded. No one in the 1980s could have predicted what internet companies would have come about, how many there would be in twenty years, the speed of the connections they would provide, the price of those services, etc. In fact, America's beloved Keynesian economist Paul Krugman predicted in 1998 that, "By 2005 or so, it will become clear that the Internet's impact on the economy has been no greater than the fax machine's." This one didn't quite pan out for the man.

Most anarchists have made it their full-time hobby to refute the state, taking on all the literature possible. I can't knock them for this; we need those types out there. But everyone doesn't have to be one. You can simply take an ethical stance against aggression, and go on to pursue your other dreams, career, taking care of the family, or whatever it is that you do.

I think people feel, "well, I want to be an anarchist, but I don't feel I can defend the whole system", so therefore they reason that they'll just sit around and wait. But for what? To reject aggression? There's no need to wait! You can do it now, before you finish reading this.

Though it might be true the bulk of anarchists are also interested in theorizing too, this is by no means necessary for one to become a non-aggressionist. It shouldn't keep anyone from accepting this ethical position because they fear defending it against the sure slew of relentless aggressionists who will definitely give them a hard time for not being a democratic socialist like everyone else.

This intellectual masturbation might get us off, but really, it's only that. We can imagine and dream, but in reality we need to beat back the state at any chance. Minarchists are as much our allies in the grand scheme of things as others who have seen past their notions of maintaining a monopolist of defense.

But expecting markets to be planned is the statist mindset. Markets develop spontaneously. We don't need central planners to guide production. That's what the price system, profit and loss, entrepreneurship, and people freely trading do on their own.

The state has corrupted money so far, turning gold to irredeemable paper (with the Keynesian fascists presently seeking a cashless society and a forced fiat currency for the world!), that people

have come to believe money is a convention of the state. They wonder how we could have money if the government didn't have a paper money monopoly anymore. One of the founders of the Austrian school of economics, Carl Menger, proved in his *Origins of Money* that money was not instituted by any central power, but arose naturally as a need for the more marketable good in which to act as a medium of exchange between other goods. Gold can act as money. But since empires cannot expand unless they gain control of the natural money, convert it to "unbacked" paper notes, and inflate it to their advantage, the American system has done just that. Such is why the imperialist U.S. welfare, warfare, national security state has grown to be what it is today.

We need markets, not government

Markets will emerge to meet the demands of consumers, fulfilling their needs, and for that preferences are always changing is why these markets cannot be planned in advanced. They must be freed, is our contention. And nor are they "perfect" either, as "market failure" theorists who ignore the state's imperfection like to think we assume. They're *preferable*; superior to the state. Nothing is perfect in this world. Criminals—in the libertarian definition, those who violate property rights—aren't going anywhere, and yet they don't have to in order to condemn their actions. In fact, I'm sure I'll die with states reaching into every corner of the Earth, having never coming close to achieving this free society (though I do believe, with the power of ideas, the tides *could* turn toward liberty, and very quickly, and we could be reaching a new epoch in history of human evolution). Shouting "utopian" to the libertarian is a sure strawman.

There are indeed criminals out there, and they probably will always exist. But here's the excellent point which might ring with the skeptics of anarchism: one can oppose rape, murder, and other such crimes, while knowing that they perhaps will never be eliminated from mankind. We are not ignorant to mankind. Libertarianism works just how man is right now (self-interested), unlike communism which requires a New Socialist Man to emerge for it to work, for it to overcome even the most basic incentive problem that will be evident once they expect all the comrades to come together for the common cause. If man cannot be free because of some moral failing or imperfection, then nor by that same...

logic should he be given power.

We *should* answer “is anarchism even possible?” when it’s asked to us, because we should do anything and everything to convince people to abandon the statist doctrine bred deep within, but I submit that anarchists don’t have to. Only those involved in pushing these ideas hard should be burdened with answering “but who will build the roads [without coercing everyone]?” for the nth time.

The politicization of society

If anyone looks around, they might see, not to my surprise, the politics breeds conflict. Living under a common, centralized state with millions of people will inevitably mean many who cannot reconcile their differences will become agitated, often taking to the [public] streets to be heard. “Antifa” and the “alt-right” are fighting in the [public] streets. This is no way we should be living.

Secession, which is one of the chief proposals of libertarians, is looking more needed than ever before. Secession is considered seditious or treasonous by the state, and even racist by many. But it is the means of breaking up with a partner (Washington) that no longer represents our needs, as many already feel. Secession is the idea that no man is bound to a sprawling political institution by virtue of his geographical location and some contract his ancestors allegedly made centuries ago, and that a means of achieving liberty is to decentralize all the way down to the individual in principle, even if there may be some practical limitations to this.

“Without a state”, they say, to divide us and pit one man against each other in a coerced political association, “we’d all be in a constant state of war with each other.” To the contrary, I’d say: it is why we are at each other’s throats now. It is the idea that a central state, whose subjects are comprised of many different people with different preferences and traditions, many “nations” if you will, that these hundreds of millions of people cannot settle their differences and instead take to the streets. We cannot reconcile them through the next vote, either.

States make life fully politicized. Look at what politics does to us: we make non-issues issues, people are obsessing over identity politics from all sides, all the news headlines are about something the state has ruined, whether health care, the budget shortfalls, the roads, the function of

security. “Transgender bathrooms rights?” Look how far we’ve come that we need to talk about getting the state out of the bathrooms. Give me a break!

Government, especially democracies, give us the idea, since they present the political means of achieving them, that we have a right and interest in controlling other people and their property. People begin to think more outward than what their focus should be. They forget that life should be about adventure, discovery, and taking care of your own. We’re losing touch with nature, caught up in the grind of politics, made ever more pervasive by social media. We should all be trading with each other, producing, enriching our lives through leisure and relationships, raising a family, doing what we love, making art and music, advancing civilization in other words. But humanity as a whole isn’t yet willing to evolve past the notion of organizing society by way of aggression.

If I’m out in public, at the bar, I hear political conversation. But I often wonder what would we be talking about if politics didn’t dominate our culture? The things we love, learned, and our future journeys, of course.

How to roll it back?

In the private, market economy, goods are allocated according to people's needs in a decentralized manner. Again, public goods are political in nature. If it's not privatized, it will inevitably be political. People will fight over access and rights to the public good. This is a great advantage for the state: to socialize healthcare is to politicize it, with the goal being of keeping the people begging the state for a piece of it rather than privately paying cash. If healthcare is left to the private and competitive market, though, it is a private matter. We see now how the issue of health in America has become largely political, with people bickering over what a Democrat or a Republican should do with it when the solution is simply to get the government out of it. Government-healthcare won't be fixed by slapping a new politician's name on it other than a Democrats, which is seemingly the only Republican gripe with its present status.

What is needed is to allow the market economy to function; to end state monopolies and allow for free entry into the market. The state, unlike private business, is not subject to profit and loss. The private businessman works to avoid losses

(value lost) and maximize profits (value added to society), and he uses his knowledge of the market, his customers, with the help of the price system, to decide what it is that people might want in the future since nothing is stagnant. Any sort of central control system must be working in the dark though, unable to maximize efficiency and rationally allocate resources. All government actions are arbitrary.

If private property is inextricable to civilization, it stands to reason public property—and protests and politics—means degeneracy. The way to end the politicization of society is through privatization; the way to end the power, through decentralization. We must depoliticize or progress for humans is at stake.

Conclusion

It is my hope that having read this article, you yourself might accept this reasoning and say, “aggression is never morally justified, even when the people who call themselves government do it”, and that it matters less what will come of this spontaneous, stateless social order than taking a principled stance against it. Really, if one rejects anarchism, what they’re saying is “we need politicians!” Don’t you think that sounds stupid yet?

We’ve long lost any ability to question the status quo. Not only is the state a given, it must be democratic, too! It doesn’t have to be this way. We don’t need a state, the coercive monopolist that has the sole right to acquire its income through non-contractual means, i.e., violating the private property ethic. Everyone should be equal before the law, not the socialist idea of equal outcomes for everyone. No one should have a special right to initiate violence against others, allegedly on their own behalf.

You don’t have to be an economist, historian, philosopher, or libertarian theoretician to accept this ethical position against aggression. This, I feel, is what keeps people from biting the bullet. You can go about your career, specializing in whatever it is you do best, as a doctor or whomever, and accept the non-aggression principle as a guiding means of how society should be organized: with the absence of aggression, private or public.

Ask yourself: do we really need politicians and bureaucrats? This is the only way? We can’t self-govern? You can call it anarchist if you want; I’m for a political-less society.

YOUR DOG, LAWFUL PLUNDER AND THE REGULATORY STATE, ARTICLE BY NICK WEBER OF DENVER

Amid our never-questioned culture of endless regulation and law-making a simple, yet crucial, socio-economic concept is highlighted by recent pet-sitting legislation: should you stop lawful plunder or participate in it?

Stories of government overreach abound: kids brought to tears because they had the gall to set up a lemonade stand without a permit, unpermitted book exchange boxes taken down due to zoning violations, greedy neighborhood kids fined for mowing yards without business licenses, and more recently, a man arrested in California for selling vegetables on the street corner.

Bizarre as these stories are, they have and will continue to occur, always framed under the guise of public safety. It's bad enough when the government comes knocking at your door for violating some obscure regulation or sends you a violation notice in the mail because you are lacking the requisite occupational license to “legally” operate your business; but what could be worse than the heavy hand of government working its way into your everyday business life?

The answer: when the full weight of the government is thrown at you at the behest of your competition. As economist Henry Hazlitt put it: “*The envious are more likely to be mollified by seeing others deprived of some advantage than by gaining it for themselves. It is not what they lack that chiefly troubles them, but what others have.*” Perhaps that is a bit too harsh. As we shall see, this will come full circle and the blame can be squarely placed right back at the hands of our benevolent...

...government.

Earlier this year in Colorado, a large boarding/kennel company complained to local officials about one person, who was using a mobile dog watching app to provide a specific service for dogs with anxiety issues and was certainly cutting into the large kennel's bottom line by offering a better service than they were able to provide. The local officials indicated that the individual was breaking the law for operating a large kennel without a permit. State legislators were quick to "rectify" the situation with House Bill 17-1228, signed into law on June 5, 2017. The bill would "change current law that requires anyone who boards another person's pet for money to be licensed. It would "allow" online platforms like Rover.com and DoggyVacay that link pet owners to potential pet watchers to operate and would limit such contract sitters to no more than three pets at a time." How or why three became the number is a mystery, but I'm sure it is for the good of the people.

At this point it is important to stop and ponder for a moment in grand terms regarding what happens when government intervenes in a market. Economist Frédéric Bastiat cogently summarized that "the real cost of the State is the prosperity we do not see, the jobs that don't exist, the technologies to which we do not have access, [and] the businesses that do not come into existence..."

Rather than allowing the market to adjust itself in response to individuals stepping forward and offering valuable services, regulators simply stifled innovation at the behest of a large company who has been enjoying an undue advantage via occupational licensing. This is an example of government creating barriers to entry that

ultimately favor one business over another. When the licensing requirements are unnecessarily burdensome, some businesses just simply exit the market, their services lost along with the associated technologies that would undoubtedly be a benefit for the consumer. To further explore the concepts of government intervening in markets and businesses turning to government to squash potential competitors, I recommend the article Bastiat, A Fine Political Economist, by Mike Morris, published in the *Front Range Voluntaryist*, July 2017.

But now, let's tackle a more focused question: why does a dog kennel need to be licensed in the first place? Without a doubt, if you are a dog lover, you are going to do your due diligence and make sure that the kennel or individual is a reputable and trustworthy entity that will offer the best care for your Fido before you send him off to boarding for a week. Does that State issued piece of paper hanging in the lobby really give you the confidence that nothing bad will ever happen at this facility? Do we really need to do the research to find what would surely be countless instances of State licensed facilities treating dogs inhumanely? If a private business wants to voluntarily obtain an independent certification, that should be their decision and could very well land them new and continued business. We must consider, however, that even with an independent certification in place, bad things could happen. One thing we know for certain is that no amount of legislation will eradicate the world of all evil, that's a fool's errand. Often times this type of legislation is framed as such: "Colorado lawmakers moved to allow online pet-sitting platforms to operate legally in this state despite concerns (*cont.*)

...from kennel operators that doing so could endanger pets or put existing facilities out of business." Gasp! There it is, right at the end of the lead sentence in the article: the government moved to allow some business to occur, but my oh my, what will happen to the existing businesses that have enjoyed government protection via licensing requirements all this time? This could put companies out of business! I'm reminded of a recent situation in Colorado where similar phrasing is being pushed regarding legislation that allows grocery stores to sell full strength beer: how can we implement allowing full strength beer sales since it will put all the mom and pop liquor stores out of business? If that is confusing to you, you are not alone. In Colorado, grocery stores were not allowed to sell full strength beer but in last year's election cycle, the people voted to overturn that prohibition. Now the state and local governments are scrambling to figure out an equitable way to phase in the legislation (which takes effect in 2019) without destroying the small liquor stores that are located right next to the grocery stores. Surely, some small businesses will go under and it will be painful, but it is most certainly a problem that government created with its prohibition on grocery store full strength beer sales in the first place. Not to mention that ultimately, the consumer loses through decreased choices in beer selection and the loss of the immediate feedback loop that exists with small local liquor store owners and their relationships with distributors and brewers...but I digress. Both the dog-sitting legislation and the prohibition on grocery store full strength beer sales have one thing in common, they represent nothing...

more than market distortions that are in need of painful, but necessary, resetting.

What we also see evidenced here is what Bastiat identified as a common belief that "anything lawful is also legitimate..." and that "many persons have erroneously held that things are "just" because the law makes them so." There is a belief in laws that is ingrained into our culture from day one: the state is here to help you and will legislate all the bad things away. Our collective cognitive dissonance allows us to ignore the reality of our over-burdened regulatory State, for we continually allow for its expansion via licensing, permits and fees within the business realm with nary a complaint. The secret to achieving this task is for the State to split up and separate out all the multifarious fees, licenses and permits that, if considered all-in, would undoubtedly be roundly rebuked by the masses. It's also helpful to not refer to these items as taxes, but what is a fee if not a tax? We fail to realize that the state will stop at nothing with continual regulatory expansion and the obligatory bureaucratic staffing associated with the implementation of these items; for how do you keep all those violators in line? This is another hidden aspect of the regulatory State.

Since government does not create income itself, it must steal the funding for myriad staffing positions of unelected bureaucrats via additional taxes. This has happened before and is inevitable with government, which always seeks to expand and control. This was plainly evident to the founding generation, to wit: one of the grievances levied at King George III was that "He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance." The..

..terrifying reality of that grievance specific to the items discussed in this article, is that it is not some King in a far away land, but our competitors, our neighbors, that bear the responsibility for expanding this type of lawful plunder. I would be remiss to fail to mention Bastiat's disdain for founding father worship, for he stated that "the world has far too many "great men," "fathers of their countries," etc., who in reality are usually nothing but petty tyrants with a sick and compulsive desire to rule over others. The defenders of the free society should have a healthy disrespect for all such men." [1] That being said the grievance itself, holds true, irrespective of any ulterior motives of the founding generation.

Most will see this new dog-sitting legislation as a "win," look-see: the government stepped in to allow a new technological sharing economy to develop within the context of already existing business licensing requirements! We need to re-frame the conversation and focus on the reality of the regulatory State, which has created an unbalanced market, pitting one business against another on the grounds of regulation violations. Without a doubt, the over-bearing licensing requirements in the first place most certainly created the problem that "needed to be solved." Oh look! Silly Fido is chasing his tail again!

[Nick Weber is a husband, father of two and loves coffee. You can follow him on Twitter: @DenLibertarian or at www.denverlibertarian.com]

[1] Basiat, Frédéric. *The Law*. Auburn: the Ludwig von Mises Institute, 2007. Epub. Introduction.

WHAT IF YOU WERE A WHITE NATIONALIST?, SUBMISSION BY "ORTHO BRO"

In the aftermath of the Charlottesville Riots, hate and vitriol has been the public message spread among the American political spectrum. Calls for violence have been spread by left and right, and I imagine they will continue to do so as the month goes on. I've witnessed many-a-libertarian dick waving back and forth over the "virtues" of punching Nazis or punching Antifa with few truly practicing the underlying values of non-aggression that we should all espouse, but that is another matter and there are likely plenty of those articles in this month's issue to fulfill your thirst. No, today I'd like to take up a moment of your reading for a cultural & historical lesson: *If you call for punching Fascists or taking away their jobs, you're feeding the horde.*

Small disclaimer. I was a Civic Nationalist and "Race Realist" for some four years of my life before being introduced to the liberty movement back in 2014. I'm a semi-practicing Greek Orthodox Christian, and a firm Agorist if that matters to you now. When I speak about ethnic nationalists, I'd like to think I know a thing or two about them seeing as they were (unfortunately) my main audience and peers for four years of my life.

The first thing you need to understand is the history of America's Nationalist peerge. "Modern" American Nazis can be traced back to George Lincoln Rockwell. You don't need to know much about him, but he was an excellent orator that was friends with Malcolm X and Elijah Muhammad. I suggest you watch some of his speeches on Youtube if you want a deeper understanding of the mindset of early Nationalists. These early nationalists, founded around the 1960s, were focused on preventing the exploitation of individuals and ensuring the state remained out of private property, while equally maintaining their racial, tribalistic ties. If it sounds a lot like an "Ethnic Paleo-conservatism" it should, as the early Nazis drew a lot of their ideas from those lines of thought. While they made significant political gains in the 60s, eventually they dissipated after George Lincoln Rockwell's murder. His ideas, however, stuck around, archived on video and in newsletters for...

...future generations that would come and pick them back up at the turn of the century.

So what makes a modern American Nazi? It's not a hatred of brown people or a desire for power over others, believe it or not. Many modern American fascists associate more with "alt-right libertarians" than they do with statism, which is why so many left-libertarians are foaming at the mouth about the alt-right in the first place. What makes an American Nazi is rather a deep distrust for a globally expansive federal government, lack of in-person social interaction, poor interactions from being raised near minority neighborhoods that have been trashed by market interventionist policies (they call it "Chiraq" for a reason), and most importantly poor living conditions.

When dealing with Virginia, we're dealing with the heart of Appalachia. I'm not sure how much you know about Appalachia, but it used to be an economically and culturally prosperous part of the U.S. before government got increasingly involved and ruined everything. Appalachia has a less than 15% degree attainment rate in 218 of its 420 counties associated with it, and it has a higher-than-average unemployment rate of about 6.5% on average. In 36 of those counties unemployment is above 10% and in 25 of those counties, more than 1 in 5 adults lack a high school education. If the rest of the USA is hurting economically right now with college kids putting off moving out of their parents houses until their mid-late 20s, then Appalachia is a magnified version of this trend. The only thing that is going to end this trend is less statist involvement in the economy allowing for people to climb out of those poor living conditions.

I want to put you into the shoes of "the founding" of a modern White Nationalist for a moment. You're 16-19. You're white, heterosexual, likely male, and you just graduated high school because you're one of the lucky ones. Either your dad left when you were in your early teens, or your family, while held together, likely experiences domestic issues and your parents are very rarely around since they both have to work in order for you to eat. You might be a lucky one and hold down a part-time job at minimum wage, but chances are you're either unemployed or underemployed. If your parents are divorced, your mom just got her GED and is going to the community college- she receives more money

than you do in federal aid on account of being a single mother. If your parents aren't divorced, then you can kiss that college dream goodbye- your family makes too much for you to qualify for federal aid despite living in near-poverty or actual poverty conditions. You try to apply for private scholarships, but half of them require you to be a minority, one-fourth of them require you to maintain a 3.5/4.0 GPA average and score an 80% or better on the SAT, and the other one-fourth turns you down. You might be lucky and get into the military, but chances are that diagnosis of ADHD when you were 7 has made you unable to serve in the military.

You can't afford college, you can't afford to move out, you start to question why everything in life is going wrong, and your time starts to get sucked into the online community. You happened to start out with some normalfag-tier meme groups on Facebook or reddit, but then you get involved with a slightly xenophobic private Facebook group, or your friend introduces you to a site like 4chan. The Nazi memes on these pages start out as a sort of "dark humor," but two months into unemployment or underemployment and you start looking at the infographics at 2 in the morning. You start listening to some old George Lincoln Rockwell speeches and think he's an excellent orator to you. Some of the infographics are of dubious nature, some of them have some truths hidden among the propaganda. It doesn't matter to you, you start to think that maybe the government is favoring minorities and maybe that's why you're in the situation you're in.

The Nationalists convince you to get into a trade school, skilled trades being typically extremely conservative and majority male, but the Unions involved, licensing, and economic halts will keep you grounded as an apprentice until your mid to late 20s. You maybe decide to virtue signal one day to your "normal" friends that you don't hate minorities, but you think what the federal government is doing is wrong, and is responsible for the situation you're in. If you're lucky, you get laughed at. If you're unlucky, you get accused of being a racist, a Nazi, etc. Doubly so if you happen to have "big L" Libertarian friends. Hell, you might have turned to Libertarianism as a source of escape from all of this, and have been shoed out by the virtue-signaling of Gary..

..Johnson supporters and left-libertarians. Eventually, you start cutting off contact with those friends (if they don't cut off contact with you), and increasingly turn to the online community or to a handful of similar "racists" and "Nazis" that you've met in real life. You get together, talk shit, and one day a news article appears about "White Supremacists" at an Oregon standoff. You immediately point out there was nothing "white supremacist" about it, or how they didn't label BLM riots as "black supremacist," and get scoffed at by those outside of your in-group. You start to see businesses like a tech company in California get sued for not being inclusive enough even though they were hiring on merit and not on race or gender, or a baker being forced to bake a gay wedding cake. This whole time, Obama refuses to call out the BLM movement for its racist ties, and keeps trying to grab your guns on the stupidest shit. You might even suspect certain tragedies like 9/11 and Sandy Hook were false flags orchestrated by the government if you happen to watch Infowars or similar streams. Sites like Huffington Post and Salon post articles that would look like they came out of Hitler's mouth if the word "white" was replaced with "jew," and mainstream media increasingly takes these sorts of sites seriously.

Then comes the Charleston Church Shooting. You rightfully point out that Dylann Roof was a nut job, but racial tensions are so high thanks to Obama and BLM that your peers just point out the Rhodesian and Confederate flags as an excuse to have them banned. You don't have time to explain the intricacies of slavery or apartheid South Africa because you know they'll just accuse you of being a revisionist or racist (not that the word bothers you any more), and Wal-Mart just took down all of their Confederate items. You hope this will just breeze over as another leftist fad, but now people are calling to tear down monuments left and right in Southern States.

Then comes along Trump. Trump is a symptom, not a cause, but he's also an accelerationist catalyst in many regards. He makes one comment about building a wall among his various moderate conservative policies, and everyone flips shit about him being racist, transphobic, xenophobic, and every other word they can throw out there. You're used to it by now, the same people have been screeching the same shit for four years while you watched them lose the house and

senate to Republicans. A sort of "silent majority" of people fed up with them remains silent and ready to vote as these "SJWs" gloat about the end of conservatism and how Hillary will become president, take away your guns, etc. You watch as *reasonable conservatives* in blue states are *beaten and bloodied* simply for *not supporting Hillary*, and how Antifa runs rampant, accusing anyone who disagrees with them of being a fascist.

Enough is enough. It's nearly election time, and if "the left" is going to treat you as a fascist and punch you for wearing a Trump hat, then you're prepared to fight back for what you believe in. If the left is going to misconstrue you as a Nazi anyways, then you're prepared to give them their loosely interpreted "Nazi" because the word has been watered down from constant use and doesn't mean anything anymore. Trump wins and the riots continue. Tensions grow worse.

It's March of 2017 now. You see Based Stickman (Kyle Chapman) hit a leftist over the head with a stick after watching an old man get pepper sprayed by Antifa. He's a libertarian by-and-large who quickly gets corrupted on social media into a Civic Nationalist after "big L" Libertarians denounced him, and he's the caricature hero the right needs, not the one it deserves. Based Stickman's policy of "carrying a big stick" to rallies to defend yourself from leftists willing to throw feces-filled water balloons at you becomes the norm, others are prepared to imitate him if needed because fighting back and fear of being doxed scares off all but the most hardcore lefties. Even they know they're being violent ideologues. You aren't afraid of being doxed any more since you can't hold down a job and can't get the education needed for skilled labor anyways, so you proudly show your face as a form of accelerationism, as a sign that you are proud of your ideals and aren't afraid of the hate and vitriol you know you'll face. By showing your face, you hope to inspire others to join your cause, you consider yourself a sort of "social sacrifice" for achieving what you believe in. You might not even be a Nazi, but by default you're now associated with them and you don't honestly care because everything is a Nazi to the left, much how everything is a Jew to a Nazi. A Unite the Right rally is formed to protest the taking down of a Robert E. Lee statue, one of the most progressive figures of the Confederacy, and while actual white nationalists might have co-opted it, you know...

...that's not why it was started. You don't care though when Antifa and similar groups decide to pick a fight with you, but after taking your advice from Based Stickman in California, you're prepared and in some ways you've set up your outfit to look like riot police to "goad" the left into action. After all, the more violent they become, the more reasonable you look to everyone else.

If you happen to know a white nationalist or someone leaning towards the "Alt-Right," please don't socially isolate them or try to get them fired. You're just encouraging the process of radicalization. Take them with you camping or hunting, have a few beers with them this Halloween, start talking with them in-person more. Listen to what they have to say in-person and suggest libertarian alternatives and how the state is disempowering them, don't just ridicule them. "Nazis" aren't made from being empowered, they're made from being disempowered, poor, mocked, shown no empathy, and socially isolated, much as the left and many libertarians are promoting them to remain right now.

Nazis might be made from those circumstances, but they can be unmade by basic human compassion, dignity, empathy, and respect, much how I was when I was introduced to libertarianism via SFL/YAL, and encouraged to speak my mind (even if they disagreed) back in 2014.

[This submission/opinion comes to us via email]

***[Buy an ad to
support
liberty]***

**Contribute, Distribute,
Communicate, Advertise,
Report, Expose, Read
online:**

FrontRangeVoluntaryist.com

Make a voluntary contribution at:

Paypal.me/thevoluntaryist

Find us monthly in print at: **The
Burrowing Owl (Colorado Springs
South), The Leechpit (Colorado
Springs West)**

Find us online:

FB: /frontrangevoluntaryist

Twitter: @FRVoluntaryist

IG: @frontrangevoluntaryist

ResilientWays.Net
ResilientWays.Net
ResilientWays.Net
ResilientWays.Net
ResilientWays.Net
ResilientWays.Net
ResilientWays.Net
ResilientWays.Net
ResilientWays.Net

BURR  WING
OWL

BURR  WING
OWL

BURR  WING
OWL

BURR  WING
OWL

BURR  WING
OWL

BURR  WING
OWL