

AN ALLIANCE OF THE MEEK

How **Social Individualism** Means
Real Freedom and Real Social Justice

By Pat Freeman

Copyright © 2004. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without written permission from the author.

Who do you have to be to have a stake in the Human Cause? Who do you have to be to have a *say* in the Human Cause? By what authority do some rule over others? If you don't already know the answers—the real answers—to such questions, this is your chance to discover them.

This is a political manifesto. Not the kind meant to put some evil maniac in power, but the kind meant to keep all evil maniacs out of power—forever.

How can that happen? Only by thinking outside the box. That box turns out to be a cage. . . .

Disclaimer

This work doesn't contain legal advice of any kind. For that, you'll have to resort to lawyers. Good luck.

It also doesn't purport to be the product of any rigorous research or formal analysis. Instead, it attempts to show what even informal analysis can reveal about the world of politics. The word "politics" as used herein doesn't have its usual narrow meaning encompassing political parties, elections, and the like. Rather, it's used in a more generic way to refer to how people do treat each other (and why)—and how they should treat each other (and why).

Some terms will be coined here. Many others will be misappropriated and abused, including being used interchangeably in a casual way. *All terms should be taken to be defined by the context in which they appear.* The whole point is to de-emphasize *language* (which can be and often is used to deceive) and focus instead on *principles*. Feel free to substitute any terms you prefer to use to identify these principles. (Those who like to obsess over terminology at the expense of Truth, however, should drop this book at once and enroll themselves in law school.)

Political censorship is one of the worst things people do. Political censors are the necessary accomplices to genocide and oppression—you can't have an Adolf Hitler without a Joseph Goebbels. However, no attempt is made to be exhaustively fair to all sides of the issues raised herein. This is a pamphlet, not an encyclopedia. In particular, the pro-Marxian viewpoint is intentionally shortchanged, being more than amply (if dishonestly) covered elsewhere. You can find it in virtually any of the products of the Corrupt Media Bloc.

Weigh it all out for yourself, and make up your own mind. Freedom begins there.

Contents

1-0 INTRODUCTION.....	9
1-1 Reality Check.....	11
1-2 Success vs. Failure.....	17
1-3 Science vs. Religion.....	23
1-4 Socialism vs. Individualism.....	27
1-5 Democracy.....	29
2-0 FREEDOM.....	31
2-1 Freedom vs. Slavery.....	33
2-2 Persuasion vs. Coercion.....	43
2-3 Power Accumulation.....	47
2-4 Limited Slavery.....	53
2-5 Marxism.....	57
3-0 DEFENSE.....	65
3-1 Aggression vs. Defense.....	67
3-2 Defense Properties.....	71
3-3 Defensive Institutions.....	77
4-0 REAL LAW.....	83
4-1 Decree vs. Real Law.....	85
4-2 Real Law Discovery.....	91
4-3 Justice.....	97
4-4 Punishment.....	103

5-0 POWER RETENTION	107
5-1 Egalitarian Institutions.....	109
5-2 Sovereignty.....	117
5-3 Citizenship.....	125
5-4 Civil Defense.....	131
5-5 Political Censorship.....	137
5-6 Capitalism.....	145
6-0 CONCLUSION	149
6-1 An Alliance Of The Meek	151
APPENDICES	161
Appendix 1: Synopsis	163
Appendix 2: Outline (Key Points)	169

1-0 INTRODUCTION

Some background is necessary in order for Politics to make any sense, starting with clearing up some key misconceptions.

1-1 Reality Check

If you were to close your eyes and try to imagine a benign, successful future for humankind, what would you see? A handful of trillionaires who own everything and run everything? Vast global government ruthlessly enforcing incomprehensible law?

If you don't want to wind up in a certain place, what sense does it make to be marching precisely in that direction?

Most people in their right minds aren't all that fanatically interested in politics. If you were to write down a list of the 5 most important things in your life, chances are politics might not even be one of them. But it should be near the top of the list, because it impacts everything. To prove it, just relocate yourself and those 5 otherwise-important things to North Korea.

The situation on the Korean peninsula is a tragedy for the Korean people, but an invaluable object lesson for all of humanity. There it is in black and white: relative prosperity in the South and abject misery in the North.

The situation can't be blamed on "racism" or any of the other usual suspects in the "divisive political scapegoats" pantheon. Same people, same dirt, same everything on either side of the DMZ, except for one thing—politics.

The subjects of the North Korean regime can do nothing to remedy their predicament, having been carefully and systematically deprived of everything necessary to effect any such remedy. Helplessness is a fundamental precondition for slavery, but the most important precondition of all is plain ignorance.

It has been said that the truth will set you free, which shouldn't be too hard to believe because it is 100% for certain that untruth will enslave

you. The only hope had by people who can't embrace truth and reject untruth (or even discern between the two) ever to enjoy Freedom is if someone else hands it to them on a platter.

There is, as it turns out, an unbreakable link between Truth and Freedom—a fact which hopefully will be made clear by the coming discussion on what Freedom actually is and what's required to achieve it.

At the foundation of everything (including politics) is Truth, or Reality. To reference Reality, we're going to be using a 3-tiered model.

The 1st tier includes: TRUTH, LAW, ARBITRATION, JUSTICE, etc.

This first layer represents Reality As It Actually Is. Unfortunately (or perhaps not unfortunately) this view of Reality is beyond the limits of human understanding. So, other than having made note of the fact that it exists, we'll set it aside for good.

The 2nd tier includes: Truth, Law, Arbitration, Justice, etc.

This layer represents our best, good faith effort at understanding Reality, within our unavoidable limitations, but uncompromised by self-delusion, wishful thinking, fraud, or malice. Since it is the absolute best we can do at any particular time (which does tend to improve over time), it is either good enough for our purposes, or else it isn't, but through no fault of our own.

The 3rd tier includes: truth, law, arbitration, justice, etc.

This layer represents our ordinary, run-of-the-mill approach to things. At this layer we may or may not have any relation to the 2nd layer, depending on whim, but no concerted effort to conform to Reality can be found here. It is at this 3rd tier that we find such things as junk science, junk religion, junk politics, junk debate, junk law, and other assorted junk. What all of these junk disciplines have in common is the triumph of agenda over Truth.

So, in effect what we're doing with the Reality Model is: (1) recognizing that we constantly have a choice whether or not we're even interested in Reality, and (2) using what amounts to proper names to label our best guesses at Reality, in contrast to ordinary nouns labeling our less-rooted-in-Reality efforts.

The important thing to understand about Reality is that it existed before any human being, that the "Arbitration" referred to isn't the human variety, and that no person had anything at all to say about Truth, Law, Justice or any of the rest of it.

Our normal human effort, on the other hand, is all about human arbitration—human whim. While circumspect people of good will may try to stay rooted in Reality to the best of their ability, others of us imagine we can just blow off Reality and indulge our fantasies, not in some private entertainment, but in our public (i.e. political) interaction, and do so at no cost.

You can even hear some guru wannabes claim things like: "The truth is whatever we believe it to be."

Interesting theory. We can put it to the test with a simple experiment. Let's send two skydivers up in a plane. The one who doesn't "believe" in gravity won't need a parachute, correct?

What we've got to get through our thick heads is that objective Truth exists. It is whatever it is. It can't be changed in the tiniest iota of a detail by wishful thinking or sloppy analysis. The Truth is something we get no opportunity to decide, only discover—if we have the ability and will to do so.

But the situation is even more dire than that: the Truth is our judge, jury and executioner. We either adequately come to understand and conform to it, or we suffer the fate of those who don't.

Looking back over human history, we can see that our perceptions, behavior, and culture have changed radically, while Reality has persisted. The Law of Gravity didn't suddenly come into existence when Galileo or Newton or Einstein finally conceived it, it was there all along.

We live in a Universe filled with Rules, and for as long as we've been searching we've been discovering new ones—a process with no end in sight. So far, none of them has shown the slightest malleability to any human belief. If belief has no effect on Reality, then it becomes necessary for Reality to affect belief.

So are we saying that something like optimism, for example, is a waste of time? Of course not. Our mental state has no impact on Reality, but it can have a huge impact on our behavior, changing it in a way that takes better advantage of existing Reality. If we don't *believe* something is possible, we're unlikely to take the steps necessary to find out if it actually *is*.

Attitude, in fact, is the difference between Winners and Losers. Winners aren't people who never lose, merely people who never give up. Paralyzed actor Christopher Reeve used to play "Superman" in the movies, but he turned out to be Superman in real life and Attitude made that happen. We can't always choose our circumstances, but we can always choose our Attitudes, and if we choose badly we can expect to do badly.

Likewise, we ought to be careful about jumping to premature conclusions about what Reality is. It's been said that if people were meant to fly, we would have been given wings. What we were given, as it turns out, is an ability to understand aerodynamics and to create technology that takes advantage of it. (Whether we should have or not is another matter, but after a century or so the results of that particular decision look mostly positive.)

And since we're not omniscient, and only part-way toward understanding what we are capable of comprehending, we often find ourselves resorting to alternatives to certainty—like guesswork, conjecture, speculation, faith. You know, facts—if you have them—are great. But what happens if you don't? Are facts the only possible basis for making a decision?

If facts were the only usable basis for decision-making, we'd have a problem because some facts we have, while many more yet elude us. Fortunately, there are alternative bases, and one of them is *risk*.

For example, suppose you had to decide whether the notion of "free will" is reality or fantasy. Setting up a scientific experiment to conclusively prove the matter one way or the other might be a pretty tall order. However, from a risk standpoint the problem becomes embarrassingly easy—simply assume that free will exists! If it actually does, then you've made the smart choice, and if not then you were just doing what Fate forced you to do. In other words, you have nothing to lose by pretending that free will is real and nothing to gain by pretending it isn't.

Here's another example: the Universe is either a Creation or else it's not. If anyone has an open-and-shut case for either scenario, it hasn't been widely publicized. But what are the risks of believing the Universe is a Creation if it isn't, and what are the risks of believing it isn't if it actually is?

What we can observe is that people will often, when faced with an absence of convincing proof, simply believe whatever they choose—whatever seems to give them comfort. (In fact, this approach is so popular that we even resort to it when contradictory evidence is readily available.)

What's even more amazing is that, while some people will choose to believe something uplifting, others will choose something bleak—even without clear proof one way or another. It's as if they're comforted by negativity, when more positive choices were equally viable based on any available evidence.

But wishful thinking, cynicism, and the other shortcomings of human nature are something we're going to have to rise above if we want to Succeed. Our understanding may be a work forever in progress, but we have to make the best decisions we can regardless, and that means making the most of whatever we have to work with.

1-2 Success vs. Failure

What is success? We can hear all sorts of people described as "successful"—including those who seem to be all about their own gratification and dominating others, the accumulators of vast wealth and power for purposes of their own. If there's such a thing as Real Success, though, we need some understanding of what it may be.

The idea of "humanism" has developed a bad reputation in some circles—well-deserved if it tries to make humanity the be-all, end-all, center of the Universe. The Universe is a mighty big place.

But we ought to have a healthy interest in the fate of our species. The Human Cause is *our* cause. Who's supposed to take responsibility for it if we don't?

So we have two kinds of Success to pursue: collective and individual.

By "collective Success" we merely mean the Success of the Human Cause itself. Although we may each have all kinds of notions as to what may qualify as a Successful outcome to the Human Project, we're necessarily in the realm of speculation. Hopefully, most of us can agree that Success probably doesn't include our near-term extinction. (Anyone who's unwilling to embrace even that minimal precept is excused from further discussion, and be sure to make an appointment with a qualified therapist on your way out!)

It's pretty hard to score a touchdown when you can't figure out where the goal line is, and that's the situation in which we find ourselves. We really don't know what we're doing, and we can't expect to remedy that anytime soon—maybe ever.

Does that mean we're whipped? No, thanks to an approach ready-made for the ignorant like ourselves—hedging our bets. This multi-tack approach is an automatic result of Freedom, in sharp contrast to the sort

of lockstep march toward disaster we see under Slavery. Tyrants are a serious liability when it comes to finding the goal line, since they tend to be insane but will tolerate no dissent or deviation from their master plans.

Despite the conviction of an endless succession of delusional megalomaniacs who're sure their mission on Planet Earth is to hijack the Human Project, it is in reality a *team* effort, and a multi-generational effort at that. How can any person claim to be its sole owner? It stretches back to dim, unknowable prehistory, and forward to some even more unknowable future.

We're all its owners, and we each bear responsibility for it. We all Succeed together, or we all Fail together.

Owing to our individual responsibility for the Success of the Human Cause, it becomes obvious that individual Success depends on our individual contributions to our collective Success.

Suppose that in the very last instant of your time here on Planet Earth, you were suddenly granted wisdom enough to understand the real value of your contribution to the Human Project, if any.

We don't know if anything like that happens, and it wouldn't matter much if it did, since it would be too late. The time to develop an understanding of what your contribution ought to be is while you still have enough time left to do something about it—which, not knowing when that is, basically means at once.

Some people see their mission on Planet Earth as all about contribution, and others see theirs as all about gratification. But some of the most gratified people ever to live—people who had their own way as often as they could arrange it, at whatever cost to others—are already pushing up daisies. Their successors will be joining them in due course. And no one will ultimately care about how wonderfully gratified they were, not even themselves.

What it all boils down to is this: contribution lives, gratification dies. We can work to the benefit of succeeding generations, as many of our

unknown forebears have already done, and be Successful people, or we can be Failures in the very gravest sense.

And make no mistake about it—there are no bigger Failures than Tyrants, whose net effect is to thwart the potential contributions of innumerable others by Enslaving them. They're willing to place our whole Mission in jeopardy just for the sake of their delusions. As Tyrants become ever more sophisticated and grandiose, that jeopardy only increases.

That's something that should concern us all.

What exactly it is that we came to Planet Earth to accomplish is something we each have to figure out, isn't it? But speaking generically, we can say that we all came here to do our best. And 3 things (of a political nature) deserving special recognition in that regard are listed in the following table, along with their opposites:

aids to Success	aids to Failure
Persuasion	Coercion
Competition	Monopoly (anti-competition)
individual responsibility	group "responsibility"

It's no coincidence that the encouragements to merit (Persuasion, Competition, individual responsibility) associate with Freedom, and that the discouragements to merit (Coercion, Monopoly, group "responsibility") associate with Statism. *Freedom is pro-merit and Slavery is anti-merit.* Marxists are all about Political Power, not Success, and the relatively poor performance of Marxian societies is simply a reflection of that.

The relationship of these principles to Success and Failure is straightforward. The odds of being able to Persuade others go up or down depending upon how right or wrong we are, whereas being able to Coerce others doesn't require us to be even a tiny bit right—just ruthless. (Note that Excellence, being naturally attractive to people, doesn't need Coercion. What does that leave?)

Competition obliges us to do our best. Monopoly allows us to do our worst and still get by—that's its whole point. Monopoly is not only Slavery, but an outright admission that we have no desire to do as well as we'd have to in order to be competitive. It's a way for Losers to steal the rewards that rightly belong to Winners.

Individual responsibility creates incentives based on something we can actually control—our individual behavior. That corresponds to basic human psychology. Being held responsible for what we have no way to control—other people's behavior—is seriously de-motivational because it runs counter to basic psychology.

A few other things (of a non-political nature) are worth mentioning in the context of Success, and one of them is Good Judgment. Not being omniscient or otherwise infallible, we have great need for an ability to make reasonably good approximations, and an inability to separate the wheat from the chaff means winding up with a shortage of wheat and a surplus of chaff.

Like everything else, Good Judgment is something that some people will have more of a knack for than others. But we all should develop whatever aptitude we have for it to the fullest, because it will be in absolutely constant demand in any Free Society. Poor Judgment makes effective self-control virtually impossible.

Another is Reason itself. Logic is a powerful capability, and possibly the only one unique to humans. Dolphins or elephants may have rich spiritual lives, who can say? And even the family pet can display a whole range of emotions. But we're the only species in our acquaintance (so far) that can do The Calculus. Reason isn't all-powerful, any more than we're all-powerful, but if it can put people on the Moon, it can offer much-needed leverage in putting people on a Free Planet Earth.

Last but not least is a tool that we alone are fortunate enough to possess—Recorded History. Hopeless people make the same mistakes over and over. Smart people learn from their mistakes, and really smart people learn from the mistakes of others. Humankind is afforded a unique opportunity to learn from the most tragic and unrepeatable mistakes of countless of our forebears, as well as benefit from their genius. That's an offer we can't refuse, and still claim to be doing our best.

We're not talking about memorizing what year the Battle of Hastings was fought in order to get a grade in History class—who cares? But anybody aspiring to Freedom needs to know *why* battles were fought, how they were won or lost, how they've been avoided (and at what cost), and everything that's ever been discovered about how force or fraud have been used to Push People Around.

Here are some examples of what the people who came before us have been able to figure out:

"Just because you do not take an interest in politics doesn't mean politics won't take an interest in you."
— Pericles (430 BC)

"They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."
— Benjamin Franklin (1759)

"Guard with jealous attention the public liberty. Suspect everyone who approaches that jewel. Unfortunately, nothing will preserve it but downright force. Whenever you give up that force, you are inevitably ruined."
— Patrick Henry (1788)

"Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." — Lord Acton (1887)

Human nature is a mixed bag, but included with it is the ability to make the most of what we've been given. Selfishness can be harnessed to produce a healthy lack of dependence on others, becoming less of a burden on them, or it can be allowed to degenerate into the pathological exploitation of others. Competitiveness can be used as a spur to ingenuity and effort, or become an excuse for vanity and chauvinism. And on and on.

The choices are ours, but the judgment of History will belong to others.

1-3 Science vs. Religion

In the popular culture, science and religion are often portrayed as antagonistic, as opposites. Actually, since they each encompass the Universe in its entirety, they necessarily overlap, and would more properly be regarded as complementary.

To be sure, they differ substantially in approach. Although they both benefit from reason, inspiration, intuition and the like, science is based on *skepticism* and religion is based on faith, i.e. *speculation*. While some may be offended by this comparison between faith and speculation (faith being assumed to correspond to Truth and speculation not necessarily so), the point here is that both can happen, by definition, in the absence of *proof*—something that science intentionally doesn't embrace.

Now, as we all know, skepticism is a good thing and speculation is a bad thing, right?

Wrong. It all depends on what's True. In other words, skepticism about Untruth is helpful, but skepticism about Truth is counterproductive. In like manner, speculation about Truth is helpful, but speculation about Untruth is counterproductive. Therefore, leverage would be available in our use of skepticism and speculation if we could somehow make educated guesses about what we'll later discover to be True.

What this means is that science, as potent as it has turned out to be in many instances, nevertheless suffers from an inherent handicap: *it's biased in favor of ignorance*. That is, it prefers ignorance to unproven Truth. The same skepticism that is its strength is also its weakness. As a result, science has been a great help when it comes to things that can readily be subjected to experiment and proof, but leaves us hanging in other areas, some of which unfortunately happen to be the most critical to politics.

Another thing about science that's not always kept in mind is that, although its insistence on proof means science has a high likelihood of yielding correct answers (when it does yield answers), its reliability can never be 100%, thanks to human fallibility.

One problem, that isn't the fault of science but rather of human nature, is this tendency we have to become fat-headed about our accomplishments. We can be reminiscent of the 12-year old kid who says: "When I was 11, I only *thought* I knew everything, but now I really *do* know everything!" It never seems to occur to us that our understanding is a work forever in progress.

So, the situation we find ourselves in is the following:

None of us knows the Truth, the whole Truth, and nothing but the Truth. All of us put together don't know it. Science can't be expected to solve this problem for us anytime soon, yet if we don't base our politics on the Truth we can expect to suffer the consequences of that. Do we have any way to take up some of the slack in our understanding?

Yes, we do—religion.

Now, some people would be aghast at the suggestion of any involvement of religion in politics, particularly those who advocate the "separation of church and state" (an impossibility, by the way, because there's really no such thing as the absence of religion, or equivalent belief in things unproven).

Their reservations aren't unfounded. While science has a long track record, religion has an even longer one that's very mixed. Theocracies are some of the worst societies ever endured, and self-righteous zealots have perpetrated all manner of atrocities against "heretical" unbelievers. However great a problem agenda-based junk science is, agenda-based junk religion is even more prevalent, and dangerous.

Also, while lots of people don't believe in a particular prophet (or in *any* prophets), everyone believes in the existence of *false* prophets. But how do you tell who's real and who ain't? Not to mention the fact that

prophets and even their "interpreters" seem to have lost any trace of their human fallibility.

Still, religion at its best has made a unique contribution to the Human Cause thus far, one we would have been much worse off without. And while it's Truth—whatever that is—that really matters, Truth is exactly the thing real religion has grappled with for a very long time, with impressive results.

The amount of commonality among real religions is very interesting. Not that popularity of an idea is proof of being on the right track—it isn't. But while contradiction can be more apparent than real (like the story of the blind men describing the same elephant in contradictory terms), *real* contradiction is a killer, since it proves at least *somebody's* wrong. So in that sense at least, commonality can be a good sign.

The point is not that clerics should be calling all the political shots, merely that to exclude religion from the list of things we use to inform our understanding is to risk missing an opportunity we may not be able to afford to miss. Particularly so, since the kind of human interaction that politics involves is well-studied in many religions, and not yet well-understood by science.

This war between science and religion that some people seem to want doesn't make a whole lot of sense. Based on our experience with them, there's no reason to completely discount either, and ample reason for concern about both.

Did you know that our "free will" is actually a Divine oversight that Theocrats have been appointed to correct? Did you know that needing to advance some religion at gunpoint in no way reflects badly on what it has to offer?

Meanwhile, the scientific community is populated by intelligent and highly educated people. But amazingly, many of these otherwise bright individuals seem unable to grasp what appears to be common sense: that not everything that *can* be done *ought* to be done. That some paths lead ultimately to joy and others to misery, and that discernment or good judgment is crucial to making the right choices.

Suppose a group of scientists wanted to conduct a cutting-edge experiment in particle physics. Suppose further that an opposing group of physicists claimed that such an experiment was very dangerous and might result in the creation of a black hole, but that the first group of physicists dismissed those concerns as nonsense. How do you, perhaps not an expert in particle physics yourself, know whom to believe?

Freedom allows people to risk their own lives in whatever pursuit they like. Risking the lives and welfare of others whose approval was never sought or given is another thing altogether. If Dr. Frankenstein forgets that it's the unwashed rabble of the countryside who must bear the brunt of any screw-ups, the reminder may come in the form of something nasty involving torches and pitchforks.

And what does all this have to do with politics? Just this—that any enterprise that chooses to take no account of human fallibility is pretty shaky from the get go. Anyone who has never made any errors or been mistaken about anything is entitled to utter confidence. The rest of us should bear our histories in mind as we go forward.

Those who refuse to entertain even the possibility of being wrong have little hope of being right. *Anybody can make a mistake*. The less likely people are to believe that, the more likely it is to actually occur. Hubris is a disaster in general, and politically disastrous in particular. That argues for circumspection—not trembling cowardice or phobic timidity, just reasonable caution and an open mind.

The hallmark of open-minded people is that they *change* their minds—not constantly, about everything, but occasionally, about things which they've had the chance to learn more about. Whereas, the kind of conviction that's uninterested in (or even hostile to) any countervailing evidence corresponds to closed-mindedness. Closed minds are a boon to Slavery but a bane to Freedom.

People can say all sorts of things, but ultimately, Truth is Truth. If it is known to some, then there should be a good chance that it can be verified by others. Being put in the position of simply having to take somebody's word for something is a Power Accumulation approach—politically, a terrible idea, as we shall see later.

1-4 Socialism vs. Individualism

Socialism, as a political notion, has a lot of fans. Individualism, the opposite notion, also has a lot of fans. But both of these notions are rooted in misunderstanding.

The "we're all in this together" idea behind Socialism is not only perfectly true, it's absolutely critical. We *are* all in this together. The Human Project is a team effort, whether we like it or not—we all Succeed together or we all Fail together.

Where Socialism goes astray is in the totally unwarranted inference it then makes: *Because* we're all in this together, *therefore* we need Joe Stalin (that trustworthy champion of "social justice") to force us all at gunpoint to do "socially just" things and refrain from doing "socially unjust" things.

On the other hand, the sort of self-serving, self-centered, self-obsessed "individualism" envisioned by some blatantly ignores the unavoidably social nature of the Human Project. It does have something going for it, however—individuals are *real*.

"Society" isn't. Society, in fact, is a *concept*—an abstraction. It's a tool for trying to think about and label what is actually a group of disparate (although politically interrelated) individuals. Now, it might be possible to claim that the individual is also an abstraction, but if it is, it's the level of abstraction that counts because individuals have brains.

You—an individual—think, therefore you are. Society does not think, therefore it is not. Individuals are sentient, and can make choices—and be responsible for those choices. Society doesn't "want" or "need" anything—it is individuals who want and need things. There is no one—not even Joe Stalin—who is in a position to speak for Society. The individual members of Society must speak for themselves.

An accurate understanding of the relationship between (intangible) Society and the (tangible) individuals it comprises would result in a better political notion—one that might be referred to as **Social Individualism**. That is, the choices we individuals make ought to be informed by an appreciation of the social nature of our common undertaking. That's a job for education—for enlightenment—not Joe Stalin and his thugs.

It is Social Individualism that encompasses both Real Freedom and Real Social Justice. Not only *aren't* Freedom and Justice mutually exclusive things, you can't have one without the other!

Socialism, which talks the talk of "social justice" while walking the walk of Slavery, has as little as possible to say on the subject of Liberty (unless it's couched in Orwellian-speak that tries to make night sound like day). Anymore, Political poverty is the source of all poverty—which makes Socialists' emphasis on (bogus) economics while resorting to forced Political impoverishment all the more ironic.

Socialism comes in many flavors, including:

Communism, Fascism, Nazism, Leninism, Stalinism,
Maoism . . . *ad nauseum*

Some people will no doubt want to split hairs between this or that variant on Socialistic Statism, but they're all unrecoverably dysfunctional. We'll be referring to them collectively as "Marxism" (after the godfather of communism, Karl Marx).

1-5 Democracy

In the minds of many, democracy somehow equates to Freedom—a dangerous misconception. Democracy would be more accurately characterized as the Dictatorship of the Fifty-One Percent. It's a political philosophy based on the notion that 49% of the people are entitled to 0% of the say-so. That has precious little to do with self-determination.

Another problem with the winner-take-all "popularity contest" is that there's no automatic link between popularity and Truth. There was a time when considerably more than 51% of the public believed that the Earth is flat, but that didn't make it so.

It's worth noting that government is not even necessary for implementing the wildly popular, but it's real handy for foisting the semi-popular off at gunpoint.

Winston Churchill's joke—about democracy being the worst form of government except all the others—is very witty and even true, as far as it goes. But to say that democracy is better than the kind of appalling alternatives we've seen thus far in human history is not actually much of an endorsement.

Still, democracy does have some real benefits. For one thing, it offers us a regular opportunity to throw the worst of the (elected) bums out. Needless to say, taking advantage of that opportunity depends a great deal on whether corruption and malfeasance by so-called "public servants" can be brought to our attention. That's not a given, what with political censorship (from whatever source) of the press being as common as it is.

Also, history has shown that military aggression is drastically less likely from democracies than from autocracies, which strongly favor imperialism. That's Real Imperialism, mind you, not the cheap political

slur bandied about by hypocritical Marxists, but the real deal—the unprovoked invasion and indefinite political oppression of other nations.

(For the record, America's own Imperialism was pretty much confined to the 19th century and the North American continent. In the 20th century, America—in partnership primarily with the scattered remnants of Britain's ex-Empire—proved to be the world's foremost *anti*-Imperialist, managing to stop the Japanese, German, and Soviet *real* Empires at considerable cost in lives and treasure. Amazing, isn't it, how a lie endlessly repeated can call even the patently obvious into question. As for those who can't tell the difference between *influence* and *coercion*, or at least hope you can't, Freedom is not their game, as we shall see later.)

One other positive thing about democracy is that it allows the possibility, at least, of a transition to Real Freedom should a majority of citizens ever come to understand what such a transition offers and what it involves. In practical terms, a substantial majority would be necessary—enough to democratically overcome the kind of resistance that can be expected from those who see some personal advantage to Slavery.

2-0 FREEDOM

Freedom and Slavery are poorly understood, and the limits of our understanding have become the limits of our political achievement.

2-1 Freedom vs. Slavery

Any person can use any words to refer to any thing. Thus, North Korean Tyrants can call their regime the "Democratic People's Republic of Korea"—even though it isn't democratic, it isn't a republic, it occupies only half of Korea, and the only relationship it has with the Korean people is that it conscripts as many as it can and starves the rest.

The obvious question here is: If an abject communist dictatorship is a good thing to *be*, why isn't it a good thing to be *called*? The obvious answer is that it *isn't* a good thing to be, ergo the need to lie about it.

Words are not Truth—Truth is Truth. Language is just a tool developed by people to try to communicate with (or deceive) each other. Honest people will choose their words with care in an effort to fairly characterize things. People whose purpose is to deceive will also choose their words with care, in hopes of succeeding at mischaracterizing things.

Now, anyone's rhetoric can get heated from time to time, and perfect honesty will be as hard to find as human perfection in general. But at some point a threshold gets crossed from more-or-less honest to materially dishonest. And while what really matters to the Human Cause are *principles*—language just being a way to represent those—*words* do become important because of their relationship to political fraud.

The word "freedom" is a case in point. For example, a catchphrase like "freedom from want" or "freedom from fear" looks like a feeble attempt to borrow some of Freedom's favorable connotations for a concept like Statism, which has fewer favorable connotations of its own. (And which deserves none at all, Statism being the actual opposite of Freedom. What about people who "fear" Oppression and "want" to own their own lives?) The very use of political bait-and-switch betrays a knowledge of what people really want as it tries to stiff 'em with something else in its place.

Nevertheless, Real Freedom is desired by many people, and even in the absence of a formal definition of it we have a pretty good instinct about what it is. The clarity of a formal definition is of great value in fending off political fraud, however, so it's high time to give one to Freedom:

Freedom is the absence of coercion.

This is a definition of principle, not words, so rather than carefully parsing the words in the manner of lawyers looking to twist them around and corrupt their meaning, please try to focus instead on the *concept* they describe. If it's any help, here is a list of synonyms:

Freedom, Liberty, self-determination, self-ownership,
Personal Sovereignty

Here is a list of synonyms that can be applied to the opposite principle:

Slavery, Oppression, subjugation, coercion, Pushing
People Around, Tyranny

The thing to take away from this discussion is that "freedom" is a word fairly used to describe a situation where coercion is absent (i.e. held at bay), and misused (perhaps intentionally) when applied to any situation where coercion is present (i.e. unchecked).

Of course, if Freedom amounts to the absence of coercion, then it follows that creating Freedom involves the elimination and/or prevention of coercion. Which in turn requires understanding something about coercion.

If there were such a thing as The Freedom Pledge, it would be simply this:

"I utterly reject coercion!"

Now, lots of people can get behind the idea of rejecting coercion when it's aimed at *them*, but what about going in the *opposite* direction? So, the first thing to realize about coercion is that it goes both ways—what might be referred to as "outbound" (you do unto others) and "inbound" (they do unto you) coercion.

One obvious answer to the problem of Outbound Coercion would be a pro-Freedom indoctrination. "Indoctrination" is considered a bad word by some, having become associated with the idea of inculcating falsehoods in a captive audience, so you may prefer "education" or "training" in its place. The idea is the same: An understanding of the counterproductivity of coercion is not something most of us are born with; it has to be—and can be—acquired.

The concept behind this understanding is not a difficult one to grasp: *Coercion is a discouragement to merit.* The plain fact is that when people can conduct business at gunpoint, they don't have to be any good.

For example, if you had to *persuade* your neighbor to buy your used computer for \$200, it helps if it actually is worth at least that much. If you can *force* your neighbor to "buy" your computer, however, it's real value becomes irrelevant, and a waste of your time to worry about.

Contribution lives, gratification dies. People focused on gratification might naturally conclude that coercion is simply an efficient approach to having their way with others. But coercion is really an excellence-killer, and therefore a major impediment to a Successful life. To grasp this powerful truth is to develop a distaste and abhorrence for coercion, something of great utility to those hoping to live in a Free Society.

On the other hand, if you want to virtually guarantee being lousy at everything you do (other than Pushing People Around), then Coercion is your best friend ever.

And what about the problem of Inbound Coercion? Unfortunately, the state of the art there is more in the nature of grim than it is cheerful. The only answer of proven effectiveness to *aggressive* force is *defensive* force.

Many—probably most—people are appalled by and opposed to violence or conflict—to fighting. Pacifism motivated by a desire to avoid human suffering is easy enough to understand, and even seems noble.

But pacifism comes in several varieties. A strange and virulent strain of pacifism exists that gives every appearance of being motivated by a desire to see Evil triumph, by refusing to embrace any effective response to it. We also know from bitter political experience that subversion and treason (giving aid and comfort to the enemy) like to try to disguise themselves as pacifism.

If Real Pacifism is meant to prevent suffering, then some understanding is required to achieve it. History teaches us that some conflicts cannot and ultimately will not be avoided, and that the procrastination resulting from trying to deny this reality has the effect of *increasing* rather than decreasing the final tally of human suffering. Some wannabe abusers simply will not take "no" for an answer, and some intended victims will decide that fighting—and even dying—is not necessarily a worse option than what their abusers had in mind.

Anyone who can grasp the fact that Slavery really amounts to "murder in slow motion" will be able to understand that Oppression no more leads to Real Peace than murder does. In this sense, Slavery also is *violence*—violent in the damage it does to the Human Cause, and additionally and explicitly violent in response to any resistance to Slavery.

So, however abhorrent fighting is, it's impossible to fairly assign blame without remembering this fundamental truth: *without Aggression, Defense never has to occur.*

One other critical point has to be made regarding Defense. While conflict is nothing to celebrate, owing to its human cost, it is accompanied by a side-effect that deserves celebration as the closest we can come to True Peace in an imperfect world—*Deterrence*.

Most wannabe aggressors—basically all of those who aren't outright insane—value their own skins if nothing else. Because of this, they can often be held in check by the credible threat of violence. Credibility here depends both on their belief that they aren't just being bluffed, and on their estimation that they will decisively and painfully lose any conflict that they provoke.

To summarize then, the antidote to Coercion—and therefore the key to implementing Freedom—depends on what might be called a "Libertarian" indoctrination and on effective Defense.

The other thing to be observed about Coercion is that it comes in two guises: what might be called "overt" and "covert" Coercion. Overt Coercion involves force and the threat of force (also known as intimidation).

Fraud is Coercion by covert means. Since self-determination depends on consent, one way for wannabe Oppressors to short-circuit consent is just to obtain it under false pretenses. It should be readily apparent that misinformed consent is really no consent at all.

So, even though Fraud isn't as obviously violent as Force, it's no less destructive to Liberty. Possibly more so, since it has the effect of turning people into agents actively working for their own Enslavement.

While isolated fraud perpetrated by individuals against other individuals constitutes a breach of Freedom, as do isolated acts of overt Coercion like murder or assault, it is organized Political Fraud that should be of particular concern to those wanting to live in a Free Society—the same way mass murder or mass imprisonment would be.

With the definition of Freedom as the absence of coercion, the answer to the question "Has Freedom ever existed?" becomes obvious.

Now, to be a U.S. citizen and to suggest that the United States isn't a "free country" is to risk sounding like an ingrate, in light of the enormous sacrifices made by those responsible for its creation and preservation.

But while the U.S. can be said with complete justification to be "freer" and even the "freest" nation in human history, it has never been Free.

Institutionalized slavery—that is, not mere de facto Slavery, but officially-recognized and legally-mandated Slavery—existed from the country's founding until a catastrophic Civil War nearly a century later, a Civil War made unavoidable by the exhausted patience of some and the refusal of others to be pushed. Race-based legalized inequality persisted for many decades thereafter, and long before it had finally been addressed, the country was overtaken by a malignant, creeping Marxism.

At no time in its history has coercion been absent in the United States. No society, in fact, has ever eliminated coercion, or even had the elimination of coercion as its goal.

Actually, Slavery and Freedom exist on a continuum, and every society that has ever existed has fallen somewhere between its extremes. Lots of past (and some present) societies have fallen so close to the Slavery extreme as to be fairly described as Enslaved. Meanwhile, there has been a centuries-long movement in Western civilization to try to understand and achieve Freedom, a movement that has lately shown signs of having run out of gas.

So, Slavery and Freedom being mutually exclusive, the question becomes: Where's the "proper" place to come to rest on the Slavery/Freedom Continuum? What is the "right" amount of Slavery to endure? How do you know? Is a gradual (or not so gradual) slide toward the Slavery end of the continuum any cause for concern? Why not?

As it turns out, the elusiveness of Freedom and the ubiquity of Slavery are not too difficult to explain. There are, in fact, Three Fundamental

Political States—Anarchy, Slavery, and Freedom—and their associated properties are illustrated in the following table:

Political State	Anarchy	Slavery	Freedom
Basis	"law of jungle"	human-invented law ("decree")	Real Law
Institutions (force principle)	none	government (i.e. Coercive)	Defensive
Social Mechanism	(unorganized)	force/fraud	persuasion
Power Distribution Model	(unorganized)	Power Accumulation	Power Retention

As the table shows, Anarchy is the most easily achieved of the Fundamental Political States, and in fact is the default state, since it alone is not dependent on the invention of any specialized institutions devoted to organizing the use of force.

The next most easily achieved Political State—and the only fully-realized alternative to Anarchy, so far—is Slavery. It is dependent on Coercive institutions like government (which is based on human-invented law—what might be called "decree"). Pro-Slavery institutions explicitly support the accumulation of Political Power, and social interaction under Slavery may be governed by force or fraud.

In order for Freedom to be achieved, it will be necessary to develop robust Defensive (non-coercive) institutions, which must necessarily be based on an investigation into and reasonable comprehension of Real Law (referred to in some circles as "Natural Law" or "Divine Law"). These Defensive institutions would be engineered so as to thwart Power Accumulation, as well as force or fraud—all social interaction in a Free Society being governed by persuasion and consent.

The invention of robust, effective Defensive institutions requires a lot more effort and understanding than did the invention of Coercive institutions, which can be quite crude and have been around in some form since before the dawn of recorded history. As a result, Freedom is by far the most difficult to obtain of the Fundamental Political States, and has resisted some of our best efforts at it.

One thing has to be made abundantly clear, however: while Anarchy-to-Slavery-to-Freedom represents a progression in terms of the sophistication of their underlying institutions, replacing Anarchy with Slavery does NOT represent a progression in terms of its effect on the Human Cause. Even though lots of people would prefer the apparent stability of Slavery over the chaos of Anarchy, the notion that Slavery poses less risk to the Human Project than does Anarchy is highly debatable.

There is probably as much misunderstanding surrounding Slavery as there is Freedom.

Human Enslavement has existed since prehistory. But for the Imperialist Europe and her colonies of a few centuries ago, Slavery and Racism joined forces—a legacy the American Revolution proved inadequate to overcome. (Not that many of the Founders, like James Madison, didn't recoil from the blatant hypocrisy.)

The very word "slavery" has come to have a fairly narrow meaning for many Americans, referring to the institutionalized slavery perpetrated against kidnapped Africans. But what actually is it that makes "slavery" Slavery?

Is it the fact that human beings were bought and sold? Would Slavery not qualify as "slavery" if Slaves simply stayed with the same Masters for life, without any bills of sale or money changing hands?

Is it the fact that institutionalized slavery used Racism as its basis? Would Slaves not qualify as "slaves" so long as their Masters were of the same race (or perhaps a "politically correct" race)?

Ownership of other human beings has nothing inherently to do with Racism or any explicit, pseudo-legal title. It is simply the power to force them to do what they otherwise wouldn't choose to do in the conduct of their own affairs. Just as "freedom" is a word fairly applied only to self-ownership, "slavery" is a word fairly applied to any condition of ownership by others.

The connection between institutionalized slavery and institutionalized racism in America's own experience is doubly unfortunate. Not only are they both bad in their own right, but their juxtaposition has served to obscure their real lesson for many people (a confusion that Marxist politicians have aggressively exploited).

The real lesson of institutionalized slavery is that *Slavery is an abomination*—period. If Racist Oppressors ultimately manage to sell us on the idea of Racism and Oppression, then they've succeeded at heaping Fraud on top of Injustice.

The cure for Racism is not to try to find it a more "politically correct" form—it is to join a larger Family. The cure for Slavery is not to try to put The Plantation under new management—it's to eradicate The Plantation for all who have the capacity and will to be Free.

2-2 Persuasion vs. Coercion

When it comes to Real Freedom, figuring out whose business is involved—whose life it is—is the central issue.

For instance, put yourself back in the days of alcohol Prohibition in the U.S. Suppose you wanted to make up a batch of home-brew and drink it at home—whose business is that? Now suppose you got intoxicated and beat up some of your family members—whose business is that? Suppose you got wasted, got behind the wheel of your car and ran over some people—whose business is that?

Now imagine that you wanted to burn a pile of old tires on your property, sending great clouds of toxic smoke over onto your neighbor's house—whose business is that?

Or, suppose your neighbors decided to shave their heads and paint them pink, a practice that deeply offends you—whose business is that?

Government decree doesn't have to fairly reflect who's entitled to what—it can just be the whim of 51% of the people (in a democracy), or of a single person (in an autocracy). But Freedom means being able to tell when people are making their own decisions, and when they're trying to make other people's decisions.

Before the word "tolerance" was hijacked by Marxists to mean whatever *they* want has to be tolerated and whatever others want doesn't, it had a perfectly good meaning—something along the lines of actually putting up with other people making choices for themselves that we wouldn't necessarily make for ourselves.

If you think about it, Real Freedom and Real Tolerance go hand in hand. Your Tolerance is other people's Freedom—their Tolerance is your Freedom.

Since Freedom is the absence of Coercion, the one thing that absolutely cannot be Tolerated in a Free Society is—you guessed it—Coercion. How do we know Coercion when we see it?

Suppose you go to the market for a loaf of bread and the merchant won't let you take it home without paying for it. Are you being coerced?

Of course not. What self-determination means in a multilateral context is mutual consent. In a Free Society, you're no more obliged to agree to other people's terms than they are obliged to agree to yours. If everyone involved can find some mutually agreeable terms, then great—otherwise, no deal.

But what if you're broke and your family is starving? Now are you being coerced if the merchant won't provide the bread for free?

No. You might be able to fairly accuse the merchant of being uncompassionate, but not of being coercive. It's not your prerogative to decide who must come to your aid, whether it be the merchant with the bread or passersby from whom you could take the money to pay for the bread. If you take other people's property against their will, then it's you who is being coercive, regardless of what your motives may be.

Real Compassion is a fine thing, a necessary thing, and not nearly as unpopular as Statists would have us believe. Gunpoint compassion—better known as "robbery"—is another matter. The Marxian version of "compassion" doesn't reflect Reality. Robbery is a job for thugs. It's Slavery, and there's nothing compassionate about Slavery.

Agreement is also good and necessary, but in general is not nearly so necessary that it ought to be achieved by force. Quite often, "different strokes for different folks" is a perfectly acceptable solution.

Yet when Coercion is available as an option, as is the case with government, it becomes a first resort rather than a last resort. Under "one size fits all" coercive government, we frequently see what amounts to the 51% zebras telling the 49% ostriches that the only way to run is on four legs, simply because they have the power to coerce. The fact that

the ostriches might have a different technique that works better for them becomes irrelevant.

Polite disagreement is not always a bad thing, and can even have a positive side. These days, the word "diversity" has been co-opted to refer to something like a rainbow of Marxists, all marching in political lockstep. But Real Diversity—as opposed to lip-service, superficial diversity—is very constructive because it allows us to hedge our bets.

Compromise is often treated as some sort of political Holy Grail, even to the point where we can be pressured just to reach *some* agreement. But compromise is overrated if it means accommodating illegitimate expectations. If your opponents want to chop off both of your legs, and you want to keep both, should you compromise and allow them to take one instead? They're not entitled to any of your limbs—you are. Better no agreement than an abusive one.

Occasionally, agreement *isn't* optional because only one choice can be made among many. For example, a river can either be dammed or not—there isn't any in-between, and multiple simultaneous approaches aren't possible.

A Free Society would have some way of identifying instances like that, and some arbitration process for resolving them that stood the least chance of devolving into outright coercion. (The reason government abuses something like eminent domain is that it can.) In all other instances, a Free Society would embrace dissent and pluralism as a sign of good political health.

A big part of getting a handle on Coercion is being able to tell the difference between Coercion and Persuasion. How do we know Persuasion when we see it?

Persuasion can be very . . . well, *persuasive*. That is, Persuasion can involve forcefulness of a sort, but never actual force. It can be reasonably persistent, but can't cross the line and become the kind of unreasonable persistence that's referred to as *harassment*. If all that sounds like it requires making a judgment call—it does.

But ultimately, it's easy to distinguish between Persuasion and Coercion. Persuasion will take "no" for an answer—Coercion won't. If you have any doubt that government is a Coercive institution, try to remember the last time you saw government take "no" for an answer for anything.

2-3 Power Accumulation

The French Revolution went in the ditch, as revolutions are wont to do, but its "Liberty! Equality! Fraternity!" motto is right on the money. These 3 principles may be thought of as Freedom's Trinity.

Liberty, also known as self-determination or self-ownership, is often misunderstood to mean that people should simply be able to do as they darn well please. What self-determination really means is that people should be able to do as they please when it comes to their own—and only their own—business. Doing as you please about other people's business is not self-ownership, but ownership of others.

There's no such thing as the "right" to violate other people's Rights. There's no such thing as the "freedom" to Push People Around. Pathological selfishness is consistent with Anarchy and Slavery. Social Individualism is consistent with Freedom because it embraces the principle of Fraternity.

The vast majority of human activity involves not just a single individual, but groups of individuals. What self-determination means in a social context is the right of individuals to give or withhold their consent—not the nonexistent "right" to make other people's decisions for them.

"Egalitarianism" has become something of a bad word, having been co-opted by Marxist scammers to refer to an equality of *material* circumstances enforced at gunpoint by Joe Stalin, regardless of any individual's effort or ability. Real Egalitarianism, however, is all about *political* equality.

A Free Society is necessarily Egalitarian, in the sense that nobody outranks anyone else politically. Since the exact purpose of Power Accumulation is to be able to pull rank on others—to subjugate them—it's obvious that a Free People would view it with appropriate suspicion, and would develop institutions promoting Power Retention (i.e. Political

Equality) as a check against it. Power Accumulation is not an act of good will toward the rest of society!

Power Accumulation and Power Retention derive from a principle that can be referred to as **The Conservation of Political Power:**

Political Power is neither created nor destroyed, except when people are created or destroyed; otherwise, it is only either retained or stolen.

To see how political power is conserved, imagine a group of 100 people that includes one "control freak" who "needs" to have power over 100 people. That leaves 99 people with power over no one, particularly themselves. It's impossible to surrender power over your life to others and somehow retain it for yourself. Being only one person, you can't simultaneously follow your own orders and someone else's (conflicting) orders.

It's common for Capitalists to defend the accumulation of power by people in the so-called private sector, and common for Marxists (i.e. Statists) to defend the accumulation of power by people in the so-called public sector. *But Power Accumulation is Power Theft.*

So, Slavery is characterized by Power Accumulation—that is, the accumulation of power by the Masters at the expense of the Slaves, to whom it rightfully belongs. Likewise, Freedom is characterized by Power Retention—in other words, political power remains distributed among its rightful owners and is not accumulated by anyone.

Now, a question may arise as to whether the transfer of power is necessarily theft, or if it can be done *voluntarily*—what amounts to willing Slavery. To address that, it's necessary to identify another principle, **The Inseparability of Authority and Responsibility:**

Whosoever hath Authority over a thing deserveth Responsibility for it, and whosoever beareth Responsibility for a thing deserveth Authority over it.

Thus, all you would need to do to legitimately reassign Authority over your life to others is to likewise give up Responsibility for your life! Can you even do such a thing? How do you know?

Power Accumulation by people in the so-called public sector is easy to visualize, because Coercion based in human-invented law is quite blunt: Either do what you're told—or be executed, imprisoned or some such other highly unpleasant consequence.

Power Accumulation by ultra-wealthy private citizens is a bit more subtle. But people who doubt the coercive power of money should spend a few decades in abject poverty and then see what they think about it. There is no shortage of evidence that people in dire financial circumstances will knowingly act against their own interests—including endangering their health and even lives—when they're unable to see any better alternative.

On top of economic desperation, there is also the ample corruption potential of just plain old greed.

Money is definitely Power, and there is a relationship between the accumulation of vast (disproportionate) wealth and the accumulation of Political Power. And just what constitutes "disproportionate" wealth? That depends.

People who haven't a penny aren't just economically impotent, they're also politically impaired because of the relationship between economics and politics. Freedom is a pretty abstract thing when you don't know where your next meal is coming from. As people begin to accumulate wealth, self-determination becomes more practical, assuming it isn't curtailed by non-economic means such as law. At some point, however, wealth accumulation ceases to have anything to do with mere self-determination.

In the Hollywood film "Chinatown" (1974), a private eye (Jack Nicholson) is surprised to discover that an already wealthy man (John

Huston) is behind a real-estate scam. "How much better can you eat?" he asks.

The answer in the movie is the real-life answer: It isn't about eating any better. It's about buying the future—other people's future.

Some people can win the lottery once and be happy. But what kind of people can win the lottery 10,000 times and still not be satisfied? Unquenchable greed is a sickness, and it's closely related to the unquenchable thirst for power—also a sickness.

There's nothing fundamentally wrong, from a political standpoint, with accumulating more and better possessions in life. But no one can drive 500,000 Porsche sportscars, or eat 50,000,000 pounds of Beluga caviar. And the accumulators of vast wealth aren't really interested in caviar, they're interested in controlling other people's lives.

The Aristocratic fairytale isn't just about the palaces, it's about the servants. Owning *things* is appropriate; owning *people* is inappropriate. Unfortunately, this Reality doesn't jibe with Aristocratic fantasy.

Pushing People Around may be entertaining as a fantasy. Evidently, it connects with some (not particularly wholesome) part of human nature. In that regard, it may be similar to the more overtly violent abuse of others that figures so prominently in what-passes-for-entertainment these days. Perhaps "virtual reality" can provide some safe outlet for warped human nature, but in real life, Slavery is an abomination.

Once upon a time in America, millionaires were considered to be very wealthy. Now, thanks to inflation and confiscatory taxation, millionaires scarcely have the means, financially, to order their own lives, within the ever-narrowing boundaries prescribed by law.

Billionaires are another matter. As things currently stand, the accumulation of billions of dollars means control of enough wealth to represent a political threat. Freedom depends on Political Equality, which depends on Political Humility. Vast wealth in the hands of the Politically Arrogant becomes a way to take political advantage of the economically disadvantaged. Disproportionate wealth can be used to

buy the kind of socio-political influence that people of more proportionate means can't hope to match.

Please don't mistake this discussion as a knock against the idea of gainful employment. Trading an honest day's labor for an honest day's pay is entirely consistent with the principle of self-determination. Using money as a tool to dominate other people in a way that amounts to ownership, however, is not. There's a world of difference, politically, between *service* and *servitude*.

Neither is all of this meant to be some pseudo-Libertarian repackaging of the Marxian class-warfare scam. Under Marxism, economic envy is used as just another politically divisive tactic in the quest for Power Accumulation. The answer, you see, to getting even with the "rich folks" is to sic a true champion of "social justice" on them—somebody like Joe Stalin, for instance.

The only point we're trying to make here is that Power Accumulation of *any* kind is consistent with Slavery, and inconsistent with Freedom. Any approach to creating a Free Society that addresses Power Accumulation only in the so-called public sector doesn't cover all the bases and won't succeed.

Lots of people subscribe to a "might makes right" worldview. Power Accumulators, being mighty, must find it particularly appealing. But while might has a lot to do with the *exercise* of Rights, it has nothing whatever to do with the *creation* of any Rights.

And here's some more bad news for the Politically Arrogant: Even if it *were* valid, there's nothing about the "might makes right" model that prevents the Meek from developing enough *collective might* to fend off Aristocrat wannabes. The only way that can happen without becoming just another exercise in Power Theft is by a cooperative, Power Retention approach.

2-4 Limited Slavery

The American Founders are highly regarded by many people. Not by Marxists, of course, who have good reason to hate them. What the Framers produced was genuinely liberal and progressive, in the quite-literal sense of being both *new* and *improved*. That's in stark contrast to what Karl Marx produced the following century, which wasn't new and improved even by dismal 19th-century European political standards—much less when compared to what was already well under way in the United States.

And the American Founders did hit a home run. In *The Declaration of Independence* (July 4, 1776), it says:

We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed.

That is an exact statement of the problem to be solved. (Only, don't mistake the expression "Pursuit of Happiness" for some advocacy of hedonism—the Founders were true Public Servants enough to know that Real Happiness comes from contribution, not some pathological quest for gratification.)

However, the Framers did something that looks a little strange on closer examination. They gave the securing of our unalienable Rights—a *Defensive* task—to government, an inherently *Coercive* institution.

That's like trying to perform heart surgery with a jackhammer—it's the wrong tool for the job. What gives?

Certainly, the Founders were what you might call "proto-Libertarians"—the opposite of Statists. The reason they didn't create Real Freedom wasn't because they didn't want it.

The catch is that creating Real Freedom is what computer geeks would call a "bootstrap operation"—like pulling yourself up by your own bootstraps. It's not possible to go directly from nothing to something. An intervening stage is required. That's because the robust Defensive institutions that Real Freedom requires take time, and can't be developed in any case under Slavery.

Yet, the American Founders had a narrow window of opportunity in which to act. Their hand was ultimately forced by the British government's move to confiscate the colonists' arms. If they were ever to mount a successful rebellion, it had to start before they were rendered politically helpless.

And so, upon prevailing in the American Revolution, they set about creating the best thing they could in such a limited time-frame, and *the very thing that Real Freedom must have as a launching pad*—**limited government**. They took that inherently Coercive, unholy monster called government and tied its hands every way from Sunday, in an effort to render it into something more suitable to the Defensive task of securing our unalienable Rights.

The United States' relatively brilliant career (so far) is proof that they did an outstanding job. They themselves were not without some apprehension as to its long-term prospects, however. Benjamin Franklin's comment about having given us "a republic, if you can keep it" is typical of that concern.

The more than two centuries that have passed since the United States' creation have afforded ample opportunity for progress in replacing Coercive institutions with the anti-Coercive institutions that Real Freedom (self-determination) requires. Unfortunately, things have gone the opposite direction, and the limited government that's absolutely

essential as an intermediate stage between Slavery and Freedom is rapidly disappearing, not just from the U.S., but from the entire planet.

That disappearance is no accident. While neither Anarchy nor Slavery is a usable precursor to Freedom, Limited Slavery (i.e. limited government) is. But Limited Slavery has instead been taken to be an end in itself. Can that really work?

It's impossible to make a compelling case for a certain amount of Slavery on a permanent basis (other than none at all). Without that, it's difficult to argue against Slavery's increase because there can be no recognized cutoff point. A little more is just as "legitimate" as a little less.

A growing public perception of the need for dependence on government (and reliance on government to hold itself in check) is an organic part of delegating the People's responsibility for their own political future to an institution like government in the first place. Meanwhile, expanding government becomes ever more attractive to people who value its Coercion potential, and who will do whatever they can to grow it further—a vicious political circle.

In reality, Limited Slavery is only good for 2 things—taking advantage of the political "breathing space" it provides to prepare for the next step in the journey to Real Freedom, or sliding back down into the pit of Unlimited Slavery.

In theory, a country like the U.S. is a "constitutional republic" rather than a democracy. That Constitution is meant to protect political minorities from unchecked government obeying (allegedly, at least) the majority's will.

That's great in theory, but reality is whatever actually happens. And the idea of using a Constitution to protect political minorities suffers from a Catch-22: *It only works if the majority wants it to.* To see that in action, it's only necessary to ask what happens when the Constitution is violated.

When the U.S. president and Congress violate the Constitution (according to the courts), they need have no fear of being hung for treason or even impeached. The absolute worst-case scenario is their

removal from office in the next election—assuming enough of the voters are upset by (or even aware of) their malfeasance. Generally, their "punishment" consists of having to try it all over again, until they finally succeed.

The same thing applies to unelected judges who violate the Constitution, except for the risk of being removed in an election, of course. Their worst-case scenario is being overturned by appellate judges—unless they themselves are the judges-of-last-resort, in which case they're home free.

On top of the fact that what amounts to Treason carries little or no risk of real punishment, *human-invented law itself has no fixed meaning*. Not only doesn't it mean whatever the People were told, it doesn't even mean what lawmakers sincerely intended it to mean. It only means what the judges-of-last-resort declare it to mean, unless the People revolt. No wonder judicial confirmation is such a big deal!

If a substantial majority of the voters understood the real spirit of their Constitution and zealously defended it against corrupt politicians, a constitutional republic might actually work. But if a substantial majority had a sincere respect for the Rights of political minorities, a Constitution would be superfluous in the first place.

2-5 Marxism

There are basically 2 ways to organize any society: it's either Egalitarian or else it isn't. A Free Society is Egalitarian by definition—self-determination being impossible in a situation where some people outrank others politically (which is what forcibly making other people's decisions for them equates to).

Elitist societies (which are Oppressive by definition) have plagued humankind throughout our history. We've heard all manner of absurd theories as to why the self-appointed elite are "better" than we are, including:

They're wealthy and we aren't —

They're "somebodies" and we're "nobodies" —

They had the "right" parents and we didn't —

They're members of the "master race" and we aren't —

They were appointed by God and we weren't —

They *are* God and we aren't —

They work for the government and we don't.

And, being "better" than we are, it's only natural that our decisions should be theirs to make. Elitists invariably produce schemes that put them in charge of telling the rest of us what we must and mustn't do about our own affairs, using made-up law enforced at gunpoint.

Of course, there are people who really *are* elite, in that they're the best in the world *at* something—the best singers, gymnasts, whatever—by some objective standard. The "superiority" of Aristocrats, however, isn't objective at all, but subjective. They're strictly legends in their own minds. And your typical Aristocrat suffers no doubt that Pushing People Around is for their own good.

The American Founders tried to debunk Elitism in what is arguably the premier American legal document, *The Declaration of Independence*, but delusions of grandeur die hard. Still, the old-time version of Aristocracy based on inheritance had begun to suffer a loss of credibility worldwide in the last couple of centuries. What's an elitist to do?

Karl Marx & Company came riding to the rescue, with one of the biggest breakthroughs in the history of politics. They discovered that a significant percentage of people will accept lip service as equivalent to the real thing. By feigning an interest in Social Justice, wannabe Elitists could pass themselves off as its true champions, whose only interest in the accumulation of Absolute Power is to defend the downtrodden. *Voila!*—Aristocracy based on inheritance has been replaced by Aristocracy based on ruthlessness.

Marxism has turned out to be such a successful hoax precisely because so many people hunger for Social Justice, see its absence in the world, and want to believe that somebody really cares and can do something about it.

Unfortunately, the answer to Oppression isn't so simple as just enabling even worse Oppression from a different source. In truth, no amount of Coercion can accomplish Social Justice. Only the *absence* of Coercion can do it—better known as Freedom!

The Marxian class-warfare spiel is a total mischaracterization. Marxists' real view of social stratification is betrayed by their seething hatred of the middle class, whom they've targeted for destruction.

Don't look now, but the Robber Barons and Joe Stalin are in bed with each other. And there's nothing at all strange about the upper class' love affair with Marxian Political Correctness. How could wannabe

Aristocrats really hate a movement that has given discredited Elitism a new lease on life?

"Aristocrat" and "Marxist" have become essentially synonymous. All Marxists are either Aristocrats themselves, or suffer from a (perverse) longing to be in the thrall of Aristocrats. Likewise, you'd be hard-pressed to find a single Aristocrat these days who hasn't made the switch to Marxism—world-class, butt-kickin' Slavery, plus all that phony "social justice" cachet? An offer like that's just too good to pass up.

As for the poor, Marxism is their best "friend" ever, so long as they have no ambitions other than to remain poor and dependent forever. According to Marxists, the only thing wrong with The Plantation of the Old South was that it wasn't run by "benevolent" government. (Or to paraphrase George Orwell, who knew a scam when he saw one: "Uncle Tom's Cabin bad, Uncle Sam's Cabin good!")

Meanwhile, the middle class poses a serious threat to Slavery. They're neither wealthy enough to own anyone, nor poor enough to have to put up with being owned *by* anyone. What's worse, the middle class provides the captive lower class with a place to escape to.

Thus the need for confiscatory taxation. The fabulously wealthy upper class can afford to pay any amount in taxes and still remain on the top of the heap, but heavy taxation is enough to force the middle class back down into poverty—and onto The Plantation, where they belong. Plus, all that money can be used to buy an awful lot of Marxist government.

Marxists desperately want to claim the mantle of populism, but theirs is an Aristocratic pseudo-populism—not the Egalitarian, Real Populism of Freedom. It isn't any lack of "redistribution" that afflicts Real People—it's Political Arrogance. (And nobody embraces *that* more tightly than do Marxists. If Joe Stalin is any indication, some "comrades" are considerably more "equal" than others.)

Marxian Socialists allegedly don't even believe in the individual, but rest assured that all the Aristocrat "somebodies" get to be individuals all they want. It's all the little "nobodies" who get to become non-entity members of some politically-convenient (for their Masters) social group.

In fact, far from being the anti-Racists they purport to be, Marxists have made "group identity politics"—*the very definition of Prejudice*—a cornerstone of their divide-and-conquer political attack. And their much-vaunted "tolerance" is as patronizing as it is phony. Marxian Aristocrats, as it turns out, are condescendingly "tolerant" of pro-Marxists, but murderously intolerant of anti-Marxists.

Progressive?? Liberal?? Just what exactly is so "new and improved" about Marxism? Aristocracy is not merely archaic, it was retarded to begin with. In the 18th century, Real Liberals would've been Constitutional Republicans (and were). In the 21st century, Real Liberals would be Libertarians—not Marxists.

Only change for the *better* qualifies as Real Progress, but Marxism is a throwback to the some of the worst behavior ever seen in human history. Marxism is the all-time world champion—*second to none*—when it comes to Genocide and Oppression, having outright murdered *dozens of millions* of people, and Enslaved *billions*. That's quite a track record! (And one Marxists never, ever admit to. What's up with that—aren't they proud of it?)

Marxist politicians must know something's wrong with their program, since they can't bring themselves to be honest about it. The real story of Marxism is reflected not in the bogus, one-party elections, but in what might be called the "inner tube" vote. People don't risk their lives in shark-infested waters to get *to* communist Cuba (that alleged "worker's paradise"), but to escape *from* it. The Berlin Wall wasn't built to keep enemies out, but to keep Slaves in.

It's common in politics to use the word "liar" for anyone who says whatever we don't particularly want to hear. But of course, real liars must not only speak falsely, they must know that they do so. And therein lies the rub, because Marxists actually come in 2 varieties: Thugs and Dupes. The Thugs know Marxism for the scam it is—the Dupes don't.

It's one of the great tragedies of the human condition that good intentions alone are not enough to get good results. If people of good will and compassion are going to make a difference, they need to learn how to

spot a political con-job, and they need to understand the true nature of Power Accumulation and its proponents.

But don't we need at least *some* Marxism (AKA Socialism) in order to have a humane society?

No. The trouble with trying to do "Marxism Lite" is that Marxism is corrupt at its core. Joe Stalin as "Robin Hood" is myth. Robbery is a job for Thugs, and Thugs are not only NOT nice people, they're ultimately uncontrollable. So any notion that Robbery is a fit means to a Socially Just end doesn't square with Reality. Marxist Dupes are full of good intentions—Marxist Thugs are not!

Trying to harness Marxism for a good purpose is like riding a tiger. The beast has another agenda. What's worse, the very thing that might keep it on a short leash—healthy suspicion and vigilance—is the first thing to disappear under the assault of all that "we're the friends of the downtrodden" propaganda.

The *real* friends of the helpless wouldn't be all about perpetuating helplessness, and good designers know that no amount of after-the-fact tinkering can rescue a fundamentally flawed design. Marxism is hopeless because it doesn't understand the first thing about Reality—not that it needs to, since its real goal is Power Accumulation anyway. All it has to do is fool most of the people most of the time.

But some of the problems for which Marxists recommend Slavery as their "solution" are real enough. Take environmental devastation, for example. Isn't that the kind of thing that only Joe Stalin can cure, and aren't any unfortunate political side-effects well worth it?

First of all, the only thing Tyrants are really dedicated to is their own hold on Power. That is the limit of their concern. Lip service guarantees nothing in the way of ultimate performance.

Moreover, Persuasion is as helpful to any cause as Coercion is unhelpful. People who can advance their program at gunpoint don't have

to be right about the particulars—which immediately decreases the chances that they actually will be.

In fact, there's reason to believe that Marxism's adoption of the environment as one of its "wedge" issues has done more to discredit environmentalism than to help it. That's unfortunate, because an appropriate regard for the state of the environment is perfectly sensible, and actually has nothing whatever to do with Karl Marx.

No society that embraced self-determination would lack for environmental concern or ways to do something about it, since too many individuals will care about that. Freedom and environmental protection are not mutually exclusive, and neither are Freedom and any of the other legitimate causes that Marxism pretends to care about.

Contrary to the claims of Marxists, Slavery isn't the solution to all of humanity's problems, because humanity has no problems that are caused by an *absence* of Slavery. In truth, humanity has no problems that are *not* caused by an absence of Understanding. The cure for an absence of Understanding is Enlightenment, not Slavery.

The struggle between Freedom and Slavery has been going on for a very long time, but it has become simplified with the arrival of Marxism. Marxism represents the way forward for Aristocratic Power Accumulators of all stripes—which makes it the clear Enemy of Freedom.

But while Marxist Thugs are the conscious, avowed Enemies of Freedom, Marxist Dupes are not. They're actually decent, well-motivated people who're more akin to the character in the TV show "Alias" who thought she was working for the good guys and ultimately found out otherwise.

If Social Justice is your goal, then you owe it to yourself to consider the proposition that Real Freedom, if it ever happens, can mean Real Social Justice for the first time in human history. There will be no shortage of people in a Free Society who care about Social Justice and can make a good case for the real thing. Coercion may seem like a way to expedite

matters, but it isn't. Persuasion begets Excellence—Coercion begets garbage.

Under Freedom, there will definitely be some people who care nothing about Social Justice. But if their plans include force or fraud, they won't get very far because that's what Defensive institutions will be in place to prevent.

Don't look now, but under Statism there are also people who care nothing about Social Justice. Unfortunately, they include the Statist Tyrants themselves because there's nothing Socially Just about Slavery. That puts people with the minimum sincere interest in Social Justice in the position of being able to perpetrate the maximum Social Injustice.

Marxism is just "Let them eat cake!" with a makeover. It's *poseur* politics—brutality posing as compassion, evil posing as good. Lip service does not a champion of Social Justice make. Statist Power Accumulators would be more accurately viewed not as Defenders, but as competing Exploiters. If the eradication of Exploitation is the goal, then Marxism is a giant leap in the wrong direction.

The future of human politics reduces to a life-and-death struggle between Slavery and Freedom. There can't be much excuse for not being able to choose, because Slavery is as manifestly evil as Freedom is manifestly good. However, neutrality is not an option in any case, since acquiescence to Slavery is all that's required from Slaves. In effect, not to oppose Slavery is to support it.

And Slavery can only produce what's in its nature to produce. To choose Slavery as some hypothetical route to Social Justice is nuts. To choose Slavery for its own sake is worse.

3-0 DEFENSE

Defense is the thing without which Freedom (the absence of Coercion) cannot occur.

3-1 Aggression vs. Defense

Most people other than sadists are repulsed by violence—at least the kind that isn't subtle enough to escape easy detection. But when it comes to politics, there's more to violence than meets the eye. Is all violence really the same?

For instance, suppose someone jumps out of the bushes and begins to try to throttle you. Suppose also that you respond by pummeling your attacker in an effort to prevent being murdered. You're both clearly being violent, but is that the whole story?

There *is* a difference between your assailant's actions and yours, and it is the difference between Aggression and Defense. Yet as the illustration shows, violence by no means automatically qualifies as Defense. Your violence is Defensive but your attacker's is not. Evidently, Defense is *constrained* by something—that is, it must meet certain criteria.

Now, answer this: how upset do you have to be before it's okay to hurt someone?

Okay, that was a trick question. There is no amount of anger that makes it okay to hurt people. It is in fact never "okay" to hurt anyone, and anger has nothing at all to do with Defense.

It's highly debatable whether anger is more of a help or hindrance to Defense, since, while anger may add motivation to a fight, it also interferes with thinking. Violence doesn't require thought—Defense does. Otherwise, how are we to know that what we assumed was Defense hasn't become Aggression instead?

Likewise, Defense isn't based on some notion that it's somehow "okay" to hurt people under certain circumstances. What it *is* based on is the realization that a bad outcome is not necessarily the worst *available* outcome—it may even be the best available outcome.

Unfortunately, we're sometimes faced with limited options, consisting only of bad and worse. In such situations, to be unwilling or unable to choose the bad option yields the same result (politically, at least) as choosing the worse option outright. In our earlier example, to be unwilling or unable to stop your wannabe murderer is to wind up being murdered.

If all this sounds like an unhappy state of affairs—it is. From a moral standpoint, it's possible to argue that allowing yourself to be murdered is superior to doing anything that might hurt your wannabe murderer. From a political standpoint, however, that looks like a recipe for achieving a surplus of aggressors and a shortage of pacifists. In any case, Aggressors are in a pretty poor position to question the morality of Defense.

At its most basic (and expressed in political terms), Aggression is about pulling rank on others. All Coercion, obviously violent or not, is actually Aggression. The purpose of Aggression is Slavery, and the purpose of Defense is to prevent Slavery.

Defense sometimes needs to happen at gunpoint, in dire circumstances (as we shall see later when discussing Defense constraints). Coercion never needs to happen at gunpoint, because Coercion never needs to happen at all!

If Aggression would somehow go away by itself, Defense would be literally effortless. Since long human experience shows that isn't going to happen, it's necessary to understand and effectively counter Aggression in order for Defense to occur. Unfortunately, many people seem fairly clueless on the subject.

Would-be pacifists sometimes act as if they believe Peace can be achieved by surrender. Forgiveness and compassion are a believable manifestation of Love for your enemies—masochism or cowardice is something else. Aggression isn't Peace, and neither is accommodating Aggression. Only the absence of Aggression qualifies as Real Peace, and Aggression is never more absent than when Aggressor wannabes don't expect to win.

Vulnerability is what Predators look for. Conversely, fearsomeness goes a long way toward quelling the worst ambitions of the badly-motivated. People who aspire to self-ownership can't afford Ignorance, Immorality, or any other form of weakness, most particularly an inability or unwillingness to fight when necessary in their own defense.

The rules for fighting are simple: If you can reasonably avoid a fight then do so, otherwise *don't lose*. It's an interesting irony of our modern times that Aggressors can often improve their lot by losing, but for Defenders to expect the same is highly unrealistic.

The "Live Free or die!" mindset may seem rash to some, but it's actually quite rational. *Slavery isn't Life*. It's a zombie state that has little potential for allowing you to accomplish your mission here—unless your mission is to help march the Human Project off into the ditch.

If the Human Cause is important in itself, then it matters how things go here on Planet Earth. That would offer an explanation not only for why doing Evil is a bad thing, but for why opposing Evil—not with more Evil but with something whose only purpose is to thwart Evil—is a helpful thing.

3-2 Defense Properties

So, the goal of Defensive force (in sharp contrast to Coercive force) is a net reduction in human tragedy. That is its political justification, and to the degree that such a thing is possible, its moral justification. (Of course, the tendency of Aristocrats to view Oppression as a joy rather than a tragedy is a serious handicap when it comes to telling Aggression from Defense.)

And just what are the characteristics of Defense that may be used to distinguish it from Aggression? Defense is:

- (1) proportionate
- (2) timely
- (3) restrained
- (4) rooted in Real Law

It's important to understand fully the implications of these constraints.

For starters, Defense is by its nature a *response* to something—namely Aggression. Therefore, its measure is determined by whatever particular Aggression it is intended to meet. *A disproportionate response to Aggression becomes simply more Aggression.*

For example, once upon a time, it was popular to fight duels to the death over perceived insults to honor. (Actually, this kind of behavior remains popular in some culturally-backward circles.) Killing people over insults is a ridiculous, obscene overreaction to an "injury" of that kind, and in no way qualifies as a Defensive act. Rather, it is murder—an act of Aggression.

The timeliness of Defense arises out of its mission to prevent, or at least reduce, tragedy. *It is impossible to prevent what has already happened.*

Thus, Defense can be real-time or even preemptive, but there is no such thing as retroactive Defense. To help nail down the principle being described (and to defeat the legalistic word-parsers), here is a list of synonyms:

Retaliation, retribution, Revenge, settling scores,
"payback"

The effect of Retaliation is a net *increase* in human tragedy, not a decrease. It is Aggression, not Defense. An obsession with getting revenge and settling scores is why endless, multi-generational wars are fought by people who just can't let go of the past—something that's already a done deal and can't be changed by anyone.

Restraint is another key feature of Defense. Force should be a last resort, not a knee-jerk reflex. Defense isn't some hair-trigger thing that goes around with a chip on its shoulder, spoiling for a fight. It can't be mindless if it hopes to reduce rather than increase tragedy—it's obliged to be thoughtful.

Defense is practically synonymous with Forbearance. Forbearance should be as conspicuously present in Defense as it is conspicuously absent in Aggression.

Having said that, Defense also requires good judgment. Wait too long and the window of opportunity to effect any improvement in a situation disappears. Unlike thoughtful restraint, mindless procrastination hardly ever leads to the path of least misery.

Lastly, while all manner of Coercive acts have managed to receive the blessing of various human-invented laws, Defense remains rooted in Real Law. It is about the preservation of unalienable Rights, not the usurpation of Political Power.

A textbook example of how all these properties of Defense come together in the real world would probably be the destruction of Saddam Hussein's nuclear reactor at Osiraq by the Israeli air force in 1981. The

threat posed by nuclear weapons in the hands of a maniacal and aggressive dictator was very great, and the response was highly targeted. It was preemptive because it was obliged to be under such circumstances, but it was neither unnecessarily hasty nor did it wait until it was too late.

Now, it may not have escaped your attention that the act of eliminating a known predator can serve two conflicting purposes at the same time. That is, it can serve as retribution for *past* offenses (an act of Aggression), while also preventing *future* offenses (an act of Defense). Does the fact that already-injured parties might derive some satisfaction from otherwise-appropriate sanctions necessary to halt a predator's pattern of abuse mean that effective Defense has to be disallowed?

Of course not. The necessity and justice of interrupting criminals' careers have nothing to do with whatever unpleasantness that may cause them—or with whatever joy that may give to their erstwhile victims.

The point is simply that Vengeance is one sort of spirit, and Defense is a very different sort of spirit, and over time the two will bear very different fruit, whether or not they might produce similar results in some particular instance. Vengeance is pathological, but Defense is anti-pathological. Society can tell the difference between Vengeful and Defensive measures, and will have more respect for the latter because Defense is no more optional than Freedom itself is.

If you think about it, the best "revenge" for past abuse is to prevent any more abuse going forward—which is what Defense is all about. Obviously, preventing a murder is much better Defense than allowing it to happen and then trying to "get even" with the perpetrator. Crimes already committed can't be Defended against, but crimes-in-progress can sometimes be stopped by fighting or the threat of force, and future crimes can sometimes be deterred.

Deterrence is a psychological tool based on convincing wannabe criminals to restrain themselves in the face of assumed failure. As such, it requires at least nominal rationality from malefactors, and so can never be 100% effective. Also, it seems to be human nature that people will

cease to believe threats they haven't seen carried out recently, as if threats had a limited shelf life.

While it's impossible to change the past, the past does give us a way to try to predict the future. Statists, who (allegedly) don't even believe in individuals, predict that all civilians are equally liable to commit crimes and that government isn't liable to commit any—even though history shows no such thing. But those individuals who've transgressed in the past have already proven that they lack the self-control needed by citizens in a Free Society. That creates the possibility of Freedom, by supplying external control only to the control-deficient, and allowing well-behaved people to control themselves.

As for telling the difference between Aggression and Defense, it's sometimes described as a matter of being the first party to resort to violence. That's basically true, but a bit simplistic. Certainly, a violent response to a non-violent provocation is not Defense, but is a looming and otherwise-unavoidable threat really a "non-violent" provocation? Defenders are under no inescapable obligation to hand the "first-strike" advantage to Aggressors, if the result is a catastrophic disadvantage—which is where preemption comes in.

The bottom line is that, like everything else associated with Freedom, when it comes to Defense, good judgment is essential.

For example, it isn't only tangibles like our persons and property that we want to protect. Intangible things like our dignity and point of view are important to us, too. Shouldn't we be able to use force to "defend" them?

No, on two counts. First, a disproportionate response to a threat is Aggression, not Defense. Having people disrespect or disagree with us may be psychologically painful, but there's nothing dire or immediate enough about that to warrant a violent response.

The second misunderstanding is pretending that force even works in those situations. Force can't be used to create respect or agreement—only fear and submission. If we genuinely are respectable and others don't show us respect, or if we are right and they don't agree with us—so

what? Is the goal really to convince our opponents of anything, or simply to punish them for having the audacity to have their own minds?

If we really believed we're right, we'd take an approach—Persuasion—that sets the highest possible standard for merit. Coercion not only shows no confidence in our audience, it shows no confidence in our argument by adopting an approach that does nothing to weed out bad ones.

Freedom is the absence of Coercion, not the absence of hurt feelings. There's no such thing as the "right" not to be offended, and an unoffended society will not be a Free Society. The cure for offense is to eliminate hypersensitivity, not Freedom.

All of which goes to show that Defense is a bit of a tricky subject, but a tremendously important one, because to get Defense exactly right is to get Freedom exactly right.

3-3 Defensive Institutions

Since Freedom is self-determination (or the absence of Coercion), the goal of pro-Freedom (Defensive) institutions is simply stated: to thwart control by others and to promote self-control. That means opposing Force (overt Coercion) and Fraud (covert Coercion), and supporting Persuasion.

And because Power Accumulation and human-invented law ("decree") are by their very nature coercive, Defense also means replacing those with Power Retention and Real Law. It goes without saying that Defensive institutions must be non-Coercive, since the express purpose of Defense is to prevent Coercion.

A Free Society—that is, one in which coercion is effectively held in check—has never existed before. How can Freedom possibly work? One way to answer that question is by studying how Slavery already does work. Whatever supports Slavery stands in the way of Freedom, since the two states are mutually exclusive.

One popular tactic used to advance Slavery is to exploit the public's fear of Anarchy. Another one is to choose a coercive approach of known ineffectiveness like prohibition, and use its inevitable failure as an argument for more of the same (meaning more and more government, of course).

So it stands to reason that any (perceived) ineffectiveness in Defensive institutions will be exploited to argue in favor of replacing Defense with Coercion ("We need law and order!"). The public's confidence in its Defensive institutions needs to be rock-solid. That's not going to be the case unless those institutions can: (1) get the job done, and (2) stick to the original mission.

Thus, denial of reality won't cut it. People who have a problem, when told they have no problem, will simply look elsewhere for answers. One

of the reasons Marxism has proved so enduring, despite having nothing real to offer, is that it at least pays lip service to real problems that non-Marxists seem happy to ignore completely.

Failure won't cut it, either. The very idea of "career" criminals would be anathema to a Free Society. Any criminal career exceeding maybe 2 crimes is a sign that something isn't working, and that Defense ain't happening. Robust Defense means wannabe abusers and exploiters are being effectively neutralized.

On the other hand, mission creep is just another path to failure, because when Defense ceases to be proportionate and restrained (as described earlier), it has become something other than Defense. In such a case, Freedom's enemies won't have to argue for replacing Defense with Coercion because it will have already occurred.

What would Defensive institutions look like? Two familiar institutions are quite similar to their Free Society counterparts: law enforcement and the military.

Modern law enforcement is substantially a Defensive institution already, and to the degree that it isn't, the blame lies mostly with the authors of human-invented law. The signature motto of law enforcement—"To protect and to serve"—is very telling. Neither protection nor service requires Coercion, and Coercion could not be fairly characterized as either protection or service!

A lot of work and thought have gone into tactics and procedures, contributing to the safety of officers, the innocent, and even criminals, who nowadays have to try pretty hard to get themselves hurt. That kind of practical knowledge and experience is directly applicable to the public safety function in a Free Society.

Pretty much the same thing can be said for the military in any democratic nation. To the degree that its role is not Defensive, that can be attributed to the inappropriate adventures of politicians and to foreign policy incompetence. (Dictatorships, of course, are another matter.)

Numerous other organizations serving a Defensive role already exist that are completely unaffiliated with government: consumer groups, people involved in Real Journalism and Debate (more on this subject later), Mothers Against Drunk Drivers—you name it. There's no reason why the institutional network supporting Freedom has to be monolithic. It's probably much better if it *isn't* monolithic, so long as all the bases are covered (preferably redundantly) by somebody.

Oppression may be thought of as coming from two potential sources: foreign and domestic. The United States has long been well-protected from Foreign Oppressors by the world's best military. But if it were the military's job to protect us from Domestic Oppression, they'd be conducting an unending series of campaigns against Washington, DC.

And even the Soviet government ultimately managed to protect Russians against Nazi Aggression. (Of course, it was Real People—not Joe Stalin—who did the actual fighting and dying.)

All governments in fact, from the worst to the best, *combine* Coercion and Defense in some proportion, where the ratio of the two is what determines whether a particular government is among the worst or best. Typically, government is much better at Defending against Coercion from non-government sources than it is from government itself. The usual M.O. for Coercion+Defense government is to giveth with one hand while it taketh away with the other.

This institutional schizophrenia is a natural result of the inherently Coercive nature of human-invented law, combined with the fact that whatever Defense it provides to the People is their most common justification for wanting to put up with government in the first place.

Obviously, there is a vast difference between the most corrupt and Oppressive governments and the least corrupt and Oppressive ones. Societies blessed with the best governments can actually be quite liveable. That's both good news and bad news.

The good news is that Limited Slavery offers really the only opportunity for taking the next step toward do-it-yourself Freedom, which involves inventing and perfecting the purely-Defensive institutions necessary to finally eliminate Coercion altogether. The best governments create an environment where such a thing is at least theoretically possible—something that would be out of the question under the worst governments.

The bad news is that Coercion+Defense government invariably grows, meaning that the Coercion increases while the Defense decreases. Even if legislators were paid twice as much to repeal old human-invented law as to enact yet more of it, it would still balloon over time because a Coercive, Power Accumulation institution like government is just too much of a temptation to the Aristocrat-minded, who're all too eager to tell the rest of us what we must and mustn't do—at gunpoint.

From a logic standpoint, it doesn't make much sense to let things steadily deteriorate until the situation gets so bad that it triggers some cataclysmic adjustment. But it's human nature to give our most immediate concerns a high priority and to let our less pressing problems pretty much fall off the radar.

This phenomenon is so well known to the politically ambitious that they've adopted "boiling the frog" as a formal strategy (so named because, by turning up the heat a little at a time, frogs are too stupid to jump out of the pot until their goose is cooked). The same incrementalism that's being used to create the Total State, however, would also be a way to create Real Freedom if it were aimed in the opposite direction.

It probably doesn't help that many people don't really understand the difference between Anarchy, Slavery and Freedom. Lots of us have bought into the idea that Slavery is the only alternative to Anarchy, or don't see how Freedom can be possible without devolving into Anarchy.

But the notion of Coercion+Defense government as some kind of "necessary evil" is a misconception. A Free Society needs effective Defensive institutions. It doesn't need any Coercive institutions

whatsoever—in fact, it needs a complete absence of those in order for Real Freedom even to exist.

The very idea that people need to be "governed"—told what they must and mustn't do by their "betters" or Masters—reeks of arrogance. People who can *behave* themselves can *govern* themselves, and moreover have a Right to do so. Those who can't behave themselves need to be Defended against. None of this requires any Coercion, or institutions that resort to Coercion.

You could continue to use the word "government" to label a new kind of institution that keeps the Defense but loses the Coercion. As we've seen, it wouldn't be totally unfamiliar to us, and would in fact bear a noticeable resemblance to government (insofar as it currently serves a Defensive role). But these institutions really deserve a new name, because relying exclusively on a system of non-Coercive, Defense-only institutions has never been attempted, let alone achieved.

If you were to go back in time a few centuries and try to convince people that it's possible for human beings to fly, you'd likely be considered crazy. At best, people might be amused but wonder what the heck good flying would be to anyone.

But Freedom isn't just some idle amusement. Freedom is the thing that makes the most of our human potential, just as Slavery makes the least of our potential. Maximizing our potential—or not—could very well be the difference between Success and Failure of the Human Cause itself.

And just like human flight was possible all along, only awaiting sufficient understanding and the development of suitable technology, so Human Freedom awaits a common understanding of what it is, what it has to offer, and what's required in the way of political technology to finally make it happen.

Defensive institutions *are* that technology, and human ingenuity is more than up to the challenge of their creation.

4-0 REAL LAW

Real Law is the basis of Freedom, just as made-up law is the basis of Slavery.

4-1 Decree vs. Real Law

Lots of people find the notion of "law and order" appealing, without having an accurate understanding of either law or order.

Not all order is equally beneficial. Endless columns of goose-stepping storm troopers look like good order to some, but represent a dangerous detour for the Human Cause. Order may be incompatible with Anarchy, but it's at least as compatible with Slavery as it is with Freedom. If anything, Tyrants are even more enthusiastic about order than Libertarians are.

As for law, the much-vaunted "rule of law" actually turns out to be the rule of *lawyers*—a Barristocracy. It is an *oligarchy*—a technocracy where legalistic technicians order all the affairs of the much larger laity.

Unfortunately for those whose fantasies revolve around making up all the rules however they see fit, we find ourselves in a Universe that came fully equipped with Rules of its own—Rules no person made or can re-make. Real Law has no regard for any human delusion.

Imagine Joe Stalin issuing a decree that henceforth, carbon atoms are no longer to have 6 protons, but 443 and a half protons instead. Rational people would understand such a decree to have no effect. Replacing Joe Stalin with elected, "legitimate" lawmakers wouldn't change a thing. Real Law would continue in full force despite such inane fantasies.

Now, no lawmaking institution is going to waste time on carbon atoms, because something like that offers no obvious advantages when it comes to Pushing People Around. But Real Law governs the interaction of humans every bit as much as it does the interaction of subatomic particles, and tolerates no violation. It pays no heed whatsoever to the pronouncements of those who pay no heed to it, and it inexorably overrules whatever they may try to do.

The difference between Real Law and human-invented law is illustrated in the following table:

human-invented law	Real Law
coercive	N/A
arbitrary	Arbitrary
artificially arcane	Naturally Arcane
lawyers, judges, legislators	scientists, philosophers, theologians

So, human-invented law (or "decree") is by its nature *coercive*. Its purpose is to Push People Around, to tell them what they must and mustn't do, at gunpoint. A concept like coercion doesn't apply to Real Law, however. We're obliged to obey the Law of Gravity, for example, but that has nothing to do with anybody owning anyone else.

Human-invented law is also *arbitrary*. It is whatever the people who have obtained the power to make it up wish it to be. But however Arbitrary Real Law is, *human* whim had nothing to do with it.

Thirdly, while Real Law is definitely mysterious, it is at least an all-Natural Mystery. Human-invented law is not only artificially, unnecessarily mysterious, *it is intentionally so*. It's unintelligible by design, so as to become the exclusive province of a legal-technician priesthood, who hand it down to the rest of us from on high.

The People can't defend what they cannot comprehend. Even if human-invented law affords us some protection, how are we to know when that's being taken away from us? We only know what we're told about it by technicians. We have no reliable way of knowing whether we're being well-served or ill-served by the people who create our rules for us, if we can't hope to understand what they're actually up to.

The confusing, "party of the second part" mumbo-jumbo used to encode made-up law would be funny if the result weren't so serious. It's as if some extreme precision were being accomplished by all that verbosity.

But human-invented law is not mathematics. It doesn't, in fact, mean anything specific at all—only whatever the judges-of-last-resort declare it to mean. It can't be used to implement Freedom, because it makes judges Rulers in a way that can't be verified by their (non-technical) Subjects. The thing that would keep judges "honest" is the wrath of the laity, which never materializes through the legalistic fog.

Unelected judges making up law doesn't even qualify as democracy, let alone Freedom. Article I, section 1 of the U.S. Constitution assigns all lawmaking authority to the Congress. That leaves no lawmaking authority whatsoever for the judicial branch. If judges can't manage to "interpret" that Constitutional provision faithfully, what confidence can we have in the rest of their pronouncements?

For those who imagine that the task of restraining government can safely be delegated to government itself, the Second Amendment offers a sobering reality check. The Supreme Court's big Second Amendment case, *U.S. v. Miller* (1939), arose out of the (unconstitutional) National Firearms Act of 1934. Not that the Firearms Act has been *ruled* unconstitutional, mind you, merely that it violates both the spirit and the letter of the Bill of Rights.

Judging by the *Miller* case, the court desperately wanted to uphold the Firearms Act, and set about torturing the law in order to achieve that end. The actual text of the Second Amendment is this:

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

The amendment says nothing explicit about the relationship between its two clauses, but according to the ordinary rules of English grammar (not to mention Political Common Sense), it implies that the first (subordinate) clause depends on the second (main clause)—that is, the People's militia depends on their Right to bear arms, not the other way around.

The Real Law referenced by the Second Amendment is simply this: No Arms means no Militia means no Free State. In other words, the militarily helpless are also *politically* helpless. Not a surprising insight, coming from a group of people who had just successfully concluded an armed revolt.

The Miller court decided to reverse the sense of the amendment, however, declaring that the Right to bear arms was instead dependent on the militia. It claimed no knowledge of the suitability of sawed-off shotguns to militia use, meaning that their regulation didn't violate the Constitution. It then left it to future anti-Constitutional judges to redefine "militia" from a *civilian* body to a *government* body, thus completing the Second Amendment's transformation from something meant to *prohibit* a government monopoly on arms into something "interpreted" to *protect* a government monopoly on arms.

Just one of a series of grim lessons on the futility of looking to Barristocrats for the protection of our fundamental Political Rights. As a reliable defender of the government-restraining Constitution, the judicial branch of government would have a lot to offer. When the third branch becomes simply a third route of attack, it's worse than useless.

Unlike human-invented law, Real Law is immune to manipulation. It can't be changed one iota of a jot by delusion, subterfuge, ignorance, or any popularity contest. Real Law is something no person invented, or can invent, or can re-invent.

It can only be *discovered*—an undertaking that science, philosophy and religion have been hard at work upon. That's not results-oriented junk science or junk religion, where agenda trumps Truth, but a more open-minded sort of discipline that goes wherever the Truth leads.

Now, this analysis may not sound entirely fair to the efforts of legislators, judges, and even bureaucrats, many of whom are decent people of good will. After all, murder is often a violation of human-invented law, and it doesn't take a world-class philosopher to realize that it's also a violation of Real Law. Murder robs us of the only resource that we can truly claim belongs to us—people.

But the efforts of some to invent decree that is consistent with Reality doesn't happen *because of* the coercive, arbitrary nature of human-invented law, but *in spite of* that nature. Something similar would happen in a Free Society, which is obliged to be Reality-based, but coercion would not be a part of it.

The fact that human-invented law sometimes references Real Law is a mixed blessing. It's helpful when we don't ignore Reality, since that's something we can only do at our peril. The downside is that, human-invented law being a package deal, the Real Legitimacy that comes from having it be somewhat rooted in Real Law creates an undeserved pseudo-legitimacy for the rest of it that ignores or even violates Real Law.

That same confusion creates problems going in the other direction. The disrespect that many people will feel toward decree of obviously dubious legitimacy is at risk of becoming an attitude of general disrespect for law, Reality-based or not.

The coercive and arbitrary nature of human-invented law can't be in any serious doubt. There could hardly be clearer proof than this: that Slavery and Robbery are generally illegal when perpetrated by civilians, and illegal to resist when perpetrated by government.

Now this is very important, so please pay close attention: *Changing human-invented law is smart, violating it is stupid.*

Nobody who *isn't* looking to get beat down should violate ANY human-invented law. If you doubt that human-invented law is all about obedience, do some research into what happens to the disobedient. Civil

disobedience is a job for the politically well-organized, and even then it's going to cost you!

4-2 Real Law Discovery

It's been said that ignorance of the law is no defense. That's probably just as well, since ignorance of human-invented law is unavoidable—even for full-time, professional technicians. There's just so darn much of it, and it's so unbelievably, mind-bogglingly obtuse. And regardless of what it may appear to mean, its "real meaning" can only be divined by a (frequently slim) majority of the judges-of-last-resort.

Guess what? Ignorance of Real Law is no defense, either. If we can't muster any interest in figuring out what it is—or worse, we have a pretty good indication what Real Law is but choose to ignore it for the sake of our agenda—the consequences of our folly can't be held off by any amount of delusion, no matter how fervent or self-righteous.

As we've already pointed out, government-issued decree sometimes makes an effort to reflect Real Law, and even succeeds to some degree. But there's not even a pretense of a common understanding that made-up law must *only* ever reflect Real Law. Indeed, there's a common understanding that government is a great tool for foisting our will off on our politically-disadvantaged fellow citizens at gunpoint.

We desperately want to use government to invent "law" and create "legitimacy" (with much emphasis on the dotting of *i*'s and crossing of *t*'s), but Real Legitimacy comes only from Real Law—in other words, from the Truth.

So, how would a Free Society go about discovering Real Law (as it applies to human politics)? Would Real Law just be whatever enough people would like it to be? Would it be whatever certain preeminent people claim it is? What can we understand about what Real Law actually is?

Science is pretty good at discovering things like the speed of light in a vacuum. Freedom, however, is not a subject heavily studied by

science—so far. But even an informal philosophical approach can yield some answers.

For starters, we can see that individual bodies have individual brains. Humankind is built on what computer geeks would call the "distributed processing" model. That has a direct correspondence to self-determination, but a pretty poor correspondence to making other people's decisions for them (i.e. Slavery)—much less to some totally hypothetical Collectivism that pretends that individuals don't really exist.

We also can see that people won't always cooperate when being told what they must and mustn't do, unless they're forced, threatened with force, or tricked. In fact, they will often decline to do what they otherwise might have chosen to do, just because they don't like taking orders—exhibiting what might be called a "Don't Tread On Me" attitude problem. (Or at least what appears to be a "problem" in the eyes of Tyrants. For all we know, it may actually be a safety mechanism designed to help prevent the Human Project from being hijacked by evil maniacs.)

From a quality control standpoint, we can observe that whenever Coercion or Monopolism goes up, excellence goes down.

Basic insights like these make any claim that political systems must embrace Coercion exceedingly suspect. Added to that, we have ample historical evidence that Less Coercive systems vastly outcompete More Coercive ones. It's hard to see how eliminating Coercion altogether mightn't do even better.

When it comes to deciding what constitutes a *crime* in a Free Society, there is a rule of thumb available that may prove helpful. Government, of course, can define "crime" in a totally arbitrary manner. Self-preservation can be deemed "illegal" (and generally will be under Marxism). Genocide can be deemed "legal" (ditto).

But if you think about it, anything that can be understood to be a Natural Crime involves Theft of Power. Rape, robbery, murder, fraud, assault, slavery—all involve taking away a person's unalienable power over self.

Real crimes are committed by people who refuse to recognize the unalienable Right of others to own their own lives.

An understanding that self-determination is a thing to be protected leads pretty directly to an understanding of how to discriminate between what must and mustn't be tolerated in order to have a Free Society.

Drug abuse provides an illustration. Under human-invented law and government, criminalizing drug abuse has proven to be a great way to grow both organized crime, and in turn, government. It's not very difficult to get 51% of the public behind the idea that drug abuse should be treated as a crime. In fact, back in those long-gone days when the U.S. Constitution actually had to be amended in order to be changed, alcohol was first prohibited and then un-prohibited with the support of a significant majority.

But how does a principle like self-determination apply to an admittedly very real problem like drug addiction? People in a Free Society would have a protected right to make their own decisions, including making what others considered to be mistakes. On the other hand, drug addiction wouldn't somehow become a reason to excuse anti-social behavior like theft or assault.

A pretty good case could be made for the idea that addicts have given up ownership of their own lives. But a Free Society would be guided by the Defensive principle that a response can't be disproportionate to the threat. A proportionate response to the threat posed by drug abuse would likely involve the wide dissemination of scientific data on its dangers, the robust protection of others from abusive addicts, and some appropriately-respectful attempts at intervention for non-abusive addicts.

Obviously, not all behavior that "consenting adults" want to pursue leads to a healthy society. *Neither does Political Oppression.* Self-determination is entirely consistent with making a public case *for* constructive personal behavior and *against* destructive personal behavior. Applying coercive sanctions against those who make choices for themselves which we happen to disapprove is another matter.

Traffic laws offer another example. Most human-invented law in that area relates pretty directly to safety. Real Law isn't much concerned with whether the right or left side of the road is the "proper" one on which to drive, but it's greatly concerned with the damage done in a head-on collision.

It's clear that having some appropriate set of common conventions for motorists enhances public safety. There's no such thing as the "right" to endanger other people. The specifics of whatever traffic "rules" were adopted might be somewhat arbitrary (within the bounds of the laws of physics), but the need for such specifics would not be arbitrary.

In other words, any investigation into Real Law would yield traffic rules not too dissimilar to the kind produced under government.

Actually, Real Law would probably yield results not unlike human-invented law in a lot of cases—minus the coercion (and incomprehensibility). Many Reality-based principles have found their way into human-invented law over the centuries—principles that virtually anyone (including non-technicians) can understand.

One instance would be the concept of *reasonableness*. Human-invented law sometimes references what a "reasonable" person would do in specified circumstances. Real Law would also have to reflect the fact that, while human beings aren't omniscient, there is a relationship between thinking and behaving responsibly.

Rather than reinvent the wheel, so to speak, it makes sense to distill these kinds of truths from existing law (translated from the legalese, of course). The portion of human-invented law that's consistent with self-ownership makes a good starting point for an understanding of Real Law, insofar as it governs human interaction.

But while the *results* from a Real Law discovery process would share some human-interaction principles with made-up law, they wouldn't share its *basis*.

That is, whatever a Free Society recognized as Real Law would be Defensive in nature, not Coercive. It also would not be unnecessarily

arbitrary—in other words, somewhat-arbitrary conventions might need to be adopted in situations where the absence of *any* convention was not an option (like the earlier example about driving on either side of the road).

Most importantly from a Power Retention standpoint, Real Law would need to be expressed in plain language, where the focus remained on the *principles* embodied rather than the *words* used to describe them—unlike human-invented law, where lawyers debate the "spirit" versus the "letter" of the law (as a prelude to contorting the letter with the aim of corrupting its spirit).

In short, a Free Society would no longer require the "legal interpretation" services of lawyers, because Real Law would be something any citizen could comprehend, by being neither unintelligible nor vast beyond reason. Whereas ignorance of human-invented law is unavoidable (even by full-time experts), Real Law would be compact and straightforward enough to be a part of every citizen's normal education.

4-3 Justice

A public trial by a jury of civilians, as guaranteed by the 6th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, is one of the most valuable Political Rights ever realized. What has happened to this Right over the decades, however, offers an object lesson on the real potential of a Coercion-based institution like government.

Nowadays, high-dollar, big-city lawyers run what amounts to "litigation farms"—using a jury pool recruited at government gunpoint. When people have to be forced to do something, it's because they don't have much interest in it. Is there some reason to be enthusiastic about indefinitely interrupting their lives, in order to be grossly manipulated by lawyers who're being well-paid for *their* time, that these people can't see?

The situation with criminal trials is hardly better. Jurors are supposedly there to determine the truth, but they're totally at the mercy of lawyers' and judges' manipulations of arcane legal rules when it comes to what subset of the facts they'll even get to hear. Furthermore, they're commanded to follow the (human-invented) law, regardless of whatever relationship that may have to actual Justice.

It's an unquestionably good thing to try to put systems in place to prevent any miscarriage of justice. It's less good—and more in the nature of neurosis—to dream up all manner of complex procedures and apply them blindly thereafter, without any concern for whether the alleged goal is attained or thwarted thereby. But this kind of behavior is a natural outcome of a Monopolistic, Coercive approach to things. The very purpose of Monopoly and Coercion is to relieve us of the need to be any good at whatever we're doing.

There are a number of strange effects surrounding "justice" as pursued under arcane, arbitrary, coercive human-invented law. For one thing, technicalism and legalism have an irresistible way of becoming all about

themselves, rather than about Real Justice, which has nothing to do with those things.

What's more, the justice meted out under human-invented law is unverifiable by design. There's not even a thought of trying to compare the results from human-invented law with some independent approach, as a check on accuracy. Justice is simply defined as whatever outcome the artful manipulation of a host of complicated rules produces. True, rulings can be appealed, but only up a few successive steps in the same flawed system—great for making sure all the legalistic hoops got jumped through, but not really a check on the efficacy of legalism itself.

The adversarial nature of a trial is . . . odd. It may look like a way to avoid being "railroaded" by a one-track investigative effort that's more about agenda than it is Truth, but all it really provides for is two competing one-track efforts. It's all about winning the case, and maybe Justice will be some accidental by-product. It creates strong incentives, but not necessarily the right incentives.

None of this is to say that decent people aren't trying to do the best they can with what they've been given to work with, and even doing a pretty amazing job considering the obstacles. But they're fighting a losing battle.

We almost always get what we were asking for—which hardly ever turns out to be what we *thought* we were asking for. Starting out with a sincere desire to see Justice done is one thing, and winding up under the yoke of a "barristocracy" is another. Monopolism and Coercion are disincentives to merit, and a poor foundation for achieving excellence at anything. Legalism is a prerequisite for a technical oligarchy, not a prerequisite for Justice.

The pursuit of Justice under a Free Society would share most of the stated goals of the technocratic version. It would also embrace many of the principles that have found their way into human-invented law due to the efforts of lawmakers who cared about Reality. What it would *not* do is assume that only technicians can hope to understand Justice, monopolize fact-finding, or force anyone who isn't an accused or convicted criminal to do anything.

The first thing to understand about Real Justice is that it only happens when miscreants are (appropriately) punished, and the innocent go unpunished. An idea that it's better for ten criminals to go scot-free than for one innocent person to be punished is fine as an expression of concern about possible abuse. Here's a better idea: that *zero* criminals go unpunished and *zero* innocents be punished. No Free Society, which has to rely on robust Defensive institutions to prevent Anarchy and Slavery, can afford either to abuse the innocent or to allow known predators to roam at will.

If Truth matters—if Reality matters—then inaccuracy isn't an option. Whatever procedures the quest for Justice employs, they're only as good as they are accurate and can be demonstrated to produce the results intended. Otherwise, they should rightly be regarded as counterproductive rather than allowed to become a substitute for the original goal.

The other thing to realize about Real Justice is that we have a limited ability to achieve it here on Planet Earth. We don't know how to un-murder or un-rape anyone. We can't do anything to change what's past, only work to prevent more of the same going forward. There's no such thing as retroactive Defense.

The desire for Vengeance is a known, somewhat-understandable part of human nature, but that doesn't make it a thing to be encouraged. To the degree that some kind of reasonable restitution is possible, it ought to be sought. But fabulously large cash awards having no verifiable relationship to the injury received are to the predatory what chum is to sharks. Combining such jackpots with a technocratic system is a recipe for winding up with a surplus of technicians.

As for making criminals "suffer" the way their victims had to suffer, it's pointless. There are better ways to heal grief. The Constitution's 8th Amendment is right to prohibit "cruel and unusual punishments"—cruelty has nothing to do with Defense, and comparable offenses deserve comparable sanctions.

The whole subject of criminal justice in a Free Society is a tricky one. Defense is about prevention, not retribution. And sanctions that

punished the innocent along with the guilty would be pretty inconsistent with Liberty.

Take capital punishment, for example. Executing people convicted of heinous crimes does nothing to undo the past, so as a method of "payment" it's hard to fathom. It does absolutely prevent recidivism, but represents an extreme way to accomplish that goal. It also relieves the public of the burden of indefinitely supporting felons, but it doesn't allow for the possibility of rehabilitation or the correction of any miscarriage of justice.

Capital punishment has been put forward as a deterrent to crime, but that issue seems unresolved. Felons appear to worry a great deal about the death penalty *after* their convictions, but to worry insufficiently about it when choosing to commit their crimes.

Likewise, the whole notion of criminals "paying their debt to society" is weird. It's as if an equivalence can be determined between some type of criminal act and a certain number of years in jail, at the conclusion of which everything is presumed to be hunky-dory.

Some of the ideas surrounding the concept of "guilt" are even stranger. People can be found "not guilty" by reason of insanity, and crimes of "passion" can be treated differently than dispassionate ones.

But if victims died, the loss is the same regardless of whether it resulted from insanity, passion, malice, negligence, or whatever. Contributing factors like that may have a lot to do with rehabilitation, but what about Defense? Do crazy or passionate people who kill really pose less danger to society?

It seems pretty obvious that a society based on Defense would be focused on the protection of its members. That has an equally obvious implication: that individuals who egregiously misbehaved in the past would remain a cause for public concern until such time as their deficiencies had been effectively addressed. *Recidivism represents a clear failure to Defend.*

Rather than some arbitrary amount of detention placed on a particular type of crime like a price tag, remedial action ought to continue until it actually succeeded in restoring a felon to an ordinary standard of self-control, so that ex-offenders turned loose on society pose no greater risk than people who behaved themselves all along. (Where felons were able to fool experts as to the degree of their recovery, it's hard to imagine the circumstances under which they should be given another opportunity to do that!)

Rehabilitation is a great thing. The possibility of restoring lost souls as useful members of society is a worthy cause. Warehousing people is another matter. About the only thing that appears to accomplish is keeping them around on the off chance that some breakthrough in treatment later occurs.

Neither does it make sense that a Free Society would finance the support of prisoners at gunpoint (i.e. by taxation). Better alternatives exist. Such support could come from family members, from altruistic citizens who believe in the mission of rehabilitation, and from the prisoners themselves, who in the worst case can work for a living like Real People.

There *is* a job of surpassing value to society that felons are in a unique position to do: helping science to understand how felons get created, so that those particular mistakes can be better avoided in succeeding generations. That represents a chance for even "incurable" criminals to lead Successful lives.

Procedure is no substitute for principle. The best justice system is not the one that has the most complicated and manipulatable rules, but the one that produces the most accurate results. Concern over whether a crime was actually committed and if so, its actual perpetrators found, is not misplaced.

But viewing an inability to stop known predators as some sort of technical victory for Civil Liberties is perverse. A Free Society wouldn't settle for any abuse from known predators or the effort to curtail them, either one. Those are not mutually-exclusive goals, and if they're being treated as such then something has gone astray.

4-4 Punishment

If everyone in society (small children included) were ferociously competent at self-defense, there would be no need for criminal sanctions since there would be no such thing as a criminal career. Even with responsibility for our Defense being shared by as many citizens as could manage it, however, the extraordinary vulnerability of some of us still calls for neutralizing known predators.

One approach that's popular in some quarters is for the well-behaved to cower behind bars and the badly-behaved to run around loose. That makes sense if the bad guys outnumber the good guys, or where Statist efforts at civilian disarmament have left the former armed and the latter helpless.

The alternative is to deal with the violent so that peaceable people can go out without undue risk of attack.

The term "law-abiding" is a little weak, because it makes no distinction between Just and Unjust law. All that's necessary to create "criminals" in a Barristocracy is to invent new laws that otherwise-peaceable citizens rightly resent or are just plain ignorant of.

Real Criminals are simply those who Abuse others, and Abuse isn't such a complex subject that everybody in a Free Society would need a law degree in order to understand it or to have a good working knowledge of what kind of behavior had been previously identified as Intolerable.

For Elitists, the definition of a "well-behaved" person is someone who remains peaceable while being Oppressed. Statism is based on the "government equals good guys and civilians equal bad guys" model, which neither reflects Reality nor provides any Defense against Criminal government. (That's a huge mistake in light of some 20th-century governments proving to be at least *5 or 6 orders of magnitude* more

dangerous than any Criminal individual. Charles Manson is small potatoes next to Joe Stalin.)

In a Free Society, well-behaved people would be those who ordered their own affairs peaceably, on the basis of persuasion and consent. Freedom must be based on an understanding that it is Aggressors who are the bad guys and Defenders who are the good guys. In that scenario, everything depends on who chooses to resort to force first or unnecessarily.

Defense calls for treating people as individuals and making a distinction between peaceable citizens and felons. One way to deal with the latter is to apply non-expiring sanctions to known criminals and to maintain a general defensive posture against wannabes. ("Non-expiring" simply means that the sanctions don't go away until the problem that made them necessary also does.)

Four levels of scrutiny would be enough to address people with:

- (1) little or no record at all
- (2) a continuously good (unblemished) record
- (3) any infractions
- (4) too many infractions

The problem is how to distinguish between ordinary human fallibility and seriously deficient self-control. A society that demands human perfection is going to be way underpopulated, but the kind of gross fallibility that's called "negligence" can do as much damage as outright malice.

As far as what constitutes too many infractions, that would probably depend on their severity—one murder would be enough. The practical value of an "any infractions" and a "too many infractions" categories would be to identify who's already a proven danger to society and who's at risk of becoming one. The latter situation calls for prompt intervention, and the former for some appropriate sanction.

Theoretically, individuals who posed a danger to others could just be banished from a Free Society, but we're fresh out of uninhabited continents to use as penal colonies. (Perhaps other, Statist societies would be interested in people who had demonstrated their lack of self-control as immigrants, since Statism has no use for self-control anyway and could always find room for more Slaves.)

Execution is the ultimate form of banishment, but being irreversible, it makes no allowance for screw-ups or the possibility of rehabilitation.

The whole issue of "punishment" is pretty iffy under existing approaches to criminal justice. Is punishment simply meant as an act of "justice" via retribution, or is it supposed to have some Defensive purpose?

There's no question that human beings, like other animals, are subject to what psychologists call "shaping" or "operant conditioning"—behavior modification based on reward and punishment. When people touch a hot stove and immediately receive a painful burn, their inclination to touch other hot stoves is reduced. A pat on the back, on the other hand, makes whatever behavior elicited it more likely to recur in the future.

So, punishment that had the effect of "curing" felonious behavior obviously qualifies as Defense—assuming it meets the usual constraints (timely, proportionate, etc.).

But what about a situation where people touch a hot stove, and then *maybe* get burned a year a half later, depending upon whether anyone saw them do it and whether they can afford a sufficiently-clever lawyer? Does that conform to what we know about basic human psychology, or fly in its face?

Clearly most people—though not all by any means—would find imprisonment punishing. But imprisonment appears to be both overused and underused.

Lots of people are imprisoned for conducting their own affairs in a way that others disapprove (and have managed to make "illegal" through the magic of made-up law). Others guilty of the same "crimes" never do any

time. Not only is this Coercion, inconsistently and unfairly applied, but it is a gross waste of a costly and draconian sanction like jail.

A Defensive Society would only use jails for Defense, and only when a better solution to the particular problem was unavailable. For felons whose crimes were against property (theft, vandalism, etc.), a Defensive response would mean preventing their access to other people's property until such time as their lack-of-control problem was resolved. Prison might be overkill for an application like that—maybe not, depending on what alternatives technology might have to offer.

Similarly, for crimes against persons like rape, murder, kidnapping, and armed robbery (with its implied death threat), Defense would mean preventing their perpetrators' access to potential victims for as long as necessary to correct the problem. If imprisonment turned out to be the best way to accomplish that goal, then so be it, but why should protection from violent felons only last for some predetermined time?

The "debt to society" nonsense is just that—nonsense. It has everything to do with trying to get even and nothing to do with Defending society against known predators.

Punishment is also viewed as a deterrent to other wannabe criminals. Deterrence meets Defense's timeliness constraint (because it deals with the present and future), but not its "rooted in Real Law" and proportionality constraints if it tries to hold people responsible for what others might do, or allows "making an example" out of existing offenders to trump dealing with their individual circumstances.

As it turns out, the same uncertainty that makes it less likely that known felons will be taken care of—the dysfunctionality of a criminal justice system rooted in legalism and technicalism—also makes it less likely that wannabe felons will refrain from doing their thing. A much better deterrent than uncertain ultimate punishment would be certain immediate failure of the criminal act itself. That requires a less vulnerable society.

5-0 POWER RETENTION

The Power Retention upon which Freedom depends can only happen with the support of special institutions.

5-1 Egalitarian Institutions

In principle, replacing Slavery with Freedom is pretty straightforward. It's just a matter of replacing Coercion with Persuasion, Aggression with Defense, "decree" with Real Law (more about that later), and Power Accumulation with Power Retention. However, Slavery doesn't happen without the support of an extensive set of institutions, and neither will Freedom.

When it comes to trying to create (Egalitarian) institutions supporting Power Retention, one good way of telling you're on the right track would be if the result were unattractive to Power Accumulators. Aristocrat wannabes are drawn to government and other Power Accumulation institutions by the opportunities they provide to Push People Around.

We know that the Human Cause is a team effort, and Freedom (being Reality-based) is obliged to reflect that. There are several ways to approach a collective undertaking.

Some people's idea of teamwork is hitching 20 mules to a wagonload of borax and beating 'em to death.

Then there's what might be called the "Baboon Model"—a hierarchical approach. Under the Baboon Model, the biggest, meanest baboon gets to be Head Baboon and push all the other baboons around. The next-biggest, meanest baboon gets to be Second Baboon, and suck up to the Head Baboon while pushing all the other LRBs (Low-Ranking Baboons) around. And so on down the list. (The Baboon Model hasn't proved all that successful even for baboons, which may say something about its suitability for humans.)

Others appear to favor a zero-sum approach, which says the best way for them to get ahead is to figure out how to keep you back. That probably has a lot of appeal for Aristocrats (for whom "living large" seems to revolve around everyone else living small).

We know what Marxism's idea of "teamwork" is: top-down, Joe Stalin says "Frog!" and you jump—or die.

Another approach could be called the "Captain Picard Model" (after the fictional TV character). In this model, the executive solicits input from a group of competent and trusted associates, and after careful consideration, generally (but not always) says: "Make it so!"

Dictators seem fascinated by the idea of leadership—even going so far as to take a title like "Dear Leader" (Kim Jong-il), "Maximum Leader" (Fidel Castro), or just plain "*The Leader*" (Adolf Hitler). Then again, it's probably just part of the scam, like the pro forma constitutions, fake elections, and title of "president" for people who appointed themselves.

In reality, Coercion is the polar opposite of Leadership. Tyrants are only "followed" at gunpoint. *No one who wants to coerce or con you is a Leader.* Real Leaders are all about inspiration and setting an example, not Pushing People Around.

With government, which has "The Power" (to make up law), coercion can be fairly overt—it can simply be "legitimized" by the government's own decree. In the "private sector" world of corporations, labor unions, and such, it's obliged to take a more covert form like corruption.

But what would Egalitarian institutions look like? Well, for starters, they wouldn't have any bosses. There's nothing Egalitarian about some people giving orders which other people are obliged to obey.

Secondly, they wouldn't be democratic. Democracy is just a means for leaving 49% of the people with 0% of the say-so. Instead, members would retain their right to give or withhold consent on an individual basis. What kind of Power Retention institutions would abandon the principle of Power Retention in their own operation?

And since the "package deal" (referred to as "bundling" in the world of Monopolies) is a favorite technique of those aiming to coerce—by forcing people to accept what they *don't* want in order to get what they *do* want—it would have no place in any Egalitarian enterprise. That

would be true with respect to any kind of action, but particularly so for financial support.

Obviously, money entrusted to such an organization also would be handled with utter transparency, so that members could see whether or not their wishes were being respected.

In short, Power Retention institutions would be arranged so as to support Equality, consent, and Real Leadership (the kind that relies on vision and persuasion), and to thwart coercion, Power Accumulation, and corruption. To the degree that some institutions made a better effort at this than others, there's no reason why people should choose the worse ones when deciding where to lend their support.

It goes without saying that Power Retention institutions wouldn't be Monopolistic, since the very purpose of Monopoly is Coercion.

As we've seen, many institutions of a basically Defensive nature already exist. They provide a good starting point, but there's a long way yet to go to make Real Freedom a reality.

Under government (which has to power to act coercively), proof of political claims or theories becomes optional. Programs genuinely or allegedly meant to address real or alleged problems can simply be treated as if they actually accomplished the intended goal—and continued indefinitely, even expanded.

With purely-Defensive Institutions, however, there'll be a need for experimentation and testing to see which proposals and ideas can actually get the job done—without the kind of harmful side-effects so common to government. Ineffectiveness doesn't qualify as Defense, and neither does Disproportionality or mission creep. Just like in the private sector, where Quality Assurance is a major issue for Competitors and a non-issue for Monopolists, Political Institutions will be obliged to work better under Defense than their counterparts have under Coercion.

In order to use government (Limited Slavery) as a launching pad for Real Freedom, lawmakers will have to create some leeway ("Barristocrat-free zones") so that such "Political R&D" can occur. When and if

experimental institutions demonstrate their superiority over the status quo, some kind of migration path will also have to be provided to phase out Coercion while phasing in Defense.

One way to get a sense of what Real Freedom will be like is to contrast it with a couple of current, real-world political implementations: the U.S. Constitution and the Libertarian Party platform.

The U.S. Constitution references Real Law pretty intimately, but does so in a context of government and human-invented law. So the Constitution as actually enforced doesn't bear too much resemblance to the Constitution as it was adopted by lawmakers. That's an organic, unavoidable outcome when delegating the People's Sovereignty to Barristocrats, which is what resorting to made-up law amounts to.

Having recognized that fundamental shortcoming, the Constitution is otherwise quite robust. It grants no (explicit) lawmaking authority whatsoever to judges (hard to believe!), it divides Power between three federal branches and again between the federal government and the States, it enumerates a limited set of powers to the federal government, and it (belatedly) provided a Bill of Rights as a further (explicitly redundant) check on government abuse of Power.

The Bill of Rights provides in particular the First Amendment prohibition of (government-originated) censorship as a check against Political Fraud, and the Second Amendment protection of civilian arms as a check against Force.

Other than that, like all government it is Power Accumulative (democratic, representative government based on made-up law) and combines Coercion and Defense, albeit heavy on the Defense and light on the Coercion (at least as originally adopted).

Government-issued decree (even that produced by 51% of the representatives allegedly acting on behalf of the 51% of the people who appointed them) turns out to be a depressingly weak Defense mechanism, due to its dependence on the "interpretation" services of "is

is" double-talking lawyers. Under that regime, something like "interstate commerce" can be defined as almost anything, very nearly (by a 4-to-5 vote) including rape.

A Free Society would certainly want to safeguard the kind of fundamental Political Rights mentioned in the Bill of Rights, but wouldn't want to leave their protection in the hands of Barristocrats. It's unrealistic to expect Power Accumulators to defend the Rights of the politically disadvantaged as zealously as the People themselves would.

The People can't defend what they cannot comprehend, and one of the given objectives of human-invented law is its incomprehensibility. Words that can only be "interpreted" by the few offer no reliable protection to the many.

We've been using "Libertarian" in a generic way to mean anti-Slavery—not to be confused with the Libertarian Party and its platform. That platform turns out to be pretty consistent with Real Liberty, so consistent in fact that it's easiest just to point out a few notable exceptions.

For one, the Libertarian Party platform is weak on immigration control. The unrestricted movement between political jurisdictions (nations, etc.) may seem like a Liberty issue, but at a practical level is dangerous to Freedom because of the extensive preparation required for people to be able to manage in a Free Society. Just as dictatorships need to indoctrinate their subjects in the ways of their system, people likewise need education of a different sort in order for self-control to work. That would routinely happen for children on the way to adulthood, but it would also be essential for immigrants—meaning that rigorously controlling immigration would be non-optional.

The Libertarian Party platform is also weak on National Defense. The American Founders were famous Pacifists and non-interventionists. They're often treated as if they were stuck in a time-warp, when actually they were highly pragmatic and contemporary. They happened to live in a time when reaching America took many weeks at sea. No one can reliably put words in the mouths of the long-departed, but it's hard to believe they wouldn't have updated their geopolitical opinions in an era of ICBMs and nukes. Human nature hasn't changed any since the 18th

century, but horrific advances in military technology have made international non-engagement obsolete.

Libertarians and Conservatives alike favor smaller government, but the real problem with government is not its *quantity* but its *quality*. True, larger government is more expensive, and therefore more Oppressive when coercively financed, but a government made smaller by reducing its Defense component wouldn't be an improvement. What needs to be (selectively) eliminated is its Coercion component, transforming Coercion+Defense government into a set of purely-Defensive institutions.

Also, *laissez faire* by itself is not particularly conducive to Liberty, because self-control is not something that happens in a political vacuum. Self-control needs a lot of intellectual and institutional support in order to take the place of the Statists' panacea, external control provided by vast government. Real Libertarians ought to be world-class champions of self-control that actually works, not moral relativists or detached bystanders.

To reject Morality altogether—either an honest, outright rejection, or a dishonest kind of rejection like moral relativism—is to reject self-control. The absence of *any* control results in Anarchy, not Freedom. But Anarchy is no longer a practical option because way too many people fear and hate it. Not to mention the fact that Anarchy is almost as wasteful of the Human Resource (and therefore dangerous to the Human Cause) as Slavery is.

There's plenty of room for debate about what specifically constitutes good or bad behavior. But there can be no doubt that some behavior tends toward Success and some toward Failure. You can call this latter behavior "sinful" or "counterproductive" or use whatever term you like, but the effect is the same.

People who can't distinguish between helpful and unhelpful behavior, or who're uninterested in virtue at all, are unequipped for citizenship in a Free Society because they're unequipped for self-control. Self-control requires both willpower and a suitable moral standard. If you don't know

Right from Wrong, or have no inclination or ability to follow through on that knowledge, self-control will fail.

For some people, like Theocrats, a "suitable moral standard" is whatever they've unilaterally chosen, and the best way to propagate it is by Force. That ignores the fact that Coercion itself is gravely Immoral. Merit has a direct relationship with Persuasion, but an inverse relationship with Coercion. A dictated Morality no more corresponds to Freedom than an absence of Morality does.

Morality itself isn't even the tiniest bit arbitrary, since it arises directly out of Real Law. However, we have the same problem with Morality that we do with Real Law in general, which is figuring out what the heck it is. A Free Society would have an active, ongoing, Real Debate on the subject of Morality, so that citizens could be as well-informed as humanly possible when making their determinations on the subject.

Effective self-control isn't only a matter of character, but also attitude and even technique. Hypersensitivity to insult, lousy anger management, and arrogance have little to offer a Free Society. The amount of preparation needed to equip people for self-ownership is daunting. Only the smart, fearless, virtuous, and industrious need apply. But we shouldn't be surprised that Freedom demands a lot, because it's worth a lot more!

You can't simply give people their Freedom. The most you can do is help those who are ready for it to give it to themselves. Freedom is a do-it-yourself proposition, and it needs a self-help approach. That's where Power Retention institutions come in.

5-2 Sovereignty

When it comes to Freedom, national sovereignty is a big deal. The Marxian wet dream—world government—is strictly a lowest-common-denominator proposition that can't accommodate self-ownership (nor is it meant to). Freedom is an experiment-in-progress that requires some to be able to go where the politically-backward fear to tread, and that can't happen without politically-independent nations.

But it's strange to hear political commentators use the word "sovereign" in relation to dictatorships, because Real Sovereignty is Personal Sovereignty. And under Slavery, Real Sovereignty is already lost. Tyrants aren't "sovereign" anything; they're Power Thieves—Usurpers.

It's easy to understand what kind of people might want to *own* Slaves: sadists, the pathologically-selfish exploiters of their fellow humans, paternalistic chauvinists, and the grandeur-deluded, for starters. (The Marxian archetype—Joe Stalin—qualifies on all counts.) But what sort of people would settle for *becoming* Slaves?

The lazy, the timid, and the busy, that's who.

Lazy people could calculate that they might as well accomplish as little as possible for others as for themselves. They could even come out ahead of the game, if they can manage to claim a disproportionate share of any bounty produced by their more industrious fellows.

Some people value even the illusion of safety so highly, and the necessity of Freedom so lightly, as to have no qualms about trading the latter for the former. A winning plan, if either (illusory) safety or Slavery were the reason we all came to Planet Earth. If not, then safety and Slavery would have to be viewed in the larger context of whatever we mean to accomplish during our brief time here.

Equally vulnerable to Slavery are the terminally busy, people for whom Freedom falls so far back in their list of daily priorities that they're happy to delegate any such concerns to others.

Delegation is a wonderful thing, a real force-multiplier—under the right circumstances. Those circumstances happen to include the availability of delegates who: (1) are competent, and (2) share your same goals.

But Sovereignty is a poor candidate for delegation. In fact, it is the ultimate in poor candidates, since Sovereignty delegation is really just Power Accumulation by another name. Under Sovereignty delegation, the delegates become your Masters, not your servants. They only share your goal if your goal is to have them Rule over you.

Furthermore, the delegation of Freedom's attendant costs risks fostering the notion that Freedom somehow grows on trees—a "something for nothing" delusion. People who actually have to defend Freedom are constantly reminded of its high cost, and thereby reminded that its value is also high.

As an instrument of Freedom, representative government is hard to fathom—and not just because government under human-invented law is inherently coercive and therefore incompatible with self-determination.

What exactly is the need for representatives? Is it that real people are hopelessly unequipped to understand all the complexities of made-up law, and thus need to rely on experts? Is it that real people are way too busy to find the time required to produce such an enormous volume of human-invented law, and thus need to delegate that job to a body of full-time professionals?

The delegation of Sovereignty is a Power Accumulation approach, which is an insurmountable problem for any pro-Freedom institution. Freedom is all about Power Retention, not Power Accumulation. In truth, representation is no more necessary to a Free Society than government and human-invented law are.

The task of ordering a Free Society isn't deciding how to most "legitimately" Push People Around. It's identifying what simply cannot

be tolerated in an otherwise-Tolerant society—in other words, what will be understood by all to warrant an appropriate Defensive response. That's a job that not only *can* be entrusted to the People themselves, but under any Power Retention approach *must* be entrusted to the People, and to the People only.

Yet as we've seen, the "popularity contest" has some serious shortcomings. It has no automatic correspondence to merit—51% of the people can be (and have been) flat-out wrong. Further, a situation where 51% of the people are willing to abuse the other 49% is not that hard for wily politicians to create. It occurs all the time in any democracy.

There's reason to think, though, that the "popularity contest" might be rescued through use of a trick: Instead of relying on what 51% of the people want to do, rely on what a much-smaller percentage refuse to consent to. A majority may not always want to defend Liberty, but there's some percentage who will. It's possible that by choosing this percentage very carefully (something research may be able to assist), the identification of genuinely Intolerable acts could be made with quite-good accuracy.

You'd never be able to get 100% of the people to agree that even murder is intolerable, but a very large majority would. Likewise, you could easily get 51% of the people to agree that (coercive) taxation *is* tolerable (especially if it appeared to affect others much worse than themselves), but a substantial minority could be relied on to disagree. There may well be a "magic percentage" (75% or 90% approval, or whatever) that closely corresponds to self-determination (Freedom) while avoiding both Anarchy and Slavery.

Referenda using such a high (anti-Coercive) threshold would be further helped by the fact that their subject wouldn't be something the ruthless 51% wanted to impose on the helpless 49%, but rather some behavior that was alleged to constitute a Natural Crime (abusive of other's Rights). In other words, the proponents in a referendum would be trying to convince a large majority of the public that the act in question is a violation of fundamental Political Rights, and so demands a Defensive response.

Defensive institutions in turn would be constrained by the results of these elections, rather like their counterpart institutions are constrained under government and human-invented law. But instead of being decided by elected technicians (legislators) and re-decided by unelected technicians (judges), these constraints would be decided by the People directly, expressed in terms that they can readily understand.

As we said before, Real Law—the basis of any Free Society—already exists, but it still has to be identified and implemented. Identification consists of: (1) proposing candidates, (2) selecting some of them, and (3) keeping a record. Implementation is a matter of education (in aid of self-control) and enforcement (should self-control fail).

There's no reason to restrict the process of proposing candidates for Real Law, but the selection process is critical. There's nothing sacred about Democracy per se (or any other political technique)—what's sacred is Power Retention—but Direct Democracy with a high threshold stands to be much less dangerous to Personal Sovereignty than alternative approaches based on Power Accumulation (like representative government).

Again, setting the "magic threshold" would require study and much care, but obviously 100% (corresponding to Anarchy, because it'll never be reached) is too high and 51% (corresponding to Slavery, because it's too easily reached) is too low. Somewhere in between (80%, 85%, who knows?) lies the closest match with self-determination (Freedom).

For the U.S., if Freedom as effective self-ownership were plotted onto a timeline, it probably would have peaked shortly after the Civil War. The arrival of women's suffrage in 1920 might appear to be a step up, since disenfranchisement of half the population is nothing short of bizarre. But while voting rights have a lot to do with who gets to be in democracy's almighty 51%, they don't necessarily map to Freedom—unless enough people are voting to protect individuals from each other, and from government.

A key milestone in the U.S. government's metamorphosis from intended Servant to wannabe Master has got to be the adoption of the national income tax. It's fascinating that it actually required a Constitutional Amendment (the 16th). That was back in the days before anti-Constitutional judges figured out that they could just "interpret" fundamental political protections out of existence without risking unemployment, much less the noose.

Of course, the income tax was promoted as a way of making the rich pay their fair share. But guess what? There aren't nearly enough rich folks to grow government to the size that Statists desire. Not to mention the fact that the wealthy tend to be much better-connected politically than Real People are. In short, it turned out to be just another divide-and-conquer scam.

Taking other people's property by force is referred to as "robbery" when perpetrated by civilians, and as "taxation" when perpetrated by government. Evidently it's very helpful to be in a position to make up all the rules (not to mention the definitions). But self-proclaimed "legitimacy" aside, what is the actual difference, morally and politically, between the two acts?

It must not be that government steals private property in a "good" cause—otherwise, civilian robbers should have the same legal defense available to them. Ditto for government's might or popularity, since that implies civilian robbers would only need to become sufficiently mighty or popular themselves in order to get a pass.

Government, lawyers, and other robbers all follow the same M.O.—they (1) figure out where the money is and (2) invent some sort of rationale for why they're entitled to it. Then they take it at gunpoint, with a clear conscience.

Absolutely everything—income, sales, property, even death—is taxed. The web of taxation has become so mature and so jaded that any indication of the presence of wealth is an automatic trigger to taxation. The same wealth is taxed over and over and over again—every time it exposes itself in its movement through society. Government can never

tax enough. Money is the lifeblood that The Plantation needs in order to metastasize.

The taxation of income is particularly heinous, in that it punishes one of the things that benefits society the most—industry, or productivity. To describe income taxation as "progressive" is to add insult to injury. There's nothing "new and improved" about robbery—it's at least the second oldest profession, and only slightly less dismal than assassination.

An income tax, in fact, is nothing less than a 5-way attack on Personal Sovereignty, because it's an excellent way to:

- (1) grow government
- (2) snoop on the People
- (3) punish work
- (4) engage in coercive social engineering
- (5) eliminate the middle class

Discriminatory taxation is doubly unfair. Government coerces when it takes private property at gunpoint, and coerces again through tax loopholes. It's next to impossible to accurately calculate what any individual benefits from or owes to any public project, making claims about tax fairness completely unverifiable. But by playing favorites, government establishes its prerogative to interfere coercively in citizens' private affairs, and to reward its friends.

Taxation's damage is political as well as social, because it impoverishes (politically weakens) the citizenry while it simultaneously enriches (politically strengthens) the government. This reinforces the relationship already implicit in the fact that government makes up the rules which the citizens must obey—a Master/Slave relationship. Whoever can take another person's property at will also enjoys a Master/Slave relationship.

But if private property can't be seized at gunpoint, how can government pay for all of its many programs that also happen at gunpoint?

Exactly. The power to coercively finance coercive programs is the political double-whammy—doubly-empowering to Slavery, and therefore a double-disaster for Freedom.

Now, no institution in a position to make up all the rules is going to refrain from granting unto itself the "right" to steal, but imagine what would happen if it did. What would be the effect of having to convince people to contribute *voluntarily* to any particular cause? What would suffer—those things which people have some use for or that which they don't?

Have you ever contributed to charitable causes? Was it because someone put a gun to your head? Would you have contributed more if you had more? Would you have more if government robbers took less (or none)?

How much property would people forcibly take from others in a Free (Egalitarian) Society? Why, none at all—zero, zip, zilch! There can't be any doubt that robbers politically outrank their victims.

The "no taxation without representation" rallying cry of the American Revolution doesn't stand up too well under close examination. Having the opportunity to vote for representatives in government has essentially *zero* relationship to how much wealth is seized from any particular individual or what that individual's ex-wealth is used to buy.

A Free Society, being persuasion-based rather than coercion-based, is another thing entirely. By retaining the right to give or withhold consent to requests for their money, individuals would also retain the political power attendant to political spending. The fate of programs favored by some would depend on whatever case could be made on their behalf to the individuals whose support was being sought. Persuasive programs would prosper and unpersuasive ones suffer.

The concept of "Tax Freedom Day" has been used to mark the point in the year when citizens stop giving all the proceeds from their labor to the government and begin keeping them for themselves. In the U.S., for example, it occurred on January 21st in 1900 and on May 2nd in 2000.

How will you know when you live in a "free" country? When Tax Freedom Day finally reaches December 31st?

5-3 Citizenship

Freedom and Egalitarianism are inseparable—the very purpose of Elitism is to Push People Around. But universal Egalitarianism is unachievable, because universal Freedom is also unachievable. Some people flat-out do not want Freedom and will never choose it, and trying to force people to be Free is an insurmountable paradox.

So, if and when those who *do* want Freedom manage to produce the kinds of (Defensive) institutions that support it, Slavery will still continue. The Enslaved portion of humankind will proceed as before, using government, made-up law, lawyers, taxation, and the other things of proven value to their chosen Political State. What will be different is that the proponents of Slavery will no longer enjoy the coerced participation of the opponents of Slavery.

But even the portion of humankind that aspires to Freedom will have to suffer some Political Inequality, because a Political State based on self-control requires individuals who have—you guessed it—self-control. Like we said, while the definition of "well-behaved" people in an Enslaved Society is those who accept "inbound" coercion, in a Free Society it's those who decline "outbound" coercion. The bare minimum needed from people allowed to run around loose in a Free Society is the ability to keep their cotton-pickin' hands off other people's persons and property.

Thus, despite the degree to which Marxists have made the whole subject of political "classes" distasteful, segmentation of human society will persist indefinitely.

One segment will be The Plantation, comprising Slaveowners (those who cannot master "outbound" Coercion) and Slaves (those who cannot master "inbound" Coercion)—all of them there by choice.

A second segment will consist of people who desired to run around loose, but who proved themselves unqualified by their own actions, whether malicious or negligent or whatever. This group is somewhat analogous to the prison population of a society under human-invented law, except that nobody will have joined it for the "crime" of self-determination.

The third segment will be Free Society, whose members have demonstrated their ability to behave themselves adequately. There will be no need or argument for any of these people to outrank the others, or to try to force them to do anything. In short, it will be recognizably Free by having all the characteristics of Freedom: an absence of Coercion, robust Defense, Political Equality, and a healthy social outlook born of a regard for other people's Right to self-ownership.

The relative sizes of these 3 groups—(1) the Free, (2) the Disqualified, and (3) the Uninterested—are hard to say, but the first would have to be predominant, since it's otherwise unlikely to exist at all. If the third group, The Plantation, prevails, the result will almost certainly be their Utopian fantasy of top-down, lowest-common-denominator world government, and all semblance of Freedom will disappear for the duration. (One way to avoid having to build the Berlin Wall is by simply eliminating West Berlin, so to speak.)

There's reason for hope, however. The majority of people—surely at least half—have the capacity for Freedom: the interest, the will, and the ability. That number could probably be increased if Real Freedom's costs and benefits were more widely understood.

If Slavery were really as universally necessary as its proponents claim, it would be quickly overwhelmed by its workload. Even the Total State would prove inadequate to so huge a task. Instead, most people are reasonably industrious, educable, and naturally non-abusive—that is, they're neither sadistic nor automatically violent in response to life's setbacks. Others whose character deficiencies grew out of disadvantaged circumstances might be reclaimed.

As for movement between the 3 groups, that certainly wouldn't be prevented by the Free—how could people who claim to espouse

Freedom refuse it to anyone who is demonstrably qualified for it, or force it on anyone who isn't?

Some ex-offenders who disqualified themselves could become re-qualified, and the more competent we become at rehabilitation the more likely such re-admission will become.

Some Slaves, and even Slaveowners, may tire of The Plantation and wish to try self-determination for a change. This implies that some mechanism would need to be in place to rescue defectors from Slavery. It's not clear how that would happen—the rest of The Plantation could be expected to be unhappy about the prospect of losing members. (Perhaps an "underground railroad". . . .)

In fact, The Plantation as a vestige of its former glory is likely to be a pretty frustrated place anyway. There's no reason why people who have no respect for their *own* Freedom would respect that of Free Society, and their enmity would be unending. That means their designs on the rest of the world would have to be Defended against unendingly, also—a process that might accommodate the rescue of wannabe defectors.

Citizenship in a Free Society would be related to performance. An individual's political status might be any one of several categories, like: qualified/vetted, provisional, unqualified, and disqualified (i.e. felon).

An "age of majority" (like 18 or 21 years) seems fair, since everyone who lives long enough eventually qualifies. But some 15-year-olds may actually be more mature than some 50-year-olds. (In fact, some specific individuals may be more mature at 15 than they later will be at 50!) Rather than something so simplistic as an age test, some sort of maturity benchmark may actually be fairer.

As mentioned before, the ability to keep one's cotton-pickin' hands off other people's persons and property is certainly a minimum qualification for Freedom, but the absence of coercive public funding implies the need for a substitute. While paying for voluntary and non-essential services through fees is probably most consistent with a Free Society, a few things don't really fit that description—like civil defense and public safety.

A Free Society could hardly afford too many deadbeats any better than it can afford Coercion. Anyone looking for a "free ride" in a Free Society has some explaining to do to its other members. Creative minds will have to find some way to encourage citizens to contribute appropriately to the common interest that nevertheless remains consistent with the principle of self-determination.

Meanwhile, the principle of Power Retention means having the broadest possible franchise—essentially encompassing everyone who has become a fully-qualified citizen by meeting whatever suitable and objective standards have been adopted.

As we pointed out earlier, Direct Democracy (with an anti-Coercive threshold) is not some Universal Absolute, but just a practical measure aimed at minimizing Power Theft. The optimum (electoral success) threshold could really only be verified by testing, just as endless testing has already proven that 51% is way too low. Should human ingenuity provide an alternative to voting that better accomplished Power Retention, then fine—but that would have to be demonstrated through extensive testing also.

One political issue of concern to a lot of people is the protection of privacy, and rightly so. But whatever the answer(s) to violation of privacy may be, the elimination of record-keeping isn't an option.

There are only 2 ways to treat people: as responsible individuals like in a Free Society, or as indistinguishable members of an assigned group, like in Collectivist/Statist Marxism. But as noted before, all groups are really just abstractions—figments of the imagination. So "group identity politics" is really just a way to pretend that some individuals can be responsible for others over whom they have no authority or control. That's the kind of logic used by storm troopers who shoot people at random for the acts of saboteurs.

Statists can dispense with the need for individual histories by simply assuming that all civilians are criminals and should be treated as such. They can, for example, define the difference between a "defensive" and "offensive" weapon as whether or not it's wielded by government, as opposed to the weapon's actual use.

Rather than a group identity approach based on something like ethnicity (low-tech prejudice) or some actuarial nonsense of the type popular with the insurance industry (high-tech prejudice), Freedom requires knowing what every individual has been up to, as a way of predicting what that same individual is likely to do next. We have no certain way to predict the future—we can only extrapolate from the past.

Record-keeping—criminal record, driving record, credit history, etc.—is already a part of contemporary societies. Those histories may seem like a curse to people who haven't behaved very responsibly, but they're a boon to those who have. A good credit rating, for example, can (and should) mean credit approval and better rates for people who've proven themselves over time to be a good risk.

Freedom has been called an Unalienable Right, and it is, but we seem to forget that Freedom is a constrained thing—the limits of Liberty are the limits of self-determination. There's no such thing as the "freedom" to Push People Around. What's Unalienable is the Right to self-determination only.

It's good to allow people who respect self-determination to run around loose, so to speak, because that's what a Free Society is. But giving free rein to Abusers—those who engage in fraud and more overt kinds of coercion—only undermines Freedom. Keeping track of who's who and providing some appropriate control for people who lack self-control is what Defensive institutions are all about.

5-4 Civil Defense

In some theoretical sense, each of us is already and always Free. We could tell Joe Stalin to "Get stuffed!" when he puts a gun to our heads, and some of us even will. But while the "Give me Liberty or give me death!" model has great symbolic value, it has even greater practical value when the "death" part is preceded by a fight against Tyranny, and possibly avoided altogether by a victory.

Aggressors want to fight—when they think they can win. Defenders must be willing and able to fight. Those who are unwilling to fight are going to wind up being abettors of Aggression, because Aggression is seldom checked by finding common cause with or accommodating Aggressors.

Mindless Pacifists who categorically reject Defense have thereby chosen Surrender—theoretical if not actual Slavery. If not experiencing actual Slavery, they have the wisdom and sacrifices of others to thank for that (a thanks which is obviously not forthcoming).

Thoughtful Pacifists, on the other hand, are faced with some tough philosophical questions. Is fighting always the worst possible thing that can happen? Could anything ever be *worth* fighting for? Is all fighting the same? Is there such a thing as a trumped-up war—a war with an ulterior motive—and could some particular fight be an instance of that?

In truth, the issue is never going to be whether or not fighting is bad—of course it's bad. But Defense, although it carries some of the usual adverse effects of all conflict, at least has the potential to preserve—when nothing else will—some things of great value, and can even act as a deterrent to both fighting and abuse. That's something object surrender can't do.

So long as Tyrants devote so much study to the Art of War, would-be Libertarians can afford to do no less. Keeping the principles of Liberty in mind, what can we conclude about the Defense of a Free Society?

From a Power Retention standpoint, it's obvious that the same broad franchise ought to apply to the right to be armed as to the right to vote. (The whole notion that citizens who can't be trusted to defend themselves responsibly can somehow be trusted to *vote* responsibly is absurd on its face—although probably not so to a generation that has been trained to rely entirely on others for protection.)

As a result, gun prohibition (AKA civilian disarmament) is a high priority for Marxian Thugs, for obvious reasons. It's also very popular with Marxian Dupes, whose hatred of guns is probably sincere enough. People often hate what they fear, and fear what they know little or nothing about.

Certainly, guns are very dangerous. Cars are even more dangerous. Guns require some proficiency in order to be handled safely. Cars require considerably more proficiency. Thus, it's hard to imagine how citizens can be entrusted with deadly cars but not with (less) deadly guns. But then, people who long to live on the Marxian Plantation "need" cars, but they don't need guns—that's what they have Joe Stalin for.

Actually, anyone who can't be trusted with a weapon can't be trusted with anything that can be *used* as a weapon—which is basically almost anything (including hands and feet). In short, such people can't be allowed to run around loose at all. To carry the Statists' argument for citizen disarmament to its logical conclusion, everyone who doesn't work for the government should be imprisoned as a "crime prevention" measure.

The idea that a heavily-armed servant (like government) will gladly suffer the rule of an unarmed master (like the People) defies both reason and experience. (Of course, government will always obey *some* of the people, since government itself is just an abstraction—a framework under which select people are empowered to Push People Around.) The natural order calls for Masters to be armed and Slaves disarmed.

A lot of attention is focused on guns as the personal combat technology of the present day. It's true that guns have rendered earlier technologies like swords and longbows largely obsolete, but those weapons were outlawed by Aristocrats of the time to the people they targeted for Oppression. The real issue is *enforced military disadvantage*. You can bet that when guns are obsoleted, wannabe Elitists will argue that the next generation of weapons must be prohibited to all but the Elite.

Any institution that can eliminate the Right to self-preservation can eliminate any Right whatsoever, and the more easily for having first neutered the only real safeguard of the People's Rights—the People themselves. The fact that governments have almost universally disarmed their citizens is a not-so-subtle testament to the real relationship between a Coercive institution like government and the Public Liberty.

The very idea behind Statism—that people in government can be trusted with power over others where people not in government can't even be trusted with power over themselves—runs afoul of Reality. It pretends that government is populated by a better species than the one comprising civil society, when all the evidence suggests that saints and sinners abound in both camps.

Except that, the more powerful (and capable of abusing people) that government becomes, the more attractive it becomes to those whose main interest *is* abusing others. And government that has achieved a monopoly over the means to fight has thereby become as powerful as it needs to be to abuse whomever it wants, at will.

That's why the protection of the Right of the People to keep and bear their own Arms figured so prominently in the American Bill of Rights—to prevent any government monopoly on arms. Any approach that accumulates weaponry in the hands of the few also accumulates Political Power in the hands of a few, and thus is inconsistent with a Free Society.

The other thing contemplated by the U.S. Constitution—a citizen militia—is likewise necessary to the security of a Free State. The Defense of the State is no more suitable to delegation than Sovereignty itself is. People who think Civil Defense is somebody else's problem,

like people who think Freedom is somebody else's problem, will never live in a Free Society of their own making.

Obviously, not everyone is equally suitable to military combat. Even the same individual can be unsuitable when very young or very old. Some people are physically frail. Some have no bravery whatsoever. But everyone who expects to be entitled to a place in a Free Society owes some appropriate contribution to its Defense.

It goes without saying that people also should not actively interfere with the Defense of the State, meaning that legitimate political debate over policy ought to be handled in a manner that doesn't endanger the State. If that sounds like it involves making a judgment call—it does.

And just in case this needs to be made explicit, the military ought to be organized around a chain of command, because that's what actually works in a war. In other words, the military function would not be Egalitarian like all the other functions of any Free Society. When someone can invent a more Egalitarian approach and prove that it wins battles, then it'll be time for a re-think.

The same citizen participation that characterizes National Defense in a Free Society also applies to Public Safety. While peace officers even under government are members of the community and enjoy some measure of support from it, in a Free Society they'd have the advantage of not being positioned *between* the community and lawmakers who spend a good bit of their time inventing new ways to Push People Around. Given a purely Defensive role, there wouldn't have to be any uncertainty in the community about whose side peace officers are on.

Vigilantism suffers from a bad reputation. In part that's due to any tendency it has had to be error-prone or rash, but it's also the product of a smear campaign aimed at boosting Statism, or the delegation of public safety to sometime-Coercive government.

Even on the old TV westerns, it was "taking the law into their own hands" when the townspeople killed the bad guys, but "law and order" when the town marshal got the exact same result. Real Justice only happens when the guilty are (appropriately) punished and the innocent

are not—to the admittedly limited degree that such a thing is possible after the fact. That has nothing inherently to do with government or any other coercive institution.

Having a professional police force is advantageous from a standpoint of training and experience, but (as realized under government) is disadvantageous from a political standpoint. It creates a conflict of mission between protecting and serving the public and enforcing whatever made-up, human-invented law got enacted, regardless of its relationship to protection or service. Further, it serves to reinforce the politically dangerous notion that the public itself has no responsibility for public safety.

Some people are not well able to defend themselves—the same ones who are ill-suited to militia service, in fact. But citizens who *are* capable of defending themselves and others should not be officially discouraged (much less prohibited), but officially *encouraged* to that end, and be given some of the same training and sensibility that full-time peace officers have.

Defense is a job for the People themselves, not a separate Power Accumulation institution like government. The ultimate check on Tyranny—and therefore guarantor of Freedom—is widespread public outrage and the means to act upon it. That's why Tyrants put so much effort into taking away the means (disarmament), and preempting the outrage itself by enforcing as much ignorance as possible (censorship).

5-5 Political Censorship

The political quality of any society will be reflected in—and to a large degree, determined by—the quality of its debate. For many, debate is all about scoring points (by whatever means) against your opponents and advancing your agenda thereby. But in Real Debate the object is to discover the Truth, and everyone who does that is a winner.

Junk debate is just the opposite. There, the idea is to allow only whatever portion of the Truth (if any) that supports your agenda to be revealed, and to obfuscate the rest—taking up any slack with manufactured untruth. (Sound familiar? Isn't that what adversarial lawyers do—except for that last part?)

We're inundated with junk debate, because people who benefit from it have made sure that the institutions it requires are fully-developed. It's easily recognized by its use of misdirection techniques like ad hominem attacks and changing the subject in lieu of addressing direct criticism—as well as plain old cooked "facts" and bad logic.

People can have a sincere difference of opinion over priorities—those are, after all, somewhat a matter of judgment, and judgment is more of an art than a science. Facts and logic, however, are much more immutable. Things either happened a certain way or they didn't, and logic follows certain uncontroversial (in an apolitical context, anyway) rules. But while real logic is good for problem-solving, illogic is only good for entertainment and fraud (and guess which of those the politically-corrupt have in mind).

In any Real Debate, the *subjective* would be carefully separated from the *objective*. All alleged facts would be rigorously tested for validity, all bad logic exposed, and all extraneous criticism or dodging of relevant criticism duly noted. That obviously requires moderators whose only agenda is Truth itself. And unlike the case with junk debate, institutions supporting all of that remain gravely underdeveloped.

You might not guess it from looking at modern society, but Honesty matters. It matters because the Truth matters. Honesty is how the Truth gets spread, and Dishonesty is how Untruth gets spread.

Now, you'd probably be as hard-pressed to find a perfectly honest person as you would an otherwise-perfect person. And you may sincerely believe that telling Aunt Hattie that her lemon pie was much better than you actually thought it was is an act of kindness, not deception.

But what we're really talking about here is Political Dishonesty—gross, intentional mischaracterization that amounts to Political Fraud. The purpose of Political Dishonesty is Political Abuse, plain and simple. No dishonest politician should enjoy a good reputation, and in a Free Society, people who engage in Political Deception would be understood to be unsuitable to any position of Public Trust, period.

It's no coincidence that political thugs are always liars. There is no reason why people who're happy to *force* others to obey would refrain from *tricking* others into obeying instead. Political Fraud is merely the covert counterpart to its more overt companion, Force. Lies are cheaper than bullets, and when believed, also more effective. Fear only works when Tyrants are watching—conviction works 24/7.

Political Dishonesty not only does the direct damage related to whatever deception it involves, it does tremendous collateral damage by eroding Trust and fostering Cynicism and Political Disengagement—a compound Political Attack that a would-be Free Society can ill afford.

Liars insult our intelligence, telling us by their actions that we're stupid enough to believe whatever they hand us. And while debating sincere but mistaken people isn't necessarily a waste of time, debating liars is nothing but tiresome, because you know from the outset that their objective is simply to deceive.

One of the easiest ways of lying to people is just to prevent them from hearing the truth. Since political censorship is the best friend of Tyrants, it must be the worst enemy of Libertarians.

A Free Society would not tolerate *any* political censorship—period. No speech would be prohibited in a Free Society, including hateful speech, hurtful speech, and flat-out wrong speech. The answer to such speech is not *less* Free Speech, but *more*. The cure for untruth is rebuttal by truth, not speech restriction.

But shouldn't Germany make denying the Holocaust, for example, illegal? The Holocaust was a great tragedy, and people who'd lie about a thing like that are obvious political troublemakers.

For starters, such thinking misunderstands the relationship between genocide and political censorship. Political censorship was the very thing that made the last Holocaust possible, and will be the very thing that makes the next Holocaust possible.

But the bottom line is that the creation of "truth referees" is a Power Accumulation approach—that is, it corresponds to Slavery and not Freedom. The power to determine what some people can say is to decide what others can hear, and any committee that has assumed the power to regulate some speech can use that same power to regulate any other speech. In effect, the "truth" will be decided by the elite few, rather than by the People themselves after hearing all sides.

Political censorship does not benefit the truth. The truth is quite capable of holding its own in any fair fight—only lies need the help of censors.

As for speech that offends, whether true or false, two characteristics of a Free Society offer some help. First, individuals would be understood to be responsible for their own actions, meaning that vile speech would accrue to the reputations of the people who espoused it. Knowing who such people are is a good thing.

Also, since a Defensive Society is not one that overreacts to provocation, then its members couldn't afford to be too thin-skinned, by definition. If "sticks and stones may break my bones but words can never harm me" can be understood by most children, it can be understood by most adults. Impoliteness and ignorance shouldn't be given any more weight than they deserve—which is basically none.

Some people misconstrue "free speech" to mean that they should be free of any consequences from their speech, but as we've already seen, a Free Society wouldn't force people to support those who offended them. On the other hand, the ever-popular organized boycott is just the opposite: It isn't about people making their *own* choices, but trying to choose what *others* will be able to see and hear (by eliminating someone's voice).

Marxists are famously in favor of "free speech"—for themselves and nobody else. Wherever Marxists are able to gain the upper hand, as they have done in academia and the media, Free Speech disappears. That all makes sense because Marxism, like lies in general, is hopelessly unable to compete if given equal footing.

Genuine proponents of Free Speech are obliged to be opponents of censored speech, because that's what the "free" in "free speech" means—uncensored. In a Free Society, people could advance whatever moral or political opinions they liked, but censorship would be the prerogative of the Individual.

The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution supposedly prevents Congress (the only entity Constitutionally authorized to make law) from abridging Free Speech, among other things. That's "supposedly" because, in a Barristocracy, the law is assumed to be whatever the judges-of-last-resort declare it to be, regardless of what it may actually say or not say (in relatively plain English in the Constitution's case).

The courts have focused a lot of attention on obscene and vulgar speech, but of course the Bill of Rights has nothing to do with pornography or "duck hunting" or any of that distractionary nonsense. It's a *political* document, intended to protect fundamental Political Rights against government infringement.

Depending upon what Barristocrats decide to do to us (campaign finance reform, anyone?), the First Amendment may or may not protect Americans from government censorship, but it doesn't even try to address censorship originating in the so-called private sector.

In the modern world, political speech is all about mass communications, since literally interpersonal communication is very limited in its impact. And just as Free Speech means uncensored speech, a Free Press is an uncensored press.

But mass communications infrastructure, like for television, can be very expensive. If its control can be concentrated in a few (Aristocrat-minded) hands, censorship becomes a very real danger. A like-minded cartel can easily filter the "information" on every TV channel according to the same political criteria—as we've seen over the past few decades in the U.S. with the rise of the Corrupt Media Bloc, where all facts and opinions unfavorable to Marxism simply disappear. That's precisely the same script that an organization run by and for Aristocrats would follow.

We know that the Media Bloc is dominated by a political monoculture. Polls tell us this. But why? If some corporation had a cultural problem, with racism for example, we'd reckon management to be responsible, whether through malice or incompetence. But what have we heard from the Media Bloc about their perceived need to exclude any possible political dissenters from their ranks?

It's ironic that the Media Bloc want to portray themselves as staunch defenders of the First Amendment. What do you suppose a thing like that is even doing in the Bill of Rights? Could it have anything to do with the fact that democracy is basically just a winner-take-all popularity contest? How hard would it be to fool 51% of the people most of the time, given total control over mass communications?

James Madison, who was in a position to know something about the First Amendment, observed that "[an aristocracy could not be safe] without a standing army, an enslaved press, and a disarmed populace". This same concept can also be expressed by the more Orwellian formula:

Big Government + Big Media = Big Brother

We don't need to be Columbia journalism majors to know the difference between *journalists* and *public opinion engineers*. News is about telling

THE story—propaganda is about telling A story. Political censorship is not something the "good guys" are going to be involved in, nor is it something that competent, real journalists are going to do, whether by accident or design.

The censorship techniques employed by the Media Bloc run the gamut from a near-to-total blackout of anti-Marxian facts and opinion—to singling out anti-Marxian opinion for ridicule—to presenting pro-Marxian and contradictory anti-Marxian opinion without comment (balance??), when even a cursory investigation into the truth would reveal the pro-Marxian view to be without substance.

Allegations of voting irregularities, for example, are very serious—whether they turn out to be true or untrue. Wouldn't Real Journalists care which was the case? Would Real Journalists showcase pro-Marxian academicians so much more enthusiastically than subsequent revelations of academic fraud? Would Real Journalists relentlessly "investigate" anti-Marxian politicians and just as relentlessly cover-up for pro-Marxian politicians?

There are several ways to spot liars, like if the walk doesn't match the talk, or if there has been a track record of dishonesty, or if you're fortunate enough to have first-hand information about the topic of discussion. In a way, the Media Bloc shot themselves in the foot when they jumped on the civilian disarmament bandwagon, because firearms are something millions of Americans own and know something about, enough to recognize a political hatchet-job when they see one.

Given a genuinely competitive media environment, whatever censorship regimen any one mass communications entity imposed would be of no material consequence, so long as competitors were there to take up the slack. Much of the content on the Internet, for example, is also censored, but the much lower (than TV) "barrier to entry" means much more competition. The overall result is that the Internet is uncensored—except of course by government in places like communist China and communist Cuba.

The lesson for a Free Society is clear. The most Power Retentive approach is for every individual to be a broadcaster, so to speak. The

next best thing is at least to avoid Power Accumulation, by distributing decision-making regarding content among as many competitors as possible. A lot is going to depend on technology costs.

Monopolies should be avoided like the plague. Wherever prohibitively expensive technologies (or anything else) make de facto Monopolies unavoidable, then some sort of strict oversight is an absolute necessity. However, placing such oversight authority in the hands of a few is just more Power Accumulation and does nothing to solve the problem.

Because it's so inexpensive to purchase a "voice" on the Internet, it's probably the closest thing to a Free Press that's ever been created. But the Internet also illustrates a couple of censorship vulnerabilities. One is the aforementioned government censorship (via filtering technologies).

The other is *taxation*. Whatever can be taxed can be eliminated for all but the wealthy. That and growing government are taxation's two main purposes, and both are antithetical to Freedom.

The bottom line regarding a Free Press is that if censorship can't be prevented, then neither can Political Fraud—better known as covert Coercion—better known as Slavery.

5-6 Capitalism

Unlike Marxism, Capitalism is a robust performer, benefiting from 2 huge advantages over its competitor: (1) it isn't an outright scam and political abomination, and (2) it taps into one of the most potent psychological forces known—greed.

But although Capitalism doesn't systematically violate Real Law to the degree that Marxism does, neither does it systematically embrace it. In other words, where Marxism is *immoral*, Capitalism is merely *amoral*. Whereas Marxism is (intentionally) compatible with Slavery and incompatible with Freedom, Capitalism is amenable to either.

Capitalism has several notable shortcomings. In theory, consumer demand in free markets automatically assigns the "right" value to goods and services, but that's obvious nonsense. When he was with us, mentally-ill Dutch painter Vincent Van Gogh couldn't give his work away. Now that he's gone, it's considered to be beyond price. The "market" has assigned grossly different values to the exact same product.

Something similar happens on the other side of the equation. By egregiously miscalculating real costs, something like strip mining can be made to appear profitable. Evidently, ignorance can play havoc with the operation of free markets. Looks like a job for Marxian central planning, right?

Wrong. Coercion is no cure for ignorance, simply an encouragement to maximum ignorance because people who can conduct business at gunpoint don't have to be right. The real answer to Capitalist miscalculation—better-informed consumers—is something Statists have to avoid at all costs because when it comes to Slaves, better-informed means less happy.

The much-talked-about Social Justice is conspicuously absent from a Slavery-based approach like Marxism, but what about Capitalism? How does it fare on the Social Justice meter?

For starters, the actual capitalists—that is, the people who finance business ventures—are hardly the vermin they're made out to be. Fair is fair. If gamblers are entitled to their losses, they must be equally entitled to their winnings. The world needs people who're willing to take a chance on the best ideas out there. The Human Project itself is basically one big gamble.

On the other hand, the gross overcompensation of executives appears to have less to do with justice of any sort than it does with the biggest pigs having first crack at the trough. Are CEOs really 1,000 times as "productive" as the people who do the actual work? Is competent management really so expensive, or is the goal to wind up with a bunch of corporate scammers by dangling the thing most likely to attract such people as bait?

Monopolism is even more unjust. There's seems to be some misconception that to be pro-monopoly is to be pro-business. *Competition* is *pro-business*—*anti-competition* is *anti-business*. The whole purpose of having a captive audience (of customers, in this case) is to be able to abuse them. Coercion is an excellence-killer, and not all Tyrants go into politics.

Not that Monopolism has anything to do with business per se. The ultimate Monopolist is government itself. But wherever Monopolism rears its ugly head, the effect on merit is the same.

It's too bad that a lot of people who claim to favor "competition" and "free enterprise" don't want to defend Real Competition more vigorously. *Competition is one of the most potent spurs to excellence known*. Under it, everyone is a winner because doing our best is what we all came to Planet Earth for.

To hear Monopolists make cynical remarks about "healthy competition" is frankly disgusting. What's so "healthy" about a contest where one

competitor kills off all the others, and chains all the spectators to the bleachers?

In truth, while selfishness can even be beneficial to the degree that it invigorates people and contributes to autonomy, at some extreme point it ceases to be anything remotely healthy and instead becomes pathological.

Pathological greed has given Capitalism a bad rap—somewhat unfairly, since it's really a problem with human nature itself. Capitalism *is* deficient, however, in that it does nothing on its own to discourage such excess, and even creates the appearance of rewarding it.

It's not news that in a free-for-all, the ruthless will tend to rise to the top. But how valuable is ruthlessness to the Human Project? There's no reason to think that the dinosaurs were insufficiently ruthless—now they're ruthlessly extinct. Evidently something more than ruthlessness is required for Success.

Capitalism's missing ingredient has to be supplied from the outside, and goes by many names: class, decency, morality and fairness. Not only *can* this happen, it *does* happen all the time. The business community is chock full of the kind of people who provide valuable products and services at a fair price, and who treat employees, customers and competitors with respect.

As for all the Crooks and Exploiters, vast government (surprise!) has been put forward by Marxists as the antidote, but its interference and dead weight aren't just limited to the evildoers. Everyone is affected, including honest businesspeople and consumers. There's a much better method of treatment that avoids big government's politically dangerous side-effects—publicity.

The real antidote to corruption is scrutiny because most people know that corruption is nasty. Abusers must rely on stealth because too many people are turned off by abuse. But if all those potential customers had a reliable way of learning the real "cost" of doing business with a particular company, a whole new set of business incentives could be created.

It's depressing to realize what an inability to develop self-policing and a general attitude of denial toward Capitalist excess have cost the world of business over the years, in terms of a ready-made excuse to grow government beyond the bounds of reason.

An unwillingness to take criticism and self-police almost never leads to good things, politically. Yet, we seem unable to figure that out. Denial is what outright crooks do when caught red-handed. People who really are on the up-and-up ought to be equally up for some honest self-assessment.

The problem, of course, is how to accomplish the necessary Vigilance. Unholy political ambition didn't die with Caesar and Hitler—it lives on in globalist mega-corporations and globalist Marxian politicians. Aristocrats infest every sphere of human activity, and while they may fight among themselves, they're all on the same page when it comes to what needs to happen to Real People.

The major media are already in the grip of Aristocrats, as we've seen, and government and business are headed that way. To expect all these Elitist types to hold each other in check rather than to conspire together is unrealistic. The vast fortunes amassed by pirates and the vast power accrued by government are all being focused on the triumph of global Marxism—the Aristocrat's junk religion of choice.

If Libertarians hope to prevail, they need to become much better organized.

6-0 CONCLUSION

The Success of humankind depends on Freedom, and Freedom depends on understanding what it is and implementing the political technology it requires.

6-1 An Alliance Of The Meek

In the not too distant past, it required the full-time efforts of most human beings just to keep us all fed and sheltered. Now, thanks to a wealth of technology, that can be accomplished by a fraction of us. What should we be doing with the rest of our available human potential?

Should we while away the hours trying to keep each other entertained? Should we spend our time making better and better TVs? Would becoming known throughout the galaxy as the species who made by far the best TVs be a fitting epitaph for humankind?

Should we devote all our energies to helping the Aristocrat wannabes among us accumulate the money and power they need to hijack the Human Project, and hope they know what they're doing?

It's shocking to try to imagine how much wisdom it would take to actually be qualified to run other people's lives, and then to realize that people who really *are* wise want nothing to do with Slavery. Who does that leave?

While Recorded History is an invaluable tool, it's a shadow of what it could've been because it has tended to be a history *of* the Tyrants, *by* the Tyrants, and *for* the Tyrants. But it is the Meek who are the unsung heroes of the Human Story. We've come this far not because of Tyrants, but in spite of them.

The time for Aristocratic grandeur has come and gone. It's time for the Meek to come into their own. The Human Cause isn't about political grandeur, it's about Political Equality.

That's a job not for Coercion, Power Accumulation and made-up law, but for Defense, Power Retention and Real Law. Human-invented law is incapable of creating anything other than a Barristocracy, unless we all

want to become lawyers. Do we all want to become lawyers, or can we find better uses for our time and talents?

A Free Society isn't Ruled by Aristocrats, Barristocrats, bureaucrats, technocrats, or even democrats. A Free Society isn't Ruled at all—only Defended. And the only thing Defense has to do is protect every individual's Right to give or withhold consent. Anything more is mission creep, or just a different mission altogether.

Aggression is Slavery and Slavery is Aggression. The purpose of Defense is to thwart Aggression, meaning that Defense is Freedom and Freedom is Defense. If you don't know the difference between Aggression and Defense—you can't tell or just plain don't care—then you don't know the difference between Slavery and Freedom.

And if you don't care about that, you *should* because the express purpose of Slavery might as well be to kick the legs out from under the Human Project—that's how wasteful it is of the Human Resource. Slavery is low-quality and Freedom is high-quality. Under Freedom, human society functions as it was meant to, with individual brains controlling individual bodies.

Some people want to bet on Slavery and that's their prerogative. It *isn't* their prerogative to force Slavery on the rest of us. Our common stake in the Human Cause obliges each of us to ask what impact Slavery—the Excellence-killer—is most likely to have on it. What the proponents of Slavery have to wonder is if there mightn't be a *reason* humans have the capacity for Excellence, and whether that capacity is something we can really afford to waste.

Everybody wants something from "Santa Claus" government, but government only has what it took from Real People at gunpoint. Government can offer nothing, nothing, *nothing* that's better or more valuable to you than ownership of your own life—and the natural role for a Coercive institution like government is Master, not Servant.

People who believe in government as Master need to be honest enough to declare that. People who believe in government as Servant need to be realistic enough to understand that government is incapable of serving

Freedom directly. The one service government can provide is to assist in the creation of its pro-Freedom successor, and then *get out of the way*.

The question concerning Coercion+Defense government is not whether it permits people to do good works in some instances and others to do bad works, but rather what is the impact of Coercion in general, and mightn't those who're interested in good works do even *better* without having it as an obstacle.

Freedom and Slavery are mutually exclusive. Freedom is one sort of goal, and Slavery is its polar opposite. If we think we can achieve a *goal* like Freedom by employing the *methods* of Slavery, we're spectacularly kidding ourselves. For those who're still unclear on which methods associate with which goal, here's a recap:

Slavery	Freedom
Coercion	Persuasion
Aggression	Defense
Decree	Real Law
Power Accumulation	Power Retention
Political Arrogance	Political Humility
Elitism	Egalitarianism
Marxism/Socialism	Social Individualism
Civilian Disarmament	Armed Citizenry
Political Censorship	Free Speech
Dishonesty	Honesty
Conspiracy	Transparency
Monopolism	Competition
Immorality	Morality
"Establishment" of Marxism/Atheism	Religious Liberty

A study of even the best governments ever produced reveals an unhealthy presence of the methods of Slavery. While there has been a historical trend toward Freedom, in the present day that trend has been decidedly reversed. The Marxian wet dream of global government (e.g. the United Nations) doesn't emphatically embrace ANY of the methods of Freedom. What does that tell you?

Slavery is *bad* and Freedom is *good*. That's how *un*-complicated the world of politics really is when you get down to basics. Slavery happens when some people own others, and Freedom happens when people own themselves. When enough people who're content simply to own their own lives can figure out how to become cooperatively effective against the machinations of wannabe Power Thieves, then Real Freedom will happen for the first time in human history.

So, time to start the Revolution, right?

Wrong. Ask the French, who rid themselves of Louis XVI, only to wind up with Robespierre, then Napoleon. Ask the Russians, who deposed Nicholas II, only to wind up with Lenin, then Stalin.

Revolution is an absolutely terrible idea, as a rule. If you've let things deteriorate politically to the point where revolution is your best available option, you've already screwed up. The best result it ever produced, the U.S. Constitution, could only be characterized as Limited Slavery, and even that result was an outright miracle. It was the product of a unique group of individuals the likes of which may never again be seen until after Freedom is a done deal. Statist societies do not produce many people of that caliber!

The bottom line is that Freedom simply cannot be created out of the chaos of revolution. The strong Defensive institutions on which it depends require much thought and experimentation, and therefore time. If they were easy to produce they would have been produced long ago.

Not only mustn't limited government (to the degree that such a thing still exists) be destroyed, it must be *preserved* as a necessary launching pad for Real Freedom—until such time as Freedom's underlying institutions can be demonstrated to be ready for primetime.

Limited Slavery is not Real Freedom, but it is an irreplaceable step in that direction. It creates some "breathing space" under Oppression—a window of opportunity to develop the kind of pro-Freedom institutions that would never be allowed to be born under less-limited Slavery.

Self-ownership, which has never happened before, can only be produced by something that's never been *done* before: Shrinking Coercion+Defense government until it goes away entirely, having been replaced by new institutions that keep the Defense and lose the Coercion.

Left on its own, of course, government does the exact opposite. It grows over time, meaning that Coercion also grows over time. We don't need to rely solely on theory to understand this—our own experience bears it out.

Unfortunately, Limited Slavery is very tempting, very seductive. Come to that, a lot of people find Unlimited Slavery tempting. It all looks so effortless and delegatory—a chance to drift through life doing whatever we're told while others take responsibility for everything, including us.

There's no doubt that Limited Slavery is far superior to Slavery. It offers a little less scope for the unholy ambitions of wannabe Slaveowners, and thereby less risk of political tragedy for Real People. That's unquestionably a net gain for the prospects of the Human Cause.

But in the same way that Limited Slavery is superior to Slavery, it's likewise inferior to Real Freedom. In addition, it's inherently unstable and over time tends to devolve back into Unlimited Slavery. That makes it a poor choice as an ultimate political goal. Limited Slavery is really only good for one thing: taking the next step to Real Freedom.

It's true that a Barristocracy is no more suited to taking the next step than it is to implementing Real Freedom directly, except that what cannot hope to be sustained indefinitely might just be managed for a limited

duration. On the other hand, if government based on made-up law can't be tamed long enough to serve the creation of a pro-Freedom successor, why should we believe that it can be tamed forever as Freedom's loyal servant?

So however difficult it is to harness democratic government for the production of the Defensive institutions needed to replace it, it at least has the advantage of being temporary. Trying to use democracy to create Freedom directly is forever, and is doomed by the inherent incompatibility of the two.

Democracy naturally tends toward Slavery, but it can be bent, so to speak, in the direction of Freedom. It all depends on the understanding and determination of political majorities. If the political will to replace government and human-invented law with self-ownership can be mustered, then democracy provides a corresponding way.

Human-invented law can be used to grant relief from human-invented law, for the purpose of testing and perfecting non-Coercive alternatives. Government Monopoly can be relaxed enough to allow competing approaches to show their superiority, with the best performers being made available for wider adoption.

Now, no one can think that Marxists will give up on Slavery willingly. Marxist Thugs claim, and Marxist Dupes actually believe, that Slavery is the path to a "socially just" Utopia. The need for Marxists to convert (what's left of) the United States in particular into just another dismal Marxian Plantation is a given, because competition of any kind makes Marxism look as bad as it really is. So a contest between Freedom and Marxism is absolutely unavoidable.

But the good news is that Aristocrats are a minority, by definition. Slavery is a pyramid scheme, built around a small number of Slaveowners at the top and a large number of Slaves on the bottom. That makes it inherently precarious. Also, should Marxist Dupes ever get wind of the fact that Slavery and Social Justice are really mutually exclusive goals, they're likely to abandon ship.

The other good news is that when the pro-Slavery/anti-Slavery camps are as evenly matched as they've been in the U.S. for the past several decades, a political minority can have a big impact. Even a small number of Libertarians can be enough to tilt the political divide, by making sure that the less-Libertarian candidates in a 2-way race lose, and that lying, faithless politicians are sent packing.

Karl Marx advised the workers of the world to unite—under the yoke of Joe Stalin. Exchanging one Oppressor for an even worse one is an excellent way to go about perpetuating Slavery.

Libertarians will also want to unite, that being the only way to outmatch the Political Power available to Power Accumulators, but they won't want to do it under just another Power Accumulation regime. That accomplishes nothing. A different kind of institution is needed—one based on cooperation and Power Retention, meaning that individuals retain their Right to give or withhold consent. Such institutions can provide a forum for Real Leadership—the kind that doesn't have to resort to Coercion.

Freedom isn't a "something for nothing" proposition. In order to receive the guarantee of self-ownership, it's necessary to give up the possibility of owning others (or being owned *by* others, depending on which way the struggle for Power goes).

Self-important types can be expected to view that as an unattractive exchange. Besides, they're pretty sure they know who's going to come out on top in their Aristocratic political fantasy.

Unfortunately for them, their somebodies-versus-the-nobodies worldview is bankrupt and always has been. Attention, Elitists! All the little "nobodies" ARE the Somebodies, and Aristocrat wannabes are delusional. They should stick to what they do best—inventing fiction.

Freedom will also take a lot of work and sacrifice. But Real People aren't unacquainted with those—they're the ones who've been doing the work and making the sacrifices all along. And the payoff is huge, not just for individuals but for the Human Cause itself.

What you've seen here undoubtedly contains errors and many omissions. It's a sketch, not a blueprint. Working out all the specifics is a job for the ingenuity of many, including you.

Not only *can* you participate, you *must*. Sovereignty delegated is Sovereignty lost.

Step Number One is developing an accurate understanding of what Real Freedom actually is. If you don't even know what a thing is, how are you supposed to recognize whether or not you have it? Here's a pop quiz that may help:

Freedom means . . .

- A. being free to do whatever the government tells you to do
- B. the freedom to Push People Around
- C. freedom from "fear" and "want"
- D. self-determination

Step Number Two is seeking out the cooperation of like-minded individuals—as many as possible. It will take a very large number of Real People to offset the political weight of the Elite and their clueless supporters. If you find yourself in an organization that wants to give power over you to someone else, whether through democracy, fraud or any other technique, say "Adios, Bozos!" and go join or start a better one based on Power Retention.

Freedom can only be created by an Alliance of the Meek, not a reliance on the Elite. Aristocrats are obliged to hate Freedom, because Freedom means the end of Aristocracy.

Humankind has waited a long time for Real Freedom. We're still waiting. Who knows, the Klingons may show up in Low Earth Orbit sometime next week to save us from ourselves. (Or would that be the Vulcans?)

But if it's going to be up to us to do the job, we'd better get started, and soon!

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Synopsis

1-0 INTRODUCTION

Some background is necessary in order for Politics to make any sense, starting with clearing up some key misconceptions.

1-1 Reality Check

Human beings are limited, but Reality matters nonetheless and we have to do our best to come to grips with it.

1-2 Success vs. Failure

Success is all about contribution, not gratification as many people assume, and Freedom promotes Success while Slavery promotes Failure.

1-3 Science vs. Religion

Science has been acclaimed while Religion has taken a beating lately, but neither is redundant—or without risk.

1-4 Socialism vs. Individualism

Both Socialism and (pathological) Individualism are dangerously myopic, but Social Individualism can produce Real Freedom and Real Social Justice.

1-5 Democracy

Democracy ain't what it's cracked up to be, and certainly isn't Freedom, but does present a unique opportunity to create Real Freedom.

2-0 FREEDOM

Freedom and Slavery are poorly understood, and the limits of our understanding have become the limits of our political achievement.

2-1 Freedom vs. Slavery

Freedom is self-ownership, Slavery is ownership by others, and the two are mutually exclusive. Government based on human-invented law ("decree") is inherently Coercive, and the elimination of Coercion requires new (Defensive) institutions.

2-2 Persuasion vs. Coercion

Being able to distinguish between Persuasion and Coercion is neither very difficult, nor is it dispensable to anyone who aspires to Freedom.

2-3 Power Accumulation

Political Power is conserved, and Power Accumulation is Power Theft. Aristocratic Elitists embody Political Arrogance, not the Political Humility necessary to Freedom.

2-4 Limited Slavery

Limited government represents a necessary intermediate step between Slavery and Freedom, but has been confused for an end in itself—a role for which it's poorly suited due to its inherent instability.

2-5 Marxism

Marxism is a hugely popular political scam, a fact well-known to Marxist Thugs but unrecognized by well-meaning Marxist Dupes. Marxism represents the way forward for Aristocrats of all stripes, and our political future consists of a fight-to-the-death between Marxism and Freedom.

3-0 DEFENSE

Defense is the thing without which Freedom (the absence of Coercion) cannot occur.

3-1 Aggression vs. Defense

Aggression and Defense are not politically indistinguishable. Aggression is an act of Slavery, while Defense is an act of Freedom (the prevention of Slavery).

3-2 Defense Properties

Defense is distinguished from Aggression by its constrained character (as well as its purpose).

3-3 Defensive Institutions

Defensive institutions are the political technology that will make Freedom possible, and will resemble the Defensive efforts of Coercion+Defense government (minus its Coercive efforts).

4-0 REAL LAW

Real Law is the basis of Freedom, just as made-up law is the basis of Slavery.

4-1 Decree vs. Real Law

Unlike Real Law, human-invented law is arbitrary and inherently Coercive. It has no fixed meaning, and can't be used to reliably protect the People from Barristocrats.

4-2 Real Law Discovery

Though Science hasn't been much help at describing the Laws pertaining to human Politics, we can gain insight from other sources, including some of the principles that have found their way into human-invented law.

4-3 Justice

Real Justice depends on accuracy, whereas the legalism of human-invented law has become a substitute for its stated goal.

4-4 Punishment

Defense has nothing to do with Vengeance or tit-for-tat Retaliatory Aggression. Neither would it allow Society to be repeatedly victimized by known predators.

5-0 POWER RETENTION

The Power Retention upon which Freedom depends can only happen with the support of special institutions.

5-1 Egalitarian Institutions

Egalitarian Institutions wouldn't incorporate any of the techniques of Coercion—including Elitism, Democracy, Monopolism, or the secrecy necessary for Fraud. They would promote self-control while effectively Defending against those who lack it.

5-2 Sovereignty

Sovereignty delegated is Sovereignty lost, and Personal Sovereignty precludes representative government (Power Accumulation) and taxation (Coercive public funding).

5-3 Citizenship

The status of Free Citizen wouldn't be automatic, but earned based on a track record of adequate self-control and public participation in the institutions of Freedom.

5-4 Civil Defense

It is the responsibility and duty of all Citizens to contribute appropriately to their collective Defense, including the militia, public safety and other Defensive institutions.

5-5 Political Censorship

The only way to prevent Political Fraud is to prevent Political Censorship, and Free Citizens would retain the power to act as their own censors.

5-6 Capitalism

Unlike Marxism, Capitalism is compatible with both Slavery and Freedom, and needs to be regulated by a well-informed and discriminating public rather than immense government bureaucracy.

6-0 CONCLUSION

The Success of humankind depends on Freedom, and Freedom depends on understanding what it is and implementing the political technology it requires.

6-1 An Alliance Of The Meek

Effective cooperation among the Politically Humble will be necessary to hold the Politically Arrogant in check.

Appendix 2: Outline (Key Points)

1-0 INTRODUCTION

1-1 Reality Check

Human Project is currently headed in the direction of Slavery
politics not as unimportant as many people believe
Slavery thrives on helplessness & ignorance
Freedom is inseparably linked to Truth
3-tiered Reality Model explained
"junk" disciplines are all about the triumph of agenda over Truth
the Truth is not for us to decide, only for us to discover
conformance to Truth determines whether we Succeed or Fail
belief can't affect Reality, therefore Reality must affect belief
Reality isn't dependent on perception, but human behavior is
we can't choose our circumstances, but we can choose our Attitudes
just because we think we know Reality doesn't mean we're right
decisions can be made on bases other than facts, like risk
people will often just believe whatever they choose, even the bleak
so far as we know, Success may require our very best efforts

1-2 Success vs. Failure

what is Success?
the Human Cause is our cause & our responsibility
Collective Success means Success of the Human Project
Freedom results in hedging our bets, making Success more likely
the Human Project is a team effort, we all Succeed or Fail together
Individual Success means contributing to our Collective Success
contribution lives, gratification dies

Tyrants are not only Failures, they jeopardize the Human Cause itself
[illus] aids to Success vs. aids to Failure
Freedom is pro-merit, Slavery is anti-merit
Persuasion rewards rightness, Coercion rewards wrongness
Competition rewards Winners, Monopoly rewards Losers
individual responsibility motivates, group "responsibility" de-motivates
Good Judgment necessary for effective self-control (Freedom)
Reason can be a potent tool in the creation of Freedom
History is a chance to learn from others' mistakes
[illus] 4 quotations: Pericles, Franklin, Henry, Lord Acton
we can harness human nature, or allow it to harness us

1-3 Science vs. Religion

Science & Religion are complementary paths to the Truth
Science based on skepticism, Religion based on faith (speculation)
skepticism & speculation could be leveraged by educated guesswork
Science has offered little help in the area of Politics
proponents of Science often disregard human fallibility
our understanding is a work forever in progress
Politics must be based upon Truth insofar as we can grasp it
"separation of church and state" an impossibility, and undesirable
Theocracies are bleak & agenda-based junk religion is dangerous
Real Religion offers otherwise-unavailable leverage on Truth
commonality among Real Religions is a good sign
human interaction better-studied in Religion than Science thus far
Theocrats go where angels decline to tread
"Dr. Frankenstein" syndrome
to discount human fallibility is to increase its danger
hubris is Politically disastrous
open-minded people occasionally change their minds
open-mindedness supports Truth & therefore Freedom

1-4 Socialism vs. Individualism

Socialism ignores Individuals, Individualism ignores Society
Individuals are real, Society is an abstraction
Joe Stalin can't speak for Society & doesn't even really want to

Social Individualism means Individuals make choices in a Social context
Freedom & Justice not mutually exclusive, but mutually dependent
Political poverty is the source of all poverty

1-5 Democracy

Democracy means 49% of the People get 0% of the say-so
no correlation between popularity & Truth
what's popular doesn't need government, what's unpopular does
Democracy better than its appalling alternatives, but so what?
periodic elections give us a chance to throw the "bums" out
Democracies less likely to commit Military Aggression
Democracy can produce whatever's sufficiently popular (even Freedom)

2-0 FREEDOM

2-1 Freedom vs. Slavery

DPRK is an undemocratic Dictatorship that starves its People
words can't impact Truth but can & do impact human behavior
Honesty is fair characterization, Dishonesty is mischaracterization
perfect Honesty impossible, but material Honesty should be expected
Political bait-and-switch a common technique
[illus] formal definition of Freedom
beware the legalistic word-parsers whose aim is to corrupt the record
[illus] synonyms for Freedom & Slavery
Coercion won't be absent unless it's prevented
[illus] Freedom Pledge
"outbound" Coercion addressed by pro-Freedom indoctrination
Coercion is a discouragement to merit
contribution lives, gratification dies
Coercion is an Excellence-killer
"inbound" Coercion addressed by Defense

"pacifism" can be a disguise for cowardice or Treason
procrastination on unavoidable Conflict doesn't minimize suffering
Slavery is "murder in slow motion"
Real Peace isn't achieved through Oppression
without Aggression, Defense never has to occur
Defense produces (less tragic) Deterrence as a side-effect
best way to Deter Aggressors is to be ready to Fight & win
Overt Coercion is force & intimidation, Covert Coercion is fraud
interpersonal Coercion bad, organized Political Coercion worse
U.S. may be Freer or Freest country, but isn't Free
elimination of Coercion has never been any Society's goal
Slavery/Freedom Continuum explained
Western Civilization has pursued Freedom erratically
what's the "right" amount of Slavery to endure?
[illus] The 3 Fundamental Political States
Defensive Institutions much harder to create than Coercive ones
Slavery more appealing than Anarchy but not Politically Better
is institutionalized slavery the only form of Slavery?
Freedom is self-ownership, Slavery is ownership by others
confusion surrounding Slavery & Racism exploited by Marxists
Racism & Oppression have been adopted rather than rejected
putting The Plantation under new management doesn't cure Slavery

2-2 Persuasion vs. Coercion

Freedom requires identifying who's entitled to what
Freedom & Tolerance are 2 aspects of the same thing
Coercion can't be Tolerated in an otherwise-Tolerant Free Society
self-determination in a multilateral context means mutual consent
Marxian gunpoint "compassion" is Robbery (Slavery)
Coercion becomes a first resort rather than last resort
"one size fits all" approach inevitable under Coercion
Marxian "diversity" isn't as constructive as Real Diversity
illegitimate expectations make a lousy basis for compromise
agreement is sometimes mandatory, usually not
Dissent & Pluralism ought to be embraced as positive
Persuasion can be vigorous, but can't resort to force or harassment
Persuasion will take "no" for an answer, Coercion won't
government never takes "no" for an answer

2-3 Power Accumulation

"Liberty! Equality! Fraternity!" is Freedom's Trinity
Freedom means doing as you please about your own business
no such thing as the "freedom" to Push People Around
self-ownership in a social context means retaining individual consent
Real Egalitarianism means Political Equality
Power Accumulation is a Politically hostile act (Usurpation)
[illus] the Conservation of Political Power
Power Accumulation is Power Theft
Slavery's about Power Accumulation, Freedom's about Power Retention
is "willing" Slavery an option?
[illus] the Inseparability of Authority and Responsibility
money is Power, disproportionate wealth means disproportionate Power
"How much better can you eat?"
the Aristocratic fantasy is about owning people as well as things
virtual reality might offer warped human nature a safe outlet
millionaires are proportionately wealthy, billionaires aren't
Freedom requires Political Humility, Slavery is Political Arrogance
honest employment is not Slavery
Marxian class-warfare scam simply a Power Accumulation tactic
the Meek can counter "might makes right" with collective might

2-4 Limited Slavery

American Constitution was genuinely Liberal & Progressive
[illus] The Declaration of Independence
Framers gave Defensive task to Coercive Institution (government)
creating Freedom is a "bootstrap operation"
Framers could do no better than Limited Slavery
"A republic, if you can keep it."
Limited Slavery has been confused for an end in itself
no "right" amount of Slavery other than none at all
Sovereignty Delegation begets Political Laziness & Dependence
Power Accumulators & government mutually-supportive
Limited Slavery a potential step toward Freedom, but unstable
Constitutional protection of Political Minorities has a Catch-22
government needn't fear punishment for violating Constitution

human-invented law has no fixed meaning
Political Minorities' only real protection is Majority Enlightenment

2-5 Marxism

a Free Society is Egalitarian, Elitism is Oppressive
[illus] Aristocratic rationale
Aristocrats aren't "better" than we are, just delusional
Marxism has unleashed the awesome political power of lip service
hereditary Aristocracy has been replaced by self-appointed Aristocracy
Freedom & Justice not mutually exclusive, but mutually dependent
Aristocratic Marxists hate the Egalitarian middle class
Marxists aim to exploit the poor
confiscatory taxation hurts the middle class (& poor), not the wealthy
Marxists are Aristocratic pseudo-populists
Marxists have embraced Racism as a political tactic
Real Liberals would be Libertarians, not Marxists
Marxism is Regressive, not Progressive
Marxism is synonymous with Slavery
Marxist Thugs are con-artists, Marxist Dupes are true believers
Marxism (based on Thuggery) is unusable for Social Justice
Persuasion is advantageous to the good guys, Coercion disadvantageous
Marxism is counterproductive to Environmentalism
our problems stem from lack of Understanding, not lack of Slavery
the Political Struggle has been reduced to Marxism vs. Freedom
Marxist Thugs are badly-motivated, Marxist Dupes are well-motivated
Coercion is too corrupt to be suitable to the creation of Justice
Defensive institutions are the real antidote to coercive Injustice
Power Accumulators aren't Robin Hood, but competing Exploiters
neutrality isn't an option in the struggle between Slavery & Freedom

3-0 DEFENSE

3-1 Aggression vs. Defense

Aggression & Defense aren't Politically indistinguishable
Defense is constrained in a way that Aggression isn't
anger is not a license to kill & it's never "okay" to hurt people
Defense recognizes that a bad outcome may be the best one available
refusing to choose a bad option might mean accepting a worse one
purpose of Aggression is Slavery, purpose of Defense to prevent it
Defense can require violence in extreme circumstances
Real Peace isn't Surrender, but the absence of Aggression
Aggressors are encouraged by weakness & discouraged by strength
Slavery is murder in slow motion
if the Human Project matters, then thwarting Evil is a good thing

3-2 Defense Properties

the goal of Defense is a net reduction in human tragedy
[illus] characteristics of Defense
a disproportionate response to Aggression is just more Aggression
there's no such thing as retroactive Defense
Defense is imbued with Forbearance, whereas Aggression lacks any
mindless procrastination is no substitute for thoughtful restraint
Defense is about the preservation of Rights, not usurpation of Power
Israeli destruction of Osiraq reactor a textbook example of Defense
Retribution is Aggression, but Preemption is Defense
a superficial resemblance to Vengeance doesn't disqualify Defense
Vengeance is pathological, Defense is anti-pathological (therapeutic!)
putting Abusers out of business is the highest form of revenge
Abusers identify themselves by their own behavior
Freedom means distinguishing the well-behaved from the badly-behaved
a violent response to a non-violent provocation isn't Defense
Defenders don't owe wannabe Aggressors any 1st-strike advantage
Force is a disproportionate response to intangible "offenses"
Coercion is anti-merit, Persuasion is pro-merit
Defense is the key to Freedom, and requires good judgment

3-3 Defensive Institutions

Defense must thwart external control & promote self-control
Slavery advanced by exploiting the public's fear of Anarchy

prohibition's ineffectiveness is used to argue for more of the same
Defensive institutions must (1) be effective, (2) avoid mission creep
denial of reality by non-Marxians has benefited Marxism
career criminals represent a failure to Defend
Defensive institutions would resemble government in some cases
Coercion in law enforcement can be blamed on law, not its enforcement
"To protect and to serve" doesn't require or allow Coercion
the military would be Defensive if not for politicians
a monolithic approach to Defense isn't necessary or even desirable
Coercion+Defense government doesn't Defend us well from itself
Limited Slavery offers a temporary window of opportunity for Freedom
government presents an irresistible temptation to Power Accumulators
"boiling the frog" strategy is being used to create the Total State
Coercion+Defense government is not a "necessary evil"
people who can behave themselves have a Right to govern themselves
Freedom capitalizes on our potential, Slavery thwarts it
Defensive institutions are the political technology behind Freedom

4-0 REAL LAW

4-1 Decree vs. Real Law

an obsession with "order" is inherently anti-Libertarian
the "rule of law" is actually the rule of lawyers (an oligarchy)
The Universe already has Rules that can't be changed by legislation
everything, including human interaction, is governed by Real Law
[illus] Decree vs. Real Law
the purpose of Decree is to Push People Around
Decree is arbitrary (whimsical)
Decree is unintelligible by design (intending Power Accumulation)
the People can't defend what they cannot comprehend
Decree's meaning isn't fixed & can be completely reversed by judges
Decree (Power Accumulation) incompatible w/ Freedom
a Barristocracy doesn't even qualify as Democracy, much less Freedom
Barristocrats can torture either the spirit or the letter of the law
2nd Amendment unambiguous: militia depends on the Right to bear Arms

U.S. v. Miller court intentionally reversed the sense of 2nd Amendment
Barristocrats are unreliable defenders of the People's Rights
Decree is human-invented, Real Law can only be discovered
a Free Society is obliged to be Reality-based, a Barristocracy isn't
Real Law is Legitimate, Decree's "legitimacy" is dubious
government is hypocritical
don't try this [Civil Disobedience] at home!

4-2 Real Law Discovery

ignorance of human-invented law is unavoidable
ignorance of Real Law is inadvisable
made-up law can reflect Real Law, but isn't limited to that
Real Legitimacy can only come from Real Law
Science hasn't been much help at determining Real (Political) Law
"distributed processing" corresponds to self-determination
human nature naturally resents Tyranny
Coercion & Monopoly are Excellence-killers
all Real Crimes amount to Power Theft
self-ownership must be tolerated, ownership by others mustn't
prohibition is a great way to grow organized crime & government
criminalizing drugs isn't a proportionate (Defensive) response
Oppression isn't the answer to wayward Liberty, Defense is
Real Law would encompass all Reality-based "decree"
Real Law would be Defensive & not unnecessarily arbitrary
Real Law would be understandable to citizens of average education

4-3 Justice

coerced jury service is a clear sign that something's gone wrong
the purpose of a captive audience is to be abused
legalism will & has become divorced from Justice
"justice" rendered under made-up law is intentionally unverifiable
adversarial trials are all about winning, not Justice
Free Society's pursuit of Justice wouldn't be Coercive or Monopolistic
Justice is absolutely dependent on accuracy
a Free Society wouldn't settle for impotence against predators
procedure shouldn't become a substitute for the original goal

our ability to achieve Justice is necessarily limited
Vengeance has no place in a Free Society
a system that overrewards lawyers will have lots of them
Defense is all about prevention, not retribution
capital punishment is only proportionate if no better option exists
paying a hypothetical "debt to society" doesn't solve the real problem
hypothetical "guilt" doesn't necessarily reflect the danger to Society
remedial action should supply what's missing in self-identified felons
jails wouldn't be coercively financed in a Free Society
felons could earn their keep by contributing to criminal science
the best justice system is the most accurate, not the most complex
protecting Society from both predators & gov't is entirely possible

4-4 Punishment

ferocious competence at self-defense would make jails unnecessary
we can lock up the good guys or the bad guys
a Barristocracy can use law to create "criminals" where none exist
"well-behaved" has different meanings under Statism & Freedom
for Statists, government equals good guys & civilians equal bad guys
Criminal gov't is vastly more dangerous than Criminal individuals
in Freedom, Aggressors equal bad guys & Defenders equal good guys
[illus] 4 levels of scrutiny based on an individual's track record
ordinary fallibility is different from inadequate self-control
early intervention might be a way to deal with at-risk individuals
banishment & execution are somewhat impractical
reward/punishment under made-up law ignores basic psychology
jails are misused as a way to punish "disapproved" self-ownership
proportionate sanctions would be the least draconian & most effective
remedial action should supply what's missing in self-identified felons
certain (& painful) failure deters better than uncertain punishment

5-0 POWER RETENTION

5-1 Egalitarian Institutions

Power Retention institutions wouldn't attract Power Accumulators
teamwork: 20-mule team ... "Baboon Model" ... "Captain Picard Model"
Coercion is the polar opposite of Leadership
Coercion must be more covert in the "private sector"
Egalitarian institutions wouldn't have any bosses
Egalitarian institutions wouldn't be democratic
Egalitarian institutions wouldn't be secretive or Monopolistic
transition from Barristocracy to Freedom requires much Political R&D
Coercion must be phased out as (pure) Defense is phased in
U.S. Constitution was an able attempt at harnessing made-up law
2nd Amendment addresses Force, 1st Amendment addresses Fraud
Decree is too dependent on "is is" lawyers to provide reliable Defense
lax immigration control is incompatible with a Free Society
advanced military technology has made Isolationism unworkable
self-control (like external control) needs institutional support
moral relativism is a deliberate attack on Freedom (self-control)
basis of Morality is Successful (vs. Unsuccessful) behavior
Freedom requires self-control, which requires Virtue & willpower
Morality can neither be dictated nor absent in a Free Society
Freedom is not for the lazy, gullible, timid, or corrupt
Freedom is a do-it-yourself proposition

5-2 Sovereignty

purpose of global government is to prevent Freedom anywhere
Real Sovereignty is Personal Sovereignty
Slaveowners include sadists, Exploiters, chauvinists, grandeur-deluded
Slave wannabes include lazy, fearful, distracted
to delegate Sovereignty is to lose it
delegating Freedom's costs contributes to underestimating its value
representation, government & made-up law are all Power Accumulation
the People themselves must decide what is Intolerable
majority won't reliably defend Freedom, but some minority will
Direct Democracy w/ high threshold is a Power Retentive approach
Defensive institutions would be constrained by election results
proper threshold is the difference between Slavery, Freedom & Anarchy
in the U.S., Freedom probably peaked shortly after the Civil War
Democracy only equates to Freedom if majority votes against Coercion

judges have discovered there's no penalty for re-making law
the income tax was and is a divide-and-conquer political scam
no moral or political difference between "robbery" & "taxation"
government, lawyers & robbers all follow the same M.O.
everything that can be taxed has been taxed
the taxation of productivity (income) isn't "progressive"
the fairness of discriminatory taxation is completely unverifiable
taxation weakens citizenry & strengthens its Oppressor (government)
coercive financing of coercive programs a political double-whammy
Robbery is an act of Political Inequality (Slavery)
"representation" has no relationship to any individual's taxation
persuasive programs would receive voluntary support
Tax Freedom Day illustrates the erosion of Liberty in the U.S.

5-3 Citizenship

universal Freedom & Egalitarianism are unachievable
Political Equality is only suitable to individuals with self-control
Society subdivided into: (1) Free, (2) Disqualified, (3) Uninterested
most individuals have the capacity for Freedom
Citizenship in a Free Society based on individual's performance
a Free Society wouldn't tolerate deadbeats or coercive public funding
Power Retention means having the broadest possible franchise
a Free Society must embrace both privacy & record-keeping
"group identity politics" approach doesn't reflect Reality
Defense requires treating people as individuals, Coercion needn't care
Defense depends on accurately identifying those who lack self-control

5-4 Civil Defense

theoretical Freedom is short-lived w/o the might to back it up
to reject Defense is to choose Slavery
Statists hate & fear civilian Arms
Statists want to ban civilian guns but not more-dangerous cars
anyone who can't be trusted with a weapon shouldn't run around loose
civilian disarmament is about enforced military disadvantage
the Right to self-preservation is the lynchpin of all Rights
Barristocrats constantly confirm their real opinion of Liberty

for Statists, the Arrogant can be trusted but the Meek cannot
gov't vs. citizenry not synonymous with "good guys" vs. "bad guys"
Power Accumulation institutions attract Power Accumulators
government monopolization of arms is a Power Accumulation approach
Civil Defense, like Sovereignty, is unsuitable to delegation
every member of a Free Society must contribute to its Defense
there's a difference between political dissent & Treason
Egalitarianism is unsuited to the military
peace officers are squeezed between the citizenry & government
Statists have conducted a smear campaign against vigilantism
Justice has nothing to do with government or Coercion
citizens who can defend themselves & others should do so
Tyrants held in check by public outrage & the means to act upon it

5-5 Political Censorship

junk debate relies on misdirection, cooked facts & bad logic
institutions supporting Real Debate are underdeveloped
Honesty matters because Truth matters
material honesty doesn't require human perfection
Political Dishonesty a disqualification for positions of Public Trust
Force & Fraud go together (lies are cheaper than bullets)
Dishonesty undermines Trust & engenders Cynicism
liars insult our intelligence
a Free Society wouldn't tolerate any Political Censorship
Political Censorship is an aid rather than an obstacle to Genocide
"truth referees" are a Power Accumulation approach
only lies need the help of Censors, the Truth doesn't
inappropriate speech should accrue to the reputations of its speakers
Censoring speech isn't a proportionate (Defensive) response
individual boycotts are an exercise in Power Retention
organized boycotts are an attempt at Power Accumulation
Marxists pay lip service to, but actually oppose Free Speech
censorship would be the prerogative of the Individual in a Free Society
the Bill of Rights isn't about pornography or "duck hunting"
the 1st Amendment doesn't protect us from the private sector
Free Speech depends on (expensive) mass communications technology
Corrupt Media Bloc is a pro-Marxian political censorship cartel
Big Government + Big Media = Big Brother
Free Speech depends on competition & Power Retention

Free Speech is vulnerable to Monopolism, regulation, taxation
Censorship supports Political Fraud (covert Coercion, or Slavery)

5-6 Capitalism

Capitalism gains unrivaled potency from human greed
Capitalism is amenable to Slavery or Freedom
ignorance impedes the proper function of free markets
there's nothing Socially Unjust about business-for-profit
corporate culture has embraced Aristocracy to an unhealthy degree
competition is pro-business, anti-competition is anti-business
Monopolism is about pathological greed, not "healthy competition"
ruthlessness is vastly overrated as a contributor to Success
Transparency is a much better check on Capitalism than Statism is
denial of Capitalist excess has backfired in favor of Statism
what do we expect the alternative to self-policing to be?
Globalism is a not-so-secret Aristocrat conspiracy

6-0 CONCLUSION

6-1 An Alliance Of The Meek

we're no longer slaves to survival, and can find other work
owning Slaves requires extra wisdom, but Slaveowners have a deficit
the Meek have done all the work, Tyrants have taken all the credit
human-invented law in itself creates only Barristocracy
a Free Society isn't Ruled by anyone, only Defended
Slavery—the Excellence-killer—poses a grave risk to Human Cause
"Santa Claus" government can't give you your Freedom
what is the real relationship between Coercion & good works?
can we achieve a goal like Freedom by adopting the methods of Slavery?
[illus] the methods of Slavery vs. Freedom
Freedom can't be created out of the chaos of Revolution

the best result Revolution ever produced was Limited Slavery
Limited Slavery is the necessary launching pad for Freedom
Limited Slavery is a window of opportunity, not an end in itself
Freedom requires shrinking government while growing Defense
Slavery is very seductive to the lazy & fearful
Limited Slavery is superior to Slavery, but inferior to Freedom
government can't be permanently harnessed, but perhaps temporarily
Democracy tends toward Slavery, but can be bent in Freedom's direction
human-invented law can be used to create "Barristocrat-free zones"
Marxists can't afford a non-Marxian U.S. which embarrasses Marxism
Aristocrats are strategically disadvantaged by their minority status
an evenly-divided electorate presents Libertarians with an opportunity
Libertarians must unite in a way that promotes Power Retention
Freedom means giving up Pushing People Around, for self-ownership
grandeur-deluded Aristocrats believe they're natural Slaveowners
the Meek are capable of the work & sacrifice that Freedom requires
this is a sketch, not a blueprint
you must participate, Sovereignty delegated is Sovereignty lost
step 1: understand Freedom, [illus] Freedom Pop Quiz
step 2: join or create Power Retention institutions
Freedom requires an Alliance of the Meek, not a reliance on the Elite
unless we're waiting on the Klingons, it's time to get started