

# NEW RAMPART

PUBLISHED BY RAMPART INSTITUTE

VOL. 5, NO. 6 (June-July, 1985)



Barry Reid

Barry Reid is a featured speaker at the '85 FOF Con.

## Karl Hess To Be Honored at Future of Freedom '85

Next to Ray Bradbury's speech, the main highlight of the Future of Freedom Conference will be a tribute banquet honoring Karl Hess on Oct. 26 at the Griswold's Hotel in Fullerton.

Hess has been one of the most influential writers in America. His award-winning *Playboy* article **The Death of Politics** caused ripples in the early student movement for individual liberty. A former speech-writer for Sen. Barry Goldwater during his 1964 presidential campaign, Hess was considered one of the leading young conservative thinkers of his generation. Yet, as the Vietnam War became more intense, Hess turned away from his conservative roots and politics to fight the establishment. Hess became a radical libertarian, and joined the anti-

(Continued on page 8)

## Parents Are VOCAL In Child-abuse Cases

By Julie Flynn

VOCAL, an acronym for a group of parents for **Victims of Child Abuse Laws**, is what the parents are becoming these days! The group fights what it calls an expanding problem of parents who face suspicion, presumption of guilt and loss of their children even when they have done nothing wrong.

The lobbying and support group for parents accused of abusing their children was founded in Minneapolis in October. The organization's mailing list has grown to 1,200 people nationwide, said Betty Lou Bauer, a co-founder of the original group in Minneapolis.

A dozen chapters have started in California, including recently formed groups in Riverside, San Bernardino and Orange counties.

"Imagine that the police can come into your home without a search warrant, can rip your children out of your arms, and can put them into an institution. Just on the basis of an anonymous phone call," said Bill Adams, a founding member of the Orange County VOCAL chapter.

Adams said the outrage he felt when he became the target of child-abuse accusations led him to start the local group.

However, he refused to discuss his case, which still is pending in juvenile court.

Another parent is less shy.

(Continued on page 5)

## WHO . . . Takes The Law Into His Own Hands?

Copyright By Anthony L. Hargis

When Bernhard Goetz shot four teenagers on a New York subway recently, the chorus accusing him of "taking the law into his own hands" was contained in practically every written and spoken report about him.

That this phrase was used so widely in the reports about Goetz seems to have surprised no one, and just as many seem to suspect that the phrase was used improperly. Instead, the outrage, puzzlement and critical attention were focused on the fact that the nearest government persecuted Goetz—not the four teenagers, each of whom has been previously convicted of theft and each of whom was carrying a sharpened screwdriver when shot.

If more time and attention were given to the phrase "taking the law into one's own hands," it would be much easier to understand why criminals are unpunished and victims are punished for successfully resisting a criminal, and, with a better understanding of the motives of this behavior, the easier it would be to eliminate such behavior.

The reason that governments leave criminals unpunished and terrorize the victims of criminals is inextricably allied with the essential and always primary purpose of government: the increase of its power.

The power of any government is derived from many sources and perhaps the most important source of power is obedient behavior of subjects. If subjects were not disposed to obedience, the state would have to place a pistol at the head of every subject in order to function—and even Hitler recognized this situation to be impossibly expensive to maintain. Thus, all states pursue policies

(Continued on page 6)

---

## NEW RAMPART

---

NEW RAMPART is published every two months. Subscriptions are \$12 for one year and \$18 for two years. Managing Editor—L. K. Samuels; Assistant Editor—Sandra Sisson; 2nd Assistant Editor—Dan Twedt; Proof reader—Marje Spencer; Contributing Editors—George Smith; Robert LeFevre; Butler D. Shaffer; Caroline Roper-Deyo; Charles D. Van Eaton and K.E. Grubbs Jr. Rampart Institute is a tax-deductible, educational organization.

Rampart Institute, Box 26044, Santa Ana, CA 92799

---



## Is China Changing? To Thine Own Self Be True

By Lorne Strider

"FROM NOW ON YOUR PEN WILL BE YOUR WEAPON. TAKE AS GOOD CARE OF IT AS A SOLDIER DOES OF HIS GUN. See that your gun is always aimed at the enemy; take care that it never hurts your own comrades."

According to a 1961 article in the Peking Review this advice was given by the communist party organizer of a Shanghai steel mill to a young steel worker who was beginning a writing career. The young writer took the advice to heart.

The guidelines worked well for the writer. His name is Hu Wan-chun, and he soon became one of China's best selling novelists.

That same article quoted Hu as saying "Many people have asked me what I have done to improve my writing techniques and what is the 'secret' of my creative writing. I have always answered: technique is important; but what is more important is a proletarian world outlook and mastery of the ideological weapon of Marxism-Leninism".

A couple years later Hu was interviewed by English writer Felix Greene; Greene asked Hu about a writer's freedom to write as he wished without being bound to national ideology. Hu responded... "The job of writers is to help root out remnants of old ways of thinking. It isn't a question of freedom to write as one pleases, it is a question of expressing the national desire to build a society in which there will be equality between people and in which everyone works for the benefit of all, rather than for himself alone."

Such was the philosophy of literature in China a few years into the period of "A Hundred Flowers", a slogan coined by Mao Tse-tung. Mao encouraged the intellectuals and writers to speak freely but when some of the best and most famous did so they were hounded into suicide, or sent to government farms for re-education. How are Chinese writers thinking today?

The 12,500 member Chinese Writer's Association held a constitutional convention in January of this year and hammered out guidelines espousing "new freedoms" for writers.

Apparently there was a mood of excitement at the

gathering where the normally reserved Chinese delegates enthusiastically insisted they'd never again return to the "Hundred Flowers" and "Cultural Revolution" days.

A sympathetic view was expressed by a high ranking Communist Party bureaucrat who assured the writers the Communist Party was determined that "literary creation must be free" and promised that writers would never again be subjected to political discrimination.

This sounds good at first reading. However, the official Chinese news agency Xinhua clarified that the state writers would "continue to be led by the communist Party and guided by Marxism-Leninism and the principles that art must serve socialism". to moderate an image of rigid control Xinhua added that the Writer's association can continue to let "A Hundred Flowers Bloom".

If this wasn't enough to cause tremorous fear among the writers Xinhua said the new constitution encourages writers "freedom is essential to develop socialist literature with Chinese characteristics."

Do Chinese authors now get new freedom? Can they speak their minds, freely criticize Communist Party officials and other bureaucrats? Can they challenge the party line and debate official doctrine?

Despite all the hoopla it would be unwise to do so. The farms are still there, ready for a writer's soft hands to man the plows. There are no new freedoms for the writers. They have only one possible employer for their work—the Communist government and the literary requirements of this government remain unchanged.

The advice given to the promising young writer in 1961 still holds today. If a Chinese writer wants to be published, not to mention be paid for his work, he must "sell" to the state. If the state is the sole buyer then only literature acceptable to the state will be purchased. The Chinese government will not buy writing that is critical of itself. So, all rhetoric aside, Chinese writers will never be "free" as long as there is only one buyer for their work.

There is a better guide for writers found in a famous quote by Polonius who advised his friend Laertes several centuries ago.

"To thine own self be true" says Polonius, and who doesn't know this familiar line today? Yet, there is more of it that is unknown and of profound importance. The entire quote is "To thine own self be true, and it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man."

Is being true to one's self the essence of selfishness and disregard for others? The Polonius quote stands in direct contrast to the Chinese Writers Association's philosophy. Are the Chinese writers on higher moral ground with their view that writing should serve the perceived interests of their society?

The two views are actually different approaches to the discovery of truth, for the Chinese writer truth can only be found within an acceptable framework of their world view and interpretation of history. One can look everywhere for truth except outside certain ideological bounds.

The problem here is that truth may in fact lie outside

(Continued on page 7)

# WITH ALL THE HANDS OUT, IT'S HARDER TO TURN OFF THE SPENDING SPIGOTS

By Charles D. Van Eaton

Several years ago my friend professor Leland Yeager of Auburn published a study which investigated the historical process of inflation in various countries over the previous 100 years. His study concluded that nations that had experienced short yet intense periods of hyperinflation had been more successful in ending inflation with minimal permanent damage than had nations in the grip of longstanding but relatively moderate periods of inflation.

Inflation is a purely monetary phenomenon. It can be stopped by simply "shutting down the printing presses." Deficits, on the other hand, are a political phenomenon and can be stopped only by the application of raw political resolve. The larger the budget deficit, the harder it becomes to gather the broad political support needed to eliminate it.

Why? Because every budget item carries with it a vocal and powerful political constituency that can and will argue that cutting or eliminating that specific item will make, at best, only an insignificant contribution to deficit reduction while causing grave "distress" to "innocent" people.

Precisely because of the political problems elected officials face when even one of many constituencies faces distress, there has never been a time when enough essential political courage and public support could be brought to bear to do the job. If anything, the situation is worse today.

In a careful analysis of the roles played by taxes and spending since 1970, Professor Thomas S. McCaleb of Florida State University concluded — as has virtually every other student of the issue — that the real source of our 25-year deficit problem is uncontrolled spending, not inadequate taxation.

According to McCaleb, "Fundamentally, the problem is the size of government, not the method of financing government activity. Federal expenditures have grown from only 18.5 percent of gross national product in 1960 to 24.1 percent of GNP in 1983 and are — even with the program cuts currently in place — expected to fall to only 22.3 percent in 1988."

Revenues, on the other hand, were 18.2 percent of GNP in 1960 (there was a deficit) and even with tax cuts are expected to rise to 19.3 percent in 1988. Both revenues and expenditures have grown faster than GNP for 25 years. But expenditures have constantly outpaced growth in revenues.

Federal deficits are distinctly the result of runaway spending. Why don't we get expenditure reduction? Because to reduce total expenditures, some programs will have to be eliminated altogether and others radically

reformed and cut back.

A spending freeze will not do the job. Freezing a program at current levels might save money in 1986, but funding for that program will increase in the years following.

Ronald Reagan's 1986 budget calls for an increase in total spending of less than 2 percent. That is not an expenditure reduction (even if it is a positive break from the trend of annual accelerating rates of expenditure increase). But, significantly, Reagan's budget does call for the outright elimination of some 25 programs.

He won't get what he wants. To cut, say, \$700 million in spending on Amtrak (the amount saved by total elimination of a program that has already cost taxpayers \$9 billion and is projected to cost \$8 billion more over the next decade) would reduce the deficit by less than four-tenths of 1 percent (that is, .0035, to be exact). Amtrak has a vocal constituency, including small-town mayors who can make life miserable for a congressman.

Cutting unneeded federal offices and field personnel could save \$4 billion. That would reduce the deficit by only 2 percent. Again the political damage outweighs the budget savings.

The same case can be made for every line item in the federal budget. Spending provides high political yield to Congress. Spending cuts yield no short-term political payoff.

I suspect that Congress will delay the budget until it's time for the fourth October "continuing resolution" in a row. The politicians will count on Reagan not to veto the whole package for fear of shutting down the government.

Perhaps the old man will fool them and bring the whole bloody mess to an end. They deserve it.

## PUT THE RIGHT WORDS IN MIKHAIL'S EAR

By Robert LeFevre

Now that the Kremlin has produced a new leader, an unusual opportunity looms.

The president's men are largely of the view that this latest change in top personnel means so little that everyone is warned not to give credence to the notion that changes in the Russian attitude could be in the offing.

\*\*\*\*\*

## The 1985 Edition of the Free-Market Yellow Pages

Over 250 listings of educational organizations, businesses and publications, Only \$2.50 per copy. Write to Free-Market Yellow Pages, Box 26044, Santa Ana, CA 92799

\*\*\*\*\*

When all the people around Ronald Reagan sing in close harmony, I suspect the opinions offered are his, not theirs. And it's a shrewd political ploy. By downplaying the opportunity, how much more applause and acclaim can be Reagan's if, like Richard Nixon, he manages a breakthrough. If Reagan blows the opportunity, he can claim there never was one.

When nearly everyone argued that there was no chance in China, Nixon pulled off the most important move of his term in office. Reagan is in a position to do something similar with Russia.

Take a look at the new man, Mikhail Gorbachev. This fellow has already been influenced by the West. The smile he flashed as he visited Margaret Thatcher in Britain and voted in Moscow shows that he is privy to show business, of which politics is the most lucrative branch.

His background shows that he is well aware that the Russian economic system is in a shambles. He was in charge of all agricultural programs on at least two occasions. Russian agricultural programs have been an unmitigated disaster since 1917. Had Stalin been in power, Gorbachev might have been shot. It is evident that he is a shrewd politician to manage not only survival but promotion.

Such political success is worthy of study. The man seems capable of dealing with the "old guard." The real problem in Russia is their deity, Karl Marx, and his spiritual descendant, Vladimir Lenin. The old guard doesn't take kindly to anyone who shows that Marx's economic theories are a bit like using strawberry jelly to shingle a dwelling.

I suspect Gorbachev **knows** what a disaster his country's economic system is, but he can't say so out loud. What he needs is a friendly voice to guide him along the path toward the practical successes free enterprise holds out—to encourage him as he moves in the only practical direction possible, to warn him—not with threats and sabers, but with wisdom—that his people will fare infinitely better if they abandon collectivist nonsense and let private persons own property.

He won't hear that voice from the Kremlin. He could hear it in the West. A few farmers and industrialists in this country have already done yeoman service to the cause.

The voice should come from this country right now. Unhappily, Reagan appears to have hitched his wagon to a starwars idea rather than remaining flexible so as to deal effectively with opportunities as they surface.

I recall an earlier breakthrough during Stalin's intransigent period of power. That vicious and ignorant politico had the idea that if he established quotas, workers would meet them. So he declared that in a few years, Russian mine production would outstrip American mine production. He issued impossible quotas.

He did provide an incentive. Miners failing to meet the quotas would be sent to Siberia. The foremen in charge would be shot.

Mightily did the miners swing their picks and run their trams. To no avail. It became clear very quickly that the quotas were fantasies.

One foreman in the Urals saw the road ahead with clarity. In a few months he would be dead and all workers under him condemned to some Gulag. His name was Stakhanov. Stakhanov went to his district commissar and asked one favor.

Since everyone was already condemned, the men were loafing. To spur production, he suggested that the output of each be weighed individually and that he be paid not a wage, but a commission on what he actually produced. Thus the men could do well for a short time before they were condemned to ice and snow.

Surprisingly, the commissar agreed. The men at Stakhanov's mine went to work with a will and actually met the quota! Stakhanov was arrested for causing the miners to steal from other mines. Stalin had an investigation which cleared Stakhanov.

Then the story was given to the press. Stakhanov became a "hero" of the Revolution, and the term "Stakhanovism" came into common usage as a "great new economic breakthrough of socialist theory!" I doubt that the Russians in power will ever admit that they made a mistake. Show me any politician who does so willingly.

If the Soviets turn to private ownership and private management, they will call it the fulfillment of Karl Marx!

I suppose then, to get along with them, we might admit that we Americans were most favorably impressed by the whole Marx family: Groucho, Harpo, Chico and Zeppo. Even that admission would be better than a war!

## How Deep The Pockets? How High The Sky? Tax Time!

By Dale Lowdermilk

Each year since 1913, bureaucrats have modified, simplified (?), homogenized and brutalized taxpayers with revisions and regulations only a corporate tax lawyer could understand. This year, people are confused over the so-called "flat tax" plans and changes in IRS procedures.

In the interest of fairness and safety, our organization, NOT—SAFE (National Organization Taunting Safety and Fairness Everywhere), would like to offer some "tax plans" that are genuinely simple (and flat!).

**Smart Tax:** This plan would tax individuals based on IQ score. Obviously, intelligent people tend to earn more and probably are taking advantage of "stupid" people. Every five years all taxpayers would be re-tested. This would either balance the budget in 15 years or confirm that (as Congress has suspected for decades) we are a nation of idiots.

**Dumb Tax:** Laziness and non-productivity resulting from intentional ignorance (smart people cheating on IQ exams) would certainly burden everyone. To solve this problem and to encourage everyone to stay in college, a universal tax of 30 percent would be placed on those who could not solve a simple quadratic equation or re-wire

an IBM computer.

**Fat Tax:** Healthy people are less of a burden to society than sick ones. To discourage overeating and poor physical condition, anyone who cannot run three miles in less than 15 minutes would be fined (taxed) \$500 each year. The grossly overweight would be sent to sweat farms.

**Brat Tax:** Many years ago, to encourage population growth, Congress allowed deductions for children. Times have changed and so must our tax law. Instead of rewarding parents for having kids, a \$1,000 tax for each child born (and then \$500 each year) would have a "cold shower" effect. Money extracted through this plan could only be used in diaper research and family-counseling programs.

**Tramp Tax:** To encourage homeowners to "adopt" a bag lady, transient or homeless person, special deductions of up to 25 percent of gross income would be allowed. Those who refuse to participate in this humanitarian program would face public humiliation, late-night telephone calls and the dreaded "tramp tax," which is a 100-percent tax on everything you earn and own. This has been described as "brutal" by many opponents, but it is designed to cure the problem of homelessness. Voluntary compliance with this tax will be mandatory.

**Pre-Death Tax:** Financial advantages can be gained by paying your death tax in advance, otherwise your heirs will face the quadruple penalty of the post-death tax. The pre-death tax has a simple formula: Take your present age and multiply it times 75 (average life expectancy). Divide that by 39,420,000 (number of minutes in a lifetime) and add to the calculated mass of our Milky Way Galaxy. The resulting amount (times \$2) equals the tax due prior to demise. (The sooner you pay, the younger you will be, and the more money you will save!)

**Sun Tax:** This unique plan will discourage Sun Belt Migrations (an evil of enormous proportions). Cancer wards of hospitals are burdened by people who, through vanity, spent hundreds of hours "cooking" their epidermal layers into oblivion. The leathery "tanned" look of the 1970s resulted in misery and carcinomas in the 1980s and huge financial burdens upon institutions and taxpayers. "Preventative taxation" upon sun-worshippers and beach-bathers years ago would have avoided this disaster. To avoid this tax, stay indoors.

**Moon Tax:** The number of hours spent each year in moonlight is directly proportional to the number of babies born out of wedlock. The Massachusetts Legislature must have utilized this information when, in 1981, it enacted tax-law revisions that included the declaration of "underground income." The law states that you must declare all income you receive in the form of money, goods and services. Examples include: income from bartering or swapping transactions, side commissions, kickbacks, illegal activities (such as stealing, drugs, etc.), cash skimming by proprietors and tradesmen, gambling, prizes and awards, and moonlighting.

**Pro Tax:** Don't worry, doctors and lawyers, this one is

not for you. This plan is designed for movie and sports professionals who are paid exorbitant salaries. Something must be done to help equalize and subsidize "less fortunate" (and less capable) members of these professions. All contracts for film stars and professional athletes must carry the 50-percent clause, which guarantees all members of the team or crew an equal one-half share of the individual's yearly income.

**Tax Tax:** Based on the theory that if you did not borrow any money to meet your "patriotic" obligations, you were not adequately taxed, a special assessment may be required. If you cannot document (within 25 cents) all expenditures for the past 10 years, a penalty tax tax of \$10,000 (or two years in prison) will be levied. The tax tax is even worse than the tramp tax, so don't mess with the IRS.

---

#### (VOCAL IN CHILD-ABUSE CASES—Cont. from page 1)

Robin Johnson, a founder of the San Bernardino chapter, said she never suspected that a trip to the family doctor to have her 4-year-old's infection treated would lead to accusations of child abuse.

Johnson's story began when she noticed a stain in her daughter Sandy's panties and sought medical attention from the family pediatrician.

The doctor discovered a vaginal bacterial growth that he believed only could be transmitted sexually. And so, as law requires, he alerted the authorities.

Six days later, Child Protective Services, backed up by the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department, arrived at the Johnson home in Apple Valley.

The frightened, crying child was torn from her mother's arms, according to a neighbor, Jenny Lacky, who witnessed the scene, and Sandy was held in protective custody for 10 days before being returned to her family.

But Sandy still was not in her mother's legal custody, so Johnson sought other medical opinions. The three doctors whom Johnson had hired to examine Sandy said she had not been sexually abused, according to documents examined by the Register.

Even so, the question of child abuse is not settled. After sessions with anatomical dolls, psychologists, the sheriff and the district attorney, the case still is under investigation.

Since then, the 30-year-old Apple Valley resident has become an activist—urging her congressmen to vote against any legislation regarding child abuse "until all persons' rights are protected" and writing to national news shows like "60 Minutes."

---

### IRISH FOLK DANCE

On Oct. 5, 1985, 7:30 PM. \$5.00. Live band, cash bar and food, draught beer. Dances led. American Legion Hall, 14582 Beach Blvd., Midway City, Orange County (north on beach Blvd., off of San Diego Fwy. 405). For more info: 213/421-0655.

---

(LAW INTO OWN HANDS— Cont. from page 1)

designed to increase the obedience of their subjects. From nursery school to the grave, the state:

- promotes the belief that an obedient, uncritical child is a good or superior child—to believe this requires a mind that is capable of believing the earth to be flat;
- promotes the leader principle where everyone is required to swear allegiance to Stalin, Hitler, the Ayatollah, the Nation, the flag or the race—and those who don't are, **ipso facto**, inferior, disobedient or enemies of the state;
- inflicts inordinate punishment against those who resist or disobey the authority of the government.

The state—above all else—always tries to cultivate a mentality of obedience by making disobedience or resistance futile and prohibitively costly. If one submissively complies with the demands of the state, one only gets slapped around a bit and loses part of one's property; if one criticizes or resists the demands of the state, one loses **all** of one's property and is shot or sent to the gulag.

While this policy of brutal suppression of disobedience is fanatically desired by every bureaucrat, its implementation is always tempered by the state's need for popular support and approval. If the state is perceived to be too beastly, its subjects will be increasingly disobedient. Thus the state has to curtail its natural tendency toward brutality for the sake of popular approval.

(Not all obedience is bad. Obedience to the laws of nature is always good. With regard to obedience to other people, one has to distinguish between selfless and selfish obedience. Selfless obedience invariably brings loss or negative results, such as death on a battlefield or the commission of a heinous crime. Selfish obedience invariably brings positive results, such as a pay check. In this article, wherever I use the term "obedience", I mean selfless obedience, unless otherwise noted.)

The reason the state needs mass obedience is because the state is a non-productive organization: in order to survive, it must take property from those who produce it. If producers refuse to voluntarily give their production to the state, the state must employ coercion—including murder—to get the property needed for its survival. If too many people resist the demands of the state, it will lose all or part of its power—and, without power, a state cannot exist.

Thus, it is vitally important for the special interest groups that control the state to reduce resistance and increase obedience of those to be ruled or looted. From the perspective of the special interest groups, the ideal salve is one who will:

- deliver his property to the state without complaint;
- die for the state without thinking;
- obey every edict issued by the state, and
- kill—without question or reflection—anyone declared to be enemies of the state.

To cultivate these anti-life qualities, the state gives rewards and privileges to those who most enthusiastically obey the thousands of stupid edicts issued by the state. Rewards and privileges are also given to those who report

those who disobey the stupid edicts.

This recognition of obedience invariably draws into the service of the state the most base, the most inept, and the most criminal people of society since their only opportunity for success or reward is to do something exceedingly stupid or exceedingly simple. Hence, great numbers of people believe selfless obedience to be a virtue because the rational virtues—such as productive work and integrity—are practically unreachable by most people. This is why the political criminal who promotes selfless obedience as a virtue is able to attract so many people.

These selflessly obedient people—wherever they are found—are the building blocks of a Nazi or Soviet regime.

To summarize the foregoing, the state is a criminal organization, and it needs widespread submission and obedience. Why then does the state persecute people who defend themselves against criminals? It seems to be a puzzle—Bernhard Goetz was not resisting the state, the teenagers he shot were all carrying weapons and all had previously been convicted of theft. The answer requires more examination.

As I've indicated, the state needs large numbers of people who willingly deliver their property to the state. In other words, since **all** states survive by acts of theft, the state wants people to meekly submit to acts of theft.

When a person repels a thief, he displays a mentality and behavior that is the exact opposite of what the state wants to cultivate. If such a person repels a common thief, he is likely to resist the demands and exactions of the state-thief also. This person represents a fundamental danger to the state and he cannot be allowed to transmit his 'diseased' attitude to others. Depending on the particular government, this person will be shot, sent to the Gulag or litigated into poverty.

But sometimes such a person will escape the fate so urgently desired by the special interest groups because prosecution of him (for successfully defending himself against a thief) might severely erode popular support of the state. And, without this popular support, the state cannot exist.

When the state perceives the liability of prosecuting our able would-be victim, the state calls on its stable of court-philosophers to character-assassinate him into submission (A court-philosopher is a very mealy-minded philosopher who has never seen anything above a bureaucrat's waist.) This assassination invariably takes the form of accusing our would-be victim of "taking the law into his own hands."

When this perjorative phrase is used in this manner, the court-philosophers commit an outrage against logic and common sense. This outrage is perpetrated with little or no effective protest because those who should protest have not identified or have not properly integrated the facts involved in a situation where someone repels a thief. Let's review these essential facts.

A factor that distinguished government from its slaves is that government is permitted action that is regarded as criminal if done by anyone else.

(Continued on page 7)

NEW RAMPART

A tax-collector, for example, may confiscate (i.e., steal) another person's bank account with impunity while a private person would be regarded as a criminal if he did the same thing. A soldier, sheriff or cop may kill another person with impunity while a private person should be regarded as a murderer if he did the same thing.

A tax-collector may take another's property with impunity because the law authorizes the tax-collector to steal and protects him or her from reprisals for those acts of theft—the tax-collector acts with the authority of law: he or she has got the law in his hands. When a private-thief attempts to take the property of another, he is merely trying to do what the tax-collector does; he is proceeding as if he had the law in his own hands; HE is "taking the law into his own hands."

When a private-murderer kills another, he is merely doing what the soldier, sheriff and cop do: he is proceeding as if he had the law in his own hands: HE is "taking the law into his own hands."

The essential distinction between a tax-collector and a private thief is that the former has the law put into his hands by someone else while the latter takes the law (i.e., the authority to steal) into hands by his own initiative.

A tax-collector is a licensed thief; the ordinary private thief is not.

I earnestly await the day when I'll see a newspaper headline proclaim **\*MAN TAKES LAW INTO OWN HANDS: ROBS LIQUOR STORE (or KILLS 13).**

When a person who defends himself against a criminal is accused of taking the law into his own hands, the accuser implies that individuals are property of the state, that they can defend themselves only within limits prescribed by the king or state and that anyone acting without these limits is acting illegally.

The right of self-defense is innate — it is not a privilege, it is an inborn right. We have a right to repel or destroy anything that threatens us—whether it be a roach or a human thief (public or private).

No state would command that people defend themselves because that is the popularly believed purpose of the state and people might construe resistance against the predations of the state to be contained within such a command. No state would issue an edict that permits self-defense because such an edict would fall into the category of an edict that permits breathing.

Everyone has the right of self-defense—independently of the state. The attempt to equate an act of self-defense with "taking the law into one's own hands" is statist nonsense. If self-defense were a conferred privilege, it would be illegal (and presumably immoral):

- \* to shelter a Jew in a Nazi society;
- \* to criticize the air conditioning in a Soviet building;
- \* to escape from the Gulag (where people are sent for the above criticism)
- \* to shoot an SS prison guard;
- \* to commit acts of sabotage against Soviet-type states or
- \* to shoot a Soviet soldier who has just exterminated and Afghani village.

To claim that any of the above acts—to claim that self-defense in general—requires permission from the state is an endorsement of totalitarianism.

When bureaucrats regard a private thief or murderer, the unformulated thought that creeps through their minds is 'there, but for the color of law, go I'.

There is a common—and very fundamental—bond between a bureaucrat and a private criminal: they are both thieves, they are both murderers and they both want docile, submissive victims. What's more, the person who repels private-thieves is regarded as a most dangerous threat by private criminals and bureaucrats. Their reactions to such a person, however, are different. While private criminals tend to avoid a victim who is likely to shoot back, bureaucrats take every measure possible to "re-educate" or eliminate such a person.

The state persecutes Bernhard Goetz because—except for the color of law—he shot four bureaucrats.

#### (CHINA IS CHANGING—Cont. from page 2)

those bounds. If it does, the Chinese writer will never discover it.

With Polonius "truth" is wherever it may be found, and being true to one's self is the first requirement necessary to discover truth elsewhere. However, there is even more. Aren't truth and falsehood related to honesty and dishonesty? Isn't Polonius recommending that we be honest with ourselves?

There are positive benefits that arise from association with those who are honest with themselves. If a man can't be honest with himself, how can he be honest with others? When dishonesty is encouraged there will be deception. I prefer the company of those who are true to themselves.

## CLASSIFIED ADS

**RATES:** 20 cents per word, \$5.00 minimum. Telephone numbers count as one word; box numbers count as two words. **Payment must accompany all orders.** Copy must be received by the first day of the month one month prior to issue date. Check or money order should be made to Rampart Institute. Classified Ads, Box 4, Fullerton, CA 92632.

### NEW RAMPART

#### A Bi-Monthly (6 editions) Journal on Liberty and Intellectual Survival

Contributing Editors:

George Smith, Robert LeFevre, Marvin Olsen, Butler D. Shaffer, Caroline Roper-Deyo, Wendy McElroy and Charles D. Van Eaton.

**NEW RAMPART** ..... \$12/one year  
..... \$18/two years

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

**NEW RAMPART** • Box 26044, Santa Ana, CA 92799  
(714) 979-5737 • (Athena Graphics)

# POT SHOTS

## COPS RAID A FAMILY BY MISTAKE!

By Andrew Parker

Police smashed their way into a house and held a terrified family at gunpoint—by mistake.

Detectives launched the Sweeney-style raid because they suspected 64-year-old Dennis Elcock of being an armed bank robber.

Seven armed officers burst into his home at 7 a.m. after breaking down the front door with sledge-hammers.

Mr. Elcock was spread-eagled on a bed with a shotgun in his back while other officers covered his wife and 27-year-old daughter.

His 90-year-old mother-in-law slept through the swoop in another room!

## RESTITUTION—AT LAST!

In Kennewick, WA a burglar was sentenced to pay the victim's theft insurance premiums for 3 years.

## GUESS WHERE?

If unemployment is 12%, inflation nearly 40%, gas rationed, 7 billion in interest on the national debt, strikes, rioting among racial groups, etc., a country obviously needs Central Economic Planning, right? The country is Yugoslavia, and it's already got that.

## DROPPING ACID!

Concerned about acid rain? One of the biggest increases in sulfuric acid in the air is from the catalytic converters put on cars by government edict in 1975 to decrease pollution.

authoritarian fringe of SDS to demonstrate against the war. Further, he stopped paying taxes, arguing that taxation was theft. Few men have ever turned away from the establishment as had Karl Hess. Not only was he an editor of **Newsweek**, but he had also worked closely with Presidents Nixon and Ford. To Hess, principles were more important than political advancement. To Hess, liberty meant more than riding in expensive cars and mouthing the ideals of free enterprise. Karl Hess lives his ideas.

For more information on FOFCon '85 call (714) 979-5737, or write for flyer—Box 26044, Santa Ana, CA 92799.

## PRICES FOR THE FOFCon '85

TICKETS: Advanced ticket sales are discounted if you mail in your order early. To receive discount you must postmark your envelope by **Sept. 10, 1985** for the first deadline, **Oct. 12, 1985** for the second deadline. The last price is for tickets bought at the door. All tickets are held at the door. **Late Banquet and Luncheon Reservations:** call (714) 979-5737. Money must be received by Oct. 22 to guarantee seating for food functions.

### NON-STUDENT (Non-Food Events)

(1a) Two-Days .....	\$55.00/\$60.00/\$65.00
(1b) One-Day .....	\$32.00/\$37.00/\$42.00

### STUDENTS (Full-time, over 10 Units—Non-Food Events)

(2a) Two-Days .....	\$28.00/\$31.00/\$35.00
(2b) One-Day .....	\$17.00/\$20.00/\$23.00

### FRI. NIGHT CELEBRITY COCKTAIL PARTY/DEBATE

(3a) Regular Ticket .....	\$10.00/\$12.00/\$14.00
---------------------------	-------------------------

### SAT. LUNCHEON WITH RAY BRADBURY

(4a) Regular Food Ticket .....	\$14.50/\$15.50/\$16.50*
--------------------------------	--------------------------

### SAT. NIGHT BANQUET HONORING KARL HESS/IMENCKEN AWARDS

(5a) Regular Food Ticket .....	\$24.00/\$28.00/\$34.00*
(5b) Golden Table Food Ticket .....	\$45.00/\$55.00/\$60.00*
(5c) Non-Food Ticket .....	\$5.00/\$6.00/\$7.00

### SUN. LUNCHEON WITH KARL HESS

(6a) Regular Food Ticket .....	\$14.50/\$15.50/\$16.50*
--------------------------------	--------------------------

### EXHIBIT TABLES (8 Foot Tables)

(7a) Sat. & Sun. Only .....	\$70.00/\$80.00/\$90.00
(7b) Fri. Night Book Sellers (Book Signing) .....	\$15.00/\$20.00/\$25.00

### PACKAGE DEALS (Non-Students)

(8a) Golden Package (All speeches, Sat. Night Banquet, both luncheons, Friday Night Celebrity Cocktail/Debate—Discounted Even More) .....	\$109.00/\$124/\$139
(8b) Silver Package (All speeches and Sat. Night Banquet—Discounted Even More) .....	\$76/\$87/\$96

**RAMPART INSTITUTE**  
New Rampart  
P.O. Box 26044  
Santa Ana, CA 92799 U.S.A.

Non-Profit  
U.S. POSTAGE  
**PAID**  
Permit No. 1197  
Santa Ana, CA