



February 2014

The End of Private Property

Dear Friend of Radio Liberty,

“Thou shalt not steal.”

God, the Eighth Commandment. (1)

“Everything the State says is a lie; everything it has is stolen.”

Friedrich Nietzsche (2)

“The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property.” Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (3)

New Mexico Governor Susana Martinez was a regular customer of hair stylist Antonio Darden. About two years ago, Darden decided that he would no longer accept the Governor’s business because of her opposition to the novel social arrangement called same-sex marriage. (4)

Six years before Darden dropped Gov. Martinez as a customer, New Mexico resident Elaine Huguenin, who runs a photography business, declined a request to photograph what was described as a wedding ceremony between two women. Rather than finding another photographer willing to take their business, the women filed a complaint with a bureaucratic body calling itself the Human Rights Commission. That agency ruled that Huguenin had violated a state law against “sexual orientation discrimination” and imposed a \$7,000 fine. (5)

The New Mexico Supreme Court upheld the fine, and the case may be headed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Not long ago, it was commonplace for customers to see signs advertising that a business owner “**reserves the right to refuse service.**” This is a dimension of property rights, which are unqualified and absolute – whether or not they are respected by those who presume to rule us.

As a business owner, Antonio Darden has an unconditional right to accept or reject customers for any reason he chooses. The same is true of Elaine Huguenin, or any other business owner. When Darden exercised that right, he was celebrated; when Huguenin did the same, she was prosecuted. Both entrepreneurs exercised their right to discriminate, which is a function of property ownership.

However, only one of them was permitted to do this with impunity, because he belongs to what the New Mexico Human Rights Commission calls a “**specially protected class.**” Huguenin, by way of contrast, has no property rights – only a qualified and revocable privilege. This is why she was punished for refusing to provide service. Her service, being involuntary, is more appropriately called servitude – something forbidden by the Thirteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which prohibits “**involuntary servitude**” except “as punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted....”

Slavery and involuntary servitude are related, but not identical, and both are prohibited by law in this country – and, more importantly, by the eternal moral law of the human universe. To the extent that any human being is compelled to render service to another, the first person is a slave.

A slave is somebody who has no right to say “**no**” – to withhold his consent to a transaction, or to refuse participation in a proposed undertaking. Slaves do not own themselves or any property they acquire. Everything they are and have can be seized and employed to serve the will of others.

Property rights, beginning with the ownership of one’s self, are the indispensable basis of any truly civilized society. And property rights, once again, must be regarded as absolute.

We are constantly told that in order for society to exist, rights must be “**balanced,**” a process involving limitations on their exercise. This is utter sophistry, rooted in the evil notion that individual rights are a conditional gift of the government. In this arrangement, the intangible, fictitious entity called the “**State**” is elevated to the position of God, and human beings are regarded as the property of the priestly caste that ministers in the state’s name.

Once it is understood that property rights are absolute, aggression – that is, the violation of those rights through force or fraud – is likewise understood to be an absolute and unconditional evil, and thus morally impermissible. This understanding is an application of the Golden Rule, which is the paramount moral law binding upon everybody in all circumstances.

Tragically, politics is the process of seeking self-interested exceptions to the Golden Rule. This is why it usually becomes an effort by some to enslave others. Our only alternatives are Christ's Golden Rule – **“Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.”** – or Lenin's formula of the Iron Fist – **“the question is who does what to whom.”** The cynical and misnamed Gay Rights movement is playing on sympathies consonant with the Golden Rule in order to establish the rule of the Iron Fist – and its supposed beneficiaries will be among those who suffer.

The compulsively left-wing publication Salon is prominent among the media organs promoting what we might call Homo-Leninism (the exploitation of the issue of homosexual rights to advance totalitarian rule.) One recent Salon essay focused on a proposed measure in Kansas that would recognize the right of business owners not to accept patronage from homosexual couples. According to the author, **“Since it is the state that is ultimately tasked to bring out the violent enforcers who effectuate the discriminating intents of public accommodations providers, the state literally cannot get out of the way.”** (6)

Like most who subscribe to the religion of statism, the author of that article imputes omnipresence to the State: It permeates everything, gives to everyone life, breath, and all things, and in it we live, move, and have our being. (7) It cannot **“get out of the way”** because it is the supernal essence of virtue; absent the benevolent intervention of the State and its enlightened emissaries, violence and oppression would thrive. At least, that's the universe as perceived by devotees of the cult of the State, who assume that those who minister in its name were immaculately conceived and thus capable of regulating social affairs in harmony with an abstract ideal of justice.

What such people either cannot understand, or will not admit, is that anti-discrimination laws *depend* on threat and practice of state violence. This isn't true of a business owner who merely declines the patronage of someone he finds objectionable.

Without naming Mussolini explicitly, the Salon contributor begins with the assumption found in the fascist dictator's totalitarian formula: Everything within the state, nothing outside the state, nothing against the state. He does explicitly invoke Lenin's statement that the basic political question is **“who does what to whom.”**

So according to Salon, **“liberty”** is a gift of the state, and libertarians are heretics because they reject Lenin's doctrines. Historically, heretic-hunters of the statist variety have been much more intolerant, and immeasurably more murderous, than those devoted to religious ideals of a more conventional kind.

The legislatures of Kansas, Arizona, Idaho, and other states have considered measures intended to protect the religious liberty of business owners who do not want to participate in **“same-sex”** pseudo-marriages. So far, all of those measures have been shouted down by a coalition of militant homosexual rights advocates and state-favored corporate interests: Arizona Governor Jan Brewer was intimidated into vetoing that state's measure by threats of a commercial boycott, including the loss of an upcoming Super Bowl. (8) This demonstrates

the fact that the cultural left has effectively completed what Gramscian revolutionaries have called the **“Long March through the institutions.”** But they won’t be finished until after they have destroyed any protection for private property and created a state that will hold **“every thought captive”** to the will of the State, as interpreted by the elite who speaks on its behalf.

This cultural revolution has made extensive use of a tactic that could be described as **“victimization”** – a type of passive aggression in which appeals to pity are deployed in tandem with threats of officially sanctioned retaliation, up to and including physical violence, against dissenters and refractories.

No morally responsible person believes that homosexuals, or anybody else, should be the victims of criminal violence. Most Christians understand that abhorrence for sexual deviance, and a desire to promote sound morality, should not translate into hatred for homosexuals.

But the cultural revolutionaries who exploit this issue aren’t satisfied by this moral understanding: They are demanding that the state reconfigure marriage and the family – institutions that transcend politics – and suppress the property rights of business owners who do not want to participate in so-called same-sex weddings and similar rituals. The argument made on behalf of this imposition is that businesses, unlike religious congregations, have public obligations that the government can enforce.

That distinction will soon disappear. The next phase of the revolution is playing out in England, where two millionaire homosexuals have filed a lawsuit to compel the leaders of a church to perform their supposed wedding. (9)

Barrie Drewitt-Barlow and his **“partner,”** Tony, **“hoped to get married in his local church, St. John the Baptist, in Danbury,”** relates an article in the Chelmsford Weekly News. However, the Church of England – displaying atypical commitment to a Biblical principle — refused to accommodate the wealthy couple’s fantasy. Furthermore, England’s **“Marriage Bill,”** which embraces the fiction that two people of the same sex can be a married couple, recognizes the right of religious organizations not to solemnize such arrangements.

This provision doesn’t prohibit same-sex couples to indulge their marital fantasies. It doesn’t permit them to compel unwilling clergymen to participate in them, and this is unacceptable to privileged bullies of the sort represented by Barrie and Tony.

“We feel we have the right as parishioners in our village to utilize the church we attend to get married,” pouted Barrie. (10)

His selection of verb is telling: He and his friend seek to **“utilize”** the church. An appropriate functional synonym would be **“exploit.”** To that end they have **“launched a legal challenge**

to the Government's decision to allow some religious groups to opt out of marrying same-sex couples."

There is another significant verb: The Government at present will **"allow"** some religious congregations the temporary and revocable privilege of being true to their convictions.

Barrie and Tony are free to find a clergyman willing to participate in their burlesque of matrimony – but finding a willing cleric won't do: They won't be **"free"** *until the State claims the power to compel the unwilling to serve them*. This is exactly the same totalitarian reasoning behind U.S. **"anti-discrimination"** measures that punish business owners who are unwilling to participate in "same-sex" wedding services.

At present, government policy in the U.S. distinguishes between **"public accommodations"** – meaning commercial ventures that advertise to the public in general – and religious bodies. This is a fleeting dispensation: Once the cultural revolutionaries have consolidated their current conquests, they will continue their implacable campaign to break *every* institution to the saddle of the State.

Those who resist will be relentlessly demonized as enemies of all that is humane and decent, subjected to government-abetted ostracism, financial retaliation, officially imposed fines, and eventually threats of imprisonment – or worse. Every act of State-consecrated harassment, persecution, and violence will be extolled as a victory in the cause of **"tolerance."**

At some point, however, the pit that was dug for peaceful believers will mutate into something much larger and more dangerous. What we are seeing is the creation of a social singularity – an expanding, infinitely dense mass of malicious hatred for God and man that will indiscriminately devour everybody. This is what happened in Revolutionary France, Soviet Russia, and National Socialist Germany — the latter of which was summoned into existence with the help of homosexual activists who were then slaughtered en masse in the **"Night of Long Knives"** purge, or sent to the death camps with other enemies of the state they had helped to construct. (11)

Although he would object to seeing his aphorism enlisted in the cause of defending the Christian faith, Voltaire's observation is appropriate to this discussion:

"Those who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities."

Claiming that two men or two women can be conjoined in a fashion worthy of the word "marriage" is facially absurd – and the effort to compel people to accept and celebrate that absurdity will lead to atrocities *that will not spare many who profess to believe it to be true*.

Guillaume Francois Berthier, a contemporary of Voltaire who strove to preserve what Voltaire sought to destroy, noted that **"The custom has been established to call 'philosophers' those who attack religion, and 'persecutorS' those who battle for its defense."** This anticipated Lenin's formula: One side was the **"who,"** the other the **"whom"**

– and the **“what”** that was being done was considered inconsequential. All that mattered was that the **“right”** people were in a position to inflict their will on the **“wrong”** ones.

“Unbelievers, you accuse us of a fanaticism which we do not have a semblance of possessing, while the hatred which animates you against our religion inspires in you a fanaticism whose too apparent excesses are inconceivable,” Berthier observed just a few decades before the French Revolution would validate his point. (12) Though Berthier couldn't conceive of the tragedy unleashed by that revolution, those horrors were merely a prelude to the impending age of persecution.

References

- 1) Exodus 20:15.
- 2) Friedrich Nietzsche, Thus Spoke Zarathustra; see — <http://praxeology.net/zara.htm>
- 3) Karl Marx, Manifesto of the Communist Party (1848), Chapter II: Proletarians and Communists.
- 4) “Gay Hair Stylist Drops New Mexico Governor as Client because she Opposes Same-Sex Marriage,” New York Daily News, February 22, 2012.
- 5) For details about the case, go to — <https://www.alliancedefendingfreedom.org/Home/Detail/4333>
- 6) “Libertarians who don't understand liberty: Why the Kansas anti-gay bill is so absurd,” Salon, February 18, 2014.
- 7) Paraphrased from Acts 17:25-28.
- 8) “Fate of Arizona anti-gay measure rests with Jan Brewer,” CNN, February 25, 2014.
- 9) “Gay dads campaign for church wedding,” Chelmsford Weekly News, August 20, 2013.
- 10) Ibid.
- 11) For two detailed treatments of the role of homosexuality in Nazi Germany – from overlapping, but very different perspectives – see “The Pink Triangle: The Nazi War against Homosexuals,” by Richard Plant, and “The Pink Swastika: Homosexuality and the Nazi Party,” by Scott Lively and Kevin Abrams. Significantly, the second book has been effectively banned.
- 12) Guillaume Francois-Berthier, Journal de Trevoux, July 1759; quoted in Will and Ariel Durant, The Age of Voltaire, pg. 757.

Written by William Grigg

What is the origin of the tragic events taking place in the Middle East? I believe the current crisis is contrived because almost all the major events that took place during the twentieth century were orchestrated by the Financial Elite that rules the world.

Brandon Smith addressed that subject in a recent article titled: "**Ukraine Crisis: Just Another Globalist-Engineered Powder Keg.**" He wrote:

"With the exception of a few revolutions, most wars are instigated and controlled by financial elites, manipulating governments on both sides of the game to produce a preconceived result. The rise of National Socialism in Germany, for instance, was largely funded by corporate entities based in the U.S., including Rockefeller giant Standard Oil, J.P. Morgan, and even IBM, which built the collating machines specifically used to organize Nazi extermination camps, the same machines IBM representatives serviced on site at places like Auschwitz. As a public figure, Adolph Hitler was considered a joke by most people in German society, until...the Nazi Party received incredible levels of corporate investment. This aid was most evident in what came to be known as the Keppler Fund created through the Keppler Circle, a group of interests with contacts largely based in the U.S.

George W. Bush's grandfather, Prescott Bush, used his position as director of the New York-based Union Banking Corporation to launder money for the Third Reich throughout the war. After being exposed and charged for trading with the enemy, the case against Bush magically disappeared in a puff of smoke, and the Bush family went on to become one of the most powerful political forces in America."

What happened to Adolph Hitler and his henchmen after World War II ended? The OSS, the CIA, MI6 (British Intelligence) and a satanic cell in the Vatican, helped them escape to South America.

To document that fact, order the following audio 4-CD-sets:

Did Hitler Escape?, Operation Paperclip, The War Against the Jews.

Radio Liberty offers several books on this subject:

America's Nazi Secret, The Secret War Against the Jews, Grey Wolf, Hunting Hitler, The Power Elite and The Secret Nazi Plan.

I believe we are entering a period of conflict and turmoil. I hope you are preparing for the difficult times that lie ahead.

Barbara and I appreciate your loyal support and your faithful prayers.

Yours in Christ,

Stanley Monteith