

we desire for ourselves, we desire for all those who are oppressed by the yoke of tyranny; we desire that our glorious army should, if necessary, again be the army of liberty."

You see that the gentle hand of The State — that good hand which gives and distributes — will be very busy under the direction of these reformers. You think perhaps it will be the same with the rough hand — that hand which penetrates and takes from our pockets?

Do NOT deceive yourselves. The politicians would not know their trade, if they had not the art, when showing the gentle hand, to conceal the rough one. Their reign will assuredly be the jubilee of the taxpayers!

"It is luxuries, not necessities," they say, "which ought to be taxed."

Won't it be wonderful that the treasury, in overwhelming us with favors, will content itself with curtailing our luxuries!

This is not all. This party of reformers intends that "taxation shall lose its oppressive character, and be only an act of brotherhood." Good heavens! I know it is the fashion to thrust brotherhood in everywhere, but I did not imagine it would ever be put into the proclamations of the tax gatherer.

Well, I ask the impartial reader, is this not childishness, and more than that, dangerous childishness? Is it not inevitable that we shall have revolution after revolution, if it is once decided never to stop till this contradiction is realized: "Give nothing to The State and receive much from it?"

Citizens! At all times, two political systems have been in existence, and each can justify itself with good reasons. According to one of them, The State should do a lot, but then it should take a lot. According to the other, this twofold activity ought to be limited. We have to choose between these two systems.

But the third system, which partakes of both the others, and consists in exacting everything from The State without giving it anything, is chimerical, absurd, childish, contradictory, and dangerous. Those who advocate such a system are only flattering and deceiving you, or at least are deceiving themselves.

As for us, we consider that The State is and ought to be nothing whatever but *community force* organized, not to be an instrument of oppression and mutual plunder among citizens, but, on the contrary, to guarantee to each his own, and to cause justice and security to reign.

The Hot Fight Over The Right To Work

Edward Maher

IN MAY, 1953, fourteen resolute *hombres* in the State of Texas remembered the Alamo and resolved to go down fighting if need be rather than surrender to overwhelming odds. The battleground was a court of justice and the force arrayed against them was a group of powerful nation-wide unions, backed by the authority of federal law. The point at issue was whether it is permissible under the Constitution of the United States to require people to join labor unions to get or keep their jobs.

This question has become hotter this year than a packed airliner waiting to be cleared for take off, and the temperature is building up steadily both nationally and in many state capitals. Eighteen of the states now have laws which forbid compulsory unionism in any form, and efforts are afoot currently to pass similar laws in over a dozen more states. Their proponents call these "right-to-work" laws; organized labor says the real objective is the "right-to-wreck" unions. Several other court cases,

in addition to the one in Texas, are in the works and are expected to reach the U. S. Supreme Court before they are finally settled.

The federal Taft-Hartley Act, governing the bulk of labor-management relations, prohibits the negotiating of "closed shop" agreements between unions and employers. The Act does allow the "union shop," under which nonmembers and new employees are required to apply for union membership within a specified time, usually 30 days. When the union shop is coupled, as it often is, with "preferential hiring," or hiring through the union, the effect is the same as that of the closed shop. Section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley Act recognized the right of states to guard against such coercive unionism: "Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or Territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or Territorial law."

Translated and condensed by Mallory Cross Johnson of the Foundation staff, from "L'État" in *Sophismes Économiques*, Volume I. Paris: Guillaumin, 1878.

Mr. Maher, former editor in chief of LIBERTY, has also written for THE SATURDAY EVENING POST, THE READER'S DIGEST, THE FREEMAN and other magazines.