

molesting you! Such a concept of freedom would appear to be the sheerest nonsense.

It is true that we Americans enjoy more freedom—less legal and illegal molestation—than the people of any other nation. But no person in America is completely free as long as violence—under the power of government or otherwise—is used to restrict or to control or to direct the activities or income of even one peaceful person. To whatever extent any person is forbidden to trade or to exchange ideas with you, to the same extent you are thereby deprived of the opportunity to trade or to exchange ideas with him.

To repeat, freedom is a relationship of mutual non-molestation among persons. Yet, the overwhelming majority of the world's people have always thought of freedom as being the legal right of some persons to impose their wills and viewpoints upon other persons. And they still do. Let us examine a few popular examples of this at home and abroad.

Houses and Subsidies

WHEN THE RUSSIAN government builds houses for some persons at the expense of other persons, it always does it in the good name of freedom. But it cannot logically be called freedom because the process of governmental housing describes a relationship

among persons wherein some persons are undeniably molesting other persons against their wills at some point within the process.

When the English government grants subsidies to certain manufacturers or farmers or other favored groups, it claims to be advancing freedom for the English people. Actually, complete freedom ceases to exist among the persons involved when government rewards some persons at the expense of other persons.

It may be alleged that while a subsidy decreases the freedom of the persons from whom the money is taken, surely it doesn't decrease the freedom of the persons who get it. This is the ever-popular "Robin Hood" concept of freedom—a person can be "free" even though he exists by doing violence to others. The person who accepts that idea of freedom can sincerely advocate complete government ownership and control in the name of freedom. And it is worth noting that the advocate of government ownership—whatever the degree may be—is always quite happy to specify who shall do the taking, whom it shall be taken from, and who shall be rewarded with the confiscated production.

Controls and Democracy

WHEN THE GOVERNMENT of Argentina initiates price controls, wage controls, rent con-