

needs.' Now, let's see how this would work in practice. You, John, would quit working because there would no longer be any incentive. You, Dick, wouldn't work because you would be provided something for nothing. In short, we would end up with a nonworking society. Work must be done, or we can't live. So we will require an 'authority' to try to induce work."

But this version, excellent as it is, emphasizes only two-thirds of the havoc wrought. It fails to show the impairment to the authoritarian himself.

The Marxian ideal presupposes the existence of three classifications of persons, the archetypes of which are: (1) the person with "ability"—that is, the one from whom honestly earned property is taken, (2) the person with "need"—that is, the one to whom someone else's property is given, and (3) the person in command of the instruments of compulsion—that is, the authoritarian.

If my contention is correct that all persons, in all three categories, suffer from social leveling by compulsion, then it follows that the whole caboodle of what are called "social gains" not only fail to benefit anyone but also must have a deteriorating effect on everyone. Here are the effects as I see them:

On the person with "ability"

There isn't much need to belabor what happens to the person with "ability." Almost everyone can clearly see the obvious injustice done to the person who has

the fruits of his labor taken away from him by force. The point is easy enough to comprehend when one thinks of his own property or income instead of the property or income of someone else. One both sees and feels the injustice of force used to deprive him of his own livelihood.

Suppose that I want to practice some act of charity. Millions of individuals have judgments on such matters, judgments based on intimate experiences and relationships which cannot be known by any governmental agency. But this voluntary act of charity—one of the highest expressions of brotherly love—is thwarted when my honestly acquired property is taken from me by government. What was mine has been declared not mine. Some usurper of authority over me has decreed a "social" claim upon my labor. Indeed, government now operates on the theory that it has a first lien on my income and property—even on my life itself. My freedom of choice is severely restricted. As a consequence, I am restrained from practicing the precepts of my own religion as reflected in my desire to be charitable. The state will practice charity for me! The state is to superimpose the principle of love! Love, through some quirk of reasoning, is to become a collective act of compulsion!

Then again, I may want to save that part of my income over and above my requirements for current living. Perhaps I may