

anyone who does not believe in the authoritarianism of a majority any more than of a Stalin—to anyone who believes in the right to life and the right to honestly acquired property—no moral absolution is gained by legalization. Taking the honest fruits of someone else's labor without his consent is evil.

SHORTSIGHTED VIEW

THOSE WHO think only materialistically will argue that the stealing of a loaf of bread is a loss to the person from whom it is taken but a gain to the thief, if the thief "gets away with it." This is a shortsighted view. The person from whom the loaf of bread is taken loses only a loaf of bread. But the one who takes the loaf without the owner's consent loses the respect of all mankind—loses the only claim he had to freedom: his integrity! Man's meaning, his chance of realizing those potentialities peculiarly his—civilization, evolution, the trend to Godliness—all are founded on integrity. Without integrity, all else is lost.

Unless one believes in authoritarianism, unless one believes that man should rule over men, unless one believes that some men should cast other men in their little images, it isn't possible to see other than harm done to the person with "need" by the compulsory taking of someone else's property.

On the person using compulsion

Of the three classifications of persons involved in social leveling by compulsion, the authoritarian—the one who administers the compulsion—has been too little diagnosed. It isn't difficult to understand the discouragement and the destruction that come to the person from whom honest gains are confiscated. It is hardly less difficult to understand the eroding of the moral fiber of those who become the "beneficiaries" of confiscated property. But what about the "humanitarian with the guillotine"? The well-meaning social reformer who uses the police force as his means of persuasion? The dictator who grabs power illegally or the leader who strives for "a mandate from the people"?

The person who attempts by force to direct or rearrange the *creative* activities of others is in a very real sense a slave-master. And here is the crux of it: A slave-master becomes a slave himself when he enslaves others. If another person is pinning me on my back, he is as permanently fastened on top of me as I am under him. True, he can, by force, keep me from being creative; but in so doing, his own energies must be diverted from creative actions to destructive actions. One who only destroys is himself destroyed. This is the same as saying that he who practices only evil is himself evil. Man's usefulness to himself, to other men, to God's creative purpose is to be