

and tax collectors take money from some people and give it to others.

And yet the same principle or natural law is violated in each case; force, or the threat of force, is used against persons to make them surrender their honestly acquired property against their wills.

Democracy

AT THIS POINT, most persons will use the word "democracy" to justify this procedure. They will maintain that it is morally correct to take another person's money if the majority of the people is in favor of it.

It seems to me that legalities and moralities are here being confused. Apparently we have now drifted so far from the concept of eternal truth that we have come to believe that the way to determine "right" is to vote on it; that what is legal is automatically morally right; that what is illegal is thereby automatically morally wrong; that truth is determined by majority decision; *that might makes right*.

But legalities do not determine moralities. Might does not make right. The fact that 51 per cent of the people may vote to take other people's money and give it to poor widows with children, does indeed make that act legal. But the act itself is still thievery — the taking of a person's property without his

consent — and all the man-made laws in the world cannot change its immorality.

Robin Hood and Jesse James were common robbers, even though in our literature and movies they have been pictured as heroes because they sometimes shared their loot with the poor. Admittedly, the robber who takes my money at the point of a gun and gives part of it to a worthy charity should not be condemned any more than the people who elect an agent to do the same thing to me on some sort of a percentage basis.

No person has a moral right to satisfy his charitable instincts with money taken by force from its rightful owner. Theft is theft, and the number of persons involved — or the mechanism used to relieve a person of his money against his will — does not change that fact.

Render unto Caesar . . .

A LONG TIME AGO, Jesus Christ indicated that a person should render unto government that which properly belongs to government, and unto God that which properly belongs to God. Unfortunately — or maybe fortunately? — He did not choose to say which is which. Ever since then, much as they had before, men have argued and fought and killed in an effort to determine the proper functions of government. A hundred years