

TAX IS THEFT!

Sure feels like it this close to April 15, right? But, of course that slogan is just hyperbole: an exaggeration. After all, we must pay our taxes? It's sort of a duty, no? Look, suppose no one paid their taxes, where would streets and sewers and social security and post offices come from? Not to mention police and marines and missiles and space shots? No doubt about it, taxation is necessary, so even if it is theft...

Think about that for a second—"even if it is theft...?". Theft is universally accepted as an immoral word. Assuming all the aforementioned services are moral and desirable (and *that* is hotly debated about all of them), how can moral ends be achieved only through immoral means? "Well, surely, nothing right can be only done wrongly; there is a right way and a wrong way of doing anything," you might say. But then there must be a right way of financing those necessary (moral) services. That is, taxation is not *necessary*, not if it is immoral.

O.K., O.K., but even if we all hate paying taxes, *that* does not mean it is wrong. There are a lot of things we don't like to do, but we have to, anyways.

There are indeed, and you are right, *that* does not make it wrong. It is right or wrong, no matter what we feel about it. It is theft, or not, no matter what our "feelings" about it at the moment. So consider this.

A man sends you a letter saying your neighbours are contributing to his fund. This "fund" performs many good acts, he claims, and perhaps he lists a few. Please send in your contribution, and get it in by the middle of the month. To assist you in deciding your contribution, which should be based on your income (or maybe purchases, or how much your house is worth, or something else, or some combination), a handy table for easy calculation is provided.

Nothing wrong here. Junk mail, perhaps; a trifle irritating. Maybe you even agree with most of the services the fund finances, and nobody could disagree with all of them. But say you choose either to ignore the letter, or send less than your assigned quota. He writes again, expressing his regret at your omission. He mentions that he has means to get your "fair share"—after all, everybody else paid their share, except for a few scoundrels.

Sounds like a threat there, and it does not look like this guy is running a very benevolent fund. Maybe you even send him back a letter telling him to stop bothering you or you will be forced to take legal action.

Now he sends more threatening letters, and finally a few of his "friends" drop by to impress upon you the meaning of your not coughing up. At this time you decide it is time for help. You look around for an agency to give you protection—a bodyguard, maybe. But there is only one in town, and those goons outside are already working for it. As you try to stop them from seizing your furniture (or bank account or whatever) they pull their guns on you. You say, "You are acting like thieves!"

"No," they answer, "you are the crook. You are withholding your share for the Fund."

"But I never agreed to pay your 'fund'. Let us go to a judge and let him decide whether I owe anything."

"Fine," they say (and is that a smile curling their lips?). "Come to the Fund office."

"Well," you reply, "not your judge, or even mine, to be fair. Let us try to agree on an impartial one."

"But," they laugh, "the Fund does not allow any other judges. Don't worry, though; if you paid more than your quota, why, you'll get the rest back."

"But I do not want to pay anything," you wail. They brandish their guns. "This is nothing but a hold-up. You're thieves!"

And they are.

There are a lot more arguments which are brought up at this point. Some samples: 1.) Your friends got together and voted to steal from you, and asked you to vote, too. You had your chance, right? 2.) The Fund is limited, and only steals some of your property. It pays its goons to fight the Bad Fund across the river, which would take even more of your property. Of course, you could not hire your own bodyguard at what you and they agree on. Why not? Well, *they* can't be trusted—but the Fund can. 3.) Widows and orphans would starve if the Fund did not feed them. And many more.

If you want the answers, and more importantly, to be able to answer them yourself, then get in touch with us. We do not believe in theft, whatever it is called, or whoever does it. We are libertarians. And we are allying.

NEW

LIBERTARIAN

ALLIANCE



—National Secretary: Samuel Edward Konkin III

National Tax Strike Coalition

This is the original 1973 NLA flyer that was republished in 1987 as MLL Issue Pamphlet #2. This and other pamphlets, books, and back issues of New Libertarian and The Agorist Quarterly are available from:

KoPubCo.com

TAX IS THEFT!

TAX IS THEFT!

- Keep what you earn!
- Plead 5th Amendment on your forms.
- Rally in protest April 15!

NEW LIBERTARIAN ALLIANCE