

New Liberty

Not the Daughter, But the Mother of Order - Proudhon

Vol. I

Storrs, Connecticut – December 2, 2008

No. 3

Unplugging Yourself From the Feeding Tube of Mainstream Health Care

If for some reason you find yourself watching network television during the day, evening, or night, odds are you will have seen several ads for prescription drugs. You know, the ones with awkward-sounding names, catchy jingles and anecdotes, and more side effects than the disease they are meant to treat. Additionally, you probably have noticed by now that America is the most obese nation in the world, and that the leading causes of death in this country include heart disease, diabetes, and various forms of cancer.

Why is this? How have we been led astray? It is easy to blame to the government, the FDA, the drug companies, and the medical field. While they do deserve their fair share of the blame, *we* the people must take responsibility for what we have done, or at least have allowed to be done to our country and to our bodies. Yes, perhaps entrusting the government to “take care of us” was a mistake, but we also must examine our degrading cultural view of health that threatens not only our world image but our life expectancy.

The mainstream media and politicians actually do have great concern for the nation’s healthcare system, but, much like their approach to our ailing economy, they attempt to alleviate the symptoms and not treat the disease. While the left and the right debate over socialization or privatization of the system, the future of Medicare and Medicaid, and other “pressing” issues, the American people are suffering and losing their vitality. The system that they simply seek to tweak, not overhaul, is one of pharmaceutical companies in bed with big government, morally whoring themselves by violating the Hippocratic oath for government handouts and tax breaks.

The medical field, hand in hand with the media’s endless system of propaganda and brainwashing the minds of Americans, asserts that all health-related problems can be solved *instantly* with a dollar and a pill. Ignoring the fact that nature probably won’t take introducing a foreign artificially-synthesized chemical into the body lightly, it has been a tried and true fact that any form of success requires hard work. One does not simply inherit a fully healthy life; it requires consistent effort and tough choices. Our culture, one which emphasizes speed and convenience due to the ever-increasing opportunity cost of time, leaves little room for fitness and a healthy diet. Instead, we have progressively lowered our standards to sitting in front of a computer screen eating fast food. *But don’t worry*, say medical ‘experts’ observing our aversive lifestyles, *we have a pill to keep you healthy!*

Now, I am *not* saying that all drugs are purposeless and malevolent or that our medical standards haven’t contributed anything to society. I am simply stating that we take too many unnatural bodily risks with the expectation that the government and/or pharmaceutical companies will bail us out when we’ve gone too far. What we should be doing instead is taking a more active role in keeping ourselves healthy. Education is critical to supporting this lifestyle. Highly credible and effective styles of natural and alternative medicine exist, but they are snubbed out and marginalized by the profit-seeking drug companies.

The moral of the story is simply, do not entrust your life and your well-being to the system. In an article as short as this, I have not the real estate to provide every health alternative, every mainstream abuse of power, nor every profit-driven corruption. Educate yourself, do research on your own, and take responsibility for your own actions, and your own body. Make better choices to preserve your health, and ignore those so-called ‘experts’ that tell you otherwise. For, as John Stuart Mill so eloquently put it in *On Liberty*, “Over himself, over his mind and his body, the individual is sovereign.”

RYAN SAFNER

Perspectives

The more corrupt the state, the more it legislates. – *Tacitus*

But when the legislator is finally elected — ah! then indeed does the tone of his speech undergo a radical change. The people are returned to passiveness, inertness, and unconsciousness; the legislator enters into omnipotence. Now it is for him to initiate, to direct, to propel, and to organize. Mankind has only to submit; the hour of despotism has struck. We now observe this fatal idea: The people who, during the election, were so wise, so moral, and so perfect, now have no tendencies whatever; or if they have any, they are tendencies that lead downward into degradation. – *Frederic Bastiat*

In order to get power and retain it, it is necessary to love power; but love of power is not connected with goodness but with qualities that are the opposite of goodness, such as pride, cunning, and cruelty. – *Leo Tolstoy*

Here’s your enemy for this week, the government says. And some gullible Americans click their heels and salute — often without knowing who or even where the enemy of the week is. – *Charley Reese*

The ultimate result of shielding men from the effects of folly is to fill the world with fools. – *Herbert Spencer*

government intervention, a direct force against the free-minded spirit. This sounds more along the lines of equality enforced through the state, which is not equality at all, for the state must regulate the changes that will be made in favor of women, leading to the silent overturn of the freedom of many men.

The state has already been instituting the overthrow of the patriarch. The state is notorious for granting an overwhelming majority of mothers custody of their children. The involvement of the welfare state is also aiding in this overthrow by giving single mothers the false impression that they can efficiently raise children alone under the stolen labor from taxpayers. Not only does the state support the single mother in a custody struggle, but the state also educates that same child. The public school system, full of governmental obedience and feminist rhetoric, continues the perpetuation of the feminist movement. It becomes blatantly obvious when your high school English teacher makes the class sing *I am Woman* for all to hear after handing everyone the lyrics. Looking back, I would not have been surprised if she tried to get the few guys present in the class to put on dresses and sing falsetto. By taking cultural education out of the hands of families, vulnerable children are left exposed to the state and its interests.

Feminism has also pushed the issue of equality of women in the workplace. The feminist movement has caused a large increase in the number of women in the labor force

Gunmen and Bagmen



Thanks to bradspangler.com for the inspiration!

Fundamentally Flawed Feminism

Feminism — the theory of the political, economic, and social equality of the sexes. Yes, it may sound good in theory, but feminism puts a rope around the individual’s neck. Fulfilling these goals either constrains a specific class or the society at large. Some individuals must be sacrificed for the betterment of the female “race” resulting in these individuals becoming responsible for the current atrocities against women. Finally, most modern feminists seek to employ equality of the sexes through government intervention, an unattainable goal in a free society.

Feminism can be viewed as the veil for the socialist state. It portrays the transfer of power, from the people to the state, as equality for all. American feminist icon Gloria Steinem once said, “Overthrowing capitalism is too small for us. We must overthrow the whole...patriarch!” The overthrow of this patriarch aims to employ equality between the sexes, which is an impossibility. While capitalism may project the inequalities between individuals, a free society would not sew them together. Rather, these differences come about from the individual abilities people have when making their own “free” decisions regarding what they wish to consume and/or produce. The only way that these differences can be minimized is by restrictions placed on individuals through

throughout the years by touting that women have every right to be part of it. I am not saying that women should not be part of the labor force in any way, for that would impede individuals in a truly free society. I am merely making the connection that the increase in the labor force contributes to the increased revenue the state gets through its oppressive forms of taxation, which it then uses for those same social programs created to start the whole thing. Furthermore, the issuing of equal wages to women in the workplace has not been effective since feminists are still arguing the subject. If this becomes effective it will impose grave consequences on society due to increased unemployment. Having the state control the wages of workers will in fact cause more people, including women, to be out of jobs. Businesses will not be able to pay these higher wages to its employees since there would be no enforcement of higher sales and revenues for the executives to write these checks. Where is this money going to come from? As wages result in increased costs, layoffs will be the only option.

Women are not benefiting from this deal. In fact, many related issues that government enforces, such as affirmative action, welfare, and even aid to giant corporations, causes only more resentment and hostility toward these same classes that were supposed to be lifted free of these burdens. Feminists should not be

(continued on back, column three)

Uconn Students for Liberty

Meets Thursday in Student Union Room 312 at
7:00 PM
Open to Everyone

Website: www.uconnliberty.wordpress.com
Send all letters to newlibertyeditor@gmail.com

Issued Fortnightly at 50 Cents a Copy
"Your Ticket to Freedom" - Alex Bernier

Obama and State Aggression in Violation of Libertarian Principles

The following article appeared in and is reprinted from *Prometheus Journal* (prometheus-journal.com)

The recent election of Barack Obama was certainly an historic moment for the United States, but for those who carry an affinity for the concept of freedom, its symbolism is rather disheartening. While the majority of libertarians (even at more traditionally mainstream outlets such as Reason Magazine) rightly preferred Obama to that neocon sycophant, John McCain, this election witnessed the triumph of a man who campaigned on the promise of a *benevolent activist government*. From the libertarian perspective, there are scant words in the English language more frightening to emanate from a politician's mouth.

Yes, Obama's political character of spirited statism poses some major problems for the cause of liberty. The state is, by definition, a coercive entity that operates through the use of force; its supposed benevolence is undermined by its history of cruelty and disruption of the natural social order. To place one's trust in the state is to the ignore the context by which it maintains and asserts its full authority. Furthermore, the use of compulsion is in clear violation of one of the foundational principles of natural-rights libertarianism, the non-aggression axiom. Murray Rothbard, the standard-bearer of 20th century market anarchism, went as far as to cast the it as the *sine qua non* of libertarian theory. To summarize the spirit of it briefly, the non-aggression principle dictates that initiatory force enacted against another is fundamentally wrong, and should be opposed by any libertarian worth his salt.

While any action by the U.S. government rests on the use of coercive authority drawn from the collection of taxes (or similar means), it stands to reason that there are different *degrees* of force, with the act of warfare being one of the most grotesque expressions of the state's violent nature. Obama's willingness to use this initiatory force abroad to "secure our freedoms" violates any interpretation of non-aggression principle. His foreign policy is that of the vulgar authoritarian, marked by interventionism and maintenance of American hegemony abroad.

Aside from his calls for increasing military presence in Afghanistan, Obama has made veiled threats toward Pakistan and Russia, with explicit ones directed at Iran. Exacerbating this potential for the immiseration of millions under America's iron fist, youth support is more feverish for the incoming president than any time since the presidency of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The frightening implications that follow from this are numerous: chief among them is that many Americans will be far more receptive to proposals toward the doctrine of war under an Obama administration, acting as willing sheep for the American empire.

Of course, the use of coercive initiatory force is a far cry from the principles upon which liberalism stands, but this fact doesn't deter Obama, who manages to get everything backwards in the following:

The Founders recognized that there were seeds of anarchy in the idea of individual freedom, an intoxicating danger in the idea of equality, for if everyone is truly free, without the constraints of birth or rank or an inherited social order - if my notion of faith is no better or worse than yours, and my notions of truth and goodness and beauty are as true and good and beautiful as yours - then how can we ever hope to form a society that coheres? (The Audacity of Hope, 86-87)

There certainly is anarchy in the notion of individual freedom, since liberty taken to its logical conclusion can only result in the rejection of all rulers, but the wording in the above passage clearly intends to display lawlessness as the inevitable result of "too much" freedom. Why is this so? Without the power structure that enables the consistent exploitation of others, alternative orders would necessarily and spontaneously develop, springing from the innate nature of mankind.

Yet if this nature is savage and inclined toward brutality as described by Thomas Hobbes, why would it be any more logical to support a system

would it be any more logical to support a system that feeds into it by further empowering the strong through political means? Fortunately, I do not believe that the only thing that prevents you from killing your neighbor is the threat of retaliatory force, but the anarchists have always maintained society has the right to protect the greater community, if necessary.

Regardless, Obama's negative view of humanity's unfettered potential is further evidenced by his abject rejection of social equality, or the idea that people should be treated without deference to societal status. In fact, Obama's writing (see above) and recent repudiation of his supposed left-wing sympathies indicate that his so-called progressivism is merely concealed communitarianism. His acceptance or indifference toward a concrete, hierarchical social order combined with the stated willingness to use force stands in dark contrast to Lockean-based liberalism or any of its derivatives.

His economic proposals are similarly opposed to the libertarian preference for decentralization. While it is true that his short-term plans were superior to those of McCain in that it certainly isn't any *less* "laissez-faire" to remedy the accumulated ills of massive state intervention via progressive taxation than to maintain the status quo, Obama continues to fill his staff with Wall Street insiders in a desperate attempt to maintain corporate capitalism through increased state power at the expense of the American citizenry. As such, his repeated appeals to the wisdom of the free market (undoubtedly to court the distinct American individualist character) are exposed as nothing more than a sham. Rather, his policy of maintaining Keynesian principles fails to recognize that the system was very nearly *designed* to collapse at some indeterminable point in the future (hint: the solution to over-accumulation is not more accumulation) due to its neglect to take into account long-term effects. After all, according to the famed economist John Maynard Keynes himself, "In the long-run we're all dead." Well, we're fast approaching the long run, and the living seem to prove an exception to Keynes' rule.

Whether its his apparent willingness to use force so as to violate the non-aggression principle, his acceptance of the justice of an inherited social inequality, or his clinging to eroding state-supported economic theories, there exists a clear separation between the notion of liberty and the plans of Barack Obama. While we may celebrate this election as a representation of America overcoming the obstacle of lingering bigotry, there is nothing about an Obama administration to get libertarians optimistic for the scaled reduction of the hypertrophic state. That change will have to arise from external sources acting in opposition to the government's desires.

RASKOLNIK

So How's The Media Treatin' Ya?

Throughout history, societies have all shared similar ways of keeping people united and bound together through their various belief and value systems. This powerful collaboration of our beliefs, values, and traditions is referred to as our culture and it is the glue that holds together the very foundation of our society. An interesting enquiry many people often have is, "Where exactly does all of our culture come from?" In past societies culture was often maintained primarily through the institutions of religion and government. These institutions created the basis of what people believed about the world, how people should behave, and what they should strive for in life. Yet with the changing of the times thanks to technological improvements, these two institutions have made way for a new kid on the block which has surpassed them both in the department of creating and reinforcing culture.

What I speak of is the mainstream media: the collective body of print, radio, television, and film. These mediums act in unison to bring you news, entertainment, and above all, general information and ways of thinking. The media helps to reinforce the "norm" in society by consistently showcasing certain viewpoints or certain images and scenarios that may be in the mainstream culture, thereby reinforcing them. For example, many sitcoms consistently show men and women in couples while never showing homosexuals together but only by themselves. This subconsciously reinforces what the "normal" couple is in our culture and ignores homosexual couples, to the extent that when we see them, it feels like an oddity and something to which we are unaccustomed.

The media can also show things from a certain point of view or perspective that can skew its meaning or importance completely; this is often called a "spin" on the story. For example if a news outlet is reporting on a sporting event where one team wins by a large margin over the other, the story can be presented from one of two angles. First it can be presented from the angle that the winning team did an excellent job and dominated or it can be presented in a way that says that the losing team played badly and lost the game for themselves. Now although both perspectives hold truth to a certain degree, if you show the story from just one of the possible angles you can change how people think about it. If you were just to say that the winning team dominated and did an excellent job, ignoring the bad play by the losing team, then people may start to believe the winning team is better than it really is.

It is precisely in this way that the media often skews stories to just one side of the possible perspectives in order to service their needs. Have you ever noticed how most headlines presented on local news networks often end with the newscaster trying to suggest that the issue at hand could somehow affect you. Stories are often presented in the following manner: "Local shooting in Hartford. How do you know if you're safe?", or "Could you be living next a terrorist? Find out at 11". These types of headlines are skewed so that the news station can attract peoples' attention, resulting in more advertising and ultimately more profit for the station. While many people would say that the station is doing just what is necessary to compete, there has to be something said for just good old fashioned honest reporting, which is what we are not getting.

Although these problems presented are troubling there is still one type of media bias that is the most disheartening and the hardest to account for. Now because the majority of Americans are busy with their work schedules and family life, they rely entirely on these news sources to inform them of the things which are going on in the world around them, but what if the news doesn't report something or puts minimal emphasis on it? Then the average American will either never hear about it or will not think twice about what is going on. So while the media may only talk about the U.S. casualties in Iraq they fail to ever report the countless dead Iraqis or the number of Iraqis humiliated or tortured (in violation of the Geneva Conventions) at the hands of our government.

When you step back and see who really controls the mass media, the agenda becomes quite clear. All of our mass media is owned and controlled at the top by a handful of huge conglomerations. This media consolidation puts the power of all the commercial radio, television, and newspapers in the laps of those 118 individuals who sit on the boards of the big ten media conglomerations. These conglomerations include names such as Disney, Vivendi, Viacom, General Electric, and Time Warner while their boards include the like of former senators, congressmen, and others formerly in government, not to mention those who have sat on other big business boards such as that of Halliburton.

As you can see there seems to be a revolving door between those wealthy elite in government, media, or big corporate business. So why would the media not want to report certain things or have a bias? To keep you believing and thinking in what the elite want you to think and know. With this grim reality we must try to reclaim our media and support the free information that is still around such as the internet where any opinion can be presented and truth can truly be found.

With that said: Don't believe all they tell you, think for yourself, and fight the corporations trying to regulate and control our only remaining sources of free information!

PHIL REI

Fundamentally Flawed Feminism (cont.)

concerned with equality of the sexes. They should, in turn, move toward the direction of individual rights for all, not those of a certain class or group in society. This would lead towards freedom *from* the government oppression that causes these problems of inequality in the first place. There will always be arguable differences between male and female, white and black, old and young, blue-collar and white-collar, etc. However, these differences are not inequalities nor disabilities, but only labels attempting to illustrate our individuality. Whether we want to continue the state's magnification of these differences is up to us.

JEFF P