

difficulty, i.e., "as we see it," for justice is a purely subjective concept.

I have no mathematical solution to the problem of a "just division" of cooperative effort. This issue has occupied the best minds of the human race since we first gathered into groups to work together. I know only that "turning it over to government" is not the answer. For how can an official (elected or appointed) set a fair price on this article without also rendering an official verdict on the merit of my ideas?

I'm convinced that justice (whatever it is) is more likely to exist in a private-ownership and profit-motivated arrangement than in a common-ownership and government-controlled arrangement.

My conviction is based on a relationship to which I can find no exception, either currently or historically. It is this: When private ownership and the profit-motivated market economy disappear, human freedom disappears at the same time. ☉

**Shawn A. Bozarth**

## Socialism in Theory and Practice

As seen through the eyes of a U.S. exchange student in Britain

ENGLAND is a hotbed of radicalism these days, mostly socialist and frequently violent. I was introduced to this brand of revolutionary socialism through one of my professors, an admitted Marxist who was sympathetic to the Socialist Workers' Party.

His argument was simple: "The capitalist system is flawed. Capitalists overproduce, rob the workers for the sake of profit and reduce them to paupers. Faced with increasing mis-

ery, the worker must sell himself to earn money for food. He has no liberty. He spends his life at a job and has no say as to his work conditions. When will this degradation end? When the working class rises up and controls the workplace."

I also observed the rising up of the working class that fall and winter of 1978-1979. A wildcat strike of 33 toolmakers at a British Leyland factory in Birmingham was sustained, without punishment, when the

other 3,000 workers in the plant threatened to strike in support of the 33. And this type of industrial action was not unusual in many unionized plants. The London *Times* stopped printing because workers refused to accept modern machinery that might have enabled the newspaper to earn a profit while meeting wage demands.

There were signs of a general strike by early 1979. Lorry drivers walked off the job. Soon there were shortages of food, especially milk for children. Dock workers struck and beat up fellow workers forced by financial necessity to try to cross picket lines. Some who did cross were subsequently expelled from the union and thus virtually barred from continuing their trade after the strike. Car bombings were reported. One newspaper was discouraged from publishing articles critical of union tactics because the newsprint union threatened to strike.

In Liverpool the morgue was closed by a strike of 12 gravediggers. London ambulance drivers struck for higher wages, leaving emergency patients to fend for themselves until the government called on the Army Medical Corps for help. Several London hospitals were so hit by walkouts of medical personnel that sick patients, including children, were unattended for hours. Striking union employees voted to search school children for sandwiches, hoping the hungry youngsters would then force their parents to persuade the schools to settle.

The strikes and ugliness subsided in March. But I had seen enough of Socialism to realize the emptiness of the promise of liberty and prosperity for the workers. Putting socialist theory into practice involves violence against persons, destruction of property, censorship of ideas, and suffering for everyone concerned. ☉

### Sylvester Petro

IDEAS ON



LIBERTY

CORRUPTION and disguised anarchy will characterize both the state and voluntary associations when they have confused their respective roles. While their services to society are of the highest order of importance when confined properly in accordance with the principles of the free society, private associations and the state become the worst and most vicious enemies of man's freedom when they confuse their nature and function. The result of such confusion is not really "society"; it is the war of all against all.

Scott W. Bixler



# The Right to Discriminate

MUCH of the case for the free market is built upon the belief in the sanctity of free choice. This includes not only the freedom to trade and associate with whomever one chooses, but also, and equally important, the freedom *not* to trade or associate.

There are only two ways for man to satisfy his needs. One method involves the use of coercion, which includes the threat of violence or force. The other is freedom, involving the process of voluntary exchange.

In acting to further his own well-being, man will not exchange values unless he believes he will benefit by doing so. A man who purchases a new suit for example, values the suit more than he values the money given in exchange. The merchant

values the money more than the suit. Both parties have improved their positions.

Whenever a third party enters the picture, either preventing exchanges that would normally have taken place, or forcing a person on either side of a trade to make an exchange against his will, mutual benefit is no longer present. One or both parties to the transaction must necessarily lose.

Such a restriction of freedom is evident in the various laws intended to provide equal employment opportunity for minorities, women, handicapped individuals, and the like. These laws are essentially denials of the market process of voluntary exchange, with consequences detrimental to all parties involved.

The Random House Dictionary defines discrimination as follows: "to make a distinction in favor of or

---

Mr. Bixler is a graduate of Grove City College with a degree in economics. He is presently an officer of the Union Bank and Trust Co., Erie, Pennsylvania.