



the man who knows what freedom means will find a way to be free



Requiem for Ruth Dazey

I called her my secretary. She was far more than that. Certainly she typed my letters, took dictation, filed carbons and correspondence and managed my office affairs. Often she originated letters, outlined programs, helped design ads and promo-copy, reminded me of commitments, and anniversaries. She even recalled what I had said to certain people so that future remarks would be in harmony and escape redundancy.

But she displayed far more than even these exceptional executive secretarial skills. Ruth Dazey understood freedom and was as dedicated to its lofty ideals as anyone I ever knew. She was tireless in probing the concept of liberty; unrelenting in her drive for truth; fierce in her determination to act and to reason in full accord with the greatest and best within her.

In the deepest sense, Ruth served as an intellectual companion for me across a span of thirty years. She was merciless, if she thought I had failed or done less than my best. She was generous in her praise if she thought it was merited. She

watched over my writings and my speeches with critical eye and ear; and with a tenacity that never flagged.

She would persist in making corrections of tiny flaws, on occasion stirring resentment and even anger when it seemed to me that she was hypersensitive or hypercritical. But always, when the last word had been set down, I was filled with thankfulness that a brilliant and lovely Ruth cared enough about liberty to demand and get the best of which I was capable.

Ruth Dazey died last September 2nd at 10:10 p.m. in Orange, California, a victim of cancer.

This issue of *LeFevre's Journal* is dedicated to her memory which lives on in the void created by her passing.

Ruth wanted no public ceremony and her wishes have been respected. This edition of *LeFevre's Journal* is offered in lieu of ceremony. Those wishing to make a final gesture of their love and friendship may make a gift to the City of Hope, Duarte, California.



FIRST CAUSE

Ruth said to me one day, "Do you believe in God?"

I looked at her in astonishment. "I believe in freedom. I am having difficulty in understanding what freedom and liberty mean. I'm not sure I can cope with anything larger in concept. Perhaps I am Confucian in my thinking; he refused to discuss God, saying that all such discussions were without substance since they had to be speculative."

"I think there is a God. What do you think?" Her green-grey eyes shone with eagerness. She leaned forward, lips slightly parted, as though expecting a profundity.

I shrugged. "Okay. If you really want to talk theology, let's set down the parameters. Let's understand that whatever either of us may or may not believe, our beliefs won't change reality. What is, is. If there is a God, our thinking there isn't one won't remove him. If there isn't a God, our thinking there is, won't produce one."

She nodded vigorously. "So far so good."

"Next," I continued, "we have to find out what you mean by 'God.' Do you mean an old, wise man, sitting on a golden throne or some fleecy cloud? Do you mean the forces of nature? Do you specify an anthropomorphic interventionist meddler? Or do you stipulate that the laws of reality which we can neither create, amend nor repeal comprise the diety?"

"What do you mean by an anthropomorphic meddler?"

"Merely this. Is there some entity designed to look like a human being on a vast or superlative scale, who intervenes in human affairs? For instance, some argue that God created man; others, that man created God. In either case, the argument runs that man is created in the image of God or that God is created in the image of man. People who personalize a diety in either manner usually ascribe to this personage supernatural powers to intervene in human affairs."

"Bob, there is definitely something in the universe bigger than you and I."

"I'm with you. Of course, there is. Indeed, there probably are many things in a universe as vast as our senses indicate, bigger than we are. I stand in awe of the beauty of this earth. I marvel at the whole of creation, both known to me and unknown. I marvel at life. I am humbled before the reality of my own existence. I did not bring myself into being. A force larger and more pervasive did. I do not plan to die by my own hand. Therefore, a force or forces larger and more powerful than I appear to be in charge of both my arrival and departure."

"You believe in God." She said it with finality.

"Aw, come on, Ruthie. Belief is too strong a

term. Let's explore that semantically for a moment so we can communicate. I would use the word 'faith' to denote a conviction which is held by an individual in the absence of facts or in contravention of facts. But I would prefer to use the word 'belief' to denote a conviction based on facts. I cannot quarrel with your faith. I think everyone is entitled, in the name of freedom, to any faith or any lack of faith he finds meaningful and helpful to himself. It seems to me that you are expressing a faith. And that is surely your privilege. But when you say 'belief,' I would wish for a marshalling of evidence upon which the belief rests. So far, you offer none."

She grinned suddenly. "All right. It seems to me that you are marshalling the evidence. You talk of the marvels of creation and admit that you didn't cause it. The mere existence of the universe and this world, and living beings on it, comprise all the evidence necessary."

"Evidence of what? I admit the universe exists. I insist that it does. It is real. But what caused it? Again we come down to the definitive. Did a benign gentleman raise a hand shaped like mine and decree it into existence? Or did the natural elements of the universe shape it and cause it to be? Just what do you mean by 'God'?"

"God is a supernatural force. I don't care about God's shape."

"Then I must disagree. I do not think there is such a thing as a super-NATURAL force. Many things are super-HUMAN. An earthquake is superhuman. A tidal wave. The creation of life. Sunlight. The wind and rain. All these are above and beyond the human. But supernatural they are not. They are quite natural."

"Oh." She thought about that.

"You see, Ruthie, this is one of my problems in talking theism. Theists, whether Christian or otherwise, appear to have a faith that, if they pray, decree, recite an invocation, spin a prayer wheel, or whatever, that somehow a force larger than nature will intervene favorably in their personal affairs. I profoundly doubt it. I think that faith in these things actually arises from ignorance as to what the human mind is capable of performing. I think it is true that if a person takes a positive attitude, asserts TO HIMSELF that he is capable of doing and achieving certain things, that he may very well achieve them . . . if they are natural. And I do not think that any of us even begin to glimpse the fantastic achievements possible for our species."

"To me, a prayer may very well have a positive effect, not because of divine intervention, but because it contains the elements of self-hypnosis. The person who has a deep faith that an outside

force may come to his aid may very well achieve more than he ordinarily would. Not because of an outside force, but because the faith builds a sense of peace and ease within himself that makes it possible for him to achieve far more than he otherwise would."

"I see what you are saying. But I don't like it."

"I don't know that I like it myself. You were asking for evidence. I can see no evidence that what may have been achieved by a person of prayerful faith might not have been achieved by the same person, if he had attained the same level of self-assurance through other procedures."

"Bob, there are literally hundreds of cases in which a person is healed by a 'laying on of hands' or by prayer."

"Let me accept that at face value. I have no personal knowledge in that direction except those things that have happened to me. What I am really saying is that I don't believe in miracles; rather I believe that what are called miracles consist of a working of natural law, for the most part unknown. When something happens that we cannot explain we call it miraculous. It is our ignorance that makes it so. Once ignorance is removed, then miracles vanish. Instead, we see the workings of cause and effect. The difference between science and superstition is the difference between accurate observation between cause and effect and inaccurate assumptions that ascribe cause-effect relations where they do not exist."

"But things have happened to you."

"Yes, they have. And at an earlier time I thought them miraculous. For example, I once caught the upper parts of three fingers in a job press. I was doing some printing and failed to bring my hand out of the mechanism after placing the paper. However, I was able to hit the non-print lever with my left hand so the pressure on my fingers was not total. None the less, the three fingers were smashed to the degree that even the fingernails broke into six or eight segments apiece. And, of course, the flesh burst and there was blood and some pretty flat digits. At that time I believed in the efficacy of prayer. In any case, I had an overwhelming feeling that I could not accept the injury as final. I experienced little pain; squeezed my fingers back into an approximation of their correct shape and bandaged my hand. Then I went back and finished the printing.

"I didn't get to a doctor for about three days. When I did, the doctor assumed that my injury was about two weeks old and remarked on how well the healing was occurring. At the time, I was certain of outside intervention. Now I am equally certain that my attitude of total rejection of the injury did the trick. The curative powers of the body, when a positive mental attitude exists, may appear miraculous; but I don't think they are miraculous. I think that's the way things work, if



Ruth's reaction to a bad pun.

mind and body function in harmony."

"But that could have been a case of outside intervention! You can't prove that it wasn't."

"True. But you can't prove that it was. And if a result could have been caused by either A or B, no acceptable evidence exists that it was either A or B."

She pursed her lips. "I think it was B."

"Fine. I don't object. But it appears to me that your statement is one of faith."

"So is yours. You just have faith in the curative powers of mind and body. You just said that there is *no* positive evidence!"

I laughed. "You got me! Good. And you're right. I don't KNOW. But building on that event and others of which we both have heard, I come to an even more profound impasse. Pardon me if I approach this by a route less than direct. Think of the thousands of persons who have prayed for divine intervention and failed to get it! I recently read the testimony of a woman who had been one of the survivors in a serious train accident. A number of cars were derailed including the one she was in. Most of the people in the other cars were killed outright or injured fatally. A few in her car, including herself, survived. She said that she prayed for help and simply 'knew' that God was going to save her.

"What about the people in the other cars who didn't make it? Must I assume that none of them prayed?"

"You don't have any evidence that they prayed."

"You're right again. No evidence. But that opens the door to my problem. The presumption of those who accept a personalized deity is that he exists as the embodiment of 'good.' I am left to assume that those in the other cars who were killed were other than 'good'. Perhaps God employed this rather untidy way of getting rid of some people he couldn't endure. But having studied people for a long time, I find myself inescapably drawn to the conviction that no human being is 'good' in any absolute sense. I venture to say that some of those

(please turn to page 10)



Letters of sympathy and expressions of love and respect for Ruth continue to arrive. Please understand our inability to hold deadlines open indefinitely. And to all those who have written for whom space was not found in this issue, please accept our deepest appreciation and pardon our omission.

"Ruth Dear:

"How can I say good-bye after all the years of sharing work and pleasure? You have been my greatest teacher. Through you, I have learned to know and appreciate people, to recognize talent in everyone. You taught me about death and about dying with dignity. Everyone who knew you died a little bit with you. The world is not the same without you.

"All your nurses felt your love. In the hospital you were always concerned about the person in the bed adjacent to yours. You always took an interest in the lives of the people around you.

"Your insurance lady became your very dear friend, though she only knew you a very few months. All your neighbors, who helped you when you needed help, were present because of your help to them. How I was privileged to be by your side in the last days. When I could get a wan smile on your face, despite your pain, it would make my day. You are truly a great lady.

"If I were asked, Ruth—Who is she? I would reply:

"She is like the quiet conversation of bamboo wind chimes in a gentle breeze,

"The subtle colors in an oriental painting,

"The beauty of a perfect pink camellia blossom.

"Always quiet and gentle, but firm in her desire for truth and understanding of herself, and other people, learning all about them, even when she lay dying. An absolute demon against wrongdoers and injustice. The willow that bends in a friendly wind would become a giant oak against the storm of injustice.

"On your desk, Ruth dear, you had the very prophetic words:

"'Each human being has an inalienable, and inherent right to live his life in accordance with his own choices and values. Implicit in this statement is the recognition that since this is my right, it is also the right of every other individual and thus I have no right to coerce or harm another, regardless of the circumstances.'

"Amen. May we all live up to the measure of those words.

"Vaya con Dios.

"Loy."

(Mrs. Robert LeFevre)

BOB TINGHITELLA: "Your ideas about life and the world around us are excellent, but you'll never make it if you depend on contributions sent in with the enclosed envelope. It was the damndest thing to get out of the *Journal* in useful condition. Your philosophy is flawless . . . your merchandising needs work, though. Keep up the good work. With so much garbage filling the newspapers and other media, your *Journal* maintains my belief that everyone isn't crazy . . . just the others!" *We'd like to improve our merchandising. Do you have some practical suggestions?*

JOHN KIDD: "I will never be able to repay you for a gift from you a few

years ago. It was the very first *LeFevre's Journal* to fall from the press and personally handed to me by beautiful, gracious Ruth Dazey. I am grateful and honored. Ruth Dazey's dedicated work for a free society of man has affected many. Ruth Dazey lives today in the hearts and minds of we who were so fortunate as to know her, and these good works will be passed on and on from generation to generation eternally, and for the good of mankind."

EDWARD UNDERWOOD: "Enclosed is a small contribution to the cause of individualism which seems to be the least understood requirement of life under present conditions particu-

larly. It seems reasonable that no matter what may be his or her mental or physical potential, no person amounts to much in the general scheme unless they realize the vital importance of the individual character and try to use it to best advantage in conjunction with others. This everyone could do to some extent by accepting only what is self evident while exposing all else to reasoning. Quite to the reverse by advertising, education, and example we are influenced to do and think in concert for which Nature has provided no orchestration. The only mentalities, judgments, and reasonings are individual only."

BILL WEISNER: "Please accept

this gift in appreciation for what you are doing in the name of freedom. The apostle Paul says in *Galatians* 5:13 'Brother, we are free; but use not this freedom for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another.' In *Romans* 12:2 Paul also says that we must not be conformed to this world. I believe that Jesus Christ exercised the ultimate freedom in the human experience by dying for what he believed in, rather than conforming or compromising. His death and resurrection is God's statement as to the worth and freedom of each individual. May we all serve Him freely, and each other, in brotherly love."

W. E. LYMAN: "What I like about you and your *Journal* is the impossibility of my predicting what position you will take, and also my feeling that it will usually be the best."

KING WILLSON: "You're getting better all the time. I had thought I'd forget about you, since I never have time to read what literature I regularly subscribe to, but your last *Journal* (vol. IV, no. 3) alone was worth more than my 'gift.' Your clear analysis of the concept of violence is the best I've ever read. I am going to work a little now to spread the word."

DEWEY DE FLON: "Am sure you will miss Ruth. I always thought she was a great help to you. She expressed herself to me in several letters. We both agreed how difficult it was at times to follow your brilliant depths of thought. My opinion seemed to tell me that her penetration was excellent. She had an excellent mind. I always stood in deep respect to her. All of us will leave a worn-out house in time but life never dies. And so Ruth will live in our minds."

JOSN KEVIN AANDAHL: "Your *Journal* is almost like a breath of fresh air in the oppressed society I am now confined to. The funny thing about most of your articles is the reaction I get from most of the crew and some of the officers onboard here. What I usually do is xerox a copy of the magazine and place it on the crew's bulletin board, secretly, of course; most likely, this command would brand me as a seditious literature pusher. My division officer, however, does read the *Journal*, and when I argue in favor of most of your articles, he cannot even provide a sufficient rebuttal. Being a journalist in the Navy is one of the biggest farces the DOD has ever produced . . . controlled press, controlled broadcast media; it is almost like freedom of the press does not even exist

here."

LLOYD LICHER: "Dear Ruth: I have a compulsion to write you after learning from Loy today of your tragic affliction. As I've come to appreciate people more and more, it seems only



Ruth Dazey chatting with Harry Hoiles, publisher of the Santa Ana Register, at a family dinner hosted by Mr. Hoiles.

appropriate to let them know what effect they've had on me and to communicate some of my thoughts, for whatever effect they may have on the other person. In your case, I'll try to write frequently as a one-way gift to you for the good life you've led and the fine person you are. Please accept them as just that, with no need for response. Now I regret never having gotten to know you better because all indications I had showed you to be a very superior person, well worth knowing in depth. Nevertheless, in my various positions your name and presence kept coming up and always left me with a pleasant feeling. Just being on the mailing list for the *Newsletter* of the Supper Club of Los Angeles brought your name to my attention many times. And then you'd attend some of the meetings of the Supper Club, and I'd always know you were there because I seemed to have a special awareness of your presence. I'll have to label it for what it is, an attraction for your person, knowing that you were an enlightened intelligence of the opposite sex. 'Hey, there's Ruth Dazey, that'll certainly add to the evening!' Women like you have always held a fascination for me. It's such a pity that there are so few of you. Of course, it wasn't just your reputation preceding you. Whenever you participated in question-and-answer sessions or discussions, it was obvious that you had exposed yourself to the best in the field and learned well what you had heard or read. And this was aug-

mented by a quiet poise and modest air of self-confidence that I couldn't help but admire. There are pretty women, and you're one of those; but when it's combined with the mind and manners you have, it makes for a truly beautiful person, in every sense of the phrase. Observing beautiful products of nature brings much pleasure to understanding, appreciative persons, of which I consider myself one. Know that you have trailed a wake of such pleasure for others as you have travelled your road of life, and I, for one, thank you for having entered at least the fringe of mine. I'd like to close this letter with a thought/state of mind I've developed as a result of having come to know the concept of libertarianism in some depth. I will admit to having had an unsettled, incomplete sense of confidence about the grand scheme of things, the universe and man's place in it, until I got into libertarianism. I can almost remember reaching a certain point where it all became so clear, obvious and right. Of course, that's the way things should be, and with it came peace of mind and confidence in the inevitability of it — maybe not within my lifetime, but that no longer mattered. I hope you've developed a similar serenity."

JOSEPH F. CAIRNES: "I like what I read in the *Journal*. However, I'm asking for clarification of one point. As I understand it, a person has a boundary around his possessions. But when another steals from the person, the thief comes into ownership. Why does the thief's boundary eliminate the first owner's boundary?" *Because that is the nature of reality. I am not condoning theft. I am taking notice of the fact that thieves steal and that nearly everything in the world has been stolen several times, including all the money we use. Here, Government is the thief. The fact is that the thief benefits from stealing by becoming the new owner. If the thief did not benefit, theft would quickly cease to occur. The difficulty with assuming that the property still belongs to the victim of theft seems to condone actions by which the victim may regain what was once his property by performing the same kind of act. This sets up the conditions for a permanent state of feud. We deceive ourselves by asking government to do the feuding for us. The truth is that every violation of a property boundary is a wrongful act, however the individual rationalizes and justifies it.*

VERN HANSEN: "Letters of condolence are never easy things to write.

And when it comes to writing one to you, Bob, about Ruth, I really don't know how. Losing her must be a bit like having some strong man grasp you by the ankles and tear most of the tendons out of your body. There must be floods and floods of memories, unabated, washing over you now, a process that will go on for weeks and months. And why not? It is a compensatory blessing to help offset in a partial manner the sense of irretrievable loss that you must endure. It confirms Ruth in you as an inseparable part of your being. Though you can't reach across the abyss of death to touch or communicate with her, surely she is one of those about whom Thomas Fuller said, 'It is best to live as friends with those in time with whom we would be to all eternity.'

DR. WILLIAM G. BYARS: "Thanks for continuing me on your mailing list. Wish government leaders and bureaucrats (the real leaders) could and would read your *Journal*. Best of all, wish they could understand what you're saying, and then follow it up. Best regards, and a long life to you!"

SIGNE CARLSON: "We've been stimulated by your ideas for years — ever since the Pine Tree, but your latest ideas expressed in 'The Heel of Achilles' article really hit home. Now we understand the frantic registration drives, postcard registration, etc."

SCOTT CLELAND: "It has been well over two years since our encounter at Wofford College during the January, 1975 Interim. The interesting points of view presented at that time by you and others still circulate in my mind and will probably continue to do so. Whether or not one agrees with these ideas does not alter their validity, and at least they require me to think (which appears to be a rapidly diminishing process in today's world, unfortunately) and occasionally to reassess, but not necessarily to change, my philosophies."

PEDRO J. EISNER: "May I extend to you my warmest congratulations for your book *Lift Her Up, Tenderly*. I have been reading the 'Austrian School' for some time now and also some of the simpler books but have never come across such a comprehensive and complete book as yours. There is no doubt in my mind that this is a basic textbook. I am actually applying it in my own family with my eldest son (15). The book will serve me a long time until it is read by all the children, in total, 10. My intention is to donate

the book to the two schools my children attend (boys and girls separately). Language is no problem, since these are English schools. I will make it a point to explain matters properly to the headmaster and librarian so that they can get as many boys and girls to read it as possible. Hopefully, they will also understand that it wouldn't be a bad idea for them to read it as well. One of the questions one of my children has asked me is 'How is it possible that good books (some of them literary works of art) cost exactly the same as books which are full of trash and are "worth nothing"?' The same was extended to records. 'How is it possible that a record by some of the best composers of the musical world played by top artists costs the same as a record which, no doubt, is of less value, not only because of what it contains, but also because of the effort put into it?' Well, I certainly found my way through (that question). By performing such an exercise from time to time, I can really appreciate the thought behind the simplicity of your explanations."

ROBERT FERRERA: "I take issue with Lois Sargent's letter which appeared in 'The Other Side' portion of your spring '77 *Journal*. I feel that it is unlibertarian of her to collectively condemn the younger generation by making unfair sweeping generalizations about the 'thousands (millions?) of today's young people who have not had disciplinary training as they grew up.' I heard the same charge made about my peers back when I was an adolescent in the 1960's, usually by alarmists who were trying to scare people into adopting drastic punitive unlibertarian measures aimed at 'solving' youth problems. Your answer to her letter very correctly points out that 'if so many are potentially evil, it follows that we cannot afford government. It is easier to deal with evil in a private person than to deal with evil in a person who holds power.' Yes, we must do more than just reduce government to its 'logical' functions of police protection and national defense, as the worst abuses of state power have arisen from precisely those two areas of statism."

JUDITH GOLDSTEIN FRIEDMAN: "I remember putting five singles in an envelope addressed to you. I also remember that that night, or the one after, I was robbed. So it's quite possible that I did not mail the envelope or that I removed two or three of the bills before mailing. I could not bear to have my name scrubbed from your mailing

list for absent-mindedness! Every time I receive the *Journal*, it is like being presented with an unexpected and much-desired gift."

JOHN R. GOODE: "My teenage youngsters are using *LeFevre's Journal* to stimulate new thinking in their classes at school. I very much appreciate your sending your thoughts to my family. Your provocative originality always gets something going here, and we would like to get together with you in person. Hope we can work something out to do this. Your friend and admirer." *When I am not conducting a seminar, I'm available.*

IRENE GREEN: "Although many people insist on freedom and/or liberty, few really understand it or its implications. Thanks for your essay in fall '77 *Journal*. It is a real brain exerciser. Always look forward to studying LeFevre's philosophy."

WALLACE B. HINSHAW: "Keep it up. Very interesting and it keeps me thinking about new ideas."

ROBERT LOW: "Obviously, there is no such thing as a free lunch. Enjoy the cabbage."

ROBERT MCCLINTOCK: "What freedoms do men have in common which evolve from man's freedom (ultimate) to think? Here are ten for your scrapbook of ideas!

1. Freedom to talk or listen or not to.
2. Freedom to read or write or not to.
3. Freedom to think, believe or not to.
4. Freedom to collect or assemble or not to.
5. Freedom to accept or reject or not to.
6. Freedom to love, care, share, trust or not to.
7. Freedom to move, travel or not to.
8. Freedom to learn or not to.
9. Freedom to be equal or not to.
10. Freedom to reveal or conceal or not to.

These freedoms are generally thought of as 'Freedoms of Speech, Press, Religion, Association, Choice, Love, Movement, Justice, Education, and Privacy. Does man have a right to them? If so, why? If not, why not?' *Man has a right to them because man exists with these potential choices innately a part of him. Man has a right to be himself.*

WILLIAM E. MILLER: "I hope the enclosed \$5.00 Federal Reserve Note will help keep your good *Journal* coming."

CARL V. MORTON: "Enclosed is a small check to show only a small token of my appreciation for your *Journal*. Since I live in the philosophical desert of South Florida, the *Journal* gives me hope and is my one contact with the outside world. I really miss your wonderful lectures."

DAVE MYERS: "Your fall '77 issue is SUPERB! I will send my gift with the arrival of my next commission check. We're holding on by the skin of our teeth. Please don't drop me. I admire and appreciate your outstanding efforts at setting forth the ideas of freedom in a reasoned, logical manner (mainly because I know how very, very difficult it is). But occasionally I find I must 'nit-pick.' On page two (in 'Freedom: A Definitive Proposal') you redefine 'liberty' and define 'freedom' and 'coercion.' It seems to me that in defining 'coercion,' you have omitted an important concept. You define 'coercion' as: 'To compel by force without regard for the individual's volition or desire.' It seems to me that you have omitted: 'compelling by force *with* regard for the individual's volition or desire.' Perhaps it was by accident that you excluded such cases, but it seems to be that THESE cases can be, at times, even MORE heinous than those in which compulsion is used WITHOUT regard for the individual's volition or desire." *You will not be dropped. And I agree to the point you make. I should have included it.*

REID A. PAGE, JR.: "Thank you for the *Journal*. I always enjoy reading it. You'll never know how much thought I've given to you and your ambitious work, in a world where there are those who will not take the time to think with you. Since I've known you so long, followed the ups and down and hopes and dreams, I'd like to make an observation—and a quiet suggestion. Please take this in the light I intend it, because I believe you have something *very* special to offer. To be funded—to grow and prosper—I believe you must have a detail *Plan* that people can identify with *Goals, partner, not education alone—Motivation* and a vehicle to accomplish it. When you make this decision, you'll be on your way and it won't be the wrong way either. More from the peanut gallery, if you want it, because I believe in you and what you're doing." *Thank you for all these generous, kindly words. No one person can or should attempt to do it all. My "plan" is to teach. Others may motivate the implementation of these teachings if they choose.*

VICKY QUIMBY: "It's relieving to hear a sane voice among such insanity."

GUY RIGGS: "My wife and I saw 'One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest' and there on the screen we saw a person representing the inevitable end product of the bureaucratic mentality: Nurse Ratched . . . We are all in a cuckoo's nest these days. We're being regulated and taxed as never before in our history. Yet most of us meekly put up with it and become uneasy or angry with someone who tries to be free. You know, the more I correspond with you, the more I wonder if I really am in a dilemma. Go see 'One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest.' I hope you'll applaud R.P. McMurphy when he tries to be free and fails. At least he tries." *Let's both keep trying. One by one we must learn to break free.*

JIM ROAF: "I, too, have some books to dispose of some day. Preferably when I am disposed of. My collection may be about a tenth the size of yours and a few (books) may be quite valuable. Whatever they are, I will add a clause to my will to the effect that they go to whoever (if anyone) buys your 'famous Rampart College Library.' I will also stipulate that funds be taken from my estate, if any, to pay the cost of packing and shipping to the owner of Rampart College Library, owner being responsible for keeping me posted as to his address. Many thanks for your efforts to define Freedom and Liberty. These are worthy objectives, to be attained like the frog reaching the pond by jumping half way at each jump."

MONA BEARDSLEE: "I am saddened by your news of Ruth. I remember her as always cheerful and helpful; and her impeccable standards were an inspiration. My sincere sympathy to



Ruth was sought out by Jenny Hausske Braun and daughter Rachel of Palmer Lake, Colorado.

Jenny's father was one of the devoted builders of Rampart College.

you both as I know how dear she was to you. How wonderful, though, that she leaves such a beautiful memory!"

THOMAS W. SANDERS: "Your *Journal* for the summer of '77 arrived last week. Terrific! You've taken on one of the key questions in libertarian theory. Your differentiation between influence and control is *crystal clear!* In a recent exchange of correspondence with an individual of the anarcho-libertarian persuasion (whatever that may be), he said: 'I have a lot of respect for Robert LeFevre, *but . . .*' (Emphasis, mine.) He then continues to accuse me of being a 'devout Follower of LeFevre.' I have heard this before, and I have always been curious as to what lay behind it. I believe I now understand it. Knowledge comes from often unexpected sources! Implicit in your differentiation between influence and control is the assumption that the nature of individual action is related to the world view which the individual holds. *Misinformation*—within the province of influence—may produce irrational behavior—the province of control. There is an ironclad relationship between these two. If one accepts the notion that individual action is controlled by the individual, with responsibility for the consequences of the action within the actor's life implied, then one must also accept the responsibility for the world view antecedent to one's actions. This is a difficult assignment, if it is taken literally. And I suspect that it is the difficulty inherent in the acceptance of this dual responsibility which causes many 'libertarians' — the libertarian politician, for example — to protest that LeFevre's view is impractical and that 'liberty can be won a little bit at a time' through action within the contemporary political system. What they are really telling us is that the lifestyle demanded by LeFevre's world view is more difficult than they are willing to attempt. What your view is really telling us is that the chance for the realization of the type of world market envisioned by competent libertarians is extremely small for the foreseeable future. Hence, a substantial number of those at the fringe of libertarian theory toy with various schemes for *making* it happen sooner, without seeing the contradiction which such action entails. As for being a 'devout Follower of LeFevre,' let me set the record straight! If being a 'Follower of LeFevre' is to believe that he espouses the most rational and consistent view on the subject of the relationship between life, property, coercion, and lib-

erty available today, then I most certainly am a 'Follower.' If being 'devout' is to believe it very strongly, to think about it continuously, to try to live it consistently—well, then I am a 'devout Follower' and very, very proud of it. It is a challenge and very much worth the effort."

JACK SHIMEK: "Thanks for your often-too-incisive observations. *Re* the Libertarian Party; you, of all people have no reason to go to lengths to clarify their muddled logic. But, then again, I didn't always think that idea was muddled. Changing oneself to one 'who knows what freedom means' from one who butts his head against the wall of what is, in the name of what ought to be, is a big step. (It is being a big step for me; tell me when I make it.) But it is the next step."

D. E. SMITH: "I am greatly moved by the Evan Cottrell letter in the summer '77 issue, and I agree. We fear all types of harm and yet tolerate regular daily plundering at the hands of government. Government is supposed to reduce crime. Yet, it is founded on crime—forcible taking of money, or taxation. Small wonder that individual citizens would have confused and eroding values. The growth of government on all levels causes a concomitant rise in crimes and trespasses of all types among the general populace. In a condition without government, we chance being harmed. With government, we are certain to be plundered, and chances are greater of being injured by another individual the more government grows and diminishes individual value systems. It seems absurd to expect value improvement among people when lack of values radiates from 'above' — from the so-called 'authorities.' I'll take my chances without government."

STERLING L. SMITH: "Your vol. IV, no. 4 is, for me, the best ever. 'The Heel of Achilles' is the first thing to make your position really credible and tenable. For the first time, I can go along with your position as being practical. A contradiction to all this has been building up in my mind: Ecology. I vividly recall my first real perception 45 years ago that business was not paying its full costs—broadly, of waste disposal. It seemed to me that this could be covered simply by essential civil suits. My awareness to this grew over the years. So it amused me when we had such an explosion of interest and the demand that everything be put right at once. I do not see how anybody but highly specialized professionals can

know enough about many of these problems to reach sound decisions. Certainly, the mass of consumers have to go on faith, on what they are told by those they believe in. And today's professionals are not a very trustworthy group. Which pro are you going to believe? So right now I am groping, trying to find some 'loose ends' to follow up to try to develop some solution that I can really believe is sound. Until then, I can only fight the government edicts which appear false to me. But I can't honestly fight all government action in this area—can't fight the principle of such government intervention. A year ago, in my then thinking, I could; but not now. I am upset." *When the pro's point out the obvious damage done to the ecology by pollutants and call for government action, the immediate response of the politicians is to punish those responsible. The correct answer is found in a free market. If the people wishing the environment cleaned up will permit businessmen to make a profit from cleaning it up, businessmen will do it. True, business has not been paying the full costs of their processes and, hence, the pollution. But business failed to pay those costs in an effort to keep prices low for consumers. In the end, the consumers must pay for everything . . . and we are all consumers, including businessmen. Let me point out that at the time of the Industrial Revolution we had pollution, sometimes far worse than what it presently is. But businessmen went to work to re-invent sewer pipes, and to come up with other developments in technology and chemistry to help whip disease and plague and to make the world safer for people. They did these things because the public demanded it. And they could profit by doing it. Today they are told they cannot profit but will go to jail. Punishment or the threat of it has always been a shabby inducement or motivation. Normally, under threat, we do only enough to escape the worst. With profits available, we can perform the seemingly miraculous.*

STANLEY YANKUS: "Frank McMahon and I were talking about ways and means of keeping weevils out of wheat. Years ago, the Australian farmers here used to keep weevils out of wheat by putting the wheat in partly filled jars. Then they put a lighted candle in the jar and sealed the lid tightly. The candle flame burnt up all the oxygen and the weevils were unable to live. Free people think of a million ideas because they have problems to solve. Under socialism, the govern-

ment is supposed to solve the problems. But the solutions don't suit me." *And sometimes the "solutions" are as bad as the weevils.*

DOROTHY SOBEK: "Looking at the political climate, hearing opinions expressed by friends and associates, I see little to be optimistic about. Yet the *Journal* continues to inspire me with renewed resolution and a resignation to the course, believing 'this too shall pass.' As you pointed out, at this time the elimination of the current government would only be replaced by another such, given the general thinking rampant today. 'The Heel of Achilles' again fortified me in the uselessness, nay the evil, of the vote. And that surely is an idea impossible to explain to otherwise intelligent and wise friends!!"

LLOYD STARK: "RE: 'Without the Consent of the Governed,' wherein you observe that people do not actually consent to be governed. I feel that most people essentially do consent to government jurisdiction because they feel the 'other guy' needs restraints. Most would not submit if they could figure out how to bind everyone else while excepting themselves. They do not feel that government will ever really kill or kidnap *them!* And they think that the government they support eventually bows to public pressure, whenever that government really gets out of hand, i.e., Vietnam, school busing, etc. Of course, yesterday's excesses become today's necessary expediences. But somehow, Bob, if you think about it, isn't it all done with the acceptance, if not outright approval of most people? And for the good reasons enumerated in the second half of your article? Always glad to hear from you." *Astutely put. Certainly we approve of having others governed. But no one in his right mind has ever asked that someone come forward to serve him in the same fashion.*

EWALD STECHHOLZ: "I read your *Journal* from cover to cover each quarter and find I can't wait to read 'The Other Side.' Although I have never met any of them, I learn from them as I continue to do from you. Virginia Bloom contributed a gem in vol. IV, no. 4, which is worth repeating: 'all those outside forces I've so comfortably blamed for my actions actually have nothing to do with the fact that it's been I who have made the choices' I also liked 'The Heel of Achilles.' It explains very nicely why I am no longer interested in the rhetoric of candidates for President, Vice President,

Governor, Senator, Congressman, Mayor, Selectman, etc. And also why I am happy to be one of those who no longer goes to the polls on election day and understands why."

JUSTIN G. BRADBURN, JR.: "Read the fall issue the day it came in . . . always look forward to what you have to prod our brains with. It causes me to think and this is something that I believe is lacking today with most people. Sometimes I wonder if I really think as deep as should be possible. 'The Heel of Achilles' truly sows the seed, so I believe, which can bring about the loss of POWER and GRANDEUR, which is our present government, be it federal, state, county or city. I am enclosing a few quotes from a couple of books which, I believe, help substantiate that non-participation by the people brings about a loss of power for those who would rule.

CHARLES M. BAKER, III: "Just received and read the fall 1977 edition and was going to send it along to my young cousin and his wife: However,

there is too much meat in the issue, and I'll want to retain it!"

ROBERT ORMSBEE: "Warm greetings to spokesmen for the remnant. Sometimes ideas take centuries to come into their own. I'm of the opinion that your works will eventually become classics. Please keep me on the mailing list for two copies of the *Journal*. As an indulgence in symbolism, when I go out I always wear two lapel pins. When asked why, I explain that the gold plated birch leaf relates to a day that I decided to become a 'keeper of the flame' (of liberty). And the pine tree on gold commemorates an event two years later when I took the road to Damascus and was struck down by the light (in a LeFevre seminar), perceiving that I was liberty's greatest enemy. 'Libertarian' became a serious word in my vocabulary. I used it sparingly, for fear my faults might taint its meaning. Today I hesitate to use the libertarian label lest my priorities be misinterpreted. After the appearance of brilliant works proposing market takeover

of government activities, we seemed to get bogged down about assuming government's coercive roles: *What should we DO about crime? Retribution? Restitution? And punishment? Later HOW best to achieve political clout? Libertarians preoccupied with coercion!* Are we steeped in the myth that government is a necessary evil? Do we have the cart before the horse? Do we ask HOW shall we effect compulsory education? No, we ask, SHOULD we have compulsory education? Then why not: SHOULD we have apprehension, retribution, restitution, and punishment. Are they either ethical, necessary, productive, or generally beneficial? If that question should be answered NO, then the primary excuse for government activities we seek to assume becomes moot. I suspect that the costs of such coercion exceeds the cost of crime itself. And civilization bears the costs, not denominated in money alone. With highest esteem and warmest personal regards to all."



SEMINARS WITH ROBERT LeFEVRE — 1978

January

15-20 Charlottesville, Virginia
22-27 Greenwood, South Carolina

February

5-10 Greenwood, South Carolina
19-24 Greenwood, South Carolina

March

5-10 Greenwood, South Carolina
19-24 Greenwood, South Carolina

April

2-7 Greenwood, South Carolina
16-21 Greenwood, South Carolina
30-May 5 Greenwood, South Carolina

May

7-12 Greenwood, South Carolina
28-June 2 Greenwood, South Carolina

June

4-9 Houston, Texas
18-23 Greenwood, South Carolina
25-30 Greenwood, South Carolina

July

16-21 Greenwood, South Carolina
30-Aug. 4 Greenwood, South Carolina

August

6-11 Wichita, Kansas
13-18 Greenwood, South Carolina
27-Sept. 1 Greenwood, South Carolina

September

17-22 Greenwood, South Carolina
24-29 Greenwood, South Carolina

October

8-13 Northern California
15-20 Greenwood, South Carolina

November

5-10 Greenwood, South Carolina
12-17 Greenwood, South Carolina

December

3-8 Greenwood, South Carolina

Sessions fully reserved by sponsor except for June 4-9 and August 6-11. For information re Houston seminar, write or call John Harvey at 3030 Audley, Houston, Texas 77098 (713) 524-6414. For information re Wichita seminar, write to Billie Bartlett, Love Box Co., Box 546, Wichita, Kansas 67201.

FIRST CAUSE

(continued from page 3)

killed were as deserving of mercy as was the woman who was saved. And I am even so bold as to assume that the woman resurrected from the wreck had also been the author of numerous deeds and words as black as any of those committed by the ones who perished.

"Why this discrimination on God's part? Prayer? If you insist. But let's go to children too young to pray. How about infants born deformed? Did none of their parents pray? You know better. What of the innocent children? Was God malicious? Or was he getting even with parents by injuring their loved ones? If true, what cruelty! And what a monstrous miscarriage of justice. If a judge must punish the wrongdoer, how can he injure the innocent just to get at the guilty?"

Ruth's face wore a wreath of triumph. "That's where re-embodiment or reincarnation comes into the picture. I accept the idea of re-embodiment. In other words, infants that are born deformed or babies who experience injuries probably earned those punishments in prior lives."

"Marvelous. You took the bait. If, indeed, each of us lives many lives and must experience the results of the misdeeds of our earlier embodiments, then we are back to cause and effect and have abandoned divine intervention. Either we must experience the results we have ourselves set into motion, or we can escape them. You can't have it both ways. If we must inevitably experience the harvests of our own sowing, then God does not intervene. But if God does intervene, then why the monstrous cruelties inflicted upon persons who have prayed for help and divine intervention and don't get it?"

"This would mean that the lady who escaped death in the train wreck had earned the escape and prayer had nothing to do with it. And the ones who did not escape could have prayed but, in fact, were only getting their own back."

Ruth squirmed in her chair, put one leg under her and sat on it. She frowned.

"Bob, say what you will. I believe there is a great force for good in the universe. I can feel it. Maybe it's my Irish ancestry."

"My dear girl. I wouldn't disturb your faith for the world. You are at liberty to have faith in anything you please. But your search for evidence puts you on both sides of a fairly high barrier."

"Does that mean that you're an atheist?"

"No. I'm not an atheist. I'm an ignorant man. But let's look at what I see for a moment. You talk of a force for good. Good, as who sees it? Is human good the highest in the universe? I don't know that. Perhaps there are others in the universe far greater and better than *homo sapien*. If so, I will insist that they are natural, too. We are all composed of the stuff from which the universe is

made. We are a part of the universe made up of universal stuff and unable to get out of the stuff we are made of and the universe we are in. Other beings may be super-human but they cannot be super-natural. Were we to meet such beings, we would probably think of them as divine, since they could do things we can't. To a dog, a man is a God. To a man, a creature that is super-human would be a God.

"Now you speak of a force for good. Perhaps the real good in the universe is glimpsed only by beings who are superior to us. Perhaps the ultimate good is high value to them, not to us.

"You and I, with our finite minds, think of human life as good and human death as evil. But to a super-being, our survival might be only as significant as the survival of a pet. A human death might be a 'good' thing in terms of super-beings.

"This is why I say I am ignorant. I do not know that God, or that even a race of Gods . . . super-beings, exists. I do not know that they do, or don't.

"Were I an atheist, I would have to be able to prove God's non-existence. To offer that proof with evidence, I would have to be able to report on the total universe. I can't even mentally grasp the size of the universe, much less report on what it contains.

"The rules of logic convince me that I cannot prove a negative. Thus, I can offer no positive proof of God's non-existence. If God is a force, larger than human, then I most assuredly believe in such a God. And that is not faith, for it is based on observation. On positive evidence.

"However, if God is an anthropomorphic interventionist meddler, ready to set aside natural law in my favor, I will argue that I do not believe in such a God. I do not object to those who say they have a faith in such a divinity. I do not know they are wrong. Perhaps they have an intuition that observation fails to confirm. But intuition is not and never can be a substitute for logic. That does not mean that intuition is wrong. It merely means that it is not logical. Or if it contains logic, that logic is of a nature too exalted for the finite mind to confirm by the rules of evidence."

"I have the idea that you are getting bored with the subject," Ruth said.

"I'm not bored. I'm merely inadequate. I don't have such an exalted opinion of myself that I presume to know it all. I am willing to learn. If you have evidence in either direction, produce it. Otherwise, it well could be that our entire conversation is merely Confucian. It's fun. We get to know each other better. Maybe we'll know more at a later time.

"Meanwhile, why don't we see what we can do to advance the cause of liberty? I think we have the capacity to learn what that is and it is human liberty that concerns us."



THE PAST MAY BE THE PROLOGUE

Shortly after I resigned from Rampart College in 1973, Ruth Dazey did the same. She came to work for me, not as my secretary, but as an assistant. She set herself up in business and performed stenographic chores for various persons and firms, in addition to taking care of those duties I asked her to perform. Factually, I didn't have enough work for a full-time employee. Furthermore, by contracting for the services I wanted, I left her free to earn additional sums and rid myself of the onerous burden of paying Social Security taxes, making withholding collections and filling out endless government forms.

Ruth was a dynamo of energy and knew how to make the best use of her time. She took a course in counseling and became a highly respected and sought-after adviser for persons in need of help as they tried to understand seething emotions, untangle the snarls in their lives and generally triumph over their problems. Here, Ruth demonstrated one of her most consistent and endearing traits. She was truly interested in others. Kind-hearted and sympathetic, she developed a keen sensitivity that brought scores of friends to her door and into her life. She unerringly sensed the good that people sought to be and to do. And she used her keen mind to its fullest. I would have to conclude that her final years, until she was stricken, were the most gratifying and happiest of her life.

She loved the weather of Southern California. She often went swimming, loved long walks and was a good tennis player; a positive whiz at ping pong. She was careful of her diet, neither smoked nor drank from habit. Meanwhile, her concern for my efforts and her outstanding skill as an editor served the cause of liberty as she understood and loved it.

One of our final discussions in depth was on the subject of competition. This was one of the more difficult areas for her to accept, in terms of economics. Her concern for the underdog brought her sympathy to the fore. Must people always compete? Must they always be trying to prove something? Couldn't they just accept life and BE? It isn't necessary to strive all the time, is it?

Then, in the fall of 1976, I knew that something was wrong. Ruth was physically active, and I couldn't put a name to whatever it was that bothered her. It occurred to me that a good vacation was long overdue.

I prevailed on her to take time off. She flew to Hawaii and spent a week in that island paradise. And she enjoyed it as a change of pace and scenery. But Ruthie could never be happy without plenty of work piled up in front of her, however she might protest the non-essential character of striving. So she came back, filled with determination to clear

up any physical problem that might be plaguing her.

She wanted no medical help of any kind. Good food, clean living, exercise . . . these she had and these she relied upon. But she was beginning to complain of pains in her back, chest and abdomen. Against her better arguments I again prevailed and got her to a doctor. He could offer no help and sent her to another. No help there, either.

She decided that a good cleansing diet would help and placed herself under the direction of a practitioner who managed to reduce her food intake to such a degree that she lost weight and began visibly to age. The pains in her abdomen worsened.

Again I insisted that expert medical help be sought. This time, the doctor found gallstones and recommended an operation. Immediately, I assumed this had been the problem all along. A gallstone operation, though serious, is not necessarily a life or death struggle. The surgeon, noting suspicious signs, obtained a biopsy of tissue from the liver. The diagnosis was now unmistakable. Ruth had cancer. From mid-May, when the discovery occurred, until she died on the second of September, Ruth kept a bright outlook and struggled to regain her health.

Sometime after the first of the year, and in worsening health, Ruth wrote an article on the subject of competition which was accepted by the Foundation for Economic Education. It was published in the September issue of *The Freeman* magazine. Ruth was very proud and happy over this success.

But medical expenses now hung over her like a pall. True to her belief in a free market, she had refused all efforts of the government to get her to sign up for medicare, medicaid, or other programs that were government sponsored or government related. She had a small policy with Prudential and, outside of that assistance, had to pay all her medical charges from her own income and savings.

By great good fortune, a Prudential Insurance



Ruth in triumph after winning an argument from me.

(please turn)

THE PAST MAY BE THE PROLOGUE

(continued)

Special Agent, Phyllis Calisch, managed to get Ruth admitted to the City of Hope. This is a pioneer institution, funded wholly by private funds and dealing with diseases that are difficult or impossible for present medical knowledge to conquer. They charged her exactly nothing for several weeks of very expensive care and treatment.

It was while Ruth was in the City of Hope that I had my final heart to heart talk with her. Although the doctors did their best to be optimistic, it was clear to Ruth, and obvious to me and most observers, that Ruth was fighting a losing battle.

"It is hard to accept that I am about to die," Ruth said. "I am not afraid of that. I just don't think I can stand too much more pain."

She was on heavy sedation, worried for fear the drugs she was taking might be habit forming.

"You may be lucky," I said to her. "All of us are dying. With the rest of us, the end is uncertain. You have the advantage of foreknowledge."

"I hope I am doing things right."

"I hope I can be as brave when my time comes."

That was dangerous, and I changed the subject. Finally, I said, "You know, I do not think the world will be as nice a place with you leaving it. It will be different with you gone. But at last, the big mystery will be solved. And you will know the answer. I will still be in the dark."

She smiled at that. "It is a mystery, isn't it?"

"Yes."

"I still remember what you said years ago. Our thinking will not create a hereafter. Nor will it

cause a hereafter to vanish if there is one. What is, is."

I nodded. I couldn't trust myself to speak for a moment.

"What do you think now? Is there something after death?"

I shook my head, fighting for time. "Ruthie," I said at last, "I can't believe that you will be leaving me with any degree of finality. I can't accept that, and I see no reason to do so. To me, you are simply going on in advance to be sure my desk is in order.

"I do not know what happens. But surely there will be work for both of us to do. And I will need someone to look after my desk, make certain my reference books are handy, see to my supplies of paper and that my pencils have been sharpened.

"It seems quite logical to me that this is the reason for your leaving. Remember the time you traveled across the country, getting me bookings so I could speak before various organizations? Now you may be traveling across the cosmos, making the same arrangements. But on a larger scale, of course.

"If I think of it that way, I obtain an eagerness about what is to come. Be that as it may, death will come to each of us when it will come. So I look upon it as a great adventure. If there is nothing, then we will have that nothing together. If there is something, then I can think of no one better qualified to see that things are in order for me. I know I can count on you to do a good job."

Ruth chuckled in that throaty way she had when she was happy deep within. She nodded with a smile. "Everything will be ready," she said.



Lefevre's Journal

Box 2353, Orange, California 92669

Lefevre's Journal is published every quarter, approximately, in Orange, California. It is not for sale, but is supplied to those who are dedicated to human liberty when those so dedicated make it possible.

Publisher..... Bob LeFevre
Editor..... Ann Furgerson
Printing and Distributing..... Bruce Galey
Typesetting..... Jack Lemieux
Artwork..... Lee Branscome

Please Forward and
Address Correction Requested

BULK RATE
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 163
Orange, Calif.