

Rodriguez. I'll kick his butt next week. We have at least three other systems to plug in and—who knows?—it might get *me* to break down and buy a modem & computer. ¶ Get Sean on tech hypocrisy. ¶ Animal rights? *Nada*. But human (sentients) have One Right and it remains forever: to Property. ¶ I react to your arguments against Natural Law the way you (properly) reacted to Krel's response to you. "Law" may be an ill-chosen word for an anarchist, but there *are* patterns in Reality. Or is it the Reality (Natural) part you disagree with? Natural Law is cultural-independent: whoever claimed otherwise? Come to think of it, from whom did you learn your understanding of Natural Law? If Nature follows no patterns, then neither does your brainwaves; *i.e.*, you cannot think (thought = order); *i.e.*, your statements to me are meaningless; hence, self-refuting. *This* is what is meant by a self-evident proof, O.K.? ¶ "Natural Law nationalism" is nonsense. Nationalism violates several Natural Laws, the most obvious being those in economics.

Brian K. Heape Consider yourself borne with.

Sinn O'Fein You scurrilous statist! Robert Nozick's connection to libertarianism is that of a Judas Goat to the herd. How *dare* you associate this crypto-statist, second-hander, Establishment-titsucker with the noble genius, Ludwig von Mises? § Specific refutations: Nozick's ultra-watery acceptance of some of the more obviously-true libertarian concepts—at the expense of ripping out their Natural-Law roots—shocked only libertarians, not the Academy or other statist intellectuals. "Making libertarian ideas reputable"—making them palatable to the State's court *intelligensia* is anathema! They can only achieve that status by dilution, obfuscation, and selling them out — which Nozick did! *Anarchy, State And Utopia* is no such thing as a "powerful political challenge" to anyone: next to Rothbard's *Ethics of Liberty* (modesty forbids my mention of *New Libertarian Manifesto*) it stands as a limp wrist next to a mailed fist. ¶ "This is why Locke rejected anarchy." *But so does Nozick!* "Nozick's state develops . . . from free market defense/protection contracts" strikes at the very heart of agorism and Rothbardian proto-agorism. All economic history gives evidence against his claim. All Fair Courts failed to revert to statism. All pro-market anarchies and current freeport minarchies have been statified by external imperial conquest. The market has attacked corrosively the most totalitarian states to eat holes of freedom (*e.g.*, *nalevo* in the USSR). His claim has no scholarly backing; hence it could have only been motivated by non-scholarly stimulus—Evil ones since it serves Evil. He serves his foul statist masters at Harvard well; no wonder they reward him richly. Tell me, Sinn, how can a fine Irish Republican as yourself support such high Anglo Tory scum as Nozick? ¶ The rest of what you claim he develops was ripped off from early libertarian zines, from early libertarian writers as Rothbard, the Tannchills, the Perkinses, Jarrett Wollstein, Skye D'Aureous & Natalie Hall, Filthy Pierre and maybe even me (he subscribed to *NLN* for a year. ¶ Finally, Robert Nozick "represents one pole in the libertarian wing today, the minarchists . . ." Really! The minarchist leaders I know, those of proven integrity on the anti-political battlefield, such as Howard Katz, Terry Diamond, Brad Linaweaver and even (borderline case but *very minarchist*) Toni Nathan, have little respect for Nozick. What has motivated you to write this *apologia* for this Quisling of libertarianism? ¶ *Note to Arthur et al.*: This is our real Enemy, not the silly ravings of the Anarcho-commies. The vile parasites who attempt to look like us but burrow through our flesh to devour our hard-core: partyarchs and Robert's *Nozis*.

Emergency Appeal Why would anyone want to submit his individuality to a Union; why would *any* bottling plant (except, maybe, statist *Coca-Cola*™) want to turn their entrepreneurship over to an anti-market collective laughingly claiming to "represent" (read "enslave") workers? Of course, the ruling class is always supportive of Unions: it makes control of workers so much easier. Look for the Union Label so you'll know which are the shoddy goods.

Vicki Rosenzweig Go for Greek, do you?

Mike Gunderloy (Again, for NAAN) Agreed.

Mike Gunderloy (Yet Again) What's *TC*? ¶ By your definition, a Free Goods Economy is impossible. Scarcity is a function of time/space/matter distribution. Obvious example: I want my *own* planet as

in Isaac Asimov's *The Naked Sun*. Nor will that satisfy me. I want to trade for ever-increasing goods and, above all, developing *knowledge* continually. ¶ Wealthy people are no closer to FGE than you and I ("the Poor"). One could just as easily argue they are *further* away in that they have to work *harder* to keep "in place." ¶ I'm afraid that even your self-replicating robot asteroids are so far away from what I could conceive of satisfying me materially, that I'd better shut up before I sound condescending. Check out Doc Smith for *my* value-wants in geometric escalation. Or Han Solo, when offered a reward more than he could imagine, "I can imagine a lot."

Bacover Gets the idea across. But are we out of fanartists already? *sigh*

COMMENTS ON FREFANZINE #47

Cover Covers will be the death of us yet. Who's the mole?

Inside Cover Editorial Cartoons? Wow! Or is this a copy?

GunderToC How did this get the title of "Railroad News?" ¶ Death to the mutated matte. ¶ Ken Gregg has the back dates of *Fref* you want (1-13). [Whoops, this comment has been superseded by Vic's recent actions. See way below.] In case you've forgotten, Ken was *Fref*'s first OE.

Neal Wilgus Hi. I get nothing special from your printed layout and I much prefer dealing with Comments. Having started off at the bottom, maybe we can work up from here. § How about something Illuminating for *NLI3*? ¶ See you in Austin?

Emery Allen Beverin I think I've seen this cartoon elsewhere. If it's original and you can do libertarian editorial cartoons, you've got a market! \$50 if drawn to my specifications. I'll consider your inspirations for \$25. Payable any way, any where you want it. ¶ Has anybody thought of doing a Prison APA? Or are there prohibitive reasons of which I'm unaware?

E.H. Carter No point in dotting eyes and crossing teas; I mostly agree. I do a lot of debating and find the printed version of speeches just doesn't transfer media well. ¶ (Ct Moral Hazard) "Holocaust Revisionism" has nothing to do with exonerating anyone, nor is there any timing involved. It's been going on for decades but only picked up steam after the Israeli-tack Phalangist atrocities in Lebanon. I'm surprised, after your neo-Oxonian presentation, that you're blind on WW2 revisionism. ¶ (Ct O'Fein) What do you mean "the rightness of being a boss?" I consider employer-employee relationships obsolete (historically), uneconomic (praxeological), debilitating (psychological), but non-coercive (morally). Is that a position of right or wrong? Finally, do you distinguish between "stateless . . . capitalism" and free-market anarchy (agorism)? If not, then you stand challenged. ¶ (Ct Vicki) We travel in different circles, for I have found no anarcholibertarians accepting statist lines on Grenada. Looks like GOS,LRHC is doing good work in Southern California; only the Defence Caucus partyarch wing supports the invasion. ¶ Why do you defend the US by insisting it is a democracy? They are no better than any other statist form and, I have argued in *NL*, worse than other forms at this point in history. ¶ You start late in your attacks on U.S. Imperialism. Let's begin with the aggression against Canada in 1776! And Tripoli in 1805, Canada (again) in 1812, Mexico in 1846 and Indian nations continually. Furthermore, no one asked the Lousianans whether they wished to be "Purchased." § What differences do you find (of totalitarian significance) among Guatemala (your choice) and El Salvador, Honduras, and Panama? I agree that Nicaragua is about as free as Colombia or Venezuela (if that's your point), but Cuba is no better than the three I named. Costa Rica is the only Caribbean state which is (currently) *freer* than the U.S. It is about to be leashed by the Empire into line, though.

Me Time is passing and wounds are healing.

Paul Reynolds (Ct Octopus) Good Grenadan revisionism except that the U.S. and Castro were on the same side of the invasion. Castro's allies were overthrown by the coup which the Trilateral Marine Corps then overturned. ¶ (Ct Arthur) "Monetary systems beget value systems" is unbelievably obtuse nonsense. Try Scarcity as the great begetter. There was plenty of valuing before the invention of money. ¶ (Ct Martin) No, welfare parasites who want jobs already have them

in addition to the welfare. What's a "good job," anyway? ¶ (Ct Sean) Jim Bumpas moved to Oregon (from Mountain View)? Damn, I might have met him in Portland in July had I known. Got an address for him?

Scot Harrison Looks like everyone's gang-banging Buchanan in Grenada. Great! But how about some comments for the rest of us?

Sean Haugh Did I ever ask you who Norman Mayer is/was? ¶ Lots of good stuff, comrade! ¶ (Ct Arthur) On Society: not bad. I think of it as a gas with people as interacting particles. Put too much pressure on and it will explode. Turn up the heat and those at the borders will evaporate off. The key is not to anthropomorphize the collection into a Collective—as you rightly point out. ¶ *What* evidence as "plain as the nose on your face" is available for the proof of systematic extermination by the German State (other than War, like the U.S., Britain, USSR, etc.)? The only response to revisionist challenges that I've seen range from "how dare you bring this up?" to bomb-throwing. Let's start with what evidence convinced *you* of the Holocaust's existence? ¶ (Ct Anni et Jimmy) "Is persuasion coercive?" And is coercion persuasive? ¶ Vgcest Mike on scarcity vs "free goods economy."

Mike Gunderloy (Ct Sinn O'Fein) Looks like he'll miss my cogent rebuttal of his Noziism. Mayhap he saw it coming and fled. ¶ "Open-minded and tolerant" is not only not a prerequisite for anarchists but is downright counter-productive. Minds should be closed to Evil and intolerant of statism in any form. A perpetual jihad until the last vestige of statism is extirpated from the last wavering brain cell—what fun! Tolerance = giving Evil equal consideration with Good; open-minded = unable to grasp reality firmly on any level. Hey, if *you* like living that way, that's *your* lookout. ¶ (Ct Rick) I do not agree with self-defence brutalizing anyone; in fact, it ennobles. But *voting* is never defensive; it can only be aggressive by its nature. ¶ The top "phone freak"-oids who go after toll-road evasion and other fee-evasion will be hired by the Insurance & Protection Agencies to thwart the second-raters. If it's not worth it to hire them under the system, the system will be changed. (Some of this goes on today, where the victimized businesses have given up on the State for protection and gone to the Counter-Economy for it.) ¶ Great est Arthur. "Society should . . ." is his problem. A better formulation would be "I want . . ." + "much of society can be convinced of this need" = "The Market will magnify my power of self-protection for less expense." ¶ I've never read anything from you before about programming to become a successful research scientist and coming to grief thereby. I had a fling at that myself and got a lot deeper (almost to the Finish Line of Ph.D.). Care to swap tales? ¶ Vgcest Paul Reynolds as well. And to Wooster! ¶ (Ct Elayne) Reformed Substance Abuser you are? Sounds like a religious position to me. Have you reformed in the direction of increase, decrease or changing the usual mix? ¶ Although four years of Bush could be worse. It's irrelevant; the Curse has never been broken so Reagan is Doomed To Die in office. Let's take bets on the day/month/year! *Ah, hahahah* ¶ (Ct Aekner) "Sierra Club" shows the establishment plutocratic nature of statist "ecology." "Protect California's coastline" = "Keep poor and ethnic undesirables away from our beach homes." Same with parks, mountains, etc. ¶ Lots of gcest Sean. ¶ (Ct *imagine*) As an anacho-elitist, did you ever get around to reading Nock? Chauntecleer showed me his "Missing Link" essay recently: most people are Neolithic mass-men; a few of us are human beings! ¶ Get Doc Hinton on Insurance Companies. ¶ (Ct Sinn) *What* bureaucracy involved in agorist protection agencies and insurance companies? The market will weed out any dabbling in, or holdovers of, bureaucracy soonest. Totally unprofitable. Read Mises' *Bureaucracy*. The only nightmare involved is for those bureaucrats who would like to see their Hell perpetuated—tough luck! ¶ Concerning your Heroic Martyrdom for The Cause, steps have been taken to get your anarcho-ship. By the way, Northeastern is not a *state* college, is it? (It'll ruin fundraising.) ¶ On *Social Anarchism*: Everyone from Rothbard (on his better days) to Nock to Tolstoy to LeFevre (to me!) agree that Anarchists will triumph by role-modeling morality. By the way, I continue to dislike the use of "ethics" as a term for those too chicken to say "morality." If you don't rob me, you're moral. If you do but can excuse it, you're ethical. Screw ethics! ¶ I violently disagree with

Baldelli's false dichotomy between Realist and Idealist, even though (or perhaps because) it is the popular, German-Idealism-derived conception. Long live the Romantic Realist: one who pursues an *achievable*, worthy Ideal until he or she achieves it or dies trying. Anarchy is achievable, on an individual or small-group basis right now. On the other hand, I find little appealing about your "water-fountain economy." *Perhaps* it's achievable but I see nothing worthy about it. In other words, what's so Ideal about stagnation? ¶ *Anarchy* (I continue to dislike *anarchism*) is not linked to an economic system but it is not freedom, only Statelessness. Complete freedom requires a completely free market—which defines Agorism which defines an "economic system." ¶ Most of what I found worthwhile in your summary of Baldelli's ethical capital vs legislation sounds like *Our Enemy, The State*, fifty years later. Nock called it *Society vs The State*. Say, why don't we have a fiftieth anniversary celebration of *OE, TS*? In fact, might be a good idea for *NLI4* theme issue . . . ¶ I know one of the key founders of the Mackay Society and wonder if he continues to consider himself MLL as his deviations grow. He used to work at the Henry George School in New York City: Mark Sullivan. ¶ Good criticism on their neo-Georgism onland titles *but all* property is limited i availability or it wouldn't be Property. Chapter One of *Man, Economy and State*, the "coke trickling down your throat" example! I agree with the rest of your criticisms unreservedly.

imagine It suddenly occurs to me who you might be: female, collectivist-deviationist anarchist from Atlanta who's previously contributed. If so, I'm truly surprised that *you* chickened out into pseudonymity. ¶ I am stunned that a human being could possibly *like* a Trek movie and *dislike* the best movie of 1984. It's true that *Temple of Doom* had a weakness that *Raiders* did not and I am all for the "Bring Back Marian Ravenwood" movement. But the problem wasn't Capshaw's portrayal (honest enough for the 1930s) but that her character was largely irrelevant. And being irrelevant, why would it make that much difference to the perfection of the rest of the film? And *what ra [excuse the typesetter hiccups] racism?* ¶ Comparing *Dr. Who* to *Indian Jones* is absurd, they are different genres (so is *Trek*, for that matter). What attractive male hero? I haven't seen episodes since I left Canada in 1968 but I must have missed something if there is now sex appeal in *Dr. Who*. ¶ Another point: *IJ* is ultra-individualistic; *ST* is statist, though Kirk does turn outlaw in the last film (will they follow through on this, next film?). *Dr Who is middle-of-the-road, limited government. Hey, this is just as valid as your attempt to judge action-adventure pulps on the basis of Feminism!* ¶ (Ct Octopus) Hmm. I feel a bit mixed reading this tirade (positive term in my lexicon). If you distinguish between the free market and capitalstatism ("capitalism," a term invented by free-market anarchist Thomas Hodgskin and swiped by Marx) then we have little quarrel here. Why can you not understand fervor for the free market but be glad he supports the "underground" economy? What's the difference to you? ¶ Ah, here I disagree: "capitalism inherently leads to statism" in context implies other forms of ideology don't. Hah! Commune-statism (communism) and Syndical-statism (fascism, guild socialism) are *not* imperialist? (They are less successful at it than capital-statism, I'll agree.) ¶ No quarrel with your Revisionist History of current events, especially Grenada. ¶ How can porn violate or even affect anyone's rights? You have your Right to yourself and all you own, as do I. How can saturation porn-publishing affect either of those in the least? *What* are you talking about? ¶ Lecturing the kid probably backfired. You could try thinking like an agorist and point out to the kid how sexism will hurt *him* rather than abstractions like "others." Grab somebody by his/her vested interest and you've got him/her! ¶ What's "manipulation" got to do with coercion? What's wrong with child porn? I don't find it a can of worms, anyone who calls the State for any reason, including child porn censorship, is no anarchist. If you can't stand the libertarian heat, get out of the Anarcho-Kitchen. ¶ One need not define child. If the entity (three-year-old human, dolphin, green tentacled BEM) claims rights, it's got 'em. If it cannot, it ain't. I reject "child" and adult as useful legal (including anarcho-arbitration) concepts. ¶ "Porn puts a stamp of approval on . . ." So what's the difference between that and someone standing up in front of you and your child and directly putting a stamp of approval on

whatever. Will you unleash violence to shut the person up? Wherein lies the difference? ¶ You are aware that rape ran rampant in ultra-repressive regimes where pornography was highly suppressed? And how much pornography did Atilla and his huns have? *What* are you talking about? ¶ Your description of pornography only proves you have read little or none. I've typeset thousands of volumes worth and the variety would (it seems) boggle your mind. I simply cannot believe the extent of your ignorance on this subject, far beyond your understandable errors in economics. ¶ *Whew!* Maybe we can get back at this point: I too support your friend who is a separatist relative to men. I know all too many relative to women and felt that way myself in my teens (Henry Higgins was an early role model). ¶ What's sexist about *Bimbo*? The original song from the 1950s was about a *boy*. — Ges on nuke plants and Silkwood. ¶ (Ct Georg) Why not vote? Because it is naked aggression, pure and simple. There are no preferable winners and can never be. All statist are the enemies of all anarchists all the time. Your ballot, as Spooner pointed out 140 years ago, marks you as a co-conspirator with a secret band of murderers and thieves. My personal favorite contemplation is simultaneously blowing up all the polling booths on Election Day, with those vicious voting bastards still in them. Perhaps when people defend themselves against voting, statist won't be so casual and flippant about the act. VOTE = the only true four-letter obscenity. ¶ Your frustration over your having to repeat yourself over and over again about Feminists not being anti-male, anti-sex and what all (I agree with you and am a card-carrying, founding member of the Association of Libertarian Feminists—ALF), may help you understand *my* frustration in having to explain elementary economic libertarian concepts over and over. Let's face it: if neither of us felt that it was valuable, we'd quit.

Rick Buchanan See my ct imagine above on *Bimbo*. It has *many* local meanings, it seems; I never even heard yours before. Probably mutated like *Bozo* did. ¶ (Ct Anni) Different point of view, eh? How about *male* beauty contests, like Mr. America? Bother you? (They do me. I don't watch them.) ¶ Gcst imagine on maximum wage *et al.* ¶ (Ct Tomas) Sorry, you're allowed to use the argument about getting resources out of the State's tentacles if and only if it objects. If you suck its teat and it smiles, you are one of its spawn. Excuse me while I adjust my crosshairs on you. ¶ (Cst me) I never dropped out of *APANYU* and never will! ¶ Should be some MLL samples in your mailbox before this zine. Join. Turn you college LA into an ass-bustin', state-smashin', draft-trashin' MLL chapter!

Georg Patterson Right on about less votes! (*Fewer* votes, for the purists. Oh, yes, I'm a purist.)

Tomas Somero Get Brian on Kaza. But there have been useful libertarian organizations. Even besides mine. ¶ Get *imagine* on infinite minimum wages. ¶ I am amazed that you attacked Nozick for probably the only thing he got right.

Anni Ackner (Ct Arthur) I guess my conditioning was lacking. I've got nothing against your description of beauty but I'd prefer taller and darker and couldn't care less about eyesize. And Tom Selleck is considered attractive? Have times changed. God, I'm feeling old now. ¶ (Ct Elayne) C'mon. "Taxi dance," indeed. Benatar is portraying a prostitute and the revolt scene is against the pimp.

Elayne Wechsler Xerox problems. Bah, humbug, back to trufannish hecto! ¶ (Ct Mike Ghu) TANSTAAFL is Frefannish and that is spoken here. ¶ (Ct Rick) I've found no lack of friends from arguing; I have more than I know what to do with or have time for. Rick seems friendly enough to me. What's *your* problem? You obviously do not stifle your disagreements for the sake of popularity—otherwise you wouldn't disagree with Rick! Aren't you the manipulative little hypocrite?

Arthur D. Hlavaty Thanks for the quote. I'll check out William Burroughs at long last. Ghod, how I used to love trapping John Boardman into blatant contradictions back in OI' NYUSFS days at Lunacons! ¶ (Ct Martin) I'm finding the problem with at least one socialist anarchist isn't her socialism but her anarchism: voting, censoring, regulating. She's worse than a partyarch! ¶ *Modern Times* is fourth on my must-read-immediately list, after Martin, Heinlein and Rothbard. I may get to it this year and pick up the discussion accordingly. Good point about Opposition sounding libertarian by selectivity. ¶ (Ct Elayne) Have I told you some of the background of

Against The Wall and Bill George? *shudder* ¶ (Ct Sean) No, anarchocollectivists obviously do *not* agree that "anarchy implies thinking and speaking for oneself." *Libertarianism and agorism* do (ideologies requiring anarchy as a component). By the way, are you aware of the (at least historical) differences between anarcho-communism and anarchosyndicalism and which has proven (on the whole) allies of individualist anarchy and which the common enemy? Do you care? (It may save your life some day.) As long as I'm at it, do you know about the "anarcholiberals" of Yugoslavia (and underground in the Eastern bloc)? Not what you might think. Feel free to ask me to elucidate on anything that's tickled your anarchofancy. ¶ (Ct Mike) "Panarchy" as you and Mike use it is community statism, a "limited government" form long advocated by Karl Hess but even he acknowledges the problems. *Expulsion* isn't the problem (really, if you are where you are by choice, why would you choose to be surrounded by disgusting and disgusted [at you] people?), escape is. The Leviticus-sers can uphold the letter of their law by putting to death any *who remain amongst them*, and as long as all are free to go, no problem. Here, then, is the overriding law which anarchists must uphold over communitarians: any and all (including "children") must be free to emigrate from a community they have rejected. I have no problems enforcing this (protection agencies with Indiana Jones-type rescuers) but non-agorists might run into unpleasant contradictory choices. If this intercommunal law is upheld, we have communitarian anarchy rather than statism. ¶ I am truly sorry to hear you had a vasectomy and devoutly hope it's reversible. You are one of the few males whose genes I would like to see remain in the pool. (Let the rest of the males slice and hack away at their testicular connections. I was ecstatic to hear Harlan whacked his off!) No need to answer; you and I have discussed my variant of social darwinism before. Of course, in my most conservative days (pre-libertarian), I strongly advocated freedom of genetically harmful substances *because* it would weed out undesireables. (The only problem with social conservatism is when they start acting like altruistic liberals, *i.e.*, "for your own good.") ¶ (Ct Sinn) See *my* (much earlier) attack on Nozick and, interestingly enough, inserted comment to you. Did you mention that son of a bitch before and thus I associated you?

Sean Haugh "Strikes" Again I'll believe in wage slavery when someone shows me their shackles keeping them from entrepreneurialism. ¶ I fit the double-bell-curve. This is a rare zine started in the middle of the cycle (I *knew* I had a lot to catch up). ¶ Hard core! on being self-employed and unreported. You make me proud, kid. ¶ Good thinking on civil pseudo-rights. ¶ The market already corrects for discrimination. As you increase your discrimination, you reduce your customers. It gets economically painful very quick because most businesses operate on the margin. (Ask Mike if you aren't sure about marginal human action; after all, he's immersed in Mises right now after all my recommendations, right?) ¶ Yeah, let's dance on the graves of the banksters. ¶ "Paul Jacob's action group" is Paul; an amusing individualist joke. ¶ *The Spark* is taken from Lenin's paper, the Bolshevik journal. It's *Iskra* in Russian. ¶ I've had mail returned from the *Internationalism* p.o. drawer. ¶ I also do most of my reading (and writing, like this) on the bus. ¶ *The Memory Hole* has had two disties since you penned those words; so where's your zine? ¶ I remain sympathetic to Iran's foreign policy. Like Libya (until Hassan's "union"), it rejects all alliances, and I love Khomeini's active hatred of the international banking conspiracy. (He smashed Chase Manhattan and Exxon as soon as he got the chance—selectively, I might add. So the world Rockefeller-controlled media portrays him as the devil incarnate. Go get him, Ayatollah, baby!) *Jihad! Muad'dib!* ¶ The Israelis would be making a *big* mistake if the attacked nuke installations in Iran. They would finally be on the receiving end of a holy war. No Moslem country but Pakistan has nuclear capability to give Iran (it's too anti-technological to develop its own), and Pakistan is a U.S. satrapy. ¶ You're right, this zine of yours should be in *Memory Hole*.

Donna Camp Welcome back. Or, like me, did you never leave? ¶ Time zips along. I even got to meet Ethan. (Good libertarian name.) Who was Andrew? ¶ There seem to be a lot of babies around me these days, even though you progenitors are of divergent ages. ¶ Enjoyed your account. Birth can only be a vicarious experience for me, alas. Sounds like you have plenty of material for an article on

birth revisionism.

Son of Mike Gunderloy Sounds like you're doing a good job of refuting your Free Goods Economy after a slow start.

Kerry Thornley Thanks for the MLL plug but I still want comments in this medium.

Bacover *This fakir* doesn't look like Harlan Ellison.

COMMENTS ON FREFANZINE #48

Well, I'm back to commenting on the previous disty. I should actually have my act together be *Fref 50*. Mayhap I shall do a brief history of *Frefanzine* in celebration. But for now, on to those comments:

Cover But is it art? Seriously, Mike, how much longer are we going to have these surreal and abstract covers? How about some Heroic Romantic ones?

ToC 75 copy count? I may typeset the next *Frefanews* and crunch it, too. 50 pages? Nuts, say I and the general. But all my cst you should give you plenty of material for *your* 50 pages.

Nancy Lebovitz A logical title; I thought of it myself once, though not for an APazine. ¶ You would do back comments on a disty I missed. ¶ Gest Arthur. ¶ (Ct Mike) If you want an APA that welcomes non-contributing subscribers, try *The Memory Hole*. ¶ (Ct Paul) The stock market is a positive sum game in a progressive market and negative-sum in a regressive one. We've had a progressive market (in the long run) since the Dark Ages, even averaging in the Depressions. (See *Human Action* for definitions.) Complication: stock brokers and lawyers skim off percentages and fees; the SEC collects some tax or registration fee as well, I think. Interested in Counter-Economic stock purchases? ¶ Great question for the anarchocommunist, but even better for the commune-statist: what happens to people that the State will not house or feed? ¶ (Ct I*(C)*E) The entity which chooses is The Will. (Long live its Triumph!)

Shane Williams Welcome. It's going to be interesting having a self-described sociopath in *Frefanzine*. All of us break dozens of laws every day. Why are *you* behind bars and most of the rest of us not? (Yes, I'm edging into a discussion of Counter-Economics.) ¶ You start from a fairly good ideological position, except maybe "restructuring of taxation..." unless you restructure it to oblivion. ¶ Ct = comment to, which comes from your ct Mike. ¶ (Ct Ackner) La Roche not only does not claim to be a libertarian but denounces us as tools of the Black Guelph conspiracy.

Yarl The Freedomite An hoary old libertarian cliché (I said it in 1970) made into cartoon. Do you do Editorial Cartoons? Comic strips? Superheroes?

Vicki Rosenzweig Bomb your local polling place? Yeah. ¶ You were a member of the Party of the Right? (*awe*) Jared Lobdell has filled me with tales and legends about it. ¶ (Ct Brian H.) Don't want to "burn Christians at the stake or something," eh? Wait till he sees *The Wicker Man*. ¶ (Ct Brian B.) Another possible market solution to parking: disposable vehicles. (Ecophilias, consider yourself taunted.) ¶ (Ct Mike ct Darlene) How is *God And Man At Yale* these days? And woman, now, too? By the way, can you get into Morry's? ¶ (Ct me) Are you serious or did you read our pitch too quickly? ¶ Rockefeller break laws, too. Of course, they get away with it, but so do we. Why not use what tricks of theirs we can scale down? ¶ I'll put you on the list for first membership in AgoraCard. ¶ (Ct Jimmy) "Liberalism was pronounced dead many years ago. It's tenacious." It's still dead, Jim. Also on the critical list: Marxist-Leninism. (See *SNIA #2 & #3* for details.) ¶ (Ct RAAG) Actually, Coolidge was, relatively, an interventionist. Now Warren G. Harding, there was a limited governmentalist. ¶ True, but one of the ways to be "flashy and popular" is to be "progressive" if the market demands it. Right now, the rock market is on the side of the post-punk angels... ¶ Just noticed a consistent typo. Ct = comment to; hence, comments to is cst; not cts. Like mothers-in-law. ¶ (Ct Sean) Hard-core protestants opposed paid clergy, too, such as my Russian ancestors and U.S. Quakers. Of course, it's not the *paying* they object to, it's having clergy at all. ¶ (Ct B.) I'm pleased to hear that the Strangely Clothed

Assholes (© Arthur Hlavaty 1978, I think) have so diverged from fandom tha Jonathan could be so surprised. Good riddance.

Martin Morse Wooster Robert Poole wore a "Smash The State" T-Shirt? You have witnesses? Photos? Mr. Minarchist, himself? ¶ Poor Ed! Want to do a piece on him for NL? (I *knew* there was someone we hadn't offended yet! No, I mean Crane's *enemies*.) ¶ (Ct Elayne) All right! (*take off gloves*) Let's get down! "I'd prefer to see my friends as friends—not as titles, power objects, or sex objects." What's a "friend?" How does it differ from a mass of protoplasm in human shape? *Ideas*, Martin. (And, even in this APA, those holding your error are Legion.) To me, human beings are a bundle of ideas—a quantum bundle of various wavelengths superimposed. Titles, power, and sex characteristics, I'll grant you, are not what I select for either. But many have thrown the following at me: "I don't like/never use 'labels'." My usual response is, "Let me know when you've decided to resume thinking and we can talk again." Labels are designations of concepts; anti-label = anti-concept = no thought. Where's Arthur? I think he was involved when I last had this out in *LASFAPA*. Anyone ought to object to being categorized monodimensionally with a label. But a collection of labels? I'm an agorist libertarian, Romantic-sf Fan, Natural-law metaphysician, scientist by education, Albertan by geographical-cultural heritage, genetically Russian, and 37 years old in that order. Tha defines me pretty well. For those who care, I'm claimed by the Canadian state as their subject, and am a monogamous heterosexual male *homo sapiens*. Long live labels! I willed them and embrace them all. ¶ (Ct imagine) Isn't *The Washington Weekly* in financial trouble? (*Aren't we all?*) How likely are you to collect that 20¢ a word? ¶ (Ct Sinn) Go ahead, read Rand; skip Nozick. And to O'Fein, if I may borrow your phrase, "You're politically incorrect—get out of my life, scum!" Oh, he already got...? ¶ I'll bite, why is the Unification Church an evil cult—or more evil cult—then, say, the Roman Catholic Church? Judging by the *Wash Times*, the Moonies are more libertarian. (Ah, the good old Edwardian era when libertarian Catholics like G.K. Chesterton were active. The head of the local C.S. Lewis Society is a Chestertonian and considers himself a libertarian, by the way.) ¶ (Ct Mike) Ridicule works only if you're in a superior position to begin with. If you're identified with an ineffectual, minor opposition, your ridicule is discounted heavily. Other tactics are then needed. ¶ "...copyrights are necessary in order to prevent theft..." Of what? ¶ Good meeting you at LA Con. Next year?

Imagine "Boy Iris?" You got the first belly-laugh I had triggered by *Frefanzine* in several disties. Poor cat...but I'm sure he'll grow up tough. ¶ Why is it an indictment of *this society* "that a major illness can totally wreck someone's already tenuous financial security?" In previous ones, she'd be *dead*. With insurance, she could have dealt with the finances (and I have no insurance, so I know I'm taking my chances); in an agorist society, the insurance would be cheapest, the competitive medical system would be cheapest, and, all else failing, interest on loans lowest. So if you want to improve "society" relative to health care, campaign for cutthroat *laissez faire* immediately! ¶ You lost my sympathy, but she sure gained it, when she remained *opposed* to State hospitals. Good woman, passing Life's Tests well. ¶ You get softer and softer core as the election approaches. You *really* think Cold Warrior Mondale would pull any punches? Reagan will be restrained by the Democrat Congress; who'll restrain Mondale? The Republicans? Remember the Goldwater-Johnson campaign and who "kept us out of Viet Nam." ¶ Here's the key: no matter who's elected, we do *not* have to live under Reagan-Bush, Mondale-Ferraro or Bergland-What's-his-name. We can choose to live under anarchy. Reagan has had no effect on my life these past four years except to provide me with a target for my anti-political writings. ¶ "I've always wanted to have an Italian vice president." You have a vice-president? You're further gone than even I thought. ¶ I'll skip arguing with you on Bruce Springsteen; you're already undoubtedly convinced I'm Out To Get You. ¶ Hey, you redeemed yourself aesthetically on the *Conan The Destroyer* question. Good Roy Thomas plot. In fact, I agree with you on every movie you mentioned... Strange. ¶ Linda Lovelace is a truly vicious little bithc. First she makes her bundle, then denounces the source to get born-again respectability. She's rightfully infamous in the industry. I'll take Marilyn Chambers any day. ¶ (Ct Mike) "Xtians"

are not the only ones into souls, by the way. In fact, they got most of their thinking on it from the Greeks (*pneuma*). So feel free to believe in souls without Christianity. (I don't, for what it may be worth.) ¶ You could lose weight eating nothing but lean meat, too. But I think I'll stay out of this round of Animal Rights, save to ask you directly: why fight for the "Rights" of anything that doesn't get up and claim they are oppressed? Surely if you must feel obligated, liberate everyone who *wants* to be and says so *first*. Then look for more trouble. ¶ Gct Rick that if we had a free market, we wouldn't need minimum wage laws. Nor would we have a mechanism with which to pass laws. A free market is impossible without anarchy. ¶ You surprise me by admitting you're weak on economics. You could totally blow me away by next telling me you'd done something about it. ¶ Another answer to Steinem is to support Nazi and Klan right to make their movies and novels. Then sexual-aggression literature would not be a special case nor would anyone think it "acceptable." Why should anyone assume *anything* printed or filmed is morally or aesthetically acceptable? A far better first approximation is the exact opposite. *Caveat emptor*. ¶ Linda Lovelace had all sorts of control over her life, all that counted in this case. She also had nothing to do with *Green Door*, that was Marilyn Chambers. ¶ A side excursion: "Is this wrong? Do these people need counseling?" What's the implied connection between these two statements? Nobody *needs* counseling, Big Sister. Quite the contrary, freedom exists in *not* listening. How would you like to be "counseled" by me in economics? Repulsive, eh? Nowhere as repelled as I feel about—profanity alert!—*psychological* counseling. Shooting psychologists is at best a misdemeanor. ¶ Sorry, *Penthouse vs Miss America vs Vanessa Williams* I see no victims. A lot of publicity for all concerned, though. ¶ (Cst me) I await your "evidence." It should be quite an expose, since none has been presented by the government or its academic toadies that systematic execution of significant numbers of Jews occurred during the brief years of the Third Reich. The camps existed and so did the work and, undoubtedly, the usual statist mistreatment. But if you continue to accept *without question* the claim that one State was significantly worse than the others and hence the others were "needed" to put it down, you perpetuate the current *real* evils we live with. No, dear imagine, there are *not* photographs of executions, nor are there any gas chambers in the camps, nor did they ever have any (not even in their architectural plans and blueprints). Weren't you the one screaming about people believing the lies about Central America in the *Journal-Constitution*? Why should it surprise you that the lies about the Enemy began with Woodrow Wilson, and continued through FDR and Truman? I'm not arguing about 100,000 vs 6 million; I am pointing out that *your state* invented that Holocaust lie and perpetuates it to manipulate your feelings today, about the validity of World War II, and that Israeli aggression today in the Middle East. Trivialize? Hardly. The point is we are *not* "talking about real people who were brutalized and murdered." We *are* talking about three real generations of Americans and Europeans (and above all, Jewish Westerners) who have been the manipulated victims of a monstrous lie. Now, let's talk about the Chatila Massacre—which was Justified by that lie. ¶ Right on! to that cartoon comparing word processors to food processors! I've been telling my pro friends that processed words sound like processed cheese.

Paul Reynolds (Ct Mike) Your economics are no credit to you, Berkman or anarcho-communism. I've read far more sound Anarcho-commie economics. ¶ Why don't you start the anarchocommune, if you'd join whatever one existed? Sounds logical to me, and then you could *show* us the superiority of your economics. My agorist community is up and running; you're welcome to visit and check us out anytime.

Anni Ackner Dorothy Sayers? What a doll! Hubba hubba! Only female Inkling, alas. Good quote choice. ¶ (Cst me) I think my Roman numeral remark was triggered by you abbreviating my initials but not my Roman III to an Arabic 3 as well, to form my usual fannish tetragram (SEK3). ¶ Wendy McElroy and Sharon Presley are well-known (outside your circle, I guess) libertarian feminists, writers for *New Libertarian* and friends of mine (though not of each other). Sharon started ALF and directed it for many years. Wendy recently edited a book on feminism, *Freedom, Feminism And The*

State. (Got into a row with the sponsoring institute by picking *anti-political* statements by individualist feminists. Heh, heh.) ¶ (Ct Sean) I would be ruled by neither, but if I have to pick one who is "sincere," I guess I'd pick Reagan over Gary Hart. The only sincere elected Democrat I ever knew was Lester Maddox. Hart sold out George McGovern and was changing his positions more often than his socks. Well-meaning? Of course, Reagan may be a well-meaning homicidal maniac; he'd certainly have to be sincere to be one...

Mike Gunderloy "Life Sucks?" But does it swallow? ¶ I'd be just as happy if *Fref* dropped below 100 [he said as he did a record-sized zine. Is this going over eight typeset pages? *double shudder*] By the way, I talked to Vic an hour before writing this and he *showed* me the first 13 disties of *Frefanzine* which he is mailing to you *now* (October 2). ¶ You and I differ greatly on what we want out of an APA. I like tight, condensed, cogent quality; you obviously wanted bloated, rambling zines. I'll continue to encourage the former and you (I guess) the latter. To put it bluntly, you see a problem that I don't. Why not adopt Vic's *Memory Hole* policy to discourage verbosity instead of fretting about "deadwood?" ¶ Not good, but *true* et E.H. Carter on anarchists agreeing. (I'd prefer a 10% agreement rate.) § (Cst me) Yeah, but how much revisionism do we do in *Fref*? Well, let's see how imagine deals with the really tough issue. (*Will the weird turn pro now?*) ¶ Actually, I did write glowingly in *The Smart Set* but you don't subscribe. You're right, I didn't have time otherwise. *sigh* I also had more interest openly expressed in me since I was more open this time about my feelings (it really works!) but, unfortunately, my interest lags. I only felt healed after Worldcon and CopperCon. Oh, well, back to fanac (*by Your Command, Master*) ¶ Don acknowledges debt and guilt. Do you need address to contact him? ¶ I am volunteering (*gulp*) to OE a Worldcon collation in Melbourne next year, if you're not going. And since Worldcon is third week in August, it evens fits your new schedule. ¶ Your Right to property means that I will come charging into the forced-labor camp at the head of the Revolutionary Agorist Cadre and free you for upholding it. It also means that gun you got busted for got manufactured in the first place (through a long chain of entrepreneurship encouraged by property-right respect and describable as a Natural Law). Propertarians undoubtedly were involved in counter-economically getting the illegal gun to you. Now I'll throw it back to you: what do you *want* from a Right? ¶ "A racist sexist pig cannot be an agorist." You got it. A libertarian, perhaps. But an *agorist* (yes, by my definition) has to have awareness of the marketplace's workings and the Market is inherently anti-discriminatory. Let me put it another way; a libertarian may be inconsistent about a lot of things and still hold the watered-down title. An agorist *must* be consistent; I built it into the concept. If you wish to wallow in contradiction, call yourself something else. ¶ (Ct me ct you) You are absolved of the sin of one-sided copying, my popish son. ¶ Oh, yeah, *that* party. When's the next! (Your anniversary party? Maybe I'll fly in...) ¶ No, you're the only one who asked about the 5% sliver of a chance wherein the LP could increase the net freedom. Let's keep it between us. (I don't want anything to be misconstrued as defence of the evil partyarchs.) ¶ I don't think people will be into modifying codes for theft purposes in an agorist society but, if I'm wrong, you'll be able to market your secure alternative. ¶ That's true, *Fref* had a horrendous record of blowing deadlines under Ken, Vic and Charles (me included, though it was only one disty). ¶ O.K., I'll contact Gilliland. Remind me a lot. ¶ Actually, considering the niggerization of "deadwood" going on, I might consider it a proud and lonely thing to join the ghetto. (Yes, I'd have worn the Yellow Star in Denmark in 1940.) ¶ (Ct - ai:) Interesting tactical decision on the poster question. I'd use your posters until *they* started ripping ours down, then unleash Reynolds in retaliation. ¶ Agree with evaluation of State counter-revolutionary actions. ¶ Right, I have yet to see women flock to any group. ¶ Makhno in the Ukraine and the FAI in Spain were under constant attack by statist armies of the left and right. Hardly "tried anarchist experiments." The Anarchovillage has had far fewer external

TYPESETTER DOWN. Didn't finish catchup. See you next ish.--SEK3