

RETALIATORY RECAPTURE

A DOCTRINE FOR POLITICAL VICTORY

BY

RICHARD R. SLOMON

POLITICAL ACTION CAUSUS

JANUARY, 1978

RETALIATORY RECAPTURE

The State is our enemy! Generally, the people who run the State are our enemies! Those who willingly contribute to the State are also our enemies! There are many, however, who are the unwilling supporters of the State, those whose property is extorted but who do not, or cannot, take action to regain their stolen property. These victims are not our enemies but, apriori, we owe them nothing. As long as the victims of the State continue to endure passively, they cannot begrudge our temporary employment of their expropriated property to defend ourselves against the predations of the State. This is the Doctrine of Retaliatory Recapture. One who is attacked has the right to disarm his aggressor and temporarily confiscate the aggressor's weapons in arresting his attack. The State is an aggressor which uses stolen property to aggress its victims. Anyone has the right to recapture that property in the maintenance of self defense.

Of course, the victims of statist theft are not culpable for the wrongs committed with their property by the State. Once an individual effectively loses control and formal possession over something, he logically cannot be held liable for the misuses of that item by someone else. The original owner of the lost property, however, in reasserting his claim must meet the costs incurred by those who effected restoration from the State. In turn, he has the prerogative to add these costs to a restitutional damage suit against the responsible government officials.

Every individual has the right of self defense as a corollary of self ownership. In extrapolation of this premise, individuals have ethical prerogative to organize in their own self defense. On the other hand, they have no obligation to defend the interests of others, and no more so, to defend the interests of others who will not or cannot defend themselves. The ethical proscription invoked against libertarians taking over the apparatus of the State because the material means of the State are stolen, is not in keeping with reality, or with the objective application of a rational egoist ethic. The apparatus of the State is so massive and all pervasive that there is no way in which we can avoid being crushed without gaining control over portions of the State.

Those whose property is being employed to aggress others may not ethically make claim against the victims of the aggression. Those who willingly lend their property to such use are obviously owed no compensation for the defensive confiscation by its victims. If I loan my rifle to someone who uses it in a hold-up and the proprietor grabs the gun and smashes it over my associate's head, thereby breaking it to pieces, I have no claim against the victim of the crime. The only recourse I have is to hold my associate liable. Or in the case where I have been extorted by the IRS for certain liquid assets, I cannot make an ethical claim against those who would sit in Congress and spend my assets defending themselves against the State which was using my property to oppress them. In concrete political terms, this means that anarcho-capitalists have every ethical prerogative to use the State apparatus to advantage.