

# Fewer Laws Mean More Freedom

By Roy Minet (Rev. 03/24/14)

Supreme Court cases deciding the religious (or other specific) freedoms of businesses such as Conestoga Wood Specialties unfortunately misdirect attention away from the important underlying issue. A succession of similar cases can be expected unless and until the fundamental cause is removed.

Whether or not provisions of the Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as ObamaCare, should override the religious convictions of private business owners and force them to buy employee health insurance that covers contraception should never have been an issue. It has arisen only as an unfortunate consequence of a prior unjustifiable use of government force: ObamaCare itself. That is the real issue.

We fought the Revolutionary War to escape the repression of King George and win our freedom. Now, we tolerate a thicket of laws more repressive in many ways than King George ever was, not to mention much higher levels of taxation. Of course, some laws are entirely proper, but so many laws go way beyond the strictly limited powers that we the people delegated to our government through the U.S. Constitution, and they often trample upon its Bill of Rights. The only legitimate purpose of government is to protect and secure individual rights to life, liberty and property, certainly *not* to restrict and violate these rights.

Individuals should be free to do whatever they like as long as they do not infringe upon the equal rights of others; live and let live. The “let live” part means that force may not be used on an individual unless that individual has used force or fraud *first*. This is the libertarian non-aggression principle (NAP). Not adhering to the NAP results in a cascade of ensuing problems that could have been easily avoided. ObamaCare is just one colossal example.

If the rights of the individual are guaranteed and someone goes into business selling bobble-head dolls they make in the basement, are that person’s rights no longer guaranteed? Of course, you do not lose any rights by selling bobble-head dolls. If several individuals form a partnership for some business endeavor, do they lose any rights? Of course they don’t. A larger enterprise may need to be handled by individuals associating with each other to form a corporation. Do the owners of such an enterprise lose any rights? No, they cannot.

Suppose a business hires employees; that is, a voluntary agreement is made to exchange labor for pay and/or benefits. Are the rights to life, liberty and property for the employees guaranteed? Of course. Are the same rights for the business owners still guaranteed? Of course. How about those rights for the customers? Yes, the rights for all individuals are still guaranteed. Everyone is fine as long as everything is voluntary and no one, including the government, *initiates* the use of force. As soon as the NAP is violated, troubles begin.

Clearly, the owners of any business must be free to decide what kind of insurance, *if any*, they wish to provide as a benefit to their employees. Employees are free to decide whether or not they wish to work for a business and customers also are completely free to patronize the business or not.

One other glaring example (among many) of a NAP violation is the government forcing a definition of marriage upon people. As with all social institutions, it is entirely up to individuals (and groups of individuals like churches) to decide and define for their community what social institutions and practices should be. The government has obviously caused a plethora of completely unnecessary and avoidable problems in these areas.

How many other “problems” could be solved if the government would simply butt out, stay within Constitutional limits and stop using force on peaceful people?

Freedom works!

(Published, *Lancaster Sunday News*, 03/30/14.)