

# THREE IS TYRANNY

## FEDDY THE FREELOADER

**By: Ted Lang**

The title from the old John Ritter TV series playing on the original cliché as three being a crowd, can illustrate human interaction relative to society's principal attributes of economics and politics.

Let's keep this analogy as simple as possible; specifically, let us keep the imaginary players gender-simple by assigning them male roles. Let us further assume that the setting for this scenario takes place much earlier in the history of the human race, when our planet was sparsely populated, or that it is occurring in a vast isolated region on our planet long ago.

Let's assume one man is a farmer and that the other is a hunter. At some point, their paths cross. Assuming their basic ability to communicate via a common language, they take note of each other's abilities, prowess and accomplishments. And of course, they take note of the successful life styles both have adopted to provide for their basic needs: water, food, clothing and shelter. Their abilities enable them to survive, and as they have become adept at surviving, they have worked a little harder to provide reserves of that which sustains life. This overabundance of that which fulfills their basic needs on an "as needed" basis is what obviously constitutes "wealth."

Wealth is represented by excess accumulations from which we can draw from in an "emergency" should a retardation or restriction preclude us from earning or working towards acquiring that which sustains us. The farmer stores surplus crops, and the hunter surplus meats, furs and hides. In addition to noting each other's differing lifestyles and vocations, they naturally progress to that phase of human interaction where they recognize that they could continue to practice their vocations independently of each other, continue to acquire wealth, but could also interact with one another to improve both their situations.

For example, the farmer might take note of the hunter's weapons, a club, a crude ax, and a crude spear, and realize that his own acquired skills in making the tools necessary for farming, such as picks, plows, shovels, rakes and seed hole implements, would also give him an advantage over the hunter in making better hunting implements than the hunter now has in his possession.

Likewise, the hunter notices the shoddy roof and housing materials the farmer has used to construct his shelter, and feels that the hides cut from game he has killed for food can be used on the farmer's hut to improve the latter's shelter. Additionally, the hunter notes that the farmer's clothing is inadequate because it is not made from animal hides and furs.

They decide to trade. In essence, this represents the superior societal relationship termed the "free market." The farmer agrees to make a whole new set of hunting implements for the hunter and to also provide him with ten bushels of grain in exchange for the hunter's "payment" of several hides, furs, and game meat that the farmer can use. They even combine in their efforts by cutting certain hides into strips for use to bind sharpened stone to wood to improve on the design and construction of both tools and weapons.

They enjoy a mutually beneficial relationship, which not only improves their vocational capabilities, but obviously greatly increases the reserve commodities they create thereby making each wealthier. And in this exchange of wealth based upon both the skills and the labors of the participants, a little extra payment is demanded by each from the other to compensate for the extra labor each contributes to the free exchange of goods and services.

Several points can now easily be made: Is profit really profit, or is it merely payment for the extra services of another that employs his skills and labor? Certainly the farmer can show the hunter how to make better tools, weapons and to grow crops, rather than do the extra work required for profit. And cannot the hunter train the farmer in his vocation, and show him how to hunt game, butcher it, cure hides and utilize animal fur and bones? Then why don't they simply train each other and dispense with the complexities of their free market system of barter?

It is this basic question that demonstrates the beauty of free market capitalism. First, shouldn't it be considered, that both the farmer and the hunter choose their lifestyles because *they* felt it best to survive and be productive in this manner? The operative word is "choose." That is the key element of the *free* market; it allows choice of vocation. Second, each gets better at what they do, not only because they *like* doing it, but also because the more they do it, the better they get at doing it. It means that freedom of choice provides an enjoyment of one's vocation, and along with the desire to survive, the freedom to do what one enjoys provides the motivation for one to do the very best one can. And it is this freedom of choice and the motivating factor of profit that promotes efficiency by allowing individuals to excel at their chosen productive specialty.

The free exchange of goods and services provides many more benefits. Does it make sense for the hunter and the farmer to enter into a dispute such that one physically harms the other? Does it pay for one to kill the other to acquire his wealth? What is the real benefit of them competing with one another such that all they acquire is a temporary condition of wealth? This is obviously the lesson from Aesop that strongly urges resistance to focusing on immediate wealth as opposed to long-term productivity demonstrated in the fable of the goose that laid the golden eggs.

Now let's consider the entry of a third man who interacts with both the farmer and the hunter. Perhaps this individual has survived long before meeting up with the highly productive farmer and hunter by somehow accomplishing both hunting and agricultural skills to some degree. But it becomes clear early on in this new relationship of three individuals, that the third man has nowhere near the skills or abilities of the first two. In fact, realizing the superior life-sustaining and wealth-acquiring skills of the farmer and the hunter, the third man decides to devise a scheme to improve his own lot. The third man plots a strategy to obtain the benefits of both.

He explains to the farmer, that he's now a good friend of the hunter, and would appreciate it if the farmer would give him some extra grain and crops that the hunter could use, as he, the third man, will transport the extra bounty to the hunter to allow the hunter more time to pursue his vocation. The third man explains to the farmer that his service in transporting the farm goods to the hunter is saving the hunter time and effort.

In a like manner, he asks the hunter to give him extra meat, hides and fur for clothes, purportedly extra game commodities required by the third man's new friend, the farmer. In this new relationship, the third man is essentially lying. He's not a real friend of either, and the original parties of this small free market do not require the extra demanded by the third man for the mutual benefit of everyone. The third man continues this fraud, thereby obtaining sustenance for not only his basic needs, but also acquiring wealth in the process.

Perhaps at some point, a disagreement develops. One earner feels that the other earner and his new friend are cheating them. The third man "settles" the dispute, and serves as a comforter and counselor to both. For is it not in his best interests to keep both free market earners working hard so that he can continue to profit from the labors of both? And eventually, in his role of counselor, peacemaker, judge and servant of both, he acquires a role that puts him on an equal basis with those that provide him with life-sustaining benefits. Eventually, this third party so-called expert usurps the goodness of his beneficiaries, and appoints himself *superior* to both.

Now the third party creates rules of conduct. He tells the farmer what, where, when and how to plant. He tells him how to farm. And in a similar manner, the third party tells the hunter how to conduct his affairs. The hunter is told he must register his weapons with the third party, and use them only as directed. Sound familiar?

We now all recognize the players. We have the real earners and creators of wealth, and we have the parasitic and worse-than-useless third entity. The third entity, the state, cannot exist without the productive labors of the people it purportedly serves. And specifically, what good or service is provided by the state? It uses lies and falsehoods to extort earnings and wealth from producers. It creates class conflict where there is no conflict, and misrepresents that one group of individuals is taking unfair advantage of the other thereby appointing itself as arbiter, and of course, demanding payment for its beneficent role.

Is it any wonder then, that politicians are not producers, but takers of wealth? Is it any wonder, therefore, that politicians are all liars? If they line their pockets with that which is plundered from earners, either as campaigners promising to make government fair if and when elected, or when elected as tax collectors and war initiators, should we really expect them to keep such promises when they acquire their third party exalted stations? It is folly to expect otherwise.

The state's primary motive is the subjugation and usurpation of individual human talent and ability. Politicians and their state are despicable for their anti-God motives to undo what the Creator gave to all humans: the freedom to work, to create, to achieve, and to be proud of wealth honestly earned and the commodities labored for to provide for our families, ourselves, and our fellow Man. The producer and the consumer, representing the free market, will always be much better off without a third party, a non-productive parasite, a troublemaker that contributes nothing, plots to take everything, and serves only as a freeloader.

"[Published originally at EtherZone.com](#) : republication allowed with this notice and hyperlink intact."

**[Mail this article to a friend\(s\) in two clicks!](#)**

---

Ted Lang is a columnist for the [The Patriotist](#) and the [Sierra Times](#) He is a regular columnist for Ether Zone.

Ted Lang can be reached at: [tlang1@optonline.net](mailto:tlang1@optonline.net)

Published in the February 4, 2004 issue of Ether Zone.  
Copyright © 1997 - 2004 [Ether Zone](#).

**[We invite your comments on this article in our forum!](#)**