







76IC (Pouch Game)

GM: Tom Gould

Aut08/W08/S08

Correction: in issue 42, we printed the F08 adjudications. Those adjudications falsely listed the Austria move f bla-ANK as failing; in actuality, it succeeded. Consequently, Austria, not Italy, owned Ankara. Also, both Italy and Austria were listed as owning Venice; actually, Austria owned it and Italy did not. Thus, Italy had a removal instead of a build; and Austria had five builds. Thirdly, the following Italian moves were listed as succeeding, but actually failed: f MID-bre, f POR-mid.

I'm sorry for these massive corrections; the GM is not to blame, because the moves printed in issue 42 were GMed by Gil Neiger, the previous GM of the game--- apparently his mind wasn't on the matter.

Autumn 08

Austria (Schilling) a bur r-BEL.

W08

Austria (Schilling) b a BUD, a TRI, a VIE. Owed two

England (Miller?) NDR! GM d's a pru, a lvn.

Italy (Hudec) NDR! GM d's f nwg

S08

Austria (Schilling) a BUL s f ank-CON, a WAR s a sev-MOS, a arm-SMY,  
a BER-kie, a ven-APU, a BEL s a mun-BUR, a bud-GAL, a tri-VEN, a vie-BOH.

England (Miller) NMR! f NAT, a EDI, f ENG, f PIC, a STP, f HOL /h/.

Germany (Hollingsworth) f DEN s a KIE s aus a bel-hol (nso), a SWE h.

Italy (Hudec) NMR! a PIE, f ROM, a MAR, a PAR, f NWY, f MID, f TUN, f POR, a BRE,  
a con (r-otb), a bur (r-gas, ruh, otb)

77IU (Urf Durfal Game)

GM: Tom Gould

W06/S07

W06

England (Stimmel) b a LVP, f EDI, f LON. Owed one.

France (Gister) d a tun

Russia (Kelly) b a MOS

S07

Austria (Strain) NMR! a BUD, a TYO, a VIE /h/

England (Stimmel) a lvp-WAL, f edi-NTH, f lon-ENG, f kie-BAL, a ber-KIE, f BEL-pic,  
f hol-BEL, f mid-WES, f por-MID, f mar-LYO.

France (Gister) a VEN s f tyn-ROM, a BUR s a pie-MAR, f BRE h, a PAR-pic.

Germany (C.D.) a MUN /h/.

Italy (C.D.) a rom /h/ (r-otb).

Russia (Kelly) a MOS s a SEV s & a UKR s & a GAL s a RUM s & a WAR s a gal.

Turkey (Tutacko) NMR! f BUL(ec), a ALB, a SER, f ADR, f ION, a ARM /h/.

A concession to England has been proposed. Please vote on it with your next moves.

## "ECONOMIC SLAVERY"

Two issues ago, I made a brief statement that the idea of "economic slavery" was absurd. This statement proved more controversial than I thought, both Glen Taylor (a science-oriented libertarian) and Don Wileman (a Canadian "liberal", i.e., mild socialist) taking exception. Taylor offered as counter-example post-Civil War blacks, who continued to work their plantations at piddling wages, being exploited in an "economic slavery" as brutal as the pre-war legal slavery. Wileman offered as counter-example 19th Century factory workers, "forced" to work at starvation wages in a hostile economic climate.

To my thinking, the question of whether economic slavery is a reality or a myth is a make-or-break one. If one rejects its reality, one is perforce required to adopt a belief in the free market; and if one accepts it, one is perforce required to accept the necessity for at least some government provision of social services, and consequently the adoption of a mild socialism.

In a true free market, individuals are free to sell their labor at whatever market price they can command. The price of an individual's labor will depend on the "supply" of his type of labor---the number of others willing and able to do his job---and the demand for his type of labor---the number of openings for individuals with his skills. Since an individual is free to take whatever available job he can find that is commensurate with his skills, the idea of "economic slavery" is absurd. If he can find no job, he may starve; and if the market is such that many individuals are competing for few jobs, forcing down his wages, he may starve. But he is not a slave.

In the postbellum South, blacks did not operate in a free market. Through social and legal pressures, blacks were unable to better their circumstances. They could not gain the education required to enter the skilled labor and professional markets; and even if they could do so, no employer would willingly employ them. Thus, blacks had no choice but to continue working as they had before; and legal strictures prevented them from demanding higher wages. Thus, blacks in post-bellum Dixie were, effectively, slaves. But they were slaves because of the moral and legal structure of Southern society; not because of economic circumstances. Though the form of their slavery was economic, the cause of their slavery was force used by Southern society to prevent them from competing in the free market. Thus, "economic slavery" did not exist; "legal slavery", of a more roundabout nature than existed before the war, did exist.

As another example, let us consider the coal miners of Appalachia before the New Deal. They lived in isolated company towns. A worker's town was effectively controlled by a single coal company; he could sell his labor to that company, or he could starve. He could not travel to another town to sell his labor there, both because he could not afford to move, and because he would be pegged as a "troublemaker" by his old town's company, and his new town's company would consult the old and refuse to hire him as a result. If he worked for a company in a coal town, he would be forced to purchase his food and other necessities of life from the company store; no other store would be available to him, because the company would use monopolistic techniques to prevent the establishment of any competing store in town. Prices at the company's store would be jacked to ridiculous heights, and unlimited credit would be available; thus, every worker would quickly run up a large tab at the company store. Consequently, workers would be forced to continue to work, because the company would close in with a huge bill if they quit. Coal miners were subjected to a form of "economic slavery." Or were they?

In fact, the "economic slavery" was actually a legal slavery clothed in economic form. The workers' slavery was created by the company's use of immoral coercive actions. Blacklisting trouble makers is an example of immoral (and illegal) action in restraint of trade. Control of the coal towns' legal apparatus by the coal companies meant the

