

Native Americans And Property Rights

By Leonard P. Liggitto

PART I

Libertarians owe a debt of gratitude to *The Individualist* for publishing "The Property Rights of American Indians," by Rosalie Nichols (February, 1970). I do not agree with some of the points made by Miss Nichols, but I think that the topic is one of fundamental importance to libertarians. The matter of precise understanding of property rights in actual practice is basic to libertarianism; yet it is an area of the most profound ignorance and plain sloppiness among many libertarian-oriented people. If such people are not reliable on the matter of property rights, one wonders whether they have been drawn to libertarianism not by its rigorous theory and practice but by heaven knows what accidental cultural attractions. Central to the libertarian is which claims and titles are and which are not property; flowing from this theoretical discovery must be action to defend property in the hands of its rightful owners and to place it in the hands of these rightful owners wherever non-owners have occupied or used it. Justice is the ultimate objective of libertarians.

Obviously, any libertarian who concerns himself or herself with such matters is engaged in the preeminent libertarian activity. Rosalie Nichols clearly is such a person. Any differences which I may have with her are secondary to the fact that she has embarked upon preeminent libertarian activity. It is an honor to engage in a dialogue with her.

The history of the European immigrants' relations with the native Americans is one of unrelieved violence. In that shameful history the English immigrants were conspicuous by their violence. Other European peoples have been less violent, and the French were reknowned for the almost good relations which they maintained with all Indians, gaining friends even among former enemies, as Rosalie Nichols notes. For almost four hundred years the English immigrants have maintained a permanent system of violence against the native Americans.

The original sovereignty claimed by Europeans over the American Indians and over the land of North America was based upon the European claim of religious superiority. Since Christianity was viewed by the Europeans as giving Christian governments and Christian individuals a superior claim compared with others, including the inhabitants, the European claim to dominance is based on their Christian religion. This was the basis by which the native Americans were denoted as 'savages' while the barbaric Europeans were denoted as 'civilized.' As Rosalie Nichols indicates, it was the designation as 'savage' or pagan upon which the rights of the American Indians to life, liberty or property were violated. One recalls the famous description of the landing of the English in North America: "First, they fell on their knees to pray; then, they fell on the Indians."

Fall on the Indians they did. In New England the Indians first encountered by the English immigrants had the misfortune to occupy and cultivate the better farm lands as well as to prefer to sell their furs to the highest bidder. Clearly savages par excellence; extermination was their fate. The other New England Indian tribes inhabiting the valuable river valleys flowing into Long Island Sound--Pequots, Narragansetts, Mohegans, etc.--were later massacred or sold into slavery in the West Indies by methods too gruesome to describe . . . but sanctioned, when not led, by ministers of religion and civilized officials. In Virginia several campaigns were fought against the Indians who had originally welcomed the settlers in the James River region; the institutionalization of Black slavery (the Indians were too

'savage' to accept enslavement which was the original hope of the labor-short, land-rich European officials) led directly to the desire for huge plantation tracts and the wars to oust the Indians from the other river valleys.

Whatever the roots of European violence, even the argument that the profound differences between Europeans and native Americans could mitigate some of the violence--irrational as that argument is--is unsupportable; the model of the methods, attitudes and practice of violence carried on by the English upon the native Americans was established in the violence of the English 'plantations' imposed on the Christian, European, and neighboring Irish (of which the current civil war in Ulster is one product). Late nineteenth century English and American social theorists (mainly socialists), creating the intellectual foundation for the New Imperialism of this last century, singled out their English forebears' violence against the Irish, native Americans, *et al.* as proof of their racial superiority--aggressors and conquerors are defined as superior to the exploited and oppressed in superman theories--and as the justification for the wars of extermination and conquest launched by England and America, and which have culminated in the American aggression in Vietnam.

However rationalized, the Europeans' claim to sovereignty over North America is logically unsupportable. However, Rosalie Nichols claims that the North American continent could be legitimately claimed by the native Americans. She says: "The American continents were not ownerless." Yes, if it is meant that certain lands were owned. Certain lands were owned and the major part was unowned. I doubt if she means that the native Americans claimed sovereignty over North America (although, of course, if such a thing as sovereignty could be legitimate the native Americans would have possessed it and not the Europeans). But, the property rights of the Indians to the land they owned must be recognized; as well as the fact that that right was totally violated by the English immigrants.

When the English immigrants landed in the Chesapeake Bay and the Massachusetts Bay they were welcomed by the Indians. The English settlers brought manufactured products not yet developed by the Indians and the Indians taught the English immigrants agricultural methods not yet developed by the English. The Indians did not view the establishment of private property in land by the immigrants as anything wrong, immoral or in violation of their rights. The Indians along the Atlantic coast recognized that there was more than enough land there to satisfy many hundreds of times the tens of thousands of immigrants who poured out of England to find a freer and better life in America. The difficulty was that the English immigrants were not satisfied to live alongside the Indians in mutual recognition of rights. The English insisted upon the power of government over the lives and the lands of the Indians. According to the English, there could be no free exchange between individuals and groups living their own lives on the wide land. The English had to have the monopoly over people and land. The people and the land had to be obedient to English immigrant officials.

The problem then was not the matter of settlement and private property, but the matter of government. Where government exists, private property rights are negated. When the English immigrants came, they were divided into two groups, or classes, the farmers who settled and worked their private property and the rulers who had

(Continued on page 5)

NATIVE

assumed farmers respect. by the 1 of aggre ernment as the 1 was litt seized 1 have to available tempt to rather which ti no mixi or land of the 1: distribut (there w by the E

Of co the India of farm the doub of Engli often the immigr if they c be mad Indians difficult of the money and wo sense 2 which th

If the land the to an t the land margina Indians feudal 'prices' farming had to Americ

Durin less vic the fact Like th valleys, terester peacefu lives a situatio sylvani: the Qua

The model c Indians agreeat the Tre Europe. the soi of the 1 as the govern

This ment o

NATIVE AMERICANS — (continued from page 4)

assumed government positions. The English immigrant farmers and the Indians tended to live in peace and mutual respect. It was the claim of government over the Indians by the English immigrant officials which was the cause of aggression and genocide against the Indians. The government officials in all the colonies used their offices as the means of their personal enrichment; since there was little in the form of liquid capital to be seized, they seized lands in the hopes that future immigrants would have to purchase lands from them if there were none available for free settlement. The governors did not attempt to develop the land to turn it into private property; rather they assigned each other large tracts of lands which they left unimproved and undeveloped--there was no mixing of labor with the lands. It was pure feudalism or land monopoly, the negation of private property. Most of the lands in the colonies not occupied by settlers were distributed among the government officials as land grants (there were also large land grants given to the courtiers by the English kings).

Of course, these tracts included the areas on which the Indians were settled and had carried out their industries of farming, fishing and hunting. So the Indians suffered the double violence of being placed under the government of English immigrant officials and of English land grantees--often the same people. If the Indians did not accept English immigrant government, war would be made upon them; if they did not accept English feudal landholders, war would be made upon them--by governments. In addition, if the Indians continued to live and to work these lands it would be difficult to get new immigrants, who now had to go to one of the land monopolists to get land, to pay much or any money for land which the Indians already lived upon and worked. The ordinary settler had enough common sense and respect for rights not to want to claim land which the Indians already lived upon and worked.

If the immigrants merely went in and worked unused land the Indians would have no objections, or if they came to an understanding with the Indians who might be using the land--the Indians valued very low economically their marginal uses of the land for hunting and fishing--the Indians would have no objections. But, this disturbed the feudal landlords who wished to assign lands and collect 'prices' or taxes. The existence of Indian settlement and farming undermined the feudal land monopolies, so the land had to be cleared by the extermination of the native Americans.

During the colonial period, the Middle Colonies witnessed less violence against the Indians. In part, this was due to the fact that most of the settlers there were not English. Like the French in the St. Lawrence and Ohio-Mississippi valleys, the Dutch, Swedes and Germans were more interested in the profits of commerce and good farming in peaceful accord with the Indians than in the destruction of lives and money in the plundering of the Indians. This situation was institutionalized with the founding of Pennsylvania by the Quakers; as in so many other matters, the Quakers are worthy of close analysis by libertarians.

The relations of the Quakers with the Indians were a model of justice which was constantly commended by the Indians themselves. The last of a series of mutually agreeable treaties between the Indians and the Quakers, the Treaty of Easton of 1758, placed the final limitation on European settlement. Pennsylvania released all claim to the soil west of the Alleghenies and of a large section east of the Alleghenies and north of the present Sunbury, as long as the Indians did not sell the territory to any other government.

This treaty of the Quakers was used by English government officials at a conference with northern Indian chiefs

at Canajoharie on the Mohawk River west of Albany as an example of English intentions (April, 1759): "I hope this surrender will convince you and all other Indians how ready your brethren the English are to remove from your hearts all jealousies and uneasiness of their desiring to encroach upon your hunting lands, and be a convincing proof to you how false the accusations of the French are that we are at war with them, in order to get your country from you." Of course, the French accusation was accurate; the English had gone to war against the French to gain the trans-Appalachian Indians' land which was protected by the French.

The officials in England in league with the American officials and the heirs of officials, who inherited the huge feudal domains that were the fruits of office-holding in America, hoped for even larger rewards by gaining land monopolies across the Appalachian Mts. Having monopolized the lands along the Atlantic coast, the planters by control of the government apparatus excluded the newer immigrants from homesteading the wide lands along the Atlantic coast. Since the Atlantic coast region is able to support many times its present population there was no economic need for Europeans to settle beyond the mountains. The only attractive resources--minerals--were either in the Appalachian Mts. or bordered major waterways such as the Great Lakes, and could have been extracted by miners whose settlements would be approved by the Indians without any difficulties.

But, as a result of the feudal land system along the Atlantic coast, the new immigrants could not pay the high 'prices' demanded by the government officials and their heirs; they hoped to be able to homestead across the mountains. Crossing out of the control of the seaboard officials, into the lands of the western Indian tribes, these settlers could and did homestead farms and gained the recognition of the local Indians. An ideal situation would have been the acceptance by the European settlers of the essentially stateless society of the Indians. The Europeans could have developed among themselves and with the Indians a social system based on free exchange which was the basis of much of the economic life of the Indians. The Quakers' excellent relations with the Indians were based on the fact that they were the only Europeans dedicated to social relations based upon equal and free exchange--which explains why Quakers have always been out of step with other Europeans.

An imperfect but acceptable system was proposed by some of the wise organizers who carried forward the American Revolutionary struggle against English officialdom and their associated American feudal landholders. The revolutionary impetus for the abolition of feudal holdings and their replacement with the institution of private property would have meant that there would be plenty of land for homesteading along the Atlantic seaboard. But, retaining elements of Christian messianism, the United States government claimed the trans-Appalachian territories inhabited by the Indian tribes. However, the trans-Appalachian areas were projected as states in the American Confederation: states composed of and controlled by the Indians themselves.

During the period of the American Revolution the control of the trans-Appalachian territory by the Indians was recognized in treaties with the American Congress such as that between the Delawares and the Continental Congress (September, 1778). In return for a trade dependency in which the Americans had the monopoly right of supplying goods for purchase by the Indians, the United States proposed that the Indians could form state governments in the trans-Appalachian area which would be equal to the states of the European settlers on the Atlantic coast. "... the United States do engage to guarantee to the aforesaid nation of Delawares, and their heirs, all their territorial

(Continued on page 6)

NATIVE AMERICANS - (Continued from page 5)

rights in the fullest and most ample manner as it hath been bound by former treaties, as long as the said Delaware nation shall abide by and hold fast the chain of friendship now entered into. And it is further agreed on between the contracting parties should it for the future be found conducive for the mutual interest of both parties to invite any other tribes who have been friends in the interest of the United States, to join the present confederation, and to form a state whereof the Delaware nation shall be the head, and have a representation in Congress." A similar project was promised to the Southwest Indians in the Hopewell Treaty of November, 1785 with the Cherokee Nation: "That the Indians may have full confidence in the justice of the United States, respecting their interest, they shall have the right to send a deputy of their choice, whenever, they think fit, to Congress."

The Northwest Ordinance passed by the Continental Congress in 1787 declared: "The utmost good faith shall always be observed towards the Indians; their land and property shall never be taken from them without their consent; and in their property, rights, and liberty, they never shall be invaded or disturbed, unless in just and lawful wars authorized by Congress." In conforming with that a treaty was drawn up with the Indian tribes north of the Ohio River and west of the Allegheny mountains. Signed in January, 1789, the United States did "confirm the said boundary line; to the end that the same may remain as a division line between the lands of the United States of America, and the lands of said nations forever," and did "relinquish and quit claim to the said nations respectively, all the lands lying between the limits above described, for them the said Indians to live and hunt upon, and otherwise to occupy as they shall see fit."

This reasonable arrangement was quickly overthrown by the new government which took control in April, 1789 as a result of the overthrow of the Continental Congress and the Articles of Confederation by the *coup d'etat* in Philadelphia in 1787. The control and exploitation of the lands west of the mountains was a major cause for the calling of the secret conclave in Philadelphia and for the Constitution it produced. Just as the impetus for the abolition of feudal holdings and the institution of private property following the revolution was blunted, so the impetus for the abolition of slavery had been blunted. Part of the drive for the new, more powerful central government was in defense of slavery. The limitation against slavery in the whole west as originally intended was restricted to the Northwest territory, opening the Southwest territory to slavery. The plantation areas of the coast had become depleted and the slave-holders required new territories extending through Georgia, Florida, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi for plantation cultivation. Land clearing by the extermination of the Indians was necessary to make room for the slave quarters.

The early aggressions by the new United States government were defeated by the Northwest Indians in November 1791; but the United States army reversed this defeat and "the big push westward over the prostrate bodies of slaughtered Indians was begun." A thorough and detailed description of the process of genocide carried out by the United States government against the American Indians would be required for a final view of the subject. A study of the "Five Civilized Nations" of the Old Southwest would be a good beginning. The Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek and Seminole had some of the most developed and productive villages among the American Indians. Their skill in agricultural industry made them especially subject to elimination. By 1838 the "Five Civilized Nations" had been driven over the "Trail of Tears" from their rich lands to the barren territory across the Mississippi River.

Bits And Pieces

By Jerome Tuccille

A few months back I mentioned in this column that a short booklet, HOW TO REFUSE INCOME TAXES - LEGALLY, written by Lucille E. Moran, might be a good investment for libertarians interested in beating the revenue authorities. My good friend and "legal advisor," Lucille Moran, has now come up with another booklet called WHAT LICENSE?, available for one fiat dollar through the Independent Bar Association of Massachusetts, P.O. Box 187, Islamorada, Florida 33036. I have read the piece in manuscript form and can testify that it is a truly radical attack on the judicial system in the best libertarian tradition and well worth the price. Miss Moran is a muckraker and radical of the Old Right variety (an anarchist although she doesn't like the word), an individualist activist well versed in natural law and early-American history centering around the revolution. She analyzes the stranglehold that privileged groups have on our judicial system and advocates the creation of independent bar associations such as her own (of which I am a board member). Lucille is now opening shop as a legal advisor at an initial fee of \$100 for those who need counsel in avoiding the income tax.

What are her credentials? The fact that she has not filed and gotten away with it for over eight years. What establishment lawyer can make that claim?

The libertarian movement has grown at a refreshing pace during the past year. It has received favorable coverage in such diverse publications as *Playboy*, *Penthouse*, *Cavalier*, *The Wall Street Journal* and *Nation's Business*, and was deemed worthy of a lampooning in the September, 1970 issue of *Esquire*. Any idea that catches on and becomes fashionable runs the risk of being exploited by unsavory characters with a firm grasp on the "pulsebeat" of the nation. So it was predictable that such a one as Jeffrey St. John, a fanatical Buckley conservative four years ago, a slavishly devout Objectivist two years ago, and a fanatically slavish Buckleyite Objectivist today, would publish an article in the *New York Times* identifying himself as a libertarian. They are stumbling out of the woodwork, tripping over one another's ambitions in a mad race to latch onto an accelerating bandwagon. Others of that stripe are sure to follow.

Realistically speaking, libertarianism is still a minor fringe movement virtually unknown among the general population which can barely pronounce it let alone understand what it's all about. For this reason libertarians must seek out alliances with larger groups in order to achieve even limited political goals. There simply are not enough libertarians around to constitute a single movement independent of all others. Murray Rothbard touched on this in his October 1st editorial, "When Revolution?" The question that poses the biggest problem for us today is: alliances with whom?

The Right Wing is, of course, hopeless all the way down the list of issues important on today's political scene: foreign policy; economics; civil liberties; a broad range of domestic policies including the draft, abortion laws and censorship (if only libertarians had known three years ago what the traditionalist half of the conservative alliance would be like once it ascended to power)! Our old friend, "Chairman Bill," has now established himself as a self-

(continued on page 7)

BITS AND

appointed
of Natio
Pantheor
These l
against
on at le
firsthand
prove fa

So we
what do
bunch of
loudmou
anarchis
present
but none
in Urugu
into a hi
cent of
its mon
down the
stolen a
In the
the swe
attack
of the
sidered

The l
too dim
destroye
tactics

This ma
societie
in our
much o
calism
knee-je

Close
sorry b
that libe
list alli
experts
sistentl
markab
the mil
Lindsay
polls.
by an a

Broad
option
tinguist
on the
structiv
peace
ganizin
of all
equalit
issue
racial
effectiv
obedier
and th
activis
and p
effecti
Indis
again
in a
tactic
out, f
just tv

U.S. IMPERIALISM

Spurred on the experience in Vietnam, a whole new generation is demanding to know the truth about American foreign policy. They no longer believe the continual flow of lies coming from the State Department and Pentagon. They want to know why U. S. soldiers, bombs and napalm are massacring a whole people in southeast Asia. Why are American boys being sent to kill and die in the hills and jungles of a peasant country ten thousand miles away? Whose interests are these soldiers defending? Since it is the peasants who are being slaughtered (perhaps by the millions), it is obvious that it is not the peasants' interests that are being defended. The questioning generation in the U. S. knows that it is not *their* interests that are being "defended". Just *whose* interests are being defended?

Fortunately, each year brings an increasing number of profound Cold War myth-debunking or "revisionist" articles and books into publication. During the past decade an important reawakening to place among academics, and among radicals in general, concerning the nature and history of U. S. imperialism which have helped to shed light on whose interests America's foreign policy has been defending in southeast Asia and elsewhere. 1969 was a vintage year for such works. Apologizing for passing over other important contributions, it seems fair to limit the field to the following three works mainly because of their brevity, pointedness and clarity: *Corporations and the Cold War*, ed. by David Horowitz (Monthly Review Press, 249 pp.); *The Roots of American Foreign Policy* by Gabriel Kolko (Beacon Press, 166 pp.); and *The Age of Imperialism* by Harry Magdorff (Monthly Review Press, 208 pp.). Each of these books is an important contribution in its own right; taken together, they combine to become a superb introduction to a clearer understanding of U. S. imperialism.

The Horowitz collection contains a seminal essay by William A. Williams, "The Large Corporation and American Foreign Policy", in which this master revisionist sets forth his grand thesis: In the 1890's after the manifest destiny of continental empire had been fulfilled, the businessmen and governmental leaders continued on with the "frontier thesis" mentality. That is, they believed that the option of continental expansion had acted as a safety valve which served to ease the social and economic dislocations among the more populous and established business, industrial and agricultural communities. There was some truth to this thesis, and since the depressed economic conditions of the 1890's coincided with the end of the continental frontier, the "frontier thesis" was further confirmed in the minds of the ruling elite. This confirmation was fashioned into an institutionalized ideological faith.

Rather than busying themselves with the necessary task of restructuring (decentralizing and liberating, my solution, not Williams') the domestic economy (an economy which was seriously distorted by both the Civil War and postwar intervention), the U. S. ruling class began on a well planned course of extra-national political-economic expansion within the categories of the "frontier thesis" in order both to "solve" the domestic ills and to maintain and extend their own position of economic control within the domestic sphere. The ideology which accompanied this expansion was that the extension of the free market was an extension of freedom. However they, of course, never tried to reconcile the inherent contradiction of free trade rhetoric and the central role that the state played in bringing about that "free trade". Freedom, self-determination and international peace came to be defined in terms of conditions which did not interfere with the new engine of international peace and freedom—"America's" expanding commercial relationships otherwise known as the Open Door Policy.

The American foreign policy over the past seven decades has been a continuous implementation of this basic policy. "Economic expansion abroad equals prosperity at home" has been the constant theme.

Lloyd C. Gardner's "The New Deal, New Frontiers, and the Cold War: A Re-examination of American Expansion 1933-1944" in the Horowitz collection is a brilliant reinterpretation of the "Good Neighbor" Roosevelt Era. The New Deal, far from being a period of "socializing" the economy, was, in its first phase, a period when the corporate-liberal leaders of U. S. state capitalism regrouped themselves for reentry into the shattered international economy, this time better prepared at home (more centralized control) to gain absolute global domination. Foreign political-economic expansion once again became the key to pulling the domestic economy out of depression. Armed with the Reciprocal Trade Act, the Import-Export Band, Lend-Lease, and finally with massive military might, the U. S. leaders had, by 1946, gained what they sought—control of the "free world" empire including the IMF and World Bank abroad and the Full Employment Act at home.

The Open Door Policy had but one more nut to crack, Bolshivism, and so the Americans began and heated up the Cold War. Not only was entry into the Russian markets important, but perhaps even more importantly, the Cold War was needed (along with export and investment outlets) to maintain Keynesian "defense" spending which would ensure the smooth operation of the whole vast system, as well as keeping the "free world" from throwing off its imperialist yoke through leftist insurgency.

Gabriel Kolko begins his book with a very important chapter, "The Men of Power", in which he convincingly identifies Big Business leaders as the ruling class in America. He shows that this ruling class dominates all of the important command posts through which limits are placed on the American System, both economic and political. There is a definite appearance of pluralism throughout the system; however, although certain competition and dissent is tolerated with the limiting parameters laid down by the ruling class, no competition or dissent is tolerated which would change the fundamental character the system's limits.

Big Business needs have become the singularly important "fount" for determining both domestic and especially foreign policy. Two excellent essays in the Horowitz collection complement Kolko's findings perfectly: "Business Planners and American Postwar Expansion" by David W. Eakins is, in a word, a gem, and one looks forward with anticipation to reading his forthcoming book along similar lines. The corporate liberal research associations were very busy and very influential throughout the New Deal, WW II, and in the postwar period. These business "think tanks" served as the key link between Big Business and government both as a repository of policy plans and as a willing source of supply for key personnel to implement those policies.

The intricate interrelationships between the National Planning Association, the Committee for Economic Development and the plans and implementation of the Marshall Plan are studied in detail. The NPA had what was later to become the Marshall Plan ready in 1944 and they were only waiting for a politically propitious moment to make it operative. The plan had no humanitarian intent whatsoever and was based solely on American domestic needs to keep corporate liberalism from retreating back into depression, to bring all of Europe under the American hegemony, and to increase corporate profits. The Truman, Acheson, Harriman "Red Menace" campaign came to their aid, and the business community increased the velocity of that scare campaign to the

(Continued on page 3)

U. S. IMPERIALISM — (Continued from page 2)

point where the politically propitious moment did arrive.

The second of these essays is G. William Domhoff's "Who Made American Foreign Policy, 1945-1963?" The answer is that Wall Street made and implemented the policy during these years. Domhoff explores the vital importance of the Council on Foreign Relations as the key link between Big Business and the various executive departments which carry out U. S. foreign policy. In addition to the CFR, the importance of the CED, the RAND Corporation, the National Security Council and other organizations as additional links are discussed.

Kolko's chapter, "The U. S. and World Economic Power", is an important overview of the international economy and the U. S. role in it. Fortunately Harry Magdoff's more detailed work fits in with Kolko's essay to give a more complete picture of the international web of U. S. imperialism.

Together they show how important the Third World's raw materials are to the U. S. domestic economy and that it is imperative for the U. S. ruling class to maintain access to and control over these materials.

Foreign aid is used in various ways to serve U. S. corporate interests (it serves no-one else's). It is used as a subsidy to the export sector. It is used to build infrastructure for the import sector. It is used to buy and maintain friendly *comprador* governments and oligarchies. It is used as a carrot to woo while military and CIA presence is used as the stick to convince. A careful mixture of grants and loans are used to make the various "free world" economies mere political-economic appendages to the U. S. economy. Both Kolko and Magdoff stress the "oneness" of U. S. economic, political and military foreign policy aspects. Magdoff's chapter "Aid and Trade" is an absolutely devastating exposure of foreign aid.

In his chapter "The Financial Network", Magdoff displays a keen depth of understanding concerning the nature of central banking and its role in the U. S. as an agency of imperialism. Central banking (the Fed), credit expansion, the major banks and their overseas branches, the IMF, and the dollar as the international reserve currency; all of these are discussed along with their interrelationships with one another and their relation to foreign aid and the spread of U. S. economic-military presence throughout the world.

Magdoff also destroys the "GNP myth" which states that since the annual foreign trade is less than 10% of the GNP, it is not very important to the economy, and therefore any talk of economic imperialism is just so much Marxist-Leninist propaganda. To say that, say, 5% of GNP is somehow unimportant in the first place would be ridiculous because 5% is a big chunk in absolute terms. But more importantly, what kinds of goods are included in that 5%? GNP figures tell us little. The imports are materials which are absolutely necessary for the survival of the system as it now functions. The exports are vital to those corporations which do the exporting. And, then, who generally controls these exporting and importing businesses? Members of the ruling class, of course. But even more important than the import-export trade is the overseas investment. Only the yearly capital exports are included in the GNP figures, the accumulated totals are not. Total revenues flowing from overseas investments have now reached the point where, by themselves, they are higher than the GNP of any other western nation. The relation between overseas investment, government aid in making those investments, and the profits thereby generated to the ruling class cannot be overestimated. U. S. imperialism is a fact, GNP or not.

The two final chapters of the Horowitz collection strike the final death knell to any lingering illusions concerning the relation between free enterprise and the U. S. economy. The U. S. economy may be a market economy, but it is a

The Individualist

An excellent new libertarian magazine has just been launched! This is *The Individualist*, the new monthly journal of the Society for Individual Liberty, and an outgrowth of *The Rational Individualist*, the magazine of the predecessor Society for Rational Individualism. *The Individualist* is a fully professional magazine, with numerous ads, and excellent layout and art work; the new publisher is the young libertarian, James Dale Davidson, who is also executive director of the new and rapidly growing National Taxpayers Union. Featured in the initial, February, 1970 issue (recently off the press) is an article on "The Great Ecology Issue: Conservation and the Free Market", by Murray N. Rothbard, who will contribute a monthly economic column for the magazine. The article is a libertarian critique of all aspects of the latest Ecology, or Environment, craze.

The forthcoming March issue will focus on a critique of the Pentagon and military spending, featuring an informative inside look at military spending by former Assistant Secretary of Defense A. Ernest Fitzgerald.

The Individualist is a bargain, available for 75¢ a copy, or \$5.00 per year, at 415 Second St., N.E., Washington, D. C. 20002.

ruling class encapsulated, increasingly fascistic market economy. Joseph D. Phillips' "Economic Effects of the Cold War" and Charles E. Nathanson's "The Militarization of the American Economy" are frightening essays which show just how intimately interrelated business and government have become. It is increasingly difficult (often impossible) to tell where the one sphere ends and the other begins.

Kolko's final chapter "The U. S. in Vietnam, 1944-1966: Origins and Objectives" is probably the best short (52 pp.) overviews yet to appear on the history of the Vietnam War and on Vietnam's strategic importance to the U. S. world empire. The Vietnamese War was *not* an inexplicable mistake into which the U. S. just happened to slip. *Neither* is the war a civil war. It is an imperialist war between the people of Vietnam and the American imperialist aggressors aided by their *compradors* in Saigon.

Kolko goes through the history of U. S. involvement in Vietnam from Yalta and Potsdam, to the victory of the people's revolution in China, to the complete economic support of the French via Marshall Plan funds, to the Geneva Conference of 1954, to American "advisors", and finally through the massive buildup of ground troops and the introduction of advanced mass murder techniques—good old "Yankee knowhow".

One point is brought out with particular clarity. The U. S. ruling class is indeed rightly worried about the "fall" of Vietnam leading to a series of similar "falls" throughout southeast Asia and elsewhere; for the domino theory *is correct*, though not in the crude sense that it is usually presented. As the Vietnamese win their self-determination by throwing off the American aggressors and their *comprador* Saigon regime, other peasants will see that it can be done, and together, the peoples of southeast Asia will ultimately push the American beast from their lands. As this happens the U. S. world hegemony will begin to crumble everywhere, and consequently the domestic system which depends for its stable existence on the world empire will enter a period of internal convulsions.

If libertarians are ever to forge a movement, they must be knowledgeable social critics, thoughtful strategists and relevant activists. To do this, they must know and understand the enemy (they must know whose interests are being defended in Vietnam), i. e., they must know and understand U. S. imperialism. An investment of several hours in reading these three books will take one a long way towards such an understanding.

— Vincent Ninell

A Monthly Newsletter

THE

Libertarian Forum

Joseph R. Peden, Publisher

Murray N. Rothbard, Editor

VOLUME III, NO. 1

January, 1971

35¢

Nixonite Socialism

It is traditional at the turn of the year to survey the state of the economy and to try to forecast what lies ahead. Despite the Pollyanna chorus with which we have been deluged for the last year by "conservative" and "free-market" economist-whores for the Nixon Administration, we can state flatly that the state of the economy is rotten, and destined to get worse.

In the 1960 campaign there first appeared the curious phenomenon of "anarcho-Nixonites", several friends of mine who had become aides to Dick Nixon, and who assured me that Tricky Dick had assured *them* that he was "really an anarchist at heart"; once campaign pressures were over, and Nixon as President was allowed his head, we would see an onrush toward the free market and the libertarian society. In the 1968 campaign, anarcho-Nixonism redoubled in intensity, and we were assured that Nixon was surrounded by assorted Randians, libertarians, and free-market folk straining at the leash to put their principles into action.

Well, we have had two years of Nixonism, and what we are undergoing is a super-Great Society--in fact, what we are seeing is the greatest single thrust toward socialism since the days of Franklin Roosevelt. It is not Marxian socialism, to be sure, but neither was FDR's; it is, as J. K. Galbraith wittily pointed out in New York (Sept. 21), a big-business socialism, or state corporatism, but that is cold comfort indeed. There are only two major differences in *content* between Nixon and Kennedy-Johnson (setting aside purely stylistic differences between uptight WASP, earthy Texan, and glittering upper-class Bostonian): (1) that the march into socialism is faster because the teeth of conservative Republican opposition have been drawn; and (2) that the erstwhile "free-market" conservatives, basking in the seats of Power, have betrayed whatever principles they may have had for the service of the State. Thus, we have Paul McCracken and Arthur F. Burns, dedicated opponents of wage-price "guideline" dictation and wage-price controls when *out* of power, now moving rapidly in the very direction they had previously deplored. And *National Review*, acidulous opponent of the march toward statism under the Democrats, happily goes along with an even more rapid forced march under their friends the Republicans.

Let us list some of the more prominent features of the Nixonite drive--features which have met no opposition whatever in the conservative press. There took place during 1970 the nationalization of all railroad passenger service in this country. Where was the conservative outcry? It was a nationalization, of course, that the railroads welcomed, for it meant saddling upon the taxpayer

responsibility for a losing enterprise--thus reminding us of one perceptive definition of the economy of fascism: an economy in which big business reaps the profits while the taxpayer underwrites the losses. There took place also the Nixonite fight for the SST boondoggle, in which \$300 million are going to follow a previous \$700 million of taxpayers' money down the rathole of gigantic subsidy to an uneconomic mess. Bill and Jim Buckley can find

(Continued on page 2)

TO OUR READERS

With this issue, the *Libertarian Forum* completes almost two years of successful, unbroken semi-monthly publication, and we have accomplished this task without sending out letters pleading for funds. The time has come, however, when financial pressures have forced a change in our publishing policy. We have suffered, first, from the inexorable inflation of costs that has hit all enterprises, and which we, at least, know is fundamentally due to the expansion of money and credit generated by the federal government. We have suffered, also, from a loss of revenue stemming from two sources: (a) a shift of many subscribers from regular to the student category--a sign that we are reaching more young people but also a financial loss to the magazine; and (b) a falling off of Libertarian Associates who subscribed at \$15 and above, a falling off that is inevitable after a new publishing venture has become self-sustaining and established.

Since the Libertarian Associates had, in effect, been subsidizing our student subscribers, we can therefore no longer afford to carry the latter at a financial loss. We are therefore hereby eliminating the student category, and raising all of our subscription rates to \$7.00 per year.

We are also cutting costs substantially by going over to a *monthly*, 8-page, publication. This is our first monthly issue. By becoming a monthly we will save a considerable amount on costs of mailing, handling, and shipping, as well as personal wear and tear on our miniscule staff. And while we will no longer be able to comment as rapidly on the news, we will benefit our readers by having more space available per month (saving on space for mastheads and addresses), and more room for longer articles.

And so, from the new monthly *Libertarian Forum*, Happy New Year to all!

NIXON SOCIALISM - (Continued from page 1)

only ecological pollution as an argument against the SST--an outright looting raid upon the taxpayer without even a flimsy cover of "national security" as a pretext. The only argument seems to be that if we do not subsidize the SST, our airlines will have to purchase the plane from-horrors!--France; on this sort of argument, of course, we might as well prohibit imports altogether, and go over to an attempted self-sufficiency within our borders. How many SST's might be purchased on an unsubsidized market is, of course, problematic; since the airlines are losing money as it is, it is doubtful how much revenue they will obtain from an airfare estimated at 40% higher than current first-class rates.

And then there is the outright \$700 million gift from the U. S. government to Lockheed, to keep that flagrantly submarginal and uneconomic company in business indefinitely. And then there is agitation for the friendly nationalization of Penn Central Railroad. Senator Javits is already muttering about legislation for the federal bailing out of all businesses suffering losses, which is the logical conclusion of the current trend.

Neither has any note been taken of the Nixon Administration's plan for tidying up the construction industry. Many people have scoffed at the revisionist view (held by such New Left historians as Ronald Radosh) that the pro-union legislation of the twentieth century has been put in at the behest of big business itself, which seeks a large, unified, if tamed labor union junior partnership in corporate state rule over the nation's economy. And yet the Railway Labor Act of 1926, which in effect compulsorily unionized the railroad industry in exchange for compulsory arbitration and a no-strike policy, was put in at the behest of the rail industry, anticipating the later labor policy of the New Deal. And now the construction industry has gotten the Nixon Administration behind a similar plan; all the members of the present small but pesky and powerful construction unions are to be dragooned into one big, area-wide industrial union, and then to be subject to massive compulsory arbitration. The fascization of America proceeds apace.

To top it off, the Administration is readying two socialistic "welfare" measures of great importance: one further socializes medicine through nationwide major medical "insurance" to be paid by the long-suffering poor and lower-middle class Social Security taxpayer. And surely it is only a matter of time until the disastrous Friedman-Theobald-Nixon scheme of a guaranteed annual income for everyone is forced through Congress, a scheme that would give everyone an automatic and facile claim upon production, and thereby disastrously cripple the incentives to work of the mass of the population.

In the area of the business cycle, it should be evident to everyone by this time that the Administration, trying subtly and carefully to "fine-tune" us out of inflation without causing a recession, has done just the opposite; bringing us a sharp nationwide recession without having any appreciable impact upon the price inflation. A continuing inflationary recession--combining the worst of both worlds of depression and inflation--is the great contribution of Nixon-Burns-Friedman to the American scene. While it is true that a recession was inevitable if inflation was to be stopped, the continuing inflation was *not* inevitable if the Administration had had the guts to institute a truly "hard" money policy. Instead, after only a few months of refraining from monetary inflation, the Administration has been increasingly opening the monetary floodgates in a highly problematic attempt to cure the recession--while at the same time failing to recognize that one sure result will be to redouble the chronic rise in prices. But now

Social Darwinism
Reconsidered

My esteemed libertarian colleague, Professor Leonard Liggio, who has always been out on the frontier of libertarian thought and practice, has of late been ruminating on Social Darwinism. There is no creed over the past century, in fact, with the possible exception of the Nazi movement, that has received as bad an intellectual "press" as Social Darwinism. It is high time that we subject this much reviled Social Darwinism to a re-evaluation.

The Liberal stereotype of the Social Darwinist is of a sadistic monster, calling for the "extermination of the unfit." But in reality the true Social Darwinist is a benign and cheerful optimist, and he arrives at his optimism from a scientific inquiry into the processes of natural law and of cause and effect. For the Social Darwinist is above all a scientist, and as a scientist he sees that the natural law of what is best for man may be violated but never avoided. The natural law of cause and effect works its inexorable way, and what this means is that bad premises, bad goals and ineffective means, are dysfunctional for man and inevitably wreak their toll. On the other hand, rational premises, values and techniques, lead with equal inexorability to benign results. This means, that *over the long run*, the dysfunctional must come to a bad end, must cleanse itself and wipe itself out, while only the truly functional and proper can remain and prosper. Any artificial interference in these beneficent natural processes can only delay and distort the results; hence, we have a

(Continued on page 3)

the Administration has swung around to the Liberal thesis of monetary and fiscal expansion to cure the recession while yelling and griping at labor and employers not to raise wages and prices--a "guidelines" or "incomes" policy that is only one step away from wage and price controls. This direct intervention is supposed to slow down the wage-price spiral. In actual fact, the direct intervention cannot slow down price increases, which are caused by monetary factors; it can only create dislocation and shortages. Pumping in more money while imposing direct price controls and hoping thereby to stem inflation is very much like trying to cure a fever by holding down the mercury column in the thermometer.

Not only is it impossible for direct controls to work, their imposition adds the final link in the forging of a totalitarian economy, of an American fascism. What is it but totalitarianism to outlaw any sort of voluntary exchange, any voluntary sale of a product, or hiring of a laborer? But once again Richard Nixon is responsive to his credo of big business liberalism, for direct controls satisfy the ideological creed of liberals while at the same time they are urged by big business in order to try to hold down the pressure of wages on selling prices which always appears in the late stages of a boom.

While we can firmly predict accelerating inflation and dislocations stemming from direct controls, we cannot so readily predict whether the Nixonite expansionism will lead to a prompt business recovery. That is problematic, surely, in any case we cannot expect any sort of rampant boom in the stock market, which will inevitably be held back by interest rates which, despite the Administration propaganda, must remain high so long as inflation continues.

All in all, how much more Nixonite "anarchism" can freedom stand

SOCIAL DARWINISM RECONSIDERED -

(Continued from page 2)

powerful argument for non-interference in these natural workings.

Take, for example, hippie culture and hippie values, with its hatred of reason, its emphasis on instant whim and mystical irrationality, its communalism and repudiation of the division of labor, its scorn of science, technology, work, private property, long-range thinking, and the production of material goods and services. There have been few creeds in human history that have been more dysfunctional than this. Now since men possess free will, since they are therefore free to adopt and act upon any creed they wish, it is possible for masses of men to become hippies; but it is not possible for them to remain long in this condition, because of the built-in "self-destruct" mechanism that the law of cause and effect imposes upon those who pursue this philosophy. Thus, when some time ago I began to despair at the spreading of hippie communes throughout society, Leonard Liggio commented cheerfully: "Don't worry about it; one hard winter will dispose of the problem."

There is a great deal of wisdom in this "Social Darwinian" attitude. Unfortunately, this dysfunctionality has not been as vivid as it could be, because foolish parents and taxpayers mulcted for welfare payments have been around to subsidize this anti-life credo and to maintain it indefinitely. Remove these subsidies, take away the indulgent check filled out by parent or welfare board, and the hippie phenomenon would have died a much deserved natural death long before now. Social cleansing brought about by the workings of natural law would have steered these misguided folk onto the proper and functional path long ago.

Let us consider two troubled parents of my acquaintance and the contrasting ways in which they have dealt with the phenomenon of hippie children. One parent said to his daughter who was yearning to drop out of college and to try the hippie path: "O. K. I'm not going to try and stop you. But I'm not going to subsidize this decision. If you want to drop out and become a hippie, you get no further financial support from me." The daughter dropped out, tried romantic hippie poverty, and in six months concluded that this was not for her; next year, she was back in college and enjoying it. The other parent, in contrast, himself steeped in foolish permissivism, said, after considerable wailing and anguish: "I don't agree with what you're doing, but I will always stand behind you and send you money if you need it." This course virtually insured that his children would continue on the hippie path indefinitely. Cause and effect were prevented from teaching their salutary lessons.

At a recent libertarian conference I ran across a man who put his libertarian position on drugs in starkly Social Darwinian terms. He said, in effect: "Let's legalize all drugs. Then these drug-taking kids will kill themselves off, and the problem will be eliminated." Harshly and crudely put, perhaps, and of course there are other libertarian grounds for legalization. But again our friend had a keen point: take away the artificial props, allow premises and nature their head, and the law of cause and effect will correct the situation with dispatch. If, as I firmly believe, psychedelic drugs destroy mind and body, then the removal of artificial restrictions will reveal this fact starkly and clearly, and the drug-takers will either fall by the wayside or correct their disastrous path.

The great libertarian Social Darwinist William Graham Sumner put the matter very clearly: "Almost all legislative effort to prevent vice is really protective of vice, because all such legislation saves the vicious man from the penalty of his vice. Nature's remedies against vice are terrible . . . A drunkard in the gutter is just where

he ought to be, according to the fitness and tendency of things. Nature has set upon him the process of decline and dissolution by which she removes things which have survived their usefulness . . . Now, we can never annihilate a penalty. We can only divert it from the head of the man who has incurred it to the heads of others who have not incurred it. A vast amount of 'social reform' consists in just this operation. The consequence is that those who have gone astray, being relieved from Nature's fierce discipline, go on to worse, and that there is a constantly heavier burden for the others to bear. Who are the others? When we see a drunkard in the gutter we pity him. If a policeman picks him up, we say that society has interfered to save him from perishing. 'Society' is a fine word, and it saves us the trouble of thinking. The industrious and sober workman, who is mulcted of a percentage of his day's wages to pay the policeman, is the one who bears the penalty. But he is the Forgotten Man. He passes by and is never noticed, because he has behaved himself, fulfilled his contracts, and asked for nothing." (Sumner, *What Social Classes Owe to Each Other*, Caxton Printers, 1966, pp. 113-115.)

Or, as that other great libertarian Social Darwinist Herbert Spencer pointed out, both the state welfare system and unthinking private charity "not only stop the purifying process, but even increases the vitiation--absolutely encourages the multiplication of the reckless and incompetent by offering them an unfailing provision, and discourages the multiplication of the competent and provident by heightening the prospective difficulty of maintaining a family. And thus, in their eagerness to prevent the really salutary sufferings that surround us, these sigh-wise and groan-foolish people bequeath to posterity a continually increasing curse." (Herbert Spencer, *Social Statics*, London, 1851, p. 324). But both Sumner and Spencer strongly endorsed that great maxim of nineteenth-century private charity: helping men to help themselves, so that they can set themselves on the proper, functional, and rational path.

Libertarians have never given proper weight to the immense significance of the demonstration by Ludwig von Mises, fifty years ago, that socialism cannot calculate, and therefore that socialism and communism simply cannot function in a modern industrial society. And since the immense population of the modern world requires an industrial society to survive, this means that socialism, being totally dysfunctional, cannot endure and must inevitably collapse. Already we have seen crucial illustrations of this great truth: notably in Lenin's total backtracking from the attempt to leap into the Communist goal of a moneyless "War Communism" shortly after the Bolshevik Revolution and his shift back to the quasi-market economy of the NEP; and in the rapid shift, since the 1950's, of Eastern Europe (notably Yugoslavia) away from socialist planning and toward a free-market economy. All this indicates that socialism cannot endure, and that the long-run victory of liberty and the free market is virtually inevitable.

All this does not mean that libertarians should remain passive and quiescent, or that we should refrain from speeding up Nature's timetable as much as we possibly can. But the point is that, quintessentially and metaphysically, we should remain of good cheer. The eventual victory of liberty is inevitable, because only liberty is functional for modern man. There is no need, therefore, for libertarians to thirst manically for Instant Action and Instant Victory, and then to fall into bleak despair when that Instant Victory is not forthcoming. Reality, and therefore history, is on our side. Social Darwinism--that seemingly bleak and bitter creed--provides us, through the instrument of science and reason, with the unquenchable long-run optimism that liberty one day shall triumph.

DUMPING NIXON — (Continued from page 1)

and the more votes racked up for McCloskey the more the embarrassment and discomfiture for King Richard. At best, there is always the possibility that McCloskey might be able to emulate Gene McCarthy in being so successful as to force the President to withdraw; and at worst, the embarrassing support for the relatively unknown Congressman will clearly be a vote of non-confidence in the President, and will soften him up for the election in November.

Some YAFers and other honest conservatives, in despair at the Family Assistance Plan and especially at Nixon's grandstand visit to China, which is a deep affront to their most cherished rhetoric if not really significant in itself, are turning in despair to a Draft Reagan movement. But honesty has never been a strong conservative suit, and indications are that the Buckleyite *realpolitik* will triumph, and that Republican conservatives, including of course Mr. Reagan, will dutifully if painfully keep their counsel and support the President. Is there no indignity which conservatives are not prepared to swallow?

Let us assume then that, after as much trouble as can be made for him, Mr. Nixon will sweep into the renomination. What then? The Democratic field is a crowded and ebullient one. In order to make some sense of the large lineup, let us first divide the hopefuls into a rough left-center-right grouping, depending on the intensity of their opposition to the abomination in Southeast Asia.

On the Right, we have those Democrats who are roughly Johnson-Nixon hawks on Vietnam. There is, first, that egregious gasbag and onetime darling of New Deal liberalism, Hubert Horatio Humphrey. Humphrey's record of toadying to LBJ marked a new low even for American politics, and the thought of a Nixon-Humphrey replay is almost too much for the human soul to contemplate. No, no, not that! Then there is the man who represents the antithesis of libertarianism in American politics, the man who is wrong on every conceivable question, the "Senator from Boeing", Henry "Scoop" Jackson (Wash.) Bad on the war, bad on the military-industrial complex, bad on the draft, bad on economics, bad, bad, bad. Mr. Statism. Another right-wing hopeful is Rep. Wilbur Mills (D., Ark.), bad on the war and draft, "conservative" fiscal expert and advocate of wage-price controls. Never. And finally, Mayor Sam Yorty of Los Angeles, rightist, clown, crusher of civil liberties, and happily with no chance whatsoever of the nomination.

In the center, demarcations between center and left become rather fuzzy. The epitome of the Center is Ed Muskie (Me.), cool, grey, colorless, fairly good on the war at this point, fairly bad on the draft. Probably the eventual candidate when the party hacks have had their day, Ed Muskie is the futherest right candidate who could be acceptable as an alternative to Nixon, and then of course only barely and without enthusiasm. Teddy Kennedy, possessed of lots of family charisma, is under the twin clouds of Chappaquiddick and Camelot, but has been moving leftward in an interesting fashion — especially his recent vote in support of the Gravel filibuster against extending the draft. Ramsay Clark is a shadowy dark horse with mysterious backing, whose only claim to our attention seems to be his revulsion against even his own tyrannies as Attorney-General. Senator Birch Bayh (Ind.) is a colorless middle-of-the-reader with some labor union support, which makes him suspect, and whose only leadership came in electoral reform and the Haynesworth-Carrswell cases, estimable perhaps but hardly making him Presidential timber.

On the Left, the man with by far the best libertarian credentials in the Democratic Party has been so badly battered by the press that scarcely anyone knows that he is there. This is Senator William Proxmire (D., Wisc.), an impeccable record on the war and the draft, a leader in the Senate on behalf of economy in

government and in opposition to the SST and Lockheed boondoggles. Highly knowledgeable and of proven leadership ability, William Proxmire has the highest rating in the entire Senate from the National Taxpayers Union on spending-and-tax votes in the last Congress, far higher than any other Senator. Proxmire is close to libertarian financial expert A. Ernest Fitzgerald, who broke the Lockheed scandal, and is sympathetic to the broad libertarian cause. PROXMIRE FOR PRESIDENT!

Of the remainder of the Left, Senator George McGovern (S. D.) is the respected leader of the anti-war constituency, especially now that Senator Hughes's (Iowa) propensity for the occult has apparently led him to withdraw from the race. McGovern is also solid on the draft. However, he (1) lacks charisma, and (2) suffers from domestic statism, especially the guaranteed annual income scheme.

It now appears that we are not to be spared a resurgence of Eugene McCarthy. Symbolically important on the war three years ago, McCarthy is poor on the draft, and is an odd sort of anti-hero in style and performance: erratic, off-handed, lazy, he has a generally poor sense of timing in manner as well as substance.

It is hard to take the loudly proclaimed entry of Senator Fred Harris (Okla.) very seriously. A Johnny-come-lately on the war and the draft, Harris just seems to be a statist with an affected "populist" style. Having done a poor job in the national committee, and facing certain defeat in primary and re-election races next year, Fred Harris apparently concluded that he had no place to go, after failing on a smaller scale, than failing as presidential candidate. Neither can we take seriously the candidacy of Rep. Anderson (Tenn.) whose one political issue seems to be support for the Berrigan brothers.

Of course, the big dramatic race is now expected to be made by one candidate possessing authentic charisma: Mayor John Lindsay of New York, expected to make a melodramatic switch of parties and then run for the Presidency. Lindsay has charisma, that is, everywhere except in New York City, and it would be hard to find any New Yorker, regardless of political persuasion, who will not predictably spit fire and curses at the very mention of Lindsay's name. And with good reason. If it is unfair to blame the entire visible deterioration of New York City in recent years on Lindsay's stewardship, it is also evidently true that he has hardly succeeded in stemming the tide. In fact, Lindsay is a spectacularly bad administrator; he manages to alienate all concerned groups in every area without helping the situation, and he approaches every problem with a scoutmasterish air of moral superiority that is far more annoying for being totally unjustified. I concede Lindsay's good record on Vietnam and the draft, but no New Yorker can contemplate Lindsay's accession to the administration of the entire country without a grimace of horror. Only one good thing has John Lindsay done as Mayor: he has evinced a genuine concern for civil liberties. He has kept the cops more or less under leash; and his concern for civil liberties has led him to place New York City in the forefront of freedom for pornography and prostitution. Until recently, that is; for in recent weeks, the onset of Presidential fever has apparently led Lindsay to a drastic shift rightward on the matter, and he has instituted a continuing crackdown on "vice" — thus cancelling the only good deed of the Lindsay regime.

The Democrats' chances in 1972 are excellent; predictably, therefore, in view of their long-standing genius for self-destruction, we can count on them trying desperately to kick those chances away. The latest manifestation is the new Women's Caucus, almost completely left-Democratic, which might well bolt the ticket if a woman is not nominated. Already, Rep. Shirley Chisholm (N. Y.) has decided to run for President, her major qualification being that she is both black and female, and thereby can run as

(continued on page 3)

In
libert
numb
colleg
attent
to Fr
(1522
autho
Way,
docur
oneti
Alt
libert
as A
Colle
of Th
identi
Randi
Objec
critic
perso
Car

DUMP

repre
Chish
Old F
embo
the co
a wo
auton
A t
in 19
mixed
popul
of the
allian
to ex
comp
Walla
critiq
is als
contr
and o
The
as ye
job in
direct
and-t
a Pro
its li
Huber
oppos
but fo
York
ceptic
cours
New I
it wil
matte
dange
caucu
chanc

LIBERTY: FROM RAND TO CHRIST

by Joseph R. Peden

In the midst of what appears to be a renaissance of libertarian thought, and a period of rapid increase in the numbers of its adherents — especially among the young college activists — it might be well for us to devote some attention to a remarkable personal testament entitled "Road to Freedom — Or to Nowhere?" published in *Rough Beast* #4 (1522 Connecticut Ave. NW, Washington, D. C. 20036). The author, Warren Carroll, formerly publisher of *Freedom's Way*, a pioneer libertarian publication, has produced a rare document — an analytic repudiation of libertarianism by a onetime true believer.

Although Carroll is familiar with several schools of libertarian thought — that of the individualist anarchists such as Albert Jay Nock, Frank Chodorov and the Rampart College group, and the limited-government classical liberals of The Foundation for Economic Education, he tends to identify libertarianism with Objectivism. As a former Randian Carroll knows the strengths and weaknesses of Objectivism intimately and his detailed and often perceptive critical analysis and disillusionment is colored by this personal experience.

Carroll begins his analysis by pinpointing a basic dilemma

DUMPING NIXON — (Continued from page 2)

representative of two "oppressed" caucuses. If only Mrs. Chisholm had been also a Chicana, a student, a Youth, an Old Person and a Welfare Mother, she could be the living embodiment of every "oppressed" and un-liberated group in the country. But even as it is, we are unfortunately living in a world where the candidacy of Mrs. Chisholm is not automatically laughed into the oblivion it so richly deserves.

A third and even a fourth party also loom as possibilities in 1972. About George Corley Wallace one can only have mixed feelings. In contrast to Fred Harris an authentic populist, Wallace makes many sound and trenchant criticisms of the existing system: of its corporate statism, its unholy alliance between Establishment rich and welfare recipients to exploit the bulk of the working and middle classes, of its compulsory integration and school busing. But, alas!, the Wallace policies hardly sustain the promise of his sound critiques; a superhawk on Vietnam and the Cold War, Wallace is also scarcely known for devotion to civil liberties; on the contrary, we can expect the ultimate unleashing of the police and of repression under a Wallace as President.

There remains the possibility of a New Left fourth party, as yet unnamed. In theory, a fourth party could do an effective job in pushing the Democrats to the Left and in a pro-peace direction, by using the time-honored device of the carrot-and-the-stick, promising (a) that if the Democrats nominate a Proxmire or a McGovern, the New Party would run him on its line as well; but (b) that if the Democrats nominate a Hubert Humphrey, the New Party would run its own man in opposition. This seems to be a simple and effective strategy, but for some reason few third parties — among whom New York's Liberal and Conservative Parties are notable exceptions — have the wisdom and maturity to pursue such a course. Going on past record, we can predict that either the New Party will collapse and not be heard from again, or that it will stubbornly insist on running its own candidate no matter what the Democrats do, and thereby threaten a dangerous split in the anti-war forces. If the black and female caucuses do not succeed in wrecking the Democrats' chances, then perhaps the New Party will finish the job.

which besets Objectivists: how can they most effectively create an objectivist social order? If they plunge into the political cauldron they are bound to compromise or sacrifice intellectual consistency — the hallmark of Objectivist morality. If they refrain from political action, they remain intellectually chaste, but doom their movement to "perpetual ineffectiveness". To Carroll this dilemma is a "fatal shortcoming" of libertarianism. Moreover, faced with this inner conflict, the libertarian is likely to be assaulted by a sense of despair that mankind in general will ever have the same passion for intellectual consistency that he has.

"By definition, the existing pattern of government everywhere prevents the realization of the libertarian dream, and the trend of current history sets steadily toward more and more concentration of power in government. Participation on any significant scale in either the political or economic system now existing entails compromises of principle that most libertarians find unacceptable. Increasingly they find themselves hemmed in and blocked on every side by their own philosophy. What was to have been a road to freedom becomes, in the real world, a cage."

"As the realization grows . . . that he is caught in a trap, . . . increasingly his thought turns either to violence or to flight." Those who succumb to violence "are quickly absorbed by the New Left and cease to be libertarians"; those who turn to flight — to desert isles or nomadism or hermitage — thereby affirm the utopian character of libertarian philosophy. "In these two swamps of failure the libertarian movement in all its forms is being swallowed up."

Clearly Carroll knows whereof he speaks. He seems to have undergone the great intellectual crisis he so accurately describes. The sordid public dispute between Ayn Rand and Nathaniel Branden seems to have precipitated a decision by Carroll to flee to the uninhabited waste of Tasmania. There he was further traumatized by finding the few isolated inhabitants gathered around a TV set watching the Ed Sullivan Show and the Australian government firmly in control of all uninhabited lands. His faith in libertarianism as a workable moral philosophy was finally shattered.

From this disillusionment, Carroll now sees three fundamental errors and a "still more fundamental failure of vision which taken together are fatal to the libertarian dream".

First of all, says Carroll, there is a "drastic misapprehension of the nature of man". Libertarians view man as naturally good and rational but corrupted by institutions i.e. the State, the schools, the family, etc. But equally, libertarians know that institutions are merely individuals acting in concert in accordance with their interests, instincts or traditional ways. Therefore, the responsibility for the evils in society cannot be placed upon institutions but upon the individuals acting within the collective behavioral framework we call an institution. "But if men got themselves into their present state through their own corruption, how then do libertarians expect to bring them out of it? The failure of all their specific programs gives the answer to that question: they cannot".

Here one should note that Carroll raises the very crucial question of the nature of evil in man — a subject of the greatest philosophical and practical importance which deserves serious analysis by libertarians. But he also asserts that because of their inadequate theory as to the true nature of man, the specific programs of libertarians have, historically, failed and in fact cannot succeed. Since he does not give further detail or example to illustrate what he has in

(Continued on page 4)

LIBERTY: FROM CHRIST TO RAND

(Continued from page 3)

mind, one hesitates to comment further than to say that as no fully libertarian society has existed in European civilization since libertarian philosophy first emerged in the age of the Enlightenment, one can hardly prove or disprove Carroll's sweeping judgement as to its pragmatic effectiveness. One can only point empirically and historically to the fact that since the 18th century there has been a continual expansion of individual liberty as an ideal and social reality in a host of areas of human thought and action. I would give Carroll's indictment a Scottish verdict of "Not Proven".

A second error, according to Carroll, is the libertarian's "optimistic misreading of history", his assumption that "his system has never failed because it never has been tried, while in fact it has never been tried because it would certainly fail! The failure of the approaches to a libertarian society which were made in the past, particularly in the 19th century, is the proof we have that a fully libertarian society would be even shorter-lived and less successful." I have already stated my belief that Carroll's historical verdict on libertarian efforts in previous centuries is not proven. But his accusation of misplaced optimism is central to the condition of despair which permeates his entire attitude towards libertarianism. As a professional historian Carroll shows a surprisingly crude appreciation of the complexity of human society and of the process by which societies undergo change. Libertarian philosophy is largely the product of the 19th century drawing inspiration from the intellectual legacy of the enlightenment. Does he really think that scarcely two centuries would see the triumph of so radical a moral, social and economic philosophy? Christianity as a wholly integrated moral and practical philosophy has been with us for two thousand years and its failures are at least as glaring as those of libertarianism. Does the failure of Christians and their society to conform to the ideals of the philosophy of Christ mean that their "system" would totally fail if ever tried? Are both Christians and libertarians hopeless Utopians? I think not. They may well be the only true realists. Only a person of the narrowest historical perception could dismiss libertarians as guilty of "optimistic misjudgement of history". They are simply not historical determinists and they recognize that a century is but a minute in the history of the human race. They do have faith in the ultimate value of and vindication of their philosophical insights - as do believing Christians.

I think that Carroll is so frustrated by the collapse of his own utopian libertarianism that he has lost historical perspective. As Paul Goodman has pointed out, the libertarian revolution is not the work of a day - or a decade - or a lifetime. It is a continuous process through the ages. The focus of the struggle changes from time to time and place to place. Once it involved the abolition of slavery; now it may be women's liberation; here it may be a struggle for national independence; there it may center on civil liberties; at one moment it may require electioneering and party politics; at another armed self-defense and revolution. Carroll expected too much too soon. There is a tendency among many libertarians to look for an apocalyptic moment when the State will be smashed forever and anarchy prevail. When they realize that the great moment isn't about to come in their time, if ever, they lose faith in the integrity and plausibility of the libertarian philosophy. Like a Christian awaiting the Second Coming of Christ when the reign of Justice shall be established and evil men receive their just punishment, the libertarian awaits the coming of the rational and anarchic age. But to lose one's faith in the validity of Christianity because evil continues to thrive in the world makes as much sense as losing one's faith in libertarianism because the New Order has not yet triumphed over the Old. Such attitudes are naive and not to be expected from mature, sophisticated men of learning. Carroll's experience should

warn us that libertarianism can quite easily become merely an adolescent fantasy in minds that are immature and unseasoned by a broad humanistic understanding. It should not be an *idee fixe* or magic formula, but a moral imperative with which one approaches the complexities of social reality.

In his discussion of what he considers to be a third fatal error, Carroll gives further clue to what ultimately repelled him in libertarianism - the "fundamental inadequacy of the materialistic value system which, in essence, they all accept". Crediting Ayn Rand with at least attempting to transcend the obvious limitation of materialism by setting up life itself as the source of value, Carroll accurately perceives that "objectivism in practice measures the value of life in material terms, by the financial profit or the personal satisfaction that can be realized from it". It is one of the great ironies that Leftists who philosophically are materialists are psychologically quite ready to sacrifice life, liberty and personal comfort for the Cause; yet Objectivists who are rhetorically preoccupied with morals, concepts, dialectic and reason are notoriously adverse to anything that smacks of idealistic altruism. Wealth and the bitch goddess success are the household dieties of the Randian cult. Who else but a Randian would sport a dollar sign as a personal fetish or totem? If they were not so narrowly chauvinistic the Randians might have chosen the more universal symbol of their cult - the golden calf. Worshipers of wealth and success, and hedonists, are seldom very attractive people. They are incapable of either love or true friendship for both are founded upon disinterested loyalty and self-sacrifice to the needs of another. It is not surprising that an audience at a West coast convention should wildly applaud a young man who openly bragged that he had betrayed his fellow students to the police and his only regret was that he had not done it for money! Or as an ex-Randian once put it, the only poetry that will ever come from the Randians will be an Ode to Greed.

Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that Mr. Carroll has abandoned libertarianism (which he tends to identify with Objectivism) and sought elsewhere for a new certitude and a new basis for his moral values. Indeed, it is to his credit that he did so. He has found a new faith; he has become a Christian. The great tragedy here is that he fails to perceive that libertarianism is not incompatible with a Christian world view. Libertarianism is not the atheism, materialism and unrestrained egoism of Objectivism or of Stirnerism or other variant schools. It is essentially the belief that voluntarism is the only just basis for human social relationships; that man is a creature whose inherent worth and dignity is beyond price; that man should live in conformity to his nature as perceived through the light of reason; that you should do unto others as you would have them do unto you. Is this at all incompatible with Christianity? The Christian is, I would argue, a natural anarchist by faith. He has a profound respect for life and human dignity; he governs himself by the inner law of conscience illumined by the teachings of Christ; he denies the State as a source of good or truth - at best it is a punishment placed upon men for their evil deeds; and he accepts moral responsibility for the consequences of his acts. The Christian finds true liberty by living his life in conformity to the will of God as manifest in the law of nature and the revealed wisdom of the great poets, prophets and sages of all ages. If Tolstoy, Dorothy Day, the Anabaptists, and Jehovah's Witnesses are not libertarians and Christians, the words are meaningless.

Carroll has done us a great service in underscoring the ultimate inadequacy of Objectivism as a social and personal philosophy, and the danger of equating libertarianism as a social philosophy with objectivism's often perverse and anti-human values. The Randian value system is a potential millstone around the neck of the libertarian movement. Many observers have noted that Objectivist rhetoric is re-

page 51

LIBER

pellent
volunt
Carroll
ruptcy
direct
ethical
ration
arianDr. V
to Tri
proble
ceived
and the
the movAs :
Carroll
flaw th
that In
flight f
proved
libertar
liberty'
"no rev
except
Why is
truth,
finds jo
scientis
why ma
march"
satisfac
from s;
the "ca
for theCarro
too mar
system:
ultimat
tactics
doomed
enough
trary, i
the libe
trast t
"doctriOn th
man an
person
area. F
natural
know o
And ye
archists
fully fo
everyon
What w
are inh
mated
There
This
and m
for m
badger

THE

Libertarian Forum

Joseph R. Peden, Publisher

Murray N. Rothbard, Editor

VOLUME III, NOS. 6-7

July-August, 1971

75c

DUMPING NIXON

We are now entering a daffy, exciting, exuberant season of Presidential politics. Perhaps come the fall of '72, with all the hoopla over, we shall be faced with the grim, cold, sobering choice of Nixon vs. Muskie, and the fix is probably in already. But at this stage of the game, we can exult in the seemingly limitless possibilities, as dozens of Democratic candidates jostle each other, black, female, Third Sex, and Lord knows how many other caucuses abound, and third and fourth parties make noises in the wings. At this point, the great quadrennial American extravaganza looms as the most exciting in decades.

Let us begin with a few clear guidelines. For the libertarian, other things being equal, the first desideratum is to punish the incumbent. If we cannot yet abolish the office of President, we can at least make a start toward redressing our grievances by ousting the existing tenant for his numerous high and low crimes and misdemeanors. If we cannot punish the President to the full extent of the natural law, we can at least retire him to the private life he so richly deserves. We can establish a new and glorious tradition of the one-term President.

That's if other things are equal, and that at least provides us with our first guideline. But other things, of course, are never equal. When we come further to consider the record in office of Richard Milhous Nixon, it is hard to find one redeeming feature, one splotch of white in the black record of the Nixon regime.

Let us summarize:

The shameful genocidal war in Vietnam and Southeast Asia continues, and Nixon has fiercely resisted every attempt by the Congress, no matter how feeble, to put an end to the war. The latest Hanoi-NLF offer totally exposes the Nixon mendacity on the phony prisoner-of-war issue, but still the Administration refuses to accept the offer, and the genocide continues.

The draft continues in full force, despite anarcho-Nixonite assurance that *at least* Nixon would remove conscription-very. Instead, Nixon simply adopted the old Kennedy scheme, which conservatives and libertarians had for years.

...ative", neo-Friedmanite economic manipulation Administration has brought us the new and venon of the inflationary recession. The re- h us, while inflation proceeds merrily on

...conomics has brought us the largest in our history, which now looms illion, with another \$30 billion

... economics is eagerly attempting

to foist on us probably the single most disastrous plan ever proposed in America: the neo-Friedmanite Family Assistance Program, which will lock an increasing number of Americans into a parasitic automatic dole.

Nixon has accelerated the system of what has aptly been called "Big Business socialism" or "corporate communism", in which the government comes ever more nakedly to the support and rescue of inefficient large corporations: e.g. the SST, Lockheed, passenger railroad service boondoggles.

The Nixon administration has moved ever closer to wage and price controls, which have been advocated by high Administration economists. In the meanwhile, it has exercised such controls in the construction industry, and for the rest of industry has adopted the old Democratic "jawboning" policy of verbal threats and intimidation which it had previously spurned.

The Nixon administration has savagely moved to suppress freedom of the press in the famous Pentagon Papers affair, including the criminal indictment of Daniel Ellsberg and an unprecedented attempt to impose prior censorship before publication. The despotic and reprehensible dissents of Nixonite judges Blackmun and Burger, coupled with the narrow and flimsy arguments of most of the other members of the bench, show that we are scarcely out of the woods even on prior censorship. (O.K., Read and Rand: is *this* enough to make you revolutionaries?) One of the major reasons for dumping Nixon is the looming menace to the structure of civil liberties built up by the Warren Court. With Justice Douglas and the magnificent Hugo Black nearing retirement, our personal and civil liberties are truly in peril unless Richard Nixon is removed from office.

When we add the unrelieved horror of the Nixon record to the original guideline against incumbents, we conclude with one great injunction that every libertarian should be able to support with enthusiasm for 1972: DUMP NIXON!

Here is a goal which all shades of the varied libertarian spectrum should find exhilarating, and indeed the signs are that a broad coalition of left, right, and center libertarians are banding together to work with other anti-Nixon forces in this crusade of cleansing and retribution. It is particularly significant that many of the current anti-Nixon libertarians were high in the Nixon-youth forces in the 1968 campaign.

Clearly, the first place to try to dump Nixon is the Republican primaries. Unfortunately, Senator Mark Hatfield (R., Ore.) has resisted all efforts urging him to run for President, and Nixon's only Republican opponent is Rep. Paul McCloskey (Calif.), whose only libertarian asset, aside from a dogged and sincere manner, is his staunch opposition to the war in Vietnam. But still this is the major single issue,

(Continued on page 2)

LIBERTY: FROM CHRIST TO RAND

(Continued from page 4)

pellent to many people otherwise attracted to libertarian voluntarism, decentralization, and even the market economy. Carroll's experience should alert us to the spiritual bankruptcy of that particular school of libertarian thought, and direct us to introduce young libertarians to alternative ethical value systems — such as Christianity — which are rationally and historically compatible with essential libertarian principles. ■

Comment

by M. N. R.

Dr. Warren Carroll's Leap Over the Wall from Randianism to Triumphantist Christianity highlights two important problems that deserve far more attention than they have received from libertarians: the growing problem of defection, and the status of Christianity and the Christian ethic within the movement.

As Professor Peden points out, a major reason for Carroll's defection was his thirst for Instant Victory — a flaw that he shared with all too many libertarians. When that Instant Victory was not forthcoming, Carroll took flight for a retreatist Utopia in Tasmania, and when that proved abortive, abandoned the cause altogether. Why can't libertarians settle down cheerfully to a lifelong struggle for liberty? Carroll says repeatedly that libertarianism offers "no reward along the way", no "reward in the road itself" except for the eventual attainment of liberty. But why not? Why is there not joy in dedication to the advancement of truth, justice, and liberty? The businessman, after all, finds joy in the ceaseless pursuit of profit and growth, the scientist in the endless quest for ever-expanding truth; why may not the libertarian obtain the same from the "long march" toward liberty? Every other "career" offers joys and satisfactions in the functioning of the career itself, and apart from specific achievements emanating from it. Why should the "career" of liberty hold any less excitement and reward for the libertarian?

Carroll does have a small point here, however. In that all too many libertarians have, in their commendable "purism", systematically ruled out *any* conceivable strategy for even ultimate or eventual victory. By ruling out virtually all tactics except pure education, libertarians have almost doomed themselves to perpetual defeat, which might be enough to discourage even the stoutest of heart. On the contrary, it is precisely in the area of strategy and tactics where the libertarian should be flexible and pragmatic — in contrast to the realm of principle where he should be "doctrinaire" and consistent.

On the whole issue that Carroll raises about the nature of man and his institutions, Carroll is about the one millionth person to totally misinterpret the libertarian view in this area. He states that "all libertarian schools view man as naturally good and naturally rational"; in contrast, I don't know of *one* that holds such an absurdly naive doctrine. And yet this has been the major charge hurled at us by archists for generations. To set the record straight hopefully for good and all, the libertarian believes, along with everyone else, that man is a mixture of good and evil. What we are trying to do is to eliminate institutions which are inherently evil and thereby provide a legalized, legitimated channel for evil to proceed unchecked in society. There should be nothing very mysterious about *that*.

This brings me to the whole question of Christianity and the Christian ethic. Not a Christian myself, I have seen for years how Christian libertarians have been abused, badgered, and hectorred by militant atheists and presump-

tuous Randians, and their libertarian *bona fides* sharply questioned. Being on the whole — perhaps as a result of their Christian training — far nicer people than their tormentors, these Christian libertarians have put up with this shabby treatment with calm and good humor. But it should be crystal clear that a libertarian movement which imperiously insists upon atheism as a necessary condition for membership is going to needlessly alienate countless numbers of potential supporters. Atheists, to be sure, believe that Christianity, like other theism, is an error; but there are millions of errors in the world, and it passeth understanding why this particular one should bar Christians from the libertarian community. There is certainly no substantial reason why Christians and atheists cannot peacefully co-exist within the libertarian movement. It is high time, therefore, for all libertarians, Christian and atheist alike, to blow the whistle on the anti-Christian abuse that has infected the movement for so long a time.

But there is more to the tale than that. For while every rationalist libertarian must hold reason higher than tradition, there is *one* sense in which the traditionalist conservatives have gotten hold of a very important point, and one that has been unfortunately overlooked by the rationalists. And that is wrapped up in the great truth of the division of labor: the fact that the vast majority of people have neither the ability nor the skill to carve out a rationalethic on their own. Ethics is a science, a discipline like other disciplines; and as in any other branch of knowledge it is vain folly to begin exploration of the science afresh and on one's own while disregarding all the other explorers and thinkers who have gone before. I once knew a Randian who tried to deduce astronomy *a priori* and out of his own head without bothering to consult any of the other literature in the field. While this was a caricature and a half-jest on his part, it exemplified all too well the rationalist — and particularly the Randian — disposition to attempt to carve out a body of thought without bothering to read one's predecessors. In the field of ethics and philosophy in general, it is simply an empirical fact that the greatest thinkers, for two thousand years, have been Christian; and to ignore these Christian philosophers and to attempt to carve out an ethical system purely on one's own is to court folly and disaster.

Apart from their respective merits, then, it is no accident that, in practical application — from sex to music — Christian ethicists should have a far more rational batting average than the Randian. After all, Randian thought has only been in existence for a decade or two, while Christianity has had two thousand years to develop. We stand on the shoulders of the thinkers of the past, even though of course we must use our reason to correct them.

But there are further, and grimmer, implications here for rationalists. For if few people have the ability or inclination to carve out an ethical system on their own, this means that they must — if their actions are to be guided by any coherent set of values — take them passively, almost on trust. But who then are the masses of men to trust for their system of values? Surely that system with the longest and most successful tradition, with the largest quota of great minds — in short, the Christian ethic. This is a bitter pill for many of us non-Christians to swallow, but I am afraid it is inescapable nevertheless.

This conclusion is reinforced when we look around at what has happened to much of today's libertarian movement. The peculiar aspects of the Randian ethic are as nothing to the *bizarries*, to the outright lunacies, into which so many ex-Randians (who constitute the bulk of the libertarian movement) have sunk, in their vain attempts to carve out a system of objective ethics on their own. (The latest craze, so we have heard, is "rational bestiality.") The Christian ethic is, in the words of the old hymn, a Rock of Ages, and it is at least incumbent upon the individual to think long and hard before he abandons that Rock lest he sink into the quagmire of the capricious and the bizarre.

Localism And Bureaucracy In The 19th Century China

By Murray Rubinstein

Phillip A. Kuhn in his Harvard East Asian series monograph, *Rebellion and Its Enemies in Late Imperial China*, seems to be describing a society and situations remote and foreign from our own. He examines in both a chronological and cross sectional fashion the development, operation and utilization of organizations created for the purposes of local self-policing and local self-defense in South China during the middle decades of the 19th century. The student and advocate of local control and individualism will find more in Kuhn's study than perhaps Kuhn himself realized or intended. Mr. Kuhn gives us a warning that local autonomy and community control are valid objectives and appropriate systems but may become distorted by either alien or ultra-radical ideology — introduced by means of force — or by operations of the central state and its servants.

The author uses historical, narrative, and sociological analysis to create a picture of a central government in decline and its local branches in a state of flux. He first traces the origins of militia demonstrating that local military units of a voluntary nature were part of the Chinese tradition (though traditionally Chinese intellectuals have tried to create the opposite impression — that Chinese were by nature non-militaristic and that the greatest times are those when the military on all levels is least important). He then examines the origin of the systems designed to halt rebellion during the years 1820 to 1860. The major sections of his book are devoted to examining the varieties of local military-civilian defense structures and the means by which central officials utilized these newly created institutions to defeat the Taipings (the "God Worshipers" — a society following a religion that was an amalgam of Christianity, Confucianism, and local folk belief. The Taipings controlled east central China from 1850 to 1864 and seriously threatened the Central Government) the Nien fei (Nien bandits — a group of guerilla style marauders who controlled the area just north of Taiping territory in the 1850's and 1860's) and the Moslem rebels (Chinese Moslems of Turkic descent who revolted in the 1860's and 1870's and gained control of large parts of modern Sinkiang province).

The main system created by the officials (in charge of local areas but holding Confucian degrees and appointed by the central government) Kuhn shows, grew out of two existing institutions that were considered mutually exclusive in normal times. The Pao Chia system was one in which families, neighborhoods, and towns were organized into units designed to police themselves and root out any people whose behavior differed from the norm. It had originated in the Sung dynasty (900-1200) and had been reintroduced by the ruling dynasty. The tuan tien system was created to organize village defense against bandit incursion and local uprising. It was created by local clan leaders and gentry (confucian scholar graduates who had either not accepted or not been given a government post). District officials and gentry returned from government service such as Chiang Chung-Yuan were instrumental in integrating both into an interlocked system of local registration (the Pao-Chia element) and local defense. Villages were organized along family lineage lines into "simples" (single village) and "multiplex" (multiple village) organizations. Out of these surveillance-defense units came the "Braves" — irregular troops of local men, and finally personal and provincial armies that became the common armies which suppressed the rebellions in this period and created the mold for the war lord armies of the twentieth century.

But where the warning and the contemporary relevance? It is this Kuhn is picturing a society in the process of breaking up. Present were many tensions not unfamiliar to us. There was racial and ethnic conflict, rural and urban competition, and finally, the basic tension between the citizen

striving for freedom and economic independence and the state trying to control his mind and tax him to his limit of endurance. The local organizations began as independent efforts to solve local problems by local means. The success these efforts had in suppressing banditry and in self-policing was seen by the government as a phenomenon that had to be directed or it could easily get out of hand. Thus the officials and the literati came in, creating official structures, introducing confucian precepts and giving the people a feeling they were aiding in an effort beyond the confines of their local area.

Mr. Lindsay proclaims the 51st State. Mr. Rockefeller calls for local government referendums. Mr. Nixon and Senator McGovern say "power to the people". Representatives of the establishment are using the slogans of the masses to create the impression that power will be returned to its rightful place. The Confucian Civil Servants are again at the gate using the people's desire for self-rule to further enslave them. Instead they hope to use populist institutions to preserve and maintain the structure of the state. Kuhn shows us how the state emerged triumphant again in China. Will the new sense of localism, individual consciousness and self-rule be again perverted to the means of the Leviathan? □

Bombing The Dikes

The following are direct quotations from testimony given before the International War Crimes Tribunal summoned to meet in Stockholm and later Copenhagen in 1967 by the world-renowned philosopher and mathematician, Lord Bertrand Russell. Five years later, they may prove to be of more than antiquarian interest.

I

"In April 1945 General Eisenhower proposed to send a 'very strongly worded message' to the German High Commissioner for Holland, Seyss-Inquart, telling him that

(Continued On Page 8)

Career opportunity in business for HARD-WORKING LIBERTARIAN

A profit-oriented, reason-why advertising agency, owned and operated by libertarians, offers a career opportunity for a meticulous, hard-working man or woman. Prior business or sales experience helpful but not necessary. We will teach you the business from the bottom up — including media buying, bookkeeping, layout and production, typing, filing, light correspondence, errands and research. Starting salary lean but livable.

In this small company you'll be able to integrate your libertarian philosophy with your career.

We are growing rapidly and promote our own people. So you can advance as far as your accomplishments take you — in management, media or copywriting.

You **MUST** be ambitious, self-motivating, honest, competent, responsible — and thrive on hard work. This business is *not* for nine-to-fivers.

If you believe you can succeed in this career, tell us how we can profit mutually by working together. Simply write in detail or phone, Jim Powell, Buzzell, Powell, Rosenthal Inc., 14 Sweetfield Circle, Yonkers, N.Y. 10704. (914) 968-3293. Please mention where you read this advertisement.

Hope In Ireland

Life has conquered, the wind has blown away
Alexander, Caesar and all their power and sway;
Tara and Troy have made no longer stay —
Perhaps the English too will have their day.

—Frank O'Connor

BITS AND PIECES — (Continued from page 6)

as an anti-Nixon candidate in the primaries if there is no-one else, since he will be an embarrassment to the administration if nothing else. Another important consideration here is the fact that McClosky is backed by Norton Simon, reported to be a strong economic libertarian who will influence McClosky considerably. This possibility is worth watching closely.

JOHN LINDSAY. Bad in so many different ways. He is an unprincipled wheeler-dealer who bends with the political winds. One thing he does have going for him is the fact that he is highly susceptible to pressure. He is good on civil liberties and not likely to come down hard against radical activism (draft and tax resistance, general civil disobedience) if it has any degree of public support at all. This could be a valuable asset to the radical movement.

EDMUND MUSKIE still looks like the front-runner among Democratic hopefuls. Muskie has a history of vagueness and vacillation on virtually every issue one can think of: the war in Asia; the draft; civil liberties; international trade; domestic social and economic policies; even on the question of environmental pollution in which he is supposed to have a strong interest. Not much here to offer the libertarian cause.

HUBERT HUMPHREY. Equally bad. He operates with the New Deal mentality of thirty years ago and his role as Vice President during the early and middle war years borders on the criminal, despite his recent babblings about "withdrawal from Vietnam." The worst of the traditional political hacks either party has to offer.

HENRY JACKSON. Totally unacceptable from a libertarian point-of-view. He is a New Deal-Great Society welfarist on domestic issues, and his past and present position on Vietnam makes Barry Goldwater sound dovish by comparison. He would also deal severely with domestic dissenters. A disaster for the libertarian cause.

TED KENNEDY. The dimmest of the Kennedy brothers, and completely unacceptable to libertarians. He is adamantly pro-draft, militantly pro-Israel, and as deeply committed to a centralized, quasi-socialistic economy as any other candidate. He is unintelligent and dominated by advisers — the wrong advisers for libertarian purposes.

Right now these are the only men who can be considered serious presidential hopefuls by any stretch of the imagination. Another dark horse possibility rests with the New Party, a left-liberal reformist group, founded by Gore Vidal among others. Vidal is a thorough-going cultural and civil libertarian with a Menckenesque view of the American scene in all its aspects. He is highly individualistic on social, cultural, spiritual and moral questions and, while exhibiting some New Dealist tendencies in his economic philosophy, he is highly sympathetic to the concept of local control of institutions. The New Party is touting Ralph Nader, muckraking critic of the Corporate State, as a presidential hopeful. Nader's great contribution to date has been as an effective gadfly on the governmental hide. He is most assuredly *not* an economic libertarian, but he is a disruptive force in opposition to the American status quo, and the reforms that will be generated by his movement will likely serve to benefit the individual — especially in the area of economic consumption.

Beginning in the fall of 1971, libertarian groups in the northeast will be making concrete plans for the new Hampshire primary to be held the following spring. Bill Baumgarth and others in the area have founded Citizens for a Restructured Republic, a libertarian front group, to work actively with other anti-Nixon forces. We should all dig in and lend these efforts our support, in any way possible. The candidate (or candidates) who will receive our support in the primaries depends largely on what happens over the next six months or so.

All in all, it is shaping up to be one hell of a time.

Traditional China And Anarchism

By Murray Rubinstein

(Professor Rubinstein's fine summary of traditional Chinese political concepts suggests an important lesson for libertarians. In Chinese thought the anarchist ideas were applied within a statist structure; there had been no attempt to overthrow the state but merely to introduce anarchist practices to modify and improve the situation. The result was oppressive; anarchist ideas cannot be applied while the state system continues in existence. In fact, it may be that the application of anarchist ideas within a statist structure can only lead to worse oppression. The state is the central issue; its abolition is the central objective. The introduction of anarchist practices or operations while the state continues to exist may not only be irrelevant but if widespread in application may result in worse oppression. This is an important warning for libertarians. What was the reason for the failure in China to move to an anarchist society? Elitism. There was a disdain for the common people and their institutions. The clan and self-help organizations provided a suitable basis for a libertarian legal system. But their powers were curtailed and limited because they were viewed as a threat to the state structure from which the ruling class drew its wealth. Although they might be committed to the anarchistic philosophy of the Chinese sages, the local rulers recognized that they drew their wealth from the statist structure. Thus, they viewed all activities against the standard of the preservation of the statist structure and acted in their official capacities not as anarchist philosophers but as statist oppressors. --Leonard P. Liggio).

The Chinese Civil Service System with its complicated

examination path and its structured pattern of rule and control from above seems far distant from an anarchistic model of society based on free association or voluntarism, and a laissez-faire economy. Yet at the heart of this system are basic concepts very close to those libertarians adopt as their own.

The ideological basis of the System was a combination of Taoism and Confucianism which represented a functional application of these seemingly contradictory thought systems. It is my purpose to examine some of these basic tenets and see how they were modified in the process of application.

Taoism, in its philosophical form, is represented by two major works, the Tao Te Ching (Book of the Way) and the Chuang Tzu. Each of these books is a product of the Warring States period, an age in which much of Chinese philosophy was developed. Taoism on this level is a pantheistic thought system which holds that the universe is a continuum in which all matter is in the process of becoming differentiated and then non-differentiated. The Taoist believes that there is a single source to the "ten thousand things" and that he must reestablish his unity with the universe. The inner harmony of nature should be related to the outer harmony of man's actions. To achieve this external harmony is to leave things alone. The best government is the least government; the best ruler is he who is content to leave his subjects alone.

Confucianism on the surface seems the opposite of this WuWei (non-action) form of rule (or non-rule). It is a

(Continued on page 8)

TRADITIONAL CHINA AND ANARCHISM

Continued from page 7)

philosophy that seems to stress precedent and strict adherence to rites and ceremonies. Li (ritual) is only one aspect of the Confucian ideology, for there is also deep faith in Jen (benevolence-good) and chih (wisdom). The operation of government and thus of society should be in the hands of the Chun-tzu - the gentleman who advises the ruler and leads by moral virtue. The Confucians viewed formal punitive law as negative and only to be used as last resort. There was no formal concept of civil law, for in a society based on virtue such would be unnecessary. In the *Analects*, this belief in government by virtue is expounded at length:

95. Confucius said, "If a ruler himself is upright, all will go well without orders. But if he himself is not upright, even though he gives orders, they will not be obeyed."

97. Confucius said, "Lead the people by laws and regulate them by penalties and the people will try to keep out of jail, but will have no sense of shame. Lead the people by virtue and restrain them by rules of decorum and the people will have a sense of shame and moreover will become good." Theoretically, therefore government means good men, living properly, rather than good laws, strictly enforced.

How did these ideas, Taoist and Confucian, work out in application? Taoist political thought was never put into practice, but the ethics became formalized and a concrete set of rituals and church structure were developed. This religious Taoism can still be seen in operation today on Taiwan.

Confucianism, on the other hand, did become the state orthodoxy. In the reign of the Han emperor Wu Ti the philosophy of Confucius, as it had been passed down and thus modified since 500 B. C., became the theoretical basis for government. During the T'ang Dynasty a method of examination was developed and a complicated government structure developed to make use of the talents of the trained scholars. The means of choosing and utilizing the potential Chun-tzu was thus devised. Once the student had passed through the three stages of exams, the district level, the province level and the central administration level and had achieved the degree of Chin Shih, he was ready to put into practice the lessons he had learned (lessons learned by memorizing and analyzing the works of Confucius and the other "Classics"). He became on the district level the embodiment of the concept of 'rule by good men'. But instead of letting society run itself, he found himself forced to rule as a despot, acting as tax collector, judge, jury and prosecuting attorney, defense chief, police chief, flood control expert, and moral instructor to the local gentry. He was constantly under the scrutiny of his superiors and had to move to a new post every three years in accordance with custom. The magistrate was thus an overburdened local bureaucrat.

very far from the ideal of a man leading by the force of moral virtue alone.

The lesson of Traditional China for those who believe in freedom and the creation of a totally free society is this: that ideas are not enough, that even concepts conceived of by men such as Confucius and Lao Tzu can become stale, rigid, even despotic in application. China in the formative centuries developed proto-anarchistic ideas. The total, unsystematic application of those ideas created a system as rigid, as formalistic, as tyrannical as any we have today.



From The Old Curmudgeon

(Once again, the need for him arises. Tall and lean, he dons his mask, leaps on his trusty white horse, and rides off into the West. Champion of Truth, Defender of Justice, scourge of deviationists, heretics, sinners, and evildoers, the bane of Young Whippersnappers, he rides again. In a storm of thundering hooves, with a hearty "Hi-yo Silver", here he is, back by popular demand... the Old Curmudgeon.)

Excess Curmudgeonry.

I never thought I'd have to say this, but as a long-time champion of both Old Curmudgeonry and the Golden Mean, I have to admit that there *can* be such a thing as being too much of a curmudgeon. For example: under the guidance of Jerome Tuccille and Murray Rothbard as Advisory Editors, Arno Press, a respected reprint publisher and subsidiary of the *New York Times*, is putting out a series, hopefully by this Christmas, of reprints on "The Right-Wing Individualist Tradition in America." One would think that libertarians and individualists would jump at the chance of wide distribution in hard cover. But no! Several Old Right-wing Curmudgeons, sequestered away on their literal or figurative mountaintops for decades, have sniffed some sort of Establishment Plot in all this and have refused to sell their copyrights to Arno - preferring to clasp their privately printed and almost unknown editions to their hermitic bosoms.

Come on, fellas; we respect and admire you for your lonely battles over the decades. But new times have arrived; it is at last "in" to be an individualist. Come on, relax and enjoy the New Dispensation; after all, we wouldn't want to vindicate the old left-wing smear that we became individualists in order to justify our anti-social psyches, would we? □

The Libertarian Forum

BOX 341
MADISON SQUARE STATION
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10010

First Class

SUBSCRIBE NOW

Please enter a subscription for:

Name: _____

Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Subscription is \$8.00 per year.

Libertarian Forum Associate subscription \$15.00 or more.

THE LIBERTARIAN FORUM

Box 341 Madison Square Station
New York, New York 10010

Published Every Month. Subscription Rate: \$8.00 per year

O
And
was
deca
W
com
pris
beer
are
the
nom
mat.
moo
euph
Assa
wage
mist
devc
Char
had
stra
a te
enth
Or
Mau
bigg
our
"war
12".
one,
the
the f
defer
The
bette
ism"
direc
to the
on th
most
many
haile
have
const
liber