

A Monthly Newsletter

THE

# Libertarian Forum

Joseph R. Peden, Publisher

Murray N. Rothbard, Editor

VOLUME X NUMBER 6

JUNE, 1977

US-ISSN0047-4517

## The Water 'Shortage'

As everyone knows, the West, and especially northern California, has been suffering from a year-long drought, leading numerous statists and busybodies to leap in to control, ration, and ordain. The water "shortage" may not be exactly blamed on the private sector, but it is there, supposedly, and surely government must leap in to combat it—not, of course, by creating more water, but by mucking up the distribution of the greater scarcity.

The first thing to be said about this is that on the free market, regardless of the stringency of supply, there is never any "shortage", that is, there is never a condition where a purchaser cannot find supplies available at the market price. On the free market, there is always enough supply available to satisfy demand. The clearing mechanism is fluctuations in price. If, for example, there is an orange blight, and the supply of oranges declines, there is then an increasing scarcity of oranges, and the scarcity, is "rationed" voluntarily to the purchasers by the uncoerced rise in price, a rise sufficient to equalize supply and demand. If, on the other hand, there is an improvement in the orange crop, the supply increases, oranges are relatively less scarce, and the price of oranges falls consumers are induced to purchase the increased supply.

Note that all goods and services are scarce, and the progress of the economy consists in rendering them relatively less scarce, so that their prices decline. Of course, some goods can never increase in supply. The supply of Rembrandts, for example, is exceedingly scarce, and can never be increased—barring the arrival of a Perfect Forger. The price of Rembrandts is high, of course, but no one has ever complained about a "Rembrandt shortage." They have not, because the price of Rembrandts is allowed to fluctuate freely without interference from the iron hand of government. But suppose that the government, in its wisdom, should one day proclaim that no Rembrandts can be sold for less than \$1000—severe maximum price control on the paintings. We can rest assured that, if the decree were taken seriously at all, a severe Rembrandt shortage would promptly develop, accompanied by black markets, bribery, and all the rest of the paraphernalia of price control.

If the water industry were free and competitive, the response to a drought would be very simple: water would rise in price. There would be griping about the increase in water prices, no doubt, but there would be no "shortage", and no need or call for the usual baggage of patriotic hoopla, calls for conservation, altruistic pleas for sacrifice to the common good, and all the rest. But, of course, the water industry is scarcely free; on the contrary, water is almost everywhere in the U.S. the product and service of a governmental monopoly.

When the drought hit northern California, raising the price of water to the full extent would have been unthinkable; accusations would have been hurled of oppressing the poor, of selfishness, and all the rest. The result has been a crazy-quilt patchwork of compulsory water rationing,

accompanied by a rash of patrioteering ecological exhortation: "Conserve! Conserve! Don't water your lawns! Shower with a friend! Don't flush the toilet!"

Well, the amusing aspect of all this is that these imbecile exhortations were as manna from heaven to the wealthy liberal elitist ecofreak population of the San Francisco Bay Area. The California water authorities were hoping and shooting for a decline of about 25% in 1977 water consumption as compared to 1976. But, lo and behold, in late June, the figures rolled in and it turned out that Bay Area communities had responded by voluntarily cutting their water consumption by 40-50%.

The "morality" of the Bay Area masses had exceeded everyone's expectations. But what was the reaction to this onrush of patriotic altruism and self-sacrifice? Oddly enough, it was mixed and ambivalent—thereby pointing up in a most amusing way some of the inner contradictions of statism. For suddenly, many of the local governmental water districts, including San Francisco's, realized that dammit! they were losing revenue! Now, water shortage is all well and good, but there is nothing more important to a bureaucrat and his organization than their income. And so the local California water districts began to scream: "No, no, you fools, you've 'over-conserved.'" (To a veteran anti-ecologist such as myself, the coining of the new term "over-conserving" was music to my ears.) The water districts began to shout that people have conserved too much, and that they should spend more, for which they were sternly chastised by the state water authorities, who accused the municipal groups of "sabotaging" the water conservation program.

Meanwhile, other local ecologists and statists got into the act. They grouched that the over-conservation had induced people not to water their lawns, which led to the "visual pollution" "unsightly" lawns, and also caused the dried leaves to become fire hazards, which is apparently another ecological no-no.

I can see it now: a debate within the wealthy liberal ecofreak community: Mr. A.: "Dammit, you've over-conserved water; your lawns are visual pollutants, and your dry leaves are endangering the environment through fire." Mr. B.: "You're a blankety-blank no-good sellout water waster. You guys have been urging me for years to conserve, and now I'm doing it and all I get is hassle."

The culminating irony has been the reaction of the local water districts to the "threat" of "over-conservation" of water and the consequent loss of revenue to the governmental water districts. The response of the Bay Area districts was: "Sorry folks, we have to raise the price of water in order to maintain the beloved revenue of the water district (us.)" So, "over" conservation has led to an increase in the price of water. It is intriguing that raising the price of water in order to ration increased scarcity is universally considered to be reactionary, selfish, and

(Continued On Page 8)

# The State and Education

By Austin W. Wright

(In our continuing efforts to present forgotten but excellent and relevant writings of the past, we are happy to reprint, for the first time since its original publication, Austin Wright's "The State and Education", which appeared in Benjamin Tucker's great journal *Liberty* in January 1897. In contrast to the usual, more raffish contributors to anarchist publications, Austin W. Wright was a well-known businessman of Chicago. He was a provision broker and was considered one of the most daring speculators on the Chicago Board of Trade. Wright often spoke on the currency question, which dominated political debate in the 1890's. He favored full financial liberty in banking and in coinage. Tucker, the leading individualist anarchist of the era, published several of Wright's addresses on banking and currency problems in the middle and late 1890's, as well as this essay on Education. He did not always endorse fully Wright's opinions, but apparently he found them sufficiently sound.)

In May 1899, *Liberty* reprinted an interview with Wright originally published in the *Chicago Chronicle*. In it we find that Wright identifies himself explicitly as an anarchist—a very courageous act in Chicago at that period!) He states that his friends have known of his views for years but that the general run of citizens of Chicago knew him as a reputable citizen and not as an avowed anarchist.

Austin Wright's true character was revealed when he was called for jury duty and, upon being examined by a judge, replied that he did not believe in laws made by men or in their enforcement, and that he would not take any oath to uphold or enforce them. He was so polite and obviously respectable that the judge dismissed him without penalty.

Wright is described in the interview as short—no more than 5 feet tall—, sturdily built, cool, nervy and imperturbable, plain spoken and dignified. He was at that time somewhat over 50 years old, a resident of Chicago for about twenty-five years, and a native-born American. Wright began his career in a hog market, weighing and buying for a large meat packing concern. Later in life he began speculating in commodities—and soon gave up his job and entered full time into commodity trading. He was soon a millionaire but lost the bulk of his fortune in the "Cudahy corner." But he remained prosperous and active in his business.

Wright began systematic reading in philosophy and political economy after his business reverse, and this reading broadened and deepened his anarchistic tendencies. Originally he had been active in Democratic politics, and his adoption of anarchist philosophy was a gradual process of mental development. He began by reading Herbert Spencer. As Wright stated: "I maintain that people which is least governed is the best governed. I don't believe in laws made by men. There is only one kind of law, and that is the law of nature. All others are mere expressions of belief. Why they should bind me unless I accept them I cannot conceive." Wright added that he agreed neither with Tolstoy and his ultra-pacifist followers nor with Parsons, Sipes, and other violent so-called anarchists. —J.R.P.) □

## The State And Education

Since the time that we have had organized government in this country, our schools have been operated and controlled by State agencies. These conditions have so long obtained that it has become fashionable to speak of our public schools as the great bulwark of American institutions, and most people look upon our public school system as the palladium of republican ideas. Therefore any criticism directed against our schools is heard with small patience, and serious opposition to the system always excites among those who hear it something akin to "connoption fits."

Nevertheless there have been in the past numerous instances where popular opinion was as firmly fixed, and seemingly as securely entrenched, in a position subsequently proven erroneous, and from which it was easily dislodged, as it is now in the matter of public schools.

The principal reason for the strong hold that our public school system has upon the public is the fact of a popular misconception as to its character. We call it a free school system. It is the word free, and the

apparent free intermingling of the children at school, that give the system its popular strength.

If it was denominated as its real character demands, and called what it is,—a compulsory school system,—it would not appeal so strongly to unthinking, but real, liberty-lovers.

Our public school system is wrong because its establishment and maintenance are an invasion of individual freedom. It takes away from parents the free exercise of rightful control over their children by obliging them to make use of school facilities which they do not approve, and to which they are opposed.

Parents are responsible for the existence of their children, and nothing should be done by the State that interferes with, or impairs, that natural responsibility. Therefore every parent should be left free to use such educational agencies and methods as are by him deemed fittest for the education of his children. No one should be encouraged in the belief, or practice, of the idea that, however many children he may bring into the world, society is bound to see to it that they shall be provided, at public cost, with an education. Personal independence should not be weakened by the cultivation of any such idea; every man should feel that the position of himself and family in society, and the education fitting them for proper occupancy of that position, are due solely to his own efforts, limited only by the natural independence incident to our social organization.

Love of offspring is the strongest affection with which we are endowed, and, if left free, its natural promptings will be sufficient incentive to impel the provision of better educational facilities than are possible in any other way. For instance, a child shows that it possesses faculties indicating a fitness for certain vocations; now these faculties need only cultivation to insure proficiency in certain special ways. The public school affords no opportunity for special training, and the enforced contributions exacted from parents in support of the public school so weaken the family resources that they are unable to expend their money in the direction that gives the best promise.

The very nature of the system limits opportunity in the public school to the established curriculum. With schools such as would naturally spring into existence everywhere is response to what was demanded, there would be opportunity to buy the kind of mental cultivation and training that was wanted; nor would time and money be wasted in the acquisition of knowledge not deemed needful by the recipients and those most interested in them. With free voluntary cooperation there would be great diversity in the kind and character of schools, and the competition and emulation incident to such a state of things would be conducive to a more rapid growth and a higher efficiency than are possible with the uniform conditions prevailing in our public schools.

No man should be deprived of that which he wants and to which he is justly entitled, by being obliged to expend his energy for things that he does not want or the use of which he cannot approve. There are millions of parents in this country obliged to contribute in the shape of taxes to the support of public schools, who are thereby deprived of the pleasure incident to the exercise of the natural right of affording their children the kind of instruction that they deem most beneficial. Those of them who are able to send their children to other schools are unjustly made to pay their money in support of the public school, receiving therefrom absolutely no return whatever. The exercise of any power on the part of the State that is, in its operation, unjust to its citizens is not only indefensible, but should be utterly condemned.

All parents as individuals have an inalienable right to educate their children in accordance with the wishes and desires of the children and themselves, guided and inspired by indications of innate talent, limited only by the exercise of equal freedom on the part of every other parent and child. And, while society may have the power to limit and abridge that right, the exercise of such power cannot justly be defended. Every exaction imposed by society should be founded upon the idea that every member of society is entitled to equal freedom; no other rule can be defended, nor is any other rule justly entitled to observance.

(Continued On Page 3)

## State — (Continued From Page 2)

Why should anybody be taxed, in order that somebody else may have and enjoy benefits at less than cost? How can there be any justification of the taxation of any individual in support of a system in the creation of which they had no choice or which they do not use.

The tendency of civilization is in the direction of homogeneity as pertaining to aggregations of individuals, and in that of a greater heterogeneity as pertaining to individuals themselves. Therefore the public school is entirely inadequate to, and wholly unfitted for, the proper education of those who are to become the citizens of the future. The public school can impart only one kind of education; all must be treated alike, as it would be manifestly improper to give any scholar a higher or more expensive form of education than others receive.

No partiality can be shown in a public school system; yet, because of the diversity of future vocation, and therefore diversity of want, the requirements of society demand different educational treatment, and different school facilities, for different individuals.

If the State has the right to establish schools in which our children are to be educated, it has also the right to compel attendance at those schools. More than that, the State has a right to say when they shall go, how long they shall stay, and what they shall study. The right of the State in this respect once acknowledged, all individual right to the exercise of education liberty is forever surrendered. The State never gives up power once exercised, except at the end of successful revolution. Is it possible by coercion to change the nature of an unwilling and unreceptive mind, so that it will receive and perceive? You can compel them to come to the educational font, but an unwilling recipient can hardly be obliged to partake. The idea of the usefulness of the mental discipline received in a stuffing process is greatly over estimated. The only discipline that is worth anything is such as acquired by experience in ways that enable the recipient to distinguish the useful from the useless; the mere memorizing and mechanical recitation of rules lacks the essential qualities of experience. Most children can attend school but a short time; the circumstances of their station in life are such that but a limited amount of education is necessary; because of the attempt on the part of the State to furnish everybody with more education than is wanted there has been a failure to furnish enough of the kind that is wanted. Supply will not create desire, but desire that is not satisfied by a supply will soon wither and die. Every scholar should receive the kind of education that he himself wants, subject to no influence other than parental. Any child that has an unquenchable desire for knowledge,—and without desire attainment is impossible—will be impelled to sufficient effort, and will incite the parental aid necessary, to enable him to satisfy that desire.

The arbitrary imposition of a fixed kind of education upon anybody by State agencies should not for a moment be permitted. A system of that kind is entirely out of harmony with the spirit of republican institutions. Institutions out of harmony with individual liberty tend to weaken and destroy those individual characteristics which are essential to the growth and development of a free people.

"Oh! But the poor,—what is to be done for them? They ought to be educated. How is it to be done? They cannot educate themselves. Surely, organized society ought to interfere here, and provide means to enable these people to lift themselves out of their present unfortunate condition."

Well, grant that that is true; how far do you propose going in that direction, and where do you propose to stop? If it is the duty of the State to provide education, it is the duty of the State to furnish the means of getting an education. Of what use are school houses and school teachers without schoolbooks; those being provided, how can children go to school with empty stomachs and without clothes? How far are you willing to go in this direction? Where shall the line be drawn at which you will stop extending the State aid? There is no stopping place, and can be none, once you justify the idea that it is proper for the State to afford education to the poor.

Acceptance of, and action in accordance with, the idea that it is the duty of the State to furnish education to the poor, instead of being an aid to them, will have ultimately an opposite effect. It will encourage improvident marriages, thereby increasing the number to which aid must be extended, and it will lower the conception of parental obligation and duty.

Think of encouraging the preposterous idea that parents need give but little thought to the necessity of educating their offspring!

Think of encouraging citizens in the belief that the education of their own children is of small concern, but that the education of everybody else's children is a matter of prime importance that can in no wise be neglected,—that is, that direct obligations to your own children are secondary to the indirect obligations to children in general!

And so people are to marry when they feel like it, and bring into the world as many children as they may, and society, not they, must assume the burden and accept the consequences! How far is it from this point to the place where the assertion comes in: "Society owes me a living; therefore I must have it." As a matter of justice, why should plenty be taxed in order that want may have? Why should the thrifty and provident be taxed in order that the unthrifty and improvident may live? Is there any justification for the taking from the good for somethings and giving to the good for nothings, thereby impairing the usefulness of the good for somethings and making the good for nothings still more good for nothing?

Oh! they say, but something must be done in the name of, and for the sake of, humanity. Well, grant it. Can human sympathy be properly expressed through the operation of arbitrary law?

Society is not a matter of creation, but it has been, and is, a thing of growth; and its best growth and development are attained in an atmosphere of freedom. From the absence of compulsory measures it does not follow that no provision will be made for those who are worthy, but-unfortunate.

Voluntary actions incited by the sympathy incident to the natural love of man for his fellows will and must be more effective than any coercive effort on the part of the State. Even if not, would the indiscriminate helping of everybody who is poor be a proper exercise of the best humanity?

Let us see. What we all desire is a society composed of strong, self-reliant, self-supporting members; now, will that be soonest attained by obliging the self-supporting to carry the non-supporting, in order that the latter may live and propagate their kind. Or will it not rather come soonest by leaving unthrift and improvidence to suffer from the consequences of their imperfections, in order that the race may the more quickly reach conditions of perfection. The best humanity is action along the line that will achieve the largest and best ultimate outcome.

Conditions of perfection cannot be brought about by governmental regulations, because people must learn to preceive what is good for them because it is good for them; and they can do this only by being allowed opportunity for the free exercise of individual faculty. Experience is the only school, and experience is a thing that, in the very nature of things, must be acquired by personal action; it can in no wise be taught by rule or learned by rote. Do what you will and as much as you may, the pains and penalties incident to the thorough adaptation of man to conditions necessary to life must be gone through with; so the highest and best humanity consists in asserting and insisting that every individual must be self-supporting and non-aggressive. Every action out of harmony with that idea only defers and makes more difficult the object to be attained; so, by helping incompetence at the expense of competence, in order that you may have the proximate seeming benefits, you are not only unjustly burdening the worthy, but you are defeating the very object sought.

Did it ever occur to any who favor aid to improvidence at the expense of providence that they propose exactly the thing that was the cause of the improvident's present condition,—that is, sacrificing the ultimate good in order that present gratification may be enjoyed?

The best humanity does not consist in increasing the evil sought to be cured. Then there are those who say that "the interest and judgment of the people most interested are not sufficient guarantee of the goodness of the commodity." That is to say, they do not know what they want; therefore, it is, and of right should be, given to those of us possessing long heads and high foreheads to prescribe what is to be taken, and oblige the recipients to partake. Now, inasmuch as personal experience is a prime essential to the growth, and development of a discriminating intelligence, how long do you think it will be necessary for the self-esteemed few to act as mentors for the ignorant many before the latter become sufficiently intelligent to act and judge for themselves, but that you do

(Continued On Page 4)

## State — (Continued From Page 3)

not know what you ought to have for yourselves, and should institute schools to their own liking and oblige you to support them and partake thereof.—what would you think of the wisdom or justice of their action? Again: did it ever occur to those of you who believe in the teleological origin and disposition of things that there are millions of people we regard religion as of more importance than all other things put together? Suppose it was insisted that everybody should be obliged to partake of religious instruction and training in our schools,—would not the end justify whatever means might be adopted in enforcement thereof? Is not something which concerns us for all time of more importance than anything that relates only to our limited stay upon earth? It is no answer to say that religious liberty must not be interfered with, for religious thought cannot justly be accorded exclusive privileges as to freedom. If it is right that men should have and enjoy religious freedom, it so right that they should have and enjoy educational freedom. If the best interests of society demand that men be left free to worship or not worship God, according to the dictates of their own consciences, the best interests of society also demand that men be left free to educate or not educate themselves according to the demands of their own innate desires. Still another thing: love of country and proper respect for its laws are not best subserved or conserved by arbitrarily obliging people who believe religious instruction necessary to support schools in which such instruction is not imparted.

Now, let us look in another direction. Man was not, nor is he, created, but, like everything else on earth, is a thing of growth; smoothing away the rough places and making things easy for him are not conducive to his best growth and highest development. He must learn by experience what is best for his growth and advancement; there is no other way of finding out. Physical nutrition is required, and mental nutrition is required; it is impossible to partake of the latter until the stomach is full; you cannot fill the head before you fill the belly. Now, if it is incumbent on the State to furnish mental nutrition, is it not a greater and more urgent duty that bodily nutriment shall be first supplied?

Without going further, it may well be asked now can the State supply a want that the people composing the State cannot supply? Whatever may be done must be done by the expenditure of energy. The State is without force, except as it gathers it from the people through the tax-gatherer; and, however much the State may gather, the force will always be subject to the loss incident to the collection and distribution thereof. The amount of force to be had can in nowise be increased; and for that reason, whenever government attempts to do too many things, or too much of anything, it fails to properly do the things that it is proper that government should do. We all desire as little government as possible; we may differ as to what is necessary, but we all desire—yes, more, we demand—that government shall be good. Government in this country is the expression of the will of the majority, and whether it is good or bad depends upon the character of the units of which it is composed. Now let us note the probable influence of our public schools citizens.

Strong, self-reliant, self-supporting citizens are essential to the best growth and highest development of society. The influence of the public school upon the early life of the individual at a time when character is being formed is inimical to the growth and development of the right kind of citizens. As children they have been supplied with an education by the State; their natural guardians and protectors have been lost sight of as factors in their education; therefore they do not feel, when they arrive at man's estate, and themselves become parents, that it is incumbent on them to educate the children that have come to them. The State has assumed that duty; they were educated in schools furnished by the State, and their children will be so educated; and so they learn to look to and lean upon the State, which soon comes to be regarded as an entity possessing resources that can, and should, be applied to the alleviation of hardships, the removal of obstacles, and, finally, the providing of the means to satisfying ordinary human needs. People learn to expect things from the State that are impossible of attainment from that source,—things that can be had only as the result of exercise of individual faculty and effort,—a fact which they have been taught to ignore. They look to, and expect from, the State the supply; at first they are disappointed only; then come feelings of dissatisfaction, then murmurs of discontent, then popular manifestations more or less lawless, such as found expression in the demonstration witnessed in 1894, which came to

be known as Coxeism. That affair was a logical sequence of the past exercise of paternal functions on the part of governmental agencies, and therefore an effect of the cultivation and growth of the idea not only that an exercise of functions of this kind is a governmental duty, but that the people have a right to expect, and demand, aid from the government whenever it to them seems necessary. Anything that aids the cultivation and growth of sentiment of this kind is wrong, and, if persisted in, can end in only one way,—that is, in the destruction and extinction of republican institution.

You cannot have a democratic republic without republicans. Republicans are always independent and self-reliant. Citizens of this character cannot be created; they must grow; and they can grow and develop only in an atmosphere of freedom. Artificial aid in the shape of compulsory schools, instead of being in harmony with what ought to be, and therefore useful, is not only unnecessary and useless, but actually repressive and harmful.

Here are young minds to be trained; how, and with what shall they be trained? Is there a teacher in the world that can tell? Is there an aggregation of teachers in the world, or can an aggregation of teachers be gotten together, that can tell what kind of training is wanted, and how best to supply it? A very wide diversity as to kind and quality is required; here are all kinds of faculty, and all degrees of the same kind of faculty, to be cultivated and trained; these faculties are in the possession of individuals no two of whom are alike; and it is expected that this vast heterogeneous number of youthful individuals can be best developed

(Continued On Page 5)

## The 'Humane' N-Bomb

Congress is now struggling over whether to adopt one of the pet weapons of American conservatives: the secret, hush-hush, new Neutron Bomb. Conservatives admire the weapon for two reasons. In the first place, as a precise nuclear weapon it tends to blur the vital line between the nuclear and the "conventional". The blurring means that the U.S. might be tempted to use the weapon in some war while proclaiming it as "conventional", only to have the war escalate into the nuclear range. The Congressional opponents of this blurring were trenchant. Senator Mark Hatfield (R., Ore.) pointed out that "because it is more precise, however, there is more temptation to use it. Once we introduce nuclear weaponry into conventional warfare, we're on our way." And Senator Dick Clark (D., Io.) added that "I find the concept of a 'limited' nuclear exchange extremely dubious. I think it is vitally important to retain the distinction between conventional and nuclear war. I think nations and leaders must be aware that when they go nuclear, they are introducing an entirely new dimension into the conflict."

But the striking feature of the N-bomb, the one that seems to make it more "precise" and "limited", and the one that really endears it to our conservatives, is that it—more or less—kills people without destroying property. Isn't that a wonderful bomb, that "only" kills human beings?

Libertarians know that "human rights" and "property rights" cannot be kept distinct, that, in the fullest sense, neither can be protected and maintained without safeguarding the other. But conservatives are not libertarians, and the conservative penchant for attempting to favor property rights while scorning human rights has never been made so crystal-clear. The joy with which conservatives embrace a weapon of mass murder which will spare material property is damning enough. It also renders particularly grotesque the recent discovery by conservatives of "human rights"—provided, of course, that the prattling of human rights be safely confined to the Communist countries. And what of the human rights of those who will or might be N-bombed?

Senator Hatfield, apparently without irony, pointed out that the proponents of the N-bomb consider it "a more humane weapon because it is more precise in its target." Since its precision consists solely in its confinement to human beings, one is sometimes tempted to question the sanity of our ruling elite. At any rate, at least one Senator, H. John Heinz (R., Pa.) was able to point out the obvious: that they were being asked "to approve a nuclear weapon that is even more repugnant than usual... which is literally dehumanizing... The neutron bomb, after all, singles out people for destruction, choosing to preserve buildings instead." □

## State — (Continued From Page 4)

mentally by sending them to schools of uniform character, where the curriculum is fixed, and can be changed only by act of some legislative body. If a man had a horse to be broken, or a dog to be trained, he would hesitate long enough to look around before he sent it to a training school of the kind we have adopted for the education of our children. Compulsory support of the public schools ought to be no longer insisted upon. Oh! but they say, that would amount to the abolishment of the system. Well, if compulsory support is what sustains the system, it certainly ought to be abolished; anything that cannot stand by force of merit upon its own feet is unworthy of a place in a free country, and the sooner it is done away with the better. Abolish schools! No, simply withdraw compulsory support. Open-mouthed astonishment immediately exclaims: "But what would you put in the place?" And, when the reply is, as it must be, "nothing," they turn with a look of contemptuous disgust, as much as to say that it is not worth while to continue the discussion. But wait one moment; is it reasonable to expect that a want, though it may be known and universal,—a want that is not the same in any two individuals, and that by right is entitled to a supply as varied as is the want,—can be anticipated and supplied by a fixed plan. In the abandonment of the public-school system the only thing necessary is to stop right where you are; as soon as desire is left free to act, the ever-responsive faculties that enable us to supply all of our wants will assert themselves, and soon find and develop the best way.

Desire and exertion, not machinery and supply, create appetite. Without purpose on the part of the recipient education is impossible; there must be a will before there can be a way; gratuitous bestowal will avail nothing, and coercion is recognition of unacknowledged defeat. Education, to be appreciated, must not be made cheap and easy of attainment; it is the things striven for and won by force or merit that are esteemed and that become profitable.

The giving away of prized things destroys the incentive for their acquisition. Under such conditions there can be no conquest of opposing obstacles, at the end of which the conqueror may proudly turn to his fellows and enjoy the sweet feelings of satisfaction aroused by admiring approval.

Change is the natural order of things; everything by which we are surrounded and with which we have to do is ceaselessly changing.

Society has ever been, and is now, the result of countless imperceptible changes that have been going on for all times. Nothing is to day as it was yesterday; nothing will be tomorrow as it is to-day; and so it is that human life is simply a matter of adaptation and readaptation to the constantly changing conditions by which we are surrounded and with which we are confronted. A proper school system must be something that is in harmony with evolutionary law, and such a system is possible only when the people are left free to supply by voluntary cooperation whatever they themselves may feel that they need. Schools that fail to meet requirements will pass away, and their places will be taken by schools that meet and satisfy the demand. These orderly, because natural, changes will take place just as easily as the stage-lines and stage-coaches of a generation ago were superseded by the railroad. And just as the primitive railroad with its puny equipment has grown and developed into the great trunk lines of today, equipped with giant locomotives, immense freight trains, and sumptuous passenger coaches, so will schools, under conditions of freedom, come into existence, and, in harmony with an always pre-existing demand, grow and develop into the highest possible usefulness.

Inasmuch as we cannot under any circumstances create, we should allow the problem to solve itself, as it surely and rightly will, by natural means in natural ways.

The teacher, instead of being circumscribed by the hampering limitations of a rigid system fixed by arbitrary law, would be free to act in an original way, always in harmony with the demand expressed by those entrusted to his care, and, instead of being, as now, a mere part of a huge machine, would, because of freedom of opportunity, become a real, living, forceful member of a noble profession with a power for good that under present conditions is impossible; for, instead of being constantly confined within the limits of prescribed rules, he would be free to adopt hopeful suggestions that must, in the very nature of things, come to him from time to time. He would grow and develop therefore into an enlarged sphere of usefulness, and would be able ultimately to command a recognition fitting this noblest of human vocations. □

## Arts and Movies

By Mr. First Nighter

*Star Wars*, dir. by George Lucas. With Alec Guinness and Carrie Fisher.

First came the hype. That *Star Wars* is going to be the biggest popular film success since *Jaws* means very little. So every season is going to have its oversold smash hit, so what? But the difference, the new hype, with *Star Wars* was its overwhelming acclaim among the critics. Usually the masses whoop it up for a *Jaws* while the critics go ape over Bertolucci or Fassbinder. Yet here they were in joint huzzahs, with the critic from *Time* flipping his wig to such an extent as to call it the best movie of the year and making *Star Wars* the feature of that week's issue.

But the oddest, the most peculiar part of it was what my fellow-critics were saying: "Hurrah, a fun movie-movie"; "good escape entertainment"; "a return to good guys vs. a happy ending again"; "movie fare for the entire family"; "like *Flash Gordon*" etc. Here were men and women who have spent the greater part of their lives deriding these very virtues, attacking them as mindless, moralistic, unaesthetic, fodder for the Tired Businessman instead of the Sensitive Intellectual. And yet here were these same acidulous critics praising these mindless, reactionary verities. What in blazes was going on? Had all colleagues experienced a blinding miraculous conversion to Old Culture truths? While I do not deny the logical possibility of such a mass, instantaneous conversion from error, my experience of this wicked world has convinced me that it is empirically highly unlikely. So what gives?

The best thing about seeing *Star Wars* is that my curiosity was satisfied. The mystery explained! For it was indeed true that *Star Wars* returns to the good guy-bad guy, happy ending, and all the rest. But there is an important catch, and it is that catch that enables our critical intelligentsia to praise the movie and yet suffer no breach in their irrational and amoral critical perspective. The catch is embodied in the reference to *Flash Gordon*: namely, that this is such a silly, cartoony, comic-strip movie that no one can possibly take it seriously, even within its own context. No one, that is, over the age of 8. Hence, in contrast to *Death Wish* or *Dirty Harry*, where the viewer is necessarily caught up in the picture and must take the viewer is seriously, *Star Wars* is such kiddie hokum that the adult critics can let their hair down and enjoy it without having their aesthetic values threatened.

To put it another way, our critics, who are bitterly opposed to a moralistic and exciting plot, are scarcely challenged by the plot of *Star Wars*, which is so designedly imbecilic that the intelligentsia can relax, forget about the plot and enjoy the special effects, which the avant-garde always approves.

Even on the kiddie level, *Star Wars* doesn't really work. It is peculiarly off-base. The hero, for example, is so young, wooden and callow that he doesn't really come off as an authentic comic-strip hero. As a result, his older mercenary aide becomes a kind of co-hero, which throws off the balance of the story. The hero presumably doesn't get the Fairy Princess in the end, either, although far worse is the casting of the Princess. For, Carrie Fisher is ugly and abrasive, and if one could care very much about the hero one would hope that nothing came of their proto-romance. Miss Fisher is the quintessence of the Anti-Princess, and this ruins whatever may have remained of interest of value in *Star Wars*. There are more problems; not only does wise Alec Guinness lose his mighty duel with his evil ex-disciple, but the whole duel is pointless and leads nowhere, even within the context of the plot.

Not only is this oversold turkey not the best movie of the year, it is not very good even within the sci-fi movie genre. Some of the critics have proclaimed *Star Wars* as even better than "2001", but that would be no great feat, since there have been few movies of any genre that have been worse than that pretentious, mystical, boring, plotless piece of claptrap. But *Star Wars* doesn't begin to compare with the science fiction greats of the past, e.g.: "*The Thing*"—the first post World War II sci-fi movie; "*It Came from Outer Space*"; "*The Night of the Living Dead*"; and, best of all, the incomparable "*Invasion of the Body Snatchers*". None of these movies needed the razzle-dazzle of "special effects"; they did it on plot, theme, and characters. Back to them! □

# Open Door Imperialism

Review of William Appleman Williams, *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*, Dell, 312 pp. and Williams, ed., *From Colony to Empire*, John Wiley, 506 pp. by Robert Dale Grinder.

By R. D. Grinder

The bicentennial has arrived. For the most part we have been enduring a celebration of America's past. Do not be deceived. America's past has not been that of "Man's last best hope." Our history is not so unique as we shall be told. There is an alternative way of looking at American history. People like Charles Beard, Harry Elmer Barnes and Albert Jay Nock investigated America's imperial thrust and its domestic class society. Their works, however, predated America's last great celebration, consensus history. The phenomenon of the early Cold War years stressed America's uniqueness, her mission, the lack of class conflict and how power was "thrust on America."

And then came William Appleman Williams. Largely through his efforts, the celebration of America's past suffered a severe setback. This he accomplished in three ways: through the publication of his own works (primarily *The Tragedy and The Contours of American History*) by developing a circle of dedicated students, many of whom became scholars in their own right, some of whom contributed pieces for *From Colony To Empire*; and by starting an avant-garde journal of radical history in the late 1950's, *Studies on the Left*. One suspects too that Williams gained importance because he was behind the plow at the right time. Even in the early sixties, Williams was brushed aside as a "crazy" in the historical profession. To be sure, some of his articles made readings books, but they were among the straw men the liberal apologists knocked down. Then, by decade's end, the *Tragedy* became the assigned reading in thousands of college classrooms. Why? Vietnam was what raised Williams to greater professional respect. It was an explanation of what had happened. If Williams is correct in arguing that the *Pentagon Papers* show that the American Empire did not "grow like Topsy," the *Tragedy* offers a plausible explanation why.

The thesis of the *Tragedy* is simple, that American policy-makers have tried, from the 1890's until the present, to build an empire without colonies, an informal Empire based on the Open Door Policy. The Open Door Policy failed because revolutionaries like the Mexicans, Russians and Vietnamese attempted to overhaul their own economies for their own national interest. Other nations, most notoriously Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan, attempted to establish autarchic units like the "Greater Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere." America's attempts to resolve the problems caused by nationalism, revolution and counterrevolution led to war and intervention. Our attempt to keep the door open to American goods likewise alienated many people. Williams points to Cuba, in the beginning, showing how America laid the groundwork for the ascendance of Fidel Castro.

The Open Door Policy was American policy-makers' response to the Crisis of the Nineties, when it appeared that the frontier had closed, that the economy was in bad shape and that markets abroad needed to be exploited in order that America's political and economic structure survive. Rightly or wrongly, these policymakers tied America's health and well-being to expansion of markets. Any attempt to nationalize one's economy or to create a political-economic "sphere of influence" was viewed as a threat to American security. Hence, the policy was conceived as a way to halt the various imperial powers from establishing "spheres" in China. They did not want China carved up by the various powers. Rather, they demanded equal entry everywhere. Although they gained a foothold in Asia (the Philippines) and helped to quash the Boxer Rebellion to insure that their wishes were honored, clearing the path to the "China market" was never easy—indeed, it led to war between America and Japan in the 1940's. Likewise, American opposition to "spheres of influence" led to the quarrel with all of the Asia powers and to the Cold War with the Soviet Union.

There was, of course, one major exception to all of this—Latin America. This American "sphere" helped to shatter Woodrow Wilson's dream of an institutionalized Open Door Policy, the League of Nations. It also marked the first point of conflict between America and Nazi Germany. Indeed, Latin America caused greater concern over Hitler's moves to revise the Versailles Treaty in Europe (during the mid-thirties). Latin America also saw the greatest extent of American

military intervention. The Mexican Revolution (1910-1940) sparked at least four major crises with her northern neighbor. Only World War II and the Cold War brought Mexico and America together. Wilson had nearly gone to war twice with the Mexican regime. Then the Mexican government moved against foreign corporations, primarily oil companies in 1924. Finally, in 1936, revolution pushed the law back on the books. America responded by cutting off loans. But that was more refined than sending in the Marines, last done for a sustained period in Nicaragua. It was to the credit of Herbert Hoover that he removed the troops and moved toward a Good Neighbor Policy. This was in stark contrast to the Wilsonian policy of teaching Latin Americans "to elect good men"—with the aid of the bayonet, in Haiti and Santo Domingo, while we were fighting the "great war" that would allow "selfdetermination." Intervention did not stop with Hoover. FDR had gunships outside Havana harbor during the year that Grau San Martin held power in Cuba. LBJ sent Marines to the Dominican Republic in 1965. And the CIA participated in the ouster of Arbenz from Guatemala in 1954 and the aborted Bay of Pigs project in 1961.

Of course, intervention was not limited to Latin America. Americans helped to quell the Boxer Rebellion in China (1900); we landed troops in the Soviet Union during World War I; Hoover's activities as "food czar" helped make certain the communists gained no strong foothold in Hungary or Germany. Finally, there was American intervention in all of Indochina, most notably Vietnam. The scale of that intervention was staggering. Attempting time and again to promote our notion of the liberal world order, we created hostile regimes which chose to fight against "open door imperialism." The irony is that "open door imperialism" was based on the assumption that American markets must expand—and that such expansion could never take place in and atmosphere of war and hostility. The policy-makers desired peace and stability, yet the policy itself all too often led to war and revolution.

The policy of "open door imperialism" was by no means gushing American idealism, as critics like George Kennan charged. It was a realistic policy designed to serve the needs of corporate capitalism, as Williams has called our political-economic system. It was fed by the ideology of expansion that had permeated the republic since its inception. In fact, as Walter LaFeber pointed out in his essay on Franklin and Madison, it was pretty much the same argument that Madison used in confronting Montesquieu's theory that a republic could not exist over a vast expanse. Madison argued quite the contrary, that a vast expanse was precisely what a republic needed. Thus the logic of expansion and the national interest were bound together. By the end of the nineteenth century, however, policy-makers reasoned that such expansion need not be territorial. This does not mean that such expansion was, as Williams implied, free-trade imperialism. The very concept is self-contradictory. Hence the argument by Crapol and Schonberger that the "free ships" alternative proposed by Cleveland and others in the 1880's was just another variation of the expansionist theme is incorrect. It failed precisely because the dynamic was in the opposite direction. The dynamic was toward more governmental intervention to gain markets abroad.

Crapol and Schonberger likewise miss the mark when they attempt to bring the agrarian interests into the evolution of the policy of imperialism. Williams makes the same mistake, I believe. The quotes from the Populists and the analysis of the free silver issue from this light are interesting but not terribly important. It was the leaders from the industrial metropolitan East who formulated this policy and it was they who carried it out. Bryan's anti-imperialist campaign of 1900 and his personal campaign to win the south and west for Wilson when the latter was the "peace" candidate ("He kept us out of war.") show that he and his followers were in the anti-imperialist camp every bit as much as LaFollette, Norris and Debs. And where did they all come from but the "colonial" West? It might be argued that the same areas that opposed the plans for a national Federal Reserve System were the same areas that opposed entry into the war (prior to April 1917). Without a doubt, the architects of America's imperial drive came predominantly from the industrial East: the Adamses, Hay, Roosevelt, Root, Lodge, Knox, Stimson, Morgan and Wilson. There was a drive for markets. It was spearheaded by an elite who sought presumed relief for a presumed problem of surplus goods. Agrarians may have called for relief also. But

(Continued On Page 7)

## Open — (Continued From Page 6)

they never held power. They were not the decision-makers. They were not then part of the ruling class.

In spite of these issues of "free trade imperialism" and the role of the agrarians in policy-making, the work of Williams, his students, and of Richard Van Alstyne is valuable. It provides an excellent framework for analyzing territorial imperialism and the foreign policy of corporate capitalism. As much as leaders of the corporate establishment desired that government ensure stability and minimize risk at home, so they did abroad. And just as domestic intervention led to further intervention, so Williams and the others show that foreign intervention opened the door to further intervention. The attempt to hold the door open throughout the world involved the United States in conflict after conflict. And the United States intervened not for starry-eyed idealism, like saving the world for democracy or from communism. Those are merely code-words. Our

## Racism or Sexism: Which Way?

It is always amusing to see their inner contradictions rise up to smite our strident and vociferous Marxoid left-liberals. Their basic view of the world is that there are the Oppressors, who are, inter alia, "racists" and "sexists", and there are the Oppressed, the victims of this selfsame racism and sexism. More specifically, the Oppressors are whites (racists)—and—male (sexists), and the Oppressed are blacks—and—females. But what happens when these neat class divisions somehow get crossed and, for example, racially oppressed black males begin to oppress sexually oppressed white females? Which way does our left-liberal turn? If he sides with the females, he will stand accused by his peers of racism; and if he sides with the black males, he will equally stand accused of sexism. It is enough, comrades, to take to drink (if liquor has not been abjured as too bourgeois.)

Historically, of course, "racism" antedates "sexism" in the left-liberal's catalogue of horrors. Left-liberals, in their long-standing horror of racism, coupled with their coddling-of-criminals ideology, have long been accustomed to excuse and whimper over criminals, be they muggers, bank robbers, murderers, or whatever. Criminals are never at fault; the fault is always "society's" (whoever that is), for not providing high enough incomes, unbroken homes, unconditional love, adequate playgrounds, or whatever. Since "society", in this peculiar usage, includes the victim but excludes the criminal, this means that the criminal is not at all responsible for his evil deeds, but that the victim (at least partially) is. From the stems left-liberal coddling of criminals. Now, in contemporary America there is the added fact that a high proportion of street crimes of violence are committed by black males (generally teen-agers). For left-liberals trained at sniffing out "racism", this adds an extra motive for cooing over the criminals and for denouncing the victims (especially if the victims happen to be white.)

Now this has been standard fare for a long time and not much to remark upon. Except that in the last few years an extra element has been added: left-liberal attacks on "sexism", especially in the ranks of white women. A part of the women's movement has been a justifiably bitter opposition to rape as a violent sexual assault on women. I don't know where left-wing feminists stand on the coddling of criminals generally, but they sure don't want to coddle rapists; on the contrary, they have been talking of taking the "Inez Garcia" route private, maximal retaliation. So far, so good, except that given this new spirit, the conditions are set for the eruption of severe inner contradiction and conflicts among leftists.

It is no accident that this contradiction has emerged in one of the most left-wing communities of the nation, Madison, Wisconsin, home of the University of Wisconsin. On the county bench sits Judge Archie E. Simonson, long-standing left liberal and coddler of criminals, especially young blacks. This May 25 the judge was disposing of the cases of three teen-aged youths (black) who had raped a high school girl (white), and giving them the usual highly lenient sentences. In the course of the sentencing Judge Simonson delivered himself of some ad hoc remarks: to the effect, that males were being bombarded with lustful sexual images, including provocative female clothing, and so "should we punish a 15 or 16 year old who reacts to it normally?" The clear implication is that this sexy environment inflames males, and that therefore rape becomes a normal reaction, especially for teenagers searching for their identity.

policy-making elite desired that America prosper, and they believed that the prosperity of America was intimately tied to its ability to maintain peace and stability (and trade) throughout the world.

Lest the reader think that Williams has no heroes in the elite, he has heroes among the enlightened conservatives. These include Herbert Hoover, Dwight Eisenhower and J. William Fulbright. Each, in his own way, attempted to minimize the enlistment of troops to protect the American empire. Hoover initiated the Good Neighbor Policy and refused to engage in saber rattling when the Japanese invaded Manchuria. Eisenhower ended the Korean conflict, made the decision not to support France with men and nuclear hardware in Indochina, and managed to keep the United States out of significant combat during his presidency. Fulbright helped to focus national attention on American policy in Vietnam. Perhaps this is why he calls on the enlightened conservative to lead America to a new policy. But then we are dealing with Williams the philosopher, the communitarian nationalist, not the brilliant analyst of American foreign policy. □

Apparently the judge had not kept in touch with recent trends in left-liberal opinion, for a predictable fire-storm descended upon his head. Feminists have picketed, and are circulating petitions for a special election to recall Judge Simonson. Instead of apologizing, Simonson added fuel to the fire by reiterating that if women wanted to end the problem of rape they should stop "teasing" men.

We hold no brief for Judge Simonson. Quite the contrary, we hold that the feminists don't seem to realize that the real problem is not the particular judge but the environmentalist-determinist ideology which they undoubtedly share with him—at least, on non-rape questions. For if a criminal is not responsible for his actions, which are determined not by his free choice but by his environment, well then, Simonson has a good case. Then, it becomes plausible to assert that porno, miniskirts, tight jeans, etc. generate lustful impulses and the therefore the rape victim—or at least the class of sexy females in general—is responsible for the rape, rather than the rapist. Instead of opting for free will, the feminists have apparently been trying to dispute Simonson on the facts, that is, to deny that scantily clad females are lust-inspiring sex objects. But since everyone knows that they are, the feminists might be able to win at the polls but not in the broader society.

The correct and libertarian line to take on rape and Simonson would be as follows: Yes, Simonson is right that our sexually drenched atmosphere can inspire lustful impulses in males. But, part of the necessary process of growing up is learning how to curb one's aggressive impulses, to learn self-control (to use an Old Culture word.) He who can't or won't practice such self-control and becomes a criminal aggressor or rapist deserves to be socked with the full majesty of the law. Simonson's implication that women should go back to the veil and the hoopskirt in order to make life easier for young proto-rapists simply won't wash. Why should everyone else's life be made gray and miserable for the sake of coddling proto-rapists? Self-control is their responsibility, not that of females who should be able to dress and act as sexily as they please, without fear of aggression wreaked upon them. If we really wanted to be Old Culture, we could give our young proto-rapists the stern injunction to go and take a cold shower.

Meantime, to return to Madison, the left-liberal community has been predictably sundered along racism/sexism lines. Thus, Mrs. Eloise Anderson-Addison, member of the board of the local Urban League and of the NAACP, complained that "black men were facing immense pressure", including stiffer penalties for rape in the future, "as a result of the heightened tension and white women's fear of rape." Mrs. Anderson-Addison added that "the issue is more black-white than mere rape," and that "my problem with the women's movement is that white women can't deal with their own racism. This is a classical example of that conflict." The reply of the local feminist leader, Mrs. Anne Gaylor, was rather wishy-washy claiming that it's a "controversy over sexism and not racism" because the protest over Simonson's statement arose before the protestors knew that the rapists were black. The fact is that these ism labels only toss a lot of red herrings to a matter that should be looked at simply and clearly as a case of aggression, of coercive crimes against other persons.

(See New York Times, June 15, 1977.) □

## The FLP Goofs Again

The Free Libertarian Party of New York, whose peregrinations we have recorded from time to time in these pages, has pulled another lulu. Within the state party, the New York City party has been the worst (and has garnered a decline in absolute as well as relative number of votes in each succeeding election in the last four years.) And within the city party it is the Manhattan (New York County) party that has been the wackiest. Having taken the lead in challenging the moral purity and honesty of fellow libertarians a year and two years ago, the New York County party, assembled in its massed might of 17 members in the recent annual convention, has endorsed the Liberal Party incumbent for City Council At-large! By a vote of 10 to 4, with three abstentions, the FLP of New York County endorsed Henry Stern, after Mr. Stern had admonished them on the political realities: "your political strength is your line on the ballot. I'm not going to argue that I'm a pure libertarian—I'm not and ... I don't think I ever will be. But you have to decide whether you want to support the city councilman who is closest to you, or whether you want to insist on a level of ideological purity that rejects everyone not gathered in this room." (Geoffrey Stokes, "Libertarian Endorsement: The 75 Per Cent Solution", *The Village Voice*, June 6, 1977.) Duly instructed, the FLP voted to endorse. What price "purity" now?

Mr. Stern was right about one thing: the strength of the LP is indeed its line on the ballot. And what are we supposed to use that strength for? To endorse some cluck who is two millimeters better than some other cluck in an unimportant local election? This is the way to squander whatever strength we may possess; it is to make of organized libertarianism, in Nietzsche's immortal words, "a laughingstock, a thing of shame."

What in the world is the point to running candidates, to having a party, to getting on the ballot? Is it to register our running endorsements of the lesser of two or three evils? Is that what we are draining the energies of libertarians to achieve? This is pointless nonsense, but it is also far worse. For our strength, our only strength, is what makes us distinctive in the political realm, what distinguishes us from all the other colors in the political spectrum. That is our glorious principles, our consistent body of truths which we must hold aloft, apply to the important political issues, and thereby sway increasing numbers of people. But to go the cynical cross-endorsement route of the Liberal and Conservative parties will not only accomplish nothing of practical value for our small party it throws away our only strength, the very point to the whole enterprise. For part and parcel of holding a set of consistent principles is only giving our endorsement to candidates who also uphold those principles—that is only to Libertarians.

For the New York party to pull this stunt is even worse than for other Libertarian Parties. For other LP's, national and state, at least have platforms where consistent libertarian principles and applications are set forth. The kooky FLP has never adopted a platform, confining itself to a few random resolutions. And what is more, in the FLP no party officials are allowed to say anything, since they might be infringing on the opinion

of some party member, and there is no party platform to stand on. The result is that only the candidates in New York can have anything to say, which makes the quality of the candidates even more important in New York State than elsewhere in the country. And now the FLP has dared to endorse a Liberal Party councilman who favors, *inter alia*, licensing and rent control. For shame!

The FLP action points up the importance of the Libertarian Party, nationwide, coming to grips with the potential and now actual evils of sellout cross-endorsements (endorsements of members of other parties) by LPs. Let us hope that at this July's convention at San Francisco, the LP will amend its rules to prohibit cross-endorsements by any constituent state parties. Let us nip this opportunist danger in the bud—right now! □

## Water — (Continued From Page 1)

Neanderthal, while raising the price of water in order to keep governmental water district revenues at their former level is considered perfectly legitimate, and barely worth commenting on. And so, the water price goes up anyway, though for the wrong reason and of course not in order to clear the market.

The most amusing aspect of this California water caper was the argument of a water district apologist on San Francisco television:

Q. But wouldn't the poor be hurt by the water district raising its water prices?

A. No, for since everyone has cut their consumption of water, the total water bill of each poor person will not increase.

In short, the poor are not being hurt by the higher price because, being forced to cut their consumption, their total bill has not increased. Thus, a price rise by a private firm is always selfish and oppressive of poor people; but when a monopoly governmental agency increases its price, the poor do not suffer at all, since if they cut their purchases sufficiently in response to the higher price, their total dollar payments will not increase. It is this sort of nonsense that our statist and busybodies are now being reduced to.

Meanwhile, how is "libertarian" Milton Friedman, now resident in the San Francisco area, taking to the water crisis? Is he advocating privatization, free competition among private water companies? Is he at least advocating the setting of a market-clearing price by the government water company? The answer to all of these is, remarkably, no. In his *Newsweek* column, Friedman favored keeping government water rationing, but making it more efficient through a typically elaborate scheme for surcharges for consumption over a certain quota of water, to be financing rebates for consuming under the quota. Thus, once again Friedmanism descends to being an efficiency expert for statism. □

### SUBSCRIBE NOW

Please enter a subscription for:

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Street \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Subscription Is \$8.00 Per Year

\$15.00 Two Years

Libertarian Forum Associate Subscription \$15.00 Or More.

### THE LIBERTARIAN FORUM

Box 341 Madison Square Station  
New York, New York 10010

### The Libertarian Forum

BOX 341

MADISON SQUARE STATION  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10010

**First Class**

Published Every Month. Subscription Rates: \$8.00 Per Year; \$15.00 Two Years