

A Monthly Newsletter

THE Libertarian Forum

Joseph R. Peden, Publisher

Murray N. Rothbard, Editor

VOLUME IV, NOS. 6-7

JUNE-JULY, 1972

75¢

McGOVERN???

At this writing, it is clear that only a miracle will keep George McGovern from the Democratic nomination for President. Perhaps the unions, the centrists, the party bosses, can mobilize a last ditch stand for the "old politics" and stop the crazies — but the chances look slim at best. But even if the McGovern steamroller sweeps to a first ballot victory, the convention will scarcely be a dull one. For the real fun of the convention will be what might be called a "meta-spectacle": the spectacle of contemplating the reactions of the mass of Middle America as they watch the goings-on in Miami over TV.

For what they will be watching is the sudden seizure of power by all the forces whom they hate and fear: the ruthless triumph of the scruffy Left — hippie youth, college kids, blacks, women, Chicanos, welfare mothers — the whole kaboodle. The comfortable old faces and power brokers — the Daleys, the party leaders, the union officials — will be all but gone, swept aside by "grass roots" power fueled by lunatic reforms insisting on quotal representation for highly selected "minorities." Along with the visible embodiment of their gut enemies, Middle America will see these forces push through programs and issues which will scare the bejabbers out of them: everything from the economic insanity of a \$1000 gift for every American to be financed by everyone making more than the gigantic sum of \$12,000 a year, to the legalization of homosexual marriages. And even if the more sensible politicians in the McGovern camp are able to tame their power-happy militants and tone down many of these programs, their radical scent will be there, to pervade the convention and the following McGovern campaign with the odor of inevitable and crushing defeat.

Two weeks before the California primary, Hubert Humphrey launched a belated campaign to inform the American public of the real ideas being promulgated by the left kids and their "sincere", slightly cretinous front man. In those two weeks, Humphrey was able to reduce the McGovern lead almost to the vanishing point. But this campaign of education will be as nothing compared to the massive Republican effort, which need only point the finger at the McGovernite programs and at their proponents, to send the South Dakotans down to a defeat more crushing than that of Barry Goldwater. To win the election, McGovern would have to hold the 1968 Humphrey states (essentially the Northeast plus Texas), and pick up a few more key states, such as California, Illinois, and Ohio. The chances of McGovern carrying Texas are surely nil, and he can scarcely carry the other states either, in the face of massive defections of the elderly, Jews, ethnics, WASPS, blue collar workers, etc. — in short, virtually the entire voting population over 30. Furthermore, the humiliated Daley machine will surely sit on its hands, and thus end any chance of carrying Illinois. Even New York is hardly safe for McGovern, considering the likelihood of an ultimate Conservative endorsement for Nixon, and of serious low income Jewish defections from a McGovern ticket.

In the extremely unlikely event of a McGovern triumph in November what would a McGovern administration be like? In the first place, the Left would become totally insufferable once again: any "New Left", anti statist and anti-Presidential glimmerings would go by the board now that

the Left felt itself in power once again. As New Left columnist Pete Hamill wrote some months ago: "Wouldn't it be wonderful to have a President we could like again?" Decentralization and community control would disappear in a new coalition unpleasantly reminiscent of FDR, and the new push would be on behalf of a compulsory egalitarian variant of collectivism. On the other hand, of course, there would be some compensations: the Conservatives, Bill Buckley, *National Review* et. al. would suddenly find their anti-statist voice after years of cooing up to Power. In politics, I'm afraid that the vehemence of one's anti-statism depends upon one's own distance from the seats of Power.

More substantively, a McGovern administration would undoubtedly get us out, posthaste, from the horror of the Indo-chinese war. Civil liberties would improve, but whether McGovern could push a repeal of the draft or the promised \$30 billion reduction in defense spending through a hostile Congress is doubtful indeed. On the domestic front, the key question is whether McGovern would be able to get his horrendous economic program through the Congress. The one hope for a tolerable McGovern presidency would be to have his economic policies blocked by an extreme right-wing Congress while he is free to "bug out" abroad. Here we have to ponder whether Congress, used to being supine before the President, will really offer determined resistance to McGovernomics. At least, the conservative Republicans, tied inexorably to the statism of Nixonomics, would be able to resume their former resistance, to galloping collectivism.

In the meanwhile, while hoping against hope that a harmless fellow like Muskie will be able to stop McGovern at the pass, there are already a few things to rejoice over in this election year. For a New Yorker, there have been two delights. One was the total collapse of the Lindsay boomlet, to such a degree that we may look forward to a speedy retirement of Big John from public life. A second was the crushing of the monstrous Bella Abzug, that Gorgon blend of Sophie Portnoy laced with Karl Marx. The issue between La Abzug and Bill Ryan on New York's West Side was not so much ideological as aesthetic, and it is pleasant to contemplate the considerable reduction of noise pollution in politics with the departure of "Battlin' Bella" from the public scene. □

The Party Emerges

From all sides, I have been bombarded with the question: have I "sold out" to the newly emerged Libertarian Party? Or, to put it less violently, have I shifted my position?

It is true that I have agreed to become an economic adviser to John Hospers, the Libertarian Party candidate for the Presidency, and that I have joined an Academic Advisory Board for the New York party (called "The Free Libertarian Party.") But I have not changed my position in the least. My strictures against the LP were not the result of "anti-party principle"; I never believed that forming a political party itself violates

(Continued On Page 2)

The Party Emerges —

(Continued From Page 1)

libertarian principle. My arguments against a national ticket were strategic and prudential; and these arguments still remain. As long as the LP has gone ahead and nominated a national ticket (Hospers-Nathan) I wish it well; but realistically I do not expect much, either by way of votes or of mass conversion, to emerge from the campaign.

I remain, furthermore, more enthusiastic about campaigns on the local level at this stage of the game. The New York FLP is pursuing this kind of strategy by concentrating its energies on two local races in Manhattan (Gary Greenberg for Congress and Forum contributor Walter Block for Assembly), and one on the loosely affiliated "Independent Rights" ticket, with Guy W. Riggs for Assembly from Poughkeepsie. Greenberg and Block, moreover, are happily using the campaign to radicalize the party itself. There are several imaginative ways by which Greenberg and Block are going beyond the rather stodgy laissez-faire platform of the official party. In the first place, Greenberg and Block go beyond the official party call for total amnesty for draft resisters, and advocate "reparations to be paid out of the pockets of the politicians and personnel who maintained the draft." If the draft is slavery and is criminal, then shouldn't the criminals be forced to compensate the victims? Here is "radical" libertarian doctrine not to be found in the orthodox political guidebooks of Objectivism. Greenberg and Block go on from there to another joyously radical demand: "A War Crimes Tribunal should be established to examine whether or not war crimes have been committed during the Kennedy-Johnson-Nixon administrations." Then they pursue the logic to go beyond the mere finger-pointing of, say, the old Bertrand Russell War Crimes Tribunal: "Perpetrators should be prosecuted." Here are planks truly worthy of libertarians who are not afraid to be "radical" — i.e. to pursue the logic of their position to its uttermost.

Greenberg, in his capacity of dealing with taxation at the federal level, has also had the courage to outrage objectivist sensibilities by calling for the raising of income tax exemptions to \$12,000, as a concrete first step in the ultimate party objective of abolishing taxation altogether. The objectivists complained that this exemption of lower and middle income groups would increase the degree of progressiveness in the income tax structure. So it would; but the important question is not the degree of progressiveness, but the amount which each group has to shell out in taxes. The wealthy would not suffer by such a program — in fact, they would be slightly better off from the rise in exemptions — and the poor and middle class would benefit enormously by the tax burden being lifted from them. In fact, why stop at \$12,000? We need at least a \$20,000 tax exemption to liberate the hard-working middle class of this country from income tax slavery.

Contrast, too, the quality of the "populism" exhibited by the tax reform programs of Gary Greenberg and the slightly better-known George McGovern. McGovern's is a completely phony "populism" which would soak to the 'gunnels everyone making over \$12,000 a year. Greenberg would completely free the lower and middle income groups from the exploitation and the oppression of income taxation. For real populism, vote Greenberg and Block! ☐

Another Lone Nut?

John F. Kennedy; Malcolm X; Martin Luther King; Robert F. Kennedy; and now George Corley Wallace: the litany of political assassinations and attempts in the last decade rolls on. (And we might add: General Edwin Walker, and George Lincoln Rockwell. In each of these atrocities, we are fed with a line of cant from the liberals and from the Establishment media. In the first place, every one of these assassinations is supposed to have been performed, must have been performed, by "one lone nut" — to which we can add the one lone nut who murdered Lee Harvey Oswald in the prison basement. One loner, a twisted psycho, whose motives are therefore of course puzzling and obscure, and who never, never acted in concert with anyone. (The only exception is the murder of Malcolm, where the evident conspiracy was foisted upon a few lowly members of the Black Muslims.) Even in the case of James Earl Ray, who was mysteriously showered with money, false passports, and double identities, and who vainly tried to claim that he was part of a conspiracy before he was shouted down by the judge and his own lawyer — even there the lone nut theory is stubbornly upheld.

It is not enough that our intelligence is systematically insulted with the lone nut theory; we also have to be bombarded with the inevitable liberal hobby horses: a plea for gun control, Jeremiahs about our "sick society"

and our "climate of violence", and, a new gimmick, blaming the war in Vietnam for this climate and therefore for the assault on George Wallace.

Without going into the myriad details of Assassination Revisionism, doesn't anyone see a pattern in our litany of murdered and wounded, a pattern that should leap out at anyone willing to believe his eyes? For all of the victims have had one thing in common: all were, to a greater or lesser extent, important anti-Establishment figures, and, what is more were men with the charismatic capacity to mobilize large sections of the populace against our rulers. All therefore constituted "populist" threats against the ruling elite, especially if we focus on the mainstream "right-center" wing of the ruling classes. Even as Establishmentary a figure as John F. Kennedy, the first of the victims, had the capacity to mobilize large segments of the public against the center-right Establishment.

And so they were disposed of? We can't prove it, but the chances of this pattern being a mere coincidence are surely negligible. If the only problem is a "sick society", a "climate of violence", and the absence of gun laws, how come that not a single right-centrist, not a single Nixon, Johnson, or Humphrey, has been popped at? ☐

Review of Hospers' Libertarianism

By R. A. Childs, Jr.

Part II

Now on to foreign policy. Perhaps the single most disappointing aspect of Hospers' otherwise excellent book is his lack of a clear, blunt, uncompromising statement of isolationism as an ideal in international relations. This, it would seem, is a crucially important aspect of libertarianism: that the military, and political power of a State should at least be confined to within its borders, and that no State should be allowed to risk war by militarily protecting those who choose to take risks and do business, own property and the like in other nations. In my view — they should be permitted to do such, but at their own risk. They — and the government — should not be allowed to jeopardize the peace and the very lives of other citizens by becoming politically and militarily involved outside the borders of the nation.

This is not the only bad aspect of this chapter. He shares the Randian belief that the Soviet Union is primarily responsible for the Cold War, and an anti-Russian tone permeates this entire chapter, as though that were the primary focus of libertarianism. Indeed, such references to Russia are to be found throughout the book — one instance of Hospers' overly narrow focussing on applications of libertarian principles. Other instances could have been picked from a much wider historical and political scope, and this would have served to differentiate libertarianism from conservatism much more than does Hospers by focussing on the Soviet Union. And there is also the fact that result of the problems caused by the second World War. Suppose, even,

First off, I think Hospers makes several historically inaccurate statements in this chapter. He makes reference to the U. S. grants of food to Russia in 1918, for instance, but curiously omits to mention the 20,000 troops which Wilson sent over to help crush the Bolshevik regime, thus perpetuating the civil war which was not between the forces of Communism and those of freedom, but between Bolsheviks and supporters of the Czar. There is also no mention of the key issue which was responsible for the triumph of Lenin — that he promised to pull Russia out of the first World War, which Kerensky was stubbornly continuing. There is constant reference to the forced labor and other monstrous things adopted in the Bolshevik's reign, but no mention of the sufferings imposed by the Czar, particularly in the war.

But this is really irrelevant. Let us grant that the Soviet Union may well be the most monstrous regime, domestically, that has ever existed. What has this to do with foreign policy? It is the Randian belief that dictatorships are more warlike than "democracies" or "freer countries." But historically this is not true. Besides, the domestic policies of another government should not be considered in considering issues of foreign policy, unless we are to abandon, in principle, the doctrine of isolationism. The most that can be made out, on Randian grounds, is that the American (or another) government can enter a war only in response to another government's having "initiated" military attacks. Barring this, the actions of another government should be, politically and militarily, irrelevant. Morally, it is a different matter entirely.

But the Cold War is a much more complicated matter. Let me approach

(Continued On Page 3)

Libertarianism —

(Continued From Page 2)

the subject this way. Suppose, John Hospers (and all Objectivists), just suppose, that the Cold War was not begun by the Soviet Union. Suppose that the Left in Eastern Europe was quite independently strong as a result of the problems caused by the second World War. Suppose, even that the victory by revolt of the domestic Communist and other Left political groups in Europe during and after the war was not encouraged by Stalin, but perhaps even opposed, on grounds of maintaining stability and not antagonizing the West (remember that the Soviet Union was extremely weak after the war). Suppose that most of the victories of the Left in Europe had little to do with Stalin, and that the same was true in Asia, particularly in China and Vietnam. Suppose that militarily or otherwise, the Soviet Union was no threat to the United States at the close of World War II, and had no aggressive intentions. Suppose that what actions it did take in Eastern Europe were motivated not out of a desire to "conquer the world," but rather from a desire to be surrounded by buffer states, to prevent a recurrence of the three invasions by means of Eastern Europe which had already occurred in the 20th century. Suppose further that U. S. business, financial, intellectual and political leaders mistakenly held that U. S. prosperity depended upon having vast and continually expanding foreign markets for American goods and investments. Suppose that they thought that political stability in most of the world was a necessary condition of this expansion. Suppose that this were threatened by growing nationalistic and revolutionary movements — communist and non-communist alike — across the globe. Suppose that the response of American leaders was to oppose all upsets of this kind not under their control. Suppose that they found it necessary, as one American Senator so eloquently put it at the onslaught of the Cold War, to "scare hell out of the American people" in order to gain widespread support for the policies necessary to accomplish their goals and combat world-wide resistance. Suppose that the myths of the Cold War were in fact founded in this context and for this purpose. Suppose furthermore that the Soviet Union's foreign policy has been largely a response to this, and that without this policy of the American government, that they would never have become involved in world politics the way they have, preoccupied as they were with building "socialism in one country." Suppose, finally, that through tortuous routes, it is the U. S. which today is responsible for actively sustaining the Cold War, and not the Soviet Union. What would our attitude as libertarians then be toward the Cold War?

Now it should surprise no one — but unfortunately it will no doubt do just that — to learn that all of these "supposes" have been extensively documented and argued for in a wide variety of sources for the last twenty years or more. Regardless of whether or not these claims are true — the issue is this: should this point of view be carefully and open-mindedly considered? Would one's position on these historical details affect one's appraisal of the Cold War, and the alleged "need" for a large defense establishment? Finally, again, would this affect one's view of U. S. foreign policy, and one's evaluation? I think the answer to all these is a resounding "yes"!

But this is not considered by Hospers. Using mostly right-wing sources for his case here, he maintains that the Allies "gave" Russia "a huge empire constituting almost one-fourth of the world's land mass and a billion people . . . while the U. S. and Britain got nothing out of the war except mountainous debts." All right, let's take a calm look at this. In the first place, no "giving" was involved. In the case of China, as ever, American military leaders in that country admitted during and after the second World War, Chiang, the ex-communist, was a gangster. Among other things, he heavily inflated the currency of China so that using 1935 as a base year, the price level rose from "1" in that year to about 85,000 seven or eight years later. In an attempt to fight the inflation, Chiang imposed wage and price controls. They were violated left and right. He then completely alienated his supporters by proceeding to murder businessmen and merchants in the public square for violating these monstrous laws. The Communists were the only major force fighting Chiang, and did in fact end the inflation after their victory — which is not to endorse them. The point is that Chiang was a gangster, and that the American government maintained this man in power for years. When they finally reduced their support, Hospers calls this act a "hair-raising horror story" and a "shoddy chapter in American history." It is one thing to oppose the Communists. It is quite another to endorse Chiang-Kai Shek.

Now for another point. Aside from the fact that nothing was "given" to Russia, and that the communist victories in many Eastern European

countries were not simultaneously Soviet victories, and aside from the fact that the U. S. had for a long time also supported other gangsters on practically every continent on the globe in the name of "fighting communism," there is much to dispute in his assertion that the U. S. and Britain gained nothing but "mountainous debts."

Let's take up the debts issue. In fact, these debts are mainly to large banking concerns closely aligned with the State who yearly reap literally billions of dollars in interest payments — paid for the loan of money which they just printed up! So someone is benefitting, and we can therefore ask whether or not this, among other things, was what was intended by wracking up such a large debt. Whatever else the debts serve as, it is obviously an excuse for the State to steal people's money to pay off, for the most part, some very influential financiers.

Finally, what else did America get out of the war? Well, let us grant that Britain lost more than it gained by almost any standard. If we use a rational ethic, which alone can define what constitutes a real, objective, "benefit" to someone, then we can say that no one benefitted from World War II, or from any other war. But let's take the issue of "benefit" and "gain" in a narrower, more journalistic sense. Before the war, the U. S. had troops in a handful of foreign countries. Today, it has troops in more than sixty. American foreign investments which pull in handsome profits for a select few of American businesses and investment houses, have grown very rapidly since the war. And with the international monetary scheme patched together at the close of the war, the American government helped to "integrate" other nations into the American monetary system, thus tying them into the complex American state-system. Foreign aid, regularly attacked by rightists as "altruistic," serves the purpose of subsidizing American corporations and of tying foreign nations into the American economic system — all within a basically State-controlled, protectionistic system. The list of this aspect of the fruits of the second World War is virtually endless.

One can also question the validity of Hospers' assertions that the Soviet Union is a military threat — either existentially or even in mere intent — to the U. S. We find Hospers stating this: "It is at least likely, however, that Soviet Russia (perhaps in combination with China) will unleash an aggressive war against the U. S.; its growing missile system is . . . geared less for defense than for an aggressive first strike. As its nuclear weaponry increases and that of the United States decreases relative to it, as is now happening month by month, there is a strong possibility that once the Soviet Union has attained a clear nuclear superiority over the United States, its leaders will issue an ultimatum to the United States government, presenting it with a choice of nuclear annihilation or military takeover and enslavement. There is also a strong possibility that instead of such direct shoot-it-out methods, the Soviet Union may play a waiting game: its leaders, seeing how much of the world has already fallen to them with American help, and seeing how successfully they have mesmerized and deluded American liberals for fifty years, are aware that the United States is becoming gradually collectivized in any case, have only to continue their present policies and the entire world may yet drop into their lap like a ripe plum. With American policy as it has been since World War II, there is considerable likelihood that things will happen exactly in accordance with such anticipations."

I want to make it clear at this point that however much I admire, respect and like John Hospers, I cannot let this passage go by without commenting on it. In my opinion, this attitude is the most dangerous one that a libertarian could take, and is potentially the most destructive for libertarianism as an ideology, and as a movement. Classical liberalism failed largely because of the pitfalls of utilitarianism, evolutionism, and its failure to confront in bold and uncompromising terms the growing militarism of the turn of the century. I think that this is the worst threat to libertarianism as well. This passage is factually inaccurate from beginning to end. It is all backwards. It is the result of failing to keep up with and confront the discoveries of revisionist historians. Moreover, it shows the importance, in a single passage, of something that I have been stressing for two years: of the critical importance of doing intensive research into current and historical world events before passing judgment on them from a libertarian perspective. Unless one confronts the works of Kolko, Williams, Weinstein, Gardner, Horowitz and others, one is making judgments about world affairs with the same justification as a doctor pronouncing on a patient about whom he knows nothing. It is a fact that both theory (which Hospers is generally brilliant in considering) and the minutiae of history are necessary for sound judgments of current world affairs. If one doesn't have theory, then the evaluation is arbitrary and subjective. If one doesn't have the wealth of historical and empirical detail needed, then the evaluation is little more than a guess — and, usually, it is a bad guess.

(Continued On Page 4)

Libertarianism —

(Continued From Page 3)

That is my objection to this and similar passages of Hospers'. By making factual errors regarding the Cold War, he implicitly comes out in favor of increasing the defense budget and of increasing the military capacities of the U. S. government!!! But any libertarian who does that faces a paradox: the defense budget is maintained by robbery, and the military capacity of the U. S. is already great enough to kill everyone on earth several dozen times. What on earth is libertarian about either of these? Is it any wonder that the people of the world often express some anti-American sentiments when they are implicitly threatened by the greatest array of weapons that the world has ever seen? And if the actions of the American State in foreign affairs — which I think are imperialistic, resting on a denial of free trade and on coercive manipulation of other nations — are performed in the name of "free enterprise," is it any wonder that those who would revolt against the blood-stained status quo revolt also against the ideology which cloaks the poison of U. S. foreign policy?

The rest of Hospers' chapter simply misses the points being raised by any major critic of U. S. foreign policy today. He does not understand the mechanisms and anti-free-market nature of colonialism and imperialism. He hasn't studied these crucially important areas enough.

But my disagreements have been emphasized enough. How, after all this, can I still praise the book? Simple — the passages which I am against comprise a maximum of 10% of the book, probably a good deal less. And in other respects, I have merely criticized omissions of issues, such as the role of big business in the rise of Statism. I have dwelt for such a long time on my disagreements because I think they are fundamental and important — especially in view of the fact that these are key issues on which Hospers is most likely to confuse and alienate the Left.

LIBERTARIANISM, thus, is a mixed book. He addressed it largely to intelligent, open-minded liberals, and solved the problems which they raise against *laissez-faire*. But he left out the potentially strongest part of his case: he didn't make use of any of the left-wing historically revisionist works which in reality bear out the libertarian argument, neither in domestic nor foreign policy. All the major problems faced today, in foreign and domestic policy, are a result of the denial of liberty by the American and other governments. This is the first thing that a libertarian has to show leftists. Furthermore, libertarians need, perhaps more than they are aware, to reject the past of America as well as the rest of the world. There was no garden of *laissez-faire* in the 19th century, and the aim and purpose of the "founding fathers" was not to establish *laissez-faire* by means of the constitution. This means that we must look at the 19th century with fresh eyes, praising the men and institutions who deserve it, and damning those who deserve that. This is one of the flaws of **LIBERTARIANISM**: it is too defensive, and wants to claim too much of the past, in matter or spirit, as its own ancestor. There is too much of conservatism left in it.

But despite all this, it is really a good book, and is as I said in the beginning: the best book to hand to somebody who has become interested in attaining a comprehensive overview of the libertarian political philosophy. But if we take our ideology and our tiny movement seriously, then we must be careful in our reservations. Ninety per cent of the book is superb. The rest is just plain wrong. ☐

Anationalism and Immortality

By Jerome Tucille

(The following is an excerpt from **HERE COMES IMMORTALITY**, a new book to be published by Stein & Day later this year. In the preceding chapter, Walt Disney has been thawed out and reanimated on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, thus becoming the world's first reanimato. The event has been televised around the world and has shaken the very foundations of modern civilization. Now . . .)

The 1990's, under the leadership of the world's first reanimato, marked the beginning of the anationalist age.

Disney was not the first to set up headquarters at sea by any means. In 1975, Burlington Industries became the first corporation to build an island-headquarters in the Atlantic Ocean, two hundred miles east of New York City. There, in international waters, the company was no longer

subject to the laws of any nation and was free to trade in the international marketplace without restrictions.

Later in the decade, an offshore complex which included a jetport, nuclear power plant, waste disposal center and deep-water seaport was built off the eastern tip of Long Island. The ostensible reason for this was to relieve air traffic congestion on land, but when the Mayor of New York City moved his administration to the island complex, the true reason was quickly seen by all.

Developers in Cleveland and Chicago followed suit, constructing jetports and power plants supported on caissons in Lake Erie and Lake Michigan. Throughout the 1980's several more companies set up shop off both the east and west coasts of the United States, and six more jetports were established offshore.

But it wasn't until 1991 that the concept of anationalism finally took hold. Disney wasn't interested merely in escaping tax laws by moving out to sea. It wasn't merely freedom from bureaucratic regulation that he was after. The vision Disney had in mind went way beyond these noble, though limited aspirations.

The dream for Disney was the creation of complete and independent parallel societies which, in effect, would compete with governments throughout the world. The concept of multi- or international corporations was already obsolete before it really got started in the mind of the reanimato. Disney would establish a series of island-communities complete with housing, schools, shops, hotels, industry, theaters — everything necessary for comfortable human existence — in international waters all over the globe.

They would not, of course, be subject to the laws of any nation. They would be free to trade among themselves and also with existing nation-states whenever it was possible. These island-societies would, in a sense, be proprietary communities developed and managed by Disney Enterprises which, in another sense, would become a giant landlord over a new, anationalist, sea-borne world society.

Floating Lefrak Cities on a grand scale, so to speak, with total ocean living for everyone.

When word of exactly what Disney was up to finally got out, sparks began to fly in virtually every country on the planet. The idea of unregulated anational communities was quickly denounced as fascism of the highest order one day, and anarchism of the lowest order the next. Some nations wanted to extend their national limits two thousand miles out to sea thereby rendering the concept unworkable from the start, but in many cases — most notably the newly emerging "Fourth World" nations — the proposed new limit vastly exceeded the size of the countries themselves.

In the United Nations, now situated on the floating jetport off the shores of Long Island, Disney was accused of trying to turn the entire planet into a giant shopping center with himself as universal landlord (earthlord?). The U. S. ambassador to the U. N. maintained that, if Disney were permitted to have his way, the oceans would be filled with gargantuan apartment buildings, mile-long department stores, penny arcades, Jerome Mackey judo schools, Fred Astaire dancing schools, high-rise health clubs and sauna baths, psychedelic pizza parlors, and amusement parks the size of Rhode Island.

The earth would eventually start to look like a never-ending Macy's Thanksgiving Day Parade.

At this point the ambassador from the Soviet Union suggested that the idea of One World Government, discussed for decades in government and academic circles, was long overdue. Only by creating a World Presidium with jurisdiction over the entire planet could counterrevolutionary schemers such as Disney be stopped.

The British ambassador politely objected to the world Presidium; he thought the word **Parliament** sounded much more democratic.

Israel wanted the world governing board to be called a **Knesset**; the United States held out for **Congress**; the Chinese delegation remained silent, figuring they would overthrow whatever group came to power anyway; and the Italian delegates fought among themselves, kicking and punching in the aisles, casting aspersions on one another's ancestry.

Meanwhile, as the debate raged inside the towering glass walls of the United Nations, Disney proceeded to build.

His first island-community went up in the Atlantic, sixty miles southeast of Martha's Vineyard off the coast of Massachusetts. His second was built further out to sea, another hundred miles east southeast of the first one. As the third ocean-community was under construction, Disney discovered he was no longer alone in his rush to create an anationalist empire. Competitors were now entering the market, timidly at first, then gradually more boldly, even as the governments of earth debated their fate at the U. N.

(Continued On Page 5)

Anationalism — (Continued From Page 4)

Hughes Industries, Helmsley-Spears, Lefrak, Levittown, Boise-Cascade and other companies were airlifting platforms out into the Atlantic, erecting modular cities in a matter of months. Some had already inaugurated STOL transport services, free of charge to prospective tenants, in a mad race to populate their communities faster than the rest. Within the space of thirty-six months, a veritable man-made archipelago had been built beginning from a point sixty miles off Martha's Vineyard and extending in a wide arc all the way to the Straits of Gibraltar. A similar network running from southern California toward Hawaii was also in the works.

On March 8th, 1994, the United Nations passed a resolution calling for the creation of a One World Governing Body with full authority over the entire planet. The World Parligressidium — a designation finally agreed upon by the various delegates — would consist of two hundred and eleven members, one each from every nation on earth. There would be, in addition, a five-man executive board comprised of the chief executives of the United States, Russia, the European Commonwealth, China and Japan, with veto power over the legislative body. A World Court would also be established which would serve as the final court of appeals in all judicial matters.

Each nation would maintain its traditional methods of selecting officials, whether by majoritarian election, representative democracy, military coup or one-party dictatorship, for the purpose of administering local affairs. Every six years each nation would hold a general election to select its ambassador to the Parligressidium.

It was a comprehensive plan, thorough in every detail. It was democratic, fair and tough at the same time. Everyone would have a say — to one extent or another at least — in deciding the people who would dictate the fate of the entire planet. It was a bold, daring, adventuresome proposal, highly innovative and imaginative, even revolutionary in all its implications. Disney and the rest of the maverick developers who were attempting to make a mockery of established authority would be given six months to dismantle their sea-borne monstrosities — or else be blasted right out of the water. Enough was enough already. Give a hooligan too much rope, and he tries to hang you with it.

The resolution was read live on global television on April 15th, 1994. The only problem was: no one seemed to be watching. Where the hell was everybody anyway?

As it turned out, Disney had picked that day to throw a monumental bash on Ocean Village number one. There was STOL service from most areas of the globe, and helicopter shuttles from the United States mainland. Who would stay home and watch television when he had a party like this to go to? It was Ringling Brothers, Barnum and Bailey, and all the Worlds Fairs in history rolled up in a single happening.

Disney was a past master at the formula $E + P = PG$ (Entertainment plus Pizazz = Profits Galore). The mobs flocked in from every nook and cranny on earth, some with their life savings in tow. More lucre changed hands that day than on any other day in memory. Parades? Candy canes? Balloons? Trombones? All the trappings of manufactured gaiety were present in spades. President Rockefeller (elected by a hair in 1992) wanted to send in the Marines to break up the affair; the Secretary-General of the U. N. thought it best to land an international taskforce to avoid the stigma of "U. S. imperialism."

But they discovered too late that Disney had hired the Marines and Green Berets to police his own operation. Cagey entrepreneur — he had anticipated something like this. Most of the military personnel through the world were now working for the anationalist developers who, after all, paid them much more than the current minimum wage. The politicians of the earth were virtually unprotected. They were at the mercy of every thug and rapist who wanted to have at them.

The United Nations sent out an appeal to the masses. We offer you stability, the security of international law and justice, protection from our common enemies. What do they offer? Parades? Gimmicks? A lifelong sideshow? They're turning the whole planet into a great big funhouse.

The consensus was, however, that the people preferred the earth to be a great big funhouse rather than a great big lunatic asylum.

Within a year one of the largest migrations in the history of mankind was well under way. The whole world was going anational — all because of the wacky dream of the world's first reincarnée.

Reanimation and anationalism all before the turn of the century. What, pray tell, could the future hold in store after this? ☐

The Polish Ham Question

By Walter Block

Supposed exponents of free trade, like YAF, conservative clubs, the Birch Society, and other right wing groups have long been actively opposing the importation of Polish hams. We shall prove that whatever principles such actions could be based upon, they are not the principles of the free market, laissez-faire system, which holds supreme the rights of trade, of property, and of voluntary association.

Opposition to the importation of Polish hams has been defended on the grounds that it is immoral to trade with thieves or receivers of stolen merchandise — a description that eminently fits the Polish government. A description, however, which also eminently fits the U. S. government, with its vast taxing system, its monstrous budget deficit, its astronomical national debt! But more destructive of the private property system even than this are the following: it is the U. S. not the Polish government which destroys property more than 10,000 miles from its own shores in the name of defense. It is the U. S. not the Polish government that threatens the destruction of the whole world with a nuclear might capable of doing just that 1,000 times over. It was the U. S. not the Polish government that was the first and only country to destroy human life (the most important private property right) on a scale unmatched before or after by dropping a nuclear bomb on a center of civilian population; and to make matters worse, after the Japanese government had offered to surrender.

Thus if there is anyone who should not be traded with, it is this U. S. government.

Such a course, however noble sounding, is not required by any libertarian principle. The consistent libertarian is no more required to refuse to trade with the U. S. government than he would be required to refuse to hand over his money to a gunman who threatened his life for that purpose. ("Trade" here includes such things as using the self-enforced governmental monopolies in roads, post-office, courts, TVA; it includes trading with government "client" monopolies in such fields as electricity, gas, and state colleges; it includes trading with those who hold a State license in order to trade, like doctors, lawyers, plumbers, barbers and taxi-cab drivers; it includes trading with anyone who deals with State-supported, coercive-restrictive unions; it includes, perhaps most analogously to the gunman, paying taxes). Consistent refusal to deal with government thieves would involve one in committing suicide, since governments control all of the earth's surface. This is anathema to libertarianism, which holds life, not death, as the ideal.

A U. S. citizen's trading with the U. S. but not the Polish government cannot be defended on the ground that "It was the U. S. but not the Polish government that seized the U. S. citizen's property; and therefore it is the U. S. citizen's subsequent trading with only the U. S. government that is an attempt to regain his stolen property. Since trade with Poland would not accomplish this, it is therefore illegitimate."

There are two weaknesses with this defense. First, the import of this argument does not so much defend trade with the State as it defends re-taking the stolen property from the State. One does not urge trade with the burglar as justified punishment. One can always trade with him.

Second, according to this argument, the U. S. citizen can trade only with governments that have seized his property; he cannot trade with governments (like the Polish government) that have not seized his property. Accordingly, he could not make a trip to Canada, a country that regularly seizes its own citizens property, but one which does not seize the property of U. S. citizens. A U. S. citizen who lives in Maryland, for instance, could not even make a trip to Nevada, for instance, for the state of Nevada, like that of Poland, had not seized any of his property.

The answer to the Polish ham enigma is this: libertarians must realize that we are all faced with overlord States, some more aggressive and some less. The answer is not to single out Communist States for opposition. All are born in aggression and involuntarism. The way to bring the blessings of laissez-faire to the Polish people is first to secure it for ourselves. The enemies of free enterprise and private property rights here in America are immeasurably benefitted when those who favor the free market are too busy worrying about the "tiger-at-the-gate" to wonder at the absence of freedom right here. ☐

Arts and Movies

By Mr. First Nighter

Sometimes a Great Nation. dir. by Paul Newman with Newman and Henry Fonda.

A great libertarian and individualist movie, this film predictably bombed out with the left-liberal youth that make up the bulk of the New York movie audience. The picture puzzled them profoundly; it was starkly individualist, fine; but how come that the great enemy of individualism turned out to be unions and their goon squads in the surrounding "community"? And that the heroism of Fonda and his family consisted in the heinous activity of strikebreaking in order to fulfill their business contracts in lumbering? The reviewers set the picture down as glorifying nineteenth-century individualism and its virtues, and that it does. This is a rugged, heroic, explicitly individualist picture; it is one of the great ones, and if the Left and the Women's Libbers don't like it, the appropriate reply is the great gesture of defiance with which Paul Newman, bloody but unbowed, ends this epic.

The Godfather. dir. by Francis Ford Coppola with Marlon Brando and Al Pacino.

The Godfather is one of the great movies of the last several years, and its enormous popularity is eminently well deserved. In the first place, it is a decidedly Old Culture movie, or "movie-movie"; it is gloriously *arriere-garde*, and there is not a trace of the *avant-garde* gimmicks and camera trickery that have helped to ruin so many films in recent years. It is a picture with heroes and villains, good guys and bad guys; there is not a trace of the recently fashionable concern with the "alienation" of shnooks and cretins searching endlessly for a purpose in life. The pace is terrific, the suspense and plot and direction and acting all excellent. Many of the lines are memorable, and "we're going to make him an offer he can't refuse" has already burned its way indelibly into American culture.

The key to the movie is the first scene, when an elderly undertaker, having gone to the police and to the courts for justice for his raped and beaten daughter, and failed abysmally to get it, at last turns to the Corleone Family for that precious quality, justice. Brando, as Don Vito Corleone, the "Godfather", berates the undertaker: "Why did you go to the courts for justice? Why didn't you come to me?" And it is further made gloriously evident that the Corleone Family's concept of justice is advanced indeed. When the undertaker asks Don Corleone to kill the assaulters of his daughter, Don Vito is shocked: "But that is not justice. They did not murder your daughter." With a keen sense of the concept of proportionate justice, of punishment fitting the crime, Don Vito agrees to make the rapists "suffer" as the daughter had suffered.

The central theme of the plot is the growth of son Michael Corleone; originally a college lad grown apart from the old Sicilian Family ways, Michael takes his stand with the family when his father is nearly murdered by other, aggressor Families, and toughens into the role of successor to Don Vito. (Actually, the word "godfather" is a weak translation of the Italian word *compare*, which also has connotations of: friend, best man, patron.)

A crucial political statement in the picture comes when Michael is trying to explain to his disapproving WASP girl friend what the Family is all about: essentially their entrepreneurship of illegal goods and services, their necessity to enforce their own contracts, and (regrettably for the libertarian) their penchant for monopoly in which they are a pale reflection of "respectable" and "legitimate" government. Michael tells his girl that his father is a man of power and influence, and hence the methods he employs, "like the President of the United States." The girl replies: "But the President doesn't order anyone killed", to which Michael rebuts: "Now you're being naive" — a masterpiece of political understatement.

But above all, a movie-movie in the grand tradition: a rugged, magnificent epic. □

"Democracy substitutes selection by the incompetent many for appointment by the corrupt few." —George Bernard Shaw.

Garbage in New York

By Joseph R. Peden

High on the list of lasting impressions of New York by the casual visitor is the dirt and trash which litters the public and often private spaces throughout the city. Keeping a city of eight million residents and some two million daytime commuters neat and clean would be a formidable task under the best of circumstances, but longtime residents of New York believe that the situation has worsened greatly in recent years. It is a commonplace of local legend that, following a regional snow storm, roads and streets in suburban communities will be cleared in hours, while city streets remain uncleared for days. In 1968 after a heavy snowfall had stranded residents of many areas of the city for three to four days because local streets were not cleared of snow, the outraged public learned that the city sanitation department had two-thirds of its snow clearing equipment out of service due to faulty maintainance. When citizens organized to complain of failure to pick up garbage regularly, they were likely to be awakened at three or four in the morning by the grinding of mashers and the crash of empty cans being hurled from the trucks by city sanitation men. While sanitation pickup in the slums never could cope with the somewhat cavalier methods of garbage disposal of slum residents — out the nearest window or in the nearest empty lot — service in middle class residential neighborhoods also began to deteriorate noticeably. Meanwhile Mayor Lindsay had paid off his political debt to the powerful Sanitation workers union by granting them wage increases making them the highest paid sanitation men in the nation and guaranteeing them retirement at half pay after twenty years service — a privilege enjoyed previously only by firemen and policemen. The cost of these pensions will burden the city for decades to come — but the Mayor will presumably have retired to another state by the time the bills come due.

The increasing costs of municipal sanitation services prompted the City Administrator to conduct a study of the comparative cost of municipal and private carting services within the city. The private carters are licensed by the city and restricted generally to collecting from commercial and industrial companies whom the municipal sanitation service refuses to serve. Thus while the city maintains a near monopoly over residential collection, and of the sweeping of the streets and collection from litter baskets in public spaces, private carters serve the business community as well as a few large residential estates which find municipal services too untrustworthy, even though free.

The private carters collect about a fourth of all waste in the city, and dispose of it in either the municipal dumps for which they pay a fee, or in private dumps, most of which are located in nearby New Jersey. Maximum rates are set by the municipal agency for private carting which is in the hands of some 450 separate firms.

The City Administrator's report was a blockbuster: it claimed that private cartmen collected refuse at about one-third the cost of the municipal sanitation department — \$17.50 per ton compared to \$49.00 per ton. A closer study of the report revealed that the municipal costs were \$39.71, but using a projected inflationary factor the estimated costs would soon reach the \$49 per ton figure. The discrepancy in cost was still so great that the city's sanitation department — newly renamed the Environmental Protection Agency — began in some panic its own study. Two years later, it reported that the private carting costs were only 18% less than the municipal service — \$31.43 per ton compared to \$38.43 per ton.

The Citizens Budget Commission, a privately funded watchdog agency, non-partisan and a long-time scourge of bureaucratic incompetents decided to make its own survey. Within a month, it issued a report challenging the EPA figures. Its staff concluded that the EPA had excluded 40% of the municipal sanitation routes from its cost estimates, and had used figures from only seven of the 450 private carting firms to estimate private costs. Rather than the \$31.43 per ton cost for private carters, the CBC found private costs to range between \$20.71 and \$25.58, depending on how one computed the weight of waste — by the ton or the cubic yard. It also discovered that the EPA estimate of its cost for collecting waste in districts with one and two-family houses was \$47.90 per ton while in two neighboring towns in Nassau County private carters charged \$17.50 or less per ton — a figure very close to that for private carting in the city according to the City Administrator's report.

What accounted for the discrepancy between the EPA costs and those of the private carters? The CBC reported that, first of all, the city paid its

(Continued On Page 7)

Garbage In New York —

(Continued From Page 6)

sanitation workers wages 20% higher than those paid by private carters, and the fringe benefits were also somewhat higher. But, the CBC report added, "the most significant difference is in the inherent efficiencies of private as opposed to municipal operations. The incentives of profit and competition act to increase efficiency in a way the Department of Sanitation could never duplicate, even under the most aggressive leadership. The high proportion of owner-supplied labor and direct supervision also acts to increase the relative efficiency of private cartage firms."

The CBC recommended that the "sensible course of action" for the City to follow would be to seek bids from private contractors for selected sanitation districts — beginning with the very high cost areas of one and two family homes. While allowing for time for the private carters to "tool up" for the extra work, a gradual conversion to private cartage might save the fiscally distressed city as much as \$59-77 million annually.

Under increasing criticism, the EPA desperately looked for some way to save its bureaucratic empire. Step one was the decision to raise the fee charged to private carters using municipal dumps to dispose of waste. As the private carters soon realized, this was a squeeze play in which the sanitation department reduced its costs per ton while increasing private carters costs per ton — reducing the discrepancy between their respective costs.

Step two was to find a way to delay responding to the recommendations of the CBC and the requests of the private carters association for discussions on future contracting of residential waste collection by private firms. Letters to the EPA went unanswered and the city agency desperately tried to avoid the problem by publicizing other gimmicks. Plans were announced for selling advertising space on municipal litter baskets. Unfortunately, potential advertisers had to accept the fact that about 6000 of the 18,000 baskets disappear from the streets annually — no one knows quite where they go. When private carters offered to empty the public waste baskets in the heavily commercial districts of the city — estimating a cost of 70 cents per basket as against a \$2.00 cost to the city — they were met with stony silence. Meanwhile the EPA officials exulted in the fact that an association of real estate managers in mid-town Manhattan announced that they would henceforth undertake the formerly municipal function of keeping the streets in front of their properties clean by daily sweeping. This was not a matter of municipal pride but a commercial necessity if they were to attract tenants to the depressed office space market.

Step three was a political masterpiece in the best New York tradition. The EPA announced in Feb. 1972 that a pilot project to test the comparative efficiency of private waste collection in residential areas would be sponsored by the EPA. The pilot district was to be Bedford-Stuyvesant — the worst black slum in the city if not the nation. And the contract to organize the new garbage collection service would be given, not to experienced, professional commercial carting firms, but to the Bedford-Stuyvesant Restoration Corp., a non-profit social rehabilitation agency established as a pilot project by the late Senator Robert Kennedy for social and economic reconstruction of slum areas through the efforts of their inhabitants. The private carters were stunned by this insanity. An EPA spokesman admitted that it would not be a fair test of private vs. city sanitation services, but it would generate jobs and test whether the slum dwellers could keep the slum cleaner than outsiders. It had two other advantages: it threatened the private carters with involvement in New York's messy racial politics if they opposed the scheme, and it postponed any immediate action on their demands for letting out bids for private garbage collection in other districts by professional, experienced carters. As the EPA explained, further pilot projects were envisioned, but the Bedford-Stuyvesant project had first priority ("Because it is there") and would tie up the limited managerial manpower of the city department for months if not years.

Slightly more than a third of America's cities rely entirely on private sanitation services; the rest have either municipal monopoly or semi-monopoly operations like New York. The empirical data produced in New York clearly indicates the superiority of the private over the municipal service. Libertarians might find this a profitable area of political agitation and public education for the hard pressed urban taxpayer. But if we are to turn back the forces of Statism we cannot rely on mere theoretical economic arguments, much less ethical entreaties. What is needed is hard research, using all the techniques of the social sciences, to prove the efficiency, and profitability, of our libertarian approaches to concrete social and economic problems. With the exception of the Chicago economists who have long pioneered in using their economic

analysis to liberate us from Statist solutions, libertarians have tended to rely on pious if true generalities — balm to the convinced but irrelevant to ever-pragmatic Americans. If libertarianism is to make any impact upon American social reality, we must begin to produce the detailed socio-economic research data to support our theoretical economic and philosophical analysis, and use it efficiently in our educational work. A fine example of this kind of work was the excellent study of "Taxis and Jitneys: The Case for Deregulation" (by Sandi Rosenbloom) in the February 1972 issue of *Reason* (294 Via El Encantador, Santa Barbara, CA 93111, 75 cents). Unfortunately, far more common are articles like that of Clarence Carson on Garbage disposal in *The Freeman* (October 1969), pp. 622-628. This is essentially a descriptive essay of the problems, and exhortation for a free market solution, and the moralistic charge of "waste not, want not". But not a single word or statistic to ground its argument in the socio-economic realities. Utterly useless to convince the hardheaded businessman, legislator or taxpayer. Mere balm to the faithful. Libertarians need far better factual data if they are to make any impact upon contemporary public opinion. ☐

Academic Freedom?

By Peter Sherman

More phony-white-liberal crocodile tears have been shed over the issue of academic freedom than perhaps over any other. More academics have waxed more eloquent over it than over perhaps any other topic receiving their tender attention. In the eyes of some, it has been equated with the very basis of western civilization. In the eyes of others, judging by their anguish, it has been equated with the Second Coming! There is not a day that goes by that does not see the American Civil Liberties Union in a virtual state of apoplexy over some real or imagined violation of academic freedom. And all this seems pale in comparison with the gnashings of teeth and frothings at the mouth by labor unions of professional academics and teachers in this fair land of ours.

From the name itself, academic freedom would seem to be innocuous enough. All it would seem to mean would be that academics, like anyone else, should have freedom. Freedom of speech, freedom to come and go, freedom to quit a job. The usual freedoms that everyone has. Such is not the case, however. "Academic freedom" has a very special meaning: the freedom to teach the subject matter in whatever way the academic in question wishes the subject taught, despite any wishes to the contrary that his employer may harbour. In other words, the employer may not fire the academic as long as he teaches the subject matter in any manner that the academic, not the employer, wishes. Now this is a very special, not to say spectacular doctrine indeed! This point may easily be proven by applying the doctrine of academic freedom to almost any other occupation. Let us consider "plumbers' freedom" for instance.

What would plumbers' freedom consist of? The right to place pipes and plumbing equipment in the position his experience had taught him was best. But suppose a customer wanted his plumbing in a place that differed with the plumber's professional, artistic, aesthetic, and other judgments as to where the plumbing should be. The plumber is of course free not to take a job if his sensibilities are outraged. (We do not yet have forced labor in this "land of the free", except, of course, when some old men decide to force some young men to fight in a jungle 10,000 miles away and call it a draft). But suppose he demands not simply the right to refuse the job, but the right to take the job and to do it his way. If there were any "plumbers' freedom" analogous to the way "academic freedom" is run, he would have just that right! He would have the right to say that when his professional competence is at odds with the desires of the customer, his views should prevail. The customer is not always right, it would seem.

It will be objected by the academic freedom-lovers that there are great differences between plumbers' freedom and academic freedom and that therefore only the latter is justified. There are several differences. Let us, however, examine them to see if they amount to much.

One alleged difference between plumbers and academics is that plumbers usually rent their services directly to the customer, while the academician rents his services to the customer (students, or parents of students) through an intermediary — the university. But the problem with this objection is that it is by no means or immediately obvious why this should make a difference, or is indeed relevant at all. Secondly, although they are perhaps in a minority, there are many plumbers who do not work directly for the customer, but rather work through an intermediary plumbing firm; and there are likewise many academics

(Continued On Page 8)

Academic Freedom? —

(Continued From Page 7)

who work directly for customers as tutors. In any case, we can consider these two cases and see if "vocational freedom" makes any more sense here than in the usual cases.

Plumbers' freedom makes no more sense in the case of an employed plumber than in the case of a self-employed one. Plumbers' freedom would mean that the employee of a plumbing firm would be free of any job requirements placed upon him by either the owner of the plumbing firm or by the customer. Since the firm serves as an agent of the customer, the employee's plumbing "professionalism" would prevail over the desires of the customers. Any employee could refuse to work on a big construction job if the plumbing specifications were not to his "professional" liking. And of course he could not be fired, for such a firing would violate his "plumbers' freedom".

Likewise, academic freedom makes no more sense in the case of an academic tutor working directly for the customer than it does in the case of an academic serving the consumer indirectly through the intermediation of a university. Such "academic freedom" would mean that the tutor would be entirely in charge of determining the way the lesson would be taught, and that as long as the tutor stuck to the subject matter for which he was hired, he could not be fired by the student. This is such an unexpected conclusion that it bears repeating, even though it follows directly from the logic of how academic freedom works in the university context: if a tutor working for a customer-student has what in the university context passes for "academic freedom", he could not be fired from that position for merely exercising his "professionalism" in a way that displeases his student-employer. The only grounds that exist for firing someone with complete rights of "academic freedom" would be gross violations of the law or professional incompetence. He could not be fired by the student over a "mere" disagreement over a substantive issue concerning the subject matter.

Another alleged difference between plumbers and academics, (alleged, let me hasten to add, by academics, not plumbers), is that the academic vocation, but not the non-academic ones require free inquiry, untrammelled rights of expression, the right to pursue their thoughts wherever their intellects shall lead them. What can one say of this arrant nonsense, except that it is probably more indicative of maniacal, religious elitism than anything else? Perhaps the plumbers could reply with the old aphorism that "Those who can, do, while those who cannot, teach." This reply would be just as relevant to the question at hand. For we are not dealing with the question of how onerous or intellectual the various vocational pursuits are. We are dealing with the propriety of "vocational freedom" in protecting the supposed right to a job as long as certain formalistic job requirements are fulfilled regardless of the wishes and desires of customers and employers. Even if we accept this elitist allegation on the part of the academics on its own grounds, it still opens up a can of worms for academic freedom-lovers. For if we accept the view that intellectual professions should have the protection of "vocational freedom" we still have to deal with "doctors' freedom", "lawyers' freedom", "chemists' freedom", "musicians' freedom", "artists' freedom" and so on, in mind-boggling array. Would "doctors' freedom" give the doctors the "freedom" to prohibit us from smoking

cigarettes, for instance, without giving us the right to fire them for such temerity? Would "artists' or musicians' freedom" give artists and musicians the right to charge us for music and art we did not appreciate? Considering the way "academic freedom" operates, one would be hard pressed to deny these conclusions. One shudders to contemplate what "chemists' and lawyers' freedom" would entail. To say nothing of "politicians' freedom".

And if we reject this academic elitism, the panorama is vastly widened. It now would include "taxi-drivers' freedom", where the taxi-drivers go where they want to go and YOU pay for it; "baby-sitters' freedom" where the baby sitter decides when baby goes to sleep. And so on. If we reject intellectual elitism, we find it harder to see just why plumbers, carpenters, tradesmen, etc., should not also have "vocational freedom". Why after all, should "vocational freedom" be reserved to only the teachers of these disciplines? If the vocation is so deserving that the teachers of it must be protected by "freedom", then surely the practitioners must be likewise protected. And if the practitioners are not deserving of the "freedom" not to be fired, then how can the teachers merit such treatment?

What we are dealing with here under the question of "academic freedom" is nothing less than a disguised attack on the very right of individuals to freely contract with one another. It is a denial of the sanctity of contract. It is a denial of the rights of individuals to make contracts with one another that do not include clauses stipulating "rights" of "academic freedom". In its effects it resembles nothing so much as the medieval guild system, in its restrictions, protectionism, and fostering of a caste system.

There is one ground upon which "academic freedom" can be supported, although it is a ground upon which precious few of its adherents would wish to support it. "Academic freedom" may be defended on the ground that it is perhaps the only device by which control over the educational system in this country may be wrested away, at least in part, from the ruling class, or power elite which now controls it. To substantiate this claim would take us too far afield. (The interested reader is referred to "The Higher Circles" by G. William Domhoff.) Supposing it to be true for the sake of argument, however, we can see that it constitutes a defense of "academic freedom". For if the ruling class analysis is true, then it is not the innocent student-consumer who is being defrauded by "academic freedom". It is not the innocent student-consumer who is being forced to maintain in employment an academic whose services he no longer desires. It is the non-innocent ruling class which is being so forced. If the ruling class theory is correct, academicians with views favorable to the ruling class have nothing to gain from "academic freedom". They will be retained in any case. It is the academic with views that are not amenable to the ruling class, and he alone, that can benefit from an "academic freedom" which prevents ruling class employers from firing him on ideological or other non-formalistic grounds.

But this is no reason to continue to obfuscate the issue of academic freedom. Academic freedom, as such, is fraud and theft, because it denies individuals the right of free and voluntary contracts. That it can also be used for good ends should occasion no surprise. Throwing rocks at people is also an illegitimate activity. Yet David could hardly have slain Goliath by eschewing this practice. □

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

The Libertarian Forum

BOX 341
MADISON SQUARE STATION
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10010

First Class

Published Every Month. Subscription Rate: \$8.00 Per Year