

A Monthly Newsletter

THE

Libertarian Forum

Joseph R. Peden, Publisher

Murray N. Rothbard, Editor

VOLUME VIII, NO. 11

NOVEMBER, 1975

US-ISSN0047-4517

POLITICS: NOVEMBER '75

During the first week in November, two important political events in the United States hit the front pages: the 1975 elections, and President Ford's "Halloween Massacre." Amidst the spate of press interpretations of these two events, no one has presented what I believe to be the correct analysis: that both of these were significant victories for libertarianism.

1. Bond Issues.

The most heartening aspect of the election was the resounding and smashing defeat delivered by voters, across the country, to massive proposals for issues of government bonds. The voting was a great public protest against swollen government spending, as well as heavy taxation for taxation would eventually have been needed to pay for the principal and interest on the bonds. It was a resounding defeat to Big Government, made even more spectacular by the fact that, in most cases, all organized groups were ardent advocates of the bond issues: the politicians, the AFL-CIO, business groups, religious and "good government" groups, etc. In New Jersey, as one observer noted, "everyone was in favor of the bond issues except the people." An upsurge in libertarian attitudes among the public is becoming manifest; how much more will come to life when the Libertarian Party becomes organized to give these strong but often inchoate public feelings a clear, organized, and institutional voice?

Across the country, \$6.3 billion in bond issues were put before the public this month; of these \$5.9 billion, or 93 percent, were rejected at the polls! The biggest rejection was directed against the mammoth \$4.5 billion bond issues proposed by the Ohio state government, of which nearly \$3 billion were to go to capital improvement projects, and nearly \$2 billion to transportation. The capital improvement bond issue was rejected by no less than 82% of the Ohio voters, and the transportation issue by 84%. All this despite Republican Governor Rhodes' ardent support as a "blueprint for Ohio", which would have been financed by increased sales and gasoline taxes. Ohio Democratic leaders were astute enough to oppose the bond issue, Lieutenant Governor Richard Celeste perceptively calling it a "blueprint for bankruptcy."

The second largest state bond package was in New Jersey, where Democrat Governor Byrne, supported by most Republicans and all other organized groups in the state, submitted four bond issues, totalling \$922 million, which were to go to water development, transportation (\$600 million, to be split, half going to mass transit lobby and half to the highway lobby), housing, and other institutions. All were turned down by substantial majorities, transportation, for example, losing by 960,000 to 580,000 votes.

The protest in New Jersey was also directed against Governor Byrne's pet project of a state income tax, which he has not been able to ram through the state legislature (partly due to the noble opposition efforts of the New Jersey Federation of Taxpayers, which includes many libertarian members and activists.) As one New Jersey Assemblyman observed, "It means you can kiss goodbye any thought of an income tax and you have to start thinking about cuts, and more cuts after that." The libertarian emphasis of the New Jersey voters was also shown by their discriminating selectivity on the state proposals; for they approved, by two to one, a proposition for tax deductions for elderly citizens. And so

the public is willing to consider tax cuts, but not increases.

In New York State, the voters rejected by 700,000 votes a proposed \$250 million bond issue that would have subsidized housing for the elderly. In the state of Washington, voters, by a margin of 2 to 1, turned down a proposed 12% tax on corporate profits to finance \$200 million for the state's schools.

All observers noted the chilling effect of New York City's financial disaster. As well it might; for New York City should stand as a permanent warning bell against runaway government and profligate spending. Akron State Senator Oliver Ocasek's plea against the bond issue: "We can't afford to have Ohio become another New York City" should, and undoubtedly will, reflect sentiments in every state and municipality in the country.

2. Defeat for the ERA.

The voters of New York and New Jersey roundly defeated the Equal Rights Amendment for their respective states. Once again, organization, financing, and access to the media were heavily on the side of the fashionable ERA: politicians, business, labor, newspapers, religious and civic groups and of course the omnipresent NOW. In contrast, the opposition was haphazard and ad hoc, consisting largely of local housewives' groups organized for the occasion. The smashing defeat of the ERA in New York, classic home of the Left, was particularly shattering to the ERA forces: the vote was 1.8 million to 1.4 million. And this despite an overwhelming 3-to-1 triumph of the ERA in the very home of Left-liberalism, New York County (Manhattan) where the vote was 131 to 41 thousand in favor. Particularly important was the embittered admission of the ERA forces that the defeat was brought about, not by the male chauvinist enemy, but by women themselves.

The blow to the national ERA also stems from the fact that this was the first time that ERA was put to an actual major test among the voters themselves. It is one thing to push the federal amendment through a complaisant state legislature, propelled by the propagandists of NOW. Then the feminists could plausibly claim to represent all of American womanhood. But now, in the vote to defeat ERA in New York and New Jersey, the "silent majority" of American women have at last spoken out. Presumably this writes finis to the ERA movement.

Libertarians have differed on ERA, but for me a stand in opposition to the amendment seems crystal-clear. In the first place, such vague terms as "equality of rights under the law" can be interpreted in almost any way by the courts. And, considering the way that the courts have been interpreting the laws in the last few decades, and considering also that almost all private activities have been ruled to be in some way "governmental", an equal rights clause applying supposedly to government, or even more vaguely to "the law", will inevitably be held to apply to private firms and organizations as well. ERA would most probably be used to fasten a permanent, egalitarian and "anti-discrimination" tyranny upon private employers, clubs, and organizations.

The supposedly sophisticated proponents derided the grassroots

(Continued on Page 2)

Politics: November '75 —

(Continued from Page 1)

opposition for "lies and misrepresentations" in holding that ERA might well mean the imposition of such things as compulsory unisex toilets. But why not? The opposition women had the good sense to realize that if government is given power, the power will be used and abused, and that given the rampant egalitarianism of our age, such rulings might well occur in the future. The fact that existing states with ERA have not so ruled, as the proponents kept rebutting, does not mean that such rulings would not be imposed in the future.

So that ERA should be opposed because it would mean aggravated government interference with private activity. But it should even be opposed if strictly confined to government itself. But shouldn't government, at least, be prohibited from sex discrimination? Not necessarily. For, suppose that government oppresses Group A in some manner that does not apply to Group B. To order government not to discriminate between the two could mean one of two things: either that the special oppression is removed from Group A, or that equivalent oppression is now imposed on Group B. To libertarians the difference is crucial. For it is better to impose oppression on A only, than to extend that oppression to both A and B.

An analogy may be drawn to the case of runaway slaves. Suppose that a portion of slaves are able to run away. If we react by insisting that all slaves be treated "equally before the law", we could be saying that all should go free; but more likely we would be saying that the runaway slaves must be dragged back because it is "unfair" for them to be free while their brothers and sisters are in chains. But surely the latter course is worse than "discrimination." Equality might well mean equality of all in slavery. Hence the very concept of "equality" is dangerous to liberty, and should be opposed.

If this is held to be a far-fetched example, then let us take the slavery of the draft. In our society, only males are drafted, and women are exempt. The national ERA would undoubtedly mean that women, too, would be subject to the draft — equality and non-discrimination in slavery! But surely it is monstrous, from the point of view of liberty, to correct the horrors of the draft by extending those horrors to the female sex. No, we should rejoice that women are exempt, and strive to extend that exemption to men as well.

And so libertarians should oppose ERA right down the line. Are the instincts of the masses more libertarian on this issue than the organized libertarian movement itself?

3. The "Halloween Massacre."

If the election results should be the liking of libertarians, what about the much-reviled "Halloween Massacre" indulged in by President Ford? The "massacre" has had a very bad press, which has been ranting and raving about "dictatorship", "weakness", et al.

a. The Form of the "Massacre."

The press has complained at length about the suddenness, the dictatorial nature of the "Massacre", the bloodletting of our best and brightest, etc. ad nauseam. Dark comparisons have been made to Nixon's infamous "Saturday Night Massacre" of Cox and Richardson. But this totally misses the point. The horror of the firing of Cox was that Cox was on special assignment to investigate despotism, corruption, and illegality within the White House itself, with Nixon himself under grave suspicion. Surely this does not apply to the firing of Schlesinger and Rockefeller. And surely, too, the President has the right to select his Cabinet. Every President has done so and has fired cabinet officers in mid-stream. Why the big fuss over this one?

b. Exit Schlesinger.

One reason for the fuss was the unceremonious dumping of Secretary of Defense Schlesinger. Well, should he have been dumped? Pipe-smoking, intelligent, and professorial he was, but what was the content of his beliefs? Surely that is more important than his IQ or his demeanor. Put bluntly, James Schlesinger was the single most dangerous man in the Administration. For it was Schlesinger who represented all the hawks, all the ultras in the Pentagon and in society at large. It was Schlesinger who fought bitterly against detente, against any cuts in military budgets, against any slight approach to nuclear disarmament, toward alleviating

New Associates

The Libertarian Forum wishes to welcome to the ranks of Libertarian Forum Associates three new members:

Frederick Cox of Decatur, Ga.

Ronald S. Hertz of New York City

Charles Jefferson of Arlington, Va.

Their support is greatly appreciated.

the terrible threat of the nuclear destruction of the human race. I am no fan of the balance-of-power politics of Henry Kissinger, but compared to Schlesinger, Super-K was the embodiment of peace and isolationism. Better balance-of-power maneuvering than hawkish drive toward nuclear war. Every friend of liberty and peace must rejoice at the speedy retirement of James Schlesinger to the private life that he so richly deserves.

By their friends ye may know them. Who, characteristically, was the very first politico to leap in with a denunciation of the Schlesinger ouster, to hint darkly that this was a sellout to the Russians? Why none other than Mr. State himself, Scoop Jackson, old friend of Schlesinger. And second and third were the ultra-hawks, Senator Jim Buckley and Ronald Regan.

Along with the departure of Schlesinger, came a cleanout of the intelligence "community", notably William Colby as head of the CIA and General Graham, hawk Schlesingerite, as head of the powerful, little-known, Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA).

c. Exit Rocky.

The press couldn't understand it: the ouster of Schlesinger angered the Republican Right, while the (virtual) ouster of Rockefeller angered the "moderates". How interpret this puzzling phenomenon? To do so, one must go beyond the "left" and "right" categories to the realities of foreign and domestic policy. The ouster of Schlesinger was a blow against the right-wing hawks; the ouster of Rockefeller was a blow against statist fiscal policy, particularly against the powerful forces lobbying for Federal aid to New York City to prevent default, a fate that New York richly deserves. After showing a few signs of buckling under intense pressure by the New York bankers, media, and politicians (including Nelson), Ford, in a manly and noble speech, told New York off, exposed its profligate spending policies, and threatened a veto of any bail-out speech (a stand reportedly stiffened by gutsy Secretary of the Treasury William Simon.) It is true that Ford caved in a bit: promising Federal aid to "essential services" after a default, allowing new debt certificates after default that would take precedence over older bonds (but who would buy them?), and implying (through Arthur Burns) various forms of aid to New York City banks overloaded with near-worthless New York City debt. But at least Ford held firm on default.

By holding on default, President Ford was listening to the libertarian instincts of the mass of Americans, angry at the very idea of Federal aid to prevent a wild-spending New York City government from meeting at least a bit of its just desserts (Actually, as many critics have pointed out, if Beame, Lindsay, Rockefeller et al. had been running a private corporation instead of a government, they would all be in jail by now for doctoring the books.)

And so, by firing Schlesinger and Rockefeller, Ford was moving toward peace on the foreign front, and fiscal conservatism on the domestic front — both steps toward liberty.

And there is another point: the firing of Rockefeller itself is an important step, for it moves against a man who embodies the corporate state, with its dangerous fusion of political and economic "power", of government and business. Moving Rockefeller away from the Presidency is highly desirable in itself, apart from the New York problem. If Ford can manage to overcome his accident-prone nature until the end of 1976, and continue to avoid such people as Squeaky Fromme and FBI-informant Sara Moore, perhaps America will be free of the menace of a Rockefeller Presidency.

Foreign Affairs Review

By Leonard P. Liggo*

"More Polish Workers Going Into Private Enterprise," was the headline of an article by Malcolm Browne (New York Times, October 17). Capitalism has not only held on in Poland but it is continuing its renaissance in the non-agricultural sector. While there was strong collectivization in other East European countries, which had had more of a feudal tradition. Poland, with a recent period of de-feudalization, stopped collectivization after the 1956 revolt. About eighty percent of Polish agriculture is privately owned and a successful base for the Polish economy. Browne attributed the maintenance of capitalist attitudes to the strength of Catholic thought in Poland.

"The Government has tacitly acknowledged that many products and services can be provided better and more efficiently by private organizations than by Communist state enterprises. Under the present policy of putting a high priority on improving the quality of life for all Poles, the Government is encouraging private enterprise.

"By the end of last year, about 400,000 Poles were working for private organizations, with 62,000 others as apprentices. In 1960, there were 251,000.

"Meanwhile, artisans working in small private workshops have been steadily increasing the value of their output, adapting themselves to the general limits imposed by the system. Last year, the artisan sector did 15 percent more business than in 1973. Scores of interviews with Polish artisans disclosed wide agreement that really good craftsmanship resulted only from private enterprise, not from state factory product.

"There is also a general belief that craftsmanship now is threatened not only by the Communist economic system but by the changes in worker psychology it has brought about.

It is a simple, easily provable fact that Communism makes people lazy, a middle-aged machinist said.

"Most people don't like to think about their work and under Communism they don't have to. That's why relatively few Poles want to be private artisans anymore, even though we are better paid than socialist-sector workers, even though we work shorter weeks and even though we get real pleasure out of our work. We have to think and put our hearts into what we do, and that is what most young people reject these days."

England

Meanwhile, the English Conservative party has moved to economic liberalism or radical liberalism. Sir Keith Joseph, who has replaced Enoch Powell (gone off the deep end in support of Ulster oppression of Catholics) as chief spokesman for sound monetary policy and fighting inflation, was roundly applauded at the recent annual party conference for defending radicalism. Daphne Preston, chairman of the Conservative Political Center's advisory committee, declared: "We must get the Government off our back." Former cabinet minister Michael Heseltine said: "We are now the sole and embattled guardians of the rights of individuals and the family against the claims of a collectivist state. So let us state the position of our party in moral terms, and bring to the fight against sterile restrictions of Socialism the fervor and enthusiasm of a moral crusade." Under Churchill, Eden, Macmillan, Douglas-Home and Heath, the Conservative party held to traditional Tory opposition to the free market. After losing the election in February 1974, Heath was defeated for leadership by Mrs. Margaret Thatcher.

Mrs. Thatcher's victory in the party was due to the work of libertarian-oriented young conservatives who are referred to as the Selsden Group, after an important program on which Heath was able to win his election to the prime ministership in 1970. Heath then abandoned the Selsden free market program for the "middle road." Sir Keith Joseph, chief policy-maker for Mrs. Thatcher, attacked middle of the roadism. "The trouble with the middle ground is that we do not choose it or shape it. It is shaped for us by the extremists. The more extreme to the left, the more to the left is the middle ground. It is a will-of-the-wisp which we follow at our peril." Part of this development can be attributed to Hayek's receiving the Nobel Prize in Economics and the speeches and articles he has given in the last year in England. This fall, Hayek had two articles in the Daily

Telegraph as well as a four page interview in its supplement. The only cloud on the horizon for the liberal revival in England is the traditional Tory imperialism. The Celtic peoples of the British Isles in Cornwall, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland find Tory governments oppressive and unresponsive to their needs, while the Labour party's strength is in the Celtic regions of western and northern British. If the Conservatives can disassociate themselves from Unionism in Ulster, and come out for decentralization in Wales and Scotland, there is a fair chance for classical liberalism to have a renaissance in England.

Norway

Like Scotland, Norway is becoming a major oil producer in its North Sea fields. It is on the verge of becoming one of the richest industrial nations in the world. "Norway is no longer a country of lumberjacks and fishermen," said Per Ravne, a former ambassador to China and now special adviser for oil and energy in the Foreign Ministry. "We are highly industrialized. We are a nation of importance." Norway has seen a re-birth of nationalism. It rejected membership in the Common Market in 1972.

The present policy is to limit oil production to 90 million tons, which will yield a revenue of 1 billion dollars. Radicals to the left of the dominant Labor party made substantial gains in the 1973 elections because of their strong nationalism. However, the conservatives are gaining strength due to their support for decentralization and preservation of small communities and limitation on industrial growth. The conservatives had emphasized development of industrial plants among the farmers and fisherman of the north: shipbuilding, chemicals, aluminum industries were built. But, oil production will draw workers to the south and upset the traditional balance of the northern communities and southern cities. A major policy, which contributed to the defeat of the Common Market, is to limit immigration. Common Market countries provide free immigration for citizens of former colonial areas. Other racial groups would bring their own social and cultural traditions, and the problems of immigrants of non-European background. All parties seem committed to limiting industrial growth due to new oil production to the limits of available Norwegian population growth. Could King Olav V's visit to the United States have been a subtle attempt to lure the millions of descendants of Norwegian immigrants from Brooklyn, St. Paul, Fargo and San Francisco back to Norway?

Germany

Germany's Social Democrats and Christian Democrats both fared badly in recent elections in the city-state of Bremen. The big winners were the Free Democratic party, winning 13 per cent of the vote (up from 7 per cent). They ran on an economy platform and demanded a fight against inflation. The New York Times in a lead editorial, "Bremen's World Message," declared that the rebuff to Chancellor Helmut Schmidt contained an important message for President Ford. The Times emphasized that the Free Democrats were the big winners in the protest vote due to their deeply anti-inflationary position.

German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt has been busy supporting the Socialists in Portugal. Germany, supported by the Low Countries' and Scandinavian Socialists, poured money into the Socialist party (major rumors claim that the German Socialists have been conduits for CIA funds into Portugal; one must read the late Westbrook Pegler's famous reports of U. S. union representatives overseas carrying CIA funds to support left-wing groups in Europe, to place the whole thing in perspective). France, Italy and England have not given support to the Socialists in Portugal because they would not be unhappy to see a Communist party victory in Portugal. A Communist victory would cause their electorates to support their middle-to-right wing governments against continental coalitions of socialists and communists who are on the verge of gaining electoral victory in Italy and France.

(Continued on Page 4)

Foreign Affairs Review —

(Continued from Page 3)

Portugal

The April, 1974 revolution in Portugal overthrew a fascist government of forty-eight years standing. In 1962 a strong call to the US was made by liberal opponents of the regime to support the overthrow of the dictatorship. Kennedy and Johnson opted for support of the fascist government over the unpredictability of liberalism. The consequences are a socialist rather than a liberal revolution, and an anti-capitalist, anti-feudal and anti-mercantilist revolution. For the last two decades the Portuguese army was involved in fighting anti-liberation wars in its African colonies and in Timor in the East Indies. India seized Goa in 1962 and China has been pleased to have the Portuguese possess Macao as a port of entry for prohibited western goods. In fighting the colonial wars, the army officers spent year after year studying Marx, Lenin and Mao in an attempt to understand and counter the successes of the anti-colonial liberation movements.

Thus, the army officers spent all their time studying socialist economics and the problems of underdeveloped, imperialist, mercantilist economies in Africa. They did not study market economics, the economic problems of the industrial Common Market, or of industrial countries. The legacy of the imperialist era is an elite which is trained to administer other countries with other kinds of economies than Portugal. After decades of administering African colonies, military administrators are trying to apply the same procedures to administering a European country.

Portugal emerged along the Atlantic Coast of the Iberian peninsula during the push in the eleventh century of the small Christian refugee states in the northern mountains to re-conquer central Iberia from Islam. While Castile and Leon pushed down the center and Aragon and Catalonia pushed down the Mediterranean coast, the Portuguese conquered as far as the Tagus River where Lisbon is located. As in Spain, the reconquest stopped for many centuries, with Islamic emirates controlling the southern territories. Thus, as in Spain, the northern provinces contain the private farms of individual peasants with a long tradition of autonomy. Such areas tend to be the strongholds of Catholicism. In Portugal, the area from Lisbon north is the area of rural homesteads, high population density, illiteracy and clericalism. Along the coast, Oporto, Coimbra, Lisbon, the large cities have become industrial centers, and the strongholds of the Portuguese Socialists. The south, the Alentejo and Algarve, were only conquered from Islam in the fifteenth century shortly before the voyages of discovery, which were continuations of these southward conquests by Portugal and Castile. The lands seized from the Moslems were granted to high nobles who established huge estates to support them at the court in Lisbon. Moslem serfs, and later landless migrant laborers were the basic populations. The voyages of discovery were seeking African slaves to work these huge estates, but with the seizure of Brazil it was more profitable to trade in slaves with the sugar plantations than with the wheat and olive estates of Portugal. Need it be said that the serf, tenant and day laborer population of the feudal south of Portugal are the mass base of the Communist party. Thus, the difference among the revolutionary movements in Portugal are rooted in whether the land system was private as in the north or socialist-feudal as in the south. The state socialism of feudalism has created the massive crisis of Portugal. No party that does not recognize that all laws must be designed with double application can long retain leadership. For the north, there must be recognition of private property; in the south, there must be abolition of feudalism. If uniformity is tried, then the northerners will revolt in the name of liberty or the southerners will revolt in the name of liberty. Either one would be justified.

Spain

In Spain, a revolutionary situation is developing. The revolution goes back to the time of the French Revolution when the royalists, the liberals, and the supporters of a pro-French regime fought among themselves. The royalists defeated the liberals and Francophiles. The royalists' strength were the Armies of the Faith composed of northern Spanish peasants. In the 1930's, Spain again was divided: in the extreme north, the Basques of the industrial coastal region were radicals. Led by their revolutionary

clergy, the Basques demanded autonomy as an independent, pre-Indo-European race. Today the Basques are the major force in the revolutionary movement against Franco. Still led by their bishops and priests, the Basques' program is radicalism and self-determination. The rest of the north is the center of clerical, conservative politics, with the Kingdom of Christ as the objective of these soldiers of the Cross. The Carlists of Navarre represent that tradition.

The industrial east of Spain, along the Mediterranean, Catalonia and Aragon, were the centers of the anarchist movements and the life-force of the revolution until crushed by the Communist-allied central army. The central army officers preferred working with the disciplined, pragmatic Communists than with the decentralist, principled anarchists. In addition to the army officers, the Communists had a mass base among the tenants and agrarian workers of southern Spain, where again the lands conquered from the Moslem emirates were distributed to the great nobles rather than created into private property. Feudalism is the seedbed for Communism. The Socialists were supported by the white collar middle class of the cities and towns. Since the Catholic Church was treated like a great noble it received many large estates and was part of the feudal system. Thus, the conflict between the left, which wished to end feudalism including the economic base of the Church hierarchy, and the right which wished to maintain feudalism. The Catholic Church supported Franco in the Civil War. But, after the war Franco kept power rather than turning it over to Catholic-oriented politicals like Gil Robles. The result has been a unity of all the opposition from the Basques and Communists to the Catholics. The contradictions of the Church supporting war to maintain its feudal privileges weighed heavily on the younger clergy of that day. They are now bishops and cardinals and support radicalism among the clergy. The Francoists call the archbishop of Madrid the Red Cardinal. A bishop of Madrid was recently exiled to Rome to protect him from attack by Francoists. Things are likely to get worse if the radicals are led by a Red Cardinal, which means that in American Catholic terms he is the right of American bishops.

The Basque, and the Catalan (which, of course, is led by the Benedictine monks of the Abbey of Montserrat near Barcelona) self-determination movements are paralleled by similar movements in France and Italy. The traditional independence movement in France is that of Celtic Brittany, which has increased in recent years. But, there was a blossoming of nationalism in southern France, Langue d'Oc, which had been conquered in the middle ages by the Franks of the north, and culturally ravished by educational centralization for the last two hundred years. The people of the Midi are not Franks, French, and they want everyone to know it. The Midi is now applied to the area bordering the Mediterranean while the Atlantic area of ancient Aquitaine is called Octian. But, the major center of self-determination activity is the island of Corsica. One problem is that when France ended its colonial empire it decided to plant its Foreign Legion in Corsica; this has led to much hostility to the French government. The militants are called the Action for the Renaissance of Corsica, and they claim that Corsica is treated as a colony. Policemen sent to Corsica are given an extra year's seniority for each year served in Corsica. The French invasion by police has caused a hardening of support, since the gun battles involving hundreds of youths created solidarity against government repression by the close-knit clans. Recently there was a European-wide conference of colonized European peoples including the Basques, Catalonians, Scots, Welsh, Cornish, Irish, Bretons, Octians, Corsicans, Sardinians and Sicilians.

Italy

The analysis of Italian political developments and American government attitudes about them which was presented this summer in the *Libertarian Forum* seems confirmed by recent events. The Council on Foreign Relations had invited Sergio Segre, director of the foreign section of the Italian Communist party, to confer with the Council's members about US-Italian relations when the Communists have to be included in a future government coalition. This reflected the recognition by leading groups in the US that the Italian Communist party could be an ally of the US in foreign affairs — since the Italian Communists would not fight to get Italy out of NATO — as it is an ally of large Italian business. However, the Administration in Washington denied a visitors visa on the ground that it would publicly demonstrate US recognition of the Christian Democratic party's weakness. In the US, the denial caused controversy because the US had just signed the Helsinki accords with the Soviet Union

(Continued On Page 5)

Foreign Affairs Review —

(Continued From Page 4)

putting pressure on the Russians to permit freedom of travel while the US was denying freedom of travel. In Italy, the issue further strengthened the Communist party because the US embassy in Italy and the US state department had aided the visit recently of Giorgio Almirante, leader of Italian Fascism. He not only was greeted by members of Congress but met with two members of the National Security Council. This caused further fears in all parties in Italy that the Communists must be included in a coalition of all parties to preserve constitutionalism. The State Department's control over visas is a violation of traditional American concepts.

Tom Wicker, in a recent article in the New York Times outlined the Italian Communist party's program to "reprivatize" the economy. Forty-five per cent of Italian gross national product is produced by state-owned or state-partner industries. Wicker says: "The ironic fact is that the Communists are saying that their economic program might reduce the nationalization of private industry in Italy and even 'reprivatize' some concerns that haven't worked well under state control." The Italian Communists do not see any possibility of maintaining a democratic regime and a socialist economy; since the elimination of the market prevents calculation and shortages are constant in the Eastern Bloc countries with socialist economies, the Italian Communists wish to maintain the market and private industry and to use the state budget to influence the economy. Since that is exactly what the US economy has been, and the results of such state capitalism are now clearly evident, the Italian Communists clearly have been trapped between admitting the validity of market economics or accepting the last vestige of socialism, the contemporary American economy. The Italian Communist economists, such as Lucinao Barca, are in a dilemma. "This approach is also influenced by what Mr. Barca sees as the failure of Keynesian economics to produce in any society a stable relationship between employment, the rate of inflation and the balance of payments. Italy, for example, has sharply improved its balance of payments — but only at the cost of a drastic cut in demand, brought on by declines in employment and production, now down to about 70 per cent of capacity."

"The idea, Mr. Barca says, is to avoid development of 'bureaucratic socialism,' with everything run by the state, but to influence entrepreneurs to choose the right options for the public good." The Italian Communists point to state ownership of food industries as examples of the need for "reprivatizing." Instead of farm subsidies which create crop surpluses in certain crops while others are constantly imported, food firms would develop long-term contracts with farmers to assure stable prices and purchases. The state-owned firms seem to the Communists to be drained by large excess bureaucracies which private firms would not have. Italian Communists appeal to those who wish to emphasize research and application of technology. Wicker adds: "All of this seems carefully designed to avoid any hint of the kind of heavy-handed socialization of most aspects of the economy that is to be found in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. . . . The Communists may be able to 'get results' even without power because businessmen and industrialists as well as workers are looking for new approaches to Italy's problems; and because the regional and provincial governments are becoming more important in Italy, just as the Communists have greatly extended their power in those governments."

Turkey

Recent elections in Turkey maintained the equal balance between the two major parties while weakening the smaller conservative parties. The conservative parties wish a return to strict Moslem observance enforced by law. The present government, run by the Justice party, lost seats in the voting although it increased its popular vote at the expense of the more conservative parties. The Justice party supports an Islamic point of view but does not want state support of Islam. It does try to maintain the traditional village culture and agrarian system rather than encourage industrial development, with the result that large numbers of Turks unable to find either agricultural or industrial work in Turkey must migrate to Germany to work in industrial firms there. The Justice party is more pro-American bases and less inclined to embarrass the US over the Cyprus dispute.

Against these conservative parties stands the Republican party, which

has the largest popular support in Turkey, about forty-five percent of the voters. The Republican party was established by the founder of modern Turkey, Kemal Attaturk. It is a secular party which wishes to eliminate the influence of religious thought in society and emphasizes science, industry and technology. As the modernizing party in Turkey, it wishes to encourage a climate of industrial expansion and investment and is critical of the taxing and spending policies of the present government. It opposes the present currency losses and large budget deficits. It is strongly supported in the cities and by educated and non-religious Turks. It is a nationalist party, strongly supported by the military officers who have been educated in modern concepts and is opposed to the control of Turkish foreign policy by US needs. It opposes US bases in Turkey and it carried out the Turkish occupation of the Turkish northern sectors of Cyprus when a pro-American right-wing Greek group attempted to oust Cyprus president, Archbishop Makarios, and attach Cyprus to the then military regime in Athens. The Turkish occupation led to the fall of the pro-American Greek dictatorship. Cyprus, Greece and Turkey have been the center of American interest in the eastern Mediterranean as bases for US influence in the oil regions of the Middle East. That was the reason the Sixth Fleet was stationed in the Mediterranean after World War II and why the Truman Doctrine launched the anti-communist crusade in March, 1947.

Israel

An interesting discussion of the Middle East appeared in the Social Democratic, pro-Zionist quarterly, *Dissent*. Henry Pachter's "Who are the Palestinians?" raised very important questions for such a source as *Dissent*. Pachter described the Arab liberation of Syria (including Palestine and Jordan) and Iraq from Turkish control in return for a British promise of sovereignty and self-determination.

The British foreign secretary issued a declaration of support for a Jewish immigration to a home in Palestine (the foreign secretary in his Memoirs "wondered how anybody could have been misled into thinking that they meant anything." On the eve of World War II, there were 1.1 million Moslems, 450,000 Jews and 150,000 Christians in Palestine. After World War II, the US refused to lift the immigration restrictions imposed after World War I mainly to keep Jews out of the US. Large numbers of Jews who wished to leave Europe and to go any place but Palestine could not find any place that would take them; once the traditional refuge for immigrants, the US, was closed, they had to go to Palestine. A UN Security Council resolution stated the terms on which a Jewish and an Arab state would each be created in Palestine. Three noncontinuous territories containing all Jews and an equal number of Arabs were created as a Jewish commonwealth, while the other half of the Moslem and Christian Palestinians were placed in the areas of an Arab commonwealth. The assumption was that the two commonwealths would form a single economic and social unit, while political and cultural life would be separate in each commonwealth. Arabs opposed being included in the Jewish sectors. The Zionist leadership sought to create a Contiguous Jewish state and to expel the Arabs from their lands in those territories. The UN resolution is the only legitimate basis in law for the solution or the Palestine question; a restoration of the status quo to the terms of the UN resolution would stabilize the situation in Palestine.

Pachter explains: "Much has been made of the Histadruth's (Jewish labor organization requiring high-wage Jewish labor instead of low-wage Arab labor) job policy. Obviously, in terms of Lenin's theory of imperialism, Jewish business has not been guilty of exploiting cheap Arab labor; rather, Jewish colonists have been guilty of making Arabs jobless and driving them from their lands. I have to explain here a subtlety of feudal law: fellahim can be sold along with the land jobless and driving them from their lands. I have to explain here a subtlety of feudal law: fellahim can be sold along with the land on which they have been sitting; but the land cannot be sold without them, pulling it away from under them. When the Jewish Agency, aware only of capitalist law, bought land from the callous effendis, it may honestly have thought that thereby it had acquired the right to expel the fellahim. . . . settlers, who had naively begun to cultivate this ground (including kibbutzniks who did so in the name of "socialism"), wondered why the former owners or tenants of those grounds were firing at them from afar or staging surprise attacks on their innocent children: from the vantage of expelled Palestinians, the settlers were usurpers, colonizers,

(Continued On Page 6)

Recommended Reading

Compiled by Bill Evers

(Mr. Evers is a doctoral candidate in political science, Stanford University.)

Henry W. Berger, "Bipartisanship, Senator Taft, and the Truman Administration," *Political Science Quarterly*, Summer 1975. Discussion of Truman's creation and manipulation of the notion of bipartisanship. Taft's belief in foreign policy debate and his opposition to intervention abroad and to executive branch aggrandizement of foreign policy decision-making.

Barton J. Bernstein, "Roosevelt, Truman, and the Atomic Bomb: A Reinterpretation," *Political Science Quarterly*, Spring 1975. Now the definitive revisionist account of the decision to drop the atom bomb. Supersedes Alperovitz and Kolko.

Leon G. Campbell, "Black Power in Colonial Peru: The 1779 Tax Rebellion in Lambayeque," *Black Academy Review*, Spring-Summer 1972. (Issue sold for \$4 by Black Academy Press, 135 University Ave., Buffalo, N.Y. 14214).

Walter Cohen, "Herbert Hoover: Some Food for Thought," *Pacific Research*, November-December 1971. The politics of food aid at the conclusion of World War I.

Walter Cohen, "U.S. Foreign Policy — A Radical Study Guide," *Pacific Research*, March-May 1972. Includes a thorough reader's guide to "right-wing" and "left-wing" revisionist material on foreign policy. (May be obtained from Pacific Studies Center, 1963 University Ave., East Palo Alto, Calif. 94303, \$6.00 per back issue.)

Sime Djodan, "The Evolution of the Economic System of Yugoslavia and the Economic Position of Croatia," *Journal of Croatian Studies*, 1972. Yugoslavian liberal Marxist economist criticizes bureaucratic socialism and the exploitation of Croatia. (Available for \$8.00 from the Croatian Academy of America, P.O. Box 1767, Grand Central Sta., New York, N.Y. 10017.)

G. William Domhoff, ed., "New Directions in Power Structure Research," *Insurgent Sociologist*, Spring 1975. Special issue of scholarly work on the Council on Foreign Relations, Advertising Council, the Industry Advisory Council to the Department of Defense, and other phenomena. (Issue available for \$3.00 from *Insurgent Sociologist*, Dept. of Sociology, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore., 97403.)

Dan Feshbach and Less Shipnuck, "Corporate Regionalism in the United States," *Kapitalistate*, May 1973. Study of regional government in the U.S.

"From Wall Street to Watergate: The Money Behind Nixon," *Latin America and Empire Report* (North American Congress on Latin America), November 1973. A financial interest group interpretation of Watergate.

David M. Hunter, "Ohio's Usury Laws and Their Effect upon the Home Mortgage Market," *Akron Law Review*, Fall 1974.

Sabri Jiryis, "The Legal Structure for the Expropriation and Absorption of Arab Lands in Israel," *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Summer 1973. (Available for \$3.00 from P.O. Box 329-A, R.D. No. 1, Oxford, Pennsylvania 19363).

Clark S. Knowlton, "Land-Grant Problems among the State's Spanish-Americans," *New Mexico Business*, June 1967. Detailed historical review that provides the background for the New Mexico landgrant struggles of 1967 led by Reies Lopez Tijerina. Published by the Bureau of Business Research, University of New Mexico, 1821 Roma Avenue, N.E., Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106.

Stephan Leibfried, "U.S. Central Government Reform of the Administrative Structure During the Ash Period (1968-1971)," *Kapitalistate*, Dec. 1973-Jan. 1974.

Michael Levin, "Marxism and Romanticism: Marx's Debt to German Conservatism," *Political Studies*, December, 1974. Shows that Marxism derives some of its important ideological views from the German conservative political tradition.

Jonathan Marshall, "Review of D. Borg and S. Okamoto, eds., *Pearl Harbor as History*," *Pacific Research*, March-April 1974.

Jonathan Marshall, "Southeast Asia and U.S.-Japan Relations, 1940-1941," *Pacific Research*, March-April 1973. Marshall's articles, based on new archival research, stress the desire of the American power elite to control access to S. E. Asian raw materials.

Charles W. McCurdy, "Justice Field and the Jurisprudence of Government-Business Relations: Some Parameters of Laissez-Faire Constitutionalism, 1863-1897," *Journal of American History*, March 1975.

(Continued On Page 7)

Foreign Affairs Review —

(Continued From Page 5)

imperialists in person, not the tools of mysterious powers across the sea."

Since the Arab peasants were the Lockean owners of the lands on which the effendis levied taxes and claimed to "own" under the Turkish regime, it is debatable that the Jewish Agency was operating under capitalist concepts of law. Pachter quotes George Antonius, *The Arab Awakening* (New York, Capricorn Books, 1965): "The revolt is largely manned by the peasantry, that is to say by the people whose life and livelihood are on the soil but who have no say whatever in its disposal; and their anger and violence are as much directed against the Arab landowners and brokers who have facilitated the sales as against the policy of the mandatory Power under whose aegis the transactions have taken place." Pachter adds: "The Jewish leaders — except for the Communists, Martin Buber, and some Chalutzim — never thought of allying themselves with these victims of colonization." Pachter also suggests that the Jewish armed groups initiated the terrorist approach to politics in Palestine. He adds: "But the Israelis who justify their claim to the land by their tribal memory of 2,000 years obviously have no argument against people whose claim is based on tribal memories reaching back only 30 years. More than the expelled's actual misery, the bitterness of the sacrifice that was imposed on them intensifies the hate that defines the Palestinians as a nation distinct from other Arabs." Pachter recommends that the Palestinian Arabs be given a choice of

compensation for lost land, residence or job, or returning to Palestine. Pachter does not say whether or not they should, if they return, be given their rightful land, residence or job, but obviously that is the only just solution. Of course, that would have to occur in the context of legal equality and the ending of special legal positions for Jews. Since the implementation of the 1947 UN security council resolution is the only international legal basis for ending the problem of Israel, these suggestions could be important contributions to the overall settlement. Pachter discusses the necessity to recognize the Arab commonwealth in Palestine as the basis for peace. He says: "There can be no settlement, no truce and no confidence between Arabs and Jews as long as their status is not determined equitably and as long as there is not international machinery to ascertain the will of the Palestinians themselves." He adds: "Both these peoples are too primitive in their tribal instincts or too immature as nations to be reasonable on such questions where self-respect is at stake." He thinks that the great powers have to impose solutions on the parties concerned. "In the beginning, a Palestinian state would probably make obstreperous noises at international gatherings, nor might it in other ways be the most desirable neighbor one would wish to have. Nevertheless, I believe that the nonsatisfied demand for a Palestinian state is now a major source of posturing, gesturing, and confrontation." (For a discussion of groups in Israel thinking about peaceful answers to Arab-Jewish relations, see Arthur Waskow's article in *Link*, Sept., 1975, published by the Institute for Policy Studies, 1901 Q Street, Northwest, Washington, D. C. 20009.)

*Mr. Liggio teaches history at SUNY, Old Westbury.

Is Dayan Just Another Rommel?

By Joseph R. Stromberg*

Review of *The Other Israel: The Radical Case Against Zionism* ed. Arie Bober (Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1972).

This important and comprehensive work is a collection of historical and political essays written by members of the Israeli Socialist Organization. ISO is the only genuine anti-Zionist organization on the Israeli political spectrum; and it is a group which accepts Arabs as full members. Despite denunciation as "Fatah agents" and police harassment, ISO maintains a consistent line of national liberation and self-determination for all Middle Eastern peoples.

By recognizing and espousing the rights of the Palestinians to their homeland, as well as the rights of the new Israeli people to areas which individual Jews legitimately pioneered and peacefully settled before 1948, ISO directly attacks the foundations of the Zionist state. On the basis of uncompromising Marxist humanism ISO has arrived at essentially the same overall position on the Palestinian question that a libertarian would come to on the basis of his own natural law (or other) premises.

The essays properly compare the Zionist establishment to the settler regime of the Boers in South Africa. Israel is thus a modern example of the original conquest-states described by the German sociologist Franz Oppenheimer in his numerous works. Sir Ronald Storrs, first civil governor of Palestine under the British mandate, welcomed the Zionists as "a little loyal Jewish Ulster" in the midst of dangerous Arab nationalists. Like Ulster, which is a tool of British imperialism in Ireland, Israel continues to function as a tool of Western imperialism in the Middle East. Unlike many conquest states, however, "Zionist colonialism displaces and expels" instead of retaining the bulk of the former owners of the soil as cheap labor. The early colonizers bought huge tracts of land "owned" by reactionary Arab effendis and threw off the Arab tenants. The slogan of "Jewish labor only", consistently followed since the beginnings of the Zionist enterprise, has even undercut the rational market option of hiring the cheapest labor; this "narrow" bourgeois alternative has always been largely defeated by the forces of Zionist nationalism and the Jewish labor bureaucracies.

A number of essays brings out Israeli expansionism, the repression of the darker Jews, native to the area, and the mistreatment of native populations. A reading of the evidence forever discredits the myth of the beleaguered little "democracy" fighting for its life. The "emergency regulations," for example, a carry-over of British measures of 1936-39, allow instantaneous martial law, including arbitrary arrest, restrictions on freedom of movement, and confiscation and destruction of property, such as the punitive dynamiting of homes. Even worse, whole areas can be sealed off from the outside, leaving the inhabitants with a choice: get out or starve. No wonder the Palestinians "voluntarily" depart. Much land has been taken over since 1948 by selective application of these regulations. No Hayekian "rule of law" here! Indeed, for repression and tyranny Israeli officialdom can compete with just about any state in existence today.

An interesting chapter discusses the class structure of Israel. Israel emerges as a society in which European Jews lord over native Jews and Arabs, and which only survives because of massive outside infusions of capital from the United Jewish Appeal, the Bonn government (which accepts Israel as the institutional expression of the victims of Nazism and pays reparations to Israel), and, of course, the United States government. But this mass of capital does not go to the national bourgeoisie, but to the Israeli state, the quasi-state Jewish Agency and the labor party bureaucracies — especially the Histadrut, a national labor monopoly which must make George Meany grind his teeth in envy. Even the much touted glorious kibbutzim are completely subsidized by the state, private firms, and banks, and are living on stolen land.

Chapters on the Israeli Left and Borochovisism reveal the built-in limitations of all factions which work within the Zionist framework. Even Uri Avnery, supposed left-wing statesman, appears to accept the Zionist status quo and attempts to evade the self-created problems of Zionism by speaking of "post-Zionist" politics and proposing a binational federation with the Palestinians. ISO regards the latter proposal as the equivalent of an Arab Bantustan.

Such left-wing Zionism, including Borochovisism which claims to derive Zionism from Marxism, ignores the central contradiction within Zionism. Zionism as European Jewish nationalism had to oppress and displace the Palestinians, once it was determined that only Palestine would be considered for Zionist colonization. A number of essays, especially, "Zionism and Universal Ethics," attack Zionism for rejecting traditional Jewish universalism and humanism. Taking anti-Semitism as a special Jewish problem, Zionism proposed a special solution and even cooperated with anti-Semites in bringing it about. Ethnocentric history and European Jewish chauvinism, which assumed that all non-Jews were the potential enemy, were central to Zionism.² Understandably, Hitler's crimes made Zionism seem perfectly plausible.

While these ISO essays only hint at such an interpretation, they point directly at the deeply rooted fascist philosophical trend in Zionism. Zionist repudiation of universalism, humanism and transcendent values in favor of the politicized tribal community defined as the highest good, brings Zionism well within the philosophical definition of fascism offered by Ernst Nolte, a contemporary German historian.³ Thus "When Zionism

(Continued On Page 8)

Recommended Reading —

(Continued From Page 6)

A fair-minded exposition of the legal thought of a famous classical-liberal Supreme Court judge.

James O'Connor, "Political Economy of State Expenditures and Revenues: A Bibliography," *Kapitalistate*, May 1973. Valuable bibliography on public finance.

Marc Pilisuk, *International Conflict and Social Policy* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.) A power-elite analysis of foreign policymaking based on thorough knowledge of the social science literature. Includes as a chapter the famous 1965 article on the military-industrial complex which Pilisuk co-authored with Tom Hayden.

"Regionalism and the Bay Area," *Pacific Research*, November-December 1972. An in-depth case study of metropolitan government.

D. I. Roussopoulos, ed., *The Political Economy of the State* (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1973.) A radical examination of who benefits from the government budget in Canada. (Available for \$3.00 from Black Rose Books, 3934 rue St. Urbain, Montreal 131, Quebec, Canada.)

Larry Sawers and Howard M. Wachtel, "The Distributional Impact of Federal Government Subsidies in the United States," *Kapitalistate*, Spring 1975. (Issues available for \$2.50 from James O'Connor, Dept. of Economics, California State University, San Jose, Calif. 95114.)

Harry N. Scheiber, "Property Law, Expropriation, and Resource Allocation by Government: the United States, 1789-1910," *Journal of Economic History*, March 1973. Includes important information on how businesses took land from private owners via the eminent domain process.

Harry N. Scheiber, "The Road to Munn: Eminent Domain and the Concept of Public Purpose in the State Courts," *Perspectives in American History*, 1971. Extensive and detailed discussion of land confiscation via eminent domain.

"Southern Militarism," *Southern Exposure*, 1973. (Published by the Institute for Southern Studies, 88 Walton St., N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303.) The military-industrial complex in the American South.

David Vogel, "Corporations and the Left," *Socialist Revolution*, No. 20, April-June 1974. Examination of the doctrine of corporate responsibility. (Issue available from Agenda Publishing Co., 396 Sanchez St., San Francisco, Calif. 94114. for \$2.00).

Steve Weissman, ed., *Big Brother and the Holding Company: The World Behind Watergate* (Palo Alto, Calif.: Ramparts Press, 1974). \$3.45. Significant New Left interpretations of the Watergate affair. □

Dayan Another Rommel? —

(Continued from Page 7)

had to choose between the Jews and the Jewish state, it unhesitatingly preferred the latter."¹ Statis to the core, such antitranscendence parallels the positions developed by Charles Maurras, the Italian socialist Mussolini, and — Adolf Hitler. It is clear from ISO's evidence that Israeli ideology justifies all criminal (from the standpoint of universal ethics) acts of the "sovereign, martial, inwardly antagonistic racial community" (Nolte's phrase for the fascist society). According to ISO, even such characteristically fascist rhetoric as "the eternity of war and the sanctity of blood" enjoys growing popularity within Israel² — a veritable revival of blood-and-soil nonsense.

The chapter on the background of the 1967 preemptive war brings out the importance of the "eternal enemy" theme in Israeli thought. Israel is a society completely militarized for the eternal struggle for illusory security — just one more crusade and we will be safe.³ But, as Nolte demonstrates, a paranoiac conception of eternal wars for "self-defense" is at the heart of genuine fascism.⁴ The fascist sincerely believes that his crimes are necessary to preserve the fragile, surrounded racial community and its incomparable culture. The interesting question of how far official statist Cold War nationalism has pushed American society down the fascist path of course deserves treatment at another time.⁵

ISO sees the solution in a revolutionary transformation of the Middle East in which the new Israeli people will become an autonomous community somehow linked to the regional socialist system. Despite its tying of constructive change to socialism and a certain weakness on the peasant issue, ISO's Marxist universalism allows it to break out of Zionism and propose self-determination of all peoples — a position strikingly similar to that which Ludwig von Mises took in *The Free and Prosperous Commonwealth* on the basis of liberal universalism.

For ISO, socialism is necessary to eliminate all "alienation," including all market relations. Yet the fact that socialist states behave as badly as other states ought to tell them something. Stalin is of course the classic case of a distinctly fascist leader utilizing an amalgam of Marxist and nationalist rhetoric, although his Bolshevik mind-set perhaps prevented him from deviating as far in words as that other nationalized Marxist, Benito Mussolini. ISO even terms nationalism a form of alienation. A libertarian would add that nationalism is part of the real problem itself: the state. In Bakunin's words the state is "the negation of humanity." Fascism in Israel or anywhere else is merely the most thorough affirmation of this alienating machine based on the atavistic fears it promotes among its subjects; fascism is the ideological affirmation of statist crime in the face of all transcendent values and institutions such as humanist ethics, natural law, universal religion, and the world marketplace.

Despite these criticisms, *The Other Israel* is a valuable and significant study, especially at a time when Henry Kissinger and Jerry Ford are committing American treasure and probably lives to the long-range defense of its miniature Leviathan state, founded on the repudiation of the best in the Judaic heritage.⁶

FOOTNOTES

¹For a libertarian exploration of the issue, see the brief essay by Imad-Din Ahmad, "The Right to Rule in the Middle East," *Abolitionist*, I, 8, p. 8 and I, 9, pp. 3-4.

²Two radical analyses which touch on Jewish chauvinism (from a Jewish perspective) are Norman Fruchter, "Arendt's Eichmann and Jewish Identity" reprinted in James Weinstein and David W. Eakins (eds.), *For A New America: Essays in History and Politics from Studies on the Left, 1959-1967* (New York, 1970), pp. 423-454; and David Horowitz, "The Passion of the Jews," *Ramparts*, XIII, 3 (October, 1974), pp. 21-8 and 56-60. The latter essay is especially perceptive and compassionate.

³Ernst Nolte, *Three Faces of Fascism: Action Francaise, Italian Fascism, National Socialism* (New York, 1969). Nolte's thought-provoking study deserves to be read in full.

⁴*The Other Israel*, p. 171.

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 235.

⁶Garry Willis, whose *National Review* traditionalism and current Berrigan-style leftism appear to be products of a medieval Catholic outlook, actually defends Israel as a chivalric crusader kingdom in a recent issue of *Esquire* (July, 1975).

⁷Nolte, pp. 507-515.

⁸An interesting beginning of such an analysis is the editorial, "The Ultra-Right and Cold War Liberalism," *Studies on the Left*, II, 1 (1962), pp. 3-8. For libertarians it would be especially important to investigate how far right-wing Objectivism, by internalizing Cold War American nationalism, has gone down the fascist path — a point to which I hope to return in a future essay. For an "economic determinist" approach to Zionism by a Bakuninist libertarian, see Stephen Halbrook, "The Philosophy of Zionism: A Materialist Interpretation", in Ibrahim Abu-Lughod and Baha Abu-Laban (eds.), *Settler Regimes in Africa and the Arab World: The Illusion of Permanence* (Wilmette, Ill., 1974), pp. 20-30.

⁹For an early critique of Israel by a libertarian's libertarian who stressed the opposition between Judaism and Zionism, see Frank Chodorov, "Some Blunt Truths About Israel," *American Mercury*, LXXXIII, 390 (July, 1956), 55-9. This appeared, incidentally, long before the *Mercury's* degeneration into a neo-Nazi organ.

*Mr. Stromberg is a doctoral candidate in history at the University of Florida, Gainesville.

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