Hatfield For President?

Senator Mark Hatfield (R., Oregon) has become famous in recent years for his courageous independence from the Nixon Administration, and for his intrepid battle against the draft and the Vietnam War. Year after year Senator Hatfield has introduced bills for the abolition of conscription, and he is now co-author of the McGovern-Hatfield amendment designed to cut off all funds for the war in Southeast Asia by 1971. At the end of June, Senator Hatfield amazed Washington by breaking party protocol and sharply suggesting that Richard Nixon and Spiro Agnew might not be nominated in 1972, especially if the war and the economy continue in the mess that they’re in now. Columnist Mary McGrory reports that “some of Hatfield’s like-minded colleagues in the Senate whispered ‘Right On’ to him the morning after”. (New York Post, June 30.)

A friendly Senate colleague of Hatfield’s explained to Miss McGrory, concerning Hatfield’s statement that the party might turn to Ronald Reagan in 1972, that “Mark did not want to seem to be pushing himself forward as a candidate.” And the knowledgeable Miss McGrory adds: “The disillusioned Senator’s name might turn up in the New Hampshire primary ballot in 1972. He might even be running as an independent with John V. Lindsay…”

There has been rising interest within the peace movement in a third political party, a party that would mobilize all the forces against conscription and war in a broad coalition that would, once and for all, smash the old frozen party structures, especially the Democratic Party, run by the bosses and hacks, and bring vital issues and choices concerning them back into American politics. As the extreme Right said six years ago (but not lately): we need a choice not an echo, and we have been getting only echoes for far too long. The Republican Party was born in the 1850’s, when the Whig party structure refused to take a clear-cut stand on the extension of slavery, and so they were shunted aside for a new party designed to focus upon that neglected issue. The Democratic Party has refused to take a clear-cut stand against the war and against conscription, it has been virtually indistinguishable from the Republicans in the great blob of the Center, and it deserves therefore to disappear in the wake of a new party which will mobilize the public on these vital issues.

When most people think of a possible new party, they think of a candidate something like John Lindsay, and, indeed, most people think of Senator Hatfield as being ideologically similar to the liberal New York mayor. But this is not the case, and libertarians especially should be alerted to the crucial differences. Mark Hatfield thinks of himself, not as a modern-day liberal but as a “classical liberal”, an eighteenth-century liberal devoted to the creed of a strictly limited government: limited at home and abroad. Hatfield thinks of himself as a disciple of Senator Robert Taft, and his courageously anti-war policy is of a piece with Taft’s “isolationism”, the foreign policy of the Old Right before the “World Anti-Communist Crusade”-mentality infected and took over the conservative movement in this country. In domestic affairs, too, Mark Hatfield believes in reducing the power of government to its classical liberal dimension of defending the free-market economy.

Above all, Mark Hatfield has had the acute perceptiveness to be virtually the only one of the small band of classical liberals in Congress to see that the old rhetoric, the old political labels, have lost their usefulness. He has been the only one to see that the classical liberal is more happy with many aspects of the New Left than he is with his old-time allies in the conservative movement. In short, Mark Hatfield is the only classical-liberal politician I know of who understands and agrees with the Left/Right concept—from the idea that the libertarian has more in common with the New Left than with the contemporary Right. More important, Mark Hatfield sees that the only hope for liberty on the political front is to forge a new coalition, a coalition combining the libertarian ideas of both Left and Right, and consisting of the constituencies to whom these ideas would appeal: students, anti-war people, blacks, and middle-class whites opposed to statism and war. A Hatfield-forged coalition would base itself squarely on slashing the powers of government at home and abroad: in getting out of Southeast Asia and re-establishing a pro-peace, “isolationist”, foreign policy; in repeal of the draft; and, domestically, in reducing the powers of Big Government in favor of a free, decentralized society.

Senator Hatfield is intelligent enough to see that, in contrast to a generation ago, a libertarian program of today, in today’s political climate, cannot be couched in rhetoric

Here is a book which goes on the must read list for radicals interested in sorting out the politics of the sixties with an eye toward being able to identify some new directions. Tuccille speaks for the rapidly growing numbers of radical libertarians, people who know where they are going, and speaks to the broadest possible spectrum of people who want to get to the same place but just haven't gotten things quite straight in their heads yet. He has written, quite simply, the best, most up-to-date, statement of radical libertarianism. Unless you read it, you will find that radical libertarianism is not a new idea, only a very old one. But in case you do want an answer to that question, Tuccille's book is where to find it. That's what he wrote it for. When you read it, you will find that radical libertarianism (or anarcho-libertarianism, a label some prefer) is a movement right-wing in origin and ecumenical in appeal. Taking one thing at a time, let's look at the right-wing origin first.

You don't have to get very far into the book before you find out that radical libertarianism is not a "new right" being set up to complement the new left. The new right are the finks—William Buckley deserves and gets more abuse than anyone else—who sold out on the last shreds of the American Revolution along about the time of the Korean War. They are the ones, who, in Rothbard's words, dedicated themselves to "the preservation of tradition, order, Christian morality and good manners against the modern sins of reason, license, atheism and boorishness". The new right are the Greek Colonels and John Mitchells.

The old right used to have a pretty strong libertarian element in it, although anyone who can't remember back that far himself will probably not have heard of three-quarters of the names Tuccille cites. If you go way back, you get to Benjamin Tucker and Lysander who?? These were men who didn't like American imperialism and militarism, state monopoly capitalism, high taxes, and parasitic bureaucrats, cops climbing your fire escape to peek and see if you are violating the laws which regulate sexual conduct among consenting adults, or customs agents who snoop to see what sort of imports you are bringing back from Acapulco. Then there is the modern sin of reason: injustice, license, atheism and bookishness. The new right are the Greek Colonels and John Mitchells.
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The State: ENEMY OF LATIN AMERICA

Unfortunately it seems that all too often libertarians, when debunking the great "U. S. Government is the international good guy" myth by pointing to the revisionist histories which are so unmarred by jingoism and great power chauvinism, concentrate on the topics which Leviathan's apologists choose to emphasize--namely the world wars, the Cold War, and Vietnam--and ignore the other manifestations of U. S. imperialism. And that, is, the subject of U. S. imperialism in Latin America is undoubtedly one of such ignored topics. Moreover, the study of Latin American imperialism is the responsibility of the libertarian, for the domestic situation there, besides being separable from U. S. imperialism, is highly significant on its own account as a problem which demands consistent explanation from the viewpoint of free market economics. Can any school ignore Third World development and still hope to win adherents in this day and age?

Many on both Left and Right have attempted to explain the political and economic problems of Latin America--the poverty and misery, the lack of freedom, and so forth--and have contributed highly significant but questionable analyses. These pitfalls are recognizable in two well-known representatives of the Left and Right, men who are highly libertarian in many areas--namely, Che Guevara and Ludwig Von Mises. Che, in his own words, the tendency of Cuba's businessmen "to make deals with the soldiers of the moment, with the politicians in power, and to gain more advantages." In a word, the libertarian imperative of nationalism is sometimes unconsciously the essential role played by the State in keeping the masses of Latin America in poverty. Actually, any competent writer on Latin America, including everyone from UN (and hence U. S. imperialist) propagandists like Raul Prebisch to neo-fascists such as Helio Oiticica (see N. and R. Shure, Latin America in Revolution, p. 370), Andre Gunder Frank, James Petras, and other Marxists have written a wealth of literature documenting--sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously--the essential role played by the State in keeping the masses of Latin America in poverty. Actually, any competent writer on Latin America, including everyone from UN (and hence U. S. imperialist) propagandists like Raul Prebisch to neo-fascists such as Helio Oiticica (see N. and R. Shure, Latin America in Revolution, p. 370), Andre Gunder Frank, James Petras, and other Marxists have written a wealth of literature documenting--sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously--the essential role played by the State in keeping the masses of Latin America in poverty. Actually, any competent writer on Latin America, including everyone from UN (and hence U. S. imperialist) propagandists like Raul Prebisch to neo-fascists such as Helio Oiticica (see N. and R. Shure, Latin America in Revolution, p. 370), Andre Gunder Frank, James Petras, and other Marxists have written a wealth of literature documenting--sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously--the essential role played by the State in keeping the masses of Latin America in poverty. Actually, any competent writer on Latin America, including everyone from UN (and hence U. S. imperialist) propagandists like Raul Prebisch to neo-fascists such as Helio Oiticica (see N. and R. Shure, Latin America in Revolution, p. 370), Andre Gunder Frank, James Petras, and other Marxists have written a wealth of literature documenting--sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously--the essential role played by the State in keeping the masses of Latin America in poverty.
ENEMY OF LATIN AMERICA— (Continued from page 3)

various Marine invasions in this and the last century, and so forth ad nauseam. Ample evidence is given to prove how the U. S. over and over has invaded Latin American countries and kicked its monopoly resources and restricted markets. The U. S. has never been content to abide by the rules of fair play in the market place of the world; no, American business has always demanded privileges--through monopoly, its means of production in order to insure American hegemony primarily so that big business could secure—through privileges denied competitors—high yielding investments, rich deposits of raw materials, and restricted markets. The U. S. has forever insisted on sabotaging the free market and in the market place of the world; no, Amerikan business has always demanded privileges to suppress competition in "her" markets, to monopolize the sources of raw materials, and to insure a higher return on investments than the market would have set.

The story of U. S. intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965 is told by Coff and Locker, who document the sugar privilege denied competitors—high yielding investments, more general study concerning the alliance between the U. S. and the Dominican Republic; how both used each other to oppress the masses, and ultimately the latter play marionette to the former or face a coup sponsored by the CIA. John Saxe-Fernandez documents the military aid by which the U. S. keeps the Central American dictator in power. What is to be done? is answered by Debray, Che, Torres and other revolutionaries in the last section. The volume clearly demonstrates the truth of the prediction by the great liberator Belfar in 1829: "The United States appear to be destined by Providence to plague America with misery in the name of liberty."

And Mises says the road to development is paved with more Western capital! Naturally, the libertarian would never want to see free trade restricted; but the U. S. Government has forever demanded exclusive privilege to market its products to keep the Latin Americans from sharing the benefits of a free market.

With the new requirement of plunder by a new ruling class--the one residing in the colony, this necessitated the extermination of the Indians (Argentia rapidly learned "free enterprise" à la Northameral and monopolization of the land. All of the above presupposed a State. Unused land reserved for monopolists by the State, Ferrer points out, had as its purpose exploitation of the poor by the rich oppressors by perpetuating a monopoly of the valuable land resource in the hands of a small elite. Wages were forced down well below their marginal productivity, since the masses were not allowed to homestead and so had to work for wages in order to survive, and since the big landowners could get by with gross inefficiency and hence high agricultural prices since they owned all the natural resources.

The masses were also exploited by the wealthy elite through the State's policy of never-ending inflation. As Ferrer clearly shows, inflation is based on governmental desire to spend money it has "created" on those holding the puppet strings, but even more on the fact that prices rise faster than wages, i.e., prices of real wealth profits zoom upwards. This profit inflation is all the better for the rich in control of the State to make plundering returns and capital accumulation through theft; furthermore, import costs rise which means a bounty on exports, all of which amounts to price increases for the masses and State privileges for domestic producers on the home and foreign markets. Finally, as if the above were not enough to fulfill the parasitic urges of the criminal class controlling the State to concentrate all the wealth in their hands, all sorts of blatantly regressive taxes--especially tariffs and excise taxes—are imposed upon the masses. Tariffs, which are high as heaven in Argentina, of course allow domestic businesses to be grossly inefficient and charge exorbitant prices to the poor. Insult is added to injury when the plunder extracted by regressive taxation is spent progressively—that is, all the subsidies and spending of the State are for the benefit of the ruling oligarchy.

Ferrer hesitates to employ such strong language, but his idea certainly back it up. They back up the class nature of the Argentine State, the principle that the purpose of the State is to make the rich richer by making the poor poorer, and the inference that the State must be abolished, the expropriators expropriated, and a completely free market substituted for the present system of monopoly State feudalism/capitalism if real economic development is to occur.

HATFIELD FOR PRESIDENT?— (Continued from page 1)

pleasing only to an extreme right-wing that is now hopelessly anti-libertarian. His rhetoric will be modern, in keeping with the perceptions of today, and in keeping with his knowledge of how a broad libertarian coalition could be forged. And make no mistake: the Senator does refer to himself, consciously, as a libertarian, and this in itself is almost unheard of in American politics. I know, I know; I know all about the cries of protest that will now be welling up in scores of libertarian hearts, those hearts which, like mine, are steeped in innate and instinctive distrust for any and every politician. The remarkable thing is that Mark Hatfield himself understands such distrust just as well, and probably shares it. A while ago he told a group of us, spontaneously bringing up the point himself: "I have not, like Faust, sold my soul to politics." I believe him. And if the time should ever come when Mark Hatfield runs for the Presidency, I shall enlist without hesitation behind his banner.

impossibility. The present State was exported from the State of Spain. Its purpose was an imperialist one, namely, to extract wealth from the colony so that, through the plundering of the economy, the ruling class would become richer. Together with the new requirement of plunder by a new ruling class--the one residing in the colony, this necessitated the extermination of the Indians (Argentia rapidly learned "free enterprise" à la Northameral) and monopolization of the land. All of this presupposed a State. Unused land reserved for monopolists by the State, Ferrer points out, had as its purpose exploitation of the poor by the rich oppressors by perpetuating a monopoly of the valuable land resource in the hands of a small elite. Wages were forced down well below their marginal productivity, since the masses were not allowed to homestead and so had to work for wages in order to survive, and since the big landowners could get by with gross inefficiency and hence high agricultural prices since they owned all the natural resources.

The masses were also exploited by the wealthy elite through the State's policy of never-ending inflation. As Ferrer clearly shows, inflation is based on governmental desire to spend money it has "created" on those holding the puppet strings, but even more on the fact that prices rise faster than wages, i.e., prices of real wealth profits zoom upwards. This profit inflation is all the better for the rich in control of the State to make plundering returns and capital accumulation through theft; furthermore, import costs rise which means a bounty on exports, all of which amounts to price increases for the masses and State privileges for domestic producers on the home and foreign markets. Finally, as if the above were not enough to fulfill the parasitic urges of the criminal class controlling the State to concentrate all the wealth in their hands, all sorts of blatantly regressive taxes--especially tariffs and excise taxes—are imposed upon the masses. Tariffs, which are high as heaven in Argentina, of course allow domestic businesses to be grossly inefficient and charge exorbitant prices to the poor. Insult is added to injury when the plunder extracted by regressive taxation is spent progressively—that is, all the subsidies and spending of the State are for the benefit of the ruling oligarchy.

Ferrer hesitates to employ such strong language, but his idea certainly back it up. They back up the class nature of the Argentine State, the principle that the purpose of the State is to make the rich richer by making the poor poorer, and the inference that the State must be abolished, the expropriators expropriated, and a completely free market substituted for the present system of monopoly State feudalism/capitalism if real economic development is to occur.

—Stephen P. Halbrook
Bits And Pieces

By Jerome Tuccille

The Black Declaration of Independence printed in the New York Times, July 3, 1970, is one of the most refreshing documents to emerge from the Black Power movement since the speeches of Malcolm X. With incisive clarity the authors of this statement, a brilliant paraphrase of the language of the original Declaration of Independence and catalogue a long list of grievances with a notable absence of emotionalism and simplistic rhetoric. The document was prepared by the National Committee of Black Churchmen, 110 East 123rd St, New York City, and signed by forty black clergymen of various faiths.

Starting with the opening words of the Declaration of Independence—"When in the course of Human Events, it becomes necessary for a people . . ."—the Black Declaration goes on to enumerate a multitude of abuses inflicted on the black community by government. These include: the "desecration" of "Dwelling Places, under the Pretense of Urban Renewal"; swarms of "Social Workers, Officers and Investigators" sent into the black communities to "harass our People"; the stationing of "Troopers and National Guardsmen" in ghetto neighborhoods "without the consent of our People"; "the dissolution of school districts controlled by Blacks" whenever they oppose outside domination; and racist attitudes in general which have isolated blacks in dilapidated areas and denied them adequate housing, schooling and employment as well as their ordinary Constitutional Rights.

The value of this Declaration rests in the fact that its creators have confined themselves to a careful historical analysis of calculated injustice, and they have stayed clear of generalized polemics about "fascism", "capitalist exploitation", and the usual sloganeering that has replaced reasonable discussion at a time it is needed most.

The document ends with the statement that blacks have continually petitioned government for an end to "Repressive Control" and that government has "been deaf to the voice of Justice and of Humanity." The final tone is ominous: "... unless we receive full Redress and Relief from these Inhumanities we shall move to renounce all Allegiance to this Nation, and will refuse, in every way, to cooperate with the Evil which is Perpetrated upon ourselves and our Communities."

This breath of fresh air is a welcome change at a time when the American nation is being inundated on all levels by torrents of fiery prose. Unless there is a sharp reversal of our government's foreign and domestic policies at once, the Second American Revolution may pre-date the two-hundredth anniversary of the first.

From the New York Times, July 5, 1970, comes word that Governor William G. Milliken of Michigan will sign a bill allowing citizens the right to file suit against public agencies and private industry which pollute the environment, Michigan will become the first state to specifically insure citizens of this fundamental right to protect their own property against unwanted invasion by contaminating elements. Other states planning similar legislation are New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Colorado, California and Texas, and a federal bill is now before the U. S. Senate.

The authorities are doing here is putting on the books a right which has always belonged by Natural Law to the people: the right of self-defense. The injection of harmful ingredients into our air supply is automatically a violation of property rights since they will eventually find their way into someone else's lungs. Likewise, water, sound and soil pollution invariably results in physical harm to other persons.

So we can thank the politicians for stating a principle which should have been obvious to everyone years ago. One beneficial aspect of this legislation is that, for a rare change, legality coincides with Natural Law. The Law 'n' Order Neanderthals don't have to worry anymore about breaking a law when they sue the Atomic Energy Commission for poisoning their children.

Lately, a few libertarians have grown fond of supporting the Mafia as a legitimate black market organization operating outside the entrepreneurial restraints of government. They reason that many Mafia activities such as gambling, melting silver coins, loansharking, prostitution, even peddling narcotics are voluntaristic in nature and ought not to be considered illegal.

Much of this is true. But what is overlooked is the fact that the Mafia no more welcomes competition in its various enterprises than does the federal government, and has gone to even greater lengths to suppress it. The racketeers have supplied their competitors with cement boots before taking them swimming, firebombed their places of business, and run competing ice cream and garbage trucks from the highways. They have utilized torture, mutilation and murder to keep their "free market" businesses from enduring the hardships of competitive enterprise.

In addition, Mafia-controlled unions are responsible for the grand-scale pilfering that has gone on for years on the docks and at our airports. The Cosa Nostra families are no strangers to the less-than-subtle art of extortion—shaking down neighborhood storekeepers for the right to stay in business. So, while there is a hilarious side to the spectacle of exotic characters with names like Tony "Big Walnut" Perrotta or Mario "Apricots" Terrazzo eluding the clutches of Big Government, it is dangerous to romanticize their peculiar brand of "Black Market Monopoly. The Mafia is every bit as Law 'n' Order—happy as Spirio Agnew. It is its own law and its own order. And Maftosi have never been too strong on due process.
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investment. Conservative estimates see 35 percent of the
nation's trackage as not being economically justifiable. Prob-
ly at least that much of Penn Central's trackage should be
pared. Yet the government wants to step in, to lend the cor-
poration money, in order to try to prevent the inevitable. For
years the railroad has been covertly disinvesting in the only
way it could--given the tight regulation of the industry--by
allowing the quality of its service to deteriorate. This is no
longer enough. Unfortunately, the Nixon Administration will
undoubtedly duplicate the policies of the Eisenhower Admin-
istration as regards the railroads: grant loans to the weakest
lines in order to tide them over a recession. Professor
George Hilton, in his The Transportation Act of 1968, has
amply demonstrated the folly of the previous loan guarantees
given the railroads. Railroads are even more susceptible to
economic fluctuations (especially the Eastern lines) than a
capital goods industry like steel. A given percentage down-
turn in steel or auto production often results in a greater
percentage downturn in rail profits. If the railroads had been
permitted to disinvest earlier, they would not be in the
trouble they are in now. If not permitted to disinvest now,
they will be in even worse shape when the next recession
hits.

Nixon, however, is not satisfied to emulate past follies. He is
apparently determined to extend government aid to any
major firm in any industry that wants it. A lot of ignorant
people have written a lot of arrant nonsense about inflation's
being caused by a "wage-price spiral." But the kernel of
truth hidden in all this talk must not be overlooked. Ever
since the Hoover New Deal, the policy of the federal gov-
ernment has been moving toward one of assuring the profit-
ability of American big business (thus guaranteeing for itself
an important source of support for its policies—foreign and
domestic). With the government more and more willing to
underwrite losses, there is less and less incentive for cor-
porate heads to heed the warnings of the market, and curril
operations where indicated. If he should continue to invest
when he should be disinvesting, the businessman can now
go to the federal government should crisis strike. All of this,
what are told (WSJ, 7/3/70), has led some of Nixon's top aides
to an 'anti-business' feeling'; these aides point out that busi-
ness executives preach free enterprise, but "come running
to us" when they get into trouble. One can be sure that these
aides will soon "shape up," or be "shipped out!"

The point here is that the business executive now need not cut
prices in the face of falling demand; or resist wage
demands of unions. Union leaders need worry less about
whether they are asking for more than a market wage. The
government has announced its willingness to supply
cash—virtually to print money up if necessary—to major
corporations that find themselves in a "liquidity crisis"
(i.e., find themselves over-extended). Keynesian Walter
Heller has spoken of an "inflationary bias" in our economy.
In doing so, he is perhaps being more prescient than Milton
Friedman (for some reason inexplicable to this author, Pro-
fessor Friedman considers Nixon to be a brilliant man bent
on bringing libertarianism to America). Up with free enter-
prise!

What is happening now is what Ludwig von Mises predicted
nearly sixty years ago would happen to those countries which
adopted the economics of inflationism. Inflation up until very
recently in this country has been largely unanticipated; it has
in effect been a tax on money holdings. The public is now
beginning to expect further inflation, and, as with any tax, are
finding ways to avoid the tax. In economic terms, they are
decreasing their demand for money. Rather than go through
the painful process of contradicting these inflationary ex-
ceptions, the government has apparently chosen to meet
them. To do this, the government must continue to inflate at
something like the present 9 to 10 percent rate. But this
will lead to expectations of inflation, and a further decrease
in the demand for money; and to a "need" for further infla-
tion... Mises has been largely dismissed by modern
 economists. His analysis is not supposed to be "applicable"
to a modern economy (wasn't Germany a modern economy
in the 1920's?). Yet seldom has an analysis been so applicable
as Mises' now. Unless the present course is reversed, we
are on the long, slow (but inevitable) road to the destruction
of our monetary system. And, as Mises has so often and so
ably pointed out, if there is any one instruction whose evolu-
tion is necessary for modern civilization as we know it, it
is that of money. If this administration does not blow us up,
it may have the dubious distinction of having brought us to
the economic ruin that so many others have failed in
accomplishing.

---Gerald O'Driscoll, Jr.