The past month has seen a ballooning, an expanding, a veritable wonderment of publicity for the libertarian movement. For the first time in my life, I meet average intellectuals: in colleges, in TV studies, in the press, who are extremely sympathetic toward and interested in the libertarian doctrine. Libertarians are literally popping up everywhere, and the chances are large that the next intellectual or opinion-moulder you meet will either consider himself a libertarian or at least be interested in the idea. The basic reason seems to be the failure of Liberalism, a failure evident to all but the most obtuse liberals. After all, Liberals have been in power for nearly forty years, and what they have wrought has been the Frankenstein’s Monster of Presidential war and dictatorship, the war in Vietnam, the Leviathan government, the military-industrial complex, and big bureaucracy at home. And so many Liberals where, and the chances are large that the next intellectual a libertarian or at least be interested in the idea. The basic tradition of Jefferson, Paine, Jackson, and Garri- son; and that in contrast, James Burnham, in a recent National Review (Dec. 1) called for a new Bismarck for America and for a re-evaluation of fascism. Accompanying the article were pictures of Mencken, Jefferson, and Robert Taft.

The "New Libertarian Creed" was then placed into the Congressional Record (Feb. 24, pp. S1888-S1889) by Senator Mark Hatfield (R., Ore.) Senator Hatfield declared: "One of the unique and well articulated new philosophies on the political scene is libertarianism. Although it claims a long history, it has not received much public attention until rather recently. Its proponents vary in their intellectual histories, coming to this point of view via the right wing of the Republican Party on one extreme and from the New Left on the other." Hatfield then proceeded to read my article into the Record as a "most comprehensive and concise presentation of this perspective,"

Buckley wound up the exchange with his "The Conservative Reply", New York Times (Feb. 16). The article was a typical Buckley performance: a series of caty ad hominem smears and misrepresentations, carefully avoiding the substantive issues. One gets the impression, indeed, that Buckley has ceased to think at least a decade ago, so caught up is he in his career as the rich man’s insult-comic (although somehow less lovable than Jack E. Leonard).

As usual Buckley rings the changes: first, on the Karl Hess comparison of Beria and J. Edgar Hoover. As usual, Chairman Bill misses the point. It was not that Karl claimed
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But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new Guards for their future security. --Declaration of Independence.

To me, for whom the "long train" has extended over nearly 20 years, that particular sentence of the Declaration of Independence, as well as the mechanism by which "man-kind are more disposed to suffer" while the evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing to which they are accustomed," has come to have very real meaning.

Only when I was faced with a choice of what crime I should elect to commit at the instigation of a government agent, for which I, not he, would be punishable, did I finally realize that something is very, very wrong in America.

But let me start at the beginning, for my story will show how almost imperceptibly freedom can be encroached upon - just as others may have experienced it, with the difference that encroachment on mine was pushed further than the average citizen's, for reasons that will emerge from my story.

My career, a highly successful one, started in England before World War 2. I was chief engineer of a leading electronics company, not long after 'electronics' was prevalent explained as an outgrowth of radio, which is an outgrowth of electricity! At the same time I was senior lecturer at two of London's colleges, with responsibility for curriculum coordination between districts.

World War 2 resulted in concentrating my attention on the electronic communications equipment needed to win the war. After the war, bureaucracy raised its ugly head very quickly in Britain, making life quite difficult. After countless frustrations with the socialist government, the Land of Opportunity attracted my attention, and my wife and I emigrated in 1953.

Because my reputation preceded me I found work easily - in fact I had a choice. The first selection was a job with Fairchild Recording, developing multi-track sound to go with the then-new wide-screen movies. Fairchild also had government contracts to develop systems for the armed services, which had been "my bag" in my native England.

This was where I should have been alerted that trouble was brewing, but perhaps America was too new for me to see the trend. I was precluded from this development work, because (a) I was not yet an American citizen, and (b) I did not possess security clearance. However, with my reputation, I encountered no difficulty finding other work.

After a little more than a year with Fairchild, I left full-time employment with that company, continued as a consultant to do work permitted to me, and extended my consulting clientele elsewhere. Being precluded from government-connected projects created "no sweat" for the time being.

From 1958 to 1961, one of my major clients was CBS Laboratories in Stamford, Connecticut. The Labs had a similar mix of work to that at Fairchild, part for consumer or industrial application, part for government contracts. However, several times engineers working on a particular government contract intimated that they would like to consult me about what they were doing, but were not permitted to do so.

In 1961, the CBS executive made a decision that affected me seriously: the Labs were to do no work except that 'covered' by government contracts. However, a coincidence gave me one more job before our association terminated. The classified job about which the engineers had wanted to consult me became declassified by being authorized as operational. It was called "NetAlert."

So my final job was writing the operating manual for NetAlert. As an engineer, I could not resist asking why they adopted somewhat inefficient ways of designing certain parts of the system. Then I learned that these places were precisely where they could have used my services. I found it a little frustrating to describe a system that I could easily have improved upon, when it was 'frozen' - all I could do was describe it.

During the late 50s and early 60s, I received several work offers for which I was highly qualified - both the people offering and I knew that - but when they learned that I had no clearance record, they sought other means of getting the work done, or else forgot about the contract opportunity altogether.

The reason for this reaction was simple. Obtaining clearance for a person of foreign birth (even if he eventually gets it) takes about 18 months. Such contracts are open for competitive bid between different companies. So a company cannot make a bid contingent on perhaps securing the services of a man necessary to its fulfilment, when that "perhaps" cannot be resolved for 18 months hence.

So I continued to work in areas that avoided this problem. However, I began to realize that my work opportunities were dwindling, as the government extended its activities into more and more fields, under one pretext or another. I have received dozens of letters from newly-formed government agencies, asking for personnel recommendations to fill vacancies for which I was qualified, but "need not apply" for this reason.

In 1960 my wife and I became citizens. We liked what we learned, in studying about our new country. The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States made a lot of sense to us, and we identified very readily with the principles there enunciated. Citizenship should be a step toward solving what was obviously looming as a problem.

In 1962, I started renewing my interest in education, and to further this, I wrote to England to obtain written confirmation about my career there. That was when I discovered that the Department Head under whom I did most of my work could not obtain written verification of all records of my schooling and teaching work before World War 2 were destroyed by enemy action during the war.

Complicating my problem was the Englishman's typical attitude, "Don't those stupid Americans know we had a war here? Why should they insist on us producing documents that no longer exist?" I had letters explaining the situation from people who knew me - wouldn't that be enough for anyone?

In 1962, something else began, that promised to help. I received a letter typed on plain paper, with a Virginia address, and signed 'Earl Holliman.' He wrote to ask me some technical questions, which I answered, as I did all letters from readers of my books and articles. Next came a letter on the stationery of the U. S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, identifying Earl Holliman as a Colonel in that service, thanking me for my information and asking more questions.

To cut a long story short, in 1964, Colonel Holliman asked if I would be prepared for retention by the U.S. Army Security Agency as a consultant, for which a relatively low order of security clearance was needed. As a possible solution to resolve my growing problem, I readily agreed. As a precaution, I mentioned the difficulty in verifying certain parts of my record in England, but was told to submit this application, that this need not prevent me (Continued on page 4)
 dass Hoovers are as bad a character as Beria; the point Karl
was making was that in one sense at least, Soviet Russia is
more democratic than the United States: that they managed
to depose the head of their secret police, whereas we are
apparently unable to do so. An astute and witty point. And
then, once more, for the 858th time, there is me and lighth-
houses. It should be clear to the most superficial reader of
mine and Buckeys writings, that he and his cohorts have
devoted at least twenty times as much space to the lighth-
house question as I ever have. Bill Buckley may consider
socialized lighthouses to be one of the burning questions
of our time, but I certainly do not.

In his article, in fact, Buckley affirms that the State does
good as well as bad things, but the only positive example he
can point to are those lighthouses again. One begins to
wonder what accounts for Chairman Bills strange obsession
with lighthouses? Setting aside with reluctance the possible
Freudian interpretation, we are left with the thought that
Mr. Buckley is very anxious to keep coercing landlubbing
taxpayers into donating free light to his beloved sailboat
a true example of the "welfare state" in action, and surely
a worthy reason for abandoning the free market.

Bill, Im willing to make a trade: if youll give up the
Cold War and the war in Southeast Asia, I'll let you have
your beloved socialized lighthouses, and may Social Darwin-
ism work its way on your boat!

Buckley tries to defend himself against my charge of
staring baying into the pit of four distinguished free-
market economists, whose intellectual fortress continues
to be National Review, the problem is that of those he
mentions, one (Wilhelm Ropke) has been dead for years, an-
other (Ludwig von Mises) has never written for his magazine,
and a third (F. A. Hayek) broke with the magazine many
years ago, vigorously denouncing Bill Buckley for his
tasteless implication after the death of Dag Hammarskjold
in an airplane crash that the latter had been cheating at
cards. Buckley's reply to Hayek was typical of his aristo-
cratic taste and refinement: tossing off his remark as a
jeu d'idée and implying that Hayek was not familiar enough
with the English language to appreciate the Buckeleys wit.
That leaves only Henry Hazlitt, who writes but seldom for
National Review in any case.
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securing clearance. So I filed some forms in quintuplicate and received notification they had been received: I should know the result in about 6 months.

But about 3 months later, I received a letter with another, much larger bunch of forms, saying the requirements for clearance had changed, would I please complete these? It did not occur to me at the time that the reason for a change in requirements might be because they had changed the clearance being sought for — nothing was said about that. I just assumed this was still the same application.

I did not receive a response until over 2 years from my original application: clearance denied. No reason given, and a letter asking for explanation received the answer that reasons could not be given as a matter of "national security."

During this time, while my reputation continued to expand, my work opportunities continued to contract: more people would ask me to undertake something, then withdraw the proverbial hot potato: to even discuss anything with me apparently assumed that anyone with my background would be "dangerous" for them.

I had been refused clearance: (1) my wife's parents were not American citizens, being British by birth, and having lived, worked and now retired, in their native England; (2) my records could not be verified satisfactorily; and (3) they could trace no details of my pre-War-2 associations, either those I mentioned in my application, or any others. They made it quite clear that there was no suspicion that I might have had "undesirable" associations. On the other hand, there was no evidence that I had not.

About this time, Bob Packwood defeated Wayne Morse as Senator from Oregon, and Bob became interested in my case. He took up the matter, and as a result of his representations in my behalf, the first and third reasons were withdrawn, but on the second the agency remained adamant: they must have access to original written documents; no affidavits and no copies of information that I had in my possession would be accepted.

Now, the reason given for this rigid requirement was the relatively high order of security clearance being sought. For lesser levels, the requirement might not be so stringent.

What had happened? Where did my clearance application get "upped" in level? What was that change in forms, about 3 months after my initial application? A piece of news about any ABM that can intercept them must travel at least at an equal speed.

Presumably this possibility has been verified under item 2 above. And presumably item 3, the capability of steering precisely enough to hit head-on at a cumulative speed of 20,000 mph has been verified too. What has not been verified is the electronic guidance system, which has not been checked, either way - which is sheer nonsense, in this context. The communists have people who are not laymen in this field. Of that you can be sure!

Let me explain the problem this way: can you fire a gun to "shoot down" a bullet coming toward you? The best gunnman alive (or dead) has never attempted this. Bullets travel faster than sound, at about 1000 mph. ICBMs travel through space at from 3 to 10 times the speed of a bullet, and any ABM that can intercept them must travel at least at an equal speed.

The layman has no way of knowing what is involved, so he tends to trust the experts. Congressmen are laymen, in this sense. But the communists have people who are not laymen in this field. Of that you can be sure!

The layman has no way of knowing what is involved, so he tends to trust the experts. Congressmen are laymen, in this sense. But the communists have people who are not laymen in this field. Of that you can be sure!

Let me explain the problem this way: can you fire a gun to "shoot down" a bullet coming toward you? The best gunnman alive (or dead) has never attempted this. Bullets travel faster than sound, at about 1000 mph. ICBMs travel through space at from 3 to 10 times the speed of a bullet, and any ABM that can intercept them must travel at least at an equal speed.

Presumably this possibility has been verified under item 2 above. And presumably item 3, the capability of steering precisely enough to hit head-on at a cumulative speed of 20,000 mph has been verified too. What has not been verified is the electronic guidance system that can direct the steering so it actually does that.

Electronic systems can be designed to function in millions of a second. But in a millionth of a second, these two objects, the ICBM and the ABM, will be approaching one another by a distance of more than 100 feet. And if their courses miss one another by 100 feet, they miss one another, period!

If the electronic system reacts only a millionth of a second slow, or over-reacts in a way equivalent to a millionth of a second fast, no hit! And if the system is designed that way - which has not been checked, either way - the possibilities of an "accidental hit" are not even as good as the possibility of your shooting down a bullet speeding toward you.

The notion that a sheer quantity of such defense will prevent some of the mass of enemy ICBMs from getting through - the pepper-pot theory - is sheer nonsense, in this context. How many bullets would you have to fire off to stop the other man's bullet hitting you, "by accident"?

That is the key question, now how do I connect this with my security clearance application? One of the jobs about which I gave information was with a technical school where I wrote the very first textbook published about Electronic Navigational Aids and Guidance Systems, right after World War 2.

I did not name the book in my application, because I have more than 40 books and close to 1000 magazine and journal articles published, so it seemed pointless to attempt to (Continued on page 5).
FACING BUREAUCRACY — (Continued from page 4)

list them. But one of the first things the investigators would learn, on checking my work at that job, would be that I wrote that book, which is still used as a text.

Realizing this I began to see why my clearance application was apparently unjustified. Somebody saw that I could be useful to check the ABM guidance system, unaware that somebody else in the bureaucracy had reasons for not wanting it checked!

This was affirmed later, when I met another electronic engineer, a native-born American, with capabilities similar to my own, who had also been invited to apply for clearance, and been refused in a similar way, although he had no basis for determining why he was refused.

Now put these items together: the only thing not checked about the ABM is that item 4, which is vital — and nobody competent to do that has been retained as an expert. Two people with that competence (to my knowledge — there may be more) have been invited to apply for clearance, and both have been inexplicably refused.

Had I been asked to check the design, even if I could find no fault in the theoretical design, I would want to see it tested on an actual simulated intercept mission: it is too easy to be a microsecond “off” here or there. Such a test has never been conducted either. Some experts with no knowledge of this kind of system have declared it will work, and that no test is necessary!

In my own case, the reason finally given for refusing clearance, and stated with adamance as an unbendable “rule,” is the one that I was told at the beginning did not matter — loss of prewar records. Had there truly been such a rule, I should have been so informed, to save unnecessary application and processing at taxpayer expense. Obviously, this “reason” was invented after the event. What other explanation is possible? And why the “need” to invent such a “rule”?

While uncovering this basis for the peculiar action — and this issue seems too hot for anyone to tackle — portends ill for our country’s future, the problems that the action itself has created for me personally are no small ones either.

During that same period, in an endeavor to break the growing impasse, at my own expense I developed a new circuit principle which became the subject of a U.S. patent in 1965. This cost me a great deal of my own resources, and I produced a convincing demonstration of its effectiveness. Its first major application would be in high power sound projection, for which any company wanting to develop it would seek government support, for application by army, navy or airforce.

As soon as the patent was issued, several companies contacted me about it, hoping I would work with them as consultant on its development with some arrangement to our mutual benefit. As such a possibility was based on an inquiry from a government agency, one question inevitably asked was, did I have security clearance? Upon learning my status, the matter was promptly dropped. So I have invested thousands of dollars, plus a few years of my time, in something that government bureaucracy is effectively prohibiting from further development, because of their other decision.

In 1967 I encountered yet another severe setback. Much of my income, as other sources receded, had been from my books, and that year proved a bad one, for several distributors went bankrupt, returning their stocks of books to the publishers for refund or credit. This resulted in reverse royalties that wiped out my income that year. Actually, this was a cancellation of a large part of my 1966 income, and should be treasurable as such.

But the Internal Revenue Service refused to accept this explanation, and insisted that I pay tax based on my cancelled earnings, even when I had no actual income. I was living on loans from the bank to support future work, and by advances from publishers, also against future work. The IRS agent was not satisfied: I must negotiate more contracts with advances, for work I could not possibly do, and then declare bankruptcy, when I had “found” that I could not fulfill the contracts.

He made some other suggestions, each of which was equally dishonest, if not outright illegal. He also told me that it was fruitless to appeal his decision, since I had already written to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in Washington, as a result of which letter (and a few more) he was visiting me.

I managed, at the time, to get a further loan to pay the immediate tax he demanded, partly because he threatened that if I did not, and if I did not sign a completely false statement of my financial position that he wrote for me to sign, he could seize all my property, including my technical library, thus preventing me from even fulfilling the contracts I had already signed.

The following year, I retained a tax accountant to prepare my return. Then I found that, not only do I not get any refund for income extracted as return against previous years, but when I repay the loans I obtained to carry on living, these are also taxable as further income! I am being taxed several times over. The only offer to make it possible for me to live is to have the accountant fill in all kinds of deductions I could not possibly have paid to anyone, to which I put my signature on the 1040 form.

This was when I reread the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and saw the light. Twice already I had been coerced into perjury: this must stop. The only way was to refuse to cooperate at all. Putting anything on that form committed me, and there was no legal way I could make a true return.

Somewhere around this time I learned about Leonard Read and the Foundation for Economic Education, and about Willis Stone’s Liberty Amendment. When I made the decision to quit allowing myself to be forced into perjury, and to stand upon the Constitution, as we had undertaken to do when we took the oath as citizens, I wrote to Leonard Read. His response was that he would not refuse to pay taxes in any way whatever, unless he was ready to start a revolution, which he was not! Did I have any choice?

I also attended a “tax revolt” meeting organized by the Liberty Amendment people. They urged me to support their cause — at the time, I could hardly to support anything! Willis Stone himself told me, when I tried to explain my position, that I must pay my taxes first, and then support his movement to get taxes repealed; that was the democratic way, he told me. When I asked him what I could use for money, first to pay impossible taxes on fictional income that I did not even have, then to support his program, he did not understand and said I must obey the law. He could not seem to understand that I had been given no possible way of obeying the law: my choice was only how I must choose to disobey it!

That was about the time when I realized the full import of those words in the Declaration of Independence that I put at the head of this article. I wrote a 10-page statement, setting this forth, sent a copy with my blank but signed 1040 form, to the IRS, with copies to President Nixon, our two Senators and the District congressman.

It is high time that we did just what the words that head this article say. It is our right and our duty. But we sure have to be pushed, before we realize it!

"War is the statesman’s game, the priest’s delight. The lawyer’s jest, the hired assassin’s trade." — Percy Bysshe Shelley.
IN DEFENSE OF NON-ROMANTIC LITERATURE

BY JEROME TUCCILLE

It should be self-evident that there is something seriously amiss with the literary views of someone who regards Mickey Spillane as one of the great writers of our time, but this apparently is not the case. A growing number of libertarians are now entering society with erroneous ideas about the body of literature that pre-dates the publication of The Fountainhead. It is Victor Hugo - H. G. Wells, Jules Verne and Sinclair Lewis as belonging to the "top notch" novelists as "better-known" Naturalists (as far as being among the "better-known" Naturalists (as far as being among the "better-known"

In her article, "What is Romanticism? (Part 1)," appearing in the May, 1969 issue of The Objectivist, Rand cites the following "Romantic" novelists as belonging to the "top rank" in the literary hierarchy: among "Romantic" writers, Schiller and Rostand. Later in the same article she blames "Naturalistic" tendencies for the "breakup of Romanticism." She lists H. G. Wells, Jules Verne and Sinclair Lewis as "among the "better-known" Naturalists (as far as being among the "better-known"

In rebutting her thesis, it has unfortunately become necessary to state the obvious: Ayn Rand to the contrary, Naturalism and Journalism are not to be confused. There is a world of difference between a realistic accounting of last night's riot in a daily newspaper and a Naturalistic portrayal of the quality of life in a given society at a given time by an accomplished novelist. The novelist brings a depth of insight to his subject matter which a journalist may not possess. Those journalists who do have this incisiveness of mind usually graduate into novelists, a la Hemingway.

The best literature usually combines good Naturalism with good Romantic values - that is, a superb rendering of what it was like to live in a certain place at a certain time, along with a moral message which will aid the reader in his own quest for values to live by. The element that makes We The Living a better novel than Atlas Shrugged is Miss Rand's good Naturalism: a sentimental account of what it was like to be in Leningrad, circa 1920s, when the revolution had already been betrayed by power-lusting bureaucrats, combined with the Romantic struggle of a young woman and her lover for the right to live their own lives. It portrays believable people in a believable situation while expressing positive moral values. On the other hand, the dialogue in Atlas Shrugged belongs in a comic strip and the characters in a James Bond fantasy.

The quality that separates good Naturalistic rendering of events from bad Naturalism is the artist's capacity for selectivity - knowing what to put in and knowing what to leave out. This is what makes Hemingway and Maugham good Naturalists (economy of style; saying more with fewer words), and Thomas Wolfe a bad Naturalist (including every veritable detail of "extraordinary"

If it weren't for good Naturalists such as Hardy, Galsworthy, Anderson, Fitzgerald, we would all be harder pressed to understand the true quality of life that existed in nineteenth and twentieth century England and America. A single novel of Hardy's is worth far more than a thousand newspaper clippings from his era. Journalists relay accurate reports; they merely relay the news; a good Naturalist drives beneath the surface to the spiritual, intellectual, and psychological currents of his time.

Didn't Victor Hugo employ Naturalism in his Romantic story of the life of Jean Valjean? What else would you call his artistic rendering of the conditions of French society that Valjean found himself enmeshed in? Or Dostoevsky in Crime and Punishment or The Brothers Karamazov or The Possessed? What else would you call the vivid imagery he used to describe the street scenes of Moscow and the Siberian countryside? It is apparent that Rand excoriates the Naturalist Emile Zola because she views his intriguing descriptions of working conditions in eighteenth-century France as an attack on "morality." It is an attack on social Naturalism, but Rand is not troubled to see the distinction and berates Zola for his "moral depravity." Rand has little to say about comedy and satire. On the two occasions on which I heard her speak about the subject she denounced both as "negative" values, and satire as particularly evil because it negates viciously. It would be too easy to attribute these views to the fact that Miss Rand is incapable of writing comedy and has absolutely no understanding of the nature or purpose of satire.

Satire is the highest form of comedy and the best satire is an extremely positive value because it negates that which deserves to be negated. It's purpose is to destroy that which is evil by holding it up to a skewer for public ridicule. Even a "sense of humor" and "laughing at oneself" (condemned, of course, by the Rand as a chipping away of self-esteem) is an attempt to eliminate the worst in man (and in ourselves) by focusing on human imperfections with the hope of doing something about them. But if one is perfect to begin with, Evelyn Waugh was probably the greatest satirist writing in English this century, and his son Auberon is following closely in his steps. Kurt Vonnegut is the closest approximation we have in this country of a first-rate satirist using the novel as an effective vehicle for social criticism. Art Buchwald and Jules Feiffer are now attempting to use satire in the theater, but whether they will stake out
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lasting reputations in this direction remains to be seen. So what if satire doesn’t offer positive values for the reader to identify with? Isn’t the stripping away of hypocrisy and immorality value enough? Does one have to produce a philosophical treatise every time he writes a story? A contemporary “serious writer” whom Ayn Rand admires very much is Allen Drury. Drury has produced some of the dreariest prose since Theodore Dreiser, and his novels are little more than apologia for the type of gunboat diplomacy advanced by Teddy Roosevelt. He calls himself a Robert Taft Republican but he is really a hard-line conservative, which is why he is so popular with the Buckleys — and now the Randians. Mickey Spillane, presenting Mike Hammer as his protagonist in the struggle between “good guys” and “bad guys”, permits his hero to break the arms of innocent people in order to extract information from them and he is praised by Miss Rand as a valuable Romantic writer. The fantasy world of James Bond is surely not “concrete-bound” (entertaining fantasy, yes; concrete-bound realism, definitely not) so it is promoted as the best of contemporary Romantic literature. This is the type of absurdity that the literary views of Ayn Rand inevitably lead to. I would suggest that she has fallen into the pit-falls of her own “mind-body dichotomy” regarding the subject of literature. More concrete-bound Naturalism in the field of Romantic fantasy might help to elevate it to the level of serious literature.

Despite all the trash that is offered in the pages of the New York Times Book Review as “good modern fiction,” one does not have to turn to Mickey Spillane or Allen Drury as an alternative. There are many good writers publishing fiction today whom Ayn Rand has apparently never even heard about. She might pick up the novels of Friedrich Duerrenmatt and discover concise Naturalistic description as a background for Romantic moral themes. She might read An Operational Necessity by Gwyn Griffin or King Rat or Tai-Pan by James Clavell for valuable Naturalistic Romanticism of the type she employed in The Fountainhead. The Godfather by Mario Puzo reveals more insight into the psychology of mobsters than can be found in a hundred news reports.

She might read Mother Night or Slaughterhouse 5 by Kurt Vonnegut for good social and political satire; Arthur C. Clarke and Isaac Asimov for Romantic themes in the realm of science fiction.

Anyone who thinks Naturalism is unexplored should study An Operational Necessity for tense and exciting plot structure. Those who think Naturalistic description is journalism ought to re-read Hemingway and Fitzgerald for economy of style and precise selection of detail. Miss Rand, herself, could use a jolt of imagination to liven her own predictable phraseology. Those who see only real-life characters in Naturalism fail to understand the subtleties of interpersonal relationships depicted by first-rate Naturalists such as Mary McCarthy, Any who think that Naturalism is devoid of moral themes should read The Quarry by Duerrenmatt. Or they can read any one of the above books for all four of these basic ingredients in a single work. Plot, theme, characterization and style are not copyrighted products of Romantic fantasists.

Literature is an exciting and multifaceted subject. It ought to be explored in great detail by those who want to enlarge their capacity for enjoyment. Anyone who pretends to compartmentalize it with trite slogans does an injustice to himself. And rational men are capable of better things than parroting the simplistic, school-girl rhetoric of others.
From The ‘Old Curmudgeon’

Have you noticed how many leftists at one and the same time hold (a) that we have entered a “post-scarcity world” making obsolete any concern with private property, a free price system, or with work and the Protestant ethic; and (b) that capitalist greed is destroying our natural resources, and therefore that government must step in and plan for their conservation? To the observer, this may seem irrational and inconsistent; but there is a “higher” consistency here: use any stick, self-contradictory or not, with which to clobber the free market and the rights of private property.

In every cloud there is a silver lining, and so there is one good fall-out from Women’s Liberation: the savage attack that the women’s libbers have been mounting against Freudianism. Until a year or so ago, the Left-liberal intellectual held Freudianism, an irrationalist creed which all Old Curmudgeons have been opposing for many years, as virtually their prime article of faith. But now the Women’s Lib assault has seriously weakened the devotion of the guilt-ridden male liberals to their Freudian faith. In a war between Freudians and Libbers, we are reminded of the old joke about the wife who hated her husband and found her husband attacked by a bear. Torn in her sympathies, she alternately shouted: “Go Husband! Go Bear!” in the hopes that these two antagonists would kill each other off. In the same spirit, we raise the cry: “Go Libbers! Go Freudians!”

One of the more amusing items in the grim news of the day was the recent report that Mrs. Patricia Buckley Bozell, managing editor of the Ultra-Catholic Triumph, had taken a swing at Tri-Grace Atkinson, leading Women’s Libber, for charging at a speech at Catholic University that, even assuming the Virgin Birth to be correct, that this makes God’s “male chauvinism” even worse, for this means that God had impregnated Mary without even sex as a compensation. While of course all libertarians deplore any physical assault upon the exercise of free speech, I confess to a sneaking sympathy for Mrs. Bozell. To have this creature spawned by the dregs of our culture heap obscene abuse upon the Catholic faith on the campus of a Catholic university would seem almost too much provocation for a dedicated Catholic to bear.

Apart from this: by what right did the federal judge force Catholic University to permit Atkinson to speak on its campus? Here was a clear invasion of Catholic University’s property right in its own campus, and the clear implication that anyone may abuse the property owner himself. This is the kind of “free speech” which every genuine libertarian should steadfastly oppose.

TAKEOFF II — (Continued from page 8)

National Taxpayers’ Union. Then there is an excellent article by Leonard Liggio, “Your Right to Be Against War”, in which Leonard sets forth and analyzes the history of the anti-militarist and anti-imperialist movement in the twentieth century, the filiation from Old Right to New Left, the roles of Albert Jay Nock and Senator Taft, etc.

Another article in the WIN issue is an interesting contribution by a left-wing Friedmanite, Henry Bass, “Libertarian Economics.” Bass instructs his fellow syndicalists that they must incorporate the insights and truths of free-market economics in any vision of a utopian syndicalist society. Finally, Karl Hess has the best shot at “Wak or Left?”, a critique of the extreme right-wing of the libertarian movement, in particular Stanford’s Harvey Hukari, Jr. and the striking gap between Ayn Rand’s novels and her current political views. While Karl’s strictures are well-taken against the extreme right-wing of the movement, he does not come to grips with the sober center-mainstream of anarcho-capitalism. To top off the issue, one Bob Calese has compiled a useful bibliography of right-wing libertarian literature which includes the individualist anarchists: Andrews, Warren, Tucker, Spooner, Greene, Mackay, Swartz; libertarian classics such as Spencer and Nock; modern contributions such as Mises, Rand, Rothbard, Tannehill, Wollstein, Tuccille; and historical accounts and collections such as Martin, Silverman, Krimerman and Perry.

All in all, the issue is must reading for libertarians. Newspapers and magazines: can other media be far behind? Numerous radio appearances by various libertarians were capped by my appearance on the NBC-TV Today show on March 8. Furthermore, books galore by major publishers on libertarianism are scheduled for next winter’s season; there will be libertarian manifestoes, readers, personal statements, reprints, and non-fiction novels. If National Review is alive now, it had better brace itself for the flood of books next season. Onward and upward!