Perhaps we are being what the Marxists call "impressionistic" (or what the Randians call "journalistic" rather than "metaphysical"), but it is very hard to escape the impression from the early Democratic primaries that the contenders are all a bunch of losers, every one. Let us ponder our gaggle of aspirants in turn.

Lindsay. Certainly the most heartwarming result of the Florida primary was the evisceration of John V. Lindsay. Striding arrogantly through the state as he does through New York City, assuming the mantle of God's gift to the American public, Big John was the recipient of almost universal adoration by the media, and of spectacularly lavish financing. Coming out of a record of administrative disaster coupled with corruption and centralized statism, Lindsay was able to pre-empt the Left with a frankly despotic position on compulsory busing. The upshot of the charisma, the media acclaim, and the billboards plastering the state of Florida was a measly 7% of the Democratic vote, at a phenomenal cost of $6 per vote. (Generally, $1 per vote is considered the outside figure in politics; John Ashbrook emerged from the Republican primary at about 25 cents a vote.) Surely we have now heard the last of John Vilet, and it couldn't have happened to a more deserving guy.

Muskie. After a disappointing victory in New Hampshire, Muskie's 9% in Florida should, by rights and by logic, put the quietus to his chances for the nomination. After all, his appeal was that of a Lincolnesque frontrunner, but what kind of a frontrunner amasses 9%? Unfortunately — unfortunately because he has clearly been repudiated by the American public — the Democrats might still turn to Muskie in the end. Muskie has all the qualities that commend themselves to centrist Democrats anxious to unify the party: a Lincolnesque air, a colorless, "sincere" personality, and very tepidly liberal on the issues. The only trouble with that strategy is that he can't seem to get any votes — but given the factionalism and the genius for self-destruction of the Democracy, they might still wind up with Muskie. Note, for example, the desperate clinging to Muskie in the New York Times editorial of March 16, as the good grey Times surveyed the Florida debacle. But Muskie is a loser, and he would surely go down to a craggy, Lincolnesque defeat in November.

The Muskie defeat has been attributed by his own aides to centrist Democrats anxious to unify the party: a Lincolnesque air, a colorless, "sincere" personality, and very tepidly liberal on the issues. The only trouble with that strategy is that he can't seem to get any votes — but given the factionalism and the genius for self-destruction of the Democracy, they might still wind up with Muskie. Note, for example, the desperate clinging to Muskie in the New York Times editorial of March 16, as the good grey Times surveyed the Florida debacle. But Muskie is a loser, and he would surely go down to a craggy, Lincolnesque defeat in November.

The Muskie defeat has been attributed by his own aides to an interesting factor: he spoke too much. They now claim that he should have kept his mouth shut, and victory would have been his. An ironic commentary on the quality of our leaders! But there was Muskie's bloviing on coast-to-coast television. Liberal columnist Harriet Van Horne (for whom the term "bleeding heart" would have to be invented if it didn't exist) gushed that Muskie's breakdown showed him to be a gentle man, and not hung up on "masculine role playing". Fine and dandy, but this was clearly not the reaction of the American voter, who wondered, not without some justice, how Muskie would react to really important emotional stress in a national crisis.

McGovern. It is true that McGovern did not campaign in Florida, but still he was on the ballot, and a whopping 6% hardly brands McGovern as the emerging choice of the American people. McGovern and Lindsay both claim to be the "populists", but there were hardly a few of "the people" to cheer them on. McGovern's good showing in New Hampshire could have been largely due to a negative interest in Muskie, as well as the intense concentration of left-wing college youth, which will not be duplicated elsewhere.

Finally, McGovern is just too far left for the American people, and he would be clobbered handily should he gain the nomination. There is one aspect of the Florida returns that has not been noted: the right-of-center candidates in the Democratic primary got a huge 75% of the votes, leaving only 25% for the left. Say what you will about the conservatism of Florida, but the figures remain eloquent on the repudiation of the left by the mass of the voters.

Wallace. The real winner in Florida, of course, was George Wallace, and this was an unwelcome sight. Let us ponder the issues on which Wallace pounded hard in the campaign: opposition to compulsory busing, opposition to high taxes, to bureaucracy, and to foreign aid. There has a lot of loose talk about the importance of a "new populism", of a populist campaign against the ruling classes. But George Wallace was the only true populist in the race, the only true champion of the average American against the ruling elite. It is not a coincidence that each one of these populist issues were libertarian issues as well. The New Left, for all its obeisances to "populism", for all its talk about someday appealing to the Goldwater and Wallace voters, has never been able to make the grade: largely because it has never been able to bring itself to call for a lowering of taxes (they merely want to shift the "priorities" of government spending). And secondly, because the New Left, for all its bowing to black nationalism, has never been able to abandon the civil rights ideal of compulsory integration, which, in busing, involves the transporting of children to outlying areas for alleged "social gains." George Wallace has been able to denounce high taxes and busing without flinching, and so he captures the vote. A further irony is that the National Black Political Convention, meeting in Gary, Indiana, itself denounced compulsory integration.

(Continued on page 4)
Ashlosky For President

By Edwin G. Dolan

With the field already so crowded a rumor - not even confirmed - of another congressman about to enter the race for president runs the danger of being greeted by a yawn. But to ignore congressman John Paul Ashlosky, representative from an obscure district in one of our midwestern states, would be a serious mistake - he is definitely a candidate with a difference.

His possible entry into the Republican primaries is especially significant in view of the two opposition candidates who had been running in New Hampshire.

On the one hand, we have John Ashbrook of Ohio, who offers voters an opportunity to express their outrage at Richard Nixon's sellout of everything he personally and the Republican Party generally have ever stood for in the area of economic policy. But many who would like a chance to register their dismay at Phase I and Phase II inflationary recession are held back by the fear that a vote for Ashbrook would be interpreted as an endorsement of that candidate's stance on foreign policy, which sustains a degree of militarism, interventionism, and crusading anti-Communism which they would just as soon see left behind as we head into the fourth quarter of the century.

On the other hand, there is the late candidacy of Paul McCloskey of California, who gave the voter a chance to tell the Administration that he hasn't been fooled by the troop withdrawals and other cosmetics of VietNamization - that Nixon's stance during the Bangla Desh crisis shows him as willing as ever to prop up sagging military dictatorships everywhere, and to stand four-square for action in the four corners of the earth. Yet a vote for McCloskey might have been taken as a vote for Republican me-too-ism on that whole range of policies, domestic as well as foreign, on which the left-wing of the Democratic party is basing its presidential drive.

So in this situation, the hoped-for candidacy of Ashlosky will combine the best elements of both opposition candidates (Nixon himself already combines the worst) and give the voters a chance to express themselves unambiguously on the issues. A few remarks from a recent speech by the congressman will show the form his platform is taking:

"What we have witnessed in recent decades is a convergence of Conservatives and Liberals, Republicans and Democrats, on one fundamental tenet of ideology - that whatever the problems we face, the solution is to be sought through ever more high-handed use of the power of the federal government.

"When political realignments seem imminent in any part of the world, the response is the power of bombs, fleets, and military aid. When the bankrupt economic policies of three administrations face us with runaway inflation and history's largest budget deficits, the answer is more power - the power to abrogate contracts, stifle the market, and impose a totalitarian-style system of comprehensive controls. And when our public school system reveals its failure either to educate our sons and daughters, or to do anything but exacerbate tensions between races and economic classes, the answer is still more power - power which can't lift us up but can force us down to a uniform level of mediocrity.

"In my view, the runaway growth of government power is not the solution to our problems - it is the problem. To this policy based on power, I oppose a policy based on freedom. Freedom for the people of the world to struggle with their own problems and if need be, to fight their own wars with their own weapons. Freedom for the individual to enter the market place to buy and sell, to bargain and negotiate without the crushing burden of economic controls, confiscatory taxation, and inflationary spending and monetary policy. And freedom for people to seek local solutions to local problems, solutions based on decentralization and community control, on diversity and individual initiative.

"I believe that American politics in coming years will witness the rise of a united opposition, based on the principles of anti-imperialism abroad and individual sovereignty at home, which will defy the outmoded labels of left and right. If you feel that my candidacy for president would hasten the emergence of this movement, I will be your candidate."

John Paul, where are you? America needs you! We have not yet begun to fight!
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Are philosophical principles absolute? Or will philosophy and political ideology, like our legal codes, have to evolve with new developments in technology and social structure in order to keep from growing obsolete?

Several writers of science fact and fiction have claimed that present struggles between "capitalism" and "socialism," "fascism" and "communism," "individualism" and "collectivism" will have no place in the world of the near future. Novelist F. M. Esfandiary talks not only about the coming New Technology, but about New Economic principles as well in his first non-fiction book, Optimism One. In Future Shock, Alvin Toffler states that present-day economic and political ideologies are already obsolete, and the notion of total individual freedom is a romantic pipedream. B. F. Skinner, in his 1971 best-seller, Beyond Freedom and Dignity, claims that man is so totally conditioned by his environment that the concepts of personal liberty and free will are nothing more than utopian myths.

He argues that people must be conditioned from birth to live in peace with their neighbors if the human race is to survive—although, exactly who will do the conditioning is never fully explained. Arthur C. Clarke and Buckminster Fuller take the position that property, both communal and private, will be an archaic concept in an age of transience, and universal mobility. Toffler also thinks that ownership and property are losing their meaning with built-in obsolescence, mass-produced throw-away items, rental rather than purchase of automobiles and housing, and the corresponding decline in materialistic permanence.

These are intriguing assertions, especially since they come from writers who have been imaginative visionaries in the field of technology and science. Fuller and Clarke, particularly, have been remarkably prescient in writing about such varied concepts as weather prediction, space travel, global communication satellites, fusion power, moving sidewalks, recycling, domed cities, etc...., years before anyone else decided they were practical. At this writing, New Jersey is looking into the feasibility of building a domed city according to Fuller's specifications—approximately thirty-five years after Fuller discussed the possibility in connection with New York City. When a few strong-willed individuals have been right so many times while virtually everyone else was dismissing them as incorrigible utopians, there is a tendency to take everything they say on faith once their ideas have been vindicated. In reality, however, their individualism and tenacity in the face of criticism puts the lie to their own statements concerning the obsolescence of choice, free will and individual determination.

It seems to me that we do someone, as well as ourselves, a disservice whenever we institutionalize him as an omniscient seer, oracle or harbinger of the future. Every new proposal, regardless of who is presenting it, deserves to be scrutinized on its own merits. The fully infallible man has not been invented yet, and chances are good that infallibility will continue to elude us long after immortality has become routine. The problem, when it comes to analyzing predictions, is to strike a happy balance between our natural tendency to demolish everyone who sounds original and creative, and to defy those who turn out to be right more frequently than not. We have to develop the ability to distinguish between the Jeanne Dixons and the Buckminster Fullers of the world—even the element of Jeanne Dixon residing within a Buckminster Fuller.

Although the various circumstances of life already men-
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long as he does so in a non-aggressive fashion. We may differ on what exactly constitutes an act of aggression. Some maintain that private ownership of a parcel of real estate is a “rip-off” which ought to be suppressed; others think pornography is an attack on the “moral climate” of the nation and ought not be available to the public. Between these extremes, however, most people can agree on a long host of issues which clearly fall into one category or another. Murder, assault, robbery, fraud, destruction of property, pollution are all obviously aggressive activities; gambling, the voluntary exchange of goods, the various forms of self-abuse and victimless acts are just as clearly non-aggressive. Even though honorable people may disagree over concrete issues, the abstract principles behind them remain constant nonetheless.

Consequently, when Alvin Toffler states that individual freedom is a pipe dream — when B. F. Skinner claims that free will and liberty is nonexistent because of environmental conditioning — what they are doing is speculating subjectively about certain conditions of contemporary life. It may well be (although neither author has succeeded in proving his theory) than man’s actions and decisions are predetermined by his conditioning and he is unable to exercise individual freedom in any real sense. It may also be true that built-in obsolescence and rental of commodities will change our ideas about property and ownership. But these are all descriptions of real or imagined social conditions, and have nothing whatsoever to do with the abstract principles of natural human rights. The axiom that man has a right to his freedom has not been called into question; even though honorable people may disagree over concrete issues, the abstract principles behind them remain constant nonetheless.

Both Toffler and Skinner go a step further, however, when they turn from speculation to advocacy journalism. Toffler talks about the obsolescence of present-day economic principles and political ideology. Since economics and politics are nothing more or less than the result of philosophical principles applied to concrete issues, Toffler is saying in effect that we need to develop a new metaphysics to help us deal with the world of the future. Where Toffler is somewhat circumspect, Skinner goes all the way and calls for the politicization of his behavioristic psychological theories. Not only does he speculate about man’s inability to function freely, he evidently wants a board of behavioral bureaucrats appointed to plan the kind of conditioning man will be subjected to. (With Ehrlich’s panel of experts determining the size of our population, a board of rabbis, priests and ministers telling us who will be frozen and who will die, and now Skinner’s corps of behavior determinists, the New Great Fair Society of today will look like a laissez faire paradise in comparison.)

While new scientific discoveries add to the body of knowledge available to man, it is difficult to foresee any developments requiring that we re-evaluate our natural rights as human beings. Specifically, it is matter how many people we freeze and bring back to life, how many cloning technologies and ecto-planes in the laboratory, how many cyborgs we manufacture, how many space ships we send toward the stars, how many diseases we learn to cure through biofeedback, and how many immortalists are walking the earth five hundred years from today. It will not alter the philosophical or practical test that arrangements are immoral and people have the right (even if not the ability) to go to heaven or hell in their own way. This principle is unchanging and will remain so until all intelligent life, whether it is flesh and blood or mostly machine, becomes extinct. It may be that struggles between “capitalism” and “socialism,” “individualism” and “collectivism” will die out as the years roll by; but this will be due to a change in terminology more than anything else. The distinctions between totalitarianism and freedom, between coercion and voluntarism, between repression and spontaneity will be with us for as long as some people try to exercise power over others. It makes little difference whether we call a free society socialist or capitalist, collectivist or individualist. Language is flexible while reality is not. Lables are unimportant, but concrete conditions are vital to everyone.

Looking at Future Shock merely as a speculative work, we find that Toffler’s predictions concerning free choice and liberty are refuted by some of his own technological projections. While he is telling us that freedom of choice is a “meaningless concept,” romantic rhetoric to the contrary, he goes on to state there will be more diversity in the near future through a proliferation of consumer goods and lifestyles and, consequently, more flexibility and options for everyone. He is telling us, simultaneously, that there will be more choices available in all areas of life, and that our ability to choose will be increasingly limited. Does he mean that Madison Avenue will become more adroit at molding public opinion and controlling consumer demands? Or that we will be paralyzed with indecision when faced with more than a small variety of alternatives? He does not tell us, unfortunately.

Logically, it would seem that man’s ability to use his power of choice assumes an added dimension with every increase in available alternatives. “Freedom,” “free will,” and “self-determination” had a strictly limited meaning when most people labored twelve and fourteen hours a day merely to feed and house themselves. A “free” man was still a slave to economic hardship. Even today, many people are required for the first time in history to spend half their waking hours at boring, dis-satisfying jobs just to buy necessities. In this respect we are more “free” than we were forty years ago, but it is a relative factor. In the kind of world Toffler is speaking of, however, where machines do all man’s drudgery for him, where today’s luxuries are mass-produced inexpensively for everyone, where moral codes, family structure and lifestyles are flexible and dynamic, total freedom becomes possible for the first time in history. Yet this is the world in which Toffler says individual freedom and choice will be a meaningless concept. If there is one way to free man from his present “conditioning” by hardship, drudgery and puritanical traditions it is through the technological advances and mobility which Toffler anticipates.

It is also difficult to understand how contemporary economic principles can ever become obsolete. An advanced economy depends upon the availability and exchange of goods. Since no society however affluent is totally self-sufficient, worldwide prosperity depends upon the mobility and transfer of goods as they are required from one society to the next. This will always be so unless we reach a day when each individual is capable of manufacturing all goods and services for himself, an unlikely if not impossible situation.

The economic options available in the future will be basically the same as they are today. Societies can either own goods in common, produce them collectively and close manage their distribution and exchange, or ownership, production and trade can be carried out privately in a free and fluid marketplace. There are, of course, many variations on these alternatives: nationalization; management without nationalization; domestic management with international laissez faire; national laissez faire and international management; one-world nationalization or management; one-world laissez faire; etc. . . . Even the colonization of other planets will not alter these conditions, for the same principles will apply to extraterrestrial societies as they develop. While honorable men can and probably will disagree among themselves as to what type of arrangement will produce the (Continued on page 6)
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busing, and called for black control of black education. This
is not only a stand that harmonizes with the anti-busing
whites (one faction at the Balck Convention actually called
for a Presidential ticket of Wallace-Chisholm) but ap-
proaches the libertarian position as well.

This is not to say that the libertarian could endorse
Wallace for the presidency; there are two major stumbling-
blocks — his ultra-hawkish attitude on Vietnam, and his
questionable financial behavior. But Wallace, as many of the
liberal Democrats have acknowledged, has raised the
issues that touch the hearts of the American
evoter, and he has raised them correctly; and no Democrat
primary has also put the boots to the candidacy of Wilbur
blocks who ignores this challenge and continues to talk in terms of
party. We are back to Square One.

But Wallace, in his own way, is a loser too, for he could
scarcely hope to be nominated by the national Democratic
party. We are back to Square One.

Mills. No observer has mentioned the fact, but the Florida
primary has also put the boots to the candidacy of Wilbur
Mills. In New Hampshire, he was a write-in candidate, but in Florida
he was on the ballot in a sympathetic, fellow-Southern state. Mills amassed
close to zero votes. Let us hear no more of Wilbur Mills, and let us be thankful.

Humphrey. The egregious gasbag, the old retread of the
Fair Deal — undoubtedly he is the second winner in Florida,
coming in after Wallace with 18% of the vote. The really
dismal feature of the voting is the recrudescence of Hubert.
No, no, not that! To top everything, Humphrey has lately
shucked off his dovish clothing and returned to the Vietnam
hawk he truly is. It is too much; another choice between
Humphrey and Nixon is too much for the human soul to
stomach. Furthermore, even if Hubert should win the nomi-
ination, which he might well do, the Democrat Left would,
and properly so, react in horror and mobilize a vengeance-
party — and all the more power to them. And so Hubert, in November, would be a hopeless loser too.

Jackson. Scoop also did fairly well in Florida, although 13%
of the vote hardly reflects a public clamor. Ideologi-

cally, though, Scoop is even worse than Humphrey; he
would be the "McBrook" Mr. Hyde to Professor Dolan's "Ashlosky". Scoop, furthermore, would be even more
likely to face an angry fourth party uprising — and so he too
would lose in November.

Chisholm. Shirley Chisholm, after campaigning long and
in Florida, and after claiming to be the living embodiment
of every black, Chicano, and female, got 4% of the vote.
Enough said.

McCarthy. It is true, again, that McCarthy did not
campaign in Florida. But he was on the ballot, after all, and
his nearly zero vote should be enough to end any possi-
bility of a McCarthy boomlet.

Yorty. Sam Yorty, with close to a zero vote dropped out.

Hartke. Vance Hartke supplied the comic relief of the
campaign. He had one billboard up in the state of Florida,
aboard that will go down in the history of American
politics. It read "WALLACE SUPPORTS HARTKE"; it was
only in tiny letters that the reader was informed that this
was not George, but Milton Wallace, Hartke's campaign
director. Milton Wallace brought Hartke, George, and
close to a zero vote. If anyone in the country exists who
happened to be worried about a "Hartke threat", he need
worry no longer.

And so there we have it, as sorry a lot as it has been
our misfortune to see in many a day. Where is our shining
knight to lead us? Where is the champion of the downtrodden? Where, indeed, for he is surely not on our list. It
begins to look as if there is one man, and one only, who
has the charisma, the magnetism, and the broad support in all
wings of the party and in all classes and ethnic groups

Recommended Reading

Rothbardian a.
Murray Rothbard has a dissection of the Value-
Added Tax in the conservative weekly Human Events
("The Value-Added Tax is Not the Answer", March 11.)
He also has a review of the Festschrift for F. A.
Hayek, Roads to Freedom, sketching the Austrian phil-
osophical position and praising the contributions of
Lachmann, Bauer, and Popper. (In the Political Science
Quarterly, March 1972.) There is also a free-swinging
and lengthy interview with Rothbard in the Feb. 25
issue of the new anarcho-objectivist fortnightly tabloid,
The New Banner (available in a special reprint for $9.00,
and for a year for $7.00, from The New Banner,
Box 1972, Columbia, S. C. 29202). Here Rothbard com-
ments on Ayn Rand, anarchism, political parties, the
New Left, strategy for libertarians, the movement, the
Friedmans — father-and-son, price controls, and many
other topics.

Banfield. One of the most brilliant books of the last couple
of years is Edward C. Banfield's The Unheavenly City,
now out in paperback (Little, Brown.) Banfield details
the destructive influence of government on urban eco-
nomics and urban society, and turns the Marxists neatly
on their head by pointing out that the major problem
with the poor is their "lower class" values and "lower
class" culture that most of them have adopted. The book
is a fine, ringing defense of the importance of what
have been much derided as "bourgeois values": thrift,
hard work, low time preference, foresight, rational pur-
pose, etc. No book in years has infuriated the Left as
has Banfield.

Ecology and all That. The libertarian answer has now
been provided for us on the ecology question, and by our own Edwin G. Dolan, in his paperback: ZANSTAAFL:
Economic Strategy for the Environmental Crisis (Holt,
Rinehart, and Winston). Here is a handy and brief reply
to the ecological Left — and written by someone who is
obviously personally fond of conservation and the great
outdoors! As a special lagniappe, also, this is the first
book to mention the Lib. Forum — specifically, Frank
Bubb's fine article on property rights and pollution.
Retreatism. Before our perfervid retreatists rush off to
a coral reef or an ocean platform, they might well stop
and consider a less quixotic solution — to live in one of
the Safe Places outlined by David and Holly Franke
in their best-selling book (Arlington House, 932 pp.,
$13.95). The Frankes unearthed 46 towns in the U. S.,
which enjoy low crime rates, low pollution, and low
taxes — and they describe them all in detail. Moreover,
the book is very handsomely produced, with hundreds of
charts, maps, and photographs.

"The freest form of government is only the least objec-
tionable form." — Herbert Spencer.
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best results (the same as with political institutions), the abstract principles underlying these issues remain constant: should man be free or controlled? should economic trade be free or managed?

Even concepts like ownership and property, which will grow obsolete according to Fuller and Clarke, will be subject to the same analysis. It seems to be true that we rent many goods today that were purchased yesterday, and the lifetime expectancy of most consumer items is far less than it used to be, but this doesn't change the nature of property and ownership per se. It only means there are fewer owners and more renters today than existed thirty years ago, and there are likely to be even fewer owners and more renters by the year 2000, present trends continuing. This may be what Clarke and Fuller mean to say, but in their enthusiasm for forecasting scientific developments they seem to be advocating a change in economic principles as well.

As for the kind of economic order we are heading toward? Latest indications are that, on the international level at least, we are evolving toward a freer market in trade and cooperation. It is becoming more and more difficult for a single nation to place restrictions on the free movement of goods across national boundaries. When that avowed "free trader," Richard Nixon, imposed a 10 percent surcharge on U.S. imports in 1971, it was the first serious attempt by a major country in a decade to derail the movement toward freer global trade that has been building since World War II. And it met with failure. The age when a superpower, however super it may be, can dictate self-protective economic policies to the rest of the world is now over. The new age is characterized by a more even balance of economic power distributed among the United States, the European Common Market, the Communist bloc, Japan, and the developing African and "Third World" nations.

In the closing days of 1971, twelve leading economists from various countries met in Washington, D.C. and unanimously recommended major changes in world economic policies. While each proposal was not pure laissez-faire, the general tone was certainly in favor of freer trade among nations. Among the list of recommendations to avoid "further economic and political crises" were: elimination of all remaining tariffs on industrial goods over a ten-year period; negotiations to limit high-price domestic policies which create food surpluses and lead to import barriers (ironically enough, while the United States was allegedly fighting inflation in 1971, Nixon was promising the farmers that the government would do all it could to keep food prices from falling too low); a gradual phasing out of agreements limiting free trade in steel, textiles and similar products; a reduced role for the U.S. dollar as a world reserve currency, and adoption of some form of fixed standard - possibly gold - to determine exchange rates. These proposals, coming as they did from the Brookings Institute and other liberal organizations, indicate a broader acceptance of free market systems. Even more pertinent is the fact that these economists acknowledged the relationship between restrictive trade policies and political turmoil, including war.

What is involved," said a spokesman for the group, "is the wider question of how the international community should organize itself. Differences between countries apart, world order will be notably prejudiced." The relationship between economic warfare and nationalistic militarism has been well catalogued by both revisionist historians and libertarian scholars during the past twenty years. Now this kinship is more generally accepted, and with this new awareness will come a broad-based movement toward a free global marketplace. What we are witnessing in the world today is a new adoption of a new metaphysics and new economic principles but, instead, the vindication of basic libertarian principles as they apply to all areas of human intercourse. These principles are emerging by default as authoritarian institutions decay and fall along the wayside on our march toward a civilized world community.

The Conservation Question
By Gerald P. O'Priscoii, Jr.

During a fight over "saving" a cluster of redwoods, Ronald Reagan is reported to have remarked that "If you've seen one, you've seen them all." Needless to say, the good governor was roundly berated for his callousness. Yet there was some truth in what the governor had to say. One wonders whether the more extreme (consistent?) members of the conservation lobby would have us save every last tree, plant, and relictive fiddle from extinction, no matter what the cost. There is some question whether the early American colonists would have ever gotten off the boats if there had been an incipient Sierra Club in the 17th century. After all, to have felled a tree, or killed a turkey would have been to upset the ecology of the continent. All the other species and creatures of the earth are supposed to be permitted to run loose, preying on their natural enemies, consuming natural resources, etc., but man is supposed to recriminate about what he does in order to survive, and sometimes, advance his standard of living. Nature, too, destroys, but this is often overlooked in all the blather from conservationists. In fact, man is, in one important respect, at a disadvantage vis à vis other animals; he does not possess instincts to insures his survival. Man must rely on his reason, and his ability to conquer natural forces in order to survive. There is no question that in the process man destroys forests, fouls streams, and, yes, exterminates whole species of other animals. So what? Species have disappeared quite independently of any action by man, as have forests. We are constantly reminded by ecologists that man is part of nature, yet when he does what every other species does — grow and expand at the expense of other species — his actions are condemned as unharmonic with, and destructive of nature. In fact, the truth is precisely the opposite. It is in man's nature to control and subdue what are termed "natural forces," to build "artificial" dwelling places, precisely because, if he does not, man will not survive. Like it or not, there is a struggle in nature for the world's scarce resources, and if men do not use their unique talents, these resources will go to the ants and elephants. Then, surely, there will be a return to pristine nature; no man, however, will be there to appreciate it. Less we forget, the business of man is man, and this does not necessarily imply that either the number or the comfort of seals and alligators should be maximized.

Of course, my quip about the early colonists was silly. There were no conservationists among the colonists for a very good reason. People who have to confront nature on a day to day basis are not given to waxing eloquent about the joys of same. The sunrise on a desert may be beautiful to the middle class urban dweller, but it spells frost and ruin to the citrus grower. A winter scene in the Rockies makes for the rancher. Nature is beautiful to those who can choose the place to retreat to after they have dabbled in pioneer life. It was feared that too fast a depletion of the nation's resources would lead to economic stagnation and decline, and that for a variety of reasons, it was doubted (Continued on page 7)
Some economists have argued that such amenities are so-called "collective consumption goods", and must, therefore, be provided by the government. Besides the fact that the conclusion doesn't even follow given the collective good assumption, the assumption is wrong. We do not see much evidence of a visit to a state park, a drive through the country, or a picnic on a scenic overlook. But such assets are reproducible, and, in fact, have been growing steadily as state parks and other public and private facilities have grown to be provided by the government. Besides the fact that the government's laxity in enforcing the pollution law will take a new turn, recognizing a principle that would be the cornerstone of any libertarian legal code: that people shall not be deprived of their persons or property without due process.  


2For a statistical mathematical argument that at least one state government (California) has actually supplied fewer parks and campgrounds than would be supplied on the free market, see Gordon Brown, Jr., "Pricing Seasonal Recreation Services," Western Economic Journal, IX, No. 2 (June, 1971), 218-25.

3It is often assumed that the federally operated recreation network is redistributive. Lower income groups by and large receive no benefit from such services. The 1959 study of Wilderness Areas in California found that the average income of wilderness campers was over $10,000 compared to a U.S. average annual income of about $6,000 (think of all the expensive, specific capital required for camping). To the extent that taxes from lower income groups support the national parks and forests, it is these groups who are subsidizing upper middle class consumers of amenities.


THE STATE

The harpies attack
Snitching from blind masses' places,
Screeching platitudes.  --Jack Wright

This was the American Dream: a sanctuary on earth for individual man: a condition in which he could be free not only of the old established closed-corporation hierarchies of arbitrary power which had oppressed him as a mass, but free of that mass into which the hierarchies of church and state had compressed and held him individually thrilled and individually impotent.  --William Faulkner.
Short People, Arise!

Surely, one of the most imbecilic movements of our time is the drive to secure pro rata quotas everywhere for various "minority groups." Academic departments in universities are being assaulted, by the government as well by propaganda, for not assuring their quotal "rights" to "minorities" now illogically defined as women, blacks, Caicanos, and youth. And every state delegation to the Democratic convention is supposed to have its assigned women-black-Chicano-youth quota, or the godswill descend in their wrath. The full absurdity of this hoopla has gone undetected because not fully and totally applied. Why aren't Irish, Italians, Albanians, Poles, Mormons, etc., assured their quotas in the Pantheon? Are we to have endless legal challenges, for example, because the Alabama delegation doesn't have enough one-legged Swedes, or because Harvard University doesn't employ enough Polish Catholics? And, of course, no one seems to mention which ethnic or whatever groups will have to be dumped and lose their jobs to accommodate the rising minorities. Which groups are over their assigned quotas?

All this was highlighted some months ago when J. K. Galbraith called on all corporations to hire blacks as top executives, in proportion to their number in the total population, and to go further, to hire them in proportion to the surrounding population in their immediate geographic area. Father Andrew Greeley, the highly intelligent conservative sociologist, countered to ask whether Galbraith is prepared to give up his post at Harvard, and to call upon Harvard to hire Irish Catholic academics in proportion to their share of the population in the Boston area. Touché!

As long as all the various "oppressed minority" groups are getting into the act, I would like to put in a plea for another, unsung, oppressed minority: short people. We "shorts," I have long believed, are the first to be fired and the last to be hired; our median income is far below the income of the "talls", and where in blazes are the short courses, stop internalizing the age-old propaganda by the tall-conspiracy. Look how "shorts" are treated: people are "short-sighted, short-changed, short-handed," and short in cash. Feldman also declared that shorts have played romantic leads? (Some, like Alan Ladd, were short, but his shortness was always cunningly disguised by the bigoted movie moguls, e.g. Ladd stood on a box in the love scenes.) Feldman also pointed out the subtle corruption of our language (presumably as engineered by the tall-conspiracy). Look how "shorts" are treated: people are "short-sighted, short-changed, short-circuited, and short in cash". Feldman also declared that when two people run for President, the taller is almost invariably elected.

OK, short people: we now have the ineluctable findings of statistical science to bolster our qualitative folk-wisdom. Short people of the world, arise! Demand your rights! You have nothing to lose but you elevator shoes!

Oh, one final note: short liberation, we must all realize, does not in any way mean an anti-tall movement. Despite the age-old tyranny of the tall, we are out to liberate all people, short and tall alike. Consciousness-raising groups for guilt-ridden tall sympathizers with our movement are now in order.

"The word state is identical with the word war. Each state tries to weaken and ruin another in order to force upon that other its laws, its policies and its commerce, and to enrich itself thereby."

---P. A. Kropotkin
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