works of mercy. As personalists, as an unincorporated group, we will not apply for this 'privilege'. . . ."

Brothel Accused of Bias
The Cottontail Ranch, a legal brothel in Esmeralda County, Nevada, has been accused of violating the civil rights of a potential customer who was refused service at the brothel because of his race. The owner of the ranch said of the matter: "Ridiculous, a bordello should have a choice in who they entertain. And, after all, everyone should have the right to decide who to go to bed with. . . ."

And That's the Whole Truth
From Hounslow, England comes word that Mayor Michael Flattery, deciding that flattery was out of date and getting him nowhere, has chucked the medieval robes of his office and instructed members of the town council to quit calling him "Your Worship." ⊖

Childs
Continued from 8

pansionistic in the purely colonial sense, however) were in error. We hold that the beliefs of F.D.R. and his key advisors in this regard were as erroneous and Statist as his other economic ideas, manifested in the domestic policies of his administration throughout the 1930's.

Looking out at the world with this belief, with the view that expanded markets were a necessity for American prosperity to continue, these leaders were faced, according to the revisionists, with several problems. They were faced with a powerful Left which had arisen throughout the world, in response to the problems generated by decades of war and depression, by the economic and political chaos generated by Statism. This left was often not connected to the Soviet Union at all, and its actions in numerous countries, from Eastern Europe to Asia, from Tito to Mao, were often not supported, and were in some cases actually *opposed* by Stalin, who was himself wary of threats to stability, the status quo, and the alliance with Britain and the U.S.—all of which were ever so tenuous.

They were also faced, in their desire for markets and stability, not only with the protectionist blocs which had developed in the previous decades, but with massive political and economic instability in Europe, Asia and elsewhere. They thought that expanding trade was possible only with this instability being brought under control, and accordingly acted to stabilize existing regimes, or likely contenders for the role of stable rulers, regardless of these regimes' commitments to liberty or the lack thereof.

This in turn brought them into conflict not only with all the other protectionist blocs throughout the world, including Britain, but with most of the Left as well, non-communist and communist alike. (Remember that the term "Left" in most of Europe meant, and still means, any political ideology which is anti-establishment, which establishment was feudalistic, monarchistic, and fascistic from 1920 on—to say nothing of its Statist nature *before* the first world war). The American leaders also made it a matter of *public policy* to regard *any* actions by the Left anywhere in the world as being under the dominance, control and responsibility of the Soviet Union, regardless of how severely this conflicted with the facts of most contexts.

Now by this revisionist-libertarian interpretation, the Cold War *is* the process of the U.S. confronting growing revolutionary and nationalistic movements, communist and non-communist, and often does not have anything to do with the Soviet Union, at least not directly or in terms of essentials. It is this fact which has brought Gabriel Kolko to ask perceptively, in his *The Limits of Power*, whether or not American foreign policy or world history would have been drastically different from 1945 on had the Soviet Union not existed. Kolko believes, as do I, that the answer is no.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union, by this analysis, has been essentially nationalistic in character, not a consequence of communist ideology, and has been formulated largely *in response* to U.S. foreign policy initiated under Roosevelt and Truman. The tragic stories of both Korea and Vietnam are consequences of this as well.

By this interpretation, *the U.S. is primarily responsible for generating and sustaining the Cold War*, although not exclusively responsible.

Now what are the consequences of this view for isolationism and conservatism? What, in libertarian-revisionist perspective, should the U.S. have done, then and now? Simply put, the U.S. should have pursued a policy of pure military and political *isolationism*. Isolationism, in this context, means that the government or the State as such (apart from private citizens) should take no actions outside of its borders, should have no tariffs or other trade restrictions, should undertake military measures at best only in the event of a direct attack upon or invasion of the United States. It should have no alliances with other governments, particularly alliances which would involve the U.S. in the defense of other nations.

The principles behind such a policy of isolationism are complex, but involve at the barest minimum the principle that the State should restrict its violence *at least* within its borders, where it can at least, in a positivistic fashion, be said to have some kind of jurisdiction or authority. (Whether or not it has any *legitimate* authority or jurisdiction even within its borders is another matter). Also, recognizing that many businessmen will choose to deal with citizens and governments of other countries, the American government should allow this, with no restrictions whatever, but *at their own risk and expense*. There should be no subsidy or insurance of trade or investment. Those businessmen and other citizens have the right to trade with foreigners, but they have no right to expect the American government to risk military conflict with other nations in order to protect their risks. In particular, they have no right to expect the American government to tax and conscript American citizens to protect their tenuous property in other countries. (The touchy issue of what happens when American businessmen get involved in the domestic Statism of other countries will not be considered here, for reasons of space).

Two alternative arguments for interventionism should be briefly dealt with. One is that we should become involved, militarily in the affairs of other nations in order to protect and defend the liberty of others. The second is that we should become involved in order to secure a supply of natural resources. The first is easily refuted, since Americans have no obligation to take positive actions to secure the liberty or well-being of anyone else. They have only the negative obligation not to violate the rights of foreigners themselves, which means not to impose trade restrictions, not to wage war, and so forth. If Americans on an individual basis choose to help others defend their rights, then they should be allowed to do so—but again, at their own risk and expense, without jeopardizing the lives and liberty of other Americans. By the very nature of war, individuals responsible for initiating violence cannot be pinpointed, stopped and punished, and mass retaliation has become a modern commonplace. Therefore, no one should take it upon himself to risk involving not only his own life and wealth in support of the liberty of foreigners, but the lives and wealth of others. These are not his to dispose of. A corollary point is that when Americans enter on such alleged "crusades" they are likely to do more harm than good.

The second argument for intervention is also fallacious. The only context in which any nation has not been able to *purchase* raw materials and other goods from other nations (individuals in other nations) has been, historically, when the government of the first nation imposed trade restrictions, to which the second government responded. Historically, there is no reason to assume that the U.S., divested of control of other countries, could not continue to purchase the materials that it needs, and no reason why other nations would stop selling materials to the U.S. Since these nations are usually in need of trade and American products, the only context in which they might refuse to trade is if the U.S. posed a military threat, which would not be the case with an isolationistic foreign policy. Therefore, there is neither a need nor a justification for interventionism on the grounds of guaranteeing supplies of natural resources. In any case, limitations on natural resources can only become a critical problem when the free market is interfered with by manipulating the price system, and higher prices which might result from having to buy goods and resources from other nations would be more than offset, on an individual level, with the reduction in taxes which could follow an isolationistic foreign policy.

Thus isolationism is the proper military and political position to take, and U.S. forces should now be withdrawn from every nation, including Vietnam. Economically, of course, there should be no restrictions on anyone's right to trade property which he justly owns. The final argument for interventionism which rests on the supposed obligation of treaties can, finally, be dispensed with as well. Morally and politically, the efficacy and obligation of contract is the only base from which the obligations to conform to treaties can be derived. Therefore, all treaties made by the U.S. government which are of the nature of a promise to intervene in other countries in the event of X event are null and void. They are null and void first because the U.S. government possesses no right whatever to bind the lives and property of Americans to anything without their explicit and individual consent. Secondly, most of these are agreements to defend not the people of a specific country, but its government. Since in all such countries the governments are not legitimate, any contract or treaty to defend them is likewise not legitimate. In other words, just as the national debt should be repudiated (unless government property can be sold to pay it) because the government had no moral right to commit the property of other people to pay for it, so also the government had no moral right to commit the lives and property of other citizens who did not explicitly and voluntarily consent to treaties. Since the government has no right to extract, by force and intimidation, the means to carry out these illegitimate commitments, this means that the commitments are null and void, except insofar as those in the government, and their supporters, choose to support them with the property and wealth that they justly own.

What, finally, about the Cold War itself, and the American defense program? By this analysis, the Soviet Union cannot rationally be considered to be a military threat to the U.S. This means that the alleged justification for the massive redistribution of property perpetrated under the label of "defense" is no justification at all, and that therefore the defense establishment should be radicaaly disassembled (though not, by this analysis, completely disassembled) through the most fundamental means: cutting off most of its funds. A depression would ensue, during which those malinvestments made because of Statism could be liquidated, but afterwards the U.S. would be able to return to a relatively free economy. Far more dislocations are perpetrated today on the American economic system in the name of "defense" than of practically anything else. Of course I object to welfare too, but that is outside the scope of this discussion and the scope of my dispute with conservatism.

These brief remarks have been intended to offer, in outline form, the reasons why I think conservatism has gone seriously astray in the name of the free market and "national security." I hope that it will suggest a different course that conservatives may take, a different analysis of events, and that, in the future, conservatives will consider putting their ideology and policies on the right course—after considering seriously the tenets of revisionism and the principles of isolationism.

To massively redistribute wealth—in the name of defense against those who propose to redistribute wealth—would be a little funny, if it weren't so obscene. I am proposing to American conservatives that perhaps, just *perhaps*, they are promoting the very things they claim to despise. Revisionism, while not flawless, offers a vitally important way out of the maze conservatives have created for themselves over the last fifteen years. ⊖

LeFevre
Continued from 9

to change the world for everyone else. They seem to feel that if only *they* can get enough power, under *their* leaderwhip all will come right.

I am rather favorably impressed with the arguments of Lysander Spooner when he contended that no man can rightfully act with arbitrary power over another man, for each man has only those rights and powers which nature has vouchsafed to him, along with everyone else. Further, all that majority-seeking solutions provide for is a shift in power, and not a diminution of power.

There is another point, which Spooner neglects, that could be mentioned here. It deals with the question of agency. Spooner does bring out the fact that a secret government is one that hides behind a secret ballot in which no man selected by the process can possibly show who his principals are. And being unable to show who his principals are, or consequently to show that anyone either attempted or pretended to grant him agency powers, he has, in fact, no power but his own. And having, of right, no such power of his own, he is, as Spooner puts it, "both in law and reason, a naked usurper." But there is more.

The factor of agency is an individual one. It is clearly quite proper, both legally and morally, for a person to agree to act for his principal, and for his principal to grant him the power to act for him. But it has long been an accepted notion, both in law and reason, that no one person can act as an agent for two or more persons who, at the moment of agency, have conflicting interests. If any person presumes to act as an agent for two different persons having conflicting interests, it is clear that such a person must of necessity be engaged in defrauding at least one of the persons he claims to be an agent for. In the private sector, should such an agent appear, he would be hailed into court, tried, and convicted for fraudulent behavior.

Now it appears that certain libertarians have the view that if only they can get enough power, through the popular voting process, then they can just as readily be the agent of all, even as those whose actions they detest now claim such agency. But since it is easily predictable, as in the Prattsburg case, that there is a divergence of interest, no one man can possibly act as an agent for all of these persons without defrauding at least the minority.

Thus, the call for libertarians to unite in political action is a call upon them to take on the mantle of those who are defrauding them at the moment, under the guise that unbridled power in their hands will be sweeter and more acceptable than the same kind of power in the hands of others.

If the libertarian movement has merit, it relates to the emergence, which it sponsors, of an individualistic morality in which each individual is responsible for himself and is the owner and controller of his own life and property. The fundamental of libertarianism is that power cannot rightfully be used to impose on the individual's rights over himself and what is his. To argue that we must gain power over those who disagree is to argue that there is no practicality to the morality of the libertarian movement. And if that is true, why should anyone care to be a libertarian?

Isn't the call to political action simply another instance of the age-old practice: the end justifies the means?

To me, the problem is summed up in the recognition that libertarians seeking political power are merely collectivists, under another name. They propose, not to serve liberty, but to serve power. They want the power to impose liberty upon those who neither understand nor value it. It is, as I have said before, the dilemma of Rousseau when he stated in his "Social Contract" that freedom is so important that "we shall force men to be free."

I submit that to force freedom is morally and logically impossible. ⊖

Rossetto Lehr
Continued from 11

in America, one example of which is the present debate over the Calley verdict. The nagging doubt that Nuremberg represented only "victor's justice," that only those who were unfortunate enough to have lost the war were tried, only emphasizes the desire to condemn all clearly demonstrated immoral acts, even those of the United States. Indeed, as the U.S. Prosecutor at Nuremberg, Robert Jackson, put it: "If certain acts and violations of treaties are crimes, they are crimes whether the United States does them or whether Germany does them. We are not prepared to lay down a rule of criminal conduct which we would not be willing to have invoked against us."

Invoking the Nuremberg precepts against the United States, however, does provide a basis for the charge of "victor's justice." The history of the United States government, both before and since Nuremberg, is studded with incidents and policies which, on the basis of the Nuremberg decisions, can only be considered criminal.

Particular atrocities, although generally ignored, appear repeatedly in the record of United States military activities. For instance, three years after exacting a treaty in 1832 expelling the Cherokee nation from its gold-rich land in Georgia, General Winfield Scott was dispatched with 7000 troops to forceably remove the Indians. Scott's men herded Cherokee men, women, and children into concentration camps, allowed white camp-followers to seize livestock, household good, and farm implements, and usually burned Indian homes to the ground. Following this, Scott forced the Indians to undertake a long forced-march to Arkansas. One Kentucky eye-witness reported, "Even aged females, apparently nearly ready to drop into the grave, were travelling with heavy burdens attached to their backs, sometimes on frozen ground, sometimes on muddy streets with no covering for their feet." Fourteen thousand Cherokees followed this "Trail of Tears"—four thousand were dead at its conclusion.

Virtually all of America's wars are tainted by atrocities, most of which have gone un-