

all human liberty have been the primary results.

The "Service State"

Dean Roscoe Pound of the Harvard Law School coined the phrase "Service State" to describe the assumption of all political and economic functions by centralized government. In such a "Service State" a subtle change has occurred in the meaning of the word freedom. As Professor Hayek phrases it: "To the great apostles of political freedom the word had meant freedom from coercion, freedom from the arbitrary power of other men, release from the ties which left the individual no choice but obedience to the orders of a superior to whom he was attached. The new freedom promised, however, was to be freedom from necessity, release from the compulsion of the circumstances which inevitably limit the range of choice of all of us..."⁷

If this definition of the Service State seems hard, let a new-styled "Liberal" of impeccable credentials state the case for us. Senator Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania

puts it plainly: "To lay a ghost at the outset and dismiss semantics, a Liberal is here defined as one who believes in utilizing the full force of government for the advancement of social, political, and economic justice at the municipal, state, national, and international level."⁸ No wonder the federal system seems so limited in its objectives and its means to people with such ambitions!

A member of the Atlee cabinet in the socialist government of England a few years ago, Mr. P. C. Gordon Walker, published a book entitled, *Restatement of Liberty*. It epitomizes much of the present thinking that has received wide acceptance on both sides of the Atlantic: "The new State will also directly augment authority and social pressure by new powers of punishment and compulsion. So far from withering away, as in theory both the individualist and the total State should, the new State, if it is to bring into being and serve a better society, must create new offenses and punish them." A restatement of liberty, indeed! ♦

⁷ Frederick Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944), pp. 25-26.

⁸ Joseph Clark, "Can the Liberals Rally?" *Atlantic Monthly*, July, 1953, p. 27.

A concluding article to appear next month will deal with the future of American Federalism.

The Buckley Campaign

IN 1886 HENRY GEORGE, the Single Taxer, ran for Mayor of New York. He lost. But to this day that particular election year in New York City history is known as the year of the "Henry George campaign." Only the most historically learned of men will recall at this date that the winner in 1886 was a man named Abram Hewitt.

The reason why George is remembered and Hewitt forgotten is that Henry George, right or wrong, stood for something. Prophecies are chancy, but I would be willing to bet a good sum, with a view to collecting or paying off in Heaven, that the 1965 New York mayoral campaign will be more or less bracketed with that of 1886. The third-place loser, William F. Buckley, Jr., will be remembered because he stood for something. John Lindsay, the winner, will be a name for the more esoteric historians. And these historians will have to look him up in Bill Buckley's own story of the 1965 campaign, *The Unmaking of a Mayor* (Viking, \$6.95).

Bill Buckley, of course, has never written a *Progress and Poverty*. But he, as much as anybody else, has recreated conservative journal-

ism in the United States as a force. When modern "liberalism" has finally revealed its impotence to solve the pressing problems of the modern world, Mr. Buckley will stand out as a leader among those who really knew what was the matter. So 1965 will be recalled in New York as the year of the "Buckley campaign." Lindsay, like Abram Hewitt, will tend to fade into the shadows.

Buckley's book about his campaign is interesting because the author talked sense to the voters and now writes about his experience with the same witty aplomb that characterized his political fencing. But the really astounding thing about Bill Buckley is not so much that he talked sense but that he actually made it fashionable to bring intelligence to bear on the problems he threw in John Lindsay's face.

This matter of making a cause fashionable is of crucial importance. For what is it that makes modern "liberalism" hang on? "Liberalism" can't feed people, for it knows nothing about the individual wellsprings of plenty. It can't stop wars, for it hasn't the least