



# 1

## What Is 'Hayek'?

Robert Leeson

### **'The Victory of Fascism in a Number of Countries Is Only an Episode in the Long History of Struggles over the Problem of Property.'**

From campfire 'Dreamtime' through seventeenth century witch-burning to flying planes into the World Trade Centre, religious 'knowledge' has defined the structure of human thought—either through oral traditions or through sacred texts such as Heinrich Kramer's *Malleus Maleficarum* ('Hammer of the Witches'). Although the Enlightenment promoted secular objectives within the residual context of these structures, 'Church' became increasingly separated from 'State.' In the physical universe, 'God' was no longer required (by scientists, at least) to explain 'order'; while in

---

R. Leeson (✉)

Department of Economics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA  
Notre Dame Australia University, Fremantle, Australia

© The Author(s) 2017

R. Leeson (ed.), *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography*, Archival Insights into the Evolution of Economics, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-60708-5\_1

the social universe, religion appeared to be retreating to the sphere of private belief. After almost 120 years of taking up arms against fellow Christians (1517–1648), the intellectual structure of the quasi-religious ‘Invisible Hand’—which explained and promoted social harmony—created the *economic* foundations of Classical Liberalism.

*Political* Classical Liberalism developed simultaneously. In the seventeenth century, the arrow of service was reversed—at least intellectually. The feudal order maintained that both Emperor and Pope were God’s (often feuding) representatives; but after the Reformation, the divine right of kings promoted the service of ‘God’ through ‘His’ representative: the nation-based King and Church. In the seventeenth-century England, the House of Stuart lost its head (Charles I), was replaced by a Republic and then by a quasi-hereditary monarchy (the ‘Lord Protector’), and then *invited* to return as constitutional rather than divine monarchs. When the death-bed Catholic Charles II was succeeded by the Catholic James II (who then fathered a son and heir), two Tories and five Whigs (the ‘Immortal Seven’) wrote the 1688 ‘Invitation to William,’ the Dutch *Stadtholder*, inviting him to invade. James II (1633–1701) thus kept his faith but lost ‘his’ property (throne)—two of his daughters reigned in his place: Mary II (1689–1694) and Anne (1702–1714).

Anne’s closest Protestant relative was then chosen to become George I (1714–1727)—of a diminished monarchy: Britain began the transition to the system of ‘Prime-Minister-in cabinet,’ not regal, government. Sir Robert Walpole (1676–1745) is generally regarded as the *de facto* first prime minister (1721–1742); and two centuries later—as Friedrich ‘von’ Hayek (1978) bemoaned that post-Habsburg Austria was governed by democracy—‘a republic of peasants and workers’<sup>1</sup>—Ramsey MacDonald (1866–1937), the illegitimate son of a farm labourer and a housemaid, became the 43rd and 45th British prime minister (1924, 1931–1935).

In the sixteenth century, the King of Spain and Habsburg Holy Roman Emperor of the First Reich, Charles V, ‘inherited’ the Burgundian Netherlands and became the sole feudal overlord—the *Stadtholder* represented *his* interests. After the 1581 Dutch Revolt, the *Stadtholder* (which continued only in the Republic of the Seven United Netherlands) became the highest executive official, appointed by the States of each Province. To reinforce this expectation, the English Parliament presented to the victo-

rious William and his wife Mary, the Bill of Rights—which limited the powers of the monarch and specified the rights of Parliament (including the requirement for regular parliaments, free elections, and freedom of speech in Parliament).

In 1607, the British Empire began in Jamestown, named after James I, the first Stuart King, capital of the colony of Virginia (1616–1699); but in 1688, his grandson, James II, fled to become a pensioner of the absolutist Bourbon Sun King of France, Louis XIV (reigned 1643–1715). In 1614, Louis XIII (reigned 1610–1643) had called a Parliament; his son is attributed with the phrase '*L'état, c'est moi.*'; and after his grandson Louis XV's reign (1715–1774), his great-grandson became Louis XVI (reigned 1774–1791). These four Kings could have ruled France for two centuries—had there been more deference towards superstition: what Hayek (1978) praised as the 'traditional element, the element of surrounding rules.'<sup>2</sup> His family had been elevated from the Third to the Second Estate in 1789—an inauspicious year for the nobility.

Louis XV's mistress, Madame de Pompadour, is attributed with the phrase '*Après nous, le déluge.*' Hayek (1978) described both the *déluge* that washed away the legal basis of Habsburg inherited titles and privileges and the 'intellectual activity' to which he devoted his life: 'The whole traditional concept of aristocracy, of which I have a certain conception—I have moved, to some extent, in aristocratic circles, and I like their style of life.' The 'Great' War between the dynasties undermined the 'spontaneous' order: 'The tradition died very largely; it died particularly in my native town Vienna, which was one of the great cultural and political centers of Europe but became the capital of a republic of peasants and workers afterwards. While, curiously enough, this is the same as we're now watching in England, the intellectual activity survives this decay for some time.'<sup>3</sup>

In March 1917, Nicholas II, the Emperor of Russia, was forced to abdicate. In the same month, Kaiser Wilhelm II's *Gotha G.IV* began bombing London: on 17 July 1917, King George V changed the name to his 'House' from 'Saxe-Coburg and Gotha' to 'Windsor.' Hayek (1978) reflected: 'Once I got to England, it was just a temperamental similarity. I felt at home among the English because of a similar temperament. This, of course, is not a general feeling, but I think most Austrians I know who have lived in England are acclimatized extraordinarily easily. There must

be some similarity of traditions, because I don't easily adapt to other countries.' Four years after the demise of the Habsburgs, Hayek left the 'republic of peasants and workers' for another republic: 'I had been in America before I ever came to England, I was here as a graduate student in '23 and '24, and although I found it extremely stimulating and even knew I could have started on in an assistantship or something for an economic career, I didn't want to. I still was too much a European and didn't the least feel that I belonged to this society. But at the moment I arrived in England, I belonged to it.'<sup>4</sup>

A few years later, Hayek told Bartley that his love affair with England had begun in America in 1923–1924: 'It was then that I discovered my sympathy with the British approach, a country I did not yet know but whose literature increasingly captivated me. It was this experience which, before I had ever set foot on English soil, converted me to a thoroughly English view on moral and political matters, which at once made me feel at home when I later first visited England three and a half years later.... In the sense of that Gladstonian liberalism, I am much more English than the English' (cited by Caldwell 2008, 690–691).

According to Hayek (1997 [1949], 224), there was a crucial distinction between the 'real scholar or expert and the practical man of affairs' and non-propertyed intellectuals, who were a 'fairly new phenomenon of history,' and whose low ascribed status deprived them of what Hayek regarded as a central qualification: 'experience of the working of the economic system which the administration of property gives.' This led Hayek (1978) to complain about the 'intellectual influence' of those who challenged *his* 'civilisation': 'On the one hand, people no longer learned the old rules; on the other hand, this sort of Cartesian rationalism, which told them don't accept anything which you do not understand.' These two effects 'collaborated and this produced the present situation where there is already a lack of the supporting moral beliefs that are required to maintain *our* [emphasis added] civilization. I have some—I must admit—slight hope that if we can refute the intellectual influence, people may again be prepared to recognize that the traditional rules, after all, had some value.'<sup>5</sup>

Those who promote religion see the world as a battle between God and the Devil; Hayek (1992a [1977]) saw the social universe as a battle

between superstitions: 'The gold standard was based on what was essentially an irrational superstition. As long as people believed there was no salvation but the gold standard, the thing could work. That illusion or superstition has been lost. We now can never successfully run a gold standard. I wish we could. It's largely as a result of this that I have been thinking of alternatives.' In his September 1984 closing address to the Mont Pelerin Society, Hayek put 'superstition' into a 'more effective form':

we owe *our* [emphasis added] civilization to beliefs which I have sometimes have offended some people by calling 'superstitions' and which I now prefer to call 'symbolic truths.' (Cited by Leeson 2013, 197)

Hayek (1978) told James Buchanan that Ludwig 'von' Mises had 'great influence on me, but I always differed, first not consciously and now quite consciously. Mises was a rationalist utilitarian, and I am not. He trusted the intelligent insight of people pursuing their known goals, rather disregarding the traditional element, the element of surrounding rules.'<sup>6</sup> Hayek (1978) was in a

curious conflict because I have very strong positive feelings on the need of an 'un-understood' moral tradition, but all the factual assertions of religion, which are crude because they all believe in ghosts of some kind, have become completely unintelligible to me. I can never sympathize with it, still less explain it. In spite of these strong views I have, I've never publicly argued against religion because I agree that probably most people need it. It's probably the only way in which certain things, certain traditions, can be maintained which are essential ... I don't believe a word of it. [laughter]<sup>7</sup>

Through 'selective evolution'—marrying cousins—the Habsburgs became 'ghosts' (extinct) before the Hayeks had been enrolled in their intergenerational entitlement programme. Hayek's (1978) 'latest development' was 'the insight that we largely had learned certain practices which were efficient without really understanding why we did it; so that it was wrong to interpret the economic system on the basis of rational action. It was probably much truer that we had learned certain rules of conduct which were traditional in our society. As for why we did, there was a

problem of selective evolution rather than rational construction.<sup>8</sup> Louis XIV's court preacher, Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet (1627–1704), described one of these traditional rules: 'I do not call majesty that pomp which surrounds kings or that exterior magnificence which dazzles the vulgar. That is but the reflection of majesty and not majesty itself. Majesty is the image of the grandeur of God in the Prince' (cited by Snyder 1967, 122).

In 1791, Louis XVI and his Queen, Marie Antoinette (Archduchess of Austria, child of Empress Maria Theresa and Francis I, Holy Roman Emperor) fled Paris, hoping to reach the Austrian border. Bourbon support for the American Revolution had created a financial crisis which necessitated the calling of a Parliament (for the first time since 1614) which resulted in the major part of regal executive authority being transferred to elected representatives. And in the United States, the Bill of Rights (1789–1791) extended its English 1689 precursor to colonial 'rebels' and their 'treasonous' Parliament.

*Political* Classical Liberalism came to mean the belief that the State should serve—exist for the benefit of—the individual. In the twentieth century, attempts were made to re-reverse the arrow of service a revival of through divine right: of ayatollahs; of the State and the Party—absolutist monarchs, Adolf Hitler and Joseph Stalin; and of 'The Free Market'—producer-funded political operatives, 'von' Hayek, 'von' Mises, Alisa Zinov'yevna Rosenbaum ('Ayn Rand') and Murray Rothbard. Ayatollahs typically rule (or seek to rule) where—to protect 'their' property—the oil industry, supported by the CIA and the British and French 'intelligence' services, had subverted the development of *political* liberalism. Coincidentally, perhaps, Hayek, Hitler and Mises were born under the House of Habsburg; Stalin and Rand were born under the House of Romanov; and had Rothbard's Jewish-born parents not migrated (to the United States) they would probably have been killed in the Holocaust of the successor State (the Third Reich) to the Habsburgs and Hohenzollerns.

Communities in which 'legitimate' and 'definitive'—but bogus—'knowledge' is produced and consumed invite scholarly investigation. The Austrian William A. Paton—who orchestrated the McCarthyite campaign to block Lawrence Klein's promotion at the University of Michigan—is described by the Jewish-born E. Roy Weintraub as 'certainly no Austrian' (Society for the History of Economics, SHOE 4 June

2014). Weintraub's 'knowledge' collaborator was his fellow History of Economics Society (HES) president Bruce Caldwell—'free' market monopolist of the Hayek Archives and Paton's fellow member of the Mont Pelerin Society—who has devoted his career to constructing a protective belt around Hayek and his 'spontaneous' order. The anti-Semitic Hayek is an HES Distinguished Fellow; and Caldwell and Leonidas Montes' academically unpublishable 'Friedrich Hayek and His Visits to Chile'—published un-refereed in the 'referred,' Rothbard-founded, Boettke-edited, *Review of Austrian Economics* (2014a, b, 2015)—was awarded the 2016 HES 'best article award prize.'<sup>9</sup>

Hayek (28 August 1975) was obliged to make a 'confidential' reply to Arthur Seldon, the co-founder of the Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA), apologizing for having apparently stated that he regarded the IEA as a mere popularizing 'propaganda' institution. The IEA, he assured Seldon, was superior to the Foundation for Economic Education's (FEE) 'propaganda' efforts (the Irvington 'setup').<sup>10</sup> In *The Freeman*, FEE's Paton (1966, 19, 20) complained that 'At times many Americans evidence an almost mystic faith in the ability of government agencies to cure all our ills.' But government employees 'have no Aladdin's lamps or other magic tools.' America was a 'disaster area': 'The disaster which has befallen us is the change in attitudes. The decline in willingness to assume responsibility and take the initiative, at individual and family levels ... And there are few signs on the horizons that we will wake up in time to avoid going over the cliff into full-fledged socialism.'

At the University of Chicago and the University of California, Los Angeles, Arnold Harberger (1999) observed Austrian School economists and philosophers at close quarters:

There was a great difference in focus between Hayek (the Austrians) and Chicago as a whole. I really respect and revere those guys. I am not one of them, but I think I once said that if somebody wants to approach economics as a religion, the Austrian approach is about as good as you can get. They approach it from the angle of philosophy: They derived the principles of free market economics from what they saw as 'the nature of man' and other fundamental principles. Their approach pays little attention to empirical measurements and testing.

When Leo Rosten asked whether he had noted the ‘unbelievable intensity with which people maintain their beliefs, and the difficulty of getting people to change their minds in the face of the most extraordinarily powerful evidence?’ Hayek (1978) replied: ‘Well, one has to be if one has preached this thing for fifty years without succeeding in persuading. [laughter]’.<sup>11</sup>

Hayek (1978) preached the language of religious conversion:

the secondhand dealers in ideas--have to play a very important role and are very effective. But, of course, in my particular span of life I had the misfortune that the intellectuals were completely conquered by socialism. So I had no intermediaries, or hardly any, because they were prejudiced against my ideas by a dominating philosophy. That made it increasingly my concern to persuade the intellectuals in the hopes that ultimately they could be *converted* and transmit my ideas to the public at large<sup>12</sup>; what *converted* me is that the social scientists, the science specialists in the tradition of Otto Neurath, just were so extreme and so naive on economics that it was through [Neurath] that I became aware that positivism was just as misleading as the social sciences [emphases added].<sup>13</sup>

In the tax-exempt *Collected Works of F.A. Hayek*, ‘converted’ was silently corrected to ‘dissuaded’:

what *dissuaded* [emphasis added] me is that the social scientists, the science specialists in the tradition of Otto Neurath, just were so extreme and so naive on economics; it was actually [*sic*] through them [*sic*] that I became aware that positivism was just [*sic*] misleading as the social sciences. (Hayek 1994, 50)

In *Human Action*, Mises (1963, 282; 1966, 282) lobbied for the Warfare State:

He who in our age opposes armaments and conscription is, perhaps unknown to himself, an abettor of those aiming at the enslavement of all.

And in the tax-exempt *Human Action The Scholars Edition* (Mises 1998), this was silently corrected through deletion.



'Hayek' means at least three interrelated phenomena:

- An individual requiring non-hagiographic biographical analysis.
- A fundraising icon.
- An integral part of a broader social, political and religious movement.

This *Archival Insights into the Evolution of Economics* series provides a systematic archival examination of the process by which economics is constructed and disseminated. All the major schools will be subject to critical scrutiny; a concluding volume will attempt to synthesize the insights into a unifying general theory of knowledge construction and influence. Part IX of *Hayek a Collaborative Biography* examines the social, political and religious movements.

Austrian School frauds—Hayek, Mises, 'Deacon' McCormick, Sudha Shenoy, and so on—are easy to detect (Leeson 2013, 202; 2015b). For example, in researching *William F. Buckley Jr.: Patron Saint of the Conservatives* (1988), John Judis (15 May 1984) asked Hayek why in 1955 he refused to let his name be listed on the *National Review* masthead (Judis had only Buckley's side of the correspondence). Hayek (27 May 1984) replied that he did not 'preserve' the correspondence of so long ago.<sup>14</sup> But simultaneously, Hayek was negotiating to send all his correspondence—including the letters that Judis wished to see—to the Hoover Institution.<sup>15</sup> Hayek thus simultaneously lied and left the evidence that exposed his lies: as soon as the Hayek Archives became 'public' (open to scholars), Judis could have uncovered the lie and found the answer to his question.

Margit Mises (1984, 44, 23) 'learned to understand' her fiancé: 'these terrible attacks were really a sign of depression, a hidden dissatisfaction and the sign of a great, great need for love.' Hayek's mental illness manifested itself in obsessive self-interest and extreme mood swings. Charlotte Cubitt did not specify which type of psychiatrist her employer was supervised by; but Hayek (1978a) explained: 'it seems that it was through psychiatry that I somehow got to the problems of political order'<sup>16</sup>; it would sound so frightfully egotistic in speaking about myself—why I feel I think in a different manner. But then, of course, I found a good many instances of this in real life.'

After his second prolonged bout of suicidal depression (1969–1974), Hayek always carried a razor blade with which to slash his wrist; he wanted to know ‘where “the poison”, that is arsenic, could be obtained.’ During his third bout (1985–), the second Mrs Hayek instructed Cubitt (2006, 168, 188, 168, 89, 111, 174, 188, 284, 328, 317) not to let her husband near the parapet of their balcony. When asked ‘What did Hayek think about subject *x*?’ his fellow Austrian-LSE economist (1933–1948), Ludwig Lachmann (1906–1990), would routinely reply: ‘Which Hayek?’ (cited by Caldwell 2006, 112). Cubitt noted that Hayek became ‘upset’ after reading an article on schizophrenia, and ‘wondered whether he thought it was referring to himself or Mrs Hayek.’ The 1974 Nobel Prize for Economic Sciences exacerbated this personality split: Walter Grinder detected ‘almost two different people’ (Ebenstein 2003, 264).

In May 1975, Governor Ronald Reagan described communism as ‘a form of insanity ... a temporary aberration that will one day disappear from the earth because it is contrary to human nature’ (cited by Kengor 2001). As president, Reagan (27 March 1984) informed Eamonn Butler of the Adam Smith Institute that ‘von’ Hayek had played ‘an absolutely essential role in preparing the ground for the resurgent conservative movement in America.’<sup>17</sup> Reagan (1984, 198) also wrote: ‘von Mises ... rekindled the flames of liberty in new generations of thinkers ... we owe an incalculable debt to this dean of the Austrian school of economics for expanding our knowledge and inspiring a new vision of liberty in our age.’

In accepting the Republican Party Presidential nomination, Reagan (17 July 1980) had invited Americans to join him in a ‘crusade to make America great again.’ He reflected about the nation’s past and its ‘shared values’ and invoked Thomas Paine’s (1776) *Common Sense Addressed to the Inhabitants of America*: ‘We have it in our power to begin the world over again.’<sup>18</sup> The United States was founded by those who were apprehensive about inherited titles: this found expression in The Title of Nobility Clause—Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8 of the Constitution.<sup>19</sup> Paine’s (2000 [1775]) ‘Reflections on Titles’ is part of *The Founders’ Constitution* (Kurland and Lerner 2000). Paine approved of the title ‘The Honorable Continental Congress’; but when reflecting on

the pompous titles bestowed on unworthy men, I feel an indignity that instructs me to despise the absurdity ... The lustre of the *Star* and the title of *My Lord*, over-awe the superstitious vulgar, and forbid them to inquire into the character of the possessor: Nay more, they are, as it were, bewitched to admire in the great, the vices they would honestly condemn in themselves. This sacrifice of common sense is the certain badge which distinguishes slavery from freedom; for when men yield up the privilege of thinking, the last shadow of liberty quits the horizon [emphases in original].

Paine's 'Reflections on Titles' is available on the Ludwig von Mises Institute website.<sup>20</sup>

A legitimate noble title requires a legitimate royal source: a *fons honorum* (the 'fountainhead' or 'source of honor'). Hayek (1978) reflected that the 'Great' War was a 'great break in my recollected history.'<sup>21</sup> It also broke the Habsburg nobility: coats of arms and titles ('von,' 'Archduke,' 'Count,' 'Ritter,' etc.) were abolished on 3 April 1919 by the *Adelsaufhebungsgesetz*, the Law on the Abolition of Nobility. Violators face fines or six months jail. Republics transform 'subjects' into 'citizens': the status of "German Austrian citizens" equal before the law in all respects' was forcibly imposed on Austrian nobles (Gusejnova 2012, 115). The Habsburg-born, Austrian-educated Arthur Koestler (1950, 19) described some of the affected: 'Those who refused to admit that they had become déclassé, who clung to the empty shell of gentility, joined the Nazis and found comfort in blaming their fate on Versailles and the Jews. Many did not even have that consolation; they lived on pointlessly, like a great black swarm of tired winter flies crawling over the dim windows of Europe, members of a class displaced by history.'<sup>22</sup> In Austria and Germany, the fledgling democracies that emerged after the 'Great' War between the dynasties perished in the 'von' Hayek- and 'von' Mises-intensified Great Depression (Leeson 2017a).

Rothbard (2006 [1992], 450) contrasted 'Mises's consistency and clarity' with Hayek's

muddle, inconsistency, and contradictions ... Since Hayek was radically scornful of human reason ... [he] had to fall back on the importance of blindly obeying whatever social rules happened to have 'evolved,' and his

only feeble argument against intervention was that the government was even more irrational, and was even more ignorant, than individuals in the market economy.

Hayek (1978) ‘just learned [Mises] was usually right in his conclusions, but I was not completely satisfied with his argument. That, I think, followed me right through my life. I was always influenced by Mises’s answers, but not fully satisfied by his arguments. It became very largely an attempt to improve the argument, which I realized led to correct conclusions. But the question of why it hadn’t persuaded most other people became important to me; so I became anxious to put it in a more effective form.’<sup>23</sup>

After Mises (1985 [1927], 44, 49) failed to persuade ‘Germans and Italians,’ ‘Ludendorff and Hitler’ and other ‘Fascists’ to form a pact with Austrian Classical Liberals, in 1947 Hayek (1978) tried ‘a more effective form’ pact—the Mont Pelerin Society:

I had already had the idea we might turn this into a permanent society, and I proposed that it would be called the Acton-Tocqueville Society, after the two *most representative figures* [emphasis added]. Frank Knight put up the greatest indignation: ‘You can’t call a liberal movement after two Catholics!’ [laughter] And he completely defeated it; he made it impossible. As a single person, he absolutely obstructed the idea of using these two names, because they were Roman Catholics.<sup>24</sup>

The initial split correlated with institutional affiliation: the religiosity of FEE’s representatives—especially its founder, Leonard Read—against the University of Chicago economists. Reverence also divided the Mont Pelerin Society—the ‘sycophancy’ that Buchanan (1992, 130) deplored when directed at ‘von’ Hayek and ‘von’ Mises but wallowed in when directed at himself by George Mason University (GMU) economists (Vaughn 2015). Much of this sycophancy manifested itself in deference towards fake nobility:

Those of us who have loved as well as revered Ludwig von Mises, words cannot express our great sense of loss: of this gracious, brilliant and wonderful man; this man of unblemished integrity; this courageous and lifelong

fighter for human freedom; this all-encompassing scholar; this noble inspiration to us all ... Mises's death takes away from us not only a deeply revered friend and mentor, but it tolls the bell for the end of an era: the last living mark of that nobler, freer and far more civilized era of pre-1914 Europe ... But oh, Mises, now you are gone, and we have lost our guide, our Nestor, our friend. How will we carry on without you? But we have to carry on, because anything less would be a shameful betrayal of all that you have taught us, by the example of your noble life as much as by your immortal works. Bless you, Ludwig von Mises, and our deepest love goes with you; We live in an age where everyone seems to be bending to the latest wind, anxious to maintain his status as 'politically correct.' Lu and Margit [Mises] were of a different and far nobler cloth and of a different age. (Rothbard 2006 [1973], 452, 453, 455; 1993, 455)

According to Rothbard (2006 [1993], 451), FEE's Orval Watts earned a 'master's and a doctor's degree in economics from Harvard University in its nobler, pre-Keynesian era.' Ethical issues widened the split: George Stigler and Milton Friedman described Read and Watts as dishonest 'bastards' (Leeson 2017b), while Friedman's (2017 [1991]) 'Say "No" to Intolerance' targeted Mises.

At the 1969 Mont Pelerin Society meeting in Venezuela, where a dinner was held to honour his 70th birthday,

Hayek apparently indicated that he had not spoken about these matters previously, 'except to the closest of friends.' He indicated, first, that while his family background was Catholic, both of his grandfathers had left the Church, that he, personally, 'had never quite bothered to classify himself religiously, other than perhaps to consider himself something of an agnostic.' Hayek then ... suggested that 'somehow it might be possible to bring two distinct "liberal" factions into harmony and cooperation for the cause of liberty: (1) a group strongly oriented in religion, and (2) a group who prided themselves in being agnostics and/or atheists. It was in that intent that the original members of the Mont Pelerin Society *were selected* [emphasis added].' Hayek continued—here calling on Henry Hazlitt and F.A. Harper, the only two people there who had been at the original meeting—that this seemed hopeless; that the two factions were not inclined to leave the religious differences lie idle.' Harper indicates that, while Hayek did not name names, he and his wife recalled that, following

a visit to an old monastery, Frank Knight was moved to deliver an ‘atheistic sermon,’ and that one of six people sitting with them got up and moved to another table. (Shearmur 2015)

The structure of production explains why Austrian ‘knowledge’ is unreliable: religious icons cannot—by definition—be dishonest crooks. At least a dozen disciples—including the devout Mormon CIA ‘intelligence officer,’ Mark Skousen, and the public stoning theocrat, Gary North—made the pilgrimage to ring the doorbell labelled ‘Prof. Dr Friedrich A. von Hayek’ (Ebenstein 2003, 316) to be told by ‘von’ Hayek (1994, 107, 37) that he was ‘a law abiding citizen and completely stopped using the title von.’ Yet Hayek (1994, 37) also referred to ‘the minor title of nobility (the “von”) which the family still bears.’ *The Times* (17 December 1931) reported that ‘von Hayek’ had been appointed to the Tooke Professorship at the London School of Economics (LSE); at the LSE Hayek was known as ‘von Hayek’; he wore his family coat of arms on his signet ring (Ebenstein 2003, 75, 298). In Frederic Benham’s (1932, v) *British Monetary Policy*, his LSE colleague, ‘Professor von Hayek,’ was thanked. *The Times* (19 October 1932) published a letter from ‘von Hayek’ (and three LSE colleagues, T. E. Gregory, Arnold Plant and Lionel Robbins) on ‘Spending and Saving Public Works from Rates’. Over half a century later—with Hayek’s approval—the shield of his coat of arms was reproduced on the cover of *The Fatal Conceit: The Errors of Socialism* (1988), edited by William Warren Bartley III (Cubitt 2006, 274).<sup>25</sup>

In and out of Austria, Hayek repeatedly attached the illegal ‘von’ to his name (Leeson 2015a, Chap. 1)—including, symbolically, his *Economica* essay on ‘The Maintenance of Capital’ (1935). Yet, in a letter to *The Times*, Hayek (14 November 1981) professed deep indignation that ‘von’ had been attached to his name: perhaps even Labour MPs could be ‘shamed’ into not answering arguments by reference to ‘descent.’ After British naturalization in 1938, he did not, he claimed, generally use it himself in that form.<sup>26</sup>

According to the official biographer appointed by the Ludwig von Mises Institute: ‘After the destruction of the monarchy in November 1918, the new republican government abolished all titles and banned their use in print. Ludwig Heinrich Edler von Mises became Ludwig

Mises according to Austrian law. Outside the country, however, he would continue to use the title that his great-grandfather had earned for his family' (Hülsmann 2007, 28, 335). Yet according to 'von' Mises' (2003 [1933] lxxxi) *Epistemological Problems of Economics*, published by the Mises Institute with an 'Introduction to the Third Edition by Jörg Guido Hülsmann' the German language edition had been signed: 'LUDWIG VON MISES VIENNA, AUSTRIA JANUARY, 1933.'<sup>27</sup>

In 1945, there was a shift to the political left: the empires of the Italian Fascists, the Japanese military (the 'Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere') and the Austro-German Nazis had been defeated; a Labour Party prime minister occupied 10 Downing Street (1945–1951) for the first time since 1931; and the Democratic Party continued to occupy the White House (1933–1953).<sup>28</sup> In response, Buckley, Frank Meyer, and M. Stanton Evans sought to provide more respectable foundations for the political right by replacing overt white supremacy and anti-Semitism with a 'fusion' of economic libertarianism, social traditionalism and militant anticommunism. The Austrian School of Economics is a magnet for homosexuals (seeking escape from 'social traditionalism') and theocrats who seek to publicly stone them to death. Apart from that cognitive dissonance, most tend to embrace the other two fusion elements (many are also overt white supremacists and covert anti-Semites).

In 1952, General Dwight Eisenhower won office by crusading against 'Korea, Communism and Corruption' (which he associated with Democrats); but the Senate vote to 'condemn' Joe McCarthy (2 December 1954) was something of a reversal; and Richard Nixon's enforced resignation (9 August 1974) appeared to further discredit the 'fusion.' Yet according to an article in Buckley's *National Review*, the climax of the (post-Nobel Prize) Hillsdale College tax-exempt Mont Pelerin meeting was George Roche III toasting Queen Elizabeth II—accompanied by

a mood of sheer bliss ... as if an Invisible Hand had prankishly arranged a sneak preview of Utopia .... Such fellowship is of course much enhanced in the vicinity of the bar, which was open three times a day .... What we could not expect was the pampering and elegant food that attended us from beginning to end .... One fellow disappeared into the service regions

with a bottle of champagne for the staffers, and almost immediately a fresh bottle appeared on his table. It was magic .... Clearly, unseen benefactors had picked up the tab; otherwise Hillsdale's budget would have rocketed into federal orbit .... It was lovely. (Wheeler 1975)

Thatcher became Conservative Party leader (1975) and prime minister (1979), Reagan became president (1981), the Berlin Wall fell (1989), and shortly afterwards the Soviet Empire crumbled. Armed with their PhD mantra ('Freedom works, baby! Freedom works'), Austrian 'free' market religion promoters facilitated the rise of an equally threatening Empire: Russia of the Oligarchs (Haiduk 2015).

In 1991, George Bush awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom to three 'fusion' activists. First, 'the greengrocer's daughter who shaped a nation to her will' and who 'sailed freedom's ship wherever it was imperilled. Prophet and crusader, idealist and realist, this heroic woman made history move her way ... there will always be an England, but there can never be another Margaret Thatcher ... Consider the 1980s and early 1990s—a golden age of liberty ... She helped mold perhaps democracy's finest hour ... Like her successor, John Major, she believed passionately in free enterprise. And so she used it to renew British initiative and national pride.'<sup>29</sup>

Second, Buckley the 'celebrated founder' of *National Review* who 'raised the level of political debate in this country, and our Nation is better for it. A true Renaissance man, we honor him today for a lifetime of achievement in American political and social thought.' And third,

Professor Friedrich von Hayek for a lifetime of looking beyond the horizon. At a time when many saw socialism as ordained by history, he foresaw freedom's triumph. Over 40 years ago, Professor von Hayek wrote that 'the road to serfdom' was not the road to the future or to the political and economic freedom of man. A Nobel laureate, he is widely credited as one of the most influential economic writers of our century. Professor von Hayek is revered by the free people of Central and Eastern Europe as a true visionary, and recognized worldwide as a revolutionary in intellectual and political thought. How magnificent it must be for him to witness his ideas validated before the eyes of the world. We salute him.<sup>30</sup>



In 1991, Hayek told his second wife to put him—not in a nursing home—but into a

lunatic asylum, yet their doctor said he was in perfect physical shape. His hallucinatory experiences exhausted him ... Sometimes he would see things in vivid shapes, green meadows, writing on the wall, and even perceived sounds. No matter how strongly Mrs. Hayek would deny the reality of these apparitions he would insist that he had seen and heard them. On one such occasion he was so distressed because she would not believe him that he clutched my hand and said that the presence of persons and their singing had lasted for nine hours. (Cubitt 2006, 355–356)

Rothbard had difficulty adjusting to life outside his 'only child' family home: according to his 1936 fourth-grade teacher's report, 'Murray seems to be so exceedingly happy that it is sometimes difficult to control his activities in the class. He must develop a more controlled behavior in the group' (cited by Long 2006). The Austrian School epigone generation co-leader, Peter Boettke (2010), wants to 'get the US out of North America'—presumably a muddled reference to secession. Fearful of travel, Rothbard (1992a) sought to time-travel back to a mythical version of the neo-feudalism from which his parents had escaped: 'We shall break the clock of social democracy. We shall break the clock of the Great Society. We shall break the clock of the welfare state. We shall break the clock of the New Deal. We shall break the clock of Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom and perpetual war. We shall repeal the 20th century.' Having supported the white supremacist 1948 Dixiecrats, Rothbard 'would not stop until we repealed the Federal Judiciary Act of 1789, and maybe even think the unthinkable and restore the good old Articles of Confederation.'

Rothbard (2007 [1958], 14), who was frightened of the dark or at least unable to sleep outside daylight hours, told Ayn Rand, an amphetamine addict, about the 'defect' in his 'own psyche.' All of his 'adult life' he had been 'plagued' with a 'phobic state,' of which his 'travel phobia is only the most overt manifestation': 'i.e. with frightening emotions which I could neither control nor rationally explain.' Rothbard was unable to cope: 'the only way I could successfully combat this painful emotion is by

sidestepping the situations which seemed to evoke it—knowing that this is an evasion, but also knowing no better way.’

From the IEA, Ralph Harris (16 September 1970) offered to supply Hayek with the name of a doctor who had been treating him for depression.<sup>31</sup> Like Mises, Hayek and Anthony Fisher (the IEA co-founder),<sup>32</sup> Rothbard (2007 [1958], 14) suffered from debilitating depression—offering to Rand ‘one or both of the following explanations’ in an effort to ‘figure out why I should have been so depressed.’ The first was that his ‘brain became completely exhausted under the intense strain of keeping up with a mind that I unhesitatingly say is the most brilliant of the twentieth century.’ The second was that he ‘felt that if I continued to see you, my personality and independence would become overwhelmed by the tremendous power of your own. If the latter, then the defect is, of course, again mine and not yours.’ Middle-named ‘Newton’ to emphasize his parents’ attachment to science, Rothbard told his new cult leader that she was his Sun Queen: ‘I have come to regard you as like the sun, a being of enormous power giving off great light, but that someone coming too close would be likely to get burned.’

In 1600, those with faith-based ‘knowledge’ insisted that the universe orbited around Jerusalem and burnt Giordano Bruno at the stake for questioning their authority. These chapters explore the process by which the sacred texts of four malevolently mentally ill individuals—Rand, *The Goddess of the Market* (Burns 2009), Mises, Hayek and Rothbard—helped construct a ‘free’ market religion which, in several countries, all but turned the State into their ‘subsidiary.’ These chapters may also have significance with respect to other cults and sects.

## Austrian ‘Logic’ and Human Rights Abuses

In at least six ways, Adolf Hitler was the product of the climate to which Hayek and Mises were major contributors.

- After arriving in Vienna in 1907, Hitler acquired anti-Semitism from the climate co-created by the proto-Nazi von Hayeks.

- Hayek's (1994, 61–62) obsession about his own Aryan ancestry predated Hitler's.
- Hayek and Mises promoted *Anschluss* (Leeson 2017a).
- Mises (2012 [1916], Chap. 10) was a lobbyist for Austro-German *Lebensraum* before Hitler.
- In promoting *political* Fascism, Mises (1985 [1927], 42–43) sought to undermine 'everywhere ridiculous' democracy:

The comparison that people drew between the men whom the democracies placed at the head of the government and those whom the emperors and kings, in the exercise of their absolute power, had elevated to that position, proved by no means favorable to the new wielders of power. The French are wont to speak of 'killing with ridicule.' And indeed, the statesmen representative of democracy soon rendered it everywhere ridiculous.

Nothing did more harm to democracy in Germany and Austria than the deflation that Mises and Hayek promoted—but according to Mises (1985 [1927], 42–43): 'Nothing has done more harm to democracy in Germany and Austria than the hollow arrogance and impudent vanity with which the Social-Democratic leaders who rose to power after the collapse of the empire conducted themselves.'

- In his *Völkischer Beobachter* newspaper, Hitler promoted Austrian business cycle theory for the same reason that Hayek and Mises did:

The government calmly goes on printing these scraps of paper because, if it stopped, that would be the end of the government. Because once the printing presses stopped—and that is a prerequisite for the stabilisation of the mark—the swindle would at once be brought to light ... Believe me, our misery will increase. The scoundrel will get by ... The reason: because the State itself has become the biggest swindler and crook. A robbers' State! ... If the horrified people notice that they can starve on billions, they must arrive at this conclusion: we will no longer submit to a State which is built on the swindling idea of the majority. We want a dictatorship. (Cited by Heiden 1944, 131–133; Shirer 1960, 87; Noakes and Pridham 1994, 19)

As a paid lobbyist for employer trade unions, Mises used *any* argument to undermine the power of labour trade unions. In ‘The General Rise in Prices in the Light of Economic Theory,’ Mises promoted a cost-push explanation of inflation that is inconsistent with his *Theory of Money and Credit*, published the year before (*Theorie des Geldes und der Umlaufsmittel* 1912). Referring to the ‘groups that initiate the rise in prices,’ Mises (2002 [1913], Chap. 7) asserted:

It is true that no effort by labor unions can permanently succeed in pushing wages above their natural level. In the best of cases, all that they can achieve is to raise wages, but they cannot prevent the necessary adjustment of wages back to their natural level. The adjustment, however, does not come about by nominal wages coming down again to their old level. The money wage remains unchanged. The rise in the prices of goods has the effect of bringing real wages back to the ‘natural’ wage that corresponds to the given conditions of the market.

President Boettke of Hayek’s Mont Pelerin Society regards historian of economic thought as ‘gullible.’<sup>33</sup> One American University, Washington, Professor of Economics dismissed Mises’ Fascism as a mere ‘moral lapse’; before requesting clarification: ‘While this chapter [Mises 2002 [1913], Chap. 7] also discusses monetary inflation, it seems oddly to suggest the possibility of ongoing inflation even with a constant money supply. I assume he changed his view after the post-WWI hyperinflations made the link so much clearer. Is this the case? Thanks, Alan Isaac’ (SHOE 22 May 2104; 24 February 2016).<sup>34</sup>

Between 1917 and 1922, four defeated dynasties fell: the Romanovs, Habsburgs, Hohenzollerns and Ottomans. At the ‘Peace’ conference, two of the victor states—Italy and Japan—sought to expand, while the empires of two other victor states—Britain and France—lingered on until after the end of the Second World War. Between the 1918 demise of the Habsburgs and Mussolini’s 1922 ‘March on Rome’ and Ludendorff and Hitler’s 1923 attempted ‘March on Berlin and Vienna,’ Mises (1951 [1922], 234–235) appeared to transfer his allegiance to the British Empire: ‘England, who had become the greatest of the colonial powers, managed her possessions according to the principles of free trade theory.

It was not cant for English free traders to speak of England's vocation to elevate backward state of civilisation. England has shown by acts that she regarded her possessions in India, in the Crown Colonies, and in the Protectorates, as a general mandatory of European civilization.'

According to Mises (1951 [1922], 235), 'Liberalism aims to open all doors closed trade. But it no way desires to compel people to buy or to sell. Its antagonism is confined to those government which, by imposing prohibition and other limitations on trade, exclude their subjects from the advantages of taking part in world commerce, and thereby impair the standard of life of all mankind.' The First Opium War (1839–1842) has analogies with the 1773 Boston Tea Party: the destruction of the 'property' of the East India Company (1200 tons of opium). Mises' 'antagonism' was directed at those whom Austrians would later denigrate as 'Public Health Nazis' who were interfering with the 'consumer sovereignty' of opium addicts. Opium later funded the terrorist attacks on the United States which Rothbard (1993) encouraged.

In 1857, two liberals in the (non-Austrian) Classical tradition, Richard Cobden and John Bright, brought down the Palmerston government over the Opium Wars. In jingoistic response, Palmerston accused Cobden of demonstrating an 'anti-English feeling, an abnegation of all those ties which bind men to their country and to their fellow-countrymen, which I should hardly have expected from the lips of any member of this House. Everything that was English was wrong, and everything that was hostile to England was right' (cited by Edsall 1986, 303–310).

Henry John Temple, 3rd Viscount Palmerston (1784–1865)—later the first prime minister of the newly formed Liberal Party (1859–1865)—referred to the Chinese who opposed the opium trade as 'barbarians—a set of kidnapping, murdering, poisoning barbarians' at the 'extreme end of the globe' (cited by Ridley 1970, 467). In *Liberalism in the Classical Tradition*, 'von' Mises (1985 [1927], 48–49) insisted that 'Fascists carry on their work among nations in which the intellectual and moral heritage of some thousands of years of civilization cannot be destroyed at one and not among the barbarian peoples on both sides of the Urals, whose relationship to civilization has never been any other than that of marauding denizens of forest and desert accustomed to engage, from time to time, in predatory raids on civilized lands in the hunt for booty. Because

of this difference, Fascism will *never* [emphasis added] succeed as completely as Russian Bolshevism in freeing itself from the power of liberal ideas.' Mises (1951 [1922], 234, n1) knew which side Austrian Classical Liberals should be on:

In judging the English policy for opening up China, people constantly put in the foreground the fact that it was the opium trade which gave the direct, immediate occasion for the outbreak of war complications. But in the wars which the English and French waged against China between 1839 and 1860 the stake was the general freedom of trade and not only the freedom of the opium trade. That from the Free Trade point of view no barriers ought to be put in the way even of the trade in poisons, and that everyone should abstain by his own impulse from enjoyments harmful to his organism, is not so base and mean as socialist and Anglophone writers tend to represent.

Mises (2012 [December 1916], Chap. 10) lobbied for Austro-German *Lebensraum*:

The industrialized countries are not in a position to prevent the agricultural countries from transitioning into being industrial nations, which would have been an effective means of retaining the status quo in the international economy, if it had only been possible to do so. From the national point of view, another method is available: the annexation of colonies that have a primarily agricultural character to the extent that the home country and the colonies together form an area that appears to be, in relation to the quality of its natural production conditions, no more densely populated than the territory of other nations. This is the path that England has followed and which Germany *ought to have followed*, had it not degenerated into the misery of provincial factionalism while the Russians and the Anglo-Saxons conquered the world ... *The foundations of a global empire are its population ... The German people currently lack these foundations.* Germany can only provide for the population within its territory by manufacturing goods made with foreign-supplied raw materials that are then sold to foreign buyers, in order to acquire those raw materials required for its own consumption, and to pay wages and other industrial incomes. This situation cannot be sustained over the long term. For this reason, the German people *need colonies for settlement if they do not wish to lose their global ranking* [emphases added].

Six years later, Mises (1951 [1922], 235) retreated to a more effective façade: 'The Liberal policy has nothing in common with Imperialism. On the contrary, it is designed to overthrow imperialism and expel it from the sphere of international trade.'

Hayek told Cubitt (2006, 15), his second authorized biographer, that of the two Empires he had watched decline, 'England's downfall had been the more painful to him.' American anti-colonialism had destroyed a large portion of the first British Empire: Hayek (1978) objected to 'extreme American anti-colonialism: the way in which the Dutch, for instance, were forced overnight to abandon Indonesia, which certainly hasn't done good to anybody in that form. This, I gather, was entirely due to American pressure, with America being completely unaware that the opposition to colonialism by Americans is rather a peculiar phenomenon.' Hayek 'did not become an American in the sense in which I became British. But I think this is an emotional affair. My temperament was more like that of the British than that of the American, or even of my native fellow Austrians. That, I think, is to some extent a question of your adaptability to a particular culture.'<sup>35</sup>

Hayek's 1974 Nobel Prize for Economic Sciences was awarded on the back of Fritz Machlup's (1974) uncritical acceptance of Robbins' (2012 [1931], Foreword, 172) uncritical acceptance (in the Foreword to the first edition of *Prices and Production*) of Hayek's assertion about having predicted the Great Depression: 'I could never have had the influence I did if it hadn't been for Robbins' (Hayek cited by Howson 2011, 206).<sup>36</sup> Hayek's fraud appears to have been uncovered at the University of Chicago between 1932 and 1934 by Knight and Jacob Viner (Leeson 2017c). Knight and/or Viner presumably conveyed their concerns to Robbins—whose Foreword was deleted from the second edition of Hayek's (1967 [1935]) *Prices and Production*.

Hayek's (1978) 'determination to become a scholar was certainly affected by the unsatisfied ambition of my father to become a university professor.'<sup>37</sup> Mises' 'great chagrin' was that a university professorship was 'never offered to him.'<sup>38</sup> Through fraud, Hayek (1978) became a university professor at the LSE in 1931: 'at once I became in a sense British, because that was a natural attitude for me, which I discovered later. It was like stepping into a warm bath where the atmosphere is the same as your body.'<sup>39</sup>

When Cubitt (2006, 51) asked whether he felt uncomfortable about Jewish people, Hayek ‘replied that he did not like them very much, any more than he liked black people.’ Initially, Hayek ‘thoroughly dislike[d]’ Mises (Leube 2003, 15). Between 1931 and 1949, Hayek, who disliked ‘very unpleasant’ Jewish accents (Leeson 2015a, 46), was exposed to British accents by living adjacent to ‘the most Jewish constituency in the United Kingdom’ (Hoare 2015). But Hayek (1978) did not acquire the middle-class language of his north-west London neighbours (as his children did) or of his LSE colleagues, but instead the accent and affectations of the English upper class. For example, schemes to limit tax revenue were promoted by people who were ‘frightfully confused.’<sup>40</sup> Knight was ‘frightfully dogmatic’ about capital theory.<sup>41</sup> Mises could be ‘frightfully exaggerating.’<sup>42</sup> Harold Laski was ‘frightfully offended by my *The Road to Serfdom*.’<sup>43</sup> Thomas Nixon Carver took ‘me to his country club and gave me a big luncheon, which I almost abused. [laughter] All I remember is that he was frightfully offended.’<sup>44</sup> Hayek encountered Viennese socialism in its ‘Marxist, frightfully doctrinaire form.’<sup>45</sup> And monotheistic religions are so ‘frightfully intolerant.’<sup>46</sup>

Hayek had ‘early been charmed’ by Keynes’ company, a ‘charm that continued’ when the LSE was moved to Cambridge early in the war as a consequence of the Austro-German ‘bombing of the British capital’ (Hamowy 1999, 283). Hayek (1994, 92) observed that people got ‘enchanted by merely listening’ to Keynes’ ‘words’: his Old Etonian ‘voice was so bewitching.’ Hayek (1978) explained that ‘Well, you see, I think the intellectual history of all this is frightfully complex.’<sup>47</sup> Keynes told him ‘Oh, never mind, my ideas were frightfully important in the Depression of the 1930s, but you can trust me: if they ever become a danger, I’m going to turn public opinion around like this [snapping fingers]’<sup>48</sup> Keynes was ‘much too self-assured, convinced that what other people could have said about the subject was not frightfully important.’<sup>49</sup> And it would ‘sound so frightfully egotistic in speaking about myself—why I feel I think in a different manner. But then, of course, I found a good many instances of this in real life.’<sup>50</sup>

Hayek (1978) was ashamed of the Italian accent which he had picked up from ‘peasants’: ‘I picked up Italian during the war in Italy—well, sort of Italian. I don’t dare to speak it in polite society.’<sup>51</sup> Hayek’s fellow Reform



Club member, the Old Etonian and Guy Francis de Moncy Burgess, had both Russian 'gold' and a Foreign Office supervisor 'too polite to inquire' about his spying (Sutherland 2005, 358). Hayek (1978) also valued deference to the 'spontaneous' order: 'the curious thing is that in the countryside of southwest England, the class distinctions are very sharp, but they're not resented. [laughter] They're still accepted as part of the natural order.'<sup>52</sup>

Hayek (1978) loved the 'strength' of certain English

social conventions which make people understand what your needs are at the moment without mentioning them ... The way you break off a conversation. You don't say, 'Oh, I'm sorry; I'm in a hurry.' You become slightly inattentive and evidently concerned with something else; you don't need a word. Your partner will break off the conversation because he realizes without you saying so that you really want to do something else. No word need to be said about it. That's in respect for the indirect indication that I don't want to continue at the moment.

In contrast, in Austria there would be an 'effusion of polite expressions explaining that you are frightfully sorry, but in the present moment you can't do it. You would talk at great length about it, while no word would be said about it in England at all.'<sup>53</sup>

Point X of President Woodrow Wilson's XIV Points doomed the Habsburg neo-feudal 'spontaneous' order: 'The people of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity to autonomous development.' According to Austrians, the 'freest' opportunity is provided by 'consumer sovereignty'—Mises (2007 [1958], 11) told the author of *Atlas Shrugged* (Rand 1957): 'You have the courage to tell the masses what no politician told them: you are inferior and all the improvements in your conditions which you simply take for granted you owe to the effort of men who are better than you.'

The upper Habsburg Estates were primarily focused on maintaining the 'privileges of their aristocratic members ... the nobles regarded the Austrian people as an extension of their own peasantry, their only function to keep the nobility in luxury' (Taylor 1964, 14, 188–9). Mises lived

with his mother until he was 53: ‘The only explanation’ that Margit Mises (1984, 25) could find was that his ‘mother’s household was running smoothly—their two maids had been with them for about 20 years—and Lu could come and go whenever it pleased him and could concentrate on his work without being disturbed.’

In *The Road to Serfdom*, Hayek (2007 [1944], v) protested:

When a professional student of social affairs writes a political book, his first duty is plainly to say so. This is a political book ... But, whatever the name, the essential point remains that all I shall have to say is derived from certain ultimate values. I hope I have adequately discharged in the book itself a second and no less important duty: to make it clear beyond doubt what these ultimate values are on which the whole argument depends. There is, however, one thing I would like to add to this. Though this is a political book, I am as certain as anybody can be that the beliefs set out in it are not determined by my personal interests.

In for-posthumous-general-consumption oral history interviews, Hayek explained what these ‘ultimate values’ were: fraud. *The Road to Serfdom*, he explained, had been written for personal interests: to allow the ‘old aristocracy’ to resume their ascribed status and to drive the ‘new aristocracy’—labour trade unionists and elected politicians—back down the road back to serfdom (Leeson 2015a, Chap. 3).

According to Rothbard (2006 [1992], 448–449), the ‘promotion efforts funded by J. Howard Pew of the then Pew-owned Sun Oil Company’ ensured that *The Road to Serfdom* ‘became extraordinarily influential in American intellectual and academic life.’ As Hayek was writing *The Road to Serfdom*, the Austrian School philosopher and *National Review* columnist, Erik ‘Ritter von’ Kuehnelt-Leddihn (pseudonym F. S. Campbell), published *The Menace of the Herd* (1978 [1943]). ‘God and Gold’ Austrian School reconquistadors embrace restored monarchy, or anything but democracy (Hoppe 2001), pope and monarch, supported by a ‘natural aristocracy’ (Rockwell 1994a), a ‘small, self-perpetuating oligarchy of the ablest and most interested’ (Rothbard 1994a) or ‘dictatorial democracy’<sup>54</sup>—‘a system of really limited democracy’ (Hayek 1978).<sup>55</sup> Otto von Habsburg was full of hope: ‘There is an extraordinary revival of religion in France ... I never would have thought one could dare to say in

France what Sarkozy is saying—that the separation of church and state in France is wrong.’ After the fall of the Berlin Wall, ‘many’ of the 400-strong ‘Von Habsburg clan have staked claims to properties previously confiscated by the Communists’ (Watters 2005; Morgan 2011).

The first Emperor of Austria, Francis I (reigned 1804–1835), was a *Doppelkaiser* (double Emperor) until defeat by Napoleon at the 1806 Battle of Austerlitz led him to abdicate (as Holy Roman Emperor Francis II) as the First Reich was dissolved. French defeat (by the Sixth Coalition, Austria, Prussia, Russia, Portugal, Sweden, Spain, the UK and some German states) facilitated the Bourbon restoration (1814–1830) and revived Roman Catholic power in Europe; French defeat by Prussia led to the Austrian-excluded Second Reich (1871–1918); and French defeat by the Austrian-led Third Reich led to Clerical Fascism (1940–1945; Chap. 10 below).

The Habsburg Pretender (1986, vii–viii) smelt counterrevolution: ‘people read Somary ... his memory is coming back to life.’ He was referring to the Austrian School banker, Felix Somary (1881–1956), who shortly after the end of the Second World War, informed him that ‘Aristocracy has to begin somewhere,’ and—pointing to westward bound ‘unkempt’ train passengers (some presumably refugees)—added: ‘These are going to be our overlords in the future’ (Watters 2005). According to Otto (1986, vii–viii), Somary was ‘one of Switzerland’s leading bankers and certainly his time’s outstanding expert on economic crises .... His roots were in the old Austro-Hungarian Empire with its *great supranational tradition* [emphasis added] and its remarkable Vienna school of economics .... We all too often lack the universal person .... Let us hope that those responsible for our fate will follow the path which he traces for us.’

In the 1970s, Austrian ‘free’ market religion revivalism was matched by an anti-Western fundamentalist revival in the Middle East and a pro-Western ‘Religious Right’ coalition which in 1980 helped replace Jimmy Carter (a devout Baptist) with Reagan (whose church attendance appeared to have primarily cosmetic value). Hillsdale College—where Reagan was, reportedly, treated ‘almost like a martyr’ (Eakin 1996)—symbolized the fusion between the Austrian School of Economics and the ‘Religious Right,’ to which the atheist Mises made significant contributions. Five years before his embrace of *political* Fascism, Mises (1951

[1922], 234–235) described what liberalism meant to him: ‘The wars waged by England during the era of liberalism to extend her colonial empire and to open up territories which refused to admit foreign trade, laid the foundations of the modern world economy ... Were England to lose India to-day, and were that great land, so richly endowed by nature, to sink into anarchy, so that it no longer offered a market for international trade—or no longer offered so large a market—it would be an economic catastrophe of the first order.’

Two years after the publication of Hitler’s (1939 [1925]) *Mein Kampf*, Mises’ (1985 [1927], 51) *Liberalism in the Classical Tradition* issued a blunt ‘eternal’ instruction:

It cannot be denied that Fascism and similar movements aiming at the establishment of dictatorships are full of the best intentions and that their intervention has, for the moment, saved European civilization. The merit that Fascism has thereby won for itself will live on eternally in history.

There appear to be seven steps in the Austrian logic chain.

- In *Human Action*: ‘Government means always coercion and compulsion and is by necessity the opposite of liberty. Government is a guarantor of liberty and is compatible with liberty only if its range is adequately restricted to the preservation of economic freedom. Where there is no market economy, the best-intentioned provisions of constitutions and laws remain a dead letter’ (Mises 1998 [1949], 283). Having added a nuance that would be inaccessible to his nuance-insensitive disciples (government is ‘the only means available to make peaceful human coexistence possible’), Mises’ (2009a, [1958], 34–35) *Liberty and Property* re-emphasized this first logical step: ‘As regards the social apparatus of repression and coercion, the government, they cannot be any question of freedom. Government is essentially the negation of liberty. It is the recourse to violence or threat of violence in order to make all people obey the orders of the government, whether they like it or not ... it is the opposite of liberty. It is beating, imprisoning, hanging. Whatever government does it is ultimately supported

by the actions of armed constables. If the government operates a school or hospital, the funds required are collected by taxes, i.e., by payments exacted from the citizen.'

- In *Liberalism in the Classical Tradition*, Mises (1985 [1927], 49) provided the second step: 'Now it cannot be denied that the only way one can offer effective resistance to violent assaults is by violence. Against the weapons of the Bolsheviks, weapons must be used in reprisal, and it would be a mistake to display weakness before murderers. No liberal has ever called this into question.'
- In 'A New Strategy for Liberty,' Rothbard (1994b), the Academic Vice President of the Ludwig von Mises Institute, provided the third step by solving the 'coordination problem' between Austrian economists and 'Redneck' militia groups:

A second necessary task is informational: we cannot hope to provide any guidance to this marvellous new movement until we, and the various parts of the movement, find out what is going on. To help, we will feature a monthly report on 'The Masses in Motion.' After the movement finds itself and discovers its dimensions, there will be other tasks: to help the movement find more coherence, and fulfil its magnificent potential for overthrowing the malignant elites who rule over us.

According to Boettke (2010), 'anger can be a wonderful muse'; and according to Misesans, Rothbard's motto was 'hatred is my muse' (Peterson 2014; Tucker 2014). Rothbard (1994c, 6) insisted that 'the least' Austrians and their fellow travellers could do 'is accelerate the Climate of Hate in America, and hope for the best.'

After the second bombing of the World Trade Centre (which killed 2606 people), various individuals were placed on 'no-fly' lists. After the first bombing of the World Trade Centre (26 February 1993), which killed six and injured hundreds, Rothbard (1993) encouraged further terrorist attacks on the United States: 'I must admit I kind of like that bit about blowing up the UN building, preferably with [UN Secretary General] Boutros Boutros-Ghali inside.' In addition to a significant proportion of the world's diplomatic community, in New York the United Nations employs 6389 people.<sup>56</sup>

- Llewellyn Rockwell Jr., the co-founder of the Ludwig von Mises Institute, and Gary North, the Mises Institute ‘Murray Rothbard Medal Of Freedom’ holder, provided the fourth step: by making Austrian ‘liberty’ an overtly religious issue. In ‘To Restore the Church Smash the State,’ Rockwell (1998) stated that ‘Religiously active Christians have only one permanent enemy in politics: the irredeemably corrupt modern state,’ while North (2013) repeated a standard Austrian refrain: ‘liberals do not like to talk about Hitler as a gun controller. They want to bury that aspect of history. They also do not like to talk about the fact that German Jews were disarmed by the state. Of course, they do not like to see people pick on Jews, but the liberals’ bottom line is this: **better a disarmed Jew who is pushed around than an armed public that is not pushed around** [North’s bold].’

Rothbard died on 7 January 1995. Buckley (1995) understated his influence: ‘huffing and puffing in the little cloister [the Mises Institute] whose walls he labored so strenuously to contract, leaving him, in the end, not as the father of a swelling movement that ‘rous[ed] the masses from their slumber,’ as he once stated his ambition, but with about as many disciples as David Koresh had in his little redoubt in Waco.’ At the 1993 siege of the Branch Davidians Seventh-day Adventists cult in Waco, Texas, Timothy McVeigh distributed a pro-gun-rights literature and bumper stickers such as ‘When guns are outlawed, I will become an outlaw,’ telling a reporter that the ‘government is afraid of the guns people have because they have to have control of the people at all times. Once you take away the guns, you can do anything to the people. You give them an inch and they take a mile. I believe we are slowly turning into a socialist government. The government is continually growing bigger and more powerful, and the people need to prepare to defend themselves against government control.’<sup>57</sup>

McVeigh wrote to a newspaper:

Taxes are a joke. Regardless of what a political candidate ‘promises,’ they will increase. More taxes are always the answer to government mismanagement. They mess up. We suffer. Taxes are reaching cataclysmic levels, with no slowdown in sight ... Is a Civil War Imminent? Do we have to shed blood to reform the current system? I hope it doesn’t come to that. But it might. (Cited by Stickney 1996, 198)

- In 'The *Real* State of the Union,' Rockwell (1994b) provided the fifth step—by fuelling fears about the 'abuse of power' which 'resulted in 86 dead religious dissenters in Waco, Texas .... Clinton cries peace, peace, but there is no peace. We are, in fact, on the verge of another domestic war. Two of our most important public intellectuals—Samuel Francis and Walter Williams—suggest we reconsider secession. That is a fitting reflection of the state of the union.'
- In the ex-Confederate States, memories linger of William Tecumseh Sherman's 'March to the Sea' and his torching of Atlanta. Rothbard was heard 'whimsically wondering in Atlanta whether, in a revolutionary situation, it would be immoral to blockade the hated *New York Times*' (Stromberg 1995, 47). McVeigh and Anders Behring Breivik provided the sixth step. On 19 April 1995, McVeigh exploded a truck bomb outside the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building, Oklahoma City, killing 168 people, including 19 children in the day care centre, and injuring 684 others: 'McVeigh was a true believer, in his mind a combatant in the resistance movement or underground army battling the New World Order, and other nations under the control of the United Nations. He was a self-made patriot and freedom-fighter, defending his country against the alleged forces of tyranny and treason' (Wright 2007, 4). In 2011, Breivik killed eight people by detonating a truck bomb amid the *Regjeringskvartalet* (the 'Government quarter') in Oslo, Norway, and then shot dead 69 participants of a Workers' Youth League summer camp.
- McVeigh was obviously hoping to 'accelerate the Climate of Hate in America,' and Breivik was inspired by Misesian literature and 9-11 style religiosity (Tietze 2015). After dismissing the references to the literature of the Mises Institute which had inspired Breivik's hate-filled manifesto, Rockwell (2011) provided the seventh step—by denying responsibility for the first six steps:

Libertarianism is the one political theory extant that consistently preaches nonviolence in every way, condemning all aggression against person and property, whether it is done by a private party or under the cover of law ... Libertarianism posits a belief that is not widely held today, but is nonetheless true: namely, that society can organize itself without violence (no theft, no murder), but only using that blessed institution of mutual cooperation

among individuals. The use of violence in any form is not only contradictory to libertarian theory; libertarianism stands alone as the only political outlook that makes nonviolence its core tenet.

Buchanan (1992, 130) met his first ‘Princess’ through a ‘luxurious’ Mont Pelerin Society meeting; and Rockwell (1997, 6–7) was horrified that a National Public Radio commentator was ‘particularly annoyed that the grief shown toward Diana’s death far surpassed the sadness at the Oklahoma City bombing.’ Rockwell, who noted that the children and ‘civil servants or gun-wielding regulators’ killed in Oklahoma had low ascribed status, sarcastically added:

What an outrage that people feel worse about the death of a princess than of a Social Security worker. Sure, Diana’s children are left without a mother; so are many children in the inner city, who fall through the social safety net thanks to federal budget cuts. Why should Diana matter any more than they do? Well, for one reason, because of the natural law. We cannot value all people equally. We certainly can’t admire civil servants or gun-wielding regulators just because they work for the government. The remnants of the monarchical cast of mind—the love of the natural elite cause us to have a greater reverence for princesses, especially when they wield no power ... Far from being the end of the English monarchy, the Diana phenomenon could mean its revival, and the revival of interest in the idea of monarchy the world over. [Woodrow] Wilson thought he had abolished the monarchical impulse in the First World War. Yet it’s back with a vengeance.

Nine years after the demise of the Habsburgs, Mises (1985 [1927], 49–50) aspired to become the intellectual *Führer* of a Nazi-Classical Liberal Pact. Mises agreed that ‘In order to assure success, one must be imbued with the will to victory and always proceed violently. This is its highest principle.’ But the ‘political tactics’ of Austrian Classical Liberals differed from Fascists because of the latter’s ‘complete faith in the decisive power of violence.’ To succeed, Fascism would have to embrace Mises: ‘If it wanted really to combat socialism, it would have to oppose it with ideas. There is, however, only one idea that can be effectively opposed to socialism, viz., that of liberalism.’



The 'similar movements' of 'bloody counteraction' that the Jewish-born Mises referred to include the anti-Semitic *l'Action Française*. Two-thirds of a century later, the Jewish-born Rothbard (1994d, e) defended Byron De La Beckwith, Jr. (the anti-Semitic Ku Klux Klan assassin of the African-American voter registration activist Medgar Evers, who was convicted because he was politically 'incorrect'), Silvio Berlusconi (a 'dedicated free-marketeer'), Mussolini (because he had a reluctant 'anti-Jewish policy'), Islamo-Fascists, and those described as 'neo-fascists.'

Referring to Mises, Hayek (1978) reflected: 'Being for ten years [1921–1931] in close contact with a man with whose conclusions on the whole you agree but whose arguments were not always perfectly convincing to you, was a great stimulus.'<sup>58</sup> The British Fascisti was established in 1923. Six years later, Hayek (1995 [1929], 68), while praising Edwin Cannan's 'fanatical conceptual clarity' and his 'kinship' with Mises' 'crusade,' noted that British–Austrians had failed to realize necessary consequences of the whole system of Classical Liberal thought: 'Cannan by no means develops economic liberalism to its ultimate consequences with the same ruthless consistency as Mises.' According to Caldwell (1995, 70, n67), the third general editor of *The Collected Works of F.A. Hayek*, Hayek was probably referring to *Liberalism in the Classical Tradition* in which Mises (1985 [1927], 49) insisted that

The victory of Fascism in a number of countries is only an episode in the long series of struggles over the problem of property.

In 'The Cultural Background of Ludwig von Mises' Kuehnelt-Leddihn explained that during the 'Great' War, 'von' Hayek and 'von' Mises fought

to prevent the 'world from being made safe for democracy.'<sup>59</sup>

'Fascism' (as defined by Mises) overthrew democracy in Italy (1922), Spain (1923), Chile (1924 and 1973), Poland (1926), Portugal (1926), Germany (1933), Austria (1934) and elsewhere. In Portugal, the *Ditadura Nacional* (National Dictatorship) of the authoritarian *Estado Novo*

(New State) lasted until the 1974 *Revolução dos Cravos* (the Carnation Revolution)—just as the Nobel Prize selection committee were preparing that year’s reward:

von Hayek’s ideas and his analysis of the competence of economic systems were published in a number of works during the forties and fifties and have, without doubt, provided significant impulses to this extensive and growing field of research in ‘comparative economic systems.’ For him it is not a matter of a simple defence of a liberal system of society as may sometimes appear from the popularized versions of his thinking.<sup>60</sup>

Cubitt (2006, 19) reported that in 1977, Hayek ‘must have meant or hoped to influence’ General Augusto Pinochet during his visit to Chile because

they shook hands, and then asked me to send him a copy of the last chapter of *Law, Legislation and Liberty III*, namely ‘A Model Constitution,’ along with a letter. Presumably to emphasise his point he also asked me to some days later to send the same to [Chilean Senator Pedro Ibáñez] though this time without any note from him.

The following year, Hayek (1978) explained his tactics to Robert Bork:

Nobody could believe more strongly that a law is only effective if it’s supported by a state of public opinion, which brings me back—I’m operating on public opinion. I don’t even believe that before public opinion has changed, a change in the law will do any good. I think the primary thing is to change opinion on these matters ... When I say ‘public opinion,’ it’s not quite correct. It’s really, again, the opinion of the intellectuals of the upper strata which governs public opinion. But the primary thing is to restore a certain awareness of the need [to limit] governmental powers which, after all, has *existed for a very long time and which we have lost* [emphasis added].<sup>61</sup>

Hayek (1978) informed Buchanan that his constitutional proposal was ‘received exceedingly friendly by the people whom I really respect, but that’s a very small crowd. I’ve received higher praise, which I person-

ally value, for *The Constitution of Liberty* [1960] but from a very small, select circle.<sup>62</sup> In 1962, Hayek sent *The Constitution of Liberty* to the Portuguese dictator (1932–1968), António de Oliveira Salazar, with a covering note explaining that he hoped that it might assist him ‘in his endeavour to design a constitution which is proof against the abuses of democracy’ (cited by Farrant et al. 2012, 521).

In 1918, 85 per cent of those who were governed by the Habsburgs were illiterate (Taylor 1964, 166, 41, 35). Mises (1985 [1927], 115) provided the foundations of aristocratic liberty:

the state, the government, the laws must not in any way concern themselves with schooling or education. Public funds must not be used for such purposes. The rearing and instruction of youth must be left entirely to parents and to private associations and institutions.

According to Hayek, the ‘dictator Oliveira Salazar attempted the right path in that sense, but failed. He tried, but did not succeed’ (cited by Caldwell and Montes 2014a, 44; b, 2015, 298). Portugal languished under Salazar’s (1932–1968) corporatist-authoritarian regime: in the mid-twentieth century, half of Portuguese homes had running water and 30 per cent had electricity. Illiteracy was widespread. Even after joining the European Union, Portugal failed to catch up with respect to human capital formation: according to figures from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, in 2009, only 30 per cent of Portuguese adults had completed high school or its equivalent (Sayare 2012).

Hayek (1978) was contemptuous of those who had been recruited to serve him and his cause:

So, again, what I always come back to is that the whole thing turns on the activities of those intellectuals whom I call the ‘secondhand dealers in opinion,’ who determine what people think in the long run. If you can persuade them, you ultimately reach the masses of the people.<sup>63</sup> You have to persuade the intellectuals, because they are the makers of public opinion. It’s not the people who really understand things; it’s the people who pick up what is fashionable opinion. You have to make the fashionable opinion

among the intellectuals before journalism and the schools and so on will spread it among the people at large.<sup>64</sup>

Having been alerted to Hayek's contempt for human rights (SHOE 20 May 2014), on 26 September 2014, Caldwell and Montes (2014a, 50; b, 2015, 304) posted a working paper on the Duke University Centre for the History of Political Economy (CHOPE) website which referred to 'the uncomfortable question of why Hayek chose to remain silent about the human rights abuses that took place under [Pinochet's] junta' without mentioning the evidence: Hayek's (1966, 1978) statements on human rights and his praise of Mises' 'ruthless consistency.'

Mises (1985 [1927], 47–48) explained that Fascist 'unscrupulous methods' involved human rights abuses: *not* excluding 'murder and assassination from the list of measures to be resorted to in political struggles.' Because Classical Liberals had previously defended human rights, the 'militaristic and nationalistic enemies of the Third International' had felt themselves 'cheated by liberalism.' Hayek was obviously determined not to make the same mistake with Pinochet and other Operation Condor dictators.

Had Hayek and Mises been genuine Classical Liberals they would have objected to human rights abuses; had they been White Terror promoters masquerading as scholars they would have been indifferent. Mises (1985 [1927], 154) was indifferent: 'Whether or not the Russian people are to discard the Soviet system is for them to settle among themselves. The land of the knout and the prison-camp no longer poses a threat to the world today. With all their will to war and destruction, the Russians are no longer capable seriously of imperiling the peace of Europe. One may therefore safely let them alone.'

The year after visiting Pinochet, Hayek (1978) defended the 'civilisation' of apartheid from the American 'fashion' of 'human rights':

You see, my problem with all this is the whole role of what I commonly call the intellectuals, which I have long ago defined as the secondhand dealers in ideas. For some reason or other, they are probably more subject to waves of fashion in ideas and more influential in the American sense than they are

elsewhere. Certain main concerns can spread here with an incredible speed. Take the conception of human rights. I'm not sure whether it's an invention of the present [Carter] administration or whether it's of an older date, but I suppose if you told an eighteen year old that human rights is a new discovery he wouldn't believe it. He would have thought the United States for 200 years has been committed to human rights, which of course would be absurd. The United States discovered human rights two years ago or five years ago. Suddenly it's the main object and leads to a degree of interference with the policy of other countries which, even if I sympathized with the general aim, I don't think it's in the least justified. People in South Africa have to deal with their own problems, and the idea that you can use external pressure to change people, who after all have built up a civilization of a kind, seems to me morally a very doubtful belief. But it's a dominating belief in the United States now.<sup>65</sup>

Do unarmed villagers, protesters, diplomats and politicians—in Sharpeville, 1960, Mỹ Lai, 1968, Chile, 1973, Soweto, or Embassy Row, Washington, 1976—have 'property' rights over their bodies? Do Classical Liberals seek to protect political prisoners from rape and torture by agents of the coercive power of the State? Or do they like Hayek (1992b [1945], 223) promote 'shooting in cold blood'? Mises (1985 [1927], 19) elevated Austrian *economic* liberalism over *political* liberalism:

The program of liberalism, therefore, if condensed into a single word, would have to read: *property* [Mises' emphasis] ... All the other demands of liberalism result from this fundamental demand.

Referring to 'Germans and Italians' and 'Ludendorff and Hitler,' the delusional Mises (1985 [1927], 44, 49) described the human rights abusers who he had enlisted to defend 'property,' 'freedom' and 'peace':

The fundamental idea of these movements—which, from the name of the most grandiose and tightly disciplined among them, the Italian, may, in general, be designated as Fascist—consists in the proposal to make use of the same unscrupulous methods in the struggle against the Third International as the latter employs against its opponents.

## Volume Overview

*The Chicago Maroon* reported that

Thanks to conservative TV and radio personality Glenn Beck's persistent promotion, former U of C professor F.A. Hayek's *The Road to Serfdom*, first published by the University of Chicago Press in 1944, climbed to the top of [Amazon.com](#)'s bestseller list this summer. Since Beck spent one episode of his *Fox News* show on the book on June 8, *Serfdom* has sold 156,000 paperback copies and 14,000 e-book copies ... it's much more academic than top-sellers like the *Twilight* series or Stieg Larsson's detective fiction.

On his website, Beck proclaimed:

This book was like a Mike Tyson (in his prime) right hook to socialism in Western Europe and in the United States. But its influence didn't stop there. It has inspired political and economic leaders for decades since, most famously, Ronald Reagan. Reagan often praised Hayek when he talked about people waking up to the dangers of big government. (Cited by Gaspari [2010](#))

In *I Chose Liberty*, Austrians discuss the influence that Ayn Rand and the John Birch Society had on their ideology: 'On any libertarian journey, an encounter with the John Birch Society was inevitable' (Blumert [2010](#), 56; see also Rockwell [2010](#) [1999], 288; Nolan [2010](#), 238; Salerno [2010](#), 307–308).<sup>66</sup> North ([2010](#), 239–240) had been recruited by a 'little old lady in tennis shoes':

My main academic interest in 1958 was anti-Communism. In 1956, the lady had taken me to hear the anti-Communist Australian physician Fred Schwarz, when I was 14, in one of his first speaking tours in the United States. Shortly thereafter, I sent Schwarz's Christian Anti-Communism Crusade \$100 (\$650 in today's money), which were big bucks for me. I had been working in a record store after school for \$1 an hour for only a few months. I remember the lady who first handed me a copy of *The Freeman*. It was in 1958. She was an inveterate collector of *The Congressional Record*. She clipped it and lots of newspapers, putting the clippings into files. She was a

college-era friend of my parents. She was representative of a dedicated army of similarly inclined women in that era, whose membership in various patriotic study groups was high, comparatively speaking, in southern California.

North was describing the Southern Californian *Mothers of Conservatism: Women and the Postwar Right* for whom Hayek's (1944) *The Road to Serfdom* had become the 'signature tome' (Nickerson 2012, 35–36).

The (Viennese-born) University of Michigan economist, Wolfgang Stolper, informed J. Herbert Fürth that Buchanan—the Austrian-influenced recipient of the 1986 Nobel Prize for Economic Sciences—fitted Josef Schumpeter's description of an 'irresponsible' intellectual: he could not see how anybody could regard him as anything other than an 'ideological fool' who spoke of 'free' markets as if they were 'magic formulas.' Chapter 2 examines the Nobel inflammatory rhetoric of Buchanan and Richard E. Wagner's (1977) *Democracy in Deficit: The Political Legacy of Lord Keynes* and the neoclassical optimization—what Hayek called 'financial considerations'—that appears to be an integral part of Austrian 'scholarship.' Also examined are Austrian 'family values' morality and the process by which crude and intensely religious ideologues become tax-funded 'Professors of Economic Science.'

In Chap. 3, Chip Berlet uncovers the interconnections between the Mises–Hayek philosophy and the roots of the 'culture wars' in the United States, the anti-labour union white supremacism in the ex-Confederate States and the conspiracy theories of Beck and the John Birch Society.

On 1 March 1934, Mises becomes member 282,632 of the Austro-Fascist Fatherland Front (*Vaterländische Front*) and member 406,183 of *Werk Neues Leben*, the official Austro-Fascist social club (Hülsmann 2007, 677, n149); in 1946, he became an FEE employee; and by the 1960s, he had become enmeshed in the conspiracy theories of the John Birch Society, the Christian Freedom Foundation, Spiritual Mobilization and the National Right to Work Committee. Part of this anti-labour union movement was stoked by white supremacist who feared that unions would force white workers to work alongside black workers. A significant number of Americans continue to see the world as a struggle with Satanic forces during the 'End Times': it was these fears that the atheist Rothbard (1992b) pandered to with his 'Outreach to the Redneck.'

Skousen (1997) may have only one academically refereed publication, but Buckley told him: ‘I keep your economics book at my bedside and tell all my friends to read it!’ Skousen was referring to *The Making of Modern Economics* (2009) which contains bogus stories about Pigouvian externalities having been invented by a gun-runner for Stalin. As FEE president, Skousen (2008), over lunch, gave Buckley a copy. Shortly afterwards, John Whitney, Chairman of the W. Edwards Deming Center for Quality Management and Professor of *Professional Practice* at the Columbia Business School, telephoned and, a few months later, arranged for Skousen to take over his courses: ‘I immediately accepted. I will be eternally grateful to William F. Buckley, Jr., for opening this door to my career.’

Skousen (1991, 12, 287, 276) described ‘The Expanding Austrian Universe’ in which Austrians had ‘taken hold’: GMU, NYU, Auburn, and the University of Nevada at Las Vegas. Other centres include Grove City College, Hillsdale College, Claremont McKenna College and the University of Dallas. Having been a full-time lobbyist for the Lower Austria Chamber of Commerce and Industry (1909–1934, part time 1934–1938), in 1943 Mises was appointed to the United States National Association of Manufacturers Economic Principles Commission where he met ‘J. Howard Pew of Sun Oil Company, the major financial contributor to laissez-faire causes; B.E. Hutchinson, vice-chairman of Chrysler; and Robert Welch, of Welch Candy Corp., who went on in the late 1950s to found the John Birch Society’ (Rothbard 1988 [1973], 103, n51). Before the Koch brothers, Pew family oil money funded the Austrian School of Economics (through Grove City College and other outlets).

In Chap. 4, Arthur Goldwag examines Austrian School sentiments—relating to the American Civil War, Holocaust revisionism, so-called scientific racism, Christian Reconstructionism, homophobia, anti-Feminism and anthropogenic climate change denial—in the context of his analysis of *The New Hate: A History of Fear and Loathing on the Populist Right* (2012) and Edward Glaeser’s (2005) formalization of the hate-based ‘rational’ transaction with voters.

In Chap. 5, Michael McVicar explores the relationship between the Austrian School’s ‘moral’ rejection of the modern nation-state and Christian Reconstruction which insists that all of civil society should be



subordinate to the strictures of ancient Biblical law: theocracy and public stoning for a host of 'moral' and civil crimes. Yet Mises' (2009a [1958], 15) promotion of 'consumer sovereignty' was based on the 'liberty' it allegedly provided from coercion: 'In the political sphere, there is no means for an individual or a small group of individuals to disobey the will of the majority.'

Paul Ryan (2012a), the 54th Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives (2015–), told the Atlas Society that Ayn Rand was 'required reading in my office for all my interns and my staff. We start with *Atlas Shrugged*. People tell me I need to start with *The Fountainhead* then go to *Atlas Shrugged* [laughter]. There's a big debate about that. We go to *Fountainhead*, but then we move on, and we require Mises and Hayek as well ... The fight we are in here, make no mistake about it, is a fight of individualism versus collectivism.' And according to Ryan (2012b):

We need a better approach to restore the balance, and the House-passed budget offers one by reintroducing subsidiarity, which the Holy Father has called 'the most effective antidote against any form of all-encompassing welfare state.'

Three years after Pinochet seized power, Hayek's (1976, 7) *The Mirage of Social Justice* reinforced the idea that the State serves only as a precondition for the success of the 'spontaneous' order generated within society: 'The services which the government can render beyond the enforcement of rules of just conduct are not only supplementary or subsidiary to the basic needs which the spontaneous order provides for... [T]hey are services which must be fitted into that more comprehensive order of private efforts which government neither does nor can determine.' The Hayekian Brian Crozier (1993, 157) claims to have drafted Pinochet's 'Constitution of Liberty.' In Chap. 6, Renato Cristi examines the influence of the 'Subsidiary State' as promoted by Jaime Guzmán, the *Kronjurist* of Pinochet's dictatorship.

In Chap. 7, Andrew Farrant and Edward McPhail discuss Hayek's promotion of 'extensive unemployment' and his contempt for Amnesty International's evidence about Pinochet's human rights abuses which he dismissed as the work of a 'bunch of leftists.'

In Chap. 8, Robert Nelson provides a broader examination of the religious ‘residue’ in social science—with a case study of the Nordic social democracy promoted by Hayek’s co-recipient of the 1974 Nobel Prize for Economic Sciences, Gunnar Myrdal.

Mises (2009b [1978 (1940)], 120) praised the achievements of Fascist Austria and its one-party Corporatist State: ‘Only one nation had attempted serious opposition to Hitler on the European continent—the Austrian nation. It was only after five years of successful resistance that little Austria surrendered, abandoned by all.’ In addition to Austria (1934–1945) and Pinochet’s Chile (1973–1990), the most prominent Clerical Fascist regimes were Getúlio Vargas’s Brazil (1930–1945; 1951–1954), Salazar’s Portugal (1932–1968), General Francisco Franco’s Spain (1936–1975), and Marshall Philippe Petain’s Vichy France (1940–1945). Chapters 9 and 10 describe some common White Terror characteristics of these regimes.

Hayek (1978) reflected about ‘what you might call the race problem, the anti-Semitism. There was a purely non-Jewish group; there was an almost purely Jewish group; and there was a small intermediate group where the two groups mixed.’<sup>67</sup> Hayek’s (1994, 61) own family was in ‘the purely Christian group; but in the university context I entered into the mixed group.’ Since Hayek (1978) ‘was brought up essentially in an irreligious family,’ the phrase ‘purely Christian’ appears to mean proto-Nazi or anti-Semitic. Hayek’s childhood friend, J. Herbert Fürth (20 April 1984), informed Gottfried Haberler that Hayek’s family ‘adhered to Nazism long before there was an Adolf Hitler.’<sup>68</sup> Fürth (23 March 1992) also told Paul Samuelson that Hayek’s father was the president of a ‘highly nationalistic society of German physicians’ who competed with the politically neutral General Medical Association. Hayek’s mother was ‘equally nationalistic, and mad at me because I had “seduced” her son from nationalism.’<sup>69</sup> Hayek explained to Cubitt (2006, 17, 51) that his mother was ‘converted to Nazism by a woman friend’; Hitler’s success was due to his appeal to women, ‘citing his mother as another example.’ To ‘his certain knowledge,’ Nazism ‘had been actively upheld’ in Austria ‘long before it had reached Germany.’

Rosten asked about Mises’ (1944, 94–96) description of the *Wandervogel* most of whom had ‘one aim only: to get a job as soon as possible with the

government. Those who were not killed in the wars and revolutions are today pedantic and timid bureaucrats in the innumerable offices of the German *Zwangswirtschaft*. They are obedient and faithful slaves of Hitler.' Hayek (1978) replied: 'Oh, I saw it happen; it was still quite active immediately after the war. I think it reached the highest point in the early twenties, immediately after the war. In fact, I saw it happen when my youngest brother [Erich] was full time drawn into that circle; but they were still not barbarians yet. It was rather a return to nature. Their main enjoyment was going out for walks into nature and living a primitive life. But it was not yet an outright revolt against civilization, as it later became.'<sup>70</sup>

Hayek was 'at pains to point out and was to repeat this many times, that his family could not have Jewish roots' (Cubitt 2006, 51). Heinrich von Hayek spent the Third Reich injecting chemicals into freshly executed victims of the Nazis. According to one of his colleagues, his victims may not have been dead when his 'experiments' began. He was a *Scharführer* (non-commissioned officer) in the *Sturmabteilung* (SA, Storm Detachment, Assault Division, or Brownshirts), and from 1934 to 1935, *Führer* in the *Kampfring der Deutsch-Österreicher im Reich (Hilfsbund)*, an organization of German-Austrians living in Germany that displayed a Swastika in its regalia (Hildebrandt 2013, 2016). He presumably used his influence to ensure that a German-Austrian living in England—his brother—would be given privileged treatment in Nazi-occupied Britain: unlike over 2300 intellectuals and politicians, 'Friedrich von Hayek' is not on the list of those whose arrest would be 'automatic' following an Austro-German invasion.<sup>71</sup>

In 1937, Hayek wrote to Walter Lippmann:

I wish I could make my 'progressive' friends ... understand that democracy is possible only under capitalism and that collectivist experiments lead inevitably to fascism of one sort or another. (Cited by Nash 2004)

When Hitler was defeated, Hayek (1992b [1945], 223) pretended to insist that captured or surrendering Nazis should be shot 'in cold blood'; but two years later, when Heinrich was barred from academic employment under German de-Nazification laws, Hayek compared the Holocaust to playing the fiddle in the Viennese Symphony Orchestra: 'It is scarcely easier to justify the prevention of a person from fiddling

because he was a Nazi than the prevention because he is a Jew' (*Spectator* 1947; cited by Ebenstein 2003, 390, n21).

In *The Road to Serfdom*, Hayek (1944)—to kick over the traces of Austrian School culpability for Hitler—blamed 'The Socialists of all Parties.' Mises (1 March 1940) assured the American-Austrian Benjamin Anderson that 'Your doubts about a visit in Europe are unfounded. It is just the right time for you to come and to see what is going on.' According to his biographer, 'Mises had been convinced that the new war would start just as the last war had ended—in the trenches. He was convinced that France and its allies would withstand any German attack. Modern conditions had made defense the most effective military strategy.' Two months later,

Mises could hardly believe what he read in the newspapers. 'Belgium! Holland!' he exclaimed in his notebook on May 10 ... On June 14, Mises exclaimed again: 'Paris!' and three days later 'Armistice!' It was an ordeal. May 1940 was, as he later recalled, 'the most disastrous month of Europe's history.' (Hülsmann 2007, 750–751)

Mises' official biographer declared that this 'was the only time he was ever wrong in forecasting an important political or economic event' (Hülsmann 2007, 750–751). Referring to 'Germans and Italians' and 'Ludendorff and Hitler,' the delusional Mises (1985 [1927], 44, 49) described those who he had enlisted to defend 'property,' 'freedom' and 'peace': 'The deeds of the Fascists and of other parties corresponding to them were emotional reflex actions evoked by indignation at the deeds of the Bolsheviks and Communists. As soon as the first flush of anger had passed, their policy took a more moderate course and will probably become even more so with the passage of time.' But the Nazis chose a Pact with the Soviet Union rather than with the Austrian School of Economics.

Between 26 May and 4 June 1940, one-third of a million Allied soldiers were rescued by the 'little ships of Dunkirk' (hundreds of merchant marine, fishing and pleasure boats). Mises again 'got in touch with Anderson, a good friend of his, who at that time was chief economist at the Chase Bank in New York. Professor Anderson immediately took the necessary steps and got for both of us a nonquota visa, which allowed us to enter the United States immediately.' On 18 June 1940, Mises received

a telegram from the University of California Dean Robert Calkins offering a position as 'lecturer and research associate professor.' Mises was in 'no way happy about this offer, but it meant a possibility and a way out.' E. F. Penrose, professor of economics at the University of California, wrote a threatening letter on his behalf: 'I trust that in the present unsettled state of Europe he will not be obstructed or be in any way interfered with in reaching the United States. If he should be interfered with in any way the fact will become known in the United States and would certainly influence public opinion strongly against whatever persons or whatever country prevented him—as an accepted immigrant—from coming to the United States' (Margit Mises 1984, 55–56).

In 1939, the St Louis ocean liner carrying Jewish refugees from Germany was denied entry into the United States. In 1940, *The Last Knight of Liberalism*—whose motto was 'Do not give in to evil,' but proceed ever more boldly against it (Hülsmann 2007, 34)<sup>72</sup>—fled to neutral America to escape from the 'Fascists' he had so recently courted:

Lu was in a terrible state of mind. As calm and composed as he seemed, he was not made for adventures and uncertainties of this kind. I needed all my courage to help him overcome his desolation. (Margit Mises 1984, 58)

Others—often at great personal risk—remained to fight those whom Mises (1985 [1927], 51) had 'eternally' blessed: 'It cannot be denied that Fascism and similar movements aimed at the establishment of dictatorships are full of the best intentions and that their intervention has for the moment saved European civilization.' In Chap. 11, Helen Fry describes the von Hayek's Nazi Austria and the efforts of an employee of the British Passport Office in Vienna who was in the 'front line of efforts' to save the country's Jews.'

## Notes

1. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Robert Chitester date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).

2. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by James Buchanan 28 October 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
3. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Robert Chitester date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
4. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Earlene Craver date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
5. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Robert Chitester date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
6. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by James Buchanan 28 October 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
7. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Robert Chitester date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
8. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Jack High date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
9. <http://historyofeconomics.org/awards-and-honors/best-article-prize/>
10. <http://www.margarethatcher.org/document/114609> Hayek Papers Box 27.6.
11. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Leo Rosten 15 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
12. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Robert Chitester date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
13. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Earlene Craver date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
14. Hayek Papers Box 29.47.
15. Hayek Papers Box 25.24.
16. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Earlene Craver date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
17. Hayek Papers Box 24.72.

18. <http://partners.nytimes.com/library/politics/camp/800715convention-gop-ra.html>
19. This states: 'No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States: and no person holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state.'
20. <http://mises.org/books/paine2.pdf>
21. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Robert Chitester date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
22. Wieser (1983 [1926], xxxix) expressed similar sentiments: 'The inconceivability of the World War was followed by the inconceivability of inner decay ... How could this all have happened? Had life not lost all of its meaning?'
23. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Earlene Craver date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
24. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Leo Rosten 15 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
25. Hayek (20 October 1987) to Bartley. Hayek Papers Box 126.4.
26. Hayek Papers Box 170. <http://www.margarethatcher.org/document/117176>. The letter was not published, presumably, because the *Times* wished to protect Hayek's reputation.
27. *Grundprobleme der Nationalökonomie* had actually been signed 'Wien, Januar 1933. **L. Mises**' (1933, xiv [bold in original]). Within Austria, in 'daily business' he was addressed as 'Professor von Mises' (Hülsmann 2007, 335).
28. When Harry Truman won in 1948, Paton complained: 'Miserable day, isn't it?' (cited by Lawrence et al. 2004, 85).
29. <http://www.margarethatcher.org/document/108263>
30. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=20239>
31. Hayek Papers Box 19.19.
32. 'As Antony's depression deepened, he found it difficult to concentrate ... At their most acute these could last weeks or even months and could render him inactive and silent, miserable but apologetic. Later in his life, the down cycle of his mood-swings was sufficiently severe to prevent him from doing any kind of meaningful work' (Frost 2002, 8).

33. <http://www.coordinationproblem.org/2014/06/robert-leeson-hayek-and-the-underpants-gnomes.html>
34. Isaacs stated: 'I consider even the brief and very conditional Mises praise offered to fascism of the 1920s to have been a moral lapse.' No mention was made of Mises' status as a card-carrying Austro-Fascist and member of the official Fascist social club.
35. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Robert Chitester date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
36. 'I am bound to say that [Austrian business cycle theory] seems to me to fit certain facts of the American slump better than any other explanation I know. And I cannot think that it is altogether an accident that the Austrian *Institut für Konjunkturforschung*, of which Dr. Hayek is director, was one of the very few bodies of its kind which, in the spring of 1929, predicted a setback in America with injurious repercussions on European conditions' (Robbins 2012 [1931], 172).
37. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Robert Chitester date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
38. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Earlene Craver date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
39. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Robert Chitester date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
40. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by James Buchanan 28 October 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
41. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by James Buchanan 28 October 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
42. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Earlene Craver date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
43. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Leo Rosten 15 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
44. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Armen Alchian 11 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).



45. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Earlene Craver date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
46. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Robert Chitester date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
47. 'Well, you see, I think the intellectual history of all this is frightfully complex, because this idea of necessary laws of historical development appears at the same time in [Georg Wilhelm Friedrich] Hegel and [Auguste] Comte. So you had two philosophical traditions—Hegelian idealism and French positivism--really aiming at a science which was supposed to discover necessary laws of historical development. But it caught the imagination—[It] not only [caught] the imagination but it appeased certain traditional feelings and emotions. As I said before, once you put it out that the market society does not satisfy our instincts, and once people become aware of this and are not from childhood taught that these rules of the market are essential, of course we revolt against it.' Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Leo Rosten on 15 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
48. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Leo Rosten 15 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
49. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Leo Rosten 15 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
50. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by James Buchanan 28 October 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
51. Hayek to Angelo Petroni (13 January 1984). Hayek Papers Box 29.12.
52. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Leo Rosten 15 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
53. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Robert Chitester date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
54. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Leo Rosten 15 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).

55. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Jack High date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
56. <https://www.quora.com/How-many-people-work-in-the-U-N-building>
57. <http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/mcveigh/mcveighwaco.html>
58. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Jack High date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
59. <http://mises.org/pdf/asc/essays/kuehneltLeddihn.pdf>
60. [http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel\\_prizes/economic-sciences/laureates/1974/press.html](http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economic-sciences/laureates/1974/press.html)
61. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Robert Bork 4 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
62. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by James Buchanan 28 October 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
63. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by James Buchanan 28 October 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
64. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Thomas Hazlett 12 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
65. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Robert Chitester date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
66. Although some of the local-level Birchers are inclined to oversimplify the cause and solution to the world's ills, I was fortunate in knowing JBS founder Robert Welch, and the great Gary Allen was a pal. Hardly libertarians, these folks always seem to be on the right side of important issues, if not always for the right reasons. The JBS advocates a vast military state, yet they are rock solid on the key matter of the U.S. maintaining a non-interventionist foreign policy. If this sounds a bit schizophrenic, well—as Murray used to say—“Everybody is entitled to one deviation” ’ (Blumert 2010, 56).
67. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Earlene Craver date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).

68. Fürth Papers. Hoover Institution. Box 5.
69. Fürth Papers. Hoover Institution. Box 6.
70. Friedrich Hayek interviewed by Leo Rosten 15 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
71. 'Nazi Black List' file. Hoover Institution Archives.
72. 'Tu ne cede malis sed contra audentior ito.'

## Bibliography

- Anderson, R. G. 1999. George and Me. LewRockwell.com. <https://www.lewrockwell.com/1999/12/robert-g-anderson/george-and-me/>
- Barros, R. 2004. *Constitutionalism and Dictatorship. Pinochet, the Junta, and the 1980 Constitution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Batamarco, R. 1995. Three Fallacies of Rent Control. Foundation for Economic Education. 1 June. <https://fee.org/articles/three-fallacies-of-rent-control/>
- Benham, F. 1932. *British Monetary Policy*. London: P.S. King and Son.
- Bennett, L. 2012. Tracking Koch Money and Americans for Prosperity. *Forbes* 31 March. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/lauriebennett/2012/03/31/tracking-koch-money-and-americans-for-prosperity/#2a762ff96c46>
- Bessner, D. 2014. Murray Rothbard, Political Strategy, and the Making of Modern Libertarianism. *Intellectual History Review* 24.4: 441–456.
- Block, W. 2008. *Labor Economics from a Free Market Perspective: Employing the Unemployable*. Singapore: World Scientific.
- Blumert, B. 2010. Where Did I Go Wrong? In Block, W. (Ed.) *I Chose Liberty: Autobiographies of Contemporary Libertarians*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Boettke, P. 2010. EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW. Peter Boettke on the Rise of Austrian Economics, Its Academic Inroads and Why the Market Should Decide. *Daily Bell* 12 December. <http://www.thedailybell.com/exclusive-interviews/anthony-wile-peter-boettke-on-the-rise-of-austrian-economics-its-academic-inroads-and-why-the-market-should-decide/>
- Brulle, R. 2014. Institutionalizing Delay: Foundation Funding and the Creation of U.S. Climate Change Counter-Movement Organizations. *Climatic Change*. 122.4: 681–694.
- Buchanan, J. 1992. I Did Not Call Him 'Fritz': Personal Recollections of Professor F. A. v. Hayek. *Constitutional Political Economy* 3.2, Spring/Summer: 129–135.

- Buchanan, J. M. and Wagner, R. E. (1977) *Democracy in Deficit: The Political Legacy of Lord Keynes*. New York: Academic Press.
- Buckley, W. 1995. Murray Rothbard RIP. *National Review* 6 February. <http://notableandquotable.blogspot.com.au/2008/04/william-f-buckleys-obituary-of-murray.html>
- Bullock, A. 1991. *Hitler: A Study in Tyranny*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Burns, J. 2009. *Goddess of the Market Ayn Rand and the American Right*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bryan, W. 2014. Giving Is Both Job and Joy for Hot Springs Philanthropist. *Three Rivers Edition* 16 November. <http://www.arkansasonline.com/news/2014/nov/16/giving-both-job-and-joy-hot-springs-philanthropist/>
- Caldwell, B. 1995. Editorial Notes. In Hayek, F. A. *Contra Keynes and Cambridge The Collected Works of F.A. Hayek*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Caldwell, B. 2004. *Hayek's Challenge: An Intellectual Biography of F.A. Hayek*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Caldwell, B. 2006. Popper and Hayek Who Influenced Whom? In Jarvie, I. Milford, K. and Miller, D. (Eds.) *Karl Popper a Centenary Assessment. Life and Times and Values in a World of Facts*. Aldershot: Ashford.
- Caldwell, B. 2007. Introduction and Editorial Notes. In Hayek, F. A. *The Road to Serfdom Texts and Documents The Definitive Edition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Caldwell, B. 2008. Hayek on Mill. *History of Political Economy* 40.4: 689–704.
- Caldwell, B. 2010. Ten (Mostly) Austrian Insights For These Trying Times. Mimeo. <http://econfaculty.gmu.edu/pboettke/workshop/Spring2010/Caldwell4.pdf>
- Caldwell, B. 2014. Center for the History of Political Economy 2013–2014 Annual Report Summer. <https://hope.econ.duke.edu/sites/hope.econ.duke.edu/files/Summer%202014%20Annual%20Report.pdf>
- Caldwell, B. and Montes, L. 2014a. Friedrich Hayek and His Visits to Chile. CHOPE Working Paper No. 2014-12. August.
- Caldwell, B. and Montes, L. 2014b. Friedrich Hayek and His Visits to Chile. *Review of Austrian Economics*. First online: 26 September 2014.
- Caldwell, B. and Montes, L. 2015. Friedrich Hayek and His Visits to Chile. *Review of Austrian Economics* 28.3, September: 261–309.
- Crozier, B. 1993. *Free Agent: The Unseen War 1941–1991*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Cubitt, C. 2006. *A Life of August von Hayek*. Bedford, England: Authors On line.

- Davidson, E. 1966. *The Trials of the Germans: An Account of the Twenty-two Defendants Before the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg*. London: Macmillan.
- Eakin, E. 1996. God and Man at Hillsdale A Conservative College's Double Vision. *Lingua Franca* 6.6, September/October. <http://linguafranca.mirror.theinfo.org/9609/hillsdale.html>
- Ebeling, R. 1975. The Second Austrian Conference. *Libertarian Forum* VIII.7: 4–8. <http://rothbard.altervista.org/articles/libertarian-forum/lf-7-7.pdf>
- Ebenstein, A. 2003. *Friedrich Hayek a Biography*. New York: Palgrave.
- Edsall, N. 1986. *Richard Cobden Independent Radical*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Evans, K. 2010. Spreading Hayek, Spurning Keynes. Professor Leads an Austrian Revival. *Wall Street Journal* 28 August. <http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052748703418004575455911922562120>
- Farrant, A. McPhail, E. and Berger, S. 2012. Preventing the “Abuses” of Democracy: Hayek, the “Military Usurper” and Transitional Dictatorship in Chile? *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 71.3: 513–538.
- Friedman, M. F. 2017 [1991]. Say ‘No’ to Intolerance. In Leeson, R. and Palm, C. (Eds.) *Friedman on Freedom*. Hoover Press: Stanford, California.
- Frost, G. 2002. *Anthony Fisher Champion of Liberty*. London: Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Gaspari, A. 2010. U of C book gets Glenn Beck bump. *The Chicago Maroon* 22 October. <http://chicagomaroon.com/2010/10/22/u-of-c-book-gets-glenn-beck-bump/>
- Glaeser, E. L. 2005. The Political Economy of Hatred. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 131.1, February: 45–86.
- Goldberg, S. 2013. Conservative Groups Spend up to \$1bn a Year to Fight Action on Climate Change. *Guardian* 21 December. <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2013/dec/20/conservative-groups-1bn-against-climate-change>
- Goldwag, A. 2012. *The New Hate: A History of Fear and Loathing on the Populist Right*. Random House: New York.
- Gusejnova, D. 2012. Noble Continent: German Speaking Nobles as Theorists of European Identity in the Inter-war Period. In Hewitson, M and D’Auria, M. (Eds.) *Europe in Crisis: Intellectuals and the European Idea, 1917–1957*. New York: Berghahn.
- Haberler, G. 1986. Reflections on Hayek’s Business Cycle Theory. *Cato Journal* 6.2, Fall: 421–435.

- Habsburg, O. 1986 [1960]. Foreword. In Somary, F. *The Raven of Zurich The Memoirs of Felix Somary*. London: St Martin's Press. Translated from the German by A. J. Sherman.
- Haiduk, K. 2015. Hayek and Coase Travel East: Privatization and the Experience of Post-Socialist Economic Transformation. In Leeson, R. (Ed.) *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography Part VI Good Dictators, Sovereign Producers and Hayek's 'Ruthless Consistency'*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hamowy, R. 1999. F. A. Hayek, on the Occasion of the Centenary of His Birth. *Cato Journal* 9.2, Fall: 279–287. <http://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/1999/11/cj19n2-5.pdf>
- Harberger, A. 1999. Interview with Arnold Harberger. An Interview with the Dean of the 'Chicago Boys.' *The Region March*. <https://www.minneapolisfed.org/publications/the-region/interview-with-arnold-harberger>
- Hayek, F. A. 1935. The Maintenance of Capital. *Economica* N.S. 2, August: 241–276.
- Hayek, F. A. 1944. *The Road to Serfdom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hayek, F. A. 1948. *Individualism and Economic Order*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hayek, F. A. 1960. *The Constitution of Liberty*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hayek, F. A. 1966. Misconception of Human Rights as Positive Claims. *Farmand* II/12, Anniversary Issue: 32–35.
- Hayek, F. A. 1967 [1935]. *Prices and Production*. New York: Augustus M. Kelly. Second edition.
- Hayek, F. A. 1974. Prize Lecture. The Pretence of Knowledge. [http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel\\_prizes/economic-sciences/laureates/1974/hayek-lecture.html](http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economic-sciences/laureates/1974/hayek-lecture.html)
- Hayek, F. A. 1975. In Haberler, G. *A discussion with Friedrich A. von Hayek: Held at the American Enterprise Institute on April 9, 1975*. Washington: American Enterprise Institute.
- Hayek, F. A. 1976. *Law, Legislation and Liberty Volume 2 The Mirage of Social Justice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hayek, F. A. 1978. *Oral History Interviews*. Centre for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles. <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>.
- Hayek, F. A. 1979. *Law, Legislation and Liberty Volume 3 The Political Order of a Free People*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hayek, F. A. 1988. *The Fatal Conceit: The Errors of Socialism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Edited by William Warren Bartley III.

- Hayek, F. A. 1992a [1977]. The Road from Serfdom. *Reason* July. <http://reason.com/archives/1992/07/01/the-road-from-serfdom/5>
- Hayek, F. A. 1992b. *The Fortunes of Liberalism Essays on Austrian Economics and the Ideal of Freedom The Collected Works of F.A. Hayek Volume 4*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Edited by Peter Klein.
- Hayek, F. A. 1994. *Hayek on Hayek an Autobiographical Dialogue*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Edited by Stephen Kresge and Leif Wenar.
- Hayek, F. A. 1995. *Contra Keynes and Cambridge. The Collected Works of F.A. Hayek*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Edited by Bruce Caldwell.
- Hayek, F. A. 1997. *Socialism and War: Essays, Documents, Reviews. The Collected Works of F.A. Hayek*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Edited by Bruce Caldwell.
- Hayek, F. A. 1999. *Good Money, Part II: The Standard. The Collected Works of F.A. Hayek*. London: Routledge. Edited by Stephen Kresge.
- Hayek, F. A. 2007 [1944]. *The Road to Serfdom: The Definitive Edition. The Collected Works of F.A. Hayek*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Edited by Bruce Caldwell.
- Heiden, K. 1944. *Der Fuehrer*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Translated by Ralph Manheim.
- Hitler, A. 1939 [1925]. *Mein Kampf*. London: Hurst and Blackett. Translated by James Murphy.
- Hildebrandt, S. 2013. Wolfgang Bargmann (1906–1978) and Heinrich von Hayek (1900–1969): Careers in Anatomy Continuing Through German National Socialism to Postwar Leadership. *Annals of Anatomy Anatomischer Anzeiger* 195.4, July: 283–295. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0940960213000782>
- Hildebrand, S. 2016. *The Anatomy of Murder Ethical Transgressions and Anatomical Science During the Third Reich*. New York: Berghahn.
- Hoare, L. 2015. In London, a Close Race Where British Jewish Voters Matter Most. *Times of Israel* 5 May. <http://www.timesofisrael.com/in-london-a-close-race-where-british-jewish-voters-matter-most/>
- Hoppe, H-H. 2001. *Democracy the God That Failed: The Economics and Politics of Monarchy, Democracy and Natural Order*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Howson, S. 2011. *Lionel Robbins*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hülsmann, J. G. 2007. *Mises: The Last Knight of Liberalism*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.



- Judis, J. 1988. *William F. Buckley Jr.: Patron Saint of the Conservatives*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Kengor, P. 2001. Ronald Reagan, Author. *Hoover Digest* Sunday, April–May. <http://www.hoover.org/research/ronald-reagan-author>
- Koestler, A. 1950. Arthur Koestler. In Crossman, R. (Ed.) *Communism: The God That Failed*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Kuehnelt-Leddihn, E. (pseudonym Campbell, F. S). 1978 [1943]. *The Menace of the Herd: Or, Procrustes at Large (Studies in Conservative Philosophy)*. New York: Gordon Press.
- Kurland, P. B. and Lerner, R. 2000. *The Founders' Constitution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lawrence, H. J., Ramage, J. A., Pitts, S. T., and Kamery, R. H. 2004. William A. Paton's Contribution to Accounting Education. *Allied Academies International Internet Conference Proceedings*. 6: 18–22. <http://www.alliedacademies.org/pdfs/paai-6.pdf>
- Leeson, R. (Ed.) 2013. *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography Part I: Influences, from Mises to Bartley*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leeson, R. (Ed.) 2015a. *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography Part II Austria, America and the Rise of Hitler 1899–1933*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leeson, R. (Ed.) 2015b. *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography Part III Fraud, Fascism and Free Market Religion*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leeson, R. 2017a. *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography Part VIII 'The Constitution of Liberty 1: 'Shooting in Cold Blood' Hayek's Plan for the Future of Democracy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leeson, R. 2017b. *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography Part VII 'Market Free Play with an Audience': Hayek's Encounters with Fifty Knowledge Communities*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leeson, R. 2017c. *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography Part XIII Chicago and the 1974 Nobel Prize for Economic Sciences*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leube, K. R. 2003. Some Remarks on Hayek's *The Sensory Order*. *Laissez Faire* 12–22. [http://laissezfaire.ufm.edu/images/7/79/Laissezfaire18\\_2.pdf](http://laissezfaire.ufm.edu/images/7/79/Laissezfaire18_2.pdf).
- Long, R. 2006. Rothbard's 'Left and Right': 40 years later. *Mises Daily* 4 August. <https://mises.org/library/rothbards-left-and-right-forty-years-later>
- Machlup, F. 1974. Friedrich von Hayek's Contributions to Economics. *Swedish Journal of Economics* 76.4, December: 498–531.
- Mayer, J. 2013. Koch Pledge Tied to Congressional Climate Inaction. *New Yorker* 30 June. <http://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/koch-pledge-tied-to-congressional-climate-inaction>



- Mises, L. 1912. *Theorie des Geldes und der Umlaufsmittel*. Munich: Verlag von Duncker & Humblot.
- Mises, L. 1922. *Die Gemeinwirtschaft: Untersuchungen über den Sozialismus*. Germany: Gustav Fischer Verlag.
- Mises, L. 1933. *Grundprobleme der Nationalökonomie* Untersuchungen über Verfahren, Aufgaben und Inhalt der Wirtschafts- und Gesellschaftslehre. Jena: Verlag von Gustav Fischer.
- Mises, L. 1944. *Bureaucracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mises, L. 1951 [1922]. *Socialism: An Economic and Sociological Analysis*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Translated by J. Kahane.
- Mises, L. 1963. *Human Action: A Treatise on Economics*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Second edition.
- Mises, L. 1966. *Human Action: A Treatise on Economics*. Chicago: Henry Regnery. Third edition.
- Mises, L. 1985 [1927]. *Liberalism in the Classical Tradition*. Auburn, Alabama: Mises Institute. Translated by Ralph Raico.
- Mises, L. 1998. *Human Action: A Treatise on Economics the Scholars Edition*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Mises, L. 2000. *Selected Writings of Ludwig von Mises, Volume 3: The Political Economy of International Reform and Reconstruction*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund. <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/mises-selected-writings-of-ludwig-von-mises-vol-3-the-political-economy-of-international-reform-and-reconstruction>
- Mises, L. 2002. *Selected Writings of Ludwig von Mises, Volume 2: Between the Two World Wars: Monetary Disorder, Interventionism, Socialism, and the Great Depression*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund. <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/mises-selected-writings-of-ludwig-von-mises-vol-2-between-the-two-world-wars-monetary-disorder-interventionism-socialism-and-the-great-depression>
- Mises, L. 2003 [1933]. *Epistemological Problems of Economics*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute. Translated by George Reisman.
- Mises, L. 2007 [1958]. Mises and Rothbard Letters to Ayn Rand. *Journal of Libertarian Studies* 21.4, Winter: 11–16.
- Mises, L. 2009a [1958]. *Liberty and Property*. Auburn, Alabama: Mises Institute.
- Mises, L. 2009b [1978 (1940)]. *Memoirs*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Mises, L. 2012. *Selected Writings of Ludwig von Mises, vol. 1: Monetary and Economic Problems Before, During, and After the Great War*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund. <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/mises-selected-writings-of-ludwig-von-mises-vol-1-monetary-and-economic-problems-before-during-and-after-the-great-war>

- Mises, M. 1976. *My Life with Ludwig von Mises*. New Rochelle, New York: Arlington House.
- Mises, M. 1984. *My Life with Ludwig von Mises*. Cedar Falls, Iowa. Center for Futures Education. Second edition.
- Montes, L. 2015. Friedman's Two Visits to Chile in Context. <http://jepson.richmond.edu/conferences/summer-institute/papers2015/LMontesSIPaper.pdf>
- Morgan, L. 2011. End of a Royal Dynasty as Otto von Habsburg Is Laid to Rest... with His Heart Buried in a Crypt 85 Miles Away. MailOnline 18 July.
- Nash, G. 2004. Hayek and the American Conservative Movement. <http://www.isi.org/lectures/text/pdf/hayek4-3-04.pdf>
- Nickerson, M. 2012. *Mothers of Conservatism: Women and the Postwar Right*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Noakes, J. and Pridham, G. 1994. Eds. *Nazism 1919–1945 Volume 1 The Rise to Power 1919–1934: A Documentary Reader*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Nolan, D. 2010. Discovering the Libertarian Within. In Block, W. (Ed.) *I Chose Liberty: Autobiographies of Contemporary Libertarians*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- North, G. K. 1986. Foreword. In Hodge, I. (Ed.) *Baptised Inflation: A Critique of 'Christian' Keynesianism*. Institute for Christian Economics: Tyler, Texas.
- North, G. K. 2010. It All Began with Fred Schwarz. In Block, W. (Ed.) *I Chose Liberty: Autobiographies of Contemporary Libertarians*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- North, G. K. 2013. Cap Pistols, Gun Control, and Ethics. Gary North's Specific Answers Wealth Building Strategy and Q and A forum. <http://www.garynorth.com/public/10643.cfm>
- O'Brien, P. J. 1985. Authoritarianism and the New Economic Orthodoxy the Political Economy of the Chilean Regime, 1973–85. In O'Brien, P.J. and Cammack, P.A. (Eds). *Generals in Retreat: The Crisis of Military Rule in Latin America*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Paine, T. 1776. *Common Sense Addressed to the Inhabitants of America*. Philadelphia: W. and T. Bradford.
- Paine, T. 2000 [1775]. Reflections on Titles. In Kurland, P. B. and Lerner, R. (Eds.) *The Founders' Constitution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. <http://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/>
- Paton, W. A. 1966. U.S.A. Disaster Area. *The Freeman* February: 16–20. <https://www.unz.org/Pub/Freeman-1966feb-00016>
- Peterson, J. 2014. Hated Was My Muse. Liberty.me. <https://wti.liberty.me/hatred-was-my-muse/>
- Rand, A. 1957. *Atlas Shrugged*. London: Random House.

- Reagan, R. 1984. In Mises, M. *My Years with Ludwig von Mises*. Cedar Fall, Iowa: Centre for Futures Education.
- Reisman, G. 1991. *The Toxicity of Environmentalism*. The Jefferson School of Philosophy, Economics and Psychology.
- Ridley, J. 1970. *Lord Palmerston*. London: Constable.
- Robbins, L. 2012 [1931]. Foreword. In Hayek, F. A. *Business Cycles Volume VII The Collected Works of F.A. Hayek*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Edited by Hansjörg Klausinger.
- Robin, C. 2011. *The Reactionary Mind: Conservatism from Edmund Burke to Sarah Palin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, A. and North, G. 1986. *Fighting Chance: Ten Feet to Survival*. Oregon: Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine.
- Rockwell, L. Jr. 1994a. The Cognitive State. *Rothbard Rockwell Report* December. <http://www.unz.org/Pub/RothbardRockwellReport-1994dec-00018>
- Rockwell, L. Jr. 1994b. The Real State of the Union. *Rothbard Rockwell Report* March. <http://www.unz.org/Pub/RothbardRockwellReport-1994mar-00018>
- Rockwell, L. Jr. 1997. The Princess Vs. the Power Elite. *Triple R* November. <http://www.unz.org/Pub/RothbardRockwellReport-1997nov-00001>
- Rockwell, L. Jr. 1998. To Restore the Church Smash the State. *Triple R* March. <http://www.unz.org/Pub/RothbardRockwellReport-1998mar-00011>
- Rockwell, L. Jr. 2008. *The Cyclical Ozone Layer Returns*. LewRockwell.com. <https://www.lewrockwell.com/lrc-blog/the-cyclical-ozone-layer-returns/>
- Rockwell, L. Jr. 2010. Libertarianism and the Old Right. In Block, W. (Ed.) *I Chose Liberty: Autobiographies of Contemporary Libertarians*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Rockwell, L. Jr. 2011. Ideas and the Culpability for Violence. *Mises Daily* 27 July. <https://mises.org/library/ideas-and-culpability-violence>
- Rohter, L. 2006. Colonel's Death Gives Clues to Pinochet Arms Deals. *New York Times* 19 June.
- Rothbard, M. N. 1988 [1973]. *The Essential von Mises*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Rothbard, M. N. 1992a. A Strategy for the Right. *Rothbard Rockwell Report* 3.3, March. <http://www.unz.org/Pub/RothbardRockwellReport-1992mar-00001>
- Rothbard, M. N. 1992b. Right-Wing Populism: A Strategy for the Paleo Movement. *Rothbard Rockwell Report* 3.1. <http://www.unz.org/Pub/RothbardRockwellReport-1992jan-00005>
- Rothbard, M. N. 1993. Who Are the Terrorists? *Rothbard Rockwell Report* 4.8, August. <http://www.unz.org/Pub/RothbardRockwellReport-1993aug-00001>

- Rothbard, M. N. 1994a. Nations by Consent: Decomposing the Nation-State. *Journal of Libertarian Studies* 11.1, Fall: 1–10.
- Rothbard, M. N. 1994b. A New Strategy for Liberty. *Rothbard Rockwell Report* 5.10, October. <http://www.unz.org/Pub/RothbardRockwellReport-1994oct-00001>
- Rothbard, M. N. 1994c. Invade the World. *Rothbard Rockwell Report* 5.9, September. <http://www.unz.org/Pub/RothbardRockwellReport-1994sep-00001>
- Rothbard, M. N. 1994d. Those Jury Verdicts. *Rothbard Rockwell Report* 5.5, May. <http://www.unz.org/Pub/RothbardRockwellReport-1994may-00009>
- Rothbard, M. N. 1994e. Revolution in Italy! *Rothbard Rockwell Report* 5.7, July. <http://www.unz.org/Pub/RothbardRockwellReport-1994jul-00001>
- Rothbard, M. N. 2006. *Making Economic Sense*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute. Second Edition.
- Rothbard, M. N. 2007 [1958]. Mises and Rothbard Letters to Ayn Rand. *Journal of Libertarian Studies* 21.4, Winter: 11–6.
- Ryan, P. 2012a. Paul Ryan and Ayn Rand's ideas: In the Hot Seat Again. The Atlas Society 30 April. <http://atlassociety.org/commentary/commentary-blog/4971-paul-ryan-and-ayn-rands-ideas-in-the-hot-seat-again>
- Ryan, P. 2012b. Applying Our Enduring Truths to Our Defining Challenge. Washington 25 April. <http://paulryan.house.gov/news/documentprint.aspx?DocumentID=292787>
- Sayare, S. 2012. Portuguese Just Shrug and Go On in the Face of Cuts and Job Losses. *New York Times* 7 June. [http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/08/world/europe/portugal-shrugs-at-austerity.html?pagewanted=all&\\_r=1](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/08/world/europe/portugal-shrugs-at-austerity.html?pagewanted=all&_r=1)
- Salerno, J. 2010. It Usually Ends with Murray Rothbard: My Long and Winding Road to Libertarianism and Austrian Economics. In Block, W. (Ed.) *I Chose Liberty: Autobiographies of Contemporary Libertarians*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Shearmur, J. 2015. The Other Path to Mont Pelerin. In Leeson, R. (Ed.) *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography Part 4 England, the Ordinal Revolution and the Road to Serfdom, 1931–1950*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shenoy, S. 2003. An Interview with Sudha Shenoy. *Austrian Economics Newsletter* Winter: 1–8. [http://mises.org/journals/aen/aen23\\_4\\_1.pdf](http://mises.org/journals/aen/aen23_4_1.pdf)
- Shirer, W. L. 1960. *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Skousen, M. 1991. *Economics on Trial: Lies, Myths, and Realities*. Homewood, Illinois: Business One Irwin.
- Skousen, M. 1997. The Perseverance of Paul Samuelson's Economics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 11.2, Spring: 137–152.
- Skousen, M. 2008. Bill Buckley and Me a True Story. *Human Events Powerful Conservative Voices* 28, February. <http://www.humanevents.com/2008/02/28/bill-buckley-and-me-a-true-story/>

- Skousen, M. 2009. *The Making of Modern Economics: The Lives and Ideas of the Great Thinkers*. London: M.E. Sharpe. Second edition.
- Snyder, L. 1967. *The Making of Modern Man: From the Renaissance to the Present*. Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand.
- Stickney, B. 1996. *"All-American Monster": The Unauthorized Biography of Timothy McVeigh*. New York: Prometheus Books.
- Stolper, G. 1967. *The German Economy from 1870 to the Present Day*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Stromberg, J. R. 1995. In Rockwell, L. H. Jr. (Ed.) *Murray Rothbard: In Memorandum*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Sutherland, J. 2005. *Stephen Spender: A Literary Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, A. J. P. 1964. *The Habsburg Monarchy 1809–1918: A History of the Austrian Empire and Austria Hungary*. England: Peregrine.
- Tietze, T. 2015. Anders Breivik, Fascism and the Neoliberal Inheritance. In Leeson, R. (Ed.) *Hayek a Collaborative Biography Part VI Good Dictators, Sovereign Producers and Hayek's "Ruthless Consistency."* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tucker, J. 2014. What Explains the Brutalism Uproar? *The Libertarian Standard* 18 March. <http://libertarianstandard.com/2014/03/18/what-explains-the-brutalism-uproar/>
- Vaughn, K. I. 2015. How James Buchanan Came to George Mason University. *The Journal of Private Enterprise* 30.2: 103–109.
- Watters, S. 2005. Von Habsburg on Presidents, Monarchs, Dictators. *Women's Wear Daily* 28 June. <http://www.wwd.com/eye/people/von-habsburg-on-presidents-monarchs-dictators>
- Wheeler, T. 1975. Mont Pelerin Society: Microeconomics, Macrofellowship. *National Review* 26 September.
- White, L. H. 2008. Did Hayek and Robbins Deepen the Great Depression? *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 40: 751–768.
- Wright, S. A. 2007. *Patriots, Politics, and the Oklahoma City Bombing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.