



# 9

## Clerical Fascism: Chile and Austria

Robert Leeson

Through terror and deception, the Americas were initially conquered by ‘God and Gold’ conquistadors, primarily subjects of King Charles V of Spain (1516–1556), the Habsburg Holy Roman Emperor (1519–1556). Otto the Habsburg Pretender revealed that the Fascist dictator, General Francisco Franco, had invited him to ‘resume’ the Spanish Crown: Franco was ‘a dictator of the South American type ... not totalitarian like Hitler or Stalin.’ Otto 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’ (cited by Watters 2005). According to Llewelyn Rockwell Jr, the co-founder of the Ludwig von Mises Institute, in ‘European history, the Habsburg monarchy was a famed guardian of Western civilization. But even those of us devoted to the old [pre-1861?] American republic are aware of the warm and long relationship between the Austrian school and the House of Habsburg’ (cited by Palmer 1997).

---

R. Leeson (✉)

Department of Economics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

Madrid and Vienna were both pivotal to the Habsburg Empire. Augusto Pinochet (1982, 33, 45, 54, 55, 56, 99–100, 102, 60–61, 150), who became a commissioned officer in 1936, as Franco began his assault on the Second Spanish Republic (1931–1939), saw the world as a ‘heroic struggle’ and a religious battle against those who sought to undermine the dominance of ascribed status. Salvador Allende, who he alleged was protected by ‘roughnecks of dubious reputation ... had exploited for his own benefit the *native simplicity* of a considerable portion of the Chilean population ... Propaganda took no rest in its mission of sowing hatred among those *simple* workers and their families [emphases added].’ Hayek (1978) was less diplomatic—referring to post-Habsburg democracy as ‘a republic of peasants and workers.’<sup>1</sup> As was Mises’ (2007 [1958], 11), who (referring to *Atlas Shrugged*) told Ayn Rand ‘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.’

Before the end their ‘Great’ War, the Habsburgs and the Hohenzollerns had driven ‘their’ subjects back to a state of serfdom: those who objected were often sent to ‘the front,’ where firing squads maintained discipline. At the end of 1914, the Germans declared the anti-war ‘Spartacus Letters’ (*Spartakusbriefe*) illegal, and Karl Liebknecht, the co-founder of the Spartacus League, was arrested and sent to the Eastern Front—despite his immunity as a Member of Parliament.

By early 1917, nearly 5% (one million) of French males had been killed in fighting—many in enforced suicidal ‘advances’: 27,000 French soldiers deserted in 1917 alone. The failure of the Nivelle Offensive led the French 2nd Division to refuse to follow orders (3 May 1917). In June 1917, mass arrests were followed by mass trials: 3427 courts-martial resulted in 2878 sentences of hard labour and 629 death sentences (43 executions were carried out).

In *Socialism*, Mises (1951 [1922], 385) argued that monopoly was exceedingly rare: ‘Perhaps the nearest approach to such a monopoly was the power to administer grace to believers, exercised by the medieval Church. Excommunication and interdict were no less terrible than death from thirst or suffocation.’ This producer sovereignty—initially provided by the Roman Empire—had been eroded by heresy, the ‘Great

Schism' (1054), the Reformation (1517–), science and the enlightenment, and then by the separation of Church and State: 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion.' In 'The Heart of a Fighter,' Rockwell (2005, 1998), the devout Roman Catholic author of 'To Restore the Church Smash the State,' appeared to see a salvation in a second Jewish-born child: 'I often think back to a photograph of Mises when he was a young boy of perhaps 12, standing with his father ... you sense that there is something in Mises's eyes, a certain determination and intellectual fire, even at such a young age. His eyes seem knowing, as if he were already preparing himself for what he might face.'

In the 1877 Satsuma Rebellion, Saigō Takamori (Takanaga), 'the last true samurai,' went 'honourably' to his death in defence of the inherited privileges of his Japanese warrior class. According to Guido Hülsmann (2007, 267–269), 'von' Mises was a decorated war hero: 'he received another medal for outstanding performance before the enemy.' But within weeks of the outbreak of the 'Great' War, Mises tried to escape:

If Mises could have gotten away earlier, in any honourable manner, he would have welcomed the opportunity. He tried, in the fall of 1914, to use his *Kammer* [Chamber of Commerce and Industry] affiliation to be transferred to some other duty ... After the Northern Front had calmed down, Mises was finally considered suitable for bureaucratic employment, and the *Kammer* connections now proved to be effective. During his Christmas holidays in Vienna, on December 22, 1915 he received orders from the War Ministry to join its department no.13 in Vienna.

In 1917, Lenin left neutral Switzerland for what he thought was certain imprisonment in Russia (Crankshaw 1954); while in 1940, *The Last Knight of Liberalism* left neutral Switzerland for neutral America (via neutral Portugal) 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 1976, 58).

In a taped interview, the morality-promoting Hayek—who had what in military circles is described as a 'Lack of Moral Fibre'—allegedly told Kurt Leube (2003, 12) that he 'never doubted that there are things in

life worth fighting for and risking one's own life for.' Leube added that Hayek had been born into an 'aristocratic family that could not only lay claim to a long academic tradition but also to a long and dutiful service to the Empire ... he was anxious to be sent as an artillery sergeant cadet to the intensely embattled Italian front ... much to his dislike he missed by a few days the Battle of Caporetto in October/November 1917 that left many dead and wounded.'

Hitler 'probably ... left Vienna to escape military service' (Shirer 1960, 44); and while conscripts were routinely executed for trying to 'clear out,' the aristocratic Hayek (1978) wanted to 'get honorably out of the fighting':

We all felt the war would go on indefinitely, and I wanted to get out of the army, but I didn't want to be a coward. So I decided, in the end, to volunteer for the air force in order to prove that I wasn't a coward. But it gave me the opportunity to study for what I expected to be the entrance examination for the diplomatic academy, and if I had lived through six months as an air fighter, I thought I would be entitled to clear out. Now, all that collapsed because of the end of the war. [tape recorder turned off] In fact, I got as far as having my orders to join the flying school, which I *never did in the end* [emphasis added]. And of course Hungary collapsed, the diplomatic academy disappeared, and the motivation, which had been really to get honorably out of the fighting, lapsed. [laughter]<sup>2</sup>

Many of Hayek's (1978) formative influences were theatrical: 'Of course, I started writing plays myself, though I didn't get very far with it.'<sup>3</sup> Hayek (1994, 153), who attempted to dictate his 'Against the Stream' biography to William Warren Bartley III, appeared to flip in and out of fantasy: 'In a sense *I* am fearless, physically, *I* mean. It's not courage. It is just that *I* have never really been afraid. *I* noticed it in the war.' Bartley asked: 'You must have been fearless to go on those airplane expeditions in the Great War where you were acting as an artillery spotter.' Hayek replied: 'Excitement, in a sense; but not a matter of fear. Once the Italians practically caught us. One in front, firing through the propeller. When they started firing, *my* pilot, a Czech, spiralled down. *I* unbelted myself, climbed on the rail. *My* pilot succeeded in correcting the spin just above the ground. It was exciting ... *I* lack nerves. *I* believe this is a thing *I* inherited from *my* mother [emphases added].'<sup>4</sup>

When Earlene Craver asked ‘what were your dreams? your fantasies of what you might do with your career?’ Hayek (1978) replied: ‘Well, at that time I really wanted a job in which I could do scientific work on the side.’<sup>5</sup> His intellectual interests were a form of ‘play’: ‘my interests very rapidly moved, then, to some extent already toward evolution, and for a while I played with paleontology;<sup>6</sup> I played for a time with this idea in the hope of resolving the conflict between nationalities in the Austro-Hungarian Empire ... in a way I played with constitutional reform at the beginning and the end of my career.’<sup>7</sup>

Austrian business cycle theory had been debunked by Pierro Sraffa (1932a, b) before Hayek (1933) had delivered his Inaugural Professorial Lecture.<sup>8</sup> Afterwards, Hayek (1941) published *The Pure Theory of Capital*: but primarily, he ‘played’ with constitutional reform and ‘knowledge’ for the last six decades of his career. Hayek (1978) reflected about his own life: ‘It is my general view of life that we are playing a game of luck, and on the whole I have been lucky in this game;<sup>9</sup> I was extremely lucky. In fact, I owe my career very largely to a fortunate accident;<sup>10</sup> it’s absolutely essential that individuals are making use of luck, and if it’s no longer worthwhile to pursue pure luck, very desirable things will be left out.’<sup>11</sup> He also reflected about the ‘luck’ that was required to get a ‘good dictator’ after the establishment of an ‘elective dictatorship with practically unlimited powers. Then it will depend, from country to country, whether they are lucky or unlucky in the kind of person who gets in power. After all, there have been good dictators in the past; it’s very unlikely that it will ever arise. But there may be one or two experiments where a dictator restores [emphasis added] freedom, individual freedom.’<sup>12</sup>

Hayek (1978) marketed himself to his ‘secondhand dealers in opinions’ as an *Olde Worlde* aristocrat.<sup>13</sup> Journalists assisted him despite being aware of the deception: the *Washington Post* reported that he ‘is everything you want an 83-year-old Viennese conservative economist to be. Tall and rumped. A pearl stickpin in his tie. A watch chain across his vest, even though he wears a digital on his wrist. An accent which melds German Z’s with British O’s.’ With ‘lovely aristocratic ease,’ he became a ‘favorite of conservative economists from Irving Kristol to William Buckley.’ While Hayek described the ‘spontaneous formation of an order’ as ‘extremely complex structures’ and the market as ‘an exo-somatic sense organ,’ the staff of the Heritage Foundation ‘hover around him with

a combination of delight and awe that makes them seem like small boys around a football hero' (Allen 1982).

The premier (post-Roche III) Hayekian fundraiser reported in *The Washington Post* that 'Hayek himself disdained having his ideas attached to either party' (Caldwell 2010).<sup>14</sup> As the carpet bombing of Southeast Asia accelerated, Mises (1963, 282; 1966, 282)—during a Democratic administration—lobbied for the Warfare State: 'He who in our age opposes armaments and conscription is, perhaps unbeknown to himself, an abettor of those aiming at the enslavement of all.'

Those members of Rose Friedman's family who had not emigrated 'all died in the Holocaust. We have never learned where or how.' In 1950, while Milton worked on the Schuman Plan, Rose experienced trauma: it was very difficult for her to let their two children 'run freely as they were accustomed to do at home because always there was the nagging fear that they might suddenly disappear. Of course I knew that they would no Nazis in the park that somehow there was always in my subconsciousness those terrible stories about what happened to Jewish children during the Nazi era. That trip to Germany haunted me for many years' (Friedman and Friedman 1998, 3, 180). When in June 1974, Rothbard, Walter Block, Sudha Shenoy, Richard Fink, Gary North, Richard Ebeling (1974) et al. initiated the Institute of Humane Studies Austrian revival, one of the conference highlights was baiting the Friedmans in person with the accusation that their son detected 'latent fascist tendencies' in his father. Shenoy (2003) recalled that 'Murray Rothbard made the whole affair fun.' Ebeling is the 'BB&T [Branch Banking and Trust Company] Distinguished Professor of Ethics and Free Enterprise Leadership' at The Citadel Military College (2014–), offering courses in 'Entrepreneurial Leadership and Capitalist Ethics' and 'Ethical Entrepreneurship and Profit-Making.'<sup>15</sup> The 'mission' of the Citadel School of Business involves the promotion of 'Integrity, diversity, and respect for others.'<sup>16</sup>

In 1967, 'Ayn Rand's writings brought about an ethical and practical revolution' in Ebeling's (2016) adolescent thinking: 'From now on I did not have to feel guilty when I saw some bum in the gutter—he had no moral claim on the product of my mind and effort.' Over 57,000 American soldiers died in the Vietnam War; many were tortured in the 'Hanoi Hilton'; and many committed suicide on their return home.

Those who suffered from post-traumatic stress disorder and were unable to adjust to civilian life often became homeless. In ‘Right-Wing Populism: A Strategy for the Paleo Movement,’ Rothbard (1992) prescribed a ‘Vienna Hilton’ final solution for these victims of the warfare state: ‘Take Back the Streets: Get Rid of the Bums. Again: unleash the cops to clear the streets of bums and vagrants. Where will they go? Who cares? Hopefully, they will disappear, that is, move from the ranks of the petted and cosseted bum class to the ranks of the productive members of society.’

As Stalin airbrushed Trotsky out of Bolshevik history, so in ‘The Transmission of the Ideals of Economic Freedom,’ Hayek (2012 [1951]) continued to airbrush-out-of-history the Austrian School approval of Fascism:

Thirty years ago liberalism may still have had some influence among public men, but it had well-nigh disappeared as a spiritual movement. Today its practical influence may be scant, but its problems have once more become a living body of thought. We may feel justified in looking forward with renewed faith to the future of liberalism ... At the end of the First World War the spiritual tradition of liberalism was all but dead ... It could be said with some justification that [Edwin] Cannan really prepared the ground, in England, for the reception of the ideas of a much younger Austrian who has been working since the early ’twenties on the reconstruction of a solid edifice of liberal thought in a more determined, systematic and successful way than anyone else. This is Ludwig von Mises ...

James Buchanan (1992, 130) observed that within the Mont Pelerin Society there was ‘too much deference accorded to Hayek, and especially to Ludwig von Mises who seemed to demand sycophancy’; and according to the Misesian, Robert Anderson (1999), similar characteristics were required for academics to avoid dismissal at Hillsdale College: ‘One hundred percent approval and agreement were required.’ The devout Presuppositionalist, Peter Boettke (2010)—who is ‘very involved’ with the Foundation for Economic Education, which Hayek identified as a ‘propaganda’ set-up (Chap. 1, above)—identified Ebeling, FEE’s fund-raising president, Mont Pelerin Society member and Hillsdale College Ludwig von Mises Professor of Economics (1988–2003), as one of the world’s premier interpreters of Mises.<sup>17</sup> Ebeling (SHOE 20 December 2015)

was ‘shocked’ by the evidence about Mises that had been presented to the Society for the History of Economics (SHOE):

Mises was also a strong proponent of free movement of people—that is, ‘open immigration.’ In December 1935, Mises penned an article on ‘The Freedom to Move as an International Problem,’ criticizing countries like Australia that limited non-whites from migrating and settling there.

Yet in *Human Action*—a ‘comprehensive treatise on economics’ written between ‘the fall of 1934 until the summer of 1940’—Mises (1998 [1949], Foreword, 821) insisted: ‘As conditions are today, the Americas and Australia in admitting German, Italian, and Japanese immigrants would merely open their doors to the vanguards of hostile armies.’ The editors of *Human Action Scholars Edition* reported that Percy Greaves ‘suggested amending this passage’ about immigration but ‘no change was made in the second edition’ (Herbener et al. 1998, xx). Having declared in second edition that there were irreconcilable antagonisms:

For the third edition, the passage is eliminated altogether and replaced with an additional paragraph calling for a philosophy of mutual cooperation to replace the view that there are ‘irreconcilable antagonisms’ between groups in society. (Herbener et al. 1998, xx)

Ebeling (SHOE 22 May 2014) also asserted that ‘anyone familiar with Mises’ writings knows that he opposed war.’ In *Mein Kampf*, Hitler (1939 [1925], 142) described his planned route to power: ‘Every form of force that is not supported by spiritual backing will always be wavering and uncertain.’ Two years later, Mises (1985 [1927], 45, 50) explained that Classical Liberalism would provide that spiritual backing:

To be sure, it should not and need not be denied that there is one situation in which the temptation to deviate from the democratic principles of liberalism becomes very great indeed. If judicious men see their nation, or all the nations of the world, on the road to destruction, and if they find it impossible to induce their fellow citizens to heed their counsel, they may be inclined to think it only fair and just to resort to any means whatever, in so far as it is feasible and will lead to the desired goal, in order to save



everyone from disaster. Then the idea of a dictatorship of the elite, of a government by the minority maintained in power by force and ruling in the interests of all, may arise and find supporters.

Mises tried to persuade Fascists that he could assist their path to power:

What happens, however, when one's opponent, similarly animated by the will to be victorious, acts just as violently? The result must be a battle, a civil war. The ultimate victor to emerge from such conflicts will be the faction strongest in number. In the long run, a minority—even if it is composed of the most capable and energetic—cannot succeed in resisting the majority. The decisive question, therefore, always remains: How does one obtain a majority for one's own party? This, however, is a purely intellectual matter. It is a victory that can be won only with the weapons of the intellect, never by force.

According to Mises (2009a [1978 (1940)], 59–60), in Austria 'I was helped by few, and distrusted by all political parties. And yet all secretaries and party leaders sought my advice and wanted to hear my opinion. I never attempted to force my views upon them, nor did I ever seek out a statesman or politician. On no occasion did I appear in the lobby of Parliament or a government department without having first received a formal invitation. Secretaries and party leaders visited my office more often than I visited theirs ... I was the economist of the land.' The delusional Mises (1985 [1927], 45, 49, 50) assumed that he would become 'the economist of the land' where 'Germans and Italians,' 'Fascists,' 'Ludendorff and Hitler' ruled: 'If it [Fascism] 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.'

In so far as the Austrians and Germans had common military objectives, Lieutenant Mises and the teenage 'Lieutenant' Hayek were in the chain of command between the de facto wartime dictator, General Erich Ludendorff, and the lower ranks, including Corporal Hitler.<sup>18</sup> Mises (1985 [1927], 43–44, 49, 45) expressed ambivalence about the *method* by which 'Ludendorff and Hitler' had sought power in 1923: 'If every group that believes itself capable of imposing its rule on the rest is to be

entitled to undertake the attempt, we must be prepared for an uninterrupted series of civil wars.’ Implausibly, Mises stated: ‘The only consideration that can be decisive is one that bases itself on the fundamental argument in favor of democracy.’

Hayek told a Paris press conference that the ‘principles of democracy continue to be just, but it is necessary to try them in a different way ... Democracy is not an end in itself’ (cited by Han 1982, 91). According to Pinochet, as dictator he had ‘always acted in a democratic way.’<sup>19</sup> Hayek (1978) approved of ‘democratic principles’ but opposed systems which were ‘democratically organised.’<sup>20</sup> In Chile, he stated: ‘Although I am an eminently democratic person, I think that the democratic system cannot be unlimited, as it needs protections to avoid the influence of power and interest groups’ (cited by Caldwell and Montes 2014a, 23; b; 2015, 280).

Hayek’s Mont Pelerin Society was funded by power-seeking interest groups and ideologues. According to Bruce Caldwell and Leonidas Montes (2014a, 52; b; 2015, 305), ‘Hayek always insisted that he was a supporter of democracy, but that democracy had to be limited.’ But Hayek (1978) was very specific—his ‘democratic principles’ collapse into a singular merit: ‘I believe in democracy as a system of peaceful change of government; but that’s all its whole advantage is, no other. It just makes it possible to get rid of what government *we* [emphasis added] dislike.’<sup>21</sup>

The Global Financial Crisis edition of *Tiger by the Tail* repeated Hayek’s assertion that those who disagreed with him were a ‘grave menace to *our* [emphasis added] civilisation’ (Salerno 2009, xviii). Who are the Austrian ‘we’? And what are the ‘different’ ways of getting rid of governments *they* dislike? In Chile, this involved a military coup. Rothbard’s (1994a) ‘we’ included ‘Redneck’ militia groups:

A second necessary task is informational: we can’t 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 that rule over us.

Pinochet (1982, 18–19) found that although amongst the Chilean military elite, ‘Knowledge of history was exchanged—some officers were real historians—and comments on the world situation, always from the angle of war,’ they lived in ‘near-total ignorance of the play of ideological tendencies.’ After the 1939 Chilean earthquake, Pinochet decided that socialists were ‘petty thieves.’ But he was horrified that the military were ‘cloistered in their barracks ... Worse still, the officers knew practically nothing of all the political activity going on in the country ... dissociated from any political leanings.’ When asked about politics, the officers replied ‘Sorry, we are apolitical and don’t like to discuss such matters.’

At this time, Pinochet (1991, 78) learnt the art of deceiving politicians or those curious about the intentions of the military: ‘We would appear ignorant when we had to discuss these matters with politicians.’ In reality, within the Chilean military, ‘There was a sort of contempt for politicians, whom we blamed for all the recent evils.’

Hayek’s Mont Pelerin Society was funded by the neo-feudal United Fruit Company (Leeson 2017). Just before the start of the cold war, Gabriel González Videla was elected president of Chile (1946–1952) with the support of his own Radical Party and the Communist Party. Allende’s Socialist Party declined to support Videla, and the Chilean worker’s union then split into a communist and a socialist wing. In 1948, US Assistant Secretary of State, Spruille Braden, threatened President Videla with a credit freeze unless the Communist Party was banned (Guardiola-Rivera 2013, 61): the result was the 1948 ‘Law of Permanent Defense of the Democracy’ (the Communist Party remained illegal until 1958). In his Arlington House memoirs, Braden (1971, 50, 441), formerly a paid lobbyist for United Fruit, who complained that Allende posed a threat to US interests and ‘threatens his own country’s capitalists,’ also noted that Chile had been governed by an oligarchy, more or less, of the so-called ‘forty families.’

Pinochet (1982, 21–23) reported that fear of torture had cured communist tantrums: previously, they had ‘shown their arrogance in front of the Army’; now they ‘either said no word or else wept and screamed for mercy, begging not to be taken away’ to internment at Pisagua. The 1948 ‘Law of Emergency Powers’ which banned the Communist Party led to ‘great happiness’ throughout Chile; he participated in the arrest of

‘communist agitators’: ‘I still remember vividly the surprise of those who believed themselves owners of the country ... Today, after so many years have passed, I can appreciate the speed at which the course the country was changed. It was a night we should remember as a milestone in the history of Chile.’<sup>22</sup>

In 1948, the poet Pablo Neruda was interned in the Pisagua concentration camp (Guardiola-Rivera 2013, 62). Pinochet (1982, 26–27) asserted that in Pisagua he had been—whilst armed only with a pistol—cornered in the kitchen by a mutiny of unarmed prisoners: ‘The circle was closing in on me. I confess I thought my end had come’—until a prisoner, Angel Veas, the former Interdente of **Tarapacá**, raised his voice: ‘The shouts managed to stop these men who seemed ready for anything. I should say that everyone of them, with no exception, obeyed, and not a single objection or complaint was voiced ...’ Pinochet (1982, 27–28, 49) interpreted this in a sinister light: communists had ‘quasi military discipline.’ Worse still, the concentration camp had been turned into a ‘Marxist Leninist university, where people were trained who would later act as agitators.’ They used ‘thousands of tricks’ to avoid having their Russian literature removed from them. These experiences led him to conclude that they would ‘not hesitate to resort to all manner of immoral acts, excesses, and crimes in order to impose their ideology on the nation, and finally that unless the population bowed to their wishes, the entire country would suffer the tragedy of a bloodbath.’ Allende (then a Socialist Party Senator) and others arrived at Pisagua to ‘find out the condition of the prisoners.’ Pinochet inferred that they had come to ‘agitate’ and told them that they would be shot if they tried to enter the camp: ‘Hearing such a firm answer, they turned back to the interior.’

Like Hitler, Pinochet’s (1991, 18, 31, 34) father was a customs official; and like Stalin, Pinochet, from age six, was educated in a seminary. Heinrich Himmler justified the final solution by explaining that they lived in an ‘iron time’ and had therefore to sweep with ‘iron brooms’ (cited by Patterson 2002, 122). Stalin’s father was a violent drunk; and Hitler told his secretary that his father ‘had tantrums and immediately became physically violent’ (cited by Hamann 2010, 18). For having ‘tantrums,’ Pinochet (1991, 23–24) was beaten by his mother with a broom stick. Public beatings were accompanied by the threat: ‘If you keep on crying I will pull your pants down and you will get it right here in the

street’—which, he reported, cured him of his ‘tantrums.’ Pinochet (1982, 63, 14) also reported that Allende’s 1970 election victory had embarrassed him: ‘the spectacle we showed the world was a highly disconcerting one.’

Those who promote religion see the world as a battle between God and the Devil; Hayek (1978) saw the social universe as a battle between superstitions: ‘You know, I’m frankly trying to destroy the superstitious belief in our particular conception of democracy which we have now, which is certainly ultimately ideologically determined, but which has created without our knowing it an omnipotent government with really completely unlimited powers, and to recover the old tradition, which was only defeated by the modern superstitious democracy, that government needs limitations.’<sup>23</sup> On his Austrian side, the ‘gold standard has irrevocably been destroyed, because, in part, I admit, it depended on certain superstitions which you cannot restore.’<sup>24</sup> In his September 1984 closing address to the Mont Pelerin Society, Hayek put ‘superstition’ into a ‘more effective form’:

*we owe our* [emphases 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)

The superstition-promoting Hayek wore his illegal ‘von Hayek’ coat of arms on his signet ring (Ebenstein 2003, 75, 298), and the intensely superstitious Pinochet wore a ruby ring with his astrological sign (Sagittarius) engraved on it—although he may have been excommunicated by the Catholic Church for ordering torture (O’Shaughnessy 2000, 77). Given the psychologizing that Hayek and Pinochet promoted, it seems reasonable to ask whether the family violence inflicted on Pinochet was a contributory factor in creating a psychopathic or fascistic personality. Did it inspire his presidential torture-them-naked policy and the associated rapes?

According to Mises (1951 [1922], 100–101):

The radical wing of Feminism ... overlooks the fact that the expansion of woman’s powers and abilities is inhibited not by marriage, nor by being bound to a man, children, and household, but by the more absorbing form

in which the sexual function affects the female body ... the fact remains that when she becomes a mother, with or without marriage, she is prevented from leading her life as freely and independently as man. Extraordinarily gifted women may achieve fine things in spite of motherhood; but because the functions of sex have first claim upon woman, genius and the greatest achievements have been denied her.

According to Rothbard (1970), 'at the hard inner core of the Women's Liberation Movement lies a bitter, extremely neurotic if not psychotic, man-hating lesbianism. The quintessence of the New Feminism is revealed.' Rothbard motivated Austrian economists by getting them to sing 'old World War I anthems' (Cwik 2010) and by orchestrating their chant of 'We Want Externalities!' (Blundel 2014, 100, n7). Rothbard (2002 [1971], 52) explained why they must oppose the Pigouvian externality analysis which underpins carbon taxes and subsidized education: 'whether Women's Libbers like it or not, many men obtain a great deal of enjoyment from watching girls in mini-skirts; yet, these men are not paying for this enjoyment. Here is another neighborhood effect remaining uncorrected! Shouldn't the men of this country be taxed in order to subsidize girls to wear mini-skirts?'

Pinochet was Danton to Rothbard's Robespierre: trouser-wearing women were banned from the Presidential Palace that had taken by force (O'Shaughnessy 2000, 120). According to Pinochet (1982, 148), the 'profound moral and economic corruption' had gone unnoticed under Allende: his coup was undertaken to 'maintain internal order and the physical and moral safety of all citizens.' In pursuit of 'liberty,' Pinochet's White Terror squads took women by force: the threat of repeated rape and endless incarceration forced some left-wing idealists to become informers. Family members—including children—were also targeted. In between rapes, Luz Arce (1994, 177) was allowed to see her six-year-old son, Rafael. After one meeting, 'I looked at my hand. It had stroked my little son's head just a while before, and now it seemed like I could touch the emptiness in them, an emptiness that permeated my entire being.'

The Australian-born, Oxford-educated doctor, Sheila Cassidy (1992 [1977], 173, 192), tried unsuccessfully to avoid electrical torture by declaring—truthfully—to her DINA (*Dirección de Inteligencia*

*Nacional*—Chilean secret police) interrogators: ‘I’m going to be a nun.’ Seeing her naked and tied-up, her interrogators became ‘sexually excited’; but unlike others (including, the previous week, a nun) she escaped rape.

In 1970, an advertising agency ran an anti-Allende ‘terror’ campaign (financed by the Anaconda copper mining corporation, Bank of America, the First National City Bank and *El Mercurio*): one prominent image was of a weeping Virgin Mary captioned ‘Queen and Patron of Chile, Deliver Us From Communism’ (Guardiola-Rivera 2013, 152–153). After Allende’s victory, Pinochet (1982, 41; 1991, 27–28, 40, 116, 157, 168) was horrified that posters of Che Guevara and Fidel Castro had replaced earlier Roman Catholic icons. But when in 1980, the essentially non-practising Christian Ronald Reagan defeated the devout Baptist Jimmy Carter, Pinochet credited the Virgin Mary for his change in international good fortune (Guardiola-Rivera 2013, 393).

As a four-year-old boy with military aspirations, doctors recommended the amputation of Pinochet’s (1982, 41; 1991, 27–28, 40, 116, 157, 168) leg after he had been run over by a horse-drawn cart. His ‘devout’ convent-educated mother offered a statue of ‘Nuestra Señora del Perpetuo Socorro’ (the ‘Virgin Mary’ or ‘Our Lady of Perpetual Help’) a deal: if her son did not lose his leg and was accepted into military school, they would both wear brown-coloured clothes (for fifteen years for the mother, and either ten years for the son—as a civilian—or two if he was able to join the military). The ‘Mother of God’ ‘rewarded’ these prayers and sent a German doctor, who provided him with ‘a miraculous cure.’ In January 1937, Pinochet placed a plaque in a church to thank the ‘Nuestra Señora del Perpetuo Socorro’ for ‘the miracle she had worked on me.’ The Pinochet family continued to benefit from inter-generational miracles: when his son was born with a stomach fever, ‘by what seemed a miracle,’ he was cured by a vaccine. When his family were on a train that crashed, he offered a prayer: ‘Thanks God they had taken one of the last cars which had not turned over.’ When he failed to board a plane that crashed he realized that ‘fate had again saved me from death.’

In her 19 January 1976 ‘Iron Lady’ speech, Mrs Thatcher stated that the ‘Conservative Party has the vital task of shaking the British public out of a long sleep. Sedatives have been prescribed by people, in and

out of Government, telling us that there is no external threat to Britain, that all is sweetness and light in Moscow, and that a squadron of fighter planes or a company of marine commandos is less important than some new subsidy.<sup>25</sup> The speech was drafted by Robert Moss (Campbell 2007, 353), the Hayekian author of the pro-Pinochet *Chile's Marxist Experiment* (1973).

Pinochet (1982, 146, 48, 17), who referred to his coup as an 'amputation' and complained that Allende used a 'sedative' on the Chilean people, recalled that since 'I was a child I had the idea that the goal of my life should be to become an Army officer and to devote my life to the career of arms ... My father would talk to me at length about the virtues of the medical profession and the beauty of its mission, while my mother used to support and encourage my ambition to wear my country's uniform and devote myself wholly to the noble office of arms.' According to a family friend, Pinochet's mother was 'very, very authoritarian ... she was fixated on military life' (cited by O'Shaughnessy 2000, 12). According to Charlotte Cubitt (2006, 89, 111, 168, 174, 188, 284, 328), Hayek's formidable mother was known in the family as the 'iron aunt.' Hayek's (1994, 37–39) mother came from a 'younger' family, that had been 'ennobled over a generation later' and who were 'definitely upper-class bourgeoisie and wealthier by far' with a 'nice fortune' and an '*appropriate* [emphasis added] standard of life.'

Latin American aristocrats—*latifundistas*—owned vast tracts of agricultural land, much of it uncultivated. In Chile in the 1960s, the top 3% of agricultural landowners received 37% of that sector's income, while the bottom 71% received 33% (Sandford 1975, 54). Pinochet's (1991, 20, 17) mother's ancestors arrived in 'our country in the early years of the seventeenth century. She descended from many illustrious conquistadors of Chile, whose traits were reflected in various gestures towards her children.' His father was the 'seventh generation through direct male line of the family founder,' a 'direct descendant of Guillaume de Pinochet' who came to Chile in the eighteenth century as a merchant.

Hayek (1994, 37–39) traced his paternal family back five generations: Laurenz Hayek 'served one of the great aristocratic landowners of Moravia,' and his son, Josef (1750–1830),



followed the landowner to Vienna as secretary when he was appointed to high government office, and after returning with him to Moravia became steward of the estate. In this capacity Josef Hayek developed two new textile factories in Moravia and Lower Austria, which in turn led to two new villages. He eventually also became a partner in these factories and acquired a substantial fortune. This was a significant achievement in the Austria of 1789, and it was this that led Kaiser Josef II to ennoble him.

Hayek's (1994, 37–39) family could have gone from clogs-to-clogs (rapid upward and equally rapid downward social mobility) in three generations. Josef's son, Heinrich, acquired a civil service job where he 'probably had to work for only two or three hours each morning; and spent a long dignified and comfortable life as a gentleman'—before losing the 'fortune on which the family's comfortable existence depended.' Heinrich then disinherited his son Gustav (Hayek's grandfather). Worse still, Gustav's expectations of inheriting from two 'maiden aunts' failed to materialize: he was thus obliged to live in 'modest circumstances.'

Hayek's (1994, 38–39) paternal grandparents were 'proud' of their 'gentility and ancestry'—but had to be rescued by private-fortune-financed human capital formation: Gustav was 'first educated by private tutors and later attended an elegant and fashionable school in Vienna the *Theresianum*, at that time still reserved for members of the nobility.' After his downward social mobility (the collapse of 'great expectations'), he was obliged to abandon his 'flashy' life as a naval 'dandy' and return to study so as to become a schoolteacher.<sup>26</sup>

Education (often tax-funded) and the 'career open to the talents' (and the consequent upward social mobility) is a challenge to ascribed status. In feudal terms, 'achieved' aristocratic status (however acquired) provides 'ascribed' entitlements to subsequent generations: 'very sharp ... class distinctions' that are 'accepted as part of the natural order' (Hayek 1978).<sup>27</sup> It was the 'liberty' of this government-chosen elite that 'von' Hayek and 'von' Mises sought to defend.

One of Pinochet's (1982, 146–147) statements to the international press appears to reveal that it was Allende's 'conductive' policies that had provoked his opponents to launch a civil war: 'On many occasions *señor* Allende stated his desire to maintain peace and quiet but without altering

his policy conducive to civil war. And yet he declared he wished to avoid civil war at all costs, that he was the first enemy of civil war.’ In line with his organic theory of the state, Pinochet (1982, 150) emphasized that his coup was designed to ‘amputate’ ‘the new Messiahs who,’ he asserted, ‘disseminate hate and rancor among the Chilean people.’

In the *Rothbard Rockwell Report*, Michael Levin (1995, 9) insisted that it was not the job of ‘white doctors and public health officials’ to care for ‘black children.’<sup>28</sup> During the October 1972 attempt to destabilize the *Unidad Popular* government, Sheila Cassidy (1992 [1977], 44) ‘worked to help maintain the general medical services.’ In August 1973—in the run-up to Pinochet’s coup—she ‘again saw doctors leave their patients in an effort to bring down the government ... The children’s hospital was situated in a densely populated poor area and the vast majority of its doctors were opposed to Allende’s government. Wards which had hitherto required ten doctors were left without medical supervision and only the emergency team, already grossly overworked, was available in case of urgent need.’

How do medical doctors end up dying in a bombed-out Presidential Palace (Allende), getting tortured by electrodes (Cassidy), or becoming president after her father was tortured to death (Michelle Bachelet)? The Argentinian medical doctor, Che Guevara, was in Guatemala when the CIA bombed Guatemala City and Árbenz was overthrown: after the coup, he told his mother, ‘I left the path of reason.’ Over the next four decades, hundreds of thousands of people—200,000 in Guatemala alone—were killed in Red and White Terror operations across Latin America (Kurtz-Phelan 2008): Guevara was executed as a guerrilla in Bolivia.

Hayek (1978) described the British National Health Service (1948–) as ‘particularly bad because while most people in Britain dislike it, everybody agrees it can *never be reversed* [emphasis added].’<sup>29</sup> The Hayekian Brian Crozier (1979, 23) asked about ‘full socialism’:

suppose a Labour government did these things but clung to the illusion that they were compatible with democracy, and therefore allowed a further free general election. Supposing this election were won by the Conservatives with an overwhelming majority and a mandate in favour of fundamental change. Would the Socialists allow the Tories to reverse the ‘reversible’? Could this be done at all without a grave social crisis, and perhaps a violent confrontation?<sup>30</sup>

According to Austrians, universal health care is an irreversible stepping stone on the road to communism and must, therefore, be stopped. In ‘Liberty and its Antithesis,’ a review of Hayek’s *Constitution of Liberty*, Mises (1961) criticized the author for suggesting that the Welfare State is ‘under certain conditions compatible with liberty. In fact the Welfare State is merely a method for transforming the market economy step by step into socialism’ as had been demonstrated by Bismarck, the ‘American New Deal and British Fabian Socialism ... What separates the Communists from the advocates of the Welfare State is not the ultimate goal of their endeavours, but the method by means of which they want to attain a goal that is common to both of them.’

Rothbard (2007 [1995], Chap. 20) concurred:

One of Ludwig von Mises’s keenest insights was on the cumulative tendency of government intervention. The government, in its wisdom, perceives a problem (and Lord knows, there are always problems!). The government then intervenes to ‘solve’ that problem. But lo and behold! instead of solving the initial problem, the intervention creates two or three further problems, which the government feels it must intervene to heal, and so on toward socialism. No industry provides a more dramatic illustration of this malignant process than medical care. We stand at the seemingly inexorable brink of fully socialized medicine, or what is euphemistically called ‘national health insurance’ ... socialized medicine could easily bring us to the vaunted medical status of the Soviet Union: everyone has the right to free medical care, but there is, in effect, no medicine and no care.

According to Mises (2009b [1958], 35), government is the ‘opposite of liberty. It is beating, imprisoning, hanging. Whatever a government does it is ultimately supported by the actions of armed constables. If the government operates a school or a hospital, the funds required are collected by taxes, i.e., by payments exacted from the citizens.’ Moss (1973, iv) issued a threat:

The lesson, and the warning, can hardly be neglected by those countries that could one day find themselves confronted by a similar set of circumstances. It is profoundly to be hoped that Chile’s tragedy, resulting in the temporary death of democracy, will not be repeated. But it must not be

forgotten who was primarily responsible for it ... there must be no confusion about where the responsibility lies. It lies with Dr Allende and his fellow-Marxists, who pursued their plans for the seizure of total power to the point where the opposition despaired of restraining them by constitutional means.

The neo-feudal hierarchy was undermined by Fabian socialists such as the founders of the London School of Economics (LSE), Sidney and Beatrice Webb, who promoted improved sanitation, publicly provided water, education and health care. Lenin denounced such municipal socialism:

The bourgeois intelligentsia of the West, like the English Fabians, elevate municipal socialism to a special 'trend' precisely because it dreams of social peace, of class conciliation, and seeks to divert public attention away from the fundamental questions of the economic system as a whole, and of the state structure as a whole, to minor questions of local self-government. In the sphere of questions in the first category, the class antagonisms stand out most sharply; that is the sphere which, as we have shown, affects the very foundations of the class rule of the bourgeoisie. Hence it is in that sphere that the philistine, reactionary utopia of bringing about socialism piecemeal is particularly hopeless.<sup>31</sup>

Four years after the Ludendorff–Hitler *Putsch*, Mises (1985 [1927], 51) declared: '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.' Seventeen years later, Mises (2010 [1944], 178)—whose Austro-Fascist membership card may have been held in storage by the Soviets—associated Fascism with the LSE:

the success of the Lenin clique encouraged the Mussolini gang and the Hitler troops. Both Italian Fascism and German Nazism adopted the political methods of Soviet Russia ... Few people realize that the economic program of Italian Fascism, the *stato corporativo*, did not differ from the program of British Guild Socialism as propagated during the first World War and in the following years by the most eminent British and by some

continental socialists. The most brilliant exposition of this doctrine is the book of Sidney and Beatrice Webb (Lord and Lady Passfield), *A Constitution for the Socialist Commonwealth of Great Britain*, published in 1920.

Importing slaves into the United States was legal until 1808; and slavery remained part of the ‘spontaneous’ order of ex-Confederate South until 1865. To forestall a slave rebellion following Lincoln’s 1863 Emancipation Proclamation, the ‘Twenty Nigger Law’ (or the ‘Twenty Slave Law’) exempted from Confederate military service one white male for every twenty slaves owned. For poorer white Confederate males, this fuelled the perception that they were fighting and dying in ‘a rich man’s war, but a poor man’s fight.’

In 1896, the Supreme Court of the United States declared that ‘separate but equal’ was constitutionally valid, but, in 1954, *Brown v. Board of Education* overturned that decision. In 1957, when Governor George Wallace of Alabama ‘stood in the schoolhouse door’ in an effort to preserve the ‘spontaneous’ segregated order, President Dwight Eisenhower sent troops to enforce de-segregation.

Mises (1985 [1927], 115) ‘stood in the schoolhouse door’: ‘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.’ Hayek (2011 [1960], 502) related this argument to *Brown v. Board of Education*: ‘there may be circumstances in which the case for authority’s providing a common cultural background for all citizens becomes very strong. Yet we must remember that it is the provision of education by government which creates such problems as segregation of Negroes in the United States—difficult problems of ethnic and religious minorities which are bound to arise when governments take control of the chief instruments of transmitting culture.’

The Habsburg Empire was a ‘spontaneous’ order until its victims objected—by assassinating Franz Ferdinand and then through desertions in the ‘Great’ War that followed. Hayek (2011 [1960], 502) continued: ‘In multinational states the problem of who is to control the school system tends to become the chief source of friction between nationalities.

To one who was seen this happen in countries like the old Austro-Hungary, there is much force in the argument that it may be better even that some children should go without formal education than that they should be killed in fighting over who is to control that education.'

In what may, in part, have been a post-Hitler determination (misguided or otherwise) to protect democracy, Austria (1945–1966) and West Germany (1966–1969) employed 'grand coalitions' between Christian Democrats and Social Democrats. Hayek (1978) appeared to interpret this compromise as involving Dickensian deference from the lower orders:

and all you needed to do in Germany if a trade union ever asked too much was to raise a finger, be careful, you will cause unemployment, and the trade union leaders would collapse; you just had to raise your finger—'If you ask for more, you will have inflation'—and they would give in. (See Leeson 2015a, Chap. 2)<sup>32</sup>

Pinochet (1991, 221) complained that while the Frei government (1964–1970) was 'pushing the country towards communism and the destruction of democracy, nobody moved a finger.' Pinochet (1982, 21–23, 55, 15, 60, 102, 56) referred to interned communists as 'those who believed themselves owners of the country.' According to Pinochet, international visitors observed that 'everything was going marvelously and Chile was to be the new paradise of the proletariat.' Those on the Left 'went about like lords of the manor.' Where *latifundistas* once ruled, '*Comandante Pepe* lorded it over the Panguipulli area and trained paramilitary groups of lumber workers.' In Santiago, those who maintained order in the slums of 'jobless migrants from rural areas' were 'lords of the manor who imposed their violent will on the weak'—Pinochet appeared to be obsessed by 'visions of the slaughter that those people might start at any moment.'

As president, the kleptocratic Pinochet acquired 'an illicit fortune ... estimated at \$28 million or more' (Rohter 2006). Jon Anderson (1998) reported that in keeping with 'family tradition,' Pinochet's youngest son had been named after a Roman ruler. When a scandal erupted in 1990 over the revelation that Pinochet's elder son, Augusto, Jr., had received

nearly \$3 million from the Army after it bought a gun factory he partially owned, Pinochet sent troops into the streets of Santiago to 'express his displeasure. The investigation was quashed, but when it was reopened three years later he sent out the troops again.'

Anderson (1998) heard Marco Antonio Pinochet and a friend discuss whether or not they would bet on a racing 'tip' given to them by a horse trainer. The friend spoke about receiving a carved stone frieze 'plundered' from Angkor Wat as a 'gift' and then, fearful of being caught smuggling it out of Cambodia, arranged to have it shipped out. Marco Antonio noted that many Latin-American governments were 'nearly as corrupt' as those in Asia.

'What Latin America needs is authoritarian democracies,' he said. 'Corrupt democracies are no good.' He lapsed into thought for a moment, and then added, 'But corrupt dictatorships are no good, either.'

While driving with an 'affluent Chilean woman,' Anderson (1998) took a wrong turn, and unintentionally entered an 'unkempt area of low-income housing and hardscrabble *cayampas*.' As they got deeper into the '*población*,' his passenger became

very nervous. Concealing her Louis Vuitton handbag beneath her legs and making sure the car doors were locked and the windows up, she exclaimed, 'We should turn around! This is where all the thieves and muggers, the murderers, rapists, and *terroristas* come from!'

For Pinochet (1991, 282, 16, 15; 1982, 81), 'working class districts' were synonymous with 'the slum area.' The Chilean upper classes had a plentiful supply of servants: in addition to 'the servants' quarters,' there was 'at the back' of Pinochet's childhood home, a 'storeroom and another room for a servant.' The main entrance of their house on Plaza O'Higgins faced the square: 'The thick heavy twin doors were opened by the servants early in the morning.'

As a child, Pinochet (1991, 16) discovered 'big boxes containing lovely books on botany an [*sic*] zoology with coloured plates of animals and plants ... That is how I leant about Darwin's theory; the corresponding

pages showed pictures of monkey faces with their features very much like humans. I was deeply impressed.’ Hayek’s (1994, 40) father, August Hayek (1871–1928), was an Honorary Professor, or *Privatdozent*, at the University of Vienna: ‘During the last years of his life, my father had become a kind of social center for the botanists of Vienna ... His remarkable memory enabled him to acquire a quite exceptional knowledge of plants, and he himself used to remark, rather regretfully, that he was more or less the last botanist who regarded it as his business to recognise most plants on inspection.’

As mayor of Vienna (1895–1910), the anti-Semitic Karl Lueger promoted the Austrian version of municipal socialism under the slogan ‘the little man must be helped’ (Zweig 1943, Chap. 2). In Linz, Hitler’s Jewish doctor, Eduard Bloch, was (according to Ernst Koref, the town’s future mayor) ‘held in high regard, particularly among the lower and indigent social classes.’ Bloch observed that as a teenager, Hitler was well-mannered, always thanked the doctor politely, and bowed before leaving. After *Anschluss*, Hitler protected him by providing a feudal title: ‘a noble Jew’ (Hamann 2010, 11, 20, 36).

Hayek’s (1994, 39–40; 1978) father was employed as an *Armenarzt*: a ‘municipal physician for the poor, the lowest rank of the Medical Officer of Health’; the family ‘was moved around Vienna. So we were living, in my childhood, in four different districts of Vienna.’<sup>33</sup> Had the ‘little man’ Hitler needed health care in Vienna, he would have received it from Hayek’s father or one of his colleagues. Lueger and prominent families like the von Hayeks co-created the anti-Semitic environment which Hitler (1939 [1925], 67) easily absorbed:

I had no idea at all that organized hostility against the Jews existed.  
And so I arrived in Vienna.

In their Institute of Economic Affairs *The Consequences of Mr. Keynes: an Analysis of the Misuse of Economic Theory for Political Profiteering, with Proposals for Constitutional Disciplines*, Buchanan et al. (1978) stated: ‘Keynes was an elitist, and he operated under what his biographer,’ Roy Harrod, called the ‘presuppositions of Harvey Road.’ Hayek (1995 [1952], 227) reflected about Harrod’s (1951) *Life of J.M. Keynes*: ‘Written



by one of his closest friends and most fervent admirer, it gives a sympathetic, yet unsparingly honest, picture of one of the most influential and colourful minds of his generation. It is based on a thorough examination of the great mass of private and official documents which are available and gives a vivid picture of the background against which the career of Keynes must be seen.'

Keynes' and Hayek's elitism was rooted, respectively, in the British and Austrian neoclassical traditions. The first sought to supplement ascribed status by facilitating achieved status (through publicly funded education); the second sought to preserve a version of the Habsburg inter-generational entitlement programme. Hayek must have known that the 'great mass' of archival evidence at the Hoover Institution would reveal the presuppositions of his family's proto-Nazi Vienna.

Hayek's (1994, 39–40; 1978) father's salary was initially equal to the 'income from my mother's small fortune,' and so he neglected to build up a private practice or rise up the hierarchy of the ministry of health, hoping instead to abandon medicine in favour of a 'full university chair in botany; my determination to become a scholar was certainly affected by the unsatisfied ambition of my father' to acquire the title of full professor:

I grew up with the idea that there was nothing higher in life than becoming a university professor, without any clear conception of which subject I wanted to do ... my interests started wandering from biology to general questions of evolution, like paleontology. I got more and more interested in man rather than, in general, nature. At one stage I even thought of becoming a psychiatrist;<sup>34</sup> it seems that it was through psychiatry that I somehow got to the problems of political order.<sup>35</sup>

Pinochet (1991, 125, 176, 22–25) was proud of becoming 'Professor of Geopolitics' at the Military Academy (War College). His maternal grandfather disappeared between 1916 and 1921, causing 'distress' to his family. In July 1916, he told Pinochet's father that he had 'decided to go to France, his fatherland, upon receiving news of the war ... he also asked him to keep the news secret until he had departed, and to take good care of my grandmother ... only afterwards, when he was already in France, did he write to his wife telling her of his decision and informing of his whereabouts.'

In August 1973, Allende confronted Pinochet about his forthcoming coup: but his naïvety led him to *not* to sack him as Commander in Chief. Pinochet (1991, 276; 1982, 106) projected the image of a ‘square military man’ who had ‘thoughts only for his institution and war activities’—while boasting that Allende took his lies at face value: ‘Pinochet is an old guy who only thinks of military matters. That man is incapable of deceiving even his own wife.’ In 1949, Hayek disappeared and then wrote to his family from the United States telling them he was going to marry his cousin (Leeson 2015b, Chap. 6).

Hayek (1978), the co-leader of the fourth-generation Austrian School, reflected about Friedrich von Wieser (1851–1926), the co-leader of the second generation: a ‘most impressive teacher, a very distinguished man whom I came to admire very much, I think it’s the only instance where, as very young men do, I fell for a particular teacher. He was the great admired figure, sort of a grandfather figure of the two generations between us ... who usually, I would say, floated high above the students as a sort of God.’<sup>36</sup> Wieser (1983 [1926], 226) reflected on the consequences of the Great War: ‘When the dynastic keystone dropped out of the monarchical edifice, things were not over and done with. The moral effect spread out across the entire society witnessing this unheard-of event. Shaken was the structure not only of the political but also of the entire social edifice, which fundamentally was held together not by the external resources of power but by forces of the soul. By far the most important disintegrating effect occurred in Russia.’

According to Leube (2003, 12), Hayek was ‘consciously devoted to the vision and splendour of the Habsburg Empire.’ Hayek (1978), whose military experiences began in the year of the overthrow of both the Romanov Empire and the fledgling First Russian Republic, ‘fought for a year in Italy, and watching the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire turned my interest to politics and political problems.’<sup>37</sup> He was contemptuous of the First Austrian Republic (1919–1934)—in contrast to which stood

the whole traditional concept of aristocracy, of which I have a certain conception—have moved, to some extent, in aristocratic circles, and I like their style of life;<sup>38</sup> my latest development [is] 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>39</sup>

Pinochet (1991, 235, 249) was horrified that the democratically elected president had declared that Chile now has in ‘Government a new political force whose social function is not to support the traditional dominant class but the great majorities.’ Allende had promised to ‘carry out his duties faithfully and to respect the constitution.’ From this perspective, Pinochet was ‘Judas’; but from Pinochet’s (1991, 253; 1982, 15) ‘Christian’ perspective, Chile was the

first country which voluntarily accepted the Marxist yoke. Thus we started a calvary which would last three years ... albeit gradually, we were advancing towards the ‘Dictatorship of the Proletariat’; ... a new ‘communist paradise.’

According to Pinochet (1982, 66), ‘As though obeying some Satanic plan, everything led to destruction. The goal was to leave the population defenceless in the face of the forces organised by the government. To this end, step by step, they brought about the demoralisation of spirits, the disintegration of customs, and social decomposition.’

Hayek (1978) added ‘tradition’ to Mises’ prejudice about ascribed status: ‘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.’<sup>40</sup> Pinochet (1982, 54) complained that under Allende, the ‘traditional courtesy and friendliness of the Chilean people had changed to aggressivity and rudeness. Vulgarity reigned everywhere.’

In 1978, midway through the genocidal Guatemalan Civil War (1960–1996), José Efraín Ríos Montt left the Roman Catholic Church and became a minister in the California-based Evangelical/Pentecostal Church of the Word. In 2012, he was indicted for genocide and crimes

against humanity. In 1980, seven Bishops from six Chilean Sees issued decrees of excommunication against Pinochet's torturers: it was not clear whether the dictator who authorized the torture was also excommunicated. In 1984, Pinochet declared: 'I pray with the frequency that a good Catholic should. In the morning, in the afternoon and at night. But I have distanced myself a little from some activities' (cited by O'Shaughnessy 2000, 76–77).

Pinochet (1982, 43–44) expressed his contempt by telling elected politicians who were 'incapable of upholding the principle of authority' that he

was not 'more papist than the pope' and that if this was how they resolved their problems, then they must also shoulder the responsibility for their procedure. Then I went home.

In April 1987, Pope John Paul II visited Chile and reportedly instructed Pinochet to relinquish power to civilians (Guardiola-Rivera 2013, 397). A week after being arrested in Britain, Pinochet told a Chilean newspaper: 'In this world they also betrayed Christ' (cited by O'Shaughnessy 2000, 170; Power 2001, 110). After his release, a Chilean newspaper reported that of those who 'disappeared' during his regime, at least 400 dissidents had been thrown from helicopters into the Pacific Ocean. The following day, Pinochet told an American television station that he was a 'patriotic angel' with nothing to apologize for.<sup>41</sup>

To Otto the Habsburg Pretender, political aristocrats like those from the Kennedy and Bush dynasties were acceptable: 'It isn't bad for a country to have people with a certain tradition, where the father gives the son the same outlook and training.' 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).<sup>42</sup> Crozier (1974, 26) reflected that 'In traditional societies, the sense of permanence, durability and stability is profound.'

Non-Austrians seek to separate Church from State, and to keep both the bureaucracy and the military apolitical. Crozier (1974, 194) complained about the influence of non-Austrian intellectuals: 'From a distance, in the intellectual armchairs of the great cities of the West—in

London, Paris, Rome, New York—there is normally an instant readiness to heap blame upon soldiers who intervene to save their countries from the follies of politicians, and a curious unwillingness to see the follies for what they are.’ Roy Hansen’s sociological investigation of the Chilean military revealed that the officer class believed that many politicians ‘had no idea what Chile is, how it must be defended from external aggression and internal subversion’: because of their incompetence, ‘the Fatherland’ could only be defended by the armed forces against ‘the subversion of the masses’ (cited by Sandford 1975, 58–59).

Pinochet’s (1985) collection of speeches are titled *Patria y Democracia* (*Fatherland and Democracy*); his coup was preceded by an equivalent effort by the neo-Fascist ‘Fatherland and Liberty.’ Caldwell and Montes (2014a, 19; b, 2015, 279) report that both of Hayek’s hosts, Pedro Ibáñez (a member of Hayek’s Mont Pelerin Society) and Carlos Cáceres, were members of Pinochet’s Council of State: in March 1979, ‘Ibáñez presented a Memorandum to the Council with a number of provisions for the new Constitution,’ which the former Chilean president (1946–1952) Gabriel González Videla described as ‘totalitarian and fascist’ (Barros 2004, 222).

Having failed with his June 1973 ‘Fatherland and Liberty’ coup, Pablo Rodríguez Grez noted that within the provisions of Chile’s ‘Constitution of Liberty,’ there ‘fits both a liberal democracy—with very few significant innovations—as well as a neo-organic democracy, capable of reducing the parties to being mere currents of opinion and of preventing the electoral game from being turned into a constant confrontation of social classes’.

Hayek (2007 [1944], 156) insisted that

It is essential that we should relearn frankly to face the fact that freedom can be had only at a price and that as individuals we must be prepared to make severe material sacrifices to preserve our liberty. If we want to retain this, we must regain the conviction on which the rule of liberty in the Anglo-Saxon countries has been based and which Benjamin Franklin expressed in a phrase applicable to us in our lives as individuals no less than as nations: ‘Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase of little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.’

In ‘A Judicial Odyssey towards Freedom,’ the Fox News contributor Judge Andrew Napolitano (2010, 232) emphasized the American embrace of Franklin in this context. In contrast, for oral history purposes, Hayek (1978) appeared to expect that ‘we will get something like what [J. L.] Talmon [1960] has called “totalitarian democracy”—an elective dictatorship with practically unlimited powers. Then it will depend, from country to country, whether they are lucky or unlucky in the kind of person who gets in power. After all, there have been good dictators in the past; it’s very unlikely that it will ever arise. But there may be one or two experiments where a dictator restores freedom, individual freedom.’

Rosten—an ‘inveterate Anglophile’ (Bermant 1997)—was horrified: ‘I can hardly think of a program that will be harder to sell to the American people. I’m using ‘sell’ in the sense of persuade. How can a dictatorship be good?’ Hayek (1978) reassured him: ‘Oh, it will never be called a dictatorship; it may be a one-party system.’ Rosten asked ‘It may be a kindly system?’ Hayek replied: ‘A kindly system and a one-party system.’<sup>43</sup>

Pinochet’s coup provided Hayek (1978) with a shortcut to influence. Without a dictator,

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>44</sup>

Hayek (1978) had

little religious background, although I might add to it that having grown up in a Roman Catholic family, I have never formally left the creed. In theory I am a Roman Catholic. When I fill out the form I say ‘Roman Catholic,’ merely because this is the tradition in which I have grown up. I don’t believe a word of it. [laughter] ... 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.<sup>45</sup>

Americans were, perhaps, most in need of religion because ‘you are willing to change your opinions very rapidly on some subject’:<sup>46</sup>

if somebody really wanted religion, he had better stick to what seemed to be the ‘true article,’ that is, Roman Catholicism. Protestantism always appeared to me a step in the process of emancipation from a superstition—a step which, once taken, must lead to complete unbelief. (Hayek 1994, 34)

Hayek (1978) recalled his Viennese youth: ‘I was very young—I must have been thirteen or fourteen—when I began pestering all the priests I knew to explain to me what they meant by the word God. None of them could. [laughter] That was the end of it for me.’<sup>47</sup> In *Hitler’s Vienna: A Portrait of the Tyrant as a Young Man*, Brigitte Hamann (2010, 19) quoted her subject: ‘At thirteen, fourteen, fifteen I no longer believed in anything, certainly none of my friends believed in the so-called communion, only a few totally stupid honor students. Except at that time I thought everything should be blown up.’ In 1904, Hitler was confirmed in Linz Cathedral (Hamann 2010, 19); in Chile, Hayek (1981)—an atheist and a serial liar—explained that

I was born a Catholic. I was baptized. I was married in the church, and they will probably bury me as a Catholic. But I have never been able to be an effective Catholic, a faithful Catholic ... I believe that we all have a duty to search for the truth. But at the same time we all need to admit that none of us is in full possession of all the truth. Of ‘all’ the truth, I said. And if you wish me to define God as the truth, then I am ready to use the word God. And I’ll go further. Providing that you do not claim to have the entire truth, I am ready to work with you in searching for God via truth. It’s a fascinating challenge.

Feudal and neo-feudal privileges were distributed to create a layer of subservience and loyalty: ‘the nobility’ would provide military services in defence of the deified and mysterious Altar and Crown. The military incompetence displayed during the ‘Great’ War undermined faith in this ‘spontaneous’ social order. But governments have a tendency to seek to shroud their activities with the mysterious and ‘it cannot be denied’ *raison d’état*. In the ‘age of the common man,’ the Italian Fascist leader

Benito Mussolini sought to expand and thus strengthen this neo-feudal layer: ‘War alone brings up to their highest tension all human energies and imposes the stamp of nobility upon the peoples who have the courage to make it’ (cited by Atran 2010, 233).

Soldiers are exposed to different formative influences than politicians or academics. Hitler (1942, 45) declared: ‘In the life of nations, what in the last resort decides questions is a kind of Judgment Court of God ... Always before God and the world the stronger has the right to carry through what he wills.’ Pinochet (1982, 154–155) sought ‘The spiritual reconstruction of the nation. The order and material cleanliness of our towns and the discipline of our actions will be a reflection of the moral transformation of the country ... to speed up these goals we beg God to help us, we ask our people for their devotion and patriotism ... I pray to Almighty to give us the light and the necessary strength to face the difficult tasks of government ...’

Armen Alchian told Hayek that when he read Fritz Machlup’s

work I can see the man talking, I can hear him, just by the words that come out. And somewhat similarly with you, when I read your work, I can see you standing there talking, because the sentences of your written material are very much like your oral sentences. They are well phrased, well put together. The first time I ever heard you—I think maybe it was at [the Mont Pelerin Society meeting at] Princeton in maybe ‘57; I’m not sure where—you got up and gave a spontaneous lecture, and all I could say was, ‘I don’t know what he was saying, but how can he phrase that so beautifully, so elegantly?’ You’ve always done that; that’s a remarkable talent that some have. How did you develop it, or was it just natural? Whatever natural may mean.<sup>48</sup>

Josef Goebbels detected similar qualities in another Austrian: ‘As a speaker a wonderful harmony between gesture, facial expression and words.’ Hitler ‘speaks about politics, ideas and organisation. Deep and mystical. Almost like a Gospel. With a shudder one walks with him past the bottomless pit of existence. The last word is said. I thank fate for giving us this man ... He is a genius. The self-evidently creating instrument of a divine destiny.’ The ‘religion’ of National Socialism had found



in Hitler its ‘religious genius’ (cited by Friedrich 2012). According to Pinochet (1982, 109–110, 150, 30, 54), in Chile

a sort of divine light illuminated those dark days ... Today when I look back on the road covered, I think how Providence, without forcing events, cleared the way of obstacles in aid of final action that we had to carry out on the government of the *Unidad Popular* ... Foreign countries sent weapons and mercenaries of hatred to fight us. But the hand of God was there to save us, a few days before the consummation of the crime that was being prepared ... The action of Marxism was ... poisoning the soul of the population ... As though obeying some Satanic plan, everything led to destruction.

Reagan (1990, 409) complained about those who ‘demand the abolition of secular governments and their replacement by priestly theocracies; to achieve their goals, they have institutionalised murder and terrorism in the name of God.’ He could have been referring to Pinochet; instead, he was referring to ‘radical Islamic fundamentalist sects’—some of whom had been enlisted in the cold war fight against the Soviets in Afghanistan.

The Nazis justified Austro-German *Lebensraum*—a prelude to the ‘final solution’—by invoking the North American pursuit of Manifest Destiny (Baranowski 2011, Chaps. 4, 5, and 6). The Latin American treatment of pre-Columbian property owners could also have been invoked: Chile conducted *Lebensraum* wars against Peru and the indigenous Mapuche (Guardiola-Rivera 2013, 39).

Native ‘Indians’ were subjected to what has been described as genocide (Stannard 1993). In 1964, presidential candidate Allende signed the Cautín Pact with the dispossessed Mapuche Indians. In 1970, he concluded his campaign with ‘Venceremos,’ which is the anthem of *Unidad Popular*, a folk song by Víctor Jara, and poem by Pablo Neruda (Guardiola-Rivera 2013, 19, 143).

The Spanish Inquisition (1478–1834) imposed orthodoxy through ‘purification’ by fire (*auto-da-fé*), while Pinochet’s Clerical Fascism combined ‘purification’ with sadism. The American embassy is situated between the Mapocho River and an office blocks and hotels—later known as ‘Sanhattan’ (Anderson 1998). Pinochet seized power on 9 September 1973; according to the CIA website:

On 28 September [1973], CIA reported that 27 cadavers, some showing signs of torture and mutilation, had been recovered from the Mapocho River ... On 3 November [1973], the CIA reported that, despite a government decree to end summary executions, 20 bodies were found shot in the San Carlos Canal ... It was apparent that the 17 January 1974 Chilean government circular prohibiting torture and providing instructions for the handling of prisoners was a public relations ruse.<sup>49</sup>

In his Nobel Prize banquet speech, Neruda (1971) described himself as a 'representative of these times and of the present struggles which fill my poetry ... I am proud to belong to this great mass of humanity, not to the few but to the many, by whose invisible presence I am surrounded here today.' His inspiration derived, in part, from the 'Indians mourning-clad left to us by the Conquest, to a country, a dark continent seeking for the light. And if the beams from this festive hall cross land and sea to light up my past, they also light up the future of our American peoples, who are defending their right to dignity, to freedom and to life.'

Pinochet's (1991, 276) regime had neo-feudal overtones: he loved to hear Mexican 'Indians' 'playing jolly melodies' and singing with 'real feeling ... The vocalist was outstanding for her lovely voice.' Pinochet, who announced his coup by playing the National Anthem, told Bishop Helmut Frenz that from his presidential perspective, 'state security is more important than the human rights. The members of MIR must be tortured as they are insane and mad. Without torture they may not sing' (cited by Cassidy 1992 [1977], 158).

According to Pinochet (1982, 269), MIR (*Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionario*) was 'the main group responsible for assaults, attempts, murders and other terrorist action,' and MAPU (Christians for Socialism) was part of the *Unidad Popular* government in which the Communist Party was—he alleged—the 'majority group.' After his coup, numerous priests were tortured to death (O'Shaughnessy 2000, 73–75). The Anglo-Chilean priest Michael Woodward was abducted and taken to the Esmeralda naval training ship. His body was never found; four decades later, two ex-naval officers were found guilty of abducting him.<sup>50</sup>

There were two competing White Terror (Fascists) groups in pre-*Anschluss* Austria: the Nazis (seeking to unify the two Germanic powers)

and the Austro-Fascists (seeking independence from the Third Reich through an alliance with Fascist Italy). Initially, Hayek and Mises favoured *Anschluss*; and during the Great Depression, they promoted the deflation which undermined democracy and facilitated the rise to power of both Hitler and Dollfuss (Leeson 2017). After becoming Austrian Chancellor (10 May 1932), Engelbert Dollfuss formed a right-wing coalition government with the *Landbund* and the *Heimatblock* (the political organization of the *Heimwehr*, the paramilitary 'Home Guard' which resembled Germany's *Freikorps*).

Hitler became German Chancellor on 30 January 1933: the Reichstag Fire (27 February 1933) facilitated his Enabling Act. In Austria, the absence of a parliamentary speaker (7 March 1933) enabled Dollfuss to govern through emergency decrees: parliament was circumvented and the National Council was prevented from meeting (15 March 1933). In May/June 1933, Dollfuss banned the Communist Party, the Austrian Nazi Party, and the *Republikanischer Schutzbund*, the paramilitary troops of the Social Democratic Party. The *Schutzbund* revolt against this disbanding sparked the Austrian Civil War (12–16 February 1934).

On 1 March 1934, Mises becomes member 282,632 of Dollfuss' *Vaterländische Front* (Fatherland Front) and member 406,183 of *Werk Neues Leben*, the official Austro-Fascist social club (Hülsmann 2007, 677, n149). Two months later, Dollfuss' 'May Constitution' created a one-party Corporate State for 'loyal Austrians': a merger of his Christian Social Party, the *Heimwehr* forces and other right-wing groups (1 May 1934). The Nazis assassinated Dollfuss (25 July 1934), but Italy's threat of military intervention temporarily saved Austria from *Anschluss*.<sup>51</sup>

Along with 'Dollfuss and Edmund Palla, the secretary of the Chamber of Labor,' Mises (2009a [1978 (1940)], 62) belonged to the three-member 'publication committee of the Economic Commission, which, with the cooperation of Professor Richard Schüller, published a report on Austria's economic difficulties.' According to the Mises Institute Distinguished Fellow, Hans-Hermann Hoppe (2009 [1997]), 'Before Dollfuss was murdered for his politics, Mises was one of his closest advisers.'

From 1 April 1909 until 1934, Mises was a full-time lobbyist for the Lower Austrian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (*Niederösterreichische Handels-und Gewerbekammer* or *Kammer* (and part-time, 1934–1938). Beneath the façade of ‘individualism,’ the Fascist-promoting Mises (1985 [1927], 175) provided the quasi-organic theory of the producer-controlled state that underpinned the Austro-Fascist Corporate State (1934–1938): ‘The parties of special interests, which see nothing more in politics than the securing of privileges and prerogatives for their own groups, not only make the parliamentary system impossible; they rupture the unity of the state and of society.’

In *Human Action*, Mises (1998 [1949], 813) later tried to distance himself from his support to the Corporate State:

the *stato corporativo* was nothing but a rebaptized edition of guild socialism. The differences concerned only unimportant details. Corporativism was flamboyantly advertised by the bombastic propaganda of the Fascists, and the success of their campaign was overwhelming. Many foreign authors exuberantly praised the miraculous achievements of the new system. The governments of Austria and Portugal emphasized that they were firmly committed to the noble ideas of corporativism.

According to Mises (2009a [1978 (1940)], 118), in January 1934, ‘Dollfuss was ready to surrender to the National Socialists. Negotiations were already quite advanced when, in the last minute, Italy put in its veto.’ The Social Democrats demonstrated because they

simply did not want to recognize that it was only the Italians who were ready to support Austria in its fight against the National Socialist takeover. They fought passionately against a ‘fascist’ course of foreign policy.

These demonstrations resulted in the ‘crushing of their leaders by government troops and the *Heimwehr*, and brought about an end to the rule of the Social Democratic Party in Viennese city government.’

Karl Josef Seitz was the first president of the First Austrian Republic, president of the National Council (1919–1920), and Chairman of the Social Democratic Party (1918–1934). He was also Mayor of Vienna

from 8 November 1923 until he was removed from office by Dollfuss and taken into custody (12 February 1934).<sup>52</sup> Mises (2009a [1978 (1940)], 118) insisted that Seitz's SDP followers should embrace Fascism:

Leaders of the Social Democratic Party who had fled to London, Paris, and Prague now openly refused any support of Austria in her fight against Hitler. They felt there was no difference between Austrian 'fascism' and that of the Nazis, and that it was not the charge of the western democracies to interfere in the struggle between the two fascist groups.

According to Mises (2009a [1978 (1940)], 59–60), in Austria

My position was incomparable to, and of greater importance than, that of any other *Handelskammer* official or any other Austrian not heading up of one of the large political parties. I was the economist of the land. This is not to say that my recommendations were carried out, or that what I discouraged remained undone. Supported by few friends, I waged a hopeless battle. A postponement of the catastrophe was all I accomplished. That events did not result in Bolshevism in the winter of 1918/1919 and that the collapse of banks and industry occurred in 1931 instead of 1921 were largely due to the success of my efforts. More could not be achieved, at least not by me.

In her Preface to Mises' *Liberalism in the Classical Tradition*, Bettina Greaves (1985, vi–vii) asserted that after 'Hitler came to power in Germany, Mises anticipated trouble for Austria. So in 1934 he took a position in Switzerland with the Graduate Institute of International Studies. ... To escape Hitler-dominated Europe, Mises and his wife left Switzerland in 1940 and came to the United States.' Rothbard (2009 [1988], 35) also asserted that between 1934 and 1940, Mises was 'in exile in Geneva from fascist Austria.' And Rockwell (2005) sought to 'draw ... attention to an event that impacted directly not only the founding of the Mises Institute but on the future of freedom itself. It concerns Mises' time of sanctuary when he lived as an *intellectual refugee* [emphasis added] in Geneva, Switzerland, during the Second World War. He found himself in a privately funded research center with other refugees from Austria and Germany, driven out for having fought against the rising tide of

socialism, both left and right.’ In reality, Mises (2009a [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.’

According to *The Last Knight of Liberalism*, ideologically the Dollfuss regime

relied on state-of-the-art Catholic political and social theory, as embodied in the writings of Othmar Spann and Pope Pius XI, both of whom glorified social order based on the respect of the professional *Stände* or estates. While Spann’s views had a deep impact on the German-speaking world, his influence could not match Pius XI’s encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931), which was a shot in the arm for the corporatist movement. As one of Mises’s correspondents from Switzerland reported, young Catholic politicians were entirely imbued with its ideas, even more than those of Othmar Spann ... Mises would later acknowledge that the man who wrote the first draft of the encyclical, Jesuit Pater O. von Nell-Breuning, was ‘one of the few German economists who in the Interwar period advocated economic freedom.’ (Hülsmann 2007, 677)

The Austrian School philosopher, Erik ‘Ritter von’ Kuehnelt-Leddihn (1943, 86; 1998), who described himself as an ‘honest reactionary,’ asserted: ‘The Ghetto, needless to say, was a privilege. It had complete self-government.’ The evidence, however, reveals that pogroms usually occurred in ghettos (or ‘Pale of Settlement’). Indeed, the term ‘pogrom’ became commonly used in English after three year of government-approved attack on Jews after the assassination of Czar Alexander II (1881–1884). The new Czar Alexander III initially blamed the Jews for the riots and in 1882 issued the repressive anti-Jewish May Laws.

The *New York Times* (1903) described the Easter 1903 pogrom as much

worse than the censor will permit to publish. There was a well laid-out plan for the general massacre of Jews on the day following the Orthodox Easter. The mob was led by priests, and the general cry, ‘Kill the Jews,’ was taken up all over the city. The Jews were taken wholly unaware and were

slaughtered like sheep ... The scenes of horror attending this massacre are beyond description ... The local police made no attempt to check the reign of terror.

Kuehnelt-Leddihn (1998) informed the readers of the *Rothbard Rockwell Report* that Jews were responsible for the Holocaust (or *Shoah*):

They should have learned the lesson that monarchs, princes, aristocrats, bishops, and popes had been their protectors and that the common man their ‘born enemy,’ especially in the urban, rather than in the agrarian ambience.

Kuehnelt-Leddihn (1998) knew who was *not* to blame:

There exists the extremely silly accusation against the Papacy that it could have prevented *Shoah*. This perfidy rests on a mountain of ignorance and thinly veiled hatreds. Much of this argument is based on the widespread belief that the Catholic Church is ‘powerful.’ It never was.

Although Rothbard and Rockwell were marketing Austrian ideas to ‘Rednecks,’ the only evidence that Kuehnelt-Leddihn (1998) provided for this assertion were given in a language that almost no reader of the *Rothbard Rockwell Report* would have understood: ‘The words of St. Augustine were always true: *et paupera et inops est ecclesia*!’ In his Arlington House *The Intelligent American’s Guide to Europe*, Kuehnelt-Leddihn (1979, 54–55) provided a translation: ‘The Church is both poor and helpless.’

As Hitler entered Vienna in March 1938, the Catholic Archbishop of Vienna, Theodor Innitzer, arranged for church bells to be rung, and allowed Nazi flags to hang from churches. In St Stephen’s Cathedral a huge picture of Hitler was hung, and according to Margit Mises (1984, 35–36) ‘the Catholic Church, led by Cardinal Innitzer, swore allegiance to the Nazis.’ Concentration camps were immediately established; and Innitzer proclaimed that *Anschluss* was the ‘fulfilment of a thousand-year-old longing of our people for a union in a Great Reich of Germans.’ In April 1938, a Nazi-supervised referendum produced a 99.73% vote in favour of union with Germany (Wasserstein 2007, 271; Shirer 1960, 429).

The Habsburg-born, Austrian-educated Arthur Koestler (1950, 19) described some of those affected by the demise of the dynasties: ‘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>53</sup> Based on ‘Conversations and interviews with Hayek I, Salzburg, 1971–77. Tapes in my possession (my translation),’ Leube (2003, 12, n1, 13) reported that Hayek, Mises *et al.* ‘had clearly assumed that their primary tasks were attached to a vast empire’ (the Habsburg’s) and so became

convinced advocates of the ‘*Anschluss*’ to Germany. They advocated the annexation not so much for emotional reasons, rather it seemed for them the only way the little Austria could economically survive. Their society had disappeared and the new Austria was simply unable to offer the type of *opportunities for leadership which Hayek and his social class had come to expect* [emphasis added].

When the Eastern Reich joined the Third Reich in 1938 (*Anschluss*), Austrians—who comprised only 8% of the total population—rapidly became disproportionately represented as SS members (13%), concentration camp staff (40%), and concentration camp commanders (70%). Austrian territory was the road to serfdom for the 800,000 victims who were compelled to work as war-time slave labourers—many of whom were murdered as the Allies advanced (Berger 2012, 84).

## 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 Earlene Craver date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).



3. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Axel Leijonhufvud date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
4. Some of the Bartley-labelled interviews were undertaken by others—it appears to be a biographical interview.
5. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Earlene Craver date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
6. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Earlene Craver date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
7. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Axel Leijonhufvud date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
8. Joseph Salerno (2010, 2009), who became a disciple of a card-carrying Austro-Fascist via Ayn Rand's fiction, described Sraffa (a Jewish-born refugee from fascism) as 'one of Keynes's more uncomprehending and rabid disciples.'
9. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Jack High date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
10. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Armen Alchian 11 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
11. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Thomas Hazlett 12 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
12. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Leo Rosten 15 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
13. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by James Buchanan 28 October 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
14. 'Even though Hayek himself disdained having his ideas attached to either party, he nonetheless provided arguments about the dangers of the unbridled growth of government' (Caldwell 2010).
15. <http://www.citadel.edu/root/csb-faculty-staff/48-academics/schools/business/badm/22431-ebeling>.

16. <http://www.citadel.edu/root/csb/48-academics/schools/business/badm/21825-our-mission-values>.
17. <http://austrianeconomists.typepad.com/weblog/2007/10/rush-to-philoso.html>.
18. The influence which led Hayek (1978) 'to economics was really Walter Rathenau's conception of a grand economy. He had himself been the raw materials dictator in Germany.' Friedrich Hayek interviewed by Leo Rosten 15 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
19. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/3237740.stm>.
20. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Jack High date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
21. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Leo Rosten 15 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
22. Pinochet incorrectly gave the date as 23 October 1947.
23. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Robert Bork 4 November 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. <http://www.margaretthatcher.org/speeches/displaydocument.asp?docid=102939>.
26. Hayek's grandfather taught Otto Neurath, who later became a leading member of the Vienna Circle. Hayek (9 July 1945) to Neurath. Hayek Papers Box 40.7. See also Ebenstein (2003, 8).
27. Friedrich Hayek interviewed by Leo Rosten 15 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
28. 'The white medical establishment, it is said, denies black mothers information about nutrition for their babies, whose mental growth is stunted (as if caring for black children is the job of white doctors and public health officials - but let that go).'
29. 'From what I've seen of the British National Health Service, my doubt and skepticism has rather been increased. No doubt that in the short run it provides services to people who otherwise would not have got it, but that it impedes the progress of medical services—that there as much as

anywhere else competition is an essential condition of progress—I have no doubt. And it’s particularly bad because while most people in Britain dislike it, everybody agrees it can never be reversed.’ Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Axel Leijonhufvud date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).

30. Crozier (1979, 23) wrote at the bottom of the page: ‘these lines were written before the general election of 3 May 1979.’
31. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1907/agrprogr/ch04s7.htm>.
32. ‘I have always maintained that the great prosperity of Germany in the first twenty-five years after the war was due to the reasonableness of the trade unions. Their power was greater than they used, very largely because all the trade union leaders in Germany had known what a major inflation was, and you just had to raise your finger—“If you ask for more, you will have inflation”—and they would give in. That generation is going off now. A new generation, which hasn’t had that experience, is coming up. So I fear the German position may increasingly approach something like [the British], but not quite as bad as the British position, because the closed shop is prohibited by law in Germany, and I don’t think that will be changed.’ Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by James Buchanan 28 October 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
33. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Armen Alchian 11 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
34. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Robert Chitester date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
35. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Earlene Craver date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
36. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Earlene Craver date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
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 Robert Chitester date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
39. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Jack High date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
40. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Leo Rosten 15 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
41. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/3237740.stm>.
42. Otto von Habsburg continued: Sarkozy 'points out that a state which subsidizes football clubs and refuses to do any economic favors to religions who want to build churches is absurd.'
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 James Buchanan 28 October 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
45. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Robert Chitester date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
46. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Leo Rosten 15 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
47. Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Earlene Craver date unspecified 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
48. Hayek (1978) replied: 'It was comparatively late, and I learned it, I think, in the process of acquiring English as a lecturing language. I don't think I could have done it in German before. I certainly learned a great deal in acquiring a new language for writing, although I have retained one effect of my German background: my sentences are still much too long. [laughter]' Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Armen Alchian 11 November 1978 (Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>).
49. <https://www.cia.gov/library/reports/general-reports-1/chile/index.html#19>.
50. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-latin-america-22445163>.

51. Mises (1985 [1927], 51) reflected: ‘So much for the domestic policy of Fascism. That its foreign policy, based as it is on the avowed principle of force in international relations, cannot fail to give rise to an endless series of wars that must destroy all of modern civilization requires no further discussion. To maintain and further raise our present level of economic development, peace among nations must be assured. But they cannot live together in peace if the basic tenet of the ideology by which they are governed is the belief that one’s own nation can secure its place in the community of nations by force alone.’
52. Coincidentally, 8 November 1923 was the day of the Ludendorff and Hitler *Putsch*.
53. 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?’.

## Bibliography

- Allen, H. 1982. Hayek the Answer Man. *Washington Post* 2 December. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/lifestyle/1982/12/02/hayek-the-answer-man/5f046174-5ded-4695-96cd-65020c0919ad/>
- Anderson, J. 1998. October 19, 1998 Issue The Dictator. *The New Yorker* 19 October. <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/1998/10/19/the-dictator-2>
- Anderson, R. G. 1999. George and me. *LewRockwell.com*. <https://www.lewrockwell.com/1999/12/robert-g-anderson/george-and-me/>
- Arce, L. 1994. *The Inferno: A Story of Terror and Survival in Chile*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Atran, S. 2010. War, Martyrdom, and Terror: Evolutionary Underpinnings of the Moral Imperative to Extreme Group Violence. In Roberts, S. C. (Ed.) *Applied Evolutionary Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baranowski, S. 2011. *Nazi Empire: German Colonialism and Imperialism from Bismarck to Hitler*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barros, R. 2004. *Constitutionalism and Dictatorship. Pinochet, the Junta, and the 1980 Constitution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berger, T. U. 2012. *War, Guilt, and World Politics after World War II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bermant, C. 1997. Obituary. *The Independent* 21 February.

- Blundell, J. 2014. IHS and the Rebirth of Austrian Economics: Some Reflections on 1974–1976. *Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics* 17.1, Spring: 92–107. <https://mises.org/library/ihs-and-rebirth-austrian-economics-some-reflections-1974%E2%80%931976>
- 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/>
- Bonaparte, N. 1916. *Napoleon in His Own Words*. Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Company. Translated from the French by Jules Bertaut.
- Braden, S. 1971. *Diplomats and Demagogues: The Memoirs of Spruille Braden*. New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House.
- 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., Wagner, R. and Burton, J. 1978. *The Consequences of Mr. Keynes: An Analysis of the Misuse of Economic Theory for Political Profiteering, with Proposals for Constitutional Disciplines*. London: Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Caldwell, B. 2010. The Secret Behind the Hot Sales of ‘The Road to Serfdom’ by Free-Market Economist F. A. Hayek. *The Washington Post*. [http://voices.washingtonpost.com/shortstack/2010/02/the\\_secret\\_behind\\_the\\_hot\\_sale.html](http://voices.washingtonpost.com/shortstack/2010/02/the_secret_behind_the_hot_sale.html)
- 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.
- Campbell, J. 2007. *Margaret Thatcher: Volume One: The Grocer’s Daughter*. London: Random House.
- Cassidy, S. 1992. *Audacity to Believe*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, Limited.
- Crankshaw, E. 1954. When Lenin Returned. *The Atlantic* September. <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1954/10/when-lenin-returned/303867/>
- Crozier, B. 1974. *A Theory of Conflict*. New York: Charles Scribner’s.
- Crozier, B. 1979. *The Minimum State: Beyond Party Politics*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Cubitt, C. 2006. *A Life of August von Hayek*. Bedford, England: Authors on line.

- Cwik, P. 2010. Faculty Spotlight Interview: Paul Cwik. *Mises Wire* 15 December. <https://mises.org/blog/faculty-spotlight-interview-paul-cwik>
- Ebeling, R. 1974. Austrian Economics on the Rise. *Libertarian Forum* October. <http://mises.org/daily/4174>
- Ebeling, R. 2016. How I Became a Libertarian and an Austrian Economist. *FEET* 2 May. <http://www.fff.org/explore-freedom/article/became-libertarian-austrian-economist/>
- Ebenstein, A. 2003. *Friedrich Hayek a Biography*. New York: Palgrave.
- Friedman, M. F. and Friedman, R. D. 1998. *Two Lucky People: Memoirs*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Friedrich, T. 2012. *Hitler's Berlin: Abused City*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Translated by Stewart Spencer.
- Greaves, B.-B. 1985. Introduction. To Mises, L. 1985 [1927]. *Liberalism in the Classical Tradition*. Auburn, Alabama: Mises Institute. Translated by Ralph Raico.
- Guardiola-Rivera, O. 2013. *Story of a Death Foretold. The Coup against Allende*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Hamann, B. 2010. *Hitler's Vienna: A Portrait of the Tyrant as a Young Man*. London: Taurus.
- Han, W.-H. 1982. *Human Rights: Problems and Perspectives*. Chinese Association for Human Rights, Center for International Studies, Guam Association for Freedom and Human Rights.
- Harrod, R. 1951. *Life of J.M. Keynes*. New York: Macmillan.
- Hayek, F. A. 1933. Trends of Economic Thinking. *Economica* 40, May: 121–137.
- Hayek, F. A. 1941. *The Pure Theory of Capital*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 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. 1978. *Oral history Interviews*. Centre for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles., <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/>.
- Hayek, F. A. 1981. Extracts from an Interview Friedrich von Hayek. *El Mercurio*, 12 April Santiago de Chile, D8–D9.
- 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. 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.

- Hayek, F. A. 2011 [1960]. *Constitution of Liberty The Definitive Edition: The Collected Works of F.A. Hayek*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Edited by R. Hamowy.
- Hayek, F. A. 2012 [1951]. The Transmission of the Ideals of Economic Freedom. *Econ Journal Watch* 9.2, May: 163–169.
- Herbener, J., Hoppe, H.-H. and Salerno, J. 1998. Introduction. In Mises, L. *Human Action: The Scholar's Edition*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Hitler, A. 1939 [1925]. *Mein Kampf*. London: Hurst and Blackett. Translated by James Murphy.
- Hitler, A. 1942. *The Speeches of Adolf Hitler, April 1922–August 1939: An English Translation of Representative Passages Arranged Under Subjects and Edited by Norman H. Baynes, Volume 1, Part 1*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hoppe, H.-H. 2001. *Democracy The God that Failed: the Economics and Politics of Monarchy, Democracy and Natural Order*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Hoppe, H.-H. 2009 [1997]. The Meaning of the Lost Mises Papers. *Liberty Australia*. <http://www.la.org.au/opinion/050309/meaning-mises-papers>
- Hoover, H. 1952. *The Memoirs of Herbert Hoover, Vol. 3: The Great Depression 1929–1941*. New York: Macmillan.
- Hülsmann, J. G. 2007. *Mises: The Last Knight of Liberalism*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- 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). 1943. Credo of a Reactionary. *The American Mercury* 57, July. <http://www.unz.org/Pub/AmMercury-1943jul-00086>
- Kuehnelt-Leddihn, E. R. 1979. *The Intelligent American's Guide to Europe*. New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House.
- Kuehnelt-Leddihn, E. R. 1998. Hebrew and Christians. *Rothbard-Rockwell Report* April: 6–12. <http://www.unz.org/Pub/RothbardRockwellReport-1998apr-00006>
- Kurtz-Phelan, D. 2008. Big Fruit a review of Peter Chapman's *Bananas How the United Fruit Company Shaped the World*. *New York Times* 2 March. [http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/02/books/review/Kurtz-Phelan-t.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/02/books/review/Kurtz-Phelan-t.html?_r=0)
- Leeson, R. 2013. (Ed.) *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography Part I: Influences, from Mises to Bartley*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leeson, R. 2015a. (Ed.) *Hayek a Collaborative Biography: Part V Hayek's Great Society of Free Men*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leeson, R. 2015b. (Ed.) *Hayek: a Collaborative Biography Part II Austria, America and the Rise of Hitler, 1899–1933*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.



- Leeson, R. 2017. *Hayek a Collaborative Biography Part VIII The Constitution of Liberty (1) 'Shooting in Cold Blood': Hayek's Plan for the Future of Democracy*. Basingstoke, England: 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).
- Levin, M. 1995. Why We Fight. *Rothbard Rockwell Report*, August. <https://www.unz.org/Pub/RothbardRockwellReport-1995aug-00008>
- Mises, L. 1951 [1922]. *On Socialism*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mises, L. 1961. Liberty and Its Antithesis. Review of Hayek's Constitution of Liberty. *Christian Economics* April.
- 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, M. 1984. *My Life with Ludwig von Mises*. Cedar Falls, Iowa. Center for Futures Education. Second edition.
- Mises, L. 1985 [1927]. *Liberalism in the Classical Tradition*. Auburn, Alabama: Mises Institute. Translated by Ralph Raico.
- Mises, L. 1998 [1949]. *Human Action A Treatise on Economics*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Mises, L. 2007 [1958]. Mises and Rothbard Letters to Ayn Rand. *Journal of Libertarian Studies* 21.4, Winter: 11–16.
- Mises, L. 2009a [1978 (1940)]. *Memoirs*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Mises, L. 2009b [1958]. *Liberty and Property*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Mises, L. 2010 [1944]. *Omnipotent Government*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Mises, M. 1976. *My Life with Ludwig von Mises*. New York: Arlington House.
- 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. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2015994/End-Royal-dynasty-Otto-von-Habsburg-laid-rest--heart-buried-crypt-85-miles-away-different-country.html>
- Moss, R. 1973. *Chile's Marxist Experiment*. New York: John Wiley.
- Napolitano, A. 2010. A Judicial Odyssey towards Freedom. In Block, W. (Ed.) *I Chose Liberty: Autobiographies of Contemporary Libertarians*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.

- Neruda, P. 1971. Pablo Neruda—Banquet Speech. [http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel\\_prizes/literature/laureates/1971/neruda-speech.html](http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/1971/neruda-speech.html)
- New York Times. 1903. Jewish Massacre Denounced. 28 April: 6.
- 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.
- O'Shaughnessy, H. 2000. *Pinochet: The Politics of Torture*. New York: Latin America Bureau and New York University Press.
- Palmer, T. 1997. Lew Rockwell's Vienna Waltz. *Liberty* September. <http://web.archive.org/web/20050318091128/http://www.libertysoft.com/liberty/features/61palmer.html>
- Patterson, P. 2002. *Eternal Treblinka: Our Treatment of Animals and the Holocaust*. New York: Lantern.
- Pinochet, A. 1982. *The Crucial Day September 11 1973*. Santiago, Chile: Editorial Renacimiento.
- Pinochet, A. 1985. *Pinochet: Patria y Democracia*. Santiago, Chile: Corporacion De Estudios Nacionales.
- Pinochet, A. 1991. *A Journey Through Life Memoirs of a Soldier Volume 1*. Santiago: Instituto Geográfico Militar de Chile.
- Power, J. 2001. *Like Water on Stone: The Story of Amnesty International*. London: The Penguin Press.
- Reagan, R. 1990. *An American Life*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Rohter, L. 2006. Colonel's Death Gives Clues to Pinochet Arms Deals. *New York Times* 19 June.
- Rockwell, L. Jr. 1994. The Cognitive State. *Rothbard Rockwell Report* December. <http://www.unz.org/Pub/RothbardRockwellReport-1994dec-00018>
- Rockwell, L. Jr. 1998. To Restore the Church Smash the State. *Triple R* March. <http://www.unz.org/Pub/RothbardRockwellReport-1998mar-00011>
- Rockwell, L. H. Jr. 2005. Heart of a Fighter. *The Free Market* 23.7. <https://mises.org/library/heart-fighter>
- Rothbard, M. N. 1970. The Great Women's Liberation Issue: Setting It Straight. *The Individualist* May. <https://www.lewrockwell.com/1970/01/murray-n-rothbard/against-womens-lib/>
- Rothbard, M. N. 1992. 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. 1988. *The Essential Von Mises*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.

- Rothbard, M. N. 1994a. A New Strategy for Liberty. *Rothbard Rockwell Report* 5.10, October. <http://www.unz.org/Pub/RothbardRockwellReport-1994oct-00001>
- Rothbard, M. N. 1994b. Nations By Consent: Decomposing the Nation-State. *Journal of Libertarian Studies* 11.1, Fall: 1–10.
- Rothbard, M. N. 2002 [1971]. Milton Friedman Unraveled. *Journal of Libertarian Studies* 16.4, Fall: 37–54.
- Rothbard, M. N. 2007 [1995]. *Making Economic Sense*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Salerno, J. T. 2009. Introduction. In *A Tiger by the Tail A 40-Years' Running Commentary on Keynesianism by Hayek*. London and Auburn, Alabama: The Institute of Economic Affairs and the Ludwig von Mises Institute. Third edition. Compiled and Introduced by Sudha R. Shenoy.
- 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.
- Sandford, R. 1975. *The Murder of Allende and the End of the Chilean Way to Socialism*. New York: Harper and Row.
- 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.
- Sraffa, P. 1932a. Dr. Hayek on Money and Capital. *Economic Journal* 42.165, March: 42–53.
- Sraffa, P. 1932b. Rejoinder. *Economic Journal* 42.166, June: 249–251.
- Stannard, D. E. 1993. *American Holocaust The Conquest of the New World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Talmon, J. L. 1960. *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy*. Britain: Secker & Warburg.
- Wasserstein, B. 2007. *Barbarism and Civilization: A History of Europe in Our Time*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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>
- Wieser, F. 1983 [1926]. *The Law of Power*. University of Nebraska-Lincoln: Bureau of Business Research.
- Zweig, S. 1943. *The World of Yesterday*. New York: Viking Press.