
Libertarian Strategy Gazette

Volume 3 Number 8

August 2003

The Virtue of Benevolence

"Hello, I am a Libertarian, and I am a jerk. Vote for me! It is in your rational self-interest! I support your right to be a jerk..."

Of course, the above is not an exact quote. It is merely the meaning that many (most?) people hear when exposed to certain rhetoric of a "philosophical nature".

Not all libertarians take this tack, of course. But the Objectivist roots of the modern libertarian movement run deep, and Randian rhetoric permeates much libertarian propaganda. It is tempting to put Ayn Rand's novels or essays into the hands of prospects. After all, Ayn Rand wrote some of the most powerful and brilliant defenses of the free market in print. Her attacks on socialists and angst-worshippers are scathingly witty and dead-on. Yet associating libertarianism with her writings is a grave error, for they contain a fatal flaw.

In the fluffy realm of common sense and conservative perturbations of the status quo, errors in analysis are mercifully bounded. Frequent resort to empiricism over perfection of logical consistency provides an error correcting mechanism in even muddle-headed thinking. In the stark realm of pure philosophy, however, where all reality must conform to a few axioms, life is far less forgiving. A single error can cause a fissure through an entire logical edifice, rendering it unfit. Ayn Rand's basing her moral philosophy on following one's own rational self-interest is one such devastating error. Its consequences are so serious that the association of Objectivism with the libertarian movement has produced a taint that is a major barrier to the libertarian movement's general acceptance -- possibly the biggest. Consider:

- o Those who understand how government really works know that to significantly cut government requires self-sacrifice. Rational self-interest on the part of the governors means to take the money and rule.

- o Even the politically ignorant know this to a degree. Indeed, they often ignore the issues at hand and vote for candidates on the basis of "character".

- o People are most receptive to new ideologies at the beginning of adulthood. This is a time of starry-eyed idealism and desire to "make a difference" in the world. The Socialists and Greens tap into this. Objectivism tries to quell it.

- o Then there are the religious (still a large number!):

Hello, I am a Libertarian and I am going to Hell. Vote for me! I will cut your taxes and increase economic growth. But I would like you to stop following "witch doctors" and wor-

[Benevolence] (Continued on page 2)

State Chairs Meet

Part Six

Bob Sullentrup, State Chair of Missouri, has again prepared an extended set of notes on the States Chairs meeting. This article began in the March 2003 **Let Freedom Ring!** and is available as a complete article in the *Electronic Supplement* to the March 2003 issue of **Libertarian Strategy Gazette** <http://www.cmlc.org/cmlc/pubs.htm>.

Sullentrup writes:

Then Mark asked, "And who in this room are small business owners"?

Virtually the whole room raised their hands.

We may not attract government employees with this strategy, but then they're not likely to be very libertarian anyway. (Arguable, since in MO there are at least four solid libertarians who are or have been government or state college employees).

We might proceed in this way, adding additional constituencies kind of like a frog jumping from lily pad to lily pad. What is it we want to get? Credibility, respectably, influence. What do we give back to them? H-o-p-e.

In so doing, our focus will change from stressing issues to constituencies. And we will change the tenor of our rhetoric - not yell and scream - changing the tone, not the substance.

Aaron Starr (CA) moved "to go forward with this proposal, to recommend to the LNC to support the branding strategy that supports small businesses as outlined by Mark". The motion passed by a solid majority.

Drug War Strategy, Ron Crickenberger

Ron Crickenberger discussed the relatively controversial issue of maintaining the failed War on Drugs as a leading issue for the Party. Ron noted the SPT voted 2-1 to keep this as a prominent issue.

Ron noted, "We own the Drug War". Moreover, it is better for us than taxes, war, or other issues. Accordingly, we "Might as well run on it", he stated.

According to polls, 74% say the War on Drugs can never be won, and 80% say the Drug War is lost.

Moreover, Ron noted that Drug War candidates typically do better than those who candidates who do not emphasize the Drug War.

[State Chairs Meet] (Continued on page 5)

(Continued from page 1) [Benevolence]
 rying about that nonexistent afterlife...

A Grand Opportunity

By identifying this error we open a golden opportunity for the libertarian movement. Here is a fix that can be done completely by those already active in the movement. It is not dependent upon a change in FEC rules, the alignment of the press. It does not require a jump in the membership size of the LP. It does not require a celebrity candidate to run for president as a Libertarian. Fixing this error is completely within the control of existing libertarians. And once it is fixed, some of these other good nice changes will come to pass.

In the introduction, I made the somewhat audacious claim that the rhetoric of self-interest is possibly the biggest barrier to the growth of the libertarian movement (and of the Libertarian Party). While his claim cannot be proven without changing the rhetoric and observing what happens, it is worth observing how well other fringe parties did while being faced with the same obstacles faced by the Libertarian Party. Despite being around longer, better organized and having a more coherent ideology than certain other "third" parties, the Libertarian Party fielded a presidential candidate that came in fifth in 2000. True, the Reform candidate had a big glop of federal welfare money to play with, but still. We got clobbered by the Greens, who have the same fundraising hurdles as the LP and more ballot access struggles.

Could it be that the LP platform is too radical? This is part of the problem, but look at the Green platform! Listen to other environmental movement organizations. Look at the platforms of the socialist movements worldwide! Recall the rhetoric of Paul Wellstone. Radical can be selling point.

Is it because libertarian ideology is too complicated or abstract? More complicated than Hegelian philosophy? Marxism? Existentialism? Keynesian economics? Theoretical meteorology (global warming)?

Is it the Federal Election Commission? If so, how did the Greens do so much better than the LP has ever done? Why hasn't the LP done better at the state house level, where federal regulations do not apply? There are states with no limitations on donation sizes from wealthy donors. Throw in the fact that the amount of money required to run a first-rate state house race in a small to medium sized state is a thousand times less than for U.S. president. If there were a group of generous multi-millionaires eager to fund winning Libertarian campaigns, they could do so under current rules.

Perhaps it is a conspiracy. The major network news people, in conjunction with the Actor's Guild, various charitable foundations, the Bavarian Illuminati and the UFOs is out to prevent the libertarian movement from gaining a foothold.

There is some evidence here, but why is it here? Why should such a large number of well-intentioned people support our enemies? Could it be that they like other people to be well-intentioned?

The socialists invoke the noble intention of helping the poor. The religious right invokes obedience to the Creator. Environmental activists invoke saving cute and interesting species, and ensuring that the planet is still interesting (or even habitable!) for our grandchildren. All very noble sounding, even if the proposed programs from these groups will fail to accomplish their stated objectives.

Meanwhile, many libertarians say: do your own thing as long as it doesn't hurt others. The fact that freedom will solve many of the above problems is merely a convenient side effect. As for Objectivists, they are on the record as saying that altruism is evil.

Are the Masses That Stupid?

The Objectivist response would be that the masses are wrong in their distrust of politicians speaking the language of self-interest. Therefore, it is critical to teach them philosophy before getting around to politics.

After all, the aversion to self-interest comes from some mistakes made in Western philosophy that lead to Immanuel Kant's categorical imperative. Kant's arguments were then taught in philosophy departments and then popularized by lesser philosophers. Political, economic, educational and moral practitioners at various levels taught this lesson to the masses until even skid row bums were speaking the language of altruism.

Then again, before Kant, we had the tag team duo of "Attila and the Witch Doctor" using might and mysticism to brainwash most people throughout most of history into an unnatural hatred of selfishness. Truly an amazing conspiracy!

And utter nonsense!

A distrust of selfishness is learned on the playground, when playing with a "ball hog", a rulebook nitpicker, or an outright cheater. It is learned at the kitchen table while fighting over the last cookie. It is learned in the den while fighting over which channel to watch. It is learned while standing in line when some brat decides to cut in front. No philosophy, or even literacy, is necessary to give selfishness a bad name. These lessons are relevant. International relations is simply child's play with nuclear weapons thrown in for fun.

Of course, Objectivists and related philosophers advocate only "rational" self-interest. Being a jerk is often only valuable in the short term. Once people know you are a jerk, they will refuse to deal with you and the net benefit is negative. Thus, a certain level of fair play and even benevolence

in personal relations is in your long-term self-interest.

For economic relations, the coincidence between benevolence to others and self-interest is very strong under a free market economy. However, even with a free market, the exceptions are not trivial! And one does not need to look up "externality" or "public good" in an economics textbook to figure this out. Examples abound in the real world.

Go to a car dealership and experience all the lies, mind games and pressure tactics for a few hours and then tell me rational self-interest is always an honorable thing under a capitalist system. Listen to a pitch for timeshare condominiums. Go to the electronics store and be sold an overpriced service contract, or have the salesperson point to the first stereo your eyes focus on when you ask for advice. Or, better yet, investigate the range of audiophile equipment available with an impressive array of ridiculously expensive engineering features, few of which produce an audible improvement in the sound. Look at the ads in a cheesy tabloid, or in the back of many magazines. Look at the moral crud served up in television or the movies. Look at the slanting of the news. Look at the spam in your mailbox!

These are all profitable activities – rational self-interest under a largely capitalist system.

Under a mixed economy, rational self-interest can include a wide variety of forms of legalized theft. Under other political/economic systems, rational self-interest can motivate such behaviors as owning and torturing slaves, turning neighbors in to the secret police, killing siblings to get an inheritance and other loathsome activities.

Acquiring and maintaining a free society requires many altruistic actions. While it is in the self-interest of most to live in a fair free-market society, lobbying for and acquiring special exceptions can be very profitable to the few. Living during a witch hunt is dangerous, but being the first to denounce it is even more so. Ditto for living under a communist or fascist regime. Slavery pulls down an economy, but being the first slave owner to release his slaves is to take a huge economic hit. If Libertarians were to gain political power, nearly everyone would benefit. However, those who get in early to build up the Libertarian Party to the point where it can get into power, will generally spend far more of their time and treasure attaining increased liberty than they will get back when increased liberty is achieved. And they pay these costs not knowing when or whether their efforts will bear fruit.

Only those who jump on the Libertarian bandwagon at the latter stages can even remotely be thought of as acting in their rational self-interest. Liberty requires some self-sacrifice.

Indeed, the current activists within the Libertarian Party perform levels of self-sacrifice that would put many self-styled altruists to shame. This includes many Libertarians who consider themselves Objectivists to one degree or another. Even the fictional heroes in Atlas Shrugged committed extraordinary acts of altruism – consider Francisco D'Anconia blowing the family pretending to be a playboy while remaining celibate -- all in the name of rational self-interest!

Why not take credit for sacrifices made? Why not shout across the airwaves that evil selfishness is the enemy of a free market? Why not bask in the praise of emotion-driven Hollywood celebrities and members of the media? Why not make a positive first impression as soon as one's speech begins, instead of spending most of the time digging out of a hole? Why shouldn't we have our own style of young hippies having rallies on college campuses and in front of government buildings?

Two False Dichotomies

Perhaps the reason is because freedom and self-interest go together. After all, if people are free, they will do what they want to do, almost by definition.

And this is where Ayn Rand was right. If the fulfillment of desire is evil, then oppression is good. Communism is the best form of oppression because nobody benefits. Pol Pot, Joseph Stalin and Adolf Hitler are true Kantian heroes.

Kant's Categorical Imperative is a piece of philosophical trash, worthy of attack. If selflessness is the only measure of morality, then charity is half evil! The giving away of wealth is "good", but receiving it is not. Better to be a malevolent altruist under this picture.

Be yourname@4liberty.net
NOW ONLY \$17/MONTH
TO LIBERTARIANS
www.excell.net
Providers of Internet Services
http://excell.net/excellnet_national-dialups.htm
Dialup in most states and Canada.
\$17.00 per month
Libertarian Owned
Libertarian Operated
Supporters of the
Pioneer Valley Libertarian Association
National Dialup Service
excell.net/excellnet_national-dialups.htm
Available in most states and some
in Canada. \$19.50 per month.

However, not all altruists fit the Kantian ideal, by any stretch. (And even Kant shied away from the logical implications of his philosophy, even as he expounded it.) Ayn Rand did a great deal of stereotyping, just as the Marxists and other angst-worshippers lump all self-interested acts (such as honest capitalism and slave-holding) together.

To break this stereotyping, it is necessary to note that selfishness vs. selflessness and benevolence vs. malevolence are orthogonal concepts.

In the Kantian world view (ignoring the full logical consequences of the categorical imperative), "good" is epitomized by acts of charity that impose a great cost on the giver (upper left quadrant). Evil is epitomized by those selfish acts that do harm to others (lower right), such as holding a feudal estate, stealing, looting, slaving, subsidy mooching and so on. This worldview had more merit in an age when most wealth was held in the form of slaves and conquered lands. A good many of the self-interested acts, were indeed malevolent.

However, this picture is flawed as Adam Smith famously pointed out. Most good deeds to others are done in the context of trade (upper right quadrant), not charity. This is true even in a mixed economy. However, there are a significant number of needed benevolent deeds that cannot be performed at a profit (including building the Libertarian Party!). These deeds merit special praise and divine reward because they are not already rewarded, not because they are the only deeds that are worthy.

Ayn Rand also had a point in casting malevolent altruism (lower left quadrant) as the purest form of evil. After all, this is evil for evil's sake. But Rand was by no means the only writer of her era to attack evil altruists. C. S. Lewis attacked many of the same philosophical and artistic trends. Indeed, the villains in *That Hideous Strength* bear a strong resemblance to those in *Atlas Shrugged*. However, Lewis had a strong grasp of the orthogonality of benevolence and self-sacrifice. Consider this passage from *The Screwtape Letters* (the letter writer is a senior devil coaching a junior on the art of temptation) [26th letter]:

The grand problem is that of "Unselfishness." Note, once again, the admirable work of our Philological Arm in substituting the negative Unselfishness for the Enemy's positive Charity. Thanks to this you can, from the very outset, teach a man to surrender benefits not that others may be happy in having them but that he may be unselfish in forgoing them.

Or from later in the same letter:

A sensible human once said, "If people knew how much ill-feeling Unselfishness occasions, it would not be so often recommended from the pulpit"; and again, "She's the sort of woman who lives for others – you can always tell the others by their hunted expressions."

C. S. Lewis was able to glorify charity while at the same time glorifying pleasure. Once again, from *The Screwtape Letters* [9th letter].

Never forget that when we are dealing with any pleasure in its healthy and normal and satisfying form, we are, in a sense, on the Enemy's ground. I know we have won many a soul through pleasure. All the same, it is His invention, not ours. He made the pleasures: all our research so far has not enabled us to produce one. All we can do is to encourage the humans to take the pleasures which our Enemy has produced, at times, or in ways, or in degrees, which He has forbidden. Hence we always try to work away from the natural condition of any pleasure to that in which it is least natural, least redolent of its Maker, and least pleasurable. An ever increasing craving for an ever diminishing pleasure is the formula. It is more certain; and it's better style. To get the man's soul and give him nothing in return – that is what really gladdens Our Father's heart.

This strikes me as rather good material to put before a drug warrior, especially one who is nominally Christian. There are many other passages in Lewis' fiction speaking well of pleasure. Indeed, Lewis' vision of pleasure strikes me as a lot more fun than Rand's rational self-interest.

Conclusion

The libertarian movement is, of course, not identical with the Objectivist movement. The language of self-sacrifice is used at time in a libertarian context – especially in Libertarian Party fundraising letters. It is also used by some LP candidates.

However, the full potential has not been tapped. The media still thinks of us as a bunch of cheapskates who do not want to pay our fair share of support for the needy. The Objectivist rhetoric is still used on many occasions and is remembered by our detractors from earlier occasions.

The crowd of tie-dyed young activists let loose as the Libertarian candidate took the stage at the huge rally. "Hello, I am a Libertarian, and I have given up a great deal of my time and my bank account to win this election, not because I get my jollies wielding power – nay, the prospect of attending Congressional hearings is one I dread greatly! I have done this because I care about my country! I care about those who languish in prison unnecessarily! I care about the poor children in this country who have to go to dangerous and ineffective government schools! I care about the endangered animals that are being lost to 'shoot, shovel and shut up!' I care..."

Carl Milsted, Jr. incrementalator@quiz2d.com is currently the advertising director of the Libertarian Party of Buncombe County NC. By day, Dr. Milsted is a physicist who writes software for national defense related applications.

Fundraising Approach

We read from LP Florida Treasurer Jack Tanner that LP-Flo rida uses Click & Pledge to handle CC processing. There is no annual fee, but they collect 4.75% on Visa/MC/Discover and 8.75% on Amex. For more data <http://www.clickandpledge.com/Products/Payment/>

J

(Continued from page 1) [State Chairs Meet]

The Drug War issue has brought in memberships and secured additional donations through headline initiatives such as the “Bump Bob Barr” campaign in GA. “The medical marijuana issue gives us good coverage”, Ron explained. MI is recognizing its incarceration expense from the Drug War. With declining revenues, MI is releasing prisoners. And federal government programs to review federal government programs have labeled drug interdiction “a complete failure”. The Drug War is a moneymaker for the Libertarian Party. It brought 750 new members last year and along with it money specifically earmarked for this. Finally, the Drug War message plays well with students. Ron noted one website enhancement under consideration is to show a thermometer” on the national website indicating the relative sizes of contributions earmarked for various political issues. The War on Drugs thermometer reading remains “hot”.

While sentiment for keeping the Drug War on the front burner remains strong, another component of the Party thinks otherwise. Steve Givot stepped in with another “intentional dialog” to help clarify the positions of the diverging factions.

The issue the group addressed was: “The LP should stop giving primary emphasis to the Drug War”. Three sets of “sentiment polls” were compiled as the intentional dialog progressed: Before, intermediate, after.

Strongly agree Tend to agree Middle or No Opinion- Tend to disagree Strongly disagree

Before 25.8% 16.1% 9.7% 19.3% 29.0%
Sean Haugh and Mark Rutherford performed the intentional dialog

Mark: *The primary emphasis by national on the war on drugs has too high of negatives to our candidates*
Sean: *Mirrored. Did I get it?*
Mark: *Almost. Emphasize national.*
Sean: *Mirrored and got it. More?*
Mark: *National is not in position to take credit for winning the War on Drugs.*
Sean: *Mirrored and got it. More?*
Mark: *This is an issue better dealt with by the many excellent advocacy groups*
Sean: *Mirrored and got it. More?*
Mark: *The LP, because of all the other groups are narrowly focused, does not own the issue*
Sean: *Mirrored and got it. More?*
Mark: *The strategic plan should be looked at as a whole*
Sean: *Mirrored and got it. More?*
Mark: *The documentation behind the strategy suggested long term and coalition building*
Sean: *Mirrored and got it. More?*
Mark: *Focusing on any issue to the extent we do with the War on Drugs, gives a state chair same level of complaints*

from candidates about national’s interference.

Now Sean and Mark reversed roles.

Sean: *Any issue that will have a large political payoff will be controversial*
Mark: *Mirrored and got it. More?*
Sean: *We will face internal and external dissent if the issue is worthwhile*
Mark: *Mirrored and got it. More?*
Sean: *Conversely, there is no issue worth fighting for if we can avoid the controversy from the beginning*

Steve Givot now framed the issue

Is this an avoidable burden, or necessary cost?
And are the benefits worth the cost?

Sean: *It is important for national party to select unique, important issues*
Mark: *Mirrored and got it. More?*
Sean: *I believe the War on Drugs is particularly good issue, and more popular with people than they may care to admit*
Mark: *Mirrored and got it. More?*
Sean: *Standing up against the War on Drugs conveys the image that the LP is a party of courage, and an advocate for those are afraid to speak, inside and outside the party*
Mark: *After two iterations, got it. More?*

At this point Steve Givot clarified that the issue was now one of getting the biggest bang for the buck.

Sean: *Through our efforts we have greatly moved the debate from the fringe onto the mainstream because we advocate the end of the WOD. There are no crack vending machine scares, no automatic assumption that we are drug users.*
Mark: *After two iterations, got it. More?*

At this point, the group voted again to see if there was any shift in sentiment.

Strongly agree Tend to agree Middle or No Opinion Tend to disagree Strongly disagree
Intermediate 4.4% 12.5% 9.4% 18.8% 25.0%
Before 25.8% 16.1% 9.7% 19.3% 29.0%

At this point Aaron Starr (CA) replaced Mark.

Sean: *We have made significant progress in 6 years and are now on the verge of a breakthrough*
Aaron: *Mirrored and got it. More?*
Sean: *We have been successful in attaching the LP to the War on Drugs issue, and when we’re on TV or radio people need to know we are behind that issue*

Now Kevin Houston (MN) substituted for Sean.

Aaron: *I believe the War on Drugs is a symptom of a bigger problem, and not the problem itself*

Kevin: *Mirrored and got it after an iteration. More?*

Aaron: *I believe the War on Drugs is a result of the government being too big. If there were no War on Drugs, the government would inflict itself on some other group*

Kevin: *Mirrored and got it after an iteration. More?*

Aaron: *I believe that going down this path is a dead end*

Kevin: *Mirrored and got it. More?*

Aaron: *I do not believe we can build a winning constituency on this issue because it is not very important to many people and few people benefit*

Kevin: *Mirrored and got it. More?*

Aaron: *Our emphasis on this is harming our ability to raise money, because this constituency does not have much money to give*

Kevin: *Mirrored and got it after an iteration. More?*

Now Kevin and Aaron switched roles

Kevin: *I believe the positives to our party are greater than negatives*

Aaron: *Mirrored and got it. More?*

Kevin: *Issue groups do not put candidates on the ballot. When we champion this issue, we gain their support - we will reap the benefits of more votes*

Aaron: *Mirrored and got it. More?*

Kevin: *We are already identified as the pot party, and running away from it will not take away the brand, while championing it would allow us to take the credit*

Aaron: *Mirrored and got it. More?*

Kevin: *Running from it will hurt us more than sticking with it.*

Aaron: *Mirrored and got it. More?*

To Be Continued

Stand Up for Liberty!

George Phillies on Political Strategy
Read how Local Organization
can save the Libertarian Party

Funding Liberty

a new book by George Phillies

Party of Principle or Party of Principal?

You be the judge!

Hear the actual conduct of the Libertarian party's 1996 and
2000 Presidential campaigns!

Be appalled by where your money went!

See how we might do better next time!

Now available as paperback and electronic downloads from
Third Millennium Publishing, <http://3mpub.com/phillies>.

Pioneer Valley

Libertarian Association

Massachusetts' oldest local Libertarian group, with regular
meetings since 1995. We meet the second Wednesday of ev-
ery month, 7:00 PM, at Bickford's Family Restaurant, Old
Boston and Pasco Roads, Springfield.

Worcester County

Libertarian Association

Founded 1996.

Experimenting now with new meeting formats.

Contact George Phillies, 508 754 1859 phillies@4liberty.net
for future meeting plans

Our Web Pages

<http://www.pvla.net> <http://www.cmlc.org>

Brought to you by www.excell.net.

Libertarian owned—Libertarian operated

Provider of internet services

