

The individualist anarchists also carried their conception of freedom into the social sphere. Again, there was consensus, this time in the direction of what is euphemistically known as "free love." In at least one case, a more moderate position of cohabitation with commitment is commended. Many of the writers espoused what might loosely be described as feminist views, although positions on women's suffrage were not taken, as is consistent with a general opposition to the existence of the state. These authors were also generally hostile to religion. Social questions, however, were discussed minimally in the pages of *Liberty*.

Some space, also, was dedicated to the question of strategy (section four), although this too garnered less attention than questions political and economic. It is clear that the individualist anarchists favored non-violence and persuasion as a route to their desired ends. Consequently, they feared "guilt by association" in the wake of the violence at Haymarket Square, Chicago, in 1886 when a police contingent was bombed while attempting to close down a meeting of anarchists. Tucker, for one, attempted to carefully delineate the differences between the violent, "communistic" variety of anarchism and his own concerns with liberty. Whatever the acumen of the individualist anarchists' strategic recommendations, the movement faded, and settled into an ill-deserved obscurity.

Much more complex than a simple precursor to libertarianism or an extension of liberalism, individualist anarchism was a genuine outburst of American radicalism. This volume is recommended to dispel the miasma of disinformation surrounding the movement dealt with in its pages, and as a worthy purchase for any reader with an interest in political theory, American or otherwise. □

Mr. Pavlik is assistant editor and director of The Freeman Op-Ed program.



Demosclerosis: The Silent Killer of American Government

by Jonathan Rauch

Times Books • 1994 • 261 pages • \$22.00

Reviewed by William H. Peterson

Calcification, a kind of spreading dry rot accompanied by a bloating of the body politic, spreads across the American landscape. It's a disease that saps the strength of the people who, ironically, are the ones who demand more and more from a government that gives them, in the end, less and less. The furor over national health insurance is a case in point. The disease reflects the plight of both Politician and Citizen who, like the proverbial maiden of easy virtue, just can't say "No." Ah, democracy!

National Journal contributing editor Jonathan Rauch coins a clever word "demosclerosis" to describe the process. The process is spread by the mushrooming of special-interest organizations who gather virtually every affected and disaffected voter into groups and counter-groups (witness, e.g., the pro-choice vs. the pro-life groups) who pressure Congress and state legislatures to do their bidding. Or else.

It is not a pretty picture nor does it render a pleasant fragrance. As observed by Chancellor Otto von Bismarck of nineteenth-century Germany, the birthplace of the modern Welfare State, anybody repelled by the sight and smell of sausage-making ought not to watch law-making—a process far removed from its nice image projected in high school textbooks on civics.

Mr. Rauch notes that the trick of political success is to fashion special-interest access and accommodation, to gather votes and financial support, to weld blocs and interests—James Madison called them "factions"—together into a winning majority. Hence no program can be cut, no tax break wiped out, no privilege lifted, without provoking the anger of one organized interest or another. The political art is to calm anger and get everybody under the government tent—a tent that eventually gets blown

away. Meanwhile, the budget grows and the dollar sinks, the state swells and the individual shrinks.

Mr. Rauch points out that seven out of ten Americans belong to at least one association, and one in four belongs to four or more. He describes one modest-sized Washington building directory as boasting the following tenants (and there's a lot more beyond the letter C):

Advertising Council
 Affiliated Hotels and Resorts
 Agudath Israel of America
 American Arbitration Association
 American Federation of Clinical
 Research
 Americans for Economic Renewal
 Center for the Advancement of Health
 Congress of Russian Americans
 Consortium for the Study of Intelligence

Thus the emergence of America's "parasite economy," its vast lobbying industry centered in Washington, its horde of lawyers with their Gucci loafers and leather attaché cases attending hearings and button-holing Congressmen and bureaucrats who find the attention too sweet to resist. So why resist?

Mr. Rauch credits much of his understanding of how government really works to public choice economist Mancur Olson of the University of Maryland and his 1965 book, *The Logic of Collective Action*. Professor Olson, like Tocqueville before him, sees the mischief of interest-group democracy, sees groups push projects with concentrated benefits and diffused costs—costs foisted on a "rationally ignorant" populace. Free-riding ethanol producers, for example, get Congress to give them a tax break and require Clean Air Act inclusion of ethanol in gasoline so as to "improve the atmosphere." Sure.

For all of the author's sharp analysis of Washington's worldly ways, however, he betrays a kind of fatalistic quality about what to do about rampaging King Kong. He is dubious, to cite an instance, about the term-limit movement which would quash legislative careerists who seek committee

advancement by seniority—adding to "sclerosis." He bemoans the knifing of President Clinton's initiative of "national service" for young people. When Cato chairman and Reagan economist William Niskanen twits Congress, Mr. Rauch responds: "I find much to admire in Congress: it works hard, it means well, it is close to the people, it has done much good." He quotes, approvingly, soothing words from liberals like Jessica Mathews, Jimmy Carter, and John F. Kennedy.

Mr. Rauch wisely says Americans should look in the mirror for key agents of their dilemma. But in the end he calls for not exorcising but "managing"—without really explaining how—the very Superstate that enfeebles and calcifies Americans and their government.

America's challenge, it seems to me, is to sharply scale down the state, return to old-fashioned morality, restore the limited-government model of the Constitutional Framers. The challenge is to get economy back into government, and get government out of the economy. The real democracy, the true empowerment, as Mises pointed out, is in the marketplace. □

Dr. Peterson, Heritage Foundation adjunct scholar, is the Lundy Professor of Business Philosophy Emeritus at Campbell University in North Carolina.

What Went Right in the 1980s

by Richard B. McKenzie

Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy,
 San Francisco • 1994 • 397 pages • \$21.95

Reviewed by Raymond J. Keating

If one were to turn to the mainstream media or the current administration in Washington, D.C., as historical guides to the 1980s, one would come to see the decade as a period of great economic decline for the United States. With the decade cast in such a dim light, one also might expect a book entitled *What Went Right in the 1980s* to be a rather slim volume.