

migration authorities? Employers?

Katharine Mieszkowski, in an article entitled "Microchip Children" in the November 2000 issue of *Salon*, states the obvious: "The potential for abuse is so ludicrously high that it's almost impossible to overstate." She cites George Getz, communications director for the Libertarian Party, who noted that:

No government has ever forced anyone to have a drivers license, [but now] try getting along without one, when everyone from your local banker to the car rental man to the hotel operator to the grocery store requires one in order for you to take advantage of their services; that amounts to a de facto mandate. If the government can force you to surrender your fingerprints to get a drivers license, why can't it force you to get a computer chip implant?

ADS opened the floodgates when it acquired, as part of its patent rights to Digital Angel in 1999, the right to sublicense the development of specific applications to other entities and to seek out joint-venture partners to develop, expand, and market the technologies. This changed the original focus of Digital Angel from banking and electronic purchases to emergency-location and medical monitoring. ADS's "joint venture" with Professor Warwick moved the device into the realm of tracking and monitoring employees, criminals, and whomever else might be deemed in need of monitoring. ADS anticipates a "potential global market . . . exceeding \$100 billion." ADS even received a special "Technology Pioneers" award from the World Economic Forum for its contributions to "worldwide economic development and social progress through technology advancements."

Mieszkowski also quotes Chris Hables-Gray, a professor, self-proclaimed "cyborgologist," and the author of *Cyborg Citizen*, who observes that "Technology is continually trumping [our] constitutional guarantees." He calls for legal protections against the misuse of chips before they become commercially available:

Citizens could ask for a law that makes it a crime to put these into a person without their [sic] permission, and to forbid, under any conditions, the government to put these into . . . citizens. . . . [W]e do not have to accept every new technology.

Increasingly, however, we simply accept new technologies by default. Scientists, inventors, and investors can scarcely resist the temptation to push the boundaries of possibility—often, of course, with the best of intentions. Understandably, men desire technologies that will save time or improve quality of life. But knowledge, once obtained, cannot simply be unlearned—a lesson as old as Adam and Eve.

B.K. Eakman, a former teacher and the executive director of the National Education Consortium, is the author of Cloning of the American Mind: Eradicating Morality Through Education (Huntington House). Her website is www.BeverlyE.com.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

Lincoln's Legacy: Foreign Policy by Assassination

by Joseph E. Fallon

"Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." For proof of this axiom, we need only look at the foreign policy pursued by the U.S. government since the end of World War II.

The United States emerged from World War II militarily victorious but politically deformed. Instead of a republic, it was now a superpower with military and economic capabilities previously unimagined. In place of a constitutional government of limited powers and official accountability was a national-security regime of executive orders, the CIA, and plausible deniability. Instead of "no entangling alliances," the U.S. government not only entered such alliances but created and fostered them—the Organization of American States (OAS) in 1948, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949, the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO) in 1954, and the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO), originally known as the Middle East Treaty Organization, in 1955. Instead of respecting the sovereignty of other nations, Washington subscribed to the messianic ideology of American Exceptionalism, the

belief that the United States is politically and morally superior to other countries and, therefore, entitled to intervene in their domestic affairs.

Such vast powers exercised as a moral imperative unencumbered by constitutional restraints were intoxicating to American politicians and to their corporate sponsors, who quickly sought to exploit them in the ensuing Cold War with the Soviet Union to impose their preferences and prejudices upon the rest of the world.

Arguably, not since the Lincoln regime had the federal government usurped so much power or imbibed such a messianic doctrine. This shaped its foreign policy, which occasionally has been conducted less by diplomacy than by selective political assassinations. Here, again, Lincoln provided a precedent.

By February 1864, Lincoln's attempt to defeat the Confederacy—first, by starving and bombarding Southern civilians and, later, by striving to foment a race war in the South—had failed. With antiwar sentiment growing and a presidential election looming in November, Lincoln desperately needed a major military victory. To that end, he authorized a cavalry raid on Richmond, Virginia, the capital of the Confederacy.

Led by Brig. Gen. Hugh Judson Kilpatrick, the raid's ostensible goal was to rescue 1,500 Union officers incarcerated in Richmond and another 10,000 rank-and-file soldiers imprisoned on nearby Belle Isle. Taking part in this raid was Col. Ulric Dahlgren, son of Lincoln's close friend Rear Adm. John Dahlgren.

The raid, which began as a comedy of errors, ended as a military fiasco. Among those killed by Confederate defenders was Colonel Dahlgren, on whose body was found an order describing the true purpose of the raid—"the city [Richmond] must be destroyed and Jeff Davis and cabinet killed." (While supporters of Lincoln, past and present, have naturally attempted to dismiss the Dahlgren order as a Confederate forgery, the investigations of historian Stephen Sears, author of *Controversies & Commanders: Dispatches From the Army of the Potomac* (Houghton Mifflin) suggest that the document is authentic.)

Such an act would be entirely consistent with how Lincoln waged his war against the South. It is more than likely that an increasingly desperate and despondent Lincoln sought his reelection in the political assassination of his Confederate counterpart.

The precedent Lincoln established was adopted by the U.S. government during the Cold War. Executing political assassinations is the responsibility of the CIA under the supervision of an oversight committee called the Special Group, located in the Old Executive Office Building.

The permanent members of the Special Group—the national security advisor, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the deputy secretary of defense, the undersecretary of state for political affairs, and the director of central intelligence—underscore the fact that political assassinations are foreign-policy directives, not operations by rogue agents. To ensure plausible deniability, the CIA often employs citizens of the targeted regime, frequently military officers, to perform the actual assassinations.

There are two types of political assassinations. One is the classic assassination of a head of state or a charismatic political leader Washington considers a threat to American interests. There is a long list of those whom the U.S. government allegedly has assassinated or planned to: Allende of Chile; Caamaño of the Dominican Republic; Castro of Cuba; Cho En-lai of China; De Gaulle of France; d'Escoto of Nicaragua; Diem of South Vietnam; Dlimi of Morocco; Duvalier of Haiti; Fadlallah of Lebanon; Figueres of Costa Rica; Guevara of Cuba; Hussein of Iraq; Kassem of Iraq; Khadafi of Libya; Kim Il Sung of North Korea; Khomeini of Iran; Kim Koo of South Korea; Lumumba of the Congo; Makarios of Cyprus; Manley of Jamaica; Milosevic of Yugoslavia; Mossadegh of Iran; Mujibur of Bangladesh; Nasser of Egypt; Nehru of India; Noriega of Panama; Recto of the Philippines; Schneider of Chile; Sihanouk of Cambodia; Sukarno of Indonesia; Torres of Bolivia; Torrijos of Panama; Trujillo of the Dominican Republic; and a number of political figures in West Germany.

The other type of political assassination is collective assassination. These are reigns of terror in which thousands presumed to be a threat to American interests are killed or “disappear.” Two of the earliest and most notorious examples occurred in Southeast Asia in the 1960's and 70's.

After the Communist Party of Indonesia allegedly attempted a *coup d'état* in 1965, the CIA provided the Indonesian military with a list of names of “communist” leaders and sympathizers to be as-

sassinated. When it was over, between 250,000 and one million people had been killed.

Two years later, the CIA established the “Phoenix Program” in South Vietnam. Devised to neutralize local support for the Viet Cong, this program resulted in the deaths or kidnappings of between 20,000 and 80,000 South Vietnamese.

In 1976, a belated and ultimately futile attempt was made to end foreign policy by assassination. As a result of the 1975 Senate investigation into covert operations by the CIA and the subsequent public outcry over the Senate's findings, President Gerald R. Ford signed an executive order prohibiting future political assassinations by the U.S. government.

Even though Presidents Carter and Reagan reaffirmed this prohibition in subsequent executive orders, by the end of the 1970's, Washington was sponsoring assassinations once again with “Operation Condor” in South America. Unlike with the Phoenix Program, the CIA did not directly administer Operation Condor, although the U.S. government did provide needed intelligence and funds. The operation covered most of the continent—in particular, Argentina, Brazil, and Chile—and was a transnational undertaking, whereby the military regimes of South America collaborated to kidnap or kill their respective opponents living in exile. Its geographic scope extended well beyond South America, reaching Italy and, eventually, the United States, where Orlando Letelier, the former Chilean foreign minister to the assassinated Allende, was assassinated in downtown Washington, D.C.

The success of Operation Condor in countering Soviet influence in South America ensured the subsequent application of this foreign-policy “model” to Central America during the 1980's.

A few years later, the Cold War had ended—and, with it, the justification given by Washington for conducting foreign policy by assassination. But the assassinations continued. Victory in the Cold War had only bolstered America's messianic complex. Washington no longer simply claimed a moral right to intervene in the domestic affairs of other countries. In the New World Order, it now asserted a right to “benevolent global hegemony.”

The United States proceeded to exercise this “benevolence” in Bosnia, Haiti, Iraq, Kosovo, and Somalia with assassinations, individual and collective. While the executive orders prohibiting the U.S.

government from engaging in assassinations never prevented Washington from commissioning them, they did impose some restraint because of the fear of exposure and censure. Whatever restraint existed, however, perished with the victims in the September 11 terrorist attacks.

Now, there are calls for the ban to be repealed. To win the “War on Terrorism,” some argue, the U.S. government must officially adopt assassination as the law of the land. Assassination is no longer to be denied, but demanded. No longer should it be the exception, but the rule. Not the last resort, but the first. Under such a law, the rule of law itself will be assassinated. The accused is presumed guilty. Hearsay replaces evidence; torture replaces interrogation; and assassination replaces the need for a trial.

However emotionally satisfying this might be for Washington and even for the American public, such a policy will have unintended consequences—what the CIA calls “blowback.” It will destabilize the United States and its New World Order, by proliferating further political assassinations. Washington's assassination of foreign “terrorists” will provoke the assassination of Americans in retaliation, while other governments will seize the opportunity to assassinate political opponents by branding them “terrorists.” The consequences will be more wars, harsher dictatorships, and international turmoil.

There will be repercussions for American citizens as well, since Washington arbitrarily decides who is a “terrorist” and what constitutes “support” for terrorism. For instance, Al Qaeda is a terrorist organization, but the Al Qaeda-supported Kosovo Liberation Army is not. Ending sanctions on Iraq is “support” for terrorism; arming Indonesia is not.

If the U.S. government can assassinate foreign opponents by demonizing them as “terrorists” or supporters of terrorism, what is to prevent Washington from employing this tactic against domestic opponents? Waco and Ruby Ridge have already proved that Washington is capable of assassinating U.S. citizens. Constitutional rights are under attack, and political dissent is being denounced as “treason,” while the U.S. government actively fosters paranoia that our fellow citizens are clandestine terrorists.

The process Lincoln began is now complete. The United States is no longer a republic but an empire, abroad and at home. The fate of past empires from Athens to the Soviet Union should be

a warning. Absolute power does more than corrupt absolutely; absolute power ultimately destroys the very government that wields it.

Joseph E. Fallon writes from Rye, New York.

THE OLD REPUBLIC

Finding the Right State for States' Rights

by Sean Scallon

It seems ironic that a man identified with the cause of states' rights and the South's quest for self-determination attended a school in the heartland of Yankee centralism. Yet John C. Calhoun was Yale man, a graduate of the Congregationalist institution that formed part of the intellectual center of New England's eventual domination over the rest of America—something that Calhoun opposed and feared.

Another Yale graduate student, Jason P. Sorens, is trying to carry on Calhoun's work today, even if the Elis are loath to admit that Calhoun attended school in New Haven.

"My wife's a South Carolinian, and she grew up not too far from where Calhoun lived and worked," Sorens said. "From that, and my time here at Yale, and through my own views on states' rights, I'm quite aware of his legacy."

That legacy of states' rights and nullification is part of Sorens' Free State Project (FSP), a libertarian group that has a plan to put into action Calhoun's views on the states' need to act independently of the federal government in defense of their own interests. The FSP hopes to attract 20,000 or more liberty-loving people to join them and to agree to relocate to a single, small U.S. state in order to move that state's body politic toward the principles of a free society. The group was formed in the aftermath of the 2000 presidential election, as, once again, Libertarians were stuck in the mire of third-party politics.

"A column written by Walter Williams," Sorens recalled, "which talked about the possibilities of secession, influenced my thinking in this direction, as did a round-

table discussion in *Liberty Magazine* about what strategies the Libertarian Party should pursue. I talked to friends and also wrote an essay in the *Libertarian Enterprise*, which is an online Libertarian magazine, and got an excellent response." And that's how the FSP was founded.

There are currently 27,000 paid-up Libertarian Party activists, according to Sorens' figures, and he believes that they are potential recruits for the FSP. Sorens hopes they can form the activist cadre of an existing state Libertarian Party, or a new political organization, or act in coalition with other existing parties in whichever state they choose. The example of the Parti Québécois (PQ) is frequently cited on the FSP website, and Sorens estimates that the PQ had 100,000 paid members by 1976, when it won control of the provincial legislature. At that time, Quebec's population was 6.2 million, a ratio of one member for every 62 people. Applying the same mathematics to a state with a population of 1.2 million or less, and where the two major political parties spend less than four million dollars each for political campaigns at all levels, Sorens believes that his group could achieve the same results as the PQ.

Utopian? Naive? Mad? There are those who would think so. But is the dream of the FSP any more insane than Libertarians or Constitutionals or Greens trying to elect a president, especially one who will likely be without congressional or state-office support? Is it any more insane than spending another year toiling in the political fields trying to cultivate another rich harvest of grassroots support just to elect an alderman? Is it more insane than "working within our two-party system?"

"Third parties don't work on a national scale," Sorens asserted. "Not just because the system is against them, but the culture is, too. If you look around the world, the parties and movements that are new and dynamic are the ones promoting regionalism, local culture, separatism, and autonomy."

And if you look back through American history, the idea of the FSP seems fairly sane after all. The migration of 20,000 or so activists into a small state pales in comparison to that of blacks from the South to Northern cities during the first half of the 20th century. It certainly would be on par with the migration of Mormons from Nauvoo, Illinois, to their desert kingdom in Utah, and at least on the level of recent political migrations of

New York liberals to Vermont, which changed the political orientation of that state from cantankerous Yankee to Ben-and-Jerry hippie, or California conservatives to the Rocky Mountain states and Texas.

So what would the activists in the Free State Project do with their "freedom," if they were elected to public office in the state to which they had migrated? For starters, they would like to repeal state taxes and wasteful government programs. Then they would end collaboration between state and federal officials in enforcing unconstitutional federal laws. They would end asset forfeiture and abuses of eminent domain, privatize utilities, and revoke inefficient state regulations and monopolies. They would negotiate directly with the federal government for more autonomy, opting out of national programs in favor of tax rebates or block grants, as some provinces have done in other countries. And there's more.

"There should be no federal role in land ownership, and we would give federal lands back to states and local communities for more productive use," Sorens said. "We also would want to give Indian tribes living within our states full autonomy. Plus, we feel that states should exercise the right to control immigration. States that would want to have a large immigrant population should have the right to do so, and those that do not wish to should have the right to put up barriers."

Such autonomy, if attained, could go in fascinating directions. Take foreign policy, for example. A state that did not favor an undeclared war could prevent the members of its National Guard from taking part or prevent citizens from being conscripted unless war were declared by Congress. They could also reject treaties that undermined their economic, political, or cultural interests, especially those drawn up in the United Nations. They could negotiate trade agreements of their own with other provinces and states around the globe.

This kind of autonomy could catch on. If the foreign-policy experts and bureaucrats in the State Department, Pentagon, CIA, Congress, White House, and United Nations knew that an unpopular treaty, trade agreement, or military adventure would be opposed by several states, they might think twice. Such resistance could break the monopoly that the current establishment has on the foreign policy of this country and rein in the growing empire.