

## From the President

by Richard M. Ebeling

**THE  
FREEMAN**  
*(Ideas On Liberty)*

MAY 2004



# Neoconservatives and the Freedom Philosophy

**T**he winter 2004 issue of *The Public Interest* contains an article by Adam Wolfson, the publication's editor, on "Conservatives and Neoconservatives." Mr. Wolfson outlines some of the central ideas of neoconservatism by contrasting them with what he refers to as traditionalist conservatism, paleoconservatism, and libertarian conservatism.

Before World War II, he points out, conservatism was really classical liberalism, with strong emphases on individual freedom, laissez-faire economics, and progress through scientific improvement. In the post-war period, under the influence of Russell Kirk's 1953 book, *The Conservative Mind*, Mr. Wolfson says, American conservatism was transformed into a political philosophy critical of modernity and its unreflective belief that social and economic change always means progress. The Kirkian conservatives emphasized the roles of tradition, custom, local community, and institutional stability in maintaining the health and balance of society. The paleoconservatives, identified by Mr. Wolfson with ideas espoused by Pat Buchanan and Paul Gottfried, are anti-free trade, anti-immigration, isolationist in foreign policy, and suspicious of political and social equality.

As for libertarianism, Mr. Wolfson states that "It is progressive, and aims at expanding economic freedom and individual choice


ever-forward. Libertarians oppose all regulation, whether of markets or morals." He says that libertarians have a "love affair" with new technologies as the path to human happiness. And, in addition, they discount any role or place for "the general welfare" and are opposed to democratic decision-making in the shaping of a "public ethos." Thus in their pursuit of advancing the right of individual choice, the libertarian, he claims, is happy if citizens are indifferent to the well-being of their country.

What, then, does the neoconservative stand for? As summarized by Mr. Wolfson, neoconservatives recognize the value of traditions and customs passed down by earlier generations, but have no desire for or belief in returning to a past that is unrecoverable and unacceptable to the vast majority of contemporary Americans. Nor are neoconservatives desirous of a turning inward from the rest of the world, as he portrays the paleoconservatives; and the neoconservatives are against anything that would smack of a denial of democratic and social equality.

In contrast to Mr. Wolfson's view of the libertarian perspective, neoconservatives are not willing to sacrifice the idea of a public arena in which the democratic polity establishes standards for the common good to which all members of society should conform. Specifically, he says that neoconservatism has no inherent disapproval of the welfare state, which he suggests the vast majority of Americans desire as a means of overcoming "insecurity." Only those welfare-state programs

---

Richard Ebeling ([rebeling@fee.org](mailto:rebeling@fee.org)) is president of FEE.



corrupting of family, marriage, and the work ethic should be opposed. In addition, neo-conservatives believe in U.S. political and military interventionism around the world to advance democracy; but the goal of such foreign interventionism, he argues, is to maintain America's interests as a "great and powerful democracy."

Mr. Wolfson's portrayal of libertarianism and neoconservatism offers an opportunity to restate the fundamental premises of what FEE's founder, Leonard Read, long referred to as the "freedom philosophy." Over a 300-year history the advocates of human freedom have argued that rights reside only in individuals, who form the unique "building blocks" of the social, economic, and political order. Society should be viewed as the mutually beneficial relationships that individuals form for the improvement of their circumstances. The role of government, as understood, for example, by the American Founding Fathers, was to protect the rights of the individual from invasion by predatory plunder so each man may be secure in his life, property, and freedom to pursue his happiness as he sees it.

## The Public Ethos

The "public ethos" is not created by government and, if it is to be healthy and consistent with the preservation of a free society, must not be controlled or manipulated by government. What is the "public ethos"? It comprises society's guiding beliefs, ideas, attitudes, customs, institutions, and ideals about the normative standards and rules for personal and interpersonal conduct. Its represents what most members of society consider to be acceptable and moral conduct in the relationships that men have with each other.

The public ethos of a free society includes strong beliefs in individual self-responsibility, the rights and dignity of the individual, and a sense of the morality of voluntary and peaceful relationships among men. It also includes the ideal that each individual should be viewed as an end in himself and not the

pawn of others. And it nurtures the philosophical and religious ideas of compassion and duty in participating in charitable good works to assist the unfortunate and the truly needy among us.

The public ethos of a free society rejects as inconsistent with liberty any notion that majorities or minorities may use the democratic process to restrict the freedom of the individual in his social, economic, and personal actions as long as he does not in any way violate the rights of others to peacefully go about their affairs. It does not believe that simply because a majority in society wants government welfare programs, because such programs give them a sense of protection from the insecurities of life, that this morally justifies the power of political coercion to redistribute wealth and limit the choices of other members of society to determine what is best for themselves, their families, and others they may care about.

The advocate of liberty is on guard against all expansions of government into the private lives and free associations of individuals because he considers political power to be corrupting and harmful to the creative potential in man. Political interventions and regulations intimidate man's mind and conscience, restrict his productive actions, weaken or eliminate the mutually beneficial and charitable associations among people, and undermine the moral sense of self-responsibility and voluntary duty to others in society.

Likewise, the friend of freedom believes that any "greatness" that America may possess on the international stage should come from being an example of individual freedom practiced at home, which then serves as an ideal for others around the world to emulate. Furthermore, political and military interventions abroad threaten the freedom and prosperity of the American citizenry, because of the costs of these global activities.

These are the freedom principles and the public ethos that we have been losing in America, and neoconservatism offers no alternative to regain them. □

**President:** Richard M. Ebeling**Editor:** Sheldon Richman**Managing Editor:** Beth A. Hoffman**Editor Emeritus**

Paul L. Poirot

**Book Review Editor**

George C. Leef

**Columnists**

Charles W. Baird	Robert Higgs
Donald J. Boudreaux	Lawrence W. Reed
Stephen Davies	Russell Roberts
Burton W. Folsom, Jr.	Thomas Szasz
Walter E. Williams	

**Contributing Editors**

Doug Bandow	Dwight R. Lee
Norman Barry	Wendy McElroy
Peter J. Boettke	Tibor R. Machan
James Bovard	Andrew P. Morriss
Thomas J. DiLorenzo	Ronald Nash
Joseph S. Fulda	Edmund A. Opitz
Bettina Bien Greaves	James L. Payne
John Hospers	William H. Peterson
Raymond J. Keating	Jane S. Shaw
Daniel B. Klein	Richard H. Timberlake
Lawrence H. White	

**Foundation for Economic Education  
Board of Trustees, 2003-2004**David Humphreys  
*Chairman*Paige K. Moore  
*Secretary*Frederick C. Foote  
*Vice Chairman*Dan Grossman  
*Treasurer*Henry M. Bonner  
Lloyd Buchanan  
Walter LeCroy  
Roy Marden  
Kris A. MaurenJane M. Orient, M.D.  
Tom G. Palmer  
Andrea Millen Rich  
Sally von Behren  
Guillermo M. Yeatts

*The Freeman: Ideas on Liberty* is published by The Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., Irvington-on-Hudson, NY 10533. FEE, established in 1946 by Leonard E. Read, is a non-political, educational champion of private property, the free market, and limited government. FEE is classified as a 26 USC 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization.

Copyright © 2004 by The Foundation for Economic Education. Permission is granted to reprint any article in this issue, except "The Wisher and the Legislator," provided credit is given and two copies of the reprinted material are sent to FEE.

The costs of Foundation projects and services are met through donations, which are invited in any amount. Donors of \$39.00 or more receive a year of *The Freeman*. For delivery outside the United States, a minimum donation of \$52.00 is requested. Students may receive *The Freeman* for a donation of \$20.00 per year. Additional copies of this issue of *The Freeman: Ideas on Liberty* are \$4.00 each.

Bound volumes of *The Freeman* and *Ideas on Liberty* are available from The Foundation for calendar years 1972 to 2001. The magazine is available in microform from University Microfilms, 300 N. Zeeb Rd., Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

Cover photo by James L. Payne

**PERSPECTIVE****The Season of Protectionism**

N. Gregory Mankiw, the Harvard professor who now chairs the President's Council of Economic Advisers, had a rough lesson in Washington culture a few months ago. Talking to reporters, he set off a firestorm when he said, "Outsourcing is just a new way of doing international trade. More things are tradable than were tradable in the past and that's a good thing." He acknowledged that this can cause individual hardship, but added, "[W]e shouldn't sort of retreat from the basic principles of free trade."

"Outsourcing" refers to the hiring of labor in other countries in order to cut costs and increase efficiency. This is nothing new, but because of changes in the world, it is taking a new form. American manufacturers, such as textile and shoe companies, long ago turned to foreign labor by setting up factories in other countries. What's new is that high-paying "knowledge jobs," such as computer programming, can now also be outsourced easily because the Internet makes the movement of information cheap and fast. Advanced telecommunications also makes it efficient to farm out less-skilled jobs, such as telephone support services. As a result of these advances, American workers who have never thought about foreign competition now must do so.

Cable-TV talk shows and newspaper columns are filled with alarm that outsourcing will drain the United States of most of its high-paying jobs. Mankiw tried to point out that alarmism is unjustified. Outsourcing is just a variation on an old theme: getting the most out of scarce resources. In the past it did not reduce us to poverty. Why would it do so now?

But in the political season, good economic theory is not often welcome. Mankiw works for a Republican President, but that didn't stop members of the GOP, such as House Speaker J. Dennis Hastert, from denouncing Mankiw's position: "I understand that Mr. Mankiw is a brilliant economic theorist, but his theory fails a basic test of real economics.