The Libertarian Government and its Foreign and Security Policy

El gobierno libertario y su política exterior y de seguridad

Dariusz Jeziorny
University of Lodz, Poland
dariuszjeziorny@uni.lodz.pl

Recibido: 06/10/2015
Aceptado: 03/07/2016

Abstract

Among the aims of this text is: firstly, to characterize how the libertarians think about security of the citizens' life and property in the case of aggression, or the possibility of aggression, from abroad. Secondly, to explore how they imagine the world-wide international order and a libertarian government's participation in it and finally to attempt an assessment of how effective the libertarian concepts proposed by the variously quoted authors could operate or be harnessed or implemented or even embraced in a governmental context. It should be possible through this article to compare and cross check whether or not the ideas focusing on foreign and security policy unite particular libertarians.

Keywords: Libertarian case of aggression, libertarian vision of world-wide international order, libertarian foreign policy, libertarian security policy.

Resumen

Los objetivos de este texto son: en primer lugar, caracterizar cómo los defensores del libertarismo conciben la seguridad de la vida y la propiedad de los ciudadanos en el caso de una agresión exterior o de su posibilidad. En segundo lugar, explorar cómo imaginan el orden internacional a nivel global y la participación en él de un gobierno libertario. Y, finalmente, tratar de evaluar el grado de efectividad con que los conceptos libertarios propuestos por los diversos autores estudiados podrían operar, ser implementados o incluso asumidos de manera comprometida en un contexto gubernamental. A través de este trabajo debería ser posible comparar y verificar si

ISSN: 1576-4184
http://dx.doi.org/10.5209/RPUB.53872

las ideas sobre política exterior y de seguridad aúnan o no a las diferentes posiciones del libertarismo.

Palabras clave: Posición libertaria frente a la agresión, visión libertaria del orden internacional global, política exterior libertaria, política de seguridad libertaria.

The title of my article may seem slightly thought provoking since there has never been a libertarian government anywhere in the world. How then can such a government and its potential foreign policy be discerned and likely international relations be described? Only by researching the body of writing from the most eminent libertarian authors can such a task be undertaken. Unfortunately compared to other fields of written thought the body of libertarian writing is not all that extensive in this sphere. The most popular themes of books and articles produced in this intellectual stream mainly address matters of: philosophical and ethical justification for individual freedom, emphasizing of sacred personal rights of disposing one's own life, health, wealth and property, espousing loud admiration for the free market economy, claiming restriction of the extended state prerogatives, describing a vision of a really free society and thus securing personal and individual freedom of citizens. All these texts are optimistic because the authors believe the individual is the best judge in his/her own life and is able to live happily in an environment deprived of constraints of freedom which are largely introduced by a state which as an entity is understood as the worst form of organization in the universe.

Moreover many libertarian thinkers assume the liquidation of the national state in favour of introducing a "spontaneous order" in which free individuals could organize their lives according to their voluntary choices without any superior state-like structure to intervene. In fact, we can find a lot of quotations suggesting that only individuals exist and by definition any attempt to give an organization like a state a character or entity status must be seen as a failure of understanding. Ayn Rand, the founder of the philosophy of objectivism – who did not see herself as a libertarian but is regarded as such by the majority of libertarian thinkers and writers – is a really important author for the development of libertarian ideas. She writes that "a nation is nothing but a multiplicity of individuals".[1] For her, there is no difference between "nation" and "society". Society is simply treated as an aggregate of individuals.[2] Murray Rothbard was a man known world-wide as "Mr. Libertarian" because of the broad acceptance of his views within libertarian thinking. He maintained that there is no sensible collective aggregation or classification of individuals. It seems that his idea of exploding the myth that "social aims", which should be understood as

[1] A. Rand, *Korzenie wojny [The Roots of Big Business]*, in *ibidem*, *Kapitalizm. Nieznany ideał [Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal]*, Poznań, Zysk i S-ka, 2013, p. 57.
[2] *Idem, Prawa człowieka [Man's Rights]*, in *ibidem*, p. 522.

collective aims, can even exist at all, would prevent the futile pursuit of unachievable and falsely defined outcomes[3] is similar to the thoughts of the late medieval philosophers who were fighting against universals.

James Buchanan, American professor of political economy states that the whole political process of decision-making could be reduced to the level of individual choices. Such a vision of politics is, according to him, no more than the normal scheme of exchange between people, like exchange of goods. Such an approach to taking political decisions allows him to expel "collective beings" from his philosophy. Only decisions of individuals exist and each individual follows their own rational knowledge and reasons. They simply want to maximize the usefulness of their chosen possibilities. If the problem is connected with wider social life, democratic voting would be the only possibility to take any decision but that would mean the majority decides but since the majority is composed of individuals without a discernable collective view it is not stable. For this reason we do not have any governments organized to function through the dictatorship of the majority. This was the problem which many liberal authors in the past tried to face. Individuals simply agree to some questions, i.e. they settle contracts, which are advantageous for members of the collective and determined by self interest of single persons. But such a way of taking decisions is reserved in Buchanan's philosophy only for post-constitutional decisions. That means the majority can not decide about somebody's life or property because the agreement upon these values is a consitutional decision. They could be restrained only by unanimous voting of citizens. In practice no change would be possible in this area.[4]

But such an approach to the decision-making process is not shared by other libertarian authors. For Tibor Machan, one of the most famous individualist philosophers in the USA, every person governs his/her own life. And there should be no subordination of the individual to other people or to the government either. Every human being has the right to be free which means nobody can decide about the fate of the other one without his/her agreement. To be a self-governing person, one must not be subjected to somebody else's decisions. Otherwise we have a typical tyranny, oppression, or compulsion of the collective. It does not matter what kind of a "collective" it is: family, clan, tribe, religion, race, sex, nation or the whole of humanity.[5] In such a situation the notions of "community feelings", or "loyalty" or

[3] M. Rothbard, *O nową wolność. Manifest libertariański [For A New Liberty. The Libertarian Manifesto]*, Lublin, 2004, retrieved 17 December 2014 from: http://pl.scribd.com/doc/20124251/Murray-Newton-Rothbard-Manifest-Libertariański, pp. 26-27.

[4] J. Miklaszewska, *Libertariańskie koncepcje wolności i własności*, Kraków, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1994, pp. 56-61, 74-75.

[5] T. R. Machan, "America's Founding Principles and Multiculturalism", in *idem*, *Classical Individualism. The Supreme Importance of Each Human Being*, London–New York, Routledge, 1998, pp. 75-76.

even "patriotism" are empty and meaningless. Machan gives an example of a person from the country attacked by the invaders. According to the individualist principles everybody has right to decide if he/she wants to defend his/her country because no state compulsion is justified. So it should be no reason to condemn a person who would prefer to play golf instead of fighting for independence.[6]

A short overview of some leading libertarian ideas which are based on individualism shows that it would be very difficult to articulate governmental foreign and security policy whilst at the same time embracing individualism. Even Buchanan's idea of a contract agreed by all members of a given society presents problems if a state governed by a libertarian principles requires to take quick and effective decisions. It would be necessary to lead a state's diplomacy in a very discreet way in conditions which do not allow for a collective contract with its citizens. Similarly, it would be impossible to conduct a military defence against foreign aggression. Whilst libertarians write in a spirited way on freedom of the individual which must not be limited in any way by somebody's own country, they rarely touch the problem of any form of danger to security coming from abroad. This is followed by the absence of any real scientific analysis of the libertarian approach to this question. Neither historians of political and economic thought, nor political scientists or even journalists have worked on how the libertarians want to deal with the whole range of issues raised in the context of foreign affairs. For all these reasons my article is something of an introductory character and may cause some deeper discussion among libertarians themselves and also social scientists interested in libertarian views.

Among the aims of this text is therefore to characterize how the libertarians think about security of the citizens' life and property in the case of aggression, or the possibility of aggression, from abroad. Secondly, to explore how they imagine the world-wide international order and a libertarian government's participation in it and finally to attempt an assessment of how effective the libertarian concepts proposed by the variously quoted authors could operate or be harnessed or implemented or even embraced in a governmental context. Methodologically I would rather tend to restrict the consideration of "libertarianism" to the published concepts of the writers from the mainstream of this movement.[7] Within the context of a short article it is only possible to describe the views of Murray Rothbard and David Friedman as a

[6] *Idem*, "Individualism and Classical Liberalism", in *ibidem*, pp. 4-5.

[7] In my approach to this problem I rather tend to follow D. Juruś's viewpoint rather than D. Sepczyńska's one. In his book (*W poszukiwaniu podstaw libertarianizmu w perspektywie koncepcji własności*, Kraków 2012) Juruś concentrates only on M. Rothbard's texts. Sepczyńska tends to enlarge the notion of „libertarianism" on all anarchists and even socialists who dreamt about freedom. But such an attitude only makes the word "libertarianism" unclear. It is simply difficult to fit in together collectivists and individualists, pacifists and revolutionaries, defenders of private property and its enemies etc. – see D. Sepczyńska, *Libertarianizm. Mało znane dzieje pojęcia zakończone próbą definicji*, Olsztyn, Institute of Philosophy at University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, 2013.

representative of the anarchocapitalist way of thinking and authors named as minarchists. This is a point of view which states that a government with confined prerogatives is justified. Libertarianism is not a closed doctrine[8] and David Friedman stated: "perhaps you will find somewhere two libertarians who agree with each other in everything, but I'm not one of them".[9] That is why their individual followers differ from each other in many details. It should be possible through this article to compare and cross check whether or not the ideas focusing on foreign and security policy unite particular libertarians.

It would be good to start with Murray Rothbard's viewpoint, because he was usually regarded as a presenting a representative view for the whole libertarian movement. In fact he promoted the idea of the spontaneous order created by individuals acting freely according to their will. Their right to self-possession of their lives, bodies and property springs from the natural rights described by John Locke. These are considered as basic rights which must not be violated. "Mr. Libertarian" believes the free market is the best regulator of everything and guarantees real freedom of particular persons. He shared the views of the Austrian School of Economics originated in late19th and early 20th century in Vienna by Carl Menger, Eugen von Böhm-Bawerk, Friedrich von Wieser and Ludwig von Mises. In his writings there is no room for an institution called "state". Rothbard has no doubts that such a structure is artificial, evil and tending to enlarge its powers. The usual tendency of every government is to monopolize all spheres of human life which bring income. It is the state which makes people slaves through imposing and exacting taxes and military conscript and these are examples of the violation of basic human rights. Rothbard was fond of repeatedly insisting that, given a real choice, he knew nobody who would like to subordinate himself to this coercion. He accuses the state of being an "aggressor" and the worst "organized banditry" in the world.[10] Notwithstanding this view and his desire to abolish and destroy the concept of a state he still wrote about foreign policy of a country. The disbanding of all existing states would be in Rothbard's opinion the best solution for the world. He is not afraid of chaos in international relations. In the absence of states he envisaged small free communities living their lives in a way chosen voluntarily. They would not posses nuclear weapon and other kinds of destructive armaments due to lack of sufficient funds. This would give rise to the possibility of small conflicts even of a permanent character which would be more acceptable and have a less damaging influence than the bombardment of

[8] You can find quite a full typology of libertarian streams in J. Bartyzel, „Geneza i próba systematyki głównych nurtów libertarianizmu", in *Libertarianizm. Teoria, praktyka, interpretacje*, Lublin, UMCS, 2010, pp. 33-44.

[9] Quotes retrieved 29 December 2014, from: http://www.libertarianizm.pl/cytaty.

[10] M. Modrzejewska, *Libertariańskie koncepcje jednostki i państwa we współczesnej amerykańskiej myśli politycznej*, Kraków Wydawnictwo UJ, 2010, pp. 144-151; quotes retrieved 29 December 2014 from: http://www.libertarianizm.pl/cytaty.

Dresden or Hiroshima during World War II which he assessed as "mass murders". Rothbard displays great optimism in stating that free citizens are rational enough and likely to avoid military solutions. He thinks that National states also live in a form of anarchy because they have no superstructure above them and that wars are not really frequent.[11]

Murray Rothbard worked out his views on international relations in the 1960s and 1970s which are the years of the "cold war". The Russian danger seemed very probable to almost everybody. So when proposing an anarchocapitalist model of the disbandment of states' (first of all it should be applied in the USA) as part of the solution "Mr. Libertarian" had to make some sort of proposal as to how to defend this country. He maintained that Moscow would never consider attacking an unarmed country which was no threat to the USSR because she would not suspect any aggression from such a country. The libertarian America would be peaceful and constitute no problem for anybody. He maintained that a libertarian based society would not be identified with a National state and this could also reduce the danger of Soviet attack. Rothbard additionally expected that the libertarian revolution could also change Russia so that the situation in the second super-power would become similar to that in the new libertarian USA. However, should the communist regime in Moscow continue and prevail then the free consumers in the USA could privately finance their weapons of deterrence (in the 1970s this was "Polaris" sub-marines or anti-ballistic missiles) and also voluntary private militaristic units to defend their personal freedom and property.[12]

At this point it is difficult not to declare Rothbard's views as naive. But the real extreme naivety of his declarations only became totally clear with his stated view that in the case of Russia successfully attacking America then the result could only bring serious problems for Moscow. According to him, history teaches that aggressors need to use local administration to rule effectively in a conquered territory and that Russian would find nothing like this to assist them in the anarchocapitalist USA. Moreover the winner would have to face the partisans who would appear for sure and fight against foreign occupation. It is worth mentioning that in Rothbard's view partisan operations are fully justified because their aim is to defend local populations therefore they would never assist an aggressor in controlling local people since their own partisan existence depends on their receiving local populace support. Rothbard maintained that in such circumstances no power is able to control a foreign and defeated territory for a long time because of the high costs involved.[13] Rothbard displayed total incompetence in sketching out such a vision. He did not know or understand how the political system of terror existed in the Soviet Union for many

[11] M. Rothbard, *op. cit.*, pp. 129-132, 159-160.
[12] *Ibidem*, pp. 142-143.
[13] *Ibidem*, pp. 143-144, 161-162.

years and how the Red Army ruled over the subordinated territories in East Central Europe after World War II.

In the meantime (i.e. before his ideal system would be introduced in the USA) the American anarchocapitalist suggests or mandates the implementation of an isolationist foreign policy. In practice it would mean non-intervention abroad. He specially criticizes the Wilsonian idea of "collective security". Rothbard translates this as an attack against the state which initiates aggression against another state and this definition is a proper one. Such a solution of collective security could only be implemented through involving further individuals in the conflict and this would have to be based on compulsory conscription. This multiplies the number of victims and is counter to the responsibility to defend the lives of civilians. In Rothbard's opinion every war is unjust if it provokes sufferings of civilians. In practice the Rothbard's idea of non-intervention would involve Washington's resignation from multilateral security pacts like NATO. He believed that if one of NATO's signatories is attacked by an aggressor (i. e. the USSR) the American government should leave the attacked country without any assistance and to become a victim of the aggressor. In Rothbard's opinion such a line of isolationism would allow the development of peaceful relations between Washington and all other countries and this would help to develop American free trade on an enlarged scale. It would also stop the growth of governmental structures. For him, trading could eliminate violence from international relations. At this point Rothbard comes back to his favourite idea of restricting the enslaving power of his own country. In his perception every American assistance abroad is executed in the name of the fight against "bestial external forces". While for him the USA government is the worst oppression in the world. In his point of view no authority has legal title to claim ownership of any territory. For Rothbard every state is evil and aggressive. Property could only belong to private citizen and because of that no government has the right to fight in defence of any territory. Therefore territorial wars between governments are, in his opinion, conflicts of two or more groups of thieves. Each government is as bad as, and no better than, the other. War would not be a problem for him if the governments would not trample innocent civilians.[14]

In the political environment of the 1960s and 1970s "Mr. Libertarian" suggested role for libertarians was that they should press the authorities to cease their tendencies to enter into wars and to stop intervening in the internal problems of other states. Creating and developing military bases abroad should also be regarded as an intervention and Rothbard's proposal is that they should all be removed. In reality this would involve American withdrawal from what he considers its "imperialist" policy pursued by all US government administrations be they Democrat or Republican. Past interventions of American governments have led, he maintains, to horrifying damag-

[14] *Ibidem*, pp. 158-162, 166-167.

es. Rothbard gives examples of: the American war against Spain in 1898, the intervention in the Philippines where the American soldiers had to pacify the uprising and the US participation in World War I which led among other things to the creation of the Bolshevik regime in Russia and the Nazi takeover in Germany. All these conflicts were used to lead Washington into world affairs in which ambitious US presidents tried to play the role of the "world gendarme" in the name of peace, security and National self-determination. Such a foreign policy made the US administration the world's worst aggressor. This tendency grew after the Second World War. Rothbard shows the examples of interventions against communism in the following chronological order: assistance delivered to countries in East Central Europe [sic!] and to Chang Kai-shek in China in late 1940s, intervention in Cuba to expell Fidel Castro and finally war in Vietnam, most tragic because of the numerous civilian victims. The Soviet aggressiveness was not even comparable according to him. The Marxists believe, in his opinion, that capitalism must give way when it comes up against socialism and no war is needed to achieve that. Moreover Rothbard treats seriously Vladimir I. Lenin's announcements about his desire for "peaceful co-existence between various socio-economic systems". According to this idea Soviet Russia had to play the role of a signpost for other nations en route to becoming a communist country. By the way "Mr. Libertarian" sees similarities between Lenin's approach and libertarian tactics of spreading their ideas in the whole world. Josif Stalin's policy during World War II proved that the Soviet Union was unprepared for military conflict because of losses experienced after the German attack in 1941. Murray Rothbard admits that the USSR began occupation of its Western neighbours in East Central Europe but justifies it on the basis that in his opinion countries from this region started aggression against Moscow in 1941 which led to huge numbers of civilian victims in the USSR (20 million people). That is why the Soviet authority wanted to guarantee their security by having safe frontiers on their western borders. Such a policy was even more necessary, according to Rothbard, because of the three years long "cold war" started by the Americans to expel communists from East Central European countries. Unfortunately "Mr. Libertarian" does not explain from where he learnt about the Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish and Czechoslovakian aggression against the USSR or about the "cold war" against Moscow begun by the USA in 1945. All these views illustrate Rothbard's naive ignorance of basic historical facts when attempting to interpret the Soviet Communist regime and its policy. But this led him to firmly believe that Americans are able to provoke Moscow (who he believed was totally unwilling to become involved in real conflict) to start the nuclear war which could lead to mass victims among people.[15] He clearly viewed the American administration as a much worse evil than the regime ruling in Moscow and readers of his expressed views are sometimes unwittingly led to a share in this belief.

[15] *Ibidem*, pp. 162-164, 166, 169-173, 175-177.

In his consideration of war as a topic Rothbard developed some interesting criteria for judging what could be a "just" war. It appeared he was not a pacifist at all. In his opinion we can consider a just was to be when an aggressor does not impose taxes, does not kill civilians and does not force young men into compulsory military service. It is interesting to notice that a revolutionary war would satisfiy all these criteria! Additionally such a revolutionary war is against the state apparatus and would also be a "war from below", involving people who really want to fight. Ordinary people are not being killed by revolutionaries because the revolutionary success depends on the support of the local population. Rothbard shows that the counter-revolutionary forces behave in just an opposite way.[16] Such reflections are not connected with foreign policy and National defence of a country but simply expose Rothbard's way of thinking about the evil called "American government". No doubt he had an American revolution in mind when developing these thoughts since Mr. Libertarian himself was vehemently opposed to any state coercion. What he failed to notice (who knows whether or not it was by accident) that the Bolshevik take-over in Russia fulfilled in some way his criteria too but soon after capturing political power, the communists introduced the policy of terror (*Cheka* was founded in December 1917) and did not care what the common population thought about it.

In summary the Murray Rothbard views on foreign and security policy are not convincing and show the real weakness of the anarchocapitalist approach to this very important aspect of human life. David Friedman, a second very representative follower of this anarchocapitalist stream, is aware that the problem of National security will exist until the whole world is transformed into a universal anarchy. Defense against nations in the present state of military technology, is, according to Friedman, a public good. He sees the whole problem as an economic one. Nowadays the weapons of deterrence are nuclear weapons and satellite intelligence so making these available for sale in a free market seems to be very dangerous. It is clear that Friedman represents a very American point of view because the majority of weaker states cannot even dream about so highly developed military technologies. Such a defence system must be territorial and this territory is much bigger than a private field. Friedman knows that financing of such a system freely by all participants would not be easy because it would be impossible to get agreement of every interested person to invest such a huge amount of money. But fortunately the yearly costs of National defence is between 20 and 40 billion dollars and the value of private property of the Americans is several hundred billion dollars a year. That is the reason which could make people willing to pay for their security voluntarily.[17] It is visible

[16] Rothbard's interview for "Reason", Feb. 1973, retrieved 14 June 2016 from: http://www.antiwar.com/orig/rothbard_on_war.html.

[17] D. D. Friedman, *The Machinery of Freedom. Guide to a Radical Capitalism*, La Salle (IL), 1995, retrieved 29 December 2014 from: http://daviddfriedman.com/The_Machinery_of_Freedom_.pdf, pp.

that Friedman's idea of financing the National defence differs from the Rothbard's one. Friedman is more realistic stating that the USA needs to possess the weapons of deterrence and anarchocapitalist societies could not afford to build a needed system of defence.

In considering the need for an organization to guarantee security from attack from abroad Friedman is a man who does not see the necessity of a state structure to deliver security for peoples lives. He envisages the possibility that smaller, freely established communities could work on their defence. They might exempt themselves from paying annual taxes to the state and thus enable themselves to start building their own security from the tax saving. But the government would also have some money from the exemption fee to guarantee security to these smaller communities. If individual communities were to be permitted to do this then over a period of time it should not be necessary to pay the government any money at all. The communities might gather the same sum from voluntary donations and finance their own defence instead of using the state service. Later on these organizations could contract with each other to take over providing National defense thus relieving the state from the job of financing national defence at all. In Friedman's concept of a step by step elimination of the government from the monopoly supply of protective force additional sources of financing for defence are enabled. He mentions one major source as being voluntary gifts from people who already spend billions of dollars a year on charity and asserts that rich landholders or insurance agencies would be likely to consider security to be a more important priority than supporting the poor or the sick. The institution of tipping for good service could be another form of payment that could be harnessed to finance security. If people give tips in restaurants for good services and even feel obliged to do it, he felt we can expect they might do the same to finance high quality defence. According to Friedman, the gross annual yield of all forms of tipping for service is about 2 billion dollars.[18] That is why he expects the public good called security from foreign enemies could attract much more money than tips for taxis or waiters. Being a leading anarchocapitalist he also focused some attention on possibilities to reduce expenditures on defence. For instance he proposed to exclude Hawaii from the protection of the nuclear umbrella built in the United States … It could be supposed of course that the population of these islands would not be happy with such a proposal.[19]

The main problem with this concept is likely to emerge when some citizens, maybe even the majority of them, refuse to pay for the state apparatus responsible for guaranteeing security from possible external aggression. It is easy to imagine

72-73.

[18] Friedman made the reservation that the numbers he gives are for about 1970; in 1995 dollar figures would be about three times as high.

[19] *Ibidem*, pp. 73-75.

that criminals or traitors do not want to pay. In the case of removing all immigration restrictions (which is also envisaged by the Libertarian Party), the more undesirable elements of humanity may feel invited to come into the embrace of the libertarian state. We can even imagine that such undesirable sorts would convince some of disappointed indigenous citizens to organize a competitive government and pay voluntarily to finance such a pseudo governments activities. It is not impossible that such a "shadow country" could buy its own weapons and create a quite separate national administration. A potential foreign enemy could easily co-finance such a structure and this would be a real danger for national legal authorities which would not be able to intervene in such a scenario before experiencing aggression from the new and parasitic governing body. All actions of the newly born authority would be peaceful, voluntary and honest, which is in full agreement with libertarian values. Such a hypothetical situation could change finally when the new government would feel strong enough to attack the legal host authority which could then fail to be able to defend against such rebels with their own military forces. David Friedman's concept could evolve and develop into these or similar situations without any problem.

Friedman admits that his proposed system of financing security is not perfect but he adds there is nothing perfect on earth – including systems based on compulsory taxes. The American anarchocapitalist wants to balance one imperfect scheme against the other and see which one is better. His reflections are only theoretical but he assumes that all *pros* and *cons* could show that the state system based on compulsory taxes could be a better one. In such a situation Friedman agrees to keep the former model of National security as the "last vestige of government". He explains: "I do not like paying taxes, but I would rather pay them to Washington than to Moscow – the rates are lower […] I do not approve of any government, but I will tolerate one so long as the only other choice is another, worse government".[20] Such a creed would not be pronounced from Murray Rothbard's mouth for sure.

There are also libertarians who admit the need for some form of limited government and also think that foreign and security policy belongs to the spheres of life subordinated to central authorities. The followers of such thinking are known as Minarchists. The word was created in 1971 by Samuel E. Konkin III, the founder of one of the libertarian streams called agorism.[21] This word had a negative connotation in his intention but finally libertarians who promoted the idea of a minimal state accepted it as an abbreviated characterization of their point of view.

[20] *Ibidem*, p. 75.

[21] Entry: Minarchism, retrieved 14 June 2016 from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Minarchism.
Agorism an ultra-anarchist stream in the libertarian movement which wants to destroy the whole system from inside. The agorists promote the so called "counter-economics" which means such a sphere of economy that is uncontrolled or even forbidden by the government (prostitution or drugs trade).

Acceptance of the state organization is conditional in their opinion. Ayn Rand claims that the only task of a government is securing a citizens basic rights to life, freedom and private property. That means every authority is not a ruler but a servant of its population. So the government's role is to defend basic human rights from any attack from abroad whilst also providing internal security of its citizens from being attacked by each other. To be effective in fulfilling their duties the state has a monopoly to exercise power to force the individuals to abide by the rules. This monopoly must be strictly controlled and restrained by clear legal norms. Coercion could be used only in the situation of somebody's aggressive behaviour. In other words, force could be used only against force as a retaliatory measure. Violence would be justified only as a reaction against violence. Individual citizens have the right to self-defence but in order to avoid general chaos of everybody using force people resigned from using it and ceded its use as a government prerogative.[22] Such an assumption is extremely important in international relations. Peace between states is sometimes very tricky and irresponsible behaviour of particular people could provoke bloody neighbouring conflagrations. So that the monopoly of state violence in international relations seems to be adequately justified. Rand thinks anarchist ideas of security policy are utopian. It is simply impossible to get the agreement of every individual on questions of relations with foreign subjects as the Anarchocapitalists would wish.[23] Rand describes three spheres of interest of a minimal government and it is exactly what the Minarchists claim:

1. Police to secure the citizen against criminals;
2. Army to avoid external aggression;
3. Courts to solve feuds between people but judged against objective norms.[24]

Placing such limits on government and its powers permits the absolving of the state from responsibility in the spheres of the economy, banking and communication systems, health care, education, support for poor people and other social assistance programs, mass media and all problems connected with morality.[25] Such an approach to the government's role is similar to ideas expressed by Herbert Spencer 1884.[26]

[22] A. Rand, *Prawa człowieka ..., op. cit.*, p. 526; *Idem*, "O naturze rządu" *[The Nature of Government]*, in e*adem*, *Kapitalizm...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 535-540.
[23] *Idem*, *Prawa człowieka…*, *op. cit.*, p. 530; e*adem*, *O naturze ..., op. cit.*, p. 544.
[24] *Ibidem*, pp. 543-544.
[25] D. Jeziorny, "Kompetencje rządu w koncepcjach Partii Libertariańskiej w USA", in J. Faryś, H. Kocój & M. Szczerbiński (eds.), *Na szachownicy dziejów i międzynarodowej polityki. Księga dedykowana Profesorowi Zbigniewowi Brzezińskiemu*, Gorzów Wlkp., 2006, p. 221.
[26] Cp. B. Sobolewska & M. Sobolewski, *Myśl polityczna XIX i XX w. Liberalizm*, Warszawa, PWN, 1978, pp. 360-374.

Having philosophically justified foreign and security policy being in the hands of the state Rand clarifies how it should be perceived and function. For her, foreign policy of the libertarian government should be peaceful. People are afraid of wars but do not give up personal violence. In international relations statist regimes have a natural tendency to make wars. "Statism" is defined as a "system of institutionalized coercion and uninterrupted civil war". This "civil war" is understood as robbery, compulsion and sufferings of citizens in the name of a "welfare state". Statism is a system in which "tribal principles" rule, which means that the "common good" is perceived as more important than individual good. In Rand's opinion there is no difference between socialism, communism and fascism. All of them are against capitalism and capitalism means peace. It is the only social system, according to her, which acknowledges individual rights and because of that eliminates coercion from social relations. The individuals simply do not have any interest in starting wars with other people because wars are costly and risky. That is why rational citizens avoid them to continue making profit from production and business. And capitalist states do the same while statists do not care for individual interests and maintain that if wars happen they can give some profit to the state. They do not care that individuals would pay a human price for a possible victory. In fact statism is a "lordship of gangs" which derive profits and maximize power during wars. Rand notices these powers expand during wars and do not reduce again to former more restricted bounds when a conflagration is finished.[27]

The last argument is strongly raised by David Boaz, a minarchist and vice-president of the Cato Institute – one of the most prestigious libertarian think-tanks in the USA. Boaz maintains that every war gives more power to a government:

1. Higher taxes are necessary to face war expenditures – the government has a new reason to rob their citizens and create new agencies which is nothing more than growing bureaucracy;
2. The "herd instinct" is activated in individuals and then it is much easier to develop the governmental power;
3. Compulsory conscription seems to be justified in the extraordinary situation;
4. Control of prices, salaries and other payments is often introduced;
5. Censorship and suppression of political opposition are serious threats to the freedom of the people.

These assumptions led Boaz to the usual libertarian conclusion that the best solution is isolationism and non-participation in wars which are quite unnecessary for the American citizens' security.[28]

[27] A. Rand, *Korzenie ..., op. cit.*, pp. 53-58.
[28] D. Boaz, *Libertarianizm [Libertarianism: A Primer]*, transl. D. Juruś, Poznań, Zysk i S-ka, 2005, pp.

It is also visible from Rand's arguments that she advocates against wars. She maintains every nation has a right to self-defence just as the individual person has. Free trade is, according to her, a tool of foreign policy too but her attitude towards providing either military or financial aid to foreign governments is completely negative. It is a tool of intervention. She remembers the American involvement in Vietnam. Her followers re-inforce her argument in recalling the humanitarian intervention in Somalia in 1992-1993. Both these events were imperialist and both were unnecessary for the defence of American interests. But Rand is not a pacifist at all, because such a viewpoint only encourages potential aggressors. Sometimes the government must go for war. But acting in the interest of self-defence of the USA is the only justified reason. That means securing the life and property of its citizens. She fully supports the deterrence policy as well. It was very successful in relations with the USSR but unfortunately the American administrations did use it consequently to counter-act all aggressive movements of Moscow.[29] Boaz supports Rand's arguments. He has got a new reason to do it – the Soviet Union is dead and there is no new similar danger. Now the libertarians can claim the government should reduce military forces, to minimize the budget deficit and leave more money in the taxpayers' pockets. Washington must not become a world policeman and should rather tend to localisation of conflicts and save more civilian lives.[30]

All the above arguments are logical. But Ayn Rand finally states that this right of self-defence does not mean that government should be allowed to introduce compulsory conscription. Forcing people to military service is nothing other than violating the human right to life. The voluntary army is the only possible model of military forces she accepts. Rand maintains that there will always be many volunteers to defend a country in the case of foreign attack. But it does not mean the Americans would have enough soldiers to send them to the many military bases the USA keep abroad. Secondly, she does not support compulsory taxes which the government uses to cover expenditures of the army. There should be only voluntary donations to finance the needs of the state structures and duties. When the citizens understand their self interest in paying for something they will have no problem in paying. Rand also suggests the possibility of financing the administration through voluntary insurances. Everybody pays for something that he considers to be important. Faced with being criticized for the lack of realism in these stated positions the founder of objectivism answers that such solutions would appear only as the final phase of the building of a free society in which people would think in a different way than in the present situation.[31]

264-265, 324-325.

[29] A. Rand, *Korzenie...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-65; E. Journe, P. Ryan, *Ayn Rand and US Foreign Policy*, retreived 27 December 2014 from: https://ari.aynrand.org/issues/foreign-policy/self-defence-and-free-trade/Paul-Ryan-Ayn-Rand-and-US-Foreign-Policy#n6, 19th Oct. 2012.

[30] D. Boaz, *op. cit.*, pp. 326-327.

[31] A. Rand, *Korzenie ..., op. cit.*, p. 62; P. Wipler, *Libertariańskie podejście do państwa*, Warszawa

Rand's argument does seem to be realistic and convincing. However many members of the Libertarian Party in the United States repeat her proposals connected with the financing of a voluntary army. David Bergland, who used to be the Party chairman in the years of 1977-1981 and 1998-2000, is sure that the American military forces should be reduced. He particularly emphasized removal of all army bases abroad which were mainly created because of settlements signed within the framework of NATO. Estimates based on governmental data indicate that in the years of the Ronald Reagan administration some half a million Americans were sent abroad for various military missions or duties. Such a policy of overseas military bases is regarded by the libertarians as interventionist and is a form of aggression. Military support of the third party in a conflict in which Washington is not involved is treated in the same way. This overburdens the American taxpayers and is fully in contradiction with their interests. Instead of such a foreign policy Bergland proposes a peaceful attitude. The Libertarian Party prefers to be isolationist in political and military relationships. But they propose to develop free trade with foreign countries. Such a way of thinking has been deeply rooted in American thinking about foreign policy for many years. Bergland shares Rand's idea of having strong deterrent weapons. But he proposes to dismantle all rockets on the continent and move them into submarines. Such a solution would strengthen security of the country because the Soviet missiles are pointed exactly at the existing rocket locations. So in the case of their dismantling on American soil, the Soviet missiles would change their targeting. Bergland's idea seems to be only partially right and it seems he was aware of this. That is why the Libertarian Party in the years of the Reagan administration supported the programme of SDI (Strategic Defence Initiative) which aimed at protecting the USA from attack by Soviet strategic nuclear ballistic missiles. Such an SDI system was regarded a defensive one and as having a retaliatory character.[32]

The Libertarian Party has never had the chance or opportunity to practice their ideas. But Ron Paul, the politician from Texas, a person fully identified with such a program, managed to be elected a member of the House of Representatives in the years of 1976-1984 and 1997-2013. His position was so strong that he decided to be one of the candidates for the presidency in 2008 and 2012, but he failed to achieve the Republican nomination.[33] Working as an American Congressman he was very active in the area of foreign relations. In his numerous speeches he always emphasised that the USA, "a champion of freedom" should not be involved in "interventionist foreign policy". He stigmatized all military involvement in various parts of the world.

2002, master's dissertation under the guidance of H. Izdebski at Faculty of Law and Administration, University of Warsaw, retrieved 27 December 2014 from: http://liberalis.pl/prace-naukowe/przemyslaw-wipler-libertarianskie-podejscie-do-panstwa/#ftnr55, ch. 2.2.7.

[32] D. Bergland, *ABC ... Libertarianizm [Libertarianism in one lesson]*, transl. J. Kropiwnicki, Warszawa, Kurs, 1987, pp. 18-19, 21-23.

[33] Entry: Ron Paul, retrieved 31 December 2014 from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ron_Paul.

Building of military bases, lending money to foreign governments or selling high quality military technologies were examples of interventionism. All these actions were not taken in the American taxpayers interest and cost them all a lot of money. That is why he called the taxpayers "sacrificial lambs". Their high sacrifices were not however able to cover a huge American budget deficit and not to mention the loss of life of many US soldiers. Moreover, he maintained that such a policy only escalated international tensions instead of lowering them. Paul, commenting on contemporary political events, disapproved of making the US government a "global policeman" who tries "to make the world safe for democracy". He also did not believe that the European allies of Washington would help in the case of foreign aggression against the USA. All these reasons allowed him to call the interventionist American foreign policy unsuccessful and ineffective.[34]

Ron Paul's thinking very much influenced his various pronouncements in the House of Representatives. His ideas focus on non-intervention which he regarded as a continuation of the American foreign policy followed in the 19th century. What is interesting is that Ayn Rand did not agree with his viewpoint. She advocated non-intervention but not the pacifism claimed by Paul. His ideas seemed to her to be too passive and she felt that Washington's foreign policy should be based on "rational self-interest" and an attitude which would sometimes require the USA administration to go and fight.[35]

Current Libertarian Party declarations dealing with foreign and security policies are very general. The Party's platform covers only some sentences on National Defence: "We support the maintenance of sufficient military forces to defend the United States against aggression. The United States should both avoid entangling alliances and abandon its attempts to act as policeman for the world. We oppose any form of compulsory national service […] American foreign policy should seek an America at peace with the world. Our foreign policy should emphasise defense against attack from abroad and enhance the likelihood of peace by avoiding foreign entanglements. We would end the current U.S. government policy of foreign intervention, including military and economic aid". Such solutions would permit, according to the Libertarian Party leaders, the development of free trade on an international scale.[36]

The Americano-centric attitude is clearly visible in this declaration and it is reflected throughout all libertarian writings previously reviewed. So it might be useful to compare the ideas of the American libertarians with those claimed by libertarian

[34] All the Paul's speeches delivered in the House of Representatives in the years of his tenure till the end 2006 were edited in one volume – see R. Paul, *A Foreign Policy of Freedom: Peace, Commerce, and Honest Friendship*, Lake Jackson, Foundation for Rational Economics and Education, 2007.

[35] This comparison of Paul's and Rand's viewpoints in: https://ari.aynrand.org/issues/foreign-policy/self-defence-and-free-trade/Paul-Ryan-Ayn-Rand-and-US-Foreign-Policy#n6 (internet access, retrieved 27 Dec. 2014), E. Journe, P. Ryan, *op. cit.*

[36] Retrieved 31 December 2014, from: http://www.lp.org/platform.

thinkers in other countries. For instance the Polish Partia Libertariańska (Libertarian Party) which was newly registered in June 2014 declares only that foreign policy should remain one of the minimal government's activities. According to the Party declaration Polish foreign policy should be based on the principle of non-aggression. This means non-participation in armed conflicts or in economic aggression (embargoes, sanctions) against other nations. Instead of this Polish libertarians claim "openness and dialogue with all the partners who are willing to take up this dialogue". The Party is in favour of the free circulation of capital, services, and goods and people to and from Poland. These values are also present in the framework of the European Union but the attitude of the Libertarian Party towards this organization is unclear. It likes neither the present model of the EU nor the tendency to create a pan-European federal country because these concepts are against the principles of freedom. The Party leadership considers it necessary to leave the EU if this federal tendency is maintained. Unfortunately the declaration contains nothing to indicate what is proposed to replace Polish participation in the EU common market. Should the government tend to build the autarchy which must be regarded contradictory to libertarian ideas? Or unification with the Eurasian Economic Union under the Russian umbrella is taken into consideration? There is also no mention of the Polish participation in NATO although the Party Declaration repeats the libertarian arguments against participation of Polish soldiers in missions abroad. They assume the creation of a voluntary, professional army complemented by territorial defence units which would serve to defend Polish citizens from attack by external enemies.[37] One must have real difficulty deducing what the Polish foreign and security policy would look like in the present situation of Russian aggression against the Ukraine – which is dangerous, without any doubt – for the independence and territorial sovereignty of Poland. Such a general declaration addressing the Polish geopolitical situation, which is totally different from the American one, must be regarded as very disappointing. Being neutral and isolationist, a distinctly viable option for a nuclear power like the USA is simply unacceptable for a medium-size country in the heart of Europe and at risk from an aggressive neighbour with a much bigger military potential.

Summing up, it is worth noting that libertarian concepts of foreign and security policy show similarities. It does not matter whether anarchocapitalist assume isolationism or minarchists do it. American libertarians are convinced that their "egoism" or self interest would make the life of citizens easier and better. But their assumptions should be assessed as rather utopian. Their belief that external nations will respect their peaceful attitude if they do not attack anybody seems to be baseless. American libertarians could also assume that nobody would start aggression against

[37] Retieved 1 Jan. 2015 from: http://partialibertarianska.org;
http://partialibertarianska.org/historia-partii;
http://partialibertarianska.org/deklaracja-ideowa.

the strongest power of the world but the terrorist attack on The World Trade Centre probably dashed their hopes in this regard. International relations are ruled by the principle that the weaker loses against the stronger one. It would be unwise to think that the USSR would not use the opportunity to enlarge its territories through subordination of weaker neighbours if American isolationism prevented Washington from assisting them. It would finally lead to the conflict of both superpowers but Moscow would by then be relatively stronger and be unlikely to think about promoting its trade in a peaceful way. This state could not afford to become antagonistic towards the USA without first developing its military strength and exercising some territorial expansion. Because of these tendencies the American government had to counteract against such possibilities. The creation of military bases abroad and lending money to allied governments were the preventive steps of this process but this was assessed negatively by the libertarians. However it was by agreeing to military bases in the countries endangered by the USSR plus provision of financial subsidies that prevented Soviet aggression and allowed the USA to remain a leading superpower in the years of the "cold war".

Trying to play the role of a world policeman after the end of the "cold war" was the other aspect of American foreign policy criticised by the libertarians. The East/West confrontational system was finished but there remained a lot of dangers, like the proliferation of nuclear weapons or radioactive materials. The libertarians could not remain blind to the danger posed to American citizens as a result of such possibilities. It would be much safer to spend taxpayers money to resist and obstruct nuclear proliferation being achieved through its products being for sale in a free market than it would be to simply permit it to take place. The libertarians do not take it into consideration that a freedom in this sphere would help rich countries and non-governmental organizations to produce or buy such dangerous technology and weapons. The next proposition which is to dissolve defensive undertakings with allies and not to interfere in their conflicts with other states could also be risky. These states could be easily invaded by the Soviet Union and then redirected in their own foreign policy against the United States. There are many examples in history to illustrate that such a possibility could be realistic. Any idea of total isolationism is difficult to be fulfilled in the case of the American superpower and is totally utopian in the case of smaller countries as it was shown in considering the Polish case.

The idea of voluntary financing of the governmental tasks connected with delivering security creates another group of problems. The libertarians are convinced that the solution they propose is realistic. If people can donate huge annual amounts of money to charitable causes (according to Bergland's estimations in early 1980s it was 1/3 of all national expenditures on police, courts and army, which were all acceptable spheres of government in the minarchists view), they can also donate sufficient funds for their national and individual security. In the libertarian's opinion citizens willingly pay for their security as a priority once they identify it is in their

own interest. Furthermore, the relative efficiency of the organisations in receipt of donated funds provides a further convincing argument. According to libertarians, private charity organizations spend only about 3-5% on their administration which seems impossible when compared with public structures financed from taxes.[38] Unfortunately this particular rosy perspective is only one of the many possibilities that could arise of course. People are usually self interested, as Ayn Rand knows, and could behave in many ways. Normally they do not pay if they are not forced to. So the likely effectiveness of the libertarian concepts is very doubtful.

The libertarian doctrine is without any doubts attractive to many people, particularly to inhabitants of the USA where freedom and optimistic faith in personal success were always very vivid. The ideas proposed by them are easy to understand, the way of argumentation is clear and appeals both to American tradition (mainly to the Declaration of Independence and to the Bill of Rights) and modernity (information driven society does not need a National state). Many people who could feel disappointed with the state institutions and the everyday behaviour of politicians could be interested in ideas tending to free the individuals from governmental coercion. Contemporary mentality is directed on self interest, individualism and consumption, which can become additional sources of support for the libertarian ideas. However the above analysis shows that the foreign and security policy is the weakest point in any libertarian programme or philosophical argument. It is unclear whether people like Murray Rothbard, who was blind to the real dangers from abroad, could propose a real security solution to citizens. The embraced ideal of dismantling state defence systems and apparatus in order to protect individuals from being oppressed by their own authorities is always presented in a very attractive way. But there is then nothing ever presented in the way of any viable protection system to guarantee security in international relations. The American rivals or trade competitors would be happy to use the opportunity of that superpower's weakness to deprive it of its position in the world. No doubt the libertarian ideas could even reach "peaceful" support and approval from them. Because it is clear that strict isolationism, coupled with the absence of any meaningful solution to providing protection from external aggressors, indicates that the very idea of the voluntary financing of National defence and strict isolationism must be regarded as utterly utopian.

Nonetheless, perhaps all this analysis could be a starting point to work on more adequate libertarian schemes of foreign and security policy. It is fair to comment of course that most libertarian thinkers overlook completely the fact that it would be most difficult to accommodate the unrestricted right of freedom of individuals with the necessity of security delivered to a large group of people. Quite apart from the collective security issue there are a also other important and practical question that

[38] D. Bergland, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-25; W. Block, "Prywatna własność, etyka i tworzenie bogactwa", in P. L. Berger (ed.), *Etyka kapitalizmu*, Kraków, Signum, 1994, pp. 154-155.

need to be addressed. How should professional diplomacy be organized in a libertarian country? What rules could direct its activities? How to formulate National security solutions in countries with libertarian governments which are endangered by foreign and maybe stronger enemies? How should a libertarian country behave in international relations? In fact to date there has been no expressed ideas on how to deal within an international framework other than Murray Rothbard's idea of having the whole world organized as a global anarchy. These are only a few questions that the libertarian perspective provokes us to think about and there is little published work to assist reflection on or seek solutions to these issues.