



REVOLUTION REPEATS THE PROBLEM

self-sacrifice, however, the paper is really saying that human beings don't like to see other human beings suffer and will learn a conditioned response (in this case pushing a button) where the only reward is seeing the cessation of another's pain. The paper could have been more aptly titled "Benevolence is Rewarding," but one had to look beyond the words the authors used (this sloppy use of the term "altruism" seems very common in experimental psychology) to see what they meant [12]. Examples like this are relatively frequent - it should be a warning to read beyond the headlines.

The above examples are on a *microscale*, relative to what can be done. There is an even greater need for *macroanalyses* - studies of whole industrialized cultures. Work of this type has already been done in anthropology, but on a superficial level. Ruth Benedict's *THE CHRYSANTHEMUM AND THE SWORD* [13] is the classic in the field as a study of pre-War Japan (Anthropologists were in great demand during World War II since Japanese customs, motives, values, etc. were utterly alien to the West. The anthropologists had to interpret Japan to the Allies.) Margaret Mead's book *AND KEEP YOUR POWDER DRY* [14] is an interesting look at the United States during the same period.

On a more advanced level there was "Project Camelot" [15], a mid-1960s attempt at a multidisciplinary study of a major Latin American society. One of the purposes of "Camelot" was to gather data for later use in social change decisions. The clandestineness of the whole operation did not go over at all well with the target country, Chile: nor did the fact that the United States was sponsoring the study. In fact, the United States' relations with all of Latin America suffered a sharp decline and "Camelot" was hastily cancelled - no country wanted to be host to what seemed to them like a super-CIA.

Perhaps the most sophisticated work being done now is the World Dynamics study led by Jay W. Forrester and sponsored by the Club of Rome [16]. This is a computer model of the world's economy which takes into account various elements of technology, institutional and governmental decisions, etc. and permits forecasts of the effects of various technological and policy changes. The implications for social change are obvious: one can test ideas of the computer model before interfering in human lives. Of course, a model is only as accurate as the studies that go into it. Forrester and his people are primarily engineers and hence

possibly not so attuned to the human cultural elements as anthropologists might be. Anthropologists, on the other hand, seem barely aware of the organizational capabilities of computers. As the two groups discover each other, models can be expected to correspond more and more closely to reality.

What implications does all of this have for libertarians wishing to develop effective social change strategies? Needed first are analyses of our current culture by competent professionals. In particular, the social forms that libertarians are now living implicitly should be made explicit and examined (for example, with marriage, is the standard Judeo-Christian concept valid for those living a libertarian ethic? What form should a libertarian or Objectivist marriage take? Can any sort of long-term commitment be made in a rapidly changing world?). Diffusion or imitation is a powerful force in modifying cultures, and if libertarians expect to change Western culture it is not unreasonable to ask them to start with themselves. Social change begins at home, as it were.

These analyses can presumably lead to one or more functional models of possible freedom-oriented societies. Some analyses have already been done (e.g., *THE MARKET FOR LIBERTY* [17]), but these only deal with some institutions and there is no indication that larger social forms have been considered. Institutions, values, laws, lifestyles, technology - all of these are interrelated (imagine what the world would be like if the automobile had never been invented!).

In addition to setting goals, these studies will give some idea (with, of course, inputs from other social science and systems analysis sources) of just how our present culture functions. After all, all the goal setting in the world is to no avail if you don't know where you are and how to get from here to there. Time is running out. Where are the lever points [18]? Where are the places that badly need shoring-up if libertarians are to have enough time to change this society? The stakes are very high. This is the only world around - study it or lose the chance to change it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(This article is intended to serve as a brief introduction to problems and methods involved in studying literate cultures. For those who wish to pursue the subject further, the following books are recommended:

Arensberg, Conrad M. and Arthur H. Niehoff *INTRODUCING SOCIAL CHANGE* (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1964).

Goldschmidt, Walter *COMPARATIVE FUNCTIONALISM: AN ESSAY IN ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966).

Hsu, Francis L.K. *THE STUDY OF LITERATE CIVILIZATIONS* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969).

Jarvie, I.C. *THE REVOLUTION IN ANTHROPOLOGY* (New York: The Humanities Press, 1964).

Klausner, Samuel Z. (editor) *THE STUDY OF TOTAL SOCIETIES* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967).

Kroeber, A.L. *ANTHROPOLOGY: CULTURE PATTERNS AND PROCESSES* (New York: Harbinger Books, 1963).

Martindale, Don (editor) *FUNCTIONALISM IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES: THE STRENGTH AND LIMITS OF FUNCTIONALISM IN ANTHROPOLOGY, ECONOMICS, POLITICAL SCIENCE, AND SOCIOLOGY* (Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science, Monograph 5, February 1965).

Niehoff, Arthur H. (editor) *A CASE-BOOK OF SOCIAL CHANGE* (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966).

Sorokin, Pitirim A. *SOCIOLOGICAL THEORIES OF TODAY* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966).

NOTES AND REFERENCES

- 1) As an excellent introduction, see "The New Right Credo - Libertarianism," by Stan Lehr and Louis Rossetto, *NEW YORK TIMES MAGAZINE*, 10 January 1971.
- 2) Oliver, Michael A *NEW CONSTITUTION FOR A NEW COUNTRY* (Reno, Nev.: Fine Arts Press, 1968).
- 3) Nichols, Rosalie "Right-Wing Rationale for Non-Recognition of Indian Rights," *THE INDIAN HISTORIAN*, Volume 3, Number 2, Spring 1970 (reprinted in *REASON*, December 1969 and January 1970, as "America the Beautiful: On Whose Lands?").
- 4) Churchman, C. West *THE SYSTEMS APPROACH* (New York: Delta Books, 1968).
- 5) Forrester, Jay W. *PRINCIPLES OF SYSTEMS* (Cambridge, Mass.: Wright-Allen Press, 1968).
- 6) "Culture" is a much broader term than "society." "Society" is the aggregation of individuals in groups, whereas "culture" subsumes everything those people do, including behavior, technology, customs, etc.
- 7) White, Leslie "History, Evolutionism, and Functionalism: Three types of Interpretation of Culture," *SOUTHWESTERN JOURNAL OF ANTHROPOLOGY*, Volume 1, Summer 1945.
- 8) Keesing, Felix M. *CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY* (New York: Rinehart and Company, 1958), pp. 150-55.
- 9) The Rationalist Church of America, P O Box 1059, Milwaukee, Wisc. 53201.
- 10) Rand, Ayn *INTRODUCTION TO OBJECTIVIST EPISTEMOLOGY* (New York: The Objectivist, Inc., 1967).
- 11) Weiss, R.F., et al. "Altruism is Rewarding," *SCIENCE*, 26 March 1971, p. 1262.
- 12) It might be noted that Weiss' paper provides an answer to those welfare statisticians who maintain that people would *not* help each other if they were not forced to do so.
- 13) Benedict, Ruth *THE CHRYSANTHEMUM AND THE SWORD* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1946).
- 14) Mead, Margaret *AND KEEP YOUR POWDER DRY* (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1942, 1965).
- 15) Wolfe, D. "Social Science Research and International Relations," *SCIENCE*, 14 January 1966.
- 16) "Club of Rome' Computerizing the World," *BUSINESS WEEK*, 10 April 1971, p. 42.
- 17) Tannehill, Morris and Linda Tannehill *MARKET FOR LIBERTY* Box 1383, Lansing, Mich. 48904.
- 18) See "Leverage Points for Social Change," this issue of *REASON*.

IN COMING ISSUES OF REASON

THE SILVER FUTURES DEBACLE

An investment adviser points out the pitfalls of allowing ideology to outweigh economic reality in making investment decisions.

THE COUNTERINTUITIVE BEHAVIOR OF SOCIAL SYSTEMS

MIT's Jay W. Forrester, author of *URBAN DYNAMICS*, presents the case for mathematical modeling of social systems and discusses why political "solutions" to problems are usually wrong.

BOYCOTT SOUTH AFRICA?

A former South African discusses the well-intentioned but naive boycott proposals and points out what sort of effects such moves have on blacks in South Africa.

LET'S COMPETE WITH LOAN SHARKS

Why should organized crime retain its legally-protected monopoly on high-risk loans? An eloquent plea for laissez-faire.

ROCK - WHERE IT'S AT

A West Coast rock musician looks at the past and present of rock - the serious music of our times. What is good rock, who does it, and how - it's really worth considering.

leverage points for social change

robert poole, jr.

Those who espouse a libertarian philosophy of social organization appear to be faced with an insurmountable task when it comes to implementing a society consistent with their values. The number of people in the United States who can be considered libertarians may be approximated in terms of, say, a few thousand serious students and academicians, ten to 20 thousand current subscribers, and perhaps 100,000 people who have had enough contact with libertarian ideas to have gotten their names on a mailing list somewhere. Whichever of these figures is most meaningful, it is clear that persons of the libertarian persuasion constitute, at best, on the order of 0.05% of the population or roughly one in 2000.

Given such numerical weakness, the chances of convincing a majority of the people to vote to end all forms of coercion seem vanishingly small, at least in the foreseeable future. This prognosis, of course, assumes that the major problems with which libertarians must deal are political and governmental. It can be argued that there are more fundamental problems of a psychological and epistemological nature, i.e., that most people do not know how to function as rationally self-sufficient persons and *therefore* create or sanction coercive institutions, rights violations, etc. This may well be the case, but it does not follow that *only* when everyone's psychoepistemology is straightened out can we have a laissez-faire society. (To my knowledge, no one

has shown this to be the case.) I would argue, rather, that the existing coercive political and governmental structure, with its control over lives, is itself the primary problem which must be dealt with and that, if coercive restraints began to be removed, the superiority of laissez-faire would become increasingly obvious. If this is the case, then the primary task is to begin making the right kinds of changes in *our institutions*, leaving the changes in values and attitudes in follow as a result.

Despite the fact that libertarians are a tiny minority, are there any indications that such a group could effect fundamental political changes? Answering this question requires an understanding of how our political system works in fact (as opposed to in theory). In theory, the role of government in America is determined by our elected representatives, who express the view of the majority in deciding upon governmental programs and policies. To effect substantial changes in the role of the State, therefore, requires that one convince a majority of the people of the validity of a certain viewpoint and then see to it that they elect candidates who support that view.

But what actually takes place in our political system? Can anyone really believe that a groundswell of popular opinion led to the government's ill-fated decision to finance the SST? Or what about its decision *not* to back the SST? Is the "public"

Give me a place to stand
and I will move the earth -
Archimedes

