

Sample Chapter: NOT FOR CITATION

John P. Jackson, Jr.

December 14, 2017

The Jew Loved by Antisemites

In one of the more famous scenes in *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*, Tom, Joe, and Huck sneak into their own funerals. Tom, feeling neglected and abused by Aunt Polly had convinced his friends to hide away with him. They have been hiding away on an unnamed island out on the mighty Mississippi River where it “was a trifle over a mile wide.” After a fruitless search, the townsfolk were convinced the boys were dead held their funerals. In the sermon the preacher “drew such pictures of the graces, the winning ways, and the rare promise of the lost lads that every soul there, thinking he recognized these pictures, felt a pang in remembering that he had persistently blinded himself to them always before, and had as persistently seen only faults and flaws in the poor boys.” Only after “the congregation became more and more moved, as the pathetic tale went on, till at last the whole company broke down and joined the weeping mourners in a chorus of anguished sobs, the preacher himself giving way to his feelings, and crying in the pulpit” do the boys reveal themselves to many shouts of disbelief and joy. The comic scene speaks to the common human conviction that, once we have shuffled off this mortal coil, *then* they’ll be sorry! Those who didn’t appreciate us in our lifetime would sure miss us once we are gone. Alas, this is not always the case.

When Willis Carto died in 2015, the *Washington Post* noted that he had been characterized by the Anti-Defamation League of the B’nai B’rith as “a professional anti-Semite and Nazi sympathizer and the mastermind” of a “propaganda empire.” A Midwesterner by birth, Carto had worked in the shadows of the racist right wing for decades. After 1960 or so, he almost never appeared in public, wrote little, and stayed out of the public eye as much as he possibly could. He controlled a series of institutions and publications that maintained the antisemitic right of American politics. These included the Liberty Lobby, and its official newspaper, *The Spotlight*, which for decades maintained offices in Washington DC and lobbied Congress, the Institute of Historical Review a “think tank” dedicated to proving that the Nazi genocide of the Jews never occurred. His lifelong goal was to create a racially-pure United States, free of Jews and the inferior colored races, what people in his circles called “The Ethnostate.” One friend eulogized by explaining that Carto was for a “half-century, the founder and patron of those political movements we now variously call Conservatism, Race-Realism, White Nationalism . . . or *Alt Right*.” Carto raised millions of dollars over the course of his career, at least some of which made it into his own pocket meaning he was constantly falling out with former colleagues. He persisted throughout the decades

largely because of his ability to be useful to the antisemitic cause, despite his questionable bookkeeping. As a former ally wrote him in 1985: “Without this grotesque individual there would have been no *Journal [of Historical Review]*..., no *Spotlight*, which still has a larger circulation than all other "right-wing" publications combined and does keep alive a spirit of resistance in thousands of persons whom we could not otherwise influence, and, in fact, no effective opposition to the Hollyhocks.”¹

Murray N. Rothbard and Willis Carto were both born in the same year, 1926, but beyond that the two men’s lives seemed to have nothing in common. Murray N. Rothbard, "the most gifted libertarian writer of his generation," was a New York City secular Jew who produced two dozen books and hundreds of articles over the course of his life. was several steps to the right of better-known libertarians such as Milton Friedman and Ayn Rand. Unlike those writers, Rothbard was an “anarcho-capitalist” who believed that even police and military functions of government could be privatized and his prolific writings had a vast influence on the libertarian social movement. Author of over two dozen books, and hundreds of articles, Rothbard inspired his fellow libertarians by the sheer force of his penetrating intellect. However, Rothbard was not much of an institution-builder. The purity of his libertarian vision meant that he could not really build allies among his fellow libertarians. If they believed in public police forces or court systems, they were not true libertarians as far as Rothbard was concerned: It was a capitalist anarchy or nothing for him.

Upon Rothbard’s death 1995, U.S. Representative Ron Paul declared that “America has lost one of her greatest men, and the Freedom Movement one of its greatest heroes.” Another obituary declared him “the founder of the modern libertarian movement.” William F. Buckley, Jr., who had sparred with Rothbard for decades, was less kind. For Buckley, Rothbard was a fanatical ideologue who was incapable of building a political coalition to advance the conservative cause. Rothbard’s single-minded pursuit of “freedom” meant that Rothbard had “about as many disciples as David Koresh had in his little redoubt in Waco. Yes, Murray Rothbard believed in freedom, and yes, David Koresh believed in God.” ²

¹“Willis Carto, Influential Figure of the Far Right, Dies at 89.” *Washington Post*, October 31, 2015, sec. Obituaries. [HTTP://www.washingtonpost.com/local/obituaries/willis-carto-influential-figure-of-the-far-right-dies-at-89/2015/10/31/80eb8aee-7f36-11e5-afce-2afd1d3eb896_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/obituaries/willis-carto-influential-figure-of-the-far-right-dies-at-89/2015/10/31/80eb8aee-7f36-11e5-afce-2afd1d3eb896_story.html). Margaret Metroland, “Remembering Willis Carto: July 17, 1926-October 26, 2015,” [HTTP://web.archive.org/web/20171108035608/HTTP://www.counter-currents.com/2015/10/remembering-willis-carto-july-17-1926-october-26-2015/](http://web.archive.org/web/20171108035608/http://www.counter-currents.com/2015/10/remembering-willis-carto-july-17-1926-october-26-2015/). Reילו P. Oliver to Keith Stimely, 13 March 1985, Stimely Papers, Box 2 Folder 2, University of Oregon Libraries. The term “ethnostate” originaged in Wilmot Robertson, *The Ethnostate: An Unblinker Prospectus for an Advanced Statecraft* (Cape Canaveral: Howard Allen. 1992). For details on Carto’s career see George Michael, *Willis Carto and the American Far Right* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2008), Frank P.Mintz, *The Liberty Lobby and the American Right: Race, Conspiracy, and Culture* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1985); Leonard Zeskind, *Blood and Politics: The History of the White Nationalist Movement from the Margins to the Mainstream*. New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 2009).

²Quotation from Allitt, Patrick Allitt, *The Conservatives: Ideas and Personalities throughout American History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 251. On Rothbard’s influence see Daniel Bessner, “Murray Rothbard, Political Strategy, and the Making of Modern Libertarianism,” *Intellectual History Review* 24 no. 4 (2014): 441–56; Gerard Casey, *Murray Rothbard* (New York: Continuum, 2010); Benjamin W. Powell and Edward Peter Stringham. “Radical Scholarship Taking on the Mainstream: Murray Rothbard’s Contribution.” *The Review of Austrian Economics* 25 no. 4 (2012): 315–27; Chris Mathew Sciabarra, *Total Freedom: Toward a Dialectical Libertarianism*. (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press,

Yet, it is Rothbard, the libertarian Jew, rather than Carto, the dedicated antisemite, that seems to inspire today's Alt Right. Mark Weber, the editor of the *Journal of Historical Review* (*JHR*), which had been founded by Carto himself, praised Rothbard in a lengthy obituary in spite of Rothbard's Jewishness by strongly implying that Rothbard rejected the reality of the Holocaust: "Rothbard embraced historical revisionism in all its facets, including taboo issues of the Second World War." With the election of Donald Trump, Rothbard's followers felt their time had come. Contrasting the strategy of billionaire funder of libertarian causes, Charles Koch, with another billionaire funder one concluded that "Koch = establishment = Romney; Mercer = in your face = Trump. Which path offers the better chance for change? Mercer listened to Rothbard and succeeded; the Kochs kicked Rothbard out and have achieved...nada.... Trump is no libertarian; Trump may even be a Trojan Horse or even co-opted. This isn't the point. What he is, or more importantly what he represents, is the key: a complete rejection of the status quo.

No wonder the *New Yorker* dubbed Rothbard, "the godfather of the Tea Party." One white nationalist concluded that "Murray Rothbard...didn't just say 'freedom works!' [he] at least honestly approached the question of how one can achieve and maintain a libertarian society. And...helped lead to the emergence of the Alternative Right. You can't talk about the Alt Right without acknowledging how so many libertarians and former libertarians understand there should be a government helicopter program." If the last phrase is obscure that is because it is one of the many codes that in which the Alt-Right delights. It refers to the manner of extra-judicial killing of Augusto Pinochet's political opponents in the 1970s, a time when, with the aid of libertarian economists of the University of Chicago, Pinochet was enacting radical free-market actions under what could be called a libertarian dictatorship. That the Alt Right chooses Pinochet's libertarian-inspired regime as admirable says a lot about the continuing power of libertarian discourse in contemporary white supremacism.³

The Right was Right before they were Alt

This book is about how today's Alt Right combines ideas from both the racist right, inspired by Carto and the libertarian right, as inspired by Rothbard. Because racism is based on the

2000). Ron Paul quoted in Llewellyn H Rockwell, ed. *Murray N. Rothbard: In Memoriam*. (Auburn: Ludwig von Mises Institute, 1995): 3. On founding libertarian movement: Mark Brandly, "Murray N. Rothbard." *Austrian Economics Newsletter* 15, no. 1 (Summer 1995): 2. William F. Buckley, Jr., "Murray Rothbard, RIP." *National Review* 47 (February 1995): 20.

³Mark Weber, 1995. "Murray Rothbard, 1926-1995." Institute for Historical Review. http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v15/v15n3p33_Weber.html. "Rothbard on Trump - LewRockwell LewRockwell.com." LewRockwell.com. Accessed November 10, 2017. [HTTP://web.archive.org/web/20170516172406/HTTP://www.lewrockwell.com/2017/03/bionic-mosquito/rothbard-trump/](http://web.archive.org/web/20170516172406/http://www.lewrockwell.com/2017/03/bionic-mosquito/rothbard-trump/). Kelefa Sanneh, 2013. "Paint Bombs." *The New Yorker*. May 13. <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2013/05/13/paint-bombs>. Gregory Hood, 2017. *The Death of Libertarianism and the Rise of the Alt Right*. Counter-Currents Publishing. Accessed January 23. [HTTP://web.archive.org/web/20170916140426/HTTP://www.counter-currents.com/2016/08/the-death-of-libertarianism-and-the-rise-of-the-alt-right/](http://web.archive.org/web/20170916140426/http://www.counter-currents.com/2016/08/the-death-of-libertarianism-and-the-rise-of-the-alt-right/). On libertarians and Pinochet see Naomi Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism* (New York: Metropolitan Books/Henry Holt, 2007); Nancy MacLean, *Democracy in Chains: The Deep History of the Radical Right's Secret Plan for America* (New York: Viking, 2017).

idea of superior and inferior groups and libertarianism is a doctrine of strict individualism, we often think that the two as incompatible. However, the intertwined history of both groups shows how easily they can be combined. To understand why, we must go back to the end of World War II, before the Right was Alt. When it was just an assorted mass of conservatives who were looking to work together, not separately.

The "Alt" in Alt Right has a double meaning. On the one hand, "alt" is German for "old" and the Alt Right claims to be the heir to the isolationist right of pre-World War II America. On the other, "alt" is also short for "alternative" making the Alt Right the alternative to the mainstream right wing of American politics. The problem is, there is no checklist of what is "Alt" Right and what is "mainstream" right. And the people you might want to put in a particular box may not want to be put there. Libertarians, especially chafe at being lumped in with the conservatives, taking their cue from one of the subjects of this chapter, pioneering libertarian Frank Chodorov. In a 1956 letter to *National Review* he declared, "I will punch anyone who calls me a conservative in the nose. I am a radical." Chodorov's fightin' words reflected Libertarians' delight in considering themselves rough-and-tumble, independent thinkers, but, as I will show later in the chapter, libertarians were seldom far from the conservative mainstream on racial issues in the mid-century United States.⁴ Before trying to understand the "Alt" in Alt Right, it is better to understand the "Right" half of the phrase.

You could write a several terabytes on trying to define "right wing politics" and people have. Let's take this handy summary provided by a recent book on American conservative politics by George Hawley:

1. Conservatives call for limited, if any, government intervention in the economy.
2. Conservatives hold that tradition, particularly religious tradition, should guide public policy.
3. Conservatives are for a strong military and a strong American military presence in the world.⁵

As Hawley notes, there is no necessary logical connection among these three tenants; the relationship among them is a contingent one that emerged out of American political culture following World War II. We can easily imagine someone who believes in a limited government and an isolationist foreign policy, for example. Or who believes in a firm religious tradition that is backed by a strong government supporting it. One way we can trace the history of the American right is to see how coalitions were formed among those who held these three beliefs and how those coalitions were broken apart at various times over the past seven decades. What we want to avoid is the tendency to divide people into different "teams." Our categories must be flexible; our boundaries porous. People seldom fit nicely into any category we want to place them in (it would certainly be easier if they did!). For example, the American right wing before World War II was marked by isolationism: they wanted no part of Europe's problems and tried hard to keep the U.S. out of World War II until Pearl Harbor forced

⁴Chodorov, Frank. 1956. "To the Editor." *National Review* 2 (20): 23.

⁵George Hawley. *Right-Wing Critics of American Conservatism*. (Lawrence: Kansas University Press, 2016): 4

our hand. After the war, the isolationism was still embraced by the libertarian branch of the party. To what extent were libertarians willing to work with conservative Cold Warriors on areas of mutual interest, such as limiting government, despite disagreeing with them on foreign policy? Followers of Ayn Rand often embraced her outspoken atheism, but would they be willing to work with religious conservatives in limiting government intervention in the economy?

The defining characteristic of the right I will use throughout this book is to take their rejection of *equality* as a supreme value. Political theorist Corey Robin argues that the mark of the Right is that it opposes the equal distribution of power. Only a certain kind of people should be making decisions in society; the rest are just not up to the task of governing. Hence, appeals to equality are suspect in all right wing discourse, whether you want to call it alternative or mainstream because right-wing thought opposes equality with freedom, an opposition with a long, long history in political discourse. Freedom means we all have the same freedom to compete and, because we are not equally gifted for the competition, there will be winners and losers. The only way to guarantee equal outcomes is to curtail the liberty of the most able of society. In the opposition between freedom and reality, the right will always come down on the side of freedom.⁶

In the nineteen-fifties, as the right was finding its footing in the postwar world, it was inequality that bound them together. The ultra-respectable William F. Buckley, Jr., in an editorial in then-new *National Review* wrote in 1956: “As our readers know, we habitually deplore the egalitarian trends in contemporary society, and turn a deaf ear to statist pleas on behalf of the downtrodden.” A regular feature in *National Review* was Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn’s column, “Letter from Europe.” In his 1952 book, *Liberty or Equality: The Challenge of our Time*, he concluded that “this writer prefers a hereditary monarch as the chief of state, because through the biological process he can also represent the element of continuity.” He argued:

To the Christian two newly-born babes are *spiritually* equal, but their physical and intellectual qualities (the latter of course in potency) are from the moment of conception unequal. It suffices to say that the artificial establishment of equality is as little compatible with liberty as the enforcement of *unjust* laws of discrimination.... Nature (i.e., the absence of human intervention) is anything but egalitarian; if we want to establish a complete plain we have to blast the mountains away and fill the valleys; equality thus presupposes the continuous intervention of force which, as a principle, is opposed to freedom. Liberty and equality are in essence contradictory.

His deep suspicion of human equality landed Kuehnelt-Leddihn a three-decade long writing gig for William F. Buckley, Jr., the longest of any of its columnists. He was hardly alone in such declarations, they were shouted from the rooftops by conservative intellectuals who believed that equality before the law or God was fine, "but to pretend that all are endowed

⁶Hawley, Right-Wing Critics: 10-13. Corey Robin, *The Reactionary Mind: Conservatism from Edmund Burke to Donald Trump*. Second Edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018). On the history of the opposition of equality and freedom see: Celeste Michelle Condit and John Louis Lucaites *Crafting Equality: America’s Anglo-African Word*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993) and Sean Wilentz, *The Politicians & the Egalitarians: The Hidden History of American Politics*. New York: Norton, 2017..

with equal gifts, whether of intelligence, creative power, or physical prowess is, of course, absurd." "Equality" according to University of Chicago professor Richard Weaver, was "a disorganizing concept" that attempted "a meaningless and profitless regimentation of what has been ordered from time immemorial by the scheme of things." ⁷

In the nineteen-fifties and early nineteen-sixties, the battle about human equality took place on the field of civil rights and the African-American struggle for equal rights. This was the largest struggle for freedom in the twentieth century. You would expect that the American right, with their focus on individual freedom would deny vehemently that a "collectivist" concept such as race should be the basis for social order. You would expect that the legal coercion of Jim Crow, enforced by the State would be a target of extensive criticism by the libertarian right. You would, of course, be wrong. In a 1960, two a report on The American Right Wing that surveyed an incredibly broad range of right wing publications and concluded "There are certainly some right wing organizations that favor integration, but none has come to light in the present survey."⁸

National Review the intellectual home of the respectable right was more muted than the rabid segregationists of the south, but no more intransigent in its opposition to Civil Rights. In a recent political biography of Buckley, Alvin S. Felzenberg, makes clear that Buckley and the *National Review* opposed the Civil Rights Movement, most notoriously in a 1957 Buckley editorial entitled, "Why the South Must Prevail" which "put *National Review* on record in favor of both legal segregation where it existed (in accordance with the "states' rights" principle) and the right of southern whites to discriminate against southern blacks, on the basis of their race. The editorial defended the right of whites to govern exclusively, even in jurisdictions where they did not constitute a majority of the population." Felzenberg notes that by 1965, Buckley had rethought his position on these matters and had a genuine change of heart. I will simply add two things: by 1965 the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act had passed meaning Buckley had lost the battle so his change of heart could have been as much a matter of political convenience rather than any devotion to African-American rights.⁹

There was almost nothing published in libertarian literature about the freedom of African Americans. Reading one of their flagship publications, *The Freeman*, and there are no articles defending African American civil rights in the decade between the *Brown* decision in 1954 and the Civil Rights Act in 1964. The subtitle of the magazine was "Ideas on Liberty" but apparently when it came to the barriers to liberty faced uniquely by African Americans,

⁷"End of the Lozenge." 1956. *National Review* 2 (4): 9. Erik R. von Kuehnelt-Leddihn and John P. Hughes. *Liberty or Equality: The Challenge of Our Time*. (London: Hollis and Carter, 1952): 252, 2-3. Reginald Jebb, "Equality Re-Examined." *Freeman* 7, (January 1957): 41. Richard M. Weaver, *Ideas Have Consequences* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948): 42.

⁸Ralph E. Ellsworth and Sarah M. Harris. *The American Right Wing: A Report to the Fund for the Republic, Inc.* (Urbana: University of Illinois Library School, 1960): 44. Online here: [HTTP://archive.org/details/AmericanRightWingEllsworthHarris1160](http://archive.org/details/AmericanRightWingEllsworthHarris1160). The 1960 findings appear confirmed in subsequent surveys of conservative/libertarian writings: Perry Martin et. al. 1999. "The Libertarian Press." In *The Conservative Press in Twentieth-Century America*, edited by Ronald Lora and William Henry Longton, (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1999): 305-75.

⁹Alvin S. Felzenberg, *A Man and His Presidents the Political Odyssey of William F. Buckley Jr.* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017): 79. The editorial was "Why the South Must Prevail," *National Review*, 24 August 1957.

they had nothing to say. The premier publisher of libertarian books for the time period was Caxton Printers. They published books by most major libertarian writers: Garet Garrett, Felix Morley, Ayn Rand, Albert Jay Nock, Rose Wilder Lane, Robert LeFevre, Roger Lea Macbride... the list could go on. Looking at the titles they published between 1946-1963, there is nothing that addresses the Civil Rights struggle in any way. Henry Hazlitt, an economist at the center of most libertarian activity of the time published *The Free Man's Library* in 1956. The book was a critical bibliography on the libertarian philosophy of individualism. In a list of over 500 books Hazlitt managed to track down and list any book with the thesis that "Taxation is theft" (seriously, how many of those do you have to read before you get the point?). He managed to include a bunch of books on how to bust a union. He managed to recommend Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn's *Liberty or Equality: The Challenge of our Time* He recommended a volume of slavery's most eloquent defender, John Calhoun as well as racist eugenicist Edward M. East's *Mankind at the Crossroads*. But not one on the oppression of African Americans by Jim Crow.¹⁰

This absence makes me agree with Eric Foner when he wrote that in the Civil Rights Era, "libertarians proved amazingly indifferent to the denial of blacks' economic and educational opportunities" (p. 314). Libertarian historian, Brian Doherty agrees in his broad survey of his own movement:

Libertarian thinkers and institutions were generally concerned, by their nature, with issues of government acting where it didn't belong. This made libertarians and libertarian ideas—for reasons that go beyond their general cultural peculiarity and outsider status from at least the 1940s to late 1970s—far from major players in some of the biggest arenas of sociopolitical ferment of the 1960s and 1970s: the women's rights, civil rights, and black rights movements. (p. 524).¹¹

Libertarians certainly gave no aid to the Civil Right struggle against Jim Crow and their writings of the time betrays their indifference to the plight of African-American citizens. When they *did* address the issue, however, they were invariably lined up with segregationists. In the most important struggle for freedom in the twentieth-century United States: libertarians' version of "freedom" favored white supremacy. The story of this chapter is the story of the purest forms of expression of inegalitarianism in the postwar world: those of Willis Carto and Murray Rothbard. Their ideas speak to a racism beyond that of the segregationists. The segregationists, after all, were willing to have black people and white people live in the same geographical areas. For Carto and Rothbard, the true solution to the race problem was to completely separate the races.

¹⁰To survey *The Freeman* consult the online archive here: [HTTP://fee.org/the-freeman/](http://fee.org/the-freeman/). The listing of Caxton Printers is Charles A. Webbert, *Checklist of the Publications of Caxton Printers, Ltd., Caldwell, Idaho, 1903-1973* (Moscow: University of Idaho Library, 1974), The listings for the relevant years can be found here: [HTTP://archive.org/details/1961CaxtonCatalog](http://archive.org/details/1961CaxtonCatalog). Henry Hazlitt, *The Free Man's Library; a Descriptive and Critical Bibliography* (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1956): citing Kuehnelt-Leddihn at 104; Calhoun at 52, 172-3; East at 65.

¹¹Eric Foner, *The Story of American Freedom*, (New York: W.W. Norton, 1998): 314. Brian Doherty, *Radicals for Capitalism: A Freewheeling History of the Modern American Libertarian Movement*. (New York: Public Affairs, 2009): 524.

Racial Separation

Willis Carto and the Joint Council for Reparation

We must lead the Nation to new vistas of personal freedom, individual responsibility and national dignity. We must fight and destroy the reactionary liberals who want to drive the world back to peonage, slavery and poverty. It is *we* who are the harbingers of the new order of the future. *We* are the progressives. And we will be victorious!¹²

With all that language about “personal freedom” and “individual responsibility” you might think that quotation is from a libertarian but those words were spoken by Willis Carto to the Congress of Freedom (COF) in 1957. The COF was one of the first umbrella organization designed to unite various aspects of the political right. The COF represented three different strands of right wing groups: “the hate groups, welded to one another by the anti-Semitism they all exploit; latter-day know-nothings who in their fear of communism oppose civil liberties as a weakness in our ramparts”and “extreme political reactionaries who are unable or unwilling to recognize the bigots in

The COF was named by Aldrich Blake in 1953 and was populated by various groups and individuals all committed to some form of right wing politics. Blake’s own organization was Liberty and Property which he founded to protect property owners from violations of their rights from fair housing laws. By 1957, Blake had taken on a young protege, Willis Carto and soon lost control of his own organization to Carto’s machinations, the first in a long line of organizations that Carto more-or-less stole. Carto was also on the board of directors for the COF, which had as its executive director Robert Lefevre, a libertarian of some repute. While we might wish to draw sharp distinctions among various right wing activists. Carto’s role in the COF speaks to the ill-defined boundaries that marked the right wing of the nineteen-fifties. The COF’s leaders included dedicated antisemites; not just Carto but others I discuss elsewhere in this book including Pedre Del Valle head the Defenders of the American Constitution, Merwin K. Hart of the National Citizen Council, and Verne Kaub head of the American Council of Christian Laymen. Libertarians included, not just Lefevre, but also Frank Chodorov, Thaddeus Ashby, editor of the Christian/libertarian journal *Faith and Freedom*; J.H. Gipson, President of Caxton Printers; Percy L. Greaves, amateur historian; Publisher Harry Hoiles; and economist V. Orval Watts.¹³

¹²Willis Carto, “Where We Stand: An Address to the Congress of Freedom,” 19 April 1957, Earnest Sevier Cox Papers, Duke University.

¹³On Aldrich Blake, Willis Carto, and Liberty and Property see John P. Jackson, Jr., *Science for Segregation: Race, Law, and the Case Against Brown v. Board of Education*. (New York: New York University Press, 2005): 47-55. Names of those involved in the COF are taken from a 1955 flyer advertising the organization which can be found here: [HTTP://archive.org/details/1955CongressFreedom](http://archive.org/details/1955CongressFreedom). Brian Doherty, *Radicals for Capitalism*, notes that Ashby published an article critical of the COF as evidence that the COF should not be considered truly libertarian since it was “more dedicated to hating commies and preserving a fantasy of America as a strictly Christian nation than to understanding and acting on the principles of liberty (314). Such a stance ignores the extent that libertarians were anti-Communists and many, like Ashby himself, were dedicated to making the United States a libertarian/Christian nation. Lefevre wrote a long letter in response to Ashby and put Ashby’s complaints as expressions of personal pique for the Congress not taking up Ashby’s pet projects. See Robert Lefevre to Editors of *Faith and Freedom*, 28 May 1955, Robert

It was at the COF that Carto first proposed the Liberty Lobby and pushed for his other projects. In the 1950s, he published a monthly newsletter called *Right*. Like the COF, Carto's announced purpose in his journal was "uniting the right" and Robert Lefevre wrote a short piece for it entitled "How Will the Right Wing Get Together?" *Right* was fairly ecumenical in the causes it supported, heaping praise on the Virginia legislature when it passed its "Massive Resistance" legislation against "the Supreme Court's communist-approved forcible Integration decision," advertising the COF's first publication, *The Truth About the United Nations*—both Lefevre and Carto had testified on behalf of the COF against the United Nations in 1955, and spoke out against taxation as much as any libertarian publication of the time. *Right* always put race and conspiracy first. So, in an article purportedly about the dangers of labor unions (always a favorite villain of the libertarians), *Right* made clear that behind the evil labor unions was a more sinister force: "When the back of Big Labor needs to be scratched, you will always find Big Zion and the NAACP helping with the scratching, and vice versa." None of this stopped Lefevre from publicly endorsing *Right* as a "mighty fine publication."¹⁴

One of Carto's pet projects in the nineteen-fifties was the "Joint Council for Reparation" (JCR) an organization he claimed was dedicated to aiding any African Americans who wanted to repatriate "back" to Africa. Carto framed the organization as a successor to the American Colonization Society (ACS), which had been formed by James Madison in 1817 as a method for eliminating "Free Negroes" from the country. The ACS represented a different kind of racist ideology than slavery did. Sociologist Pierre van den Berghe categorized two kinds of racist social systems: First, "paternalistic," in which race relations follow the master-servant relationship, and "competitive" in which actual physical separation replaces the elaborate social etiquette preventing race mixing in paternalistic racial systems. Joel Kovel used the terms "dominative" and "aversive" to describe roughly the same categories. In paternalistic/dominative systems, the races may live together as long as the rules for the subordination are made clear to all. In competitive/aversive systems, it is denied that the races can live together and full geographic separation is required. Like all analytic categories, the real world seldom fits neatly into either category. Nonetheless, such different forms of racist ideologies can be useful heuristics for historical inquiry. For example, George Fredrickson found the aversive ideology in the Free Soil movements of the 1850s. Joel Williamson contrasted racial "conservatives" who embraced the newly freed slaves as inferior, but still

Lefevre papers, Box 49, Folder 3.

¹⁴Robert Lefevre, "How Will the Right Wing Get Together?" *Right* no. 24 (September 1957): 2. On Virginia: "In a Thundering Voice" *Right* no. 3 (December 1955): 3. On the UN: "That Are Right," *Right* no. 7 (April 1956): 6. The book was Congress of Freedom. *The Truth about the United Nations: The Speeches, Findings, and Resolutions of the Congress of Freedom, Inc.: Assembled in Convention in Veteran's War Memorial Auditorium, San Francisco, April 25-30, 1955.* (San Francisco: Congress of Freedom, Inc., 1955). Lefevre's UN testimony was: Robert Lefevre, *Review of the United Nations Charter. Part 11* (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1955): 1579–82, available here: [HTTP://archive.org/details/1955LeFevreUNTestimony](http://archive.org/details/1955LeFevreUNTestimony). Carto's UN testimony was: Willis Carto, *Review of the United Nations Charter Part 10* (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1954): 116–19, available here: [HTTP://archive.org/details/1955CartoUNTestimony](http://archive.org/details/1955CartoUNTestimony). On labor unions see: "Capitalism Carries With it Seeds of Own Destruction: What is Really Behind the 'Drift to Socialism?'" *Right* no 45 (June 1959): 1. Lefevre endorsement appeared in an advertising flyer that can be found here: [HTTP://archive.org/details/RightEndorsments](http://archive.org/details/RightEndorsments).

had a subservient place for them in the New South with “Radical” racists who advocated that African Americans had to be physically removed from the continent completely. Carto articulated this competitive/aversive racism much more than he did the paternalistic/dominative ideology of white segregationists. The idea behind, the ACS was that the only role for African Americans in the United States was in slavery. A free black person had no place in American society and therefore had to be “returned to Africa.”¹⁵

Carto had bootstrapped the JCR with the aid of Earnest Sevier Cox, a white nationalist who had been pushing for repatriation since the 1930s. Cox had been the ideologue behind the 1924 Virginia Racial Integrity Act which had tightened Virginia’s miscegenation laws in the name of racial purity. Cox’s views had changed little since he published his book, *White America*, in 1923. “Our color problem is primarily that arising from the presence and the increase of the African in our midst” he wrote, “the Negro problem overshadows all others, both in gravity and in interest.” Cox had worked closely with the remnants of Marcus Garvey’s organizations in the 1930s and into the 1950s to send African Americans to Liberia. As late as 1953, Cox was testifying in front of Congress for this cause. In the 1950s and 1960s, Carto publicized Cox’s ideas on repatriation in his publications. “The reason that Repatriation is inevitable,” Carto wrote in *Right* under his pseudonym, E.L. Anderson, Ph.d., “is that White people are determined to solve the Race Question and Repatriation is the only possible solution... Segregation is definitely not a solution because segregation, in time, leads to total amalgamation.” And endless stream of articles from Cox, Carto and other “rightists” filled the pages of *Right*, and its successor journal, *Western Destiny*.¹⁶

Carto was ahead of the right-wing curve regarding Black Nationalism, a fact that *Right* was sure to let its readers know: “*Right* was the first and for awhile the only publication in America which told its readers about the Negro nationalist groups” it bragged. By the early nineteen-sixties, with the increasing popularity of the Black Muslims, Malcolm X, and two scholarly books that explored the ideas of the Black Nationalism. Mainstream conservative periodicals wrote terrified headlines: “Black Muslims on the Rampage” and “Black Muslims are a Fraud.” The liberal *Nation* assured its readers that the drive among African Americans for integration and full equality in society was too strong to make any Black Separatist movements anything to worry about.¹⁷

¹⁵On Carto’s advertising the JCR to the COF see his letter “Dear Delegate to the Congress of Freedom” at [HTTP://archive.org/details/JCRtoCOF](http://archive.org/details/JCRtoCOF). On the American Colonization Society see the Library of Congress exhibit at [HTTP://www.loc.gov/exhibits/african/afam002.html](http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/african/afam002.html). Pierre L. Van den Berghe, *Race and Racism: A Comparative Perspective* (New York: Wiley, 1967): 27-33. Joel Koval, *White Racism: A Psychohistory* (New York: Pantheon, 1970): 30-32. George M. Fredrickson, *Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate Over Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971): 130-164. Joel Williamson, *The Crucible of Race: Black-White Relations in the American South Since Emancipation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984): 109-139.

¹⁶For details on Cox’s postwar alliance with Carto see John P. Jackson Jr. and Andrew Winston. “The Last Repatriationist: The Career of Earnest Sevier Cox.” In *Race and Science: Scientific Challenges to Racism in Modern America*, edited by Paul Farber and Hamilton Cravens, 58–80. Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2009. For Cox’s testimony for Congress see Earnest Sevier Cox, *To Provide Aid to Persons in the United States Desirous of Migrating to the Republic of Liberia*, Pub. L. No. S. 138, 40 (1953) found at: [HTTP://archive.org/details/1953CoxTestimony](http://archive.org/details/1953CoxTestimony). E.L. Anderson, “Repatriation Is Inevitable.” *Right*, no. 25 (October 1957): 2. For an example of Cox’s own writing for Carto see: Earnest Sevier Cox, 1964. “Brief History of the Back to Africa Movement.” *Western Destiny* 9 (5):11.

¹⁷“Negro Nationalism Surges: A Special Report.” *Right*, no. 46 (July 1959): 2. “Black Muslims on the

On the far-right, the publication of two scholarly books on Black Nationalism inspired Professor Revilo P. Oliver to sound the alarm about the threat of Black Nationalism. Revilo P. Oliver (he claimed he was the fifth generation of first-born Oliver males to sport the first name, a palindrome of the last name), was a professor of Classics at the University of Illinois. He began his political career firmly in the respectable right, writing short pieces for his close friend William F. Buckley, who once described Oliver as “the single most erudite man I have ever known.” In 1958, Buckley was dismayed to find that a number of his writers were also on the governing board of the John Birch Society (JBS) which was formed by candy manufacturer, Robert Welch. Welch was deeply concerned by the International Communist Conspiracy. Most of the founding Council of the JBS, as listed in *The Blue Book* (the manifesto that launched the Society), were businessmen. There were eighteen businessmen, one of which was Fred Koch, father of the infamous Koch brothers who are still deeply involved in conservative politics. Oliver and Notre Dame law professor Clarence Manion were the lone academics on the Council. It is not clear that Buckley’s wariness of the JBS was because he feared the competition or if he had genuine concerns about the over-the-top conspiratorial rhetoric of the JBS. What we do know is that by 1962, Buckley made clear that the JBS was hurting the conservative cause more than helping it because of their outrageous claims about the International Communist Conspiracy.¹⁸

Buckley’s excommunication of the JBS made little impact on Oliver. By then he had switched from *National Review* to the JBS’s official house organ, *American Opinion*. It was there where he published his analysis of the Black Muslims. Oliver’s piece dripped with racist stereotypes that would have been worthy of the most redneck southerner, and Oliver’s essay was in fact reprinted in the segregationist Citizen Council magazine. Oliver warned that the Black Muslim pledge to abstain from alcohol, drugs, and crime might *appear* to be praiseworthy, in fact, those requirements were necessary to constrain his follower’s natural “appetites and impulses.” Illinois could not be part of the Nation of Islam’s Black homeland because “climate is bad and that there are many manufacturing plants that the white devils will have to operate to supply the Black Republic.” For Oliver, it was clear that the Black Muslims could not have possibly been as clever as they appear to the outsider since the black mind was incapable of such subtle planning, “It is obvious” he concluded “that Elijah’s operations are conducted with a shrewdness and strategy that cannot have emanated from his own mind. It is also obvious that they conform perfectly to the standard pattern that the Conspiracy uses to excite race war throughout the world.” Significantly, Oliver omitted the near-mandatory modifier “Communist” before the word “Conspiracy.” This signaled Oliver’s imminent departure from the JBS. Three years later, in 1966, Oliver was out of the JBS, just as he was off of the *National Review* roster earlier. In his resignation, Oliver denied that he was antisemitic, but claimed that he had given a speech that nonetheless had offended some

Rampage” *U.S. News & World Report* 53 (August 13, 1962): 6. Aubrey Barnette and Edward Linne “Black Muslims Are a Fraud.” *Saturday Evening Post* 238 (February 27, 1965): 23–29. Herbert Krosney, “America’s Black Supremacists.” *Nation* 192 (May 6, 1961): 390–92.

¹⁸William F. Buckley Jr., *Cruising Speed--a Documentary* (New York: Bantam, 1972): 97. Welch, Robert. *Blue Book*. Belmont: John Birch Society, 1959, online at: [HTTP://archive.org/details/TheBlueBook](http://archive.org/details/TheBlueBook). On Buckley and the JBS see Felzenberg, *A Man and His Presidents*: 136-135; and D. J. Mulloy, *The World of the John Birch Society: Conspiracy, Conservatism and the Cold War*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2014.

super-sensitive Jews, “thus endangering the supply of what Mr. Welch calla ’Jew money.’” We will pick up Oliver’s story in a subsequent chapter, including his descent into the Nazi right wing and his role in inspiring Timothy McVeigh’s bombing of the Federal building in Oklahoma in 1995 which killed 168 people. Back in 1963, at the *National Review*, there was a different opinion of the Black Muslims, one that matched more closely to Carto’s than to Oliver’s.¹⁹

The respectable *National Review* in a sneering editorial presumably written by Buckley, mocked the idea that African Americans should be demanding complete integration into the United States. This demand for “the evanescence of color” was foolish and “doomed to founder on the shoals of existing human attitudes -their own included....they are tough and sharp, a graveyard for any dreamboat that tries to glide over them.” However, “a voice is cutting through the hubbub of anxiety which rises from the knowledge, by both sides, that there is *no* solution, as solutions go, to our dilemma” and it was that of Elijah Muhammad who, Buckley argued, called for a racial apartheid along the lines of South Africa. Since the true racial integration was impossible, Buckley found such a solution more and more likely: “the progenitive ugliness distracts less and less from the fact that at least here is a man with a Program. And as other programs fail, which they will, his Program will loom larger and larger.” Carto’s program, The Joint Council on Repatriation, went nowhere, however. As Revido Oliver later recalled Carto’s “suddenly resurrected American Colonization Society,” was just “as suddenly returned to its century-hallowed tomb after the pitch was made” and was just “another hit-and-run operation” by Carto. However, it did help inspire another advocate for a separate homeland for African Americans: Murray Rothbard.²⁰

Murray Rothbard and Racial Separation

While not a household name as much as Ayn Rand and Milton Friedman are, Floyd Arthur Harper (1905-1973), who wrote under the name F.A. Harper and who was known to his friends by the ungenerous nickname “Baldy” was an important figure in the post-World War II libertarian movement. Baldy Harper is remembered more for his organizational prowess than his writings, but comparing his writings to that of the racist right of the 1950s shows how much the libertarian rhetoric of “freedom” served the ends of the racist right.

An agricultural economist, Harper moved from Cornell University in 1946 to join the staff of the Foundation for Economic Education (FEE), Harper, who moved further and further right in the 1950s into the camp of anarcho-capitalism with Murray Rothbard, left FEE in 1958 to join the staff of the William Volker Fund, which had been subsidizing libertarian thinkers and publications throughout the 1950s. At Volker, Harper pitched his idea of the Institute for Humane Studies (IHS) an educational outreach institute to push free market principles and ideas. Unfortunately for him, his ideas were insufficiently Christian for the Fund’s manager, Harold W. Luhnow, who had fallen under the spell of R.J. Rushdoony, who believed that libertarianism had to be grounded in his own particularly narrow form of

¹⁹Revido P. Oliver, “Black Muslims,” *American Opinion* 6, no. 1 (1963): 29, 31. This essay was reprinted as “The Black Muslims,” *The Citizen* (May 1963): 7-24. Oliver’s resignation letter is here: [HTTP://archive.org/details/RevidoOliverResignationFromJohnBirchSociety](http://archive.org/details/RevidoOliverResignationFromJohnBirchSociety).

²⁰“Enter Muhammed?” *National Review* 14 (July 2, 1963): 520, 521. Revido P. Oliver to Colonel Dall, 17 December 1970, in Pedro Del Valle Papers, University of Oregon Archives, Box 4.

Calvinism. Harper, cut off from Volker funds by the early 1960s, founded the IHS eventually settling in permanent offices in Menlo Park, California. For a brief time the IHS claimed to be associated with Stanford University until Stanford took him to court and the court “ordered not to use the Stanford name in his organization.” The IHS “Board of Advisors” included many high-profile libertarians including Chodorov, Lefevre, Rothbard, his mentor Ludwig van Mises, Austrian economist Fredrich von Hayek, co-founder of *Human Events* Felix Morley, historian James J. Martin, and G. Warren Nutter. Today, the IHS is associated with George Mason University thanks to one of Harper’s biggest fans, Charles Koch, who subsidizes the enterprise generously and has been on the Board of Advisors since the beginning.²¹

In 1955 Harper wrote one of the very few libertarian responses to *Brown v. Board of Education*. Harper criticized the decision, not for the outcome about which he remained silent, but for the reasons for the decision. Brown held that regardless of the quality of the segregated facilities, “To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone.” Harper’s piece appeared in 1955, a year after the decision. He argued that *Brown* was a “Decree of Racial Inferiority” because:

Is not this opinion clearly discriminatory against the Negro race? It is, beyond question, based on the idea that the exclusive company of Negroes in school is somehow lacking in educational opportunity. If the nine Supreme Court Justices did not themselves each believe that Whites are superior to Negroes, surely they would not have supported the opinion which says, in effect, that Whites are superior to Negroes.²²

Harper’s piece appeared in 1955, a year after the decision. Perhaps he just read the opinion late, perhaps the *Freeman* where it was published had a backlog of pieces and it waited in the queue for a year. Or, perhaps it was because Harper read this:

In the two nation-shattering decisions made by the Supreme Court the question of Negro racial inferiority was considered. In the *Dred Scott* case Chief Justice Taney considered the concept held by certain white men that the Negro was so inferior that it was a blessing for him to be enslaved by the white man.

²¹On the Volker fund and Rushdoony see Michael J. McVicar, *Christian Reconstruction: R.J. Rushdoony and American Religious Conservatism* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2015): 61-78. On Stanford and the court order see Lyle M. Nelson to Group Research, Inc 21 September 1964, Group Research Records, Box 176, Columbia University. On the names associated with IHS see "Institute for Human Study" 1966 and "Institute for Humane Study" 1970 both in Group Research, Inc. Records, Box 176, Columbia University. On Koch’s funding currently see: [HTTP://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php/Institute_for_Humane_Studies](http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php/Institute_for_Humane_Studies).

²²*Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* 347 U.S. 483, online at: [HTTP://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/347/483](http://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/347/483). F.A. Harper, “A Decree of Racial Inferiority.” *Freeman* 5 (May 1955): 8. This argument misunderstands the why the Court found what it did, see John P. Jackson Jr., *Social Scientists for Social Justice: Making the Case Against Segregation*. (New York: New York University Press, 2001).

In the School Desegregation decision Chief Justice Warren imputed to the Negro a sense of inferiority when placed in Negro schools with Negro teachers.²³

This second quotation was also published in 1955 and the author was Earnest Sevier Cox. The response to *Brown* was not the only similarity between Harper's views and those of Cox. *Western Destiny* published a letter from Harper supporting the idea of getting rid of anyone who does not really belong here:

The idea you keep stressing of repatriation of persons who by nature or preference are not in accord with the traditions of this country is a potent idea. If put into effect, this could have a valuable effect on internal peace and harmony. This proposal should not be thought of as purely a color distinction either. If any person prefers some social arrangement now operating in some other land, let him go there peacefully, rather than to remain here and generate civil war.²⁴

Far more than Harper, Murray Rothbard offered the most elaborate explanation for how libertarian ideology supported racial separation. To understand his reasoning we need to start at a counter intuitive place: Rothbard's defense of the South in the American Civil War. Many of Rothbard's arguments were eventually adopted by the contemporary "neo-Confederate" movement such as the idea that the North, not the South, was to blame for the outbreak of hostilities owing to the "maneuvering of Lincoln to induce the Southerners to fire the first shot on Fort Sumter." No doubt slavery was an evil, but the Northern Republicans were committed to "old Federalist-Whig principles: to high tariffs, to internal improvements and government subsidies, to paper money and government banking, etc.: Thus,"Libertarian principles were now split between the two parties." In other words, high tariffs and greenback currency were as evil as enslaving millions of human beings. It was just too tough to pick a side in this for Rothbard.²⁵

Rothbard believed that secession was the very heart of his libertarianism. Every individual had the right to leave the Nation, "secession need not, and should not, have been combated by the North; and so we must pin the blame on the North for aggressive war against the seceding South." Rothbard showed no concern that secession might have continued, or at least extended, slavery: the right to secede was freedom itself. Rothbard's found the North filled with a "fanatical millennialist fervor, of a cheerful willingness to uproot institutions, to commit mayhem and mass murder, to plunder and loot and destroy, all in the name of high moral principle and the birth of a perfect world." Rothbard's defense of the South parroted "John C. Calhoun, the great intellectual leader of South Carolina, and indeed of the entire South" in his condemnation of taxation, which in his view justified southern secession.²⁶

²³Earnest Sevier Cox, *Unending Hate: Supreme Court School Decision a Milestone in the Federal Program to Break the Will of the White South in Its Dedicated Purpose to Remain White*. Richmond: Earnest Sevier Cox, 1955.

²⁴F.A. Harper, "Letter to the Editor," *Western Destiny* 10, no. 5 (May 1965): 2.

²⁵Murray N. Rothbard, "Slavery and War: Excerpted from a 30,000-word Memo to the Volker Fund, 1961," found at: [HTTP://web.archive.org/web/20140709022939/http://www.lewrockwell.com:80/1970/01/murray-n-rothbard/slavery-and-civil-war/](http://web.archive.org/web/20140709022939/http://www.lewrockwell.com:80/1970/01/murray-n-rothbard/slavery-and-civil-war/)

²⁶Murray N. Rothbard, "America's Two Just Wars: 1775 and 1861," In *The Costs of War: America's Pyrrhic Victories*, edited by John V. Denson, (New Brunswick: Transaction, 1997): 129, 127. On Rothbard's admiration for Calhoun see his fawning treatment of him in his masterwork: *Man, Economy, and State*;

In 1963, Rothbard argued that the first civil rights organization, the NAACP used “the courts instead of the streets, i.e. to confine the Negro movement to State processes, instead of direct action by the masses.” But, since segregation hadn’t budged, since the *Brown* decision almost a decade before, African Americans got “restive and understandably so.” Thus began the wave of the “center” marked by the non-violent resistance of Martin Luther King, Jr.: The bus boycotts, the sit-ins, etc. Each succeeding wave of African-American leadership was more radical than the last. Past leaders must struggle to keep abreast, thus the NAACP had to approve of mass protests in order to remain credible. Rothbard noted that African Americans had finally thrown off the shackles of non-violence and have loudly announced that they will defend themselves against racist police officers and other representatives of the white state. Rothbard thought that we were on the brink of a Negro revolution that may succeed or be defused. For the Black Muslims, and other “more radical groups...it means a Negro nation in the Black Belt of the South.” Like Harper, Rothbard had been tracking Carto’s leadership on this issue in the white right, “The Muslims are a highly interesting movement,” he wrote, “which received favorable publicity years ago in the ultra-right-wing *Right* magazine. The Muslims have a far more libertarian program than the other Negro organizations, opposed to compulsory integration. Indeed, as a Negro nationalist movement, they favor voluntary segregation of the races, preferably in a Negro nation in the “Black Belt” of the South, or in a Negro return to Africa.” Rothbard looked to *Right* to support his own advocacy of Black Nationalists’ calls for a racial homeland.²⁷

Rothbard’s embrace of Black Nationalism was not an aberration from his anarcho-capitalism, it was central to it. Just as he believed the slave-holding South had every right to break away from the tyranny of Northern taxation, so too did *any* ethnic minority have the right to self-rule and break away from the United States. As the Black Power movement grew more vocal in the nineteen-sixties, many whites responded by embracing their own white ethnicity—a movement bloomed fully in the nineteen-seventies. Rothbard believed throughout his long career every race should have its own distinct homeland and denied that this was a racist view: “Is a genuine apartheid solution ‘racist?’ But what sort of ideologues combine together two very different doctrines: racial domination, and racial separation, and call them both ‘racist?’ Why is it ‘racist’ to want to be left alone?” Rothbard was, for a brief time, a supporter of the Black Panthers. His language when he withdrew his support in 1969 was telling: “All this means that we should, at the very least, withdraw our enthusiasm from the Panthers. In any event, it is the responsibility of whites to build the white movement, and to concentrate our time and energies therefore on white rather than black affairs.” The libertarian movement was a white movement and *we* should stop

a Treatise on Economic Principles. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1962. Also: Murray N. Rothbard, 1961. “Conservatism and Freedom: A Libertarian Comment.” *Modern Age* 11:217–20.

²⁷Murray N. Rothbard, “The Negro Revolution,” *New Individualist Review* 3, no. 1 (1963): 30, 33, 35. Rothbard’s first essay on “Negro Nationalism” appeared the same year as a very similar essay by A. James Gregor, later to become a professor of political science at Berkeley. Like Rothbard, Gregor urged that Black Nationalism should be taken seriously. In 1963, Gregor was working with Carto’s close associates and other segregationists on legal cases to aimed at overturning *Brown*. A. James Gregor, “Black Nationalism: A Preliminary Analysis of Negro Radicalism.” *Science & Society* 27 no. 4 (1963):415–32. On the origins of Gregor’s essay and his work to preserve segregation see John P. Jackson Jr, *Science for Segregation: Race, Law, and the Case Against Brown v. Board of Education* (New York: New York University Press, 2005): 106-110, 194-5.

meddling in *black* affairs. An added advantage of a Black Republic for African Americans, Rothbard explained to historian Harry Elmer Barnes in 1966 was that “we’d get the Negroes off our backs!!!”²⁸

The chief ideologue of Carto’s racial separatist views in the 1970s and 1990s was Wilmot Robertson, a pseudonym for Humphrey Ireland, a reclusive writer who began Howard Allen Press, which published many intellectual defenses of scientific racial separatism. Through a series of books and his own slickly-produced magazine, *Instauration*, Robertson became the chief intellect behind racial nationalism. In the most important of these works, *The Ethnostate*, Robertson called for carving the planet into racial exclusive enclaves. “It is perhaps the only peaceful and sensible means of assuring white survival in an increasingly antiwhite, nonwhite world. Withdrawal and reorganization, devolution to ensure evolution would seem to be the most logical and intelligent road to salvation for a people-and possibly a planet-facing extinction (Robertson 1992, 224). This similarities between Robertson’s vision and Rothbard’s vision has not been lost on Alt Right though leaders, even as they remain suspicious of Rothbard’s Jewishness: “Murray Rothbard (Jew) noted that the truth about racial differences should be shouted from the rooftops in order to preserve a libertarian society. He stated that if you scratch an egalitarian, you will find a statist and held that opposition to Martin Luther King Jr. was true mark of a libertarian. He even endorsed something approaching the ethnostate”²⁹

Toward Holocaust Denial

The particular form of the racist ideology shared by Carto and Rothbard manifested itself in a related, if unexpected way. It paved the way for Carto’s most lasting contribution to the racist right: Holocaust denial. The Cold War split the political right. Before World War II, conservatives were hesitant to become involved in another European conflict and it was not until Pearl Harbor that isolationism surrendered to intervention. After the war and the dropping of the “Iron Curtain” over Europe, the right was of at least two minds. On the one hand, many saw the threat of International Communism as demanding a vigorous and active involvement in the world. On the other, many on the libertarian right argued for a complete withdrawal into pre-war isolationism. The split between the Cold Warriors and the isolationists also split *Human Events* in the 1950s, one of the few outlets for conservative political thought. William F. Buckley, Jr., who would soon become the gatekeeper of the respectable right soon embraced only Cold Warriors.

²⁸Murray N. Rothbard, “The Vital Importance of Separation.” The Rothbard-Rockwell Report 5, no. 4 (April 1994): 1: 8. Rothbard, “The Panthers And Black Liberation.” The Libertarian 1, no. 4 (May 15, 1969): 3. Rothbard to Harry Elmer Barnes, 30 July 1966, James Martin Papers, American Historical Center, Laramie Wyoming.

²⁹Wilmot Robertson, *The Ethnostate: An Unblinkered Prospectus for an Advanced Statecraft* (Cape Canaveral: Howard Allen, 1992), 224; at: [HTTP://archive.org/details/TheEthnostate](http://archive.org/details/TheEthnostate). Gregory Hood, 2010. “White Nationalism The Only Realistic Solution.” *The Occidental Quarterly*, March 17. [HTTP://web.archive.org/web/20170216055416/http://www.toqonline.com/blog/white-nationalism-the-only-realistic-solution/](http://web.archive.org/web/20170216055416/http://www.toqonline.com/blog/white-nationalism-the-only-realistic-solution/). For background on Robertson see: Mitch Berbrier, “Impression Management for the Thinking Racist: A Case Study of Intellectualization as Stigma Transformation in Contemporary White Supremacist Discourse.” *Sociological Quarterly* 40: (1990):411–33.

For the antisemitic right, Jews are biologically selected to live parasitically on their racial superiors and hence have produced and maintained a false story of genocide in order to propagate the state of Israel. If one is interested in resuscitating hardcore racist thought, it helps one's cause to deny that such thought leads to genocide. This stance eventually transformed into Carto founding the *Journal of Historical Review*. What is less well-documented is how libertarians prepared the ground for institutionalized Holocaust denial following World War II. Libertarians were willing to join forces with antisemites in order to progress their political agenda. Many right wing historians labored to show that Hitler had been the victim of British aggression and that Roosevelt had tricked the Japanese into the Pearl Harbor attack to force the US into war. Of these figures, Harry Elmer Barnes was the most notable. Barnes had been an important figure in rethinking the origins of World War I, arguing that Germany could not be entirely blamed for hostilities. After World War II he was determined to repeat his earlier triumph, turning out self-published pamphlets arguing that Roosevelt, not Hitler, was responsible for the war and that "Court Historians" were covering up the truth. Writing to Harry Elmer Barnes in 1955, libertarian James J. Martin asked, "When is someone going to debunk this story of the 6,000,000 Jews murdered in the concentration camps? Jewish population after the war was larger than in 1938." (Martin to Barnes, 13 July 1955, Martin Papers)

Libertarians would soon provide a forum for right wing historians to write--against America's entry in the war. Libertarians attempted to equalize Allied and Axis culpability for the war as well as claiming that American and German war "atrocities" were roughly the same. The arguments first developed in libertarian journals were eventually adopted in full by Carto's racist right. For example, every article in the Spring 1966 issue of the libertarian journal *Rampart*, was eventually reprinted by Carto's Institute for Historical Review. The next chapter investigates how libertarians seeded the ground for the full flowering of modern Holocaust denial.