

# 自由意志主义“右”对了

Getting Libertarianism Right

[美] 汉斯-赫尔曼·霍普 著

HANS-HERMANN HOPPE

李三 译

道老师 校

人的行为研究社区

## 文档制作：人的行为研究社区

制作时间：2023 年 11 月 26 日

最后修订：2023 年 11 月

米塞斯学院 网址：<https://mises.org/>

奥地利经济学派经典作品的英文版本都能在米塞斯学院网站获取

## 打印装订建议：

可参照如下建议打印装订成册：

- 1、打印时更改布局页面设置为：页边距：内侧：5.8 cm；外侧：1.5 cm
- 2、页码范围→多页处，选 对称页边距
- 3、应用于 选 整篇文档
- 4、本文档适合 A4 纸双面自动打印，裁切为 18 cm \* 25 cm 规格装订

# 目 录

目 录 .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
第一章 .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
第二章 .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
第三章 .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
第四章 .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

# Introduction by Sean Gabb

引言 肖恩·加布

THE WRITINGS COLLECTED IN THIS book are mostly addresses given in Bodrum to the Property and Freedom Society, of which Professor Hoppe is both Founder and President. I was fortunate to hear them read out to the gathering, and I am deeply honoured to have been asked to provide an Introduction to the published versions.

本书中收集的文章，大多是在博德鲁姆举办的财产与自由协会时的演讲，霍普教授是该协会的创始人和主席。我很幸运地听到他们在聚会上朗读，我很荣幸被邀请为出版的版本做一个介绍。

I will divide my Introduction into three sections. First, I will give a brief overview of Hoppe's early life and intellectual development. Second, I will write at greater length about the academic work that has placed him at the head of the international libertarian movement. Third, I will discuss the main theme or themes that emerge from the present collection.

我将把我的引言分为三个部分。首先，我将简要介绍一下霍普的早期生活和智力发展。其次，我将更详尽地论述，他成为国际自由意志主义运动领袖的学术工作。第三，我将讨论这本文集要表达的主题。

## HOPPE: CHILD OF THE WEST GERMAN SETTLEMENT

Hans-Hermann Hoppe was born on the 2nd September 1949 in Peine, a town in the British Sector of occupied Germany. After attending various local schools, he first went to the University of Saarland in Saarbrücken and from here moved to the Goethe University in Frankfurt, where he studied under the notable neo-Marxist Jürgen Habermas, who also served as the principal advisor for Hoppe's doctoral dissertation in Philosophy on David Hume and Immanuel Kant. In those days, Hoppe was himself a Marxist, and had no serious differences with his master. He said later: "What I liked about Marxism is that it made the attempt to provide a rigorous,

deductively derived system.<sup>1</sup> To any external observer, he was following a path followed by many thousands of his generation. It should, in the normal course of things, have ended in a tenured post in which his duty, under cover of spreading disaffection, was to preach conformity to the new order of things in West Germany.

1949年9月2日，汉斯-赫尔曼·霍普出生在英国占领地区的德国小镇佩纳。在当地的各所学校毕业之后，他首先去了萨尔布尔肯的萨尔大学，之后又从这里去了法兰克福的歌德大学，在那里他师从著名的新马克思主义者约尔根·哈贝马斯，他也是霍普关于大卫·休谟和伊曼努尔·康德的哲学博士论文的主要导师。在那些日子里，霍普自己就是一个马克思主义者，和他的导师没有什么严重的分歧。他后来说：“我……马克思主义的优点在于它试图提供一个严谨的、演绎推导的体系。”在任何一个旁观者看来，他所走的道路是他那一代成千上万人都走过的。按照事情的正常进程，他应该终老于一个终身职位，在这个职位上，他的职责是在散布不满情绪的掩护下，鼓吹遵从西德的新秩序。

However, what he soon disliked about Marxism was its failure as an intellectual system. His disenchantment was a gradual process, and he went through a period in which he was influenced by Karl Popper, and was even a social democrat in politics. His final break with leftism came while writing his habilitation thesis on the foundations of sociology and economics. He began with the notion that, while certain truths about the world can be known a priori, the laws of Economics and Sociology are at least largely known by induction. He then rejected this, moving to the view that Economics, in contrast to Sociology, is an entirely deductive science. This, then, led him to the discovery of Ludwig von Mises. Here was a system that made the same ambitious claims as Marxism. Austrianism was a set of interlocking and largely deductive theories of Economics, Politics, Law, and much else. Unlike Marxism, it held together intellectually. It also generated true knowledge about the world. The last step

---

<sup>1</sup> “The Private Property Order: An Interview with Hans-Hermann Hoppe,” Austrian Economics Newsletter 18, no. 1 (2014). Available here: <https://mises.org/library/private-property-order-interview-hans-hermann-hoppe> – checked, November 2015.

《私有财产秩序：汉斯-赫尔曼·霍普访谈》，《奥地利经济通讯》，第18期。1(2014)。 <https://mises.org/library/private-property-order-interview-hans-hermann-hoppe> - 检查，2015年11月。

remaining on this new and unpredicted path was to discover Murray Rothbard. Hoppe ended the 1970s as a radical free market libertarian. No longer welcome at any West German university, in 1985 he left for the United States.

然而，他很快就不喜欢马克思主义，认为它是一种知识体系的失败。他的觉醒是一个渐进的过程，他经历了一段受卡尔·波普尔影响的时期，甚至在政治上是一个社会民主主义者。在撰写关于社会学和经济学基础的教授论文时，他与左派的最后决裂。他首先提出这样的观点：虽然世界上的某些真理可以先验地认识，但经济学和社会学的规律至少在很大程度上是通过归纳法认识的。然后，他拒绝了这一点，转而认为，与社会学相比，经济学完全是一门演绎科学。这一点引领他发现了路德维希·冯·米塞斯。这是一个与马克思主义同样雄心勃勃的体系。奥地利学派是一套环环相扣的、很大程度上是演绎的经济学、政治学、法学以及其他许多领域的理论。与马克思主义不同，它在思想上是团结一致的。它也产生了关于世界的真实知识。在这条意想不到的新道路上，剩下的最后一步就是发现默里·罗斯巴德。20世纪70年代末，霍普成了一名激进的自由市场的自由意志主义者。他不再受到西德大学的欢迎，于1985年去了美国。

## HOPPE: HEIR OF ROTHBARD

Until 1986, he taught in New York under Rothbard's supervision, "working and living side-by-side with him, in constant and immediate personal contact." They then moved together to teach at the University of Nevada in Las Vegas. Here, they stood at the centre of what became "the Las Vegas Circle" - a grouping of libertarian economists and philosophers as brilliant and productive as any in the entire history of the libertarian movement. Other members of the Circle included Yuri Maltsev, Doug French, and Lee Iglody. Hoppe remained in Las Vegas as a Professor until 2008. But he admits that nothing was ever the same after Rothbard's untimely death in 1995. He saw Rothbard as his "principal teacher, mentor and master," and as his "dearest fatherly friend."

直到1986年，他都在罗斯巴德的指导下在纽约教书，“和罗斯巴德一起工作和生活，保持着经常和直接的个人联系。”后来，他们一起搬到拉斯维加斯的内华达大学教书。在这里，他们站在后来的“拉斯维加斯圈”的中心——一群自由意志主义经济学家和哲学家，他们在自由意志主义运动的整个历史上都是杰出且多产的。这个圈子的其他成员包括尤里·马尔采夫、道格拉斯·弗兰奇和李·伊格洛迪。霍普一直在拉斯维加斯担任教授，直到2008年。但他承认，1995年罗斯巴德英年早逝后，一切都变了。他视罗

斯巴德为“主要的老师、导师和大师”，是他“最亲爱的父亲般的朋友”。

Though he produced much other work during his time with Rothbard and after, his most important contribution, both to libertarianism and to Philosophy in general, is probably his work on what he calls Argumentation Ethics. Every secular ideology appears to rest on shaky foundations. Free market libertarianism is no exception. Why should people be left alone? Why should they be free? We can argue that freedom allows people to make themselves happier than they would otherwise be. We can argue that it lets them become richer. The response is to ask why people should be happy or rich. These may be self-evident goods, but are not always so regarded. A further objection is to start picking holes in the definition and measurement of happiness. Or we can claim that every human being is born with certain natural and inalienable rights, and that these include the rights to life, liberty, and property. The objection here is to ask how, without God as their grantor, these claimed rights are other than an exercise in verbal flatulence.

尽管在与罗斯巴德共事期间及之后，他创作了许多其他作品，但他对自由意志主义和一般哲学最重要的贡献，可能是他所称的论辩伦理学。每一种世俗意识形态似乎都建立在不稳固的基础上。自由市场的自由意志主义也不例外。为什么要让人们独处？他们为什么要自由？我们可以说，有自由比没有自由让人们更快乐。我们可以说，这让他们变得更富有。回答是问为什么人们应该快乐或富有。这些可能是不言而喻的优点，但人们并不总是这样认为。另一个反对意见是，开始在幸福的定义和衡量上吹毛求疵。或者我们可以宣称，每个人生来就拥有某些自然的、不可剥夺的权利，这些权利包括生命权、自由权和财产权。这里的反对意见是要问，没有上帝作为他们的赐予者，这些声称的权利如何不是口头上的放屁。

Hayek and von Mises, the two men who did most during the middle of the twentieth century to keep classical liberalism alive as an ideology, were various kinds of utilitarian. Rothbard, who took Austrian Economics and fused it with native American radicalism to create the modern libertarian movement, shared a belief with Ayn Rand in natural rights. For many years, until more practical disputes emerged after the end of the Cold War, almost every libertarian gathering involved a rehearsal of the differences between the two schools of foundation.

哈耶克和米塞斯，这两位 20 世纪中期，保卫古典自由主义作为一种意识形态做出了最大贡献，他们是不同的功利主义者。罗斯巴德将奥地利经济学与美国本土激进主

义相融合，创造了现代自由意志主义运动，他与安·兰德(Ayn Rand)对自然权利有着共同的信仰。多年来，直到冷战结束后出现了更多实际的争议，几乎每次自由意志主义者的聚会，都涉及到两种基础学派之间的分歧。

What Hoppe tries with his Argumentation Ethics, is to transcend this debate. In doing this, he draws on his early work with Habermas, on the Kantian tradition of German Philosophy, and on the ethical writings of Rothbard. He begins with the observation that there are two ways of settling any dispute. One is force. The other is argument. Any one party to a dispute who chooses force has stepped outside the norms of civilization, which include the avoidance of aggressive force, and has no right to complain if he is used very harshly. Anyone who chooses argument, on the other hand, has accepted these norms. If he then argues for the rightness of force as a means of getting what he wants from others, he is engaging in logical contradiction. In short, whoever rejects the libertarian non-aggression principle is necessarily also rejecting the norms of rational discourse. Whoever claims to accept these norms must also accept the non-aggression principle.<sup>1</sup>

霍普在《论证伦理学》一文中试图超越这种争论。在此过程中，他借鉴了早期与哈贝马斯的合作，借鉴了德国哲学的康德传统，以及罗斯巴德的伦理著作。他首先指出，解决任何争端都有两种方法。一个是武力，另一个是论证。争端的任何一方如果选择使用武力，就已经超出了文明规范的范围，文明规范包括避免使用侵犯性的武力，因此，如果他受到非常严厉的对待，他没有权利抱怨。另一方面，任何选择论证的人都已经接受了这些规范。如果他接着为武力作为一种从别人那里得到他想要的东西的手段而辩护，他就陷入了逻辑矛盾。简而言之，拒绝自由主义不侵犯原则的人必然也拒绝理性话语的规范。无论谁声称接受这些准则，则必然接受不侵犯原则。

Speaking long after first publication, Hoppe denied that this was a retreat from natural rights:

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Hans-Hermann Hoppe, "The Ultimate Justification of the Private Property Ethic," Liberty, September 1988. Available here: [http://www.hanshoppe.com/wp-content/uploads/publications/hoppe\\_ult\\_just\\_liberty.pdf](http://www.hanshoppe.com/wp-content/uploads/publications/hoppe_ult_just_liberty.pdf) - checked November 2015.

例如，见 Hans-Hermann Hoppe, 《私有财产伦理的终极正当性》，《自由》，1988 年 9 月。可在这里：[http://www.hanshoppe.com/wp-content/uploads/publications/hoppe\\_ult\\_just\\_liberty.pdf](http://www.hanshoppe.com/wp-content/uploads/publications/hoppe_ult_just_liberty.pdf) - 2015 年 11 月检查。



I was attempting to make the first two chapters of Rothbard's *Ethics of Liberty* stronger than they were. That in turn would provide more weight to everything that followed. I had some dissatisfaction with [the] rigor with which the initial ethical assumptions of libertarian political theory had been arrived at. Intuitively, they seemed plausible. But I could see that a slightly different approach might be stronger. Murray never considered my revisions to be a threat. His only concern was: does this ultimately make the case? Ultimately, he agreed that it did.<sup>1</sup>

Indeed, Rothbard gave the theory his highest praise. He called it

a dazzling breakthrough for political philosophy in general and for libertarianism in particular. . . . [Hoppe] has managed to transcend the famous is/ought, fact/value dichotomy that has plagued philosophy since the days of the Scholastics, and that had brought modern libertarianism into a tiresome deadlock.<sup>2</sup>

在首次出版很久之后，霍普否认这是对自然权利的一次退却：

我试图加强罗斯巴德《自由的伦理》前两章的表达力度。这反过来又会为接下来的一切提供更多的权重。我对自由意志主义政治理论的最初伦理假设的严谨性有些不满。直觉上，它们似乎是可信的。但我可以看出，稍微不同的方法可能会更强大。默里从没把我的修改当成威胁。他唯一关心的是：这最终能成立吗？最终，他同意了这一点。

事实上，罗斯巴德对这一理论给予了最高的赞扬。他称其为一般政治哲学，特别是自由意志主义的一个令人赞叹不已的突破。[霍普]成功地超越了著名的是/应该、事实/价值二分法，这种二分法自经院哲学家时代以来就一直困扰着哲学体系，并使现代自由意志主义陷入了令人厌烦的僵局。

If Rothbard was the obvious leading intellectual of the libertarian movement, Hoppe

---

<sup>1</sup> "The Private Property Order."

《私有财产法令》。

<sup>2</sup> Symposium, "Hans-Hermann Hoppe's Argumentation Ethics: Break-through or Buncombe?" *Liberty*, November 1988. Available at [http://www.libertyunbound.com/sites/files/printarchive/Liberty\\_Magazine\\_November\\_1988.pdf](http://www.libertyunbound.com/sites/files/printarchive/Liberty_Magazine_November_1988.pdf) - checked November 2015.

研讨会，“汉斯-赫尔曼·霍普的论证伦理学：突破还是毁灭？”自由，1988年11月。可在 [http://www.libertyunbound.com/sites/files/printarchive/Liberty\\_Magazine\\_November\\_1988.pdf](http://www.libertyunbound.com/sites/files/printarchive/Liberty_Magazine_November_1988.pdf) - 检查 2015 年 11 月。

was his obvious and chosen successor. By the time of Rothbard's death, he had made solid contributions not only to foundational ethics, but also to Economics, Politics and Law. He was an inspiring teacher and a public speaker in demand all over the world. There was no one in America or in the world at large better qualified to take up where Rothbard had left off. He now became the editor of The Journal of Libertarian Studies, and a co-editor of the Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics.

如果说罗斯巴德是自由意志主义运动中显而易见的知识分子领袖，那么霍普就是他显而易见的、被选中的接班人。到罗斯巴德去世时，他不仅在基础伦理学方面，而且在经济学、政治学和法学方面都做出了坚实的贡献。他是一位鼓舞人心的老师，也是一位在全世界都很受欢迎的公众演说家。在美国乃至全世界，没有人比他更有资格继承罗斯巴德的遗志。他现在是《自由意志主义研究杂志》的编辑，也是《奥地利经济学季刊》的联合编辑。

Rothbard himself, though, was not universally accepted within the libertarian movement. One of his numerous talents had been for making enemies. He had many reasons for making, or just for attracting, enemies. He was an isolationist in an age when the American Right defined itself by opposition to Communism and the Soviet Union. He was sceptical of big business in a movement that was largely in love with American capitalism. He was an anarchist among economists who were feeling their way towards privatisation and deregulation. He saw every step of America's ascent to world power as a betrayal of the American Way. He was variously in alliance with leftists and with ultra-conservatives. He was at open war with the utilitarian statist and soft money advocates of the Chicago School. He was soon out of sorts with the Cato Institute which he had done much to found. He was scathing in his contempt for political correctness and the very idea of a universal equality that went beyond an equality of negative rights.

然而，罗斯巴德本人在自由意志主义运动中并没有被普遍接受。他的众多才能之一就是树敌。他有很多理由制造敌人，或者仅仅是吸引敌人。在那个美国右翼以反对共产主义和苏联来定义自己的时代，他是一个孤立主义者。在一场很大程度上热爱美国资本主义的运动中，他对大企业持怀疑态度。他是一名无政府主义者，当时的经济学家正摸索着走向私有化和放松管制。他认为美国崛起为世界强国的每一步都是对美国方式的背叛。他在不同程度上与左派和极端保守派结盟。他公开与功利主义的中央集权主义者和芝加哥学派的软货币倡导者开战。不久，他就对他苦心经营的卡托研究所感

到厌烦了。他尖刻地蔑视政治正确，蔑视超越消极权利平等的普遍平等观念。

Hoppe is a still more divisive figure. An avowed cul-tural conservative, he has no time for the more hedonistic or leftist strains of libertarianism. From the beginning, his libertarianism has placed more emphasis on property rights than on tolerance. In the Democracy: The God that Failed, he writes that, in his ideal community,

[t]here would be little or no "tolerance" and "openmindedness" so dear to left-libertarians. Instead, one would be on the right path toward restoring the freedom of association and exclusion implied in the institution of private property.<sup>1</sup>

霍普是一个更有争议的人物。作为一名公开的文化保守主义者，他没有时间去考虑自由意志主义中更为享乐主义或更左倾的派别。从一开始，他的自由意志主义就更强调财产权而不是宽容。在《民主:失败的上帝》一书中，他写道，在他的理想社会中，左翼自由意志主义者所珍视的“宽容”和“开放”很少或根本没有。相反，人们将走上恢复私有财产制度所隐含的结社自由和排他性的正确道路。

He adds:

In a covenant concluded among proprietor and community tenants for the purpose of protecting their private property, no such thing as a right to free (unlimited) speech exists, not even to unlimited speech on one's own tenancy. One may say innumerable things and promote almost any idea under the sun, but naturally no one is permitted to advocate ideas contrary to the very purpose of the covenant of preserving and protecting private property, such as democracy and communism. There can be no tolerance toward democrats and communists in a libertarian social order. They will have to be physically separated and expelled from society. Likewise, in a covenant founded for the purpose of protecting family and kin, there can be no tolerance toward those habitually promoting lifestyles incompatible with this goal. They — the advocates of alternative, non-family and kin-centered lifestyles such as, for instance, individual hedonism, parasitism, nature-environment worship,

---

<sup>1</sup> Hans-Hermann Hoppe, Democracy: The God that Failed (New Brunswick, N. J. : Transaction Publishers, 2001), p. 211.

汉斯-赫尔曼·霍普，《民主:失败的上帝》(New Brunswick, n. j. : Transaction Publishers, 2001), 第 211 页。

homosexuality, or communism- will have to be physically removed from society, too, if one is to maintain a libertarian order。<sup>1</sup>

他补充说:在业主和社区租户之间为保护他们的私有财产而订立的契约中, 不存在自由(无限制)言论的权利, 甚至不存在对自己的租户财产的无限制言论。一个人可以说无数的话, 宣扬太阳底下几乎任何一种思想, 但自然没有人被允许提倡与维护和保护私有财产的契约宗旨相悖的思想, 比如民主和共产主义。在自由意志主义的社会秩序中, 不可能容忍民主主义者和共产主义者。他们将不得不在物理上被隔离, 并被驱逐出社会。同样, 在为保护家庭和亲属而建立的盟约中, 不能容忍那些习惯性地提倡与这一目标不相容的生活方式的人。他补充说:在业主和社区租户之间为保护他们的私有财产而订立的契约中, 不存在自由(无限制)言论的权利, 甚至不存在对自己的租户财产的无限制言论。一个人可以说无数的话, 宣扬太阳底下几乎任何一种思想, 但自然没有人被允许提倡与维护和保护私有财产的契约宗旨相悖的思想, 比如民主和共产主义。在自由意志主义的社会秩序中, 不可能容忍民主主义者和共产主义者。他们将不得不在身体上被隔离, 并被驱逐出社会。同样, 在为保护家庭和亲属而建立的盟约中, 不能容忍那些习惯性地提倡与这一目标不相容的生活方式的人。他们——倡导另类的、非家庭的、以亲属为中心的生活方式, 例如, 个人享乐主义、寄生、自然环境崇拜、同性恋或共产主义——如果要维持自由主义秩序, 也必须从社会中移除。

These statements and others of their kind have been and remain wildly controversial within the libertarian movement. I think it no exaggeration to say that just about everyone in the Movement, since about 2000, has defined himself by what he thinks of Hoppe. Some regard him as the greatest living libertarian, others as The Devil. The only point of agreement is that he is a thinker who cannot be ignored.

这些言论和其他类似的言论在自由意志主义运动中一直存在并且仍然存在着巨大的争议。我想可以毫不夸张地说, 从 2000 年开始, 几乎运动中的每个人都用他对霍普的看法来定义自己。一些人认为他是在世的最伟大的自由意志主义者, 另一些人则认为他是魔鬼。唯一的共识是, 他是一位不容忽视的思想家。

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 216-17.

同上, 第 216-17 页。

## THE PRESENT COLLECTION

This being so, [the present collection](#) will be useful as a brief statement of where Hoppe stands on the most important issues within the Movement – and the most important issues of our age. I am sensible of the truth that, while many skip over Introductions, others judge a book by its Introduction. I am therefore more than usually sensible of the need for a brief and accurate summary and discussion of the contents that follow my Introduction.

既然如此，这本文集将有助于简要说明霍普在运动中最重要的问题和我们这个时代最重要的问题上的立场。我意识到这样一个事实：虽然许多人跳过了《引言》，但其他人却只看《引言》来判断一本书。因此，我比通常更清楚地意识到，有必要对我引言之后的内容作一个简短而准确的总结和讨论。

In several places, Hoppe restates and emphasises his view that the basics of libertarianism are derived by a chain of deductive reasoning from undeniable premises. We live in a world of scarcity. Either resources are scarce, or the time in which to use them is scarce. We all have different ideas on how these resources are to be used. Therefore, if we wish to live in a world where conflict over resources is minimised, we must agree on rights of ownership and transfer.

在一些地方，霍普重申并强调了他的观点，即自由意志主义的基础是从不可否认的前提中推导出的一系列演绎推理。我们生活在一个物质匮乏的世界。要么是资源稀缺，要么是使用资源的时间稀缺。对于如何使用这些资源，我们都有不同的想法。因此，如果我们希望生活在一个资源冲突最小化的世界里，我们必须就所有权和转让权达成一致。

It must be taken for granted that we own ourselves. To claim the opposite leads to obvious inhumanity. It raises at least the potential for unlimited conflict over who owns whom. Where external resources are concerned, the ideal solution is that they belong to whoever first appropriates them from the State of Nature, and that they are then transferred by consent – that is, by sale or by gift or by inheritance. This is, of course, the ideal solution. In much of the world, landed property has been possessed for thousands of years, and has been repeatedly confiscated and reassigned. There is not a square inch of England or Western Europe the title to which derives from its

original appropriator。 The practical solution, then, is a rebuttable presumption in favour of existing titles - the rebuttal being good evidence of title derived from an earlier chain of possession。 The exception is state property。 This should be restituted to the holders of its last reasonable title。

我们必须理所当然地认为我们拥有自己。相反的主张会导致明显的不人道。它至少引发了关于谁拥有谁的无限冲突的可能性。就外部资源而言，理想的解决办法是，它们属于首先从自然状态中占有它们的人，然后经同意转让，即通过出售、赠与或继承。当然，这是理想的解决方案。在世界上的许多地方，土地财产已经被占有了数千年，并一再被没收和重新分配。在英格兰或西欧，没有一平方英寸的土地是由原来的占有者得来的。因此，实际的解决办法是，支持现有所有权的可反驳的推定，而反驳是源于较早占有链的所有权的良好证据。例外是国有财产。这应该归还给最后一个合理所有权的持有者。

Either this is irrefutable, or denying it leads to greater conflict than leaving things as they are。 Here, though, the self-evident nature of libertarianism ends。 Certain further propositions derived from Economics continue the chain of self-evident truth。 But other discussions of the approach to, or the shape of, a libertarian society involve questions of pragmatic engagement。

要么这是无可辩驳的，要么否认这一点会导致比保持现状更大的冲突。然而，在这里，自由意志主义不言而喻的本质结束了。从经济学中推演出来的某些进一步的命题延续了不言而喻的真理链。但其他关于自由意志主义社会的方式或形态的讨论涉及务实参与的问题。

If the entire human race looked alike and thought more or less alike, libertarian activism would be a matter of unvaried and undiscriminating outreach。 But the human race, as it exists, is endlessly diverse。 There are differences of appearance, differences of ability, differences of belief and expectation。 These differences are plain between individuals。 They are plain between different groups of individuals。 We are not some tabula rasa, on which the Spirit of the Age may write as it will。 We are born different。 We grow more different still in how we respond to whatever is meant by the Spirit of the Age。

如果整个人类都长得很像，思想也或多或少相似，那么自由意志主义行动主义就会是一种不变的、不加区别的延伸。但是人类，就其存在而言，是无限多样的。外貌的不

同，能力的不同，信仰和期望的不同。这些差异在个体之间是显而易见的。它们在不同群体的个体之间是明显的。我们不是一张白纸，时代的精神可以随心所欲地在上面书写。我们天生不同。我们在如何回应时代精神的意义上变得更加不同。

In the long term, Hoppe and his critics are in full agreement. They look forward to a single humanity, united in respect for life, liberty, and property, all enriched from the cultural and material benefits that derive from a world of universal freedom. For the moment, this single humanity does not exist - nor is it likely to exist. Either we must take account of these facts of difference, or we will not. If we will not, then we shall become useless intellectuals - endlessly talking to each other, and to nobody else, about the relationship between the non-aggression principle and the doctrine of contractual frustration. Or we shall become dangerous intellectuals - advocating policies, in the name of the non-aggression principle, that do not reduce but increase the likelihood of conflict over resources. If we do choose to take account of these differences, then we find ourselves firmly on the unpopular side of nearly all the questions that define the age in which we live.

从长远来看，霍普和他的批评者完全一致。他们期待着一个统一的人类，在尊重生命、自由和财产方面团结一致，所有人都从一个普遍自由的世界所带来的文化和物质利益中得到丰裕。就目前而言，这个单一的人类并不存在，也不太可能存在。我们要么必须考虑到这些差异的事实，要么就不考虑。如果我们不这样做，那么我们就变成无用的知识分子——没完没了地相互谈论互不侵犯原则和契约挫折原则之间的关系，而不与其他任何人讨论。否则，我们就变成危险的知识分子——打着互不侵犯原则的幌子，鼓吹那些不会减少反而会增加资源冲突可能性的政策。如果我们确实选择考虑这些差异，那么我们就发现，在几乎所有界定我们生活的时代的问题上，我们都坚定地站在不受欢迎的一边。

If there is room for debate over the causes, one fact is plain. This is that the freest and most prosperous societies ever to exist are those dominated by broadly heterosexual males descended from the hunter-gatherers who settled Western and Central Europe and Northern Asia. Indeed, if there is room for debate over causes, the most likely cause - something deniable usually by the products of long and expensive university education - is something inherent to these peoples, rather than some set of contingent circumstances local to the past few thousand years.

如果对原因还有争论的余地，有一个事实是显而易见的。这就是，有史以来最自由、

最繁荣的社会，是那些由广泛的异性恋男性统治的社会，这些男性是定居在西欧、中欧和北亚的狩猎采集者的后裔。的确，如果对原因有争论的余地，最可能的原因——通常被长期和昂贵的大学教育的产物所否认的原因——是这些民族固有的东西，而不是过去几千年当地的一些偶然情况。

This is not to say that these groups are "better" than others in any abstract sense. It is not to say that all members of these groups show equal aptitude to preserve their traditional or acquired social orders. Nor is it to say that all members of other groups are equally unable to acquire or preserve the relevant social orders. It is certainly not to invite us to think ill of those other groups. Hoppe has always been clear on this, and his Bodrum conferences are nothing if not diverse. It is simply a matter of facing general facts. There are bearded women. There are men with breasts. Not every Englishman keeps his appointments. Not every Nigerian ignores them. Even so, basing our conduct on exceptions rather than generalities is bound, sooner or later, to prove inconvenient.

这并不是说这些群体在任何抽象意义上都比其他群体“更好”。这并不是说这些群体的所有成员都表现出同样的能力来维护他们传统的或获得的社会秩序。这也不是说其他群体的所有成员都同样不能获得和保持相关的社会秩序。当然，这并不是要我们去贬低其他群体。霍普在这一点上一直很清楚，他的博德鲁姆会议也很多样化。这只是一个面对普遍事实的问题。有留胡子的女人。有乳房的男人。不是每个英国人都赴约。并不是每个尼日利亚人都忽视他们。即便如此，将我们的行为建立在例外而非一般性的基础上，迟早会被证明是不方便的。

One consequence of this approach is that Hoppe opposes anti-discrimination laws. If there were a law that only white Christian heterosexual males were allowed to practise as doctors, he would denounce this - just as he has, at the outset of his system, denounced any kind of chattel slavery. Such laws violate the negative corollary of the right to freedom of association. If we are to be free to associate as we choose, so we are to be free not to associate. Sometimes, our decisions will be grounded in the social realities just mentioned, sometimes not. In any event, they are our decisions, and they should not be prevented by law.

这种做法的一个后果是，霍普反对反歧视法。如果有一条法律规定，只有信奉基督教的异性恋白人男性才被允许从事医生工作，他会谴责这一点——就像他在他的制度开始时谴责任何形式的奴隶制度一样。这些法律违反了结社自由权利的消极含义。如果



我们有选择结社的自由，那么我们也有不结社的自由。有时，我们的决定将基于刚刚提到的社会现实，有时不是。无论如何，这是我们的决定，不应该被法律阻止。

A second consequence is that there should be an end to "regime change" and "nation-building" in other parts of the world. In this present collection, Hoppe mentions his opposition to our Middle Eastern interventions in passing. But his opposition is profound and firm. The alleged reasons of these interventions are all proven or probable lies. Even otherwise, the project of exporting our ways to places where there is neither desire for them nor aptitude to receive them can only lead to more bloodshed than leaving people with their own ways.

第二个后果是，世界其他地区的“政权更迭”和“国家建设”应该结束。在这本作品集中，霍普顺便提到了他对我们干涉中东的反对。但他的反对是深刻而坚定的。所谓的这些干预的原因都是经过证实的或可能的。即便如此，把我们的方式输出到那些既没有欲望也没有能力接受它们的地方的计划，只会导致更多的流血，而不是让人们按照自己的方式去做。

The third consequence is that he is opposed to open borders. This returns me to Hoppe's point about the pragmatic application of libertarian theory. There are libertarians who memorise some pithy statement of the non-aggression principle, and immediately conclude that all borders are immoral. This approach ignores the present realities. Mass-immigration from outside the regions mentioned above has plainly negative effects. It increases crime and disorder. It greatly expands the roll of welfare claimants. It provides a growing constituency for politicians whose careers are one long attack on life, liberty, and property. Open borders in themselves at the moment - and especially open borders plus a welfare state and our endless wars of aggression that produce endless waves of refugees - are an attack on civilisation.

第三个后果是他反对开放边境。这让我回到了霍普关于自由意志主义理论的实用应用的观点。有些自由意志主义者记住了一些关于互不侵犯原则的简明扼要的陈述，然后立即得出结论：所有的边界都是不道德的。这种做法忽视了当前的现实。上述地区以外的大量移民显然有负面影响。它增加了犯罪和混乱。它极大地扩大了领取福利的人数。它为政治家提供了越来越多的支持者，他们的职业生涯是对生命、自由和财产的长期攻击。目前开放边界本身——尤其是开放边界加上福利国家和我们无休止的侵略战争，这些战争产生了无休止的难民潮——是对文明的攻击。

Nor is there any reason to believe that a truly libertarian society would allow what now passes for open borders. People have the right to trade with each other, not settle where and how they please. One of the central claims of libertarian theory is that all costs can and should be privatised. Well, any entrant to a libertarian community may impose costs that outweigh the benefits of his presence. If so, it is the undeniable right of the property-owners in such a community to deter new entrants they regard –for whatever reason - as undesirable. Those who choose not to will be open to tort actions for allowing a nuisance on their property. A libertarian world would be a patch-work of communities. These would provide for every conceivable taste. Most of them, however, would probably be rather exclusive in their entry policies. There would be room for communities that welcomed all-comers with open arms. Hoppe's view, however, is that these would be a minority of communities, and that their failure would be an example to others.

也没有任何理由相信，一个真正的自由主义社会会允许现在被视为开放的边界。人们有权利相互贸易，而不是在他们喜欢的地方和方式定居。自由意志主义理论的核心主张之一是，所有成本都可以而且应该私有化。嗯，任何进入自由主义社区的人都可能带来超过其存在收益的成本。如果是这样的话，在这样一个社区里，业主有不可否认的权利阻止他们认为——无论出于何种原因——不受欢迎的新进入者。那些选择不这样做的人将因允许对其财产的妨害而面临侵权诉讼。一个自由意志主义的世界将是由社区拼凑而成的。这些可以满足所有你能想到的口味。然而，它们中的大多数在进入政策上可能相当排外。社区将有空间张开双臂欢迎所有来客。然而，霍普的观点是，这些社区将是少数群体，他们的失败将成为其他社区的榜样。

Now, this is an argument about a world that does not exist, and may not exist for a very long time. We live in a world of nation-states, all with borders. What is to be done about immigration in such a world? Hoppe accepts the basic illegitimacy of the present order of things, but accepts that it is the present order. If civilisation is to survive in even its present defective condition, it is necessary to insist that states should act as trustees for those who fund them. This does not mean a total ban on immigration or hostility to individuals on the basis of their appearance. But it does mean strict control of borders and the deportation of undesirable entrants. It also means higher charges for the use of public property on those who have contributed nothing to its development. It means no access to such welfare as may - however unwisely -

beavailable to the settled population。 Anything less than that is best described not as "equality" or "anti-discrim-ination," but as "forced integration。 "

现在，这是一个关于一个不存在的世界的争论，可能在很长一段时期内都不存在。我们生活在一个民族国家的世界里，所有国家都有边界。在这样一个世界里，我们应该对移民做些什么？霍普承认前事物秩序的基本非法性，但接受它就是当前秩序。如果文明要在目前这种有缺陷的状态下生存下去，就有必要坚持国家应该充当资助者的受托人。这并不意味着完全禁止移民，也不意味着因为外表而对个人怀有敌意。但这确实意味着要严格控制边境，驱逐不受欢迎的入境者。这也意味着对那些对公共财产的发展毫无贡献的人收取更高的费用。这意味着无法获得定居人口可能获得的福利——无论多么不明智。任何低于这一标准的东西，最好不要用“平等”或“反歧视”来形容，而是用“强制融合”来形容。

Most of Hoppe's polemical attacks in recent years have been on the self-described left-libertarians。 These combine an acceptance of leftist notions of equality and anti-discrimination with some belief in free markets。 At the same time, he does not regard himself in any sense as a leader of what is called the Alt-Right。 This is a broad coalition of national socialists, white nationalists, conservatives of various kinds, and disenchanted libertarians。 It came to prominence in 2016 for its support of Donald Trump。 It became notorious in 2017 for the riotous assembly it provoked at the Charlottesville Rally。

近年来，霍普的大多数争议性攻击都是针对那些自称为左翼自由意志主义者的人。他们既接受左派的平等和反歧视观念，又相信自由市场。与此同时，他在任何意义上都不认为自己是所谓的另类右翼的领袖。这是一个由民族社会主义者、白人民族主义者、各种各样的保守派和幻灭的自由意志主义者组成的广泛联盟。它在 2016 年因支持唐纳德·特朗普而出名。2017 年，它因在夏洛茨维尔集会上引发的骚乱集会而臭名昭著。

Hoppe accepts that the Alt-Right and libertarians share an opposition to the bloated, malevolent, warmongering elites who rule most Western countries。 He has opened a dialogue with some of the more reasonable Alt-Right leaders。 But he remains wary of the Alt-Right as a whole。 He dislikes its frequent mysticism - its appeals to a "higher wisdom" than the cautious rationalism of the Enlightenment。 He dislikes its obsession with race rather than a clear view of actual differences between individuals and groups of individuals。 He particularly dislikes its concessions to socialism - socialism, so long as its "beneficiaries" are white people。 If the Alt-Right evolves into a broad attack on

undeniable evils, so much the better. If, as seems likely, it will become a coalition of totalitarian or semi-totalitarian cults, he wants nothing to do with it.

霍普承认，另类右翼和自由意志主义者都反对统治大多数西方国家的奢靡、恶毒、好战的精英阶层。他与一些比较理性的另类右翼领导人展开了对话。但他仍然对整个另类右翼保持警惕。他不喜欢它频繁出现的神秘主义——它呼吁一种“更高的智慧”，而不是启蒙运动时期谨慎的理性主义。他不喜欢它对种族的痴迷，而不是对个人和个人群体之间实际差异的清晰认识。他尤其不喜欢它对社会主义的让步——只要它的“受益者”是白人，那就是社会主义。如果另类右翼演变成对不可否认的邪恶的广泛攻击，那就更好了。如果(看起来很有可能)它成为极权主义或半极权主义邪教的联盟，他不想与之有任何关系。

## CONCLUSION

### 结论

Hoppe mentions several times in this collection that he is growing older, and that he will continue working so long as his health allows. I hope he will continue for many years to come. But let us allow that all life is uncertain, and accept that he may be taken from us tomorrow. This would be a terrible loss. At the same time, I have not the slightest doubt that, on the basis of what he has achieved so far, the intellectual world has been made a better place by Hoppe's presence within it. And I both hope and believe that the inspiration his work provides will one day contribute to the emergence of a better world for all humanity. If this short collection of his writings, and if my brief Introduction, can form part of this contribution, it will not have been published in vain.

霍普在这本合集里多次提到，他正在变老，只要他的健康允许，他将继续工作。我希望他能在未来的许多年里继续这样做。但是，让我们承认所有的生命都是不确定的，并接受他明天就可能会离我们而去的事实。这将是一个可怕的损失。与此同时，我毫不怀疑，在他迄今所取得的成就的基础上，知识世界因霍普的存在而变得更加美好。我希望并相信，他的作品所带来的灵感，终有一天会为全人类创造一个更美好的世界。如果他的这个短篇作品集和我的简短介绍可以构成这个贡献的一部分，那么它的出版就不会是徒劳的。

Sean Gabb

Deal

# 一、现实的自由意志主义

A Realistic Libertarianism

Hans-Hermann Hoppe

Libertarianism is logically consistent with almost any attitude toward culture, society, religion, or moral principle. In strict logic, libertarian political doctrine can be severed from all other considerations; logically one can be — and indeed most libertarians in fact are: hedonists, libertines, immoralists, militant enemies of religion in general and Christianity in particular — and still be consistent adherents of libertarian politics. In fact, in strict logic, one can be a consistent devotee of property rights politically and be a moocher, a scamster, and a petty crook and racketeer in practice, as all too many libertarians turn out to be. Strictly logically, one can do these things, but psychologically, sociologically, and in practice, it simply doesn't work that way. [my emphasis]

从逻辑上讲，自由意志主义几乎在所有对待文化、社会、宗教或道德原则时的态度是一致的。在严格的逻辑上，自由意志主义政治学说可以从所有其他应考量的因素中分离出来；从逻辑上讲，一个人可以是——事实上，大多数自由意志主义者都是：享乐主义者、自由意志主义者、不道德主义者、一般宗教尤其是基督教的激进敌人——但仍然是自由意志主义政治的忠实拥护者。事实上，按照严格的逻辑，一个人可以在政治上始终如一地拥护财产权，但在现实中却是一个揩油分子、一个骗子、一个小偷和一个敲诈勒索者，就像太多的自由意志主义者都是那样。严格的逻辑上，人们可以做这些事情，但在心理学上，社会学上，在实践中，它根本不是这样运作的。(我的重点)

Let me begin with a few remarks on libertarianism as a pure deductive theory.

让我先从作为纯粹演绎理论的自由意志主义的特征开始讲起。

If there were no scarcity in the world, human conflicts would be impossible. Interpersonal conflicts are always and everywhere conflicts concerning scarce things. I want to do X with a given thing and you want to do Y with the same thing.

如果世界上没有匮乏，就不可能存在人类冲突。无论何时何地，人际冲突都是关于稀缺物品的冲突。我想用某一给定的东西做 X，而你想用同样的东西做 Y。

First appeared on lewrockwell.com, September 30, 2014。

Because of such conflicts — and because we are able to communicate and argue with each other — we seek out norms of behavior with the purpose of avoiding these conflicts. The purpose of norms is conflict-avoidance. If we did not want to avoid conflicts, the search for norms of conduct would be senseless. We would simply fight and struggle。

因为这些冲突，也因为我们能够相互交流和论辩，我们就可以寻求行为规范，以避免这些冲突。规范的目的是避免冲突。如果我们不想避免冲突，那么寻找行为规范将毫无意义。我们只会战斗和争抢。

Absent a perfect harmony of all interests, conflicts regarding scarce resources can only be avoided if all scarce resources are assigned as private, exclusive property to some specified individual. Only then can I act independently, with my own things, from you, with your own things, without you and me coming into conflict。

在所有利益无法完全协调的情况下，只有将所有稀缺资源作为私有的、排他性的财产分配给特定的人，如此才能避免稀缺资源的冲突。只有这样，我才能自主地行动，我的是我的，你的是你的，区分你和我，我们才不会陷入冲突。

But who owns what scarce resource as his private property and who does not? First: Each person owns his physical body that only he and no one else controls directly (I can control your body only indirectly, by first directly controlling my body, and vice versa) and that only he directly controls also in particular when discussing and arguing the question at hand. Otherwise, if body-ownership were assigned to some indirect body-controller, conflict would become unavoidable as the direct body-controller cannot give up his direct control over his body as long as he is alive; and in particular, otherwise it would be impossible that any two persons, as the contenders in any property dispute, could ever argue and debate the question whose will is to prevail,

since arguing and debating presupposes that both, the proponent and the opponent, have exclusive control over their respective bodies and so come to the correct judgment on their own, without a fight (in a conflict-free form of interaction).

然而，谁拥有该稀缺资源作为他的私有财产，而谁又不拥有呢？

第一，每个人都拥有自己的身体，只有他自己能直接控制，而其他人不能。也就是我只能直接控制我自己的身体，从而间接控制你的身体，反之亦然。特别值得一提的是，在讨论和辩论当前某一问题时，只有他能直接控制自己的身体。如果将他的身体所有权分配给一些间接的身体控制者，就不可避免地产生冲突，因为只要他活着，直接的身体控制者就不能放弃他对自己身体的直接控制。任何两个人，尤其是作为任何财产纠纷中的竞争者，都不可能争论和辩论谁的意志应占上风的问题，因为争论和辩论的前提是，他们二者都对各自的身体拥有排他性的控制权。这样，无需战争，他们自己就会在一种没有冲突的互动形式中做出正确的判断。

And second, as for scarce resources that can be controlled only indirectly (that must be appropriated with our own nature-given, i. e., unappropriated, body): Exclusive control (property) is acquired by and assigned to that person, who appropriated the resource in question first or who acquired it through voluntary (conflict-free) exchange from its previous owner. For only the first appropriator of a resource (and all later owners connected to him through a chain of voluntary exchanges) can possibly acquire and gain control over it without conflict, i. e., peacefully. Otherwise, if exclusive control is assigned instead to latecomers, conflict is not avoided but contrary to the very purpose of norms made unavoidable and permanent.

其次，对于我们只能间接控制的稀缺资源的排他性的控制权（财权），我们应以我不被占用的身体去占有它从而先占先得，或者通过自愿（无冲突）的交换从别人那里获得该资源。只有这样，资源的第一个占有者(以及所有后来通过自愿交换链与他联系在一起的所有者)，才有可能在没有冲突的和平情况下，获得并控制资源。否则，如果把排他性的控制权交给后来者，冲突就无法避免，规范也就会被违背，从而不能持久存在。

Let me emphasize that I consider this theory as essentially irrefutable, as a priori true. In my estimation this theory represents one of the greatest — if not the greatest — achievement of social thought. It formulates and codifies the immutable ground rules



for all people, everywhere, who wish to live together in peace。

让我强调一下，我认为这个理论在根本上是无可辩驳的，是先验正确的。在我看来，这一理论代表了社会思想最伟大的成就之一——如果不是最伟大的成就的话。它为世界各地希望和平共处的所有人民，制定和编纂了不可改变的基本规则。

And yet: This theory does not tell us very much about real life。 To be sure, it tells us that all actual societies, insofar as they are characterized by peaceful relations, adhere, whether consciously or subconsciously, to these rules and are thus guided by rational insight。 But it does not tell us to what extent this is the case。 Nor does it tell us, even if adherence to these rules were complete, how people actually live together。 It does not tell us how close or distant from each other they live, if, when, how frequent and long, and for what purposes they meet and interact, etc。 To use an analogy here: Knowing libertarian theory — the rules of peaceful interactions — is like knowing the rules of logic — the rules of correct thinking and reasoning。 However, just like the knowledge of logic, as indispensable as it is for correct thinking, does not tell us anything about actual human thought, about actual words, concepts, arguments, inferences and conclusions used and made, so the logic of peaceful interaction (libertarianism) does not tell us anything about actual human life and action。 Hence: just as every logician who wants to make good use of his knowledge must turn his attention to real thought and reasoning, so a libertarian theorist must turn his attention to the actions of real people。 Instead of being a mere theorist, he must also become a sociologist and psychologist and take account of “empirical” social reality, i. e. , the world as it really is。

然而，这个理论并没有告诉我们很多关于现实生活的事情。当然，这个理论告诉我们，所有现实的社会，只要它们以和平关系为特征，无论是有意识的还是潜意识的，人们都会遵守这些规则，从而受到理性洞察力的指导。但这个理论仍然是不够的，它并没有告诉我们更多关于现实生活的事情，也没有告诉我们这种情况在多大程度上如此。这个理论也还没有告诉我们，人们即使完全遵守这些规则，实际上是如何生活在一起的，人们彼此生活得多近或多远；也没有告诉我们，人们是以什么条件、什么频次、多长时间以及为了什么目的而交汇和互动，等等。打个比方：了解了自由意志主义理论就是明白了和平互动的规则，就好像是了解了逻辑规则就是

明白了正确思考和推理的规则。然而，就像逻辑知识一样，尽管它对于正确的思考是必不可少的，但它并没有告诉我们任何关于人类实际的思想、实际的词汇、概念、论证、推理和总结的使用和构成，所以和平互动的逻辑(自由意志主义)也没有告诉我们任何关于人类实际的生活与行动。因此，正如每一个逻辑学家想要充分利用自己的知识，就必须把注意力转向真实的思考和推理，一个自由意志主义理论家也必须把注意力转向真实的人的行为。他不能仅仅是一个理论家，他还必须成为一个社会学家和心理学家，要思考“经验的”社会现实，即世界的真实面貌。

This brings me to the topic of “Left” and “Right。”

这让我想到了做“左”与“右”这个主题。

The difference between the Right and the Left, as Paul Gottfried has often noted, is a fundamental disagreement concerning an empirical question。 The Right recognizes, as a matter of fact, the existence of individual human differences and diversities and accepts them as natural, whereas the Left denies the existence of such differences and diversities or tries to explain them away and in any case regards them as something unnatural that must be rectified to establish a natural state of human equality。

正如保罗·戈特弗里德(Paul Gottfried)经常指出的那样，左翼和右翼之间的区别，是关于一个经验问题上的根本分歧。事实上，右翼承认人类个体差异和多样性的存在，并将其视为自然。而左翼则否认这种差异和多样性的存在，或试图消解它们的存在，并在任何情况下都将之视为不自然的东西，为了建立人类平等的自然状态，因此必须对此加以纠正。

The Right recognizes the existence of individual human differences not just with regard to the physical location and makeup of the human environment and of the individual human body (its height, strength, weight, age, gender, skin- hair- or eye-color, facial features, etc。 , etc。 )。 More importantly, the Right also recognizes the existence of differences in the mental make-up of people, i. e. , in their cognitive abilities, talents, psychological dispositions, and motivations。 It recognizes the existence of bright and dull, smart and dumb, short- and far-sighted, busy and lazy, aggressive and peaceful, docile and inventive, impulsive and patient, scrupulous and careless people, etc。 , etc。 The Right recognizes that these mental differences, resulting from the interaction of the physical environment and the physical human body, are the results of both

environmental and physiological and biological factors。 The Right further recognizes that people are tied together (or separated) both physically in geographical space and emotionally by blood (biological commonalities and relationships), by language and religion, as well as by customs and traditions。 Moreover, the Right not merely recognizes the existence of these differences and diversities。 It realizes also that the outcome of input-differences will again be different and result in people with much or little property, in rich and poor, and in people of high or low social status, rank, influence or authority。 And it accepts these different outcomes of different inputs as normal and natural。

右翼承认人类个体差异的存在，这不仅体现在人类生存环境的物理位置和构造，以及个人身体的物理特征(身高、力量、体重、年龄、性别、肤色、头发或眼睛的颜色、面部特征等等、等等)。更重要的是，右翼还承认在人的心智构成上存在差异，即他们的认知能力、天赋、心理倾向和动机都有不同。它承认存在各样的人，敏锐的和迟钝的，聪明的和愚蠢的，短视的和远见的，勤劳的和懒惰的，好斗的和平和的，守旧的和有创造力的，冲动的和有耐心的，审慎的和粗心的，等等，等等。右翼承认，这些心智差异是由物理环境和人体的相互作用造成的，是环境因素和生理、生物因素共同作用的结果。右翼进一步承认，人们会因血缘(生物共性和关系)、语言、宗教、习俗与传统的影响，从而在地理空间、情感上联系在一起(或分离)。总之，右翼承认这些复杂的因素导致的差异和多样性的存在。此外，它还认识到，不仅投入有差异，投入的结果也不，从而导致人们财产的多与寡，富和穷，以及社会地位、等级、影响力或权威的高低。右翼接受这些不同的投入和不同的结果，并认为这些都是正常的，也是自然的。

The Left on the other hand is convinced of the fundamental equality of man, that all men are "created equal." It does not deny the patently obvious, of course: that there are environmental and physiological differences, i. e., that some people live in the mountains and others on the seaside, or that some men are tall and others short, some white and others black, some male and others female, etc.。 But the Left does deny the existence of mental differences or, insofar as these are too apparent to be entirely denied, it tries to explain them away as "accidental." That is, the Left either explains such differences as solely environmentally determined, such that a change in

---

environmental circumstances (moving a person from the mountains to the seaside and vice versa, for instance, or giving each person identical pre- and post-natal attention) would produce an equal outcome, and it denies that these differences are caused (also) by some — comparatively intractable — biological factors。 Or else, in those cases where it cannot be denied that biological factors play a causal role in determining success or failure in life (money and fame), such as when a 5 foot tall man cannot win an Olympic gold medal in the 100 meter dash or a fat and ugly girl cannot become Miss Universe, the Left considers these differences as pure luck and the resulting outcome of individual success or failure as undeserved。 In any case, whether caused by advantageous or disadvantageous environmental circumstances or biological attributes, all observable individual human differences are to be equalized。 And where this cannot be done literally, as we cannot move mountains and seas or make a tall man short or a black man white, the Left insists that the undeservedly “lucky” must compensate the “unlucky” so that every person will be accorded an “equal station in life,” in correspondence with the natural equality of all men。

相对应的，左翼深信人在根本上是平等的，人人“生而平等”。当然，它并不否认显而易见的现实：存在环境和生理差异，也就是说，有些人住在山上，有些人住在海边，有高个子也有矮个子，有白人也有黑人，有男人也有女人，等等。但是左翼明确否认人的心智存在差异，或者，只要这些差异太明显而不能完全否认，它就试图把它们解释为“偶然的”。也就是说，左翼要么将这些差异解释为完全由环境决定的，例如，环境条件的一个变化(例如，将一个人从山区搬到海边，反之亦然，或者给予每个人相同的产前和产后关注)会产生相同的结果，并且否认这些差异是由一些相对难以处理的生物因素引起的。又或者，在那些无法否认生物因素在决定人生成败(金钱和名声)中起因果作用的情况下，左翼也认为这些差异纯粹就是运气，不能由个人承担成功或失败的结果，即使明知道一个 5 英尺高的男人不能赢得奥运会 100 米短跑金牌，或者一个又胖又丑的女孩不可能成为环球小姐。在任何情况下，无论是由有利还是不利的的环境条件、或者生物特性引起的，左翼认为所有可观察到的人类个体差异都应平等对待。然而这是不可能做到的，正如我们不能移山移海，不能使高个子变矮、黑人变白一样。左翼坚持认为，不应得的“幸运儿”必须弥补“不幸的人”，这样每个人都将被赋予“平等的人生地位”，与所有人的自然平等相一致。

With this short characterization of the Right and the Left I return to the subject of

---

libertarianism。 Is libertarian theory compatible with the world-view of the Right?

And: Is libertarianism compatible with leftist views?

在对右翼和左翼做了简短描述之后，我回到自由意志主义的主题上来。自由意志主义理论与右翼的世界观相容吗？自由意志主义与左翼观点相容吗？

As for the Right, the answer is an emphatic “yes.” Every libertarian only vaguely familiar with social reality will have no difficulty acknowledging the fundamental truth of the Rightist world-view。 He can, and in light of the empirical evidence indeed must agree with the Right's empirical claim regarding the fundamental not only physical but also mental inequality of man; and he can in particular also agree with the Right's normative claim of “laissez faire,” i. e. , that this natural human inequality will inevitably result also in unequal outcomes and that nothing can or should be done about this。

对右翼来讲，答案是肯定的。每一个对社会现实即使只有模糊了解的自由意志主义者，都会毫不费力地赞同右翼世界观的基本真理。他能够，同时根据经验证据，确实必须同意右翼的经验主义主张，即人不仅在生理上而且在心智上都是不平等的；他也能够特别同意右翼关于“自由放任”的规范性主张，即这种自然的人类不平等将不可避免地导致结果的不平等，并且人们对此无能为力，也不应该为之做什么。

There is only one important caveat, however。 While the Right may accept all human inequalities, whether of starting-points or of outcomes, as natural, the libertarian would insist that only those inequalities are natural and should not be interfered with that have come into existence by following the ground-rules of peaceful human interaction mentioned at the beginning。 Inequalities that are the result of violations of these rules, however, do require corrective action and should be eliminated。 And more-over, the libertarian would insist that, as a matter of empirical fact, there exist quite a few among the innumerable observable human inequalities that are the result of such rule-violations, such as rich men who owe their fortune not to hard work, foresight, entrepreneurial talent or else a voluntary gift or inheritance, but to robbery, fraud or state-granted monopolistic privilege。 The corrective action required in such cases, however, is not motivated by egalitarianism but by a desire for restitution: he (and only he), who can show that he has been robbed, defrauded or legally disadvantaged should be made whole again by those (and only those) who have committed these crimes against him and his property, including also cases where restitution would result

in an even greater inequality (as when a poor man had defrauded and owed restitution to a rich one)。

然而，只有一个重要的警告。虽然右翼可以接受所有人类的不平等，无论是起点还是结果，认为都是自然的。但自由意志主义者坚持认为，只有那些遵循前面提到的人类和平互动的基本规则而产生的不平等是自然的，而且也不应该受到干涉。然而，违反这些规则所造成的不平等，则的确需要采取纠正行动，并应予以消除。更重要的是，自由意志主义者坚持认为，作为一个经验事实，在无数可观察到的人类不平等中，有相当多的不平等是这种违反规则的结果，比如富人的财富不是来自努力工作、远见卓见、企业家才能，或自愿的赠予、遗产，而是来自抢劫、欺诈或国家授予的垄断特权。然而，在这种情况下所需的纠正行动不是出于平等主义，而是出于恢复原状的愿望。那些能够证明自己被抢劫、欺骗或在法律上处于不利地位的人，应该得到赔偿，而赔偿应来自那些曾经对他的财产权犯下罪行的人。这种赔偿不过是恢复他们应得的，即使这个赔偿过程可能会导致更大的不平等，例如一个穷人曾经欺骗了富人，而欠富人一个赔偿的时候。

On the other hand: As for the Left, the answer is an equally emphatic “no.” The empirical claim of the Left, that there exist no significant mental differences between individuals and, by implication, between various groups of people, and that what appear to be such differences are due solely to environmental factors and would disappear if only the environment were equalized is contradicted by all everydaylife experience and mountains of empirical social research. Men are not and cannot be made equal, and whatever one tries in this regard, inequalities will always re- emerge. However, it is in particular the implied normative claim and activist agenda of the Left that makes it incompatible with libertarianism. The leftist goal of equalizing everyone or equalizing everyone's “station in life” is incompatible with private property, whether in one's body or in external things. Instead of peaceful cooperation, it brings about unending conflict and leads to the decidedly unegalitarian establishment of a permanent ruling-class lording it over the rest of the people as their “material” to be equalized. “Since,” as Murray Rothbard has formulated it, “no two people are uniform or ‘equal’ in any sense in nature, or in the outcomes of a voluntary society, to bring about and maintain such equality necessarily requires the permanent imposition of a

---

power elite armed with devastating coercive power。”<sup>1</sup>

另一方面，对于左翼来说，答案同样是坚决的“不”。左翼依据他们的经验主义，主张平等，认为个人之间，或者不同人群之间，不存在显著的心智差异。即使有些差异，而这些差异似乎完全是由于环境因素造成的，如果环境平等，差异就会消失。

他们的这种说法与所有日常生活经验和大量的实证主义社会研究相矛盾。人不是也不可能被平等，无论在这方面做什么努力，不平等总是会重新出现。然而，左翼所特别强调的规范主张和激进的行动议题，是与自由意志主义不相容的。左翼的目标是使每个人都平等，或者使每个人的“生活地位”平等，这与私有财产是不相容的，无论是关于一个人的身体还是外在事物。左翼的价值主张多带来的不是和平合作，而是无休止的冲突，并导致一个绝对不平等的永久统治阶级的建立，这个统治阶级将统治其他人民，把人民当做他们的“螺丝钉”，不过螺丝钉还真是平等的。正如默里·罗斯巴德(Murray Rothbard)所阐述的那样，“因此，在任何意义上，没有两个人在本质上是相同的或‘平等’的。换句话说，在一个自愿社会的结果中，要实现和维持这种平等，必然需要一个拥有毁灭性强制力的权力精英的永久统治。”

There exist countless individual human differences; and there exist even more differences between different groups of individuals, since each individual can be fit into countless different groups. It is the power elite that determines which of these differences, whether of individuals or of groups, is to count as advantageous and lucky or disadvantageous and unlucky (or else as irrelevant). It is the power elite that determines how - out of countless possible ways — to actually do the “equalizing” of the lucky and the unlucky, i. e. , what and how much to “take” from the lucky and “give” to the unlucky to achieve equality. In particular, it is the power elite, by defining itself as unlucky, that determines what and how much to take from the lucky and keep for itself. And whatever equalization is then achieved: Since countless new differences and inequalities are constantly re-emerging, the equalizing-job of the power elite can never ever come to a natural end but must instead go on forever, endlessly.

人与人之间存在着无数的个体差异；每个个体都可以归入无数的不同群体，因而不

---

<sup>1</sup> “Egalitarianism and the Elites”, Review of Austrian Economics 8, no. 2 (1995): 45.

同的个体组成的群体之间存在着更多的差异。个人之间的差异，或群体之间的差异，什么样的差异是有利的还是不利的？是关乎幸运或不幸的？是无关紧要的？这些选择是由权力精英决定的。在无数可能的方案中，正是权力精英真正决定了如何做到幸运和不幸之间的“平等”，即，从幸运的人那里“拿走”什么以及拿走多少给不幸的人，从而实现平等。尤其是，权力精英通过把自己定义为不幸的人，从而决定从幸运的人那里拿走什么和拿走多少，并归自己所有。无论实现了怎样的平等，由于无数新的差异和不平等会不断再次出现，权力精英致力于平等的工作自然就永远不会结束，而是必定会永远持续下去。

The egalitarian world-view of the Left is not only incompatible with libertarianism, however. It is so out of touch with reality that one must be wondering how anyone can take it seriously. The man-on-the-street certainly does not believe in the equality of all men. Plain common sense and sound prejudice stand in the way of that. And I am even more confident that no one of the actual proponents of the egalitarian doctrine really, deep down, believes what he proclaims. Yet how, then, could the Leftist worldview have become the dominant ideology of our age?

左翼的平等主义世界观，不仅与自由意志主义不相容，而且与现实如此脱节，以至于人们一定会怀疑怎么会有人把它当回事。普通人有常识，也有合理的推理，他们无论如何都不会相信所有人都是平等的。而且我也确信，没有一个平等主义学说的真正支持者，在内心深处真的相信他所宣称的那些口号。但是，左翼的世界观怎么会成为我们这个时代的主导意识形态呢？

At least for a libertarian, the answer should be obvious: the egalitarian doctrine achieved this status not because it is true, but because it provides the perfect intellectual cover for the drive toward totalitarian social control by a ruling elite. The ruling elite therefore enlisted the help of the “intelligentsia” (or the “chattering class”). It was put on the payroll or otherwise subsidized and in return it delivered the desired egalitarian message (which it knows to be wrong yet which is enormously beneficial to its own employment prospects). And so the most enthusiastic proponents of the



---

egalitarian nonsense can be found among the intellectual class.<sup>1</sup>

自由意志主义者轻而易举地解释了这个现象：平等主义学说获得了这样的地位，不是因为它是正确的，而是因为它为统治精英推动极权主义的社会控制提供了完美的智力掩护。一方面，统治精英们寻求“知识分子”(或“喋喋不休阶级”)的帮助，希望“知识分子”为统治精英提供咨询。另一反面，知识分子为统治精英提供平等主义理论，根本不在乎这个理论是否是错误的。作为回报，统治精英为知识分子提供薪资或其它补贴，以及有利的职业前途。因此，在知识分子阶层中，可以找到平等主义无稽之谈最狂热的支持者。

Given, then, that libertarianism and the egalitarianism professed by the Left are obviously incompatible, it must come as a surprise — and it is testimony to the immense ideological powers of the ruling elites and their court intellectuals — that many who call themselves libertarian today are, and consider themselves to be, part of the Left. How is such a thing possible?

如前所述，自由意志主义的观点和左翼宣称的平等主义观点明然是不相容的，然而，今天许多自称为自由意志主义者的人却认为自己是左翼的一部分，这确实令人感到惊讶——这也证明了统治精英及其宫廷知识分子的巨大意识形态力量。这种事情何以成为可能的呢？

What ideologically unifies these left-libertarians is their active promotion of various “anti-discrimination” policies and their advocacy of a policy of “free and non-discriminatory” immigration.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Murray Rothbard has listed them: “academics, opinion-molders, journalists, writers, media elites, social workers, bureaucrats, counselors, psychologists, personnel consultants, and especially for the ever accelerating new group-egalitarianism, a veritable army of ‘ther- apists’ and sensitivity trainers. Plus, of course, ideologues and researchers to dream up and discover new groups that need egalitarianizing.” (Ibid., p. 51)

默里·罗斯巴德列出了他们：“学者、舆论塑造者、记者、作家、媒体精英、社会工作者、官僚、顾问、心理学家、人事顾问，尤其是不断加速的新群体平等主义，一支名副其实的‘治疗师’和敏感性培训师大军。”当然，理论家和研究人员还需要设想和发现需要平等主义化的新群体。(同上，第51页)

<sup>2</sup> As for who among today’s so-called libertarians is to be counted as a leftist, there is a lit- mus test: the position taken during the recent presidential primaries on Dr.

正是因为这些“左翼自由意志主义者”在意识形态上的统一，使得他们积极推动各种“反歧视”政策，并倡导“自由和非歧视”的移民政策。

These “libertarians,” noted Rothbard, “are fervently committed to the notion that, while each individual might not be ‘equal’ to every other, that every conceivable group, ethnic contingent, race, gender, or, in some cases, species, are in fact and must be made ‘equal,’ that each one has ‘rights’ that must not be subject to curtailment by any form of ‘discrimination.’”<sup>1</sup>

罗斯巴德指出：这些“自由意志主义者”狂热地相信这样一种观念——虽然每个个体可能并不与其他个体“平等”，但每个可以想象的群体、民族、种族、性别，或者在某些情况下，每个物种，实际上都是而且必须是“平等的”；每个人都有“权利”，这些“权利”不应受到任何形式的“歧视”，从而受到限制。

But how is it possible to reconcile this anti-discrimination stand with private property, which all libertarians are supposed to regard as the cornerstone of their philosophy, and which, after all, means exclusive property and hence, logically implies discrimination?

但是，怎样才能使这种反歧视的立场与私有财产协调一致呢？所有自由意志主义者都应该把私有财产视为他们哲学的基石，毕竟，私有财产意味着排他性财产，因此，逻辑上就隐含着歧视。

---

Ron Paul, who is easily the purest of libertarians to ever gain national and even international attention and recognition. Beltway libertarians around Cato, George Mason, Reason, and various other outfits of the ‘Kochtopus’ dismissed Ron Paul or even attacked him for his “racism” and lack of social “sensitivity” and “tolerance,” i. e. , in short: for being an upstanding “right-wing bourgeois,” leading an exemplary personal and professional life.

至于今天所谓的那些自由意志主义者，谁能被算作左派，有一个关键的测试：在最近的总统初选中，罗恩·保罗博士(Dr. Ron Paul)所采取的立场，他无疑是最纯粹的自由意志主义者，获得了全国乃至国际的关注和认可。围绕着卡托、乔治·梅森、理性和其他各种各样的“科奇托普斯”的自由意志主义者对罗恩·保罗不屑一顾，甚至攻击他的“种族主义”和缺乏社会“敏感性”和“宽容”，也就是说，简而言之，他是一个正直的“右翼资产阶级”，过着堪称典范的个人和职业生活。

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. , p. 102. .

同上，第 102 页。

Traditional leftists, of course, do not have this problem。 They do not think or care about private property。 Since everyone is equal to everyone else, the world and everything on and in it belongs to everyone equally all property is “common” property — and as an equal coowner of the world everyone has of course an equal “right to access” to everywhere and everything。 Absent a perfect harmony of all interests, however, you can not have everyone have equal property and equal access to everything and everywhere without leading to permanent conflict。 Thus, to avoid this predicament, it is necessary to institute a State, i.e., a territorial monopolist of ultimate decision-making。 “Common property,” that is, requires a State and is to become “State property。” It is the State that ultimately determines not just who owns what; and it is also the State, then, that ultimately determines the spatial allocation of all people: who is to live where and allowed to meet and have access to whom — and private property be damned。 After all, it is they, the Lefties, who would control the State。

传统的左翼当然没有这个问题，因为他们不考虑也不关心私有财产。既然每个人都是平等的，世界和世界上的一切都应平等地属于每个人，所有的财产都是“共同的”财产——作为世界的平等共同所有者，每个人当然都有平等的“权利”进入任何地方、占有任何东西。你没有可能让每个人都拥有平等的财产和平等的机会，因为这会导致永久的冲突，除非你能找到让所有利益完美和谐的途径。因此，为了避免这种冲突困境，有必要建立一个国家，即某一地域具有垄断性的最终决策者。也就是说，需要有一个“国家”，把“共同财产”变成“国家财产”。国家不仅最终决定谁拥有什么，国家还最终决定了所有人的空间分配——谁住在哪里，谁被允许见面，谁可以接近谁，而私有财产将被诅咒。总之，正是他们，左翼分子们，将控制国家。

But this escape route is not open to anyone calling himself a libertarian。 He must take private property seriously。

但这条退路并不对任何自称自由意志主义者的人开放。他必须严肃、认真地对待私有财产。

Psychologically or sociologically, the attraction of non-discrimination policies to libertarians can be explained by the fact that an overproportionally large number of libertarians are misfits or simply odd — or to use Rothbard's description, “hedonists, libertines, immoralists, militant enemies of religion . . . , moochers, scamsters, and

petty crooks and racketeers”——who became attracted to libertarianism because of its alleged ‘tolerance’ toward misfits and outliers, and who now want to use it as a vehicle to free themselves from all discrimination typically, in everyday life, dished out to their likes。 But how do they do it “logically? ” Left-libertarians, bleeding heart libertarians and humanitarian cosmopolitan libertarians are not simply leftists。 They know of the central importance of private property。 Yet how can they seemingly logically reconcile the notion of private property with their promotion of anti-discrimination policies and in particular their propagation of a policy of discrimination-free immigration?

为什么“平等主义”对左翼自由意志主义者有吸引力呢？从心理学和社会学的角度，我们可以做如下解释。正如罗斯巴德所说，左翼自由意志主义者中很大比例的人要么古怪要么不合群，或者他们是“享乐主义者、放纵翼、不道德主义者、宗教的激进敌对者……白吃党、诈骗分子、以及小流氓和敲诈勒索者”。他们之所以被自由意志主义所吸引，是因为自由意志主义所倡导的对不合群者和异类的“宽容。现在他们想把自由意志主义作为一种工具，让自己摆脱各种“歧视”，而这些“歧视”是他们在日常生活总会遇到的。但他们是如何“合逻辑地”做到这一点的呢？左翼自由意志主义者、热血自由意志主义者和人道主义世界自由意志主义者不仅仅是左翼，他们也知道私有财产的核心重要性。然而，他们如何在逻辑上调和私有财产的概念与他们提倡的反歧视政策？特别是他们宣传的对待移民的反歧视政策？

The short answer is: in placing all current private property and its distribution among distinct people under moral suspicion。 With this claim, the left-libertarians fall into the opposite error from that committed by the non-libertarian Right。 As indicated, the non-libertarian Right commits the error of regarding all (or at least almost all) current property holdings, including in particular also the property holdings of the State, as natural and just。 In distinct opposition, a libertarian would recognize and insist that some present property holdings, and all (or at least most) State- holdings, are demonstrably unnatural and unjust and as such require restitution or compensation。 In reverse, the left-libertarians claim that not only all or most State-holdings are unnatural und unjust (from this admission they derive their title ‘libertarian’), but that also all or most private property holdings are unnatural and unjust。 And in support for this latter claim, they point to the fact that all current private property holdings and

their distribution among various people have been affected, altered and distorted by prior State action and legislation and that everything would be different and no one would be in the same place and position he currently is had it not been for such prior State-interferences。

对上述问题的简短回答是，在道德的审视之下，将现有的私人财产在不同的人之间分配。有了这一主张，“左翼自由意志主义者”陷入了与“右翼非自由意志主义者”相反的错误。如前所述，非自由主义右翼犯了一个错误，即将所有(或至少几乎所有)当前的财产持有，特别是国家的财产持有，视为自然和公正的。与此截然不同的是，自由意志主义者承认并坚持，某些现在的财产持有状况，以及所有（或至少大部分）的国家持有财产的状况，是不自然不公正的，应恢复原状或应该赔偿。相反，左翼自由意志主义者声称，不仅所有或大多数国家持有的财产都是不自然和不公正的(因为这一个主张，他们获得了“自由意志主义者”的称号)，而且所有或大多数私人财产持有也都是不自然、不公正的。为了支持后一种说法，他们指出，所有目前的私有财产持有及其在不同人之间的分配都受到先前的国家行为与立法的影响、改变以及扭曲，如果没有这种先前的国家干预，一切都会不同，没有人会处于他目前的位置和地位。

Without any doubt, this observation is correct. The State in its long history has made some people richer and others poorer than they would have been otherwise. It killed some people and let others survive. It moved people around from one place to another. It promoted some professions, industries or regions and prevented or delayed and changed the development of others. It awarded some people with privileges and monopolies and legally discriminated against and disadvantaged others, and on and on. The list of past injustices, of winners and losers, perpetrators and victims, is endless.

毫无疑问，这种观察是正确的。国家在其漫长的历史中，使一些人变得更富，而另一些人则变得更穷。它杀死了一些人，让其他人幸存下来。它把人们从一个地方驱赶到另一个地方。它促进了一些专业、行业或地区的发展，阻碍、延缓和改变了另一些专业、行业或地区的发展。它授予一些人特权与垄断权，在法律上歧视和不利于另一些人，等等。正是国家造成了过去的不公正，造成了赢家与输家，造成了作恶者与受害者，这个清单罄竹难书。

But from this indisputable fact it does not follow that all or most current property

holdings are morally suspect and in need of rectification。 To be sure, State-property must be restituted, because it has been unjustly acquired。 It should be returned to its natural owners, i. e. , the people (or their heirs) who were coerced to 'fund' such 'public' property by surrendering parts of their own private property to the State。 However, I will not concern myself with this particular "privatization" issue here。<sup>1</sup> Rather, it is the further-reaching claim that past injustices also render all current private property holdings morally suspect, which does not follow and which is certainly not true。 As a matter of fact, most private holdings are likely just, irrespective of their history — unless and except in such cases in which a specific claimant can prove that they are not。 The burden of proof, however, is on whoever challenges the current property holdings and distribution。 He must show that he is in possession of an older title to the property in question than its current owner。 Otherwise, if a claimant cannot prove this, everything is to remain as it currently is。

虽然事实是无可辩驳的,但我们并不能从此就推论出,目前所有或大多数的财产持有,在道德上是可疑的、需要纠正的。诚然,国家财产必须归还,因为这些财产是不正当获得的。它应该归还给它的自然所有者,即那些被迫放弃自己的部分私有财产,交给国家来“资助”这种“公共”财产的人(或他们的继承人)。但是,我不想在这里讨论这个特殊的“私有化”问题。但是,我们并不能说,当前所有的私有财产状态就应该在道德上受到怀疑,说它们是不公正导致的,是不合理不正确的。事实上,大多数私人财产很可能是公正的,无论其历史如何——除非也仅除非某一特定索赔人能够证明其不是公正的。然而,举证责任落在了对目前的财产持有和分配提出质疑的人身上。他必须证明对此财产,他拥有比目前业主更早的产权。否则,如果索赔人不能证明这一点,则一切保持原样。

Or: To be more specific and realistic: From the fact that Peter or Paul or their parents, as members of any conceivable group of people, had been murdered, displaced,

---

<sup>1</sup> See on this subject Hans-Hermann Hoppe, "Of Private, Common and Public Property and the Rationale for Total Privatization," *Libertarian Papers* 3, no. 1 (2011). <http://libertarian-papers.org/articles/2011/lp-3-1.pdf>

参见 Hans-Hermann Hoppe, “私有财产、公共财产和公共财产以及全面私有化的基本原理”,《自由意志论者论文》第 3 期,第一(2011)。 <http://libertarian-papers.org/articles/2011/lp-3-1.pdf>

robbed, assaulted, or legally discriminated against in the past and their current property holdings and social positions would have been different if it had not been for such past injustices, it does not follow that any present member of this group has a just claim (for compensation) against the current property of anyone else (neither from within nor from outside his group). Rather, in each case, Peter or Paul would have to show, in one case after another, that he personally has a better title to some specified piece of property than some current, named and identified owner and alleged perpetrator. Certainly, a considerable number of cases exists where this can be done and restitution or compensation is owed. But just as certainly, with this burden of proof on any challenger of any current property distribution, not much mileage can be gained for any non-discriminatory-egalitarian agenda. To the contrary, in the contemporary Western world, replete with "affirmative action" laws that award legal privileges to various "protected groups" at the expense of various other correspondingly un-protected and discriminated groups, more — not less — discrimination and inequalities would result if, as justice would require, everyone who in fact could provide such individualized proof of his victimization was actually permitted to do so by the State and bring suit and seek redress from his victimizer.

或者更加具体和实际地说：即使彼得或保罗或他们的父母作为任何可能的人群的成员，在过去曾被谋杀、被迫迁移、被抢劫、受到袭击或在法律上遭受歧视，假如没有过去的这些不公正行为，他们当前的财产持有和社会地位将会有所不同，但这也并不意味着这个群体的任何现在的成员能对其他任何人的当前财产有权要求索赔或补偿，无论这个被要求者是来自他们群体内部或外。恰恰相反，在每种情况下，彼得或保罗必须一一证明，他本人对某块具体的财产拥有更好、更古老的所有权证明，比某个当前的、被命名和确定的所有者和被指控的犯罪者要充分。当然，在相当多的情况下，这是可以做到的，而且需要恢复原状或赔偿。但同样可以肯定的是，任何挑战当前财产分配的人都要承担举证责任，这种举证责任使非歧视平等主义议程不会有多大进展。相反，在当代西方世界，充斥着“平权运动”的法律，这些法律赋予各种“受保护群体”法律特权，这些特权是以牺牲各种其他对应未受保护和受歧视的群体为代价的。如果按照司法所要求的那样，每个能够提供个性化受害证明的人都被国家实际上允许这样做，并且可以起诉并向施害者寻求赔偿，那么必然会导致更多而不是更少的歧视和不平等。

But left-libertarians — the bleeding-heart and humanitarian-cosmo-politan libertarians — are not exactly known as “fighters” against “affirmative action.” Rather, and quite to the contrary, in order to reach the conclusion that they want to reach, they relax or dispense altogether with the requirement for someone claiming victimhood of offering individualized proof of victimization. Typically, in order to maintain their intellectual status as libertarians, the left-libertarians do so quietly, surreptitiously or even unknowingly, but in effect, in giving up this fundamental requirement of justice, they replace private property and property rights and rights violations with the muddled notion of ‘civil rights’ and ‘civil rights violations’ and individual rights with ‘group rights’ and thus become closet-socialists. Given that the State has disturbed and distorted all private property holdings and distributions, yet without the requirement of individualized proof of victimization, everyone and every imaginable group can easily and without too much intellectual effort claim somehow “victimhood” vis-à-vis anyone else or any other group. <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Characteristically, this stealthy transformation of libertarianism into closet-socialism via the confused notion of ‘civil rights,’ has been identified decades ago already by Murray Rothbard. To quote him: “Throughout the Official Libertarian Movement [of left-libertarians], ‘civil rights’ has been embraced without question, completely overriding the genuine rights of private property. In some cases, the embrace of a ‘right not to be discriminated against’ has been explicit. In others, when libertarians want to square their new-found with their older principles, and have no aversion to sophistry and even absurdity, they take the sneakier path blazed by the American Civil Liberties Union: that if there should be so much as a smidgen of government involved, whether it be use of the public streets or a bit of taxpayer funding, then the so-called ‘right’ of ‘equal access’ must override either private property or indeed any sort of good sense.” Ibid., pp. 102/03.

罗斯巴德(Murray Rothbard)几十年前就已经发现了，通过使用“公民权利”这一令人困惑的概念，将自由意志主义悄悄转变成了隐蔽的社会主义的特点。引用他的话：“在整个官方自由意志主义运动中(左翼自由意志主义者)，‘公民权利’被毫无疑问地接受，完全凌驾于私有财产的真正权利之上。在某些情况下，对“不受歧视的权利”的接受是明确的。在另一些地方，当自由意志主义者想要将他们的新发现与他们的旧原则结合起来，并且不忌讳采用荒谬的诡辩，他们会选择美国公民自由联盟(American Civil Liberties Union)开辟的更为隐蔽的道路：如果应该有一点点政府介入，无论是公共街道的使用还是纳税人的一点资金，那么所谓的“平等使用”的“权利”必须凌驾于私有财产或任何理智之上。同上，第 102/03 页。



但是，自诩为悲天悯人、人道主义、世界主义、自由意志主义的左翼自由意志主义者，并不被认为是“反对平权运动”的“斗士”。相反，为了得到他们想要的结论，他们放宽了或完全取消了对声称自己是受害者的人需提供个性化受害证据的要求。通常，为了保持他们作为自由意志主义者的智识地位，左翼自由意志主义者悄悄地、秘密地甚至不知不觉地如此行事，但实际上，在放弃这一基本正义要求的同时，他们以“公民权利”和“侵犯公民权利”的模糊概念取代了私有财产、财产权和权利侵犯，用“群体权利”取代了个人权利，从而成为了“秘密社会主义者”。鉴于国家扰乱和扭曲了所有私有财产的持有和分配，但不需要个别的受害证明，每个人和每一个可以想象到的群体都可以轻易地、不需要太多的智识努力，就能以某种方式对其他任何人或任何其他群体声称自己是某种程度上的“受害者”。

Relieved of the burden of individualized proof of victimhood, the left-libertarians are essentially unrestricted in their 'discovery' of new "victims" and "victimizers" in accordance with their own presupposed egalitarian assumptions. To their credit, they recognize the State as an institutional victimizer and invader of private property rights (again, from this derives their claim to be 'libertarians'). But they see far more institutional and structural injustices and social distortions, far more victims and victimizers, and far more need for restitution, compensation and attendant property redistribution in the current world than only those injustices and distortions committed and caused by the State and to be resolved and rectified by shrinking and ultimately dismantling and privatizing all State holdings and functions. Even if the State were dismantled, they hold, as late and lasting effects of its long prior existence or of certain pre-State conditions, other institutional distortions would remain in place that required rectification to create a just society.

由于减轻了对受害者身份进行个性化证明的负担，左翼自由意志主义者根据自己预设的平等主义假设，在“发现”新的“受害者”和“施害者”方面，基本上是不受限制的。值得称赞的是，他们承认国家是制度化的施害者和私有财产权的入侵者(再一次，他们自诩是“自由意志主义者”)。但是，他们看到当今世界存在着更多的体制和结构上的不公正与社会扭曲，看到更多的受害者和施害者，看到更多需要恢复原状、赔偿和随之而来的财产再分配，而不仅仅是国家所犯下和造成的不公正和扭曲，因此应该通过缩小并最终解散和私有化所有国家财产和职能来加以解决和纠正。他们还认为，即使国家被解散，作为其长期存在的后期和持久影响，或某些先于国家存在的

条件，其他制度上的扭曲依然存在，需要纠正以创建一个公正的社会。

The views held by left-libertarians in this regard are not entirely uniform, but they typically differ little from those promoted by cultural Marxists. They assume as 'natural,' without much if any empirical support and indeed against overwhelming evidence to the contrary, a largely 'flat' and 'horizontal' society of 'equals,' i. e. , of essentially universally and world-wide homogeneous, like-minded and -talented people of more or less similar social and economic status and standing, and they regard all systematic deviations from this model as the result of discrimination and grounds for some form of compensation and restitution. Accordingly, the hierarchical structure of traditional families, of sex roles and of the partition of labor between males and females, is considered unnatural. Indeed, all social hierarchies and vertical rank orders of authority, of headmen and clan-chiefs, of patrons, nobles, aristocrats and kings, of bishops and cardinals, of 'bosses' generally, and of their respective underlings or sub-ordinates, are viewed with suspicion. Similarly, all great or 'excessive' disparities of income and wealth — of so-called 'economic power' — and the existence of both a downtrodden under-class as well as of an upper class of super-wealthy people and families are deemed unnatural. As well, large industrial and financial corporations and conglomerates are considered artificial creatures of the State. And also suspect, unnatural and in need of repair are all exclusive associations, societies, congregations, churches and clubs, and all territorial segregation, separation and secession, whether based on class, gender, race, ethnicity, lineage, language, religion, profession, interests, customs or tradition.

左翼自由意志主义者在这方面的观点并不完全一致，但他们通常与文化马克思主义者所提倡的观点差别不大。他们想当然地认为，在没有太多经验支持的情况下，和没有压倒性证据的情况下，一个很大程度上是“平坦”和“水平”的“平等”社会是“自然”的，也就是说，基本上是世界范围内同类的、志趣相投的、有才能的人，他们的社会地位和经济状况或多或少相似。他们认为所有系统性偏离这个模式的人都是歧视的结果，也是某种形式的补偿和恢复的理由。因此，传统家庭的等级结构、性别角色和男女之间的劳动分工被认为是不自然的。事实上，所有的社会等级制度和垂直的权力等级制度，族长和部落首领，庇护人，贵族，大臣和国王，主教和红衣主教，一般的“老板”，以及他们各自的下属或下级，都受到左翼自由意志主义者的

质疑。同样的，所有巨大或“过度”的收入和财富差距——所谓的“经济实力”——以及受压迫的下层阶级和由超级富豪及其家庭组成的上层阶级的存在，都被认为是不自然的。同样，大型工业和金融公司，联合企业也被认为是国家的人造产物。同样可疑的、不自然的、需要修复的是，所有排外的协会、社团、集会、教堂和俱乐部，以及所有地域隔离、分离和分裂，无论是基于阶级、性别、种族、民族、血统、语言、宗教、职业、利益、习俗或传统。

From that vantage point, the 'victim' groups and their 'victimizers' are easily identified. As it turns out, 'victims' make up the vast majority of mankind. Everyone and every conceivable group is a 'victim,' except that small part of mankind composed of white (including northern Asian) heterosexual males, living traditional, bourgeois family lives. They, and especially the most creative and successful ones among them, (excluding interestingly only rich sports or entertainment celebrities) are the 'victim izers' of everyone else.

从这个有利的角度来看，“受害者”群体和他们的“施害者”很容易识别。事实证明，“受害者”构成了人类的绝大多数。除了一小部分过着传统资产阶级家庭生活的白人(包括北亚人)异性恋男性之外，每个人、每个能想到的群体都是“受害者”。他们，以及他们中那些最有创造力的、最成功的人，都被看成是其他人的“施害者”，不过富有的体育或娱乐名人除外。

While this view of human history strikes one as bizarre in light of the amazing civilizational achievements originating from precisely this minority group of 'victimizers,' it coincides almost completely with the victimology also propagated by cultural Marxists. Both groups only differ on the cause of this similarly identified, described and deplored 'structural state of victimization.' For the cultural Marxists, the cause for this state of affairs is private property and unbridled capitalism based on private property rights. For them, the answer how to repair the damage done is clear and easy. All necessary restitution, compensation and redistribution are to be done by the State, which they presumably control.

虽然惊人的文明成就正是源于这一小群人，但是依据这种解释人类历史的令人奇怪的观点，他们就是“施害者”。这一观点完全符合文化马克思主义者所宣传的受害者学。文化马克思主义者和左翼自由意志主义者的不同之处在于，就是造成这种被相似地识别、描述和谴责的“结构性受害状态”的原因。文化马克思主义者认为，造成这

---

种状况的原因是私有制和以私有制为基础的无节制的资本主义。对文化马克思主义者来说，如何修复所造成的损害的答案是明确和容易的。所有必要的恢复、赔偿和再分配都将由国家来完成，而他们大概控制着国家。<sup>1</sup>

For the left-libertarians this answer does not work. They are supposed to be in favor of private property and the privatization of State-property. They cannot have the State do the restitution, because as libertarians they are supposed to dismantle and ultimately abolish the State. Yet they want more restitution than only that resulting from the privatization of all so-called public property. Abolishing the State is not enough for them to create a just society. More is needed to compensate the just mentioned huge majority of victims.

对于左翼自由意志主义者来说，这个答案行不通。他们支持私有财产和国有财产的私有化。他们不允许让国家来恢复原状，因为作为自由意志主义者，他们应该瓦解并最终废除国家。然而，他们希望得到的赔偿不仅仅是来自所谓的公共财产私有化所产生的赔偿。对于他们来说，仅仅废除国家还不足以创建一个公正的社会。为了补偿上文提到的绝大多数受害者，还需要更多的措施。

But what? And on what grounds? Whenever there is individualized proof of victimization, i. e., if some person A can demonstrate that another person B had invaded or taken A's property, or vice versa, no problem exists! The case is clear. But absent any such proof, what else is it that the 'victimizers' owe their 'victims,' and on what grounds? How to determine who owes whom how much and of what? And how to implement this restitution scheme in the absence of a State, and without thereby trampling on someone else's private property rights? This poses the central intellectual problem for any self-styled left-libertarian.

但是什么？基于什么理由？只要有个人受害的证据，即，如果某人 A 可以证明另一个人 B 侵犯或拿走了 A 的财产，反之亦然，就不存在问题！情况一目了然。如果拿不出这样的证据，“施害者”还欠“受害者”什么呢？“受害者”又基于什么理由向“施害者”索赔呢？没有国家的情况下，如何确定谁欠谁什么？欠多少？如何在不侵犯私有

---

<sup>1</sup> "文化马克思主义者"是一个具有特定含义的词组。它指的是一种政治观点或理论，认为社会问题和不平等主要源自于文化领域，而非经济领域。这个概念起源于 20 世纪后期，在西方国家的学术界和政治讨论中被广泛使用。

财产权的情况下实施归还？这给任何自封的左翼自由意志主义者提出了一系列核心的知识问题。

Not surprisingly, the answer given by them to this challenge turns out evasive and vague。 From all I can gather, it amounts to little more than an exhortation。 As a keen observer of the intellectual scene has summarized it: "Be nice!" More precisely: You, you small group of 'victimizers,' must always be especially 'nice,' forgiving, and inclusive vis-à-vis all members of the vast majority of 'victims,' i. e. , the long and familiar list of everyone except white, heterosexual males! And as for enforcement: All 'victimizers' not demonstrating proper respect to some victim-class member, i. e. , victimizers who are 'nasty,' unforgiving or exclusive or who say 'nasty' or disrespectful things about them, must be publicly shunned, humiliated, and shamed into obedience!

毫不奇怪，左翼自由意志主义者对这个挑战所给出的答案显得含糊而模糊。根据我所了解的情况，它基本上等同于一种劝告，正如一个对知识界格局敏锐的观察者所概括的——做好人！或者换句话更确切地说：你们这些少数的“施害者”，在与绝大多数“受害者”，也就是除了白人、异性恋男性之外的那长长的熟悉名单上的所有人相处时，必须特别友善、宽容和包容！那么如何落实到行动上呢？他们认为，所有未能向某些“受害者”群体成员展示适当尊重的“施害者”，那就是表现恶毒、不宽容或排斥。这些“施害者”也应在公开场合受到排斥、羞辱，直到被羞辱到服从为止！

At first sight or hearing, this proposal how to do restitution may — as can be expected coming from 'nice' people — appear, well, well meaning, harmless and plain 'nice'。 In fact, however, it is anything but 'nice' and harmless advice。 It is wrong and dangerous。

不惊诧也不意外，这个赔偿建议的确是“做好人”，看起来很有意思，很无害，很“好”。然而，事实上，这绝不是“好”的或无害的建议，这个建议不仅错误而且危险。

First off: Why should anyone be particularly nice to anyone else — apart from respecting ones' respective private property rights in certain specified physical means (goods)? To be nice is a deliberate action and takes an effort, like all actions do。 There are opportunity costs。 The same effort could also be put to other effects。 Indeed, many if not most of our activities are conducted alone and in silence, without

any direct interaction with others, as when we prepare our meal, drive our car, or read and write。 Time devoted to 'niceness to others' is time lost to do other, possibly more worthwhile things。 Moreover, niceness must be warranted。 Why should I be nice to people who are nasty to me? Niceness must be deserved。 Indiscriminating niceness diminishes and ultimately extinguishes the distinction between meritorious and faulty conduct。 Too much niceness will be given to undeserving people and too little to deserving ones and the overall level of nastiness will consequently rise and public life become increasingly unpleasant。

首先，人们应该互相尊重对方对物质财富的私人产权，但除此之外，人为什么应特别地对另一个人好？友善是一种主动的行为，需要付出努力，就像所有行为一样。而主动的行为必然有机会成本，主动的友善必然会舍弃其他可能的效果。实际上，我们的许多活动（即使不是大多数），都是独自静默进行的，这些活动与他人没有直接的互动，比如我们做饭、开车或阅读和写作。在“对他人友善”上花时间，会放弃把时间用于其他可能更有价值的事情上面。此外，友善必须是有理由的，我为什么要对那些对我恶劣的人友善？友善必须是值得的，不加区分的友善会削弱甚至消灭优良行为和有缺陷行为之间的区别。如果过多的友善给予不值得的人，而对值得的人则太少，如此，社会整体将变得越来越恶劣，公共生活将变得越来越不愉快。

Moreover, there are also genuinely evil people doing real evil things to real private property owners, most importantly the ruling elites in charge of the State-apparatus, as every libertarian would have to admit。 One surely has no obligation to be nice to them! And yet, in rewarding the vast majority of 'victims' with extra love, care and attention, one accomplishes precisely this: less time and effort is devoted to exhibiting nasty behavior toward those actually most deserving of it。 The power of the State will not be weakened by universal 'niceness,' then, but strengthened。

此外，也存在名实相符的恶人，他们对真正的私有财产所有者做了绝对邪恶的事情，其中最重要的是那些掌握国家机器的统治精英们，每个自由意志主义者都必须承认这一点。我们显然没有义务对他们友善！然而，公众对广大“受害者”报以额外的爱、关心和关注，其实际效果却是减少了用于对最恶毒的人进行批评与惩罚的时间和精力。而且，国家的权力不会因为普遍的“友善”而被削弱，而是会被加强。

And why is it in particular the small minority of white, heterosexual males, and especially its most successful members that owes some extra-kindness to the vast majority of all

other people? Why not the other way around? After all, most if not all technical inventions, machines, tools and gadgets in current use everywhere and anywhere, on which our current living standards and comforts largely and decisively depend, originated with them. All other people, by and large, only imitated what they had invented and constructed first. All others inherited the knowledge embodied in the inventors' products for free. And isn't it the typical white hierarchical family household of father, mother, their common children and prospective heirs, and their 'bourgeois' conduct and lifestyle — i. e. , everything the Left disparages and maligns — that is the economically most successful model of social organization the world has ever seen, with the greatest accumulation of capital goods (wealth) and the highest average standards of living? And isn't it only on account of the great economic achievements of this minority of 'victimizers' that a steadily increasing number of 'victims' could be integrated and partake in the advantages of a worldwide network of the division of labor? And isn't it only on account of the success of the traditional white, bourgeois family model also that so-called 'alternative lifestyles' could at all emerge and be sustained over time? Do not most of today's 'victims,' then, literally owe their lives and their current living to the achievements of their alleged 'victimizers?'

为什么少数白人异性恋男性，尤其是其中最成功的成员，要对绝大多数人格外友善？为什么不是反过来呢？毕竟，我们今天的生活水平和舒适程度，在很大程度上决定性地依赖于他们的技术发明、机器、工具和小工具，即使不是全部，也有大部分是起源于它们。总的来说，所有其他人都只是模仿他们最先发明和建造的东西。其他所有人都免费继承了发明者产品中蕴含的知识。典型的白人等级家庭——由父亲、母亲、他们共同的孩子和未来的继承人组成，他们以“资产阶级”的行为和方式生活——也就是说，左翼所贬低和诋毁的一切——难道不是世界上有史以来在经济上最成功的社会组织模式，拥有最大的资本货物(财富)积累和最高的平均生活水平吗？难道不是只有因为这个“施害者”少数群体的巨大经济成就，才使越来越多的“受害者”能够融入并分享全球分工网络的优势吗？难道不是只有基于传统白人资产阶级家庭模式的成功，才使所谓的“另类生活方式”能够出现并持续存在吗？那么今天的大多数“受害者”难道不是实际上都应该把他们的生活和当前的生活水平归功于他们所谓的“施害者”的成就吗？

Why not the 'victims' giving special respect to their 'victimizers'? Why not bestow special honor to economic achievement and success instead of failure, and why not give special praise to traditional, 'normal' lifestyles and conduct rather than any abnormal alternative that requires, as a necessary condition of its own continued existence, a pre-existing dominant surrounding society of 'normal' people with 'normal' lifestyles?

为什么“受害者”不给予他们的“施害者”特别的尊重？为什么不把特别的荣誉授予经济上的成就和成功而是失败呢？为什么不把赞扬给予传统的、“正常”的生活方式和行为，而要给予那些不正常的选择呢？难道那些标新立异的不正常的生活方式，就不需要一个“正常运行”的社会做为其自身继续存在的必要依托吗？

I will come to the apparent answer to these rhetorical questions shortly。 Before, however, a second strategic error in the left-libertarian advice of special niceness towards 'historic victims' must be briefly addressed。

我将很快给出这些反问句的明显答案。然而，在此之前，我们必须简要地指出，在给“历史受害者”特别友善的建言中，左翼自由意志主义者存在第二个策略错误。

Interestingly, the 'victim' groups identified by both left-libertarians and cultural Marxists differ little if at all from the groups identified as 'underprivileged' and in need of compensation also by the State。 While this poses no problem for cultural Marxists and can be interpreted as an indicator of the extent of control that they have already gained of the State apparatus, for left-libertarians this coincidence should be cause for intellectual concern。 [Why would the State pursue the same or similar end of 'nondiscrimination' of 'victims' by 'victimizers' that they, too, want to achieve, if only by different means?](#) Left-libertarians are typically oblivious to this question。 And yet to anyone with only some common sense the answer should be apparent。

有趣的是，左翼自由意志主义者和文化马克思主义者所认定的“受害者”群体，与被认定为“弱势群体”、同样需要国家补偿的群体几乎没有区别。对于文化马克思主义者来说，这并不构成问题，并且可以被解释为他们已经很大程度上掌控了国家机器的指标。但对于左翼自由意志主义者来说，这种巧合应该引起思想上的关注。如果仅仅是因为采用的手段不同，那么国家为什么要追求“施害者”对“受害者”“不歧视”这一目的或



与之类似的目的呢？左翼自由意志主义者通常对这个问题视而不见。然而，对于稍有常识的人来说，答案应该是显而易见的。

In order to reach total control over each individual person, the State must pursue a divide et impera policy. It must weaken, undermine and ultimately destroy all other, rival centers of social authority. Most importantly, it must weaken the traditional, patriarchic family household, and especially the independently wealthy family household, as autonomous decision-making centers by sowing and legislating conflicts between wives and husbands, children and parents, women and men, rich and poor. As well, all hierarchical orders and ranks of social authority, all exclusive associations, and all personal loyalties and attachments — be it to a particular family, community, ethnicity, tribe, nation, race, language, religion, custom or tradition — except the attachment to a given State qua citizen-subject and passport holder, must be weakened and ultimately destroyed. And what better way to do this than to pass anti-discrimination laws!

为了达到完全控制每个人的目的，国家必须实行分而治之的政策。它必须削弱、破坏并最终摧毁所有其他与之敌对的社会权威中心。最重要的是，国家必须通过宣传和立法，在妻子和丈夫、子女和父母、女人和男人、富人和穷人之间制造冲突，以此削弱传统的父权制家庭，尤其是那些独立富裕的家庭，从而削弱这些家庭作为自主决策中心的地位。此外，国家会制造公民和护照持有人对国家的依恋，而削弱所有社会权威、等级制度、专属协会，削弱并摧毁所有的个人忠诚和情感依恋——包括对特定家庭、社区、族裔、部落、民族、种族、语言、宗教、习俗或传统的忠诚和情感依恋。要做到这些，还有什么手段会比反歧视法更加有效？

In effect, by outlawing all discrimination based on gender, sexual orientation, age, race, religion, national origin, etc., etc., a vast number of people are declared State-certified 'victims.' Anti-discrimination laws, then, are an official call upon all 'victims' to find fault and complain to the State about their own 'favorite' 'oppressors,' and especially the more wealthy ones among them, and their 'oppressive' machinations, i.e., their 'sexism,' 'homophobia,' 'chauvinism,' 'nativism,' 'racism,' 'xenophobia,' or whatever, and for the State to respond to such complaints by cutting the 'oppressors' down to size, i.e., in successively dispossessing them of their property and authority and correspondingly expanding and strengthening its own monopolistic power vis-

---

à-vis an increasingly weakened, fragmented, fractionalized and de-homogenized society。

实际上，通过禁止基于性别、性取向、年龄、种族、宗教、国籍等的一切歧视，许多人被宣布为国家认证的“受害者”。因此，反歧视法是一种官方呼吁，要求所有“受害者”找出错误，并向国家投诉他们自己“喜欢的”“压迫者”，尤其是他们当中比较富有的人，以及他们的“压迫性”阴谋，即“性别歧视”、“同性恋恐惧症”、“沙文主义”、“本土主义”、“种族主义”、“仇外心理”或其他什么，并要求国家通过减少“压迫者”的规模来回应这些投诉，不断剥夺压迫者的财产和权威，使社会日益削弱、分裂、碎片化和异质化，如此同时，相应地扩大和加强自己的垄断权力。

Ironically, then, and contrary to their self-proclaimed goal of wanting to shrink or even eliminate the State, the left-libertarians with their peculiar, egalitarian victimology become accomplices to the State and effectively contribute to the aggrandizement of its power。 Indeed, the left-libertarian vision of a discrimination-free multicultural society is, to use Peter Brimelow's phrase, Viagra to the State。

具有讽刺意味的是，与他们自己宣称的要缩小甚至消灭国家的目标相反，左翼自由意志主义者带着他们特有的平等主义受害者论，成为了国家的帮凶，并有效地促进了国家权力的扩大。的确，用 Peter Brimelow 的话来说，左翼自由意志主义者对无歧视的多元文化社会的愿景是国家的“伟哥”。

Which brings me to my final subject。

这就引出了我的最后一个主题。

The role of left-libertarianism as Viagra to the State becomes even more apparent when one considers their position on the increasingly virulent question of migration。 Left-libertarians are typically ardent advocates in particular of a policy of 'free and non-discriminatory' immigration。 If they criticize the State's immigration policy, it is not for the fact that its entry restrictions are the wrong restrictions, i. e. , that they do not serve to protect the property rights of domestic citizen, but for the fact that it imposes any restrictions on immigration at all。

当人们考虑到左翼自由意志主义在日益严重的移民问题上的立场时，他们作为国家伟哥的作用就变得更加明显了。特别在“自由和非歧视”移民政策上，左翼自由意志主义者是典型的狂热的鼓吹分子。如果他们批评国家的移民政策，并不是因为其入境限制

是错误的限制，即这些限制根本无助于保护国内公民的财产权，而完全就是因为它对移民施加了限制。

But on what grounds should there be a right to un-restricted, "free" immigration? No one has a right to move to a place already occupied by someone else, unless he has been invited by the present occupant. And if all places are already occupied, all migration is migration by invitation only. A right to "free" immigration exists only for virgin country, for the open frontier.

但是，有什么理由允许不受限制的“自由”移民呢？除非受到目前居住者的邀请，否则任何人无权搬到已被他人居住的地方。如果所有的地方都已被占用，那么所有的移民都是受邀请的移民。“自由”移民的权利只存在于处女地和开放的边境。

There are only two ways of trying to get around this conclusion and still rescue the notion of "free" immigration. The first is to place all current place occupants and occupations under moral suspicion. To this purpose, much is made of the fact that all current place occupations have been affected by prior State-action, war and conquest. And true enough, State borders have been drawn and redrawn, people have been displaced, deported, killed and resettled, and state-funded infrastructure projects (roads, public transportation facilities, etc. , etc. ) have affected the value and relative price of almost all locations and altered the travel distance and cost between them. As already explained in a slightly different context, however, from this undisputable fact it does not follow that any present place occupant has a claim to migrate to any place else (except, of course, when he owns that place or has permission from its current owner). The world does not belong to everyone.

只有两种方法可以试图绕过这个结论，还能挽救“自由”移民的概念。第一个是将所有现在的居住者和占有状况，置于道德怀疑之下。为了达到这个目的，很多人都提到了这样一个事实，即所有目前的地方占领都受到以前的国家行动、战争和征服的影响。的确，国家边界被重新划定，人们流离失所，被驱逐出境，被杀害和重新安置，国家资助的基础设施项目(道路，公共交通设施等)影响了几乎所有地点的价值和相对价格，并改变了它们之间的出行距离和成本。然而，正如在一个稍微不同的背景下已经做出的解释那样，从这个无可争议的事实出发，并不意味着任何现在的居住者都有权迁移到其他任何地方(当然，除非他拥有那个地方或得到了现在的所有者的许可)。这个世界并不属于每一个人。

The second possible way out is to claim that all so-called public property — the property controlled by local, regional or central government is akin to open frontier, with free and unrestricted access。 Yet this is certainly erroneous。 From the fact that government property is illegitimate because it is based on prior expropriations, it does not follow that it is un-owned and free-for-all。 It has been funded through local, regional, national or federal tax payments, and it is the payers of these taxes, then, and no one else, who are the legitimate owners of all public property。 They cannot exercise their right — that right has been arrogated by the State — but they are the legitimate owners。

第二种可能的解决方法是声称所有所谓的公共财产——即地方、地区或中央政府控制的财产类似于开放的边境，可以自由无限制地进入。然而，这显然是错误的。从政府财产是非法的这一事实来看，因为它是基于先前的剥夺、征用，但这并不意味着它是无主的，供所有人自由使用的。它是通过地方、地区、国家或联邦税款资助的，因此，是纳税人，而不是其他任何人，是所有公共财产的合法所有者。他们无法行使他们的权利——那个权利已被国家剥夺——但他们是合法的所有者。

In a world where all places are privately owned, the immigration problem vanishes。 There exists no right to immigration。 There only exists the right to trade, buy or rent various places。 Yet what about immigration in the real world with public property administered by local, regional or central State-governments?

在一个所有地方都归私人所有的世界里，移民问题不复存在。不存在移民的权利。只存在交易、购买或租用各种场所的权利。然而，在公共财产由地方、地区或中央政府管理的现实世界中，移民又该如何呢？

First off: What would immigration policies be like if the State would, as it is supposed to do, act as a trustee of the taxpayer-owners' public property? What about immigration if the State acted like the manager of the community property jointly owned and funded by the members of a housing association or gated community?

首先：如果国家像它应该做的那样，作为纳税人-所有者的公共财产的受托人，那么移民政策会是什么样子？如果国家扮演由住房协会或封闭式社区成员共同拥有和资助的共有财产的管理者的角色，那么移民问题又会如何呢？

At least in principle the answer is clear。 A trustee's guideline regarding immigration

would be the “full cost” principle。 That is, the immigrant or his inviting resident should pay the full cost of the immigrant’s use made of all public goods or facilities during his presence。 The cost of the community property funded by resident taxpayers should not rise or its quality fall on account of the presence of immigrants。 On the contrary, if possible the presence of an immigrant should yield the resident owners a profit, either in the form of lower taxes or community-fees or a higher quality of community property (and hence all-around higher property values)。

至少在原则上，答案是明确的。受托人关于移民的指导方针将是“全额成本”原则。也就是说，移民或其邀请居民，应支付移民在其逗留期间，使用所有公共物品或设施的全部费用。由居民纳税人出资的共有财产的成本，不应该因为移民的存在而上升，或者质量下降。相反，如果可能的话，移民的存在应该给居民所有者带来利润，或者以降低税收或社区费用的形式，或者以提高社区财产质量的形式(从而全面提高财产价值)。

What the application of the full cost principle involves in detail depends on the historical circumstances, i. e. , in particular on the immigration pressure。 If the pressure is low, the initial entry on public roads may be entirely unrestricted to ‘foreigners’ and all costs insofar associated with immigrants are fully absorbed by domestic residents in the expectation of domestic profits。 All further going discrimination would be left to the individual resident owners。 (This, incidentally, is pretty much the state of affairs, as it existed in the Western world until WW I. ) But even then, the same generosity would most likely not be extended to the use made by immigrants of public hospitals, schools, universities, housing, pools, parks, etc.。 Entry to such facilities would not be “free” for immigrants。 To the contrary, immigrants would be charged a higher price for their use than the domestic resident-owners who have funded these facilities, so as to lower the domestic tax-burden。 And if a temporary visitor-immigrant wanted to become a permanent resident, he might be expected to pay an admission price, to be remitted to the current owners as compensation for the extra-use made of their community property。

全成本原则的详细应用取决于历史环境，即特别取决于移民压力。如果压力较小，公共道路上的初始入境可能完全对“外国人”开放，所有与移民相关的成本都由国内居民完全承担，因为他们期望从中获得国内利润。所有进一步的歧视将留给个体居民所有

者自行决定。(顺便说一句,这基本上是战前西方世界的状态。)但即使在那时,对移民使用公共医院、学校、大学、住房、游泳池、公园等设施也不太可能给予同样的慷慨。移民进入这些设施不会是“免费”的。相反,移民将被要求支付比资助这些设施的国内居民所有者更高的价格,以降低国内税负。如果临时访问的移民想要成为永久居民,他可能需要支付一个“入场费”,作为对他们社区财产额外使用所作补偿金,以转交给当前所有者。

On the other hand, if the immigration pressure is high — as currently in the entire Western, white, heterosexual male dominated world — more restrictive measures may have to be employed for the same purpose of protecting domestic resident owners' private and common property. There may be identity controls not only at ports of entry, but also at the local level, in order to keep out known criminals and otherwise undesirable riffraff. And apart from the specific restrictions imposed on visitors by individual resident-owners regarding the use of their various private properties, there may also exist more general local entry restrictions. Some especially attractive communities may charge an entrance fee for every visitor (except for resident-invited guests) to be remitted to resident-owners, or require a certain code of conduct regarding all community property. And the requirements of permanent ownership residency for some communities may be highly restrictive and involve intensive screening and a heavy admission price, as is still the case today in some Swiss communities.

另一方面,如果移民压力很大——就像目前在整个西方、白人、同性恋男性主导的世界一样——为了保护国内居民所有者的私人和共同财产,可能不得不采取更多的限制性措施。不仅在入境口岸,而且在地方一级,也可能有身份控制,以便将已知的罪犯和其他不受欢迎的流氓拒之门外。此外,除了个别居民对访客使用其私人物业的具体限制外,可能还有更普遍的本地入境限制。一些特别有吸引力的社区,可能会向每位访客收取入场费(居民邀请的客人除外),并将其转交给居民业主,或者要求对所有社区财产制定一定的行为准则。对某些社区的永久所有权、居住权的要求可能非常严格,包括严格的筛选和高昂的入场费,就像今天瑞士一些社区的情况一样。

But of course, then: this is not what the State does. The immigration policies of the States that are confronted with the highest immigration pressure, of the US and Western Europe, have little resemblance with the actions of a trustee. They do not

follow the full cost principle。 They do not tell the immigrant essentially to “pay up or leave。” To the contrary, they tell him “once in, you can stay and use not just all roads but all sorts of public facilities and services for free or at discounted prices even if you do not pay up。” That is, they subsidize immigrants — or rather: they force domestic taxpayers to subsidize them。 In particular, they also subsidize domestic employers who import cheaper foreign workers。 Because such employers can externalize part of the total costs associated with their employment the free use to be made by his foreign employees of all resident public property and facilities — onto other domestic taxpayers。 And they still further subsidize immigration (internal migration) at the expense of resident-taxpayers in prohibiting — by means of non-discrimination laws — not only all internal, local entry restrictions, but also and increasingly all restrictions concerning the entry and use of all domestic private property。

但是，当然了，这并不是国家应该做的。面临最大移民压力的美国和西欧国家的移民政策，与受托人的行为几乎没有相似之处。他们没有遵循全部成本原则。他们基本上没有告诉移民，“要么付钱，要么离开”。相反，他们告诉他，“一旦进入，即使你不付钱，你不仅可以免费或以折扣价使用所有道路，还可以使用各种公共设施和服务。”也就是说，他们补贴移民——或者更确切地说：他们迫使国内纳税人补贴移民。特别是，他们还补贴那些进口廉价外国工人的国内雇主。因为这样的雇主，可以将与他们的雇佣有关的总成本的一部分——其外籍雇员免费使用其境内所有公共财产和设施——转嫁给其他国内纳税人。他们还进一步补贴移民(国内移民)，以牺牲居民纳税人的利益为代价。他们通过不歧视法律，不仅取消所有国内和当地的入境限制，而且越来越多地取消所有有关入境和使用国内私有财产的限制。

And as for the initial entry of immigrants, whether as visitor or resident, States do not discriminate on the basis of individual characteristics (as a trustee would, and as every private property owner would, regarding his own property), but on the basis of groups or classes of people, i. e. , based on nationality, ethnicity, etc。 They do not apply a uniform admission standard: of checking the identity of the immigrant, of conducting some sort of credit check on him, and possibly charging him an entrance fee。 Instead, they allow some classes of foreigners in for free, without any visa requirement, as if they were returning residents。 Thus, for instance, all Rumanians or

Bulgarians, irrespective of their individual characteristics, are free to migrate to Germany or the Netherlands and stay there to make use of all public goods and facilities, even if they do not pay up and live at German or Dutch taxpayers' expense. Similarly for Puerto Ricans vis-à-vis the US and US taxpayers, and also for Mexicans, who are effectively allowed to enter the US illegally, as uninvited and unidentified trespassers. On the other hand, other classes of foreigners are subject to painstaking visa restrictions. Thus, for instance, all Turks, again irrespective of their individual characteristics, must undergo an intimidating visa-procedure and may be entirely prevented from traveling to Germany or the Netherlands, even if they have been invited and command over sufficient funds to pay for all costs associated with their presence.

至于移民的初次入境的差异对策，无论是作为访客还是作为居民，各国其实可以采取两种途径：其一是以个人特征为基础，就像委托人对受托人，也像每个私有财产所有者对待自己的私有财产；其二是以群体或阶层为基础，如以国籍、种族为基础——而他们选择了后者。他们没有采用统一的录取标准：检查移民的身份，对他进行某种信用检查，并可能向他收取入场费。相反，他们允许某些阶层的外国人免费入境，不需要任何签证，就好像他们是回国的居民一样。正是在这样的政策下，所有的罗马尼亚人或保加利亚人，不论其个人特点如何，都可以自由迁徙到德国或荷兰，并留在那里使用所有公共物品和设施，即使他们不支付费用，并靠德国或荷兰纳税人的钱生活。波多黎各人访问美国，并使用美国纳税人所支付的公共服务，也是类似的情景。墨西哥人也是如此，他们实际上被允许以不请自来和身份不明的入侵者的身份非法进入美国。另一方面，其他类别的外国人受到严格的签证限制却受到严格的签证限制。因此，例如，所有土耳其人，无论其个人特点如何，都必须经历一个令人生畏的签证程序，并且完全可能被禁止前往德国或荷兰，即使他们已被邀请，并拥有足够的资金来支付与他们的存在有关的所有费用。

Resident owner-taxpayers are thus harmed twice: once by indiscriminately including some classes of immigrants even if they can't pay up and on the other hand by indiscriminately excluding other classes of immigrants even if they can.

因此，居民纳税人受到了两次伤害：一次是不分青红皂白地接纳某些类群的移民，即使他们无力支付；另一次是不分青红皂白地排斥其他类群的移民，即使他们有钱支付。

Left-libertarians do not criticize this immigration policy as contrary to that of a trustee



of public property ultimately owned by private domestic taxpayer-owners, however, i. e. , for not applying the full-cost principle and hence wrongly discriminating, but for discriminating at all. Free, non- discriminatory immigration for them means that visa-free entry and permanent residency be made available to everyone, i. e. , to each potential immigrant on equal terms, regardless of individual characteristics or the ability to pay for the full cost of one's stay. Everyone is invited to stay in Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland or the US, for instance, and make free use of all domestic public facilities and services.

然而, 左翼自由意志主义者并不批评这种移民政策, 与公共财产的受托人政策是相反, 这些公共财产最终由国内私人纳税人所有, 也就是说, 没有应用全成本原则, 因此是错误地歧视, 实际上是根本没有歧视。对他们来说, 自由、无歧视的移民, 意味着向所有人提供免签入境和永久居留权, 即平等对待每一个潜在的移民, 而不论其个人特征, 也不论其支付全部停留费用的能力如何。例如, 每个人都被邀请留在德国、荷兰、瑞士或美国, 都可以免费使用所有国内公共设施和服务。

To their credit, left-libertarians recognize some of the consequences this policy would have in the present world. Absent any other, internal or local entry restrictions concerning the use of domestic public properties and services and increasingly absent also all entry restrictions regarding the use of domestic private property (owing to countless anti-discrimination laws), the predictable result would be a massive inflow of immigrants from the third and second world into the US and Western Europe and the quick collapse of the current domestic 'public welfare' system. Taxes would have to be sharply increased (further shrinking the productive economy) and public property and services would dramatically deteriorate. A financial crisis of unparalleled magnitude would result.

左翼自由意志主义者也认识到这一政策将对当今世界造成的一些后果, 这一点值得称赞。如果没有任何其他关于使用国内公共财产和服务的内部或当地入境限制, 并且越来越缺乏关于使用国内私有财产的所有入境限制(由于无数的反歧视法律), 可预见的结果将是, 来自第二和第三世界的大量移民涌入美国和西欧, 并导致当前国内“公共福利”制度的迅速崩溃。税收将不得不大幅增加(进一步收缩生产性经济), 公共财产和服务将急剧恶化。这将导致一场规模空前的金融危机。

Yet why would this be a desirable goal for anyone calling himself a libertarian? True

enough, the tax-funded public welfare system should be eliminated, root and branch. But the inevitable crisis that a “free” immigration policy would bring about does not produce this result. To the contrary: Crises, as everyone vaguely familiar with history would know, are typically used and often purposefully fabricated by States in order to further increase their own power. And surely the crisis produced by a “free” immigration policy would be an extraordinary one.

然而，为什么这是一个自称是自由意志主义者的理想目标呢？诚然，税收资助的公共福利体系应该彻底取消。但是，“自由”移民政策所带来的不可避免的危机，并不能实现这个结果。恰恰相反，每一个对历史略知一二的人都知道，危机通常被国家利用，继而往往有意制造，以便增加它们自己的权力。毫无疑问，“自由”移民政策引发的危机将是一场非同寻常的危机。

What left-libertarians typically ignore in their nonchalant or even sympathetic appraisal of the predictable crisis is the fact that the immigrants who caused the collapse are still physically present when it occurs. For left-libertarians, owing to their egalitarian preconceptions, this fact does not imply a problem. For them, all people are more or less equal and hence, an increase in the number of immigrants has no more of an impact than an increase of the domestic population via a higher birthrate. For every social realist, however, indeed for everyone with any common sense, this premise is patently false and potentially dangerous. A million more Nigerians or Arabs living in Germany or a million more Mexicans or Hutus or Tutsis residing in the US is quite a different thing than a million more home-grown Germans or Americans. With millions of third- and second-world immigrants present when the crisis hits and the paychecks stop coming in, it is highly unlikely that a peaceful outcome will result and a natural, private-property-based social order emerge. Rather, it is far more likely and indeed almost certain that civil war, looting, vandalism, and tribal or ethnic gang warfare will break out instead — and the call for a strong-man-State will become increasingly unmistakable.

左翼自由意志主义者，面对这场可预见的危机，做出冷漠甚至同情的评价，他们显然忽略了这样一个事实：当危机发生时，造成危机的移民在危机发生时仍然存在。对于左翼自由意志主义者来说，由于他们的平等主义先入为主的观念，他们看不到这个事实蕴含的问题。对他们来说，所有人或多或少都是平等的，因此，增加移民数量的影

响并不比通过提高出生率来增加国内人口的影响大。然而，对于每一个社会现实主义者来说，实际上对于每一个有常识的人来说，这个前提显然是错误的，并且具有潜在的危险。一百多万的尼日利亚人或阿拉伯人住在德国，或者一百多万的墨西哥人、胡图族人或图西人住在美国，这与一百多万土生土长的德国人或美国人是完全不同的。当危机爆发且工资停止发放时，数百万第三世界和第二世界的移民居住在当地，和平解决问题的可能性非常小，一个基于自然、私有财产的社会秩序出现的可能性也很小。相反，更有可能，几乎可以肯定，将爆发内战、抢劫、破坏和部落或种族团伙战争，并且对强大国家的呼声会变得日益明显。

Why, then, one might ask, does the State not adopt the left-libertarian “free” immigration policy and grasp the opportunity offered by the predictable crisis to further strengthen its own power? Through its internal non-discrimination policies and also its current immigration policies, the State has already done much to fragment the domestic population and so increase its own power. A “free immigration” policy would add another, enormous dose of non-discriminatory “multiculturalism.” It would further strengthen the tendency toward social dehomogenization, division and fragmentation, and it would further weaken the traditional, white, heterosexual male dominated ‘bourgeois’ social order and culture associated with the “West.”

那么，人们可能会问，为什么国家不采取左翼自由主义的“自由”移民政策，抓住可预见的危机提供的机会，进一步加强自己的权力？通过其内部的不歧视政策以及目前的移民政策，国家已经在分裂国内人口方面做了很多工作，从而增加了自己的权力。“自由移民”政策将再加上一剂非歧视性的“多元文化主义”，这将进一步加强社会异质化、分裂和碎片化的趋势，并将进一步削弱传统的、白人、异性恋男性主导的“资产阶级”社会秩序和“西方”特色的文化。

The answer as to ‘why not?’ appears simple, however. In contrast to left-libertarians, the ruling elites are still realistic enough to recognize that besides great opportunities for State growth, the predictable crisis would also entail some incalculable risk and could lead to social upheavals of such proportions that they themselves may be swept out of power and be replaced by other, ‘foreign’ elites. Accordingly, the ruling elites proceed only gradually, step by step, on their path toward a “non-discriminatory multiculturalism.” And yet they are happy about the left-libertarian “free immigration” propaganda, because it helps the State not just to stay on its present divide et impera

course but to proceed on it at an accelerated pace。 Contrary to their own anti-statist pronouncements and pretensions, then, the peculiar left-libertarian victimology and its demand for indiscriminating niceness and inclusiveness vis-a-vis the long, familiar list of historical "victims," including in particular also all foreigners qua potential immigrants, actually turns out to be a recipe for the further growth of State power。 The cultural Marxists know this, and that is the reason why they adopted the very same victimology。 The left-libertarians do apparently not know this and are thus the cultural Marxists' useful idiots on their march toward totalitarian social control。

为什么国家不采取左翼自由主义的“自由”移民政策呢？答案也许很简单。与左翼自由意志主义者相反，统治精英仍然足够现实，他们认识到，除了国家扩张的巨大机会之外，可预测的危机也会带来一些无法估量的风险，并可能导致大规模的社会动荡，以至于他们自己可能被赶下台，从而被其他“外国”精英所取代。因此，统治精英们只能慢慢地、一步一步地向“非歧视性的多元文化主义”迈进。然而，他们对左翼自由意志主义者的“自由移民”宣传感到高兴，因为它不仅有助于国家保持目前的分而治之的路线，而且还有助于加快这一进程。因此，与他们自己的反国家主义宣言和主张相反，独特的左翼自由主义受害者论，及其历史上长长的、熟悉的“受害者”名单，尤其包括所有潜在移民的外国人，采取一视同仁的友善和包容，这种做法，实际上是国家权力进一步增长的处方。文化马克思主义者清楚这一点，这就是他们采取同样的受害者论说的原因。左翼自由意志主义者显然不知道这一点，因此他们是文化马克思主义者走向极权社会控制的有用的白痴盟友。

Let me come to a conclusion and return to libertarianism, and the topic of Left and Right — and thereby finally also to the answer to my earlier rhetorical questions concerning the peculiar leftist victimology and its significance。

让我来做个总结，回到自由意志主义，回到左翼和右翼的话题——从而也最终回答我之前关于特殊的左翼受害者论说及其意义的修辞问题。

You cannot be a consistent left-libertarian, because the left-libertarian doctrine, even if unintended, promotes Statist, i.e., un-libertarian, ends。 From this, many libertarians have drawn the conclusion that libertarianism is neither Left nor Right。 That it is just "thin" libertarianism。 I do not accept this conclusion。 Nor, apparently, did Murray

---

Rothbard, when he ended the initially presented quote saying: “but psychologically, sociologically, and in practice, it simply doesn't work that way.” Indeed, I consider myself a right-libertarian — or, if that may sound more appealing, a realistic or commonsensical libertarian — and a consistent one at that.

你无法成为一个始终如一的左翼自由意志主义者，因为即使不是故意的，左翼自由意志主义的信条也会促进国家主义，而这不符合自由意志主义的目标。由此，许多自由意志主义者得出结论：自由意志主义既不是左翼也不是右翼。这只是“单薄”的自由意志主义。我不接受这个结论。显然，默里·罗斯巴德(Murray Rothbard)也不这么认为，他在结束最初提出的引言时说：“但从心理学、社会学和实践角度来看，事情根本不是那样运作的。”事实上，我认为自己是一个右翼自由意志主义者——或者，如果这听起来更吸引人的话，是一个现实主义的或常识性的自由意志主义者——而且是一个始终如一的自由意志主义者。

True enough, the libertarian doctrine is a purely aprioristic and deductive theory and as such does not say or imply anything about the rival claims of the Right and the Left regarding the existence, the extent and the causes of human inequalities. That is an empirical question. But on this question the Left happens to be largely unrealistic, wrong and devoid of any common sense, whereas the Right is realistic and essentially correct and sensible. There can be consequently nothing wrong with applying a correct aprioristic theory of how peaceful human cooperation is possible to a realistic, i. e., fundamentally rightist, description of the world. For only based on correct empirical assumptions about man is it possible to arrive at a correct assessment as regards the practical implementation and the sustainability of a libertarian social order.

的确，自由意志主义学说是一种纯粹的先验和演绎的理论，因此该理论并没有阐述或暗示任何右翼和左翼关于人类不平等的存在、程度和原因的对立主张。这是一个实证问题。但是在这个问题上，左翼恰好是大半不现实的，大半是错误的，大半是没有常识的；而右翼是现实的，本质上是正确的和理智的。因此，把人类和平合作如何可能的正确的先验理论应用于现实的，即基本上是右翼的对世界的描述，是没有错的。因为只有基于对人的正确的经验假设，才有可能对自由意志主义的社会秩序的实际应用和可持续性，做出正确的评估。

Realistically, then, a right-libertarian does not only recognize that physical and mental abilities are unequally distributed among the various individuals within each society

and that accordingly each society will be characterized by countless inequalities, by social stratification and a multitude of rank orders of achievement and authority。 He also recognizes that such abilities are unequally distributed among the many different societies coexisting on the globe and that consequently also the world- as-a-whole will be characterized by regional and local inequalities, disparities, stratification and rank orders。 As for individuals, so are also not all societies equal and on a par with each other。 He notices further that among these unequally distributed abilities, both within any given society and between different societies, is also the mental ability of recognizing the requirements and the benefits of peaceful cooperation。 And he notices that the conduct of the various regional or local States and their respective power elites that have emerged from different societies can serve as a good indicator for the various degrees of deviation from the recognition of libertarian principles in such societies。

现实地说，一个右翼自由意志主义者，不仅认识到生理和心智能力在每个社会中的不同个体之间，其分布是不等同的，因此，每个社会都将以无数的不平等、社会阶层化、众多的成就和权威等级为特征。他还意识到，这些能力在地球上共存的许多不同社会之间，同样是分布不均的，因此，整个世界也将以区域性和地方性的不平等、差异化、层级化和等级顺序为特征。与个体的不平等一样，并非所有社会都平等且处于同一水平线上。他进一步注意到，在这些不均匀分布的能力之中，不管在任何给定的社会内部，还是在不同社会之间，认识和平合作的要求和利益的心智能力，也是不同的。他注意到，不同地区或地方国家的行为，以及他们各自的权力精英的行为，可以作为一个很好的观察指标，用来观察这些社会对自由意志主义原则的认知有多大程度的偏离。

More specifically, he realistically notices that libertarianism, as an intellectual system, was first developed and furthest elaborated in the Western world, by white males, in white male dominated societies。 That it is in white, heterosexual male dominated societies, where adherence to libertarian principles is the greatest and the deviations from them the least severe (as indicated by comparatively less evil and extortionist State policies)。 That it is white heterosexual men, who have demonstrated the greatest ingenuity, industry, and economic prowess。 And that it is societies dominated by white heterosexual males, and in particular by the most successful among them, which have produced and accumulated the greatest amount of capital

goods and achieved the highest average living standards。

更具体地说,他现实地注意到,自由意志主义作为一种思想体系,最早是在西方世界,由白人男性,在白人男性主导的社会中发展起来的,并且得到了最详尽的阐述。在异性恋男性主导的白人社会中,对自由意志主义原则的坚持是最大的,对自由意志主义原则的偏离是最不严重的(从相对较少的邪恶和敲诈勒索的国家政策中可以看出)。白人异性恋男性展现出了最伟大的创造力、勤劳和经济实力。而由白人异性恋男性主导的社会,尤其是由他们中最成功的人主导的社会,生产和积累了最多的资本财,并且达到了最高的平均生活水平。

In light of this, as a right-libertarian, I would of course first say to my children and students: always respect and do not invade others' private property rights and recognize the State as an enemy and indeed the very anti-thesis of private property. But I would not leave it at that. I would not say (or silently imply) that once you have satisfied this requirement "anything goes." Which is pretty much what 'thin' libertarians appear to be saying! I would not be a cultural relativist as most "thin" libertarians at least implicitly are. Instead, I would add (at a minimum): be and do whatever makes you happy, but always keep in mind that as long as you are an integral part of the worldwide division of labor, your existence and well-being depends decisively on the continued existence of others, and especially on the continued existence of white heterosexual male dominated societies, their patriarchic family structures, and their bourgeois or aristocratic life style and conduct. Hence, even if you do not want to have any part in that, recognize that you are nonetheless a beneficiary of this standard "Western" model of social organization and hence, for your own sake, do nothing to undermine it but instead be supportive of it as something to be respected and protected。

有鉴于此,作为一名右翼自由意志主义者,我当然会首先对我的孩子和学生们说:永远尊重和不侵犯他人的私有财产权,并将国家视为敌人,它实际上是私有财产的对立面。但我不会就此罢休。我不会说(或默默暗示)一旦你满足了以上这个要求,“任何事情都可以”。因为这几乎就是“单薄”的自由意志主义者所说的话!我不会像大多数“单薄”的自由意志主义者那样,成为一名文化相对主义者。相反,我会至少补充说:做任何让你快乐的事,但要永远记住,只要你是世界范围内劳动分工的一个组成部分,你

的存在和幸福就决定性地取决于其他人的继续存在，特别是取决于白人异性恋男性主导的社会的继续存在，取决于他们主导的父权制家庭结构，取决于他们的资产阶级或贵族的生活方式和行为。因此，即使你不想参与其中，也要认识到你仍然是这种标准的“西方”社会组织模式的受益者，因此，为了你自己的利益，不要去破坏它，而是支持它，把它作为一种值得尊重和保护的東西。

And to the long list of 'victims' I would say: do your own thing, live your own life, as long as you do it peacefully and without invading other people's private property rights. If and insofar as you are integrated into the international division of labor, you do not owe restitution to anyone nor does anyone owe you any restitution. Your coexistence with your supposed 'victimizers' is mutually beneficial. But keep in mind that while the 'victimizers' could live and do without you, albeit at a lower standard of living, the reverse is not true. The disappearance of the 'victimizers' would imperil your very own existence. Hence, even if you don't want to model yourself on the example provided by white male culture, be aware that it is only on account of the continued existence of this model that all alternative cultures can be sustained at their present living standards and that with the disappearance of this "Western" model as a globally effective Leitkultur the existence of many if not all of your fellow 'victims' would be endangered.

对于一长串的“受害者”，我想说：做你自己的事，过你自己的生活，只要你和平地做，不侵犯别人的私有财产权。只要你融入了国际劳动分工，你不欠任何人任何赔偿，任何人也不欠你任何赔偿。你与你假定的“施害者”共存是互利的。但请记住，虽然“施害者”可以在没有你的情况下生活，尽管生活水平较低。但反过来却是未必，没了“施害者”将危及你的生存。因此，即使你不想以白人男性文化为榜样，也要意识到，只有这种模式的持续存在，所有其他文化才能维持目前的生活水平，而随着这种“西方”模式作为一种全球有效的主流文化的消失，许多(如果不是全部的话)你的“受害者”同胞的存在将受到威胁。

That doesn't mean that you should be uncritical of the "Western," white male dominated world. After all, even these societies most closely following this model also have their various States that are responsible for reprehensible acts of aggression not only against their own domestic property owners but also against foreigners. But neither where you live nor anywhere else should the State be confused with "the



people。” It is not the “Western” State, but the “traditional” (normal, standard, etc.) lifestyle and conduct of the western “people,” already under increasingly heavy attack by their very “own” State-rulers on their drive toward totalitarian social control, that deserves your respect and of which you are a beneficiary。

这并不意味着你应该对“西方”、由白人男性主导的世界盲目崇拜。毕竟，即使是这些最贴近这种模式的社会，也有它们各自的国家，这些国家不仅对其国内的财产所有者实施可耻的侵犯行为，还对外国人进行侵犯。但是无论你住在哪里，还是在其他任何地方，都不应该把“国家”与“人民”混为一谈。不是西方“国家”，而是西方“人民”的“传统”(规则、标准等)生活方式和行为，值得你尊重，并且你也从中受益。这种生活方式和行为，已经在其自身的国家统治者朝着极权社会控制的进程中，受到越来越严重的打击。

## 二、论民主、去文明化进程和寻找一种新的反主流文化

### ON DEMOCRACY, DE-CIVILIZATION, AND THE QUEST FOR A NEW COUNTERCULTURE

Because every action requires the employment of specific physical means — a body, standing room, external objects — a conflict between different actors must arise, whenever two actors try to use the same physical means for the attainment of different purposes. The source of conflict is always and invariably the same: the scarcity or rivalrousness of physical means. Two actors cannot at the same time use the same physical means — the same bodies, spaces and objects — for alternative purposes. If they try to do so, they must clash. Therefore, in order to avoid conflict or resolve it if it occurs, an actionable principle and criterion of justice or law is required, i. e., a principle regulating the just, lawful, or “proper” vs. the unjust, unlawful, or “improper” use and control (ownership) of scarce physical means.

因为每个行动都需要使用特定的物理手段——一个身体、站立的空间、外部物体——当两个行动者试图使用相同的物理手段达到不同的目的时，二者之间必然产生冲突。冲突的根源总是一贯相同的：物质手段的匮乏或竞争。两个行动者不能同时使用相同的物理手段——同一个身体、空间和物体——达成不同的目的。如果他们试图这样做，冲突必然发生。因此，为了避免发生冲突，或在发生冲突时有解决之道，需要一个操作的公正的法律原则和标准。这个原则可以用于在界定稀缺物质资源的使用权和所有权时，区别什么是公正、合法或“恰当”，什么是不公正、非法或“不恰当”。

Logically, what is required to avoid all conflict is clear: It is only necessary that every good be always and at all times owned privately, i. e., controlled exclusively by some specified individual (or individual partnership or association), and that it be always recognizable which good is owned and by whom, and which is not or by someone else. The plans and purposes of various profit-seeking actor-entrepreneurs may then be as different as can be, and yet no conflict will arise so long as their respective actions involve only and exclusively the use of their own, private property.

那么，什么原则或标准才能达到使用这些手段时，在逻辑上不会出现冲突？答案是，只要这件商品的所有权是明确的，是由某个特定的人（个人合伙或联合体）独家控制的，只要明确某些物品属于某人所有，某些物品属其他人所有。

逻辑上来说，避免所有冲突，其所需是明确的：只需要每一种商品，总是并且在任何时候都是私人拥有的，即，由某个特定的个人(个人合伙或联合体)独家控制，并且人们总是能辨认出哪些物品是由某人所有的，哪些物品是由他人所有的。各种追求利润的行动者-企业家的计划和目的，可能会有很大的不同，但只要他们各自的行动只涉及并仅限于使用自己的私有财产，冲突就不会产生。

Yet how can this state of affairs: the complete and unambiguously clear privatization of all goods, be practically accomplished? How can physical things become private property in the first place; and how can conflict be avoided in these initial acts of privatization?

然而，这种局面——所有商品的完全和明确的私有化，如何在现实中实现？物理形态的东西首先是如何成为私有财产？在这些私有化的最初行动中，如何避免冲突？

A single — praxeological — solution to this problem exists and has been essentially known to mankind since its beginnings — even if it has only been slowly and gradually elaborated and logically re-constructed. To avoid conflict from the start, it is necessary that private property be founded through acts of original appropriation. Property must be established through acts (instead of mere words, decrees, or declarations), because only through actions, taking place in time and space, can an objective intersubjectively ascertainable link be established between a particular person and a particular thing. And only the first appropriator of a previously unappropriated thing can acquire this thing as his property without conflict. For, by definition, as the first appropriator he can not have run into conflict with anyone in appropriating the good in question, as everyone else appeared on the scene only later.

对于这个问题，人类一开始就发现了一个简单的行动学的解决方案，而且这一方案后来缓慢地、逐步地被阐述，并且得到合乎逻辑地重构。为了从一开始就避免冲突，私有财产必须通过原始占有行动来建立。财产必须通过行动(而不仅仅是言语、法令或声明)来确立，因为只有通过在时间和空间中发生的行动，在一个特定的人与

一件特定的物之间，建立一种客观的、主体间可确定的联系。而且，第一个占有者只有占有先前未被占用的物品，才能无冲突地获取这个物品作为他的财产。因为，根据定义，作为第一个占有者，他不可能在占有该物品时与任何人发生冲突，因为其他人都是后来才出现的。

This importantly implies that while every person is the exclusive owner of his own physical body as his primary means of action, no person can ever be the owner of any other person's body. For we can use another person's body only indirectly, i. e. , in using our directly appropriated and controlled own body first. Thus, direct appropriation temporally and logically precedes indirect appropriation; and accordingly, any non-consensual use of another person's body is an unjust misappropriation of something already directly appropriated by someone else.

这无疑意味着，每个人都是自己身体的唯一拥有者，作为行动的初始手段，而没有人可以成为任何其他人身体的所有者。因为我们只能首先直接占有和控制自己的身体，才能间接地使用另一个人的身体。因此，直接占有在时间上和逻辑上优先于间接占有；因此，对他人身体的任何非自愿使用都是对已被其他人直接占有的东西的不公正侵占。

All just (lawful) property, then, goes back directly or indirectly, through a chain of mutually beneficial

— and thus conflict-free — property title transfers, to prior and ultimately original appropriators and acts of appropriation. Mutatis mutandis, all claims to and uses made of things by a person who had neither appropriated or previously produced these things, nor acquired them through a conflict-free exchange from some previous owner, are unjust (unlawful).

所有正当的(合法的)财产，透过一系列互利的(因而无冲突的)财产所有权转移，最终都可直接或间接地回溯到先前和最初的占有者和他们的占有行为。如果一个人既没有先占或者未生产过这些物品，也没有通过无冲突的交换从以前的某个所有者那里获得，那么，他对这些东西的所有要求和使用都是不公正的(非法的)。

Let me emphasize, that I consider these elementary insights argumentatively irrefutable and hence, a priori true. If you want to live in peace with other persons

---

— and you demonstrate that you wish to do so by engaging in argumentation with them — then only one solution exists: you must have private (exclusive) property in all things scarce and suitable as means (or goods) in the pursuit of human ends (goals); and private property in such things must be founded in acts of original appropriation — the recognizable embordering or enclosure of scarce resources — or else in the voluntary transfer of such property from a prior to a later owner。

我要强调，我认为这些基本见解在论证上是无可辩驳的，因此必定先验正确。如果你想与其他人和平共处——通过与他们论辩来证明你希望这样做——那么唯一的解决办法：所有稀缺的和适合追求人类目的(目标)，作为手段(或商品)的东西，你必须拥有私有(排他性)财产权；这些事物作为私有财产，必须建立在最初的占有行动之上——可识别的对稀缺资源的占有或圈定——或者建立在自愿的转让基础之上，即这些财产从前一个所有者自愿转让给后一个所有者。

We can say, then, that these rules express and explicate the “natural law.” “Natural,” given the uniquely human goal of peaceful interaction; and “natural,” because these laws are “given” and merely discovered as such by man. That is, they are emphatically not laws that are made- up, contrived, or decreed. In fact, all man-made (rather than discovered or found) law, i. e. , all legislation, is not law at all, but a perversion of law: orders, commands, or prescriptions that do not lead to peace, but to conflict, and hence are dysfunctional of the very purpose of laws。

因此，我们可以说，这些规则表达和阐释了“自然法则”。这里的“自然”是指对于人类独特的和平互动目标，这些法则是“本就存在”的；它们是由人类发现的，而非创造、设计或颁布的。事实上，所有人造的（而不是被发现或找到的）法律，即所有立法，实际上不是真正的法律，而是法律的扭曲：这些是命令、指令或规定，并不会带来和平，而只会导致冲突，因此与法律的真正目的背道而驰。

This does not mean that, with the discovery of the principles of natural law, all problems of social order are solved and all friction will disappear. Conflicts can and do occur, even if everyone knows how to avoid them. And, in every case of conflict between two or more contending parties, then, the law must be applied — and for this jurisprudence and judgment and adjudication (in contrast to juris-diction) is required. There can be dis- putes about whether you or I have misapplied the prin-ciples in specific instances regarding particular means. There can be disagreements as to the

“true” facts of a case: who was where and when, and who had taken possession of this or that at such and such times and places? And it can be tedious and time-consuming to establish and sort out these facts. Various prior-later disputes must be investigated. Contracts may have to be scrutinized. Difficulties may arise in the application of the principles to underground resources, to water and to air, and especially to flows of water and air. Moreover, there is always the question of “fitting” a punishment to a given crime, i. e., of finding the appropriate measure of restitution or retribution that a victimizer owes his victim, and of then enforcing the verdicts of law.

这并不意味着，一旦发现了自然法则的原则，所有社会秩序问题都得到解决，所有分歧也都会消失。即使每个人都知道如何避免冲突，冲突仍然可能发生。因此，在每起两个或多个争执方之间的冲突中，都必须适用法律——为此需要司法、裁决和裁决（与司法管辖不同）。在特定手段的具体情况下，你或我是否错误应用了这些原则可能存在争议。在案件的“真实”事项方面可能存在分歧：谁在何时何地，谁何时何地占据了那个东西？确立和梳理这些事实可能是乏味且耗时的。可能需要调查各种先后发生的争议。契约可能需要仔细审查。在应用原则到地下资源、水和空气，尤其是水流和空气流动方面，可能会遇到困难。此外，总是会存在惩罚与特定罪行“相称”的问题，即找出施害者欠其受害人的适当的赔偿或报复的措施，然后执行法律的裁决。

Difficult as these problems may occasionally be, however, the guiding principles to be followed in searching for a solution are always clear and beyond dispute.

尽管这些问题有时会很困难，然而，寻求解决办法时所应遵循的指导原则总是清晰且无可争议。

In every case of conflict brought to trial in search of judgment, the presumption is always in favour of the current possessor of the resource in question and, mutatis mutandis, the burden of a “proof to the contrary” is always on the opponent of some current state of affairs and current possessions. The opponent must demonstrate that he, contrary to prima facie appearance, has a claim on some specific good that is

older than the current possessor's claim。 If, and only if an opponent can successfully demonstrate this must the questionable possession be restored as property to him。 On the other hand, if the opponent fails to make his case, then not only does the possession remain as property with its current owner, but the current possessor in turn has acquired a lawful claim against his opponent。 For the current possessor's body and time was misappropriated by the opponent during his failed and rejected argument。 He could have done other, preferred, things with his body-time except defend himself against his opponent。

在每起冲突案件被带到法庭寻求裁决的情况下，推定总是有利于涉及资源的现持有者。类推而言，反对某种当前状态和当前所有权的人，就应该为自己的主张举证。对手必须证明，与表面现象相反，他对某种特定商品的权利要求比当前所有者的权利要求更早。当且仅当对手能够成功证明这一点时，可疑财产才必须作为财产归还给他。另一方面，如果对手没有提出自己的理由，那么不仅该占有权仍然是其当前所有者的财产，而且当前所有者反过来获得了对对手的合法索赔。他原本可以用他的身体和时间，做其他更喜欢的事情，而不是保护自己免受对手的攻击。他原本可以用他的身体和时间，做其他更喜欢的事情，而不是保护自己免受对手的攻击。

And importantly also: the procedure to be selected for dispensing justice along the just indicated lines is clear and implied in the very goal of peaceful, argumentative conflict resolution。 Because both contenders in any property dispute — John and Jim — make or maintain opposite truth claims — I, John, am the lawful owner of such and such a resource versus no, I, Jim, am the lawful owner of this very same resource — and hence, both John and Jim are interested, partial or biased in favour of a particular outcome of the trial, only some disinterested or neutral third party can be entrusted with the task of dispensing justice。 This procedure does not guarantee that justice will always be done, of course。 But it assures that the likelihood of unjust verdicts is minimized and errors of judgment most likely and easily be corrected。 In short, then, for each and every property dispute between two (or more) contending parties it must hold: No party may ever sit in judgment and act as final judge in any dispute involving itself。 Rather, every appeal to justice must always be made to "outsiders," i. e. , to impartial third-party judges。

同样重要的是：沿着刚才指出的路径，裁决争议应该有清晰的程序，而且该程序本

就隐含在目标之中，即以和平、辩论的方式解决争议。因为在任何财产争端中，双方争议者约翰和吉姆都提出或维护了相反的真实主张——“我，约翰，是某某资源的合法所有者”；“我，吉姆，是这个同样资源的合法所有者”。既然约翰和吉姆都希望裁决的特定结果不偏不倚，只有某些无利益关系或中立的第三方才可以被委托以执行伸张正义的任务。当然，这个程序并不能保证正义总会得到伸张，但它确保了不公正裁决的可能性被最小化，并且错误的裁判很可能并且很容易被纠正。简而言之，对于每一起涉及两个（或多个）争议方之间的财产争端，必须遵循的原则是：争议中的任何一方都不得在涉及自身的争议中担任裁决者并且作为最终的裁决者。相反，每次诉诸司法都必须向“局外人”提出，即向中立的第三方法官提出。

We may call the social order emerging from the application of these principles and procedures a “natural order,” a “system of natural justice,” a “private law society,” or a “constitution of liberty.”

我们可以把应用这些原则和程序所产生的社会秩序，称为“自然秩序”、“自然正义体系”、“私法社会”或“自由宪法”。

Interestingly, although the prescriptions and requirements of a natural order appear intuitively plausible and reasonably undemanding on its constituent parts, i. e. , on us as individual actors, as a matter of fact, however, we inhabit a world that sharply deviates from such an order. To be sure, there are still traces of natural law and justice to be found in civil life and the handling of civil disputes, but natural law has become increasingly deformed, distorted, corrupted, swamped, and submerged by ever higher mountains of legislative laws, i. e. , by rules and procedures at variance with natural law and justice.

有趣的是，尽管自然秩序的规定和条件在直觉上似乎是合理的，且对其组成部分(既作为个体行动者的我们)来说是合理的。然而，事实上我们却生活在一个与这种秩序大相径庭的世界。当然，在市民生活与民事纠纷的处理中，依然可以找到自然法和正义的痕迹，但自然法已经变得越来越畸形、扭曲、崩坏、湮灭，并且被淹没在越来越高的立法法（不同于自然法和正义的规则、程序）的大山中。

It is not too difficult to identify the root cause for this increasingly noticeable deviation of social reality from a natural order and to explain this transformation as the necessary consequence of one elementary as well as fundamental original error.



This error — the “original sin,” if you will — is the monopolization of the function of judgeship and adjudication。 That is, the “original sin” is to appoint one person or agency (but no one else! ) to act as final judge in all conflicts, including also conflicts involving itself。

识别社会现实日益偏离自然秩序的根本原因并解释这种转变并不是太困难，它是一种基本的、原始的错误所必然导致的结果。这个错误，可以说是“原罪”，就是司法和裁决职能的垄断。也就是说，这个“原罪”是指任命一个人或机构（但没有其他人！）来充当所有冲突的最终裁判，包括涉及其他自身的冲突。

The institution of such a monopoly apparently fulfills the classic definition of a State as a monopolist of ultimate decision-making and of violence over some territory that it acquired neither through acts of original appropriation nor through a voluntary transfer from a previous owner。 The State — and no one else! — is appointed and permitted to sit in judgment of its own actions and to violently enforce its own judgment。

这种垄断制度显然完全符合国家的经典定义，即某一领土内的最终决策者和暴力垄断者，而该领土，既不是通过原始占有行为获得，也不是来自先前所有者的自愿转让。国家——而不是其他任何人！——被任命且被允许对其自身的行为进行裁决，并以暴力方式强制执行它的裁决。

This involves in and of itself a twofold violation of natural law and justice。 On the one hand, because the State thus prohibits everyone involved in a property dispute with itself from appealing for justice to any potential outside third-party judge; and mutatis mutandis, because the State excludes everyone else (except itself) from proffering his adjudication services in such conflicts。

这本身就涉及到对自然法和正义的双重违反。一方面，国家禁止任何与自己有财产纠纷的人，通过向任何可能的第三方法官上诉寻求正义；同时另外一方面，国家不允许除自己之外的任何人在这种冲突中提供裁决服务。

Moreover, from the original error predictable consequences follow。 As a universal rule, each and every monopoly, shielded from competition, leads to higher prices and a lower quality of the product or service in question than would otherwise be the case。

In the special case of a judicial monopoly and the particular service of adjudication, this means on the one hand that the quality of law and justice will fall and natural law will be successively replaced by monopolist made legislation, i. e. , perversions of law. Predictably, the monopolist will use his position as ultimate decision-maker not only to resolve conflict between contending property owners, but increasingly also to initiate or provoke conflicts with private property owners, in order to then decide such conflicts in his own favor, i. e. , to expropriate the just property of others to his own advantage on the basis of his own made-up laws. And on the other hand, the price to be paid for justice will rise. In fact, the price of justice will not simply be a 'higher price' that justice seekers may or may not be willing to pay (as would be the case for any other monopoly), but a tax that justice seekers must pay whether they agree to it or not. That is, private property owners involved in property disputes with the State will not only be expropriated via legislation, but they must also pay the State for this "service" of expropriating them, thus adding insult to injury.

此外，从最初的错误中可以预见到一系列的后果。作为一个普遍的规律，每一种垄断，在免于竞争影响的情况下，都会导致相关产品或服务的价格上涨，同时质量下降。在司法垄断，尤其是仲裁这个特殊服务被垄断的特殊情况下，这意味着一方面法律与公正的质量将下降，另一方面自然法将逐渐被垄断立法取代，即法律会越来越扭曲。可以预见，垄断者不仅会利用他作为最终裁决者的地位，来裁决有争议的财产所有者之间的冲突，而且，他也会越来越多的制造或挑起与私有财产所有者之间的冲突，以便在这些冲突中以自己的利益为依据做出裁决。然后，根据他自己制定的法律，征用他人的正当财产来实现自身的利益。另一方面，为了获得正义需要支付的代价也会上升。事实上，公正的代价不仅仅是正义追求者可能或可能不愿意支付的“更高价格”（就像其他任何垄断一样），而是正义追求者必须支付的一种税收，无论他们是否同意。也就是说，与国家发生财产纠纷的私人财产所有者不仅会通过立法被剥夺，而且他们必须向国家支付这种剥夺他们的“服务”费用，因此雪上加霜。

In effect, with the establishment of a judicial monopoly all private property becomes essentially fiat property, i. e. , State-granted private property. Private property is only provisionally private and left under private control, i. e. , only until some State-made law or regulation does not decree otherwise, thus creating an environment

of permanent legal uncertainty and causing an increase in the social rate of time-preference。

实际上，随着司法垄断的建立，所有私有财产基本上都变成了法定财产，即国家授予的私有财产。私有财产只是暂时的私有，也就是只有在某些国家制定的法律或条例没有颁布之前，这些财产才能置于私人控制之下。这种法律永远不确定的环境，进一步造成私有财产因法律的不确定性而处于更高的不确定性中，最终导致社会时间偏好的提高。

Let me term this process that is set in motion with the institution of a State: the progressive deviation from a natural order and system of justice and the increasing erosion of all private property rights and corresponding growth of the legislative and regulatory powers of the State, the process of de-civilization。

这个发轫于国家体制而启动的司法垄断进程，我把它命名为“去文明化进程”，因为司法制度不仅逐渐偏离了自然秩序，还日益侵蚀私有财产权，特别是逐步增长了国家的立法与统治权力。

While steady in its direction, the process of de-civilization begun with the establishment of a State may proceed at different speeds at different times or places, sometimes more slowly and sometimes at a faster pace。However, another, additional, error can be identified that will result in an acceleration of the process of de-civilization。This second error is the transformation of the State into a democratic State。This transformation does not involve any change in the status of the State as judicial monopolist。Yet it still involves a significant twofold change: entry into the State and the position of ultimate judge is opened for every (adult) inhabitant of a given territory and the function as final judge is exercised only temporarily, for some short fixed period by the winner of regularly recurring secret and anonymous one-man-one-vote elections。

一个国家建立开始，其去文明化进程的方向是稳定的，但在不同的时间、不同的地点，可能以不同的速度进行，时慢时快。然而，可以确定另一个额外的错误，它会导致加速去文明化进程。这第二个错误就是，国家转变成为民主国家。这种转变，不涉及国家作为司法垄断者地位的任何改变。然而，它仍然涉及一个重大的双重变化：进入国家以及通向最终裁决者宝座的大门，向这一领土上的每个(成年)居民开放。至于最终

裁决者的职能，只能由获胜者在固定的短时间内被临时行使，这些获胜者来自反复举行的秘密的、匿名的一人一票的定期选举。

Predictably, this change will lead to a systematic acceleration of the process of de-civilization。

可以预见，这种变化将系统性的加快去文明化进程。

On the one hand, as Helmut Schoeck above all has amply demonstrated, the feeling of envy is one of the most widespread and powerful of de-civilizing motivational forces. All major (high) religions have therefore condemned the desire for the property of one's neighbours as sinful. In a natural order or a system of natural law and justice, people too, some more and others less, are tempted to expropriate the property of others to their own advantage. But in a natural order, quite in accordance with religious prescriptions, such temptations are considered immoral and illegitimate and everyone is expected to suppress any such desires. With a State in place, some — a few — people are permitted to give in to such immoral desires for an indeterminate period and use legislation and taxation as means to satisfy their own desire for the property of others. Only with democracy, however, i. e. , the free and unrestricted entry into the State, are all moral restraints and inhibitions against the taking of others' lawful property removed. Everyone is free to indulge in such temptations and propose and promote every conceivable measure of legislation and taxation to gain advantages at other people's expense. That is, whereas in a natural order everyone is expected to spend his time exclusively on production or consumption, under democratic conditions, increasingly more time is spent instead on politics, i. e. , on the advocacy and promotion of activities that are neither productive nor consumptive, but exploitative and parasitic of and on the property of others. Indeed, even the opponents of such a development must waste their time increasingly on unproductive endeavors, i. e. , on politics, if only to defend themselves and their property or take precautionary actions against such incursions. In fact, under democratic conditions, a new class of people emerges — politicians — whose profession it is to propose and promote law— decrees and taxes designed to expropriate the property of some to the advantage of others (including and foremost themselves)。

一方面，正如赫尔穆特·舍克(Helmut Schoeck)首先充分证明的那样，嫉妒是最普遍、最强大的反文明动力之一。因此，所有主要(高级)宗教，都谴责觊觎邻居财产的欲望，认为是有罪的。在自然秩序或自然法则和正义的体系中，人们也或多或少地受到诱惑，想要为了自己的利益侵占他人财产。自然秩序和宗教教规完全一致，都视这种侵占他人财产的欲望是不道德不合法的，都要求人们抑制这样的欲望。当国家存在时，一些人(少数人)被允许在不确定的时期内，屈服于这种不道德的欲望，并利用立法和税收作为手段，来满足他们觊觎他人财产的欲望。然而，只有在民主制度下，所有人都可以自由且不受限制地成为国家的一部分，对夺取他人合法财产的所有道德限制和约束都被清除了。每个人都可以自由地沉迷于这种诱惑，并提出和推动每一种可以想象的立法和税收措施，以牺牲他人的利益来获取自己的利益。也就是说，在自然秩序中，每个人都被期望把时间专门花在生产或消费上，而在民主条件下，越来越多的时间被花在政治上，也就是说，倡导和促进既不生产也不消费的行为，而是剥削他人财产，寄生于他人财产之上。事实上，即使是反对这种发展的人，也必须把越来越多地时间，浪费在非生产性的努力上，即政治上，哪怕只是为了保护自己和自己的财产，或者预防这种入侵而采取行动。事实上，在民主条件下，出现了一个新的阶级群体——政客——他们的职业是提出和促成立法——法令和税收，旨在剥夺一些人的财产，以有利于其他人(包括他们自己，尤其是他们自己)。

Moreover, owing to regularly recurring elections, the politicization of society never comes to an end but is constantly reignited and continued. Legal uncertainty or lawlessness is thus heightened and social time preferences will rise still further, i. e., increasingly shortening the time horizon taken into consideration in one's action-plans. And in the process of political competition, i. e., in the competition for the position of ultimate decision-maker, such politicians and political parties will rise to the top who have the least moral scruples and the best skills as demagogues, i. e., of proposing and propagating the most popular assortment of immoral and unlawful demands from a near limitless supply of such demands on offer in public opinion.

此外，由于定期举行选举，社会的政治化永远不会结束，而是不断被重新点燃、持续下去。因此，法律上的不确定性或无法无天的情况就会加剧，社会时间偏好将进一步上升，即在个人行动计划中考虑的时间跨度日益缩短。在政治的竞争过程中，即在角

逐最终裁决者宝座的过程中，那些最缺乏道德底线，最擅长于蛊惑人心的政客和政党将崭露头角。也就是说，公众舆论中提出的近乎无限的这种诉求，煽动者从中提炼并宣扬各种最受欢迎的不道德和非法的口号。

On the other hand — as the other side of the same coin — democracy will lead to increasing corruption. With open entry into the State, the resistance against State-rule is reduced and the size of the State will grow. The number of State employees and administrators will increase, and because their income and livelihood is dependent on the continuation of the State's power of legislation and taxation, they will, not necessarily, but in all likelihood, become reliable and loyal supporters of the State. In particular, the class of intellectuals, i. e. , the producers of words (wordsmiths) in contrast to the producers of things (manufacturers), will be thus bought off and corrupted. Because there is only little and fickle market demand for words rather than things, intellectuals are always desperate for any help they can get to stay afloat, and the State, in permanent need of ideological support for its relentless onslaught against natural law and justice, is only too willing to offer such help and employ them as public educators in exchange for the appropriate propaganda.

另一方面，作为同一枚硬币的另一面，民主将导致腐败的增加。随着进入国家通道的大门被打开，对国家统治的抵抗会减少，同时国家规模却会扩大。国家雇员和行政人员的人数将会增加，由于他们的收入和生计，依赖于国家立法和征税权力的持续性，他们未必一定会，但极大可能会成为国家铁杆和忠诚的支持者。在市场上多的是对实物生产的需求，而对文字生产者（舞文弄墨者）的需求少且多变，知识分子难以找到他们的买家。那么，知识分子会把自己卖给谁呢？一方面，国家想要无情攻击自然法，想要制造支持自己行为的意识形态；另一方面，知识分子想要资助，想要被包养。二者一拍即合，国家资助知识分子，雇佣他们进行公共教育，进行有效的意识形态宣传，于是知识分子就这样被收买并腐化。

Yet it is not only State employees that are so corrupted. Tax-revenue and the State's range of control over other, non-monetary assets and holdings will far exceed what is necessary to employ and equip its workers. The State can also disperse income and assistance to various members of civil society. The loyalty of the poor and downtrodden can be assured through so-called social welfare programs, and the rich and the captains of banking and industry, and indirectly also their employees, can be

corrupted through government privileges, contracts, and interest bearing governments bonds。 And this same policy can be used also for the purpose of “dividing” the members of civil society, so as to more easily control an increasingly factionalized or “atomized” population。 Divide et impera!

当然，不仅仅是政府雇员才如此腐败。国家通过征税和占有，对其他非货币资产和财产的控制规模，将远远超过雇用和装备其雇员所需的费用。国家还可以将收入和援助分配给公民社会的各种成员。所谓的社会福利计划，一方面能够通过分配社会福利以获得穷人和受压迫者的忠诚，另一方面也可以腐化富人、银行、工业巨头，同时也间接包括他们的员工。对于后者，国家用政府特权、契约和计息的政府债券，去收买他们。同样的政策，也可以用来“分裂”公民社会的成员，以便于更容易控制日益派系化或者“原子化”的人口。分而治之！

While the principal direction of social evolution can be safely predicted based on a few elementary assumptions about the nature of man, the State, and of democracy in particular, all details concerning the process of de-civilization remain uncertain and unclear。 To be more specific, history must be consulted。 In particular, about the last hundred years must be looked at, i. e. , the history since the end of WWI in 1918, when modern democracy came into its own displacing the former monarchical State。

基于对人、国家、特别是民主的本质的一些基本假设，我们可以有把握预测社会进化的主要方向，但是，关于去文明化进程的所有细节，仍然是不确定和模糊的。更具体地说，我们应该借鉴历史，尤其是近一百年来的历史，自1918年一战结束以来的历史。在这个历史阶段，旧时的君主制国家，都被现代民主取而代之。

While this history confirms the general prediction, the actual results are truly horrendous, surpassing the worst fears。 As far as moral degeneration and corruption is concerned, and taking only the US as the dominant example and model of a democratic State into consideration, a few indicators may suffice as illustration。

这段历史证实了这个一般性的预测，实际结果非常可怕，超过了最坏的担忧。美国是民主国家的主要范例和模式，而我们只需要几个指标就可以说明美国的道德堕落和腐败有多么严重。

In the US, a Code of Federal Regulations — a document listing all government rules

and regulations

— did not exist at the beginning of the period (until 1937)。 By 1960, the Code had reached 22,877 pages, and by 2012 it had swollen to a total of 174,545 pages, subdivided into 50 titles, regulating in minutest detail the production of everything imaginable, from agriculture and aeronautics to transportation, wildlife, and fisheries。 Whereas natural law is comprised of only three principles: self-ownership, original appropriation, and contractual property transfer from a prior to a later owner, then, today, after a hundred years of democracy, no aspect of production and consumption is left free and unregulated。 As well, at the beginning of the period no more than a handful of “federal crimes” existed, concerning matters such as “treason” or the “bribery of federal officials” (while all “normal” crimes were defined and prosecuted by the individual States)。 By 1980 the number of “federal crimes” had already grown to about 3,000, and by 2007 it had reached 4,450, criminalizing not just ever more non-tortious actions and victimless crimes but increasingly also motives, thoughts, words, and speech。

美国《联邦法规法典》是一份重要文件清单，它列出所有政府规章制度的文件，而这份文件从篇幅到内容都发生了巨大的扩容。1937年这个法典还不存在，1960年达到22877页，2012年达到174545页。在2012年的版本中，已经分为50个标题，对从农业、航空到运输、野生动物和渔业，所有能够想象得到的生产，进行了最详细的规范。我们知道，自然法仅由三个原则组成：自我所有权、初始占有权和契约性转移（即从先前所有者到后来所有者）。然而到今天，经过一百年的民主治理后，已经没有哪个生产和消费领域是自由和不受管制的了。此外，我们再来看看“联邦罪行”这个栏目。这一时期肇始，存在的“联邦罪行”仅仅只有少数项，只涉及诸如“叛国罪”或“贿赂联邦官员”等事项（同时，所有“常规”罪行都是由各州自行界定和起诉的）。到1980年，“联邦犯罪”的名目已经增长到3000种左右，到2007年达到4450种，不仅更多的非侵权行为和无受害者犯罪被定为犯罪，而且越来越多的动机、思想、文字和言论也被定为犯罪。

As a second indicator for the degree of corruption it is revealing to contrast the total population number with the number of State-dependents。 Presently, the total population of the US is about 320 million, or about 260 million, if we subtract the number of people below age 18 and ineligible to vote。 By contrast, the number of



people wholly or mostly dependent for their livelihood on State-funding includes the following: The number of State-employees (of all levels of governments) is about 22 million. Forty-six million people receive “food stamps.” Sixty-six million people are “Social Security” recipients. Eight million people receive “unemployment insurance.” Federal government spending alone on for-profit firms amounts to some \$500 billion, accounting according to an estimate by Charles Murray for about 22 percent of the American workforce or about 36 million people.

作为腐败程度的第二个指标, 比较人口总数与依赖国家的人数, 可以揭示问题。目前, 美国总人口约为 3.2 亿, 如果减去未满 18 岁且没有资格投票的人数, 约为 2.6 亿。相比之下, 完全或大部分依靠国家资金维持生计的人数包括: 国家雇员 (各级政府部门) 的人数约为 2200 万。4600 万人领取“食品券”。6600 万人是“社会保障”受益人。800 万人领取“失业保险”。另外, 联邦政府也对某些营利性企业进行补贴或资助, 据查尔斯·默里(Charles Murray)估计, 仅联邦政府在营利性企业上的支出就高达 5000 亿美元, 约占美国劳动力的 22%, 约 3600 万人。

Lastly, non-profit organizations and NGOs, with annual revenues of \$2 trillion and almost 12 million employees, receive about a third of their funding from government, accounting for about another 3 million dependents — thus bringing the total of State-dependents to about 181 million people. That is, only 79 million people or about one third of the adult (above 18) US population of 260 million (or about 25 percent of the total population of 320 million) can be said to be financially wholly or largely independent of the State, whereas close to 70 percent of the US adult population and 57 percent of the total population are to be counted as State-dependents.

最后, 年收入达 2 万亿美元和雇员近 1200 万的非营利组织和非政府组织, 其经费约有三分之一来自政府, 另外约有 300 万受扶养者。根据前面的疏枝, 我们会发现受国家扶养者的总数达到约 1.81 亿人。也就是说, 只有 7900 万人, 或者是 2.6 亿成年美国人(18 岁以上)的三分之一(总人口 3.2 亿的 25%左右), 可以说在经济上完全或大部分独立于国家, 而将近 70%的美国成年人和总人口的 57%被视为受国家抚养。

Finally, as a third indicator of moral degeneration and corruption, a look at the top of the democratic State system is instructive: at the politicians and political parties who run and direct the democratic show. In this regard, whether we look at the US or any of its satellite States in Europe and all around the globe, the picture is equally

unambiguous and clear — and equally bleak。 If measured by the standards of natural law and justice, all politicians, of all parties and virtually without any exception, are guilty, whether directly or indirectly, of murder, homicide, trespass, invasion, expropriation, theft, fraud, and the fencing of stolen goods on a massive and ongoing scale。 And every new generation of politicians and parties appears to be worse, and piles even more atrocities and perversions on top of the already existing mountain, so that one feels almost nostalgic about the past。

最后，作为道德沦丧和腐败的第三个指标，审视民主国家体系的顶层，即主导民主运作的政客和政党，是很有启发性的。在这方面，无论我们是看美国还是其在欧洲及全球各地的卫星国家，情况都同样明显和清楚 — 但同样令人沮丧。如果按照自然法和正义的标准来衡量，所有政客、所有政党，几乎无一例外，都直接或间接地犯有谋杀、杀人、侵入、侵犯、征用、偷窃、欺诈和大规模的侵吞罪行。而且每一代新的政客和政党似乎都更糟糕，积累了更多的暴行和堕落，以至于人们居然会怀念过去。

They all should be hung, or put in jail to rot, or set to making compensation。

他们都应该被绞死，或者被送进监狱，或者做出赔偿。

But: Instead, they parade around in public and broad daylight and proclaim themselves — pompously, pretentiously, arrogantly, and self-righteously — as saintly do-gooders: as good Samaritans, selfless public servants, benefactors, and saviors of mankind and human civilization。 Assisted by a hired intelligentsia, they tell the public in endless loops and variations that as in Alice's wonder-land nothing is what it seems:

“When I use a word,” Humpty Dumpty said in rather a scornful tone, “it means just what I choose it to mean — neither more nor less。”

“The question is,” said Alice, “whether you can make words mean so many different things。”

“The question is,” said Humpty Dumpty, “which is to be master — that's all。”

但是，朗朗乾坤之下，他们却大摇大摆地在公众面前炫耀自己——傲慢地、自命不凡地、自大地、自以为是地——自称为圣洁的行善者：善良的撒玛利亚人、无私的公仆、恩人、人类和人类文明的救世主。在雇佣的知识分子的帮助下，他们周而复始、巧舌如簧地告诉公众，一如梦游爱丽丝仙境般，所视非所见。

“当我用一个词的时候，”胖墩儿用一种相当轻蔑的语气说，“它的意思就是我赋予它的意思——不多也不少。

“问题是，”爱丽丝说，“你能否赋予文字这么多不同的意思。”

“问题是，”胖墩儿说，“**谁是话事人——这才是重点。**”

And it is the politicians, who are the masters, and who stipulate that aggression, invasion, murder, and war are actually self-defense, whereas self-defense is aggression, invasion, murder, and war。 Freedom is coercion, and coercion is freedom。 Saving and investment are consumption, and consumption is saving and investment。 Money is paper, and paper is money。 Taxes are voluntary payments, and voluntarily paid prices are exploitative taxes。 Contracts are no contracts, and no contracts are contracts。 Producers are parasites, and parasites are producers。 Expropriation is restitution, and restitution is expropriation。 Indeed, what we can see, hear, or otherwise sense does not exist, and that which we cannot see, hear, or otherwise sense does。 The normal is anormal and the anormal normal。 Black is white and white is black。 Male is female and female male, etc。

政治家才是话事人，他们可以将侵略、入侵、谋杀和战争定义为自卫，当然也可以把自卫定义为侵略、入侵、谋杀和战争。同理，自由即强制，强制即自由。储蓄和投资就是消费，消费就是储蓄和投资。钱是纸，纸就是钱。税收是自愿支付的，自愿支付的价格就是剥削性的税收。契约不是契约，没有契约就是契约。生产者寄生虫，寄生虫也是生产者。征没就是归还，归还就是征没。的确，我们能看到、听到或以其他方式感觉到的东西是不存在的，而我们不能看到、听到或以其他方式感觉到的东西是存在的。正常就是非正常，非正常就是正常。黑色是白色，白色是黑色。男即女，女即男，等等。

Worse, the overwhelming majority of the public, far exceeding even the number of State-dependents, falls for this nonsense。 Politicians are not despised and ridiculed but held in high esteem, applauded, admired, and even glorified by the masses。 In their presence, and in particular vis-à-vis “top” politicians, most people show themselves awestruck, submissive, and servile。 Indeed, even those opposing or denouncing one particular politician or party do so almost always only to propose or hail yet another, different but equally absurd and confused politician or party。 And

the intelligentsia, finding its own verbal mumbo-jumbo echoed in the blabbering of this or that politician or political party, virtually drools over them。

更糟糕的是，绝大多数民众，甚至远远超过依赖国家抚养的人数，对这种无稽之谈信以为真。政治家不是被鄙视和嘲笑，而是受到群众的高度尊重、欣赏、赞美、甚至膜拜。面对他们，特别是面对“顶级”政客，大多数人表现出敬畏、顺从和奴性。事实上，即使是那些反对或谴责某个特定政治家或某一特定政党的人，这样做的目的，也几乎总是为了推荐或呼唤另一个同样荒谬和糊涂的政治家或政党。知识分子，发现他们晦涩难懂的辞藻，被某个政客或政党的胡言乱语所复述时，简直恨不得跪舔对方。

And on the other hand: The number of those who still hold on to the principles of natural law and justice as the basis of all moral judgment, and who assess the contemporary world accordingly as an “Absurdistan,” i. e. , an insane asylum run by crazed megalomaniacs, makes up no more today than a minuscule minority of the population, smaller in size even than the infamous 1 percent of the “super rich” of leftists’ fame (and with little if any overlap with this latter group)。 And tinier still is the minority of those, who recognize also, however vaguely, the systematic cause of this outcome。 And all of these — the few sane people left within the asylum —, then, are under constant threat by the guardians and wardens of this “Absurdistan” called democracy, and are branded as Neanderthals, reactionaries, extremists, pre-enlightenment dumb-dumbs, sociopaths, or scum。

另一方面：那些仍然坚持自然法与公正的原则是道德判断的基础的人们，并据此评估当代世界是一个“荒诞世界（Absurdistan）”，一个由狂妄自大的疯子经营的疯人院。今天，他们只占人口的极少数，甚至比左翼口中声名狼藉的占人口 1%的“超级富豪”还要少（而且前者与后者几乎没有交集）。而能稍微意识到这一结果的系统性原因的人，更是这少数人中的极少数者。而所有这些人——精神病院里剩下的少数神志正常的人——则不断受到威胁，这种威胁来自被称为民主的“荒诞世界”的守护人和监狱长，同时，他们还被贴上各色标签：尼安德特人、反动分子、极端分子、未被启蒙的聋哑人、反社会分子或人渣。

Which brings me to the Property and Freedom Society (PFS)。 Because it purposefully assembles precisely such outcast Neanderthals: people who can see through the “Schmierentheater” (fleapit) going on before their eyes, who have had it with all blathering politicians and mass-media darlings, and who have consequently just one

wish: to exit, i. e. , to opt out of the legal system imposed on them by the democratic State。

这就让我想到了“财产与自由协会” (PFS)。因为它有意地聚集了这样一群被驱逐的“尼安德特人”，他们能看穿了眼前所发生的荒诞闹剧 (Schmierentheater)，看透这个肮脏的跳蚤窝 (fleapit)，他们忍受不了喋喋不休的政客和大众传媒的宠儿，因此只有一个愿望——退出，即退出民主国家强加给他们的法律体系。

But wherever these Neanderthals happen to reside, they find themselves in the same predicament: the exit is barricaded or entirely barred. Secession from the State's territory is not permitted. One may emigrate from one country to another and thus leave one State-jurisdiction A for another jurisdiction B. But one's immovable property remains thereby subject to the jurisdiction of A, also and especially in the case of sale, and likewise remains the transfer of all moveable property subject to A's jurisdiction. That is, no one, anywhere, can exit with his property left intact, whether in staying or moving elsewhere. And not only is secession prohibited and considered treasonous by politicians, but it is viewed as illegitimate, as shirking one's duties, also by the overwhelming bulk of the 'educated' or rather brain washed public. Thus, matters appear hopeless for Neanderthals。

但无论这些尼安德特人碰巧居住在哪里，他们都发现自己处于同样的困境：出口被堵塞或被完全封锁。脱离本国领土，是不允许的。一个人可以从一国移居到另一国，从而离开一个国家的司法管辖区 A，前往另一个司法管辖区 B。但是，他的不动产仍然受 A 的司法管辖，特别是在出售的情况下，同样，所有动产的转让也仍然受 A 的司法管辖。也就是说，任何地方的任何人，都不能在财产完好无损的情况下离开，无论是离去还是留下。脱离被认为是叛国行径，从而被政客们禁止，同样的，绝大多数“受过教育”或被洗脑的公众，也视脱离行为是不合法的，是逃避个人责任的行为。因此，尼安德特人似乎没有希望了。

The PFS can not offer a way out of this predicament, of course. Its gatherings, too, must take place on the ground and are as such subject to State-law and jurisdiction. It cannot even be taken for granted that meetings such as ours will be always and everywhere permitted to take place. PFS meetings can offer no more, then, than a brief escape and reprieve from our real life as inmates of an insane asylum, if not on the ground then at least in the virtual reality of ideas, thought, and argument。

当然，财产与自由协会（PFS）无法提供摆脱这种困境的方法。它的集会也必须在地面上进行，因此受国家法律和司法管辖。不能想当然地认为，像我们这样的会议，总是如我们所愿，被允许在任何地方举行。PFS 会议至多只能提供一个短暂的逃避和解脱，使我们暂时逃离我们视为疯人院的真实生活，即使不是在现实中，至少也是在观念、思想和论辩的虚拟现实。

But, of course, these meetings have a real purpose。 They want to accomplish a change in the world of things。 At the very minimum, they want to prevent the Neanderthal culture, i. e. , the culture of natural law, order, and justice, from going entirely extinct。 They want to help sustain and provide intellectual nourishment for this increasingly rare species of people and culture。

但是，当然，这些会议有着真正的目的。它们希望在现实世界中产生改变。至少，它们希望防止尼安德特文化，也就是自然法、秩序和正义的文化完全被灭绝。它们希望帮助维持这个日益稀有的人群和文化，并为之提供智力滋养。

More ambitiously, however, the PFS wants to help these Neanderthals and their culture regain strength in public opinion by putting them on open display and showcasing them as a uniquely attractive and fascinating species and counterculture。

然而，更雄心勃勃的是，PFS 希望通过公开展示尼安德特人和他们的文化，把他们作为一个独特的、有吸引力的、迷人的物种和反主流文化展示出来，帮助他们重新获得公众舆论的支持。

To achieve this goal, the PFS, seemingly paradoxically, engages in a policy of strict discrimination, i. e. , of exclusion and inclusion。 Thus, on the one hand, the PFS systematically excludes and discriminates against all representatives and promoters of the present, dominant democratic State-culture: against all professional politicians, State-judges, -prosecutors, -jailers, -killers,-tax-collectors, and -bankers, all warmongers, and all advocates of socialism, legal positivism, moral relativism and egalitarianism, whether of “outcome” or “opportunity。” On the other hand, positively, the PFS seeks out and admits only people, who have adopted for themselves Thomas Jefferson's dictum that “There is not a truth existing which I fear ... or would wish unknown to the whole world,” who accordingly know of no intellectual “taboo” and of no “political correctness,” and who are committed instead to uncompromising

intellectual radicalism, will ing to follow the dictates of reason wherever these may lead。 More specifically, the PFS seeks out and admits only people dedicated to the recognition of justly acquired private property and property rights, freedom of contract, freedom of association and of dis-association, free trade, and peace。

为了实现这一目标，PFS 采取了似乎是自相矛盾的严格歧视政策，即排斥和包容。因此，一方面，PFS 系统地排斥和歧视所有代表和推动现行占主导地位的民主国家文化的人：排除所有职业政客、国家法官、检察官、狱吏、杀人犯、税吏和银行家，排斥所有战争贩子和一切支持社会主义、法律实证主义、道德相对主义和平等主义（无论是“结果”还是“机会”的）的人。另一方面，积极地说，PFS 寻找并只接纳这样一些人，他们把托马斯·杰斐逊的格言，“没有一种真理是我害怕的，也没有一种真理是我希望全世界都未知的”。因此，他们不知道什么是智力上的“禁忌”，也不知道什么是“政治正确”。相反，他们致力于毫不妥协的知识激进主义，愿意遵循理性的指令，无论这些指令会把他们引向何方。更具体地说，PFS 寻求并只接纳这样一些人，他们致力于承认正当获得的私有财产和财产权、契约自由、结社和解散自由、自由贸易，还有和平。

Following this strict policy of discrimination the PFS, after ten years of its existence, has established itself as a veritable monopoly in the world of intellectual societies: a society made up of exceptional individuals of all ages, intellectual and professional backgrounds and nations, free and unpolluted by all Statists and everything statist, unrivalled in the interdisciplinary breadth and depth of its radicalism, gathered in beautiful surroundings and united in a spirit of conviviality and comradeship; a society smeared, despised, and even hated (and yet secretly envied) by all the usual suspects, and yet hailed by all those who have had the wisdom and fortune to see and experience it。

按照这种严格的歧视策略，PFS 存在十年后，在知识界确立了自己真正的垄断地位：这是一个由不同年龄、不同知识和专业背景、来自不同国家的杰出个体组成的社团；它自由而纯净，它远离所有的国家主义者和国家主义色彩；它激进思想的跨学科广度和深度无人可及；它的成员聚集在美丽的环境中，团结在友爱和同志情谊的精神中。这个社团常常被那些庸常之辈抹黑、鄙视甚至仇视（但暗地里却被羡慕），却被所有有智慧者和幸运看到和经历它的人所欢迎。

Unlike other, 'regular' monopolies, however, it is not my goal to preserve and maintain

the PFS's current monopoly position。 Quite to the contrary。 In setting an example, by producing an appealing and indeed beautiful product — a privately produced public good, if you will— it is my hope that the PFS's present monopoly position will only be a temporary one, and that its example will serve as an inspiration to others, that more and more similar associations and meetings will spring up, that the dominant democratic unculture will thus be put increasingly on the defensive and opened up to public ridicule, and that ultimately they, the proponents and exponents of the reigning democratic un-culture, will be considered outcasts in polite society。

然而，与其他“常规”垄断不同，我的目标不是保留和维持 PFS 目前的垄断地位。恰恰相反，这是在树立榜样，通过生产一个具有吸引力的，确实美丽的产品——一种私人生产的公共物品，如果你愿意——我希望 PFS 目前的垄断地位只是暂时的，作为例子，将会激励其他人，那样，越来越多类似的协会和会议将不断涌现，占主导地位的民主非文化（un-culture），将因此越来越处于守势，并受到公众的嘲笑。最终，那些占主导地位的民主非文化的支持者和倡导者，他们会被上流的智识社会视为弃儿。

There are some positive signs: the one-day Mises Circle events across major US cities, Rahim Taghizadegan's Wertewirtschaft gatherings in Austria and Andre Lichtschlag's Eigentuemlich-Frei conferences in Germany。 However, I am afraid that to match the accomplishment of the PFS will be a difficult task and that it is to maintain its unique status for quite a while。 Personally, I am planning to continue this project as long as my and especially also Gülçin's strength holds up and, even more importantly, as long as you keep coming and effectively supporting the intellectual product and enterprise that is the PFS。

目前有一些积极的迹象：在美国主要城市举行的为期一天的米塞斯圈活动，在奥地利举行的拉希姆·塔吉扎·德根（Rahim Taghizadegan）的 Wertewirtschaft 聚会，以及在德国举行的安德烈·利希奇拉格（Andre Lichtschlag）的 Eigentuemlich-Frei 会议。然而，我担心，追赶 PFS 的成就，将是一项艰巨的任务，它将在相当长的一段时间内保持其独特的地位。就我个人而言，只要有我的力量支持，尤其是 Gülçin 的力量支持，更重要的是，只要你继续参与，有效地支持 PFS 这个知识产品和企业，我会一直坚持这个项目。



### 三、自由意志主义与另类右翼：寻找社会变革的自由意志主义策略

#### LIBERTARIANISM AND THE ALT-RIGHT: IN SEARCH OF A LIBERTARIAN STRATEGY FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

We know the fate of the term liberal and liberalism. It has been affixed to so many different people and different positions that it has lost all its meaning and become an empty, non-descript label. The same fate now increasingly also threatens the term libertarian and libertarianism that was invented to regain some of the conceptual precision lost with the demise of the former labels.

我们清楚自由意志主义者和自由主义学说这两个词的命运。它被贴在太多不同的人、不同的定位上，以至于失去了所有的意义，成了一个空洞的、没有描述性的标签。如今，同样的命运也日益威胁着“自由意志主义者”和“自由意志主义”这两个词，它们的发明，是为了重新获得一些随着前面提到的两个标签的消亡而失去的概念精确性。

However, the history of modern libertarianism is still quite young. It began in Murray Rothbard's living room and found its first quasi-canonical expression in his *For A New Liberty: A Libertarian Manifesto*, published in 1973. And so I am still hopeful and not yet willing to give up on libertarianism as defined and explained by Rothbard with unrivalled conceptual clarity and precision, notwithstanding the meanwhile countless attempts of so-called libertarians to muddy the water and misappropriate the good name of libertarianism for something entirely different.

不过，现代自由意志主义的历史还很年轻。它发轫于默里·罗斯巴德(Murray Rothbard)的客厅，并在1973年出版的《为了新自由：一份自由意志主义宣言》(*For A New Liberty: A Libertarian Manifesto*)中，首次找到了准规范的表达。在这本书中，罗斯巴德定义和解释了自由意志主义，他以无与伦比的概念清晰度和准确性阐述了这一理念。虽然所谓的自由意志主义者总是试图把水搅浑，想把“自由意志主义”的好名声滥用于完全不同的某些东西，但我仍满怀希望地坚持罗斯巴德的定义和解释。

The theoretical, irrefutable core of the libertarian doctrine is simple and straightforward and I have explained it already repeatedly at this place. If there were no scarcity in the world, human conflicts or more precisely physical clashes would be impossible. Interpersonal conflicts are always conflicts concerning scarce things. I want to do A with a given thing and you want to do B with the same thing. Because of such conflicts — and because we are able to communicate and argue with each other — we seek out norms of behaviour with the purpose of avoiding these conflicts. The purpose of norms is conflict-avoidance. If we did not want to avoid conflicts, the search for norms of conduct would be senseless. We would simply fight and struggle.

自由意志主义理论的、无可辩驳的核心，简单而直接，我在这里已经重复解释多次。假如世界上不存在稀缺，就不会有人之间的冲突，更确切的说，就不会有身体上的冲突。人际冲突往往是关于稀缺物品的冲突。我想用一个给定的东西做 A，而你想用同样的东西做 B。因为会有冲突，也因为我们能够相互沟通和论辩，我们就会寻求行为规范以避免这些冲突。规范的目的是避免冲突。如果我们不想避免冲突，那么寻找行为准则将毫无意义。我们只会战斗和争斗。

Absent a perfect harmony of all interests, conflicts regarding scarce resources can only be avoided if all scarce resources are assigned as private, exclusive property to some specified individual or group of individuals. Only then can I act independently, with my own things, from you, with your own things, without you and me clashing. But who owns what scarce resource as his private property and who does not? First: Each person owns his physical body that only he and no one else controls directly. And second, as for scarce resources that can be controlled only indirectly (that must be appropriated with our own nature-given, i. e., unappropriated, body): Exclusive control (property) is acquired by and assigned to that person who appropriated the resource in question first or who acquired it through voluntary (conflict-free) exchange from its previous owner. For only the first appropriator of a resource (and all later owners connected to him through a chain of voluntary exchanges) can possibly acquire and gain control over it without conflict, i. e., peacefully. Otherwise, if exclusive control is assigned instead to latecomers, conflict is not avoided but contrary to the very purpose of norms made unavoidable and permanent.

世上并没有什么所有利益的完美协调，只有尽量避免有关稀缺资源的冲突，而避免

冲突的唯一途径就是将所有稀缺资源作为私有的、排他性的财产分配给特定的个人或群体。如此，你用你的东西，我用我的东西，你我各自独立行动，就不会有冲突。但是，哪些稀缺资源该被当成私有财产？谁该拥有这些私有财产？首先：每个人都拥有自己的身体，只有他自己，没有其他人可以直接控制。其次，对于只能间接控制的稀缺资源(必须用自然赋予我们的，即不能被他人占用的身体来占有)：排他性的控制权(财产)由首先占有该资源的人获得并分配给他，或者通过与之前所有者的自愿(无冲突)交换获得该资源。因为只有资源的第一个占有者(以及所有后来通过自愿交换链与他联系在一起的所有者)才有可能在没有冲突，即和平的情况下，获得并控制资源。否则，如果把排他性的控制权交给后来者，冲突则无法避免，反而与我们想让规范成为必然和永久这个目的背道而驰。

Before this audience I do not need to go into greater detail except to add this: If you want to live in peace with other people and avoid all physical clashes and, if such clashes do occur, seek to resolve them peacefully, then you must be an anarchist or more precisely a private property anarchist, an anarcho-capitalist, or a proponent of a private law society。

在各位读者面前，我无需详细阐述，只需要补充一点：如果你希望与其他人和平相处，避免所有的身体冲突，或者如果发生这样的冲突，寻求和平解决，那么你必须是一名无政府主义者，或者更准确地说，是一名私有财产无政府主义者，一名无政府资本主义者，或者是一名私法社会的支持者。

And by implication, then, and again without much further ado: Someone, anyone, is not a libertarian or merely a fake libertarian who affirms and advocates one or more of the following: the necessity of a State, any State, of 'public' (State) property and of taxes in order to live in peace; or the existence and justifiability of any so-called "human rights" or "civil rights" other than private property rights, such as "women rights," "gay rights," "minority rights," the "right" not to be discriminated against, the "right" to free and unrestricted immigration, the "right" to a guaranteed minimum income or to free health care, or the "right" to be free of unpleasant speech and thought. The proponents of any of this may call themselves whatever they want, and as libertarians we may well cooperate with them, insofar as such a cooperation offers the promise of bringing us closer to our ultimate goal, but they are not libertarians or only fake libertarians。

那么，言下之意，同样无需赘述：一个真的自由意志主义该有上述的那些观点，若有人提倡以下的一种或多种观点，他就是个假的自由意志主义者，或者就根本不是自由意志主义者。这些观点如：一个国家或任何国家，为了和平生活都需要“公共”（国家）财产和税收；或者，除私有产权外，还存在着各种貌似正当的权利，如“人权”、“公民权利”、“妇女权利”、“同性恋权利”、“少数民族权利”、“不受歧视的权利”、“自由和不受限制移民的权利”、“最低收入保障权利”、“免费医疗的权利”，“自由言说和思想的权利”等等。如果持有这些观点的人又自称是“自由意志主义者”，也不是不可以，我们也愿意与他们合作，只要这种合作能让我们更接近我们的最终目标。但是，他们根本就不是自由意志主义者，连冒牌货都不是。

Now, “a funny thing happened on the way to the forum.” While Rothbard and I, following in his footsteps, never went astray from these theoretically derived core beliefs, not just non-libertarians but in particular also fake libertarians, i. e. , people claiming (falsely) to be libertarians, and even many possibly honest yet dimwitted libertarians have selected and vilified us as their favorite betes noires and incarnates of evil. Rothbard, the spiritus rector of modern libertarianism, has been branded by this so-called “anti-fascist” crowd as a reactionary, a racist, a sexist, an authoritarian, an elitist, a xenophobe, a fascist and, to top it all off, a self-hating Jewish Nazi. And I have inherited all of these honorary titles, plus a few more (except for the Jewish stuff). So what funny thing has happened here?

现在，在观念冲撞的论坛里，罗斯巴德和我一直都坚守这些从理论上得出的核心理念，却居然成了众矢之的。他们，那些非自由意志主义者，或假自由意志主义者，或误称自己是自由意志主义者的人，或者那些虽然自称自由意志主义者却冥顽不灵的人，把罗斯巴德和我视为怪物和邪恶的化身。罗斯巴德，是现代自由意志主义者的灵魂导师，却被所谓的“反法西斯”群体贴上了反动派、种族主义者、性别歧视者、独裁者、精英主义者、仇外者、法西斯分子，甚至是自我憎恨的犹太纳粹分子这样的标签。而我继承了所有这些光荣标签（除了没说我是犹太纳粹），并且还多了几个。事情为何如此滑稽？

Trying to develop an answer to this question brings me to the topic of this speech: the relationship between libertarianism and the alternative right or “Alt-Right,” which has gained national and international notoriety after Hillary Clinton, during the 2016 presidential election campaign, identified it as one of the inspirational sources behind

the “basket of deplorables” rooting for Trump (and whose leadership, to its credit, after Trump’s election victory, quickly broke with Trump when he turned out to be just another presidential warmonger)。

为了寻找这个问题的答案，让我想到了这次演讲的主题：自由意志主义与非主流右翼 (the alternative right) 或“另类右翼”(Alt-Right)之间的关系。在 2016 年总统选举期间，希拉里·克林顿(Hillary Clinton) 将“另类右翼”视为支持特朗普的“一群可怜虫”，此后“另类右翼”在国内外的声名都臭了大街。幸好，“另类右翼”领导层迅速与特朗普决裂，事实证明特朗普其实不过是一个好战的总统。

The Alt-Right movement is essentially the successor of the paleoconservative movement that came to prominence in the early 1990’s, with columnist and best-selling author Patrick Buchanan as its best known representative。 It went somewhat dormant by the late 1990s, and it has recently, in light of the steadily growing damage done to America and its reputation by the successive Bush I, Clinton, Bush II, and Obama administrations, reemerged more vigorous than before under the new label of the Alt- Right。 Many of the leading lights associated with the Alt- Right have appeared here at our meetings in the course of the years。 Paul Gottfried, who first coined the term, Peter Brimelow, Richard Lynn, Jared Taylor, John Der byshire, Steve Sailer, and Richard Spencer。 As well, Sean Gabb’s name and mine are regularly mentioned in connection with the Alt-Right, and my work has been linked also with the closely related neoreactionary movement inspired by Curtis Yarvin (aka Mencius Moldbug) and his now defunct blog Unqualified Reservations。 In sum,these personal relations and associations have earned me several honourable mentions by America’s most famous smear-and-defamation league, the SPLC (aka Soviet Poverty Lie Center)。

另类右翼运动，本质上是久负盛名的旧保守主义运动的继任者，这个运动在 1990 年代初崭露头角，以专栏作家和畅销书作者帕特里克·布坎南最为人所知，它在二十世纪 90 年代后期有所消退。最近，鉴于老布什 (Bush I)、克林顿、小布什 (Bush II) 和奥巴马政府对美国及其声誉造成的持续不断的损害，在“右翼”的新标签下，他们比以前更有活力地重新出现。多年以来，许多与另类右翼运动有关的主要人物，都出现在我们的会议上。是保罗·戈特弗里德 (Paul Gottfried) 首先创造了这个词，同样使用这词的人，还有彼得·布里梅洛 (Peter Brimelow)，理查德·林恩 (Richard Lynn)，贾里德·泰勒 (Jared Taylor)，约翰·德比希尔 ( John Der byshire)，史蒂夫·塞勒 ( John Der byshire)

和理查德·斯宾塞 (John Derbyshire)。同样，肖恩·加布 (Sean Gabb) 和我的名字，经常与另类右翼联系在一起，我的工作也曾与新反动运动 (neoreactionary movement) 联系在一起，该运动受柯蒂斯·亚文 (Sean Gabb) (又名孟子·莫德巴格) 和他现在已经关闭的博客 (Unqualified Reservations) 所启发，并且与之密切相关。总而言之，这些私人关系和联系，使我在美国最著名的诽谤和中伤联盟 (smear-and-defamation league) ——SPLC(又名苏联贫困谎言中心 (Soviet Poverty Lie Center)) 中受到了多次荣誉提名。

Now: How about the relationship between libertarianism and the Alt-Right and my reasons for inviting leading representatives of the Alt-Right to meetings with libertarians? Libertarians are united by the irrefutable theoretical core beliefs mentioned at the outset. They are clear about the goal that they want to achieve. But the libertarian doctrine does not imply much if any thing concerning these questions: First, how to maintain a libertarian order once achieved. And second, how to attain a libertarian order from a non-libertarian starting point, which requires (a) that one must correctly describe this starting point and (b) correctly identify the obstacles posed in the way of one's libertarian ends by this very starting point. To answer these questions, in addition to theory, you also need some knowledge of human psychology and sociology or at least a modicum of common sense. Yet many libertarians and fake libertarians are plain ignorant of human psychology and sociology or even devoid of any common sense. They blindly accept, against all empirical evidence, an egalitarian, blankslate view of human nature, of all people and all societies and cultures being essentially equal and interchangeable.

现在，自由意志主义和另类右翼之间的关系如何？我又为何邀请另类右翼的主要代表和自由意志主义者会面？自由意志主义者因无可辩驳的理论核心信念而团结一致，这些信念在开头已经提到，他们清楚他们想要实现的目标。但是，自由意志主义的理论并未对以下问题有太多明确的说明：第一，如何在实现自由意志秩序后保持这种秩序。第二，如何从非自由意志主义的起点建立自由意志的秩序，这需要 (a) 正确描述这个起点和 (b) 正确识别从这个起点到实现自由意志主义目标的道路上的阻碍。为了回答这些问题，除了理论之外，你还需要一些人类心理学和社会学的知识，或者至少需要一点常识。然而，许多自由意志主义者和伪自由意志主义者，对人类心理学和社会学一无所知，甚至缺乏任何常识。他们无视所有的经验证

据，盲目地接受一种平等主义的、空白的人性观，认为所有的人、所有的社会和文化，本质上都是平等并可相互替代的。

While much of contemporary libertarianism can be characterized, then, as theory and theorists without psychology and sociology, much or even most of the Alt-Right can be described, in contrast, as psychology and sociology without theory。 Alt-Righters are not united by a commonly held theory, and there exists nothing even faintly resembling a canonical text defining its meaning。 Rather, the Alt-Right is essentially united in its description of the contemporary world, and in particular the US and the so-called Western World, and the identification and diagnosis of its social pathologies。 In fact, it has been correctly noted that the Alt-Right is far more united by what it is against than what it is for。 It is against, and indeed it hates with a passion, the elites in control of the State, the MSM, and academia。 Why? Because they all promote social degeneracy and pathology。 Thus, they promote, and the Alt-Right vigorously opposes, egalitarianism, affirmative action (aka “non-discrimination”), multiculturalism, and “free” mass immigration as a means of bringing multiculturalism about。 As well, the Alt-Right loathes everything smacking of cultural Marxism or Gramscianism and all “political correctness” and, strategically wise, it shrugs off, without any apology whatsoever, all accusations of being racist, sexist, elitist, supremacist, homophobe, xenophobe, etc., etc。 And the Alt-Right also laughs off as hopelessly naïve the programmatic motto of so-called libertarians (which my young German friend Andre Lichtschlag has termed as “Liberallala-Libertarians”) of “Peace, Love, and Liberty,” appropriately translated into German by Lichtschlag as “Friede, Freude, Eierkuchen。” In stark contrast to this, Alt-Righters insist that life is also about strife, hate, struggle and fight, not just between individuals but also among various groups of people acting in concert。 “Millennial Woes” (Colin Robertson) has thus aptly summarized the Alt-Right: “Equality is bullshit。 Hierarchy is essential。 The races are different。 The sexes are different。 Morality matters and degeneracy is real。 All cultures are not equal and we are not obligated to think they are。 Man is a fallen creature and there is more to life than hollow materialism。 Finally, the white race matters, and civilization is precious。 This is the Alt-Right。”

许多当代自由意志主义者是理论家，却被描述为没有心理学和社会学知识。反过

来，大部分甚至绝大部分另类右翼有心理学与社会学知识，但是他们没有理论。另类右翼分子并没有被一个普遍接受的理论团结起来，也不存在任何类似于定义其含义的规范文本的东西。相反，另类右翼在描述当代世界，尤其是美国和所谓的西方世界，以及对其社会弊病的识别和诊断方面，本质上与自由意志主义者是一致的。事实上，我们已经正确指出，另类右翼的团结远远不是因为他们支持什么，而是因为他们反对什么。它反对，实际上是强烈地憎恨控制国家的精英、主流媒体和学术界。为什么？因为它们都助长了社会的堕落和病态。它们提倡平等主义、平权运动(又名“非歧视”)、多元文化主义以及“自由的”大规模移民，以此作为实现多元文化主义的手段，而另类右翼则极力反对以上这些。此外，另类右翼厌恶一切带有文化马克思主义或葛兰西主义色彩的东西，以及所有“政治正确”。从策略上讲，它明智地对所有关于种族主义、性别歧视、精英主义、至上主义、恐同、仇外等等的指责，不屑一顾，且毫无歉意。所谓的自由意志主义者(我年轻的德国朋友安德烈·利奇施拉格(Andre Lichtschlag)称之为古典自由意志主义的(“Liberallala-Libertarians”)的纲领性格言——“和平、爱和自由”(freedom, Love, And Liberty)，利奇施拉格(Lichtschlag)把它恰当地翻译成德语为“Friede, Freude, Eierkuchen”，另类右翼对此嗤之以鼻，认为这是无可救药的幼稚病。与此形成鲜明对比的是，另类右翼人士坚持认为，生活也充满了冲突、仇恨、斗争和争斗，不仅是在个人之间，也包括在共同行动的各种群体之间。因此，科林·罗伯逊(Colin Robertson)的《千禧一代的悲哀》(Millennial sorrow)恰如其分地概括了另类右翼：“平等是胡扯，等级制度是必不可少的。种族是不同的，两性是不同的。道德很重要，堕落是真实存在的。并非所有文化都是平等的，我们也没有义务认为它们是平等的。人是一种堕落的生物，生活不仅仅是空洞的物质主义。最后，白人很重要，文明是宝贵的。这就是另类右翼。”

Absent any unifying theory, however, there is far less agreement among the Alt-Right about the goal that it ultimately wants to achieve。 Many of its leading lights have distinctly libertarian leanings, most notably those that have come here (which, of course, was the reason for having invited them here), even if they are not 100-percenters and would not identify themselves as such。 All Alt-Right ers that have appeared here, for instance, have been familiar with Rothbard and his work, all the while the most recent presidential candidate of the Libertarian Party had never even heard of Rothbard's name, and all of them, to the best of my knowledge, were outspoken supporters of Ron Paul during his primary campaign for the Republican Party's nomination as presidential candidate, all the while many self-proclaimed libertarians attacked and



tried to vilify Ron Paul for his supposedly (you already know what's coming by now) "racist" views.

然而，由于缺乏统一的理论，另类右翼关于最终想要实现的目标的共识，要少得多。它的许多领军人物都有明显的自由意志主义的倾向，最引人注目的是那些来到这里的人(当然，这也是我们邀请他们来此的原因)，即使他们不是百分之百的自由意志主义者，他们也不会认为自己是这样的人。罗斯巴德是自由意志主义的代表人物，出现在这里另类右翼都非常熟悉罗斯巴德和他的作品，他们也都支持荣·保罗 (Ron Paul) 参与共和党总统候选人提名的初选。而就我所知，在最近的其他美国总统候选人中，他们自称是自由意志主义者，但是其中有些人甚至从未听说过罗斯巴德的名字。其竞选团队竟然以“种族主义”来诋毁荣·保罗，至于事实是什么，懂的都懂。

However, several of the Alt-Right's leaders and many of its rank and file followers have also endorsed views incompatible with libertarianism. As Buchanan before and Trump now, they are adamant about complementing a policy of restrictive, highly selective, and discriminating immigration (which is entirely compatible with libertarianism and its desideratum of freedom of association and opposition to forced integration) with a strident policy of restricted trade, economic protectionism, and protective tariffs (which is antithetical to libertarianism and inimical to human prosperity). (Let me hasten to add here that, despite my misgivings about his "economics," I still consider Pat Buchanan a great man.)

然而，一些另类右翼的领导人及其许多普通追随者，也支持与自由意志主义不相容的观点。正如之前的布坎南 (Buchanan)，还有现在的特朗普 (Trump)，他们一方面支持限制性的、高度选择性的和歧视性的移民政策，这好像符合自由意志主义，符合自由意志主义的结社自由观点和反对强迫融合观点；另一方面，他们又支持贸易限制、经济保护主义和保护性关税政策。后者与自由意志主义背道而驰，更不利于人类繁荣。(赶紧补充一下，尽管我对帕特·布坎南的“经济学”有所保留，但我仍然认为他是个伟大的人。)

Others strayed even further afield, such as Richard Spencer, who first the term Alt-Right. In the meantime, owing to several recent publicity stunts, which have gained him some degree of notoriety in the US, Spencer has laid claim to the rank of the maximum leader of a supposedly mighty unified movement (an endeavour, by the way,

that has been ridiculed by Taki Theodoracopulos, a veteran champion of the paleoconservative-turned-Alt-Right movement and Spencer's former employer)。When Spencer appeared here, several years ago, he still exhibited strong libertarian leanings。 Unfortunately, however, this has changed and Spencer now denounces, without any qualification whatsoever, all libertarians and everything libertarian and has gone so far as to even put up with socialism, as long as it is socialism of and for only white people。 What horrifying disappointment!

其他人甚至走得更远，比如理查德·斯宾塞(Richard Spencer)，是他首先普及了“另类右翼”一词。与此同时，由于最近几次的宣传噱头，斯宾塞在美国赢得了一定程度的恶名，他声称自己是一场看似强大的统一运动的最高领导人(顺便说一句，这一运动遭到了塔基·西奥多拉科普洛斯(Taki Theodoracopulos)的嘲笑，他是旧保守派转向另类右翼运动的资深拥护者，也是斯宾塞的前雇主)。几年前，当斯宾塞出现在这里时，他仍然表现出强烈的自由意志主义倾向。然而，不幸的是，情况有所变化，斯宾塞现在毫无保留地谴责所有的自由意志主义者以及一切自由意志主义的事物，并且他还走的更远，甚至容忍社会主义，只要它是白人的社会主义。多么令人震惊的失望啊!

Given the lack of any theoretical foundation, this split of the Alt-Right movement into rival factions can hardly be considered a surprise。 Yet this fact should not mislead one to dismiss it, because the Alt-Right has brought out many insights that are of central importance in approaching an answer to the two previously mentioned questions unanswered by libertarian theory: of how to maintain a libertarian social order and how to get to such an order from the current, decidedly un-libertarian status quo。 The Alt-Right did not discover these insights。 They had been established long before and indeed, in large parts they are no more than common sense。 But in recent times such insights have been buried under mountains of egalitarian, leftist propaganda and the Alt-Right must be credited for having brought them back to light。

由于缺乏理论基础，另类右翼运动分裂成对立派别的情况几乎可以说是意料之中。然而，这一事实不应误导人们轻视它，因为另类右翼带来了许多重要的见解，这些见解对于回答自由意志主义理论所未能解答的两个问题至关重要：如何维护自由意志主义的社会秩序；以及如何从当前明显非自由意志主义的现状走向这样的秩序。另类右翼

---

并非“发现”了这些洞见，其实这些原则早已确立，而且在很大程度上不过是常识。但是在最近的时期，这些见解都被埋在大量的平等主义、左翼宣传的大山之下，另类右翼必须得到赞扬，因为他们重新将这些见解带回到人们的视野之中。

To illustrate the importance of such insights, let me take the first unanswered question first.

为了说明这些见解的重要性，我先来回答第一个没有回答的问题。

Many libertarians hold the view that all that is needed to maintain a libertarian social order is the strict enforcement of the non-aggression principle (NAP). Otherwise, as long as one abstains from aggression, according to their view, the principle of “live and let live” should hold. Yet surely, while this “live and let live” sounds appealing to adolescents in rebellion against parental authority and all social convention and control (and many youngsters have been initially attracted to libertarianism believing that this “live and let live” is the essence of libertarianism), and while the principle does indeed hold and apply for people living far apart and dealing with each other only indirectly and from afar, it does not hold and apply, or rather it is insufficient, when it comes to people living in close proximity to each other, as neighbours and cohabitants of the same community.

许多自由意志主义者认为，维持自由意志主义社会秩序所需的只是严格执行互不侵犯原则（NAP）。否则，根据他们的观点，只要避免侵犯，就应该坚持“各自生活，互不干涉”的原则。然而，尽管这种“各自生活，互不干涉”听起来吸引那些反抗父母权威和一切社会惯例和控制的青少年（许多年轻人最初被吸引到自由意志主义，相信这种“各自生活，互不干涉”是自由意志主义的本质），并且这个原则确实适用于相距甚远、仅远距离间接交往的人群。但是当涉及生活在彼此附近的人，作为同一社区的邻居和同住者时，这个原则并不适用，或者说是充分适用的。

A simple example suffices to make the point. Assume a new next-door neighbour. This neighbour does not aggress against you or your property in any way, but he is a “bad” neighbour. He is littering on his own neighbouring property, turning it into a garbage heap; in the open, for you to see, he engages in ritual animal slaughter, he turns his house into a “Freudenhaus,” a bordello, with clients coming and going all day and all night long; he never offers a helping hand and never keeps any promise that

he has made; or he cannot or else he refuses to speak to you in your own language, etc. , etc. Your life is turned into a nightmare. Yet you may not use violence against him, because he has not aggressed against you. What can you do? You can shun and ostracize him. But your neighbour does not care, and in any case you alone thus 'punishing' him makes little if any difference to him. You have to have the communal respect and authority, or you must turn to someone who does, to persuade and convince everyone or at least most of the members of your community to do likewise and make the bad neighbour a social outcast, so as to exert enough pressure on him to sell his property and leave. (So much for the libertarians who, in addition to their "live and let live" ideal also hail the motto "respect no authority! ")

一个简单的例子足以阐明这一观点。假设有一个新的邻居。这个邻居并未对你或你的财产进行任何侵犯，但他是一个“糟糕”的邻居。他在他自己的地上乱丢垃圾，将其变成了一个垃圾堆；在公开场合，他进行着动物的宰杀仪式；他将他的房子变成了一个红灯区，整天整夜有客人进进出出；他从不伸出援手，也从不履行他所做的任何承诺；或者他不能或者拒绝用你自己的语言和你交流，等等。你的生活变成了噩梦。然而你不能对他使用暴力，因为他没有对你发动攻击。你能做什么？你可以回避和排斥他，但是他并不在乎。而且无论如何，你独自“惩罚”他对他来说几乎没有有什么影响。你要么自己拥有被尊重的权威，要么你必须求助于拥有这种权威的人，以说服和劝服你社区的每个人，或者至少是大多数人，也采取同样的行动，使不良邻居成为社会的弃儿。你要动员更多人一起对他施加足够的压力，迫使他出售自己的财产并离开。（对于那些除了他们的“各自生活，互不干涉”理想之外，还赞扬“不尊重任何权威！”的自由意志主义者而言，这就是现实。）

The lesson? The peaceful cohabitation of neighbours and of people in regular direct contact with each other on some territory — a tranquil, convivial social order— requires also a commonality of culture: of language, religion, custom, and convention. There can be peaceful co-existence of different cultures on distant, physically separated territories, but multi-culturalism, cultural heterogeneity, cannot exist in one and the same place and territory without leading to diminishing social trust, increased tension, and ultimately the call for a “strong man” and the destruction of anything resembling a libertarian social order.

这个教训是什么？邻居之间，以及某些领土上经常直接接触的人们之间，他们的和

平共处，不仅需要宁静而和睦的社会秩序，还需要文化的共性——语言、宗教、习俗和传统。人们之间相处，如果在空间上有间隔，或者在物理上有分隔，不同文化和平共存不是难题。但是在同一个地方，多元文化主义、文化的异质性，却难以共存。勉强的共存会导致社会信任减少、紧张局势加剧，最终引发对“强人”的呼唤，破坏任何类似自由意志主义的社会秩序。

And moreover: Just as a libertarian order must always be on guard against “bad” (even if non-aggressive) neighbours by means of social ostracism, i. e., by a common “you are not welcome here” culture, so, and indeed even more vigilantly so, must it be guarded against neighbours who openly advocate communism, socialism, syndicalism, or democracy in any shape or form. They, in thereby posing an open threat to all private property and property owners, must not only be shunned, but they must, to use a by now somewhat famous Hoppe-meme, be “physically removed,” if need be by violence, and forced to leave for other pastures. Not to do so inevitably leads to — well, communism, socialism, syndicalism, or democracy and hence, the very opposite of a libertarian social order.

此外，正如自由意志主义秩序必须采用社会排斥的方式才能得到守卫，即通过一种普遍的“这里不欢迎你”的文化，始终警惕“坏”(即使是非侵略性的)邻居一样，它也必须更加警惕地防范这样一些邻居——他们公开提倡共产主义、社会主义、工团主义以及形形色色的民主。他们对私有财产和财产所有者，构成了公开的威胁，因此，我们不仅必须避开他们，而且还必须——用一个现在有些出名的霍普梗来说 (Hoppe-meme)——“物理清除”，如果需要，可以使用暴力，迫使他们离开，迁往他处。非如此，则不可避免地会导致共产主义、社会主义、工团主义或民主，因此，不可避免地会导致一个与自由意志主义的社会秩序截然相反的结果。

With these “rightist” or as I would say, plain commonsensical insights in mind I turn now to the more challenging question of how to move from here, the status quo, to there. And for this it might be instructive to first briefly consider the answer given by the liberallala, the peace-love-and-liberty, the Friede-Freude-Eierkuchen, or the capitalism-is-love libertarians. It reveals the same fundamental egalitarianism, if in a slightly different form, as that exhibited also by the live-and-let-live libertarians. These, as I have just tried to show, define what we may call the “bad neighbour problem” — and what is merely a shorthand for the general problem posed by the coexistence

of distinctly different, alien, mutually disturbing, annoying, strange, or hostile cultures — simply out of existence。 And indeed, if you assume, against all empirical evidence, that all people, everywhere, are essentially the same, then, by definition, no such thing as a “bad neighbour problem” exists。

这些“右翼”的见解，或者用我的话说，是普通的常识性的见解。我现在转向更具挑战性的问题，即如何从现状到达理想境地。对于这个问题，先简要考虑一下自由意志主义者提出的答案可能是有益的，至于自由意志主义者，我称之为和平-爱-自由意志主义者 (the peace-love-and-liberty)、和谐快乐自由意志主义者 (the Friede-Freude-Eierkuchen)、或者资本主义就是爱的自由意志主义者 (the capitalism-is-love libertarians)。自由意志主义者的答案，可能揭示了一种基本的平等主义，虽然形式稍有不同，但与“各自生活，互不干涉”的自由意志主义者相似。就像我刚刚试图展示的那样，这些自由意志主义者所定义的“坏邻居问题”——仅仅是对明显不同的、陌生的、相互干扰的、令人讨厌的、奇怪的或敌对的文化共存所带来的普遍问题的简化表述——根本就不复存在。实际上，如果你不顾所有的经验证据，假设所有人在任何地方本质上都是相同的，那么根据定义，就不存在所谓的“坏邻居问题”。

The same egalitarian, or as the liberallala-libertarians themselves prefer to call it, “humanitarian” spirit also comes to bear in their answer to the question of a libertarian strategy。 In a nutshell, their advice is this: be nice and talk to everyone — and then, in the long run, the better libertarian arguments will win out。

同样的平等主义精神，或者正如古典自由意志主义者 (liberallala-libertarians) 自己更愿意称之的那样，“人道主义”精神，在他们对自由意志主义策略问题的回答中也显而易见。简而言之，他们的建议是：友善地与每个人交谈——最终，更好的自由意志主义观点将获胜。

Outside egalitarian fantasy lands, however, in the real world, libertarians must above all be realistic and recognize from the outset, as the Alt-Right does, the inequality not just of individuals but also of different cultures as an ineradicable datum of the human existence。 We must further recognize that there exist plenty of enemies of liberty as defined by libertarianism and that they, not we, are in charge of worldly affairs; that in many parts of the contemporary world their control of the populace is so complete that the ideas of liberty and of a libertarian social order are practically unheard of or

considered unthinkable (except as some idle intellectual play or mental gymnastics by a few “exotic” individuals); and that it is essentially only in the West, in the countries of Western and Central Europe and the lands settled by its people, that the idea of liberty is so deeply rooted that these enemies still can be openly challenged。 And confining our strategic considerations here only to the West, then, we can identify, pretty much as the Alt-Right has effectively done, these actors and agencies as our principal enemies。 They are, first and foremost, the ruling elites in control of the State apparatus and in particular the “Deep State” or the so-called “Cathedral” of the military, the secret services, the central banks and the supreme courts。 As well, they include the leaders of the military-industrial complex, i. e. , of nominally private firms that owe their very existence to the State as the exclusive or dominant buyer of their products, and they also include the leaders of the big commercial banks, which owe their privilege of creating money and credit out of thin air to the existence of the central bank and its role as a “lender of last resort。” They together, then, State, Big-Business, and Big-Banking, form an extremely powerful even if tiny “mutual admiration society,” jointly ripping off the huge mass of taxpayers and living it up big time at their expense。

在平等主义的幻想乐园之外，在真实世界中，自由意志主义者首先必须是现实主义者，并从一开始就像另类右翼那样不仅承认个人之间的不平等，而且还要承认不同文化之间的不平等，这些不平等都是人类存在中不可根除的现实基础。我们必须进一步认识到，按照自由意志主义的定义，这世界存在着许多自由主义的敌人，而掌握控制着世界事务的是他们而不是我们。在当代世界的许多地方，他们对民众的控制是如此彻底，以至于民众对于自由和自由意志主义社会秩序的理念几乎是闻所未闻，就算是遇到也视为异端邪说，视为“怪咖的游戏”或“天方夜谭”。而实质上，只有在西方，在西欧和中欧国家以及其人民居住的衍生国，自由的理念才根深蒂固到足以公开挑战自由的敌人。如果将我们的自由意志主义策略考虑仅限于西方，我们可以几乎与另类右翼一样，有效地确定这些掌控者和权力机构是我们的主要敌人。他们首先是控制国家机器的统治精英，尤其是军方、情报机构、中央银行和最高法院所谓的“深层国家”或“大教堂”的领导层。此外，他们还包括名义上依靠国家作为其产品独家或主要购买者而存在的大型商业银行的领导者，以及依靠中央银行作为“最后贷款人”并可以无中生有地创造货币和信贷的大型商业银行的领导者。因此，国家、大企业和大银行联合形成了一个权力极其强大而人数很少的“权贵共同体”，他们

向大量纳税人勒索，以纳税人的巨大代价支付这群权贵的奢侈生活。

The second, much larger group of enemies is made up of the intellectuals, educators, and “educrats,” from the highest levels of academia down to the level of elementary schools and kindergartens. Funded almost exclusively, whether directly or indirectly, by the State, they, in their over whelming majority, have become the soft tools and willing executioners in the hands of the ruling elite and its designs for absolute power and total control. And third there are the journalists of the MSM, as the docile products of the system of “public education,” and the craven recipients and popularizers of government “information.” Equally important in the development of a libertaian strategy then is the immediately following next question: who are the victims? The standard libertarian answer to this is: the taxpayers as opposed to the tax-consumers.

统治精英的目的，是为了获得绝对权力和完全控制，因而我们的第二大敌人，是由知识分子、教育家和“教育工作者”组成的。他们上至学术界的最高层，下至小学和幼儿园。他们几乎完全由国家直接或间接资助，绝大多数人已成为统治精英手中的软工具和心甘情愿的刽子手。同样，我们第三大敌人就是主流媒体。主流媒体的记者们一方面是“公共教育”系统培养的温顺的绵羊，是权贵们的捧臭脚分子，也是他们进一步驯服百姓的“肉喇叭”。自由意志主义策略所要达成的共识，是回答这个重要的问题：谁是受害者？标准答案是：是纳税人，而不是食税者。

Yet while this is essentially correct, it is at best only part of the answer, and libertarians could learn something in this respect from the Alt-Right: because apart from the narrowly economic aspect there is also a wider cultural aspect that must be taken into account in identifying the victims.

然而，尽管这在本质上是正确的，但它充其量只是答案的一部分，自由意志主义者在这方面可以从另类右翼那里学到一些东西：因为在确定受害者时，除了狭隘的经济方面之外，还必须考虑到更广泛的文化方面。

In order to expand and increase its power, the ruling elites have been conducting for many decades what Pat Buchanan has identified as a systematic “culture war,” aimed at a transvaluation of all values and the destruction of all natural, or if you will “organic” social bonds and institutions such as families, communities, ethnic groups, and genealogically related nations, so as to create an increasingly atomized populace,



whose only shared characteristic and unifying bond is its common existential dependency on the State。 The first step in this direction, taken already half a century or even longer ago, was the introduction of “public welfare” and “social security。” Thereby, the underclass and the elderly were turned into State-dependents and the value and importance of family and community was correspondingly diminished and weakened。 More recently, further-reaching steps in this direction have proliferated。 A new “victimology” has been proclaimed and promoted。 Women, and in particular single mothers, Blacks, Browns, Latinos, homosexuals, lesbians, bi- and transsexuals have been awarded “victim” status and accorded legal privileges through non-discrimination or affirmative action decrees。 As well, most recently such privileges have been expanded also to foreign-national immigrants, whether legal or illegal, insofar as they fall into one of the just mentioned categories or are members of non-Christian religions such as Islam, for instance。 The result? Not only has the earlier mentioned “bad neighbour problem” not been avoided or solved, but systematically promoted and intensified instead。 Cultural homogeneity has been destroyed, and the freedom of association, and the voluntary physical segregation and separation of different people, communities, cultures, and traditions has been replaced by an all-pervasive system of forced social integration。 Moreover, each mentioned “victim” group has thus been pitted against every other, and all of them have been pitted against white, heterosexual, Christian males and in particular those married and with children as the only remaining, legally unprotected group of alleged “victimizers。” Hence, as the result of the transvaluation of all values promoted by the ruling elites, the world has been turned upside down。 The institution of a family household with father, mother, and their children that has formed the basis of Western civilization, as the freest, most industrious, ingenious, and allaround accomplished civilization known to mankind, i. e. , the very institution and people that has done most good in human history, has been officially stigmatized and vilified as the source of all social ills and made the most heavily disadvantaged, even persecuted group by the enemy elites’ relentless policy of divide et impera。

为了扩大和增加其权力，统治精英们几十年来一直在进行帕特·布坎南(Pat Buchanan)所定义的系统性“文化战争”，旨在对所有价值观进行重新评估，摧毁所有自然的，或者你称之为“有机的”社会纽带和机构，如家庭、社区、种族群体和有血缘相关的民

族，以创造一个日益原子化的民众，他们唯一的共同特征和统一纽带，是他们对国家的共同生存依赖。此进程的第一步，即引入“公共福利”和“社会保障”，早在半个世纪甚至更早以前就已经开始了。因此，下层阶级和老年人变成了国家依赖者，家庭和社区的价值还有重要性相应地被减少和削弱了。最近，这个进程采取了进一步的措施。一种新的“受害者学”得到宣扬和推广。妇女（特别是单身母亲）、黑人、棕色人种、拉丁裔、同性恋、女同性恋、双性恋和变性人被赋予“受害者”地位，并通过不歧视或平权运动法令获得法律特权。同样，最近这种特权也扩大到外国移民，无论是合法的还是非法的，只要他们属于刚才提到的类别之一，或者是非基督教宗教的成员，例如伊斯兰教。结果呢？前面提到的“坏邻居问题”不仅没有得到避免和解决，反而有系统地被促进和加剧。文化同质性已被破坏，结社自由、不同人民、社区、文化和传统之间自愿的物理隔离和分离已被一种无所不在的强制社会融合的制度所取代。此外，每一个在上面提及的“受害者”群体，都因此与其他群体对立，所有这些“受害者”群体都与白人、异性恋、基督徒男性对立，尤其是那些已婚和有孩子的男性，他们是唯一剩下的、不受法律保护的所谓“施害者”群体。因此，统治精英推动所有价值观的重新评估，其结果就是世界已经被颠倒。作为人类已知的最自由、最勤劳、最具独创性、最全面的文明，即构成西方文明基础的由父亲、母亲和孩子组成的家庭制度，这种制度和这些人，在人类历史上做出了最大贡献。现在，这些家庭制度以及这些制度之下的家庭，却被官方污名化，诋毁为是所有社会弊病的根源，并在敌方精英分而治之的残酷政策下，成为了最弱势，甚至是受迫害的群体。

Accordingly, given the present constellation of affairs, then, any promising libertarian strategy must, very much as the Alt-Right has recognized, first and foremost be tailored and addressed to this group of the most severely victimized people。 White married Christian couples with children, in particular if they belong also to the class of taxpayers (rather than tax-consumers), and everyone most closely resembling or aspiring to this standard form of social order and organization can be realistically expected to be the most receptive audience of the libertarian message (whereas the least support should be expected to come from the legally most “protected” groups such as, for instance, single Black Muslim mothers on welfare)。

因此，考虑到目前的事态，任何有前途的自由意志主义策略都必须——正如另类右翼已经认识到的那样——应首先针对受害最严重的这群人量身定制，并且解决问题。那么，谁会是自由意志主义观点的支持者呢？是那些白人已婚基督教夫妇有子

女的家庭，特别其中的纳税人阶层（而不是食税者）；除此之外，还有那些愿意接近或渴望接受这种社会秩序和组织标准的人。至于反对自由意志主义观点的会是什么人？当然是现行法律上那些最“受保护”的群体，例如领取福利的黑人穆斯林单亲妈妈。

Given this constellation of perpetrator-enemies vs. victims in the contemporary West, then, I can now come to the final task of trying to outline a realistic libertarian strategy for change, the specifics of which will have to be prefaced by two general considerations. For one, given that the class of intellectuals from the tops of academia to the opinion-moulding journalists in the MSM are funded by and firmly tied into the ruling system, i. e. , that they are a part of the problem, they also should not be expected to play a major if any role in the problem's solution. Accordingly, the so-called Hayekian strategy for social change, that envisions the spread of correct libertarian ideas starting at the top, with the leading philosophers, and then trickling down from there to journalists and finally to the great unwashed masses, must be considered fundamentally unrealistic. Instead, any realistic libertarian strategy for change must be a populist strategy. That is, libertarians must short-circuit the dominant intellectual elites and address the masses directly to arouse their indignation and contempt for the ruling elites.

鉴于当代西方的施害者——受害者（perpetrator-enemies）的这种局势，我现在想尝试概述一个现实的自由意志主义变革策略，具体内容将以两个一般性考虑为前提。首先，任何自由意志主义的变革都不要寄希望于知识分子群体。整个学术界的知识分子阶层，无论是学术明星，还是主流媒体中制造舆论的记者，都受到统治体系的资助且与之牢牢绑定，他们自己本身就是问题的一部分。因而，哈耶克所谓的社会变革策略，根本就没有任何现实的可行性。因为哈耶克所设想的正确的自由意志主义思想的传播途径，是从上到下，是从哲学家到记者，然后到平民大众。而这些哲学家、记者，他们怎么可能反对自己。相反，任何现实的自由意志主义变革策略都必须是平民主义的策略。也就是说，自由意志主义者必须绕过占统治地位的知识精英，直接面向大众发声，以激起他们对统治精英的愤慨和蔑视。

And second, all the while the main addressees of a populist libertarian message must be indeed the just mentioned groups of dispossessed and disenfranchised native whites, I believe it to be a serious strategic error to make “whiteness” the exclusive

criterion on which to base one's strategic decisions, as some strands of the Alt-Right have suggested to do。 After all, it is above all white men that make up the ruling elite and that have foisted the current mess upon us。 True enough, the various protected "minorities" mentioned before take full advantage of the legal privileges they have been accorded and they have become increasingly emboldened to ask for ever more "protection," but none of them and all of them together did not and do not possess the intellectual prowess that would have made this outcome possible, if it were not for the instrumental help that they received and are receiving from white men。

其次，如果我们把“白人”作为策略决策的唯一标准，那是非常严重的策略错误，尽管另类右翼人士也是这样建议的。虽然我们认为，本土白人群体被平等主义或民粹主义剥夺了财产和一些权利，但我们也要看到，统治精英也是白人男性，而这些统治精英把目前的混乱强加给了我们。诚然，前面提到的各种受保护的“少数群体”充分利用了他们被授予的法律特权，并变得越来越大胆地寻求更多“保护”，但是无论是过去还是现在，如果不是白人男性提供的帮助，他们单独或合力也不具备使这些“保护”成为可能的智力能力。

Now, taking our cues from the Buchanan-, the Paul- and the Trump-movements, on to the specifics of a populist strategy for libertarian change, in no specific order except for the very first one, which has currently assumed the greatest urgency in the public mind。

现在，我们从布坎南(Buchanan)运动、保罗(Paul)运动和特朗普(trump)运动中得到启示，看看民粹主义的自由意志主义策略变革的具体细节，除了第一个之外没有具体的顺序，这是公众心目中目前最紧迫的问题。

One: Stop mass immigration。 The waves of immigrants currently flooding the Western world have burdened it with hordes of welfare parasites, brought in terrorists, increased crime, led to the proliferation of no-go areas, and resulted in countless "bad neighbours" who, based on their alien upbringing, culture, and traditions, lack any understanding and appreciation of liberty and are bound to become mindless future supporters of welfare-Statism。 No one is against immigration and immigrants per se。

第一，停止大规模移民。目前涌入西方世界的移民浪潮，给西方世界带来了大量的

福利寄生虫，带来了恐怖分子，增加了犯罪，导致了禁区（no-go areas）的扩散，并导致了无数的“坏邻居”。这些“坏邻居”带来了他们自己的异国教育、文化和传统，却并不理解和支持真正的自由，他们未来注定会成为福利国家主义的无脑支持者。没有人反对移民和移民人员本身。

But immigration must be by invitation only. All immigrants must be productive people and hence, be barred from all domestic welfare payments. To ensure this, they or their inviting party must place a bond with the community in which they are to settle, and which is to be forfeited and lead to the immigrant's deportation should he ever become a public burden. As well, every immigrant, inviting party, or employer should not only pay for the immigrant's upkeep or salary, but must also pay the residential community for the additional wear and tear of its public facilities associated with the immigrant's presence, so as to avoid the socialization of any and all costs incurred with his settlement. Moreover, even before his admission, every potential immigrant invitee must be carefully screened and tested not only for his productivity but also for cultural affinity (or “good neighbourliness”) — with the empirically predictable result of mostly, but by no means exclusively, western-white immigrant-candidates. And any known communist or socialist, of any colour, denomination, or country of origin, must be barred from permanent settlement — unless, that is, the community where the potential immigrant wants to settle officially sanctions the looting of its residents' property by new, foreign arrivals, which is not very likely to say the least (even within already existing ‘commie’ communes). (Brief message to all open-border and liberallala libertarians, who will surely label this, you guessed it, “fascist”: In a fully privatized libertarian order there exists no such thing as a right to free immigration. Private property implies borders and the owner's right to exclude at will. And “public property” has borders as well. It is not unowned. It is the property of domestic taxpayers and most definitely not the property of foreigners. And while it is true that the State is a criminal organization and that to entrust it with the task of border control will inevitably result in numerous injustices to both domestic residents and foreigners, it is also true that the State does something also when it decides not to do anything about border control and that, under the present circumstances, doing nothing at all in this regard will lead to even more and much graver injustices, in

particular to the domestic citizenry。)

我们反对的不是移民本身，但我们会邀请一些人而排斥另一些人。所有移民必须是有生产力的人，也就是他们应该自食其力，应被禁止获得所有国内的福利。为了确保这一点，他们或邀请他们的一方必须向他们将要定居的社区提供保证金。如果移民成为公共负担，这笔保证金将被没收，且应将这些移民驱逐出境。同样，每个移民、邀请方或雇主不仅应该支付移民的生活费或工资，而且还必须支付移民居住社区因移民的到来所造成公共设施的额外损耗，以避免移民定居所产生的任何和所有成本的社会化。此外，甚至在他被接纳之前，每一个潜在的移民受邀者都必须经过仔细的筛选和测试，不仅要看看他的生产能力，还要看看他的文化亲和力(或“睦邻友好”(good neighbourliness))——经验上可以预测的结果是，大多数(但绝不是全部)是西方白人移民候选人会入围。任何已知的共产主义者或社会主义者，无论肤色、教派或原籍国为何，都必须被禁止永久定居——除非，潜在移民想要定居的社区，正式批准新的外国移民掠夺其居民财产，这是不太可能的(即使在已经存在的“共产主义”公社中(‘commie’ communes))。(在一个完全私有化的自由意志主义秩序中，不存在自由移民的权利。私有财产意味着边界和所有者的排他权。“公共财产”也有边界，它不是无主的。它是国内纳税人的财产，绝对不是外国人的财产。边境控制是必须的。虽然国家确实是一个犯罪组织，把控制边境的任务委托给它，将不可避免地给本国居民和外国人造成许多不公正。但当国家掌有边境控制权，又决定对边境控制不采取任何行动时，不采取行动本身也就是一种行动。鉴于目前的情况，在边境控制这方面不采取任何行动，将导致更多和更严重的不公正，特别是对国内公民。所以古典自由意志主义者对于开放的边境，以及开放边境上不作为的政府，是大可以给他们贴上“法西斯主义”这个标签的。)

Two: Stop attacking, killing, and bombing people in foreign countries. A main cause, even if by no means the only one, for the current invasion of Western countries by hordes of alien immigrants, are the wars initiated and conducted in the Middle East and elsewhere by the US's ruling elites and their subordinate Western puppet-elites. As well, the by now seemingly 'normal' and ubiquitous terrorist attacks in the name of Islam across the Western world are in large measure the "blow-back" of these wars and the ensuing chaos throughout the Middle East and Northern Africa. There should be no hesitation to call these Western rulers what they are: murderers or accessories to mass murder. We must demand, and cry out loud instead for a foreign policy of

strict non-interventionism。 Withdraw from all international and supranational organizations such as the UN, NATO, and the EU that intricate one country into the domestic affairs of another。 Stop all government-to-government aid and prohibit all weapon sales to foreign States。 Let it be America First! , England First! , Germany First! , Italy First! , and so on, i. e. , each country trading with one another and no one interfering in anyone else's domestic affairs。

第二， 停止攻击、杀戮和轰炸外国人民。当前大批外来难民涌入西方国家的一个主要原因， 即使不是唯一的原因， 是美国统治精英及其下属的西方傀儡们， 在中东和其他地方发起和实施的战争。同样， 到目前为止， 在西方世界里， 以伊斯兰教的名义进行的看似“正常”和无处不在的恐怖袭击， 很大程度上是这些战争的“反击战”

（“blow-back”）， 也是对随之而来的整个中东和北非的混乱局面的“反击战”。应该毫不犹豫地称呼这些西方统治者： 杀人犯或大屠杀的帮凶。相反， 我们必须要求并大声呼吁实行严格的不干涉主义的外交政策。退出所有国际和超国家组织， 如联合国、 北约和欧盟， 这些组织使一个国家卷入另一个国家的内政。停止一切政府间援助， 禁止向外国出售一切武器。美国人可以说美国优先， 同样也可以英国优先、 德国优先、 意大利优先， 等等都行！ 换句话说， 每个国家的人民都可以与别国人民相互贸易， 而不是让国家组织和政府干涉别国内政。

Three: Defund the ruling elites and their intellectual bodyguards。 Expose and widely publicize the lavish salaries, perks, pensions, side-deals, bribes, and hush monies received by the ruling elites: by the higher-ups in government and governmental bureaucracies, of supreme courts, central banks, secret services and spy agencies, by politicians, parliamentarians, party leaders, political advisors and consultants, by crony-capitalists, “public educrats,” university presidents, provosts, and academic “stars。” Drive home the point that all their shining glory and luxury is funded by money extorted from taxpayers, and consequently urge that any and all taxes be slashed: income taxes, property taxes, sales taxes, inheritance taxes, etc. , etc。

第三， 剥夺统治精英及其知识精英护卫队的经费。揭露并广泛宣传统治精英们（包括政府高层及政府官僚机构、最高法院、中央银行、特工机构和间谍机构、政客、议员、政党领袖、政治顾问和智囊团、裙带资本家、公共教育官僚、大学校长、教务长和学术“明星”等）所获得的丰厚薪水、特权、退休金、私下交易、贿赂和封口费。强调他们所有的光环和奢华都是由向纳税人勒索的税金所支持的。为此， 人民应该要求削减

任何税收、所有税收，包括所得税、财产税、销售税、遗产税等等。

Four: End the FED and all central banks. The second source of funding for the ruling elites, besides the money extorted from the public in the form of taxes, comes from the central banks. Central banks are allowed to create paper money out of thin air. This reduces the purchasing power of money and destroys the savings of average people. It does not and cannot make society as a whole richer, but it redistributes income and wealth within society. The earliest receivers of the newly created money, i. e. , the ruling elites, are thereby made richer and the later and latest receivers, i. e. , the average citizen, are made poorer. The central bank's manipulation of interest rates is the cause of boom-bust cycles. The central bank permits the accumulation of ever greater "public debt" that is shifted as a burden onto unknown future taxpayers or is simply inflated away. And as the facilitators of public debt, the central banks are also the facilitators of wars. **This monstrosity must end and be replaced by a system of free, competitive banking built on the foundation of a genuine commodity money such as gold or silver.**

第四，终结美联储和所有央行。统治精英们的第二个资金来源，除了以税收的形式向公众勒索的钱之外，就是来自央行。央行被允许凭空创造纸币。这降低了货币的购买力，消灭了普通人的储蓄。它不会也不可能使整个社会更加富裕，但它会在社会内部重新分配收入和财富。统治精英们作为新创造的货币的最早接受者，因此变得更富有，而普通民众作为较晚和最后的接受者，则变得更加贫穷。央行对利率的操纵是繁荣-萧条周期的原因。央行允许积累越来越多的“公共债务”，这些债务作为负担转移到未知的未来纳税人身上，或者干脆通过通货膨胀消除。作为公共债务的推手，央行也是战争的推手。我们应以真正的商品货币（如黄金白银）为基础，建立自由竞争的银行体系，以代替和终结美联储与央行这样的怪物和法币这样的怪胎。

Five: Abolish all 'affirmative action' and 'non-discrimination' laws and regulations. All such edicts are blatant violations of the principle of the equality before the law that, at least in the West, is intuitively sensed and recognized as a fundamental principle of justice. As private property owners, people must be free to associate or disassociate with others: to include or exclude, to integrate or segregate, to join or separate, to unify and incorporate, or to disunite, exit, and secede. Close all university



departments for Black-, Latino-, Women-, Gender-, Queer- Studies, etc. , etc. , as incompatible with science and dismiss its faculties as intellectual imposters or scoundrels。 As well, demand that all affirmative action commissars, diversity, and human resources officers, from universities on down to schools and kindergartens, be thrown out onto the street and be forced to learn some useful trade。

第五：废除所有“平权运动”和“不歧视”法律、法规。法律面前人人平等，至少在西方是一直被公认为正义的基本原则，而所有这些“平权运动”和“不歧视”的法律法规却违反这一原则。作为私有财产的所有者，人们**有权**自由地与他人连结或者脱离：接纳或排斥，联合或分离，加入或离开，统一或分裂，合并或退出。关闭所有大学的黑人研究、拉丁裔研究、妇女研究、性别研究、酷儿（Queer-同性恋）研究等系所，等等，因为这些系所与科学背道而驰。至于这些学科的教师，他们就该被视为知识骗子与败类，应该被解雇。同时，把所有平权运动委员们、各类官僚，以及上至大学，下至中小学和幼儿园的人力资源主管都扔到大街上，并强迫他们学习一些有用的技能。

Six: Crush the “Anti-Fascist” mob。 The transvaluation of all values throughout the West: the invention of ever more “victim groups,” the spread of “affirmative action” programs, and the relentless promotion of “political correctness,” has led to the rise of an “anti-fascist” mob。 Tacitly supported and indirectly funded by the ruling elites, this self-described mob of “social justice warriors” has taken upon itself the task of escalating the fight against “white privilege” through deliberate acts of terror directed against anyone and anything deemed “racist,” “right- wing,” “fascist,” “reactionary,” “incorrigible,” or “unreconstructed。” Such “enemies of progress” are physically assaulted by the “anti-fascist” mob, their cars are burnt down, their properties vandalized, and their employers threatened to dismiss them and ruin their careers — all the while the police are ordered by the powers that be to “stand down” and not to investigate the crimes committed or prosecute and punish the criminals。 In view of this outrage, public anger must be aroused and there must be clamoring, far and wide, for the police to be unleashed and this mob be beaten into submission。

第六，打击“打着反法西斯旗号的暴徒”。让我们重新审视西方当前的价值观——统治精英们发明了越来越多的“受害者群体”，不懈地宣传“政治正确”，不断地传播“平权运动”，终于煽动起一群“打着反法西斯旗号的暴徒”。在统治精英的暗中支持和间接

资助下，这群自诩的“社会正义战士”轻而易举地为别人扣上各种帽子——诸如种族主义、右翼分子、法西斯分子、反动分子、不可救药者、顽固不化者，从而为自己粉饰出“反对特权”的正义形象，实际干着恐怖行为的勾当。这些“正义主义战士”肆无忌惮地攻击“进步的敌人”，烧毁他们的汽车，破坏他们的财产，威胁他们的雇主，毁了他们职业生涯。“正义主义战士”还阻碍警察执法，阻碍司法过程，阻碍行政行为。作为普通公众面对这样的暴行，仅有愤怒是不够的，必须大声疾呼，强烈要求解放警察制服暴徒。

(Query for liberallala-libertarians, who are sure to object to this demand on the ground that the police asked to crush the “anti-fascist” mob are State-police: Do you also object, on the same grounds, that the police arrest murderers or rapists? Aren't these legitimate tasks performed also in any libertarian order by private police? And if the police are not to do anything about this mob, isn't it ok. then that the target of its attacks, the “racist Right,” should take the task upon itself of giving the “social justice warriors” a bloody nose? )

(问一问古典自由意志主义者 (liberallala-libertarians)，他们肯定会反对这一要求，理由是要求镇压“反法西斯”暴徒的警察是国家警察：但是，你也会以同样的理由反对警察逮捕杀人犯或强奸犯吗？这些合法的任务不也是由私人警察按照自由意志主义的秩序来执行的吗？如果警察对这群暴徒不采取任何行动，那么他们攻击的目标，“种族主义右翼”，自己承担起打爆“社会正义战士”鼻子的任务，难道不可以吗？)

Seven: Crush the street criminals and gangs. In dispensing with the principle of the equality before the law and awarding all sorts of group privileges (except to the one group of married white Christian men and their families) the ruling elites have also dispensed with the principle of equal punishment for equal crime. Some State-favored groups are handed more lenient punishment for the same crime than others, and some especially favored groups are simply let run wild and go practically unpunished at all, thus actually and effectively promoting crime. As well, no-go areas have been permitted to develop where any effort at law-enforcement has essentially ceased to exist and where violent thugs and street gangs have taken over. In view of this, public furor must be provoked and it be unmistakably demanded that the police crack down quick and hard on any robber, mugger, rapist, and murderer, and ruthlessly clear all current no-go areas of violent gang-rule. Needless to say that this policy

should be color-blind, but if it happens to be, as it in fact does, that most street criminals or gang members are young Black or Latino males or, in Europe, young immigrant males from Africa, the Middle East, the Balkans, or Eastern Europe, then so be it and such human specimens then should be the ones that most prominently get their noses bloodied. And needless to say also that in order to defend against crime, whether ordinary street crime or acts of terrorism, all prohibitions against the ownership of guns by upstanding citizen should be abolished.

第七，打击街头犯罪及其团伙。除了一群已婚的白人基督徒男人和他们的家庭之外，统治精英们几乎授予其他各类群体以特殊的名称与特殊的权利，这不仅废除了“法律面前人人平等”的原则，也废除了“同罪同罚”的原则。对于同样的罪行，一些受国家优待的群体，得到的惩罚比其他群体要轻，而一些受到特别优待的群体，则被放任不管，实际上根本不受惩罚，这一切实际上有效地助长了犯罪。同时，有些地区完全成为执法盲区，群氓和街头帮派接管了这些地区，而且这些区域还在扩大。鉴于此，公众的愤怒必须被点燃，并要求警方迅速、严厉打击任何强盗、抢劫犯、强奸犯和杀人犯，并无情地清除目前暴力团伙统治的所有禁区。当然，这项政策应该是不分种族的。如果碰巧事实上清扫到的犯罪群氓或帮派成员是（美国）的黑人或拉丁裔青年男性，或者是（欧洲）来自非洲、中东、巴尔干半岛或东欧的青年男性，也该一视同仁、以暴制暴，这群人，他们本就是最亲暴力的（get their noses bloodied）。所有妨碍正直公民武装自己的枪支禁令都应废除，让公民能够自己防止街头犯罪，制止恐怖主义。

Eight: Get rid of all welfare parasites and bums. To cement their own position, the ruling class has put the underclass on the dole and thus made it a most reliable source of public support. Allegedly to help people rise and move up from the underclass to become self-supporting actors, the real — and actually intended — effect of the State's so-called “social policy” is the exact opposite. It has rendered a person's underclass status more permanent and made the underclass steadily grow (and with this also the number of tax-funded social workers and therapists assigned to “help and assist” it). For, in accordance with inexorable economic law, every subsidy awarded on account of some alleged need or deficiency produces more, not less, of the problem that it is supposed to alleviate or eliminate. Thus, the root cause of a person's underclass status: his low impulse control and high time preference, i. e.,

his uncontrolled desire for immediate gratification, and the various attendant manifestations of this cause, such as unemployment, poverty, alcoholism, drug abuse, domestic violence, divorce, female headed households, out-of-wedlock births, rotating shack-up male companions, child abuse, negligence, and petty crime, is and are not alleviated or eliminated but systematically strengthened and promoted. Instead of continuing and expanding this increasingly unsightly social disaster, then, it should be abolished and be loudly demanded that one take heed of the biblical exhortation that he who can, but will not work, also shall not eat, and that he who truly cannot work, due to severe mental or physical deficiencies, be taken care of by family, community, and voluntary charity.

第八，消除所有福利寄生虫和流浪汉。为了巩固自己的地位，统治阶级用救济金收买下层阶级，使他们成为最可靠的拥趸和票仓。政府所谓的“社会政策”，据说是为了帮助人们从下层阶级上升到自立的阶层，但其实际效果恰恰相反。它使一个人的下层阶级地位变得更加持久，同时使下层阶级稳步增长(与此同时，大量受税收资助的社会工作者和治疗师，也被分配去“帮助和协助”它)。因为，根据无情的经济规律，每一笔因所谓的需求或不足而发放的补贴，都会产生更多而不是更少的问题，而这些问题本应得到缓解或消除。因此，一个人处于底层地位的根本原因是：他的低冲动控制和高时间偏好，即他对即时满足的不受控制的欲望，以及随之而来的各种表现，如失业、贫困、酗酒、滥用药物、家庭暴力、离婚、女户主家庭、非婚生育、不停换茬的同居男伴、虐待儿童、过失和轻微犯罪，所有这一切，都并没有得到缓解或消除，而是被系统性地强化和促进了。因此，与其继续和扩大这一日益严重的社会灾难，不如废除它，并大声要求人们听从《圣经》的劝告：能工作但不愿工作的人也不应吃饭，而那些由于严重的精神或身体缺陷而确实不能工作的人，应由家庭、社区和自愿慈善机构照顾。

Nine: Get the State out of education. Most, if not all, social pathologies plaguing the contemporary West have their common root in the institution of “public education.” When the first steps were taken, more than two centuries ago, in Prussia, to supplement and ultimately replace a formerly completely private system of education with a universal system of compulsory “public education,” the time spent in State-run schools did in most cases not exceed four years. Today, throughout the entire Western world, the time spent in institutions of “public education” is, at a minimum,

around ten years, and in many cases, and increasingly so, twenty or even thirty years. That is, a large or even the largest part of time during the most formative period in a person's life is spent in State-funded and State-supervised institutions, whose primary purpose from the very beginning was not to raise an enlightened public, but to train "good soldiers" and "good public servants: " not independent and mature or "mündige Bürger," but subordinate and servile "Staats-Bürger." The result? The indoctrination has worked: the longer the time a person has spent within the system of public education, the more he is committed to leftist-egalitarian ideas and has swallowed and wholeheartedly internalized the official doctrine and agenda of "political correctness." Indeed, in particular among social science teachers and professors, people not counting themselves as part of the Left have practically ceased to exist. Consequently, it must be demanded that the control of schools and universities be wrest away from the central State and, in a first step, be returned to regional or better still local and locally-funded authorities, and ultimately be completely privatized, so as to replace a system of compulsory uniformity and conformity with a system of decentralized education that reflects the natural variation, multiplicity, and diversity of human talents and interests.

第九，废除国家的公共教育。大多数(如果不是全部的话)困扰当代西方的社会病症，都有一个共同的根源，那就是“公共教育”制度。两个多世纪以前，当普鲁士开始采取第一步措施，以普及的义务“公共教育”制度补充并最终取代以前完全私人的教育制度时，在公立学校度过的时间在大多数情况下不超过四年。今天，在整个西方世界，接受“公共教育”的时间至少是 10 年左右，在许多情况下，越来越多的是 20 年甚至 30 年。也就是说，一个人一生中最有可塑性的成长期的大部分时间，甚至是绝大部分的时间，都是在国家资助和国家监督的机构中度过的，这些机构的主要目的，从一开始就不是培养开明的公众，而是培养“好士兵”和“好公务员”，不是培养具有独立的“成熟人格的人 (mündige Bürger)”，而是培养具有服从性和奴性的“国家主义者” (“Staats-Bürger.”)。结果呢？毫不意外，这种灌输起了作用：一个人在公共教育体系中待的时间越长，他就越倾向于持有左翼的平等主义观念，越倾向于全盘接收“政治正确”的官方意识形态和议题。事实上，特别是在社会科学的教师和教授中，不认为自己是左翼的人实际上已经不复存在了。因此，必须要求从中央国家手中夺取学校和大学的控制权，并在第一步将其归还给地区，甚至更好的是归还给社区，并由当地资助的机构管理，并最终将其完全私有化，以使用一种反映人类天赋和兴趣

的自然变化、多样性和差异性的分散教育制度，取代强制统一和均质化的教育制度。

Ten: Don't put your trust in politics or political parties. Just as academia and the academic world can not be expected to play any significant role in a libertarian strategy for social change, so with politics and political parties — after all, it is the ultimate goal of libertarianism to put an end to all politics, and to subject all interpersonal relations and conflicts to private law and civil law procedures. To be sure, under present, all-pervasively politicized conditions an involvement in politics and party politics cannot be entirely avoided. However, in any such involvement one must be keenly aware of and guard against the corrupting influence of power and the lure of money and perks that comes with it. And to minimize this risk and temptation, it is advisable to concentrate one's efforts on the level of regional and local rather than national politics, and there to promote a radical agenda of decentralization: of nullification and peaceful separation, segregation, and secession. Most importantly, however, we must take heed of Ludwig von Mises's life-motto: Do not give in to evil, but proceed ever more boldly against it. That is, we must speak out whenever and wherever, whether in formal or informal gatherings, against anyone affronting us with by now only all-too-familiar “politically correct” drivel and left-egalitarian balderdash and unmistakably say: “No. Hell no. You must be kidding.” In the meantime, given the almost complete mind-control exercised by the ruling elites, academia, and the MSM, it already requires a good portion of courage to do so. But if we are not brave enough to do so now and thus set an example for others to follow, matters will become increasingly worse and more dangerous in the future, and we, Western civilization and the Western ideas of freedom and liberty will be wiped out and vanish.

第十，不要相信政治或政治组织。正如不能指望学院和学术界在自由意志主义的社会变革策略中发挥任何重要作用一样，政治和政党也是如此——毕竟，自由意志主义的终极目标是终结一切政治，将所有人际关系和冲突纳入私法和民法程序。当然，在目前普遍政治化的情况下，不可能完全避免参与政治和政党政治。然而，在任何这样的参与中，人们必须敏锐地意识到并防范权力的腐败影响，以及随之而来的金钱和津贴的诱惑。为了尽量减少这种风险和诱惑，明智的做法是把精力集中在本社区和本地区的政治层面，而不是国家政治层面，以推动分权的激进议程：即废

除权力、和平分离、隔离和脱离。然而，最重要的是，我们必须牢记路德维希·冯·米塞斯的人生格言：不要向邪恶屈服，而是更加大胆地与之对抗。也就是说，无论何时何地，无论是在正式还是非正式的聚会上，我们都必须大声疾呼，反对那些用现在已经司空见惯的“政治正确”的胡说八道和左翼平等主义的胡言乱语冒犯我们的人，并明确地说：“不。绝对不。你一定在开玩笑。”与此同时，考虑到统治精英、学术界和主流媒体几乎完全控制了思想，这样做已经需要很大的勇气。但是，如果我们现在没有足够的勇气这样做，并为他人树立榜样，事情将在未来变得更加恶化和危险，西方文明和西方自由的理念将会被彻底摧毁而消失。

## 四、和默里一起成长

### COMING OF AGE WITH MURRAY

I first met Murray Rothbard in the summer of 1985. I was then 35 and Murray was 59. For the next ten years, until Murray's premature death in 1995, I would be associated with Murray, first in New York City and then in Las Vegas, at UNLV, in closer, more immediate and direct contact than anyone else, except his wife Joey, of course.

我第一次见到默里·罗斯巴德，是在1985年夏天。当时我35岁，默里59岁。在之后的十年里，直到1995年默里过早去世，我一直和他在一起，先是在纽约，然后在拉斯维加斯，在拉斯维加斯大学，比任何人都有更密切、更直接的联系，当然，除了他的妻子乔伊。

Being almost as old now as Murray was at the time of his death I thought it appropriate to use this occasion to speak and reflect a bit on what I learned during my ten years with Murray.

现在，我已经和默里去世时差不多老了，我想利用这个合适的机会，谈谈和反思一下我在默里身边的十年里所学到的东西。

I was already an adult when I first met Murray, not just in the biological but also in the mental and intellectual sense, and yet, I only came of age while associated with him — and I want to talk about this experience.

当我初识默里时，我已成年，不仅仅在生理上，而且在精神和智力上都是如此。然而，我只有在和他交往后，才变得成熟——我想谈谈这段经历。

Before I met Murray I had already completed my Ph. D. and attained the rank of a Privatdozent (a tenured but unpaid university professor), the same rank incidentally that Ludwig von Mises once held in Vienna. Apart from my doctoral dissertation (Erkennen und Handeln), I had already completed two books. One (Kritik der kausal- wissenschaftlichen Sozialforschung), that revealed me as a Misesian, and



another, about to be published in the following year (Eigentum, Anarchie und Staat), that revealed me as a Rothbardian. I had already read all of Mises's and Rothbard's theoretical works. (I had not yet read Murray's voluminous journalistic work, however, which was essentially unavailable to me at the time.) Thus, it was not my personal encounter with Murray, then, that made me a Misesian and Rothbardian. Intellectually, I was already a Misesian and Rothbardian years before I ever met Murray personally. And so, notwithstanding the fact that I am myself foremost a theoretician, I do not want to speak here about the grand Austro-libertarian intellectual edifice that Mises and, in his succession, Rothbard have handed down to us, or about my own small contributions to this system, but about my long personal experience with Murray: about the practical and existential lessons that I learned through my encounters with him and that turned me from an adult to a man who had come of age. I moved to New York City, because I considered Murray the greatest of all social theorists, certainly of the 20th century and possibly of all times, just as I considered Mises the greatest of all economists, and, with Mises having long gone and out of the picture, I wanted to meet, get to know, and work with this man, Rothbard. I still hold this view concerning the greatness of Mises and Rothbard. Indeed, even more so today than 30 years ago. And since then, there has been no second Mises or Rothbard. Not even close, and we may have to wait for a long time for this to happen.

在我遇到默里之前，我已经完成了博士学位，并获得了私人教授(Privatdozent)的职位(终身教职，但没有薪水的大学教授)，凑巧的是，路德维希·冯·米塞斯曾经在维也纳也担任过同样的职位。除了博士论文(Erkennen und Handeln)，我已经完成了两本书。其中一本是《理性的批判》(Kritik der causal - wissenschaftlichen Sozialforschung)，它揭示了我是一个米塞斯主义者；另一本是次年出版的《本质、无政府与国家》(Eigentum, Anarchie and state)，它揭示了我是一个罗斯巴德主义者。我已经读过米塞斯和罗斯巴德的所有理论著作。(然而，我还没有读过默里那部浩如烟海的纪实著作，那时候我根本读不到。)因此，使我成为米塞斯主义者和罗斯巴德主义者的，并不是我与默里的个人接触。认识默里之前，在智识上，我早已经是米塞斯派和罗斯巴德派的一员了。因此，尽管我自己首先是一个理论家，我不想在这里谈论米塞斯及其继任者罗斯巴德留给我们的伟大的奥地利自由意志主义的知识大厦，也不想谈论我自己对这一体系的小贡献，我只想谈谈我与默里之间的交往经历：在与他的接触中，我学到了现实的和存在主义的经验教训，正是这些经验教训，使我从一个男人变成了一个成熟的男人。我

搬到了纽约，因为我认为默里是 20 世界最伟大的社会理论家，也可能是所有时代中最伟大的，一如我认为米塞斯是所有经济学家中最伟大的一样。然而，鉴于米塞斯早已离开我们的视野，世间唯遗罗斯巴德，我渴望见到他、了解他，并与之一起工作。时至今日，对于米塞斯和罗斯巴德的伟大，我依然坚信不疑。事实上，相比于 30 年前，我对此的态度更为笃定。从那 30 年前始，世间再无米塞斯和罗斯巴德。即便是仅仅能够接近他们伟大的人都没有出现过。下一个伟大的经济学家何时出现？我们也许要等待漫长的时光才可以见到那一幕。

So I moved to NYC knowing Murray's work, but knowing almost nothing about the man. Remember, this was 1985. I was still writing in longhand and then using a mechanical typewriter, acquainting myself with a computer for the first time only during the following year at UNLV. And Murray never used a computer but stayed with an electric typewriter until the end of his life. There were no cell phones, there were no emails, no internet, no Google, no Wikipedia, and no Youtube. At the beginning, even fax machines did not exist. My correspondence with Murray preceding my arrival in NYC, then, was by old, regular snail-mail. Murray expressed his enthusiasm about my wish to meet and work with him and immediately offered to enlist the help of Burton Blumert, and indeed, Burt then was of instrumental help in facilitating my move from Europe to the US. (The wonderful Burt Blumert, owner of Camino Coins, and founder of the original Center for Libertarian Studies that would ultimately be merged with the Mises Institute, was one of Murray's dearest friends and confidants. He was also a great benefactor and dear friend to me.)

因为知道默里的成就，所以我搬到了纽约，但对这个人却几乎一无所知。我记得那是 1985 年。我还在用手写写作，后来使用机械打字机，直到在内华达大学拉斯维加斯分校 (UNLV) 的第二年，我才第一次接触到电脑。默里从未使用过电脑，直到他生命的尽头，一直都在使用电动打字机。没有手机，没有电子邮件，没有互联网，没有谷歌，没有维基百科，也没有 Youtube。一开始，甚至连传真机都没有。在我到达纽约之前，我和默里的通信是用老旧的、普通的蜗牛邮件 (snail-mail)。默里表达了希望与我见面，一起工作的热情，并且立即寻求伯顿·布鲁默特 (Burton Blumert) 的帮助，事实上，我从欧洲搬到美国的过程中，伯顿帮了我很大忙。(牛逼的伯特·布鲁默特是卡米诺币的所有者，也是自由意志主义研究中心最初的创始人，该中心最终与米塞斯研究所合并。他是默里最亲密的朋友和知己之一，他同样也是我的恩人和好朋友。)

I had seen some photos of Murray, I knew that he, like Mises, was Jewish, that he taught at Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute (subsequently renamed New York Polytechnic University and nowadays Polytechnic Institute of NYU), that he was the editor of the much admired Journal of Libertarian Studies, and that he was closely associated, as its academic director, with the Ludwig von Mises Institute that Lew Rockwell had recently, 35 years ago, in 1982, founded. That was about it.

我曾经看过默里的一些照片，知道他和米塞斯一样，都是犹太人。他在布鲁克林理工学院（Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute）（后来更名为纽约理工大学（New York Polytechnic University），就是现在的纽约大学理工学院（Polytechnic Institute of NYU））任教，他是备受推崇的《自由意志主义研究杂志》（Journal of Libertarian Studies,）的编辑，作为该杂志的学术负责人，他与路德维希·冯·米塞斯研究所（Ludwig von Mises Institute）一直保持着密切的联系，该研究所是卢·洛克韦尔（Lew Rockwell）在35年前，也就是1982年创立的。仅此而已。

And so, both unprepared, we met for the first time in Murray's university office. Here was I, the 'cool blonde from the North,' to cite a popular advertisement for bitter tasting northern German beers, young, tall and athletic, somewhat unsociable, dry and with a dry sense of humour, and more on the blunt, sarcastic, and confrontational side. Perfect Wehrmacht-material, if you will. And there was Murray: the 'big-city neurotic,' to use the German title of Woody Allen's comedic Annie Hall, a generation older, short and round, non-athletic, even clumsy (except for typing), gregarious and hilarious, never moping but ever joyful, and, in his personal dealings (quite unlike in his writings), always non-confrontational, well-tempered, or even tame. Not exactly Wehrmacht-material. Personality-wise, then, we could hardly have been more different. Indeed, we were quite an odd couple — and yet, we hit it off from the start.

于是，第一次见面，我俩都没做什么准备，地址就在默里的大学办公室。这就是我，一个“来自北方的酷酷的金发郎”，引用一则德国北部苦味啤酒的流行广告语：年轻，高大，健壮，有点不合群，冷漠，带着一种冷峻的幽默感，但是更有直率、讽刺和对抗的一面。如果你愿意，那就是完美的德军材料。默里是这样的：用伍迪·艾伦(Woody Allen)的喜剧《安妮·霍尔》(Annie Hall)的德语标题来说，他是“大城市的神经质患者”，年长了一代，又矮又胖，不擅长运动，甚至有些笨拙(除了打字)，爱好交际，善于搞笑，从不忧郁，永远乐呵呵，在与人交往时(与他的作品很不一样)，总是客客气气，

平易近人，甚至逆来顺受。完全不是当德军的料。在性格方面，我们简直有天壤之别。的确，我们是相当奇怪的一对——然而，我们一见如故。

Given the long, special relationship between Germans and Jews, especially during the 12-year period of National Socialist Party rule in Germany, from 1933–45, I, as a young German meeting an older Jew in America, had been afraid that this history might become a potential source of tension. Not so. Quite to the contrary.

鉴于德国人和犹太人之间长期而特殊的关系，尤其是在 1933 年至 1945 年国家社会党(National Socialist Party)统治德国的 12 年期间，作为一名年轻的德国人，我在美国 and 一位年长的犹太人待在一起。我一直担心这段历史可能造成关系紧张的潜在原因。然而，事实却恰恰相反。

On the subject of religion itself, there was general agreement. We were both agnostics, yet with a profound interest in the sociology of religion and quite similar views on comparative religion. Yet Murray greatly deepened my understanding of the role of religion in history through his unfortunately uncompleted great work, during the last decade of his life, on the history of economic thought.

关于宗教本身的问题，我俩的观点是一致的。我们都是不可知论者，但对宗教社会学有着浓厚的兴趣，关于比较宗教学的观点也非常相似。然而，默里在他生命的最后十年里，通过他那本未能完稿的伟大的经济思想史著作，极大地加深了我对宗教在历史中所起作用的理解。

Moreover, in our countless conversations, I learned from Murray about the importance of complementing Austro-libertarian theory with revisionist history in order to come up with a truly realistic assessment of historic events and global affairs. And it was I, then, as some one who had grown up in defeated and devastated post-WWII West Germany with the then (and still) 'official history' taught across all German schools and universities of (a) feeling guilty and ashamed of being German and German history and (b) believing that America and America's democratic capitalism was 'the greatest thing' since or even before the invention of sliced bread, who had to revise his formerly still, despite all Austro-libertarian theory, rather naïve views about world affairs in general and US-American and German history in particular. As a matter of fact, Murray made me fundamentally change my rather rosy view of the US (despite Vietnam and all that)

and helped me, for the first time, to feel consoled, content, and even happy about being German, and to develop a special concern for Germany and the fate of the German people。

此外，在我们无数次的交谈中，我从默里处看到了修正主义史学的重要性，为了对历史事件和全球事务做出真正现实的评价，需要修正主义史学来补充奥地利自由意志主义理论。而我，作为一个在二战后战败和满目疮痍的西德长大的人，当时(现在仍然)在德国所有的学校和大学里，都教授着这样的“官方历史”，(a)作为德国人对德国历史感到内疚和羞愧，(b)相信美国美国的民主资本主义是自切片面包发明以来，甚至也是发明之前最伟大的东西。我不得不修改我以前的理论观点，尽管是奥地利自由意志主义的理论，但是我对世界事务的看法，尤其是对美国和德国历史的看法，是幼稚的。事实上，尽管有越南发生的烂摊子，我依然对美国有相当乐观的看法，但是默里彻底改变了这一点，并帮助我第一次感到安慰，满足，甚至为德国人感到高兴，并对德国和德国人民的命运产生了特别的关注。

To my initial surprise, then, — and ultimately my great and pleasant relief — Murray was quite a Germanophile。 He knew and highly appreciated the German contributions to philosophy, mathematics, science, engineering, scholarly history, and literature。 His beloved teacher Mises had originally written in German and was a product of German culture。 Murray loved German music, he loved German baroque churches, he loved the Bavarian beergarden atmosphere and the from-church-to-beer- garden-we-go tradition。 His wife Joey was of German ancestry, her maiden name being JoAnn Schumacher, and Joey was a member of the Richard Wagner Society and a lifelong opera buff。 As well, most of Murray's friends that I would eventually meet turned out to be Germanophiles。 Foremost among them Ralph Raico, the great historian of classical liberalism, whom I had hoped to see again at this occasion but who sadly left us forever almost a year ago now。 I met Ralph only a few months after my arrival in NYC, at a party held at Murray's apartment on the upper Westside。 I immediately took to his caustic sarcasm and over the years we developed a close friendship。 Apart from our many meetings at various Mises Institute events, I still fondly remember in particular our extended joint travels in northern Italy and especially when, at a conference in Milano, sponsored by some friends and affiliates of the once (but no longer) secessionist Lega Nord, some self-proclaimed — who would have guessed

that? ! — “anti-fascist” demonstrators appeared in front of the conference hotel to denounce us, to our great amusement, as ‘libertari fascisti.’ Ralph was also the one who introduced me to the revisionist scholarship concerning WWI and WWII as well as the entire inter war period, and it was Ralph who taught me about the history of German liberalism and in particular its radical 19th century libertarian representatives that had been almost completely forgotten in contemporary Germany。

最初让我感到惊讶，而最终却让我感到欣喜与宽慰的是，默里是一个非常亲德的人。他了解并高度赞赏德国在哲学、数学、科学、工程学、学术历史和文学方面的贡献。他敬爱的老师米塞斯，作为德国文化的产物，最初是用德语写作的。默里喜欢德国音乐，喜欢德国巴洛克式教堂，同时他也喜欢巴伐利亚啤酒花园的氛围和从教堂到啤酒花园的传统。他的妻子乔伊具有德国血统，娘家姓乔安·舒马赫，乔伊是理查德·瓦格纳协会的成员，一生都是歌剧迷。而且，我后来见到的默里的大多数朋友都是亲德派。其中最重要的是拉尔夫·雷科（Ralph Raico），一位伟大的古典自由主义的历史学家，我曾希望这次能再次见到他，但遗憾的是，他在大约一年前永远地离开了我们。到达纽约的几个月后，我在默里位于上西区的公寓举行的一次聚会上认识了拉尔夫。我立刻喜欢上了他那尖锐的讽刺，多年以来，我们有了亲密的友谊。除了我们在米塞斯研究所举办的各种活动上的多次会面外，我至今仍对我们在意大利北部的长时间联合旅行记忆犹新，尤其是在米兰举行的一次会议上，那次会议是由曾经(但已不再)分裂主义的北方联盟(Lega Nord)的一些朋友和分支机构主办的，其中一些人自称是——谁能猜到呢？——“反法西斯”示威者出现在会议酒店前，谴责我们是“自由法西斯主义者”（‘libertari fascisti.’），这让我们感到啼笑皆非。拉尔夫还向我介绍了关于第一次世界大战和第二次世界大战，以及整个战争期间的修正主义学术。拉尔夫还教我了解德国自由主义的历史，尤其是 19 世纪激进的自由意志主义代表，这些代表在当代德国几乎被完全遗忘了。

Incidentally, Lew Rockwell, too, early on showed his Germanophile credentials. When we first met in NYC in the fall of 1985, he drove a Mercedes 190, he then went astray for a few years, driving an American-made pickup truck, but ultimately returned to the fold by driving a Mini Cooper, produced by BMW。

顺便说一句，卢·罗克韦尔(Lew Rockwell)也很早就亮明了亲德派的身份。1985 年秋天，我们第一次在纽约见面时，他开着一辆奔驰 190，后来他误入歧途几年，开了一辆美国制造的皮卡，但最终还是重回正道，开了一辆宝马生产的 Mini Cooper。

But above all it was Murray who taught me never to trust official history, invariably written by the victors, but to conduct all historical research instead like a detective investigating a crime. Always, first and foremost and as a first approximation, follow the money in search of a motive. Who is to gain, whether in terms of money, real estate, or sheer power from this measure or that? In most cases, answering this question will lead you directly to the very actor or group of actors responsible for the measure or policy under consideration. Simple as it is to ask this question, however, it is much more difficult and requires often arduous research to answer it, and to unearth, from under a huge smokescreen of seemingly high-minded rhetoric and pious propaganda, the hard facts and indicators — the money flows and welfare gains — to actually prove a crime and to identify and 'out' its perpetrators. Murray was a master in this, and that at a time when you did not have access to computers, the internet, and search machines such as Google. And to do this detective's work, as I learned from Murray, you must go beyond official documents, the MSM, the big and famous names, the academic 'stars,' and the 'prestigious' journals — in short: everything and everyone deemed 'respectable' and 'politically correct.' You must also, and in particular, pay attention to the work of outsiders, extremists, and outcasts, i.e., to 'disrespectable' or 'deplorable' people and 'obscure' publication outlets that you are supposed to ignore or not even know about. To this day, I have heeded, and indeed relished following this advice. Anyone who could see my list of bookmarks of frequently visited websites would likely be surprised, and any establishmentarian or leftist in particular would likely be shocked and shudder in disgust.

但最重要的是，默里教会我，永远不要相信胜利者书写的官方历史，而要像侦探调查犯罪一样，进行所有的历史研究。首先，最重要的是，作为初步假设，通过金钱来寻找动机。无论是从金钱、房地产还是纯粹的权力方面，谁将从这个或那个措施中获益？在大多数情况下，这个问题的答案，将直接把您引向正在负责制订措施或政策的参与者或参与组织。问这个问题很简单，然而，要回答这个问题却困难得多，往往需要艰苦的研究，并从看似高尚的言辞和虔诚的宣传的巨大烟幕下，挖掘出确凿的事实和指标——资金流向和福利收益——来证明犯罪，并且识别和“揭露”肇事者。在那个时候，没有电脑、互联网和谷歌这样的搜索引擎，默里就已经是这方面的大师了。正如我从默里那里学到的那样，要完成这项侦探工作，你必须超越官方文件、主流媒体、大人物和名人、学术“明星”和“有声望的”期刊——简而言之：所有被认为是“可敬的”和“政

治正确的”人与事。你还必须特别注意那些局外人、极端分子和被排斥者的作品，也就是说，那些“不受尊敬的”或“可悲的”人，以及那些你本应忽视或甚至不知道的“鲜为人知的”出版渠道。一直到今天，我都听从这个建议，而且确实很乐意听从这个建议。任何人，看到我经常访问的网站的书签列表，都可能会被惊讶到，尤其是建制派或左翼人士，任何一个都可能会感到震惊和厌恶。

With this general perspective and outlook on things, revisionists such as Murray (and myself) are regularly charged, contemptuously, as some nutty conspiracy theorists. To this charge, Murray would typically respond: First, put bluntly and sarcastically, even if one were a certified paranoid this can not be taken as proof that no one was actually after you and your money. And second and more systematically: Conspiracies are less likely, of course, the larger the number of supposed conspirators. Also, it is naïve to assume the existence of just one big all- encompassing conspiracy run by one all-powerful group of conspirators. But conspiracies, often rival or even contradictory conspiracies, i. e. , confidential efforts of various groups of people acting in concert in the pursuit of some common goal, are indeed an ever-present feature of social reality. As any action, such conspiracies can succeed or they can fail and can lead to consequences that were un-intended by the conspirators. But realistically speaking, most if not all historical events are more or less exactly what some identifiable people or group of people acting in concert intended them to be. Indeed, to assume the opposite is to assume, incredibly, that history is nothing but a sequence of unintelligible accidents.

因为这种对事物的总体看法和视角，像默里(和我自己)这样的修正主义者，经常被轻蔑地指责为是一些疯狂的阴谋论者。对于这一指控，默里通常会如此回应：首先，坦率却不失讽刺地说，即使一个人被证明是偏执狂，这也不能证明没有人真的在窥视你，并且觊觎你的钱财。第二点，也是更系统的一点：当然，所谓的阴谋者越多，阴谋的可能性就越小。同时，假设存在一个由全能的阴谋者策划的包揽一切的大阴谋，无疑是天真的。但是阴谋，通常是相互竞争甚至是相互矛盾的，也就是说，不同群体为了追求某种共同目标而努力采取一致的秘密行动，确实是社会现实中永远存在的一种特征。正如任何行动一样，这样的阴谋可能会成功，也可能会失败，同时可能会导致出现阴谋者意想不到的后果。但现实地说，大多数(如果不是全部的话)历史事件或多或少都是某些可识别的人或一群人一致行动的结果。事实上，假设相反的情况，假设历



史啥也不是，只是一系列难以理解的意外事件，这是令人难以置信的。

Moreover, in learning from Murray about the necessity of complementing Austro-libertarian theory with revisionist history so as to gain a complete, realistic picture of the world and worldly affairs, I also received constant training from him in the art of prudent and judicious judgment and evaluation of people, actions, and events。 Pure theory allows us to make rather clearcut judgments of true or false, right or wrong, and effective, leading to the goal intended, or ineffective。 But many if not most actions and events provoking or eliciting our judgments do not fall into the category of matters that can be thusly evaluated。 We are surrounded, or better still: encircled, by a class of people — politicians and stateagents — that, day-in and day-out, renders and enforces decisions that systematically impact and affect our property and consequently our entire conduct of life without our consent and even against our explicit protestation。 In short: we are confronted by an elite of rulers, instead of, in contradistinction, an elite of agents。 And confronted with politicians and political decisions, then, our judgment concerns the evaluation of, at best, second-bests。 The question is not true or false, right or wrong, effective or ineffective。 Rather, it is this: Given that political decisions are per se false, wrong, and ineffective, which of these decisions is less false, wrong, and effective and comparatively closer to the truth, the right, and the good, and which person represents a lesser evil or a greater one than another。 Such questions do not allow for a scientific answer, because answering them involves the comparative evaluation of countless immeasurable and incommensurable variables。 And in any case, newly discovered facts about the past or future developments may well reveal any such judgment as mistaken。 But the answer is also not arbitrary。 What is true, right, and effective is given, as fix-points, and reasons must be supplied, whether based on logic or empirical evidence, for locating various second-bests as closer or more distant to such points。 Rather, judgment-making in matters such as these is a difficult art, much like entrepreneurship is not a science but an art。 And just as some people are good at entrepreneurship and others bad, indicated by monetary profits or losses, then, so are some people good at judging political events and actors and others bad, gaining or losing in the reputation as wise and prudent judges。

此外，我从默里那里了解到有必要用修正主义的历史来补充奥地利自由意志主义理论，

以获得一个完整的、现实的世界和世界事务的图景时，我也从他那里得到持续的技艺训练，对人、行为和事件进行审慎而明智的判断和评价的技艺。纯理论允许我们对真与假、对与错、达到预期目标有效或无效，做出相当明确的判断。但是，许多(如果不是大多数的话)引发或引出我们判断的行为和事件，并不属于可以这样评价的事物范畴。我们被一群人包围着，或者更好的说是：被一群人——政治家和国家代理人——包围着，他们日复一日，在未经我们同意，甚至不顾我们明确抗议的情况下，做出并执行那些系统性地影响和损害我们的财产的行为，从而影响了我们的整个生活。简而言之：我们面对的是统治精英，而不是代理人精英。面对政治家和政治决策，我们的判断最多只能是次优的评价。这不是一个真或假，对或错，有效或无效的问题。相反，它是这样的：考虑到政治决策本身是错误的、有问题的和无效的，那么，这些决策中哪一个错误小一些、问题少一些，效果会更好一些，会相对更接近真理，正义和善良；比起另一个人，哪个人代表的邪恶会更小或者会更大。这些问题不可能有科学的答案，因为回答这些问题，需要对无数无法测量和不可通约的变量进行比较评估。无论如何，有关过去的最新发现，或者未来发展的事实很可能都会表明，任何这样的判断都是错误的。但答案也不是武断的。必须指出什么是真实的、正确的和有效的固定的参考点，同时，无论是基于逻辑还是经验证据，必须给出理由，这样才能确定各种次优选择离这些点到底更近还是更远。显然，在这类问题上做出判断是一门困难的艺术，就像创业不是一门科学而是一门艺术一样。正如有些人擅长创业，有些人不擅长(以金钱的盈亏来衡量)一样，有些人擅长判断政治事件和政治人物，而有些人则不擅长，他们通过明智和谨慎的判断来赢得或失去声誉。

Murray was of course not unfailing in his judgments. During the late 1960s and early 1970s, for instance, he misjudged the antiwar stand of the New Left as more principled than it really was, something that he afterwards readily admitted as a mistake. And I know of at least one, rather personal case, where Joey's judgment was better and more on the mark than his. This notwithstanding however, I have not encountered anyone of sounder, subsequently vindicated judgment than Murray.

当然，默里的判断当然不是一直不出错的。例如，在 20 世纪 60 年代末和 70 年代初，他错误地判断了新左翼的反战立场，认为它比实际更有原则性，他后来欣然承认这是一个错误。我知道至少有一个，相当私人的案例，乔伊的判断比他更好，更中肯。尽管如此，我还没有遇到这么一个人，他的判断比默里更透彻、更正确。

With this I want to come to the second major lesson I learned during my long

association with Murray。 While the first lesson in revisionism concerned matters of practice and method, the second lesson concerned existential matters。

说到这里，我想谈谈在与默里的长期交往中学到的第二个重要教训。修正主义的第一课是关于实践和方法的问题，第二课是关于存在主义的问题。

Before I met Murray, I knew of course that he was a radical outsider in a predominantly leftist-liberal academia and I expected (and was willing to accept for myself) that this would involve some sacrifices, i. e. , that one would have to pay a price for being a Rothbardian, not only, but also in terms of money。 But I was quite surprised to realize how high this price was。 I knew that Brooklyn Polytechnic was not a prestigious university, yet I expected Murray to occupy there a comfortable, well-paying post。 Moreover, at the time I still fancied the US as a bastion and bulwark of free enterprise and consequently expected that Murray, as the foremost intellectual champion of capitalism and the personified antithesis to Marx, would be held in high esteem, if not in academia then certainly outside of it, in the world of commerce and business, and accordingly be rewarded with a certain degree of affluence。

在认识默里之前，我当然知道，在一个以左翼自由主义为主的学术界，他是一个激进的局外人，我预计(也愿意接受)这将涉及一些牺牲，也就是说，一个人要成为罗斯巴德主义者，不仅要付出代价，而且要付出金钱的代价。但当我意识到这个价格是如此之高时，我被严重地惊讶到了。我知道布鲁克林理工学院并不是一所著名的大学，但我希望默里能在那里找到一份舒适、待遇优厚的工作。此外，当时我仍然幻想美国是自由企业的堡垒，因此我期望，默里作为资本主义最重要的知识斗士，马克思化身的对立面，即使不是在学术界，也肯定会在学术界之外的商业和商业领域，受到高度尊重，并相应地获得一定程度的富裕。

In fact, at Brooklyn Polytechnic Murray occupied a small, grungy, and windowless office that he had to share with a history professor。 In Germany, even research assistants enjoyed more comfortable surroundings, not to speak of full professors。 Murray ranked among the lowest paid full professors at his school。 Indeed, my German National Science Foundation grant at the time — a Heisenberg scholarship — turned out to be considerably higher than Murray's university salary (something that I was too

ashamed to reveal to him after I had discovered it). And Murray's apartment in Manhattan, large and filled to the ceiling with books, was dark and run-down. Certainly nothing like the penthouse that I had imagined him to occupy. This situation improved significantly with his move in 1986, at age 60, to Las Vegas and UNLV. While my salary went down there as compared to my previous compensation, Murray's went sharply up, but was still below \$100,000, and he could afford to buy a roomy but spartan house. Even as the holder of an endowed chair at UNLV, however, Murray did not have command of any research assistants or a personal secretary.

事实上，在布鲁克林理工学院，默里只有一间又小又脏、且没有窗户的办公室，同时还不得不和一位历史教授共用。在德国，即使是研究助理也能享有更舒适的环境，更不用说全职教授了。在他的学校，默里是收入最低的全职教授之一。事实上，我当时得到的德国国家科学基金会资助——海森堡奖学金——比默里的大学薪水高得多(在我发现这件事后，我羞于向他透露)。默里在曼哈顿的公寓很大，里面堆满了书，但是却又黑又破旧。当然不像我想象中他住的顶层公寓。1986年，60岁的他搬到拉斯维加斯和UNLV后，这种情况得到了显著改善。虽然我的薪水与之前相比低了，默里的薪水却大幅提升，但仍低于10万美元，他有能力买一套宽敞但简朴的房子。然而，即使作为UNLV的特聘教授，默里也没有任何研究助理或私人秘书。

Yet Murray never complained or showed any bitterness or signs of envy but always plugged along joyfully and pushed ahead instead with his writings. This was a hard lesson for me to learn and I am still having difficulties following it at times.

然而，默里从来没有抱怨过，也没有表现出任何不满或嫉妒的迹象，他一直坚持写作，并且乐此不疲。这对我来说是很难学会的，很多时候，我仍然做不到这一点。

A propos, Joey and Murray once told me laughingly how, at the time when they were still dating, both had expected the other to be a good catch. Joey, because Murray was Jewish, and Murray, because Joey was gentile — only to then find out that they were both wrong in their expectations.

乔伊和默里曾经笑着告诉我，在他们还在约会的时候，他们都希望对方是一个好对象。乔伊，因为默里是犹太人，而默里，因为乔伊是非犹太人——结果发现他们的期望都错了。

Moreover, despite his towering achievements as an intellectual champion of free

market capitalism, Murray never won any prizes, awards, or honours to speak of. That he did not win a Nobel prize in economics was not surprising, of course. After all, the great Mises also did not win it. But in the US alone there existed dozens of institutions — think-tanks, foundations, business associations, research centers, and universities — that professed their dedication to free markets and liberty, and yet none of them ever awarded Murray any significant prize or honorary award, all the while they showered people with money and awards who had done little more than to suggest — “daringly” — some incremental reform such as, let’s say, lowering the marginal tax rate from 35 percent to 30 or cutting the budget of the EPA by some percentage points, or who had simply expressed their “personal love” of “freedom” and “free enterprise” often, loudly, and emphatically enough.

此外，作为自由市场与资本主义的知识斗士，尽管默里已经取得了巨大的成就，但他从未获得任何奖项或荣誉。当然，他没有获得诺贝尔经济学奖并不令人意外。毕竟，伟大的米塞斯也没有赢得它。但仅在美国就有几十家机构——智库、基金会、商业协会、研究中心和大学——宣称他们致力于自由市场和自由，但没有一家机构授予默里任何重大奖项或荣誉奖，而他们却一直向那些几乎什么也没做的人提供金钱奖励，这些人提出一些“大胆”的渐进式改革，比如说，把边际税率从 35% 降至 30%，或者把环保署的预算削减几个百分点，或者只是经常性地、大声地、激情满满地抒发他们对“自由”和“自由企业”的“个人热爱”。

None of this fazed Murray in the slightest. Indeed, he expected nothing else, for reasons that I still had to learn.

这一切，丝毫都没有让默里感到不安。的确，他对别的事完全不在意，至于原因，我还没有弄清楚。

What Murray realized and I still had to learn was that the most vociferous and ferocious rejection and opposition to Austro-libertarianism would not come from the traditional socialist Left, but rather from these very selfproclaimed “anti-socialist,” “limited government,” “minimal state,” “pro-private enterprise,” and “pro-freedom” outfits and their intellectual mouthpieces, and above all from what has become known as the Beltway Libertarians. They simply could not stomach the fact that Murray had demonstrated with plain logic that their doctrines were nothing but inconsistent intellectual clap-trap, and that they were all, to use Mises’s verdict vis-a-vis Milton

Friedman and his company, a “bunch of socialists,” too, notwithstanding their vehement protestations to the contrary. For, as Murray argued, once you admitted the existence of a State, any State, defined as a territorial monopolist of ultimate decision-making in every case of conflict, including conflicts involving the State itself, then all private property had been effectively abolished, even if it remained provisionally, qua State-grant, nominally private, and had been replaced instead by a system of “collective” or rather State-property. State, any State, means socialism, defined as “the collective ownership of factors of production.” The institution of a State is praxeologically incompatible with private property and private property based enterprise. It is the very anti-thesis of private property, and any proponent of private property and private enterprise then must, as a matter of logic, be an anarchist. In this regard (as in many others) Murray was unwilling to compromise, or “intransigent,” as his detractors would say. Because in theory, in thinking, compromise is impermissible. In everyday life, compromise is a permanent, and ubiquitous feature, of course. But in theory, compromise is the ultimate sin, a strict and absolute ‘no no.’ It is not permissible, for instance, to compromise between the two incompatible propositions that  $1+1=2$  or that  $1+1=3$  and accept that it is 2. 5. Either some proposition is true or it is false. There can be no “meeting in the middle” of truth and falsehood. Here, regarding Murray’s uncompromising radicalism, a little anecdote told by Ralph Raico seems apropos.

默里已经意识到，而我仍然需要了解的是，对奥地利自由意志主义最激烈、最大声的拒绝和反对，不是来自传统的社会主义左翼，而是来自这些自我标榜的“反社会主义”、“有限政府”、“最小国家”、“亲私营企业”和“亲自由”的机构及其知识分子喉舌，尤其是那些被称为“环城自由意志主义者”（the Beltway Libertarians）的人。默里用清晰的逻辑证明了他们的学说只不过是前后矛盾的智力陷阱，这一点，他们根本无法接受，而且，用米塞斯对米尔顿·弗里德曼（Milton Friedman）和他的同伴所下的定语来说，他们都是“一群社会主义者”，尽管他们激烈地反对。因为，正如默里所说，一旦你承认一个国家的存在，任何国家，被定义为在所有冲突中，包括涉及国家本身的冲突中，拥有最终决策权的领土垄断者，那么所有的私有财产都已经被有效地废除了，即使它暂时保留为国家授予的名义上私有财产，并且已被“集体”或更确切地说是国家财产制度所取代。国家，任何国家，都意味着社会主义，被定义为“生产要素的集体所有制”。国家制度在行为学上与私有财产和以私有财产为基础的企业是不相容的。它是私有财

产的对立面，因此，从逻辑上讲，任何私有财产和私有企业的支持者，都必须是无政府主义者。在这方面(正如在许多其他方面一样)，默里不愿意妥协，或者用他的批评者话来说，他是“不妥协的”。因为在理论上，在思想上，妥协是不允许的。当然，在日常生活中，妥协是一个永久且普遍存在的特征。但从理论上讲，妥协是最大的罪恶，是一个严格而绝对的“不不”。例如，不允许在  $1+1=2$  或  $1+1=3$  这两个不相容的命题之间妥协而接受它是 2。5。某个命题不是为真就是为假。真理与谬误不可能“在中间相遇”。在这里，关于默里不妥协的激进主义，拉尔夫·雷科 (Ralph Raico) 讲的一件小轶事似乎很合适。

To quote Ralph:

Murray was someone special. I recognized that fact the first night I met him. It was after the Mises seminar; a buddy of mine and I had been invited to attend, and afterwards Murray suggested we have coffee and talk. My friend and I were dazzled by the great Mises, and Murray, naturally, was pleased to see our enthusiasm. He assured us that Mises was at least the greatest economist of the century, if not the whole history of economic thought. As far as politics went, though, Murray said, lowering his voice conspiratorially: "Well, when it comes to politics, some of us consider Mises a member of the non-Communist Left." Yes, it was easy to see we'd met someone very special.

引用拉尔夫的话:

默里是个特别的人。我第一次见到他的那晚就意识到了这一点。那是在米塞斯研讨会之后;我和我的一个朋友被邀请参加，此后，默里建议我们喝杯咖啡聊聊天。我和我的朋友被伟大的米塞斯迷得眼花缭乱，默里自然很高兴看到我们的热情。他向我们保证，米塞斯即使不是整个经济思想史上最伟大的经济学家，至少也是本世纪最伟大的经济学家。默里说，就政治而言，压低了自己的声音：“嗯，说到政治，我们中的一些人认为米塞斯是非共产主义左翼的一员 (the non-Communist Left)。”是的，很容易看出我们遇到了一个非常特别的人。

Unlike Murray, quite a few individuals who had learned essentially everything they ever knew from Murray, in particular his Man, Economy and State, were willing to make such intellectual compromises, and they were richly rewarded for their intellectual “flexibility” and “tolerance.” But that was not Murray! And consequently, he was (and still is) ignored, excluded, or denounced by the chieftains of the “limited-government-

free-market- industry。” And he was essentially left without any institutional support, as a lone fighter, until the arrival of Lew Rockwell and the Mises Institute。

与默里不同，有相当一部分人基本上是从默里那里学到了他们所知道的一切，尤其是他的那本《人、经济与国家》，他们愿意做出这样的智力妥协，他们也因为智力上的“灵活性”和“宽容”得到了丰厚的回报。但那不是默里！结果，他一直被“有限政府-自由市场-产业”的领袖们忽视、排斥或谴责(现在仍然如此)。他一直是一个孤独的斗士，基本上没有任何机构的支持，直到卢·罗克韦尔（Lew Rockwell）和米塞斯研究所的到来。

I experienced this Rothbard-phobia second- handedly, if you will。 For as soon as word had gotten out that the new German arrival was Murray's boy and also appeared rather “intransigent,” I found myself immedi- ately placed on the same blacklists with him。 Thus, I had quickly learned a first important real-life lesson of what it means to be a Rothbardian。

不瞒您说，我亲身经历过罗斯巴德恐惧症（Rothbard-phobia）。这个新来的德国人是默里的死忠粉，而且看起来相当“刺头”，这样的消息一经传出，我立马发现自己和他一样，被列入了黑名单。因此，我很快就学到了第一堂重要的现实生活课，作为一个罗斯巴德主义者到底意味着什么。

Another lesson was in humility。 Murray had a huge library, had read and digested an enormous amount of literature and was consequently a humble man。 He was always reluctant and highly sceptical to assume or rec- ognize any “originality” claims。 “Originality” claims, he knew, are made most frequently by people with tiny libraries and little reading。 In distinct contrast, Murray was highly generous in giving credit to others。 And he was equally generous in giving advice to anyone asking。 Indeed, on almost any conceivable subject, he was prepared, off the top of his head, to provide you with an extensive bibliography。 As well, he encouraged any sign of productivity even among his lowliest students。

我学到的另一课是，谦卑。默里有一个巨大的图书馆，他阅读并消化了大量的文学作品，因此是个谦虚的人。他总是不情愿地、高度怀疑地假定或承认任何“独创性”的主张。他明白，所谓的“独创性”往往是那些图书馆很小、读书很少的人说出来的。与之形成鲜明对比的是，默里非常慷慨地赞扬别人。他也同样慷慨地给任何询问的人提供



建议。事实上，在几乎任何你能想到的主题上，他都有所准备，可以不加思索地给你提供大量的参考书目。此外，他鼓励任何有创造力的思考，哪怕是他水平最低的学生。

While I always tried to follow this example, I could not bring myself to go quite as far as Murray did, however. Because I thought and still think that Murray's humility was excessive, that he was humble almost to a fault. His students at Brooklyn Polytechnic, for instance, mostly engineering majors (or, as Murray described Mises's students at NYU, "packaging majors"), had no idea who he was, because he never mentioned his own works. They were genuinely surprised to find out from me who their jolly professor was when I substituted teaching Murray's class while he was out of town. And at UNLV the situation was not much different. While I actively promoted him as his unofficial PR-agent, Murray continued in his self-deprecation. Although he had written on almost any imaginable subject in the social sciences, he would, when he suggested or assigned term papers to his students, mention his own related writings, if at all, only as some sort of afterthought or upon specific request.

虽然我一直努力以默里为榜样，但无论如何，我无法让自己做得像默里那样。因为我一直认为默里过于谦虚了，他的谦虚几乎低到了尘埃里。例如，他在布鲁克林理工学院(Brooklyn Polytechnic)的学生大多是工程专业的(或者，用默里的话说，米塞斯在纽约大学的学生是“包装专业的”)，他们不知道他是谁，因为他从来没有提到过自己的作品。当我在默里出城时替他代课，他们从我那里得知他们那令人愉悦的教授是何方神圣时，他们真的很惊讶。在 UNLV，情况并没有太大不同。当我积极推动他成为他的非官方公关经纪人时，默里继续他的自我贬低。尽管他写过几乎所有能想到的社会科学领域的文章，但只有当他向学生建议或布置学期论文时，他才会提到自己的相关文章，即使有，也只是作为事后的想法或应特定的要求。

Yet Murray's extreme modesty had also another, unfortunate effect. When we moved to Las Vegas in 1986, we had expected to turn UNLV into a bastion of Austrian economics. At the time, UNLV's basketball team, the Runnin' Rebels, under coach Jerry Tarkanian, were a national powerhouse, always slightly scandalous, but impossible to overlook. We had hoped to become the Runnin' Rebels of economics at UNLV. Several students had transferred and enrolled at the university in anticipation of such a development. But these hopes were quickly disappointed. Already at our arrival at UNLV the composition of the economics department had significantly changed, and

then majority rule, democracy, set in. To balance the Austrian influence, only one year later, the department majority decided, against our opposition, to hire a no-name Marxist. I urged Murray to use his position and reputation to interfere with the university's higher-ups and prevent this appointment. Except for Jerry Tarkanian, Murray was the only nationally recognized person at UNLV. He held the only endowed chair at the university. We knew the university's president and provost socially and were on cordial terms with both of them. Accordingly, I believed that there was a realistic chance to overturn the department's decision. But I could not persuade Murray of his own powers.

然而，默里的极端谦虚也产生了另一个令人遗憾的后果。我们在 1986 年搬到拉斯维加斯时，曾期望把拉斯维加斯大学 (UNLV) 变成奥派经济学的堡垒。当时，在杰里·塔卡尼安 (Jerry Tarkanian) 教练的带领下，拉斯维加斯大学的篮球队“奔跑的反叛者”(Runnin' Rebels) 是一支全国性的强队，总会出点丑闻，但不容忽视。我们曾希望成为拉斯维加斯大学经济学领域的“奔跑反叛者”。预料到这种情况的发展，已有几个学生转学到这所大学就读。但这些希望很快就落空了。在我们到达拉斯维加斯大学的时候，经济学系的组织架构已经发生了很大的变化，作为多数决原则的民主开始了。为了平衡奥地利学派的影响，仅仅一年之后，系里的多数派不顾我们的反对，决定聘请一位名不见经传的马克思主义者。我敦促默里利用他的地位和声誉来干涉学校的高层，阻止这项任命。除了杰瑞·塔卡尼安 (Jerry Tarkanian)，默里是拉斯维加斯大学唯一得到全国认可的人。他担任这所大学唯一的特聘教授。我们认识这所大学的校长和教务长，且有社交往来，并与他们都很友好。因此，我相信有一个现实的机会推翻系决定。但我无法说服默里相信他自己的能力。

After this missed opportunity matters became worse. The department continued to hire anyone but an Austrian or Austrian sympathizer. Our students were maltreated and discriminated against. The department and the dean of the business college denied me tenure (which decision was overruled by the university's provost and president, not least because of massive student protests and the intervention of several university donors). The department chairman wrote an outrageous, nasty, and insulting annual evaluation of Murray's professorial performance (upon which the university administration forced the chairman to resign from his position). As a consequence, a second chance for us arose to turn matters around. Plans were

---

developed and were discussed with the provost to split the department and establish a separate economics department in the College of Liberal Arts. This time Murray became involved. But the initial momentum to our advantage had been lost in the meantime, and after the first signs of resistance, Murray quickly resigned and gave up. He was not willing to take off his gloves, and our secessionist project soon fizzled out in defeat.

错失这个机会之后，事情变得更糟了。该系继续雇用除了奥地利人或奥地利同情者以外的任何人。我们的学生又受到不公正对待和歧视。系里和商学院院长拒绝授予我终身教职(因为大规模的学生抗议，再加上几位大学捐赠者的干预，该校教务长和校长否决了这个决定。)。系主任对默里的授课业绩写了一份令人发指的、恶毒的、侮辱性的年度评估报告(随后，大学行政部门迫使系主任辞去了职务)。结果，我们有了第二次扭转局面的机会。他们制定了计划，并与教务长进行了讨论，打算把这个系分开，在文理学院建立一个独立的经济学系。这一次默里也参与了进来。但与此同时，我们失去了最初的优势，在最初的抵抗迹象出现后，默里很快就放弃了。他不愿意弄脏自己的手 (take off his gloves)，于是我们的分离主义计划很快就以失败告终。

Only to quickly finish our UNLV saga: After Murray's death in 1995, I continued working at UNLV for another decade in an increasingly hostile environment. The once protective university administration had changed, and I felt ever more unappreciated and out of place. Even my great popularity among students was used against me, as proof of the "danger" emanating from my teaching. In 2004, I became embroiled in a scandal. In a lecture I had hypothetically suggested that homosexuals, on average, and owing to their characteristic lack of children, had a comparatively higher degree of time preference, i. e., of present-orientation. A cry-baby student complained, and the university's affirmative action commissar immediately, as if he had only waited for this opportunity, initiated official proceedings against me, threatening severe punitive measures if I were not to instantly and publicly recant and apologize. "Intransigent" as I was, I refused to do so. And I am certain that it was only this steadfast refusal of mine to beg for forgiveness that, after a full year of administrative harassment, I ultimately emerged victorious from this battle with the thought police, and the university administration suffered an embarrassing defeat. A year later I resigned from my position and left UNLV and the US for good.

我们在拉斯维加斯大学的传奇故事很快迎来结局：默里在 1995 年去世后，尽管环境越来越恶劣，我在拉斯维加斯大学仍然继续工作了 10 年。曾经保护我的大学管理层已经改变了，我感到越来越不受重视，以及越来越格格不入了。甚至利用我在学生中的声望来对付我，证明我的教学存在“危险”。2004 年，我卷入了一桩丑闻。在一次演讲中，我假设同性恋者，由于他们没有孩子的特点，平均而言，有相对较高程度的时间偏好，即现在取向。一个小 P 孩学生投诉了，学校的平权运动委员立即对我提起了正式诉讼，仿佛他一直在等待这个机会一般，威胁说如果不立即公开撤回并道歉，就会采取严厉的惩罚措施。尽管我很“不妥协”，但我拒绝这样做。我确信，正是由于我坚定地拒绝乞求原谅，在经历了整整一年的行政骚扰之后，与思想警察的战斗中我最终取得了胜利，而大学行政部门则遭遇了尴尬的失败。一年后，我辞去职位，永远离开了拉斯维加斯大学和美国。

Coming back to Murray: Naturally, I was disappointed about the developments at UNLV. But they did not have the slightest effect on our continued cooperation. Maybe Murray had been right and more realistic all along and it was I, who had suffered from too much youthful optimism? And in any case, there was one more important lesson about the larger scheme of things that I still had to learn.

说回到默里：我自然对拉斯维加斯大学的发展感到失望。但这一切对我们继续合作没有丝毫影响。也许默里一直以来都是对的，而且更加现实，而我呢，受到了太多年轻人乐观主义的影响？无论如何，还有一个更重要的教训是我还需要学习的。

Whereas most people tend to become milder and more 'tolerant' in their views as they grow older, Murray grew increasingly more radical and less tolerant over time. Not in his personal dealings, as I already emphasized. In this regard Murray was and remained to the end a 'softie,' but in his speeches and writings. This radicalization and increasing 'intransigence' came in response to developments in the world of US politics at large and in particular within the "limited-government-free-market" industry and among the so-called libertarians assembled around Washington, DC's Beltway. There, everywhere, a slow yet systematic drift toward the Left and leftist ideas could be observed. A drift that ever since, up to this day, has only further gained in momentum and grown in strength. Constantly, new "rights" were 'discovered' and adopted in particular also by so-called libertarians. "Human rights" and "civil rights," "women rights" and "gay rights," the "right" not to be discriminated against, the "right"

---

to free and unrestricted immigration, the “right” to a free lunch and free health care, and the “right” to be free of unpleasant speech and thought。 Murray demolished all this allegedly “humanitarian” or, to use a German term, this “Gutmenschen” talk as intellectual rubbish in demonstrating that none of these supposed “rights” were compatible with private property rights。 And that, as libertarians above all people should know, only private property rights, i. e. , the right of every person in the ownership of his physical body and the ownership of all external objects justly (peacefully) acquired by him, can be argumentatively defended as universal and compossible human rights。 Everything except private property rights, then, Murray demonstrated again and again, are phony, non-universalizable rights。 Every call for “human rights” other than private property rights is ultimately motivated by egalitarianism and as such represents a revolt against human nature。

随着年龄的增长，大多数人的观点往往会变得更温和、更“宽容”，而默里却随着时间的推移变得越来越激进、越来越不宽容。我已经强调过，越来越激进的，不是他的个人行事风格。在这方面，默里一直是一个“软蛋”，但在他的演讲和著作中，却恰恰相反。这种激进化和日益增长的“不妥协”，是对美国政坛总体发展的回应，尤其是对“有限政府-自由市场”行业发展的回应，以及对聚集在华盛顿特区环城公路周围的所谓自由意志主义者的回应。在那里，在任何地方，都可以观察到一种缓慢却系统性地转向左翼和左翼思想的暗流涌动。从那时起，直到今天，这一趋势的势头和力量只会进一步增强。新的“权利”不断被“发现”，并被采纳，尤其是被所谓的自由意志主义者采纳。“人权”和“公民权利”，“妇女权利”和“同性恋权利”，不受歧视的“权利”，自由和不受限制的移民“权利”，免费午餐和免费医疗的“权利”，以及自由发表不友善言论和思想的“权利”。默里撕下了所有这些所谓的“人道主义”面具，或者用一个德语术语来说，这些“Gutmenschen”的言论是知识垃圾，他指出，这些所谓的“权利”统统都与私有财产权不相容。而且，正如自由意志主义者应该首先知道的那样，唯有私有财产权，即每个人对自己身体的所有权，以及他用公正地(和平地)手段获得的所有外部物体的所有权，才能被论证为普遍的和可能的人权。那么，默里一次又一次地证明，除了私有财产权之外，其它的一切权利，都是虚假的、无法普世化的权利。除了私有财产权之外，每一种对“人权”的呼吁，最终都是由平等主义驱动的，因此意味着对人类本质的叛乱。

Moreover, Murray moved still further to the right — in accordance with Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn's dictum that “the right is right” — in pointing out that in order to

establish, maintain, and defend a libertarian social order more is needed than the mere adherence to the non- aggression principle。 The ideal of the left- or “modal”- libertarians, as Murray referred to them, of “live and let live as long as you don’t aggress against anyone else,” that sounds so appealing to adolescents in rebellion against parental authority and any social convention and control, may be sufficient for people living far apart and dealing and trading with each other only indirectly and from afar。 But it is decidedly insufficient when it comes to people living in close proximity to each other, as neighbours and cohabitants of the same community。 The peaceful cohabitation of neighbours and of people in regular direct contact with each other on some territory requires also a commonality of culture: of language, religion, custom, and convention。 There can be peaceful co-existence of different cultures on distant, physically separated territories, but multi-culturalism, cultural heterogeneity, can not exist in one and the same place and territory without leading to diminishing social trust, increased conflict, and ultimately the destruction of anything resembling a libertarian social order。

此外，默里还进一步右转——与埃里克·冯·库涅尔特-莱迪恩（Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn）的名言“权利是正确的”相一致——他指出，为了建立、维持和捍卫一个自由意志主义的社会秩序，需要的不仅仅是坚持互不侵犯原则。正如默里所说，左翼或“模态”自由意志主义者的理想是，“只要你不侵犯他人，你就过自己的生活，也让别人过自己的生活”，这对反抗父母权威、反抗任何社会习俗和控制的青少年来说，听起来很有吸引力。对于那些生活在遥远的地方，彼此之间只能间接地、远距离地打交道和交易的人来说，同样也可能已经足够。但是，当涉及到作为邻居和同一社区的共同居者而彼此生活得很近时，这显然是不够的。邻居之间的和平共处，以及在某些领土上彼此经常直接接触的人们，也需要一种共同的文化：语言、宗教、习俗和惯例。不同的文化可以在遥远的、物理上分离的领土上和平共处，但多元文化主义、异质文化，不可能共存于同一个地方和同一块领土，这种共存不可能不导致社会信任的减少，也不可能不导致冲突的增加，最终会破坏任何类似自由意志主义社会秩序的东西。

If Murray had been ignored, neglected, or resented before by the usual suspects, now, with this stand against everything deemed “politically correct,” he was vilified and met with undisguised hatred。 The by now only all- too-familiar litany of denunciatory terms followed: Murray was a reactionary, a racist, a sexist, an authoritarian, an elitist,

a xenophobe, a fascist and, to top it all off, a self-hating Jewish Nazi.

如果说默里以前被人忽略、忽视或憎恨，那么现在，由于他反对一切被认为是“政治正确”的东西，他受到诋毁，同时也遭到毫不掩饰的仇恨。到目前为止，人们再熟悉不过的谴责词接踵而来：默里是一个反动派、一个种族主义者、一个性别歧视者、一个威权主义者、一个精英主义者、一个仇外者、一个法西斯主义者，最重要的是，他是一个自我憎恨的犹太纳粹。

Murray shrugged it all off. Indeed, he laughed about it. And indeed, to the consternation of the “smear bund,” as Murray referred to the united popular front of his “anti-fascist” detractors, his influence only grew and has continued to grow still further since his death. It may not be widely recognized, but without Murray there would be no Ron Paul as we know him — and I say this without wishing thereby to diminish or belittle Ron Paul’s own, personal role and extraordinary achievements in the slightest —, there would be no Ron Paul movement, and there would be no popular or, as the “smear bund” prefers to say, no “populist” libertarian agenda.

默里对这一切不屑一顾。事实上，他对此还笑了。事实上，令“诽谤联盟”(默里指的是针对他的“反法西斯”批评者的联合人民阵线)惊愕的是，他的影响力一直在只增不减，并且在他死后，还在继续增长。这可能没有得到广泛的认可，如果没有默里，就不会有我们所知道的荣·保罗，这一点可能还没有得到广泛的认可——我这么说，并不是希望因此丝毫贬低或轻视荣·保罗自己的个人作用，以及他的非凡成就——就不会有荣·保罗(Ron Paul)运动，也不会有大众运动，或者像“诽谤联盟”喜欢说的那样，不会有“平民主义”自由意志主义议程。

As for me, my own views radicalized, too, along with Murray’s. My Democracy: The God That Failed was the first major documentation of this intellectual development, and if anything, my radical intolerance regarding anything left-libertarian and “politically correct” has been growing still ever since. Almost needless to say that I, too, then have been awarded the same and even a few extra honorary titles by the “smear bund” as Murray (except for the self-hating Jewish stuff). Yet I had learned to shrug all of it off, too, as I had seen Murray do it, and as Ralph Raico had always encouraged and continued to advise me. In addition, remembering a popular German saying helped me: “viel Feind, viel Ehr.” And indeed, the ongoing success of my annual Property and Freedom Society conference-salon, now in its 12th year, held and

---

conducted in a genuinely Rothbardian spirit, has demonstrated the utter failure of all defamation campaigns directed at me. If anything, they have helped rather than hindered me in attracting an ever larger circle of intellectual friends, affiliates, and supporters.

至于我，我自己的观点也和默里的一样激进。我的《民主：失败的上帝》是这一思想发展的第一个主要文本，如果说有什么不同的话，那就是我对任何左翼自由主义和“政治正确”的极端不容忍，从那以后就一直在增长。几乎不用说，我也被“诽谤联盟”授予了与默里相同甚至更多的“荣誉头衔”(除了自我憎恨的犹太人)。然而，我也学会了对这一切不以为意，就像我看到默里所做的那样，就像拉尔夫·雷科一直鼓励并持续建议我那样。此外，记住一句流行的德国谚语对我也很有帮助：“再见，费恩，再见，厄尔。”

(“viel Feind, viel Ehr.”) 事实上，我的财产与自由协会年度会议沙龙(Property And Freedom Society conference-salon)获得了持续的成功，到现在已经是第 12 个年头了，它本着真正的罗斯巴德精神举办和组织，这一事实证明，所有针对我的诽谤活动都彻底失败了。如果说有什么不同的话，那就是它们帮助而不是阻碍了我吸引越来越多的知识分子朋友、附属机构和支持者。

I should add that during the last decade or so, under the wise and strict guidance of my lovely wife Gülçin, I have also made great strides in combining uncompromising intellectual radicalism with personal lovability, even though nature and natural disposition have prevented me from coming anywhere close to Murray in this regard.

还应该补充一点，过去的十年左右时间，在我可爱的妻子 Gülçin 明智和严格的指导下，在将不妥协的激进主义思想与个人的可爱相结合方面，我也取得了长足的进步，尽管在这方面，我的天性和性格使我无法与默里相提并论。

I have said far too little here about Lew, and I sincerely apologize. But this I must say: Lew, apart from Murray has been one of the most important people helping me become the man that I am today. And to Murray, who I am sure is watching us today from up high, I say: thank you Murray, you are my hero, “I shall not look upon his like again,” and I hope you are happy with your student. I always felt tremendous joy when you told me “great Hans, Attaboy,” and even if I can't hear you right now, nothing would give me greater pleasure than if you said it again right now up there, where the kings of thought are gathered.



关于卢，我在这里说得太少了，我表示真诚的歉意。但我必须说：除了默里，卢是帮助我成为今日之我的最重要的人之一。同时，我相信此时此刻，默里一定在天上望着我们，我想对他说：谢谢你，默里，你是我的英雄，“我再也不会看到像他那样的人了”，我希望你对你的学生感到满意。当你对我说“伟大的汉斯，好样的”时，我总是感到无比的快乐。即使我现在已听不见你说话，但如果现在你出现在这里，在这个思想帝王聚集的地方，再说一遍那句话，我依然会感到非常高兴。

## 索引

略。