

Hayek's Road to Serfdom in Contexts

Jeremy Shearmur, Philosophy, School of Humanities, Australian National University.

Jeremy.Shearmur@anu.edu.au

1. Introduction

Hayek's Road to Serfdom was a surprising – and surprisingly influential – book. It was surprising, because in many respects it was not the kind of work that one might have expected Hayek to write. For his reputation to that point was as an economist in the Austrian tradition, and as someone with an interest in the history of thought. The Road to Serfdom was written as a semi-popular book (Hayek clearly thought it popular, but it was sufficiently scholarly to be the object of several different popularizations; see below¹); and Hayek clearly thought that in writing it, he was doing something that might put his academic reputation at risk (and it does, indeed, seem to have harmed him). At the same time, there is a sense in which there is a great deal of substance behind the book – which also calls for explanation.

The book itself – dedicated to 'socialists of all parties' – was concerned with what Hayek saw as some problems about the then-popular ideal of a planned society, or of the continuation into peacetime of the kind of governmental planning that people in Britain were becoming used to in a wartime regime. Hayek's own political orientation was, clearly, towards a market-based liberalism. But it is important to bear in mind that the book was also in some ways quite interventionist – enough for Keynes to remark upon;² and for the later, and then more stridently free-market, Hayek subsequently to critique in a new preface.³ His overall argument might be put in terms of his having suggested that an uncritical enthusiasm for planning could put at risk freedom, democracy, and also the successful operation of a market economy. The more substantive message of the book, however, was not one of 'laissez faire' – of which he was explicitly critical – but rather the idea that those who favoured governmental intervention needed to give a lot of thought as to how this was to take place, so as to avoid putting into jeopardy values which they also (typically) favoured. Hayek was particularly concerned just because it seemed to him that many features which people recognised and disliked about then-contemporary Germany, were, in fact, the longer-term products of the kinds of measures that they, themselves, were championing. (In this context, it should be stressed that what he was concerned with was the country's 'totalitarian' character, not death camps and so on, which subsequently dominated people's image of the Germany of that period: Hayek had, prior to the publication of the book, reviewed a couple of books which set out to discuss the kind of economic order which was favoured in the Germany of the time.⁴)

The book was also surprisingly successful. In Britain, it seems to have initially got the kind of reception that Hayek was hoping for – in terms of academic engagement, but at the same time, to have been a surprise best-seller (or at least it would have been, had sufficient paper supplies been available). Hayek, however, became concerned that it was being taken up just on the political right; and it was widely thought that Churchill was echoing Hayek's ideas when, in an election speech, he suggested that the plans of the British Labour Party would lead to a need for a Gestapo.⁵ In the

United States, the effect was even more marked: his book was enthusiastically espoused by those on the free-market right, and denounced in intemperate terms by those identified with planning.⁶ More significant, it was made the subject of a condensation which was distributed with Readers Digest (in addition, a major car manufacturer commissioned and distributed to its workforce a short cartoon version of the book).⁷ In Britain, a Conservative MP wrote his own much longer abridgment of the book, which was published using part of the paper ration allocated to the Conservative Party for electioneering purposes.⁸

The Readers Digest popularization had a further consequence: it was read by a young British man, who at the time was in the armed forces, Antony Fisher, who thought that something needed to be done. He had initially planned to go into politics, but after a meeting with Hayek, he was inspired by the idea of setting up a think-tank. From this – on the back, it might be noted, of profits from the factory farming of chickens – was eventually set up Britain's Institute of Economic Affairs, and Canada's Fraser Institute, and, indeed, a whole slew of market-orientated policy institutes which did a lot, over the years, to disseminate and apply market-liberal ideas.⁹

In the present paper, my concern is not, however, with this wider picture, but with a more narrow one: what might one say about the sources of The Road to Serfdom, in the sense of the problems and concerns which gave rise to it?

2. Concerns About Calls for Planning in Britain

The first and most obvious starting-point, is with the attraction at the time of ideas about a planned society. It is important to bear in mind that in Britain there was enthusiastic support for planning, seen as 'scientific', from a number of Marxist scientists and popularisers of science such as Crowther and Hogben, but also much more widely. (It is striking, say, the degree to which the science journal Nature became identified with such a perspective.¹⁰) It acquired further popularity among many who thought that the only remedy for depression was large-scale governmental action (people who were inspired, variously, by Mussolini and Keynes); by those who were enthusiastic about at least the idea of Stalin's 5-year plans in the USSR, and more generally by those who warmed to wartime planning as a model for peacetime.

All this led in its turn to misgivings. If one thinks only of Britain (and one might, here, clearly also add John Anderson in Australia¹¹), it is striking to consider the way in which people of otherwise very different outlooks expressed concerns about these developments. Let me mention two rather different examples.

On the one hand, there was Michael Polanyi.¹² He was a most interesting man. Despite the fact that his criticisms of planning and interest in ideas about spontaneous order have led people to see him

as close to Hayek, he was, in fact, a rather different kind of character. He was initially a professor of chemistry, but developed interests in social theory. He was interested in the claims that were made for socialist planning in the Soviet Union, but became critical of them on the basis that – on his analysis – the figures did not add up.¹³ He should not, though, be seen as someone simply on the right of politics. He was very impressed with Keynesian ideas in economics and what he took to be their implications for public policy: he went round the country giving popular talks about them, which he eventually published as a book, Full Employment and Free Trade.¹⁴ While he initially joined Hayek's Mont Pelerin Society, over time it became clear that he was not very much in sympathy with its tendencies towards classical liberalism, and the main focus of his political attention instead became the Congress for Cultural Freedom. This was an (in the event) CIA-funded network of anti-communists, and included many somewhat left-inclined intellectuals – whose ideas about freedom contrasted quite strongly with those of Hayek. Polanyi's particular initial concern, however, was with the move to introduce planning into science – in which connection he was led to develop arguments that had a certain parallel with those of Hayek (and to develop ideas about 'spontaneous order' on which Hayek was later to draw). One got, more generally, in his writings a concern for ideas about planning as a threat to a free society, his vision of which, however, contrasted interestingly with Hayek's more classical liberal perspective.

A second example is C. S. Lewis, the professor of literature and Christian apologist. In, notably, the final volume of his science fiction trilogy, That Hideous Strength,¹⁵ there is sustained criticism of an allegedly science-based planning Institute, notionally headed by a character clearly reminiscent of H. G. Wells. Lewis's concern is that such planning would involve the undermining of various kinds of liberty, and the removal of restraints upon the activities of the police, on experimentation on animals, and so on. It is also interesting that while Lewis noted the self-identification of such 'planning' with a scientific approach, he has one of the characters in his story – who is depicted as being the only first-rate scientist who appears in it – dismissing the whole thing as having nothing whatever to do with real science. The ideas with which these things are contrasted are perhaps best described as a conservative, Christian natural law perspective.¹⁶ His story gets complicated as the book develops, in that the true significance of the Institute with which he is concerned, turns out to be rather different, and related to the combination of spiritual and science fiction themes of Lewis's trilogy – as well as involving ideas drawn from Tolkein and Charles Williams. Yet there are, nonetheless, in the initial stages of the story which relate to the ideal of planning, certain common concerns with both Hayek and Polanyi. Accordingly, one very obvious source for The Road to Serfdom, consists of concern that Hayek felt – along with people of very different orientations – for what the implications might be of the kinds of calls for social planning which were being voiced in Britain both before and during the Second World War.

3. Issues From Germany and Austria

It is important, however, to bear in mind that an important theme of Hayek's was that the ideas that he was concerned about, were developments that in his view had already been taken much further in German-speaking countries, and which had, there, come to what he thought was their fruition. With just what was Hayek here concerned? A full survey of relevant social thought in the German-

speaking world would require knowledge that I simply do not have, and I will here concentrate on some themes with which Hayek is explicitly concerned. It is, however, well worth noting the following point. Karl Popper's Open Society and Its Enemies, which was written in New Zealand during the Second World War, was, as Malachi Hacohen has noted,¹⁷ much concerned with issues that had been discussed in Austria prior to Popper's leaving for New Zealand. What is striking, however, is the degree to which there are commonalities between the ideas with which the book took issue, and Hayek's discussion in The Road to Serfdom. While Popper had met Hayek in London prior to leaving for New Zealand (they had not known one another in Austria), their discussions seem to have related to Popper's concerns about what he called 'historicism', and also to issues relating to determinism. In New Zealand, Popper had come across some of Hayek's writings, including 'Freedom and the Economic System',¹⁸ in which he developed some criticisms of planning. But Popper was shocked when he received a copy of Hayek's Road to Serfdom, by the degree to which there were similarities between their writings.¹⁹

This, however, was for the most part a product of their having taken the same kinds of ideas about planning as their targets, rather than of the kind of arguments that they developed against them. For one might say that Hayek, while not in any simple sense just applying his arguments about the problems of economic planning under socialism and the views about the significance of markets in the coordination of information to which it seems to me clear that he was led by that discussion,²⁰ can very much be understood as looking critically at the vision of a planned society from a perspective informed by those views. By way of analogy with James Scott's Seeing Like a State,²¹ one might say that, when Hayek was looking at proposals for planning, he was seeing like an 'Austrian' economist. Popper, by contrast, seems to me best understood as informed by a Kantian-influenced republican individualism, a concern about human suffering, but, above all, by the fallibilism of his epistemology.

But with what did Hayek engage? He has told us that the germ from which The Road to Serfdom developed was a memo that he wrote to the Director of the L.S.E. in 1933. It concerned the socialist character of National Socialism. A copy of this memo has been identified by Bruce Caldwell, and included in The Road to Serfdom: Text and Documents. It is, however, rather disappointing in its content: it refers to some socialist-influenced programmatic ideas drawn up by an economic adviser to Hitler, Gottfried Feder, which were socialistic in their character, and to State Commissioners being placed in charge of various industries in 1933. However, as Caldwell notes, Feder's ideas were dropped, and the commissioners swiftly displaced. All told, while what Hayek wrote might have looked plausible in 1933, the National Socialists, when in power, did not pursue policies which were socialist in any systematic sense, and anyone attracted to National Socialism because of its early socialist rhetoric, must have been sorely disappointed.

There is, however, something else which was relevant, and with which Hayek was – on the face of it somewhat oddly – concerned in his Inaugural Address at the L.S.E. What I have in mind, here, is the fact that when Hayek delivered his Inaugural Address at the L.S.E. in 1933 'The Trend of Economic

Thinking',²² he spent much of his time attacking the ideas of the younger German Historical School of Economics, and what he thought were the problematic consequences of their work for social policy.

Why, one might ask, was Hayek concerned with a critique of these thinkers – whose work was for the most part not available in English, and which would hardly have been well-known to his audience? Now one immediate reason is that just before delivering his Inaugural, Hayek had been working on his edition of the writings of Carl Menger, whose Untersuchungen takes issue with the methodological ideas of the younger historical school. Indeed, as I mentioned in my discussion of this topic in Hayek and After, Hayek's introduction to the collected works discusses some of these issues in terms similar to those that Hayek used in his Inaugural.²³ This, however, is hardly in itself an explanation for the inaugural. That, I think, has to be looked at rather in terms of the concerns that Hayek expressed within it.

For what worried Hayek about the work of the younger historical school, was what he thought were the ways in which their ideas served in his view to undermine the anti-utopian characteristics of classical and modern theoretical economics. That is to say, for Hayek, a major achievement of such economics was to have made us conscious of the way in which many features of the economic organization of commercial society, which we are apt simply to take for granted, are, in fact, the products of various mechanisms and disciplines; mechanisms and disciplines which, if we were to contemplate them without an awareness of these theoretical inter-connections, we would be apt simply to dislike, and wish to get rid of. In Hayek's view, the problem about the work of the younger historical schools, was it seemed to him to undermine this, in his view, key anti-utopian achievement of theoretical economics.

In his 'Inaugural Address', he linked this to some remarks about the significance of Mises' critical writings about socialism. But there is, I think fairly clearly, a more general connection between his concerns here, and his critique of planning in The Road to Serfdom. For Hayek is not so much opposed to the ethical concerns that had led people to wish for a planned society,²⁴ as he is worried about the way in which people had lost sight of the systematic constraints under which we operate, and as to the character of which economic theory had alerted us. In The Road to Serfdom, Hayek is concerned with a social order which we have inherited, which allows for a distinctive combination of individual freedom and the coordination of economic activity; something which he came to believe that the efforts of those who favoured a planned society would serve to undermine.

I will say more, shortly, about the relevance of the German younger historical school. But first, I need to discuss one other issue. This relates to Hayek's ideas about the rule of law. For one important theme in his writings – both in 'Freedom and the Economic System', and in The Road to Serfdom – is the rule of law, and the way in which this would in his view be called into question by economic planning. (This was a theme that particularly provoked the wrath of Finer.) However, something needs to be said about this idea in Hayek's work – an idea that, as I have argued

elsewhere, comes with time to play an even more prominent role in his social theory.²⁵ For while Hayek writes about this, and about the possibilities of improving it, in utilitarian terms,²⁶ it becomes clear over time that Hayek's views about the rule of law are not like those of the English common law tradition, to which he tends to assimilate it.²⁷ Rather, Hayek's view, as he sometimes clearly indicates, is influenced by the so-called Rechtsstaat tradition; and this, in turn, should be understood as a Kantian-influenced approach to legal theory. Here, I wish to flag not just the importance of this in Hayek's work, but also the fact that, to my knowledge (which here may be very fallible), the important issue of Hayek's legal philosophy, and its relation to the law which he was taught as part of his studies at the University of Vienna, has not been studied systematically.

I have referred to this issue in the context of 'Germany and Austria', just because I wish to stress that, in this particular respect, Hayek's views run the risk of being misunderstood, if they are simply assimilated to English ideas. What it is particularly important to note, in this context, is that despite Hayek's own references to utilitarianism, and despite the fact that his legal ideas also play a key functional role in his wider classical liberal view of a well-functioning commercial society, the specific strand from Rechtsstaat theory gives his work what might usefully be identified today as a 'republican' character – in the sense, that is, of the recent work of Pettit and of Skinner.²⁸ And this – it is important to note – is in many respects developed in deliberate contrast to Isaiah Berlin's ideas about liberty, which are themselves typically seen as a standard representation of English liberal views.

4. Recent Work by Bruce Caldwell

In the final section of this paper, I wish to discuss the significance for the study of Hayek's political thought, and our understanding of his Road to Serfdom, of some recent work by Bruce Caldwell. Caldwell, in many articles and essays, in his biography of Hayek,²⁹ and in addition in his editorial work on various volumes of Hayek's Collected Works, has in my view established himself as the foremost Hayek scholar of our time. However, and to my great good fortune, Caldwell is not particularly interested in Hayek's political thought. As a result, from my perspective, his work throws up various nuggets of gold, the value of which from this point of view, his discussion seems to me not fully to bring out.

I have, on the present occasion, been fortunate enough to have had the chance to look at, and lucky enough to have received his permission to refer to, some editorial work which he is undertaking in connection with a new edition of Hayek's Scientism and the Study of Society, which will also include his 'Individualism: True and False'. This contributes the two final items to the present paper.

The first relates to Hayek's initial time in the United States: he spent the period from March 1923-May 1924 in New York. While he was there, he attended, *inter alia*, lectures by Wesley Clair Mitchell on the history of economic thought.³⁰ Now, what Caldwell's work brings out, is the degree to which Hayek – who was familiar enough with the remaining impact of the historical school in Austria – found many facets of Mitchell's approach all too familiar. That is to say, what while much here was interesting and distinctive, much also seemed to him very close to the ideas of the younger historical school. It is this – and its link to political radicalism – that seems to me to explain why it was the case that Hayek thought it worthwhile to engage in his Inaugural Address with the ideas of people who, in all other respects might seem to have been simply a historical curiosity, and one which was also, for the most part, imprisoned within a language not familiar to most English-speaking people with an interest in economics.

There is, however, much more in Caldwell's recent work. For in his introduction to this new volume, Caldwell, in addition to discussing at some length Hayek's reactions to Mitchell, also discusses his systematic plans for academic work. These were first set out in a letter to Fritz Machlup, which Hayek wrote in August 1939. Hayek wrote about his plans: (I here make use of Caldwell's translation):³¹

A series of case studies should come first, that would have as its starting point certain problems of methodology and especially the relationship between the method of natural science and social problems, leading to the fundamental scientific principles of economic policy and ultimately to the consequences of socialism. The series should form the basis of a systematic intellectual historical investigation of the fundamental principles of the social development of the last hundred years (from Saint-Simon to Hitler)

And these, it seems to me, are of great importance in understanding The Road to Serfdom. For what they bring out, is the way in which, prior to The Road to Serfdom, Hayek had systematic plans for writings which were intended to form a two-volume work, and which became, *inter alia*, The Counter-Revolution of Science, Scientism and the Study of Society, 'Individualism: True and False', and The Road to Serfdom. Indeed, The Road to Serfdom turns out to have been a popularized version, written quickly because it seemed to speak urgently to issues of the time, of what would have been the final part of this larger work.

It is worth noting briefly what this material consists of.

First, there is Hayek's critical historical discussion of Saint-Simon and Comte. This is researched in detail, is still a fascinating read, and indicates clearly the way in which a certain kind of perspective, associated with a particular view of science and engineering, was seen as giving true insights as to how we should understand society, and also a social technology. There was, also, a vision of a good society as one directed by such experts – a theme which clearly resonates with certain strands in Fabian socialism. Hayek wrote only a very little of material which was going to discuss Hegelian and Marxist ideas, and what there is, is mercifully brief. While it is clear that some strands in Marxism shared in the scientistic approach of the first strand of Hayek's analysis, and while it is clear that

some people who favoured such views were among the most important voices urging the planning of both society and science, it would seem to me that Hayek would have been on a hiding to nothing, if he had tried to argue such a view in detail as an interpretation of Marx. (It is, though, worth noting that Popper, in his writings, took issue with such an interpretation of Marx, which would have been familiar to him from his time in Austria – not, least, as a Marxist – and which was also of some importance as it also fitted the reading of Marxism being offered in the Soviet Union.)

Second, there are Hayek's methodological writings. These represent an interesting amalgam of, on the one side, material that came out of 'Austrian' reflections on methodological issues in discussion circles in Vienna, together with distinctive ideas which Hayek elaborated further in his Sensory Order. There is also, however, some interesting material in which Hayek discusses historical themes, and issues relating to the limitations of reason, in ways that are taken up more extensively in the writings of his old age.

Next, there was what was planned to be a more extensive and scholarly treatment of what became The Road to Serfdom. It would seem as Hayek was diverted from this plan by the wish to write something more popular, and that The Road to Serfdom, in consequence, was seen by him as an expansion of Freedom and the Economic System. At the same time – and as is witnessed by Popper's reaction to the book – there was much more to it, than there was to the argument of the pamphlet.

Finally, there was 'Individualism: True and False'. This itself was an interesting piece of work, in the sense that it brings out clearly a theme with which Hayek was already grappling in his Inaugural Address, but which also poses some characteristic problems for his political thought. By this I mean a distinctive appeal both to traditionalism – and to what might be described as the need for deference in the face of useful inherited customs and systems – and also a rationalistic, improving, individualism. Whether there is any way in which these elements can be reconciled, seems to me one of the open problems generated by Hayek's work.

All this seems to me of importance, for several reasons. First, it forces those interested in the development of Hayek's ideas – and, notably, his social and political thought – to take note of the fact that the historical order in which this material appeared cannot be uncritically relied upon as a guide to the development of his ideas. This is particularly important in the sense that the ideas of 'Individualism True and False', which might naturally be read as in some ways serving to revise the somewhat rationalistic optimism of The Road to Serfdom, could well have been contemporary with it. Further, this is certainly the case with regard to those aspects of 'Scientism and the Study of Society' which in some ways anticipate the more evolutionary and anti-rationalistic themes of Hayek's later years. While the later work seems to me, while interesting, much more problematic in terms of its own coherence, Caldwell's editorial work, it seems to me, brings out that there is a real task facing those who wish to offer a reading of The Road to Serfdom; namely, as to just how the

ideas that Hayek sets out in that volume are to be understood in relation to Hayek's other writings which were intended originally to form parts of the very same project.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I have set out to review some of the contexts in which one might see Hayek's Road to Serfdom. I believe that they add weight to the idea that the book should not just be seen as something of a popular character. But how, if I am right, should we approach it?

First, there are respects in which it is obviously concerned with the expressing of misgivings of a program to plan society, and more particularly one which takes its inspiration from a certain view of natural science, and from 'the engineering mentality'. Hayek here is joining a number of other writers in expressing concern about the intellectual soundness of such an approach, and worries about its implications for the working of the economy, and for people's liberty.

Second, in doing this, he is writing more particularly with an eye to discussions about these matters which had taken place for many years in the German-speaking world. Here, the point of comparison with Popper is, I think, particularly useful, for the following reason. Popper and Hayek each came to the conclusion that their critical perspectives were similar, as were their targets. But what, then, becomes interesting is the remarkable difference between the kinds of arguments that they offer – something marked, I believe, on the one side because Hayek's perspective is informed by the kind of view that he was drawing from the economic calculation argument, and from his work on the function of prices in the transmission of information. On the other, because Popper was, in a sense, largely innocent of economics, so that his criticisms came more from his moral anti-collectivism, his fallibilism, and from issues in scientific method

Third, the specific insights from Hayek's economic perspective were, I believe, reinforced by his more general concerns about the role of economic theory in the criticism of political utopianism, and his worries about the younger historical school – and what he found to be similar currents which he encountered in the institutionalism that he encountered at Columbia University – as serving to undermine this. It is not that he was blaming these economists for all the fanciful ideas about the possibilities for the rational re-casting of society which were flourishing in the period in which he was writing. His concern, rather, was that the discipline that he thought that economics should have been exerting, of making people aware of their limitations, and of the limitations that are imposed upon us by the political and other social systems of which we are making use, was lost. Clearly, there was also a strand of this in the Marxian tradition, too: of a sense in which laws of economics were only a product of human self-imposed constraints, which could be overcome as we moved to a new regime of truly human freedom...

Fourth, there are Hayek's legal ideas. In The Road to Serfdom, these are not explicated in any detail. In addition, as I have already indicated, there is a tendency in his work to mix elements that it is not clear are easily compatible – such as notions from the Rechtsstaat tradition, and ideas for the piecemeal utilitarian improvement of the legal system, of a kind which we would now associate with 'law and economics'. It is important to note what is involved here, just because – as I have suggested above – when Hayek talks about the rule of law, I think that he is best understood as drawing on Rechtsstaat ideas, when he himself tends to assimilate his views to the less exacting demands of the English doctrine of the rule of law.

Finally, there is the whole issue of reading The Road to Serfdom as part of the broad programme of work that he sketched out to Machlup, rather than just as a small, and largely self-contained tract for the times.

I do not know how fruitful these suggestions will prove in offering an interesting reading of The Road to Serfdom itself. With any luck, I will be able to report back to you upon this, next year.

Notes

The current version of this paper has been prepared for distribution to those taking part in the 2009 HETSA 2009 meeting. I would like to thank Bruce Caldwell for his comments on an earlier version.

¹ See, on this, my 'Hayek, The Road to Serfdom and the British Conservatives', Journal of the History of Economic Thought; 28, No. 3, September 2006, pp. 309-14.

² See, on this, my 'Hayek, Keynes and the State', History of Economics Review 26, Winter-Summer 1997, pp. 68-82.

³ See Hayek's 'Preface to the 1976 Edition', in, for example, The Road to Serfdom: Text and Documents ed. Bruce Caldwell, University of Chicago Press, 2007.

⁴ They were published as 'Nazi Order', in The Spectator on April 14, 1941. They were a review of Paul Einzig's Hitler's 'New Order' in Europe and C. W. Guillebaud's The Social Policy of Nazi Germany and are now reprinted on pp. 173-75 of Socialism and War, volume 9 of Hayek's Collected Works.

⁵ See, on this, my 'Hayek, The Road to Serfdom, and the British Conservatives'.

⁶ Cf. Herman Finer, The Road to Reaction, Boston: Little, Brown, 1945. There is also a striking – and revealing – transcript of an American radio discussion of The Road to Serfdom, held in the Hayek Archive. One might contrast with this Barbara Wootton's much more temperate Freedom Under Planning, London: Allen & Unwin, 1945.

⁷ This has now been republished by Britain's Institute of Economic Affairs. See The Road to Serfdom with The Intellectuals and Socialism, London: Institute of Economic Affairs, 2005.

⁸ See, on this, my 'Hayek, The Road to Serfdom and The British Conservatives'.

⁹ See now Gerald Frost, Antony Fisher: Champion of Liberty, London: Profile, 2002.

¹⁰ There is a useful discussion of this and of other relevant material, in Bruce Caldwell's 'Introduction' to The Road to Serfdom: Texts and Documents.

¹¹ Cf. John Anderson, The Servile State, St Leonards: Centre for Independent Studies, 2009.

¹² My comments here draw on research in the Michael Polanyi Archive at the University of Chicago.

¹³ Cf. his U.S.S.R. Economics. Fundamental data, system and spirit., Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1936, and The Contempt of Freedom: The Russian Experiment and After, London: Watts, 1940 (a volume which Hayek reviewed in Economica).

¹⁴ See his Full Employment and Free Trade, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1945. See also Paul Craig Roberts and T. Norman Van Cott, 'Michael Polanyi's Economics', Independent Review 1999, 3, no. 4, pp. 575-80.

¹⁵ C. S. Lewis, That Hideous Strength, London: Bodley Head, 1945.

¹⁶ On which, see notably his The Abolition of Man, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1944. In certain respects, That Hideous Strength offers a dramatization of themes from The Abolition of Man, and also of other writings on political themes, to be found in such collections as his Undeceptions ed. W. Hooper, London: Bles, 1971.

¹⁷ See Malachi Hacohen, Karl Popper: The Formative Years, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

¹⁸ Hayek published two pieces under this title: 'Freedom and the Economic System', Contemporary Review, 1938, and Freedom and the Economic System, Public Policy Pamphlet No. 29, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939. It was with the latter with which Popper was familiar.

¹⁹ See for discussion my Hayek and After and The Political Thought of Karl Popper, both London: Routledge, 1986.

²⁰ See, in this context, Hayek's papers on economic calculation and on the use of knowledge.

²¹ James C. Scott, Seeing Like a State, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

²² Now included in The Trend of Economic Thinking in Hayek's Collected Works.

²³ See on all this, my Hayek and After, chapter 2.

²⁴ See notably in this context Hayek's 'On Being an Economist', delivered to the L.S.E. Students' Union in 1944, which I discuss in Hayek and After, pp. 40-1.

²⁵ See my 'Hayek, Keynes and the State'.

²⁶ See, for example, Freedom and the Economic System, pp. 11-12.

²⁷ See, for some useful discussion of the respects in which Hayek's discussion differs from the British conception, Joseph Raz's 'The Rule of Law and Its Virtue', in Liberty and the Rule of Law, ed. R. L. Cunningham, Texas A & M University Press, 1979, pp. 3-21. Hayek's assimilation itself takes place at two levels; first, because he does not himself seem to spot the differences; second, that in his later writings, he shifts, under

the influence of Bruno Leoni, towards a more explicitly common law understanding of the ideal development of the law (on which see my Hayek and After, pp. 88-91).

²⁸ Cf. Philip Pettit, Republicanism, London: Oxford University Press, 2000; and Quentin Skinner, Liberty Before Liberalism, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1998.

²⁹ Bruce Caldwell, Hayek's Challenge, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

³⁰ See Alan Ebenstein, Hayek, Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave, 2001, chapter 4.

³¹ The letter, F.A. Hayek to Fritz Machlup, August 27, 1939 (in German) is available in the Fritz Machlup papers, box 43, folder 15, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University.