

Setting the Record Straight on the Libertarian South African Economist W. H. Hutt and James M. Buchanan

William Darity Jr. ^{*}, M'Balou Camara[†], and Nancy MacLean[‡]

Working Paper No. 184

May 26th, 2022

ABSTRACT

In their stormy response to Nancy MacLean's book *Democracy in Chains*, some academics on the libertarian right have conducted a concerted defense of Nobel Laureate James Buchanan's credentials as an anti-racist, or at least a non-racist. An odd component of their argument is a claim of innocence by association: the peripatetic South African economist and Mont Pelerin Society founding member William Harold Hutt was against apartheid; Buchanan was a friend and supporter of Hutt; therefore, Buchanan could not have been abetting segregationists with his support for public funding of segregationist private schools. At the core of this chain of argument is the inference that Hutt's opposition to apartheid proves that Hutt himself was committed to racial equality. However, just as there were white supremacists who opposed slavery in the United States, we demonstrate Hutt was a white supremacist who opposed apartheid in South Africa. We document how Hutt embraced notions of black inferiority, even in *The Economics of the Colour Bar*, his most ferocious attack on apartheid. Whether or not innocence by association is a sound defense of anyone's ideology or conduct, Hutt, himself, was not innocent of white supremacy.

<https://doi.org/10.36687/inetwp184>

JEL Codes: B25, I24, I28, J15, N17, N12, N37.

Keywords: Race and economics; James Buchanan, Libertarianism, South Africa, Public Choice.

^{*} Samuel DuBois Cook Professor of Public Policy, Duke University

[†] Associate in Research, Samuel DuBois Cook Center on Social Equity, Duke University

[‡] Professor of History and Public Policy, Duke University.

In their stormy response to Nancy MacLean’s book, *Democracy in Chains*, some academics on the libertarian right have conducted a concerted defense of Nobel Laureate James Buchanan as an anti-racist, or at least a non-racist. An odd component of their argument is a claim of innocence by association: the peripatetic South African economist William Harold Hutt was against apartheid; Buchanan was a friend and supporter of Hutt who brought him to the University of Virginia as a visiting professor; therefore, Buchanan could not have been a racist (their reductive interpretation of MacLean’s actual argument about his conduct). At the core of this chain of argument is the inference that Hutt’s opposition to apartheid proves that Hutt himself was committed to racial equality. (Geloso, 2017; Magness, 2017; Carden, 2018; Magness, Carden, and Geloso, 2019).

However, just as there were white supremacists who opposed slavery in the United States, this paper demonstrates Hutt was a white supremacist who opposed apartheid in South Africa.¹ We document how Hutt embraced notions of black inferiority, even in *The Economics of the Colour Bar*, his most ferocious attack on apartheid. Whether or not innocence by association is a sound defense of anyone’s perspective, Hutt, himself, was not innocent of white supremacy.

Past investigations have examined and documented how white supremacy produces and reproduces structural inequality. Research by geographers, education policy scholars, historians, and sociologists theorizes how white racism is existentially significant and socially complex. These studies explore how white supremacy abides within the contours of modern institutions, policies, practices, power structures and academic discourses. The scholars show how historical legacies – those rooted in white supremacy – shape present-day norms. The link between colonization, genocide, and enslavement enabled by white supremacy is expressed in today’s unequal health, wealth, and social outcomes. White supremacy is one of the dominant logics of racism and grounds for sustaining ongoing intergroup inequalities across the globe (Christian, 2002; Leonardo, 2004; Bonds and Inwood, 2012).

We argue here that Hutt’s economic rationale for eliminating apartheid was not anti-racist (as advertised), but rather an all-too-familiar attempt to preserve white elite power through promotion of economic liberty. An in-depth look at Hutt’s ideological framework strikingly reveals how opposition to apartheid hardly establishes anyone’s credentials as an anti-racist.

¹ Hutt was hardly unique in this stance. From the early years of legal racial separation in South Africa there were white opponents of apartheid, primarily on pragmatic grounds, who simultaneously subscribed to the premises of white superiority (Carter 1955, Lipton 2000). Even in today’s post-apartheid South Africa, many whites who ostensibly are sympathetic to the needs of black South Africans commit so fervently to “color blindness” that they ultimately engage in “white denialism” about the continued presence and impact of racism (van der Westhuizen 2019).

Correspondingly, embrace of antislavery and anti-colonialist ideology is not equivalent to rejecting belief in black inferiority. We argue that Hutt's (1) colonial logics, (2) denigration of non-whites, and (3) allegiance to what he referred to as "white civilization" provide irrefutable evidence of his embrace of white supremacy and the structural racism it produces.

William Hutt is little known today outside the ranks of the Mont Pelerin Society and the libertarian movement, but his role as an ideological ally of James M. Buchanan, which Buchanan's defenders have emphasized, makes an examination of Hutt's writings worthwhile and, indeed, timely. After all, Buchanan was little known outside economics, political science and the political right until MacLean presented evidence that he was an intellectual architect of the radical right. Buchanan advised the Cato Institute, the Heritage Foundation, the Institute for Economic Affairs, the Liberty Fund, and the Chilean military junta headed by General Augusto Pinochet, among many other radical right institutions. MacLean's research in the Buchanan House Archives at George Mason University in Virginia showed why and how his academic programs appealed to and were sponsored by fossil fuel and tobacco corporations, among other businesses; by rightwing funders such as the William Volker Fund, the Relm Foundation, the Earheart Foundation, the Scaife Foundation, and ultimately by Charles Koch himself, who has become George Mason's largest and most influential donor, having invested tens of millions of dollars in its Economics Department, Mercatus Center, and Scalia School of Law to advance his political project. Furthermore, she revealed how Buchanan's "secretive cause with deep and troubling roots" became integrally connected with the global promotion of neoliberal political economy by the Mont Pelerin Society and the Atlas Network (MacLean, 2017; MacLean 2021).

Despite the evidence of Buchanan's role in the development of a radical libertarian right that both enlists and further entrenches racism, Buchanan's disciples defend him as anti-racist or at least a "non-racist." Core to their case is the fact that Buchanan hired Hutt in 1966 as a visiting professor of economics at the University of Virginia, two years after Hutt published *The Economics of the Colour Bar*, a strenuous critique of apartheid. Buchanan was a longtime friend of Hutt and expressed great admiration for his ideas. The inferences drawn are twofold: first, that Buchanan invited Hutt *because* of his opposition to apartheid, and second, that the invitation of Hutt proves that Buchanan could not have allied with segregationists, as MacLean demonstrated (Geloso, 2017; Magness, 2017; Carden, 2018; Magness, Carden, and Geloso, 2019).

Or so the argument has gone thus far. This defense prompts us to pose a question that has not been given adequate recognition in scholarly literature. Is opposition to South African apartheid proof that an individual did not hold white supremacist beliefs? Could one oppose apartheid in South Africa and still be a white supremacist?

The case of Hutt makes clear that the two have co-existed. This should not come as a surprise because it is an example of a larger historical and contemporary pattern in which those who

oppose institutions of racial segregation or racial oppression still can maintain beliefs about white superiority. That was true of the elite early Americans who joined the American Colonization Society (ACS), founded in 1816. While the ACS opposed slavery and promoted manumission, it believed that blacks were inferior and that whites and free blacks could never live in harmony, so it worked to resettle freed African Americans in West Africa – particularly in modern-day Liberia and Sierra Leone. The racism of the ACS was so obvious and offensive that it led the free African American David Walker to pen one of the most powerful and moving jeremiads in the history of U.S. social movements, wherein he declaimed against ACS slaveholders “who have their feet on our throats,” and refuse to see that “this country is as much ours as it is the whites.” (Walker, 1829; reprint 1995).

Though it is often forgotten, the later disenfranchisement of African Americans was formally race-neutral, so as not to run afoul of the Constitution as amended during Reconstruction. That’s why it relied on such stratagems as the grandfather clause, the poll tax, and literacy tests.

So, too, the half-century reign of *Plessy v. Ferguson* depended upon the fiction of “separate but equal” to allow state-imposed racial segregation. Once the Supreme Court under Earl Warren and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibited that sleight of hand, members of the U.S. right shifted from endorsing “Massive Resistance” to embracing “color blindness” as a strategy to fight civil rights enforcement (MacLean, 2006).

Hutt’s history bears out how opposition to state-sponsored oppression need not derive from belief in human equality. We find that, in addition, it illuminates an important pattern in our time: the connections between some libertarians and racist causes that a growing number of recent scholars have charted. Indeed, the way that libertarian economics—particularly the Austrian economics with which Hutt identified--both accepts existing racial inequity and provides a putatively race-neutral strategy of perpetuating it helps to explain the recurring pattern that historian Janek Wasserman has captured with the phrase “libertarian to alt-right pipeline.” It operates not only in the U.S. but also in Germany and Austria, where some leading Hayekians have rallied to neo-fascism over the last decade. The slippage became so common and noticed by 2010 that even Peter Boettke, the George Mason-based doyen of Austrian economics, admitted that the racists had won control of the rubric. Boettke lamented that “the name Austrian economics has been lost as a focal point for a tradition of economic scholarship, and is now a focal point for something else. We have to let it go.” (Wasserman, 2019; Slobodian, 2018a and 2018b; Jackson, 2021; MacLean, 2021).

II

Who, then, was William Harold Hutt? Born in London in the final year of the nineteenth century and trained at the London School of Economics, he relocated to the Republic of South Africa in

1927 to take a position as senior lecturer (later, professor and dean of the Faculty of Commerce) at the University of Cape Town until his retirement in 1965. From then until his death in 1988, Hutt went on to a plethora of temporary posts at aggressively free market-oriented institutions in the U.S., including the University of Virginia's Department of Economics under James Buchanan's leadership, the Hoover Institution, the University of Dallas and the Ludwig von Mises Institute. (Hutt Papers "Inventory," 2007). He was an advocate of Austrian economics with "absolute faith in the powers of the free market" (Schneider, 2003). In recognition of his contributions to the cause over decades the Mont Pelerin Society named him a Roe senior fellow in 1984.

The Economics of the Colour Bar was his carefully crafted attack on South Africa's system of apartheid. In this 1964 book, Hutt provided an economic rationale for opposing apartheid, the scheme of institutionalized racism and discrimination practiced in the Republic of South Africa. To end it, Hutt supported the competitive operation of free markets. They would in time "dissolve" prejudice like any other "anachronistic custom." By limiting flexibility in the labor market and the improvements in productivity and prosperity that might have come from an open market, apartheid cost South Africa dearly. Indeed, he argued that apartheid was the ultimate source of inefficient labor markets in South Africa. (Hutt, 1964).

In a subsequent article entitled "South Africa's Salvation in Classical Liberalism" (1965), Hutt stated plainly that apartheid put into practice "more honest and blatant - not more effective - methods of discriminating against non-whites." Hutt was forthright, even sometimes passionate, in condemning the "deplorable effects" of apartheid and "the deliberate and often almost sadistic affront to the dignity of the non-White races" that created understandable "bitterness." To Hutt, this legally-enforced discrimination was an unproductive interference with the market for labor which enabled whites to maintain unwarranted economic privileges. He depicted it as system created by white trade unions and voters to protect themselves from competition, a kind of collective rent-seeking, to borrow a term later developed by the public choice tradition with which Hutt allied. Capital, in his view, was coerced into accepting the system, a depiction later researchers rejected. (Hutt, 1965; Schneider, 2003).²

Hutt was convinced that discriminating differentials in the labor market would cease to exist only with complete elimination of legalized apartheid. He believed a market system free of barriers would produce economic growth to provide greater opportunities to all South Africans, including

² Schneider observes that "Hutt's nearly complete absolution of business owners' responsibility for apartheid" led to criticism from the anti-apartheid left in the country, including the Black Consciousness movement. Black activists who looked to unions as "their only hope to wring concessions from the government" found his arguments against the labor movement unpersuasive. (27) He offers a helpful factual correction in place of Hutt's "efforts to paint all capitalists as anti-apartheid reformers." No, explains Schneider: "Labor-intensive industries tended to support apartheid while capital-intensive and skilled-labor-intensive industries tended to oppose it." (30)

Black South Africans. To him, economics explained discriminatory practices and (in turn) discriminatory practices explained the shortage of skilled Black labor.

Yet, Hutt did not object to all forms of discrimination, viewing prejudicial decisions in associational relations as a matter of private preference. After a year in Charlottesville, he became adept in the language (and even the italics) used by the most strategic local opponent of desegregation, Leon Dure. On the speaking circuit, Hutt made Dure's case to young American conservatives: "the right of *free* association implies the right *not to associate* as well as to *associate*," pointing to exclusive clubs as aspects of a "free society." He went further, to say that discrimination "implies injustice," while segregation "does not." And at a moment when students and faculty in Virginia and elsewhere in the country were demanding an end to the exclusion of African Americans, Hutt advised that owing to this principle of free association, the proscription of discrimination "does not mean that the courts must force...every white university to admit non-Whites."³ (Hutt, 1966; MacLean, 2021).

Nor did Hutt reject limitations on electoral processes and outcomes. He objected to "sudden, universal enfranchisement [of Black Africans] during the transitional period" from Black exclusion to inclusion in South Africa's voting system. He also argued that prior to "extending the franchise" to Black Africans, "'ironclad' property-rights protections" must be put in place. Hutt wanted to ensure that there was no possibility of land or other redistribution from the white colonizers to Blacks victimized by colonialism (Magness, Carden, and Murtazashvili 2022, 534).⁴

Hutt's objection to the state-mandated practices excluding Blacks from particular lines of employment in South Africa's labor market stemmed from his "ideological attachment to free markets" (Schneider, 2003). In this context, apartheid "amounted a system of racial capitalism under which black economic activity was severely restricted and black wages were kept artificially low while white workers and white businesses prospered" (Schneider, 2003).

In a notable chapter of his 1964 book, Hutt insisted that the "market is color blind and race blind." Under free-market conditions, Hutt assured that employers who excluded productive workers from employment on racial grounds, whether white or Black, would be driven out of operation because their preference will lower profitability. In "An Economic Plan for the Negro

³ Indeed, in this piece written for young American conservatives, Hutt criticized the Warren Court twice (cagily, not by name). Hutt, "An Economic Plan for the Negro - Civil Rights and Young 'Conservatives,'" 793.

⁴ Magness, Carden, and Murtazashvili (2022, 533) enthusiastically trumpet the following quotation from Hutt at the start of their recent article defending him as a classic liberal: "In a democratic society perhaps the most vital nondiscrimination principle which has to be entrenched is that majorities shall have no power to enrich themselves through government at the expense of minorities" (Hutt, 1965). This is a peculiar statement, since democracy in South Africa necessitated giving the Black African majority the right to vote and make policy. MacLean (2017) provoked Buchanan's acolytes by arguing that the "nondiscrimination principle" in his version of public choice theory actually aimed to entrench *minority* rule, particularly that of the wealthy.

– Civil Rights and Young Conservatives,” Hutt claimed that “there is a strong profit incentive to search out and, as far as possible, offer more productive and better-paid employment opportunities to members of any races which have been excluded from them by custom or prejudice” Hutt (1966).

III

So how was it that Hutt, an economist who advocated the elimination of a scheme of labor market regulations that favored white labor, simultaneously subscribed to white supremacist ideas? We demonstrate this by providing evidence on three key themes. The first is Hutt’s colonial logic. The second is Hutt’s tendency to denigrate non-whites. The third is his explicit declaration of allegiance to the superiority of “white civilization.”

In the opening lines of *The Economics of the Colour Bar*, Hutt posed the following question in reference to Black Africans: “How far can their inferior economic status be said to be caused by natural handicaps and how far by injustice at the hands of white people? Usually there is a mixture of causes.” He stated “it may be charged further that insufficient was done to educate the natives as administrators for eventual self-government.” However, in addition to suggesting that Blacks required additional specialized training and education, Hutt held that Blacks are “naturally handicapped.” This perspective aligns well with the logic that alleged a benign mission for European colonial projects. Indeed, Hutt believed that the “spirit of that [colonial] policy was essentially one of tolerance, even respect, for different ways of living; it was an attitude that facilitated the task of harmonious and just administration.” Whites were motivated, generously, to “train primitive people for operations which require intelligence, judgement, and responsibility.” (Hutt, 1964; also Slobodian, 2018).

Finally, Hutt used cultural determinism to explain the economic position of Black South Africans. He deployed terms like “tribal superstitions and customs,” “primitive background,” “irrational,” “backwardness of the indigenous peoples” He further adduced a “leisure preference of Africans,” owing to their “unacquisitive nature” and general “wantlessness.” Through such language, Hutt propagated an idea that Blacks are not efficient economic agents; they are lacking, and their irrational behaviors help explain their position in society. In doing so, he exposed his belief that white peoples’ attempts at “developing” the “natives” were justified (Hutt, 1965; Hutt, 1964).

Hutt not only glorified whites, but also directly belittled the dignity and humanity of nonwhites. In regard to racial inequality and Black poverty in the United States in 1984, he stated that “there seems to have been a reluctance to admit that the major cause of the damage wrought on the Black people was due to the unwillingness of their community to fight aggressively for well-paid employment by deliberately reducing their *per capita* demands for wage compensation” (Hutt,

1984). “The major cause”? Yes, he actually wrote that. Hutt maintained that Blacks have excluded themselves through unwillingness to undercut prevailing wages by volunteering to work at a discount.

For Hutt, on average whites did not need labor market protections such as apartheid and Jim Crow to do better than Blacks, because whites on average are superior in productivity. Those whites who do worse under free market conditions do not deserve superior outcomes. Hutt’s belief in markets as mechanisms for rewarding merit carried the expectation that typically whites would do better than Blacks, regardless.

One of the aims of his book was to establish that racial animus is something that all humans are capable of possessing. He alleged that Blacks were guilty of a particular form of racial hatred: “colour resentment,” defined as envy, bitterness, resentment, and indignation against whites of superior status (Hutt, 1964). He argued that this was different from (but no better or worse than) “colour prejudice,” that is, contempt for races of inferior status. He went further, admonishing that “races which grumble about the ‘injustices’ or ‘oppressions’ to which they are subjected can often be observed to be inflicting not dissimilar injustices upon other races.” In other words, he aimed to deny the victims of apartheid the moral high ground claimed by the anti-apartheid movement.

These passages attest that Hutt clearly saw the world through the lens of racial superiority and inferiority. Time and time again, he demonstrated his belief that the fundamental source of racial disparity in South Africa and elsewhere was dysfunctional Black behavior. “The fears of the presently dominant whites are reasonable, realistic, and genuine,” he declared. So, too, “the determination to preserve white civilization is not ignoble” (Hutt, 1964; Hutt, 1965).

IV

Hutt went beyond academic writing on race. By 1980, if not before, he began writing to South African officials in a direct attempt to shape policy. Those letters are revealing; they illustrate how he believed neoliberal policies could maintain white dominance. Writing in 1981 to P. W. Botha, then prime minister of South Africa and leader of the pro-apartheid National Party, Hutt offered a plan for “the survival of white civilization in the Republic of South Africa, in spite of the present growing world hostility.” Sending along a copy of his own book, he assured Botha that with the adoption of his proposals “the Republic could safely abandon all discrimination based on color, race or ancestry.” How to make the end of discrimination safe for “white civilization”? Sounding like his friend James Buchanan, he explained: “the sphere of government will have to be strictly curtailed through iron-clad constitutional constraint.” The country must embed the “right to work” in the constitution to prevent unions from building power. Also, “it will be essential to eliminate” all forms of popular collective action that enlisted “coercive

power” such as strikes and boycotts. With the ability of the Black majority to enlist citizenship rights to remedy inequality thus ruled out of court at the constitutional level, Hutt offered two other practical proposals to shore up the advantages whites had accrued through generations of domination: “proportional [flat taxes], not progressive taxation,” and a system not of one person, one vote, but rather one “in which each man’s vote is weighted to his income.” With democracy thus restricted, it would be “politically safe” for Botha to end apartheid.⁵ As historian Quinn Slobodian summarized Hutt’s stance: “He opposed apartheid in the workplace, but he advocated a new economic hierarchy of electoral privilege to replace it” (Slobodian, 2018).

So, too, did Hutt advocate, elsewhere, for offering incentives to induce whites to give up apartheid—in effect, buying consent. While he saw no reason to compensate Black South Africans for the intentional harms imposed by decades of white domination, he did argue as early as 1965 that there should be accommodation to “allow the formerly privileged races to adjust themselves to [the] emerging equality of opportunity.” He even suggested that after a decade of transition, “a small minority *might* still need special protection or subsidy” (Hutt, 1965, his italics).

Hutt elaborated on what would be needed to make nondiscrimination succeed in a 1983 letter to Mangosuthu Gatsha Buthelezi, Chief Minister of the KwaZulu bantustan. Hutt urged Buthelezi to read the work of “an outstanding Black American intellectual, Professor Walter E. Williams of George Mason University.” Williams’ work, Hutt counseled, “shows how economic prejudice and racial hostility fail to prevent economic advancement of races which have the required attributes of ambition, integrity and thrift.”⁶ The point was obvious, and insulting.

What was Hutt’s proffered strategy to end apartheid’s disfranchisement of the Black majority without displacing “white civilization”? The same as he had urged since the 1960s: free-market capitalism—with financial restrictions on political participation. He encouraged whites to “stand together” behind a democratic, non-racial government whose policies would make no mention of race. All they need do was substitute class for race, he intimated. For “there is no discrimination in an electoral law which limits the franchise to persons who have attained educational or responsibility qualifications, provided either that there is genuine equality of opportunity to acquire such qualifications, or that genuine steps are being taken to bring about that equality” (1965).

Citizenship should be earned, he argued, even against the fierce headwinds of history. If all citizens had the right to “*qualify* for the vote,” no longer could South Africa be criticized for racial discrimination. This way, white South Africans could maintain power while saving face in a world turning against them over the obvious injustice of apartheid and the brutal repression of

⁵ W. H. Hutt to the Honorable P. W. Botha, August 7, 1981, Hutt Papers, Hoover Institution Archives.

⁶ W. H. Hutt to Chief Mangosuthu Gatsha Buthelezi, March 4, 1983, Hutt Papers, Hoover Institution Archives.

the struggle against it. Ending *de jure* exclusion, a policy like this would maintain *de facto* white power because as late as the early 1990s, the overwhelming majority of Black South Africans had no greater than a third-grade education and starkly limited income. The system Hutt proposed, far from ending white supremacy, would lock it in on more solid ground because ostensibly race-neutral injustice would be more challenging to contest, even as it pushed Black South Africans further into poverty and economic exploitation.

V

In light of the record presented here, it makes sense that W.H. Hutt chose to conclude his scholarly career at the Ludwig von Mises Institute in Auburn, Alabama. Alabama was a “natural home” for an institute to honor the founder of the Austrian school, noted a writer for the *Wall St. Journal*, because “the Heart of Dixie was also the heart of sensible economic thinking.” The writer went on to explain: “At the heart of Austrian economics is a skepticism of powerful, central authority. And Southerners have always been distrustful of government. Our libertarian streak,” he continued, erasing from historical memory all those who were not reactionary whites, “makes us natural allies of the Austrian tradition.” (Wingfield, 2005).

Hutt himself testified to an affinity for elite southern reactionaries when he dedicated a 1984 manuscript to Strom Thurmond and Jesse Helms. Hutt judged these two senators, who built their careers on race-baiting and opposition to civil rights reform, to rank among “the most enlightened congressmen in the United States” (Hutt, 1984).

Hutt’s final scholarly home in Alabama was founded by the self-described paleolibertarian Lew Rockwell in 1982, with the blessing of von Mises’s widow, funding from then congressman Ron Paul, and the intellectual guidance of Mises’s most unwavering mentee, Murray Rothbard, who served as the academic advisor to the enterprise. Their understanding of liberty led them toward an embrace of neo-Confederacy potent enough in time to achieve recognition as a “hate group” by the Southern Poverty Law Center. “The institute aims to ‘undermine statism in all its forms,’ and its recent interest in neo-Confederate themes reflects that,” reported the SPLC. Indeed, Rockwell made the case that, in his words, the Civil War “transformed the American regime from a federalist system based on freedom to a centralized state that circumscribed liberty in the name of public order.” Things got worse, Rockwell argued, with civil rights laws that inflicted “involuntary servitude” on business owners (SPLC, 2000; see also SPLC, 2003).

A final intriguing fact about the desperation of Buchanan’s defenders: they simply invented the notion that Buchanan invited Hutt to Virginia because of his anti-apartheid position. In actuality, although the work on apartheid became Hutt’s most famous writing, Buchanan said he most “admired two of his earlier books, *Economists and the Public* and *A Plan for Reconstruction*.” As to the output for which Hutt became better known, including “on the South African Color

Bar,” Buchanan said that he “was not really familiar enough with these works to lead a seminar.” Given a chance to comment in print on Hutt’s contributions to economics, Buchanan never mentioned the anti-apartheid writings.⁷

As the analysis in this paper has demonstrated, no longer can the libertarian defenders of James Buchanan hold up W.H. Hutt as a shield for their cause. His career’s worth of writing shows beyond doubt that Hutt’s opposition to state-mandated apartheid, rooted in neoliberal economics (which he preferred to depict as “classical liberalism”), was fully compatible with a commitment to white supremacy. To pretend otherwise is to engage in dogma-driven denialism.

What Hutt’s actual history underscores is a truth which a growing number of scholars have documented: that one of neoliberalism’s core aims has been to constrict democracy, including by packaging old prejudices in new and sturdier market-based protections.

⁷ James Buchanan to William M. H. Hammett, President of the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, Feb. 23, 1983, Hutt Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, and “Hutt’s Role in Economics: An Interview with James Buchanan,” in “W. H. Hutt: An Economist for This Century,” *Manhattan [Institute for Policy Research] on Economic Policy*, v. 3, n. 5 (1983), *ibid.*

Bibliography

- Bonds, A. and Inwood, J. (2016). "Beyond white privilege: Geographies of white supremacy and settler colonialism." *Progress in Human Geography*. Vol. 40(6) 715-733.
- Carden, Art. "Did Economist James Buchanan Support 'Massive Resistance' to School Desegregation?" *Forbes*, Dec. 21, 2018.
- Carter, G. M. (1955) "Union of South Africa: Politics of White Supremacy" *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 298 March pp.142-150.
- Christian, M. (2002). "An African-Centered Perspective on White Supremacy." *Journal of Black Studies*, 33(2), 179-198. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/002193402237224>.
- Geloso, Vincent. "James Buchanan on racism." *Notes on Liberty*, June, 26, 2017: <https://notesonliberty.com/2017/06/26/james-buchanan-on-racism/> .
- Hutt, W. H. (William Harold) Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.
- Hutt, W. H. (1964). *The Economics of the Colour Bar*. London: Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Hutt, W. H. (1965). "South Africa's Salvation in Classic Liberalism." *Il Politico* 30:4 pp. 782-795.
- Hutt, W. H. (1966). "An Economic Plan for the Negro - Civil Rights and Young 'Conservatives.'" *Modern Age*, Summer 1966.
- Hutt, W. H. (1984). *The Impoverishers - A Postscript*. Typescript in James M. Buchanan Collection, Special Collections, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA.
- Jackson, John P. Jr. (2021). "The Pre-History of American Holocaust Denial." *American Jewish History*. Vol. 105, no. 1/2 (January-April).
- Johnstone, F. (1970). "White Prosperity and White Supremacy in South Africa Today" *African Affairs*, 69: 275 pp. 124-140.
- Leonardo, Z. (2004). "The Color of White Supremacy: Beyond the Discourse of 'White Privilege'." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 36: 2.
- Lipton, M. (2000) "Review Article: White Liberals, 'the Left,' and the New Africanist Elite in South Africa" *International Affairs* 76 pp. 333-343.
- MacLean, N. (2017). *Democracy in Chains. The Deep History of the Radical Right's Stealth Plan for America*. New York: Viking Press.
- ". "Enchaining Democracy: The Now Transnational Project of the US Corporate Libertarian Right," for *The Condition of Citizenship*, vol. i : *Neoliberal Politics and Sociological Perspectives*, ed. Jürgen Mackert, Hannah Wolf, and Bryan S. Turner (New York: Routledge, 2021), 20-36.

- . (2006). *Freedom Is Not Enough: The Opening of the American Workplace*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press and the Russell Sage Foundation.
- . “How Milton Friedman Exploited White Supremacy to Privatize Education.” Institute for New Economic Thinking. Working Paper No. 161. September 1st, 2021.
- Magness, Phillip W. “Nancy MacLean’s segregationist sins of omission ... and commission,” July 2017: <https://philmagness.com/2017/07/nancy-macleans-segregationist-sins-of-omission-and-commission/>.
- , A. Carden, and I. Murtazashvili. (2022). “‘The Danger of Deplorable Reactions’: W. H. Hutt on Liberalism, Populism, and the Constitutional Political Economy of Racism” *The Independent Review* 26:4 Spring pp. 533-552.
- , -----, and Vincent Geloso. (2019) “James M. Buchanan and the Political Economy of Desegregation.” *Southern Economic Journal*, v. 85, n. 3, 714-741.
- Ricky, L. A. (2001). The globalization of white supremacy: Toward a critical discourse on the racialization of the world. *Educational Theory*, Vol. 51(4).
- Schneider, G. E. (2003). “Neoliberalism and Economic Justice in South Africa: Revisiting the Debate on Economic Apartheid.” *Review of Social Economy*. 1: 1 pp. 23-50.
- Slobodian, Quinn. (2018a). *Globalists: The End of Empire and the Birth of Neoliberalism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . (2018b). “Perfect Capitalism, Imperfect Humans: Race, Migration, and the Limits of Ludwig von Mises’s Globalism.” *Contemporary European History*.
- Southern Poverty Law Center, “Into the Mainstream: An array of right-wing foundations and think tanks support efforts to make bigoted and discredited ideas respectable.” *Intelligence Report*, Aug. 15, 2003.
- . “The Neo-Confederates.” *Intelligence Report*, Sept. 15, 2000.
- Tabb, W. K. (1971). “Capitalism, Colonialism, and Racism.” *Review of Radical Political Economics*, vol. 3(3) August pp. 90-106.
- van der Westhuizen, C. (2019) “South Africa’s Liberals are Failing to Wrap Their Heads Around Race” *The Conversation* November 14 <https://theconversation.com/south-africas-liberals-are-failing-to-wrap-their-heads-around-race-127029> .
- Walker, David. *David Walker’s Appeal to the Coloured Citizens of the World, but in particular and very expressly, to those of the United States of America*. Originally published 1829. Reprint: New York: Hill and Wang, 1995. With a new introduction by Sean Wilentz.
- Wasserman, Janek. (2019). *Marginal Revolutionaries: How Austrians Fought the War of Ideas*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wingfield, Kyle. "Von Mises Finds a Sweet Home in Alabama." *Wall St. Journal*, August 11, 2006: W33.