The Abandoned Road

When the course of civilization takes an unexpected turn—when, instead of the continuous progress which we have come to expect, we find ourselves threatened by evils associated by us with past ages of barbarism—we naturally blame anything but ourselves. Have we not all striven according to our best lights, and have not many of our finest minds incessantly worked to make this a better world? Have not all our efforts and hopes been directed toward greater freedom, justice, and prosperity?

If the outcome is so different from our aims—if, instead of freedom and prosperity, bondage and misery stare us in the face—is it not clear that sinister forces must have foiled our intentions, that we are the victims of some evil power which must be conquered before we can resume the road to better things?

However much we may differ when we name the culprit—whether it is the wicked capitalist or the vicious spirit of a particular nation, the stupidity of our elders, or a social system not yet, although we have struggled against it for a half a century, fully overthrown—we all are, or at least were until recently, certain of one thing: that the leading ideas which during the last generation have become common to most people of good will and have determined the major changes in our social life cannot have been wrong.

We are ready to accept almost any explanation of the present crisis of our civilization except one: that the present state of the world may be the result of genuine error on our own part and that the pursuit of some of our most cherished ideals has apparently produced results utterly different from those which we expected....

That democratic socialism, the great utopia of the last few generations, is not only unachievable, but that to strive for—it produces something so utterly different that few of those
who now wish it would be prepared to accept the consequences, many will not believe until
the connection has been laid bare in all its aspects.

**Individualism and Collectivism**
Before we can progress with our main problem, an obstacle has yet to be surmounted. A
confusion largely responsible for the way in which we are drifting into things which nobody
wants must be cleared up. This confusion concerns nothing less than the concept of socialism
itself. It may mean, and is often used to describe, merely the ideals of social justice, greater
equality, and security, which are the ultimate aims of socialism. But it means also the
particular method by which most socialists hope to attain these ends and which many
competent people regard as the only methods by which they can be fully and quickly attained.
In this sense socialism means the abolition of private enterprise, of private ownership of the
means of production, and the creation of a system of "planned economy" in which the
entrepreneur working for profit is replaced by a central planning body. . . .
The dispute between the modern planners and their opponents is, therefore, not a dispute on whether we ought to choose intelligently between the various possible organizations of society; it is not a dispute on whether we ought to employ foresight and systematic thinking in planning our common affairs. It is a dispute about what is the best way of so doing. The question is whether for this purpose it is better that the holder of coercive power should confine himself in general to creating conditions under which the knowledge and initiative of individuals are given the best scope so that they can plan most successfully; or whether a rational utilization of our resources requires central direction and organization of all our activities according to some consciously constructed "blueprint." The socialists of all parties have appropriated the term "planning" for planning of the latter type, and it is now generally accepted in this sense. But though this is meant to suggest that this is the only rational way of handling our affairs, it does not, of course, prove this. It remains the point on which the planners and the liberals disagree.

It is important not to confuse opposition against this kind of planning with a dogmatic laissez-faire attitude. The liberal argument is in favor of making the best possible use of the forces of competition as a means of coordinating human efforts, not an argument for leaving things just as they are. It is based on the conviction that, where effective competition can be created, it is a better way of guiding individual efforts than any other. It does not deny, but even emphasizes, that, in order that competition should work beneficially, a carefully thought-out legal framework is required and that neither the existing nor the past legal rules are free from grave defects. Nor does it deny that, where it is impossible to create the conditions necessary to make competition effective, we must resort to other methods of guiding economic activity. Economic liberalism is opposed, however, to competition's being supplanted by inferior methods of coordinating individual efforts. And it regards competition as superior not only because it is in most circumstances the most efficient method known but even more because it is the only method by which our activities can be adjusted to each other without coercive or arbitrary intervention of authority. Indeed, one of the main arguments in favor of competition is that it dispenses with the need for "conscious social control" and that it gives the individuals a chance to decide whether the prospects of a particular occupation are sufficient to compensate for the disadvantages and risks connected with it.
The successful use of competition as the principle of social organization precludes certain types of coercive interference with economic life, but it admits of others which sometimes may very considerably assist its work and even requires certain kinds of government action. But there is good reason why the negative requirements, the points where coercion must not be used, have been particularly stressed. It is necessary in the first instance that the parties in the market should be free to sell and buy at any price at which they can find a partner to the transaction and that anybody should be free to produce, sell, and buy anything that may be produced or sold at all. And it is essential that the entry into the different trades should be open to all on equal terms and that the law should not tolerate any attempts by individuals or groups to restrict this entry by open or concealed force. Any attempt to control prices or quantities of particular commodities deprives competition of its power of bringing about an effective co-ordination of individual efforts, because price changes then cease to register all the relevant changes in circumstances and no longer provide a reliable guide for the individual's actions.

This is not necessarily true, however, of measures merely restricting the allowed methods of production, so long as these restrictions affect all potential producers equally and are not used as an indirect way of controlling prices and quantities. Though all such controls of the methods of production impose extra costs (i.e., make it necessary to use more resources to produce a given output), they may be well worth while. To prohibit the use of certain poisonous substances or to require special precautions in their use, to limit working hours or to require certain sanitary arrangements, is fully compatible with the preservation of competition. The only question here is whether in the particular instance the advantages gained are greater than the social costs which they impose. Nor is the preservation of competition incompatible with an extensive system of social services—so long as the organization of these services is not designed in such a way as to make competition ineffective over wide fields.

It is regrettable, though not difficult to explain, that in the past much less attention has been given to the positive requirements of a successful working of the competitive system than to these negative points. The functioning of a competition not only requires adequate organization of certain institutions like money, markets, and channels of information—some of which can never be adequately provided by private enterprise—but it depends, above all, on the existence of an appropriate legal system, a legal system designed both to preserve
competition and to make it operate as beneficially as possible. It is by no means sufficient that
the law should recognize the principle of private property and freedom of contract; much
depends on the precise definition of the right of property as applied to different things. The
systematic study of the forms of legal institutions which will make the competitive system
work efficiently has been sadly neglected; and strong arguments can be advanced that serious
shortcomings here, particularly with regard to the law of corporations and of patents, not only
have made competition work much less effectively than it might have done but have even led
to the destruction of competition in many spheres.

There are, finally, undoubted fields where no legal arrangements can create the main
condition on which the usefulness of the system of competition and private property depends:
namely, that the owner benefits from all the useful services rendered by his property and
suffers for all the damages caused to others by its use. Where, for example, it is impracticable
to make the enjoyment of certain services dependent on the payment of a price, competition
will not produce the services; and the price system becomes similarly ineffective when the
damage caused to others by certain uses of property cannot be effectively charged to the
owner of that property. In all these instances there is a divergence between the items which
enter into private calculation and those which affect social welfare; and, whenever this
divergence becomes important, some method other than competition may have to be found to
supply the services in question. Thus neither the provision of signposts on the roads nor, in
most circumstances, that of the roads themselves can be paid for by every individual user.
Nor can certain harmful effects of deforestation, of some methods of farming, or of the smoke
and noise of factories be confined to the owner of the property in question or to those who are
willing to submit to the damage for an agreed compensation. In such instances we must find
some substitute for the regulation by the price mechanism. But the fact that we have to resort
to the substitution of direct regulation by authority where the conditions for the proper
working of competition cannot be created does not prove that we should suppress competition
where it can be made to function.

To create conditions in which competition will be as effective as possible, to supplement it
where it cannot be made effective, to provide the services which, in the words of Adam Smith,
“though they may be in the highest degree advantageous to a great society, are, however, of
such a nature, that the profit could never repay the expense to any individual or small number
of individuals”—these tasks provide, indeed, a wide and unquestioned field for state activity. In no system that could be rationally defended would the state just do nothing. An effective competitive system needs an intelligently designed and continuously adjusted legal framework as much as any other. Even the most essential prerequisite of its proper functioning, the prevention of fraud and deception (including exploitation of ignorance), provides a great and by no means yet fully accomplished object of legislative activity.