

Governments, Peoples, and their Uses of Technology

By

James A. Todd

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....	2
II. The Purposes of Governments.....	3
A. Constitutional Governments.....	3
B. Totalitarian Governments.....	5
III. The Capacity of Governments.....	7
A. Propaganda.....	8
B. How Technology is Developed.....	9
1. The International Marketplace.....	11
IV. The Powers of Governments.....	13
A. The Purpose of Rights.....	13
1. Technology Only Changes the Manner of Infringement.....	14
B. Does Technology Require <i>New</i> Rights?.....	16
C. Structural Protections Against Abuse	18
V. Conclusion: Technology and Social Improvement.....	20

... [W]e are probably only at the threshold of an age in which the technological possibilities of mind control are likely to grow rapidly and what may appear at first as innocuous or beneficial powers over the personality of the individual will be at the disposal of government. The greatest threats to human freedom probably still lie in the future. — Friedrich Hayek (1960).

I. Introduction

This essay addresses the question of whether Hayek's concern has been borne out by events, or whether technology has in the past generation been in favor of individual liberty.

The propositions are not mutually exclusive: mind control could have been used by some unscrupulous government at some point; however, notwithstanding that, technology on balance may be shown to have historically produced more liberation from government since the time Hayek wrote the above passage. This paper will, therefore, undertake the task of demonstrating the unlikelihood of government's nefarious use of technology against its citizens and further show that, given this unlikelihood, technology has and will continue to be a force for liberating mankind and not oppressing it.

Just as Hayek used mind control as a proxy for his apprehension of technology, I will use it in discussing some reasons why technology has not proven as detrimental to liberty as he forecasted. Three factors must converge in order for Hayek's gloomy prognostications concerning that specific technology to be borne out: 1) that a government would have as its *purpose* the control of the minds of its subjects; 2) that this same government would have the *capacity* so to control its people; and 3) that a

government with this purpose and capacity has the lawful *power* to control the minds of its people. In short, there must be a correspondence of purpose, capacity and power in order that a government might act in the way that Hayek forecasts. This paper will analyze the likelihood of governmental mind control in light of these factors. In doing so, I will show that these same elements must together be present when discussing *any* ominous governmental uses of technology, and how the unlikelihood of their convergence means that technology has and will continue to be to the advantage of mankind and freedom more so than to the illegitimate reasons of state.

II. The Purposes of Governments

A. Constitutional Governments

The purposes behind why governments seek to do or not do certain things are never demonstratively clear. Constitutional governments must generally act with a purpose that is consistent with the ends stated in the constitutional charter(s) and in the benefit of the common good. In American constitutional law, for instance, protections of individual liberty by courts vary with the likelihood that governmental action inures to some legitimate governmental purpose—the more objectively legitimate that a governmental purpose is shown to be, the more deference is accorded to government in carrying out the schemes devised to suit that purpose. I suspect this is largely the case under most types of rule-bound government, where the legitimacy of the governmental purposes themselves may, in many instances, be called into question by the individual litigant. With an exacting review of the purposes of government when infringements on

rights are alleged, as a part of its constitutional order, it is difficult to see how any government so scrutinized may promote mind control as one of the necessities of state.

Notwithstanding this, *surreptitious* mind control, free of judicial review or public scrutiny, might yet be attempted by a government that had such purposes but dared not broadcast them.¹ Assuming such a capacity exists, the fantastical notion that government would attempt to control the minds of an otherwise free society through subversive means calls for an analysis of *why* this might be attempted by any rational governmental actor. Constitutional governments generally base their legitimacy on being acceptable to the people; by multiple officeholders positively influencing public opinion through their respective actions and inactions rather than resorting to the physical brutality that technological mind control entails. Constitutional government, originating more or less from the people, has no incentive to control minds in a physical way. It does not depend for its existence upon a person or all people thinking certain things to be true when in fact they are not. Constitutional government *accommodates* the disparate views and beliefs arising out of the minds of people in society through the means of elections, decentralized decision making on most matters, toleration of speech, the press, and religion, and the observance of generally-applicable rights and rules.

Furthermore, constitutional government does not demand a single aim or end that requires consolidated belief among the citizenry. The overall focus of Hayek's legal thought is that there must only be widespread obedience to general rules—rules left to their own operation, and applicable to unforeseen actors and actions having a purpose all

¹ Hayek suggests that an infusion of the water supply by mind-altering substances might someday be attempted, furnishing an example of surreptitious and not overt mind control. See *The Constitution of Liberty*, 216 (2nd ed., Chicago: 1978)

their own.² Free government requires obedience to these duly-enacted rules and not mindless automatons. A governmental system built upon rules involves a mutuality of government and citizen that mind control would eliminate. The government wants simple obedience to general laws that furnish advantages to society, while the citizen wants thoughtfully to frame his conduct in accordance to these rules in order to maximize the benefits of his efforts.

B. Totalitarian Governments

In cases where a government is not bound by particular rules of conduct, or the arbitrary regime, mind control might very well be advanced by government as one of its purposes; indeed, mind control may be a necessity. Totalitarian regimes depend on the widespread acceptance of chosen ideologies concerning that regime (as well particular views of the world and human existence as a whole) in order that they might exist. Popular legitimacy not based upon notions of consent, prescription, accepted belief, or legality, but instead based upon a blatant inversion of facts, suppression of truth and dissent, and an eradication of religion and established mores requires that people think and reason in certain ways contrary to received wisdom. Where it is impossible in a non-physical way to wipe a person's slate clean of what had hitherto served as an ordering principle, the government might purpose to use technological means by which to do so. So it is clear that there exist governments in the world today so lawless and brutal that they might undertake to control the minds of men. However, as the next section will show, the desire to do so does not always correspond with the practical capacity for the same.

² *Ibid.* at 152.

Hayek wrote that, in totalitarian systems, “it is not enough that everybody should be forced to work for the same ends. It is essential that the people should come to regard them as their own ends.”³ He went on to record that “totalitarian governments succeed to a high degree in making people think as they want them to.”⁴ While free society does not require such a convergence of individual ends, totalitarian governments demand this and will use whatever means they have to bring this state of affairs into existence.

* * *

That mind control has generally not been the project of government since the time that Hayek wrote, I believe, is due in large part to the absence of this first element necessary to a use of mind control against citizens—that few governments find it within their needs or purposes to alter the mind of men to act or think in a certain way. Any system of government that acts in a way that might be predicted and analyzed in terms of law and rationality; that is, the democratic governments that Hayek found worth discussing in his great treatises—would not need to undertake mind control. Nevertheless, one must not completely dismiss those who do indeed have purposes of mind control in reviewing whether these purposes may someday align with the capacity to do the same.

³ Friedrich Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*, 153 (Chicago, 1945).

⁴ *Ibid.*

II. The Capacity of Governments

Government's monopoly of force has always meant that it has the capacity for great brutality against the people over whom it has dominion. This brutality, and the corresponding imperative for liberty, has not shown itself to be dependant on the technological capabilities of government. Whatever a government seeking to do great evil might have at its disposal, even if it is mere machetes and stones, it will use. And if it intends to do evil against its people, it will usually find the means. The imperative of individual liberty in all events remains unchanged regardless of what government might have in its arsenal.

Where regimes have sought to control the minds of the societies over which they have dominion, they have done so not through the use of technology, but by the *prevention* of the technological advance of its people. For example, through censorship of information, the North Korean regime has sought to insulate its people from any current of thought contrary to the ideology of the state; here, mind control is achieved through the *absence* of any technology that would disseminate thought or opinion contrary to state-sanctioned ideology.⁵ Likewise, totalitarian Cuba has sought to isolate its people from the liberating effects of technology by the suppression of devices for outside communication and by state-control of all mediums of information (the breakdown of which is happily advancing through the underground use of the internet, an example of this principle at work).⁶ Mind control, loosely defined, has been largely a

⁵ On the policy of deprivation of technology in North Korea, see Martin van Creveld, *The Rise and Decline of the State*, 380 (Harvard: 1997).

⁶ James McKinley, Jr., "Cyber-Rebels in Cuba Defy State's Limits," *New York Times*, March 6, 2008, at <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/06/world/americas/06cuba.html?st=cse&sq=cubans+using+internet&scp=1>.

function of the negating of technology within a particular society and not the affirmative use of technology to inflict some sort of biological mind-change among the population. Coerced education (or “reeducation”) in the ideology of the regime has been the method of mind control practiced by its proponents, as well as through the ruthless suppression of all manifestations of the free mind. In sum, regimes that depend upon mind control for their legitimacy find technology to be an enemy and not an ally to their purposes.⁷ Technology, as in the case of Cuban cyber-rebels, more often frees society from such control and is therefore on the side of liberty.

A. Propaganda

In addition to the prohibition of technology, governments that have an interest in mind control have traditionally used the most effective tool at their disposal—propaganda. While propaganda is not solely used by unfree governments, Hayek noted that its effects vary “in magnitude and in kind” according to the degree of freedom within society.⁸ The totalitarian government advances its propaganda, in an effort to control minds, to the exclusion of all other thoughts, ideas, and opinions. It brooks no rivaling doctrines; especially not ones that advance notions of political freedom. It holds a monopoly on the means and substance of information propagated to the people, and the people are thereby isolated from all other sources of information. Hayek maintained that this manner of exclusion and control, arrogated to itself by the totalitarian government, is as effective in molding minds in any direction it chooses as any cumbersome technological approach to mind control.⁹

⁷ *Road to Serfdom* at 160 (noting that in a totalitarian system “[e]verything which might cause doubt about the wisdom of the government or create discontent will be kept from the people”).

⁸ *Ibid* at 154.

⁹ *Ibid*.

When government does not have to compete against notions of freedom that might arise through technology-based contacts with other peoples, it will inevitably achieve whatever brainwashing purpose it desires. But it does not follow from this that one need be concerned about technology as an agent of government mind control when propaganda has been at the root of most effective efforts in that direction. The dissemination of propaganda may be facilitated by—but its existence does not depend upon—sophisticated or novel technologies. The control of information essential to making propaganda effective (present in totalist states, absent in free ones) is not a function of government's undue technological advantage but instead a product of the absence of liberating technologies in the hands of the people. Mind control by disinformation and exclusion is countered by man's increasing ability to contact new and foreign sources of information, which is precisely the kind of thing that technology makes possible.

B. How Technology is Developed

All of this is not to say that the governments that desire to practice mind control would not employ mind-altering, personality-controlling agents against the population if they possessed the necessary technology. But it is not in the nature of societies imprisoned by such regimes to develop new technology; likewise, governments that would hold the productive engine of society captive by mind control do not usually find such a technology readily at their disposal. Hayek noted that any technological advancement comes through a decentralized process, where perhaps thousands of independent actors generate the research, development, financing, and manufacture of

said technology.¹⁰ The history of man's material progress is the story of his freedom from governmental constraints to invent, experiment, and invest in new ways to save labor and improve his well-being.¹¹ All of these things are predicated on a freedom of thought, right to private property, and voluntary association that would be strikingly absent under a government that purposed to control the minds of its people.

The impotence of any productive process held captive by government was documented no better than by Hayek himself.¹² Furthermore, systems tolerating *no* private ownership of the means of production have proved ineffective in producing the essentials of human existence, let alone sophisticated technologies that may be used for personality control. A government-run society does not have the luxury of technical development when all productive efforts must be directed at preventing starvation.

Instead, a government seeking to control the minds of its people would have to depend upon uncontrolled societies generating this technology for them. A regime that would seek to control the minds of its subjects must do so by milking technologies developed in a decentralized, private process of invention and manufacture capable of existence only in a free society. If this fact provides little comfort (given the inevitability of bad regimes getting the technology they want over time), perhaps it is well to add that free societies, by dint of the same processes that led to the development of the technology sought by the bad regimes in the first place, will oftentimes generate the antidote to harmful agents in the hands of government.¹³ For every ominous use of otherwise

¹⁰ *Constitution of Liberty* at 392-393.

¹¹ See generally David Landes, *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations*, (Harvard: 1998), especially his chapter "The Invention of Invention," 45 ff.

¹² *Constitution of Liberty* at 392. Hayek notes that central planning provides short-term fears but proves ineffective in generating technology over time.

¹³ Hayek makes this point in *Road to Serfdom* at 44.

innocuous technology, generated by the ingenuity of liberal society, there may be produced by that same ingenuity a later technology capable of remedying the effects of the former. Such is the dynamism of a free economy.

1) The International Marketplace

History has shown that when an unfree government openly enters the international marketplace in search of new technology, for whatever purpose, ideas necessary to the development of that technology penetrate its borders along with it. A good example is the development of military technology in the Near East. The evolution of military technology in Eighteenth Century Europe caught the attention of the Ottoman Turks, who insinuated themselves with the various courts of Europe in pursuit of these new technologies and tactics. The consequent change in Islamic society was not, however, limited to the successful replication of European military technology. Along with this technology came ideas about freedom that led to an opening up of society in ways not intended by its rulers.¹⁴ The ideas of individuality on which European military theory was based at the time caught hold among peoples under Ottoman control.

The point is that when a government seeks to be a buyer-participant in the international marketplace of technology, even when it has an intention to use the acquired technology in ways not conducive to freedom, it often finds that its society has opened up to the developmental freedom upon which this technology depends. A government must take the benefits and burdens of its international engagements. This is perhaps why free

¹⁴ Bernard Lewis, *What Went Wrong?: Western Impact and Middle Eastern Response*, 19-22, (Oxford: 2002). Of course, the trend toward liberty didn't last, and technology was in the long run used to support autocracy. However, Professor Lewis sees new openings occasioned by the most modern of technologies, especially as they pertain to the opening of communication.

trade has been advanced so stridently in any program of freedom, while attempts at economic self-sufficiency have been the policy of those seeking to keep people unfree.¹⁵

The concern that a totalitarian regime would pilfer, rather than develop, the technology necessary to mind control is very real but is not new. Hayek addressed those technologies in which the development came about for beneficent purposes, such as agents of personality control, and how these might be misused. I suspect that all technologies developed throughout human history might be misappropriated by bad governments for ominous purposes. This should not discredit either technology or the freedom necessary to it. Immoral uses of technology, as opposed to the technology-in-itself, involve a discussion of the legitimate purposes and powers of governments and should not lead one to apprehend technology as such; technology in the abstract, like fire, is neither good nor bad unless one observes the uses to which it is put. Governmental abuse of technology is not a problem of technology and should not be redressed in a way that harms technological development. Rather, it is a problem—and a perennial one—of politics.

* * *

Technology, both in public and private use, is the natural offspring of liberty. The capacity of government to practice the technology of mind control depends largely on the freedom of the underlying society necessary to technological development. A

¹⁵ Ludwig von Mises, *Socialism*, 205, (Liberty Fund ed., 1981) (noting an ideological basis in socialist countries to prohibit exchange with non-socialist countries); Milton Freidman and Rose Friedman, *Free to Choose*, 50-51 (HBJ, 1980) (“Few measures that we could take would do more to promote the cause of freedom at home or abroad than complete free trade”).

government observant of the individual liberties necessary for any technology to develop—most especially rights of private property and freedom of thought—will not purpose to practice mind control, nor (as we will see) will it have the lawful right to do so.

IV. The Powers of Governments

While Hayek's specific point is about mind-control technology, it is clear that his more general argument is that as the technological capacity of government advances, so too should the claims of liberty available to man in society. Due to the impossibility of an exhaustive list of protections against conceivable government action, there must be "a general clause protecting against government's interference those immunities which individuals have in fact enjoyed in the past."¹⁶ This, I believe, gets to the heart of Hayek's concern about technological development and its implications for liberty.

All would stipulate that a government that does not limit itself by law will not trouble itself with the rights of subjects it does not wish to observe. Such a regime's inability to practice technological mind control depends on a lack of technological capacity and not an absence of purpose or power. What Hayek has in mind, and what I will address here, is the adequacy of legal protections in *free* societies against something in the nature of mind control.

A. The Purpose of Rights

A happy similitude exists between the liberties necessary for technological development and those needed to protect a person from technology in the hands of government. In this sense, specific liberties serve a dual role—they serve a productive as

¹⁶ *Constitution of Liberty* at 216.

well as a preventive capacity. One may use his private property to experiment and develop a technology, and later claim that development and its proceeds as his property. He may use his property right in that development in withholding it from government entirely, or if he transfers it to government, claim immunity on his property from that development if used by the government adversely against him.

Hayek's discussion of technology is in the context of constitutionalism and general rules; he is seemingly skeptical of the capacity of legal protections to adapt to changes in technology and the concomitant advances in the capacity of government. But an increase in the *capacity* of government does not, however, necessarily increase its rightful *powers*. There may evolve many different ways available to government to do the same prohibited thing or invade the same private sphere. There have been such recognitions in American constitutional law, where the courts have employed the classic legal protections of Anglo-American jurisprudence, such as against unreasonable search and seizure of the person or home, against novel threats to privacy engendered by police technology.¹⁷

1) Technology Only Changes the Manner of Infringement of Existing Rights

Hayek posited a "general clause" as a possible remedy to his overall fear regarding technology, in order for bills of rights to remain meaningful in protecting "those immunities which individuals have enjoyed in the past."¹⁸ First, it must be pointed out that these past-enjoyed immunities to which Hayek made reference will continue to exist as immunities no matter the propensity of government to invade them. This is the

¹⁷ See, e.g., the United States Supreme Court's holding in *Kyllo v. United States*, 533 U.S. 27 (2001) (holding that thermal imaging may not be used to invade a suspect's home without a warrant).

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

whole point of rights. Immunities, or rights, ordinarily cannot make reference to the *manner* of possible government intrusion upon them—if this was a prerequisite to the existence of a right, it would truly be impossible to catalog any safeguards against government.¹⁹ If, for example, the guarantee of the free press only referred to a certain manner in which the press shall not be infringed—such as by prohibiting government only from using specified technologies to interfere with a radio station’s frequency—then worries about new forms of technology in the hands of government would be relevant to this established immunity. It might be quite vexatious to such an established liberty, so expressed, if the government developed new technological means by which to suppress the radio media that are not addressed in the terms of the existing right. However, since rights normally delineate spheres of protected interest the government’s intrusion onto which *in any manner* is proscribed, one may have greater confidence in their durability.

Hayek may be stating that there is an established immunity from mind control not arising out of constitutional documents but instead based upon government’s historic incapacity to practice such control—a *de facto*, not a *de jure* limitation. But I would disagree with this as well. Government is not free to practice overt mind control as a form of invidious penalty without the observation of due process of law. Before one may be subjected to such a practice, he must be lawfully detained, proven to have been guilty of the offense charged, and given this punishment only if it is shown to have been proscribed by established law and is not unconstitutionally cruel and unusual. These are just some of the established immunities that would serve as a high bar to mind control in

¹⁹ It is true, however, that some rights arise to proscribe certain onerous *practices* of government, conferring on the citizen no general sphere of interest. This means that so long as the government does not carry on in a certain manner in accomplishing its goals, there is no grievance. The government may deprive a person of his life, for example, but it cannot do so with a bill of attainder or without due process.

the English-speaking world. Indeed, this could be said of any society requiring some form of due process as a condition to individual punishment.

Surreptitious mind control, employed society-wide as a matter of policy and not individual punishment, is redressed by a lack of conceivable purpose why this may be pursued by a government legitimized by public consent and that only has as its interest the public's adherence to general rules (discussed above). Further, if members of society discover mind-altering agents, for instance, in their drinking water and trace them to government, they may redress this injury through the existing means of challenging any government action invading their person or property. It would be no different than when a government actor pollutes a person's property. That person may sue to have the pollution abated and demand compensation for the injury, in keeping with the scheme of private property rights good against private or public invasion.

The past immunity from mind control that citizens have enjoyed has not only been due to the mere absence of the enabling technology. As noted above, widespread mind control may be practiced without the aid of modern technology; nevertheless, constitutional governments have never chosen such a course. The immunity against mind control arose because few (even in government) could dispute that such an abhorrent practice violates both the terms and spirit of one's fundamental rights in a constitutional government.

B. Does Technology Require *New* Rights and Immunities?

My intention is not to be dismissive of Hayek's concern. There may very well be technological advances that enable government to carry out a species of invasion that is not addressed by traditional protections of liberty and property. Hayek believed that

mind control spelled the dawn of this type of innovation; I have argued that protection against mind control (and most other forms of coercion) is afforded by existing rights and immunities. But Hayek is correct in noting that traditional liberties might be found at some point to lack the expansiveness necessary to address imaginative new abuses of technology by government. This may happen when the abuse goes not to the manner of invasion of spheres of already-protected interest, but to the type of individual interest abused itself—whereby new categories, or spheres, of interest must be stated as protected in law because they are not addressed by the traditional ones. Technological advance requires the expression of new rights when it is clear that technology would invade an important sphere of interest that had not been previously addressed in form or substance. Mind control is not such an advance because its use would run afoul of a citizen's existing interest in bodily liberty, the rights associated with a free mind such as speech, press, and religion, and the freedom from wanton behavior by government against property. The Anglo-American constitutional schemes have thus far proven to have expressed a person's liberty interests in such a way as to embrace all conceivable spheres that might be violated by either brute or sophisticated governmental conduct.

There comes a point, however, where one must have faith that the perceived weaknesses in chartered rights will not be exploited for something akin to mind control. If a hitherto free government exploited some perceived weakness in the constitution in order to control the minds of individuals, we might be at the point where constitutional government is at an end, rendering the attempted vindication of even the most explicit rights by legalistic means an exercise in futility. At that point, arguments about presumptions, enumerations, and general clauses of liberty would be of little use.

The blanket protections afforded to life, liberty, and property by constitutional government (namely, that the deprivation of each requires the observation of due process of law), broadly encompass all meaningful spheres of human interest, past, present, or *in futuro*. As long as this general protection of liberty and property remains, technology will remain broadly compatible with individual liberty. Government’s use of technology, however imaginative, simply cannot deprive someone of any form of his liberty or property if “liberty” and “property” are protected by lawful processes. Hayek focused on bills of rights—he feared that catalogued rights would prove not to be in keeping with changes in technology. In so focusing, Hayek overlooked the positive sphere of interest man enjoys in “life, liberty, and property,” against, as Hayek would put it, “*all vital infringements.*” This spells the ultimate limitation on government, where its power is bounded by a sphere of individual liberty that cannot be invaded except in accordance with law. This keeps the constitution more broadly compatible with liberty, where one is free in all spheres not expressly denied to him by law. Inasmuch as this is the case, there is a presumption of liberty.²⁰

C. Structural Protections Against Abuse

But leaving aside the life, liberty and property argument, I think Hayek’s fear is overwrought. The protections of a citizen’s rightful sphere of liberty—as argued by the Federalists when the American Bill of Rights was drafted—continue to be largely structural. I submit that the two most important features of the American constitutional order, as it gives reality to individual liberty, are the structural notions of federalism and separation of powers. Bills of rights do not negate these features, they reinforce them by making explicit certain limitations on government already made implicit by the nature of

²⁰ As reinforced by the Ninth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

the government itself, thereby providing something of a “double protection” for things enumerated. Hayek noted that a government in which powers are separate requires a rare cooperation in carrying out coercive action.²¹ And the advantages to liberty of a federated structure have been praised by Hayek, quoting Lord Acton, in at least two instances.²² Both of these constitutional features serve as practical limitations on government more precious than mere paper guarantees. They guarantee that a malicious scheme against the people will not be carried out because this scheme must be ratified by many different holders of power whose respective ideas of justice and views of the Constitution might be different.

The complete erosion of constitutional liberty will not be due to a technological advance; it will be when the democratic process completely swallows the constitutional order, by finally deeming certain short-term societal objectives to be more important than the chartered limitations on government. The presence of this problem as it has already manifested itself has not been caused by any change in technology but by an introduction of political ideas allowing for a relaxation of constitutional norms. “While it is true,” Hayek reminded us, “...that inventions have given us tremendous power, it is absurd to suggest that we must use this power to destroy our most precious inheritance: liberty.”²³ Nothing in modern technology compels an erosion of liberty. We must preserve the free form of government; freedom from abuse of technology will thereby follow.

²¹ *Constitution of Liberty* at 185.

²² *Ibid* at 184; *Road to Serfdom* at 220.

²³ *Road to Serfdom* at 52.

V. Conclusion: Technology and Social Improvement

The foregoing reasons why technological mind control has not been a reality point to why the greatest threats to human freedom are not necessarily increasing as technology advances. Technology has and always will be the offspring of the durable principle of liberty: liberty furnishes a private sphere in which the citizen might develop technology yet not be hindered when that technology is in the hands of government. Technology will therefore continue to be a liberating force for mankind. Not only does it liberate man from any monopoly on information, it frees him from economic dependency on the state or private charity. Technological substitution of human labor leads to a division of knowledge that will further solidify the exchange-based economy, allowing one to focus his efforts toward his specialization while fulfilling all of his material needs through exchange.²⁴ The exchange economy makes possible—indeed, makes necessary—social cooperation. In a regime of social cooperation, in which each individual realizes that a satisfaction of his material needs and wants depends upon the diffused technical expertise of many others, man will find that his interest is furthered by each individual having a sphere of autonomy free of government control. Prosperity born of technological improvement sensitizes each member of society against the “tainted breezes” of tyranny—the more one has the greater stake he has in his and others’ liberty from arbitrary government.²⁵

Technology, moreover, may be the only hope that those imprisoned by tyranny have, as evidenced by these peoples’ thirst for the fruits of its development.²⁶ Its

²⁴ *Constitution of Liberty* at 22.

²⁵ *Constitution of Liberty* at 32. Hayek noted that one is just as dependent on the liberty of others as he is on that of himself.

²⁶ Will Weissert, “Cubans Line up for Cell Phone Service,” Associated Press, April 14, 2008, at

exchange among nations spurs in the recipient nations ideas about how such technology develops in the first place, which can only be fruitful for the spread of individual liberty and initiative. Technology opens up the world of ideas to those peoples desperate to learn of something better than the totalitarianism all around them. It opens minds more often than controls them.

http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20080414/ap_on_hi_te/cuba_cell_phones.