
THE
FREEDOM
MOVEMENT
ITS PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE
BRAD LIPS
ATLAS
NETWORK

THE FREEDOM MOVEMENT

ITS PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

BY BRAD LIPS

The Freedom Movement
Its Past, Present, and Future

By **Brad Lips**

Cover artwork: *Liberty III* by **Diana Zipeto**
Used with permission by the artist
Design by **MainTask.pro**

Atlas Network
Two Liberty Center
4075 Wilson Boulevard
Suite 310
Arlington, Virginia 22203
AtlasNetwork.org

Over the past two decades, I have seen the freedom movement evolve in exciting ways.

Where our movement is headed next will be determined by partners of Atlas Network and the generous community of philanthropists that rallies to support them.

The purpose of this short monograph is to raise important questions that need answers as we navigate our way forward. I don't believe there's a single best path to take, but it's incumbent upon all of us who care about freedom to be intentional in our strategies.

I hope those who work at partner organizations of Atlas Network will use this book to prompt discussions that will guide your work. Let's open ourselves up to new thinking that might transcend what has been tried in the past. In that same spirit, I hope this monograph brings new people into the conversation about how freedom's champions can be more successful.

This book's origins are in a paper I delivered at the 2019 annual meeting of the Association of Private Enterprise Education, for a session on the 70th anniversary of the publication of F.A. Hayek's *The Intellectuals and Socialism*. I have added data drawn from Atlas Network's internal records so you have a snapshot of our what our movement looks like at the start of 2020, and I have included a current directory of our partner universe. The final section brings up questions about the future of our movement that I hope will prompt vigorous discussion—and then, action.

I'll close this introductory note by expressing gratitude for those who have built our movement as it exists today and who have nurtured my understanding of the currents that will shape the course of freedom in the future. Prominent among this group are many past and current colleagues at Atlas Network, too numerous to name.

I'm grateful also to those holding this book today, who have big dreams to achieve new breakthroughs for liberty. This book is for you.

Brad Lips
January 2020

CONTENTS

WHAT IS THE FREEDOM MOVEMENT?

The "freedom movement" is a short-hand term for the community of people who devote time and resources to the task of solving social problems through the expansion of human liberty. Those of us who self-identify with this social movement see our challenges as both (1) a contest of ideas (we must be persuasive that pro-liberty ideas yield more moral and beneficial outcomes than competing ideologies) and (2) a practical project of implementation (we must channel our efforts where they can produce changes that benefit real people).

The freedom movement exists because of a shared, firmly-held belief that communities depend on a set of principles—the presumption of liberty, well-defined and secure property, and the rule of law—to achieve and sustain peace, prosperity, and civility. The personal commitment of members of this movement is heightened by a sense that our principles are under attack.

F.A. Hayek's 1949 essay *The Intellectuals and Socialism* was a central inspiration to how the movement evolved over the past 70 years. Hayek explains the ascendency of socialism that had taken place by the middle of the 20th century and lays out a blueprint for fighting back—not with force, but with ideas:

> "We need intellectual leaders who are prepared to resist the blandishments of power and influence and who are willing to work for an ideal, however small may be the prospects of its early realization."[1]

Those of us in the freedom movement aim to answer Hayek's call.

We answer the call because we believe it to be morally right. We answer the call despite Hayek's warning that "small may be the prospects" of achieving our end goal. We know there will be no permanent victory in curbing the growth of government. Thomas Jefferson taught us, "The natural progress of things is for the government to gain ground and for liberty to yield."[2] All around us, we see that governments tend to amass more powers over time and, despite sometimes-admirable intentions, encroach on individuals' ability to pursue happiness on their own terms.

The Big Government Goliath has the potential to grow ever more powerful. Much like the corrupt bargains by which public-sector unions use members' dues to elect politicians who can direct taxpayers' dollars back into union coffers, and by which subsidized firms use taxpayer dollars to lobby government for ever more subsidies, it is common

to see governments and their allies working to de-legitimize independent voices. While the Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program at the University of Pennsylvania counts more than 500 think tanks operating in China alone, recent months have seen the forced closure of independently-run groups like the Unirule Institute, which had voiced criticisms of government from a classical liberal framework. In the U.S., too, candidates for president in the 2020 cycle have proposed cracking down on "corruption" defined as lobbying or issue advocacy.

We in the freedom movement need to be the Davids who will face down the Big Government Goliath. This is not a partisan project, nor a political one. It is a project of persuasion based on firmly held principles.

We take inspiration from those who inspired great breakthroughs for liberty in the past, including:

- Those who contributed to the rejection of tyranny and founding of a constitutional republic in the U.S., such as John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon, who authored *Cato's Letters* (1723); Thomas Paine and his pamphlet *Common Sense* (1776); and the authors of the Federalist Papers (1788).
- The Anti-Corn Law League that formed in Britain in 1838 to uplift the poor through the removal of protectionist trade policies.
- The American Anti-Slavery Society, which was co-founded in 1833 by William Lloyd Garrison, who understood the need to create moral urgency to combat complacency about an evil institution. He famously said, "I have a need to be all on fire for there are mountains of ice about me to melt."[3]

Today's freedom movement sees other mountains of complacency to melt.

- Civil liberties are threatened by a surveillance state that has adapted 21st century technologies to its own ends.
- The explosion of government debt and unfunded liabilities has set the stage for significant economic disruptions that will hurt the poor the most.
- A variety of democratic and legal institutions that are supposed to protect citizens' liberties and property have been corrupted to advance the interests of those holding political power.

These are daunting challenges. Whether they can be solved effectively is a question I can't answer. What I do know is that incremental

improvements for liberty can be achieved, and—as we learned in 1989 with the fall of the Berlin Wall—sometimes bigger breakthroughs follow small ones.

What's more, we should take heart in the incredible progress that has been achieved for humanity over recent centuries within imperfect, only partially-free societies. Future generations will share in the blessings of freedom as long as we stay vigilant in preserving existing institutions and keeping at bay the worst threats of the statists of both left and right.

Our freedom movement contains within it many camps, including some that are inclined to see the glass half-full and others that are inclined to see it as half-empty. Blunting severe threats surely requires a sense of urgency and a willingness to embrace pragmatic, "less bad" half-measures. Building a popular movement for liberty requires a patient long-term commitment that is anchored in a vision of how ideal free social orders could exist.

These viewpoints and strategies are not mutually exclusive. The freedom movement of the future requires both.

THE IDEALS AT THE HEART OF THE FREEDOM MOVEMENT

Atlas Network's published vision statement seeks "a free, prosperous, and peaceful world where the principles of individual liberty, property rights, limited government, and free markets are secured by the rule of law."

We want to see communities flourish all over the world by respecting the dignity and creative potential of each individual. Most problems are best addressed by people who freely cooperate with one another through civil society and the free market, under a transparent and equally-applied rule of law.

We are therefore skeptical of government interventions that coerce people to behave in certain ways, or that privilege some parties above others, or that displace the role of private actors who might solve problems more effectively. Even with the best intentions, governments tend to fail at creating robust programs that adapt to changing public needs. Their activities become a burden on taxpayers and they drain resources from higher-value projects. Their attempts to fix past wrongs clumsily stoke new resentments and distort incentives for those they try to help.

This is not to say that free markets will produce *optimal* outcomes. It is only to highlight that government-run programs rarely will improve upon outcomes that arise via markets and civil society. After all, private actors have the incentives to listen to unsatisfied customers. They want to retain their business. Those unsatisfied with government services have only indirect means for expressing themselves. Cynical politicians can exploit this asymmetry. They amass power by promising they can deliver a fairer society; once in power, leaders have little incentive to deliver on the promises they have made. Cynically, politicians may prefer to "keep the issue," and campaign on it again, rather than solve it. More to the point, they have little capacity to solve it, since government programs tend toward one-size-fits-all actions, invariably bringing negative unintended consequences.

For this reason, the freedom movement builds awareness of policy issues and the reasons to be skeptical of those who promote top-down solutions to social problems. Those entrusted with state powers should be humble and should understand that that innovation and compassion cannot be commanded from on high. Markets and

civil society evolve creative solutions through competition and cooperation; governments that impede activities in these spheres invariably diminish the society's well-being.

Think tanks and other civil society organizations play a vital role in providing research and analysis that can inform policymakers, and the broader public, of the costs and benefits of laws and regulations. To be credible, such organizations need to be committed to the pursuit of truth. Those that are funded by governments rarely provide disinterested analysis; so too, those that are funded by a particular commercial interest.

This is why Atlas Network partners only with organizations that are guided by core principles, that operate with diversified funding bases, and that take their own governance seriously. Such think tanks can be authentic allies to all people who aspire to enjoy the opportunities, and take on the responsibilities, of living in a free society.

Such organizations also can nurture a lasting appreciation of the institutions that sustain free societies, so the public will become more immune to the temptations of government intervention.

Atlas Network does not proscribe to our partners any particular agenda for moving societies in the direction of free institutions. We believe there is no best way to reform existing government programs and no ideal end state toward which all should aspire. Rather, we believe there should be a multiplicity of efforts that increase the sphere of freedom for people, so that all committed individuals can play a part in unleashing human potential and discovering the extent to which our societies may flourish.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE FREEDOM MOVEMENT

The freedom movement that emerged after World War II worked from a hypothesis that policymakers (i.e., those with legal authority to implement reforms) stand at the *end* of a process that begins with idea originators.[4] In between, there is a change in public opinion that happens on a timetable out of anyone's direct control, but which is influenced heavily by an intellectual class that F.A. Hayek famously called "second-hand dealers" in ideas.

According to Hayek, the intellectual "need be neither [an original thinker nor an expert in a particular field of thought]: he need not possess special knowledge of anything in particular, nor need he even be particularly intelligent. What qualifies him for his job is the wide range of subjects on which he can readily talk and write, and a position or habits through which he becomes acquainted with new ideas sooner than [his audience]."[5] In other words, intellectuals are *popularizers* of ideas.

In the early post-WWII period, classical liberal philanthropists—such as the Volker Foundation, which was at the peak of its influence from 1947 to 1962—focused attention on *idea originators* in academia, so that the intellectuals would need to wrestle with classical liberal viewpoints that had been largely absent from public debate in the decades prior. Much of the intellectual bulwark for protecting the free society was built during the second half of the 20th century by beneficiaries of this type of philanthropy—Hayek and Friedman, of course, but also fellow Nobel Laureates James Buchanan, Gary Becker, Ronald Coase, Vernon Smith, and Elinor Ostrom (as well as Bruno Leoni, Gordon Tullock, Peter Bauer, Harold Demsetz, and many others who were never recognized by the Nobel committee).

At the same time, the market-oriented, independent think tank went from being an unusual idea to a mainstream one. The man who would eventually establish Atlas Network, Antony Fisher, was inspired by a conversation he had with F.A. Hayek in 1945, following the publication of *The Road to Serfdom* and its warm public reception. Hayek was thinking deeply about how to ignite a classical liberal response to socialism. He would convene the first meeting of the Mont Pelerin Society and publish *The Intellectuals and Socialism* two and four years later, respectively.

Fisher's idea for influencing the intellectual class in favor of freedom came to fruition first in the London-based Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA), which achieved lift-off in 1957 with the hiring of its first General Director Ralph Harris. The IEA was established as an independent, non-partisan think tank, operating as a non-profit charitable organization. The goal was to "analyse topical issues, to provide answers, and, at the same time, to resist the seductive call of compromise," according to Fisher in an IEA publication titled *20 Years of Economic Dissent*.[6] In the same booklet, Hayek explained:

> "In our advocacy of policy we must not confine ourselves to what is regarded as 'politically possible.' If we do not succeed in sufficiently changing public opinion to make politically possible what sensible people have regarded as politically impossible, we should not avert the threatening fate."[7]

This model of the independent think tank, pioneered in part by the IEA, would prosper for a number of reasons. Among them:

1. The academy drifted left over many decades; many of those who self-identify as part of the freedom movement did not see an academic career as a viable option because of concerns about viewpoint discrimination. Think tanks offered those would-be academics a refuge.

2. Think tanks created products that aimed for broad public consumption or for influence with policy-makers. For some, this manner of purposeful engagement proved fulfilling in ways that academia did not.

3. Many freedom movement philanthropists determined that their donations had greater impact with think tanks, compared to universities with larger budgets, broad revenue streams, and competing priorities.

The number of independent think tanks in favor of free markets has exploded to more than 500 worldwide, from scarcely a dozen in 1981. That was the year Antony Fisher created what became Atlas Network, because of his belief that a profusion of independent think tanks would advance liberty more effectively than any single effort. A chorus, after all, will have a stronger voice than any soloist.

The other reason for taking a mutual fund-style approach to the think tank industry—funding a basket of institutions, rather than a single effort—is that it created fertile ground for experimentation. Inevitably,

some experiments fail and the sector evolves in response to what strategies prove more adaptive in the world of ideas.

Some experiments fail for good reason. For instance, Atlas Network has long emphasized the importance of independence for think tanks. Think tanks that attach themselves to a partisan agenda, or that operate essentially as a front for a particular interest, rather than the public weal, do a disservice to the entire think tank community by creating legitimate skepticism about their willingness to pursue the truth wherever that leads.

Other debates about "best practices" will continue to run their course. Does building an endowment safeguard the mission and focus of an independent think tank, or does it breed a kind of complacency that is harmful over time? Can think tanks prosper when housed within universities, or will they invariably find their mission undermined by hostile university administrators? The think tank market will evolve based on the results of trial-and-error.

Looking back over the two decades that I have been involved with Atlas Network, I identify four major trends that have shaped our movement:

1. The donor community has become impatient with think tanks that measure "output" but not "outcomes." Many in the freedom movement once saw their role as preserving a set of endangered ideas, so that they might be reborn at some later point in history after circumstances had changed. *Producing material* was a worthy end goal when the movement subscribed to this understanding of its broad purpose. But circumstances have changed in a way that's best described by Tarren Bragdon, founding president of the Foundation for Government Accountability (FGA), "I don't want donors to support FGA because we *fight* for the good cause. I want donors to support FGA because we *win*." This does not mean that all think tanks need to define their goals in terms of policy victories, but think tanks do need to be able to articulate how their outputs (what they produce) will have outcomes that matter in the real world.

2. The explosion of information in the digital age has put a premium on organizations with effective communication programs. If information was once a scarce resource, people today are challenged by its abundance. The instant availability of alternative information and entertainment devalues hard-to-consume research for many audiences, and leads to shorter attention spans.

Think tanks exploited this opportunity in some cases (e.g., creating "transparency tools" that organize government-published information in useful ways as a public service). In pushing toward policy goals, think tanks have woken up to the power of personalized story-telling to engage audiences and motivate action. After all, statistics can be difficult to absorb, or worse, breed a fatalism about the enormity of a problem and the difficulty of affecting change. Telling stories about individual people has proven effective for many think tanks, and is leading to a reimagining of think tanks' roles as marketers of ideas and positive-sum policy reforms.

3. The costs of production and distribution for all sorts of media products has plummeted. The mix of products from think tanks has come to include video programs, podcasts, and games. Think tanks compete for visibility on social media in order to distribute content to ever wider audiences and to engage them directly.

4. Think tanks are competing with organizations that focus on grassroots mobilization, and need to adapt in order to remain relevant. Taxpayer groups (some billing themselves as "do tanks") have had a big influence in certain countries. In India, we have seen mass protests to protect privately-run schools that serve the poor from government encroachment. In the U.S., we saw more investment in grassroots mobilization in the wake of the Tea Party protests that arose a decade ago. There are risks here. To the extent that philanthropists who have traditionally supported classical liberal think tanks pivot toward more political activities (under the rubric that "the next election is the most important ever"), there is a danger that the brands of many in the freedom movement will be tarnished with the taint of partisanship.

These factors and others have helped shape a diverse and growing freedom movement.

They also have created a tension: can freedom movement organizations succeed in a new media world, with donors wanting signs of fast impact, with an eye toward youthful audiences with seemingly ever-shrinking attention spans—and still remain scholarly and independent?

I know they can. I'm proud of how the vast majority of our partners navigate the tradeoffs here. But it is important to speak candidly of temptations that could undermine the credibility of what we've been building since that first conversation between Fisher and Hayek. Af-

ter all, it will be through our own vigilance that we sustain appropriate norms for organizations inside the freedom movement. Let us keep this in mind, in these next sections, as we take a look at the movement that exists today and envision how it might evolve in the wake of opportunities emerging on the horizon.

THE STATE OF THE FREEDOM MOVEMENT ENTERING 2020

As we begin January 2020, Atlas Network has crossed an exciting threshold. For the first time in our organizational history, we have more than 500 partners around the world. Our team constantly reviews our partner directory to remove organizations that are inactive or are no longer engaging with our programs. So as you read this, our numbers may have slipped back below 500, or perhaps they will have grown larger.

The most current iteration of our directory is public and listed under the Partners tab at AtlasNetwork.org.

While there are certainly other groups, scholars, and activists that pursue the goals of the freedom movement without any connection to Atlas Network, our partner universe represents an important cross-section of the movement. Statistics drawn from our internal databases can shed light on the diversity of the organizations in our movement, how they focus their efforts, and what resources they can deploy to achieve their goals.

Newcomers to Atlas Network tend be quite surprised by the global nature of the movement. Our 502 partner organizations are located in 98 different countries. Breaking this down by region:

- 204 are in the U.S. and Canada
- 135 are in Europe
- 93 are in Latin America and the Caribbean
- 42 are in Asia and the Pacific
- 28 are in Africa and the Middle East

In 45 other countries, Atlas Network has one or more "proto-partners" who are not represented in the numbers above. These are organizations that we would consider an ally for the freedom movement, despite not meeting the criteria we require for partner status and inclusion in our directory.

While 62% of our partners reside in the "most free" quartile of countries, per the *Economic Freedom of the World* report published by Fraser Institute, this means that 189 (38%) do not. They divide up 17%, 12% and 9% among the second, third and fourth quartiles, respectively.

From our perspective at Atlas Network, one of the truly heartening trends of recent years has been the growth of strong groups in difficult

This word cloud is built form the mission statements of Atlas Network's 502 partners.

and developing parts of the world where the freedom movement was fragile (or completely barren) only ten years ago. It's truly inspiring to attend our Asia Liberty Forum or Africa Liberty Forum and take stock of the rising young leaders with principled and pragmatic plans for increasing freedom in their countries.

Just look at the last two winners of our Templeton Freedom Award, the largest prize program in the think tank space. The Foundation for Economic Freedom in the Philippines accomplished a major victory to restore property rights for 2.5 million farmers who had been effectively denied the full use of their land. The Egyptian Center for Public Policy Studies withstood the turbulence that followed the Arab Spring and brought about significant progress toward budget transparency and then the elimination of government energy subsidies—a great strike against cronyism and a victory for public accountability to the citizenry. These accomplishments make clear that think tanks from developing countries can compete with the best in the world.

Another notable trend among our think tank partners has been an increase in grassroots work and policy advocacy. More than 80% of our partners worldwide indicate that they undertake these types of activities, which depart from Antony Fisher's original think tank model of commissioned experts doing original policy research which could then be presented to opinion influencers (the "second-hand dealers in ideas," to use Hayek's terminology).

In a survey asking our partners to indicate which activities are part of their normal course of work, we collected the following responses:

- Educational activities—89% of our partners
- Grassroots mobilization—83%
- Policy advocacy—81%
- Original research—79%
- Student outreach—68%

These statistics show a willingness to step away from the ivory tower and engage directly with members of the public and decision-makers. I see this as a response to what I identified earlier as the first of four external trends that have shaped our movement; that is, the hunger among donors to see outcomes and not just outputs from their investments in freedom.

Along these lines, my Atlas Network colleague Lyall Swim has encouraged our partner organizations to become very intentional about where they concentrate their efforts to bring about social change. He has anchored these conversations in research he developed applying Everett Rogers' "diffusion of innovations" theory to questions of public policy.[8]

One the important take-aways from Lyall's research is that organizations do not need to become "all of the above" shops (i.e., developing policy innovations, *and* winning over early adopters, *and* working towards the embrace of a winning majority). But it is important for an organization to know where on this spectrum it can have the most impact, in part because this illuminates where it will need outside collaborators to actually achieve desired outcomes.

With more of our partners keeping this perspective in mind, there is a growing desire for an "ecosystem of liberty groups" in each country and state.

This collaborative model is replacing some of the unhealthy rivalries that we used to see, where it seemed some think tank leaders would prefer to stand alone atop a small hill rather than share credit in scaling a much bigger challenge. Our more visionary partners reject the idea that we are in a zero-sum world, where another liberty group's success is coming at their own expense.

They see the task is to achieve exciting outcomes, often as part of a larger coalition. They have the confidence that, over the long term, greater

opportunities will emerge as a consequence of playing nicely with allies in a successful movement.

What kind of resources do our partner think tanks bring to their work?

There are a couple of ways to look at this question. Overall, the aggregate annual budget of our partner universe is approximately $909 million, although the top ten organizations account for 34% of this total. For this reason, it is more meaningful to look at the median budget among our partner organizations, which was $479,000, rather than the average.

Looking across the network, our partners report a revenue mix of 36% from foundations, 36% from individuals, 17% from corporations, 4% from government and 7% other.

The average age of the organizations in our directory is 14 years old. 38% of our partners were founded during the 2010s. 29%, 13% and 10% were founded during the 2000s, 1990s and 1980s, respectively. Only 9% were established prior to 1980.

Our surveys indicated that, on average, our partner organizations have 11 paid full-time staff members and three part-time.

In summary, the average Atlas Network partner has a lean team that works with an annual budget of a few to several hundred thousand dollars—and a lot of hustle.

It's impressive to look at the outcomes being achieved by those receiving grants from Atlas Network. Look for example, at a portfolio of 69 project grants we awarded over three years, focused on liberating enterprise and entrepreneurship through policy change. Our grants averaged just over $16,000 per project. While work on 28 projects from this portfolio is ongoing, already these grants have achieved 59 measurable increases in categories of economic freedom in Argentina, Bolivia, Burundi, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Honduras, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Lithuania, Mexico, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Peru, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Ukraine, and Uruguay. This is a tremendously cost-effective strategy for poverty alleviation, which we know occurs as a consequence of economic freedom and heightened levels of commercial activity.

Of course, not all Atlas Network partners focus on delivering tangible results in the short term. Many partners of Atlas Network focused on educational activities that are geared to talent development, so that young people exposed to classical liberalism today might be in positions of authority in a decade or two.

This requires patience and persistence. It means stomaching a certain amount of risk that one's efforts will come to nothing. There are wonderful examples, however, of the long-term strategy being very much vindicated.

The Federalist Society was started by law students in 1982 to create a community that dissented from the orthodoxy at law schools and embraced a philosophy of judicial restraint rooted in the text of the U.S. Constitution. Nearly four decades later, five of its former members sit on the Supreme Court.

Brazil's Instituto de Estudos Empresariais was created in 1984 as a club of young business leaders devoted to the democratic ideal of individual freedom under the rule of law. Several of its members now lead major corporations and some have filled important government posts. While it's right to take President Jair Bolsonaro to task for various disturbing and illiberal comments he as made, it is also clear that Brazil's economic policies have moved in the direction of greater freedom during his administration, thanks to an intellectual consensus that might not exist without the IEE.

Looking around the world, I can see very admirable communities of classical liberals working with real purpose and impact, in places as disparate as the Balkans, Pakistan, Guatemala, and Morocco. In each of these cases, I think of the small investments in educational programs that brought together a community in these locations, and unlocked all this latent potential.

As I close this section, I also reflect on the early investments that were made in Atlas Network—then known as Atlas Economic Research Foundation—as an organization. The visionaries who got involved during our early years understood the potential of our fledgling partners, and they saw the need for an organization of global scope that would smartly serve the network. The next section discusses how Atlas Network fulfills this role today.

URACHSTRASSE 27
D-7800 FREIBURG (BREISGAU)
77216

Mr. Anthony Fisher,
1750 Taylor St., Apt 1101,
San Francisco,
Calif 94133

1 January 1980

Dear Anthony,

I entirely agree with you that the time has come when it has become desirable and almost a duty to extend the network of institutes of the kind of the London Institute of Economic Affairs. Though it took some time for its influence becoming noticeable, it has by now far exceeded my most optimistic hopes. And at least some of the institutes that you have more recently created, especially the Canadian one, prove that this was not mere special luck in finding unusually able people to run it, but that when repeated, the experiment promises equal success.

What I argued thirty years ago, that we can beat the Socialist trend only if we can persuade the intellectuals, the makers of opinion, seems to me more than amply confirmed. Whether we can still win the race against the expanding Socialist tide depends on whether we can spread the insights, which prove much more acceptable to the young if rightly expounded than I had hoped, fast and wide enough. As I keep saying, I am optimistic in the sense that if the politicians do not destroy the world in the next twenty years, I am sure then a new and less misguided generation will be able to take charge. But I am no longer sure that we have twenty years: while the growing understanding of the young makes me hopeful, what I see happen in politics makes me most apprehensive about the next ten years or so.

The future of civilisation may really depend on whether we can catch the ear of a large enough part of the upcoming generation of intellectuals all over the world fast enough. And I am more convinced than ever that the method practiced by the London Institute is the only one which promises any real results.

Sometimes I feel that what is really missing most is an understanding on the part of the capitalists themselves of the merit of what they are doing and the danger which they and with them we are all facing. They seem to share with the socialists the belief that it is a battle of interests and not a battle of intellectual arguments which guide social evolution. The attempts to appeal to the mass by propaganda in which they can sometimes be interested are futile. No system or systematic propaganda can undo the effects of the preaching of three to four generations of journalists, teachers and literary people who have honestly believed in socialism. It is only through that class we can hope to influence majority opinion.

I have sometimes despaired that this can be done at all. But the influence which it now appears thirty years' work of the Institute of Economic Affairs has achieved has made me again more optimistic. In building up that institute and trying the technique elsewhere you have developed a technique by which more has been achieved in the right direction than in any other manner. This ought to be used to create similar institutes all over the world and you have now acquired the special skill of doing it. It would be money well spent if large sums could be made available for such a concerted effort. If this letter can help you in any way in such endeavours, you are of course free to use it in any manner you think desirable. Your efforts will certainly have my blessings.

With kind regards and best greetings of the season, cordially yours,

F. A. Hayek

THE ATLAS NETWORK STRATEGY

The letter shared on the previous page, from F.A. Hayek to Atlas Network's founder Antony Fisher (whose name is misspelled here by Hayek as Anthony), is a wonderful testament to the influence of Fisher's first career as a think tank entrepreneur: "In building up [the Institute of Economic Affairs] and trying the technique elsewhere you have developed a technique by which more has been achieved in the right direction than by any other manner." The letter no doubt fanned the flames of enthusiasm for Fisher as he contemplated the creation of Atlas Network (founded in 1981, the year after this letter was written) to create a multiplicity of organizations working toward the advance of liberty.

Our team today remains faithful to this idea that our movement needs pluralism. Many organizations may share similar aims, but each with its own style and strategy. Fisher could have tried establishing branches of the Institute of Economic Affairs, but he understood the success of a think tank depends on the entrepreneur who leads it. A leader needs to be well-connected to his or her local market and ready to seize opportunities that can emerge at any time. Fisher foresaw how attempts to coordinate efforts among many think tanks would be fraught with difficulty and would complicate the local relationships that are essential to engaging a broader audience with our ideas.

For this reason, we welcome growing numbers of experiments to the freedom movement. At the same time, we understand that growing the number of organizations that collaborate with Atlas Network cannot be a goal in itself. Having ten very effective think tanks would be preferable to having one hundred ineffective think tanks. For that reason, internal discussions at Atlas Network focus on not just having a partner in a certain location, but also having a *self-sustaining* partner that is *having a demonstrable impact*.

It's not an easy climb for think tanks to become financially stable and impactful. Many who enter the freedom movement are passionate about our ideas, but uninterested in the mechanics of how to run a think tank—until they hit the first crisis. Suddenly, they realize it is critical to develop systems for budgeting, accounting, project execution, marketing, fundraising, talent development, and so on. Atlas Network developed a portfolio of training programs to impart best practices in those areas, and to encourage think tank leaders to develop a smart division of labor among their management teams.

While we continue to provide some foundational courses on think tank best practices, the real emphasis within our Leadership Academy is on "best fit." We have developed special capacities for facilitating peer-to-peer learning. This is where many practical insights are revealed, and there is significant benefit that comes from developing a connectedness among high-performing peers. This is how think tank leaders discover new (and ever-rising) performance benchmarks against which they can measure their own progress.

That is especially important at the "grass tops" level, since those leading top organizations are multipliers in their own right, disseminating ideas throughout their own think tanks and beyond. At one time, the public perception of Atlas Network was that we oriented newcomers to the think tank world; today, we are proud that the top officers of the best organizations in the freedom movement regularly engage with our programs.

Much of our success can be attributed to a genuine ethos of humility that pervades our team. As my colleague Matt Warner has told partners who seek our training, "We don't have the conceit that we can solve your specific problems; rather, we aim to help you uncover and troubleshoot for *why you haven't solved these specific problems on your own*."

The wisdom of this approach is that teams will "own" the solutions they create themselves, whereas they may resist the solutions being imposed by outsiders. In this way, finding your own solution is better than being given the best solution.

This mirrors how we think about the broader value created by independent think tanks in their own communities. Atlas Network's Poverty & Freedom project builds on a growing consensus that traditional aid has failed as a strategy for economic development; it is the rules of the game (e.g., whether economic liberties are protected) that determine whether communities will lift themselves from poverty. But what still seems underappreciated by many in the economic development community is that, in charting a strategy forward, the practical knowledge of local insiders is more valuable than the technical knowledge of international development experts.

The local independent think tanks that partner with Atlas Network are ideally positioned to be catalysts to positive reforms. Each think tank combines sound economic analysis with an insider's read of local dynamics that are essential to prioritizing reforms and crafting them to endure.

Atlas Network's Poverty & Freedom project contains two grant lines; one to accelerate the locally-grown solutions to poverty that aim for

specific policy changes, and one to provide broader educational efforts on the reasons that free enterprise and limited government benefit the poor. Atlas Network values work all along the Overton Window,[9] and we understand that the role of some think tanks is to play the long game of policy change: creating knowledge and passion for reform among rising generations while not getting discouraged by the unlikelihood of policy wins, so the movement ultimately will creep closer toward policy relevance.

However, we especially celebrate policy wins—that is, legislative or regulatory actions that implement policy recommendations favored by our partners. Such wins make manifest the potential our partners have for changing the world in the direction of liberty.

We see the freedom movement growing stronger through engagement with the programs we operate within a strategy we call "Coach, Compete, Celebrate!"

> COACH: we provide the freedom movement's most sophisticated suite of training programs (online and in-person, with a focus on case studies, peer-to-peer interaction, and personalized mentoring).
>
> COMPETE: we create opportunities for our partners to compete for grants and prizes. We direct over $5 million annually to nearly 200 grantees within our partner universe; in most cases, we require that grantees raise matching funds locally, to minimize the risk of a dependency effect and to improve the odds of organizational or project sustainability.
>
> CELEBRATE: we use our publications, online assets, and the events we hold annually on five continents to celebrate what is truly excellent and inspiring in our movement. This external validation stokes ambitions, raises the baseline of expectations, and creates interest in engaging in our training programs, thereby restarting this Coach, Compete, Celebrate! cycle that constantly raises expectations of what it means to be great at advancing liberty.

This strategic framework is scalable, and is a smart entry point through which philanthropists can provide incentives for the broad freedom movement to address a wide array of challenges. Together we can improve the quality of life in communities, whether by freeing trade from tariffs and quotas, removing restrictions on the rights of women, lifting restraints on freedom of speech, or any of a myriad of obstacles to freedom.

A WORD TO OUR CRITICS

Before moving to concluding thoughts and questions about the future of the freedom movement, I want to pause to address critics of Atlas Network—some of whom, I suspect, have cynical motives, but no doubt there are others with genuine questions and concerns.

The scope of Atlas Network is worldwide. Our local partners have demonstrated that they can be catalysts to social change within their communities. Feverish articles have been written, by some who are inclined to a top-down understanding of the world, imagining Atlas Network as the orchestrator of a global conspiracy.

This is not how we work. Our partners are fully independent. We do not provide long-term support to our partners precisely because we encourage them to find ways to thrive by taking cues from *local* stakeholders who value civil liberties, free enterprise, and the rule of law.

A deep sense of humility is impressed upon the DNA of Atlas Network and the organizations with which we work. We cannot possibly know what should be the priorities for our partners, or the best strategies for realizing the priorities they identify.

What we *can* do is help our partners learn from one another's experiences, thereby broadening their horizons about what can be accomplished. And we can help donors, who value efforts to increase human freedom and who trust our team's expertise in grant giving.

We do not fund projects that seek political outcomes. We advise our partners to provide policy advice to all parties who are willing to listen; this is the route to establishing broad and lasting credibility.

We do not work to advance any industry's or company's agenda, except that all for-profit enterprises should appreciate our efforts to establish a level playing-field under which to operate with minimal interference by government.

We do not take donations from governments or political parties. This prohibition is written into our bylaws, and press reports that allege Atlas Network has been funded by the National Endowment for Democracy, or other taxpayer-funded entities, are simply wrong. We cannot speak for our partners, of course; they make their own decisions.

To those who seek to silence or "de-platform" Atlas Network or its partners, I suggest that you re-examine your motivations for limiting speech of those with whom you disagree. Free societies are built on the

idea that we are all fallible. Banning unwelcome opinions, rather than answering them with reasoned debate, leads in an authoritarian direction that I hope we all see as unwelcome.

To those who accuse classical liberals of being motivated by greed, consider for a moment the historical record: living standards have risen dramatically as more people have enjoyed the blessings of property rights, free exchange, and other liberal institutions. The poor have the most to gain from a continued expansion of economic and personal liberties.

To those who would try to draw connections between our organization and unsavory bigots and racists, you do not understand our philosophy at all. We believe in equal rights for all people. We know that our own work benefits from a diversity of perspectives, and we do not welcome into our programs those who would undermine our goal of building an inclusive freedom movement with a diversity of thought, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and religion.

QUESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF OUR MOVEMENT

In thinking about the future of the freedom movement, each of us who identifies with it should do a little soul searching: *What am I personally aiming to achieve?*

Any social movement is, first and foremost, a collection of individuals. The progress we make together will depend on how each of us defines purpose within our individual lives.

More and more, it seems to me, leaders within the freedom movement are thinking about how to achieve tangible benefits for ordinary people, moving the emphasis from "proving we're correct" to "contributing to good." I think we can focus on the latter and have faith that fair-minded people will come to connect good works to smart premises regarding topics of political economy.

I don't have data to back this up, but I suspect that twenty years ago, a large contingent of the freedom movement might have answered my question in terms of "preserving an intellectual tradition," and then they would list their favorite scholars, from Aquinas to Maimonides, Locke to Montesquieu, Smith to Bastiat, or Hayek to Friedman.

Teaching this intellectual heritage is important, of course, especially while it is neglected in our universities. But it is healthy for our movement to focus more on ways to have a real-world impact on others' lives, regardless of whether it expands the fan clubs of our favorite economists and moral philosophers.

Paying homage to intellectual heroes may even be counter-productive in an era like ours, in which many countries see a reshuffling of political alliances. The U.S. freedom movement contains many who are nostalgic for the coalition that William F. Buckley and his *National Review* colleagues built in the 1950s—of free-marketeers, traditionalists, and anti-communists—which reached its ascendency under Reagan. But the 2020s will require a new recipe for achieving victories for liberty. We can't be focused on the past in a way that prevents us from bringing together a winning coalition under a new Big Tent, which leads to a second big questions: *Who will be our allies in the years ahead?*

My hope is that the intense partisanship that exists today may burn itself out and create a new opportunity to build a sane middle around classical liberal principles. As I see it in the U.S, the opposition to President Donald Trump has energized the extreme hard left; in turn, this

has emboldened—among some (of course not all) of Trump's fans—an identity politics of the right. A similar dynamic is playing out in parts of Europe, and indeed in countries all over the world.

While there's a temptation to rally to the tribe that you find less objectionable (because it more stridently opposes the greater enemy), those of us in the freedom movement need to maintain a longer-term perspective. In doing so, we may find new allies. I hypothesize that there is a growing contingent on the center-left who are horrified by the attacks on free speech being waged on campuses by leftists with increasingly authoritarian tendencies.

We may never persuade them to read Milton Friedman, but we can have civil and constructive conversations all the same. The third question is thus: *Can we get past the tribal identifications that currently define our politics, or even our ideological debates, to start afresh on conversations that matter?*

I am encouraged that we can. Part of my confidence on this matter is informed by Atlas Network's experience over the past 18 months with our Doing Development Differently project. The project funds "homegrown solutions to poverty" developed by our partners to increase economic freedom in their home country, and raises awareness of this strategy among the economic development community. At the outset, I suspected we would be looked upon as unwelcome promotors of fringy libertarian ideas; I'm very happy to have discovered the extent to which I was wrong.

As my colleague Matt Warner explains in his recent book, *Poverty & Freedom: Case Studies on Global Economic Development*, there has been a great deal of healthy introspection within the foreign aid community about the limits of direct aid and the need for enterprise-friendly rules on the ground. Scholars from traditions far outside the various schools of free-market economics have reached conclusions very compatible with F.A. Hayek, Hernando De Soto, Peter Bauer, and others we are quick to celebrate.

Imagine the progress we can make if we build bridges with open-minded scholars (who we've mistakenly pigeonholed as "on the other side") while staying true to the important admonition of Hayek's that I cited earlier, that "we must not confine ourselves to what is regarded as 'politically possible.'"

I am confident that our movement can make this transition, as it depends on virtues we demonstrate regularly: a commitment to scholarship that aims to discover truth, a devotion to free speech, and an ap-

preciation of diverse viewpoints. The only leap that is required is to get out of our comfort zone and engage sincerely with those from different ideological camps.

Could this happen even in the universities? This is another live question, which will make a big difference in how our freedom movement evolves.

As I see it, the university itself is in crisis. There is growing disillusionment with the value of higher education, as costs have grown and as employers no longer presume a college diploma is a marker of job readiness. But few universities will reform themselves proactively. After all, the structure of incentives that has evolved in academia does not prioritize the student experience.

Universities seek accreditation and representation on lists of Best Colleges. They bestow tenure and other career perks on professors who publish frequently in top-tier academic journals. This incentivizes the development of research agendas on highly specific topics of little relevance to anyone outside the specialty itself. Lost in all this is what most of us would hope for—an enriching experience for students with robust debate of diverse perspectives that prepares them for a purposeful adulthood.

There are a few disruptors in higher education that deliberately foster multi-disciplinary research and are developing student engagement strategies that come much closer to the ideal we have for meaningful education. Guatemala's Universidad Francisco Marroquín, which bills itself as "the world's only libertarian university," comes first to mind. UFM raises my hopes that actors within the freedom movement could bring much-needed reform to the university system itself.

The freedom movement's philanthropists have stepped up in important ways to create university-based centers (UBC) that advance free-market economics and the ideas of limited government. These can serve as oases for candid discussions of more diverse viewpoints than are typically aired in a college classroom.

While the simple existence of these UBCs is a sign of progress, a big question for the future is: *what does real success look like for UBCs connected to the freedom movement?* As currently constructed, most UBCs face the same fundamental problem as other non-profits ("how do you evaluate your own effectiveness in the absence of market signals?"), and to their detriment, their leaders are more insulated from tackling the problem. After all, UBCs are typically led by a professor whose pri-

mary focus is a research and teaching agenda; building a dynamic Center is at best an after-thought. He or she was probably identified to lead the UBC because of pedagogic talents or published research, and without regard to strategic vision or management prowess.

Atlas Network is exploring how UBCs could benefit from our "Coach, Compete, Celebrate!" strategic model, which is based on the insight that leaders need to engage in friendly competition with high-performing peers in order to discover margins for improvement.

Our cause would benefit immensely if the higher ed landscape was full of UBCs that could serve as bright lights attracting a younger cohort. I wonder again if we have the proper messaging in place for this challenge.

One of the most provocative passages in Hayek's *The Intellectuals and Socialism* observes a deficiency among classical liberals:

> "In particular, socialist thought owes its appeal to the young largely to its visionary character; the very courage to indulge in Utopian thought is in this respect a source of strength to the socialists which traditional [classical] liberalism sadly lacks.... The intellectual, by his whole disposition, is uninterested in technical details or practical difficulties. What appeals to him are the broad visions, the spacious comprehension of the social order as a whole which a planned system promises." (p. 21)

I find it interesting that Hayek uses the term "courage" here, and two other times in his short essay. He understands that, for most of us, projecting a Utopian vision of the free society will be outside our comfort zone.

There are good reasons for this. Classical liberals understand human beings are imperfect and operate with limited knowledge. We appreciate checks and balances within the design of governments precisely because it limits the extent to which any particular leader can bind society to a Utopian vision. This gives us a very different temperament than Utopian thinkers who confidently put forward "New Deals" of various sorts to bring mankind to a more elevated state.

But even if we put aside Hayek's adjective, "Utopian," I would suggest that we not let ourselves off the hook here. Think of the adjectives you would use in describing a Utopia. I've got three in mind, and I'll pose this final question to you: *Can we in the freedom movement find the courage to be visionary, forward-thinking, and optimistic?*

I believe it's essential that we answer this question in the affirmative.

The utilitarian case for liberty is diminishing in its appeal. Part of the problem is that, as society grows more affluent (as a consequence of capitalism producing material abundance), cost-benefit analyses ring hollow.[10]

What people are hungry for is not economic efficiency, but meaning. They want their lives to be part of a noble project. The populists of left and right know this. It is why they elevate the tribal affinities of old, and why populist leaders claim to represent "the people"—with a caveat. In the words of my colleague Dr. Tom G. Palmer in *Reason*, "The key to understanding populism is that 'the people' does not include *all* the people. It excludes 'the enemies of the people,' who may be specified in various ways: foreigners, the press, minorities, financiers, the '1 percent,' or others not seen as being 'us.'"[11]

Our freedom movement must embrace the two-fold task of (1) discrediting the populists' and collectivists' road to a promised Utopia, and (2) painting our own vision of a good, just, and prosperous future toward which we strive.

The former task seems achievable, since so many Big Government plans revolve around unattractive, nanny-state paternalism, and they invariably end in economic distress.

The latter task will be more difficult, and I believe we need a great deal of soul searching within our movement to develop satisfactory ways forward. I'll share just a few ideas here.

Emphasize the need for choice. The breakthroughs we have seen in technology during this century can be helpful for reimagining how government needs to reform to enable greater personalized choice. Generations that have grown up on smartphones, who have watched Facebook go from disrupter to passé, are unlikely to stay content with a welfare state that has seen little change in a half century. Can we change the conversation by insisting on the same levels of customer choice and personalized services from government that we see in the rest of our lives? If there were a broader appreciation of the evolutionary nature of economic and social progress, it would be easy to make the case for dismantling public institutions that, for decades, have been failing the most vulnerable among us. We need to create a more compelling vision of how the public would benefit if they were less dependent on government, and more able to benefit from services offered through markets or civil society groups with greater capacity for adapting to evolving needs.

Make friends with artists. It's ironic that so many artists—who are immersed in their own creative individuality, who hustle like entrepreneurs to gain attention for their work, who often push boundaries of their art forms—feel alienated from those of us in the freedom movement who are their genuine advocates. We need more friends on the stages of comedy clubs, writing songs, making video games, and so on. I was very happy to see Cato Institute host its first art exhibition, *Freedom: Art as the Messenger*, during the summer of 2019, which is where I came across *Freedom III*, the Diana Zipeto painting that graces this book cover.[12]

Don't turn away from inequalities that matter. We need to focus our efforts on improving the lives of those struggling in poverty or otherwise marginalized by forces beyond their control. There is a temptation among members of the freedom movement to downplay the problem of "inequality," because ideologues of the left march under this banner to stoke envy and resentment as they call for government-led redistribution. Friends in the freedom movement have critiqued how the left defines the problem and proposes to solve it, but too often we come across as cold and uncaring. Yes, it is rational to address the real problem of poverty (not the statistical measures of gaps between rich and poor that we define as "inequality"), but we ignore at our peril that concerns with relative well-being and status seems to be baked into our DNA. Our movement needs to emphasize that the inequalities that matter are born from government-imposed obstacles (to education, to employment, to lucrative government contracts that seem invariably to go to political insiders).[13]

If we do this effectively, we have an opportunity to present an inclusive vision of how freedom serves the interests of ordinary citizens.

In our rhetoric we need to emphasize the universality of our philosophy and how it respects the rights, the dignity, and the capacity for responsibility of every person.

In recent remarks to celebrate the life of Donald Smith, a friend of Atlas Network who died on October 30, 2019, Tom Palmer described Smith's philanthropy as an inspiring expression of his "love for the freedom of others." The phrase comes from a 19th century Brazilian abolitionist named Joaquim Nabuco who wrote:

> "Educate your children, educate yourselves, in the love for the freedom of others, for only in this way will your own freedom not be a gratuitous gift from fate. You will be aware of its worth and will have the courage to defend it."[14]

This is the key.

As classical liberals, we appreciate how pursuing one's self-interest in a market economy creates positive results. We understand that moral claims upon successful individuals to "give back" are ill-founded. But this does not mean that our love of freedom is selfish. Rather, we embrace an enlightened *love for the freedom of others*, because of a genuine and profound respect for the capacities and creativity of each person.

Our friends at Students for Liberty updated the slogan that appeared on the Gadsden Flag of 1775 to read: "Don't Tread on Anyone." This is the foundation of the positive vision that will bring greater numbers to the freedom movement.

The timing is right. There is a worldwide revolt against political elites. Tribalism in politics has reached a fever pitch that most people find exhausting.

We can remain radical in putting forward policy prescriptions that enhance liberty—consistent with the enduring wisdom to be unconstrained by what is regarded as "politically possible"—while being moderate in our tone and emphasizing our love for the freedom of others.

As we demonstrate that our intentions include fairness and opportunities for the poor, we can be the rational center that reaches reasonable people from left and right who are growing tired of the extreme socialism and extreme nationalism that rose up during the 2010s.

If we strike that tone while continuing to uphold the basic virtues of our movement,[15] we could see our ranks swell and our influence grow. We will be able to answer the call to action that Hayek gave at the close of *The Intellectuals and Socialism*.

> "If we are to avoid such a development [the trend toward socialism], we must be able to offer a new liberal programme which appeals to the imagination. We must make the building of a free society once more an intellectual adventure, a deed of courage. What we lack is a liberal Utopia, a programme which seems neither a mere defence of things as they are nor a diluted kind of socialism, but a truly liberal radicalism which does not spare the susceptibilities of the mighty (including the trade unions), which is not too severely practical, and which does not confine itself to what appears today as politically possible.....
>
> "The main lesson which the true liberal must learn from the success of the socialists is that it was their courage to be Utopian which gained them the support of the intellectuals and

> therefore an influence on public opinion which is daily making possible what only recently seemed utterly remote… Unless we can make the philosophic foundation of a free society once more a living intellectual issue, and its implementation a task which challenges the ingenuity and imagination of our liveliest minds, the prospects of freedom are indeed dark. But if we can regain that belief in the power of ideas which was the mark of liberalism at its best, the battle is not lost. The intellectual revival of liberalism is already under way in many parts of the world. Will it be in time?"[16] (p. 26)

Hayek arrived just in time to inspire a freedom movement that vanquished an imperial communism that threatened the world in the second half of the 20th century.

We now have a diverse and growing institutionalized freedom movement that could keep at bay the new threats faced by the free society in our current century. We should be grateful to all of the visionaries who have devoted both time and treasure to the task of strengthening the freedom movement so that we can meet future challenges. Let's honor their sacrifices by staying hungry to do more for our shared cause in the days ahead.

ATLAS NETWORK PARTNER DIRECTORY

Atlas Network updates an online Global Directory of partner organizations on a quarterly basis. As of January 2020, 502 active partners are listed. The following list is organized regionally: Africa (Sub-Saharan), Australia & New Zealand, Canada, East Asia & Pacific, Europe & Central Asia; Latin America & Caribbean; Middle East & North Africa; South Asia; and the United States.

Visit AtlasNetwork.org for the latest list and links to the websites of all current partners.

AFRICA (SUB-SAHARAN)

Centre For Development and Enterprises Great Lakes (Burundi)
Nkafu Policy Institute (Cameroon)
Teachings of Entrepreneurship on Antipoverty Movement (Ethiopia)
IMANI Center for Policy and Education (Ghana)
Institute for Liberty and Policy Innovation (Ghana)
Institute of Economic Affairs - Ghana (Ghana)
Audace Institut Afrique (Ivory Coast)
Libre Afrique (Ivory Coast)
African Students For Liberty (Kenya)
Freedom and Citizenship (Mauritania)
Chevauchee Foundation (Namibia)
African Objectivist Movement (Nigeria)
Ominira Initiative for Economic Advancement (Nigeria)
Centre for Development and Enterprise (South Africa)
Free Market Foundation (South Africa)
South African Institute of Race Relations (South Africa)
Students' Organization for Liberty and Entrepreneurship (South Sudan)
Liberty Sparks & Tanzania Students for Liberty (Tanzania)
Action for Liberty and Economic Development (Uganda)
Coalition for Market and Liberal Solutions (Zimbabwe)

AUSTRALIA & NEW ZEALAND

Australian Institute for Progress (Australia)
Australian Taxpayers' Alliance (Australia)
The Centre for Independent Studies (Australia)
Institute of Public Affairs (Australia)
LibertyWorks (Australia)

Mannkal Economic Education Foundation (Australia)
New Zealand Taxpayers' Union (New Zealand)
The New Zealand Initiative (New Zealand)

CANADA

Alberta Institute
Canadian Constitution Foundation
Canadians for Democracy & Prosperity
Canadian Taxpayers Federation
Fraser Institute
Frontier Centre for Public Policy
Institute for Liberal Studies
Justice Centre for Constitutional Freedoms
Macdonald-Laurier Institute
Manning Centre for Building Democracy
Montreal Economic Institute
World Taxpayers Associations

EAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Mekong Research Center (Cambodia)
The Babel Institute (China)
The Ronald Coase Center for the Study of the Economy at Zhejiang University (China)
Fuping Development Institute (China)
I, Pencil Institute (China)
Shanghai Institute of Finance and Law (China)
Lion Rock Institute (Hong Kong)
Center for Indonesian Policy Studies (Indonesia)
Institut Demokrasi dan Kesejahteraan Sosial (Indonesia)
Suara Kebebasan (Indonesia)
The Indonesian Institute, Center for Public Policy Research (Indonesia)
Japanese for Tax Reform (Japan)
Institute for Democracy and Economic Affairs: IDEAS (Malaysia)
Institute for Leadership and Development Studies (Malaysia)
Islam & Liberty Network (Malaysia)
Silk Road Foundation (Mongolia)
Foundation for Economic Freedom (Philippines)
Adam Smith Centre (Singapore)
Teach North Korean Refugees Global Education Center (South Korea)
DoiMoi.org (Vietnam)
Economica Vietnam (Vietnam)

Market Solutions Research Center for Social and Economic Issues (Vietnam)

EUROPE & CENTRAL ASIA

Institute for Public Policy and Good Governance (Albania)
Austrian Economics Center (Austria)
Hayek Institut (Austria)
Public Association Discussion and Analytical Society "Liberal Club" (Belarus)
Scientific Research Mises Center (Belarus)
European Centre for International Political Economy (Belgium)
European Policy Information Center (Belgium)
Ludwig von Mises Institute-Europe (Belgium)
Association "Multi" (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
Center for the Advancement of Free Enterprise (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
Liberalni Forum (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
Access to Information Programme Foundation (Bulgaria)
Bulgarian Libertarian Society (Bulgaria)
Institute for Market Economics (Bulgaria)
Centre for Public Policy and Economic Analysis (Croatia)
Lipa Taxpayers Association (Croatia)
CEVRO Institute (Czech Republic)
Civic Institute: Občanský Institut (Czech Republic)
Liberální institut (Czech Republic)
Paralelní Polis (Czech Republic)
Center for Politiske Studier (Denmark)
Justitia (Denmark)
Centre for Free Economic Thought (Estonia)
Libera Foundation (Finland)
Association pour la Liberte Economique et le Progres Social (France)
Contribuables Associes (France)
Fondation iFRAP (France)
Generation Libre (France)
Institut Coppet (France)
Institut de Formation Politique (France)
Institut des Libertes (France)
Institut Economique Molinari (France)
Institute for Economic Studies - Europe (France)
Institute for Research in Economic and Fiscal Issues (France)
Liberaux.org (France)
Knowledge Fund (Georgia)

New Economic School – Georgia (Georgia)
Centrum für Europaeische Politik (Germany)
Cologne Institute for Economic Research (Germany)
Freedom Today Network (Germany)
Friedrich A. von Hayek Society (Germany)
Network for Constitutional Economics and Social Philosophy (Germany)
Prometheus - Das Freiheitsinstitut (Germany)
Walter Eucken Institut (Germany)
Center for Liberal Studies – KEFiM (Greece)
Greek Liberties Monitor (Greece)
Free Market Foundation (Hungary)
Paradigm Institute (Hungary)
Andriki (Iceland)
Icelandic Research Centre for Innovation and Economic Growth (Iceland)
Libertarian Society of Iceland (Iceland)
Edmund Burke Institute (Ireland)
Istituto Acton (Italy)
Istituto Bruno Leoni (Italy)
Lodi Liberale (Italy)
Think-in (Italy)
Tocqueville-Acton Centro Studi e Ricerche (Italy)
MOST Business Incubator (Kazakhstan)
Central Asian Free Market Institute (Kyrgyzstan)
European Center of Austrian Economics Foundation (Liechtenstein)
Lithuanian Free Market Institute (Lithuania)
Moldovan Economic Freedom Institute "Milton Friedman" (Moldova)
LIBERTANIA - Center for Contemporary Politics (North Macedonia)
OHRID Institute for Economic Strategies and International Affairs (North Macedonia)
Civita (Norway)
Forum Obywatelskiego Rozwoju (Poland)
Freedom and Entrepreneurship Foundation (Poland)
Fundacja Liberte! (Poland)
Instytut Libertatis (Poland)
Koliber Association (Poland)
Kultura Liberalna Foundation (Poland)
Mises Institute of Economic Education (Poland)
Polish-American Foundation for Economic Research and Education (Poland)
Warsaw Enterprise Institute (Poland)

Institute for Political Studies (Portugal)
Center of Institutional Analysis and Development Eleutheria (Romania)
CISED (Romania)
Adam Smith Center for Market Economy (Russia)
Hayek Institute (Russia)
Balkan Objectivist Center (Serbia)
Center for Anti-Authoritarian Studies (Serbia)
Libertarijanski klub - Libek (Serbia)
Conservative Institute of M.R. Stefanik (Slovakia)
F.A. Hayek Foundation (Slovakia)
Institute of Economic and Social Studies (Slovakia)
Institute of Political and Economic Education (Slovakia)
Institut Karantanija (Slovenia)
Visio Institute (Slovenia)
Centro Diego de Covarrubias (Spain)
Civismo (Spain)
Foro Regulación Inteligente (Spain)
Foundation for the Advancement of Liberty (Spain)
Fundación Internacional para la Libertad (Spain)
Fundación para el Análisis y los Estudios Sociales (Spain)
Institución Futuro (Spain)
Instituto Atlántico de Gobierno S.L. (Spain)
Instituto Juan de Mariana (Spain)
Red Floridablanca (Spain)
Free Trade Europa (Sweden)
Centrum för Rättvisa (Sweden)
The Ratio Institute (Sweden)
Timbro (Sweden)
Avenir Suisse (Switzerland)
Liberales Institut (Switzerland)
Tajikistan Free Market Center (Tajikistan)
Association for Liberal Thinking (Turkey)
Freedom Research Association (Turkey)
3H Hareketi (Turkey)
Syrian Economic Forum (Turkey)
Bendukidze Free Market Center (Ukraine)
CASE Ukraine (Ukraine)
Centre for Economic Strategy (Ukraine)
EasyBusiness (Ukraine)
Ekonomichna Pravda (Ukraine)
Institute for Economic Research and Policy Consulting (Ukraine)

Ukrainian Economic Freedoms Foundation (Ukraine)
Ukrainian Students for Freedom (Ukraine)
Adam Smith Institute (United Kingdom)
Ayn Rand Centre (United Kingdom)
Big Brother Watch (United Kingdom)
Centre for Policy Studies (United Kingdom)
Centre for Welsh Studies (United Kingdom)
Civitas: The Institute for the Study of Civil Society (United Kingdom)
Cobden Centre (United Kingdom)
Conservatives for Liberty (United Kingdom)
The Freedom Association (United Kingdom)
Geneva Network (United Kingdom)
Institute of Economic Affairs (United Kingdom)
Institute of International Monetary Research (United Kingdom)
John Locke Institute (United Kingdom)
Legatum Institute (United Kingdom)
Network for a Free Society (United Kingdom)
Open Europe (United Kingdom)
The TaxPayers' Alliance (United Kingdom)

LATIN AMERICA & THE CARIBBEAN

Ayn Rand Center Latin America (Argentina)
Fundación Atlas para una Sociedad Libre (Argentina)
Fundación Bases (Argentina)
Fundación Centro para la Apetura y el Desarrollo de America Latina (Argentina)
Fundación Club de la Libertad (Argentina)
Fundación Educación para el Futuro y la Responsibilidad Intelectual (Argentina)
Fundación Federalismo y Libertad (Argentina)
Fundación Libertad (Argentina)
Fundación Libertad y Progreso (Argentina)
Instituto Acton (Argentina)
Nosotros los Contribuyentes (Argentina)
Nassau Institute (Bahamas)
Centro de Estudios de la Realidad Económica y Social (Bolivia)
Fundación Nueva Democracia (Bolivia)
Instituto de Ciencia, Economía, Educación y Salud(Bolivia)
Libera Bolivia (Bolivia)
Centro Mackenzie de Liberdade Economica (Brazil)
ILISP - Instituto Liberal de São Paulo (Brazil)

Instituto Atlantos (Brazil)
Instituto de Estudos Empresariais - IEE (Brazil)
Instituto de Formação de Líderes de Belo Horizonte (Brazil)
Instituto de Formação de Líderes de Santa Catarina (Brazil)
Instituto de Formação de Líderes de São Paulo (Brazil)
Instituto Liberal (Brazil)
Instituto Liberdade (Brazil)
Instituto Lideres do Amanha (Brazil)
Instituto Millenium (Brazil)
Instituto Mises Brasil (Brazil)
Livres (Brazil)
Students For Liberty Brasil (Brazil)
Centro de Estudios Públicos (Chile)
Centro de Investigación de Empresa (Chile)
Círculo Acton Chile (Chile)
Ciudadano Austral (Chile)
Fundación Instituto Res Publica (Chile)
Fundación Libertad y Desarrollo (Chile)
Fundación Nueva Mente (Chile)
Fundación P!ensa (Chile)
Fundación País Justo (Chile)
Fundación para el Progreso Chile (Chile)
Horizontal (Chile)
Instituto de Estudios de la Sociedad (Chile)
Instituto Ideas Republicanas (Chile)
Leadership Institute Chile (Chile)
Centro de Innovación y Liderazgo (Colombia)
Corporación Pensamiento Siglo XXI (Colombia)
Instituto de Ciencia Política Hernán Echavarría Olózaga (Colombia)
Asociación de Consumidores Libres (Costa Rica)
Asociación Instituto Libertad y Desarrollo Humano (Costa Rica)
Asociación Nacional de Fomento Económico (Costa Rica)
Instituto de Desarrollo Empresarial y Acción Social (Costa Rica)
The Democracy Lab (Costa Rica)
Centro Regional de Estrategias Económicas Sostenibles, Inc. (Dominican Republic)
Instituto OMG (Dominican Republic)
Fundación Ecuador Libre (Ecuador)
Instituto Ecuatoriano de Economía Política (Ecuador)
CREO (El Salvador)
Fundación Salvadoreña para el Desarrollo Eonomico y Social (El Salvador)

Movimiento 300 (El Salvador)
Center for Economic and Social Studies (Guatemala)
Centro de Investigación Economicas Nacionales (Guatemala)
Fundación para el Desarrollo de Guatemala (Guatemala)
Guatemala Inmortal (Guatemala)
Instituto Fe y Libertad (Guatemala)
N'ap sove Ayiti (Haiti)
Fundación Eléutera (Honduras)
Fundación para la Libertad Económica (Honduras)
Caribbean Policy Research Institute Limited (Jamaica)
Caminos de la Libertad (Mexico)
Instituto de Pensamiento Estratégico Ágora A.C.(Mexico)
Instituto Mexicano para la Competitividad A.C. (Mexico)
México Evalúa, Centro de Análisis de Políticas Públicas A.C. (Mexico)
Fundación Libertad (Panama)
ISA, Instituto de estudios para una Sociedad Abierta (Panama)
Asociación de Contribuyentes del Peru (Peru)
Contribuyentes Por Respeto (Peru)
Democracy & Development International (Peru)
Hiperderecho (Peru)
Instituto Invertir (Peru)
Instituto Libertad y Democracia (Peru)
Instituto Peruano de Economía (Peru)
Instituto Político para la Libertad (Peru)
Lampadia (Peru)
Latin American and Iberian Law and Economics Association (Peru)
Center for the Study of Contemporary Open Societies (Uruguay)
Centro de Economía, Sociedad y Empresa (Uruguay)
Centro de Estudios de la Realidad Económica y Social (Uruguay)
Centro de Estudios para el Desarrollo (Uruguay)
Centro de Divulgacion del Conocimiento Economico para la Libertad (Venezuela)
Econintech (Venezuela)
Forma, Formación y Acción (Venezuela)
Instituto Libre Desarrollo (Venezuela)
Liderazgo y Visión (Venezuela)

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

The Egyptian Center For Public Policy Studies (Egypt)
Israeli Freedom Movement & The Ayn Rand Center (Israel)
Jerusalem Institute for Market Studies (Israel)

Tacharut - The Movement for Freedom of Employment (Israel)
The Israel Center for Social and Economic Progress (Israel)
Lebanese Institute for Market Studies (Lebanon)
Arab Center for Scientific Research and Humane Studies (Morocco)
Minbar al Hurriya (Morocco)
Pal-Think for Strategic Studies (Palestinian Territories)

SOUTH ASIA

Afghanistan Economic and Legal Studies Organization (Afghanistan)
The White Social Organization (Afghanistan)
Centre for Civil Society (India)
Centre for Public Policy Research (India)
Bikalpa- an Alternative (Nepal)
Hriti Foundation (Nepal)
Pokhara Research Center (Nepal)
Samriddhi Foundation (Nepal)
Alternate Solutions Institute (Pakistan)
Policy Research Institute of Market Economy (Pakistan)
The TAU Institute (Pakistan)
Advocata Institute (Sri Lanka)

UNITED STATES

Acton Institute
Americans for Tax Reform Foundation
American Transparency - OpenTheBooks
Archbridge Institute
Arizona Center for the Philosophy of Freedom
Arkansas Center for Research in Economics
Arkansas Policy Foundation
Atlas Society
Ayn Rand Institute
Badger Institute
Beacon Center of Tennessee
Beacon Hill Institute
Becket
Benjamin Rush Institute
Better Cities Project
Bill of Rights Institute
Blackstone & Burke Center for Law & Liberty
Bluegrass Institute for Public Policy Solutions
Buckeye Institute

Caesar Rodney Institute
California Policy Center
Calvin Coolidge Presidential Foundation
Capital Research Center
Cardinal Institute for West Virginia Policy
Cascade Policy Institute
Cato Institute
Center for Economic Accountability
Center for Freedom and Prosperity Foundation
Center for Independent Thought
Center for Public Choice & Market Process
Center for the Study of Liberty, Inc.
Center of the American Experiment
Centro para Renovación Económica, Crecimiento y Excelencia
Certell, Inc.
Charter Cities Institute
Citizens' Council for Health Freedom
Civitas Institute
Claremont Institute
Clemson Institute for the Study of Capitalism
Common Sense Policy Roundtable
Commonwealth Foundation
Compact for America Educational Foundation, Inc.
Competitive Enterprise Institute
Conscious Capitalism
Consumer Choice Center
Economic Thinking
EdChoice
Ed Snider Center for Enterprise & Markets
E Foundation for Oklahoma
Empire Center
Energy and Environment Legal Institute
Estudiantes por la Libertad - SFL
Ethan Allen Institute
European Students For Liberty
Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy Studies
First Liberty Institute
Foundation for Economic Education
Foundation for Excellence in Education
Foundation for Government Accountability
Foundation for Individual Rights in Education
Foundation for Research on Economics and the Environment

Foundation for Research on Equal Opportunity
Franklin News Foundation
The Freedom & Virtue Institute
Freedom Foundation
Freedom Foundation of Minnesota
Free the People Foundation
Free To Choose Network
Friends of UFM
The Fund for American Studies
Future of Freedom Foundation
Galen Institute
Garden State Initiative, Inc.
Genetic Literacy Project
Georgia Center for Opportunity
Georgia Public Policy Foundation
Goldwater Institute
Granite Institute
Grassroot Institute of Hawaii
Heartland Institute
Heritage Foundation
Hoover Institution
Hudson Institute
Human Rights Foundation
Idaho Freedom Foundation, Inc.
Ideas Beyond Borders
Illinois Policy Institute
Independence Institute
Independent Institute
Independent Women's Forum
Institute for Faith, Work & Economics
Institute for Faith & Freedom at Grove City College
Institute for Free Speech
Institute for Humane Studies
Institute for Justice
Institute for Policy Innovation
Institute for Principle Studies
Institute for Spending Reform
Intercollegiate Studies Institute, Inc.
James G. Martin Center for Academic Renewal
James Madison Institute
John Jay Institute
John Locke Foundation

Junior Achievement- Rocky Mountain
Just Facts Foundation
Kansas Policy Institute
Ladies of Liberty Alliance
Language of Liberty Institute
Law & Economics Center at George Mason University
Leadership Institute
Let Grow, Inc
The Libertarian Institute
Libertas Institute
Liberty Fund
Liberty International
Liberty Justice Center
Lincoln Network
Lucy Burns Institute
MacIver Institute
Mackinac Center for Public Policy
Madison Liberty Institute
Maine Heritage Policy Center
Manhattan Institute for Policy Research
Maryland Public Policy Institute
Mercatus Center
Miller Upton Program at Beloit College
Mississippi Center for Public Policy
Mont Pelerin Society
Mountain States Legal Foundation
Moving Picture Institute
Music for Liberty
National Center for Public Policy Research
National Review Institute
National Taxpayers Union
Nevada Policy Research Institute
New Civil Liberties Alliance
Niskanen Center
Oklahoma Council of Public Affairs, Inc.
Pacific Legal Foundation
Pacific Research Institute
Palmetto Promise Institute
Pelican Institute for Public Policy
Philadelphia Society
Philanthropy Roundtable
Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research

Platte Institute
The Policy Circle
Property and Environment Research Center
Reason Foundation
R Street Institute
Rio Grande Foundation
Show-Me Institute
Smock Media
Social Evolution
South Carolina Policy Council
Speech First
Startup Societies Foundation
State Policy Network
Steamboat Institute
Students For Liberty
Sutherland Institute
Taliesin Nexus
Tax Foundation
Taxpayer Education Foundation
Taxpayers Protection Alliance
TechFreedom
Texas Public Policy Foundation
Think Freely Media
Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy
Truth in Accounting
Virginia Institute for Public Policy
Washington Policy Center
We Do Better
Wisconsin Institute for Law & Liberty
Yankee Institute for Public Policy, Inc.
Young America's Foundation
Young Americans for Liberty Foundation
Young Voices

ENDNOTES

1 F.A. Hayek, *The Intellectuals and Socialism* (London: The IEA Health and Welfare Unit, 1998), p. 26.

2 Jefferson to Edward Carrington, 27 May, 1788, available at https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/01-13-02-0120

3 Henry Mayer, *All on Fire: William Lloyd Garrison and the Abolition of Slavery* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), p. 120.

4 Edward J. López's "Exchange Opportunities Between Think Tanks and Academia: Symbiosis in the Intellectual Structure of Production" (first draft, as presented at the 2016 General Meeting of the Mont Pelerin Society) draws a line through observations made by John Stuart Mill, John Maynard Keynes, F.A. Hayek, and Milton Friedman to describe this "supply chain model" for understanding the structure of production of ideas.

5 F.A. Hayek, p. 10.

6 *20 Years of Economic Dissent*, Institute of Economic Affairs, 1977, page 12

7 Ibid., page 15.

8 Lyall Swim, "Can Think Tanks Create the Inevitable," https://www.atlasnetwork.org/news/article/can-think-tanks-create-the-inevitable

9 The phrase refers to a popular conception, developed by the late Joseph Overton of Mackinac Center for Public Policy, of how politicians operate within a window that contains a range of policy options that a politician can recommended while retaining popular support. Some think tanks champion policy solutions within the Overton Window; most Atlas Network partners seek to move the Overton Window so pro-liberty policies gain acceptability and improve their odds of implementation.

10 James M. Buchanan's "The Soul of Classical Liberalism" (*The Independent Review*, v.V.,n.1, Summer 2000, pp. 111-119) makes this point while renewing the call, as Hayek did, for an overarching vision of the free society we are working to build

11 Dr. Tom G. Palmer, "The Terrifying Rise of Authoritarian Populism," *Reason* (Aug/Sept 2019)

12 Cato Institute has a video on the exhibition, curated by Harriet Lesser and June Linowitz, at: https://www.cato.org/multimedia/cato-video/freedom-art-messenger

13 I expound on this theme at greater length in an article called "Beyond Greed and Envy, Beyond Right and Left," published by Atlas Network on January 7, 2019. See: https://www.atlasnetwork.org/news/article/beyond-greed-and-envy-beyond-right-and-left

14 Joaquim Nabuco, *Abolitionism: The Brazilian Antislavery Struggle*, trans. and ed. by Robert Conrad (1883; Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1977),

p. 172. (In Conrad's translation, thus: "Let them educate their children—indeed, let them educate themselves—to enjoy the freedom of others without which their own liberty will be a chance gift of destiny. Let them acquire the knowledge that freedom is worth possessing, and let them attain the courage to defend it.")

15 By this, I mean to suggest that it's critical that the freedom movement (1) remain independent of vested interests; (2) remain anchored to genuine scholarship in the pursuit of Truth; (3) preserve a non-partisan spirit of being willing to promote the principles, rather than the parties or the persons who profess to embrace them, sometimes falsely.

16 Hayek, page 26.

17 *20 Years of Economic Dissent*, Institute of Economic Affairs, 1977, page 12

18 Ibid., page 15.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

BRAD LIPS

Brad Lips is the chief executive officer of Atlas Network, which increases global prosperity by strengthening a network of independent partner organizations that promote individual freedom and are committed to identifying and removing barriers to human flourishing. Lips joined the organization in 1998, and since becoming CEO in 2009, has overseen significant organizational growth that has more than doubled the budget and created new opportunities for freedom and prosperity for more than 500 partners in 98 countries.

Lips is a sought-after speaker on five continents and regularly shares his expertise on poverty reduction, free enterprise, organizational leadership, and achieving growth and impact in the marketplace of ideas. His work has been published in *Regulation, National Review Online, Investor's Business Daily, The Daily Caller, Forbes, Fox News, American Spectator, American Thinker, and RealClearPolitics*.

Lips received his MBA from Emory University's Goizueta Business School and his undergraduate degree from Princeton University. He is a member of the John Templeton Foundation, Templeton World Charity Foundation, and Templeton Religion Trust, and serves on the boards of directors of the American Friends of the Institute of Economic Affairs and the Institute of Economic Studies - Europe. As a member of the Mont Pelerin Society, Lips chaired the Organizing Committee of its General Meeting in Miami, Florida in 2016. Prior to joining Atlas Network, Lips co-founded an Internet start-up, conducted equity research for Smith Barney, Inc., and worked in a policy research capacity for the Progress & Freedom Foundation.

To request that Lips speak to your organization, please contact Melissa Mann, Atlas Network's Vice President of Communications, at Melissa.Mann@atlasnetwork.org.

THE FREEDOM MOVEMENT

ITS PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

Whether you are new to the freedom movement or a long-time fellow traveler, you'll find insights in this monograph on Atlas Network's worldwide project to protect and enhance the freedom of others.

From his perspective of twenty years with Atlas Network—which serves as a hub for more than 500 organizations in the U.S. and nearly 100 other countries—Brad Lips provides analysis of the freedom movement's past, shares statistics about its present, and asks questions that will determine its future.