

a welfare-state Trojan Horse prepared for us by Left-Libertarians and deluded conservatives. The voucher plan, which received fervent and indeed hysterical endorsements from the entire media panoply of left-libertarians and neoconservatives, was totally crushed by a vote of 70 to 30 percent, losing in every one of California's 58 counties. The voucher scheme would have brought the private schools of the state under government control, but the measure was defeated because affluent suburbanites—the heart of the California electorate—came to realize that the voucher scheme was an updated compulsory school busing plan, that would have wrecked the fairly workable suburban schools by compelling them to accept inner-city youth who are often ineducable and criminals to boot. Indeed, a major credit for defeating the voucher Prop. 174 should go to our own Lew Rockwell, who, in a widely read article in the *L.A. Times*, clued the suburbanites to the dangers of school vouchers. Note, for example, this rueful retrospective on the defeat by ardent voucher supporter, Left-Libertarian Alan W. Bock, writing in the once hard-core libertarian, now neocon, *Orange County Register*:

"Even in Orange County, where voters might be expected to be philosophically friendly...[to vouchers]—but where the government schools do seem to be several notches above the quality of those schools in south-central Los Angeles and the rest of the state—a majority voted against giving parents in other parts of

the state a fighting chance to opt out of the failing government system."

Giving parents "a fighting chance" is of course a euphemism for welfare payments extracted from long-suffering taxpayers. In a free society, there is no call for "vouchers" or for "expanding choice" by robbing taxpayers. The only good "voucher" is a dollar, a dollar that one can spend on any desired good or service, but of course the dollar, in a free society, must be earned by one's own merits, and not gained by robbing productive taxpayers. No one deserves more of a "choice" or a "chance" or "voucher" than he has earned on the market by productive effort.

Bock goes on with this re-creation that reeks of welfareism and egalitarianism at its most blatant:

"It's a sad but true aspect of the nature of most human beings that if they don't feel a sense of crisis about their own particular circumstances, it's hard to develop the kind of empathy with those in worse circumstances that will impel people to act to relieve those others."

Scratch a "libertarian" these days, and you will find... a leftist. ■

Bosnian Update: No Peace, No Peace-Keeping

by M.N.R.

The quintessential craziness of the Bosnian situation is em-

bodied in this paradox: we are forced to cheer because the peace agreement failed in Bosnia, while the bloody conflict continues and expands. Why? Because our top priority is keeping U.S. troops out of the mess, and Slick Willie is pledged to send 25,000 U.S. troops into Bosnia *as soon as* a peace agreement is signed. The troops would be there to "keep the peace," whatever that may mean, and so that means no peace, no "peacekeeping" troops. No peace for Bosnia, means no war for the U.S.A.

The UN mediators had worked out a peace agreement, which the Croats, and the Bosnian Serbs, finally signed. The Serbs signed with great reluctance, for they would have had to give up the greater chunk of the Bosnian land that the Serbs had won on the ground, and cede it to the Muslim central government. But the Serbs were willing to sacrifice to end the crippling U.S./UN economic embargo, and to get the international force off their backs. For a while it looked as if the 25,000 American boys would indeed be shipped to police the Bosnian hell-hole. But fortunately, the Muslim authorities, after dancing around the issue, angrily turned down the peace agreement at the last minute, griping that they would not sign unless and until the evil Serbs were forced to give up all of the territory they had won by force of arms.

While good for the cause of U.S. non-intervention, however, the Bosnian Muslims acted like the spoiled fools that they are. Why did we at RRR hail the Bosnian Serbs when *they* failed

to sign an imposed peace, while we scorn the Muslims for a similar act? Because the Serbs were heroes, defying all of world Received Opinion, and willing to take on the rest of the world for what they believed to be simple justice. Whereas the Muslims only wish to resume their coerced imperial domination of Bosnian Serbs, and to do so, not in defiance of World opinion, but in an attempt to pressure the US/UN to pull Muslim chestnuts out of the fire. The nature of their defiance is the reverse of the Serbian; the Bosnian Muslims are not heroes, but poltroons.

Since the Bosnian Muslim failure to sign, the cause of non-intervention is looking better and better. For now it has become all too clear that all three religious-ethnic groups are avidly engaging in "ethnic cleansing." The Croats and Muslims are battling each other fiercely. The dread Croat HVO has been happily killing Muslims, and now the Muslims have been pushing back Croats in central and southern Bosnia, and have been eagerly doing a lot of cleansing themselves. But if everybody's doin' it, then Americans find themselves incapable of intervening. For the American psyche is such that, in any given conflict, there has got to be only

The Muslims wish to resume their coerced imperial domination of Bosnian Serbs.

one set of demonized Bad Guys, cruelly victimizing one or more sets of Good Guys. Given one Bad Guy, Americans can psych themselves up to intervene for "Peace" and Justice, preferably heading some sort of international coalition of Good Guys, so that Americans can talk themselves into thinking that they are not being imperialist warmongers. But given a ferocious conflict among three sets of Guys, each of whom is Bad, and Americans are stopped in their tracks. Varying shades of gray do not make up the stuff of self-righteous Global Crusades.

In the meanwhile, while the Bosnian Muslim authorities are whining for world opinion about the perils of the coming winter, one wing of Bosnian Muslims is still enjoying unprecedented prosperity and peace with their neighbors. At the far western tip of Bosnia lies the Bihac district, an isolated Muslim pocket around the city of Bihac, totally surrounded by Serbs and Croats. One would think that these Muslims would have been all wiped out by now, and yet they are doing just fine, thank you. The reason: they are led by an uncommonly shrewd and far-sighted Muslim businessman, Fikret Abdic. Abdic has kept the peace with the

Muslims' neighbors, and the Bihac pocket has prospered from a series of deals that Abdic has made with Serbs and Croats in the surrounding territory. Among all the Bosnian Muslim leaders, Abdic has been alone in denouncing the imperial ambitions and warmongering of the Muslim authorities in Sarajevo, led by the implacable Alija Izetbegovic. When the Izetbegovic regime insisted on defying the peace agreement, Abdic announced that he had had enough, and proclaimed a new, secessionist Independent Republic of Muslim Bihac. Promptly, the despotic and centralizing Izetbegovic regime sent Muslim troops out to crush the Bihac secessionists, who have organized guerrilla troops to defend themselves from their fellow-Muslims.

The irony: the Muslims of Bihac are in grave danger, not from the supposedly evil Croats or the more evil Serbs, but from their own co-religionists of the tyrannical Sarejevo regime! Let the neocons and the other Global Interventionists try to make some sense out of that! ■

**Our
Libertarianism,
and Theirs
by Justin Raimondo**

The process of researching and writing *Reclaiming the American Right* was, for me, a revelation. In searching through libraries and second-hand bookshops for evidence of the lost