

article on "The New Fusionism" in the *May Chronicles* of the way the Establishment will eventually dispose of its current conservative allies, applies in spades to how they will get rid of whichever Left-Libertarians have managed to Make It in the current political climate.

Fleming writes: "they [the "official conservatives"] have established a cozy relationship with the leftist establishment media who recognize them for what they are: safe and well-groomed lapdogs who bark but never bite. When the day comes that they are no longer needed, the conservatives will be treated like a lower-class sweetheart picked up for a summer affair. I only hope they're given carfare for the long ride home back to their side of town." Considering their social status and their cultural values, I'm sure that the Left-Libertarians will neither expect nor receive carfare. They'll be happy with the right to hitch-hike.

The Road To Rome?

by M.N.R.

The hottest new rumor among Left-Libertarians is that I have taken "The Vows," that is, that I have joined the Catholic Church. The hottest new rumor among neo-cons is that Paul Gottfried has just done likewise. Paul and I have put our heads together and agreed that that is the best single reason yet for signing up.

What's with these dingbats? It says a great deal about the mentality of these people — both Left-Libertarian and the neo-con wing of The Enemy, who are in so many

ways brothers and sisters under the skin. First, it shows that, for them, joining the Catholic Church is just about the worst thing you can say about your enemy. Why is that? Why, for them, should becoming a Catholic be the ultimate in disgrace? What deep-structure motivation accounts for this curious phenomenon? As for me, I for one do not consider becoming a Catholic on a par with becoming a child molester; on the contrary, I consider it an honorable course. Presumably, one reason for this rumor is that in recent years I have been championing the role of Christianity in human affairs, and in particular that of the original and continuing Christian Church — known inaccurately to most people as "Roman Catholic." Apparently, these Modals, Randians and post-Randians to the man, are incapable of understanding how anyone could be appreciative of the Christian Church without actually having been converted — or, in their eyes, snatched up, something like the invasion of the body snatchers. How could I, a non-believer, become an ardent fan of Christianity? Because, unlike the Modals, whose world-view has evidently been frozen in aspic for decades in the middle of *Atlas Shrugged*, I've learned something over the years.

I am the last person to decry gossip, but it's amazing how much time and energy Modals spend on inventing, contemplating, or spreading rumors. But why not? After all, they've got nothing else to do.

Well, I might as well let you Modals in on it; the Pope has decided to make me a Cardinal *in pectore*. When the time is right, he

will disclose this appointment to the world. Remember: you heard it first here. ●

Contra Don Feder

by M.N.R.

The latest neo-con tactic on the neo-paleo split is to deny that such a split within conservatism exists. *Everyone* is supposedly on the side of the neo-cons, except of course Pat Buchanan, who has apparently created the split within his own fevered imagination. What about the rest of us? As Rand used to say: Blankout.

Conservative columnist Don Feder is the latest to weigh in with this tactic (*Boston Herald*, May 9). Like so many others, Don was horrified at Pat's column quoting Paul Gottfried's now famous article in *RRR*, "Scrambling for Funds." So what about *us*? Feder dismisses us as just simply, terribly *obscure*. Poor Paul Gottfried is so obscure, he doesn't have to be named; Feder only mentions that Paul teaches in an "obscure" college. Feder also sneers at *RRR*'s circulation. Not very long ago, conservatives, in a small minority among opinion molders, did not consider small circulation a badge of shame; almost the contrary. But now that the neo-con-run conservative movement is all over the media, Numbers become the criterion for being taken seriously.

And yet Feder, a former Randian and therefore a long-time enemy of libertarians, can't resist the occasion to fulminate against obscure me at some length, despite our "*Tropical Fish Quarterly*-sized circulation." His major indictment is that, horrors! I favor

legalizing prostitution and hard drugs. Feder, his world these days gravitating somewhere between Norman Podhoretz and Bill Bennett, does not seem to realize that not only does virtually every free-market economist advocate drug (and presumably prostitution) legalization, but that so do almost all economists of any persuasion. I am the last person in the world to cite the word of economists as a final authority, but at least Feder should realize that these views are not bizarre or outlandish except in the small corner of the world that he inhabits.

Feder, dredging up the Soviet threat once more, accuses me of being opposed to national defense and advocating massive guerrilla warfare a la *Red Dawn* against any possible Soviet invasion. Well yes, Don, I do strongly favor the right to bear arms, and I do believe it impossible for a government to tyrannize any population where the people are armed to the teeth. And yes I *did* like *Red Dawn*, which was brown-baited by all left-wing critics. And by the way, Don old boy, where do *you* stand on gun control? Since both the Randians and the neo-cons tend to favor gun control, what do *you* say about it? Or are you going to say that only Pat Buchanan and a few of us "laissez-faire utopians"

**And yes, I
did like
Red Dawn,
which
was
brown-
baited by
all left-
wing
critics.**

are opposed to gun control, and stand foursquare on the Second Amendment?

Pat Buchanan of course cannot be dismissed by Feder as some obscure turkey, since obviously Buchanan's circulation and audience is gigantic as compared to Don Feder's. So what does Feder do to dismiss Buchanan? Ah, of course, what else? He dredges up the old anti-anti-Semitic ploy, except that *he* is even more hysterical about it than Weisberg, Muravchik, and the rest of the crew. Feder goes so far as to liken Pat's positions as akin to "the collected correspondence of Adolf Eichmann and

Julius Streicher." To paraphrase Don Feder's former guru Ayn Rand, it almost makes one wish that Don would meet up with people like Eichmann, Streicher, et al. personally, and find out the difference between them and Pat "on his own hide."

Feder protests that, unlike neocons, he supported Goldwater rather than Humphrey or Johnson in 1964. He's right about that; in those days, he was a Randian. In later days, he found religion, and came to support various theocratic policies. Lew Rockwell has the last word on this phenomenon. "The only thing worse than a Randian," says Lew,

"is a Randian who has Found Religion and stayed a Randian."

Burt Blumert just reminds me that Feder had his own newsletter in the 1970s, *First Principles*, but the Randian rag went out of business because he couldn't get any subscribers. So much for the *Tropical Fish Quarterly!* •

The Molestitarian Party?

by Llewellyn H.
Rockwell, Jr.

A few years ago, a friend of mine was invited to dinner at the home of a top Libertarian theorist and psychiatrist. The evening was disrupted, however, as the doctor's small boy ran through the house screaming that he hated his father. As it turned out, the kid had a point.

The psychiatrist explained to my friend that since children have the same rights as adults, it would be immoral for him to force his son to go to bed.

After all, he related, you can't force your next-door neighbor to go to sleep just because you think it's good for him. As a Libertarian, he could only try to persuade his child. The persuasion hadn't worked, but that was the price of liberty.

The doctor went on to tell my friend about the moral dilemma he'd faced as a new parent: his baby hated having his diaper changed. Since we can't force our next-door neighbor to change his clothes, can we force