

problem is why we let so many vegetables receive useless care for so long." The problem, opines Schwartz, is that our health insurance systems, private as well as public, are "too mindlessly generous." Schwartz concludes: "The time to end this idiocy is now." (*USA Today*, May 30).

Our final specimen is Derek Humphry, head of the Hemlock Society, the most venerable of the right to suicide groups, and careful up to now to stress consent. Where does he stand on the case of Helga Wanglie? Humphry begins by saying that patients "should always have the right of choice to live or die," and if they are in a persistent vegetative state, their families should decide. OK, so what about Helga Wanglie? Here is Humphry's new and contradictory position: "If overwhelming medical opinion says treatment is pointless, courts should arbitrate disputes between doctors and families." Now just a minute: where do courts get the right to decide life or death? Does government have more of a right to commit murder than doctors, or what? And on what principles are the courts supposed to decide that "arbitration"?

No, the mask is off, and Doctor Assisted Death and Mr. Liberal Death With Dignity, and all the rest of the crew turn out to be simply Doctor and Mister Murder. Watch out Mr. and Ms. America: liberal humanists, lay and medical, are not only out to regulate your lives, and to fleece your wallets and pocketbooks. They're out to kill you! Libertarians, as embodied in the sainted "Nolan Chart," have always assumed that conservatives are in favor of economic liberty, whereas liberals are

in favor of civil, or personal liberty. *This is "personal liberty"?*

The excuses of these killers is that far more important than prolonging life is the "quality of life." But what if a key part of preserving and enhancing that quality is getting rid of this crew of murdering liberals, people whom Isabel Paterson, with wonderful perception and prophetic insight, termed "the humanitarian with the guillotine"? What then? So where do we sign up to assist *their* death? •

## Rockwell vs. Rodney and the Libertarian World

by M.N.R.

Anyone who knows Lew Rockwell knows that he can take care of himself, that he doesn't need me or anyone else to leap to his defense. In fact, Lew enjoys it when libertarians go bananas about him, because it confirms his already low opinion of the Modal Libertarian. But I'm getting sick of it. I'm getting sick of cretins and half-illiterates, of bozos who can hardly parse a sentence, who have achieved nothing at all in their miserable lives, displaying the unmitigated gall, the flagrant chutzpah, to presume to sit down and read Lew out of libertarianism. A typical letter received: "Dear Mr. Rockwell: I didn't read your article, but I read Bill Bradford in *Liberty*, and I agree that you're a fascist, you're not a libertarian at all, and you should be read out of the human race." Bradford is a business man who decided to buy himself a libertarian magazine. Well fine, but

so what? What's he ever done apart from that? The fact that he *calls himself* a scholar and philosopher should cut no ice with anyone.

There are real problems in the world that cry out for libertarian analysis and action. One key problem was the late Gulf War, that made virtually every American "feel good about himself" and about the American State, and apparently accomplished nothing else — except the slaughter of about 200,000 Iraqis. One would think that libertarians would be passionately interested in this issue. Were they? Hell no. Most libertarians couldn't care less about the whole issue. Half of the LP members supported the war. And Bradford? As usual, he hemmed and hawed on both sides of the issue, getting indignant only at a few readers who *thought* he had opposed the Gulf War.

In a laid-back movement of this sort, one that cares little about such vital problems as war and mass murder, you would think it would take some truly cataclysmic issue to elicit widespread anathemas and excommunication. But you would be wrong. When Lew Rockwell came to the defense of the LAPD's beating of *one*, read one, criminal, Rodney King, one would have thought that the earth had opened and Armageddon had been launched at last. Such agony, such hatred, such *geschrei*, had not been seen in the libertarian movement since Ayn Rand kicked Nathaniel Branden out of *Paradise* in 1968.

From the hysteria and disproportionality, it is obvious that much more is going on here than is apparent on the surface, that as in many other cases, the Modals are

not engaging in sober reasoning on the issue, but are carrying out some hidden agenda that is not part of official libertarian programs and protocols.

Before getting to the hidden agenda, let us consider the alleged provocation: the Rodney King case. We have here a problem of Rush to Judgment by Videotape, part of the trivialization and sentimentalization of public opinion, which more and more resets on where video cameras happen to be pointing. Throughout the entire 20th century, the American public had never heard of a Kurd, and cared nothing about their dreams or aspirations, about their oppression or their betrayal by Henry Kissinger years ago. Then, because the videocameras of the world happened to be pointing in the direction of thousands of fleeing and poverty-stricken Kurds, George Bush was forced to reverse his original decision not to intervene, and to send troops and supplies in for God knows how long to preserve an independent Kurdish entity. If the TV cameras had been pointed to Ethiopia, or toward the Shiites in southern Iraq, who knows what crazy intervention Bush would have felt forced to undertake?

Yes, Rodney King was vigorously beaten by L.A. cops with batons. In all the hysteria, no one seems to have asked *why* they kept beating on King. That's because videocameras are dumb, and people who follow them blindly are even dumber. Videocameras know nothing of context. What was the context of the King beating?

1. Rodney King was a convicted criminal, armed robber, on parole. *Not* a libertarian, or a model citizen, or even a decent one.

2. Rodney King was speeding maniacally on the highways and on the city streets. When flagged down by the cops, he speeded up, refusing to stop and be questioned. Anyone who knows anything about traffic or any other cops knows that they like their orders for quiet, standing still, etc. to be obeyed, and they get nervous when these orders are disobeyed. And, in the context of our criminal urban population, *there is nothing wrong with that.*

Having been led on a wild and merry chase, the cops were already edgy. But then King refused to get out of the car, had to be pulled from it, and then refused all orders to stand still, insisting on dancing around, advancing on the cops in a menacing manner, and making obscene threats to a lady cop. What were the cops supposed to do in this situation?

3. In the good old days, before left-liberalism did its evil work, the cops knew what to do in this potentially menacing situation. (Remember: they had no way of knowing if King was armed.) They would have administered a choke hold on Rodney King, which would have subdued him immediately. But the noxious forces of left-liberalism (supported, no doubt,

by the equally noxious and far more hypocritical forces of Modal Libertarianism), had gotten choke holds outlawed as being unfair to the poor criminals.

4. So what was left? The cops shot Rodney King with a tazer gun, which inflicts no lasting harm, but which knocks out the recipient's muscles and forces him to lie down and be subdued. Tazers always work — except that Rodney King, though shot *twice* with a tazer, unprecedentedly showed no ill effects whatever. Like Rasputin, who seemed superhuman and invincible, Rodney King kept dancing around maniacally and advancing on the cops in a threatening fashion.

So now what, wiseguys? If *you* were in the cops' spot at that point, what would *you* have done? Try to *reason* with Rodney King, like Bob LeFevre? Try to give him a short course in Randian theory? Given the failure of the tazer,

given the outlawing of the choke hold, there was only one thing the cops could do: and that was to beat Rodney King into submission with batons. Except a couple of baton blows couldn't do it. *Why* did the cops keep beating King again and again with their batons? The Rasputin factor; he simply wouldn't go down.

Sorry, there was one more thing the cops could have done: they could have taken their guns out and shot the S.O.B.. Would

**The anti-Rockwell Modals are carrying out a hidden agenda.**

you have been happy with *that*, Mr. and Ms. Modals?

5. There is life after the King beating. A couple of weeks after the incident, King allegedly assaulted a police officer with a deadly weapon. Soon after *that*, Rodney King, actually and not simply allegedly picked up a transvestite prostitute in his truck; as they were about to perform a lewd act, the cops advanced upon them, whereupon King tried to run down a police officer with his car.

Let us again ponder the Rasputin Factor: Rodney King received a beating which would have put most of us in the hospital for many months. Yet only a couple of weeks later, the guy is cheerfully picking up a transvestite prostitute.

The L.A. cops and Lew Rockwell have been implicitly or explicitly accused of "racism" in this affair because King is black. But I venture to assert that the shoe is on the other foot: that if King had been *white*, there would have been no national fuss at all, there would have been no hysterical calls, by the ACLU and others, for Chief Gates' immediate ouster or for criminal prosecution of the officers. And there would have been no nation-wide hysteria by the myriad of other libertarian jackasses. In short, what we are seeing, among Modal Libertarians as well as their left-liberal cousins, is racism-in-reverse.

Of the host of libertarian criticisms of Rockwell's article, *only one* was sober, rational, coherent, and non-hysterical, that of Justin Raimondo in the *Libertarian Republican*. Justin did not agree with Rockwell's position, but it was a pleasure to read, because it was a model of what libertarian discus-

sion should be all about, and used to be before the libertarians decided to stop thinking for themselves and fall into a Politically Correct goosestep.

Essentially, Justin holds that while private guards might have been justified in beating Rodney King, that police, being government officers, must be held to a far more rigorous standard. This is a cogent position, with which I have a great deal of sympathy, but I have come to the conclusion that it is not satisfactory. I would like to see all government functions, including police, privatized, but *pending* that consummation devoutly to be wished, I now believe that those government functions which are actually valuable services (e.g. roads, mail carrying, or police, but *not* regulating industry or levying taxes) should be carried out *as far as possible* like a private business. Thus, government is a lousy mail carrier and should get out of the mail carrying business — or at the very least allow private competition—but failing that and keeping the mail monopoly, it should try to carry out its job as efficiently and as like a private firm as possible. Some libertarians (*not* Justin Raimondo) hold that all government functions should be carried out as *inefficiently* as possible (e.g. mail carriers should be throwing mail into the dumpster) so as to discredit the State and bring about privatization rapidly. But I think this is a repellent strategy and inflicts needless pain and extra oppression on a citizenry already sufficiently oppressed by the State.

So *why* did such a host of libertarians rouse themselves from their usual stupor to hurl curses

and anathema at a long-time leading libertarian for one disagreement on a scarcely earth-shaking issue? The answer is a hidden agenda, and that agenda is the entire social and cultural mind-set of Left-Liberalism. For our beloved Modals *are* indeed social and cultural Leftists, more so even than we had originally suspected; they have bought into the entire panoply of feminism, egalitarianism, victimology, "civil rights," the sanctity of the compulsory integrationist, socialist, and fake "Doctor" Martin Luther King, and all the rest of the odious baggage. In short, these Left-Libertarians have bought into the whole Politically Correct package, and as in the case of all P.C.'s, everyone who disagrees with them on any of these issues is automatically stigmatized with the litany of "racist, sexist, and homophobic."

Note that while Left-Liberals are scarcely advocates of the free market, they don't really *care* about that any more; no student, for example, ever gets hauled up on charges for being too enthusiastic about the free market, or about cuts in the capital gains tax, or for being excessively critical of socialism or the planned economy. That is not the cutting edge of *today's* political issues, and so the Liberal Establishment is willing to tolerate Left Libertarians who are Correct on the issues that matter, and to keep them around as occasional pets. Not so, however, with paleos, whether paleocons or paleolibertarians, who, being on the cutting edge of today's issues, enjoy no such indulgence from the Establishment. But pretty soon, the Modals will Get Theirs. What Tom Fleming said in his wonderful

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