

missionary goal of liberty and the free society. But that goal is, for Koch, never defined or explained. There comes a point in any mission where "revising," and "openness to change," takes one over into a very different mission indeed. The only clear aspects of the new Kochian mission are its devotion to change, change for its own sake, and hostility to any rigid resistance to change, even in behalf of liberty. Worship of change, and a salute to Marx though not to his rigid followers: One wonders what in the world William and Hillary Rodham Clinton could find wrong with the new Kochian mission? Poor F.A. Harper must be spinning rapidly in his grave.

One close and long-time associate of Harper and of IHS told me that Koch's speech was an "outrage." It is impossible to call it anything else. One wonders, also, how the IHS associates, fellows, and graduates who assembled for Koch's speech felt about its peroration, when Koch told them: "I know you are well aware of the investment the [Lambe] Foundation and the Institute have made in each of you, financially, personally, and spiritually." How do they feel about this "investment," and what Charles may expect from them in the future about "repaying" it, as they carry on their designated mission for change? Were they as chilled as I was? In any case, it might be well for all Kochean payrollees and grantees—as his present and future "missionaries"—to pay careful note to the kind of mission they might be getting into.

And "market-based management"? Whether it is only a glorified Suggestion Box or it is based on the harebrained analogy between socialism and the business firm, Charles Koch, its founder, on the point of unveiling the meaning of MBM, failed to do so. It is beginning to seem that, like the Wizard of Oz (a

story written by another Kansan), behind the veil and the hokum disseminated by the Wizard of Wichita, there is, quite simply, nothing there. Despite the trumpeting of All the Koch's Horses and All the Koch's Men, the highly touted MBM simply doesn't exist. The Kochian Emperor has no clothes. ■

The Carnage of Liberalism

by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

When Colin Ferguson went shooting on the Long Island Railroad, he aimed only at whites and Asians. Crumpled notes in his pocket, headed "reasons for this," spewed hatred against his victims. He even delayed his murders until the train left New York City. "Because of my respect for Mayor David Dinkins," he explained in one note.

The killer's attitude is not unique. It is reinforced in government policy, universities, and popular culture. Is the underlying cause of this heinous crime liberalism itself? "I hate them with a passion," Ferguson wrote of his white neighbors. That's our culture's attitude in a nutshell.

For decades now, liberals have told blacks they are victims of whites. Any problems they have individually or as a community are the white man's fault. They need and deserve cossetting by the government, and special treatment by the private sector.

Everything from affirmative action to shorter prison sentences for violent criminals reinforces this special treatment. Reason is thrown out the window when any public tragedy is tinged with racial overtones. We can't punish inner city rioting, and a senate staffer recently suggested we can't increase the penalties for rape.

"He feels discriminated against by everything and everyone," said a lawyer to excuse Ferguson's actions. Poor baby! The killer is the son of a middle-class pharmacist and made the deans's list at Nassau Community College, but our culture tells him to feel victimized.

Turn on any black radio station, and you get an earful of hate. In the African-American section of the bookstore, almost all books reinforce hatred of The Man. Black newspapers are dedicated to discovering white malice in the day's news. The nation's tv networks and op-ed pages have long preached white racism as the cause of all underclass ills, and liberal academics agree.

Afro-centric education, in all schools and colleges now, teaches that whites suppressed and stole black contributions in the arts, science, and philosophy, that Aristotle, Bach, and Einstein were

frauds. This makes as much sense as the popular beliefs that whites invented AIDS and crack to bring about black genocide, but the hatred it legitimizes is murderous.

The welfare state tells poor blacks that they deserve a large slice of other people's earnings. Since this became official policy, property crime has zoomed. Who can be surprised? If you can take other people's money through the ballot box, why not eliminate the middleman?

In large cities, white pedestrians have to live with racial harassment, while liberals say the public should ignore it, or accept it as just, even when it's a prelude to a mugging.

Juries are tied in knots by blacks who refuse to consider convicting a black perpetrator. The excuse is echoed all across the culture—there are too many young black males in prison—as if that eliminated the need for individual justice.

Liberals have fueled envy and hatred of all the successful, including Asians, who threaten to replace whites as number one on the hate parade. And murder is the result.

We hear that the answer is gun control. Yet Ferguson bought his 9-mm. pistol after a 15-day waiting period. Who doubts that he would somehow have found a gun even if the waiting period were 15 years? The answer is not to ban guns, but to arm the people. If the train passengers had been properly outfitted, it is Ferguson who would be dead.

We are paying a bloody price for decades of liberalism, and Ferguson is only one of many examples. Another was Damian

Williams, who smashed Reginald Denny's head with a brick simply because he was the wrong race. The list could go on and on.

For the sake of public order—the first requirement of a decent society—we need widespread gun ownership by the law-abiding, and an end to liberal sanctioning of racial violence. ■

Federal Insurance Fraud

by L.H.R., Jr.

The movie classic "Double Indemnity" tells the story of an attempted insurance fraud. A wife conspired to murder her husband and collect his life insurance, a double payment because of the cause of death. She was foiled by a tough-minded insurance company executive.

But the film also showed how insurance is supposed to work. The company offered double payment on its life insurance policies if the insured were killed when he fell off a moving train. Why did the company offer such a proviso? Because the data told it that this virtually never happened, and when it did, executives suspected foul play.

Despite what the left would claim, insurance companies are in the business of making money, not granting welfare. The firm must collect more in premiums than it pays out in settlements. And to do that reliably, the company's actuaries must correctly assess the risks inherent under every set of relevant circumstances.

Most of us don't know the odds of our falling off a train (although with Amtrak, they're undoubtedly higher than when the trains were private). But we don't have to know the odds. Insurance companies do, if they offer that form of insurance. For when a company grants insurance against some random event, it is betting that it is not going to happen.

What are the chances of being killed by an asteroid? Pretty slim. If a company insures against that, it will charge extremely low premiums.

What are the chances that a member of a drug-dealing inner-city gang will be gunned down? Pretty high. That means very high premiums, or, probably, no insurance at all.

The risk inherent in most insured events for any one person at any one time falls somewhere between the impossible and the unlikely. It's not easy to stay ahead of the uncertainties that nature imposes on us. It is a business that can only be handled by hard-bitten capitalists.

Sound insurance principles, as well as the rule of law, require that people who try to defraud the company be weeded out. If an astronaut applies for an asteroid-protection policy, he has to tell the truth about his profession or face possible criminal penalties. Neither can a member of the Crips or the Bloods be allowed to lie about his address.

Insurance fraud is still illegal—for people in the private sector, anyway. It's not for the central government, of course. In fact, it seems to be mandatory, and the feds are about to perpetrate