

nerve to coin an "ism" of their own, earnestly exhorting us to "take steps to promote a renewed commitment to transatlanticism."

This loony, over-intellectualized abstraction will generate about as much enthusiasm among conservatives as a proposal to adopt Esperanto as our official language, and demonstrates the distance that separates the neoconservative intelligentsia from the mass base of the conservative movement.

That's why a political program to stay out of foreign wars, to steer clear of foreign entanglements, and to guard our own borders against an invasion of illegal aliens, will win the day.■

*Mr. Raimondo's seminal book on the history and resurgence of the Old Right, Reclaiming the Right, is \$15 from the RRR. Phone 1-800-325-7257 to order.*

## I Hate Canada

by Paul Gottfried

**O**n a recent trip to northern Nova Scotia, it became clear to me that our Canadian neighbors put up with a degree of government theft that would be intolerable even in Bill Clinton's America. In return for their welfare state, which features medical plans and partly subsidized university tuitions, Canadians surrender to the federal and provincial governments well over 50% of their earnings. This does not include 20% sales taxes and provincial excise taxes.

Allow me to be up front about my prejudice. I loathe the Canadian government more than any other regime I have ever had to deal with, including that of Communist Hungary. Canadian bureaucrats are the self-righteous custodians of social-

ist virtue, and they reek with a kind of Anglo-Saxon Labourite smarminess.

Since the death of my wife I have fought against a thousand legal obstacles and an army of "concerned" Canadian judges and administrators to gain possession of property in Toronto bequeathed to my children by their mother. The Canadians have done all that is legally possible, including the rejection of legal forms with slightly smudged print, to keep the estate from going through probate.

Things that irk Americans, at least normal ones, about their government are to most Canadians entirely inoffensive. Thus the imposition of affirmative action programs in Canadian universities and government-related industries and operations has not caused the anger north of the border which is now exploding against this practice in the U.S.

For many years I have speculated on the reasons for the remarkable passivity shown by Canadians in the face of an overbearing managerial state. Why do they allow their state to strip them of their money, cultural identity, and so much more and barely react, outside of the Western provinces, which resemble politically and socially our mountain states?

Why do the majority of Anglophone Canadians, who reside in Ontario, give over to public administrators control of their lives? Americans have done much of the same. But there is also a rising populist reaction abroad in the U.S. Moreover, the public sector and taxation in the U.S. are more restricted than in Canada. Both have grown more rapidly among Canadians, especially since the 1970s.

Certain historical explorations have been advanced to account for the differences between the two so-

cieties. And though all have merit, neither individually nor together do they add up to a sufficient cause. True, the U.S. was founded upon a classical liberal experience, a taxpayers' revolt, whereas Canada was ruled directly by the British Crown into the second half of the 19th century. Thus Canadians, unlike their American cousins, developed a natural deference for centralized authority, even if it did not rest upon their consent.

The frictions between English and French Canadians furthered the tendency among both groups to look to the government as an arbitrator. It may be argued that Canadian political fights have focused too often on linguistic honors. The result has been to allow administrators to tax people blind.

These explanations are useful but require qualifications. The British Protestant settlers of Anglophone Canada were not significantly different from those who went to the Thirteen Colonies, and most of their early history shows the same patterns of legal self-rule. The Loyalists who fled from the American revolutionaries were not royal lackeys but people of independent judgment who resisted intimidation.

The French Catholics had their own independent streak. Those in the Maritimes developed highly scientific agriculture in the mid-eighteenth century with irrigation dikes that kept out salt water. And though a "priest-ridden" and "economically backward" people—from an English point of view—the Quebecois in Upper Canada were certainly not drones of any central power.

The point is, there were conditions that predisposed Canadians to their present managerial captivity, but there is no justification for exaggerating either their prevalence or

**Allow me to  
be up front  
about my  
prejudice.**

effect. It is not so much what it was but what has changed in the Canadian character which has created a servile people for a servile state.

The two once dominant cultures have collapsed into therapeutic mush, a combination of yuppieism, victimology, and socialism, and except for a linguistic difference, it is almost impossible to tell them apart. After watching hours of Anglophone and Francophone TV and reading reams of English and French Canadian newspapers, I am astonished by how little they differ. *CBC*, *Radio Canada*, *Le Devoir*, and the *Toronto Star* all feature the same special pleading on behalf of feminists, gays, "disadvantaged" West Indians, native Americans, and Inuit (a.k.a. Eskimos).

The *Toronto Star* ran a feature story in mid-July about a timely resolution that will be brought up and no doubt adopted at the Canada Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Church this month. The resolution will call for a repudiation of Martin Luther's anti-Semitism and express regret for the putative effects of this prejudice.

The story's author, Michael McAteer, is clearly gratified that the Lutheran delegates will "confront their founders' hatred," which contributed to the Holocaust because "Nazis... quoted his writings to justify and legitimize their persecution of the Jews." The editor of the magazine *Canada Lutheran* believes that "the resolution may be a small gesture but is appropriate and timely." In the May issue of Canada's leading Lutheran publication, the same editor answers the question: "Is this really past history or are we being naive about the

depth of anti-Semitism? I continue to hear anti-Semitic slurs from some of our members in casual conversation. Signs of anti-Semitism continue to appear in Canada. Fringe groups spout neo-Nazi slogans and some deny that the Holocaust ever happened."

The associations are both arbitrary and hysterical. It is doubtful that any connection can be shown to exist between the elderly Luther's diatribes against Jews and the "spouting of neo-Nazi slogans" in Canada. It is also unclear what the editorial means by "anti-Semitic slurs," which can refer to anything nowadays, from real vilification to momentary departures from politically correct language.

Nor is it explained what kind of relation is supposed to exist between questioning the reality of the Holocaust

and Luther's slighting reference to German Jews. Does one presuppose the other? Would the Nazi persecution of Jews and criticism of the history of the Holocaust have come about without Luther?

As far as I can see, Luther's role was minimal in the first case and nonexistent in the second. It is also doubtful whether Luther's unfavorable comments about Jews, uttered toward the end of his life, had any effect on the character of Lutheran

churches. Almost all of them from the beginning were under state control and took political positions accordingly.

Why should Canadian Lutherans accept responsibility for insensitive remarks made by their founder? There is no sane reason they should. They are certainly not going around inciting their country-

men to violent acts against Jews or anyone else; and there is no demonstrable causal relation between Luther's badmouthing of Jews and Canadian neo-Nazism. The latter, we are told, is a fringe movement in any case.

Luther abetted worse things against other Christians than against Jews. He actively encouraged the persecution and slaying of Anabaptists, which Lutheran princes carried out. Does *Canada Lutheran* show the same alacrity in bemoaning Luther's attacks on Anabaptists as they do in apologizing for his anti-Semitism? The answer is obvious.

Anabaptists, Calvinists, and Catholics, all of whom Luther vented his spleen on, are unmistakable members of Western Christian civilization. The leaders of one of Canada's largest Protestant denominations therefore cannot appear politically correct or properly contrite if they mention any of these Christian groups as objects of Luther's invective.

Jews, by contrast, enjoy standing as victims of the Christian world. Though it would be hard to demonstrate that Luther contributed to their victimization, apologizing in his name to Jews and other designated victims of Western prejudice does win applause from Canada's elite press.

While all this does not explain fully the submissiveness of Canadians to their government, it does indicate features of Canadian life which have bearing on this topic. Anglophone Canadians have embraced our therapeutic culture, to the point of imitating our worst victimological lunacy. (All the buses in Toronto are now sporting signs with the warning in large red letters: "Homophobia is a social disease!")

What one sees in Canada is also present throughout the West and not only in the U.S. It is the establishment of what Sam Francis

**Does *Canada Lutheran* show the same alacrity in bemoaning Luther's attacks on Anabaptists as they do in apologizing for his anti-Semitism?**

calls a transnational managerial elite. Though present in what remains of the private sector, this elite is especially well entrenched in public administration, public universities, and service industries which feed off public revenues. It is also fatefully allied to the communications sector, which works zealously to increase government control over everything once held to be private.

As in the U.S. the establishment of the welfare state was only a transitional stage, to the mental reconstruction now being undertaken by political and media elites.

Unlike the Americans, who once revolted against arbitrary taxation, the Canadians have no such tradition to romanticize and revive. Though I myself find much in the Loyalist cause to admire, particularly the stubborn refusal to renounce a monarch who by modern standards was certainly no tyrant, the revolutionary precedent is what protects us against the kind of monster government which Canadians take for granted.

Despite Bill Clinton's rejection of any comparison between our Mi-

litamen and 18th-century Patriots, to most Americans it is not absurd to believe in the right of citizens to protect themselves against perceived political tyranny. Most Americans still believe, however weakly, that government and public administration depend on the continuing consent of the citizenry. This means that citizens have the right to pass judgment on the entire regime—and not only over its office-holding fixtures and rotating parties.

Canadians believe nothing of the kind. They accept their rulers, whether royal tax collectors or scientific socialists, and lack the emotional and moral resources to oppose either effectively.■

*Dr. Gottfried's indispensable Conservative Movement is \$18 postpaid from the RRR. Phone 1-800-325-7257.*

**Citizens have the right to pass judgment on the entire regime—and not only over its office-holding fixtures and rotating parties.**

politicking, Gingrich was a liberal Republican: a big spending, big taxing, big regulating, welfare-warfare statist whose vision for the party consisted of recruiting more black voters by any means. Of course the liberals were glad to tout Gingrich (and his friends like Jack Kemp) as a new breed of scary, young radicals. Yet he represented exactly the kind of opposition they dream of: partisan on trivial matters, bipartisan on substance.

Naturally, the Reign of Gingrich has been a disaster. He used the Revolutionary Moment of December 1994-January 1995 to arrange the bailout of Mexico, make the silly "Contract with America" the only permissible legislative agenda, and accumulate massive amounts of money and personal power. He now wields that power to exclude any agenda more radical than his own. The truth is, the man on the street has a more radical agenda than Gingrich.

His greatest crime has been to make the freshman voting bloc almost completely impotent through exclusion. He has broken his promise to abolish, or even cut, the Public Broadcasting Corporation, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Most people on the Right view these items as the *bare minimum* for this Republican Congress.

But no one—except those who have come to expect the worst from him—thought he would become Congress's leading defender of the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species Act, and affirmative action. (Even quota programs operated within the House's direct purview

**Rothbard-Rockwell Report** (ISSN 1080-4420) is published monthly by the Center for Libertarian Studies, 875 Mahler Rd., Suite 150, Burlingame, CA 94010. (800) 325-7257. Second-Class Postage paid at Burlingame, CA 94010 and additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes to Rothbard-Rockwell Report, P.O. Box 4091, Burlingame, CA 94011. *Editors:* Murray N. Rothbard (1926-1995) and Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr. *Contributing Editors:* Sarah Barton, David Gordon, Paul Gottfried, Michael Levin, and Justin Raimondo. *Publisher:* Burton S. Blumert. *Associate Publisher:* Daniel Rosenthal. *Managing Editor:* Sybil Regan. Subscription: \$49 for 12 issues. Single issue: \$5. Copyright ©1995 by the Center for Libertarian Studies. All rights reserved. Unauthorized reproduction of this newsletter or its contents by xerography, facsimile, or any other means is illegal.

## Newt's Blowup

by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

**A**nyone who followed Gingrich's career before he was elected speaker knew exactly what was going on. He made his name by opposing two powerful Democratic politicians in the House, Tip O'Neill and Jim Wright, and was widely credited with their demise in public opinion and public life.

But aside from his partisan