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Without using the term, Thomas Sowell illustrates Frederic Bastiat's concept of "legal plunder" in his discussion of the problem of "moral hazard," which occurs when someone else assumes the costs, and thus the liability, for other people's misfortunes or misbehavior. It has often been said that there is no such thing as a free lunch, and that is true enough. Somebody pays the bill. It is important to distinguish between "What Is Seen and What Is Unseen," as Bastiat put it, when calculating the costs of any program, including "free lunches."

"Liability" is an "inescapable concept," as R. J. Rushdoony emphasized. "Sovereignty" is another. So what is this "sovereign debt" we hear so much about? Well, much of it is the result of granting a privilege of "limited liability" to various and sundry classes of people for this purpose or that. Let's call it the sovereign's offer of a free lunch. But the liability does not disappear. The lunch must be paid for by somebody. The bill is simply palmed off onto others. In our case, it is the taxpayers and future generations who shoulder the burden.

Likewise an audience with the king with secured passage along the king's highway, especially that the king will stand for the expense of any accident that may occur along the way. Imagine the confidence such a benefit might inspire in the careless.

"Although 'moral hazard' is an insurance term," as Thomas Sowell notes, "it applies to other government policies besides insurance. International studies show that people in countries with more generous and long-lasting unemployment compensation spend less time looking for jobs. In the United States, where unemployment compensation is less generous than in Western Europe, unemployed Americans spend more hours looking for work than do unemployed Europeans in countries with more generous unemployment compensation."

"People change their behavior in other ways when the government pays with the taxpayers' money. After welfare became more readily available in the 1960s, unwed motherhood skyrocketed. The country is still paying the price for that — of which the money is the least of it. Children raised by single mothers on welfare have far higher rates of crime, welfare and other social pathology."

What are the costs of "limited liability?" We must never forget that someone pays the bill. What does it mean to be "Society's child." "Free lunches" in the form of free access to abortion services are one way of hiding the costs.

"We hear a lot of talk about 'safety nets' from big-government liberals, who act as if there is a certain pre-destined amount of harm that people will suffer, so that it is just a question of the government helping those who are harmed. But
we hear very little about 'moral hazard' from big-government liberals. We all need safety nets. That is why we 'save for a rainy day,' instead of living it up to the limit of our income and beyond."

"We also hear a lot of talk about 'the uninsured,' for whose benefit we are to drastically change the whole medical-care system. But income data show that many of those uninsured people have incomes from which they could easily afford insurance. But they can live it up instead, because the government has mandated that hospital emergency rooms treat everyone."

"All of this is a large hazard to taxpayers. And it is not very moral." It is what happens when legal plunder becomes universal plunder and everybody lives at the expense of everybody else. The gravy train has grown into a juggernaut that drives everything before it. But it left the track long ago.

Back in the 1930s, about the time the social security system was instituted, the very influential political scientist Harold Lasswell defined politics as "who gets what, when, how." Later, in the 1960s, at a time when the actuarial tables still seemed favorable for keeping social security solvent, the economist Paul Samuelson could freely admit that it was a Ponzi scheme. But Samuelson did not foresee the demographic effects - the broken families, abortion on demand, the welfare dependency - of what Belloc had much earlier called The Servile State and Hayek called The Road to Serfdom. What many thought to be a blessing turns out to be a curse. As the poet Robert Southey put it in another context: "Curses are like young chickens, they always come home to roost."

"There is a way that seems right to a man, but its end is the way to death" (Prov. 16:25). Proverbs addresses the larger problem of our social service state by singling out an ordinary example: "Whoever puts up security [surety] for a stranger will surely suffer harm, but he who hates striking hands in pledge is secure" (Prov. 11:15 ESV).


According to Jonah Goldberg, the White House is out to sea in a leaky boat. The Democrats in the congressional Tidal Basin are about to become chum for the sharks.

"What's clear right now is that the president who claimed to be the personification of a world-historical moment has clearly misread his mandate, the mood and the moment."

http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/244882/last-refuge-liberal-charles-krauthammer

Charles Krauthammer lands a few more bare-knuckled punches on America's liberal ruling elite. "Liberalism under siege is an ugly sight indeed. Just yesterday it was all hope and change and returning power to the people. But the people have proved so disappointing. Their recalcitrance has, in only 19 months, turned the predicted 40-year liberal ascendancy (James Carville) into a full retreat. Ah, the people, the little people, the small-town people, the 'bitter' people, as
Barack Obama in an unguarded moment once memorably called them, clinging 'to guns or religion or' — this part is less remembered — 'antipathy toward people who aren’t like them.' A lot of these people turned out for the rally at the Lincoln Memorial today. I am looking forward to hearing some firsthand accounts on Monday.

http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/print/244897

Victor Davis Hanson builds his case against the liberal establishment on many of the same points raised by Krauthammer. The indictment falls into six parts. Part four on the futility of taxation is excellent, as is "A Culpable America?"

Here is the text of part five:

"5. Disingenuousness. There is also a growing belief that the Obama administration is advancing an agenda that it cannot be fully candid about, because that agenda does not command broad support. As a result, we are habitually asked to believe that what administration appointees or supporters say is not what they really mean, or at least was taken out of context."

"Justice Sotomayor did not really mean that wise Latinas make better judges than white males. Van Jones did not really mean that George W. Bush was in on 9/11, or that white youths are more likely to be mass murderers, or that whites are chronic polluters of the ghetto. Eric Holder no more meant that Americans are cowards than one of Anita Dunn’s heroes really is the mass-murdering Mao. We should not believe that the top priority of the head of NASA is to advance Islamic outreach, or that the president himself thinks that police routinely act stupidly, stereotype, or arrest innocent people on their way to get their kids some ice cream. Imam Rauf did not really say that we created bin Laden, or that we kill more innocent Muslims than al-Qaeda kills innocent non-Muslims."

"All this dissimulation started with the Rev. Jeremiah Wright, whose mistake was not saying the outrageous things he said — Mr. Obama and the compliant media had contextualized his corpus of hate well enough — but finally insulting the media at the National Press Club. The former was seen as a misdemeanor; the latter proved a felony."

"Do Obama supporters, then, reveal their true beliefs only in gaffes and unguarded moments, while filling their official statements and communiqués with pretense?"

Hanson concludes his column by asking: "How will all this play out?"

"There are many millions of Americans who have a rising stake either in receiving reallocated federal money or in administering its distribution. For nearly half a century, the public schools have been telling millions of children that America’s preeminence is ill-gotten, based largely on exploitation of less fortunate others, here and abroad. So the country is divided, and a president claiming to be the great healer of our age is proving to be the most divisive chief executive since Richard Nixon — and, in the view of an increasing majority of Americans, by his own intent."
In *How Evil Works*, David Kupelian gives a succinct description of where all this dissimulation and dependency leads. "With this constant cultural subversion in the background, no wonder millions of Americans have gradually been demoralized into depending on government to solve all of their problems, fueling today's uncontrolled, cancerlike growth in government."

So let's hear it for those who would once again bind our political institutions with the chains of the Constitution: the Constitution of Limitations rather than the Constitution of Powers foisted on us by the Progressive Insurgence.

**Sunday 29**


James Lewis gets carried away with his rhetoric, along with his spelling and geography, but his point that "Fascism Is Sadism" is on target. He could easily be discussing the points made by Rene Girard in such books as *The Scapegoat* and *I See Satan Fall Like Lightning* about the human tendency to mimic others (mimetic desire) and the dangerous propensity to scapegoat others that accompanies imitation. The reversion to a primitive sort of tribalism is an ever-present temptation, especially once "the thin veneer of civilization" has been breached.

"In civilized societies armed force is always used with the greatest self-discipline possible. That is a defining feature of civilized societies compared to all the others. Self-discipline in the use of force is not a reflection of cowardice, like so much of the left's vaunted pacifism. Self-discipline is an aspect of courage and civilized purpose."

"'With malice towards none, with charity for all.' Lincoln's words are worth repeating here. Lincoln commanded a horrific war in which terrible acts were done in the name of the Union. When it was over he did not celebrate the suffering of the South, nor even the victory of the North. 'With malice towards none, with charity for all." That phrase defines civilization."

"Without over-praising ourselves, that is in fact how the United States has acted in victory. 'Charity toward all' was a major reason for the Marshall Plan to rescue Europe, including Germany, and it was a big reason why Woodrow Wilson was so easily suckered by the French and British after World War I. 'With malice towards none' drove MacArthur's decision to keep the Emperor of Japan as the head of state after horrific American losses against the Japanese. It was how America behaved in 1990 when the Soviet Union crumbled of its own inner contradictions. We had no victory parades, no annual celebration to commemorate the defeat of our only nuclear foe in history - until this month, that is, when Iran started its first nuclear reactor."

"With malice towards none: That was how George W. Bush acted in Iraq after the three-week knock-down of Saddam's army. That is why we could not leave Iraq in its own bloody mess when insurgency and civil conflict broke out afterwards. We stuck with it, against a vicious sabotage campaign from the entire Left, and we established an elected government."
Perhaps all of this is because we have preserved a memory of our founding ideals – the faith of our fathers – in our national memory. The sermon this morning wrapped up our departing pastor's series of 8x8, eight sermons on Romans 8, and culminated in a valedictory note: a celebration of Christ's victory. There is now no condemnation and there is no separation "for those who are in Christ Jesus." As the Apostle Paul himself concluded: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or danger, or sword? . . . No, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him who loved us. For I am sure that neither death nor life, nor angels nor rulers, nor things present nor things to come, nor powers, nor height nor depth, nor anything else in creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8:36-39 ESV).

Monday 30


It is outrageous for the Obama Administration to submit to or even send a report of any sort to the viciously anti-Israel human rights commission. It should not recognize that body and should not cooperate with it. And it certainly should not point an accusing finger at an Arizona law that is none of their business.

http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/columns/Seventy-percent-of-Americans-know-they_ve-been-conned-639878-101758743.html

Hugh Hewitt discusses the meaning of the rally at the Lincoln Memorial for the "70 percent [of Americans] presently massively underrepresented in the federal government, the Manhattan-Beltway media elite and academia." One thing these media have not disclosed is that, as the Washington Examiner noted, $5.5 million was raised for wounded veterans.

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704147804575455343989369472.html?mod=ITP_opinion_0

Leslie Jacobs discusses the post-Katrina New Orleans experiment with charter schools, where 70% of the children attend.


Walter Russell Mead discusses "The Greening of Godzilla" and adds a short feature entitled "Bambi vs. Godzilla."

http://www.time.com/time/photogallery/0,29307,2012592,00.html

A sweet rite of passage in gang-infested Ciudad Juarez is depicted in this slide presentation published by Time Magazine.

Tuesday 31

http://pajamasmedia.com/blog/islamolepsy-the-new-pathology/?singlepage=true
The Jewish Canadian poet and essayist David Solway is always a pleasure to read, although this piece on "Islam for Dhimmis" is also intense and formidable. Here Solway describes the etiology of a disease he identifies as "Islamolepsy" that paralyzes the mind, will, and fortitude of our reigning intellectual class.

"What we are observing, I suspect, is the onset of a debilitating disorder which manifests as a seizure of the mental organ, a lack of elasticity in responding to complex and threatening situations. It is as if the mind has been paralyzed by a variant form of cataleptic fit, characterized by fixity of posture, obliviousness to external stimuli, loss of control, and diminished sensitivity to pain. The malady is induced by profound emotional shock accompanied by withdrawal from reality – an unconscious way, perhaps, of amortizing the great multicultural blunder for which we are responsible but cannot admit to ourselves. Knowing subliminally that we have been instrumental in soliciting our own ruin, and too weak to respond decisively, the only asylum that remains is a species of dementia that shields us from the truth."

"In other words, those who suffer from the distemper, as it emerges in the social and political sphere, are simply unable to acknowledge, absorb, and confront the magnitude of what is transpiring before their very eyes. They cannot discriminate among the external stimuli or recognize them for what they are. Suicide bombings, terrorist strikes, multiple casualties, stealth jihad, meretricious vouchers of good intentions, legal assaults, cultural implosion, a billion-strong adversary riding the wave of the future – it is all too much for our Islamoleptic media, intelligentsia, entertainers, and political masters to fully take in. It appears they have sought refuge from the unassimilable in a classic fugue state or succumbed to split-mind syndrome. As Martin Amis astutely comments in The Second Plane, “The death cult always benefits, initially at least, from its capacity to astonish and stupefy.” I quibble only with Amis' 'initially.' The trouble is that once stupefaction sets in, it tends to make itself at home."

"The etiology of the affliction that merits the name of Islamolepsy issues, it bears repeating, in a host of predictable symptoms: the rejection of personal complicity, the denial of palpable reality, the construction of an alternate world in which a bellicose and inimical claim to ascendancy is blithely endorsed, the rigid and untenable conviction of superior insight, the false consolation of intellectual torpor and, of course, the tendency to fall back on moral histrionics to discredit those who can still see clearly."


Phyllis Chesler, who escaped from Afghanistan in 1961, discusses the absence of serious attention given to the murder of Christian medical aid workers by the appropriate political authorities.

http://pajamasmedia.com/phyllischesler/2010/08/16/is-it-%e2%80%9cracist%e2%80%9d-to-tell-the-truth-about-islam-free-speech-under-siege/

Phyllis Chesler discusses the battle against "lawfare," a form of warfare in which Islamists in particular bring lawsuits designed to curb First Amendment
freedoms. The new SPEECH Act, for which Rachel Ehrenfeld had campaigned, now blocks the enforcement in the United States of libel judgments against American authors.

http://www.buffalonews.com/city/capital-connection/washington/article175227.ece

A political scientist is predicting a Republican takeover in the House.


Just as it has been obvious for decades that the U.S. Treasury has become a political slush fund, it is likewise evident that the federal bureaucracy is a bien pensant liberal political machine. Last week, Ed. Sec. Arne Duncan encouraged DOE employees to attend Al Sharpton's rally last weekend. If the counter-rally had been held on a weekday, would he have been so blatant as to give them the day off with pay? All this reminds me of the NEA's campaign in the 1980s through its traveling Conference on the New Right Radicals.


"Japan-Style Stagnation? You Should Be So Lucky." Spengler's gloomy assessment of American markets and the long-term economic outlook does not appear to have yet been posted in the Asia Times. A return to something like the Reagan Revolution would help, but we would have to start decentralizing the political system and systematically dismantling the social service state in the process.

Wednesday, September 1


Here is a list of demands by the hostage-taker at the Discovery Channel building in Maryland. He fits the description of what in the past has been called a "deep-ecologist."

Thursday, September 2


Kyle-Anne Shriver continues to explore the president's immersion into liberation theology. Clicking on a link to "collective redemption" and then on another link, I found the following favorable remark about the president when he was a community organizer in Chicago: "He was a natural, the undisputed master of agitation, who could engage a room full of recruiting targets in a rapid-fire Socratic dialogue, nudging them to admit that they were not living up to their own standards. As with the panhandler, he could be aggressive and confrontational. With probing, sometimes personal questions, he would pinpoint the source of pain in their lives, tearing down their egos just enough before
dangling a carrot of hope that they could make things better." Has anything changed? Is this what we are supposed to believe in?

http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2010/08/31/back-to-school/

Walter Russell Mead is one of our best foreign policy scholars. Here he offers sound advice to college students to help make them satisfied and competitive in today's (and tomorrow's) rapidly changing world.

Friday 3


What Jean Raspail warned about in the 1970s is becoming a daily reality in France: the end of laicism in the face of Islamist muscle-flexing. The slaughter of sacrificial animals on streets is already a reality. Here is footage of mass Muslim prayers in Paris streets that blocks traffic and effectively keeps people from being able to enter or leave their homes.


The rules have changed, as Jonah Goldberg commented recently. The Open Secrets blog lists several rules, followed by the Murkowski exceptions that set the rules on their ear. Murkowski led Miller in the polls by more than two to one in late July (see the link at "being moose-whipped"). This is one for the record books, but we should not be deceived. This may be an anti-incumbency year more than a Republican year.

Saturday 4


Peter Heck notes some of the contrasts between last weekend's Glenn Beck and Al Sharpton rallies, both of which were given roughly equal attention by the media, but largely to the detriment of the latter. "While the Beck rally featured speakers honoring God and country, the left's rally was laced with anger, bitterness and profanity." The same could be said of any other Left-wing counter-demonstration.

Some of Heck's observations merely illustrate what any attentive observer would expect. "The images and sounds that emerged from the two competing events did more to damage the credibility and cause of left-wing activists from Sharpton to Obama than anything Glenn Beck, Sarah Palin, Rush Limbaugh or other conservative spokesmen could have done in 20 years. Why? Because for any American citizen willing to pay attention (and many of them did), it was a real-time depiction – no filter, no interpretation, no cosmetics – of the stark contrasts between two totally different views on this country, its heritage and its destiny."

"Sure, there were the anecdotal comparisons like noting how the media incessantly referred to Beck as a 'controversial conservative,' while the uber-controversial
and race-baiting Al Sharpton received the undeserved title of 'civil rights leader.'"

"There was the humorous exercise of comparing the cleanliness of the National Mall after Beck's rally (supposedly full of environment-hating corporate polluters) to the trashed Mall after Obama's inauguration (attended by the environmentally conscious left)."

"But the meaningful contrasts - the ones that spoke volumes to a watching nation - were far more profound. While the Beck rally featured speakers honoring God and country, the left's rally was laced with anger, bitterness and profanity."

http://www.globalpolitician.com/26577-iran-israel-palestine-turkey-obama

This piece by Sam Vaknin, "Middle East Talks Aimed to Forestall Israeli Attack on Iran," is perplexing: it is dated yesterday but places July and August (this year or last year?) in the future. But it is probably worth passing along because of its timeliness. It contends that Israel will launch an attack on Iran's nuclear facilities no later than next month and cites September 6-8 as one possible launch window. Of course, such windows have been coming and going with some regularity. Many observers concluded last month that the fueling of the Bushehr reactor has given it a status of "King's X" untouchability.

The piece is not well proofread, which is a reason for my perplexity over its timeframe:

"In a previous article, titled 'Preparations for Attack in Iran Almost Complete' (dated July 10, 2009), I revealed the existence of the training mock near Eilat and Aqaba by the Red Sea. A few days later, Israel made the presence of its Navy in the Red Sea public. Though it has not been a secret hitherto, it has hardly been trumpeted. The navy's role is support the mission with sea-launched precision cruise missiles (of Israeli manufacture). In general, Israel is trying to minimize the involvement of American materiel in its forthcoming foray into Iran."

"One word about the 'windows' mentioned in my earlier article. As any military planner and intelligence agent knows, these are not actual operational dates. 'Windows' are possible operational dates and are dictated by the confluence of weather projections, known troop movements, political and geopolitical circumstances, and military preparedness. Additional windows exist in September and October this year. It is likely, therefore, that Israel will attack in July or August, but no later than October 2010.

"The targets for Israel's attack on Iran have been chosen: one is close to the sea, the other is inland. Members of Sayeret Matka"1 are now conducting joint (often nightly) exercises with Israel's Navy SEALS (the 'Shayetet') off the coast of Ashkelon and on the beaches of Haifa. While the deployment of the commandos and other ground forces will be done mostly by air, their evacuation, 4-6 hours later, will be accomplished by sea."

Sunday 5
Erik Ritter von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, who has been described as "The Last Knight of the Habsburg Empire," was an aristocrat (Ritter=knight) by birth. Brad Birzer introduces Russell Kirk in this article as a knight-errant, as what Edmund Burke earlier described as the "natural aristocrat."

The anthropologist Ralph Linton and Talcott Parsons distinguished between ascription and achievement as sources of status. But Burke's phrase does not make any such assertion about the natural aristocrat, whose virtue is neither simply ascribed nor simply achieved.

In November 1987, we brought Russell Kirk to campus to deliver a set of bicentennial lectures. One of his lectures was entitled "A Gathering of Gentlemen," in which he effectively conveyed to our students the exceptional qualities of the framers of our Constitution. A week later, Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn gave several talks, including an excruciatingly vivid and profoundly moving chapel message on human depravity that ended with a paraphrase from St. Teresa of Avila: "Deos o nada!" (God or nothing). In a lecture he gave in class, Erik acknowledged the recent visit of his friend Russell Kirk and illustrated the above distinction by honoring him as a true gentleman.

Brad Birzer shows many of the ways in which Russell Kirk lived up to Burke's description of the natural aristocrat. The entire Samson family was privileged for many years to have had several visits with Russell Kirk and his family – at the Kirk home in Mecosta, at Philadelphia Society meetings, and at our homes in Marion, Indiana, and Holland, Michigan. My children did not get to know Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn beyond one or two visits, but he holds a high place in my esteem and affection, as well.

Toward the end of his essay, Birzer notes the following: "In his 1989 Prospects for Conservatives, perhaps his most polemical and, simultaneously, his most brilliant work, Kirk argued that one separated the economic from the legal from the political from the cultural only with forced artificiality. The 'economic problem blends into the political problem, and the political problem into the ethical problem, and the ethical problem into the religious problem.'[40] Coming from one Creator, all of creation is of a unified whole. The solution to everything, Kirk rightly noted, was a true understanding of the virtues, as developed and handed down through the western tradition: prudence, fortitude, temperance, justice, faith, hope, and charity. Only a cultivation and habituation of these, through the acceptance of grace, will order the soul and the commonwealth. If these are lost, if grace is rejected, the soul and the commonwealth are also lost.[41]"

"While all of the virtues work together, it is love, the greatest of the virtues, that holds the rest together. In one of the most beautiful paragraphs composed in the entirety [of the] twentieth century, driven by blood, ideologies, and technology, Kirk wrote

'At the back of every discussion of the good society lies this question, What is the object of human life? The enlightened conservative does not
believe that the end or aim of life is competition; or success; or
enjoyment; or longevity; or power; or possessions. He believes, instead,
that the object of life is Love. He knows that the just and ordered
society is that in which Love governs us, so far as Love ever can reign
in this world of sorrows; and he knows that the anarchical or the
tyrrannical society is that in which Love lies corrupt. He has learnt that
Love is the source of all being, and that Hell itself is ordained by Love.
He understands that Death, when we have finished the part that was
assigned to us, is the reward of Love. And he apprehends the truth that
the greatest happiness ever granted to a man is the privilege of being
happy in the hour of his death.[42]

We start our Political Theory class at Liberty University with some Bible
passages. One of them, Romans 13:8-10, gives what I maintain is a practical,
working definition of love. Bastiat's "legal plunder" shows how greed effaces
the love of neighbor. Rene Girard's "mimetic rivalry" shows how envy destroys
it. Indeed, the Pauline definition of love may well be the chief theme of the
course, along with a wide variety of lessons in its opposite: in the practical
idolatry that constitutes the intellectual and pragmatic basis of the modern
ideology against which Russell Kirk took up his "sword of imagination."

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-
dyn/content/article/2010/08/27/AR2010082702138_pf.html

A note from Open Europe: "Charles Kupchan, the Georgetown Professor who predicted
that the EU would become more powerful while the US would be losing power, has
argued in the Washington Post that 'The European Union is dying - not a dramatic
or sudden death, but one so slow and steady that we may look across the Atlantic
one day soon and realize that the project of European integration that we've
taken for granted over the past half-century is no more... European politics will
become less European and more national, until the E.U. becomes a union in name
only.'"

Kupchan blames this prospective failure on the revival of European nationalism,
but the real problem was the overreaching of Europe's political elites and the
way in which they marginalized any real public choice or dissenting voice, as
Jack Rakove noted years ago.