

UNLV

March 11, 1992

The Editor
National Review
 150 East 35th St.
 New York, N.Y. 10016

Dear Sir:

I am outraged at your shoddy journalism. Not only did you publish lengthy excerpts from my presidential address to the John Randolph Club (NR, Mar.6) without ellipses; you published them without my permission. The copy given to your Mr. McGurn was not a clean one, and one that I had not proofed; more importantly, it was given to him only for his information, and under express instruction not to publish any of it. Moreover, Mr. McGurn gave repeated and explicit assurances that none of the speech would be published without my express permission. Not only that: the editing was such as to make my speech seem far less ideological and far more of a personal attack on Mr. Buckley than it really was.

Furthermore, if you had had the common decency to ask for my permission to publish, I would have refused. For the same reason that I strongly advised Pat Buchanan not to reply to Buckley's article: because *National Review* is in thrall to the neoconservatives, and because *National Review* is no longer the forum within which all differences among conservatives must be discussed and resolved. Pat Buchanan's entry into the presidential race has made it crystal clear that *National Review's* day is finally done; now that we have *Human Events* for political news, *Chronicles* for intellectual substance, and Pat Buchanan as the political leader of our movement, who needs *National Review*? The answer is no one, apart from neoconservatives, and those who crave jobs and contacts inside the Beltway. Certainly not the younger conservatives, who are enthusiastic Buchananites; and not your donors and subscribers, once they find out what you have been up to.

National Review is "history;" it is a walking corpse who thinks it is still a living and vibrant force in American life. Why don't you have the grace to face reality and, along with Mr. Buckley, go into permanent retirement?

Sincerely yours,

Murray N. Rothbard
 S.J.Hall Distinguished Professor
 of Economics

tively fond of someone he once clearly detested? The answer, I would venture to give, has nothing to do with theology and everything to do with social acceptability. *Tempori parendum!* ■

Dr. Gottfried, an adjunct scholar of the Mises Institute, teaches politics at Elizabethtown College.

**Left-
 Libertarianism:
 The Cato-
 Cornuelle
 Connection**
 by Joe Melton

These days, the changes wrought by the collapse of the Soviet Union have gotten us used to living in a time warp. (Serbs vs. Croats! An independent Ukraine! A move to bring King Michael to the throne of Romania!) So it was more fascinating than astonishing for veteran libertarian-watchers to see, recently, the return of Dick Cornuelle, once one of the movers and shakers of the movement. And still more fascinating to see him brought back under the auspices of the Cato Institute. And thereby hangs a tale.

Strange as it may seem, Dick was brought back in the form of a front page article "The Power and Poverty of Libertarian Thought" in the January-February 1992 *Cato Policy Report*, an article moreover, that is simply a reprint of a London *Times Literary Supplement* article