MEMBERSHIP TOPS 7000

As of 10/06, the National membership has reached 7244! This number exceeds our old record high of 6750 in 5/85! WHY? With recent membership contests, two Ron Paul mailings, C-span viewers joining, and the new confidence about the LP has had an effect on the number of renewals. Our goal is for 10,000 by the '91 convention in Chicago -- wanna bet we make it?

************

COLLEGE OUTREACH PROGRAM

With over 200 contacts, 71 clubs and literature tables, Young Libertarians are appearing on college campuses across the country. If you are interested in starting a YL on your local campus, contact the LP HQ for further information. You will receive a complete organizational manual and a "care package", everything you'll need to spread the LP word in its fight for freedom.

************

THANKS for the clippings that have been sent in this month!

************

SHOULD WE RE-LEGALIZE DRUGS?

...our latest position paper, now available through LP HQ. The LP has definitely taken the lead in the drug legalization issue. At the recent NORML conference, Arnold Trebach of the Drug Policy Foundation claimed to take the Libertarian position on drug legalization, as did NORML board member Dan Viets. Several LPers from across the country were in attendance, including LP staffer Me Me King.

Don Ernsberger recently appeared on ABC's Issues and Answers in Philadelphia. Don received many calls... all favorable.

The AP bureau chief contacted the LP HQ recently for an official statement, we are now being included and highlighted in all background releases. What clippings we see, many LPers are being published concerning the "drug war". Its your turn...write today!

The drug issue Task Force Report is now available through LP HQ. YES, re-legalize!

************
The Libertarian Party stresses freedom over intervention

**By William J. Hickman**
Granville, Ohio

The Libertarian Party wants people to be allowed to do whatever they choose, as long as it does not harm others. The party is known for its support of individual liberties and its opposition to government intervention in personal and economic affairs.

The Libertarian Party stresses freedom over intervention...
Not a Libertarian

To the Editor: I have been uncomfortable that columnist Stephen Chapman is labeled Libertarian. His column on immigration of Soviet Jews (Sept. 16) justifies my qualms. Chapman is correct that it is inappropriate to give these people the legal status of refugees, but one cannot leap from this point — as Chapman does — to the conclusion that they should be denied entry.

The Libertarian position is that immigration and emigration should not be regulated by the state. This unpopular position follows by necessity from the view that all fundamental rights belong to individuals, and the honest admission that no valid social contract has collectivized these rights.

I'm not sure what you should call Chapman. But I am sure that provocative, thorough-going, genuine Libertarian columnists can be found.

DANIEL KIAN MCKIERNAN
Lake Oswego

Drug-legalization cry revived

Bush speech stirs up proponents of decriminalization

By Sharon F. Griffin
Staff Writer

While President Bush prepares to launch an all-out attack in this nation's war on drugs, some local and national observers are questioning whether the President has his guns aimed in the right direction.

"Legalize drugs," Richard Rider, chairman of the San Diego Libertarian Party, said yesterday. "If you legalize drugs you will destroy the drug cartel. You will destroy the drug dealers. You will put them out of the business."

Rider's call for the decriminalization of drugs is not a new idea, nor is he alone in his sentiments. Baltimore Mayor Kurt L. Schmoke, Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz and Willam F. Buckley Jr., editor of the National Review, are among a growing number of national figures who now call for the legalization of some, if not all, drugs.

Mr. Bush, in his televised address to the nation Tuesday, never once mentioned the idea of decriminalizing narcotics. To the contrary, the President vowed to not only crack down on hard-core addicts and dealers but also on casual drug users.

People such as Rider maintain that Mr. Bush is simply planning to reuse tactics that already have failed. "The question is: Are we going to deal with it as a medical and ethical problem or are we going to deal with it as a criminal problem?" Rider said. "As long as we deal with it as a criminal problem, we will pay far, far more both directly in costs and indirectly, in our freedoms."

Schmoke last year called for a national debate on decriminalization.

"Decriminalization would take the profit out of drugs and greatly reduce, if not eliminate, the drug-related violence that is currently plaguing our streets," he wrote in a commentary that appeared in the Washington Post. "Decriminalization will not solve this country's drug-abuse problem, but it could solve our most intractable crime problem."

Dr. Mitchell Roseenthal, founder of the Phoenix House Foundation — the nation's largest private, non-profit substance-abuse agency — does not see the decriminalization of drugs, not even marijuana, as a reasonable solution.

San Diego Mayor Maureen O'Connor also opposes legalizing drugs, and yesterday she said she supports the President's position that there are no casual drug users.

The President's stated stance toward casual and recreational drug users has not gone without notice, and already such users are gearing up for a fight.

"This attack on casual drug users is going to create a huge protest movement against the law," predicted Steve Hagar, editor of High Times, a New York-based magazine that deals primarily with topics on marijuana use.

"The (government) is going to be facing a Vietnam situation in another year," Hager said yesterday. "The marijuana protest movement just got the biggest shot in the arm that it could have ever received."

President's plan to target marijuana users.

"The (government) is going to be facing a Vietnam situation in another year," Hager said yesterday. "The marijuana protest movement just got the biggest shot in the arm that it could have ever received."

Dale Giereing of NORML — the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws — yesterday expressed similar outrage at the President's plan to target marijuana users.

"If this is what the drug war is all about, it is the worst thing to come down the pike since McCarthyism," he said, referring to Sen. Joseph McCarthy's attacks on people and groups in the 1950s by charging, often falsely, that they were Communists.

Too much regulation

Editor, Star-Free Press:

So Proposition 123 provides the latest episode of the voters looking to government for help through regulation only to be disappointed once again. Are you surprised? When are you going to wake up and smell the roses, Californians?

As a nation we became great by allowing a free market system to work, and believing that the government that governs best leaves alone. In the past two decades, however, we have looked to government to intervene into the free market system whenever that market did not yield the result deemed desirable by a special interest group.

Each time new regulation is attempted, a new bureaucracy (including, in this case Roxani Gillespie) is formed, consuming carloads of tax dollars and providing unsatisfactory results. Roxani Gillespie is not the problem. Regulation is the problem. Don't believe it? Look at the products and services that have been subject to the most regulation: savings and loans, postal service, public schools, railroads, automobile insurance — all industries that many believe are providing very poor service at high cost.

Compare that to the industries that are thus far relatively unregulated: household appliances, private schools, private parcel delivery, TV, computers, electronics, supermarkets, shopping centers. Which system do you think works better, government regulation or free markets?

As a Libertarian, I'd rather let the free markets work and be rid of the costly government bureaucracy that in most cases has not provided any overall benefit. Let's not just get rid of the insurance commissioner, let's get rid of the Insurance Commission.

ROBERT A. CHATENEVER
Ventura