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To Probe Party's Future

The decisions made at LP/10 will greatly influence the future course of the Libertarian Party; in many ways, this year's convention will be the most crucial in the party's ten-year history.

In recognition of this fact, the convention's organizers have scheduled a Keynote Panel which will address some of the major issues facing the LP. Its deliberations will take place in the main convention hall immediately following opening remarks by National Chairman David Bergland, who will serve as the panel's moderator.

Each of the panel's four participants is a long-term activist with a history of major contributions to the cause of liberty; between them, they bring some 60 man-years of experience to this colloquium. The four scheduled participants are:

Roy Childs, a leading libertarian theorician and currently editor of Libertarian Review. Childs' late-1960's "Open Letter to Ayn Rand" is regarded by some libertarians as one of the key documents of its era, and Childs has been an outspoken — even controversial — spokesman within the movement ever since.

Don Emmsberger, who has also been

**Armed Forces May Be Used In "War On Drugs"**

by Patrick L. Lilly

If you ever had the feeling that the government had declared unabashed war on you, the following will come as no surprise, though it may still shock you. If you've managed to avoid that feeling, you may have a rude (if necessary) awakening.

Similar bills are now in the U.S. House and Senate, described by Newhouse Service (4 June, '81) as "quietly slipping through," that would amend the 19th-century Posse Comitatus Act, allowing the U.S. military to be directly involved in attack operations against drug owners, dealers and importers, under the command of federal civilian anti-drug agents. The term unabashedly being used by the news media and spokespersons for the government is "war." The Armed Services of both houses of Congress have already approved amendments which would, in a radical shift of established custom and policy, turn the military loose on U.S. (and other) citizens to enforce drug prohibition.

The Senate bill is couched in more guarded language but the House version expressly authorizes the use of military hardware and personnel to make seizures.
Westward Population Shift Bodes Well for LP Future
by Chris Hocker

The 1980 census was most useful for bureaucrats, welfare recipients, and political observers. Leaving aside the first two of these categories (and the symbiotic relationship between them), political observers have had a field day noting that the results of the census will mean a significant shift of political power in the coming years from the North and East to the South and West.

The relevant statistics are as follows: Total U.S. population went up by 12.3 percent, to 226,500,000. Only three states actually lost population — New York, Rhode Island, and the District of Columbia — but the percentage gain in every northern and eastern state except Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine was well below the national average, while the percentage gain of every southern and western state except Alabama was above the national average — and Alabama, at 12.2 percent, was only one tenth of a point below average.

Eleven southern and western states took a total of 17 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives from ten northern and eastern states. The big winners were Florida (4), Texas (3), and California (2), with Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, Oregon, Tennessee, Utah, and Washington picking up one seat each. The biggest loser was New York (5), followed by Illinois, Ohio, and Pennsylvania at two each, and Indiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, and South Dakota each dropping one.

The top ten states in terms of percentage gain in population were, with the exception of Florida and Texas, far western states with relatively low starting populations: Nevada (63.8), Arizona (52.9), Florida (41.1), Wyoming (41.1), Utah (37.3), Alaska (32.3), Colorado (30.2), New Mexico (26.9), and Texas (26.4). Hawaii and Oregon were eleventh and twelfth.

All of these statistics suggest some reasonably encouraging trends for libertarians, economically, socially, and politically. The top ten growth states are all popularly perceived as places of "opportunity," almost frontier-like places, where regulation is minimal, entrepreneurial ability is valued, entrenched urban political machines are absent (along with urban decay), and the deer and the antelope play. Many of the people migrating to these states do so to get jobs — and many others do so to create jobs, to build something new and unique for themselves whether or not it involves getting rich.

The people who pack up and head west — and "west" as a state of mind could be Florida or Maine as easily as Alaska or Nevada — leave behind more than just their jobs, their families, their friends, the double sets of deadbolts on their doors, and four levels of income taxation. Many of them also abandon some or all of their former lifestyle, religion, and political behavior. Now that they’re in Roswell, they don’t have to be Presbyterians or Democrats if they don’t want to.

The political implications of the population shift are best looked at long-term. For the 1980s, the change in the makeup of Congress will be significant but not earth-shattering — and it certainly won’t mean a tidal wave of conservative Republican representatives as some observers have suggested. Congressional district reapportionment is determined by the legislature in each state, and seven of the eleven states which will gain House seats have Democratic-controlled legislatures. (Interestingly enough, five of the ten legislatures in the states which will lose House seats are controlled by Republicans, which should drive one more nail into the coffin of the party system.)

Continued on page 7
From The Chair
by Ruth E. Bennett

For all of you who have not been reading your Libertarian literature in recent months, there will be a National Libertarian Party Convention in Denver, August 26-30.

This is an opportunity you should not pass up. Not in many more years will there be a Convention that will be as accessible or inexpensive to attend. The next Convention will be in New York. This is your opportunity—don't waste it.

There are events and packages to fit into everyone's budget. There will be opportunities to meet, talk and party with the movers and shakers of the libertarian movement. Whether you're looking for an educational experience or just an opportunity to have a good time, LP/10 will be the best and only opportunity in many years to mingle with Libertarians from around North America.

This Convention also offers all CLP members to show off the Libertarian Party to their friends. There will be programs to appeal to everyone so be sure to bring your friends and business associates to speeches, panels and workshops.

Colorado will also have a chance to make an positive impression on the rest of the national libertarian community. Let's show how hospitable Coloradans can be by making Convention attendees feel welcome as our guests.

The CLP will have a Hospitality Suite at LP/10. The room will be available for all CLP members to leave belongings, freshen up, caucus or whatever. Just check in with Len Jackson or Ruth Bennett at the Convention to find the room number.

I look forward to a large number of Coloradans participating in LP/10. We are the hosts and this is our Convention. See you there!

Join Local Boards!
by Phil Prosser

Libertarians! Join those local and state boards. No greater opportunity exists to get the Libertarian message out among the most politically active and effective members of the community. Yet these institutions have been largely ignored by Libertarians for years.

Boards and commissions exist to control energy use, land use, barber shops, and every last detail of our lives. Libertarians can influence these boards and help to lessen their impact. With a little luck and patience we may even get them to dissolve. Most of these organizations hold public hearings from time to time where Libertarians can turn out in mass to support our positions. By just such methods do leftists inflate their influence far beyond any level of public support that they may enjoy.

So far we have a Libertarian on the Park County Citizens Advisory group to update the Park County Master Plan. Two other Libertarians have applied for positions on their local draft boards. The possibility of a Libertarian draft board raises possibilities that boggle the imagination.

Anyone interested in joining local boards or commissions should contact Linda Kaiser c/o CLP, 1041 Cherokee, Denver, CO 80201. Linda has experience at this sort of thing that she is eager to share.

So let's get out there and join; the time for change is now!

Colorado Libertarian Calendar

1st and 3rd Wednesday every month: Discussion group, 7:30 p.m., Party office, 1041 Cherokee, Denver, 573-5229.

2nd Wednesday every month: CLP Cocktail Party, 7:30 p.m., Party office, 1041 Cherokee, Denver. Relax, informal, Cash bar.

4th Wednesday every month: CLP Board Meeting, 7:30 p.m., Party office, 1041 Cherokee, Denver.

1st Wednesday every month: Boulder County Libertarian Association meeting, 7:30 p.m., Capitol Federal Savings Building, 1913 Broadway, Boulder.

Aug. 12 Colorado Libertarian Party Cocktail Party, 7:30 p.m., no-host, 1041 Cherokee, Denver.
Aug. 19 Discussion Group — From Here to There: Implementing Liberty, 7:30 p.m. at Headquarters.

Sept. 2 Discussion Group — Foreign Policy and National Defense, 7:30 at Headquarters.
Sept. 9 CLP Cocktail Party — Come talk over all the good times everyone had at LP/10, 7:30 at Headquarters.
Sept. 16 Discussion Group — Justice without Compulsion, 7:30 at 1041 Cherokee Headquarters.
Oct. 7 Discussion group — Gradualism vs. Radicalism, 7:30 at Headquarters.

Colorful Group — The Problems with Freedom, Headquarters office at 7:30 p.m.

If you would like to have meetings of your county or local Libertarian organization listed or if you know of any happenings which might be of general interest to Libertarians please write to Colorado Liberty, c/o Colorado Libertarian Party, 1041 Cherokee, Denver, CO 80204.

Solving the Energy Crisis
by Barry W. Poulson

Americans have come to accept the idea that we are in the middle of an energy crisis created by the OPEC countries. Yet, recent studies show that we are sitting on vast quantities of untapped energy resources in this country. The question is why are we faced with shortages and higher prices for energy if we have such vast quantities of untapped energy resources? I suggest that this problem can be explained not by OPEC policies, but rather by our own domestic policies.

At the state and regional level, we find major constraints on energy development, particularly in the policies pursued for a profit; a company that responded in innovative ways to the problem of environmental protection, government regulations that provided incentives for the company to allocate resources to the protection of the environment at reasonable costs, and reasonable tax policies that provided revenues for the local community to cope with some of the effects of energy development on the community.

We cannot afford the waste of resources that has accompanied exploration and development of energy in areas such as Boulder County. The Colorado-Wyoming coal project in Craig demonstrates that efficient development of energy resources is
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At the state and regional level, we find major constraints on energy development, particularly in the policies pursued by western states.

A report to the American Institute of Professional Geologists states that mining and energy companies in Colorado are prevented from exploring and developing properties because regulators take actions which are contrary to the spirit and interest of environmental and mining laws.

Militant public groups and environmental organizations conspire with government agencies to make unreasonable and illegal demands on extractive industries. They demand numerous government permits, environmental impact statements, and engage the companies in lengthy court suits in order to delay exploration and development of mineral resources. In some cases, companies find their equipment and property sabotaged. These tactics make the costs of many energy projects prohibitive. Boulder County and other counties on the eastern slope of Colorado have experienced no significant energy development in recent years despite the fact that these counties were historically major sources of coal and petroleum resources.

It is impossible to explore and develop energy resources without some impact upon the environment and upon local and regional economies of the west. Energy development must be reconciled with the desire to protect the environment and to satisfy the interests of local residents. Some areas in Colorado have developed successful energy projects that satisfy these goals.

One of the best examples is the Colorado-Wyoming coal project near Craig, Colorado. The company designed a method for extracting coal using open pit methods that replaced most of the soil to its original contours. They experimented with a variety of reforestation techniques involving replacement of the topsoil and planting of grasses consistent with the surrounding vegetation. Tax revenues generated by the company were used to support the improvement of roads, schools, and other public projects in the Craig areas. The wages and salaries paid by the company gave a boost to the local economy.

The success of the Colorado-Wyoming coal project was based upon several ingredients: an efficient energy company capable of developing energy resources
Libertarian Strategy For The 80’s
Two Views

“Marketing is the key.”
by Patrick L. Lilly

In 1980, the Libertarian Party, led by Ed Clark, accomplished its basic goal of becoming a permanent, recognized part of the American political scene. The Party is no longer a tiny, obscure group whose ideas are unknown and which could be lumped together with the Socialist Workers’ Party, the American Independents, and other “third” parties. The LP is now the third party, not only by its own reckoning, but in the perceptions of the news media, the politicians, and the public at large.

With this new status comes a new and larger set of responsibilities. With it, too, should come a serious reassessment of the Party’s role in the political process, a reassessment of political strategy based on a hard-nosed analysis of the political realities of the 1980’s. Those realities are not always of the common-sensical variety, and if the LP is to continue to grow in the new decade as it did in the last one, then those who chart its course must properly understand the historical principles and social dynamics which govern the emergence of a new party in this country. To begin with, one should realize that a new political party must go through two more-or-less distinct stages on the road from its birth to the status of a major political party. If no better terms suggest themselves, these may be called the “organizational” and the “marketing” stages.

In the organizational stage, the main challenges faced by a new party are procedural, nuts-and-bolts kind of things. They are institutional barriers that have to do with getting started from nothing and with simply letting the populace know that the new organization exists. Such barriers and challenges face all new organizations, and they have little to do with the philosophy espoused.

research into issues, so that their history as well as their general philosophical implications can be succinctly addressed, will become a critical element. Frequently the make-or-break

“First, we must be accepted as friends.”
by Paul Bilzi

Since the completion of the 1980 Presidential campaign, much attention has been focused on the topic of Libertarian political strategy. In the May issue of Update, Milton Mueller gives his ideas of what does not constitute strategy. In particular, he correctly identifies “holding High the Banner of Pure Principle” as a foundation or anchor for the Libertarian Party, but not in itself a strategy. He goes on to explain how a plan of action is bound by the need to allocate scarce money and personnel, and also how it is not necessary at all times to discuss all facets of libertarian philosophy, providing no deception is involved. This analysis is fine as far as it goes, but ends where it started: “What should libertarian political strategy be?”

It should be obvious that the Clark campaign — run from the top with an emphasis on television ads and national media exposure — was not the answer. At least in terms of votes received. Even as a vehicle to expose the public to libertarian ideas, it seems that the results achieved nowhere approached the effort expended. This criticism is not levelled solely at the Clark effort, but much of what the LP has done throughout its history. In my opinion, libertarianism cannot be brought to the public from the top down.

I am pleased to see much attention recently being paid to the idea of grassroots organizing. This to me seems like a much more productive way of utilizing resources and talents. However, before we assume the word grassroots to be the panacea for all our ills, perhaps we should ask what a grassroots organization should do. If it merely mimics National or state parties by holding meetings, issuing press releases, sponsoring speakers, etc., then I submit that it is doomed to failure.

For the past fifteen years or so, I have had an uneasy feeling about the strategies
Research into issues, so that their history as well as their general philosophical implications can be succinctly addressed, will become a critical element—frequently the make-or-break factor—in Libertarian campaigns in the next few years. Libertarian candidates will no longer be able to distinguish themselves from their opponents merely by men and women whose moral principles are beyond reproach. It now also becomes vitally important to convince the public that they are people whose feet are squarely planted on the ground, whose ability to address the mundane concerns of day-in and day-out politics is their qualification. The operant criterion is competence.

During the 80′s, Libertarians will find it necessary to shed completely any lingering image as “pie-in-the-sky” dreamers, nice but unrealistic thinkers. And, as California LP Congressional candidate James McClarin has suggested, there is a time “window” for accomplishing this. 1990 will be far too late for Libertarians to suddenly begin impressing the public as knowledgeable and competent. The job must be done a long before there is a viable Libertarian contingent in the Congress or in the泯 of any of the state legislatures, or there will never be such a contingent.

Any faltering in this regard will produce a faltering in the LP′s quantitative growth and the expansion of its influence. And the lesson of American history is terribly clear that no new party can afford to stop growing before it is finally and permanently established. Even a momentary loss of momentum can easily be fatal.

Libertarians will have to learn, too, how to become effective, ward-healing political operatives against a less than ideally congenial background, and without ever compromising their principles. Taking advantage of trends in public opinion without misrepresenting positions, watering down proposals, or making unkeepable promises is one of the demanding fence-walking skills which few Libertarians have mastered. Yet, but which many more will have to very soon, if the party′s growth is to continue.

Make no mistake — the Libertarians have done all of these difficult things up to now as well as they needed to — better, in fact, than most people would have expected them to back in 1972. But even though defending unpopular proposals may seem like a horrendous task to the political newcomer, it is not until now been the main problem faced by the fledgling party. Thus far, the main problems have been those procedural and institutional ones mentioned earlier. But in the 1980′s, that relationship will be sharply reversed. From now on, Libertarians must meet the challenge of marketing their ideas in a way that is not only philosophically, but also technically, correct. If we can do that, we will succeed where every other new political party in this century has failed. We will continue to build on our initial organizational base, and go on to alter the whole philosophical complexion of the American political system and government.
Mystery Essay
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The correct answer, and the contest winner, will be announced in a later issue. To learn the results, subscribe to Colorado Liberty!

On the basis of all known past human experience, there are no general conclusions with regard to societal organization which can be postulated with confidence. It seems to me that there certainly are.

1.
First, government is necessary — some degree of government — in any civilized society. There are believers in the possibility and desirability of a governmentless anarchy as a practicable form of human association. But the number of these advocates is comparatively very small, and there is no evidence within human historical experience to support their thesis, and there is considerable evidence indicating otherwise.

2.
Second, while government is necessary, it is basically a non-productive expense, an overhead cost supported by the productive economy. And like all overhead items, it always has a tendency to expand faster than the productive base which supports it.

3.
Third, government is frequently evil. And we do not mean by this that they (governments) are merely dishonest. For all governments, with very rare exceptions indeed, are thoroughly dishonest. We made the statement in print, a few months ago, that there has never in the history of the world been a government (and this includes government under any name) that did not possess the ambition to dominate the whole of society, the pretense being that it was necessary for the good of the people. The author himself has been impressed by the profusion of societies and organizations etc. of all types found entirely devoted to propaganda for this purpose. It is with this that we begin.

the limitations of governmental power, and the bestial intermixture of the various products of human effort, or can ever appraise the impact of changing circumstances and changing desires on the infinite ramifications of interrelated human activity, one half as well as the planning, appraisal, and resulting corrections will be accomplished by a completely free market if given the opportunity. For the free market automatically weighs, measures, and integrates into its decisions increments of need, of difficulty, and of motivation that are too small, too numerous, and too hidden for the planners ever to discover them. And the equations to be dealt with are too infinite to be resolved by any human brain or committee of human brains, even if all the variables and constants could be accurately set forth in such equations.

A government trying to step in and improve the workings of a free market is exactly like a man who tries to light an outdoor fire at noon of a bright June day to show you the sun. But a government’s answer to any criticism as to the inadequacy of the lantern is always to bring more lanterns and then more lanterns — until eventually the smoke and glare of the lanterns so seriously interfere with and shut off the light of the sun that everybody actually has to work mainly by lantern light.

It is interesting to note, too, that in any society the government, and its allies who want to use the lanterns, always claim the justification that the society’s economy is more complex than those which have preceded it. They insist that therefore the lantern of planning and control are necessary and helpful now, no matter how futile and harmful they have been shown to be in the past. Of course exactly the opposite is true. The more complex the economy, the more the individual becomes the more nearly infinite the shades and grades of impulse which determine the proper interchanges and relationships between its components become; then the more impossible and ridiculous is any undertaking to plan and control those relations, and the more the automatic workings of a completely free market is needed.

8.
A government increases in power, and as a means of increasing its power, it too far into the daily lives and doings of its subjects, was far better for the Roman Empire in the long run than the intentionally benevolently government of Diocletian or of Constantine, whose bureaucratic agents were everywhere. Let’s dramatize this fact — or opinion — by bringing it closer home. And your speaker would like to have it understood that he does not condone dishonesty in the slightest degree. Yet I had rather have for America, and I am convinced America would be better off with, a government of three hundred thousand officials and agents, every single one of them a thief, than a government of three million agents with every single one of them an honest, honorable, public servant. For the first group would only steal from the American economic and political system; the second group would be bound in turn to destroy it. The increasing encroachment of government, in all nations, has constituted the greatest tragedy of the twentieth century.

Let’s spotlight just one particular result of this tragic development which has occurred in connection with man’s age-old worry — war. That result is the frequency, the length, the destructiveness, the horror destructiveness, and the total of impact on the population, of the wars of the twentieth century. In the physical sciences we are accustomed to using combined measurements, such as foot-pounds, kilowatt-hours or man-days. Let’s invent such a phrase for the measurement of war, and call it the day-number-horror unit. In the use of that three-way calculation we multiply the days of suffering by the number of people who suffer by the depth of the suffering, to arrive at an appraisal. Then I believe you will find that pretty generally throughout history, and despite other factors causing occasional exceptions — and very definitely throughout recent centuries, the day-number-horrors measure of any war has been proportional to the contemporary extensiveness of government. In fact and specifically, it has been directly proportional to the product of the quantities of government in the nations involved at the time a war was fought.

Also, you will find that it is the huge quantity of government which, more than anything else, makes these tremendously destructive wars not only possible, but unavoidable. One illustration should
As a government increases in power, and as a means of increasing its power, it always has a tendency to squeeze out the middle class; to destroy or weaken the middle for the benefit of the top and the bottom. Even where there is no conscious alliance for this purpose, such as formed the basis for Bismarck’s beginning of the socialization of Germany or Franklin Roosevelt’s beginning of the socialization of America, the forces to that end are always at work — as they have been in England for fifty years. In the nations that the gods would destroy, they first make the middle class helpless through insidious but irresistible government pressures.

The form of government is not nearly so important as its quality. Justice and a lack of arbitrariness, for instance, are two characteristics of a government that are most important to the welfare and happiness of a people. They are as likely to be found — or more accurately, as little likely to be found — under any one form of government as another. Rampant interference with personal lives is the most obnoxious characteristic of any government, and that is found just as readily under elected officials as under hereditary monarchs. In fact, as the Greeks pointed out, as has been well known to careful students of history ever since, and as the founding fathers of our own republic were well aware, when an elected government succeeds in attracting and maintaining an overwhelming majority behind it for any length of time, its moral instincts make it the most tyrannical of all forms of social organization.

"War on Drugs"
Cont. from page 1

culture, and that no program of legislation and law enforcement even vaguely compatible with strict enforcement of the Constitution’s pro-individual rights provisions, and the very libertarian American tradition, can ever conceivably eradicate it.

But whereas the Consumer Reports people recommended that the government should quit beating everyone’s head against the wall upon making this observation, the existing executive branch says “Give us the tanks, the tracking satellites, the bazookas, the machine guns, the troop movements without consideration of private property rights, etc. of the military, cont. on page 7
Pro-Draft Forces Launch New Offensive

by Mark David Travis

In a recent widely-reported proposal drafted by the Reserve Forces Policy Board, a Pentagon advisory panel, Chairman Louis Conti decreed the decline in reserve strength of American armed forces and advocated the reinstatement of conscription. Exploiting recents jingoist sentiment and Cold War hysteria, Conti presented Congress with the standard right-wing criticisms of the voluntary army, adding that military service is a citizen's moral obligation.

The debate over conscription raises critical questions about the direction of United States defense policy and the strategic balance of power. Unfortunately, Conti failed to capitalize on this opportunity to contribute anything worthwhile to the discussion. Instead, he offered a plethora of well known and discredited allegations regarding the perceived unfairness of the All-Volunteer Force (AVF) and its inability to defend our country.

Conti's first observation was that the AVF does not meet the nation's present security requirements. While this is perhaps the most serious criticism of the volunteer army, no evidence whatsoever was furnished to justify this claim.

What Conti did present were doubts and suspicions concerning the capability of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) forces to defend Western Europe in the event of a Soviet-Caucasian Pact invasion. He noted that "there is no longer any time, once a European war has begun, to draft, train or send men to fight, which leaves several options: either a return to the draft or some kind of national service obligation or a change of incentives to attract recruits." The last option was rejected in view of the length of time needed to eliminate the "poor staffing of soldiers in the reserve." Conti is realistic in his assessment of U.S. manpower levels as inadequate to insure a swift and decisive response to a sudden Pact attack. He is dishonest, however, when charging that those levels are insufficient to satisfy the legitimate defense needs of the continental United States.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that the demands of America's global troop commitments have become so vast that they can no longer be secured through voluntary action alone. While perfectly adequate to counter any direct invasionary threat to the U.S., the AVF is not suited to quick mobilizations for foreign wars, and was never designed to support the troop levels essential for preserving global supremacy and dreams of empire.

After curtailing the Right's demand for a more aggressive and interventionist national posture, Conti proceeded to woo the Left with an appeal for a more ethically balanced AVF. Citing statistics, he noted that Blacks and Hispanics serve in the volunteer army in numbers exceeding their ratios in the national population. This observation led Conti to identify minority soldiers as "mercenaries for the middle class."

The racial argument is a Pentagon favorite since it plays both to liberals and conservatives. To liberals who might otherwise support the AVF the question is put: "Do you want to see just Blacks and minorities dying in case of war?" To conservatives the allusion is made to the spectre of a predominantly non-Caucasian army dispatched to some Third World nation to kill people of similar ethnic stock.

The widely held belief that the volunteer army imposes an undue burden on minorities is spurious. It was during the draft that Blacks, the poor and the uneducated were victims of systematic discrimination, a problem attributable to the inequities of Selective Service. It was during the draft that they were paid slave wages far less than what they could have earned as civilians. It was during the draft that soldiers had no chance to choose the best of competing alternatives and were forced to serve — no matter how unremunerative, dangerous or incompatible with personal conviction that service might be.

If Blacks are overrepresented in the enlisted force it is because they are now paid a competitive wage and find that the benefits of military service exceed the opportunity costs of public sector employment. If this leads to a racially "unrepresentative" force, then the blame rests with the civilian sector, not with the AVF. The large majority of Blacks in uniform represent progress on the part of the military, not the contrary.

The late Rep. William Steiger (D-Wisc.) remarked that the racial issue "should be turned around to ask why society as a whole doesn't follow the Army's example in providing equal opportunity and a fair chance of advancement." This sentiment is shared by former Secretary of the Army, Clifford Alexander, and leaders of the Congressional Black Caucus, who have not hesitated to criticize the paternalism of those who "would deny Blacks the opportunity to enlist in the Armed Forces." (The Black Caucus, in fact, has gone on record opposing both registration and the draft, and has made a special point of contradicting the racial argument.)

Conti's allegations concerning inequities in the socioeconomic composition of the AVF may also be dismissed. According to Military Manpower and the All-Volunteer Force (Richard Cooper, Rand Corporation, 1978), "The AVF is at least as representative of the total population as was its draft-era counterpart. In terms of both geography and income, today's enlisted population faithfully mirrors the general population from which it is drawn."

The report found the distribution of enlistments by geographical area and family income to be virtually identical to the distribution of the sixteen to twenty-one-year-old male population. That is, neither the poor nor people from any specific geographic area are overrepresented. The highest income brackets are underrepresented, although this has been the case both in peacetime and in war.

In conclusion, Conti speculated on civic responsibility—posing that "military service in a democracy is the obligation of a citizen." This is his weakest defense since Americans may someday favor conscription, but even that would not alter its moral character.

As long as the state has recourse to a draft, militarists like Conti will clamor for its return. They will not hesitate to express alarm at a 2% shortfall in recruitment and intimate that it jeopardizes the existence of Western civilization. They will not hesitate to appeal to any segment of society to any ideological faction in their unremitting drive to engineer the reactivation of Selective Service.

For AVF detractors there will always be too many soldiers who are Black, Hispanic, poor, uneducated, Southern, over thirty, married, unpatriotic, inexperienced, gay, drug addicted, career oriented, and psychologically maladjusted. The generals and their flunkies in Congress and the media will never tire of defining some "representative" group they think should serve, and then bitch if that group is too small.

Most complaints about the volunteer military, then, do not hold up under close scrutiny. That is not to say that potentially serious problems do not exist. They do, but they reflect inefficient decision-making procedures and the absence of market incentives, which inevitably give rise to resource misallocation. A draft would only exacerbate these problems, institutionalize inefficiency and manpower underutilization.

Rep. Steiger, a longtime supporter of the AVF, delivered the following testimony before the House Armed Services Committee: "As long as we can fall back on the simple solution of returning to forced service through conscription, the feeling is, why go through the bother of trying to make our military manpower policies work? It strikes me that those who deplore today's force and who look longingly to the alternative of the draft lack perspective."

"There is a tendency to forget that our Armed Forces have traditionally been made up of volunteers. We have had conscription in only thirty of our 200-plus years as a nation. And there is a tendency to forget the reports of low morale, bad pay, bad living conditions, packed barracks and high AWOL and desertion rates that plagued our draft Army."

"Difficulties remain: attrition, improving the recruiting process and pro-
In conclusion, Conti speculated on civic responsibility, positing that military service in a democracy is the obligation of a citizen. This is his weakest defense since he is no philosopher, and in the absence of convincing teleological argumentation, such an "obligation" is nothing more than a subjective moral claim. The majority of the LP really a national party, or is it in fact a regional party, likely to make significant inroads only in the West?

Internal Organization: Is the party's national structure too centralized? Not centralized enough? Is the National Committee too large? Too small? Superfluous entirely? Should future presidential campaigns be more accountable to the National Committee? If so, how should the accountability be enforced?

All of these are questions that the party must resolve, starting at LP/10 and continuing throughout the years ahead. And while the Keynote Panel is not likely to reach any final, universally-accepted conclusions, hopefully it will start the convention delegates thinking about the issues they must face.

**Mystery Essay Contest Entry Form**

Defining the term broadly, to what extent would you describe the ideas expressed in our Mystery Essay as being libertarian?

- [ ] Entirely
- [ ] Very Much
- [ ] Mostly
- [ ] Somewhat
- [ ] Very Little
- [ ] Not At All

Who do you think wrote this essay?

When do you think it was written?

Would you like to see us run further contests of this type in Colorado Liberty?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Care

Your Name

Address

City____________________ State____ Zip____

I hereby agree to an agreement that I am running this essay without my consent. Enclosed is $6 for six issues.

Mail completed form to: Colorado Liberty, 1041 Cherokee Street, Denver, CO 80204. Contest entry deadline is September 15, 1981.
1981 Platform
Colorado Libertarian Party

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

We, the members of the Libertarian Party, challenge the cult of the omnipotent state and defend the rights of the individual.

We hold that all individuals have the right to exercise sole dominion over their own lives, and have the right to live in whatever manner they choose, so long as they do not forcibly interfere with the equal right of others to live in whatever manner they choose.

Governments throughout history have regularly operated on the opposite principle, that the State has the right to dispose of the lives of individuals and the fruits of their labor. Even within the United States, all political parties other than our own grant to government the right to regulate the lives of individuals and seize the fruits of their labor without their consent.

We, on the contrary, deny the right of any government to do these things, and hold that where governments exist, they must not violate the rights of any individual: namely, (1) the right to life — accordingly we support prohibition of the initiation of physical force against others; (2) the right to liberty of speech and action — accordingly we oppose all attempts by government to abridge the freedom of speech and press, as well as government censorship in any form; and (3) the right to property — accordingly we oppose all government interference with private property, such as confiscation, nationalization, and eminent domain, and support the prohibition of robbery, trespass, fraud, and misrepresentation.

Since governments, when instituted, must not violate individual rights, we oppose all interference by government in the areas of voluntary and contractual relations among individuals, people should not be forced to sacrifice their lives and property for the benefit of others. They should be left free by government to deal with one another as free traders; and the resultant economic system, the only one compatible with the protection of individual rights, is the free market.

Taxes

All taxation is a flagrant violation of the fundamental right of individuals to keep the fruits of their labor. We therefore oppose all forcible collection of money or goods by government, and call for the disbanding of all excise taxes, except where individual water rights presently are being exercised.

Public utility monopolies in the area of water storage, distribution and use must also be abolished and water as a resource returned to its proper place as a privately owned commodity in a free market.

We call for the termination of the monopoly held by the Denver Water Board and similar local government agencies elsewhere in Colorado.

Since government uses tax money to finance water projects, we urge termination of such subsidized engineering jobs in Colorado as federally funded water projects, mine drainage abatement and the Foothills Water Treatment Facility.

In addition we oppose the exercise of federal reserve powers and interstate compacts to the detriment of any Colorado water right. To the extent that downstream water users claim the right to Colorado water, disputes should be settled through stipulation, arbitration, or litigation.

We oppose manipulation of the environment by the State, and call for an immediate end to taxpayer financed weather modification experiments and programs.

Equal Rights

We deny the right of government to discriminate on the basis of sex, race, color, creed, age, national origin, disabilities, sexual or political preference. Nonetheless, we oppose legislative or judicial attempts to regulate discrimination in private relations and transactions.

We particularly deplore the oppression of handicapped persons, the environment through token social programs, the government-medical complex, militarized architectural changes or any laws which institutionalize discrimination. Individual and voluntary cooperative efforts are the only ways to solve the problems of the disabled and simultaneously preserve their dignity.

Abortion

We do not believe the State has any right to interfere with a woman's personal choice regarding termination or continuance of a pregnancy. However, we are opposed to taxpayer financing either for abortion or for support of abortion clinics.

Undocumented Aliens

We condemn any and all round-ups of individuals not possessing required government documents as restrictions on the fundamental freedom to work and move about unmolested.

We support fair immigration, such as attempts to keep Cubans and Asians out of Colorado, and to be withdrawn.

We oppose tax-financed welfare and transfer payments to aliens, just as we oppose them in general.

The Right to Privacy

We support the full and complete protection of each individual's right to privacy from invasion either by government or individuals. The government should not use electronic or any other means of surveillance in order to monitor the actions of any individual without the consent of that individual.

Public Services

We believe that the marketplace provides the best measure of demand for services. Accordingly, we disapprove of such service as public education, and advocate the abolition of all government attempts to develop or restrict (by eminent domain, subsidies, or otherwise) energy production or consumption.

Mass Transit

Governmental attempts to provide mass transit interfere with voluntary exchange and are costly and grossly inefficient. A free market in transportation will provide options allowing better, more responsive service at reasonable rates. Therefore, we favor unregulated competition and transportation alternatives. Specifically, we recommend transfer to the private sector of all equipment held by the Regional Transportation District.

Environment

The present system of regulation fails to prevent the deterioration of our environment, wastes tax dollars, and arbitrarily limits individual rights. Regulations are misleading, since they permit the government to establish arbitrary "tolerable" levels of pollution.

We advocate the development of an economic system to establish individual property rights to air, water, and other natural resources. Present legal principles which provide for the protection of individual rights through the institution of civil actions should be expanded so that the principles of trespass, nuisance, and negligence fully protect individual rights regarding damage done to air or water, or by others.
Government Spending

We advocate massive and immediate reductions in spending at all levels of government, enforced by strict budget limitations. An economy unfettered and undrained by government will provide ample opportunity for all. Subsidies to special interests forcibly take resources from those who have earned them to reward those favored by government. Therefore, we favor ending all types of government subsidies. Public funds should not be used to support or oppose any particular party, candidate, or issue.

Government Licensing and Regulation

We advocate repeal of all laws creating and protecting government-sanctioned monopolies, and demand an end to all licensing requirements and regulatory activities because they interfere with the individual's right to enter into voluntary contractual arrangements. In Colorado, this includes abolishing the Public Utilities Commission, eliminating the monopoly status of Mountain Bell and the Public Service Company, and allowing unregulated access to local broadcasting by cable, satellite, and pay television companies. We also advocate elimination of the 55 mph speed limit, all vehicular inspection requirements and licensing, and licensing of drivers. We believe that public safety can be more effectively assured through a strict application of liability laws.

Individuals in Government

Government officials and employees should be held personally responsible for their activities that violate rights of individuals. We favor voluntary means of financial support, instead of tax-financed salaries, for candidates elected to public office and oppose all laws restricting such voluntary financing.

Water

We favor the recognition of private rights to ownership of water. Any residual claims of the State to water or its use should be returned to private ownership. As an interim measure we advocate water user fees for all Colorado residents so that water becomes subject to the same supply and demand factors as other resources and community

gardening termination or continuance of a pregnancy. However, we are opposed to taxpayer financing either for abortion or for support of the child.

Gun Control

We uphold the individual's right to self-defense and, therefore, the right to keep and bear arms. Thus, we oppose all laws at any level of government restricting the ownership, possession, manufacture or transfer of arms and ammunition. We also oppose all laws requiring their registration.

Criminal Justice

We call for the repeal of all victimless "crime" laws, since they are no more than one group's imposition of its moral standards upon the voluntary actions of individuals. Furthermore, we believe that such repeal, and pardoning of those convicted, would immediately alleviate overcrowded conditions found in jails and prisons and would allow better protection of citizens and property from violent crimes.

In particular, we condemn continuing Colorado legislative attempts to control or eliminate obscenity, pornography, massage parlors, escort services, and use of any chemical substance or drug paraphernalia. The criminal justice system should be restructured to emphasize restitution to victims at the expense of the convicted offenders. The present system of "criminal justice" does not provide true justice because crimes not currently defined as unjustified acts against the lives, property and rights of specific individuals.

Police Powers

We favor drastic reductions in the discretion currently accorded to police officials to take violent action against others on whim and with impunity. In particular, the virtually complete immunity from criminal prosecution for acts such as theft, breaking and entering, false arrest, kidnapping, strip searches and the like which police officers enjoy must be changed.

Unions and Collective Bargaining

We support the individual's unrestricted right to free contract and voluntary association including participation or non-participation in a labor union and oppose the use of government as a tool or weapon in labor relations.

Free Market Zones

As a transition step toward establishing a universal free market, we favor the establishment of free market zones, i.e., areas in which all federal, state, and local regulations, taxes, services and subsidies would be permanently eliminated. We support the right of individuals in any geographic area to establish free market zones.

Public Services

We believe that the marketplace provides the best measure of demand for services. Accordingly, we favor private, rather than governmental, ownership and operation of so-called public services, such as water, gas, public utilities, transportation, fire protection, trash collection and health care facilities. As an interim measure, a system of user fees should be established to more rationally relate the use of services to their costs.

Education

We advocate total separation of education and the state. Government schools interfere with the free choice of individuals and severely limit educational alternatives and progress. The proper solution to our educational ills is a free market in education so that individuals can choose the manner (and the language) in which they will be educated.

As an interim measure, we support tax credits for tuition and other educational expenses, with no restrictions placed on the manner of their use, and repeal of taxes levied against private schools.

We call for elimination within the state education system of forced busing, forced administration of drugs, corporal punishment, and compulsory education laws. Requirements of a state license or other certification to offer educational services must also be ended.

Public Lands and Land Use

Land use planning is properly the responsibility and right of the owners of the land. We oppose government ownership of land, and laws that restrict the right of private property owners to use, dispose of and covenant with regard to their property as they see fit. We advocate private operation of parks and preservation of wilderness through privately owned conservancies.

With respect to private property, we urge an end to government control of land use through such devices as zoning laws, building codes, eminent domain, regional planning and urban renewal. We insist that real costs of new development be borne by the developer or the purchasers, rather than by all taxpayers within that municipality.

Hallmarks of a Free Society

To the extent that the following conditions are approached in a society, the people of that society are free. To the extent that these conditions are absent, the people are oppressed:

- No Conscription.
- No Taxation.
- No Censorship.
- No Spying.
- No Restraint of Trade.
- No Registration of Citizens.
- No Travel Restrictions.
- No Laws Against Victimless Acts.
- A Hard Currency.
- Citizens Have the Right to Keep and Bear Arms.

David F. Nolan
The Selective Service and You

From the Official Selective Service Publication:

What is the Selective Service System?
It's a government agency which will provide people for the Armed Forces in the event of a national emergency. Since the start of the All Volunteer Force in 1973, it has been in a "standby" position. However, Selective Service must be ready to respond immediately in time of need. The purpose of registration is to improve this ability.

How Will You Register?
If you are required to register, go to the nearest United States Post Office, pick up a form, fill it in, and hand it to a postal clerk who will check your form with an identification, such as your driver's license. The postal clerk will not give you a receipt. However, you will later receive a verification letter from the Selective Service.

Please note that postal clerks are not familiar with the details of the Selective Service System. They can only help you in filling out the Registration Form. If you have questions that this pamphlet doesn't answer, write to the Selective Service System, 600 E Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20435.

After You Have Registered, What Happens?
The information you have given us will be put into our files. You will be sent a copy of that information to be sure it is correct. If the information about you is wrong, please change it on the form supplied to you and mail it back to us. You will not be issued a registration card, but you should keep your verification letter as proof of your registration. If you do not receive a verification letter within 90 days, you should write Selective Service at 600 E Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20435.

What If You Move?
The law requires you to let us know if you move. Simply mail us your new address on a Change of Information form which you can get at your nearest Post Office, U.S. Embassy or Consular Office.

Will There Be A Draft?
There are no plans at this time for a draft. No one has been drafted in the U.S. since 1972. A draft could not begin unless the Congress decides that it is needed. The purpose of registration is to have the names and addresses of those who might be called in the event a draft should become necessary, as in a national emergency. With this file of names and addresses, processing could begin quickly and smoothly.

Who Would Be Selected For Induction?
If you are not already a member of an armed service - active, reserve or National Guard - you could be selected through a lottery system. There is no lottery system in the Selective Service System. People selected for induction would be sent a letter of instructions which would explain their rights and responsibilities.

If A Draft Begins, What Are Your Rights?
The law says you should report for examination and induction if you are ordered to do so. You may request a postponement, deferment or exemption. For example:
If you are a student in college, you may finish the semester; if a senior, you may finish the year.
If you are a high school student, you may stay in school until you graduate (up to age 20).
If your induction would create a hardship to your dependents, you may ask for a deferment.

And What it Really Means:

What is the Selective Service System?
It is a government agency that provides slaves to be sent overseas to die in foreign wars. Without this system, the kids couldn't be rounded up nearly fast enough.

How Will You Register?
Turn yourself in at the nearest Post Office. Don't ask the postal clerk for help or you'll just have to return later to do it right.

After You Have Registered, What Happens?
Sooner or later, we'll come and get you. By the way, don't think that the "no receipt" business means you can get away with claiming the Post Office lost your registration form.

What If You Move?
We'll find you.

Will There Be A Draft?
This isn't registration for the Irish Sweepstakes, you know.

Who Would Be Selected For Induction?
People who register.

If A Draft Begins, What Are Your Rights?
Rights? Surely you jest. If you beg and snivel a lot, maybe we'll let you off, but you really don't have any rights.
How Do You File A Claim?
Instructions on how to file a claim will be included with letters of induction. You would fill out the form for postponement or reclassification and send it to Selective Service.

What Happens When You File A Claim?
You will be given the chance to present information to support your claim to a local draft board. You can be assisted in this by counselors, family members, clergy, and any other person you may want.

You could not be drafted until you are offered all of your appeal rights under the law.

Who Makes These Decisions?
Your claim would be considered by local draft board members. These people will be from your community.

Who Would Be Most Likely To Be Called In The Event Of A Draft?
Those who reach their 20th birthday in the calendar year of the draft will be the first group to be called. Others would be called as necessary.

"War on Drugs"  
Cont. from page 4
so we can enforce prohibition in a way that isn't compatible with full respect for constitutionally-mentioned individual rights.

By the time you read this, it may or may not still be possible to influence your Congressperson and Senators before the full houses vote on the proposal. It may not even be possible as this is written; large, very Establishment forces are pushing this. Unless the Congress defeats this proposal, however, it will become law. Can anyone seriously think that Reagan won't sign it? And the inevitable result of that is that someday soon, some people — maybe including you — will have to choose between immediate military capture — by "your own" government — or immediate deadly combat with the military forces that the Reagan administration is using your money to arm more heavily.

Population Shift  
Cont. from page 1
into the coffin of the myth that the Republican Party has resisted any of the policies responsible for the migration from the North and East.

What the population shift will do in the short run is make politics at the state and local level more volatile and less predictable, with new voters who have no particular party allegiance often determining the outcome of elections. Important municipal, county, and even statewide offices in western and some southern states are often nonpartisan, in contrast to northern and eastern elections in which every candidate from governor to dogcatcher is part of a formal party ticket. New immigrant voters will therefore have even less reason to form party allegiances (most new immigrants these days are coming into Western states from Asia and Latin America), and elected officials, in turn, will owe less and less to formal party structures. When these officials move up to higher offices, their choice of party will often be more a matter of convenience than of ideology — unless and until American political parties are reconstituted along ideological lines.

This same phenomenon heightens the electoral prospects for Libertarians — or, at the very least, it does nothing to diminish them. Already, a handful of nonpartisan office holders in two high-growth western states — Alaska and California — are in fact formally affiliated in some way with the Libertarian Party. Hypothetically, some of these individuals could seek higher offices under the Libertarian banner and carry with them into the race several advantages which third party candidates typically never have, such as name recognition, a track record, a financial base of contributors, and political clout. Such situations, should they materialize, could only enhance the prospects for the Libertarian Party to attain major party status.

By no means am I suggesting that Libertarian political activists should begin focusing their attention on nonpartisan races. On the contrary, they should work that much harder to build a strong, viable party structure which will induce ideologically compatible nonpartisan office holders to run as Libertarians when the time comes. What I do mean to suggest is that the population shift between 1970 and 1990 parallels and even exemplifies important national trends during the same time period. Libertarians would do well to be aware of these trends, and to take advantage of them.

Chris Hocker is the publisher of Libertarian Review. The foregoing article appeared in the March, 1981 issue of that publication and is reprinted by permission.
Our government has become a monster. Its policies of ever-increasing taxation, regulation, and inflation have crippled our economy and given us ten-cent dollars.

Every aspect of our personal lives is subject to its constant scrutiny and intervention; the new Omnibus Crime Bill (S 1722), now pending in Congress, would make its police-state demands a reality.

We’re dedicated to restoring the American Dream. By radically reducing the size and power of government, and setting people free to live as they choose, so long as they respect the same right of others.

We stand uncompromisingly for civil liberties, a free-market economy.
A poster version of this ad is available for $3 at the Colorado Libertarian Party booth.

The Libertarian Party

Prosperity.

Freedom.

Peace.

A poster version of this ad is available for $3 at the Colorado Libertarian Party booth.