



FREE LIBERTARIAN

Monthly Newsletter of the Free Libertarian Party

Vol 2, No 4

April 1973

STATE CONVENTION

The following is a revised schedule of events for the FLP State Convention. All items listed will be held at the Williams Club; 24 East 39th Street. Since none of us are in the business of predicting the future, the times are approximate. But every effort will be made to begin the sessions on time.

FRIDAY, MARCH 30:

- 6 PM: Concurrent meetings of the Following Committees: Rules, By-Laws, Credentials and Platform
- 8 PM: Opening ceremonies
Reports from the Credentials and Rules Committees
- 9 PM: Election and installation of Convention Chairperson
- 9:15 PM: Address by Harry Browne (author of How to Profit from the Coming Devaluation)
- 10:30 PM: Treasurer's Report
Recess for the Night

SATURDAY, MARCH 31:

- 10 AM: Report from the By-Laws Committee and adoption of any amendments to the By-Laws
Recess for lunch
- 3 PM: Address
Report from the Platform Committee
Recess for supper
- 7-12 PM: This time has been set aside for any caucuses

SUNDAY, APRIL 1:

- 11 AM: Opening address
- 11:30 AM: Election of FLP officers
Recess for lunch
- 3:30 PM: Endorsement of candidates for public office at the 1973 general election
Adjournment

Candidates for Party and public office will be having their literature available at the Convention. Also available will be copies of the proposed By-Laws amendments and the reports of the Platform Committee. All delegates are urged to get this material.

THE FLP NOW HAS A TELEPHONE AT THE PARTY OFFICE: IT IS (212) 354-0292

NATIONAL LP NEWS

The 1973 National Libertarian Party Convention will be held at the Holiday Inn; Interstate 71 and State Route 82; Strongsville, Ohio 44136, (216) 238-8800. (It's a suburb of Cleveland.) Registration for the Convention will begin at 6 PM, June 7th in the lobby of the Inn. Convention sessions will be held all day on June 8th and 9th. There will be a National Executive Committee meeting on June 10th, with anyone welcome to attend as an observer. Further details on these and all social activities will be forthcoming as plans are finalized.

Room rates, per day, are as follows: single occupancy, \$16...Double occupancy, \$20...Multiple occupancy, add \$3 per person to \$20 rate. Rates do not include the 4 1/2% Ohio tax.

The Inn is one mile north of Ohio turnpike Exit #10, and only ten miles from Cleveland-Hopkins airport. A call on their direct line at the airport terminal will bring the Inn's free courtesy car to pick you up (and return you for your departure).

Credit cards accepted by the Holiday Inn are: Gulf Oil, American Express, Diner's Club, Master Charge and Bank Americard.

There are only 148 rooms left now - so get your reservations in early.

Also, register for the Convention now! You don't even have to be an LP member to attend.

Registration fee for LP members is \$8 prior to May 15th, \$10 after that date. For non-members, its \$10 prior of May 15th and \$12.50 after that date.

Send your registrations to: **LIBERTARIAN PARTY**, P.O. BOX 31638; AURORA, COLORADO 80011. (This is the new address for national headquarters.)

If enough New Yorkers are interested in going to the Convention, the FLP could charter a bus. But this means at least 30-40 people. So if you plan to go, send a note or postcard to the State office.

Following the mailing of the nomination notice for the open position of National Executive Committee seat from Region 8, only one nomination was received for this position: Steven Carr, who was nominated by George Jacobs. Mr. Carr has accepted the nomination, and the chair has ruled to accept him for the position without further ballot.

FROM THE CHAIR

This is my last From the Chair column; and I've been trying to decide whether to devote it to looking back or looking ahead. Although the past ten months have given me many happy and exciting things to look back on, and looking into the future is always fascinating, other thoughts have pushed these two possibilities out of my mind. What I have really been thinking can be summed up in two questions: "What have I learned?" and, "What is the value of what we have been doing?"

I believe both of these questions have the same answer: "I have learned the value, the overriding importance of radical* thought in dealing with the reality of my life."

That reality is social, political, economic, ethical as well as personal and in every respect I've come to the realization as never before that only radical thought, radical analysis and radical solutions offer any future better than the present. Whatever problems we face must be perceived, understood and dealt with in accordance with 1) the root nature of the problem, and 2) the principles we understand (to the best of our understanding) to be consistent with reality.

I freely admit that at the beginning of my association with the FLP my radicalism (if it could be called such) was tenuous at best. It was limited by the desire to "be effective," to "accomplish things." I believed the FLP's real task was to determine what, in the real world, actually could be accomplished and then setting our sights on that goal.

Such is no longer my conviction. Libertarianism is a radical movement. Libertarians, even the most conservative libertarians, are radicals. The Libertarian Party, if it is properly named, is a radical party. We are radicals and we must remain radicals if we expect to improve our lives.

I have come to realize that, for me at least, the only choice that is consistent with my convictions requires me to swim against the current, directly upstream. Anyone who tries to remind me that I'll never reach the opposite shore that way will find me readily agreeable. I don't simply want to change sides of the river, I want to get to its source.

I hope the FLP will continue to be and will become even more radical. If it grows, I hope the growth will come from others who perceive the importance of radicalism rather than from those who can be satisfied with small changes, small improvements and small victories.

Thank you for a great year. Thank you even more for all of the things you've given me. I hope it was a two-way street.

Yours in liberty
Jerry Klasman

*RADICAL: "Of, pertaining to, or proceeding from the root." Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary

IN THE NEWS

FLP member Jack Brookner appeared on NBC's Editorial Reply on February 24th to respond to and NBC editorial in favor of price controls on food.

Jack said, "At a time when the Administration, and especially Secretary Butz, is finally reflecting credit on itself by decontrolling the economy, most recently by taking the restrictions off of nine million acres of idle farm land, and consequently reducing farm subsidies by one billion dollars, at such a time it's disappointing to see WNBC-TV advocating the use of expanded price controls as a substitute, however temporary, for the free competition of the market place in an industry particularly well suited for free competition.

"This action by the Department of Agriculture pinpoints the fact that there has been restrictive government policies, not wicked agro-businessmen, which have kept food prices up and rising, by taking farm land out of use."

We've received the following release from Sanford P. Cohen - who has already declared his candidacy for Congress next year (in the 25th C.D.)

"Congressman Hamilton Fish, Jr. is sponsoring a National Waste Recovery bill in the House of Representatives.

If passed, the bill is designed to expedite the "waste disposal problem" at the national level. The bill would set up another inefficient government bureaucracy. The bill would "nationalize" garbage.

The politicians and bureaucrats can't improve postal service, can't solve the drug problem, and haven't acted to prevent future VietNams. And now Rep. Fish wants the Federal Government to run the garbage business."

The *Free Libertarian* is published by the

FREE LIBERTARIAN PARTY, INC.

15 West 38th Street, Room 201
New York, New York 10018

Free to members

All articles, features, columns, letters, ads and announcements must be received at above address by 20th of month preceding publication.

Classified Rates

\$1.00 per column inch
\$1.00 MINIMUM

PLATFORM: PRO & CON

If the long-range goal of this party is to imbue the people of this country with the fullest possible understanding of Libertarian principles, then the events of the open hearing (2/3/73) can only be viewed as an obscenity. Most people are woefully ignorant of both these principles and their practical applications. Indeed, the only comment I have heard from these people, when questioned on their knowledge of Libertarianism, is, "Aren't they a bunch of anarchists?"

In light of this ignorance, a state platform is not only an absolute necessity (it has been argued otherwise) but must be a kind of micro-cosmic philosophy, i.e. a statement of principles from which is derived concrete applications to man's behavior.

On Sunday, the question of whether the platform (if any) should be primarily philosophic or "specific" actually arose, was debated and voted on. The members of the Party based on the philosophy of individual rights voted for "specifics." Aside from this decision's being the nadir of pragmatism, it is obviously based on a false alternative. It should be both. In my judgement, the majority report of the Platform Committee meets this requirement; the minority report does not; and the question of no platform at all is an absurdity not worth discussing.

I was very saddened and disheartened by the pitiful showing at this hearing. Are the people of the Libertarian Party the passionate defenders of freedom or are they the somnabulistic perpetrators of a life-defying, life-denying apathy? The turnout at the Convention will be the judge.

I urge you to request copies of the reports, to attend the Convention and to vote the majority report as the platform for New York State.

I have resigned from the Platform Committee for the same reason I joined: in protest of ignorance, stupidity and moral masturbation. I hope I will not have to leave the Party. I hope to see the members of this Party rise in passionate affirmation of the principles of the road to freedom. Members of the Free Libertarian Party of New York: What is your answer?

Lynda Marchetti

The differences between the proposed platforms are political, not philosophic or economic. The FLP is not a philosophically pure strain as Objectivism. It doesn't represent a single economic doctrine as FEE does, although on economics we are very close to such agreement, at least in NY. And the FLP certainly doesn't represent a homogenous political point of view, within the context of the whole libertarian movement. And that's the crux of our problem in drafting a platform.

The problem boils down to whether the platform

should reflect a single viewpoint, objectivist, as representative of the majority of the FLP, or whether the platform should be fusionist. I came to the Platform Committee as a fusionist and neither Paul Hodgson's warnings of impending doom nor Lynda Marchetti's vehemence have convinced me that the objectivists have an actual majority in the FLP or that we should all bow before the eternal fountainhead.

In a party so uniform philosophically, compared to the rest of the political spectrum, I see no need to further narrow our range of viewpoints. In every political movement with any reasonable amount of success, there is some diversity of political views, and I would rather that our diversity should move to the right toward a little more anarchism rather than to the left toward more collectivism.

I think that that's a fair statement as to what the real difference is between the "minority" and "majority" platform drafts. That does not mean we need to accept the non-libertarian accusation that we are some sort of anarchist group. I think we should accept, on the other hand, some of the responsibility for the irrational hatred people have of anarchists and should not be afraid to counter such liberal myths.

I've not always been in favor of platforms. But Goldwater unfortunately found in 1964 that the public wants to have a detailed programmatic document, not a philosophical statement or even a periodic manifesto, which I would prefer, ideally. So Sam Konkin finds himself putting forward a proposal originated by that unadulterated conservative, the Senator.

What the "minority" platform proposes is essentially "limited government," but not in so one-sidedly an objectivist way (that is, pro-government) that those preferring less government will not be represented in the most basic Party statement of positions.

I owe a special responsibility to the membership to disabuse them of the notion that there is a majority and a minority on the Platform Committee. What's now a minority was originally the majority, but two of its supporters resigned for personal reasons. Then Lynda was accepted without our knowing that she was already on Paul's side, a situation caused by Paul's silence at several points. Even now the "minority" has 4 of the 8 Committee votes and may become the majority at the next meeting, so let's not talk of majorities and minorities.

The FLP is a political party, and that means we must accept a diversity of viewpoints, within the limits set by the general philosophy of libertarianism. The "minority" platform draft does that; the "majority" platform does not.

Jack Brookner

After attending the Platform Committee hearings on Feb. 4th, I have come to the conclusion that the Committee has done a very poor job and

that it has not produced anything closely resembling an acceptable platform.

A Libertarian Party platform should unite the Party in the sense of stating the positions on which all (or virtually all) members of the party agree. It should not take positions on which there is disagreement among members. Like a good definition it should isolate the respects in which the members of the class are similar to each other and different from all who are not members of the class. This the proposed platforms have not done.

In the first place neither the anarchist nor the limited government members of the Committee could agree; this resulted in a majority report, signed by the five limited government members and a minority report signed by the four anarchist members. I am a believer in limited government; but even the limited government platform was not acceptable to me. Out of 20 sections I had to reject four in their entirety and parts of five more.

What was most objectionable was the tendency for members of the Committee to write their own pet theories into the platform. A deterrence theory of imprisonment - as opposed to a retribution theory which I hold - was written into both reports as official Party doctrine. I do not see how either theory can be derived from the principle of non-initiation of force. The majority report favored abolishing capital punishment and included the idea that convicted criminals should pay the cost of their trials. Whatever merit there is in these ideas (and I do not think there is very much), a person can disagree with them and be a libertarian. Most incredibly the majority report endorsed floating exchange rates, a position which directly contradicts the gold standard, as, under a gold standard, the free market necessarily results in fixed exchange rates.

The minority report contains the statement: "the most general cause of crime is that people's desires usually exceed their capacity to produce." What about those of us who believe that the cause of crime is fundamentally moral, not economic?

Both platforms supported abortion. What about those who believe that the unborn child has a right to life? For us the libertarian ethic requires that this right be protected (either by a government or a defense agency). Is there anything unlibertarian in our belief?

To cap it all off Paul Hodgson, in explaining the majority report, stated that he regarded the platform as a "contract" between the party and its candidates. When I asked him if this meant that all candidates would be required to support the platform, his answer, while evasive, did not deny it.

I do not want to see a party platform shoved down anyone's throat; especially I do not want to see a party platform that is a "contract" between the party and its candidates put in over the opposition of a large minority of the party. This would only alienate that minority. What we are trying to do is to bring people in, not drive them away. The Platform Committee was given the job of creating a document which represents the Party to the outside world; instead of doing this, members of the Committee are trying to get their own pet

theories endorsed as official party doctrine. If they do this by rational persuasion so that their ideas truly become representative of the party, then fine. But if they do it by measures which leave 49% of the Party feeling unrepresented by the platform, then it can only result in harm, not good.

(To illustrate the degree of ideological rigidity being imposed, during the discussion Paul Hodgson, a signer of the majority report, expressed the opinion that anyone who did not support the gold standard should be thereby disqualified from the Party's nomination. Yet, as previously mentioned, his own report endorsed floating exchange rates, a direct contradiction to the fixed exchange rates which are one aspect of the gold standard.)

Lee Schubert has already taken the position that there should be no platform. I propose a 2/3 rule so that neither the platform itself nor any individual plank can be accepted without receiving a 2/3 vote in favor. This, I think, will prevent a narrow majority from shoving a platform down the minority's throat and will result in a more acceptable platform.

If my 2/3 proposal is not accepted or if it does not result in a satisfactory platform at the Convention (and it does not appear at this time as though it will because the Convention is not the place to do the great amount of work which remains to be done on the platform), then I will support the position of no platform and hope that the Party can do a better job in writing a platform next year.

Howard Katz

TAX REBELLION REPORT

As taxation is a high priority issue politically as well as economically in libertarian thought, this will hopefully become a regular monthly column. It will attempt to give a wide area of reportage and will not just cover group tax resistance; but will report on major cases of individual resistance and will also go into the constitutional arguments against taxation and reasons for resistance. Naturally, with ever increasing support for the Liberty Amendment, the long range goal is the repeal of the 16th Amendment and an end to all socialist economic operations, i.e. TVA and the other 700 or more activities, within the government. In the interim, it is hoped that with a greatly increased number of individual and group tax rebels, there will be a major favorable court ruling on the constitutionality of the income tax as well as other taxes.

As this column is being written, I was very happy to learn of a decision just handed down by the U.S. Court of Appeals in individual tax resistance case. It is a moral victory, even though it is a legal defeat.

In June of 1970, Jack Malinowski was indicted

for allegedly falsifying his W-4 form. Jack claimed 14 dependents. In April of 1971, his trial began. While being tried, he filed a 1040 form for the prior year reiterating his claim of 14 dependents. This gave him no taxable income. About \$900 had been withheld for the first half of the year. Subsequently, he received a refund check dated 11/13/72 for \$477. A week later, he received a notice showing his overpayment of \$385, which meant he would receive another refund. With so much bureaucracy in the Infernal Revenue Service (sic), one hand didn't know what the other hand was doing. The IRS got an indictment against him for falsifying the number of dependents while they were acknowledging his right to those dependents by granting a refund. On November 14, 1972, Jack appealed his conviction to the U.S. Court of Appeals. Several days later the Court ordered the IRS to disclose several confidential documents to Jack's attorney for the purpose of filing a supplemental brief relative to the documents. After that a decision was rendered. The Court upheld Jack's conviction. He was sentenced to three months probation without any fines or conditions. This is the moral victory. I have spoken with Jack's attorney, John Egnal, and he advises me that the case is on appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. Jack Malinowski is a member of the Philadelphia War Tax Resistance. Right on Jack.

Due to lack of space, this column on individual tax rebels will be continued at a later date. However, I would like to name a few of the leading rebels around the country. They are: Lucille Moran, Vivien Kellems, Jim Scott (arrested September 25th for failure to file a 1040), Robert Lyon, Marvin L. Cooley, Claire Kelley, Gunar Bundy, Vaughn Ellsworth and Jerome Daly.

Remember, TAX IS THEFT.

Kenneth W. Kalcheim

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS ON NATIONAL

by Paul Hodgson

(continued)

The potential for any of these types — regardless of motivation — turning a state party into an anti-libertarian organization which happens to support some libertarian programs (e.g., abolition of the draft and foreign adventurism, or defending due process of law or freedom of speech) while actively pursuing statist ones in other areas (e.g., against abolition of the Fed. and legal tender laws, or of taxation and subsidies) grows in proportion to the eclecticism of its membership. Suppose, for instance, that the N.Y. party grew to 10,000 members, the great majority of which supported civil libertarian policies but called for maintaining or increasing controls and subsidies of the economy by local, state, and Federal government; and at the same time, the Calif. party grew big in Southern Calif.,

with 9,000 out of 10,000 pushing for decontrol of the economy and "tougher anti-crime measures" — e.g., bugging, preventive detention, dossiers, etc. Woe unto National and any state party associated with it come convention and campaign time!

Yet the L.P. must grow far beyond such numbers before it can have any substantial effect on politics; it will never succeed as an elitist party or a political coffee klatch. In today's culture, where can we draw this membership from except such groups as the "civil libertarians" and the "silent majority", who are essentially a-philosophical?

If such a state party should arise, how could the various state parties which remained libertarian dissociate themselves, both separately and in the National Party, to ameliorate the damage to years of hard work and to withdraw support from such pragmatic and/or power politics? Only on the basis of the Statement of Principles outlined above. That is the meaning in an organizational context of "the party of principle."

In the period 1972-74, however, the National L.P. will reflect the ideas and action of those who came as delegates to the '72 convention, particularly those who were elected to the ExecComm. (Anyone was able to register as a delegate and attend.) I should point out that the L.P., both National and state, are still in a period of initial organizing. National, for instance, is still looking for people to organize state parties in those states lacking them. When National finds such a person and recognizes him as chairman pro tem of a state organization, it is up to that person to do the organizational work, and it is up to the organization thus formed to submit an affiliation petition to National ExecComm certifying that they have endorsed the Statement of Principles in open convention and to submit a constitution and/or by-laws and list of officers. Once the ExecComm has accepted that petition (and only then), that party has the same status as all others affiliated with National. Any independent organization in a state lacking an affiliate party can, however, submit a petition and be chartered without prior recognition by National.

National's other organizing is proceeding along three main lines: fund raising, membership, and advertising and publicity. Funds are still quite low, which limits the other two, but we should be setting up a system at the next ExecComm meeting which will improve the situation. In addition, a few special projects have been undertaken by various ExecComm members; e.g., a consumer issues study by Ed Clark, a Congressional rating service by Eric Royce, an election laws study by David Nolan, an L.P. general info-research office by Eric Westling, and a campaign advisory group by Frank Robinson. Some of these are provisional at present, and further study and reports are due from the people involved.

The ExecComm meets roughly once every six months (next at the workshop-convention June 8-10 in Cleveland) and ballots by mail on business which doesn't require a personal meeting. We are preparing to diversify into a division of labor along the following lines: advertising, internal communications, fund raising, information material packages, meeting coordination, national press releases, newsletter, operations (i.e., honcho the whole business — your truly), platform committee contact, judicial committee contact, special projects coordination, and VIP correspondence. I expect to see a substantial evolution in this setup in the next few months, and some results.

Some broader aspects of these questions:

National politics (and power) in this country still centers around Congress, believe it or not. Usurpation of power by the Executive is occurring by default of that august body,

and will be rectified (along with all other national usurpation of power) only by Congress; you can bet the President won't do it, and the Supreme Court can only buy time (of which there isn't much left. On the other hand, can you imagine a Libertarian President trying to implement his program over the opposition of a Demo-Republican Congress? Unmitigated national disaster.

Add to all this the fact that the solution of state political problems (especially financial-economic) is dependent on liberation from Federal power, and one conclusion becomes inescapable in logic: *The road to freedom takes us first to Congress.*

But it is *only the state parties* which can do that, *by their own autonomous effort.* What help the National L.P. can provide by way of clearing-house coordination, information collection-dissemination, advice (but *not* money), or any other project involving economies of scale, it certainly will if it has the resources to do so. But even in this, the states must make known what will be most useful to them; National needs *continuous input* from the states, not just at convention time. Use the pen.

We can add that quadrennial intangible — coattails — which at this point means the ability of National to provide a visibility which would not otherwise be possible now for the smaller state parties. The Hospers-Nathan campaign, which culminated in a vote in the Electoral College with some national publicity, provided some of that. I expect the '76 campaign to serve essentially the same function. About 1980 and '84 I won't speculate ..

Beyond that, National will provide additional experience for those involved with it, and I cannot overemphasize the value of such experience. What we go through in party effort and organization, and in straightening out principles and their detailed applications — be it in conventions, committee work, party literature, publicity, campaigning, or general exposure — will be the primer for, as well as the means of mounting, the campaigns in which we actually face our opposition as a serious threat, in elections or in office — *especially for Libertarian Congressmen.* If we aren't seasoned vets by then, forget it. They'll tear us up.

Anyone interested in National should write to Denver for the information package and especially for the Platform and the Constitution, by-laws and Rules. I also recommend a subscription to the National newsletter if not a National membership.

I say again in conclusion: what National does, and whether we get to Congress in time, depends on what you do in your state party. I invite any more particular questions at the upcoming state convention.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Concerning Mr. Muchnick's article in the February issue, he states the following, "The number of crimes committed with pistols, long since tightly controlled, has gone up 80%." He gives this as irreversible proof that gun control laws should be liberalized. I say that's enough proof that we should have strict gun control laws (in all states) to be able to apprehend these people when they commit their crimes.

The greatest deterrence to crime is the certainty of getting caught. If the people Mr. Muchnick was referring to know that their gun number can be quickly reached by the police they're going

to think twice.

The assassin of Gov. Wallace walked into a Wisconsin gun shop, proved he was over 21, and walked out with a Saturday Night Special that nearly killed a presidential contender.

No gentlemen, I don't want to take away your right to own guns, I just want to make sure that guns aren't easily accessible to the Bremer's. We can't say tough gun control laws won't work when in some states (e.g. Wisconsin) guns are plentiful and in other states the law is reasonable. Finally, Mr. Muchnick cites countries where callous gun control laws didn't work for the citizenry but against them (e.g. Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy). What about Great Britain? Which has proportionately a quite lower murder rate.

GREGORY BRESIGER

I must object to Mr. Castrovinci's misrepresentation of fact in the previous newsletter when he says, "...its (i.e., the "majority" report's) author has stubbornly refused to alter it in any way, apparently feeling that his own views are infallible and in no need of alteration." (My emphasis.)

First, a comparison of the majority report with the initial work-draft (which was prepared by "its author" at the request of the present and previous FLP Chairpersons, for the Committee to rewrite as it saw fit) will show complete revisions in many areas and substantial revision throughout. Second (and more to the point), with the sole exception of the preamble, "its author" had one vote like everyone else on the Committee as to what changes would be made. Any five members (out of nine) decided the question on every motion. It was not up to "its author" to "alter" the Committee report.

If Mr. Castrovinci (et al.?) is unaware of this, it is probably because he (like the other three minority members) refused to take any part in the proceedings after they were reversed on the questions of which work-draft was to be used (the alternative having been a collection of partially finished work by the minority members) and of "neither-~~nor~~", etc. Having dismissed it out of hand when the Committee convened, then effectively walking out after the other five decided to use it, they made no attempt to "alter" it — if, indeed, they even read it.

I therefore find Mr. Castrovinci's assertion ludicrous at best, and a bit disingenuous under the circumstances.

Also, I must correct a typographical error in my platform letter (among seven other errors): In the fourth paragraph, "...the most specific issues ..." read "... the most important specific issues. ..." in the copy I submitted, which is a substantial difference in meaning.

PAUL HODGSON

Attention: All clubs wishing to place notices in the FLP Newsletter must submit exact written copy by the 20th of the preceeding month. No copy will be accepted over the phone.

CLUB NEWS

If you wish to organize an FLP club, contact Howard Rich at the FLP office. An organizing kit will be provided which consists of model by-laws, instructions for organizing, literature and PR handbooks, party literature, names, addresses and telephone numbers of members and prospects in your area, speaker(s) for organizing meetings, charter applications, etc. The FLP Membership Committee will provide as much help as needed to get you started. It will even suggest projects for those clubs requesting ideas.

If you wish to join a club, the choice of existing clubs follows. If none suits you, you'll have to sit around and wait for someone else to form one in your area or YOU'LL HAVE TO DO IT YOURSELF!

ALBERT JAY NOCK FLP CLUB (AJNFLPC) (Queens) (chartered). This will be an oral reading club of libertarian literature. Contact Robert Cohen at (212) 762-3203.

BRONX LIBERTARIAN CLUB (BLC) (chartered). The Bronx Club will have its fourth meeting on Sunday, April 15th at the home of member Bill Roth, at 7 PM. Some of the Club members will be working on research and research files for the FLP (both for the upcoming campaign and for more long term purposes). Anyone interested either in attending the meeting or in doing research (or helping with filing) should contact Tom Avery at (212) 584-5493.

BROOKLYN LIBERTARIAN PARTY CAUCUS (chartered). The next meeting of the BLPC will be Wednesday, April 3rd at 7:30 PM at the home of Paul Tanzer; 164 Prospect Place; (212) 857-6751.

LIBERTARIAN ABORTION ACTION GROUP (LAAG) (Manhattan) (chartered). The Club is devoted exclusively to the abortion issue, but will also be dealing with contraception law repeal, and is open to men as well as women. During the Convention LAAG will caucus Saturday, March 31st at lunch. The next meeting will be on Monday, April 16th at the FLP office at 7:30 PM.

MID-HUDSON LIBERTARIAN CLUB (MHLC) (Poughkeepsie) (chartered). The MHLC meets every third Thursday of the month at 8 PM at the Unitarian Church; 67 Randolph Avenue; Poughkeepsie. For information contact Guy Riggs (914) 462-0613.

FLP RADICAL CAUCUS (FLPrC) (unchartered). Contact Sam Konkin at 635 East 11th Street or J. Neil Schulman at (212) 595-9143.

LIBERTARIAN ANTI-CENSORSHIP CLUB (Manhattan) (unchartered). The sole purpose of this club is to mobilize action against government censorship of motion pictures, the theater and literature. Contact Louis Sicilia at (212) 361-8000 ext. 323 (9 to 5) or (212) 663-2562 (evenings).

LIBERTARIAN EDUCATION ISSUE CLUB (LEIC) (unchartered). For information contact Noah Fuhrman at (212) 737-8851 or write to him at 35 East 85th Street; New York, N.Y. 10028.

LIBERTARIAN TAX REBELLION COMMITTEE (LTRC) (unchartered). The LTRC seeks people interested in the tax rebellion to aid the Committee in its goals. Contact Kenneth W. Kalcheim at (212) 288-0327.

LIBERTY AMENDMENT CLUB (unchartered) - For information contact Nona Aguilar; 52-07 74th Street; Elmhurst, N.Y. 11373 or Ken Kalcheim at 288-0327.

NASSAU LIBERTARIAN CLUB (NLC) (unchartered). NLC is concentrating on the issue 'Legalization of Drugs to Aid in the Control of Crime.' For further information write P.O. Box 32; West Hempstead, N.Y. or call Mary Jo Wanzer at (516) 4-1-6010.

STATEN ISLAND LIBERTARIAN CLUB (SILC) (unchartered). For information contact Timothy Killoran at (212) 761-5596.

SUFFOLK LIBERTARIAN CLUB (SLC) (unchartered). For further information contact Richard Lerner at (516) 543-9463 (evenings).

MISCELLANY

NYLA MEETINGS

Held the first and third Friday of each month at 8 PM at the Laissez Faire Bookstore in Greenwich Village.

On April 6th & 7th Kenneth W. Kalcheim and Nona Aguilar will speak on Tax Rebellion. Tax Rebellion Kits will be available for a donation of \$10.

William Arethyn, an old English sheepdog made \$22,500 in four months through shrewd investments on the London stock market. The shaggy little tycoon, pet of investment consultant Bob Beckman, is currently stumping British tax officials who want to collect the tax on the capital gains registered in his name. Beckman refuses to pay, claiming the money belongs to the sheepdog. Beckman insists he merely reads off lists of possible stocks to buy or sell; but the canine makes all the decisions, giving the go-ahead signal by wagging his tail or licking his chops.

FREE LIBERTARIAN PARTY, INC.
15 West 38th Street
New York, N.Y. 10018

FIRST CLASS MAIL

CLASSIFIED

WANTED: Office Furniture - all size tables, cabinets, lamps, accessories, trays, supplies, refrigerator, chairs. Donators should contact the FLP office; 15 West 38th Street; NYC 10018; (212) 354-0292.

WANTED: People to form a Blue Shield Group for lower insurance rates. If interested, please call Mona at LO 2-6916.

Safeguard your assets against inflation. Invest in gold and silver coins. Write Liberty Coin Service, Dept. M-4, 223 Abbott, East Lansing, Michigan 48823.

LIBERTARIAN TAX REBELLION COMMITTEE: We offer a Tax Rebellion Kit for a donation of \$10, which will show you how to avoid paying income taxes, telephone taxes, etc. legally and to defend yourself in Federal Court with the U.S. Constitution to keep out of jail. Please send donations to: Kenneth W. Kalcheim; 349 East 65th Street - Apt. 5C; New York, N.Y. 10021.

LP of California has available cassette tapes of Hospers speeches and debate with Socialist Workers Party candidates and other goodies (posters). For price list write LP of California; P.O. Box 71383; Los Angeles, Calif. 90071.

I NEED MONEY!

I have announced my candidacy for U.S. Congress from the 25th district 22 months prior to the election. The reasons are simple - there is a lot of work to be done; and I want to win. I'm not out to get 1% of the vote, or even 10%. I am running to win. If you want to help a libertarian get to Congress (regardless of your district), send money to:

CITIZENS FOR COHEN
P.O. Box 1776
Poughkeepsie, N.Y. 12601

PLEASE ENTER SUBSCRIPTION FOR:

☐ \$4/one year ☐ \$7/two years

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY & STATE _____ ZIP _____

Enclosed is check _____ money order _____
for \$ _____

Mail to: **FREE LIBERTARIAN PARTY, INC.**

15 West 38th Street
New York, N.Y. 10018

The *Free Libertarian* costs money to print and mail. And there ain't no such thing as a free newsletter, although there is such a thing as the *Free Libertarian*.

A subscription to the newsletter costs \$4 per year. The newsletter is included in membership fees to all FLP members. Friends of Libertarianism who wish to continue receiving the newsletter on a regular basis are urged to fill out and return the coupon.

LAISSEZ FAIRE BOOKSTORE: Tremendous selection of Libertarian, Free Market and Romantic Literature.
AVAILABLE NOW

LAISSEZ FAIRE INDIVIDUALIST LIBERTARIAN CALENDAR for 1973. 297 events of significance to libertarians. All are relevant; 267 are *explicitly* libertarian, including 119 *explicitly* anarchist events. **LAVISHLY ILLUSTRATED!** Photos of Spooner, Tucker, Rothbard, Mises, LeFavre plus 7 other illustrations. \$2.25. Add 25 cents for first class postage.

LAISSEZ FAIRE BOOKS* 208A Mercer Street, (corner of Bleeker) NYC (212) 674-8154.

INDEPENDENT LIBERTARIAN COMMENTARY: Articles, newsnotes and current libertarian events. Sample copy free. Robert Cassella; 60 Broad Street, Staten Island, N.Y. 10304. \$4 per year.

NEW LIBERTARIAN NOTES: Articles, news, theory for east coast radical libertarians and science fiction reviews for freedom fen. \$4 for 12 issues. Checks payable to Samuel E. Konkin, III; 635 East 11th Street - Apt 24; New York, N.Y. 10009.

OUTLOOK: The Libertarian Monthly: The liveliest, most provocative political magazine, featuring leading libertarian writers and thinkers. \$6 per year. **OUTLOOK:** 208A Mercer Street; New York, N.Y. 10012.

We will give a gold sovereign to anyone securing 10 subscribers to **GOLD Newsletter**. National Committee to Legalize Gold; 1524 Hillary Street; New Orleans, La. 70118. Offer unlimited.