


June, 1975



Vol. 3 NO. 4

SHOCKWAVE

Published by the
LIBERTARIAN PARTY
of WASHINGTON STATE
Tel. (206) 285-0704
Chairman
RICHARD DYMENT

Editor ED FOWLER Assistant Editor SIGNIE FOWLER

BRIEFLY FROM LAST MEETING

There are approximately 64 subscribers to SHOCKWAVE at present, about half of which are new members.

Richard Slomen presented the major points of the Political Action Committee meeting held at Pat Artz' home. Among those items discussed were how to achieve a larger and more active membership, particularly in the Spokane, Vancouver and Kelso areas; setting a goal of increasing membership to 1,000 people within the next 12 months. The full report will be given at the June business meeting.

Carl Nicolai reported on Initiative 308 which isn't doing too well due to lack of financing.

Richard Slomen suggested that radical ideology is absolutely necessary for mass movement led by Libertarians. The Party must take stands.

Bill Rausch asked that anyone interested in running for any office in November for King County or Seattle City Councils contact Richard Dymont, State Chair.

Richard Slomen suggested that one person run seriously and that LPWS resources be placed solidly being him or her.

A letter from Ed Crane asking for financial support for the emerging 3rd Party Libertarianism was read. A request was made for names to send copies of Crane's letter to. Richard Dymont will take all such names.

The subject of door fees at business meetings was scheduled to be the first order of business at the June business meeting. Richard Kenney and Sylvia Lovegren were asked to prepare pros and cons for inclusion in this SHOCKWAVE. (See elsewhere for their reports.)

THE NATIONAL SCENE.....

By Patricia A. Artz

KAY HARROFF, JIM BLANCHARD and GREG CLARK were elected to the National Executive Committee to fill the resignations of Scott Royce, Karl Bray and Bill Westmiller. Bill felt his responsibilities as Chairman of the California LP might interfere with his capability for living up to his own standards as national secretary. Greg Clark took over the secretarial duties on Sunday at the Execom meeting in Chicago and will chair the Credentials Committee for the national convention in N.Y. by virtue of holding that office. Bill was elected to the Bylaws and Constitution Committee which he chaired last year in Dallas.

Karl is so involved with this fight with the IRS and his appeal to the U. S. Supreme Court that he decided his effectiveness as an Execom member would be diminished at least for the next six months. Karl will be back in the future, hopefully with a major victory to his credit.

KAY HARROFF, who tallied 80,000 votes in her run against John Glenn for U. S. Senate in Ohio last fall, and who is Ohio LP Chairperson, has announced her candidacy for the PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION OF THE LIBERTARIAN PARTY in 1976. Kay is a dynamic, objective, hard-line Libertarian who is equally articulate on economics and civil liberties issues. This was my first opportunity to meet her. Kay, John Vernon of Oklahoma and I talked until the wee hours of Sunday morning. John, an Oklahoma City restaurateur, chalked up 17,000 votes in a citywide election there last fall. Both he and Kay ran as Independents because of state election laws. John initiated a fund raiser at the banquet Saturday to help Kay off-set some of her campaign deficits. Over \$550.00 was forthcoming from a crowd of around 200 persons.

GUY RIGGS OF N.Y. HAS ALSO ANNOUNCED HIS CANDIDACY FOR THE LP PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION. Looks like an interesting race shaping up for the top spot. No announced candidates for the VP yet.

The election of JIM BLANCHARD to the Execom adds valuable dimension to the Committee. The stature and success of his "Committee to Legalize Gold" and his contribution to the financial stability of the party via the New Orleans conference virtually assures his re-election in convention. Every delegate should be encouraged to seek Jim out in N.Y. to become better acquainted with him.

Speaking of the N.O. Conference, the Kentucky State Chairperson, Bobbie Jahn (pronounced like "yawn" and her husband, Marty Jahn, Region 5 Execom member, followed exactly the directions sent to all states for promoting the conference and participating in the profits. They earned \$1,000.00 for the Kentucky LP. Not many states followed up.

Several states report formation of campus groups. The California organizations are calling themselves the "Young Libertarian Alliance". The next 18 months should be a fertile period for channeling the normally stepped-up interest of a national political year and the disillusionment of the young with POLITICS AS USUAL into the Libertarian fold.

ANDREA MILLEN, National VC and guiding light of the publications committee, requests position papers of general interest which could be adapted to national interest be sent to her. They may be official position papers or those developed by individuals. DON'T FORGET - both LP News and Reason reprint the best published editorials each issue. Don't be modest.

The LIBERSIGN with the addition of the words "Toward Liberty" in the crossbar was adopted at Chicago. This may come on the floor at the convention.

As stipulated in our national bylaws, we elected ten members to the PLATFORM COMMITTEE, the other ten to be selected by the ten states with the largest membership as of December 30, 1974 (as I was elected by Washington State). Five of those elected by the Execom MUST be from small states and five can be from the larger. Ed Clark, Chairman elected at the Washington, D.C. meeting in November, from California; Joe Cobb, Ill.; Bill Evers, Calif.; and Murray Rothbard and Ralph Raico, N.Y. represent the five large states. Eric Westling, Colorado; Jerry Millett, Louisiana; Bobbie Jahn, Kentucky; JoAnn Chernow, Penn.; and Richard Kenney, Massachusetts, were elected from small states.

The BY LAWS COMMITTEE, Chaired by BILL OF HOWELL of Texas, will be composed of Fran Youngstein, N.Y.; Bill White, California; Kurt Germann, N.Y.; Bill Westmiller, Calif; Lee Schubert, N.Y.; Jan Croxton, ???; Sparkie Hall, La.; Phil Manger, Md.; and our own Sylvia Sanders.

CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE, GREG CLARK, Chairman, will be staffed by Porter Davis, Oklahoma; Marty Jahn, Kentucky; Bill Sussel, Calif.; and Dave Nolan, Colorado.

You should have received the first convention flyer by now which includes a questionnaire and a pre-registration blank which entitles you to a 5% discount on the convention package by sending in your \$7.50 fee now. WHY PAY MORE? REMEMBER - YOU NEED NOT BE A DELEGATE TO ATTEND AND THERE IS A GREAT EDUCATIONAL PACKAGE INCLUDED.

MORE NEXT MONTH ON BOTH THE CHICAGO MEETING AND THE NATIONAL CONVENTION.

THE BOSTON MAYORALTY - -
MAJOR LP ELECTION EFFORT FOR 1975

By Richard Kenney

David E. Long, Chairman of the Massachusetts Libertarian Party, is a candidate for Mayor of Boston. Because of the off-year nature of the race, because of the prominence of Boston in nationwide news currently, and because of Long's principled approach to libertarian politics, this election struggle deserves the attention and support of all libertarians. No other political event of this year will provide as much return for your dollars.

David is a graduate of St. Johns College (the great books curriculum college), a computer programmer, and a radical libertarian. He joined the Massachusetts LP in early 1973 and became chairman a year later. An MLP delegate to Dallas, he was elected regional executive committee member there and is currently into his second stint as MLP chair. Under his leadership the MLP has been expanded

and professionalized, and is enjoying a high level of morale. The mayoralty campaign will be the MLP's first political bid since the 1972 presidential election.

David announced his candidacy at the recent state party convention and immediately received first page coverage in Boston's largest newspaper, The Boston Globe. At his press conference he called for the abolition of the Boston School Committee, for decentralization of school control to the neighborhood level, and for a citywide voucher system. The Globe quoted him as an advocate of power to the people "in its most fundamental sense by granting individuals full control over their lives and property" and as working toward the "immediate deregulation and ultimate repeal of all laws regulating transportation, gambling, alcoholic beverages, sexual relations between consenting adults, construction and zoning, prices, wages, and rents." Other positions Long has been emphasizing include "drastic decentralization" of the Boston Police Department and a program designed to reduce the size of city government by offering "tax rebates to any person or group who privately contracts for services now provided by the city". This is one LP campaign which promises consistent advocacy of principled libertarianism on all issues, combined with creative proposals for implementing the principles.

This is a national election off-year. The Boston mayoralty is one of the few elections being contended. Because of the prominence of the busing issue nationally, Boston promises to be in the news regularly. As with Fran Youngstein's 1973 bid in New York, David Long's mayoralty candidacy will not be simply a local matter. A well-funded campaign will be able to make a major contribution to the American peoples' awareness of and commitment to the cause of liberty.

As David commented at his press conference: "Boston is on the verge of another revolution. I want this revolution to occur at the voting booths, not in the streets. I want this revolution to be a Libertarian revolution, striking out against the growing power of government at all levels - federal, state, and city!"

Help him along by sending your check to:

COMMITTEE TO ELECT DAVID E. LONG
MAYOR OF BOSTON
Box 2610, Boston, Mass. 02208

IF YOU HAVE SOMETHING TO SELL AND WOULD LIKE TO ADVERTISE IN A SMALL BUT GROWING MONTHLY THAT REACHES PEOPLE WHO EXPECT AND CAN APPRECIATE QUALITY.....A SHOCKWAVE CLASSIFIED AD WILL COST \$2.00 MINIMUM FOR 20 WORDS, 7 CENTS A WORD AFTER THAT. OR YOU CAN BUY 1/4 PAGE FOR \$5.00, 1/2 PAGE FOR \$8.00, OR A FULL PAGE FOR \$15.00.

ATTENDANCE FEES ??!

AGAINST ATTENDANCE FEES

By Richard K. Kenney

(1) THE PROPER BASIS FOR MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION IN LPWS IS IDEOLOGICAL, NOT FINANCIAL. It's a matter of agreement with LP principles as expressed by the pledge and platform - not of ability to pay for or even willingness to spend money on any particular "service".

(2) OPEN MEETINGS ARE DESIRABLE IN PRINCIPLE. Anyone interested in the struggle for liberty should be welcome at our meetings; their commitment justifies their presence. And their commitment and talent may be considerable without including a desire for costly meeting rooms, or a belief that attending and contributing to a meeting requires payment. Closing our meetings to those skeptical of entrance fees could have the effect of making the meetings themselves less valuable.

(3) TANSTAAFL vs WELFARISM - A RED HERRING! Arguments that "It's costing us money, therefore you should have to pay, too" or "why should I have to subsidize moochers?" betray a misunderstanding of psychology and freedom. The costs do not HAVE to be incurred. Nor do you HAVE to contribute; payment is and should continue to be voluntary. Some people simply may not value the hotel "services". Others may actually disvalue them. And "free-riders" are hardly evil. The desire to have everyone pay for every value you produce shows an absence of the attitude appr. to a benevolent creator: magnanimity.

(4) ALTERNATIVES EXIST. Neither costly rooms nor attendance fees are necessary. Private homes, restaurants which provide meeting places for dinner groups, rooms available without charge - these and other arrangements are possible. As is an alternative form of funding: voluntary contribution. If sufficient money is not raised by asking for it, people really don't value the "service".

(5) RENTED ROOMS WASTE NEEDED FUNDS. The LPWS is severely strapped for funds and needs every dollar available for waging political struggle - for printing literature, for postage, for advertising, demonstrations, election campaigns, legal fees. Fancy rooms are a luxury we can ill afford. Within our present budget the \$200+ annually devoted to meeting rooms at the Towers is absurd! Attendance fees will institutionalize this irrational expense.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The NEXT LPWS MEETING will be held on Saturday, June 28th, 1975, at 8:00 p.m. at the University Towers Hotel, located at 45th and Brooklyn N.E. in the University District.

The JULY BUSINESS MEETING of the LPWS is scheduled for July 26th at 8:00 p.m., also in the University Towers Hotel.

There will be no LPWS business meeting in August due to preparations for the NATIONAL LP CONVENTION in NEW YORK LABOR DAY WEEK-END.

MANDATORY ADMISSION CHARGES - THE LIBERTARIAN ALTERNATIVE

By Sylvia Lovegren

The primary argument against a mandatory door charge at LP monthly meetings is that it would be an "involuntary" method of paying for the assessed room charges. This argument breaks down immediately when scrutinized.

The LP does not "volunteer" to pay for the space it rents from the University Towers - it only volunteers to rent the space. Once the liability is incurred, choice vanishes. And because the Party has the moral and legal obligation to pay for the space, it has a corresponding obligation to assure its ability to pay - by collecting from those attending the meetings. Since attendance at meetings is not mandatory, those who have taken the responsibility of paying for the room owe nothing to those who cannot or do not wish to pay.

Under our present voluntary system, however, an individual may choose not to help pay an existing liability, and can claim the moral right to enter meetings without paying a dime. Which leaves responsible Party members with the "moral obligation" to pick up the tab. A peculiar situation for a libertarian to find himself in! Compounding the dilemma is the fact that the voluntary system is by definition an honor system. Perhaps all who attend the monthly meetings are honorable and will pay their own way. Perhaps. But, surely in a libertarian society each individual should decide for himself who is or is not honorable, rather than having the party organization make that decision for him.

In fact, the voluntary, honor system currently in operation forces each of us to be either moochers or suckers, neither of which should be appealing to any libertarian. One alternative is to refuse to make "voluntary admission donations" on moral grounds.

Another is to institute mandatory admission fees to the monthly meetings which alternative, besides being consistent with libertarian principles, certainly seems a much more practical solution to the problem of paying the rent.

The entire matter, at first blush, appears to be a great waste of time and a good deal of trouble for such a minor issue. But the application of libertarian principles on a day-to-day "minor" basis is really the major part of our fight to build a liveable and moral society. The first place to start building that society is within our own party.

Beginning next month SHOCKWAVE will be mailed to paid subscribers only, except for samples sent to prospective new members. Anyone who wishes to continue receiving SHOCKWAVE but has not paid the \$5 subscription fee please do so before July 10th to insure uninterrupted service.

DEADLINE for next issue is July 10th. Send all material and correspondence to: SHOCKWAVE, P. O. Box 2096, Seattle, Wa. 98111, or Ed Fowler, 621 South 194th Street, Seattle, Wa. 98148.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

(A new column for your input pro or con on articles included in the SHOCKWAVE.)

TO: The Editor - Shockwave

A correction or clarification, if you please, to a statement by Sylvia Lovegren in her thought provoking column "Thoughts at Random", May 1975.

She refers to an editorial in the Wall Street Journal opposing the Equal Rights Amendment on the grounds that what it will mean in practice is the increase of bureaucratic meddling in all our lives. She then proceeds to make the assumption that that is indeed the case, adding "One of the planks of the 1974 LP platform contains the text of the ERA and there is no doubt that Libertarians support every individual's right to be equal before the law." The last part of that statement is certainly true.

The plank to which she refers does include the essence, the spirit in which the ERA is intended, but goes much further and in fact specifically precludes the section feared by WSJ. I quote from the platform: "(11) DISCRIMINATION - Equality of rights under the law should not be denied or abridged by the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, on account of sex, race, color, creed, age, national origin, or sexual preference. We shall oppose any governmental attempts to regulate purely private discrimination. However, we condemn bigotry as irrational and unjust."

Therefore, to answer Sylvia's query, libertarians handle the question by dividing it and analyzing each part.

We have already granted that libertarians support every individual's right to equality before the law and the potential for integrated toilet facilities is too ludicrous to discuss.

That part of the ERA which provides for the use of force to implement the law has already been written into the Civil Rights Act of 1964, I believe under Title VII, and is now being used and will continue to be used whether or not the ERA is ratified by enough states to make it the law of the land.

To put it another way, the mischief has already been done and will not soon be undone. Are we now to throw away the opportunity to correct a two hundred year old error of deliberate omission for the sake of rejecting a portion of that proposal which is offensive but which in fact already exists? I think not, as do the majority of individuals who have seriously considered and studied this issue.

One should not, however, be surprised that the editors of WSJ which is dominated by conservatives have not bothered to do so. Conservatives are not known for upholding civil libertarian issues and have rarely opposed the use of force to impose their morality on other human beings, i.e., victimless crimes.

Steve Kimball is to be complimented on his superbly rational article on abortion. He states in his second paragraph, "The most unfortunate aspect of the controversy is the emotionalism in which it is shrouded." This statement applies to the ERA as well.

We have an ERA in Washington State and we have eliminated laws against abortion. This has caused no great upheaval.

When I started to work for the Libertarian Party in 1972 I had hoped I could work for the rights of all individuals and never again need to write or speak specifically on women's issues. Apparently that hope is not to be realized in the near future.

It is offensive to me to ask to be granted under the law that which I was taught was mine by birthright. It offends my sense of dignity as a woman and doubly offends my sense of justice as a human being.

Today women have only one right under our Constitution - the right to vote.

If the ERA is not ratified this time out, how many generations will be required? Another 200 years? Most feminists realize it will take several more generations to uproot the base causes of discrimination and certainly would prefer to see our precious time and creative energies focused on those evils rather than a prolonged crusade for equality on paper.

Hopefully we have re-learned that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty - but let us be done with it and get on to other issues!

Patricia A. Artz

CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND
PSYCHIATRIC OPPRESSION

by Richard Kenney

The third annual National Conference on Human Rights and Psychiatric Oppression will take place in San Francisco from July 2nd thru 6th. The conference hopes to bring together many of those concerned about psychiatric injustice. Last year's conference, held in Topeka, Kansas, was attended by over 300 professionals, concerned citizens, and former victims of psychiatric oppression.

Each year thousands of people are locked up, heavily drugged, and given electric shock, all under the guise of "helping" them! Many of these individuals are committed and "treated" against their will. In addition to its direct coercion, psychiatry frightens countless others into conformity. This conference is an important step of involvement with the struggle for control of our own bodies, brains, and minds. Workshops will cover topics such as: psychiatry and the law, the experience of "madness", psychiatric oppression of gay people, sex roles and stereotyped behavior, strategies for the future struggle against the therapeutic state, and so forth.

For more information, contact:

NAPA, 2150 Market Street, S.F. 94114

GUN CONTROLS

by Richard Dymont

Recently I received a one page report put out by a local conservative organization warning me that this year the 94th Congress was once again being beseiged with various types of gun control legislation, 44 bills in all. It went on to say that out of the 40 million hand guns in this nation only two one-hundredths of one percent of hand guns were used in homicides, or put another way, that only 99.98% of the handguns were NOT used in homicides. The basic theme and conclusion of this letter was that Socialists and liberals want to disarm the United States citizenry as an end to their own means and that we should write to our congressmen opposing these bills.

In part I must agree with this type of letter in that a gun is ONLY a tool and that it in itself cannot initiate the use of force, only the human operator can. There is an ever growing clamour in the newsmedia to eliminate the citizens' right to own private property of this nature while maintaining that police and other government organizations have the sole right and need to own and bear arms. Also it is obvious to me that the statist continue to play upon the voters very real fears of rising crime rates and acts of violence by disseminating misinformation that would have you believe that with stringent gun controls our crime rates will drop and people will stop killing each other.

I must also agree that the gun can act as a deterrent to crime, especially when it comes to using a gun to deter the government from enslaving its citizens, which is the largest and most prevalent crime being perpetrated worldwide today. It comes as no surprise to me that of all the various parts of the United States Constitution that the statist could attack that it is the Bill of Rights that they single out, most often, as their target of attack. They are fully aware that the first ten amendments to the U. S. Constitution were adopted with the express purpose of protecting the individual citizen's natural rights from infringement by their own government. If the statist are to have their way, then they must remove or negate such dangerous amendments to the Constitution as the Second Amendment which states in part, "THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS SHALL NOT BE INFRINGED", for not to do so would leave in the potential slave's hands the final means of defense against those that would enslave them.

As you can see, so far I pretty well agree with our conservative friends on the gun control issue and I hope they continue to do all they can to combat this very real danger to our individual liberties. But it is my opinion that they are not really attacking this issue in a manner that is going to influence the average voter for the average voter is not concerned with "commie hating groups" and their rhetoric (no matter how substantial some of it may be). They are interested in protecting themselves and

their families from the ravages of a GROWING CRIME RATE.

If we are to be successful in our fight against gun controls, we must first make the average voter re-examine his premises concerning the REAL causes of criminal behavior so that his attention will be turned from the purely superficial issues of gun control to the basic issue of what causes criminal behavior.

For example, if we want to re-focus the voter's attention, we could use the following two examples (among many) as a prelude to expanding our reasoning on the far more important problem of what is causing the continually rising crime rates: In their arguments for gun controls the knee-jerk intelligencia and the statist often use the argument that in Great Britain where there are stringent gun controls there is less gun-related crimes than in the U. S. Maybe so, but what about Switzerland where they have a citizens' army with a gun in every household and a lower crime rate than in Great Britain? What about Jamaica where the government, because of a constantly increasing crime rate, has imposed super stringent controls on guns... where it is a prison term offense to be in possession of a single bullet much less a gun of any sort...where laws protecting citizens from unreasonable search and seizure have been waived...where massive house to house searches, roadblocks, et cetera, are a normal every day and night routine...where the crime rate CONTINUES TO RISE in spite of all the loss of liberties by its citizens and the growth of government under the guise of gun controls?

Usually the response to examples of this nature consist of something like "okay, so guns aren't the problem and rising crime rates are, so what do you do about it?" As I mentioned before, now the door is open to where we can discuss the real problem and not be wasting our time and efforts on superficialities such as gun controls which only serves to confuse things and make our opponents premises seem more worthwhile.

In my opinion the reason for the rising crime rates are essentially due to the erosion in the respect for and understanding of property rights. For this reason I hold out no real hope for the conservative element or the liberal element fights against crime. Neither the conservative (with his views on huge military programs, interventions, draft resistors, drug users, et cetera) nor the liberal (with his views on economic controls, welfarism, subsidies, taxes, et cetera) can ever hope to fully recognize, much less explain, the basic necessity of respect of and observance of property rights if we are to stop this ever-increasing rise in crime.

With both types continually pressing for more tax monies to cover the expenses of their police actions, drug enforcement programs, welfare programs, subsidies,

et cetera, how can we ever expect the private productive area to be able to produce the wealth necessary for new jobs for our ever-expanding population? How can we expect the kid in the street to respect property rights when the leaders of his government, under the pressure of the liberals and conservatives, continues to ignore his rights and impose forced schooling, minimum wage laws, drug penalties, increasing taxes on him or her until it finally becomes clear to this kid that the only way he or she is going to make it is by force or by copping out all together.

If we are ever going to reverse the crime rate we must establish a society where the incentive is there to produce rather than steal or rob, where a person is allowed and in fact rewarded for using his abilities productively rather than stymied and stifled at every step by laws designed to benefit one segment of the society over another.



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.

Yes, I am speaking about a Libertarian society where everyone's private property will be protected, where the conservative may keep his gun and the liberal may keep his drugs and where the government will be there solely to protect our individual rights rather than interfering with our private lives at every turn. So for this reason I maintain that it will have to be the libertarian voice that is heard and understood if such arguments against gun controls are to be heard, for neither the conservatives nor the liberals have an answer that is consistently correct.

MEMBERSHIP SCHEDULE

Basic membership in the LPWS is free, but the related services are not. It is the funds donated by the membership which will eventually insure our success.

Informational Membership \$2.50
Includes meeting notices only.

Subscribing Membership \$5.00
Includes one year subscription to LPWS Newsletter SHOCKWAVE.

Sustaining Membership \$15.00
Includes one year subscription to SHOCKWAVE, one year LPWS position papers, notices.

Life Membership \$50.00
Includes life subscription to SHOCKWAVE, LPWS position papers, notices. One year free admission to LPWS annual convention.

Life Sustaining Membership \$100.00
Includes life subscription to SHOCKWAVE, LPWS position papers, notices. Life-free admission to LPWS annual conventions.

1 year subscription to SHOCKWAVE only. \$5.00 enclosed.

I am interested in learning more about the LP. Enclosed is \$1.00 for an informational package.

I would like to join the LPWS. Enclosed is \$____ (See Membership Schedule).

I hereby pledge that I do not advocate, nor will I initiate, physical coercion or fraud against any individual or individuals.

Signature required for membership

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ ZIP _____

Telephone _____