

Arizona LIBERTY

MONTHLY NEWSLETTER OF THE ARIZONA LIBERTARIAN PARTY

\$3 PER YEAR - 12 ISSUES

September 1975

1975 NATIONAL LIBERTARIAN PARTY CONVENTION

Vol.1.1, No.4

CHOOSES MacBRIDE / BERGLAND FOR 1976

NEW YORK CITY, AUGUST 26 - SEPTEMBER 1

Convention business actually started on Tuesday, August 26, with two full days of activity by the Platform Committee, the Constitution, Bylaws and Rules Committee, and the Credentials Committee.

The full convention convened on Thursday, August 28. After welcoming remarks by Ed Crane and David Nolan and the Keynote Address by Dr. John Hospers, the convention got down to business. To expedite the adoption of anew platform, only the changes to convention rules pertaining to platform debate and adoption were considered at that time. The changes chiefly involved limits on debate of platform planks and rules governing voting requirements to amend, adopt and delete planks.

Numerous changes and additions to the platform were recommended by the Platform Committee. Many of the planks represented a radicalization of the 1974 Platform, making explicit many positions previously only hinted at. The Statement of Principles itself was not changed in substance, but only in emphasis in the first statement, where the order of the two clauses was reversed:

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

Considerable controversy arose over certain of the planks. In particular, a statement concerning the right of any individual to publish any information about government activities and operations (The Daniel Ellsberg Amendment) had been recommended for inclusion in the plank on the freedom of speech and the press. After much debate, and tabling of the plank, the issue was finally revived in the form of a separate plank on government secrecy. The less radical version adopted by the convention condemns government use of secret

classifications to keep information from the public arbitrarily and favors placing the burden of proof on the government to show that any individual violating secrecy classifications has actually harmed the rights of other individuals (concerning whom the government holds confidential information) or has actually harmed national security.

Other controversial planks considered by the convention and ultimately accepted in diluted form included disarmament—the favoring of mutual disarmament down to police levels was rejected—and taxation, supporting those who challenge taxation on moral, legal, and constitutional grounds was reduced to recognizing the rights of individuals to do so.

Finally, about 1:00 AM Saturday morning, the convention completed the adoption of a new platform for 1976.

On Saturday, August 30, once again the convention considered rules changes, this time those pertaining to the selection of candidates and the election of officers. Provisions were adopted for recording votes for "none of the above" and, in the event "none of the above" receives a majority in the selection of candidates, for obtaining an entire new slate of nominees.

By Saturday, a total of 248 delegates to the convention had been registered and accepted by the credentials committee.

Nominations were then opened for the presidential candidate. Roger MacBride, Kay Haroff, and Guy Riggs were nominated. Roger MacBride won easily on the first ballot:

MacBride	142
Haroff	62
Riggs	34
None of the above	2
Abstain	4

Roger made his acceptance speech, emphasizing that this will be a campaign without compromise of libertarian principles, and by noon Saturday we had a 1976 presidential candidate. Television coverage of the morning session was fairly extensive, by the way, with both NBC and CBS in attendance.

Saturday afternoon, nominations for the vice presidential candidate were opened, and Tonie Nathan, Jim Trotter, and Manny Klausner were nominated. There was to be no easy decision on the vice presidential candidate, however. No candidate received a clear majority on the first ballot:

Trotter	97
Klausner	85
Nathan	45
None of the above	1
Abstain	7

Then, during the short intermission for re-polling of the delegations for the second ballot, rumors began flying. It was being said that MacBride would veto the selection of Trotter as his running mate if, as seemed possible, the convention were to choose Trotter on the second or third ballot. It was said that Roger was taking this stand due to Trotter's personal tax resistance. Many delegates were stunned or upset, because the previous evening Roger MacBride had stated that he found all of the potential V.P. nominees acceptable as running mates.

The entire convention was turning into an uproar as the second ballot began. However, only two states, Alabama and Alaska, had cast their votes when Roger MacBride asked to be recognized to speak to the convention. He confirmed the rumors that he would veto Jim Trotter as a candidate and explained his reasons. He stated that he had learned, since the previous evening, of Jim Trotter's failure to file Federal Income Tax Returns for several prior years. He said that everywhere the news media would focus on that one issue and ignore the broad libertarian principles and platform.

A sizable portion of the convention did not accept the explanation or reasoning, and clearly and audibly expressed themselves. Shortly thereafter, Jim Trotter addressed the convention. He explained that his failure to file had been, not tax resistance, but simply due to his inability to pay income tax for those years and

still be self-supportive. He said that due to a now increased income he would be filing amended returns next year. And, finally, he stated that he was withdrawing from the nomination and asked that his supporters back Tonie Nathan.

The third ballot (by my reckoning) was taken and the convention appeared to be deadlocked:

Nathan	110
Klausner	87
None of the above	30
Abstain	8

At this point the convention was ready to begin taking additional nominations. But it was decided to hold further nominations until the following day, to give everyone a chance to think and act cautiously, and to allow the credentials of potential candidates to be reviewed prior to their names being placed in nomination.

Sunday morning, three additional names were placed in nomination: Walter Block, John Vernon, and David Bergland. It then came to light that once again MacBride might find one of these nominees unacceptable, again on the same one-issue campaign argument as before.

Professor Robert Nozick was then recognized. He made a compelling objection, stating that the news media could seize on any isolated issue in our platform and turn it into "the" issue, and that it was no more likely they would do this because of a particular candidate.

Roger MacBride acknowledged the strength of Nozick's arguments and then stated he would not veto any of the present nominees. And the convention selected a vice-presidential candidate on the fourth ballot:

Bergland	137
Vernon	36
Nathan	21
Klausner	19
Block	19
None of the above	2
Abstain	1

(David Bergland teaches law at Western State College of Law in California and was actively working on adding "none of the above" to California ballots when he was called Saturday night to fly to New York City to be a nominee.)

Sunday afternoon, these national officers were elected:

Chairperson	Ed Crane
-------------	----------

Vice-Chairperson Andrea Millen
 Secretary Greg Clark
 Treasurer Fran Youngstein

These Executive Committee members-at-large were elected:

Jim Blanchard Phillip Manger
 Ed Clark Daivd Nolan
 John Hathaway Bill Susel
 Richard Kenney

And for Region 3, these Executive

Committee members were elected:

John Ainsworthy
 Bill Howell
 Michael Thompson

The convention reconvened on Monday, September 1, to take up additional Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules changes. However, a quorum was not available, so the convention adjourned.

9/16/75

John Kannarr, Delegate

THE LIBERTARIAN PARTY: IT'S ABOUT TIME

The Libertarian Party was created to give voice to those millions of Americans who increasingly are recognizing that government is the source of society's ills and that a dramatic reduction in its size and power must come about soon if we expect to preserve our personal liberties and maintain our material abundance. We are the only political party that is consistently pro-freedom — a party of principle. The principle on which our platform is based is that of the sovereignty of the individual.

It is this total commitment to the principle of individual liberty that makes libertarians distinct from both liberals and conservatives. There is much talk today about the possibility of a conservative third party or the emergence of the American Party as a serious threat to the established parties. Such an eventuality would, in our opinion, have little effect on the continued growth of government and its liberty-stifling bureaucracy.

The modern conservative movement is perhaps twenty years old. It has been well financed and has articulate and well known spokesmen. Yet the growth of statism in the past twenty years has continued at a rapid and virtually un-interrupted pace. Why? Because conservatives have not been consistently pro-freedom. They have not based their arguments on reason and principle. They have, in effect, accepted the basic premise of those who are perfectly willing to agree with liberals that the government has the right to control the individual — it is only in the area of control where there may be differences of opinion.

When conservatives ask the government to control everything from gambling

to private sexual conduct, they are providing liberals with the philosophical framework needed to legitimize such totalitarian schemes as OSHA and EPA. When conservatives endorse the Supreme Court ruling allowing local censorship or call for government control of the news media, they are providing liberals with the premise necessary to argue for government control of education and forced busing.

The list of conservative compromises on the principles of individual liberty is painfully long. Even in the area of economics the conservative record is not good. One cannot claim to be for free enterprise on the one hand and support business subsidies, fair trade laws, and tariffs on the other. These inconsistencies have proven fatal to the conservative movement. It's time for a new direction — one with the dynamism of a cause that is just and does not compromise. The Libertarian Party is in the forefront of such a movement.

We will bring back to the arena of political debate the question of what right the government has to meddle in our personal affairs, "redistribute" our income, control our businesses and commit us to secret foreign entanglements. Today, political debate presupposes the government's right to control our lives. The time has come to change all that. The time has come to undertake a spirited and massive second libertarian revolution in this country — before we lose all of the liberties the first one gave us 200 years ago.

We need your help. I urge you to join and support the Libertarian Party. There is much to be done and the time left to do it is growing short.

- Edward H. Crane, III
 National Chairman

TREASURER'S REPORT

I am respectfully submitting the following financial statement for the Arizona Libertarian Party, exclusive of the Arizona Liberty (a separate financial entity). The period covered by this statment began Aug.

18, 1975, when I assumed the position of Treasurer for the Arizona Libertarian Party. I will gladly respond to any questions you may have concerning the statement.

ARIZONA LIBERTARIAN PARTY FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Beginning Balance (8/18/75)		\$59.56
Receipts		
Haroff Reception	\$58.00	
Contributions	26.00	
Sale of Nozick Book	20.00	
	<u>\$104.00</u>	
		\$163.56
Disbursements		
Scottsdale Hilton*	\$24.00	
Earl Gottlieb*	25.00	
Hotel Valley Ho**	100.00	
Bank Service Charges	0.71	
	<u>\$149.71</u>	
Ending Balance (9/15/75)		\$13.85
Outstanding Indebtedness		
Hotel Valley Ho**	\$484.59	
Earl Gottlieb*	75.00	
Kwik-Kopy*	5.20	
	<u>\$564.79</u>	

* Haroff Reception Expenses
** MacBride Dinner Expenses

Obviously, our current financial position is not good. Any Party activities in the immediate future must be on a strict cash-in-hand basis. Every effort must be made to discharge our debts quickly, lest the party and our cause receive adverse

publicity. I personally welcome any suggestions you may have concerning the Party Treasury, and I urge you to contribute whatever you can at this time.

9/16/75, John Kannarr, Treasurer, 934-3050.

JOIN THE FIGHT

Many Americans complain these days of a general feeling of helplessness, of being powerless to prevent the runaway destruction of our freedoms. This despite the fact that the fight to restore our liberty is gaining strength and momentum daily.

Perhaps their feeling of not being important stems from their own inactivity, the failure to stand up and do something positive to help their side win. Since they're not personally involved in the fight, they can't see how the battle is going.

The Libertarian Party is a major force in the freedom fight. It needs and deserves your support. In fact, the outcome of our struggle depends on your support, both moral and financial.

Put your money where your mouth is. Take out your wallet or checkbook RIGHT NOW and commit at least \$20 to the fight If you won't fight for your rights, who will? Put your money in an envelope and send it to: ALP, Box 501, Phoenix, AZ 85001. You'll feel better if you do—I guarantee it! RB

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

A federal court has ruled that racial discrimination is not a crime if practiced against whites. That is the import of an amazing decision handed down by Judge Thomas D. Lambros of the U.S. District Court for Northern Ohio. Lambros recently dismissed a suit brought by a white postal worker who claimed that he had been denied a job in favor of a less qualified black who was promoted solely for reasons of race.

The judge claimed that while it "no doubt seems unjust to the plaintiff", white persons may not file claims of racial discrimination under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. Officials of the Civil Service Commission were outraged by the decision and are urging the government to support an appeal.

(*Human Events*, September 6, 1975)

HAVES & HAVE-NOTS

Last week I stood at a grocery meat counter while a young couple in their early 20s, she with a \$25 hair-frosting job and rings on every finger and he the perfect example of young manhood, discussed the \$1.89 per lb. T-bone steaks.

Finding none to their liking, they ordered special cuts, just SO thick, with nice fillets, to be picked up the next morning. Later I stood behind them in the checkout area with my hamburger while they paid for their other goodies with food stamps.

My young son wanted a watermelon but I explained to him, at \$3 each, they were too expensive, yet we stood and observed a man with food stamps carry out two! They obviously can afford what we cannot.

Another eye-opener is observing the so-called head of the household purchase his liquor with cash while his wife buys quality groceries with her food stamps.

My husband puts in 14-hour days to help support these deadbeats who will be enjoying their "easy life" long after he works himself into an early grave. If these people choose not to work that's their privilege, but why should taxes from my husband's check, and others like him, help to provide their "easy life"? If I sound resentful and bitter, you

better believe I am! We live within our income and dispense with items we can't afford and carry it home in my '61 Ford.

(Mrs. Janet In-Albon, Phoenix)

* * * * *

The government's food stamp program has been such a success—38.9 million Americans are now eligible—that a New York congressman has come up with an even better idea. Rep. Charles Rangel (D-NY) is considering legislation to supply the poor with "clothing stamps" to enable them to outfit themselves in fine style. Pushing the idea is William A. Tatum, an aide to New York Mayor Abraham Beame, who says that is "psychologically destructive" for poor people not to have the latest fashions.

(*Human Events*, July 5, 1975)

* * * * *

The Communist government in Cuba has made it a crime for private citizens to grow their own vegetable gardens. Soaring inflation combined with rigid price control has led to extreme shortages in various items. Others remain expensive so many Cubans have taken recently to growing most of their own food supplies, much to the embarrassment of the government. The new edict comes into effect immediately.

CULTURAL SHOCK

After a few weeks in the U.S. many Vietnamese refugees are beginning to suffer from cultural shock. Like any one who moves from a familiar culture in which he was raised, no matter what its drawbacks, the Vietnamese are finding life totally dif-

ferent and less satisfactory than life in their homeland. From their point of view, Americans dress wrong, eat all the wrong foods, talk and behave very strangely. Be it ever so humble, there's no place like home, even if it's South Vietnam.

THE POLICE ADVERSARY

"Reform of the relationship between the police and the people of Abaco is badly needed. To be effective, the police need more help, support, and cooperation from the public. This will not happen so long as the police appear to be the adversary of the populace. There is no place for 'special police' who seem to be spying on segments of the community. There is no place for policemen who seem to be here to keep the people in line. We cannot tolerate police who act with immunity to the laws they force us to obey. Police who seem to delight in catching people on

technicalities do not instill public trust or respect. When honest citizens fear the policeman on his beat, are suspicious and resentful of his presence, there is need for change. The feeling of a police state is a serious danger sign. The policeman's role should be that of friend and protector of the people. His actions, demeanor, and conduct should reflect this role. Only then will his function be proper. Then he will win the respect and support of the community."

(The Abaco Independent, June 14, 1975)

TRADE HURTS RUSSIANS

Speaking before the AFL-CIO in New York last week, famed Soviet exile Alexander Solzhenitsyn defended himself against stories that said he had asked the United States to liberate the Russian people. "This is not true." Solzhenitsyn insisted, "I have always told my countrymen that they must save themselves and not look to outsiders." All that he is asking of the U.S., he said, is to stop making concessions and giving economic aid. "When they bury us alive," he pleaded, "please do not send them shovels and the most up-

to-date earth moving equipment."

Solzhenitsyn said "our whole slave system depends on your economic assistance." And it is American trade, he insisted, that allows the Soviet economy to concentrate its resources on armaments and preparations for war. Remove that trade, he said, and the Soviet economy would be obliged to devote some of its resources to feeding and clothing and housing the Russian people, "something this Socialist economy has never been able to do."

(Human Events, July 19, 1975)

WHAT IS LIBERTARIANISM

Libertarianism is a belief in and a devotion to freedom, specifically freedom from government intervention into the private economic and social affairs of the individual. While the word "libertarianism" is of relatively recent origin, the concepts which it represents are older than the United States. In fact, a fervent belief in liberty and freedom from government intervention—called variously "nonconformism" and "individualism"—was the motivating force behind the founding and expansion of our country.

Nonconformism with an all pervasive Church/State drove the original settlers from England to the relative freedom to be found on America's shores. Nonconformists abandoned these original settlements when they too developed governments which stifled the individual, and set up communities that practiced social and religious toleration. Some nonconformists left even the most ideal settlements to tame and settle the western lands, where almost absolute freedom from government intervention could be had.

Individualists forced the American break with England, over the issue of a foreign government usurping the rights of free men to determine their own economic and social affairs. Individualists, who had fought for freedom and who would not see it frittered away by the establishment of a powerful centralized state, caused the adoption of the Articles of Confederation—under which political power was dispersed to the largest extent possible. When government proved too weak under this arrangement, it was Individualists who provided for a more perfect union by establishing a new government under the Constitution, but withholding ratification of the new arrangement until a Bill of Rights was added to protect the populace from the state.

The heyday of Individualism came in the period that immediately followed the Constitution's ratification. Jefferson's Republican Party was avowedly individualistic and warred fiercely and successfully against the statist Federalists. With the demise of the Federalist Party, the Jeffer-

sonian maxim that, "The government governs best that governs least" was practically enshrined as the prime tenet of American political life. Tragically, since the demise of Jefferson's Republican Party no major party has espoused the cause of Individualism.

Even though Individualism was deprived of a political vehicle, it was not without adherents throughout the rest of the 19th Century. The Classical Liberalism of this period was an ideology of Individualism. While the Classical Conservatives were demanding tariffs and other forms of government intervention in the economy to "benefit" industry; and the Radicals (Greenbackers, Populists and Socialists) were demanding different but equally interventionist government policies to "benefit" labor and agriculture, only Classical Liberals were opposed to government management of, or participation in, the economy.

On a non-economic level, the situation was much the same. The main threat to the social freedom of the individual was the Prohibitionist movement. The adherents of this movement were drawn from the ranks of the Conservatives (who were opposed to sin) and the Radicals (who were opposed to opiates). The opponents of Prohibitionism were the Liberals, who fought it for the same reason that they fought government intervention in the economy. Prohibitionism was a similar unwarranted intrusion of state authority over what should have been the private decision of the individual.

During the first five decades of the 20th Century the Classical Liberal developed into the Modern Liberal, eschewing Individualism and adopting concepts such as the "Welfare State" and the "Planned Economy". On the other hand, the Modern Liberal is still pretty much committed to social liberty. During the same period the Classical Conservative evolved into the Modern Conservative, adopting an anti-statist economic philosophy in the process. However, the Modern Conservative still believes in government enforced adherence to rigid social codes.

The renaissance of Individualism, re-named Libertarianism, has taken place over the last twenty-five years. An individual can become a Libertarian in either one of two ways. One way is for a Liberal or Radical to see the incongruity of believing in social freedom and a controlled economy, and becoming an adherent of the free market. The other way would be for a Conservative

to see the incongruity of believing in economic liberty and government dictated social mores, and becoming an adherent of social freedom. Libertarianism is thus the only ideology without internal contradictions. Libertarians believe in liberty in both the economic and social spheres.

Libertarianism is not, however, a monolithic movement. While all Libertarians agree with the Jeffersonian Republican maxim that, "The government governs best that governs least", there is some disagreement in Libertarian circles as to how severely the state can be reduced before order degenerates into chaos.

There are some Libertarians who hold that no government at all is needed for the maintenance of liberty and order. These are the Anarcho-Capitalists. Unlike other Anarchists, who are violently opposed to the free market system, the Anarcho-Capitalists have such an abiding faith in the free market that they feel that it could provide all the services traditionally performed by the state.

Less extreme, but no less doctrinaire, are the Objectivists. These are the followers of Ayn Rand, author of two very powerful novels, *Atlas Shrugged* and *The Fountainhead*. The Objectivists believe that the State should only provide police, judicial and national defense services; all other services traditionally performed by the State being supplied by private companies competing in the free market.

The remainder, and majority, of Libertarians hold a less strict limited government position. They agree that the state should provide police, judicial and defense services and are willing to concede that under special circumstances the state must be empowered to perform even more services than these minimal three (examples of such being disaster relief or immunizations during epidemics—situations in which private companies would not act because no profits are to be made or could not act with the speed required.)

All Libertarians agree, however, that no matter how large or small the state is, there are certain things that the government must be forbidden from doing. The first is trying to regulate social mores by legislative fiat. Libertarians recognize that each individual has the right to determine for his or herself his or her adherence to any social codes. The second is interfering with the free market's ability to deliver the goods and services that

individuals desire. Libertarians realize that governmental intervention in, and interference with, the economy always does harm to the economic system.

Although there is disagreement in Libertarian ranks as to the ideal size of government, all Libertarians are working amicably together to help whittle down the elephantine welfare state. Libertarians realize that not until such time as the state is reduced to the level desired by the limited government advocates would there be any need for conflict among Libertarians as to whether further reductions were desirable. The prospect is that such a severe paring down of the state will not take place overnight. So for the foreseeable future all Libertarians will be working to-

gether to reduce governmental power, thereby freeing the economy and the individual.

Libertarianism has made many strides in the last twenty-five years. Many former Conservatives, Liberals and Radicals have been converted to Libertarianism. Many more have become Libertarians in everything but name. A nationwide Libertarian Party has existed since 1972 and many Libertarians are active in the other parties as well. There is thus every reason to believe that the philosophy of Nonconformism-Individualism-Libertarianism will once again become the dominant factor in American political life.

- Joseph L. Gentili,
Brooklyn, New York

FLAK DEPT.

Sir: In response to your response to my letter, if you want to make a ridiculous hypothetical case--as in your second paragraph I can make one also. Why not have dentists take a new board exam when they move from one city to another even within the same state? Remember, now, that these exams can take upwards of five days each.

How can you, as a libertarian, justify being permitted to practice on one side of a state line, but not on the other? When European Common Market countries permit dentists licensed in one country to practice in any of the others, the policy which prevents national reciprocity here in the U.S. merits re-examination.

I doubt if even you believe that the

policy of the Arizona State Board is, as they profess, to protect the public. To protect them from competition would be closer to the truth.

A.S., Paterson, New Jersey

AZLIB: You missed my point completely. I wasn't making a "ridiculous hypothetical case". Licensing dentists (or anyone else, for that matter) is unconstitutional. The right of the citizen to practice the profession of his choice is guaranteed under the Ninth Amendment to the Constitution. The government has no valid power to "regulate" citizens in this area. Licensing is an illegal conferral of monopoly privilege.

Arizona Liberty is the monthly newsletter of the Arizona Libertarian Party, P.O. Box 501, Phoenix, Arizona 85001, (602) 271-9091, \$3 per year (12 issues). Edited by Rene Baxter, and published by the Arizona Libertarian Party. All contents are from original or published sources, believed reliable, but not guaranteed.

Arizona Libertarian Party Officers: Chairman-Michael B. Thompson, Treasurer-Areta Johnson, Secretary-Jim Kirk, Finance Chairman-Bruce Cameron, Press Coordinator-David Lizzio.