

# LIBERTARIAN LIFELINE



## Garin Park Barbeque Set for October 10

The East Bay Region of the Libertarian Party of California has scheduled a pre-election picnic to honor our local and statewide candidates. Join us at Garin Park in Hayward as we celebrate freedom and honor our hard-working candidates for office.

The event will feature the LP's Gubernatorial candidate Steve Kubby, our candidate for U.S. Senator Ted Brown, Gail Lightfoot, our candidate for Secretary of State, Joe Farina, our candidate for Attorney General, Jon Petersen, our candidate for State Treasurer, Calaveras County Supervisor and Lieutenant Governor candidate Tom Tryon and Duncan Wheat, our candidate for the 15<sup>th</sup> Assembly District.

Food, soft drinks, beer, wine and condiments will all be available, so bring your appetite along with your friends and families. In addition, bring footballs, baseballs, soccer balls, frisbees, and any other outdoor toys to make your day at the park relaxing and fun. If music is your passion, we will have musical entertainment courtesy of Jim Funk and his guitar.

Garin Park is located in south Hayward just off Mission Boulevard. From Interstate 880, take the Industrial Parkway exit and drive east to Mission Boulevard. Turn right on Mission and then take the first left turn, which will be Garin Avenue. This will lead you right to the park. The Libertarian Party signs and banners will be easily visible in the Pioneer picnic area, so you shouldn't have any trouble finding us. Parking will cost \$3.50 per car and a suggested \$5.00 donation per attendee will help the Party cover the cost of hosting this event.

Bring your friends and family for an old-fashioned barbeque and political barn-raising for the Party of Principle.



*Steve Kubby, the LP's candidate for Governor of California, was instrumental in the passage of Proposition 215, the landmark voter initiative to legalize marijuana for medicinal purposes.*



*Joe Farina is an Attorney from Sacramento and the LP's candidate for Attorney General. Last July, he successfully argued our case against the proponents of Proposition 6, who challenged our ballot argument in opposition to the measure. They lost, and our argument now appears in the Ballot Pamphlet as originally written.*



*Ted Brown, former Chair of the LP of California and our candidate for the U.S. Senate seat currently held by Barbara Boxer. Ted has authored many of the LP's positions that appear in the Ballot Pamphlet, and co-authored the argument against Proposition 6 with Joe Farina.*



*Gail Lightfoot has twice served as Chair of the LP of California and received more votes than any other Libertarian in the June Primary to confirm her nomination as our candidate for Secretary of State. With a background in Public Health Nursing, she has also represented the LP as a Congressional candidate.*



*Tom Tryon, our candidate for Lieutenant Governor, currently holds the highest elected office of any Libertarian in California as a two-term member of the Board of Supervisors of Calaveras County. As a long-time rancher, he has earned a high degree of credibility for the LP in Northern California.*



*Jon Petersen has served as the LPC's Treasurer and currently is our Northern Vice Chair. An experienced treasurer, manager, computer programmer and community leader, Jon has worked with financial systems, community groups, statewide organizations and city budgets. He is well prepared to be California's next State Treasurer.*

# Call for Activism

The East Bay Region Libertarian Party is 454 members strong, the fourth largest region in California in terms of paid membership. The combined number of registered Libertarian voters in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties is 4,869, the highest registration numbers we have seen in a decade.

The party organization itself, however, rests on the backs of only a handful of hardworking, dedicated activists. Each of these activists wears multiple hats and performs many duties to make sure the party continues to function.

Despite the gains we've made in recent years, we are still criticised for being ineffective, for our inability to promote our cause, our inability to get our viewpoint presented to the public, and our inability to get more candidates on the ballot, let alone elected to office.

Few of our critics realize how difficult it is to run for office, how much work it is to get even one press release mentioned in a single newspaper, or how much work is involved in planning, organizing and coordinating a single political fundraiser. The Democrats and Republicans have the money to hire consultants and professional public relations organizations to take care of all these details. The Libertarian Party has to depend on our own resources.

Politics is a numbers game, and there is strength in numbers. But our numbers are pitifully small compared to the incumbent parties. So we have had to work extra hard with fewer resources to maintain our ballot status and ensure that California voters have a Libertarian alternative to vote for at the polls. When one of our activists falls ill, or is for any reason unable to perform a duty, the party falls even further behind. Last month, our chair was gravely ill, and with our human resources stretched as thin as possible, we have not been able to be as effective an organization as we would like at a critical time in the election cycle.

We have an urgent need for more activists to share the work of running our party. The core regional officers are capable and dedicated, but there simply aren't enough of them to go around. We need back-up support to help us out when unforeseen circumstances affect our operations. The more hands that are available to perform the work of democracy, the less work will need to be done by all, and much more will be accomplished.

The party has an immediate need for a membership coordinator/database manager. This may not be a glamorous job, but it is vitally important. The database is more than just a mailing list, and maintaining it requires only a few hours of work each month. The database manager need not be a computer professional, but simply have basic clerical skills. The file is currently in Microsoft Access format, but can be exported to any other software package that will do the job. All you need is a computer and a willingness to learn a new skill. As an added bonus, database management skills are quite marketable in today's high-tech job environment.

Perhaps even more pressing is the need for a new editor for the *Libertarian Lifeline*. The current editor has been grinding out the newsletter every month for more than four years, and it is time for new blood to revitalize the publication. Writing skills are important, as are some desktop publishing tools, but the job chiefly requires enthusiasm and a commitment to keep to the publishing schedule.

Every January, we elect new Party Officers. We have been fortunate to have had a series of strong, dedicated chairs over the past few years, and we need to continue growing the party with dynamic and inspiring leadership. The position of Vice Chair has

## LIBERTARIAN LIFELINE

Copyright© 1998 by the Libertarian Party of California, East Bay Region, 20993 Foothill Blvd., #318, Hayward, CA 94541-1511. Articles, except copyrighted articles, may be reproduced with credit. All submissions for publication accepted under these terms. Opinions are those of the signed authors or, if unsigned, of the editor.

**Editor:** Terry Floyd

**Assistant Editor:** Katherine McKay

**Printed by:** East Bay Region LP

**Chair:** Jeffrey Sommer (510) 537-3212

**Executive Committee Rep:** Doug Ohmen (925) 820-0812

**Treasurer:** John Taylor

**East Bay Party Line: (510) 531-0760**

**\*\*\*New Home on the World Wide Web!!!\*\*\***

**<http://www.awen.com/lifeline.html>**

**News & Events deadline:** 15<sup>th</sup> of the month. Send to Editor, 240 Sybil Avenue, San Leandro, CA 94577 or call (510) 351-0973. Submit on paper, diskette, or internet e-mail to: [TLFLOYD@LMI.NET](mailto:TLFLOYD@LMI.NET) For subscription info, see page 7.

been vacant for the past year, and this vacancy has greatly diminished our organizational ability. Our current treasurer has declared his intention not to run for another term, so this is another vitally important job that must be done. Ideally, each officer should have a deputy available to pick up the slack in the event of illness or vacations.

While we have never had an official position of Press Liaison, it is clear that we need someone to disseminate press releases from all levels of the party to the local media, someone who would be willing to regularly notify all the newspapers in our area of local party activities, and to arrange press interviews for our candidates. This person should also be willing to get to know the political reporters at the daily newspapers published by the Alameda News Group and the Contra Costa Times, as well as the small neighborhood weeklies. An e-mail account and a fax machine (or fax modem) are all that is really necessary for this essential job.

So if you ever thought about becoming more active in the party, there has never been a better time to volunteer than now. Your Libertarian Party needs you, as does your community and your country. We cannot just roll over and let the Democrats and Republicans continue to rob us of our choices, our wages and our liberties. We've already fallen much too far down that slippery slope and the climb back up the mountain will be long and difficult.

Freedom does not come cheaply; it requires hard work on the part of thousands of patriotic citizens. Please do your part. Call the LP at (510) 531-0760 or come to our next meeting to get all the details.

"Law after law breeds  
A multitude of thieves.  
Therefore a sensible man says:  
If I keep from meddling with people,  
they take care of themselves;  
If I keep from commanding people,  
they behave themselves;  
If I keep from preaching at people,  
they improve themselves;  
If I keep from imposing on people,  
they become themselves."

- Lao-Tzu (founder of Taoism), 6th century B. C.

## Money Down a Rathole

by R. H. Weatley

The American taxpayer is being asked, yet again, to fork over stacks of cash to save yet another tottering economy. The patient this time is Russia. The conduit, as usual, is the International Monetary Fund.

The rhetoric is mystifying. We are told that giving Russia \$20 billion (or maybe it's \$17.6 billion, or perhaps \$25 billion; the numbers change daily) will "restore confidence in the Russian economy."

Why in the world would it? The Russian economy is clearly on the verge of collapse. Investors surely know this. Why would the infusion of a relatively small amount of dollars change anything?

How can \$20 billion be considered "a relatively small amount of money?" It is when it is spread out over a country the size of Russia. Let's try some round numbers. The population of Russia is, say, a quarter of a billion people. So the \$20 billion represents \$80 per capita. Suppose we actually gave each man, woman, and child in Russia their \$80 share. How long would it last? A week? A month? For comparison, consider the United States. All the coins and bills in circulation come to less than \$600 billion. This would run the American economy on a cash basis for maybe a week and a half. Even if the Russian economy is a tenth of ours, the proposed injection of dollars won't keep the wheels spinning for long.

But, we are told, the cash isn't to spend, it's to restore confidence. How is that done? Well, by meeting short-term debt service so Russia can avoid default. But this really amounts to saving the investors, not Russia. Because the debt service will come up again and again. The money really buys time for Western investors and banks, who will lose their shirts when the Russian economy goes belly up.

The IMF wants to use American taxpayers' money to delay the inevitable so that investors — both domestic and foreign — in Russia can sneak out the back door with whatever they can salvage before the roof crashes in on them. Most of the money will end up, one way or another, in secure bank accounts outside of Mother Russia. And, the system will implode anyhow, just a little later than it would have without the payoffs. It's time to pull the plug on this patient.

It will be painful in the short term, but doling out more cash will only extend the agony and put off the eventual recovery. □

---

*This article originally appeared in **The Internet Herald**, an on-line newspaper published by emerging Generation X writers. R.H. Weatley has written a weekly political column, *What I Think*, since 1994. Free subscriptions are available via electronic mail. Write to [Editor@pookas.com](mailto:Editor@pookas.com).*

# Framing the Question

By Katherine McKay

Libertarians know that the arguments of liberals rest on unspoken assumptions with which we do not agree. But unearthing those assumptions in the heat of an argument, or pausing to question them in a fast-paced speech, is difficult to do. Keeping a set of logical principles in mind helps greatly.

Letting the liberal frame the debate allows him to state it in such a way that the libertarian has no choice but to go on the defensive, answering the question as posed instead of challenging it, and defensiveness is always seen as the weaker position. Few people are aware of the underlying structure of arguments, and if we can keep in mind that there is a structure, and that we can detect it with some inquiry, we have a chance of making our viewpoint understood.

If we have a functioning knowledge of the fallacies expressed in language (known as informal fallacies, as opposed to formal, or symbolic logic, fallacies) we will be able to detect the underlying weaknesses in the arguments of those we debate, or of those whose articles we read. Without an understanding of these principles, we will be fooled all our lives, and though we may dimly sense that the other person's argument is unsound, we will not know how to refute it by showing what it rests on. Knowledge of the fallacies also keeps our own arguments honest.

One of the major mechanisms by which unsound arguments prevail is the fallacy known as "**complex question.**" The question asked masks a previous question which was not asked but whose answer is assumed. Thus, the respondent is trying to defend a position while having tacitly already conceded a previous point which he would have disputed had he been aware of it. The classic example of complex question is: "Have you stopped beating your wife yet? Answer yes or no." It is readily apparent that the question presupposes an affirmative answer to the previous unasked question, "Have you ever beaten your wife?" (Nixon once pointed out that reporters were using this fallacy when he said, "That's like asking me if I have stopped beating my wife yet." Probably few people grasped what he was talking about.)

Complex question is alive and well in the framing of many current debates, such as whether liberals or conservatives are more compassionate toward the poor. To detect the fallacy, we must examine the term "compassionate," a word from religious vocabulary which has been greatly abused in recent years. As used in a formulation of social policy, it can have several meanings, but the liberal definition is "redistribution of wealth from the haves to the have-nots." The libertarian position refers to the destructiveness of continued handouts and the long-term advantage of requiring people to take personal responsibility for their lives. But if the libertarian cannot articulate this distinction during a debate, he has already lost – because by default he has accepted the liberal's definition, which assumes the moral high ground without earning it. The libertarian who does not point out the hollowness of his opponent's position is seen to be "against" the poor and underprivileged.

There are many other fallacies which can be found in newspapers and books, on TV and radio, and in heated conversations all around us. They all attempt to bypass the hearer's reasoning powers, either by appealing to emotions which override reason, by intimidation, or by making what sounds like a good argument to those unversed in logic. Following are several types identified by logicians, along with the Latin names by which they are sometimes known. These fallacies often overlap one another.

**Non sequitur** ("it doesn't follow") is a general class of fallacies advancing arguments that have nothing to do with the point:

**Ad hominem** – attacking the arguer instead of the argument. For example, Democrats and the liberal media, uncomfortable with Kenneth Starr's findings in his investigation of Bill Clinton, have been reduced to calling him names such as a "legal blackmailer," a "Peeping Tom prosecutor," or simply a "Republican special prosecutor." (Name-calling is the final degeneration of this fallacy.) "**Poisoning the well,**" a variant, claims the arguer is so prejudiced that his reasons are mere rationalizations, and therefore not to be taken seriously. Dismissals of the positions of the opposite political party as "partisan," regardless of their merit, belong here.

**Appeal to the masses** (*ad populum*) – the use of popular slogans and jingoism to win the masses over to one's side. Appeals to "compassion" and "helping the "poor" are automatically successful because of the

emotional loading of the terms. Anyone who disputes the action being proposed is accused of being against compassion and the poor.

**Appeal to authority** (*ad verecundiam*) – “showing” that a position is true because an authoritative person says so. It is not necessarily fallacious when the appeal is to an authority *in the same field*, as, for example, when a question of physics invokes what Einstein said about it. However, when a political or religious question is supported by appealing to Einstein, this fallacy is committed. The “authority” of scientific and technical information can also be abused in this manner. Statistics are frequently manipulated to “prove” whatever the manipulator wants to prove, and the majority of people will be too cowed by the scientific standing of statistics to question how they were arrived at.

**Appeal to pity** (*ad misericordiam*) – an appeal to the emotions, such as that routinely used by the plaintiff’s bar to induce juries to award large settlements to plaintiffs whose injuries are due to their own stupidity, simply because they have suffered and the defendants have the resources to pay. The infamous fine of \$2 million on McDonald’s over spilled hot coffee is an example of this, as are the repeated attempts by smokers to make the tobacco companies pay for their self-induced illnesses.

**Tu quoque** – literally, “you too,” turning the same or a similar charge on the accuser, with the implication that one wrong will cancel out another wrong, which may work in math but not in human relations. A president’s peccadilloes are excused on the ground that “they all do it” or “other presidents did the same thing.”

**Straw man** – misinterpreting an argument and replying to the misinterpretation, rather than to the original argument, which is usually more difficult to refute. This insidious fallacy is widely used by officials holding press conferences and very rarely questioned by reporters eager to get on to the next question. Recently I have heard defenders of Clinton claim that it is naïve to require public officials to be “flawless” or “perfect.” That extreme position is easy to ridicule, but in fact it is not held by anybody. It is more difficult to answer the reasonable request of voters that public officials be honest and truthful.

**Language fallacies** are rooted in some type of ambiguity in the use of words:

**Equivocation (ambiguity or doubletalk)** – a

word is used in two different senses between the premise and the conclusion of an argument. The 19<sup>th</sup> century French economist Bastiat demonstrates this fallacy in an absurd syllogism to show the futility of protectionism: The more one works, the richer one is. The more difficulties one has to overcome (set up by tariffs and overregulation), the more one works. Therefore, the more difficulties one has to overcome, the richer one is, so protectionism is a good thing for the economy. This clearly uses two senses of the word “work,” the first meaning “expend labor for productive purposes” and the second meaning “expend labor to overcome artificial obstacles.” Unfortunately, protectionists still confuse labor expended with results attained.

**Composition** – reasoning from what is true only of parts of a whole to what is true of the whole. John Stuart Mill’s Utilitarianism was based on the flawed argument that, since each person’s happiness is a good to that person, therefore the general happiness is a good to the aggregate of all people.

**Division** – reasoning from what is true only of the whole to what is true of parts of the whole. Affirmative action and other systems of preferences are based on this fallacy. It is assumed that a person in a category of people who have traditionally been disadvantaged must himself be disadvantaged, and therefore preferences are given to him to “make restitution.” For example, many government contracts are set aside for businesses owned by blacks, even though the contracts may repeatedly go to affluent businessmen from the black middle class.

**Material fallacies** have to do not with confusions of words but with confusions in the actual matters being discussed:

**False cause** (*post hoc ergo propter hoc*) – claiming that because one event followed another, it was therefore caused by it. The history of scientific endeavor is a battle against false cause, and politics and economics are fertile fields for this fallacy. False cause is shown in the spectacle of Bill Clinton’s taking credit for the country’s recent prosperity, when he was merely on the scene as it began. The converse is also true: I myself heard Jimmy Carter claim that Herbert Hoover “caused” the Great Depression.

**False analogy** notes similarities while ignoring differences, to read into the analogy more than the facts warrant. Using the language of war to portray business competition, domestic or foreign, is an ex-

ample of this fallacy. Because warring sides conflict with each other, an analogy is drawn with industrial competition. In fact, businesses may conflict with others in the same industry, but the effect on the economy as a whole is beneficial, which is not the case with war. The differences between war and the free exchange of goods and services are so great they outweigh the few seeming similarities.

**Overgeneralizing** (*secundum quid*) – instancing a few examples to draw a sweeping conclusion with little discrimination. People who have traveled to a foreign country are prone to deduce the national character from their limited experience. A negative version, **guilt by association**, sometimes called “tarring with the same brush,” equates large numbers of people on the basis of a single trait, e.g., race, nationality, etc.

**Special pleading** - giving only the reasons supporting a position, suppressing the reasons against it, as in a courtroom, where opposing lawyers each present the same matter in ways favorable to their positions. The phenomenon of “spinning” news by those with a vested interest in having the public perceive the issues their way is also in this category.

**Circular argument** (sometimes called begging the question or *petitio principii*) – presenting the conclusion to be drawn in the premises, or defining terms in such a way that the conclusion is inevitable. If a left-winger castigates a right-winger for belonging to the Republican Party, and then demonstrates the evil nature of the Republican Party by the fact that it contains such people, he makes a circular argument.

**Ad ignorantium** – challenging an opponent to disprove an argument, which can rarely be done. The corollary is that if it can't be disproven, it must be true. Radical environmentalists often proclaim that human actions (read: business) are degrading the earth to the point of no return, and require anyone who doesn't agree to disprove their claim. Of course, it is impossible to prove that a particular event will not happen in the future. A variant is **thin entering wedge**, predicting that if a particular action is allowed to happen, a catastrophic consequence will occur. The opponent, again, finds it hard to disprove something that has not happened. For example, it is presently being claimed that if businesses are not subjected to heavy environmental regulations in the near future, they will pollute so freely that the earth will be rendered unlivable.

**Self-evident truths** – prefacing one's position with “everybody knows” or “all intelligent people know” or “the American people want,” a proposition established not by evidence but by definition. The obvious corollary is that if you disagree, you are not intelligent, or in step with the majority. After a political race, a politician's personal positions are often claimed to be those of “the American people” even if he won by a very slim majority.

**False dichotomy** – considering things to be black or white with no shades of gray. The very words “black” and “white,” when applied to race, are an example. Skin tones of “white” and “black” people are actually a broad continuum from very light tan to very dark brown, and there are so many people who are racial mixtures that the terms are meaningless, yet they are continually used to categorize the population. The slogan “cooperation, not competition” (generally extolling the moral superiority of central planning over private enterprise) uses this fallacy, because there are elements of both cooperation and competition in public agencies and private businesses alike. In the field of human behavior generally, it is rare that a situation is either one or extreme or another; most situations are multivalued.

In a proper argument, premises are presented which lead to a conclusion different from the premises. A valid argument is one whose conclusion follows logically from its premises. Truth in an argument has reference to outside evidence, and a correct conclusion logically drawn from true premises is both true and valid. Understanding the principles on which proper arguments rest keeps us from being sucked into many traps and allows us to distinguish between sound and unsound positions. It is a study which will produce more benefit for our ability to reason clearly than almost any other.

### Resources:

- Joseph G. Brennan, A Handbook of Logic, Harper & Row, 1961.  
 James D. Carney, Richard K. Scheer, Fundamentals of Logic, Macmillan, 1974.  
 Stuart Chase, Guide to Straight Thinking, Harper & Row, 1956.  
 Irving M. Copi, Informal Logic, Macmillan, 1986.

# Marin LP News

Greetings from Marin!

Not only is the election of our candidates coming up in November, but also the 1999 LPC Convention will be in nearby San Jose. The Libertarian Party stands for freedom of choice. We believe strongly in the Constitution and the rights of people to make choices regarding their lives.

Candidates' Conference:

Come listen to our statewide candidates discuss today's hot issues: The national health care ID number. Smokers' rights. The rights of businesses not to be overregulated by government. Or just spend a casual evening tasting wine and greeting members from all over the state.

Upcoming Marin events:

October 9th:

3:00 p.m. Candidates' reception at the Winsor Winery in Tiburon.

5:00 p.m. take the Blue and Gold Ferry with the Candidates to Fishermen's Wharf for only \$5.50.

Then at 6:00 p.m., have dinner with the Candidates at McCormick & Kuleto's, located at 900 North

Point Street, near Fisherman's Wharf in San Francisco. Dinner will cost \$20 per plate, not bad for San Francisco.

October 11th:

10:30 a.m., brunch with the Libertarian Party's candidate for Secretary of State Gail Lightfoot and enjoy a live performance of "Impromptu" directed by a former member of the Fairfax Players. Tickets for the performance are \$7.00 per person.

1:00 p.m. The Smoker's Choice Forum Awards will be given to the Silver Peso, Sport-A-Mania and Milani's, three local bars who have supported our "Repeal the Ban" campaign. Tickets for the Forum are \$5.00 and will feature Senate candidate Ted Brown and Attorney General Candidate Joe Farina.

All events on October 11 will be at the Mill Valley Masonic Lodge, Bldg #19 on Corte Madera Avenue

Tickets for all events: RSVP Only by Oct 6th call (415) 339-7887. If you leave your address we will send you a candidates pamphlet outlining all the events. For the latest news, check out the Marin LP Web page at <http://www.sirius.com/~pagangas>

## MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

(For those joining the LP as a voting member)

I hereby certify that I do not believe in nor advocate the *initiation* of force as a means of achieving social or political goals.

Signature(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City, State & ZIP+4 \_\_\_\_\_

(Optional)

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ FAX: \_\_\_\_\_

email: \_\_\_\_\_

### Libertarian Party of California

20993 Foothill Blvd., #318  
Hayward, CA 94541

☐ Basic LP Membership  
(includes *LPC Monthly*,  
*LP NEWS* + *Lifeline*) \$25

☐ Subscription only to  
*Libertarian Lifeline* \$10

☐ Donation (Thank you!)

Please make checks payable to:  
**Libertarian Party of California**

I would like to join: ☐ Marin County LP ☐ East Bay Region LP

☐ Recorded in database

# CALENDAR OF EVENTS **OCTOBER**

**Friday, October 9, 1998, 3:00 p.m. Candidate Reception at Winsor Winery in Tiburon** followed by a Ferry Trip to San Francisco and a fundraising dinner at 6:00 p.m. at McCormick & Kuleto's at 900 NorthPoint Street, San Francisco

**Saturday, October 10, 1998, 11:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. Garin Park, Hayward. Barbeque with the Candidates.** For details, see story on page 1.

**Sunday, October 11, 1998, 10:30 a.m. Brunch and live performance of "Impromptu"** at the Mill Valley Masonic Lodge, Buidling 19, Corte Madera Avenue in Mill Valley. Followed by the **Smoker's Choice Forum** at 1:00 p.m. Tickets are \$7.00 and available by calling (415) 339-7887.

**Sunday, October 18, 1998 6:00 p.m. "The Unrepentant, Unreformable IRS,"** a special dinner presentation by Shelly Davis, former IRS historian and author of ***Unbridled Power: Inside the Sectret Culture of the IRS*** at the Grand Hyatt San Francisco Hotel, 345 Stockton Street in San Francisco. Tickets are \$60 per person for dinner and cocktails. Please RSVP no later than October 12 to (818) 506-0200.

**Sunday, October 18, 1998, David Boaz of the Cato Institute speaks at UC Berkeley's Zellerbach Hall.** As part of the "Spitfire Tour" of celebrities promoting their causes on college campuses. For more information, contact [www.spitfiretour.com](http://www.spitfiretour.com), or David Boaz at [www.cato.org](http://www.cato.org).

**Tuesday, October 27, 1998, 7:00 p.m. Oakland/Berkeley Libertarians** in the 16th Congressional District will meet to discuss regional issues at the Albatross Pub in Berkeley, located at 1822 San Pablo Avenue (near the corner of University and San Pablo). For more information, contact Jeffrey Sommer at (510) 537-3212.

**Wednesdays, 6:30 p.m. UC Berkeley Libertarians** meet in Room 206 of Dwinelle Hall on the campus of the University of California in Berkeley. Help us welcome back the students and keep the Cal Berkeley Libertarians enthusiastic and active. For more information on the student libertarian group, contact George Lee at (510) 664-2237 or check their website at <http://www.ocf.berkeley.edu/~callib>.

Libertarian Party of California  
20993 Foothill Blvd., #318  
Hayward, CA 94541-1511

**Address Correction Requested**

**Non-Profit Organization**

**U.S. Postage Paid  
Oakland, CA  
Permit No. 34**

