

CALIBER

CALifornia
LIBERTarian
NEWS

July 1978

Volume VI, No. 6

Libertarians Jubilant Over Passage of Proposition 13

"At last, we're on the winning side," said Libertarian Party Chair Bruce Lagasse of the passage of Proposition 13, the Jarvis-Gann Tax Limitation Initiative. "It's the first thing I ever voted for that won," said Northern Vice Chair Cynthia Hilton. Libertarians all over California celebrated on June 6 as county after county reported a 2 to 1 landslide victory for Prop. 13.

In Los Angeles, Paul Gann of People's Advocate, and co-author of the bill, joined the LP for victory festivities; meanwhile, in San Francisco, Yes on 13 workers and Libertarians for Prop. 13 congregated at Ed Clark for Governor Headquarters at 1620 Montgomery Street to watch the returns.

As the June 6th deadline approached and the likelihood of Prop. 13's passage became more and more apparent, the excitement mounted. The victory parties which were being planned all over the state prompted one LP member to remark, "For libertarians June 6th will be like the Fourth of July and New Year's Eve all rolled into one." At one high-spirited party, 35 LP members and friends gathered in Santa Clara County to celebrate. As the totals started coming in and it became clear that predictions of Prop. 13's passage were accurate, spirits rose even higher. Announcements of vote totals were met with loud cheers by jubilant libertarians, as each county's totals were reported.

And it appears that the California Tax Revolt has started a nationwide tax protest movement. State tax limitation drives have been initiated by irate taxpayers in 34 states. There is even talk of a *federal* income tax limitation initiative.

We hope that Prop. 13's victory will be a major turning point for the libertarian movement and for liberty in the United States. It seems that our work, and our victories, are just beginning.



Photo by Bruce Lagasse.

Paul Gann congratulates Pablo Campos, chair of Libertarians for Proposition 13.

Inside this CALIBER

On the winning side. We may have started something. Prop. 13 victory celebration story on page 1. Victory Statement from the chair on page 8.

Ed Clark makes radical return to SF Bay Area. Excerpts from an interview on radio station KQAV of San Jose are reprinted on pages 6, 7, and 8.

Chris Hocker returns to San Francisco as Ed Clark's Campaign Manager. Story on page 4.

Police raid gun show at Santa Clara County Fairgrounds. Story on page 4.

Criminal Code Reform is unfortunately alive and well, contrary to news reports. Story on page 5.

Petition gatherers organize for Ed Clark campaign. Story on page 4.

Pot petition circulates in San Francisco. Story on page 5.

New York libertarians have a governor's race too. Story on page 9.

Requiem, an article written by LPC Chair Bruce Lagasse on a plane returning from the Provo, Utah, funeral of Karl Bray, appears on page 5.

Departments:

From our Readers, page 2.

From the Editors, page 10.

From the Chair, page 3.

Brief Notes, page 12.

Resolutions, page 8.



Photo by Bruce Lagasse.

Los Angeles Libertarians watch election returns at victory party.

Letters

On Locke on Property

I read with interest the letter from Palo Alto [May, 1978 CALIBER] in regard to property rights, or more specifically, the right to own land. I feel the question was legitimate, and will try to answer this question satisfactorily.

The following passage is from Locke's two treatises on government.

"He that is nourished by the Acorns he pickt up under an Oak, or the Apples he gathered from the Trees in the Wood, has certainly appropriated them to himself. Nobody can deny but the nourishment is his. I ask then, when did they begin to be his? When he digested? Or when he brought them home? Or when he pickt them up? And 'tis plain, if the first gathering made them not his, nothing else could. That *labour* put a distinction between them and common. That added something to them more than Nature, the common mother of all, had done; and so they became his private right. And will anyone say he had no right to those acorns or apples he thus appropriated because he had not the consent of all mankind to make them his? Was it a robbery thus to assume to himself what belonged to all in common? If such a consent as that was necessary, man had starved, notwithstanding the plenty God had given him. We see in *Commons*, which remain so by compact, that 'tis the taking any part of what is common, and removing it out of the state nature leaves it in, which *begins the property*; without which the common is of no use. And the taking of this or that part, does not depend on the expressed consent of all the commoners."

The commons mentioned here were lands set aside in feudal times to be used by all. Clearly, if the lands were not owned by someone, that is *de facto* owned, meaning controlled, then "nature's gift to posterity" would be empty indeed. If you cannot say what is to become of the fruits of your labor, then I'll jolly well wait until your crop is ripe and take it for myself. And how many years would you toil under these conditions? How much would be produced in the California food basket if after an investment of irrigation, machinery, fertilizer, seed and years of pruning, and harvesting, the farmer was subject to my undeserving demands. (This is the nature of taxation.) Doesn't it seem reasonable to assume that after such an investment the producer is no longer operating under the conditions of the state of nature, and in fact has a right to protect the fruits of his labor?

Roy Pflingsten
Lodi, CA

Platform in Error

Thank you for reprinting the LPC platform in the June 1978 CALIBER. One of the most pleasing characteristics of the LP is that it affords every member the opportunity to participate in choosing its direction. I experienced this opportunity personally when I attended the state convention and was invited to sit as a delegate.

During the Sunday afternoon session I proposed an amendment to the plank on prison reform striking the words "repeatedly and blatantly" from the third sentence in paragraph two. This motion was passed by an overwhelming voice vote, yet the change does not appear in the version of the platform that was included in the June CALIBER. Why not?

Kevin Dye
Culver City, CA

Editors note: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. The notes of the Secretary (as delivered to the Style Committee) do not indicate that this motion passed. At least one member of the Style Committee remembered the motion and believed it had passed, so the question was reported to the Executive Committee at the April 30th meeting. The question was referred to the Secretary. In the rush to complete work on the platform, no definitive ruling was made, and the platform was printed corresponding to the Secretary's original report. Unfortunately, the Executive Committee will be unable to take up the question until its July 29th meeting. In a document so long and complex as our platform, we are lucky only one question of this type has come up. We hope it can be cleared up quickly.

Moral Grounds Missing

Bruce Lagasse's "Vote for Larry Libertarian" is difficult to discuss. It's hard to argue with arbitrary assertions. He says: "You do *not* say that capitalism is superior to socialism. Even though it's true. . . You do *not* say that victimless crime laws are immoral. Even though it's true." Period. No explanation, no further discussion of the issue.

Ignoring for the moment that the Libertarian Party has *already* condemned homophobia as immoral, in no uncertain terms, what possible advantage (tactical or otherwise) is there in refusing to condemn the bigotry of the totalitarian New Right loudly and publicly? Is it that we might alienate those who, like Anita Bryant, think homosexuality *per se* ought to be a crime punishable as a *felony*? Is it that the message of liberty might never reach those who would lock up a considerable portion of the population for a minimum of twenty years?

In fact, such people will *never* get the message of liberty. Regardless of their stand on other issues they are basically totalitarians, social fascists in conservative drag, who believe that economic issues can be separated from socio-cultural issues. They believe that the economic sphere can remain free while the cultural sphere is shackled. In fact, *it cannot be done*. If libertarians know anything at all, it is this: mixed premises lead to the mixed economy, and the mixed economy leads to tyranny.

The so-called "New Right"—masterminded by direct mail magnate Richard Viguerie—is the single greatest threat to individual rights since the rise of Hitler. They have big money, big mailing lists, and big ambitions. And their chief target is the gay minority. They are very clever, one has to admit—cashing in on economic resentment against the new emerging gay middle class is quickly building them a power base. Gays unhampered by the economic liabilities of large households make good targets. . . . The "New Right" is perfectly well aware of all this. Viguerie knows how to manipulate people, and does not hesitate to do so. His *Conservative Digest*, which recently nominated Anita Bryant for "Conservative of the Year," is the last word in quasi-blue-collar crudity.

The Libertarian Party of California must consistently denounce the forces of bigotry and social fascism wherever and whenever they dare to rear their ugly heads. We must do so on *moral grounds*, over and over, in our publications and our public pronouncements. Victimless crime laws cannot be condemned on any other than moral grounds. If I am denied the whole field of morality, how then can I condemn such a thing as *laws against certain types of love-making*?

Justin Raimondo
San Francisco Libertarians for Gay Rights

Editors reply: We believe you have missed the point of Bruce Lagasse's column which was directed at a strategy for *communicating* libertarian ideas to *voters*. It is important to have a moral and consistent position; however we think it is poor strategy to berate non-libertarians with righteous indignation, or to smother them with moralistic platitudes.

When is a subsidy not a subsidy?

Both the ballot recommendations (numbers 3 and 10) and the platform (Individual Rights and the Economy: Section 7) arouse my concern. The one flows from the other. The platform section, second sentence, "Relief from taxation will not be considered a subsidy," is either a flat contradiction of a well established fact, or, at best, a very misleading oversimplification. It all depends on what is meant by the word "relief."

I question whether tax "relief" granted to only a limited class of taxpayers for the purpose of stimulating certain types of economic en-

Letters

continued from page 2

deavors favored by governmental agencies is actually relief. I posit that such so-called "relief" is in fact a government subsidy. The only difference between this and the usual transfer payment scheme is that this payment is in the *form* of a reduction of the tax liability of the subsidized individual. Added evidence of the true nature of such credits is that they can usually be applied against the taxpayers' prior and subsequent years' tax liabilities if the current year's liability is insufficient to absorb the full credit. Who pays? Who do you think? The tax burden of the lucky few is merely shifted to their less fortunate friends and neighbors.

If we choose *not* to call this a subsidy (which we oppose), I must ask if a rose by any other name would smell less sweet? My apologies to the spirit of the bard.

If the sweet smell of subsidy has not yet caused my reader to lose his appetite for such tax "relief," I must next point to the very heart of our philosophy, the *free marketplace*. I would like to point out that this tax benefit is intended to "relieve" only one who violates the terms of the market, knowing that the tax collector will reward his folly. To wit: I may install a money losing alternative energy system (i.e., one which will wear out 20 years before it pays for itself) because I will still come out money ahead next April 15th. I seriously doubt that the economy and the whole body politic will come out as well as the users and manufacturers of alternative energy sources. Is this not government allocation of resources? Is this not government intervention in the economy, in the marketplace?

When does a libertarian vote for government subsidies, economic intervention, and interference in the marketplace? Answer: when a blindly emotional antipathy toward taxation robs him of his reason.

I suggest that this antipathy would be better directed toward curtailment of government spending and economic intervention. If we are successful *here*, taxation will take care of itself.

David Matthew Keefe
Seal Beach, CA

Editors note: *We reprint here the text of an editorial reply prepared by Charles Barr and broadcast on radio station KNX on March 28, 1978.—Eds.*

In an editorial in favor of more government subsidies for higher education, KNX said, "Expanding grant and student loan programs makes more sense than tax credits."

The Libertarian Party believes that KNX's position makes *no* sense. KNX apparently believes that it's all right to rip off your neighbor, as long as Washington acts as the middleman. That's what subsidies are all about.

Let's define our terms. Taxation is the legalized theft of a person's money by government officials. A subsidy is the distribution of some of that stolen money to a special interest group. A tax credit means that a person is allowed to keep some of his or her own money from the tax collector, to spend on a designated purpose.

The Libertarian Party strongly endorses tax credits as a means of keeping more money in the hands of the people who earn it, and out of the hands of government. The Libertarian Party platform calls for an end to *all* government subsidies, whether for education or anything else.

KNX also said that legislation on elementary and high school tuition should be separate from legislation on college tuition. The Libertarian Party advocates tax credits for education at *all* levels. In addition to cutting taxes, such a measure would help break the public school monopoly, by enabling many lower and middle class parents to send their children to private schools.

The Libertarian Party endorses education tax credits for three reasons: it will cut taxes; it will force the public schools to compete on a more equal basis with private schools; and it will allow children to receive a better education.

A tax credit measure is being considered by Congress right now. If you support tax credits for education, please write your senators and congressman immediately.

From the Chair

Confidence Game

Why aren't there more LPC activists?

In addition to mere disinclination to becoming involved, it's my guess that there is widespread belief by LPC members that they lack the ability to do activism-type things.

I'm going to let you in on a secret.

Perhaps the most important lesson I have learned during my years in the Libertarian Party involves the incredible types of things you can achieve if you simply decide that you're going to go ahead and do them.

Most people's biggest obstacle in doing something is their inner conviction that they are incapable of doing it. They put severe self-imposed limitations on what they can achieve; and for the most part, these limitations are totally unnecessary.

Many envy the successful activists in the LP for being able to do things they themselves could "never" do.

Don't you believe it.

Anything They Can Do... (you can do better)

If others can do it, most likely so can you; and the most important factor in your doing something is to make up your mind that you're going to do it.

Two years ago, the LPC undertook a task that was "clearly" beyond its capabilities or means. Because an initially small group of LPC activists refused to concede the seeming impossibility of putting MacBride-Bergland on the ballot, and were able to "infect" an increasing number of other LPC members with their vision, the task was accomplished.

But at what cost? The petition drive in 1976 virtually wiped out the Presidential campaign in California by consuming all of its resources.

This year, we **MUST** avoid that frenzied hysteria.

The less time and money we have to devote to getting Ed Clark on the ballot, the more time and money can be used for Ed Clark's active campaign. And, no less crucially, to the ballot drives and campaigns of our local candidates.

One way to cut down on the required time and money spent on the petition drive is to get more output from our volunteers.

Many of you have memories of the previous petition drive. One big advantage we have over 1976 is that we know it **CAN** be done. What we should shoot for now is to get it over and done with as soon as possible.

To Dream the Impossible Dream

How about this as a goal: Let's shoot for four weeks and out.

If every LPC member can get at least 25 signatures, that would be 25,000; 1/7 of the total statewide goal.

If all of you can get 25 signatures a week for 4 weeks, that would be 4/7 of the statewide goal. Twenty-five signatures a week would require two hours at most.

Think of the leveraging effect: Just 2 hours a week for 4 weeks from each LPC member would virtually assure ballot status for Ed Clark.

And all it takes is for each of you to make up your mind that you can do it.

I want to emphasize, as forcefully as I can, based on personal experience: If you can overcome that inner conviction of inability, you can do more than you thought possible.

There may be plenty of things you can't do, based on physical or intellectual limits; but you'd be surprised at how the psychological limits you think you may have will disappear, simply by your decision not to be bound by them.

As some great sage once said, "Most people fail to recognize their biggest stumbling block because it is concealed under their hat."



Chris Hocker to Manage Ed Clark Campaign

Libertarian Party National Director Chris Hocker arrived in San Francisco in May and assumed new responsibilities as Manager of the Ed Clark for Governor Campaign. While Ed was being interviewed in San Jose (see story on page 6), Chris was busy hosting an opening party for the San Francisco Campaign Headquarters at 1620 Montgomery Street.

First priority for the new campaign manager (and ex-editor of CALIBER) is gearing up for the petition drive, which will begin June 26. "We must collect those signatures. If we don't, Ed won't be on the ballot," warned Chris. He continued, "But we can do it—easily—if each member makes a contribution to the Ed Clark campaign right now."

Chris has calculated that we need a minimum of \$40,000 to pay petition carriers to collect the required number of signatures. That comes to roughly fifty dollars per member. However, each 200 signatures collected by a volunteer will save us \$50; so we are asking for a minimum donation of \$50 from each member of the Libertarian Party of California, or a pledge to collect a minimum of 200 signatures. Donations for the petition drive may be sent (and made payable to) the Ed Clark for Governor Committee, 1620 Montgomery St., San Francisco, CA 94111. To volunteer to work on the petition drive, you may telephone Campaign Headquarters at (415) 397-1336 or you may call the petition coordinator in your region (see listing on page 4).

Letters *continued from page 3*

Editors note: Copies of the following letter have been sent to the *San Jose Mercury* and the Registrar of Voters. We would appreciate correspondence from readers who may have had similar experiences on June 6th.—Eds.

Government Efficiency

As a member of the Libertarian Party, I was almost denied my right to vote on many local and nonpartisan issues in last Tuesday's election. I thought you would like to know the facts in this matter:

a) The officials at my polling place (#1807) did not know which ballot to give me, even though I explained that the "nonpartisan" ballot was to be used and showed my "nonpartisan" sample ballot. Their list showed me as LBT rather than NP, and therefore they tried to find a Libertarian ballot!

b) After 20 minutes of dialing, the local inspector finally got a phone call through to the Registrar's office. After hanging up the phone, she gave me a nonpartisan ballot, *but informed me I could vote only on the 13 state propositions*. I was specifically told not to vote on the two San Jose charter amendments, the mayor, councilmembers, judgeships, or anything other than those 13 propositions. The inspector installed the Nonpartisan card on the voting machine so as to tape off all but the last page of the ballot.

c) Only after I flatly refused to accept these instructions was it agreed to place another call to the Registrar's office so I could speak with them myself.

d) During the ensuing 20 minutes of again trying to reach the Registrar's office, the inspector at one point commented that my party should have informed me when I registered that I was giving up my right to vote on these issues! My efforts to explain the absurdity of the situation were to no avail.

e) Upon reaching the Registrar's office a second time, the correct information was provided, and I was permitted to vote the entire nonpartisan ballot.

This experience raises several questions in my mind:

1) Why didn't the printed instructions and the pre-election training of the officials cover the proper procedure to be used with Libertarian Party members?

2) Why was incorrect information received by the election inspector in the first telephone conversation?

3) Assuming the local inspector had even the most fundamental

Petition Gatherers Organize

Coordinating petition gathering for the Ed Clark for Governor Campaign in the major population centers will be Eric Garris in the San Francisco Bay Area ((415) 668-4857) and Caroline Brailer in the Los Angeles area ((213) 761-1779).

Local petition drive coordinators are listed by region as follows:

Region	Name(s)	City	Telephone
1	Steve Sparling	Nevada City	(916) 265-9733
3	Dennis Miller	Roseville	(916) 967-6910
4	John Ryland	San Francisco	(415) 647-7950 (415) 992-9555
7	Bill White	Los Altos	(415) 961-4837
9	Saul Rackauskas	Camarillo	(805) 482-9507 (213) 849-2481
	Alan Bedkober	Santa Barbara	(805) 687-3818
	Lynn Kinsky		(805) 687-3818
11	Bruce Lagasse	Sherman Oaks	(213) 788-1353 (213) 391-0711
13	Rudy Tietze	Altadena	(213) 351-2815
17	Bill Maxfield	Long Beach	(213) 435-3852
18	Mike Anzis	Irvine	(714) 552-9255 (714) 835-1055
20	Sara Baase	San Diego	(714) 460-9136 (714) 286-5231
	Jack Sanders		(714) 222-3415

Santa Clara Gun Show Raid

by Dante DeAmicis

About a dozen agents from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (BATF) in cooperation with the Santa Clara County Sheriff's Department conducted a warning raid at the June gun show in San Jose.

The exits were sealed and agents went from table to table taking names and handing out booklets of laws they said the sellers were violating. A few sellers were taken away for unknown reasons.

It appears this was done to make some future raid, where numerous people will be arrested, hold up better in court.

Libertarians should make the BATF's activities a vocal issue. Remember, this is the same federal agency that is currently trying to ram through a national gun registration scheme by regulation that was too hot to go through Congress as a bill.

If the BATF and their supporters are allowed to effectively close down gun shows, their rather loose interpretive and enforcement powers will be further affirmed. The ultimate goal of having only the government possess firearms will be one step closer.

The BATF enforced the last Prohibition. They would also be enforcing this one.

Letters *continued*

understanding of the election procedure, why didn't she realize the absurdity of her first instructions and clarify these on the spot, during that first phone conversation? (Clearly a San Jose resident's party affiliation cannot deny him the right to vote on a city charter amendment!)

4) Must it really take 20 minutes for a local precinct to reach the election headquarters for vital instructions?

I am concerned that a less persistent Libertarian would have been intimidated into giving up his right to vote on these local and nonpartisan issues. While I am sure the problem was one of poor communication and ignorance rather than a deliberate attempt to interfere with the electoral process, it nevertheless clearly needs correcting before the next election.

Keith M. Ferguson
San Jose, CA

Requiem

"Bruce," the voice on the phone was saying, "I've got some very bad news. Karl passed away this morning."

What do you do when they turn all your lights out? How do you live through an unliveable moment?

You can say a few words, you can hang up the phone, you can sit and look into space for 15 minutes, 30 minutes, who knows how long. It doesn't sink in because your mind refuses to accept it.

Of course you've known for some time that Karl had cancer; that it was supposed to be terminal; but you've never really believed it. Somehow, Karl would pull through, he would fight it and lick it.

And this is what you believed, because the alternative was unthinkable. And it's impossible not to grasp at any straw—the news was mistaken, it was premature, another phone call will say it was a false alarm. Until the horrible moment when you can no longer put off or evade the knowledge—Karl Bray is dead.

What do you do? Because you have a friend who can hold you and give you support, you can finally summon up the strength to let go, to break and shatter with grief. And from the bottom of your heart, you are grateful to your friend for helping you pull through this necessary, but dreadful, moment.

You're not alone.

All through the libertarian movement, there is a ripple of shock and grief, even from those who did not know him personally. You recall the inscription on the statue of the Polish patriot Thaddeus Kosciusko, in Lafayette Square in Washington, DC: "And Freedom Shrieked As Kosciusko Fell!"

Is there another person in the libertarian movement for whom those words would be more fitting?

And now he's gone—forever.

What do you do? You can reflect on the qualities that made Karl Bray such an important part of so many people's lives. Many have written, argued, spoken and advocated the ideals of freedom, of liberty. Karl lived them.

By no wish of his own, he was thrown into numerous confrontations with the state; and he never backed down. His convictions were undiminished by any suffering he was subjected to.

He had a strong personality; but much more than a man of personality, he was a man of character.

He held his convictions not only with a fierce passion but with a calm, matter-of-fact certainty that was almost terrifying in its innocence and simplicity.

He had a strong personality; but much more than a man of personality, he was a man of character. And it was this monumental strength

of character, of integrity that was like a tangible aura, that drew men and women of good will to him irresistibly.

But he was more than just a marble saint that you could only approach with reverence. He was a man with whom you could walk along the Santa Monica Beach, admiring the pretty girls wearing their bathing suits; or lie in the sand at Black's Beach, admiring the pretty girls *not* wearing their bathing suits. You remember how Karl was as excited as a kid during a fireworks show at the Hollywood Bowl.

The man who could take out a full page ad in the Salt Lake *Tribune*, right after Nixon froze wages and prices, and in full view of the world, tell the President of the United States to go to hell, was also the man who could sit up all night to chat about old movies, hiking trips, poetry and music, beautiful women and handsome men.

And you found it easy and natural to stay up all night to talk with Karl because his enthusiasm, his optimism, were so infectious and invigorating; in addition, you wanted to make the most of every opportunity you had to enjoy his company, and not let any moment get away.

You admire and respect the hero; it is the human being that you love.

What do you do? You can stand by an open grave, next to a brown coffin, on a cool Thursday morning in Provo, Utah, and listen to Hank Hohenstein deliver a rapturous, glowing eulogy that brings its own shafts of light to a gray, overcast day.

Later, you can sit in the little three-room suite he had fixed up in the basement of his parents' house, talking with some of his friends; all of you half-expecting Karl to walk in at any moment and apologize for being late.

But down deep, you know that he's not going to walk in, not ever; and it would be so terribly easy to give way to despair and bitterness, that a man who loved life with such ferocious intensity could be dead at thirty-four, while so many rotten miserable jerks live to ripe old ages. It's difficult to fight back this sort of feeling, but you must, because Karl's legacy should not be bitterness and despair. Instead, think of this: Karl's body lived thirty-four years; but his active, restless, searching mind lived many years beyond that; and his mighty spirit will never die, not while those who love liberty still exist.

What do you do? Finally, I guess, through the tears and the grief, you can give thanks that for a brief time—all too brief—his life touched yours; and left memories that will always stand tall.

Goodbye, Karl.

Sleep well.

—Bruce Lagasse

Libertarians Urge Pot Initiative

By John K. Cotter

The Libertarian Party of San Francisco has announced its support for the newly-begun San Francisco Marijuana Initiative. The Initiative is being sponsored by several community groups, including the Libertarian Party, and by Dennis Peron, now facing charges that he operated a marijuana supermarket. The Initiative won unanimous approval of the San Francisco Libertarian Party.

In order to gain a place on the November ballot the Initiative must gain nearly 11,000 signatures by the August cut-off date. The Initiative states that it is the policy of the people of San Francisco that the district attorney and chief of police stop enforcement of the laws against possession, cultivation, or transfer of marijuana.

To libertarians, the marijuana issue is not just a matter of what is viewed by liberals as "civil liberties." It's a matter of economic freedom as well.

If you agree and would like to help in getting this important initiative on the November ballot, please call me at (415) 982-8880 days, and 921-2613 evenings.

Criminal Justice Bows to Pressure

by Sally Foster

On May 11 the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice began mark-up (amending) on the "Criminal Code Reform Bill of 1978," HR 6869 (SB 1437)—"Son of One." The *Washington Post* and the *New York Times* ran headlines which suggested the bill was dead. This, I suspect, was a ploy to help the Justice Dept. force the Subcommittee to quit stalling and begin mark-up.

Chairman James Mann is holding three mark-up sessions per week in order to have a 200 page version ready by the end of June. The full Judiciary Committee plans to discuss it, voting it out in July. Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Rep. Pete Rodino (D-NJ), is one of its major supporters. Not much hope there.

Frank Wilkenson, of the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation (NCARL) and a tireless lobbyist against SB1437/HR 6869, says, "The bill is now recognized as controversial, and we must continue to keep pressure with letter writing and other activities." The pressure on legislators to approve this bill is enormous. Can the citizens of this country match it through letter writing? Let's hope libertarians will at least make the effort.

Write your congressmen and ask your friends to do so as well.

THE ED CLARK TAPES

Ed Clark, Libertarian Party candidate for Governor of California, was interviewed Sunday, May 28, on radio station KBAY in San Jose. His interviewer was libertarian John David Webster, public affairs director of KBAY, who regularly hosts the Sunday night talk show. Following are some excerpts in which Ed distinguishes himself from other politicians and gives voters a reason to vote libertarian:

John Webster: You say . . . government which governs least is best, and so forth; but surely there is a place for government, isn't there? I mean we can't just have no laws and let everybody . . . do as they choose?

Ed Clark: Well, I think the just government is the government that is only concerned with the defense of rights, and that is a government that is composed of the police, the court system, and some national defense system. With respect to the police and the courts, these really could be largely provided or completely provided by a private court system and a private police system.

JW: . . . How would that actually work? . . .

EC: With respect to . . . burglary . . . which is a very great problem all throughout California, I think those services could be provided on a private basis . . . more efficiently than they are now provided by a city or a county police force.

JW: Are you talking about an individual neighborhood contracting with several people who want to provide a given service?

EC: I'm talking about competing . . . private groups like Pinkerton's and other private security groups who would compete and offer their services to neighborhoods or to whole cities. I think by that type of competition, we would develop better, sounder police forces that

"If the services are really important, people will provide them for themselves."

would be less expensive to people than what exists today.

JW: That's very idealistic . . . I see people who might suggest for instance that you might end up with a . . . vigilante kind of force. You have people who can't go from one neighborhood to another with this kind of private system.

EC: Well, I think in this kind of private system that you have to have a uniform body of law, and the law has to involve the basic libertarian premise that no one can use force or fraud against someone else. And if you accept this common body of law, I think the conflicts between different groups would be minimal.

JW: . . . What do you see as some of the key issues in the race for governor?

EC: Well, I think the Jarvis-Gann (Proposition 13) is very likely to pass . . . Assuming this passes, one pressing issue will be to avoid any tax increases to "compensate" for the lost Jarvis-Gann revenue. I believe the state of California can get along without those revenues, that the people ought to keep that money; and to prevent the legislators in Sacramento from raising taxes will be an important issue in my campaign.

JW: How, then, do we provide for these services?

EC: If the services are really important, people will provide them for themselves. One of the major uses of tax revenues is in education. I think everybody agrees that the quality of public school education in California has gone down consistently for the last ten years. Jarvis-Gann will make it possible for middle-class individuals to send their children to private or parochial schools. They haven't been able to afford it. Now, they will. Give them more choice. Provide better education for their children. That's one example of a vital service—education—that could be much better handled if the private sector got substantially larger.

JW: Why can you not appear as a Libertarian candidate on the ballot?

EC: Because of the restrictive ballot laws . . . We still don't have the

required number of registered voters to get on the ballot as an official party . . . For a new party to qualify in California, it requires 63,000 registered voters in that party. We don't have that many. It's one of the toughest requirements in all the states of the United States, and it's really designed to keep new parties from getting on the ballot . . .

JW: How were you actually able to qualify as an independent candidate?

EC: I am going to do the same thing that our Presidential candidate, Roger MacBride, did in the summer of 1976. I'm going to have a petition drive—it starts June 26—hope to have it completed by about the 15th of August, by which time I will be an official ballot candidate.

JW: [asks stand on victimless crimes]

EC: Victimless crimes are a whole series of voluntary acts by adults. They're acts that may have some bad effect on the person who commits them. Chocolate cake is one of the biggest sources of victimless crime there is. If you eat too much, you may have heart trouble and then you have to go to the hospital and you've really hurt yourself. I think the hard core law and order people should be against chocolate cake, because people could use chocolate cake to hurt themselves. Of course, another example is marijuana, which is a very mild drug. Scientific tests show that it's not very serious, not as bad for you as smoking cigarettes, and yet we're spending tens of millions of dollars trying to prevent people from doing what for them is recreation. I think that's not a proper function of government . . . The great historical example, of course, is prohibition in the 1920's. We spent hundreds of millions of dollars in the 1920's. We created the Mafia. We corrupted the police force and government in almost every state in the union. And we killed . . . people. Government Prohibition Agents were poisoning industrial alcohol so it couldn't be used to drink. And oftentimes, that did end up in beverages that people drank, and people were killed by

"The real roots of slavery and oppression are governmental roots."

their own government. I think we've had enough of prohibition.

JW: [re affirmative action] Don't you feel that it's important that the government be involved in these kinds of issues to make sure that people are guaranteed their rights, that we have these kinds of governmental programs? How else can we rectify some of the injustices of the past?

EC: I think injustices are done to people and I think people can deal with injustice better on a private level than they can with government intervention. I'm firmly in favor of affirmative action programs in the private sector, but . . . then when you get into the public sector, and you have an affirmative action program, you're saying that a particular individual should be preferred over another equally qualified individual because of race. I don't think that really has any role in tax-supported institutions. I support that as a voluntary type of conduct throughout the private sector. The real roots of slavery and oppression are governmental roots. Slavery was a governmental program with thousands of laws in every southern state which established slavery. They had codes which made it a crime to teach blacks how to read. They had codes that strictly regulated how the slaveowners had to treat the slaves. They had codes that made it perfectly legal for absolutely inhumane conduct by slaveowners against slaves. The whole concept of slavery is completely opposed to the libertarian position of individual rights. What I should think would be a just system of laws would absolutely prohibit that in any way from occurring . . . The real hard core segregation has always been segregation by law, by government dictate.

[Dialogue with callers.]

Rosalie: . . . I was wondering what Mr. Clark's position is on other ways of rectifying injustices such as slavery, military conquest, and unjust incarceration, for example, the Japanese-Americans during the second World War, who had to wait some twenty-five years for their bank accounts which had been impounded by the government to

continued on page 7

THE ED CLARK TAPES

be released again. What is Mr. Clark's position on the return of stolen property?

EC: The Japanese-Americans waited twenty-five years to get their bank accounts back, and then they didn't get any interest with it, so that because of inflation, they got back about twenty cents on the dollar. That's a vicious crime. I think it was unconstitutional to put the West Coast Japanese in the concentration camps. I think they ought to be compensated for it. They didn't put the Japanese in the Hawaiian Islands in concentration camps. They only did it on the West Coast because it was politically popular. It was a crime. The people were mistreated. We should make public apologies to them. . . . We should find a way to compensate them, particularly for their loss of businesses. . . . With respect to . . . the Mexican population of California in the 1840's, who had large land holdings taken away from them by the legislators in the Mexican-American War, I think a lot of those titles to the land are good titles. They ought to get that land back. There's land in California, Arizona, New Mexico which should be given back to the heirs of the people from whom it was seized. With respect to slaves in the South, there are a lot of mansions down in the South that were built by slaves, and Senator Eastland I believe is living in one of them. One of the solutions is to take those plantations and those mansions that were built with slave labor and sell them off to the highest bidder and distribute the proceeds to the descendants of the people who built them.

JW: What is your stand on funding for abortion?

EC: On the question of abortion, I think that a woman's body is her own, that she has the right to do what she wants to do with her body, and that her rights prevail over anything else that's involved. Women should have a right to have an abortion if they wish to do it. . . . With respect to the government paying for it, I don't believe that the

"Libertarians propose a very basic change in American society."

government should provide this service. I think this is an ideal service to be provided by the private sector.

JW: When the government is taking less out of your . . . pocket, you have more to decide about what you are going to do. And those people who support that issue would have the funds to support it in the private sector.

EC: Yes, I think they would.

Johnnie: Hello, Mr. Clark, my name is Johnnie Staggs and I'm a write-in candidate for mayor here in San Jose. . . . I would like to ask your opinion of the Briggs Initiative.

EC: I'm unequivocally opposed to the Briggs Initiative. I think the Briggs Initiative interferes with the rights of gays to their own personal life style and to their rights to free speech. I think there's no grounds for discriminating against them. I spoke a couple of weeks ago to a group called California Junior State which is a statewide group of young people who are very active in politics. They had a poll of that group as to whether they were opposed or in favor of the Briggs Initiative. About 75% of them were opposed to it. They thought teachers should be selected on the basis of how good those teachers are. . . . There are plenty of Democratic teachers teaching Republican kids, Republican teachers teaching Democratic kids, a lot of . . . students who don't agree with the views of their teachers; but basically what the students are interested in is good teachers. I think that should be the standard.

JW: What is your feeling as far as the death penalty?

EC: Philosophically, I'm not opposed to the death penalty. I believe that if someone has taken another person's life, then it is proper, in very limited circumstances, to take that person's life. It costs \$30,000 a year to keep someone in a prison. Why should people pay to keep someone there who has intentionally taken a life, particularly if he's the kind of person who is likely to do it again? . . .

Casey: . . . Could he please explain to me the difference between his platform and that of Ed Davis in that Mr. Davis also is pro the Jarvis-Gann Initiative, is opposed to the Briggs Initiative, and also expresses a concern for law and order?

EC: I think there is a lot of difference between Ed Davis and myself. In the whole area of victimless crime, he has consistently come out for the position that the government does have the right to stop people from using marijuana. He thinks marijuana is a terrible thing. He thinks the next step after marijuana is rape and murder. That's not my position at all. I think the people who use marijuana are no more criminal than, and just as peaceful as, the average citizen. . . . With respect to gay rights, with respect to the rights of gays to live in our society in a peaceful way, I don't believe Ed Davis believes in that. He believes in raids. He believes in suppressing that type of conduct. On the whole civil rights issue, I think there is no one who is running. . . . now in the Republican primary, since John Briggs dropped out, with whom I differ more.

Eddy: [doesn't believe people will be more benevolent if taxes are reduced] . . . It seems to me that they would keep the money rather than give it. . . .

EC: The same benevolent impulses that now cause people to vote for candidates and to vote for social programs that help the poor, that help the sick, those same . . . feelings would transfer themselves into voluntary contributions. I think the private sector is much more efficient and I think it's truly more benevolent to voluntarily give your money than to have some people who don't believe in the present social programs be taxed.

Eddy: . . . It's a lot easier to vote than to give money. . . . When it comes down to giving money for people who really need it, many people won't do it.

"People who use marijuana are no more criminal than, and just as peaceful as, the average citizen."

EC: In the United States today voluntary charitable gifts are over thirty billion dollars. . . . If you go back in American history to the 1830's and the 1840's, in the states in the Northeast you had universal literacy, you had everybody going to school, even the poorest people. And the money for the poorest people who couldn't really afford to pay for it, was provided on a voluntary basis. I think this shows that education, which is certainly a basic part of our Western civilization, a part of our whole culture, is something that would be provided to all segments of society, even without taxation.

Eddy: What happens . . . if you happen to be wrong? People don't give their money? Then you'll have millions of people without jobs, back alley abortions. . . . The evidence is not so clear to me that people will suddenly become benevolent. . . . that seems like an off-the-cuff kind of conclusion.

EC: I think the thirty billion dollars in charitable gifts show that people already are benevolent. The question is, how much more benevolent would they become if taxes were a lot lower? I believe that they would be at least benevolent enough to provide the same level of services for the poor as provided today. And we have to agree that the services that the government is providing for the poor are really atrocious. The people who suffer from the worst education in the state of California are poor people who are locked into the public schools, who have teachers oftentimes who don't care what they're doing. . . .

JW: [to Eddy] Let's assume that people would not make contributions, they'd keep all their money. . . . Do you support the idea that when people don't want to support a thing that somebody somewhere should decide, well, you're going to give it to them anyway?

Eddy: I think there's a certain amount of difficulty in the proposition he makes because. . . I don't think people will give their money.

EC: Let me just give an example. This is Ed Clark again. During the

continued on page 8

Ed Clark Tapes

continued from page 7

1972-73 recession, when a lot of people were unemployed, when there was really more need, charitable gifts went up substantially. . . .

In the United States, before the last fifteen to twenty years, it was the responsibility of young people to take care of their parents as long as their parents lived. If you didn't have the current tax program, you'd get back to that. I'd certainly take care of my parents. I think most people would. Right now you can slough it off. You can say, let the state of California or some other state take care of them. But if it wasn't available, you'd do it. . . .

Eddy: Well, I just wish us a lot of luck, because we're going to need it, if all of these taxes get cut.

EC: Let me say something else. Libertarians propose a very basic change in American society, much less government, much greater force in the private sector. And I don't think it's a proper attack on that proposal to say that it won't be perfection; because the present system is *ugly, vicious, and dirty*. The present system has millions of people unemployed. People are unemployed largely because of government programs. If government programs weren't so oppressive, if taxes weren't so high, there wouldn't be the unemployment that exists today. So that, just because the libertarian society may have some people who don't get everything that it would be nice to have them get, doesn't mean it isn't better.

Eddy: I think libertarians place an extreme amount of emphasis on the faults of the government, where I don't think that the government is as much to blame as general society. . . . To me the government is

just a symptom of the general problems that we have. . . . Getting rid of the symptom is not going to get rid of the disease. Prejudice, crime, and all the other problems we have are not brought on by government. Government may fight them badly. . . it's certainly not the cause.

EC: I think crime is largely brought on by government. There is a great deal of crime that is produced by government action directly. I think that civilized society is a society of responsible adults. Today's society, where people are pushed around and controlled by the government, tends to create a society of followers, a society of dependent people. I think it's a less creative society than would exist if everybody had to stand up and make their own decisions as an adult. One of the things that led me to libertarianism is that it's an opportunity for individual growth. It's an opportunity for individuals. . . to take control of their own lives. This leads to a more diverse society, a richer society, a more mature society, a culturally better society than the one we have today.

JW: It sounds like you're going to almost work yourself out of a job—that in four or eight years there won't be any need to re-elect an Ed Clark.

EC: That's the object of the Libertarian Party—to reduce government in the state of California and all across the country. We want to cut down the high levels of taxes. We want to cut down controls on people. We want to cut down controls of business to create more jobs. And that's what we're going to do. Step by step, we're going to do it. When the people are ready for our minimal kind of government, when they elect. . . a sufficient number of people to do that, then there will just be the police force and the national defense force and the courts. And the rest of society will be wholly in the private sector.

Resolutions Adopted in Convention by the Libertarian Party of California February 20, 1978

Balance-the-Budget

Whereas, the Congress will not, on its own, balance the federal budget;

Whereas, inflation is caused in part by federal deficit spending;

Whereas, 80% of Americans favor a balanced budget;

Whereas, at least twenty-one states have officially petitioned Congress to propose a Balance-the-Budget amendment or convene a limited constitutional convention for that sole purpose;

Whereas, when thirty-four states have so petitioned, the Congress will have no choice but to act;

Whereas, California is not one of those states which have so petitioned;

Resolved, that the Libertarian Party of California demands that the State of California officially petition the Congress to propose a Balance-the-Budget amendment or convene a limited constitutional convention for that sole purpose.

Space Programs

We oppose attempts to artificially promote by propaganda the aerospace industry in the state of California and we oppose government subsidies to this industry. The government should be completely removed from space exploration, scientific investigation, and eventual human settlement in space.

Libertarians in Public Office

Whereas, the Libertarian Party of California declares its purpose to be to proclaim and implement the statement of principles of the National Libertarian Party by engaging in political and informational activities within the state of California, and

Whereas, this convention considers the seeking and exercise of public office by libertarians intent on reducing coercion in society to be both virtuous and necessary,

Be it resolved, that this convention recognizes and applauds the candidacies of the following members of the Libertarian Party of California:

Bernie Perra, Assembly, 70th District
Jim Gallagher, Assembly, 73rd District
Paul Beard, Congress, 39th District
Edward Ogawa, Assembly, 42nd District
Mike Grotke, Assembly, 66th District
Ernst Ghermann, City Council, Culver City
Sam Sewall, City Council, Redlands
Dave Bergland, Senate, 36th District
Dave Merrick, Supervisor, Santa Cruz
Bill Wingfield, Assembly, 62nd District

Prop. 13, The First of Many Victories

by Bruce Lagasse

This time, the good guys won.

The people of the state of California have bitten back.

In a monumental victory for the homeowner, the renter, and the taxpayer, Proposition 13, the Jarvis-Gann Initiative, has been overwhelmingly approved by the voters of California.

The traditional scare tactics of big-spending politicians and their allies were no match, this time, against the frustration and anger of desperate taxpayers driven to the wall by years of legislative indifference and arrogance.

This time, the taxpayers did not fall for the too-little, too-late bribery of Proposition 8.

In the euphoric glow, however, we must not forget that this monumental victory is only a first step.

With the momentum we've built, now is the time to push for *permanent* tax relief. Now is the time to push, not only for limitations or rollbacks of other state and local taxes, but, more importantly, of state and local spending as well. Ladies and gentlemen, it's our money, our homes and our lives; let's fight to hang on to them.

Resolutions

continued

In Support of Proposition 13

Whereas, the people of California have been laboring under an oppressive and confiscatory property tax burden;

Whereas, Proposition 13, the Jarvis-Gann Initiative, provides for the immediate reduction of property taxes, and provides California residents with significant protection against increases in other taxes by state and local government;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Libertarian Party of California hereby endorses Proposition 13, the Jarvis-Gann Initiative, and strongly urges its adoption in the June 1978 election.

New York Campaign '78

by Tom Avery

The Free Libertarian Party of New York has endorsed Gary Greenberg, a former State Chair, as its candidate for Governor. A New York City trial attorney, Gary was the campaign manager of Fran Youngstein's 1973 bid for Mayor of the Big Apple.


Seeking to attract national news media attention as past New York campaigns have done (a *Newsweek* article, a von Hoffman column, etc.), the Greenberg campaign got off to a quick start. The *New York Daily News*, the largest daily newspaper in the country, mentioned the candidate on the same day he was endorsed. (The same political reporter who wrote the key article on Fran Youngstein in 1973 devoted a full paragraph of his weekly political column to the Greenberg candidacy.) Several other newspapers, in different parts of the state, have already reported on the campaign and there has been some radio coverage as well. The news coverage is expected to increase sharply after the August petition drive wins Gary a spot on the ballot.

This year there are a couple of issues in the New York Governor's race that will have nationwide impact. One of those issues is crime. Like voters in other states, New York voters have become more concerned about the rate of violent crime. This spring the State Assembly and the State Senate in New York passed a bill to bring capital punishment back to life in New York. Governor Hugh Carey (Democrat) vetoed the bill and the Senate failed (by a close margin) to override his veto. Carey's Republican challenger has begun to attack him for the veto and is trying to project the image of someone who is "tough on crime."

Gary Greenberg is the only contender who is an experienced criminal attorney. He is eminently qualified to present and defend a credible libertarian alternative to the standard liberal and conservative programs: repeal all victimless crime laws and free the police and the courts to protect the citizens against *real* crime.

What happens in New York promises to set a precedent for what happens elsewhere in the country, especially since the police are tied to another important issue: the New York City fiscal crisis. While the municipal labor unions haggle with the city over their contracts, and while the nation's most overburdened taxpayers complain about the deterioration of municipal services (including police protection), the federal government is getting ready to bail out New York. The Libertarian Party will have the only candidate in the race opposed to federal loan guarantees. The City should learn to live within its means, cutting out such non-essential "services" as vice squads and narcotics detectives. (If Washington, D.C. rescues New York, can other spend-thrift American cities be far behind?)

Before the petition drive, Greenberg workers are preparing for the work ahead. A professional designer and a professional typographer are teaming up to produce quality campaign literature. A brochure is in the works and a fundraising package, including a letter from Roger MacBride, has already been sent out to the New York Party's past contributors. Another mailing is scheduled soon. The first of four issues of a special campaign newsletter is now being printed. Finally, a libertarian multi-media expert is planning radio and television commercials for the fall, as well as a Greenberg for Governor slide show at the National Convention in Boston. For further information, write The Free Libertarian Party, 15 West 38th Street, Room 201, New York, NY 10018.



FREE CATALOG

Over 700 books on Libertarianism, Free Market Economics, Revisionist History, Philosophy, Psychology, Education and more. Write or call for a free catalog. Laissez Faire Books, Dept. D102, 206 Mercer St., New York, N.Y. 10012, 212-674-8154.

Tired?

Are you tired of winning in arguments and not changing anyone's mind? Tired of frustrating conversations and circular debates? Then maybe it's time for you to come to "The Art of Political Persuasion," a workshop designed to tackle these and other problems libertarians have when speaking to others.

"The Art of Political Persuasion" has been presented in over eight states to more than 1,000 people. In Los Angeles in April, such libertarians as Ed Clark, Dave Bergland, Robert Poole, and Bruce Lagasse learned how to improve their effectiveness in getting libertarian ideas across to non-libertarians. The speaker, Michael Emerling, is a long-time libertarian activist from Arizona and a political speech-writer/ghostwriter. Some of the subjects to be covered in the two-day workshop are:

- How to become an effective debater
- How to think up new ideas and strategies to persuade others
- How to write good speeches and articles
- How to multiply your effectiveness as a persuader
- How to package and market your political ideas
- How to win political converts from the Left and Right

Bruce Lagasse, LPC Chair, attended the April session in Los Angeles: "There are many different ways to say something. What this workshop does is to tell you how to say it in the best way to achieve your goal; especially if your goal is to reach people and persuade them to listen to, and accept, libertarian ideas. I thoroughly enjoyed the workshop and I think you will, too. I heartily recommend it."

Bruce will present a 20-minute talk on "Overcoming Fear of Public Speaking" at the July workshop.

Information:

Date: July 15/16, 1978. THIS IS A NEW DATE: THE WORKSHOP HAS BEEN RESCHEDULED TO JULY 15/16, 1978. **Location:** Oakland Airport Travelodge, 150 Hegenberger Road (airport exit off Freeway 17—the Nimitz), (415) 635-5300. Saturday and Sunday, July 15/16, 1978, 9:00 a.m.—6:15 p.m. each day. \$20 for the weekend, \$15 Saturday only, \$10 Sunday only. YOUR MONEY BACK if you don't feel you've learned anything from the workshop. For a complete schedule of topics or further information, contact Cynthia Hilton, 1428 Jackson Street, #108, Oakland, CA 94612; (415) 832-1278. To make your reservation, return the coupon below by July 11. Make checks payable to Cynthia Hilton.

Any funds left after expenses are covered will go to the Northern California Libertarian Party—support your party and help yourself! Come to "The Art of Political Persuasion," July 15/16, in the Eastbay.

"The Art of Political Persuasion"

Saturday & Sunday, July 15/16, 1978

9:00 a.m.—6:15 p.m. each day

Oakland Airport Travelodge

150 Hegenberger Road [airport exit off Freeway 17]

Name _____

Address _____

City/Zip _____

Telephone # _____

Fee: \$20 for weekend, \$15 Saturday only, \$10 Sunday only

I have enclosed my check (made payable to Cynthia Hilton) in the amount of _____ \$20 _____ \$15 _____ \$10

Mail this form to: Cynthia Hilton
1428 Jackson Street, #108
Oakland, California 94612
[415] 832-1278

Resolutions

continued from page 8

Opposing Rent Control

Whereas, we recognize the right of property owners to control, use, or dispose of their property in any manner consistent with the rights of others,
Therefore, be it resolved that we oppose all proposed forms of rent control and call for the immediate repeal of existing rent control legislation.

Apartment Owners and Dwellers Rights

Whereas, the Libertarian Party holds private choice as paramount; and
Whereas, we oppose any governmental attempts to regulate discrimination in the private sector;

Be it therefore resolved that we oppose any regulations interfering with the right of a landlord to exercise choice in the selection of tenants and the tenants' right to choose to live in an area that fits their life style. This includes, but is not limited to, restricting tenancy to adults only, families only, senior citizens only, people without pets, or people with pets.

Return of Ownership

Whereas, every individual has the right to his or her own property, and
Whereas, the right to property includes the right to use, control and disposal, and
Whereas, when property is coercively taken, held, or sold or otherwise disposed of by the state against the will of the valid owners, whether by military conquest, eminent domain or other statist action, the owners are deprived of their property rights,

Be it therefore resolved, that the state and others in possession of stolen property, give up its possession and return it to those persons documenting ownership in the private sector, fully recognizing the right of private parties who have come into possession of stolen property unknowingly to seek redress from the guilty parties.

Gay Tax Protest

Whereas, taxation is a basic violation of property rights and inevitably results in conflicts over how tax money is to be spent, and

Whereas, lesbians and homosexuals are sometimes excluded from the services of, or employment in, agencies supported in part by their taxes,

Be it therefore resolved that the Libertarian Party of California supports the efforts of the Libertarians for Gay Rights, through the gay tax protest, to educate the gay community about the injustice and oppression caused by government control and financing of the school system.

Deregulation of the Midwifery Profession

Whereas, the Libertarian Party of California holds that "certification of competency" can only be provided by a free market,

Whereas, we oppose government interference in contract negotiation, and,

Whereas, we maintain that an individual has the right to decide for herself or himself whatever medical services and/or conditions she or he wishes,

We therefore deplore the current efforts by the Legislature and the courts to discourage and prohibit the practice of midwifery.

A.B. 860

Whereas, the Libertarian Party of California has urged full deregulation of the trucking industry at state as well as federal level, and

Whereas, the recently passed Assembly Bill 860 (1977) does further restrict the independent truck driver by prohibiting the establishment of routes as agreed upon in private contract,

We therefore declare our opposition to A.B. 860 and urge its immediate repeal.

Resolutions Adopted at the Executive Committee Meeting, April 30, 1978

Gun Ownership

Whereas, the Libertarian Party of California considers gun ownership to be an inherent right; and

Whereas, the Libertarian Party of California deplores the unilateral action of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms in instituting a computerized gun registration system in defiance of Congress and the clear will of the people of the United States;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Libertarian Party of California demands that the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms rescind its decision to establish law by regulation, and repeal the regulations set up in violation of the intent and spirit of Congress, the people, and the Bill of Rights.

Editorial

The Briggs Initiative

We have received enough comment about the letter in favor of the Briggs Initiative (published in the June CALIBER) to indicate that it was a mistake to publish it without response. We had hoped that printing the letter verbatim would provide an answer to the issue raised, not because of its offensiveness but because it so obviously could refer to any group: to reasonably discreet Jews, or reasonably discreet atheists, or heretics, or communists, or libertarians, or chocolate addicts. We believed that the letter waved a red flag at the weakness in its own argument.

The Libertarian Party of California is on record in unequivocal opposition to the Briggs Initiative (see the Winter 1977 issue of CALIBER). The reasons are clearly stated and have nothing to do with advocacy of any style of life. Our opposition is equally vocal in the case of other oppressed groups, including marijuana smokers and unwilling taxpayers.

This November, the Briggs Initiative is going to be an important issue on the ballot. Here, for once, the issue is government, or public, discrimination. This is a chance to demonstrate the unfairness of taxation, the inequity of government institutions serving private interests, the evil inherent in attempts to legislate morality.

But wait. How strong is our case? The pro-Briggs letter asks us to look at "the fine print of the Briggs Initiative." It gives us a sample of the kind of argument we are going to face. It asserts that the Briggs Initiative does not attempt to interfere with private conduct, only with public conduct. This idea deserves a serious hearing and response because we are going to hear similar arguments raised by apologists for Briggs between now and November. We recommend that you obtain a copy of the Briggs School Employees Initiative and read it carefully. If this material becomes law, it will set some very unpleasant precedents for groups outside the gay community.

First, there is the chilling insistence on the "state's interest in preserving and perpetuating the conjugal family unit." We have some sympathy with the traditionalist's fear of the disintegration of our culture, but where is the evidence that homosexuality makes any contribution to its disintegration? Unfortunately, in many people's

Resolutions

continued from previous column

Opposing S.B. 1437

Whereas, the National Committee of the Libertarian Party has condemned S.B. 1437/H.R. 6869; and

Whereas, this legislation creates new and threatening statutes which will lead directly, through extension of jurisdiction, to greater federalization of law enforcement and the creation of a police state; and

Whereas, this will result in further denial of the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence and of the human rights recognized in the Bill of Rights; and

Whereas, decriminalization of many activities and defederalization of law enforcement must be the first steps in meaningful revision of the criminal codes;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Executive Committee of the Libertarian Party of California urges the defeat of S.B. 1437.

Opposing the Spraying of Paraquat

Whereas, the Libertarian Party of California holds it is not the function of government to poison people; and

Whereas, the U.S. government did introduce, did spray, and still actively participates in the spraying of paraquat and other herbicides to destroy Mexican marijuana crops which subsequently enter the United States and are distributed and do threaten the health of Californians;

Be it therefore resolved that the Executive Committee of the Libertarian Party of California opposes all U.S. government involvement in the spraying of paraquat on Mexican marijuana fields and demands an immediate end to all such spraying.

Editorial

continued from previous page

minds this fear is easily transformed into a desire for the state to protect us from change. Many states have extremely restrictive divorce laws justified on precisely these grounds: the state supposedly has an interest in preserving the family, even when each of its individual members wishes its dissolution. We imagine anti-birth control and anti-abortion laws are supported on similar grounds.

Second, public homosexual conduct is defined as "advocating, soliciting, imposing, encouraging, or promoting of private or public homosexual activity directed at, or likely to come to the attention of, schoolchildren and/or other employees." Now, according to Thomas M. Griffin, chief counsel to the California Department of Education, "School districts have the right under present law to dismiss teachers who engage in sexual activity with a child of school age or below, who engage in sexual activity in public, whose sexual activity is a crime, or whose activity causes such notoriety as to decrease the effectiveness of the teacher in relating to students and parents." The language of the Briggs Initiative evokes images of homosexual teachers using their positions of authority to recruit children to a lifestyle feared and detested by their parents. But Mr. Griffin tells us that parents are *already protected* against such occurrences by laws pertaining to the effectiveness of a teacher in relating to parents. These laws accomplish this end without condemning any group of people for "conduct" unrelated to teaching.

What, then, is the purpose of the Briggs Initiative's proscription of what it calls "public homosexual conduct"? We believe its purpose is to capitalize on people's fear of outrageous behavior (anything we are not used to), together with people's dissatisfaction with the consequences of public, tax-supported, compulsory education, to build a political constituency for Mr. Briggs. The method is that age-old politicians' practice of uniting people against a scapegoat. First, we focus

on some feared action. Then we associate some easily distinguished group of people with that action. Finally, we focus all the hate that can be generated, from any frustrations available, onto that group of people. When we have exterminated, or retrained, or "cured" that group, all our problems will be solved (unless maybe there is *another* group. . .).

Contrary to the assertion of pro-Briggs apologists, the Briggs Initiative singles out and attacks a group of people *precisely* for the private and victimless actions that distinguish them from others, while maintaining the fiction that it is protecting us from acts against which we already have sufficient and unprejudicial protection. Note that the Briggs Initiative could be interpreted to prohibit heterosexual teachers from publicly advocating tolerance or acceptance of homosexuals.

It is true that parents are always at the mercy of school boards who continue to employ ineffective teachers. But this is the result of the establishment of public compulsory education and should be attacked directly as such. Taxation and coercion are inherently unfair and dangerous, and victimize all of us.

When people are sent to jail for using heroin and people defend this by saying heroin addicts rob people, libertarians say, "Make robbery illegal, not heroin." When people are sent to jail for possessing unregistered firearms because everybody knows guns kill people, libertarians say, "Make murder illegal, not guns." When teachers are fired for admitting to homosexual conduct, libertarians say, "Fire ineffective teachers, prohibit promotion of any particular lifestyle in public schools, and work for a private school system where parents can purchase the kind of education they want for their children. Don't single out heroin users, or handgun owners, or homosexuals, because *you* may be next."

Libertarianism

Libertarianism is nothing more nor less than the politics of Liberty. While other parties and groups seek to use the tools of politics to give some groups power over others, to enrich some at the expense of others, or to impose some set of values on those who disagree with those values, Libertarians seek nothing more than Liberty.

In economics, Libertarians advocate the establishment of the purely free market, that is, a market unhampered by government intrusion.

In the field of civil liberties, Libertarians hold that individuals must respect the right of others to live different lives, to read and enjoy different commodities, to shape their relationships, sexual and other, in their own way, to live their lives in their own way, at their own ex-

pense and risk, never forcing others to pay for their mistakes.

Americans two hundred years ago knew that eternal vigilance was the price of liberty, and were prepared to pay that price. Whether we are willing to pay that price today is a question which must be answered individually, by each of us. But we of the Libertarian Party have made our choice. Moved by a passion for justice, by compassion for those oppressed by State power and privilege, we have raised the banner of Liberty.

*Adapted from **Libertarianism**, Libertarian Party Position Paper #1, available at \$5/100 from Libertarian Party National Headquarters, 1516 P Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.*

**LIBERTARIAN PARTY OF CALIFORNIA
Membership Application**

Southern Headquarters: P.O. Box 71383, Los Angeles, California 90071 (213) 240-2556
Northern Headquarters: P.O. Box 2375, Stanford, California 94305 (415) 386-3115

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

Phone _____ Unlisted, do not release

Send me _____ voter registration card[s].

I hereby certify that I do not believe in or advocate the initiation of force as a means of achieving political or social ends.

Date _____ Signature _____

- Student. Name of school _____ \$ 6.00
- Regular \$ 15.00
- Sustaining \$ 25.00
- Sponsor \$ 50.00
- Life \$250.00

The above amounts all include a subscription to CALIBER, the LPC state newsletter.

- Dues only—exclude newsletter (deduct \$5.00 from above amount) _____
 - Newsletter subscription only \$ 5.00 _____
 - Voluntary contribution to help build the LPC _____
- Total** _____

Brief Notes

The 1978 Libertarian Party National Convention will be held this Labor Day weekend at the Copley Plaza Hotel in Boston. The first event will be a Friday morning breakfast with featured speaker Robert Nozick. Other featured speakers include Thomas Szasz, Karl Hess, D. T. Armentano, David Brudnoy, Murray Bookchin, Gary Greenberg, and Richard Eberling. Panels, seminars, and lectures are planned on issues including racism, space exploration, homophobia, energy fascism, feminism, and much more. For more information, write HUBCON '78, c/o LPM, Box 2610, Boston, MA 02208. (Source: Bill Hurst, HUBCON Publicity.)

LIBRE reports exactly 6,000 voters registered Libertarian in California as of May 10, 1978. That's quite an increase from 4,951 in January.

The Region 14 monthly meeting will be held Thursday, July 20 (6:30 p.m. for dinner; 8:00 p.m. for the meeting). The scheduled speaker is Alan Bock of Libertarian Advocate, a Washington based lobby. Alan writes the monthly column "Washington Watch" in Reason Magazine and is a contributing editor for LP News. Region 14 meetings are held at the Copper Penny Restaurant, 315 S. Brand, in Glendale.

A fundraising art auction has been scheduled by Region 18 to be held Friday evening June 30th at the Fountain Valley Recreation Center. The event will be professionally produced by Jamin Art Auctions, the nation's largest special function gallery. The artwork includes oils, lithographs, etchings, serigraphs, woodcuts, water colors, and other media, all custom framed. A fantastic door prize consisting of an artwork from Jamin will be included in the admission price of \$1.50. Complimentary champagne and hors d'oeuvres will be served. (Source: Orange County Libertarian.)

CALIBER is published monthly by the Libertarian Party of California. One year subscription is \$5.00; \$6.00 for first class mail delivery. Individual copies are \$.40 each. CALIBER editors are Gloria Rotunno and Ray Strong.

Send all editorial correspondence to:

CALIBER
c/o Jean Graphics
Almaden Business Center
6455 Almaden Expressway
San Jose, CA 95120

For subscriptions, renewals or address changes write to:

CALIBER Subscription Department
Libertarian Party of California
P.O. Box 71383
Los Angeles, CA 90071

San Diego—Tax resistance leader Barbara Hutchinson will appear on the November ballot to challenge incumbent Tax Assessor E. C. Williams. This was the result of a surprising showing Hutchinson made in the primary voting on June 6. She trailed the incumbent by only 425 votes out of more than 400,000 cast for the four candidates running. The top two candidates win the right to a run-off on the November ballot.

No one expected such a strong showing, even in a year when the flood of tax protest is raging. Barbara had spent much of the month of May out of town, instead of campaigning, and her expenditures during the campaign came to only \$19.22. As it turned out, her best advertising had been her ballot occupation listing as "Tax Pro- tector." This carried a lot of weight with an electorate that was in the process of passing Proposition 13 almost two to one.

According to LP News, LP member Ann Hammond finished second with 33 per cent of the vote in a three-way race for City Council in Garland, Texas. In a similar race in Janesville, Wisconsin, LP member Art Jackson finished second with 36 per cent. Wisconsin LP State Chair B. J. Larson made the runoff in a twelve-way race for four seats on the Racine school board, but failed to finish among the top four. (Source: March-April LP News.)

Orson Bean, well-known Broadway and TV personality, has recorded a 30-second radio spot for Ed Clark. The ad was aired the week of May 8 on KCBS (San Francisco), KFWB (Los Angeles), and KSDO (San Diego). If you would like to help the Ed Clark for Governor Campaign by purchasing some air time in your area, call Shirley Gottlieb at (213) 344-9936. (Source: Ed Clark for Governor Campaign Update.)

The Church of Moral Ethics has established two funds in memory of Karl Bray: one will help defray medical expenses, the other will assist in establishing a Freedom Library to contain Karl's books, papers, and correspondence. For further information, write to P.O. Box 674, Hermosa Beach, CA 90254. (Source: Henry J. Hohenstein, Pastor.)

Libertarianism

Libertarianism is nothing more nor less than the politics of Liberty. While some other parties and groups seek to use the tools of politics to give some groups power over others, to enrich some at the expense of others, or to impose some set of values on those who disagree with those values, Libertarians seek nothing more than Liberty.

The position paper entitled "Libertarianism," is available from from the Libertarian Party National Headquarters, 1516 P Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.

CALIBER

CALifornia
LIBERTarian
NEWS

Published monthly by
THE LIBERTARIAN PARTY OF CALIFORNIA

Northern Headquarters:
P.O. Box 2375, Stanford, CA 94305

Southern Headquarters:
P.O. Box 71383, Los Angeles, CA 90071

Bulk Rate
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 3382
San Jose, CA

DAVE NOLAN
1818 S. JASMINE
DENVER CO 80224
NLN-DNV JAN 1979