

# Libertarian VANGUARD

\$2.00

December 1982

Voice of Radical Libertarians

Issue 23

## November 2, 1982: LP Holds Its Own by Eric Garris

Copyright © 1982 Libertarian Party Radical Caucus

WE HELD OUR OWN. That about sums up the LP's performance in 1982. Results around the country were mixed with slight to moderate increases in most states, and no increases and slight declines in others.

The total number of voters who cast at least one vote for a Libertarian was about 1.5 million, compared to 1.7 million in 1980. However, in 1982 there was a lower turnout and Libertarians only appeared before  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the voters (compared with 100% in 1980 by virtue of Ed Clark's 50-state ballot status), so the relative proportion increased slightly.

Some alarmists in the LP see 1982 as an indication of disaster. *Update* has claimed that the LP "suffered the most serious electoral setback in its ten year history." What this means is that vote totals in several states, particularly Alaska, were not up to the hype that was presented over the past year by the Crane Machine.

The biggest setback in this election

was Alaska, where the Crane Machine poured virtually all its resources. The Randolph campaign for Governor, relying upon the nomination of a moderate Republican to differentiate Randolph from the major parties, was crushed by the primary victory of conservative Tom Fink, a Randolph ally. The campaign spent over \$550,000 for 26,000 votes, or about 14.7%. This is only three points over Ed Clark's 1980 Alaska percentage.

At the same time, Alaskan LP legislative candidates and local activists were taken for granted. They were on their own with no help from national and state parties, and little help or communication from Randolph. Randolph and his national fundraisers counted on eight possible wins, but no one came close. They did well, however, receiving as much as 39% in a two-way race and 28% in a three-way race. For other information on Alaska, see the individual state breakdowns.

*Update* also claims that no other Libertarians were elected to office this year. This is not true. If the Craniacs imported to Alaska had taken notice of their own grass roots, they would have noticed a victory. In the October municipal elections in Alaska, Bruce Wammack was re-elected to a Borough Assembly seat. A few other Libertarians were also elected in November. Paul Dillon, an appointed incumbent City Councilman from Philomath, Oregon, won reelection. And an incumbent County Coroner in Wisconsin who changed his ballot listing to Libertarian won reelection unopposed.

The biggest gains were made in Montana, where Larry Dodge received close to 4% for U.S. Senate. Another statewide candidate received 9.5% in a three-way race, and several legislative candidates scored in double digits.

Third party elections expert Richard Winger believes that the LP gained in 1982. "In most areas, support for LP candidates matched or bettered Clark's

*continued on page 2*

## Statement Released by Fugitive Draft Resister

WASHINGTON, October 25, 1982—The following statement was released today by Paul Jacob, a political activist who was indicted by the Arkansas Grand Jury on September 23, 1982 for failure to register for the draft. Though he is the 11th person to be indicted for this offense, Jacob's case is unique in that he is the only draft resister who has been indicted that the F.B.I. cannot locate for prosecution, despite a nationwide search. Jacob, former chairman of the Arkansas Libertarian Party, left his home in 1981 (after receiving a threatening letter from the Selective Service System) and has been living underground in an attempt to avoid prosecution. His statement follows:

I refuse to register for the draft. The draft is absolute state control over the individual. The draft is slavery and I will not assist the government in their attempt to take away my freedom.

The Selective Service System (the agency which brings us the military draft) is in serious trouble. Continued noncompliance, which is now 1 in 5, will soon mean the end to the registration program and may stop a future draft.

The government cannot enforce the registration law against so many resisters, but they will try to intimidate the many by making examples of a vocal few.

The trial and conviction of Benjamin Sasway clearly demonstrate that the U.S.

*continued on back page*



# Election

continued from page 1

1980 totals." He feels that, in general, 1982 was a successful election.

Murray Rothbard hoped that the election would sober up LP activists. "It's clear that the great Craniac swindle is over," he said. "The quick victory model is dead in the water. We have to settle in for the long haul. We need to recruit cadre, educate, and build on the grass roots." Rothbard pointed out that "we cannot rely on what the objective conditions might be," but "we must continue to hang in there and build the party."

Rothbard drew an analogy to the American Revolution. "It's like the debate over conventional versus guerilla warfare," he said. "Washington almost lost the Revolution by trying to build an army like the British. But most victories were achieved with quick, guerilla actions. We just don't have the resources to build an army like the major parties now."

Ken Fanning, defeated LP legislator from Alaska, pointed out that "the major parties feel threatened and are fighting back against us." He cited the anti-Libertarian radio ads that were run by the Republican Party in Alaska and which attempted to loosen soft LP support in crucial races.

Fanning feels that more educational activities have to be at the core of party-building over the next few years. "We have a big job to educate people about the economic disaster we are headed toward," said Fanning. He believes that the LP must quickly reevaluate its strategy and tactics.

In 1982, the LP ran over 900 candidates, a record number. But many activists think that quality is much more important than quantity. "We should run fewer candidates," Murray Rothbard told LV. "We should concentrate more on local party building, and run in selected races." There seemed to be no correlation between high vote totals and the number of candidates run.

The election results left LP Presidential nominee-seekers with fewer candidates than they expected to have. At this

point, names mentioned most prominently include Ron Paul, Dick Randolph, Joe Fuhrig, Larry Dodge, and Walter Williams.

The LP fell far short of the goal set out a year ago in *LP News* of obtaining ballot status in 24 states. The party added or kept ballot status in 14 states. Ballot status was obtained in Alaska, Arizona, Montana, and Indiana, and lost in Oregon and Michigan. Ballot status was maintained by vote totals in California, Nevada, Hawaii, and Wisconsin, and by merely running candidates or just being there in Alabama, Idaho, Kansas, Delaware, South Carolina, and North Carolina. The goal of ballot status may be overemphasized in some cases. With laws varying widely from state to state, ballot status is worth a lot more in Texas or Oregon than in Idaho or Alaska.

The following is a state-by-state summary of the results we have at press time. Some states are incomplete or omitted because they do not compile minor party results until weeks after the election. We hope to cover those results in our next issue.

**ALABAMA:** We kept ballot status just by staying around. Henri Klingler received about 1% for Governor and Tim Gatewood received 8.8% for Public Service Commissioner in a two-way race. Five Congressional and two legislative candidates received between 0.7% and 4.8%.

**ALASKA:** After spending over \$550,000, Dick Randolph received 26,500 votes (14.7%), for an average cost of over \$20 per vote. In return for all this, the LP achieved permanent ballot status.

The latest *Update* incorrectly stated that Randolph's total was the best for a third party candidate for Governor nationwide in 40 years. It is the best since 1974.

Randolph was counting heavily on moderate Terry Miller winning the Republican primary. Instead, conservative Tom Fink, a Randolph ally, upset Miller. Both Randolph and his campaign advisors agree that this was the factor that put Randolph out of the running. With Randolph stressing economic issues and supporting the relocation of the State Capitol (a \$2.8 billion ballot issue), he agreed with his Republican opponent on virtually every campaign issue. Randolph was so close to Fink that Fink was under consideration as a running mate for Randolph after Fink's expected loss in the primary. Reportedly Randolph suggested half-jokingly to Fink at a meeting with other LP leaders months ago that they should flip a coin to see who would run for Governor and who would run

for Lieutenant Governor.

When Fink won the primary, it became clear that Randolph was running a losing race. But the Randolph campaign continued to dominate the Alaska LP's political agenda. (Randolph says he and his staff knew they had no chance after Fink's primary victory.) Many local activists and national observers believe this cost them at least a few legislative seats. The legislative candidates received no money or support from the national or state LP organizations. Many activists had hoped that, when Fink won, Randolph would deemphasize his statewide effort and turn his efforts toward helping the Fairbanks candidates. All of the local legislative candidates were outspent and out-campaigned by their opponents.

Ken Fanning, our one incumbent running for reelection, received only 39% in a two-way race. He and Randolph both believe that he lost due to reapportionment. Fanning was forced to run in the district in which he has lived. "There's no way a Libertarian or a Republican could have won in that district," Fanning said in an interview with LV. "It's part of the university area and is very liberal. Many are on the government dole."

However, he disagrees with Randolph as to why we lost the other local seats. "I disagree with Dick, who thinks it [the Alaska campaign] was a success," he said. "We got kicked in the teeth and we need to reevaluate." He blamed defeat on a strategy which overemphasized the Governor's race. "Dick wasn't around enough. The Governor's race eroded our funds and manpower. People who would have given us lots of money gave it to Dick, and we had no support from the state party or national."

Former national director Eric O'Keefe, who worked on the Randolph campaign the last two months, told Richard Winger that "if we had known that the legislative candidates were in trouble, we would have done something about it." A simple poll in the important districts would have told them.

An interesting factor in the race was the appearance of radio ads which attacked the LP. The ads, paid for by the Republican National Committee, featured a conversation between two people, one of whom was thinking about voting for the Libertarians. The other gives him a grand list of all the things we are for as the potential Libertarian voter grows more horrified. At the end of the ad the voter is informed that Libertarians would even legalize "kiddie porn," to which the voter replies, "Over my dead body!" The Randolph campaign responded quickly, pointing out that the Alaska LP does not support legalization of pornography for anyone but adults (this differs from the national LP platform). After the ads generated much publicity, Republican Fink ordered them off the air. Randolph and Fanning believe that

Permission to reprint this article in whole or in part is hereby granted, provided it is accompanied by this notice: Reprinted with permission from *Libertarian Vanguard*, 3790 El Camino Real, No. 172, Palo Alto, CA 94306, U.S.A. \$12/year.

the ads were "so outrageous" that they did not hurt Randolph's campaign.

Randolph's support for moving the state capitol from Juneau to Willow (near Anchorage) puzzled many Libertarians. "Juneau is just not accessible to most people, you can't drive there," Randolph told *Vanguard*. "The money issue is an important one to Libertarians (\$2.8 billion) but they would have spent that much rebuilding the capital in Juneau and building a major road to it. Those plans are underway and supported by Governor-elect Sheffield." The obvious Libertarian solution, overlooked by Randolph, is to oppose both measures.

John Wood, chair of the ALP platform committee and a leader of the Anchorage LP, was very critical of the Randolph campaign. "The people running the campaign didn't know a damn about Alaska politics and alien-

Eric O'Keefe, Kent Guida, and other Craniacs sent to Alaska to run the Randolph campaign quickly alienated local activists by "running the whole show" and received the nickname "The Aliens" from the locals. "It quickly became 'Us' against 'Them,'" said Wood. "You don't win elections that way."

When asked about the much touted six to eight wins that Randolph and his "lower forty-eight" fundraisers promised, Wood replied, "that's a lie. We could have elected two at best if everything went our way." He thinks that several candidates ran excellent races and some of them did "very respectably." "We can't just come in here and start electing everyone to state office. We have to educate and start electing people to local offices first. We have to look at the long run and work on educational efforts." Wood himself ran in the October election for

"influential people" to convince them that our program is "sane and rational." "The major parties are starting to feel threatened by us and are starting to fight back," he said. "We have a big job to do educating people about the economic disaster we are coming toward, and the majors are going to fight us at every point."

Randolph believes that most of the legislative races were blown by the candidates themselves. "We should have been able to win 8 races," Randolph told LV. "But the candidates just didn't run the kind of races, make the kind of commitment they needed to make to win, with two exceptions." Those two exceptions are Fanning, whom he feels was reappointed out, and Jerri Benshoof, who got 23.9% in a three-way race for State Senate in the Fairbanks area. Randolph said he wanted to study the returns before saying why he thinks Benshoof lost.

In what might have been their best district, two Libertarians petitioned for one legislative seat in Fairbanks. This resulted in very negative media coverage and bad feelings in the Fairbanks LP. Reportedly, Paul Wagner received the nomination at a Fairbanks LP meeting with over 60% of the membership in attendance. Lynette Clark claimed that while Wagner had won the support of the majority of the Fairbanks LP, she had the support of most LP members in her *district*, and had already filed her petitions by the time of the meeting.

Both filed anyway, and both campaigned. Bad feelings ran high, and there was even debate over excluding Clark supporters from attending an executive committee meeting (which is supposedly open to all ALP members). Wagner received 10% and Clark 8% of the vote. The group that supported Clark has decided to split off from the ALP and form the Fox Libertarian Party. It was reported that Clark's group may be seeking affiliation with the national LP.

The Alaska LP must reevaluate its strategy. While Bruce Wammack won reelection to the Fairbanks Borough Assembly, incumbent Libertarian John Davis lost his reelection bid for the Kenai Borough Assembly. Worst of all, they lost their biggest asset, a presence in the legislature. One thing they must learn is that they cannot achieve success based upon the chance of who wins another party's primary. The Alaska party should also start to address a broader variety of issues, including civil liberties and foreign policy. International issues have never been addressed by the Alaska LP and they have never run a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives or the Senate. To do so will likely put them at odds with either the national LP's non-interventionist position, or the conservatism of their constituency.

Randolph seems to be the only one who sees his campaign as a great success. "We

## Alaska Results

Name	Race	Percent	Number In Race	Place
Ken Fanning (inc)	State Rep.—Fairbanks	38.9	2	2
Jerri Benshoof	State Sen.—Fairbanks area	23.9	3	3
Ron Berg	State Rep.—Fairbanks area	27.4	3	3
Susan Shaffer	State Sen.—Kenai Peninsula	34.8	2	2
Andre Marrou	State Rep.—Kenai	27.8	3	2
Ken Damm	State Rep.—Kodiak	31.5	2	2
Wes Craske	State Rep.—Sitka	21.0	2	2
John Manley	State Rep.—Juneau	15.6	2	2
Darrel Welsh	State Rep.—Matanuska Valley	9.1	4	4
Paul Wagner*	State Rep.—Fairbanks	10.1	4	3
Lynette Clark*	State Rep.—Fairbanks	8.0	4	4
Lorraine Stout	State Rep.—Highway System	20.0	4	3
Ted Carson	State Rep.—Kenai	17.2	3	3

\*Running for the same seat

ated most of the LP organization in Anchorage [the largest population center]," Wood said. "They came in and ran a 'closed shop.'"

Wood complained that the Randolph campaign kept local activists in the dark about developments on the campaign. "No one knew the Lieutenant Governor candidate he picked [Christensen]. He had not been involved in the LP. When he resigned, I didn't find out about it until the media called for comment." Christensen resigned from the ticket three days before the filing deadline and was replaced by Donnis Thompson. Wood said the lieutenant governor fiasco was only one example of the disorganization that pervaded the Randolph campaign. "Their plans were totally disorganized," he said. "They should have campaigned early around the state to spread the libertarian message and put into place a grass roots organization for the campaign. They should have also prepared a contingency plan in case Tom Fink won, instead of basing all plans on running against Miller."

Anchorage municipal assembly and received 39% in a four-way race. He came in second, six points behind the winner.

Wood plans to run for state chair of the ALP at their April convention and expects to be opposed by Randolph's people. He said that Eric O'Keefe has applied for a not-yet-created position of state director at a salary somewhere between \$40,000 and \$50,000. "Randolph wants to run again in four years and wants to keep O'Keefe around," he said. Wood pledged that he and Chuck Adams, chair of the Anchorage LP, would oppose O'Keefe's appointment "all the way."

Wood promised to fight for principled campaigns in the Alaska LP. "If they [the Randolph-Crane forces] take over, we're going to run candidates locally down here on libertarian principles and screw any ideas they have about running some Republican. They have to live up to our principles, because that's what we're going to run on."

Fanning believes that the Alaska party and the national LP need to do more education of

have a much stronger statewide presence," he said. "We brought in many good people in all major communities of the state." He says he is "extremely unlikely" to run for the legislature in two years. Asked about a 1984 Presidential race, Randolph paused and replied, "At this time, no I would not. I said a while back that I would not run, and nothing has happened *at this point* to change my mind." (emphasis added)

**ARIZONA:** The ploy of running "newly-converted" conservative Republican and former Congressman Sam Steiger for Governor to achieve ballot status worked—barely. Steiger received 36,526 votes for 5.04% (5% is required for ballot status). Randall Clamons received 2.77% for U.S. Senator and other statewide candidates received as much as 5.31%. All ran as independents.

Steiger generated the most controversy in the LP this election year with his statement on television that he would support bringing back the draft. Steiger later recanted under intense pressure from LP leaders.

Buck Crouch, touted as a possible winner, received 25.36% for State Legislature in a two-way race. This compares to 1980 when he received 19% in a three-way race. Terry Orgill received 14.76% and Jack Jones received 9.57% in three-way races for the legislature. Orgill's race was for two seats; about 29% of those voting cast one vote for him. Other candidates received between 1.99% and 6.51%.

**ARKANSAS:** In our only Arkansas race, Carolyn Williams received about 31.25% in a four-way race for Little Rock Board of Commissioners. Very good, Carolyn!

**CALIFORNIA:** As a whole, LP vote totals were down. Legislative and Congressional candidates received an average of two percentage points less than in 1980.

Joe Fuhrig, who ran one of the best statewide radical campaigns in LP history, received 105,206 votes (1.37%) for U.S. Senate. This is the largest number of votes for any third party candidate for Governor or Senator this year. His total budget was under \$25,000 and he campaigned extensively around the state for ten months. Dan Dougherty, who ran a more traditional (Clark-like) campaign for Governor and spent \$45,000, received 79,028 votes (1.02%).

Two candidates received at least the two percent needed for retaining ballot status: Less Antman for Treasurer (2.28%) and Bart Lee for Attorney General (2.20%). (Fuhrig, Antman, and Lee are Radical Caucus members.) Other statewide candidates got between 1.42% and 2.02%.

Congressional and Legislative candidates facing two major party opponents received between 1.30% and 5.72%, down from highs of 17% and 9% in 1980. Dan Gorham, a former state legislator from Florida, received

14.37% in a two-way race for Congress in Los Angeles.

Bill Evers received 4% for one of the four seats on the state Board of Equalization. He was endorsed by the San Francisco *Chronicle*. In San Francisco, George O'Brien got 33,112 votes (26.45%) for Board of Education and Robert DaPrato got 15,219 votes (11.66%) for Community College Board.

Lack of coordination and direction was a major reason for the low totals. No candidate ran an exceptional race, and there was no high-visibility statewide race to create a "coattail" factor. The media paid very little attention to LP candidates. Very little was done near the end of the campaigns to capitalize on the base they did have. Some candidates did much better in polls before the election than in actual vote totals. One candidate for Congress who ran a very soft-core but expensive campaign showed 15% in one poll two weeks before the election, but ended up with less than 2%.

**COLORADO:** Paul Grant ran a good radical race for Governor and received about 2%. Phil Prosser received about 20% in a two-way race for legislature. John Hartman received 23% in a two-way race for Rio Blanco County Commissioner.

**CONNECTICUT:** Statewide candidates received between 0.7% and 1.08%, and other candidates did about the same. This is a slight increase from previous totals.

**DELAWARE:** Ballot status was kept by libertarian registration remaining above one-twentieth of one percent.

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:** Opportunists Miss Opportunity: there were no Libertarian candidates on the ballot in D.C. If we had run a candidate for City Council-At-Large, we would almost certainly have obtained ballot status. Two seats were open and local rules say that no party may nominate more than one candidate, although voters vote for two. This time there was one candidate each from the Democratic and D.C. Statehood Party, with both winning. A Libertarian probably would have received at least the 7,500 votes needed for ballot status.

The D.C. LP is not an activist organization. It is run by the Crane Machine, and several local Libertarians have actually been *excluded* from membership. All new members must be approved by Jule Herbert, former chairman. The D.C. party was established as an arm of the Crane Machine and has never done anything outside of barely making ballot status for Clark in 1980. We hope that next time some independent Libertarians will seize this opportunity for ballot status that was ignored by the Craniacs.

**FLORIDA:** LPRC activist and Florida LP Vice-Chair Dianne Pilcher received 9.42% in a three-way race for state legislature in Or-

lando. Pilcher's race was a great success for the Florida LP. To get on the ballot, she and two other LP candidates had to get 3% of the registered voters in the district to sign a petition. They did this over objections from long-time Florida LP leaders that to attempt it was futile.

Pilcher's total is one of the best in the nation for legislature in a three-way race. She ran an active, hard-core campaign and spent about \$2,000 (about \$1.30 a vote). Her opponents spent \$5 and \$7 a vote.

Gerald Nyren spent about \$10,000 for a legislative seat from Jacksonville and received 7.83%. State Chair Alan Turin, on a very small budget, got 3.81% in Miami. Some LP write-ins ran very strong campaigns, but totals have not yet been reported.

Larry Pino, who was narrowly defeated in his bid for State Chair earlier this year, lost a seat on the Winter Park City Council by a two-to-one margin. During the campaign, Pino repudiated his past ties to the LP and the American Civil Liberties Union, and publicly joined the Republican Party. Local leaders of the FLP and the ACLU made it clear the feeling was mutual.

**HAWAII:** Rockne Johnson received 10.15% of the vote for Congress in a two-way race, maintaining ballot status (barely — they needed 10%). Amelia Fritts received 5.63% in Hawaii's other Congressional district. Christopher Winter got 11.48% of the vote for Honolulu City Council in a two-way race.

**ILLINOIS:** Bea Armstrong got about 0.8% in the race for Governor. Joan Jarosz received about 4% running against New Right Congressman Phil Crane.

**INDIANA:** Steve Dashbach received 0.51% for Secretary of State, enough for ballot status by a handful of votes.

**KANSAS:** James Ward received 1.01% for Governor and Alan Weldon received 7.44% for Insurance Commissioner (in a race with no Democrat). State Board of Education candidates Kim Earnest and Marion Nunemaker received 30% and 15% respectively in two-way races. Lorence Bishop received 14.66% and John Brewer 17.23% in two-way races for the legislature. The totals and number of active campaigns indicate much increased activity in Kansas. The LP keeps ballot status based on a lawsuit won earlier this year.

**KENTUCKY:** Two candidates for legislature each received under 1.0%.

**LOUISIANA:** Congressional elections were held in late September here. James Agnew received 23% for Congress in a two-way race. Another candidate received about 1%.

**MAINE:** Vern Warren received 0.78% for Governor. Gregory Flemming, running as an independent for Congress, received 1.69%. Three legislative candidates on the ballot received between 5.82% and 7.70%.

**MARYLAND:** Gerald Schneider received 5,141 votes or about 19% of those cast in a five-way race for three seats for legislature. This was their only race.

**MASSACHUSETTS:** Rebecca Shipman, who ran an active race for Governor, received 17,088 votes (0.84%). Author Howard Katz, running for U.S. Senate, received 18,507 votes (0.90%). Other statewide candidates received between 2.89% and 3.80%. Top vote-getter was Donald Washburn for Auditor with 69,495. Local candidates in two-way races ran well, with the following results: Anthony Laudani for Congress, 15.33%; Susan Poulin for legislature, 16.94%; Richard Beaumier for legislature, 17.28%; Leland Webber for legislature, 15.25%.

**MICHIGAN:** Dick Jacobs, who generated controversy within the LP for his gradualism, received only 15,492 votes (0.5%), 4,500 short of the total needed to retain ballot status. Michigan was one of two states to lose ballot status. (Oregon was the other.) Jacobs ran on one major issue, his tax-cutting amendment, which proposed mild tax cuts but locked funding for public education into state law. (See *Vanguard*, Issues 20 and 21.) Because of Jacobs' soft-core libertarianism, he was almost indistinguishable from the Republican Party or the anti-tax Tisch Independent Citizens Party, which received 75,000 votes (about 2.5%) and now has permanent ballot status. Bette Erwin, running for U.S. Senate, had called for continuation of income taxes to support "courts and jails, environmental protection, and a military system to protect our borders"; she did only slightly better than Jacobs with 0.6% of the vote.

Other leading statewide candidates received under 1%. Denise Kline, running for State Board of Education, got about 1.5% in a statewide race. Peter Avery received the highest LP vote total in the nation with 210,951 votes for Supreme Court Justice. This was a five-candidate race for two seats, with about 10% of those voting casting a vote for Avery. Shelia Hart received 8.81% running for Congress in a two-way race. The top legislative vote-getter in a three-way race was Janet Parks with 5.5%.

**MINNESOTA:** Frank Haws for Governor received 0.33%, and Fred Hewitt for U.S. Senate received 0.29%. Linda Taylor, running for Secretary of State, received 30,605 votes for 1.86%. Top local candidate was Wjason Willett with 4.48% for legislature.

**MISSISSIPPI:** James Bradshaw received 6.46% for Congress in a two-way race.

**MISSOURI:** Mike Fee received 3.34% for legislature, which gave the LP ballot status in that one district. LP member John Watkins received 31.86% in a two-way race for Dade County Prosecuting Attorney as an independent. However, he could have been listed as

a Libertarian for the same signature requirement, so we tend to doubt his commitment to the LP. The Missouri LP chose not to run any statewide candidates, even though they would have had a good shot at statewide ballot status.

**MONTANA:** Perhaps our brightest star of 1982. Larry Dodge, who ran an active, radical, full-time campaign for U.S. Senate, received 11,833 votes (3.8%). Dodge was perceived as an important and articulate candidate by the media. The Republican Party publicly attacked the LP in literature and news releases. Linda Hoffman received 9.5% in a three-way race for Clerk of the Supreme Court, a statewide partisan race. This is our best percentage in a statewide race outside of Alaska.

Both Dodge and Hoffman got more than the 10,000 votes needed for ballot status. Dodge spent about \$20,000 and campaigned full-time for six months. Hoffman was endorsed by *The Missoulan* daily newspaper. *The Missoulan* also ran a very complimentary editorial on the LP two weeks after the election.

During the campaign, a number of controversies erupted within the Montana LP over local candidates. Attempts by radical Libertarians to require local candidates to sign a statement pledging support to the LP Statement of Principles failed after a long battle. At the center of the controversy was Michael Tanchek, a Councilman of a small town, who received 41% in 1980 for legislature as a Libertarian.

Tanchek has stated that he is "too independent for the LP," and has been criticized by party leaders for soft-peddling Libertarianism. As a Councilman he rarely proposed libertarian programs. At one point, he planned to abandon the LP and run as an independent, but ended up filing as a Libertarian. Tanchek received 34% for State Senate, 7 points fewer than two years ago.

Bryan Spellman, running for legislature, was also criticized by party leaders for taking unlibertarian positions. Spellman was endorsed by *The Missoulan*, which noted his pledge to retain tax funding for public education and other government services. Spellman received 4.8%, less than any other LP candidate in Missoula County.

Controversy still rages over LP State Secretary Pat Summers. Summers was elected to a seat on the Missoula Urban Transit Board, which runs the local bus system. Summers was originally endorsed by the LP and listed in their literature, assuming that a state officer would run a good Libertarian campaign. Instead, Summers came out for continuation of government funding and monopoly for the city bus system. She was removed from later printings of LP literature, and has been repudiated by party leaders.

Other legislative candidates ranged from 2.0% to 10.4% in three-way races, and from

14.8% to 20.1% in two-way races. They included: Gary Palm, 10.5%; Walter Deets, 9.0%; Chris Mullin, 7.6%; Gary Scheer, 20.1%; Harley Harris, 16.8%; Jeff Conway, 15.5%; Mike Hall, 14.8%. Don Doig received 3.1% for Congress.

An LP-sponsored ballot initiative to de-regulate beer and wine licensing for restaurants was defeated 60% to 40%. The LP gathered 30,000 signatures to qualify the measure and spent a total of \$5,100 on the campaign. Opponents, funded by the Tavern Guild, spent \$60,000. The LP was also an early and vocal supporter of a Nuclear Freeze/Anti-MX Missile initiative which passed 57% to 43%.

**NEVADA:** Vote totals were generally higher than in past years, with Dan Becan receiving 1.92% for Governor. Rowena Von Wolff received 2.93% for Lt. Governor. Ballot status may be achieved in Nevada by getting a certain number of votes (about 10,000) for any office in the state. The Nevada LP made it with two candidates, Peter O'Brian for Clark County Clerk (14,172 for 12.01%) and William Carlye for Clark County Recorder (14,682 for 12.91%) in two-way races. Tom Morris received 14.52% in a two-way race for legislature, and other candidates ranged from 2.17% to 7.40%.

Margaret Kasper, who was listed by the Nevada LP as one of their candidates, received 45% in a two-way, non-partisan race for State Board of Education.

One LP candidate was disavowed by the party for not really being a Libertarian. R.J. Edwards received only 2.10% in his race for Clark County Sheriff following the repudiation.

**NEW JERSEY:** John Lutz lost the race for a seat on the Kingwood Town Council, where he would have joined Libertarian Dick Siano, by 56 votes. No other information at this time.

**NEW YORK:** John Northrup, Free Libertarian Party candidate for Governor, received about 20,000 votes, 30,000 short of ballot status. Northrup spent about \$110,000, or over \$5 per vote.

The FLP is the oldest large-state LP to consistently run candidates. Their best year was 1973, when Fran Younstein received close to 9,000 votes in New York City for Mayor. Since then they have run several statewide campaigns with gradual increases in vote totals (except for Clark for President, who received over 50,000 votes). Although the gradual increases should be encouraging, sky-high promises have turned off many activists. But State Chair Gary Greenberg continues to run the FLP with an iron hand, holding virtually no meetings that might encourage activity by others.

James McKeown received 35,428 votes (0.7%) for U.S. Senate and the FLP candidate for Comptroller received about 40,000 votes (0.84%).

**OHIO:** Many Ohio candidates were noted for running soft-core campaigns. Phil Herzing, who endorsed the flat rate tax, got the worst total of any statewide LP campaign in Ohio with 37,413 (1.09%) for U.S. Senate. Phyllis Goetz received 40,196 votes (1.19%) for Governor. Other statewide candidates ranged from 2.53% to 6.13%. Thomas Brown did best with 197,105 (6.13%) for State Treasurer in a two-way race. Kathy Brown received 12.29% in a two-way race for Congress. Other candidates received between 0.75% and 3.81%.

**OKLAHOMA:** Virginia Henson, an LP registrant (other information unavailable) received 37.29% in a two-way race for District Attorney. Pat Patton, running for State Treasurer, received 1.58%. No other statewide campaigns were run.

**OREGON:** The LP lost statewide ballot status, which required 5% for a statewide office. Closest was Burgess Laughlin who received 4.40% for Labor Commissioner. Paul Dillon, who was an appointed incumbent City Councilman in Philomath, won reelection.

Running for Governor, Paul J. Clelland received 2.1%, the highest percentage for that office behind Randolph in Alaska and Steiger in Arizona. Marilyn McCabe, in a non-partisan race for Multnomah County Commissioner, received 35% in a two-way race against a well-known incumbent. Bill Goodman got 9.7% in a three-way race for Yamhill County Clerk.

Conrad Williamson, running in a five-way

race for two seats on the Lafayette City Council, came in fourth, but due to the particular political climate in that city, he may be appointed to a seat on the council vacated by the man just elected mayor. If he is appointed, Libertarians will have three city council members in Oregon.

**SOUTH CAROLINA:** Statewide candidates for Treasurer, Secretary of State, and Comptroller General received 6-7.5% in two-way races. They keep ballot status just by running candidates. Gordon Davis received about 10% for Congress in a two-way race.

Several local candidates did quite well. Candidates in two-way races ranged from 5.0% to 10.0% and in three-way races from 2.0% to 8.0% for legislature. John Comer received 12.0% in a three-way race for York County Council.

**SOUTH DAKOTA:** In our only race there, Emmett Elrod received 3,277 votes for about 25% of the total. However, it was a three-way race for two seats in the legislature. This means that actually over 50% of the voters voted for Elrod, still not enough to win, but an excellent showing.

**TEXAS:** David Hutzelman received 11,277 votes (0.56%), far short of the 2% needed for permanent ballot status. Other statewide candidates ranged from 0.71% to 2.24%. Many other projects were dumped by the Texas LP in favor of an all-out petition drive for ballot status this year only, and it was barely achieved. While the statewide totals are disappointing, a court decision which

put the Citizens Party on the ballot without petitioning provides a ray of hope for changing Texas' restrictive ballot laws.

Texas had more Libertarian candidates on the ballot than any other state. Some did quite well. One who didn't was Congressional candidate Parker Abell, who called for "stringing up" public officials who favor open borders. He got the lowest percentage of any Congressional candidate, about 0.4%.

Candidates in three-way races got as much as 7%, and the following candidates received good totals in two-way races: Nancy Wilson for State Board of Education (15.42%); Liz Barthlow (St. Bd. of Ed.), 11.14%; David Luckstead (St. Bd. of Ed.), 13.07%; Sharon Lucas (State Sen.), 11.28%; Doris Smith (St. Sen.), 12.67%; Jim Millard (St. Sen.), 13.59%; Ron McInturff (St. Sen.), 15.85%; Ted Norris (St. Sen.), 12.04%; Scott Bieser (St. House), 11.43%; Kenneth Royer (St. House), 14.79%; Tommy Glenn (St. House), 16.70%; William Timmons (St. House), 17.75%; Tom Owens (St. House), 10.27%; Joe Ellerbrock (St. House), 11.22%. Tom Snead received almost 8% in a three-way race for State House.

**UTAH:** George Mercier received about 1,100 votes for U.S. Senate, or about 0.2%. Other results unavailable.

**VERMONT:** Candidate for Governor John Buttolph received 0.49% and U.S. Senate candidate Bo Adlerbert received 0.54%. Other statewide candidates received between 0.95% and 4.50%, just short of the 5% needed for ballot status. In a three-candidate race for two legislative seats, Ed McGuire received 359 votes, which means that 25% of the voters voted for him. Other legislative candidates received about 4%.

**VIRGINIA:** Scott Bowden received 1.31% for Congress in the Virginia LP's only race.

**WISCONSIN:** The LP maintained ballot status by getting over 1% in a statewide race. James Hoffert received 26,871 votes (2.63%) for Attorney General in a race with no Republican. An incumbent County Coroner who switched his party affiliation to Libertarian during the previous term won reelection. He ran unopposed in a partisan race and was listed as a Libertarian.

**WYOMING:** Dave Dawson received about 3,000 votes, or about 15.1% in a multi-seat district, for legislature.

*The author would like to thank the following people who provided assistance essential to writing this article: Kathleen Jacob-Richman; Boyce Kendrick; Cynthia Nessina; Bill Barlow; Sean Donnelly; Don Doig; Della Scott; John Fund; Dick Randolph; Ken Fanning; Ann Justi; and Honey Lanham. Special thanks go to the heroic Richard Winger, whose ongoing election research and analysis are always indispensable.*

## Local LPRC Contacts

### California/South

Linda Freeman  
10652 Brighton Drive  
Santa Ana, CA 92705  
(714) 832-4029

### California/North

Libertarian Books & Periodicals  
1800 Market Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
(415) 864-0952

### Florida

Dianne Pilcher  
637 W. Princeton, No. 2  
Orlando, FL 32804  
(305) 423-1129

### Hawaii

Jerry Dickson  
1645 Ala Wai Boulevard  
Honolulu, HI 96815  
(808) 955-4917

### Illinois

Tom Verkuilen  
5649 N. Drake Avenue  
Chicago, IL 60659  
(312) 463-4741

### Ohio

Gayle Hosmer  
2471 Sunbury Road  
Columbus, OH 43219  
(614) 476-4583

### Utah

Bob Waldrop  
c/o Utah Libertarian Party  
3282 South 1300 East  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84106  
(801) 485-0421

### Washington

Rod Colver  
22002 Highway 99, No. 20  
Edmonds, WA 98020  
(206) 776-8420 or 583-0610

# In The Literature

## Bibliography on Just Wars

by David Gordon

MUCH OF THE DISCUSSION about just wars in current American political theory and philosophy has centered around one book: Michael Walzer's *Just and Unjust Wars* (Basic Books, 1977). The author, for many years associated with the democratic socialist journal *Dissent*, rejects both pacifism and an "anything goes" approach in war. He rejects utilitarianism and, arguing from a moral theory in general based on rights, sets forth fairly detailed principles governing most of the major problems of present day interest. (E.g., when, if ever, is a nation justified in invading another country? What measures may be taken to counter terrorism?) Walzer distinguishes between the moral principles which determine whether a war is just from those which regulate what may legitimately be done in a war. It doesn't follow, in his view, from the fact that a war has been justifiably undertaken that there are no limits to what one may do the enemy. Also notable in Walzer's approach is that he has revived, and given contemporary applications to, many of the distinctions of the medieval scholastics.

Much of the literature dealing with Walzer's book has been critical. For arguments that Walzer has been too much inclined to favor the *status quo* in international relations, rejecting the possibility of a radical change in the in-

ternational system, see Gerald Doppelt, "Walzer's Theory of Morality in International Relations" *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 8 (1978), pp. 1-26, and David Luban, "Just War and Human Rights" *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 9 (1980), pp. 160-181. Walzer launches a counter-attack against these and other detractors in "The Moral Status of States: A Response to Four Critics" *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 9 (1980), pp. 209-229. Some philosophers have charged that Walzer is unfair to utilitarianism: see, e.g., Douglas Lackey, "A Modern Theory of Just War" *Ethics* (April, 1982), pp. 533-546, and Walzer's response, *ibid.*, pp. 547-548. By far the best discussion of Walzer's book is Robert Nozick's review in *Reason* (December, 1978), pp. 19, 35.

Walzer, as I have indicated, draws on the scholastic tradition, but he is not a committed advocate of the natural law position. A much more stringent application of the traditional natural law position to modern warfare may be found in two essays of Elizabeth Anscombe: "War and Murder" and "Mr. Truman's Degree." These are conveniently available in Volume 3 of her *Collected Philosophical Papers*. Anscombe insists, in the first of these essays, on a sharp distinction between civilians and soldiers and, in the second, rejects as im-

moral the mass bombing of civilians. (She and Philippa Foot were the only two Oxford faculty members voting against their university's granting President Truman an honorary degree.) In contrast to Walzer, who thinks that situations of impending moral catastrophe may swamp the ordinary rules of morality, Anscombe is an absolutist. If an action falls under a prohibited description, (e.g., the intentional taking of innocent life), it may never be justifiably done, no matter what the circumstances.

The just war question has split contemporary libertarians. Many have argued that war is justifiable only in direct response to attack; in all other circumstances, a nation ought to follow a strict policy of non-intervention. The most forceful advocate of this viewpoint has been Murray Rothbard: see his *Ethics of Liberty* (Humanities, 1981) and *For A New Liberty* (Macmillan, 1978). Eric Mack takes a contrary view in "Permissible Defense" *Reason* (July, 1977), pp. 26-31.

For a full understanding of the issues in the just war debate, one must examine the historical background. Two good guides are James F. Johnson, *Ideology, Reason and the Limitation of War* (Princeton, 1975) and the same writer's *The Just War Tradition and the Restraint of War* (Princeton, 1981). The latter volume discusses the notion of total war with particular reference to the views of Clausewitz and Jomini. I do not have space to discuss particular historical thinkers or episodes here, but, as useful background to current conflicts between the developed countries and the "third world," one should consult James Muldoon, *Popes, Lawyers, and Infidels: The Church and the Non-Christian World* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979). Also, for an interesting Marxist perspective, see Eduard Kardelj, *Socialism and War* (Belgrade, 1960).

The works I have so far mentioned have, however strict the limits they place on war, not rejected it altogether. Two very interesting pacifist works, written from a religious point of view, are John H. Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus* (Erdmans, 1972) and Vernard Eller, *War and Peace from Genesis to Revelation* (Herald Press, 1981). Eller is the father of Enten Eller, recently convicted for refusing to register for the draft. □

## Libertarian Vanguard

*Libertarian Vanguard* is published by the Central Committee of the Libertarian Party Radical Caucus. The views expressed here do not necessarily represent the views of the Libertarian Party or its affiliates. Address all correspondence to: LPRC, 3790 El Camino Real, No. 172, Palo Alto, CA 94306.

Editor ..... Scott M. Olmsted  
Editorial Board ..... Bill Evers, Eric Garris, Colin Hunter,  
Scott Olmsted, Justin Raimondo, Murray Rothbard

# Militarism Watch

## The High Frontier: Castles in the Air?

by Jeffrey Rogers Hummel  
and Sheldon Richman

THE ALLURE OF a workable defense against nuclear attack is understandable. Libertarians, like the bulk of the American people, feel uncomfortable being targeted by 7000 Soviet strategic nuclear warheads. At the same time, libertarians, again like almost everyone else, have moral qualms about the 9000 U. S. strategic warheads pointing back at the Russian people. Most consider nuclear deterrence, the cornerstone of U. S. military policy since the close of World War Two, to be at best a necessary evil. Any effective defensive system that de-emphasizes nuclear retaliation appears to provide an escape from the difficult choice between deterrence and disarmament. It offers the prospect of security without either the moral culpability of deterrence or the risks of disarmament.

One such defensive proposal that has recently received much attention is the Heritage Foundation's High Frontier, brainchild of retired Lt. Gen. Daniel O. Graham. The High Frontier has aroused especially intense interest with *Reason* editor Robert Poole, *Individual Liberty* contributing editor Jarret Wollstein, Libertarian Defense Caucus Steering Committee member Dick Eagleson, and others in the libertarian movement.

In a recent memo criticizing LP support for the nuclear freeze, Poole wrote, "I think it would be far wiser to stake out a position distinctly different from both the Republicans and Democrats, and distinctly libertarian—e.g., endorsement of the High Frontier. . . . The LP should take the *moral* high ground, separating ourselves clearly from both other parties, denouncing MAD and urging a complete reorientation of strategic policies from *offense* to *defense*. That would be more consistent with libertarian principles as well." (Emphasis in original.) So let us critically examine the High Frontier proposal and discover exactly how many of Poole's claims are justified.

The High Frontier is a multi-faceted system whose most distinctive feature is

the deployment in space of a range of weapons—from non-nuclear missiles to laser and particle-beam satellites—designed to destroy incoming nuclear warheads. Graham, the former director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, briefly describes his system:

I visualize a layered defense. The first layer would be a space-borne defense which would effectively filter a Soviet missile attack in the early stages of flight. The second layer would be a broader space protection system, probably using advanced beam weaponry to further reduce the effectiveness of a missile attack and to defend other space assets from a variety of attacks. The third layer would be a ground-based point defense system capable of removing any Soviet assurance of success of a first strike against our missile silos—even *before* a space system is deployed—and of intercepting Soviet missiles which later might leak through the space defenses. A passive fourth layer would be civil defense which becomes a valuable aspect of strategy in conjunction with these active defense layers. (Daniel O. Graham, "Defense and Development of the High Frontier," *Imprimis*, v. 11, June 1982.)

To evaluate the High Frontier proposal, we must first determine whether it is intended as a *supplement* or a *substitute* for nuclear deterrence. Most libertarian advocates of the High Frontier seem to imply that the system would replace the U. S. government's offensive nuclear arsenal. Graham lends credence to this implication when he waxes indignant at the more than thirty-year-old "brooding menace of 'balance of terror' doctrines" and at the "poorly conceived U.S. security policies such as Mutual Assured Destruction." He beckons his fellows to redirect their attention toward "a long-neglected aspect of our security—protective strategic defense."

Despite these rhetorical flourishes, Graham clearly envisions the High Fron-

tier as a supplement to the U. S. nuclear deterrent. After all, ground-based point defenses of missile silos are a key feature of the proposal. Indeed, Graham concedes that the High Frontier would involve not only maintenance of but also substantial "strengthening of our [sic] offensive deterrent strength. The requirement to replace aging strategic bombers, missiles, and missile launching submarines is certainly *not* obviated by a new emphasis on strategic defense." ("High Frontier: A New Option in Space," *National Security Record*, The Heritage Foundation, no. 46, June 1982, emphasis in original.)

The ultimate mission of the High Frontier assumes critical importance because the technological demands placed upon a system designed as a substitute for the U. S. nuclear deterrent are necessarily so much greater than those placed upon a system designed merely as a supplement. Graham argues that a nuclear defense which is less than one hundred percent effective is still valuable. "Defenses throughout military history have been designed to make attack more difficult and more costly—not *impossible*. Defenses have often prevented attack by making the outcome uncertain. Given the drastic consequences of a failed nuclear attack on an opponent, the critical military task is to keep a potential aggressor *uncertain of success* if not certain of failure." (*National Security Record*, emphasis in original.)

Graham's comments are valid for a defensive system that is linked to an offensive nuclear capability, but lose their force when considering a defensive system that replaces that offensive nuclear capability. Such a substitute system *must*, in fact, be virtually one hundred percent effective, or it is totally useless. A system that destroys an incredible ninety-five percent of all incoming missiles and bombers would still leave the U. S. vulnerable to over 300 Soviet nuclear warheads, surely enough to devastate U. S. society if the Soviets felt the need to attack.

Yet the most confident advocates of the High Frontier dare not claim or anticipate an effectiveness approaching that level. As Roger Molander, former member of the National Security Council and now head of Ground Zero, points



out in his book, *Nuclear War: What's In It For You?*:

The physics and engineering problems [of particle beam weapons] which remain to be solved are prodigious, and the most optimistic talk about these weapons comes from politicians and generals, not from scientists and engineers. The story with laser weapons is basically the same. . . . It will be at least a decade, and maybe several, before we know for sure whether it is even possible to design a particle beam or laser system that might shoot down bombers or missiles. And then it would take another five to ten years to build an effective system . . .

Admittedly, the High Frontier proposal involves conventional on-the-shelf hardware for its first generation of orbiting battle stations, but their projected effectiveness is even lower than that of laser and particle beam weapons. Otherwise, there would be no reason for the High Frontier to deploy these more advanced systems as a second-generation back-up.

Furthermore, the deployment of the High Frontier will not occur within some static technological freeze-frame. It will occur within a dynamic technological environment where the opposing side will have powerful incentives to develop countermeasures and penetration aids. The history of ABM development in the sixties indicates that countermeasures and penetration aids are comparatively easier to develop and less costly to deploy. That is the main reason that both sides agreed to forego extensive ABM deployment.

Even if the High Frontier should prove one hundred percent effective, the U. S. government can hardly be expected to deploy it as a substitute for its offensive nuclear arsenal. The dynamics of state power, and the incentives faced by those who dominate the U. S. national-security establishment, ensure that any government-deployed space-based defensive system will most probably end up as a supplement to the existing U. S. nuclear arsenal, regardless of the intentions of its non-establishment advocates.

In other words, a High Frontier system designed to replace offensive nuclear weapons is both technologically futile and politically naive. On the other hand,



a supplementary High Frontier system confers none of the advantages claimed by libertarian advocates. It does not reorient strategic policy from offense to defense, as Poole asserts, but rather strengthens the offensive orientation of U. S. policy. It does not eliminate any of the moral difficulties involved in nuclear deterrence, and certainly does not take over the high moral ground in the nuclear debate.

Indeed, the sole advantage of a supplementary High Frontier system, according to Graham himself, as we have seen above, is that it introduces some additional uncertainty into Soviet nuclear planning. But since any conceivable Soviet nuclear first strike must already take account of substantial uncertainty, resulting both from the survivability of U. S. submarine-launched ballistic missiles, as well as from such other factors as accuracy bias, warhead fratricide, and operational difficulties, we have reason enough to dismiss the High Frontier proposal.

A High Frontier system deployed in addition to the U. S. government's offensive nuclear arsenal is more than just unnecessary. Because it will emerge within the deadly dynamics of deterrence, with its mutually reinforcing fear and hostility, it will be positively dangerous. To the extent that it is actually effective, the High Frontier will in essence unilaterally

disarm the Soviet Union against its will. Coupled with the continued existence of the U. S. offensive capability, this would enormously increase the risk of nuclear holocaust. Before it becomes operational, the High Frontier may have the ironic effect of inviting the very attack it is intended to prevent.

To the extent that the High Frontier is ineffective, it will be a total waste of taxpayer resources. Quite likely, the High Frontier could bestow the worst of both worlds: a system that is, in reality, ineffective, but perceived as effective by the other side. At best, the High Frontier will raise arms race rivalry to a new level.

Perhaps one of the most sober appraisals of the High Frontier comes from one of its more cautious advocates, Michael Dunn, editor of the Libertarian Defense Caucus publication, *American Defense*. Dunn recently wrote:

The High Frontier concept, though promising, should not be uncritically accepted as a 'cure' for the pressing issue of what to do with nuclear weapons. The best the High Frontier approach can do is elevate the arms race to a new level of complexity, possibly a level where we [sic] can attain and maintain technological superiority over the Soviets. The Soviet response to such a strategy would be to discover a loophole through which they could mount an attack, or devise a counterweapon

## Space Wars

against the space-based interceptors. If for any reason this space-based defense were to fail, it will still be necessary to retain other weapons (such as nuclear weapons) with which to retaliate. (Response to letter to the editor, *American Defense*, no. 5, Aug. 1982.)

In short, the High Frontier is not the technological panacea that its libertarian advocates have advertised. It will not make all the hard moral and practical questions associated with nuclear weapons magically disappear. Moreover, it clearly violates libertarian principles. Because the High Frontier is to be deployed by the U. S. government, it must necessarily be coercively funded. A privately-deployed High Frontier system, of course, would not be objectionable on libertarian grounds, but this fact no more justifies a state-deployed High Frontier system than the legitimacy of private schools justifies the existence of tax-supported state schools. Libertarian principles require the disarming of the state and the denationalization of defense.

Those libertarians who wish to find some third alternative to deterrence and disarmament cannot achieve their goal by putting more weapons into the hands of the U. S. government. If they are really sincere, they should instead promote a voluntarily-funded, privately-owned, space-based defensive system that attempts to destroy *all* nuclear warheads, regardless of whether they are targeted against innocent Americans or innocent Russians. Such a private system would avoid all the practical dangers of linking a nuclear defense with an existing offensive arsenal of over 9000 warheads. Libertarians must never forget that the state taints whatever it touches—religion, education, trade, and yes, even defense. □

### Hunter & Ready

Software Consultants

**COLIN HUNTER**

713 Santa Cruz Ave. Suite 2  
Menlo Park, Ca 94025

ONE OF AMERICA'S most famous nuclear physicists seems to have been watching too many sci-fi movies lately.

In a recent talk with employees of the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, Edward Teller, father of the H-bomb, urged scientists to work on a "third generation" of atomic devices that could provide "an effective nuclear shield for the nation." Teller apparently was referring to a scheme he has advanced for launching X-ray lasers into space to shoot down Soviet nuclear missiles in case of war.

Teller met with President Reagan in mid-September to boost the proposal, and to urge that funding for X-ray lasers be increased by about \$200 million over the next few years.

The Air Force is already spending several hundred million dollars a year on highly classified laser research, and has recently created a space division to coordinate its plans for putting weapons into orbit. Its efforts to develop an anti-missile laser are strongly supported by influential members of Congress, including Sen. Malcolm Wallop, R-Wyo.

The Soviets are also pursuing such research, but neither they nor we stand much chance of putting it to practical military use, according to a workshop on laser weapons organized by physicists at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. It concluded, in the words of MIT Professor Kosta Tsipis, that "lasers have little or no chance of succeeding as practical cost-effective defensive weapons."

To keep at least one laser weapon above the Soviet Union at all times, we would have to field at least 50 attack satellites. Each would have to be prepared to destroy about 1,000 Soviet missiles within a time window of only eight minutes, allowing only half a second to kill each missile.

That's a tough job, particularly since the Soviets could send up decoy rockets or take other countermeasures to confuse our satellite sensors. Worse, each satellite would need an impossibly large power source to feed its laser—on the order of several hundred megawatts, the size of a commercial power station.

The task of getting enough fuel into

space to power the lasers would require four space shuttles, each making two trips a year for about 125 years. Even the slowest Russian should be able to come up with an effective response by then.

Finally, our laser satellites would themselves be vulnerable to Soviet attack, particularly before they were made operational. The prospect of the United States developing such a defensive shield might well provoke the Soviets into trying to shoot down our satellites or, more dangerously yet, threatening to launch a first strike before their missile force was neutralized.

But if Teller's idea gets the go-ahead, there won't be much for Russia to worry about. His X-ray laser depends on a nuclear bomb explosion producing a powerful, aimable beam of X-rays out the end of a copper tube, instants before the whole system is vaporized.

All fine and good. But that means having at least one bomb for every Soviet missile; if the system were not 100 percent accurate, many more bombs would be needed. So thousands of bombs would have to be above the Soviet Union at all times; to achieve this, we would need at least 50 times as many in orbit around the earth. That's an awful lot of hydrogen bombs to produce and send up into space, many more than are now in our entire arsenal.

Moreover, once one of our X-ray bombs goes off, it will destroy other nearby satellites, including our own. Nuclear explosions in space of the sort Teller envisions create enormously powerful electromagnetic pulses that wipe out communications on earth and disrupt the workings of other satellites too distant to be destroyed.

If Teller has his way and the United States devotes a few hundred million dollars to developing his idea, the Soviets will follow suit and we will have another arms race on our hands. Why not invest all that energy in trying to reach an agreement with the Soviets to ban the deployment of weapons in space?

*This article originally appeared as an unsigned editorial in the San Jose Mercury, October 5, 1982.*

# Libertarian Strategy

## Why Leninism Is Wrong

by Murray N. Rothbard and Bill Evers

THE IDEAS OF LENIN often have a fatal allure for Libertarian Party radicals. We each have to confess some responsibility for radical libertarian interest in Lenin because each of us has written articles in the past saying that there were things to be learned from reading Lenin's writings and writings about Lenin—and also about Sam Adams, Zionism, the Jacksonian Democrats, the antislavery abolitionists, and so forth.

But the fact is that Lenin was wrong. (Of course, it is still educational to read about people who were wrong. Some of Lenin's fruitful insights are discussed in Tom Palmer's article available as an LPRC reprint.) Obviously for libertarians, Lenin was wrong because he was a socialist and imposed a totalitarian despotism on the Soviet people. But he was also wrong on key strategic and organizational matters.

Lenin was wrong because he and his followers tend to claim that the sole, universally valid route to social change is via a military-style, disciplined, extremely centralized party containing only cadre members. (Cadre is simply a technical term for a hard-core, knowledgeable activist.)

Lenin's prescription of a disciplined cadre party led him and his leading adherents to minimize control by the membership over the party organization, to stifle debate and ban factions within the organization, and all too often—both in the party and in political work in the society at large—to neglect persuading and educating others as to the wisdom of the course or policies to be followed.

Certainly there is nothing wrong with having as many cadres—that is, as many skilled, dedicated, and informed activists—as possible. Certainly there is nothing wrong with LPRC members wanting the cadres in the Libertarian Party to be as radical as possible in ideology and strategy. The Leninists' emphasis on cadres is not wrong here. The Leninist error lies in having *only* cadres in the party and barring participation by those who have not dedicated the whole of their lives to the cause.

Lenin made his revolution as leader of an underground conspiracy in autocratic tsarist Russia, where socialist political parties were illegal. In contrast, the experience of Western liberal democratic societies shows that ideological causes can best be advanced by working in parties and institutions that are open to large numbers of people and not in concentrating one's hopes for social change on a small cadre organization. Slavishly following Lenin's Russian model would be a mistake in America.

What is needed in America to bring about a libertarian victory is large-scale organization that enlists and talks to large numbers of people.

The LP has always had the intention of enlisting large numbers of adherents. It is an open, membership-controlled organization, with a structure that balances centralized and decentralized features. The LP's strong state-level parties, for example, would be anathema to a Leninist party.

Control by the membership, decision-making after open debate, and organized promotion within the party of alternative strategies and policies makes the Libertarian Party much less likely to make a catastrophic strategic or ideological mistake because of a single leader's or a tiny group's decision. Our own personal experiences in the libertarian movement have convinced us of the need for these procedures and structures.

The Libertarian Party is stronger and healthier because it accepts for membership all who agree to basic libertarian principles. Right now the nonaggression principle is embodied in a pledge that all members must sign. (We think that an even better members' pledge would be one promising to uphold the Statement of Principles.) Thus all Libertarian Party members have agreed upon certain common political values. But the LP is not a monolith, and its rules wisely do not demand strict orthodoxy on matters of detail of all its members in the way that Leninist parties do.

This does not mean that the LP does not take its platform seriously or that LP

members should not continue to demand that LP candidates and spokespersons not contradict the platform. What makes the Libertarian Party different from the Republicans and Democrats is that ours is a party of principle. And as members of a principled political party, we Libertarians care deeply about the consistency and radicalism of our platform and about loyalty to principle and program by those who present the party's views to the public.

Our libertarian movement needs both searching and open debate because none of us has all the answers, and only through the critical process of debate can we best discover how our principles apply to current problems and best assess the options we face in trying to advance our cause.

Leninist parties don't have open debate or organized factions. In November 1920, Lenin told the Moscow Communist Party conference: "It is time to say . . . that in the future we will not tolerate the slightest deviation in the direction of cliques."

In March 1921, at Lenin's suggestion, the tenth congress of the Soviet Communist Party banned all factions and caucuses. Outlawry of factions and caucuses has been a feature of Leninist parties ever since.

But in order to have control by the membership and adequate checks on mistakes by the leadership, you have to have the possibility of forming factions. Party members need to have the right to join together to advance their own views.

As we have said, the Libertarian Party, in contrast to our foes the Republicans and Democrats, is and must be an *ideological* party—a party firmly dedicated to the triumph of consistent principle in politics. There is always a problem in any fast-growing party that ideology will be forgotten in a fascination with technique and even in the scramble for political power. If we are to keep our reason for being, this must never be allowed to happen. The purpose of caucuses and factions is to keep reminding the party of its own ideology and that ideology's day-to-day importance in party activity and party life. In a sense, a caucus acts as the party's conscience.

In addition, our libertarian ideology is a mighty and complex one, and there

are bound to be differences of emphasis among libertarians on which parts of the ideology to stress, or even conflicts over parts of the ideology itself or over its application to concrete political problems. Good libertarians, for example, differ strongly over such questions as children's rights or capital punishment. The caucus, therefore, exists to push its particular application or emphasis within the broader libertarian framework, and to try to convince the rest of the party of the correctness of its own particular view.

The LP, furthermore, has become too large and complex, and its growth too rapid, to permit all ideological discussion and controversy to be jammed into two tumultuous days at each biennial national convention. It is no longer enough to have a brief platform discussion every two years, important as the platform is. It is also vital to have continuing, day-to-day discussions over ideology and political issues. The caucus, with its periodical publication and its organized meetings, provides a vital means for these discussions and controversies to take place on a continuing basis. In this way, ideology within the party is not stifled, but on the contrary is vivified, discussed, taught, thought about, and made a vibrant, integral part of the life of the party.

Not only would Leninism require dismantling organized dissent and dialogue within the Libertarian Party, it would also require imposing an "iron discipline" on LP members as individuals. Everyone would have to obey all orders from the top. Such a party-wide iron discipline is not only unjustified by circumstances that might necessitate it (such as underground political life in tsarist Russia); it is also alien to American political culture and contrary to the temperament of a great many of those attracted to the Libertarian Party—who tend to be highly non-conformist and individualistic in character.

In any case, once we have recognized that a large-scale, principled mass movement including a mass-based political organization is the road to achieving liberty in a country like the United States, it doesn't make much sense to close the doors after ten years of LP growth, turn away eager but untutored recruits, and kick out all but the most orthodox and

obedient. Point number one of the LPRC's Ten Points stresses working for a principled, mass-based party; we think that this is the proper goal of libertarian radicals. Anyone seeking to Leninize the Libertarian Party would not only be making a grave mistake, but would face a probably impossible task.

Creating a separate Leninist party out of some segment of the Libertarian Party would not only be a waste of resources and energy. It would also weaken the libertarian movement and infect it with the narrow sectarian attitudes that have destroyed the American socialist movement. Who wants to be active only in a tiny grouplet with its stifling atmosphere, inbred perceptions, and siege mentality? Better by far to be part of a grand and growing movement—a move-



## V. I. Lenin

ment with healthy differences of opinion within it. One of the great strengths of the libertarian movement has been the recognition that we are all in this together and that we want the American public to join in our project of creating a libertarian society.

One aspect of the narrow, sectarian spirit characteristic of Leninist parties is that they demand allegiance from their members on everyday matters of culture, religion, and family life. Communist parties, for example, demand that their members be atheists and that they accept "socialist realist" views on art.

The private lives of Americans include their ethnic traditions, their family life, their religious life, and their life in various fraternal and charitable groups. To the extent that a political party like the LP attempts to dictate a correct position on family life, religious life, or on cultural matters, it becomes oppressive and overbearing. We libertarians saw this in the Randian movement where Rand had strictly enforced views on marriage, personal development, painting, dance, literature, religion, and so forth. Not only is this far too intrusive for most normal people to put up with, but in a statist party like the Communist Party, such Leninism prefigures the totalitarianism of the Bolshevik regime, in which politics consumes all spheres of life.

In addition, proclamations that there is a libertarian marriage, a libertarian child-rearing, a libertarian religion, a libertarian psychology, a libertarian culture, a libertarian health regimen, or a libertarian fictional genre (science fiction) are disruptive diversions into non-libertarian matters. If the LP confines itself to politics and economics, there will be fewer areas of disagreement among members and fewer possible reasons for splits and divisions.

We must point out, at this juncture, that Milton Mueller, formerly head of Students for a Libertarian Society, disagrees strongly with us on this. He does believe and has stated in numerous articles and speeches that the LP, SLS, and the libertarian movement in general should adopt positions on cultural values and make certain cultural views their own. We believe that his position is sectarian and wrongheaded.

Another major mistake Leninists often make is failing to raise the consciousness of the public about ideological matters. Leninists tend to rely on their own tight-knit organization to be the decisive factor in a crisis. They tend not to educate the public about final goals and instead tend to give the public slogans that are misleading and that apply only to immediate problems. Even in organizations where they have had influence (such as American labor unions in late 1930s), Leninists had such influence solely because of the posts they held and practical work they had done, rather than because they were open about their political

*continued on back page*

# Why Evers and Rothbard Are Wrong

by Justin Raimondo

I SUPPOSE Rothbard and Evers are sick and tired of being red-baited by right-wing libertarians and the *National Review* crowd—and one can hardly blame them. Ever since *National Review* accused Rothbard of being pro-Communist because he dared suggest that one might learn something from reading Lenin, our conservative opponents (as well as opportunists within our own movement) have persistently tried to smear Radical Libertarians with the “Leninist” brush.

But the response of Rothbard and Evers to this crude smear campaign—the latest installment of which is a widely circulated letter by Ed Crane—is more than just an over-reaction. “Why Leninism Is Wrong” amounts to conciliating and providing an opening for the very opportunists these two Radical Libertarian leaders have fought so vigorously in the past.

## CENTRALISM VERSUS DECENTRALISM

AT PRESENT, the national Libertarian Party is a loose federation of state and local organizations—a condition which reflects the LP’s low level of ideological unity and cohesiveness. Given the all-pervasive influence of opportunism within our movement. It couldn’t be otherwise. That is, the national LP is organizationally weak because it is ideologically weak. No one is suggesting that the way to solve this problem is to “turn away eager but untutored recruits, and kick out all but the most obedient.” The ideal subjective conditions—i.e., an ideal LP organization—cannot be wished into existence. What is needed is a wide-ranging and *conclusive* debate over the proper strategy for a Libertarian victory. Edicts from the National Office will never alter the fact that the premature creation of the LP has now culminated in a serious internal crisis.

The ongoing “centralist/decentralist” debate often serves as a smokescreen for underlying ideological rifts. A local candidate with hawkish foreign policy views, for example, will invoke decentralist arguments—point out that, although the LP platform is a fine document, it just won’t play in Peoria. And the

super-centralism so characteristic of the Crane Machine can and has been used to bludgeon all criticism of opportunist positions and policies out of existence. Unless and until we turn the LP around, so that it is truly the party of principle, Radical Libertarians must seek to re-define the terms of this debate from “centralism versus decentralism” to radicalism versus opportunism.

## THE ORGANIZATION QUESTION

BUT ONCE WE HAVE FACED—and resolved—the question of content, we must settle the question of *form*.

The core of “Leninism” is the concept of democratic centralism—that is, the principle of freedom of discussion and unity in action. What this means in practice is that, after a majority has prevailed over a minority within the organization, the majority policy must be implemented by all members—until such time as the policy might be proven wrong by the course of events, in which case the minority will have the right to re-open the discussion. Lenin correctly maintained that an organization devoted to radical social change is not and cannot be a mere debating society. If every member is free to publicly say and do whatever he or she feels like saying or doing, then why have an organization at all? Such an organization would be permanently paralyzed, quickly discredited and would soon fall apart. *Concerted action* is the whole point of political activity; without the self-imposed discipline of the democratic centralist (or “Leninist”) concept, no effective political action is possible. It is like trying to build a house without the benefit of tools.

Contrary to what Rothbard and Evers assert, organized factions are intrinsic to the democratic centralist conception of politics. Edicts issued by a national center isolated from all criticism are unlikely to be obeyed—and that goes for *any* movement without “perks” or patronage to offer, whether Libertarian or Marxist-Leninist. Far from suppressing all factions and all dissent, the very nature of “Leninist” politics makes the appearance of factions inevitable. If every member of

a democratic centralist organization is committed to unity in action, then it follows that members with a minority viewpoint will be constantly attempting to win over the majority *precisely because the stakes are so high*.

Rothbard and Evers counterpose the “Leninist” cadre party to a mass-based party, as if the two were mutually exclusive. But merely opening up the LP to anyone who agrees with the so-called nonaggression axiom is no guarantee that “a grand and growing movement” will automatically spring into being. Everybody in our movement—including those Radical Libertarians who see the need for a cadre organization—wants a mass-based LP. The real question is: how do we built it? I maintain that *first* we must organize a disciplined, radical Libertarian Party based on the principle of “freedom of criticism, unity in action”—and that this party will then act as the catalyst which will generate a genuinely libertarian mass movement. A loose federation of local groups united around a single vague axiom is simply incapable of organizing itself out of a paper bag. This is true because such a group has nothing to organize around—no real program, no strategy, and therefore no hope of success.

## IDEOLOGY AND ORGANIZATION

THE ORGANIZATIONAL questions in dispute here cannot be severed from the underlying ideological issues which they inevitably raise. A key argument by Rothbard and Evers in favor of the softline approach stems from a strange faith in liberal democracy—strange, that is, coming from Radical Libertarian leaders. “*The experience of Western liberal democratic societies*,” they write, “shows that ideological causes can best be served by working in parties and institutions that are open to large numbers of people and not in concentrating one’s hopes . . . on a small cadre organization.” [Emphasis added.] Now, the problem is somehow to translate this curious statement. Surely Rothbard and Evers aren’t telling us that cadre organizations have never worked within mass organizations and parties. If so, then what is the (Trotskyist) *Militant* group doing in the British Labor Party? What has been the trade union policy of every Leninist organization, what has been the practice of these

groups in the anti-war movement if not "working in . . . institutions open to large numbers of people"? In fact, it is only the clearly-defined goals and admirable discipline of these groups that have made whatever influence they have in mass movements possible. But Rothbard and Evers—being history buffs—are undoubtedly aware of all this. Then what can they *mean*?

Behind their "anti-Leninist" strategy for liberty is a touching faith in U.S. "democracy." They really believe that Libertarians can come to power by taking the exclusively electoral road.

Perhaps nothing is more responsible for the growth and influence of opportunism within our movement than this dangerous reformist illusion. The fact is that *no ruling class has ever given up its power voluntarily*—and any movement for radical social change which fails to realize this will never achieve its goals. This doesn't mean that we can't use the electoral process to build the party and achieve some intermediate goals—given the particular conditions we face in the U. S., this tactic is absolutely necessary. But Rothbard and Evers elevate this *tactic* to the status of a *strategy*: it seems they really envision Libertarian elected officials transforming the U. S. into a free society without a fight. Revolutions are fine, they seem to be saying—in Tsarist Russia, or in some Third World dictatorship. But not in the good old USA.

It is true that liberal democracy makes the immediate possibility of mass revolutionary action more remote than in a nation like, for example, Nicaragua—that, after all, is its main function. But all the democratic nationalist illusions in the world cannot change the grim fact that *we are at war*. We are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the most powerful, most dangerous ruling class the world has ever seen. The same people who dropped the bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, who rained more bombs on the Vietnamese than were dropped on Germany during World War Two, and who are now contemplating a "winnable" nuclear showdown—these are our enemies. The present system cannot be reformed or wished away—extra-parliamentary action is, ultimately, the prospect awaiting us.

Only a tightly-disciplined, democratic centralist cadre organization can win

the war against statism. As to what this mode of organization would entail—that is a subject too large for an article already too long. Suffice it to say that the straw-horse constructed by Rothbard and Evers—an organization which dictates "a correct position on family life, religious life or on cultural matters"—has nothing to do with what I and other Radical Libertarians are proposing. Simply because "Leninist" organizations—and primarily non-political movements like "Objectivism"—have incorporated such features in the past does not mean we will necessarily repeat their mistakes.

The "Leninist"—or, as I like to call it, the *democratic centralist*—conception of political organization is a *long-range* strategic vision. We must recognize that the immediate prospects for liberty—for "Freedom In Our Time," as an old and incredibly naive libertarian slogan puts it—are quite dim. We must take the long view. Instead of putting our energy and hopes into a "quick victory" scenario—the reformist illusion which envisions a Libertarian victory at the polls and the peaceful, straight-line transformation of society—we must take a more realistic tack. A loose federation of local groups united around a one-or-two-sentence phrase is an ephemeral creature indeed. If we're going to hold up the banner of Libertarian principle in the decades to come, we're going to need something far more substantial than that. □

● Did you get the 1982-1983 Publications Catalogue of the Cato (Crane And The Others) Institute? Did you notice that No. 12 of the Cato Papers is—missing? And what was No. 12? It was *Revisionism: A Key To Peace and Other Essays* by historian Harry Elmer Barnes. And what was so offensive about this volume? Nothing except that its author had written elsewhere on Holocaust revisionism, though this collection contains nothing on that subject. As we reported in our last issue, Ed Crane was unhappy that his institute had been linked by an author writing on anti-semitism to Holocaust revisionism, even in so tenuous a manner. So now, at the suggestion of Tom Palmer, Crane has simply removed the offending volume, for which we award him a **BRICKBAT**. Will you sell us your stock of No. 12, Ed? We think these essays by Barnes are worth reading even if others aren't. . . .

● Californians showed amazingly good sense in voting down a bottle bill in November. We thought the unlibertarian aspects of such measures were obvious. But apparently not, because Tom Ritter, candidate for state senate in Pennsylvania, in discussing the advantages of bringing the initiative and referendum process to his state, declared that Pennsylvanians might want to use it to pass a bottle deposit law. A **BRICKBAT** (with a ten-cent deposit) to him. . . .

● Most libertarians appreciate the responsibility of the U.S. government for provoking world tensions through its pursuit of the cold war, the arms race, and a generally confrontationalist stance toward the Soviets. But it was still a pleasure to read Diane Proter's article in the June-July *Minnesota Liber-*

## Strategy and Tactics in American Ideological Politics

*compiled by Bill Evers*

Halstead, Fred. *Out Now! A Participant's Account of the American Movement Against the Vietnam War* (1978).

Kraditor, Aileen S. *The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890-1920* (1965).

Kraditor, Aileen S. "The Liberty and Free Soil Parties," in Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., ed., *History of U.S. Political Parties* (1973).

Kraditor, Aileen S. *Means and Ends in American Abolitionism, Garrison and His Critics on Strategy and Tactics, 1834-1850* (1969).

Kraditor, Aileen S. *The Radical Persua-*

*sion, 1890-1917* (1981). A comparative study of the Socialist Party, Socialist Labor Party, and Industrial Workers of the World.

Maier, Pauline. *From Resistance to Revolution, Colonial Radicals and the Development of American Opposition to Britain, 1765-1776* (1972).

Remini, Robert V. *Martin Van Buren and the Making of the Democratic Party* (1959).

Starobin, Joseph R. *American Communism in Crisis, 1943-1957* (1972).

Weinstein, James. *The Decline of Socialism in America, 1912-1925* (1967).

# & Bouquets

arian entitled "The Only Way to World Peace Is To Be Peaceful." A **BOUQUET** to her and to Fred Hewitt, U.S. Senate candidate, who is credited with originating the statement that became the article's title. . . .

• The pledge that members of the National LP must sign—"I hereby certify that I do not believe in or advocate the use of force as a means of achieving political or social ends"—has been taking a beating at the state level. The Colorado party removed it as one of their membership requirements last May, for which we award them a forceful **BRICKBAT**. The usual arguments about it being an unlibertarian, McCarthy-style "loyalty oath" were made, and Wainwright Dawson, candidate for state treasurer, announced he would quit the party if it were not removed. (How did you bring yourself to join in the first place, Wainwright?) Ed Leeper wrote in the June *Colorado Liberty*, "If the party can't stand diversity within its own ranks, how can it tolerate diversity in society at large?" How many times does it have to be said that private organizations, including political parties, are not formed to be diverse, but for a *particular purpose*, and that to require members to state that they agree with that purpose is *not* a violation of libertarian principle? We think asking members to state that they agree with our principles is not only reasonable, but highly desirable in our topsy-turvy world of rampant political opportunism. . . . The Maryland LP shares Colorado's **BRICKBAT** for defeating a motion at their August convention to add a pledge of agreement with libertarian principle to the requirements for membership on their state central committee. In the debate on this, Bob Booze upheld the idea of a pledge, while Tom Mathers argued against it. . . .

• A **BRICKBAT** to Dave Walter, LP candidate for Lt. Governor in Pennsylvania for advocating raising highway taxes (which he and Ronald Reagan are calling "user fees" these days). Libertarians are for returning resources to the legitimate private sector, not for enriching bureaucrats. The point that Walter could have been making is that the level of government taxes and fees are governed by political motives, while prices on private roads would be governed by commercial considerations and freely agreed to. It's dangerous for Libertarians to get on the Reaganite bandwagon of "revenue enhancement" through "user fees." What we want is private property—not a toll-collecting, road-building government. . . .

• In a ceremony that was as much a lecture on the social philosophy of traditions as it was a wedding, LPRC Central Committee member Bill Evers married LP of California Chair Mary Gingell on November 2 in Palo Alto. A wedding **BOUQUET** to them for pursuing a coalition strategy. . . .

• A **BRICKBAT** to Pete Ferrara and the Cato Institute for Ferrara's new booklet on social security, published by Cato. Ferrara's original book on the subject was gradualist in the extreme. Now he compounds his error by leaping immediately to the suggestion of compulsory Individual Retirement Accounts. . . .

• A **BRICKBAT** to the leadership of the Pennsylvania LP for advocating changing their party name to the Independent Party. The goal of the Libertarian Party is and should remain the creation of a mass-based, ideologically-committed vehicle for advancing liberty—a mushy, catch-all name works against this goal. . . .

## LPRC Order Form

### LPRC Draft Program

\_\_\_\_\_ Beyond Left and Right: The Unfinished Revolution, \$1.00

### Reprints (complete set \$5.00)

\_\_\_\_\_ Strategies for a Libertarian Victory, by Murray N. Rothbard, \$2.00  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Why Be Libertarian?, by Murray N. Rothbard and What Is a Libertarian?, by Walter E. Grinder, \$1.00 for both  
 \_\_\_\_\_ A Matter of Principle, by Justin Raimondo, \$1.50  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Libertarianism Versus "Low-Tax Liberalism," by Murray N. Rothbard, \$1.00  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Toward a Libertarian Movement, by Tom G. Palmer, \$0.50  
 \_\_\_\_\_ The Importance of the Caucus, by Murray N. Rothbard, \$0.25  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Resolutions on Strategy and on Coalitions and Alignments, Libertarian National Committee, \$0.50

### Back Issues (\$2.00 each) (any 8 for \$12.00) (complete set \$20.00)

\_\_\_\_\_ October 1982: Ron Paul, Crane's Libel, Fuhrig Interview, etc.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ August 1982: The Flat Rate Trap, Debate Over Disarmament, etc.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ June 1982: El Salvador, Ayn Rand R.I.P., Hocker's Memo, etc.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ February 1982: Poland, South Africa, etc.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ August 1981: CIA, An Action Program, The Anti-Party Mentality, etc.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ June 1981: El Salvador, Nagriamel, Poland, SLS, Ed Crane, etc.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ February 1981: Guardian Angels, El Salvador, Left-Opportunism: SLS, etc.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ November 1980: Poland, Time for a Rude Awakening, LPRC Draft Program, etc.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ October 1980: Poland, SLS, Rothbard Keynote, etc.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ July 1980: Cuba, Nagriamel, Howard Jarvis, etc.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ February 1980: Afghanistan, Conscription, etc.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ January 1980: Iran Revolution, Hostage Crisis, etc.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ December 1979: Police Repression, Native Americans, Clark for President, etc.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ September 1979: Libertarian Land Reform, National Review, etc.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ August 1979: The Fall of Somoza, Szasz Speaks, Ron Paul on Nicaragua, etc.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ May 1979: War by Proxy, LPC Convention, Michael Emerling, etc.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ February 1979: Illegal Aliens, Drug Enforcement Agency, etc.

### Tabling Kit (\$35.00)

\_\_\_\_\_ A Complete Package: 10 copies of the latest *Vanguard*, plus back issues, reprints, and a form for ordering additional material at discount prices. Retail Value \$115.

### Membership/Subscription

I agree with the LPRC's Ten Points, and I want to join the LPRC as a regular member (and receive a six-issue subscription to *Libertarian Vanguard*)—\$12.00. (\$6.00 for students; please give school name.)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (signature)

I would like a six-issue subscription to *Vanguard*—\$12.00.

I enclose an additional contribution of \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

Payment in U.S. dollars only.

Overseas subscribers, please add \$6.00 for additional postage.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City/State/Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Libertarian Party Radical Caucus • 3790 El Camino Real, No. 172 • Palo Alto, California 94306 U.S.A.

# Koch Cuts Off *Update*

*Update* newsletter has been receiving a \$10,000 to \$15,000 annual subsidy from David Koch since its inception. In addition, its unpaid editor, Bob Capozzi, receives a salary from the Crane-controlled and partially Charles Koch-financed National Taxpayers Legal Fund. David Koch has decided to end his subsidy. Nonetheless, it is likely that the Crane Machine will juggle funds and continue to publish *Update*. □

## *Update* Updated

*Libertarian Vanguard* has recently obtained a rare copy of the first printing of the September 1982 issue of the Crane Machine's publication *Update*. For \$0.50 we will send to anyone who requests it photocopies of the original pages three and eight. Page three contains a misleading photo caption calling Earl Ravenal the "father of noninterventionism" (great-great- . . . great-grandson might be more appropriate). The headline that appears on the original page eight is "The LP's Latin America-Style Coup," referring to personnel decisions by LP National Chair Alicia Garcia Clark, who was born in Mexico. (We wonder what the headline would have said had she been born in Africa.) □

# Leninism

*continued from page 12*

values and had a mass base of support for those values.

We must never make this mistake. LP literature for the public and LP campaigns must reach out to and seek to enlist the bulk of the American public. We must bring the message of libertarianism to millions.

We must use popularly understandable libertarian theory to analyze current events and expose the evils of statism. We must present the public with the glorious prospect of a society freed of tyranny, injustice, and war.

We can and should devote major efforts to seeking votes for our candidates—both as a measure of our success in educating the public and in order to elect officials who can roll back the state. But if officials are elected by voters who have *not* been educated about libertarian ideals—voters who do *not* expect libertarian programs—those officials are in a position of weakness, not of strength. They have no mass base of support, and the public will not support them if they stick by libertarian principle.

This is why the LP must firmly reject Eric O'Keefe's getting-elected-is-everything approach articulated in his August 26, 1982 valedictory strategy memo. Mere vote-chasing and neglect of educating the public is a recipe for disaster. It is an approach in which all the incen-

tives favor opportunism and betrayal of principle.

Without the active support of large numbers of people on the basis of their genuinely libertarian convictions, we can accomplish nothing. We need to build a constituency for liberty. The public awaits us. We are convinced of the soundness of our cause. Let's roll up our sleeves and get to work making this a truly mass movement. □

## Draft Resister

*continued from page 1*

courts are merely concerned with legality and, for the most part, care nothing about justice. I will not allow myself to be judged by this court of unjust laws.

I resisted registration for the draft because I do not want to be a conscript in the military. I've left my home and my family to go "underground" because I do not want to be a convict in a federal prison. The draft and imprisonment are both slavery.

I also want to show, by my example, that the choice is not between registration-and-the-draft or non-registration-and-jail. Obviously, quiet resisters won't be prosecuted, but even vocal resisters, such as myself, can remain free.

The issue is not: Have I broken the law? I have. The issue is: Have I done what is right? Again, I have. I proudly admit that I am guilty of placing my individual liberty above state coercion. □

*Libertarian Vanguard* is published by the Libertarian Party Radical Caucus. Letters to the editor are welcome. Subscriptions are \$12 for 6 issues. Change of Address should be sent promptly to avoid missing issues.

Advertising Rates: full page—\$90, half-page—\$50, per column inch—\$5. Camera-ready copy only. Payment must accompany order.

Libertarian newsletters of all varieties, we would like to exchange our newsletter for yours. Add us to your mailing list and send us your last issue marked 'Exchange.' We will add you to our mailing list. Also, write for permission to reprint articles from *Libertarian Vanguard*.

Libertarian Party candidates, send us literature and news clippings from your campaign. The best will receive our coveted 'Bouquet' award.

Address all correspondence to: Libertarian Party Radical Caucus, 3790 El Camino Real, No. 172, Palo Alto, CA 94306.

Libertarian Party Radical Caucus  
3790 El Camino Real, No. 172  
Palo Alto, CA 94306

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

FIRST-CLASS MAIL  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
Palo Alto, CA.  
Permit No. 486

Colorado Liberty  
1041 Cherokee Street  
Denver, CO

E  
80204