

OCTOBER MEMBERSHIP MEETING IN REVIEW

by Walter Ziobro, Jr.

A gathering of the faithful occurred Friday evening of 18 October at the Hammond House near Boston College. About twenty members and a half-dozen guests managed to find their way to the affair before the evening was through. The Executive Board offers its apologies to anyone who became hopelessly lost in the back roads of Chestnut Hill. [Ed.'s note: It was pointed out to me shortly before the meeting that the map pictured in the last issue of LIBERTY had north down and south up. Mea culpa.]

After some general socializing, the meeting got underway with the reading of the minutes of the last membership meeting in May by Jack Waldron, and the presentation of a semi-annual treasurer's report by me. Jack Waldron related the unfortunate turn of events which required him to find speaking replacements for Murray Rothbard, who couldn't make the seminar planned for the following Thursday. Chairman David Long announced the upcoming appearance of Ayn Rand at Ford Hall, and stated his plans to distribute leaflets there. Also, in response to a question on the Treasurer's report, Mr. Long related his views on project financing.

At about this point, Leo Kahian, American Party candidate for governor, and his running mate, Dr. Nicholas Greco, appeared, having been invited by MLPer Vince Drosdik, to present their views. Mr. Kahian gave a speech for God, flag and Mom's apple pie, in which he differentiated himself from Sargent and Dukakis on taxes, busing and welfare. The discussion which followed revealed general agreement of those present with Mr. Kahian's views on education -- he's for local control and eventual privatization -- but general disagreement with his views on obscenity laws -- he's for them.

After a break for coffee, the Party welcomed Dick Adair, Republican candidate for state representative in Medford. He introduced himself as a "laissez-faire capitalist", recounted his efforts in the Republican Party to promote economy in government, and spoke on the necessity of phasing out the property tax, which he thought was especially unfair. In response to questions, he said he was generally in favor of repealing victimless crime laws, except in the case of minors, and of considering segregation of prisoners according to nature of offense and past record. A vocal minority challenged his stand on reducing environmental

protection in some cases.

With the hour getting late, and attendance dwindling after Mr. Adair's exit, the meeting was adjourned without consideration of proposed changes in the MLP Constitution. I believe it was a stimulating meeting for those who made it. Special thanks go to Margaret Stenerson who arranged for the room and the refreshments.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

The MLP Exec Board meeting will take place Sunday, December 8, 12:30 p.m., at the home of Margaret Stenerson, 107 Oak Lane #10, Brockton. All are invited. We will be discussing means for raising the visibility of the LP in Massachusetts. Call Ms. Stenerson if you need directions, 588-5068.

A Region 8 LP Conference has tentatively been scheduled for the weekend of December 14-15. Region 8 comprises New York and the New England states. The principle topic will be the feasibility of organizing parties in Maine, Vermont and Rhode Island. These states currently have no local organizations. If you wish to observe, contact David Long (232-0050) for details of time and place.

The next MLP membership meeting will be in Framingham, at the town library on Route 9 in Framingham Center. We will meet from 1:00 to 5:00 p.m., on Saturday, January 18. We have some important rules changes to consider; some of these rules must be thrashed out before our next regular convention. Please try to attend. Members will receive a special notice & map prior to the meeting. All others, please call Sandra Cohen, 879-6073 (Framingham), if you need directions.

95 CENTRE ST.  
BROOKLINE, MASS. 02146

David & Susan Nolan  
15063 East Stanford Ave  
Denver, CO 80232

BULK RATE  
U. S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
BROOKLINE, MASS.  
PERMIT NO. 59548

Massachusetts

#21 NOV-74

LIBERTY

NEWSLETTER OF THE  
MASSACHUSETTS LIBERTARIAN PARTY

### In This Issue:

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

- MLP Exec Board Meeting
- LP Regional Conference
- MLP Membership Meeting

- Vince Drosdik, Sylvia Sanders and Walter Ziobro offer different viewpoints on abortion. Ford Hall Steve Klein comments on Hand's talk at Ford Hall Forum.
- Walter Ziobro gives a recount of last month's MLP membership meeting.
- Jack Waldron discusses the rise and fall of the Committee for Economic Education.

#### Big Election Wrapup...in Next Month's LIBERTY!!!

- Commentary on state and local elections in Massachusetts. (Election Forecast: Bleecchhni)
- Summary of LP elections in New York, California, Ohio and elsewhere around the country.
- Margaret Stenerson proposes a position paper on oucher education.

Comments, articles and letters to the editor are invited. Let us know what you think of this newsletter, of the MLP, the LP, the Universe.

## FROM THE CHAIR



DON'T LISTEN TO  
THEIR FOOLISHNESS —  
LISTEN TO MINE!

Well, I certainly have taken some flak from a number of you with regard to Mr. Drosdik's article on Leo Kahian and the American Party. Several MLP members have expressed a general concern about the Party seeming to endorse Mr. Kahian, and, to a lesser extent, Richard Adair.

Let me say this about that.

First, I thank you for letting me know that you are concerned. This Party can be only what its members make of it; there is no "invisible hand" to lead me, or any of the other activists among us, along the "true path". We believe in freedom and noncoercion. Most of us also believe in rational self-interest. But there are areas in which well-intentioned libertarians will disagree (see, for example, the articles on abortion elsewhere in this issue).

Concerning Party policy regarding support of non-LPers, my feelings are these: in general, the MLP should not officially support or endorse any candidate of any other parties. However, this does not mean that we cannot as individuals support or work for candidates who offer an alternative to the current coercive-altruist State. I felt that Dick Adair represented such an alternative. Vince Drosdik felt that Leo Kahian represented such an alternative. The Executive Board of the MLP has at no time issued a statement of support or endorsement of either of these two persons. If some of you have taken the fact that articles in recent issues of LIBERTY have discussed the merits of various non-libertarian candidates as official endorsement by the Party, in spite of the fact that the articles were signed by individuals and clearly labeled as being the opinion of that individual, then you are defining the terms "support" and "endorsement" differently from my interpretation of those words.

Finally, I should like to enunciate the policy of the Party regarding its newsletter, LIBERTY. This has been discussed in depth by the Executive Board, and the consensus is this: The newsletter has a publisher, the Massachusetts Libertarian Party, and an editor, currently me. The publisher has the ultimate say over what may be printed, but the day-to-day operations of the newsletter are left to the discretion of the editor. He is required by the Executive Board to print any announcements, articles, edicts or other pronouncements of the Board. In addition, he may be required not to publish certain types of material, such as articles or editorials which would falsely indicate that something was the policy of the Party when in fact it was not. Beyond this, however, the editor has an absolute discretion over what will appear, or will not appear, in the newsletter. [I admit that it is rather a sticky wicket when the editor of the newsletter is also the chair, but I am making an honest effort to keep the functions separate, and to differentiate between my personal opinions, and my statements ex cathedra, for which I invoke the Randian doctrine of infallibility.] If the editor makes enough people unhappy, for any reason, he can be removed by a majority vote of the Executive Board, or upon approval, by a majority of the membership, of a resolution to remove the editor.

Let me finish with this thought: as editor, I intend to print a variety of opinion in this newsletter. No valid viewpoint will be intentionally excluded. If you don't like what is being published, write a screaming letter to the editor. Or better still, write your own article. All I ask is good english, good reasoning and good will.

[David Long is the chairperson of the MLP and edits its newsletter LIBERTY. He is currently busy studying strategies to ward off his impending impeachment.]

To the Editor:

I am writing in order to register, in the strongest possible terms, my complete opposition to Vincent Drosdik's suggestion [M.L. #20] that the Libertarian Party should support, even in a qualified way, Leo Kahian, the American Party candidate for governor. As the article itself makes clear, Kahian is in favor of legislation restricting some of our most fundamental rights, including freedom of speech and freedom to engage in certain forms of sexual behavior. Moreover Kahian justifies his support of such laws on the most grossly irrational and superstitious grounds (e.g., pornography is evil because it is "against the law of God"). That a supposed libertarian could urge anything less than complete and emphatic repudiation of such a medieval mentality is profoundly disturbing.

Libertarianism, Mr. Drosdik, is the philosophy which advocates complete freedom from all forms of coercion, social as well as economic (insofar as these can even be distinguished). Consequently the policy of the Party should be to withhold support from anyone who is not at least essentially and on principle committed to the implementation of all such freedoms. Clearly Kahian does not even come close to satisfying this criterion. To support him would indeed be to "send them a message in the State House", but it would be a message not in support of freedom and enlightenment but of repression and ignorance.

Michael J. Gorr  
Cambridge, Massachusetts

-----  
Massachusetts LIBERTY is the newsletter of the

Massachusetts Libertarian Party  
95 Centre Street  
Brookline, Massachusetts 02146

Editor: David E. Long

LIBERTY is sent to MLP members without charge. Individual membership dues for one year are \$6.00. Non-members may subscribe at the rate of \$3.50 per year. The officers of the Massachusetts Libertarian Party are:

Chair: David E. Long  
232-0050 (Brookline)  
Vice-Chair: David Reardon  
444-1906 (Needham)  
Historian: John K. (Jack) Waldron  
839-5594 (Grafton)  
Treasurer: Walter J. Ziobro, Jr.  
672-5437 (Fall River)

ROTHBARD? WELL, NOT QUITE....

On October 24 the Committee for Economic Education had planned to present Murray Rothbard lecturing on Austrian economics. Jack Waldron, Executive Director of C.E.E., had hoped for a turnout of 100-200 persons from the financial community of greater Boston. A mailing announcing the event was sent out to nearly 1500 persons, including over 800 financial executives, several hundred professors of economics and finance at major Bay State universities, and about 300 libertarians in this area.

Unfortunately, for reasons not entirely clear, Dr. Rothbard cancelled his speaking date about one week before he was scheduled to appear. The decision was made to cancel the event unless a speaker could be found (now on very short notice) who discuss the current economic situation from the Austrian standpoint with authority and clarity. We were lucky enough to get not one, but two, experts of the Austrian School, Dr. Walter Block and Prof. Jay Bloom, both from New York.

(cont on page 7)

FLASH!!!

As this issue of LIBERTY goes to press, final results of most LP contests are not in. The next issue of LIBERTY will contain a complete wrapup and commentary on the elections in Massachusetts and on LP races around the nation.

One early result: Dick Adair, Republican and self-proclaimed "laissez-faire capitalist", has apparently lost the contest for state representative from the 20th Middlesex district to Fred Dello Russo. Adair put on a suprisingly strong showing, however, coming from virtually nowhere, with almost no organization and little money, to receive about 40% of the vote.

The only other campaigns of much interest in Massachusetts were the third-party attempts by the American Party and Socialist Workers. Amazingly, Kahian (AP) polled about 12% of the vote! His slogan: "Send them a message". He did. The American Party is now a permanent ballot party in Massachusetts. Gurewitz and the Socialist Workers fared less well, garnering about one and one-half percent of the tally.

More on this and other campaigns in the next LIBERTY.

by Stefan Klein

On October 20, Ayn Rand gave her annual talk at Ford Hall Forum. The title this year was "Egalitarianism and Inflation", and, in effect, the speech contained two separate parts, one dealing with each of these two topics.

Rand attacked egalitarianism in the first 20 minutes of the talk. Although the philosophical points were old hat to anyone even remotely familiar with Objectivism, what made this part interesting was her ability to come up with "horror file" material. She quoted extensively from a review, which appeared in the New York Times Review of Books, by Bennett M. Burger of a book by Herbert Gans, a review which openly advocated egalitarianism carried to its logical extreme. She also cited a Wall Street Journal article which described the destruction of the Chilean economy under Allende's attempts to impose egalitarianism.

In discussing inflation, Rand brought forth no new philosophical or economic insights, but she treated the audience to a sparkling display of her skill as a writer. Using imagery and analogy in masterful fashion, she reduced inflation's causes and effects to terms that even an economic illiterate could understand.

Using scenarios ranging from an individual on an island to a small community of farmers and tradesmen, Rand showed how time, savings, money and credit relate to production. Her central themes: 1) just as a farmer must save his stock seed for next year's planting, an industrial economy's future production requires investment capital generated from savings; 2) money is worthless unless there are goods and producers to back it up; 3) credit must be based on the future productivity of the borrower or it can bankrupt a community. She scored a particularly telling point when she likened federal and international financial practices to those of the man who tries to live by constantly borrowing money, by paying each loan as it comes due by borrowing more.

The question period, as usual, dealt with a wide range of topics, from Beethoven (Rand doesn't like his sense of life) to abortion (she emphatically denied that an "unformed collection of cells" could have a right to life). As is also usual, Rand's answers were excellent when she took the trouble to think them out, but fair-to-poor when they involved her pet hangups.

Rand was asked (for the umpteenth time) to explain her objections to the John Birch Society. She replied that they don't defend capitalism; they merely oppose communism.

She was asked to comment on Boston's busing situation. She replied that the government shouldn't run schools, nor dispose of children's education against the wishes of the parents.

One questioner noted that the economics of the world are interdependent, and asked whether international institutions might be the way to get out of trouble. Rand replied that the interdependence is based on the infinite credit chain she outlined in her speech, so internationalism would only make things worse. The credit chain must be broken.

My favorite moment was when Rand was asked that tired old chestnut, "What would you do with welfare recipients?" Her answer: "I don't think they're my property to dispose of."

One questioner hit a blind spot when he asked what Rand thought was the reason that American universities are so collectivist. Her answer: "Immanuel Kant". Surely the answer is more complex than that; one man didn't single-handedly mold the philosophy departments of a thousand universities.

There are certain questions which Rand has answered a hundred times, but every year people ask them again. Could she comment on her split with Branden? "I've written about it; look it up." Could she discuss her next book? "I haven't begun to write it yet." What is the movie status of Atlas Shrugged? "It's safely in my possession."

And, of course, the annual denunciation of the Libertarian Party. This time, she was a little more specific than usual about her reasons, which ranged from the utterly ridiculous to the mildly plausible. She claimed that since it is impossible to educate people by means of a political campaign, the LP must merely be seeking publicity. She may be right about political campaigns (I have some doubts myself, which is why I'm not very active in the LP), but she has no basis at all for questioning the LP's intentions. She accused the Libertarian Party of denouncing her while stealing her ideas without giving her credit. I don't know who denounced whom first, but Hospers' Libertarianism footnotes Rand's books more times than I'm about to count. Finally, she claimed that the LP's leadership has no consistent philosophical outlook, and therefore doesn't defend capitalism consistently or well. Here she has something of a point; you don't have to be a Randian purist to object to the activities of some state LP's. A case in point: New Hampshire LP, for

(cont. on page 5)

by Vincent A. Drosdik, III

The libertarian holds true the validity, the existence, of the rights of man to life, liberty and property. Rather than being an artificial ideology seeking to change man's nature, libertarianism is a philosophy that is in accord with the real nature of man -- a being acting individually but in a social environment, egoistic and yet enjoying social intercourse. The ultimate right is that to life itself, though it is restricted and even impossible without the rights to liberty and property.

This belief in life, liberty and property is an outgrowth of thinking in the Enlightenment, and, in part, can be traced back centuries to Thomas Aquinas and Aristotle. It is the philosophy of natural law.

The question at hand is whether abortion, feticide, is moral, and whether it is the duty of the State to prohibit abortions. I cannot promise any major discovery or any new theory here to sway those who already believe firmly in the right of the mother or parents to kill the fetus (or "terminate the pregnancy", a phrase that hides the nature of the act). The many arguments defending this supposed right are well known, so I will not repeat them here.

The criterion of viability outside the womb cannot be used as an argument for abortion, as a newborn babe obviously cannot survive on its own either (remember Romulus and Remus?). Further, science is advancing to the point where it may be possible to breed babies in test tubes.

Let me refer to natural law once again. This includes not only man's right to life, liberty and property, but the entire order of existence. Man is conceived, born, lives, dies. It is the nature of things, not our wishes, that governs existence. Just as the "liberals" have tried to repeal the economic law of supply and demand -- and have failed -- man cannot repeal the nature of life and death. A fetus is as much a human being as an adult, just as coal is as much carbon as diamonds.

To kill the unborn baby flies in the face of nature, just as homosexuality is contrary to the nature of man as a creature of two sexes each needing the other to create life. The difference, as far as the State is concerned, is that homosexuality does not necessarily involve coercion, while abortion does (against the baby). Of course, I cannot answer the anarchists in this matter, for there would be no State to enforce any natural law or defend natural rights. [cf. article by Walter Ziobro in this issue. -Ed.]

Another approach to the question

of the right of the fetus to life is that of contract. As Dr. John Grady writes in his excellent booklet, "Abortion, Yes or No" (American Opinion reprint, \$0.50), "If the mother exercises the privilege of sexual intercourse when there is a possibility pregnancy will occur, then she must likewise accept the responsibility for any pregnancy which may ensue from it." The father, likewise, must accept responsibility for supporting the child. The child cannot be denied its life for the sake of convenience. (This holds true especially today with ready availability of a wide variety of contraception-preventing methods.) This criterion of convenience has frightening legal consequences, some of which we saw in Hitler's Germany and today in the Communist world (and, I might add, in economics in our own country).

Finally, I might appeal to your non-rational "instincts". Simply look at the gruesome photographs of aborted fetuses in the widely available book, Handbook on Abortion, and ask yourself, Is it murder?

If we conclude that abortion is murder, and that the State has a justified existence to defend natural rights, then abortion should be illegal except to defend the very life of the mother.

[Mr. Drosdik is a contributing editor to Southern Libertarian Review and will soon be resuming undergraduate studies at the University of Virginia.]

RAND (cont.)

instance, recently attempted to merge with the American Party and was nearly swallowed by it.

[Mr. Klein is Vice-Chairperson of IFRS and a long-time MLP member. He contributes to numerous libertarian publications, including UNBOUND! and Cogitations.]

## THOUGHTS ON ABORTION, BIRTH CONTROL, CHILDREN &amp; CHOICE

by Sylvia A. Sanders

Sex, procreation and abortion are emotionally loaded subjects; to discuss them objectively takes an effort of will. In addition, the act of creating a new life is unique and awe-inspiring; it is different in kind from any other human activity. It is difficult to analyze procreation (and such related subjects as birth control, abortion and children) in the same way we analyze other issues. Certainly few other topics raise such intense and basic conflict among libertarians. This alone indicates a need for some new and careful thinking.

Most people who argue that abortion is morally wrong do so from the premise that a fetus is a human being and, hence, abortion is a form of murder. Though I will touch on the question of whether a fetus is human later on, I want to begin by offering an argument for the right to abort which is valid even if you think a fetus is a full human being.

Imagine yourself in this situation [note 1]: you have been living as responsibly as you can, violating no one's rights -- you are the perfect libertarian. But suddenly you wake up one morning to find yourself hooked up with tubes connecting your blood system to a person you've never met before. This person explains that he/she has deficiencies of the digestive, circulatory, respiratory and excretory systems, and needs to be attached to another person's blood stream in order to survive. In other words, this person is a parasite and can live no other way -- and you're the host. If you disconnect yourself, she/he will die. Do you have the right to do this? I say YES, most definitely yes. No person's need, no matter how great, can exert a moral claim on your life. Although it certainly might be a kind, humane act for you to remain hooked up, you have no moral responsibility to do so. I believe most people would agree with me here.

This example bears great similarity to the situation in which many women find themselves. A woman may have been acting in a most responsible manner (i.e., using a highly reliable birth control method) and yet find herself, suddenly and against her will, inhabited by another human being (granting for the present that a fetus is a human being) which needs the use of her body for its survival. But need is

-----  
 Note 1: Credit for this analogy should be given to Judith Jarvis Thompson. See her article "A Defense of Abortion", in Philosophy & Public Affairs, Vol. I, #1 (Fall, 1971).

not a sufficient claim upon a person's life.

Morality makes sense only in the context of choice. One cannot be responsible for a situation in which one has had no choice, no control. The strongest form of this argument, applied to abortion and children, is this: no woman (or man, or couple) is obligated to any fetus or child she may conceive or bear unless and until she makes a choice to accept that obligation. This means that one would be justified in giving birth to a baby and then letting it die (for example, in a case where an abortion would be more dangerous than giving birth). In other words, a fetus (or even a child that has been born) has no automatic right to be cared for and supported by its parent(s). Only if the parent(s) make a decision to do so are they morally bound to support the child.

It could be argued that pregnancy is always (except in the case of rape) the result of a conscious decision -- the decision to have sexual intercourse. The only absolutely certain way to avoid pregnancy is to avoid sexual intercourse, or to have one's reproductive organs removed or altered. All other methods of birth control have a failure rate: some miniscule, others quite large. (It is little comfort to know that you are the "one in a thousand" who became pregnant on a "nearly 100% effective" method.) Thus anyone who depends on standard methods of birth control does so (or should do so) with the understanding that pregnancy might still result (just as an unforeseeable mechanical failure in one's car could cause an accident). For me, however, the key remains the choice to have and support a baby.

Let's now look at the question of whether a fetus is a human being. Is the essence of humanness two-leggedness, or a certain level of intelligence, or a certain appearance? To the best of my knowledge, no one has yet come up with an airtight definition of what it is to be human. For me the word "human" connotes a capacity for awareness that surpasses that in other organisms -- an awareness of oneself and one's surroundings profound enough to allow -- and indeed require -- conscious decisions regarding one's actions. To be human is to be a choosing (and hence moral or immoral) being. Beings who are not capable of such choices -- i.e., plants, animals, fetuses, small children and mentally defective people -- are not human, and as such, are not entitled to the same rights as human beings. What they are entitled to is a sticky question, but one I shan't go into here.

The argument that a fetus has the "potential to be a human being" and is therefore entitled to be treated as a human being, seems awfully weak. After all, a sperm and an egg sitting in separate culture dishes have the potential to be a human being also; all that is needed is for them to be combined and then grown in a suitable environment. In fact, any random cell in your body has the potential to be a human being, given the proper treatment in a biological laboratory. But are you committing murder when you cut yourself and kill some cells? Of course not!

Those who argue that a fetus is a human being, I think, a difficult time in drawing the line. If a fetus is a human, why not an embryo? Why not a just-fertilized egg? And if a just-fertilized egg is a human being, what about birth control methods (such as the intra-uterine device) which work by preventing the implantation or proper growth of a fertilized egg? Certainly these must be as bad as abortion!

[Ms. Sanders is a longtime MLP member and activist for women's rights. She recently moved from Massachusetts and now is living in Bellingham, Washington.]

SOME THOUGHTS ON ABORTION  
AND THE PROTECTION OF THE LAW

by Walter Ziobro, Jr.

Primary in the purely legal argument on abortion is whether or not the fetus should be considered a legal person. Since it is possible that legal actions can conceivably be taken on behalf of the fetus, or even against it, such as establishing a trust in its name, or suing in its name, or even having its trust sued, the state cannot deny the legal personhood of the fetus. Note: this does not mean that fetuses are rational beings: corporations are examples of legal persons that are not rational beings in and of themselves.

However, although the state may not be able to deny the fetus personhood, it does not follow immediately that the state must grant to it its protection. This touches upon the larger question of whether or not the state may deny or qualify the equal protection of its laws to someone within its jurisdiction. The Fourteenth Amendment prohibits this in the U.S., but I shall touch upon some of the abstract principles behind this for the sake of clarification.

In a state, such as the U.S., in which secession is suppressed, equal protection must be maintained or the social contract is broken; if the social contract is broken then rebellion is the only recourse to the aggrieved citizens. If secession were permitted, then any state could deny or qualify its protection of anyone; this would be so because aggrieved citizens could always secede and form a state of their own if they thought the protection of the former state insufficient.

How does this relate to abortion? Granting the preceding argument that the fetus can be considered a legal person, it must, in a state in which secession is suppressed, be granted the full protection of the law, otherwise its parents, or trustees, would have no legal recourse in its behalf. In a state in which secession were permitted, the fetus would be denied the full protection of law by any one state, because the parents would be free to choose a state that recognized it.

What does this mean to a woman contemplating abortion? If she lives in a state in which secession is suppressed, such as the U.S., she has no choice but to place herself outside the protection of the state, i.e., such as an abortion on the high seas on an unregistered ship. If she does so she risks being victimized in a crime from which she could have no recourse. This must be so in order that the protection of the law not be deprived from the fetuses of those parents who want protection for it. If such a woman is a citizen of a state which permits secession, then her action will depend on whether or not her state has chosen to grant the fetus its protection. If it has, she must secede and become a citizen of a state which has not if she wishes an abortion without risk to herself. If no state of which she knows denies the fetus protection, she must risk putting herself outside the protection of all states if she wants an abortion.

[Walter Ziobro is Treasurer of the Massachusetts Libertarian Party. He has written a number of position papers currently held by the MLP.]

(ROTHBARD, cont.)

The speakers outlined the causes of inflation and discussed the effects of various attempts by the government to "fine-tune" the economy, showing that any such attempts must ultimately fail. A spirited discussion period followed the lectures. The attendance was disappointing, but those who did come felt they had spent a very worthwhile evening.