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Terrorism
America a War Zone?

by Rev. Chris Mohr

The terrifying saga of the hijacking of TWA's Flight 847 has ended. The lives of dozens of innocent Americans were in the hands of a band of Moslem terrorists. And a recent CBS News Report on terrorism warns us that the Holy War against America may soon come to our own country. Thousands of militant Lebanese and Iraqi people living in America are creating the network of financial and tactical support needed to sustain a consistent policy of terrorism against American people who never leave the country. Within twenty years, our nation could easily become a war zone, and such common activities as shopping in a mall or flying on a plane to St. Louis could become life-threatening. The horrifying scenes of Beirut we see on our television screens could soon become the views from our living room windows. International terrorists have already used bombs with enough explosive force to destroy the Pentagon, and their weaponry becomes more sophisticated with each passing year.

We have been raised in a country that espouses the libertarian value of respect for individual life, and almost every American is revolted by the tactics of thugs who use innocent people as pawns in their political struggles. But like it or not, there are countless hundreds of thousands of people who do not share our libertarian values, and any one of them would be more than happy to blow us away if he thought it would aid his cause. And because many of these terrorists await their reward for good if they die while committing a terrorist act, there is no retribution we can threaten them with. If we want to limit the spread of terrorism, we will have to come to grips with the factors that motivate it. And we will have to have the courage to retreat from some of the more dangerous elements of American foreign policy that seem to fuel terrorist attacks against us.

Like most Americans, I am abysmally ignorant of the realities of Arab culture, and frankly I'm not terribly interested in learning more about what appears to be an oppressive society. But I do realize that there are few major regions of the world that are more profoundly at odds with the values of American culture. We have much more in common with Russia than we do with Libya. And yet our history of involvement with the Middle East reveals a callous disregard for the Arab people.

As early as the nineteenth century, the captains of industry and the leaders of government realized they could both greatly enrich their powers by joining forces. Politicians were tempted by the lure of industry's vast wealth, and some industrialists were equally tempted by the ways in which a friendly government could quickly increase their sphere of influence in the marketplace. Domestically, these corporate statisticians enacted the relatively benign practices of regulation, licensing, taxation. But on the international front, away from the direct scrutiny of the American people, businesses bought the military might of the United States to secure investments through indescribable brutality, corruption of foreign governments, and sometimes even the wholesale slaughter of native peoples who occupied desirable lands. This is a practice the Marxists call imperialism; it is made possible only through the unholy marriage of government and business into a new realm of corporate statism.

The development of nuclear weapons after World War II made the all-out wars of the past impossible. In its place we now have a new kind of "underground" war. When America engages in such a war, it is called "covert operation." When our enemies do the same thing, it is called "terrorism." No matter which side engages in such tactics, countless thousands of innocent people are butchered.

In America, terrorists are seen as crazed religious fanatics. But they will not be so easily dismissed. It is true that the Koran, like the Old Testament, has passages that would be considered brutal by modern standards. And there is no denying that a fundamentalist movement is growing in the Arab nations. The Islamic Jihad, the followers of the Ayatollah, and others are ready and willing to abide by the harshest doctrines of their Holy Book. But consider another excerpt from the Koran, which

Justice vs. The Judicial System

By Ramee McClellan

In 1978 Gary Dotson was convicted of rape and had served about six years of his sentence when in May of this year his "victim" confessed that she had not been raped by anyone. The judge that had presided over Dotson's earlier conviction decided again that Dotson was guilty and returned him to Joliet prison to serve the remainder of his sentence. The Governor of Illinois in a public hearing declared that Dotson was guilty but that justice would be best served if Dotson was released. Officially, Dotson is a free and guilty man.

Does the Gary Dotson case in Illinois mark the fad accomplished of the "justice" system in America? Many people I have talked with say so. Purposely, I have spoken only with non-lawyers about it. Here is why lay people have said they think the Dotson case will break the camel's back.

- It received national attention and exposure. Governor "Big Jim" Thompson stepped out of political character to temporarilly quiet the controversy by "reasoning" that Dotson is guilty but should also be

See Justice Pg. 6

See Terrorism Pg. 7
Regional Roundup

News from Boulder

by Jerry Van Sickle

Voters turned down more sales taxes for a new cultural center! A sizable majority said no - in spite of a special, single issue, election which brings out voters “in favor” - and in spite of support from 8 of 9 city council members, and the Chamber of Commerce, and “leading” citizens, and the only daily newspaper, and sizable public and private funding. $100,000 of the taxpayer funds went into public “education” as well as preliminary designs. Most of the pre-election opposition and negative votes seemed to be against the lavish expense and snobbish backing. Libertarians joined other opponents under the rousing banner, Visagoth Fund.

Local builders have filed a lawsuit against the Danish growth control ordinance. These limitations on population have been instituted through building “allocations”, using builders and developers as convenient scapegoats. A second look might remind Boulderites that these bad guys are only midwives for the human beings who would like to come here. A wall and gates would make the issue clear - the freedom to move and settle anywhere. The “taking” of property by local government is also involved. Property rights would entitle owners to the beneficial use of land as long as they safeguard the rights of neighbors. Zoning has tampered with property rights, and protections, but had been accepted by the courts because some use is allowed. Growth controls prohibit any use whatsoever for those owners who don’t win allocations.

Unfortunately these constitutional issues may not be heard by the court system which has taken some recent steps in favor of private property rights. Reportedly this lawsuit will argue that a city may not impose growth controls because such power resides only at the state level.

The Capricious Maw of Police Power

by Jim Glennie

Those of you who know Hue Futch won’t be surprised at his latest escapade. Hue, one of the co-founders of the Libertarian Party, has been a resident of Park County since 1972, living in a remote subdivision called Harris Park Estates. The subdivision was established in the 1960’s; some 20 years prior to the adoption of zoning regulations and building codes in Park County. Most of the residents of Harris Park are in a low income bracket (taxes are low and the lot size is small and affordable). Houses are scattered and each bears the indelible and unique imprint of its owner. Everyone, it seems, is a collector of something unusual; old bottles, scrap lumber, old automobiles in various states of repair, antique farming implements, boulders, used vehicle parts, etc. A delightful air of “live and let live” permeates the community.

When the subdivision was created, the roads were dedicated to the public. However, because they did not meet county specifications, they were never accepted for snowplowing and maintenance. The homeowners themselves bought an old road grader to perform these services. Enter then the police power in the form of the Zoning Officer, Duane Harris. He wrote several “summons and complaints” to Harris Park residents, citing them for violations of ordinances prohibiting “junk” and “inaudible vehicles.” And even though Futch is the only permanent resident on his narrow, dead-end, dirt street which he plows and maintains himself, he did not escape the long arm of the law. He too was issued a summons.

This happened about seven months ago. Futch determined to fight the county in court by representing himself. He enlisted the aid of several libertarian friends to help him devise a strategy and to do the research and leg work necessary to build a strong case against the county.

His case has four major thrusts: a) to show that his collection of antiques is not junk; b) to show that his automobiles are bona fide collector’s items as defined by Colorado law, and not inoperable vehicles as claimed by the county; c) to show that the county does not own the streets in Harris Park, and therefore has no authority to prohibit him from parking his vehicles there; d) to show that the Park County zoning resolution is unconstitutional both on its face and in its application to him and to Harris Park.

Motions hearing is scheduled for July.

During the course of research into case law concerning zoning ordinances many appalling court decisions have been encountered in which the Supreme Court of Colorado in essence held that the landowner has no inalienable rights to his property, that whatever the county officials deem to be a permissible or impermissible use shall be, and that there is no recourse from local political decisions. However, every so often there is a court opinion that is good news for libertarians. One such opinion was written by Justice Frantz dissenting from the majority in Vogts vs. Guerrette (142 Colo 527, 1960).

“In those decisions, relied upon by the majority, constitutional safeguards apparently were fed to the capricious maw of police power, as if rights guaranteed by a written constitution must succumb to the unwritten law known as the police power. “This opinion is more than just a dissent — it is a warning and the sounding of an alarm. In the ultimate the stakes in this case are high: the rights of man as an individual and person are under fire. On this matter there shall be no leap in the dark by this court, if the opinion shall be that the ... statute is valid, it shall be accepted for what it is: a derogation of the ‘natural, essential and inalienable’ rights of man which we as judges are sworn to protect and enforce.

Permit the legislature to despoil the man, permit inchmeal destruction of his innate rights as an individual, and eventually he will not be what the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution recognize him to be — a creature endowed with certain inherent, inalienable rights — but something greatly less than man, subject to the dictates, yes, the whims of the state. Every retreat, if only by inches, from the concept of man as a person of individual, innate rights, is a move nearer the complete desiviture of those attributes which distinguish man from the remainder of creation. The Bill of Rights, the protective shield of natural rights, marks the great difference between this country and those authoritarian states subscribing to materialistic statisti”
The naughtiest boy in the world

by Carolyn Phelps

Castle Rock — Albert Herbert Hawkins, the naughtiest boy in the world, will be given a second chance by the Douglas County Board of Education. And even though he is the only permanent resident on his narrow, dead-end, dirt street which he plows and maintains himself, he did not escape

In the fall, the shelves of Douglas County elementary school libraries when school opens. In action taken last February 5, the Board of Education voted 4-2 to banish two books by English author Frank Dickens, to "adult only" shelves. In one of the books, "The Naughtiest Boy in the World," our hero, frightened the Queen of England with a spider and then turns around in Albert Herbert Hawkins and the Space Rocket and commandeer a space station by frightening the scientists away with a mouse. Subversive stuff.

Mrs. Kathleen Risner, a devout Mormon and mother of six, thought so. She was so upset in fact that she submitted a formal complaint to the Board of Education insisting they remove the books from the school libraries. In her complaint she claimed that the books promoted disobedience and disrespect for authority and there was absolutely no consequence for deviant behavior.

As per the procedure implemented specifically to deal with such complaints, the Superintendent of Schools appointed an ad hoc citizens committee, made up of a Baptist minister, a teacher, and a parent, to review the books and submit their recommendations to the board. The committee agreed with Mrs. Risner that the books indeed encouraged disrespect for the norms of society and the protagonist didn't receive any corrective discipline for his misdeeds. They recommended the books be put in a separate place where only adults could check them out. In this way adults could read the books with their children and offer alternatives to misbehavior. This, they said, wasn't censorship but only setting priorities.

Two board members and several members of the audience expressed their concerns about the precedent being set for anyone, in this case one person, to claim about a book and succeed in removing it from general circulation. But the other four board members allowed the discussion to center on the literary merits of the books and decided that since the book was of absolutely no literary value, they would go along with the committee recommendations. "The books aren't worth arguing about so let's throw them out," was the general consensus.

The truth is they threw out the books to appease a vocal minority who would like to expand their religious zeal into political clout. The school board elections were coming up in May and the board was threatened by the possibility of this special interest running their own candidates and stealing the election. Noting the larger turnout at school board elections, one can see why they were feeling the political heat.

Afterwards, amid cries of censorship from the media, the hastily organized Citizens for Albert Herbert Hawkins, and the American Civil Liberties Union, the board still defended their action by insisting this wasn't a censorship issue. After all the books were still in the libraries weren't they? No sir, this wasn't a book burning board.

The ACLU ran an advertisement in the local newspaper soliciting clients for a lawsuit against the school board. In the meantime CFAHH drafted a letter to the board requesting a place on the agenda of the next board meeting to present their views and request the board rescind their decision. They asked the ACLU to wait to file suit until after CFAHH had a chance to handle the issue locally. In this way CFAHH offered the board the opportunity to settle the issue without litigation forever by saving the taxpayers an exorbitant amount of money on a cause the board would surely lose. CFAHH was scheduled on the agenda for April 16, two weeks before the school board elections.

In the largest turnout for a school board meeting in ten years CFAHH presented their case on behalf of the silent majority. The presentation emphasized three major points: First Amendment issues (the right to read), political issues (special interest pressure), and procedural issues (the board hadn't addressed the issues in the complaint).

The board had give up arguing the censorship issue and it surely didn't want to discuss the political issue at a public meeting so that left the procedural issue. They had judged the books by their literary value not the moral issue of respect for authority and disobedience without consequence as brought by the complainant and the ad hoc committee. After much discussion of where they went wrong with the old procedure, they decided they would form a committee to revise the procedure and run old Albert through again.

By the end of June, after two public readings, the new procedure was approved. By the middle of July, Risner filed an expanded complaint against Albert Herbert Hawkins. She says her kids learn enough bad things on the school bus without being exposed to Albert Herbert Hawkins too. Basically the complaint is the same. A seven member standing committee, appointed by the Superintendent will replace the old three member ad hoc committee in reviewing the books. Once the committee makes its recommendations and after the Superintendent has considered them, the board will take final action. We should know the verdict on poor Albert by then.

It's hard to imagine the Douglas County Board of Education risking the wrath of the silent majority again, or worse, tempting a lawsuit from the ACLU, but then again one never knows. The procedures change but while we rely on politicians and committeee to make decisions for us, we can never be sure from which direction the next erosion of freedom will come.
Routt County Routes Abuse

By Bob Jahelka

Drug enforcement activities by the sheriff have been minimal, according to critics, who point to the low number of arrests, so this area is also getting attention. Some suspicion exists that drug trafficking involves government officials and the Colorado Attorney General has been asked to help. Greg Smith of the Attorney General’s special investigation unit said he lacks the resources to investigate, so a direct appeal to the Governor is being considered.

Founders of the organization include George Specht who won a $25,000 settlement from the City of Steamboat Springs for an illegal search and seizure. Also included is Carmen Alessi who won a $450,000 settlement from the County of Routt in a dispute over a use permit for his gravel pit.

Media attention aroused the interest of many and the foundation has begun receiving complaints of government abuse. One wonders if this is the tip of the iceberg.

The ombudsman concept originated in Sweden in 1869 and since World War II has spread to several countries including the U.S. The original idea has the ombudsman as a government employee who looks for incidents of unjust or harsh treatment of persons by police, prosecuting attorneys, or judges, and such other matters as taxation, voting or government payments. Perhaps the idea of the ombudsman as a government employee is the reason that it hasn’t spread further. Can you imagine politicians, bureaucrats and their “Good old boy” associates willingly hiring a whistle-blower?

A TAXING POEM

I.R.S. TAX AUDIT

Tax his cow, Tax his goat,
Tax his pants, Tax his coat.
Tax his ties, Tax his shirt,
Tax his work, Tax his dirt.
Tax his chew, Tax his smoke,
Teach him Taxes is no joke.
Tax his car, Tax his gas,
Tax the roads he must pass.
Tax his land, Tax his wage,
Tax the bed in which he lays.

Tax his tractor, Tax his mule,
Teach him taxes is the rule.
Tax his bath, Tax his sink,
Tax him if he tries to think.
Tax his booze, Tax his beers,
If he cries, Tax his tears.
Tax his ills, Tax his trash,
Tax his notes, Tax his cash.
Tax him good, don’t let him know
After Taxes there’s no dough.

If he hollers, Tax him more,
Tax him till he’s good and sore.
Tax his coffin, Tax his grave,
Tax the sod in which he lays.
Put these words upon his tomb,
"TAXES DROVE HIM TO HIS DOOM".

From the chair

By PENN PFIFFNER

The Colorado Libertarian Party has been taking a new direction ever since last year.

Thanks to the efforts of the last Chair, Dwight Filley, the last Finance Director, Bob Hurt, and Treasurer Bob Sheffield, the Party eliminated its debt and learned to operate in the black.

We have reemphasized the political nature of the Party, and we are working now toward the next elections. Already, ten people have declared their willingness to become candidates or lineholders; compare this with only seven who ran in 1984. We are signing up precinct captains and getting regular attendance for the worknights. A strong candidate for the governor’s race is being actively sought, and our top priority is seeking candidates for 50 more positions.
Tweedle-Dem and Tweedle-Dumb

By JERRY VAN SICHE

It's time to introduce a new libertarian heresy - that there's hardly a spoonful of difference between policies of Republican and Democratic administrations, local to national. Those of you who love one of these parties, or hate the other, will have to swallow your outrage to test the argument.

With few exceptions, policies initiated by either party, have been carried by their opponents. The size of government keeps increasing. Social Security was not repealed by its initial opponents. The tentative pump priming programs of President Hoover, to fight the great depression, were criticized loudly by candidate Franklin D. Roosevelt before he implemented the same "new deal" - wholesale. Most farm, labor and foreign policies introduced by one party have been kept and run by the other. Changes are glacial and tend to be supported gradually within both parties.

Political theory suggests that the two major parties are bound to be similar. Each is struggling to win the same voters - voters who share the great center of public opinion.

If you tell me the rhetoric is different between rival governors and parties, I'll agree. But what's left when all the smoke has cleared? Are the final results very different?

There's an easy explanation. Politicians and bureaucrats, once in office, are pleased to administer or enlarge existing programs, and award contracts and jobs created by these programs. Political winners do not give up the power they fought so hard to win. Politicians, administrators and recipients of government programs become a powerful, dedicated lobby for the perpetuation of programs funded by taxpayer dollars.

So, if you look behind the rhetoric, the differences in policies between the two major parties are small. Libertarians lump both of them together to make a point, and call them Republi-crats or Demo-publicans. The point is that both major parties tend to enlarge political power and diminish liberty.

The difficult task, inside the political game, is to reduce public decisions and controls - and to enlarge individual responsibility and freedom.

Dear Fellow Libertarians:

I would like to invite you to the August 14th cocktail party. The party will be held Wednesday, 14th 7:30-10:00 at Bob & Betty Hurt's house, 1456 Fillmore Denver. The theme of this party is one of introducing non-members to the ideas of the Libertarian Party. There will be the usual cash bar, hors d'oeuvres, and good conversation. In addition these will be some short speeches by local Libertarians, and an opportunity for questions.

YOU YOU YOU.....will with your support make or break this event. If you decide not to invite your friends, neighbors, & associates this event will fail. If you decide to come alone or with one friend success will be marginal. If however you decide to arrive, and the arrival of three non-Libertarians. You can be assured of the success of this event.

Do you agree this will help increase membership & awareness for the C.L.P.? Will you give your support??

Doug Anderson
CLP Membership Chair
Editorials and

Conventions: Incest or cross-fertilization?

By RUTH BENNETT
GUEST EDITORIAL

Once again it happened. Not only here, but in many other states. The turnouts at L.P. State Conventions are disappointing.

In Colorado we've had conventions that involved over a hundred participants. We've had extensive programs, flown in speakers from all over the country, and heated battles over platform planks and changes to our governing documents. What's happened to the crowds, to the interest, to the enthusiasm?

I think that there are a couple of reasons attendance is falling off. One reason is that we've spent over a decade fine-tuning our Constitution and By-Laws. They're in pretty good shape. We have an administrative organization that mostly works. (That is, the organization works, the people holding office don't always work.)

We've also spent over a decade working on our Platform. It's been changed in tenor several times and now reflects issues important to Colorado leaving more national issues to the National Platform. We've hammered out how the philosophy of libertarianism applies to issues. Few, if any, topics are still in serious dispute.

Another reason is lack of new speakers. Many of us don't really want to hear the same people over and over, regardless of whatever great stuff they may have to say. We've become incestuous, inbred, and maybe even somewhat boring.

When something isn't working, (and I contend that falling attendance at State Conventions indicates that they are not working) then the market is telling us something. We obviously need to change it if we are doing. We need to come up with a new marketing strategy for continuing to revise our Platform and governing documents.

In Washington State this year we had an enormously successful Freedom Conference in April and a poorly attended State Convention in June. We conducted no business at the Freedom Conference and had novel, unusual and innovative speakers and program at the Freedom Conference. The State Convention was almost entirely business and one lone (though very good) speaker. The Freedom Festival had over one hundred participants and the Convention only 18.

Maybe these two aspects of most conventions, business and program, are not mutually inclusive. If we concentrate on, say regional conventions, we can position them to reach out to non-Libertarians and "old timers" alike. Doing conferences in off years from National Conventions can be a means of generating enthusiasm for elections, teaching campaigning skills and such, and as a means of getting members from various states within regions to be together, cross-fertilizing ideas and building strong regional organizations.

Then on a state level we could have business sessions, maybe one, maybe more, each year. We could have revisions of constitution and By-Laws one Saturday (with a big party afterward) and revisions to the Platform another weekend.

We need to determine what our purposes are in having State Conventions. Is the purpose to revise documents or to exchange ideas or to draw in new people or to have a great party or to have interesting programs? Of course these are not mutually exclusive, but in recent years trying to combine all of these hasn't been successful, particularly in states with a longer history of Libertarian activism.

Once a state can determine what it wants to accomplish (revise documents, having a program, etc.) then it can establish the best means for achieving those goals.

Whether people aren't attending state conventions because the business doesn't interest them, or they find the speakers and program boring or because they figure they can have a better time doing anything else, we need to recognize those reasons and adapt our conventions to meet the changing needs and interests of Libertarians.

Abortion: No Unwritten Contract

To the Editor:

Ed Hoskins makes a good case, in his column in your Spring Edition, for gaining revenge by living well - rather than spending all our energies on tax resistance. It's an important debate and I hope it will continue.

I'm left uncomfortable, though, that Mr. Hoskins leaves a couple of important points out of the reckoning.

The first is the moral dimension. Given the awesome
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To the Editor:

Upon reading your recent guest editorial, "Abortion: A Tough Issue," by Mark Schauer, I found myself inspired to reply.

There are three things I find very helpful in Mr. Schauer's arguments: 1) He does not try to deny the humanism of the fetus, 2) He clearly states the nature of the conflict in an unwanted pregnancy: between the mother's right to control her own body and the baby's right to life itself, and 3) He correctly states that the government should not fund abortions.

There is one thing that I do not find helpful in his arguments, and that is the idea of an "unwritten social contract." I think he is correct that the mother has not taken on some sort of social contract by becoming pregnant. It is rather an absurd idea after all. A fetus could hardly engage in some sort of formal agreement such as a contract! And if it is equally believable that some sort of spoken, written agreement with society would exist or be considered binding. Rather, the idea of a contract is confusing and beside the point in this issue, by the mere nature of its impossibility.

If there can be no unwritten contract in this issue, it follows that not only can the woman involved not be held liable, then neither can the baby. When a woman becomes pregnant, her body is involved, whether she chooses to have the baby or not. Her control over her body has already been affected by the fact of the pregnancy and no matter what happens next, the rest of her life is some way affected.

Certainly, I think that being forced to raise an unwanted child would be "cruel and unusual punishment" to the mother and the child. There are other options to that.

Sincerely,
Becky Head

Facts of freedom

Let's face the facts of freedom — money. Money means being able to work or do business as we please, to make a profit or just sustain a certain level in society. Of course there is also the freedom in spending your money. If you buy equipment for business or just go out for a night on the town, there's a certain amount of freedom involved. Fundamentally speaking, money — how we make it and how we spend it is the basis of our freedom.

Imagine if restrictions were on the how, where, when and why of our earnings. Would it put us in the same category as slaves? The only way this could happen is if we allow some entity or entities to control our money system. The beneficiaries would be of course, government and big business; the losers would be you and me.

Let's put a stop to the control of our money system before we're branded as slaves!

Michael D. Zink
Denver

To the Editor:

I appreciated Mark Schauer's making the effort to put abortion "into reasonable perspective." But unfortunately, his Spring editorial, "Abortion: A Tough Issue," has serious problems.

"Let's assume," he says, "that the fetus is a human being" with the right to life. "It is assumed," he adds, "that when the parents decide to have children that they have made a commitment to support them, and the failure to do so is criminal." Of course, once children are conceived, they already have them. Yet he adds, "If a woman decides to have a child, then changes her mind," she should have around three months to be free to do so. The father, too? Are the preborn human beings or are they "returnable" merchandise? We can't have it both ways.

He seems to be saying that parents can be bound by "an unwritten social contract." But although he asks, "What is an 'unwritten social contract'?" he doesn't define the term, or explain how it fits with libertarian theory, or say who the parties are, so one can't be sure important debate and I hope it will continue.

I'm left uncomfortable, though, that Mr. Hoskins leaves a couple of important points out of the reckoning.

The first is the moral dimension. Given the awesome damage done with tax dollars to our fellow men, including provocation of a final War of utter destruction, is there not a heavy responsibility on us to pay as few taxes as possible, even if by so doing we do not maximize our own net income? To treat such blood money as "only overhead" like shoplifting and bribery, seems to make light of that moral obligation.

The second is more pragmatic; Mr. Hoskins' formula would so feed the monster that we shall hasten our own destruction. Take the example of a talented person able to earn $30,000 half time, on which he might pay income tax of $1,500.

He considers a choice: spend the rest of his time preventing that theft, resisting the tax. His net gain on this strategy would be $15,000, a sum that would be denied to the Savages.

Alternatively he might find that to damn the taxes and go out to earn another $50,000 in this time, he's right to the 50% bracket and has to pay $10,000 of it to the Feds. Still, his net gain is $25,000 — some $10,000 more than the first alternative. Mr. Hoskins would doubtless advise this choice.

Now look at the difference between the two from the Fed's viewpoint. They receive in total $40,000 from strategy #1 but zero from strategy #2. Our hero has gained $10,000, but meanwhile he has handed our oppressor four times that much. Even if he were to donate the $10,000 to the Livertarians to help "buy our own Congress," he has increased the odds against us, not eased them.

The revenge might turn out, don't you think, to be rather empty?

Yours sincerely,
/s/ A.J. Davies,
Minister.
Thank you


The Colorado Libertarian Party also wishes to thank those members and supporters who have given several hours of their time at least once in the last six months to a party worknight. Activities at worknights include contacting people who have expressed some interest in the party, keeping members up to date on dues, finding precinct captains, identifying candidate possibilities, stuffing envelopes, and encouraging affiliates. Thank you Pat Canty, Steve Coddington, Dave Daniels, Dwight Filley, Judd Pink, Doug Anderson, John Williams, Judy Huffman, Dave Haines, Lloyd Tempero, Jerry Van Sickie, Grace Reed, Hazel Barrett, George Wetzel, Mike Kruse, Kate Barrington, Gerry Hatch, Marjorie Lunnon, Tom Fachan, Jim Glennie, Becky Head, Gary Coen, Jan Coen, Kevin Crosby, Craig Green, Stan Larson, Cathy Rovey, John Erwin, and Bob Hutt.

Filley on freedom

Selling libertarianism, the “yes but” technique

Most of us hate to admit it, but working for freedom involves marketing — being a good salesperson. “Yes but” is a powerful psychological sales technique that often helps make a sale or get a sound, yet unconventional idea across.

Suppose you have just finished telling someone you are against tariffs, and other trade restrictions. Often, that someone will reply that Detroit would be a ghost town if we did not protect it from foreign autos.

The yes but technique involves agreeing partially with his statement, and then re-enforcing your argument, i.e. “Yes, Detroit would be adversely affected initially, BUT every American who buys a foreign car would enjoy the benefit of lower price Japanese autos. The benefits seem to outweigh the costs.”

What you have done is make your companion feel he has won a point, or at least was partially right. He can begin to agree with you without losing face.

If on the other hand, you might have said something like, “Nonsense, trade restrictions are always harmful in the long run.” You certainly would have gotten his hackles up, and while the ensuing argument might have been more fun, it would not have been as persuasive.

To take another example, say a friend starts waving a newspaper in front of you which contains an article announcing the Surgeon General has issued another warning about cigarette smoking. “You Libertarian’s are against almost everything the government does, but what could be wrong with this?” he demands.

By Dwight Filley

You have two choices. You can try to explain how the Surgeon General’s salary is paid by extracting tax money from widows and orphans, which will probably go over like a lead balloon, or you can say “Yes, there is no doubt some benefit to such reports, but if the government really wanted to improve the nation’s health, why doesn’t it stop subsidizing tobacco growers?” Using the yes but technique disarms the other guy, and instead of triggering a defensive replay, helps form a sort of bond, as the two of you grope for the truth.
So be a salesperson for Liberty. It will pay off.

Toward being free

By JAN PRINCE

Living with a Libertarian

If I had your money ...

Holding on to your money...
National chair

To the Editor:

My name is Randy Ver Hagen. I was elected LP Chair at the British National Committee meeting on April 30th, 1985. The purpose of this letter is to formally announce my candidacy for National Chair at the August convention.

In the time I have been Chair, I have gained a significant insight into the problems that our party faces today. The single greatest lesson that we should have learned by now is that we must work within our budget—no debts, only black ink. I am developing a "nuts & bolts" program to get us moving again, in a direction that truly can be adequately supported.

We must spell out specific goals, such as electing at least one Libertarian in every state. We need three separate campaign manuals: federal, state and local. We must be willing to fund monthly LP NEWS publishing.

We must have a vision of our party for what it can be, and work accordingly. If the manifestation of that vision is change, then we must change, regardless of the tenure of person or program. We elected more people to office in 1984 than in any other year, and raised over one million dollars. So we have made advances in some areas.

It is my sincerest hope that our membership and their delegates to the National Convention will possess the necessary vision for our party. The benefits of such vision will be measured in our future successes. We can be successful; we must be successful.

Randy T. Ver Hagen
Chairman, Libertarian Party

Living with a Libertarian

For a democrat, republican or nonpolitical type, living with a libertarian can have the same qualities as inhabiting a foreign country. In fact, viewing your libertarian mate as a foreigner may help you to understand and even learn to enjoy the entire experience.

I remember my gradual and surprising acceptance of an unfamiliar culture when I started reading the book Shogun. When reading the initial chapters I was appalled at the "barbaric" behavior of the 18th century Japanese. Along with the English protagonist, I learned of the history, climate and living conditions that spawned that society. Soon, the protagonist and I learned how to view the world through the eyes of the Shogun. Our map of reality changed to include the rich landscape of the Japanese mind of that period.

That transformation of my point of reference taught me a lesson I have remembered in dealing with those whose ideologies differ radically from mine. To understand someone you have to "walk a mile in his shoes.

Start by asking your libertarian friend questions about how they came to develop their beliefs. (An inside tip—read Atlas Shrugged or if you were a Biblical use your differences as an opportunity to broaden your comprehension of the world. Not too many people have the luxury of a live-in "Devil's Advocate" to challenge and expand their reality.

I also invite you to take note of how your mate interacts on a day to day basis with the real world as opposed to her/his stated ideologies. In by experience a person's ideologies seem to be stored in a nice package, unwrapped now and then for viewing; and have little to do with the way they live their lives.

Good friends with whom I ideologically differ are often ones whose company I enjoy most for several reasons. Their purpose and values are similar to mine, even though their concept of how they are to be achieved are unlike. Leave libertarian friends who espouse the "live and let live", or "the fittest survive" doctrines who have been known to endanger their life and limb — not to mention their precious dignity — dodging oncoming traffic to rescue a frantic puppy from a flattening fate, to lend money to someone needy knowing they will never be repaid. I've known avowed socialists who are more exacting business tycoons that any "capitalist" I've ever heard of.

Whenever your mate's viewpoint drives you to the desire to turn them in to the IRS, remember all the reasons you were attracted to them in the first place; remember why you enjoy their company and what you learned from them has added to your perspective. Humor their need to be right and picky — remember they choose you to live with.

Looking into a mirror all the time does get boring.
free. Politically clever and morally confusing.
—It was a relatively simple case that people could understand and judge having only the information provided by TV. And the people could see what the high altitude Judge couldn't.
—We all know how it feels to lie. And we know how it feels to suffer under the need to "come clean". And we know the relief of confession. Dotson's alleged victim looked like we would look in her shoes. No one was able to find an ulterior motive for her confession. It seemed all America knew Dotson was innocent. Except for the judge. There is a three part mechanism at work in all people all the time. It goes like this:
1. There is an impulse inborn in all people to ALWAYS TRY TO BE RIGHT.
2. Ego abates the impulse and it rapidly divorces itself from ACTUALLY BEING RIGHT.
3. So when we error, as we all do, we tend to repeat the error to prove (back to 1) that we were right in the first judgement.
I suspect this was the judge's problem. To be right in 1985 he must have been wrong in 1979. Too much for him to confront.
As a young cop in our nation's Capital I suspected that there was a cancer growing in the system after my first case went to trial in 1967. By the time my riot cases were over in 1968 I knew for sure that I was part of a system that was inefficient, corrupt, political and committed only to preserving and enlarging itself.
I saw lawyers coerce money from clients in the hallways just outside the courtroom. I learned that a lawyers favorite tactic is protraction (continuance). It adds to his fee and at the same time hides his lack of knowledge about the case. I saw relevant testimony disallowed by a judges application of the rules of evidence and procedure.
All that is to say what? It is this. Next to the size and power of government, there is no movement in America more deserving of the Libertarians' attention than the revolt against the injustice rampant in the justice system. Justice delayed is justice denied. Civil court has become a socially acceptable place to avoid responsibility.
Six hundred fifty thousand lawyers cost Americans about $30,000,000,000 a year in DIRECT fees. This amount does not include the billions consumers pay for the results of the lawyer's work. When lawyers sue to win, somebody pays. Those costs are always passed on to consumers. A gynecologist in Colorado (never guilty of malpractice) will pay $30,000 in 1985 for malpractice insurance. You and I pay for that.
The system was designed and built by lawyers for lawyers. It serves their needs. Now hold on to your saliviousness. Who gives them the power to do this? The answer is every person who ever uses them. It is that simple.
The American Mediation Association is in business so that you can resolve your problems with other people without lawyers and without courtrooms. The choice really is yours. Make the right one. Call your mediator BEFORE you call your lawyer.

A cause of war; a peace solution
By Stormy Mon

Most of us like to think of ourselves as "peace loving people": we wouldn't consider armed robbery as a solution to a financial shortfall, wouldn't initiate force against others, or condone or support that kind of activity.
Yet that behavior has crept into our society — in fact permeates it at every level, in every way, in the form of politics.
Perhaps Bill Simon summarized this best in 1978 in his book A TIME FOR TRUTH: "If you would not confront your neighbor and demand money at the point of a gun to solve every new problem that may appear in your life, you should not allow the government to do it for you."
Or as Thomas Jefferson said, "It is strangely absurd to suppose that a million human beings collected together are not under the same moral laws which bind them separately."
Anytime, anywhere, anyone advocates the initiation of force to "solve a problem", they are a cause of war. Aggression or the threat of coercion (taxes and compulsory anything) are acts of war. And these little individual wars, centralized through governments, are the cause, the foundation, the support and sanction of bigger wars.

Libertarian Solution

Postscript: There are many good organizations actively solving this problem. For help in finding them, call the American Mediation Association (303) 695-6249.
Next to the size and power of government, there is no movement in America more deserving of the Libertarians attention than the revolt against the injustice rampant in the justice system.
Libertarian Calendar

1st Tuesday of every month, the Libertarian forum meets in the Brand Building, 203 S. Galena St., Aspen. Call 925-8282 for more information.

3rd Tuesday of every month, Boulder County Libertarian Association, 7:30 p.m., meets at 1913 Broadway, Boulder. Call Jerry van Sickie for details at (h) 442-5581 or (w) 444-5678.

2nd Wednesday of every month, CLP Cocktail Party, 7:30 p.m., 1956 Fillmore, Denver. Relaxed, informal, cash bar.

4th Thursday of every month, Park County Libertarians meet. Call Phil Prosser for details at 839-7693.

THE COPIER STORE

WHERE VARIETY SAVES YOU TIME AND MONEY

SALES
Purchase, Lease, Rent-plus-Trade-Ins, Consignment

SERVICE
Factory Trained-plus-Parts Inventory

SUPPLIES
Paper and Toner for all Brands

FACTORY AUTHORIZED DEALER FOR:

TOSHIBA • SHARP • O' JETTI • SAXON • 3M

Ric O

Canon • Mita • Mita • Panasonic

Sanyo • Royal • Savin • IBM • Xerox

NEW OR USED

MON-FRI 8 AM-6 PM • SAT 11 AM-3 PM

922-8698
445 Federal Blvd.

Vote with dollars

Penn Pfifner's informal Vote-With-Dollars poll is complete and the results are as follows: 15 votes were cast with contributions totaling $322.00. M.L. Hanson, Denver banker and President of the Colorado Federation of Business and Professional Women, was the frontrunner.

The Campaigns Committee appreciates your support thus far and would like to encourage others interested in running for office or being a lineholder (it's painless, really!) or individuals willing to donate time, services or funds to contact Kate Barritte at 830-1401 or leave a message at Libertarian Party Headquarters, 2196 South Holly, Suite 207B, Denver 80222, 753-6789.

Quotations

"Taxes are going up so fast that government is likely to price itself right out of the market." - Dan Bennett

NEED MONEY?
READ THIS!

The Colorado Libertarian Party is looking for a responsible, business-oriented person to serve as Food Booth Coordinator for the summer season. Profits made on this booth will be split between the Coordinator and the CLP. You can turn your weekends into cash!!! For further info, call Bob Hurt at 329-3218 or Dwight Filley at 322-2689.

APARTMENT OWNERS
Vacancies kill cash flow.
TENANT READY APARTMENT SERVICES
will make your vacancy attractive quickly, and at an attractive price.
FREE ESTIMATES: 322-2689
Dwight Filley, President
I recently saw hanging up in a Middle Eastern food store in Denver: “We, Allah, have created you male and female, and have made you nations and tribes that ye may know one another — not that ye may despise one another.” (Holy Qur'an, C111:1-3). Is this a doctrine that preaches hatred and murder? Or have we replaced our prejudice against blacks with a new prejudice against Arabs? We know that the Islamic terrorists believe they will be rewarded by God if they die in this “Holy War.” The media portrays this belief as some kind of foreign, incomprehensible dogma. But it sounds very familiar to me. How many Americans believe that God has rewarded our brave soldiers who fought and died for freedom in World War II?

In fact, many of the Islamic “terrorists” I have seen on television or read about do not seem like crazed fanatics at all. The leaders appear to be intelligent, calculating people who see that it is not possible to launch a direct war against the United States. But they know that it is possible to undermine the intervention of US interests into their countries through acts of war in areas where we are vulnerable. They have accepted that in all wars, innocent people are murdered to promote the cause of one country over another. They are at war against the United States, and they will kill the people of this country until we adopt a more libertarian foreign policy.

I abhor the brutal killing of innocent Americans. But in the long run, I do not believe we are helpless to stem the tide of terrorist acts against Americans. Americans are the targets of over 40% of all terrorist attacks in the world. We can reduce that percentage by relaxing our military presence worldwide. Our armed forces were designed to protect us from foreign invasion, and they should serve no other function. Let’s stop subsidizing foreign investments with our armed services, and let’s see if the desperate acts of international terrorists don’t drop dramatically as a result.

The decades of oppression, brutality and genocide of our country supported through such puppets as the Shah of Iran are now exploding back in our faces. And soon, we may hear those explosions in our own backyards.

The American government is not innocent of the charge of terrorism. We have trained 200,000 Latin American and South American soldiers in the tactics of torture right here in America, supplying them with millions of dollars worth of the most modern tools of torture. We have mined the harbors of Nicaragua. We pour millions of dollars into “humanitarian” aid for the Nicaraguan contras, making almost no requirements for them to account for how their millions are spent. If Congress sets a ceiling on military aid to a right-wing dictatorship, these dictatorships go to the heavily-subsidized country of Israel, who manufacture unlimited quantities of guns with American aid. Israel itself has terrorized the innocent millions of Lebanon, indiscriminately bombing cities with modernization programs funded by us.

And in the Middle East, we have a shameful record of supporting monsters like the Shah of Iran, who tortured and murdered everyone who opposed his “modernization” programs for Iran. You can be confident that in every case where we have supported a brutal dictatorship, our government has been using military force to ensure that other countries would accept the infusion of American capital. You can be equally confident that the American Corporate State has not hesitated to exercise its military muscles in the oil-rich Arab land.

Ten years ago a Jewish friend of mine told me that Israel is not just a war on the Jews, but because America needed a reliable military base in the Middle East to protect its corporate interests, and that the Zionist dream has been destroyed by the endlessly escalating militarization of Israel. The decades of oppression, brutality and genocide of our country supported through such puppets as the Shah of Iran are now exploding back in our faces. And soon, we may hear those explosions in our own backyards.

The atrocities perpetrated by our government in the interests of corporate investment would not be possible from a bystander acting alone. Areas that are hostile to American business interests would have to be avoided, and our entrepreneurs would simply have to invest their capital in the stable and friendly countries. Most of our international “covert operations” are nothing more than a subsidy for businesses that want to operate profitably in foreign countries. Generally, the cost in human lives of such a policy is staggering. And an inevitable backlash of this policy by terrorist acts against Americans.

---

**Welfare Warriors**

**More Money, Fewer Solutions**

By STORMY MC

*Losing Ground: American Social Policy 1960-1980*, by Charles M. Bracker, Jr. and 200 others. media text sensationalizes personal stories, rarely or never providing the economic, social, political and media context.

**LIBERTARIAN**

Suggested contribution

USED PAPERBACKS (good to excellent condition)

- Branden, Nathaniel *SELF-ESTEEM* $1.50
- Casey, Doug *CRISIS INVESTING* $1.00
- Heinlein, Robert *MOON IS A HARSH MISTRESS* $1.50
- Locke, John *TWO TREATISES OF GOVERNMENT* $1.50
- Mill, John *ON LIBERTY* $1.00
- Orwell, George *ANIMAL FARM* or *1984* $1.00

*Colorado Liberty* Page 7
By STORMY MC


The major portion of this book is a sad, tragic review of what massive federal government assistance and assaults have done for and to the poor. Well meant programs have given people the incentive to be unemployed and not take family responsibilities.

"The effect of the new rules was to make it profitable for the poor to behave in the short term in ways that were destructive in the long term. We tried to provide more for the poor and produced more poor instead. We tried to remove the barriers to escape from poverty, and inadvertently built a trap."

"For the first time in American history, it has become socially acceptable within poor communities to be unemployed. Those who keep working are chumps."

So we have another massively documented instance of government is not the solution, but is definitely part of the problem. Or as Walter Williams said, "Helping the poor through government is like feeding sparrows through horses."

But author Murray goes much further than that common knowledge and shows the psychological and moral damage done for generations to come. Although the book is academically written with lots of statistics and graphs, and extensive bibliography and notes, the summaries at the end of each chapter give each a nicely wrapped synopsis. All facets of the problem are covered including history, employment, education, crime, family, etc.

He also points out that the evening TV news and other media tend to sensationalize personal stories, rarely or never mentioning they are showing exceptional situations for dramatic effect. These superficial summaries give a very distorted picture of the cause and effect relationships this book cataloged.

The policies are the lying bureaucracies, juggling figures with the government budgets to justify their continued existence. Any self respecting private organization would be embarrassed by the record of failure, but these welfare warriors just demand more money.

All through the book, we patiently wait for alternative solutions. Murray is honest: "I don't know the answer, nor do I know my knowledge, does anyone. The number of 'politically feasible' changes that would make a difference is approximately zero."

The key phrase here is "politically feasible." Then the author does discuss some of the fundamental questions involved: the true goals of self reliance. He concludes with two desired changes he doesn't see happening soon. Both from a libertarian perspective, are mixed blessings.

In education, he wants to open the process to competition, but suggests a voucher system, thus leaving funding and control in the hands of inefficient government.

For the welfare system itself, he bravely proposes scrapping the entire federal effort and turning the whole mess over to private organizations and local government. Despite all his arguments, he hopes New York City, among others, can do a better job than the feds.

In social services circles, this book has become a focal point for lively discussion and thought — and is on its way to being a classic in its field.
Colorado Libertarian Party
2186 South Holly Street, #2078 • Denver, Colorado 80222 • (303) 753-6789

Membership Application

Date: ____________________________

I would like to: □ Join □ renew my membership in the Libertarian Party as indicated:

Name ____________________________
Address _______________________________________
City ________________________ Zip ____________
Phone (h) ___________________ (bus.) ____________

“T hereby certify that I do not advocate or believe in the initiation of force for the achievement of social or political goals.”
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Membership categories include subscription to Colorado Liberty (6 issues per year)

FROGS AND FREEDOM

By STORMY MON

You can’t kill a frog by dropping him in boiling water. He reacts so quickly to the sudden heat that he jumps out before he’s hurt. But if you put him in cold water and then warm it up gradually, he doesn’t decide to jump until it’s too late; by then he’s cooked.

People are just as foolish. Take away their freedom overnight, and you’ve got a violent revolution. But steal it from them gradually, on the installment plan, and you can paralyze an entire generation. In case you

TERRORISM

We must stop trying to solve problems at gunpoint. Education is paid for by taxes backed by guns, and attendance is compulsory. Courts backed by guns are trying to settle disputes. Licensing and consumer protection are enforced by bureaucratic, political, government guns. Then we piously tell the world we want to export freedom — with guns. Better, cost-effective freedom alternatives exist.

Ruth Bennett holds forth once again when she visited Colorado recently.

LEGALIZE FREEDOM