Two-Party System Collapsing

As the events of election year 1980 unfold, one fact becomes increasingly evident: millions upon millions of American voters are thoroughly fed up with the tired two-party system which has dominated the political process in this country for 120 years.

Not since 1912, when Teddy Roosevelt left the Republican Party to run as a "Bull Moose" Progressive, has there been such widespread talk of mass defection from the Democratic and Republican candidates for President. Political pollsters estimate that as many as 15% to 30% of the voters in November's election could decide to vote for someone other than Reagan or Carter; the prospect of a third candidate deadlocking the election—or at least holding a "balance of power" position—is being discussed widely.

At the moment, most of the speculation in this regard centers around Congressman John Anderson of Illinois, who has announced his intention to run as an Independent. But it is doubtful that Anderson will be able to muster for ballot listing in more than one-third to two-thirds of the 50 states and his organizational base is small and fluid.

Yet nationwide in 1980? It's hard to say, but several positive signs are worth noting.

First, it is probable that Clark will be listed on the ballot in all 50 states, plus the District of Columbia. No other third-party or independent candidate, including Anderson, will come anywhere near matching this achievement.

Second, as the standard-bearer of the Libertarian Party, Clark represents a coherent, identifiable point of view based on consistent principles. He makes sense, and he is clearly not an opportunist like Anderson. As the summer wears on, this distinction will become increasingly apparent to the voting public.

Third, and most important, there will be more than 500 other candidates running for office as Libertarians. Their statewide and local campaign efforts will reinforce Clark's presidential bid, and will receive added credibility from Clark's efforts in return.

In sum, the Libertarian Party is in a unique position to offer a credible alternative to the American voter. As the only party calling for radical tax cuts, non-interventionist foreign policy, and a complete end to welfare programs, the Libertarian Party is the only party that can be a real alternative to the two-party system.

NEW CLP OFFICE at 1041 Cherokee Street in Denver will serve as headquarters for the Clark and Phelps campaigns.

Colorado Libertarians Open Headquarters

Even as the Anderson For President Headquarters at 13th and Downing was closing down, the State Headquarters of the Libertarian Party and the Clark for President campaign was opening near downtown Denver.

Libertarians held an open house at their new headquarters on May 31. Those in attendance were updated on the campaign’s ballot drive, which has been completed in thirty states.

In a telegram to mark the occasion, Libertarian Party founder and nationally syndicated newspaper columnist and radio commentator John Hospodar said: "This is just the beginning. We have a mission to fulfill, a message to share, and a future to secure. The Libertarian Party and the Clark/Phefles campaign are excited to be a part of this exciting new chapter in American political history."

The Libertarian office will serve as the focal point for all the party's Colorado activities in this election year. In addition to housing the production facilities for Colorado Liberty, it will also be the location for regular functions such as the discussion group and the monthly cocktail party.

Located at 1041 Cherokee, three blocks west of Broadway and one block north of Speer Boulevard, the offices are open to the public Monday through Friday from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Visitors are encouraged to drop in and learn more about the Libertarian Party and the Clark and Phelps campaigns.

For more information, call 303-534-4444.
Jim Phelps is Senate Contender

Colorado Libertarians have chosen newspaper columnist Jim Phelps as their nominee in the U.S. Senate race this year. As the LP's candidate, Phelps will be opposing Democratic incumbent Gary Hart and a Republican contender not yet selected.

Phelps believes it is possible for him to win the Senate race this year. "Less than half of the potential voters in Colorado are registered with the two old-line parties," he notes. "The majority are either registered as unaffiliated or not registered at all.

"The Libertarian Party is in a unique position to offer a credible alternative to the American voter. As the only party calling for radical tax cuts, a non-interventionist foreign policy, and full respect for individual civil liberties, its appeal cuts across traditional lines, and offers a new direction for the alienated voter who sees little to vote for in Ronald Reagan or Jimmy Carter.

Looking beyond 1980, it appears evident that the LP will continue to build on the momentum generated by this year's campaigns, and will soon establish itself as the third major political party in the United States.

See related stories on pages 4 & 5.

TAPPING A KEG to celebrate the HQ Grand Opening on May 31. A total of 60 CLP members attended the festivities that evening.
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Editors Note: Jim's newspaper column, "Today's Logic," is carried by 32 papers in 17 states. A recent column from the series appears on page three.
From The Chair
by John L. Mason

Things are popping. The Clark campaign continues to achieve ballot status successfully. By the time you read this, we should be on the ballot in 32 states, the number we achieved in all of 1976, including two of the hardest, West Virginia and Oklahoma. Here in Colorado we have opened our new offices at 1041 Cherokee St. in Denver, and plans are underway for running state and local campaigns. And that’s our next major step.

Two years ago, we ran nine candidates for state office in Colorado. We had very little money and no experience, but three of those candidates—M.L. Hanson, Jim Phelps, and Neil Smith—achieved notable results and visibility in their campaigns. This year we can do even better. Indeed, we must do better.

The independent candidacy of John Anderson has raised a lot of questions about our prospects this year. Elsewhere in this issue, you can read an analysis of Anderson’s impact. But aside from the obvious philosophical differences between Anderson and Clark, there is a crucial political difference: unlike Anderson, Clark is backed by a real political party. The Libertarian Party has for the past eight years been forging a three-party system in this country. We’re not there quite yet, but we intend to have a long-term and continuing impact on the nature of government and politics. We are not a trendy, six month flash-in-the-pan political phenomenon that will go away as soon as a president is elected. We are a party, and we run candidates at all levels, wherever we can. It is vitally important this year, especially with the arrival of Anderson’s candidacy, that wherever possible, a voter entering the polling booth sees a Libertarian candidate for President, Vice-President, U.S. Senate, Congress, State Senate, and State House. Of course, we can’t run candidates in all the races, but we can give it our best shot. And we must.

At this time, we have an able candidate for U.S. Senate, in Jim Phelps. Members have expressed interest in three of the five Congressional races. Numerous party members have expressed interest in running for the state legislature. The office facilities and staff will be available to all candidates who need or want help. Think about the impact of all those Libertarians on the ballot and your role in the campaign. Then fill out the form on page 5 in this issue to let us know what you can do. We are the nation’s third largest party. Let’s prove it.

Discussion Group Formed

A Discussion Group has been recently organized, and will meet the first Wednesday of each month at the Libertarian Party offices at 1041 Cherokee Street in Denver.

The discussion group was organized by Bruce Werness and fourteen others to help members become familiar with Libertarian philosophy and its applications, and to help develop a greater confidence by the participants in their ability to communicate Libertarian ideas to others.

The next meeting will be held July 2nd at 7:30 p.m. The topic will be “Foreign Policy.”

Personal Privacy—Good News and Bad
by Patrick L. Lilly
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Colorado Libertarian Calendar

June 13 Debate: Market Socialism vs. Libertarianism. Allan Shelly, Asst. Prof. of Economics and David Goodrich, Libertarian, square off 7:30 p.m., Rm. #161 at the Univ. of Col. at Den., 14th & Arapahoe, Denver.

June 13 Nathaniel Branden at Stapleton Plaza Hotel at 7 p.m. For information call E.K. Kovac at 837-1655 or the CLP Office.

June 25 Libertarian Party Board meeting, 7:00 p.m. at Party Office, 1041 Cherokee, Denver.

July 2 Discussion Group, 7:30 p.m. at Party Office, 1041 Cherokee. Topic: Foreign Policy. Contact office (573-5229) or Bruce Werness (237-9315).

July 8 Clark Ad on CBS 9:55 p.m. Invite your friends over to watch!


July 11 Clark Ad on ABC 9:45 or 9:55 p.m. Invite your friends over to watch!

July 15 Colorado Liberty copy deadline and ad closing.


July 22 Beginning of petition drive for local candidates. Colorado Liberty ad material due.

July 23 Libertarian Party Board meeting, 7:00 p.m. at Party Office, 1041 Cherokee, Denver.

July 24 Clark Ad on NBC, 9:55 p.m. Invite your friends over to watch!

July 26 Colorado Liberty paste-up. Contact office for time. (573-5229)

Aug. 2, 3 Libertarian National Committee Meeting, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Contact office.

Aug. 6 Discussion Group, 7:30 p.m. at Party Office. Contact office (573-5229) or Bruce Werness (237-9315) for topic.


Aug. 27 Libertarian Party Board Meeting, 7:00 p.m. at Party Office.

Sept. 2 Petition deadline.

Sept. 3 Discussion Group.
The federal government gives and the federal government takes away.

Privacy, that is.

First, the bad news. The Federal Communications Commission, in keeping with the spirit of socialized ownership of the airwaves, has made it easier for police agencies to plant radio homing devices on individuals or their cars. Under the proposed new FCC rules, several frequencies would be opened up for this purpose, and the requirement for FCC approval of each instance of radio tagging would be removed.

At the same time, the FCC specifically rejected one electronics manufacturer's request that people other than the cops be allowed to use their products. The Commission said it was worried about "greatly expanding the capabilities of the individual to intrude electronically into the private affairs of others." So now the only people you have to worry about "intruding electronically into your private affairs" are the ones your tax money pays to do just that.

The good news is that David Miller, Carl Nicolai and William Ralphe have finally been granted their patent for an anti-bugging device for phones. The trio first filed for their patent late in 1977, but the National Security Agency put out a secrecy order which stopped the patent from being issued, and also slapped a gag order on the inventors forbidding them from discussing the mechanism of their invention with anyone.

In February, their legal battle was finally finished, and they were granted a patent for the "Phasophone." According to the patent application, the new device uses a method of scrambling voice signals which is substantially different from other methods now in use by federal agents and others. The inventors claim that a conversation scrambled with a Phasophone is virtually impossible to decode with any other equipment; the recipient must have another Phasophone and the proper code information.

NSA agents had obtained their gag order based on the contention that the device would be a "threat to national security" because the NSA regularly spies on foreign government officials in this country. It is uncertain just when the Phasophone will become available on the market, or how much it will cost. It would have to be pretty expensive, though, to not be worth it.

---
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Foreign Policy & Strategic Defense
Two Libertarian Perspectives

Strategic Disengagement: Prerequisite for Peace
by Mark David Travis

Last year, Students for a Libertarian Society and other anti-draft organizations successfully resisted efforts by congressional forces to reactivate the Selective Service. Congressional hawks, who tried desperately to bring back conscription, were compelled by strong public opposition to suspend deliberations on pro-draft legislation.

Since that time, however, the world scene has changed dramatically. Following the takeover of the American embassy in Iran and the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, the hawks have revived the political initiative once again. Aided by the sensational media coverage, these developments elicited military factionalism in the press and government that has conspired to usher in a new wave of war hysteria.

Having been subjected for several months to a mawkish outpouring of patriotic fervor and outright jingoism, the American people—who vehemently opposed the draft only six months ago—have become the unwitting victims of a disease masquerading as its own cure: the statist policies of domestic regulation and foreign intervention. The prognosis appears reasonably certain: an intensification of geopolitical conflict and the increased possibility of war.

As America's extended post-WWII empire of client regimes disintegrates, our strategic interests will become engaged with increasing frequency. Because of the unavoidable decline in our capacity to project our power overseas (which, incidentally, has very little to do with defense), we are now confronted with global troop commitments so vast and economic "vital interests" so

Strategic Defense: Minimizing Costs & Risks
by David F. Nolan

The questions of foreign policy and national defense are among the most vexing of many that face our society. Men and women of good will will disagree vehemently as to what course we should pursue, and even among Libertarians—who are united on basic principles—there is considerable dispute.

Much of this disagreement, I am convinced, stems more from misunderstandings and failures to communicate than from any fundamental differences regarding the kind of world we seek to create. Virtually all of us, I believe, would agree that an ideal approach to foreign affairs and defense strategy would satisfy the following conditions:

1. It would minimize the likelihood of our becoming involved in armed conflict—especially nuclear war;
2. It would assure that, in the event of a nuclear attack, we would survive with minimum damage;
3. It would minimize the costs to the American people, both in terms of economics and impositions on individual freedom.

Unfortunately, we live in a world where risk-cost tradeoffs are necessary. We cannot "zero" any of these three factors without leading to unacceptable increases in the other costs or risks.

At one extreme, spending nothing on defense would certainly reduce costs, and might reduce the risk of war—then again, it might not—but it would offer no assurance of surviving a nuclear attack. At the other extreme, a massive national security program might maximize prospects for survival under attack, but at the cost of our having invulnerability for ourselves. Instead, we rely on a threat—the threat of mass destruction of innocent people if our own population is harmed. "You kill 50 million of our people, and we'll kill 50 million of yours."

This doctrine is morally reprehensible and rightly repugnant to Libertarians. And because the present-day debate among conventional politicians implicitly equates defense with retaliation, many Libertarians look with disfavor on anyone who advocates a strengthened defense system.

Repelled by the moral assumptions of those who advocate ever-larger, ever-costlier, ever-nastier retaliation systems, many of us throw ourselves uncritically into the opposite camp—joining those who call sincerely for disarmament, dismissing the threat of totalitarian powers and extending the benefit of every doubt to some of the world's leading mass-murderers.

This is a knee-jerk reaction and it is a mistake. The present debate pivots on a false dichotomy, "More of the same" and "disarmament in the face of threat" are not the only choices. There is a third alternative, and it is the one that we should be advocating.

That alternative, put simply, is a true defense system: one which does not rely on the threat of mass retaliatory destruction after the fact, but instead assures that we can knock down anything anyone throws at us. A shield, rather than a stockpile of grenades.

Such an approach is not only unquestionably superior in its morality, but also comes far closer to optimizing our risk-cost ratio. A purely defensive system, based on
Today's Logic

by Jim Phelps

If you are in favor of the draft, consider these points:

1. The defense of our country and our freedoms is the most important duty of our government.

2. Our troops overseas, in Europe and elsewhere, could not begin to stop Russia from conquering any country she chooses except, possibly, the U.S. itself. Russia's overwhelming superiority in manpower, tanks and other conventional firepower would quickly take over any individual country or all of Europe.

3. Having our troops on foreign soil would delay the conquest a day or two, or perhaps a week or two. It would not change the final result. Our troops would act as a trip wire to get us involved in a war immediately.

4. Bringing all our troops home would save us billions of dollars now and tens of thousands of trained soldiers in the event of war.

5. The savings we would make by bringing our troops home would enable us to pay all members of our All Volunteer Army more money. That way we would have all the volunteers we need so no draft would be necessary.

6. We should never fight another land war anywhere in the world. To do so without nuclear weapons would be useless. Suppose we were to fight such a war and be on the verge of losing it. Rather than lose our freedoms and be subjected to massacres a hundred times worse than those in Cambodia, we would surely fire our nuclear missiles. Conversely, if Russia were to be on the verge of losing, she would fire her nuclear missiles. (Is there any doubt Hitler would have done so if he had possessed them?)

7. If nuclear missiles were fired anywhere at the end of such a war, why lose millions of soldiers first?

8. We would be much more likely to stop or prevent such a war by making it clear that we would use our nuclear weapons. Perhaps not on the enemy's territory, but on the enemy's soldiers who invade our territory or our Allies' territory. Thus, if Russia invaded West Germany, we would, at the request of West Germany, annihilate the invaders on West German soil.

9. To be willing to fight a war in this manner would not require more soldiers than we now have and, therefore, would not require any drafting.

10. Finally, it would be hypocritical of us to take away the freedoms of our young people and force them to defend our freedoms.

Mark Trais is a senior majoring in economics at the University of Colorado at Denver and is the Denver coordinator for the Students for a Libertarian Society.

1980-81 OFFICERS of the Colorado Libertarian Party. Standing, left to right, are Dick Eshelman, Membership Director; John Williams, Campaigns Director; Larry Pelkenbrock, Finance Director; Dave Nolan, Communications Director. Seated in front is John Mason, State Chair.
The Anderson Factor

Many Libertarian activists are understandably concerned about the effect that John Anderson's Independent campaign for the presidency may have on the Clark for President campaign.

Since well before Anderson announced his Independent effort, Clark for President Headquarters has been monitoring Anderson's plans and analyzing his potential impact—sometimes with information supplied directly by Anderson's own supporters.

Our conclusion: That in the long run—before the end of the campaign—Anderson's candidacy will benefit the Clark campaign and the Libertarian Party.

This conclusion is based on three factors: ballot status, voter perception, and the message of the campaign.

In terms of ballot status, it appears virtually certain that Ed Clark will be on more state ballots than will Anderson. Anderson declared as an Independent too late to qualify for the ballots in Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, New Mexico, and Ohio—all five of which will list Clark.

In terms of voter perception, Anderson's position is far less tenable than Clark's. Anderson and his campaign have been subjected to little critical examination thus far, but instead have been hailed as the source of "new ideas." Of course, Anderson's ideas are as new as a Wendell Willkie button. Once this is perceived, Anderson's image is likely to be tarnished considerably.

Anderson's entry into the race does serve the important purpose of desanctifying the Two Party System, as well as sensitizing the news media to the institutional problems faced by all third party candidates. As Anderson's image declines, voters who are willing to accept the option of a candidate who is neither a Republican nor a Democrat will remain in the market for a true alternative.

Anderson must prove that he can win; there is no other reason for his campaign. If such proof is not forthcoming, he won't be perceived as a serious candidate. Clark, on the other hand, is building a permanent organization and movement in the political sphere which should continue to grow after 1980. Clark needn't demonstrate that he will win in order to impress voters and observers with the fact that he is succeeding in his objectives.

In terms of message, of course, Anderson has serious problems. He is a self-described "centrist," a combination of the worst aspects of both Republicans and Democrats. He is explicitly pro-taxes and pro-government.

His appeal thus far has not been from his ideas, but rather from his willingness to take positions which are likely to be unpopular with his audience. His appeals for "sacred" strike a certain responsive chord with some people, most of whom are bright and well-remained. He doesn't mean them. In fact, as he begins his campaign as an Independent, he is less willing to take unpopular positions, preferring instead to speak before audiences composed mostly of his own supporters.

There is encouraging evidence to indicate that Clark and Anderson will receive equal exposure as the campaign progresses. Already, the two received equal billing at the annual banquet of the White House Correspondents Association, as well as at the write-up of the event in the Washington Post.

To summarize, Clark and Anderson are starting from completely different levels: Anderson, a well-known figure in the public eye; Clark, who has consciously concentrated his efforts thus far in gaining ballot status and building an organization before emerging into view. Anderson's impact is likely to diminish even as Clark's impact grows greater during the summer and fall.

The initial goals of the Clark campaign—creating a three party system, building a strong, permanent organization, and establishing a national awareness and interest in Libertarian ideas—are well within reach. Anderson or no Anderson, these goals can and will be achieved.

---

Join the Core of the New Coalition

Is Anderson Two-Faced?

Washington, D.C. (May 9)—John Anderson was criticized today by Ed Crane, Communications Director for Libertarian presidential candidate Ed Clark. Anderson, according to Crane, "is being disingenuous in his recent attacks on the two party system."

In a May 8 article in the Washington Post, Anderson is quoted as stating, "They say the two-party system has a lock on this country. I say no." Crane claimed that "Anderson's record in Congress proves that he himself helped to break the two-party control of the electoral process."

As evidence of "Anderson's duplicity" on the matter, Crane cited the Congressman's testimony on federal elections before the House Subcommittee on Elections on October 16, 1973. "When this landmark legislation was being discussed in Congress," said Crane, "John Anderson was its leading Republican proponent, and he made no bones about how it would protect the two major parties from competition."

In the testimony, Anderson said, "But I hardly need remind the committee that there are other important objectives as well. It is imperative that there be strong institutions capable of fashioning consensus and reconciling diverse interests and views. The alternative is perpetual governmental stalemate and inertia. I believe that our political parties perform that aggregating and consensus forming role, so it is vitally imperative that the changes we adopt not discourage their ability to thrive."

The testimony continued, "Thus, in designing a public finance program, we must take care to see that political parties are encouraged and strengthened rather than undermined them because of this important institutional influence that they can have on the whole political process."

"Anderson," said Crane, "might be admired for the audacity with which he so candidly discusses the real motivation behind the Federal Election Campaign Act if it weren't for the hypocrisy it exposes in his current position."

Crane also charged that Anderson's views on the subject had not changed as late as November 15, 1976 when, in a panel discus-
This is the year to build a new coalition in American politics. Of former liberals and former conservatives who oppose government intervention both in domestic and foreign affairs. Of non-voters in search of a real alternative. Of people from all walks of life who view government as the problem, not the solution, and who find new hope in Ed Clark and the Libertarian party.

At the core of this new coalition are tens of thousands of Libertarians all over the country who are making an extraordinary commitment to the Ed Clark for President campaign in this election year. If you're a Libertarian, you can help this campaign make a dramatic breakthrough in our quest to create a free, prosperous, and peaceful society.

Join the core of the new coalition. Make your commitment. This is the year.

---

**Latest EPA Madness**

Excerpted from an Environmental Impact Statement:

"Field Methodology: The forty acre area was covered in random meandering pedestrian transects. The access road was covered with 1-16 meter meandering pedestrian transect. Five lithics were observed on the access road. Special attention was given to rodents, backdirt, and beds and open areas.

"Results and Recommendations: No cultural materials were observed except for the five lithics and ceramic jug pieces (see map). Cultural resource clearance is recommended for the location."

What it really means is a lot simpler than it sounds. Two archaeologists walked down a path through a grassy field, encountering evidence of rodents and ants (of no apparent concern to the EPA), then along a road where they encountered 5 rocks (lithics) and broken containers of recent vintage (because of the recommendation, obviously not evidence of an ancient culture).

Ken Riggs, whose company paid $3,500 for the entire report ($350 for archaeologists) suggests that the report demonstrates "how a specialized, non-communicative vocabulary can arise as part of regulatory rituals, intending to lend credence to an activity of questionable value."

But just think of all those happily employed bureaucrats!
GOP Showdown—End of an Era

by David F. Nolan

As of this writing, the race for the Elephant Party’s presidential nomination is all but over. Barring a heart attack or a faux pas of gigantic proportions, former California Governor Ronald Reagan has it locked up.

The implications of a Reagan-Carter matchup in November are many, and I will explore them in some depth in a future issue of Colorado Liberty. For now, however, I would like to offer some observations on the state of the Republican Party—specifically, to look beyond this year’s contest and hazard some guesses as to the shape of the GOP in years to come. For the present preoccupation with the election at hand has tended to obscure a major fact: that the GOP is now at the end of one era, and about to enter another.

Look back over the last 20 years, and you will note that GOP affairs have largely been dominated by a small handful of men—Nixon, Rockefeller, Goldwater, Ford, and Reagan. Struggles within the party have centered around these men; disputes over policy and strategy have been conducted in their names, by their partisans and hirelings.

Reagan’s current quest for the nomination represents the final act in this two-decade-long play. In the event that he is elected president, he will de facto become the major force in shaping his party’s future.

The Gold Standard Has Its Time Come Again?

by Phil Peacock

God rules in Heaven, but money rules on earth. Even the Devil dances for gold.

For a long time now, gold has been used as a means of exchange and a measure of wealth and value; it was the primary medium of exchange. As a result, they like to do this because it allows them to spend without having to raise taxes to pay for it. Since there are now more receipts but not more gold, each receipt is worth less.

Obviously, money has value to the citizen only as long as he can accept it with the confidence that it will be bought and sold for a fair amount of value.
as a means of exchange and a measure of wealth and value; it was the primary medium of exchange when prosperous merchants thronged the streets of Babylon six thousand years ago, and it still stands as one of the few true stores of value and probably will remain so far into the future.

Why should we worry about gold today, now that our government has abandoned it as a money system? Well, despite the denials of politicians, gold is money. And one of the most important characteristics of gold as money is that its quantity can't be easily increased without effort, just as it takes effort to increase the quantity of any other wealth be it a bushel of corn or a Cadillac.

Gold has the disadvantage of being inconvenient at times, especially for large transactions, so in the past certain people got into the business of warehousing others' gold and issuing receipts. For convenience, it became common practice to trade the receipts rather than the gold itself—which was fine as long as the gold represented by the receipt was actually in the warehouse. It's important to understand that the receipt isn't money and has no value itself; its worth derives solely from the fact that it can be redeemed for gold.

Unfortunately, politicians got into the act and decided that they were going to control the money system by holding the gold and issuing the receipts. The problems began when the politicians started issuing more receipts (currency) than they had gold to issue.

Obviously, money has value to the citizen only as long as he can accept it with the confidence that it can be exchanged for something of value and that the value it represents will remain relatively stable. It's an interesting historical note that every paper currency not backed by silver or gold has eventually collapsed.

All indications are that the United States is rapidly approaching a currency crisis. Our inflation rate has reached such a level that it is virtually out of control—and despite record interest rates, borrowing continues at an almost frantic pace. Many government spending programs have built-in escalators indexed to the cost of living, so that the costs tend to snowball. Since the politicians, and perhaps many citizens, aren't willing to take the necessary unpleasant steps to resolve the crisis, the politicians' only recourse is to keep increasing the money supply—which, of course, makes the inflation just that much worse.

Current economic trends indicate that a return to the gold standard is the only viable alternative to eventual runaway inflation. Without some kind of backing, our currency will eventually become worthless, and only those holding something of real value will survive with their assets intact. If the dollar were immediately rebacked by gold, the total amount of dollars divided by the gold in Fort Knox would put the price of gold over $1,500 per ounce, so anyone holding gold would come out way ahead. If a new currency is issued (a definite possibility), those holding gold will at least retain the value they had before the collapse; they might not come out very much ahead, but at least they won't lose everything.

There is going to be a lot of evasion and fingerpointing by many politicians to avoid dealing with this problem, and many of them will even believe their ridiculous arguments and accusations—but don't you believe them. There will certainly be fluctuations in the gold and silver market, but the long-term trend will be toward precious metals. Anyone who understands money and why and how it works will have some of his assets in gold or silver. In these troubled economic times, it's the best insurance you can have.

Government is an association of men who do violence to the rest of us.

LEO TOLSTOY
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National Committee Meets

The Libertarian National Committee held its quarterly meeting in Dallas, Texas, on May 3 and 4. The meeting coincided with the Southwest Libertarian Conference which was hosted by the Texas party.

Speaking at the conference was Libertarian presidential candidate, Ed Clark, who left early to attend a press banquet in Washington, D.C., at the request of U.S. News and World Report.

Roy Childs, editor of Libertarian Review, delivered an impassioned speech on the bright prospects for the Libertarian Party's future, which was received enthusiastically by the audience of over 100. On Sunday, Childs addressed the conference with a detailed analysis of American foreign policy. In both speeches, Childs presented Libertarian proposals as the only alternative for a world of peace and prosperity, and stressed the clearly humanitarian reasons that demand the adoption of our positions.

Other speakers included National Vice-Chair M.L. Hanson and Party co-founder Dave Nolan, both from Colorado, who participated in a panel on political communications.

Announced at the National Committee meeting was Dick Randolph's long-anticipated decision on the U.S. Senate race in Alaska. Randolph, who could not attend because of his duties as the nation's first Libertarian legislator, announced that he would run for re-election to the Alaska State Legislature. The decision was part of the Alaska Libertarian strategy to become a more effective and perhaps even dominant element in the Alaska legislature this year.

With good prospects for electing a number of additional Libertarians to the House, Randolph felt that his experience and reputation would be best used in forging an effective Libertarian caucus. He left open the possibility that he would run for Governor in 1982.

The major action taken by the National Committee was the creation of a Special Platform Committee, charged with preparing a comprehensive plan for the constant review of the Party Platform, and developing a Platform that would expire upon appointment of the regular committee. In other action, the National Committee approved distribution of three ads prepared by Dave Nolan and the Advertising/Publications Committee. The ads will be provided to state and local parties at a nominal fee. One of the ads is shown on the last page of this issue of Colorado Liberty.

M.L. Hanson was appointed Finance Committee Chair and authorized to immediately undertake a fund raising effort on behalf of the National Headquarters.

Handy Household Guide to Potentially Prosecutable Paraphernalia

-exact image content-

Paraphernalia Ban Effective July 1

The government's war on drugs continues to escalate and Colorado has joined the bandwagon. Effective July 1, it will be against the law to possess or sell drug paraphernalia in the State of Colorado.

Legislators, not to mention the Governor and Attorney General, have been fully aware of the constitutional frailty of this law all along. Indeed, they are probably aware that the fear of such legislation being passed has
SUBSCRIBE TO COLORADO LIBERTY

After only six issues, COLORADO LIBERTY is already widely acclaimed as the best libertarian newspaper in the nation. Regular contents include:

- News items on national and local issues.
- Commentary/opinion columns by LP Founder Dave Nolan, Jim Phelps, John Mason, Mark Travis, Patrick Lilly, and others.
- National dialogue between LP leaders, in M.L. Hanson's "Vice Versa" column.
- Plus cartoons, reprints of items from other sources, and cryptic observations.

Look through this issue, and you'll see why people are talking about COLORADO LIBERTY. Then mail in the coupon below, and receive six issues for only $5.

TO: COLORADO LIBERTY, P.O. Box 1557
Denver, Colorado 80201

Please send me six issues. Enclosed is $5.
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We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. THOMAS JEFFERSON
U.S. Declaration of Independence
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The War Against Pleasure-Seekers

by Patrick L. Lilly

One year ago, this paper carried an analysis on the subject of victimless “crimes,” and the distortion of language and logic which is necessary to their continued prosecution. What was said then is, perhaps, even more timely today. For the intervening year has seen little progress in this area of legal reform. Indeed, it has seen the emergence of an anti-hedonistic revival which seriously threatens all the progress which libertarians have made against legally-enforced conformity over the last decade.

That progress has truly been tenuous. Few laws have actually been repealed, as they should have been. Few secret police agencies have been abolished, or even had their authorities seriously cut back by statute. For the most part, progress has consisted solely of a slight change in attitude, a shift in executive branch priorities, and the lessening of a few penalties. These actions were undertaken at the discretion of the state, and can be completely reversed at that same discretion. In 1980, the political forces are again building, no longer on the defensive, to accomplish that reversal. It could happen any time now—and very quickly—compared with the agonizing slowness of liberalization in the past.

The most serious threat comes in the area of drug prohibition laws. A feature story in the New York Times Magazine this past February tells of the rapid growth around the country of grass-roots pressure groups formed to reinforce the rotting foundations of marijuana prohibition. These groups, formed by (and mostly of) parents who are aghast that their children smoke marijuana, are rallying around the “save our children” argument that prohibitionists and censors have traditionally turned to when the public’s receptivity to their proposals flags. They are getting, predictably, the assistance of the government schools in spreading their message.

Their basic message is, of course, that pot is bad for you, especially if you are young, but also incontrovertible evidence of some mental instability which must be stamped out at all costs.

The hapless individuals herded into these programs—under threat of imprisonment—find their very personalities and personal values under attack. They must publicly acknowledge the state’s metaphysics, and agree to help convert others to it, in order to keep themselves out of jail.

Here in Colorado, the renewed war is in full swing. The Republican-controlled legislature recently passed a ban on the possession of all drug paraphernalia. But it should come as no real surprise that substantial numbers of Democrats have jumped on the prohibition bandwagon. The pressure groups which have been formed are nothing if not vocal, and are busy flexing their political muscle. Teachers’ groups, “service” organizations, and, of course, law enforcement agencies, are all busily lobbying for more discretionary power for the police.

Lack of principle is, alas, the root cause of the opposition’s poor preparedness. Those who stood to lose the most from this kind of legislation delayed—indeed, seemed adamant about delaying—doing anything to temper the threat. When the political trial balloon was floated, in the form of a proposal to force record stores out of the paraphernalia business, the owners of many head shops actually supported the idea, figuring that it would reduce their competition. The prohibitionists must now be having a good guffaw into their sleeves at this—since, by seeking a benefit from state intervention into the market, the head shops merely helped to cut their own throats. They emboldened the prohibitionists, and are now in danger of being run out of business themselves.

The war on personal pleasure is proceeding on other fronts, as well. Colorado Springs virtually eliminated both massage parlors and escort services within the last year, and now the police in Denver are seeking a change in the law to ban escort services with a sense of humor.
message.
Their basic message is, of course, that pot is bad for you, especially if you are young. And, of course, insofar as they seek simply to educate people and persuade them peacefully to their point of view, libertarians have no objection to their actions. Alas, that is not as far as they go.

One of the first places the new prohibitionists go for help in "persuading" people is the police department. Vice squads nationwide, their image badly deteriorating of late, naturally welcome this new wave of people urging them to enforce prohibition more, not less, enthusiastically.

Among the results, already beginning to emerge, are revitalized networks of spies and informers, larger numbers of adolescents and young adults herded into "rehabilitation" indoctrination programs, and, of course, more vicious busts and stiff sentences for the evil "pushers" (i.e., entrepreneurs).

It shouldn't be overlooked, either, that the "rehabilitation" programs, which often involve monstrous invasions of civil liberties, are rarely greeted with hostility by liberals, who persist in the delusion that this type of handling of drug "offenders" is somehow better than imprisonment. Imprisonment has at least a kind of brutal honesty to it. "Rehabilitation," on the other hand, gets harder and harder all the time to distinguish from the "re-education" which Communist countries work upon people who refuse to accept the state's version of reality. In this country, just as in all Communist countries, the official version of reality says that recreational use of drugs is not only morally wrong.

Anita tops Unpopularity Poll

One of the more interesting sidelights of the annual Capitol Hill People's Fair, held May 10th and 11th at East High, was the "Political Unpopularity Poll," sponsored by the Libertarian Party and the Ed Clark for President Committee. Asked to vote for the "biggest turkey of them all," and voting with their money, fair-goers cast their ballots in a surprising fashion.

Candidates included campaign front runners Carter, Kennedy, and Reagan; Iranian rulers the Shah and the Ayatollah; and the fundamentalist orange-spokesperson, Anita Bryant.

President Jimmy Carter, described as "perhaps the most inept President ever," finished last (least unpopular) in the balloting.

and escort services within the last year, and now the police in Denver are seeking a change in the law to ban escort services there. They boldly admit that they cannot show that the people they want to imprison are breaking any law, so they simply ask that what their prey are doing be made illegal.

In short, the forces of conformity are on the offensive again, and those who value freedom in general, or who want to live a lifestyle that is in any way unconventional, had better take note and commit themselves to action soon. If they can do it to somebody else, they can do it to you, too.

Most of this, of course, could have been prevented, if the eight Libertarians who ran for seats in the legislature in 1978 had been elected; instead, most of those seats are now held by Republicans. With Republicans in control of both houses, anti-choice legislation is pitifully easy to pass. Think long and hard about that in November.

Free men are free because they are ornery and don't let the government take their kind of things. They're free because of the freedom they're given. They're free because they have the freedom to do what they want. They're free for the way they think and the way they act. They're free for the way they dress and the way they talk. They're free for the way they live and the way they die.

—R.A. Heinlein
Revolt in 2100
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A MONSTER IS LOOSE UPON THE LAND.

Our government has become a monster.
Its policies of ever-increasing taxation, regulation, and inflation have crippled our economy and given us ten-cent dollars.
Every aspect of our personal lives is subject to its constant scrutiny and intervention; the new Omnibus Crime Bill (S.1722) comes to mind.

We're dedicated to restoring the American Dream. By radically reducing the size and power of government, and setting people free to live as they choose, so long as they respect the same right of others.
We stand uncompromisingly for individual freedom.
Omnibus Crime Bill (S 1722), now pending in Congress, would make its police-state powers all but complete.

Its constant interventions in the affairs of peoples around the world have earned us massive ill-will and magnified the risk of war. And now, once again, there is talk of conscripting young Americans to fight and die in foreign lands.

Responsibility for these conditions lies with the politicians — Republican and Democrat alike — who have controlled our destiny for too long.

But now, there's a new party. The Libertarian Party.

uncompromisingly for civil liberties, a free-market economy, and a non-interventionist foreign policy.

And our opposition to conscription — for any purpose — is total.

If that sounds like what you've been looking for, we invite you to join the hundreds of candidates and thousands of individual members who are working to build a real alternative in American politics.

The Libertarian Party. 2300 Wisconsin Avenue, NW. Washington, DC 20007.