



FREE
TAKE ONE

P E N N S Y L V A N I A

L I B E R T Y

APRIL 1987

Volume 2, Number 4



THE DRAFT: A PERIL FROM WITHIN

by Drew Clark

"Where is it written in the Constitution that you may take children from their parents, and parents from their children, and compel them to fight the battles of any war in which the folly or wickedness of the government may engage it?"

-Daniel Webster

December 9, 1814

Misery loves company. How ironic that Selective Service, the independent agency charged with the miserable task of preparing for America's next draft, enjoys the political company of both the left and the right. The draft is a fundamental violation of our civil liberties - and quite possibly a form of "involuntary servitude" prohibited by the 13th Amendment. But the continued presence of draft registration bears testimony to the fact that neither Republicans nor Democrats ultimately care about the rights of young American citizens. Both hawks and doves are so caught up in their collectivist views of society that they don't even think twice about threatening to deprive individual men and women of

their most sacred freedom.

Conservative Blinders

Conservatives, unfortunately, view every corner of the globe - from Nicaragua and the Philippines to Israel and Western Europe - as vital enough to justify committing sizable portions of our Pentagon budget. The fact that preserving this role as world policeman may require that the garrison state be stoked with draftable young men - over and above the necessary tax dollars - is of little concern to those who do the United States' strategic planning.

Even though the military has seen dramatic increases in both the number of recruits and their scores on the Armed Forces Qualification Test during Reagan's presidency, Pentagon professionals gloomily note that the number of men who are 18 to 21 years of age will drop from 7.8 million this year to 6.6 million in 1995 and predict that a peacetime draft is bound to return in the 1990's if the nation's military plans stay on track.

In an interesting twist of conservative logic, many rightwingers actually argue that a draft could save the nation

money. If everyone had to serve in the military, Uncle Sam would no longer need to pay competitive wages to lure prospects into the armed forces. However, this argument conveniently leaves out the Introductory Economics concept of opportunity cost - it ignores the resources society wastes when every young person must donate two years of their life to the state.

More principled defenders of the free market have contested this view, and in a statement arguing against any moves toward the reimposition of the draft, 143 economists, including Nobel Laureate Milton Friedman and White House economic experts Beryl Sprinkel and James Miller, argued in part that "saying that a draft would reduce the cost of the military is like saying that the pyramids were cheap because they were built with slave labor."

Liberals Worse

Instead, conservatives commonly claim that the draft is a test of patriotic will and declare that citizens must respect majority decisions in all cases. But while Republican rhetoric is bad on this issue, one could argue that the

Democratic record is worse. Remember that it was Jimmy Carter, the human rights advocate from Plains, who reintroduced draft registration in May 1980. Even more curious, then-candidate Ronald Reagan wrote in a letter that "the draft or draft registration destroys the very values our society is committed to defending", and consistently campaigned against such registration. Obviously, Reagan has trimmed his ideological sails more than a little since then, but today it is still the Democrats who press hardest for the draft. Gary Hart, the 1984 dark horse presidential candidate who has emerged as the 1988 Democratic front runner - and a favorite among college students - remains the most prominent advocate of a return to national military service. One of the Senate's most liberal members (the past summer he received a 99 percent approval rating from Americans for Democratic Action), Hart's view of the draft is "a program of universal national service in which all young people would be given the option of serving in either a military or nonmilitary capacity."

(continued on page 4)

THE DRUG WAR

by Andy Barniskis

Old-line conservatives and others who abhor drugs and what they can do to our society, probably felt a thrill of euphoria when the House passed its drug bill 382-16 on September 11 last year. Given that an election-year Congress is a fairly accurate barometer of the country's mood, euphoria may be widespread.

From Nowhere to Crisis

An ABC News poll of what Americans considered the nation's most serious problem indicated almost no concern for drugs a year and a half ago. Late last year a similar poll showed 80 percent thought drugs were our most serious problem.

Many people are relieved that federal officials, after years of appearing powerless to stop the flow of drugs, have decided to get tough. The bill provides for the death penalty for dealers and military forces on our borders. It relaxes search and seizure laws that have rendered evidence inadmissible. And it makes \$300 million available to escalate the war on drugs.

I might share in the euphoria except for one thing: I remember experiencing those emotions once before and I remember all too clearly what followed.

"Getting Tough" Last Time

It was an afternoon in August, 1964, and I was fishing along the banks of a quiet lake in Bucks County. A news bulletin came over a portable radio announcing that American patrol boats had been attacked by the North Vietnamese in the Gulf of Tonkin and that U.S. planes were retaliating.

I remember clearly my feelings of relief and euphoria. As one of the generation born at the end of World War II and raised in a society sold on the infallibility of American policy, I shared the frustration over the indignities visited upon us by the communists over the years. It seemed we were always turning the other cheek.

But no more. We had finally gotten tough. We were shooting real bullets and dropping real bombs. The bad guys were getting what was coming to them and soon all would be right with the world. But oddly, on that day in 1964, a sudden chill ran down my spine, like the chill folklore says results from somebody walking on your grave.

It may not have been my grave but the graves of more than 50,000 of my generation of Americans. A little more than a year from that day in 1964, I was a draftee in basic combat training. Five years later, I

was a veteran being snubbed on campus. More than 10 years later I shared the humiliation of our country's first military defeat.

Perhaps that's why the news of the escalating war on drugs leaves me with no euphoria - only the chill down my spine. I fear this escalation, too, will turn out to be not a cure but a new potentially fatal disease.

Ominous Parallel

Maybe I'm reaching too far for an analogy but I think there's an important and ominous parallel.

Just as widespread frustration over the success of communist imperialism in the post-WWII era led to unconstrained power in the executive branch, frustration over the perceived drug explosion has led to calls for emergency powers for federal officials.

While most people are aware that Lyndon Johnson used such powers to escalate the Vietnam War to a degree unimagined in 1964, few are aware of the grave danger that later presidential "emergency powers" created. On October 30, 1969, Richard Nixon issued a broad Executive Order giving the president power to act "in any national emergency type of situation." Government agencies could take over just about all services and citizens could be mobilized into work brigades.

I'm suspicious of a "national drug emergency" which gives broad power for death sentences. Experience suggests such ambiguous wording can and will be interpreted for political purposes.

I'm also suspicious of turning our military forces into a national police force. Even the massive increase in federal funding for local forces smacks of this, since we have two decades of proof that federal funding translates into federal control.

The use of improperly obtained evidence seized in warrantless searches should not even require discussion; it's

FREEDOM ERODING

Does your 5-year-old child have a Social Security number yet? Well, "Big Brother" at the Internal Revenue Service tells us that he/she will be needing one as a consequence of the new income tax "reform" law (signed by a president who promised "to get government off our backs").

Have you turned over your Social Security number to your landlord? If you live in a Pittsburgh apartment building, the "Big Brother" at the city Finance Department requires landlords to turn in this

unconstitutional. The vague requirement that evidence be obtained "in good faith" amounts to no restriction at all.

Most of all, I'm suspicious of a "national emergency" which moved from being off the charts two years ago to top Administration priority just last year.

Inevitable Failure

The war on drugs is not going to work. Increasing the risks for drug dealers is only going to drive drug prices (and profits) that much higher, attracting more ambitious but disadvantaged young people into the trade. There will be the added glamour and macho appeal of risking a death sentence. We should remember that even Thomas Jefferson, otherwise our most libertarian

President, supported a death sentence for smuggling 180 years ago. Naturally, that failed to stop it.

Don't get me wrong. I'm not an advocate of drugs. I have two children, one of them just entering his teens, so drugs worry me. But the flow of drugs over our borders could increase tenfold and my kids could remain safe simply by doing what I did 20 years ago - saying "no". They might find it very difficult to say no to an unconstrained government. And unconstrained governments have been responsible for far more deaths throughout history than all the drugs ever manufactured.

(Andy Barniskis is an unaffiliated civic activist and writer in Bucks County. This article appeared on in the Bucks County Courier Times.)



"OK, PAL, LIBERTY WEEKEND'S OVER—UP AGAINST THE WALL! WE GOTTA CHECK THAT MAGAZINE FOR DIRTY PICTURES... LET'S SEE YOUR HETEROSEXUAL CONDUCT LICENSE... YOU BEEN SMOKING ANY CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES? FILL UP THIS BOTTLE, PLEASE..."



The Libertarian Party Is...

The Libertarian Party has two major principles: 1) Each individual has sole dominion over his own life and the fruits of his labor; 2) No individual or group has the right to initiate force (or the threat of force) or fraud against others.

These two principles are applied equally to economic liberties and civil liberties. Whereas liberals tend to support civil liberties, they do not hesitate to violate individual rights when it comes to intervening in and controlling the economy and how you spend your money. In a similar fashion, conservatives pay lip service to voluntary trade with little government interference in the market, but they don't hesitate to violate individual rights when it comes to legislating their version of morality.

The Libertarian Party is the only political party which applies the principles of liberty equally to civil and economic issues.

information on their ominous sounding "Tenant Registration Form".

During 1984, the news media did a good job of keeping the issue of "Big Brother" in front of us constantly. George Orwell's famous novel of a futuristic society where "individual rights" have been replaced by an all powerful government has faded from the spotlight.

But a few of us (American Civil Liberties Union members and libertarian "Big Brother" watchers) have not forgotten Mr. Orwell's warning. A new year is about to start and "Big Brother" continues to nibble away at our freedom.

It will soon be 1984 plus three. Do you know where your freedom is tonight?

(This letter was written by LPP member Leo Alman, and published in The Pittsburgh Press, 12/26/86)

"HELP" HURTS CONTRAS

by Jorge E. Amador

Ronald Reagan has been pushing Congress hard to approve \$100 million in additional aid to the "contra" fighters in Nicaragua. In his zeal to overthrow that country's Sandinista regime, he has labeled it a Soviet "beachhead" in the Western Hemisphere, a "malignancy" that, if left unchecked, will spread until it becomes a "mortal threat."

The clear implication is that anyone who doesn't agree with his proposal is unwittingly (or otherwise) helping to perpetuate Marxist rule and permitting the communist disease to consume the Americas. It is better to assist the contras in order to pressure the Sandinistas into a favorable settlement of the conflict, says the President.

Fears of a new Vietnam

Some Democrats and others, while agreeing that the Sandinistas must be contained somehow, oppose Reagan's plan and liken his statements to those of Vietnam War-era hawks who warned that the communists would land in California if they were not contained at the South Vietnam border. Reagan's opponents, like Rep. Albert Bustamante (D-TX), prefer a negotiated arrangement without military pressure, in the hope that the Sandinistas, feeling secure in their domain, will expand political freedoms and refrain from exporting their "revolution." Says Bustamante, "Serious diplomacy has not been given a chance." Some warn that the only military approach with any hope of success may be precisely that which failed at such high cost in Vietnam--the commitment of American troops.

Both sides are partially correct. Reagan is right that the Sandinistas' repressive regime will not soon go away

unless steps are taken to counter it. And the President's liberal and moderate opponents are also right in arguing that throwing money at the problem isn't going to make the situation any better.

But both sides are partially wrong. If a negotiated settlement takes place without strong pressure on the Sandinistas, they will continue, in the name of "social justice" and "fighting poverty," to tax and regulate what's left of Nicaragua's market economy, closing the door of opportunity to millions of their countrymen and assuring Nicaragua's continued poverty. If they remain in power, Ortega and his followers will keep spreading socialist dogma among young Nicaraguans in the name of "promoting literacy," and they will prevent the expression of dissent by making it ever more difficult to gather the capital that's needed to operate independent newspapers.

Military Pressure Wrong

However, for the United States to apply military pressure on Ortega's government, directly or through the contras, plays right into Ortega's hands and strengthens, not weakens, his grip on the people. The United States has a bad reputation in Nicaragua, as elsewhere among intellectual circles in the Third World, for browbeating small nations into submission. At home and abroad, the Sandinistas elicit sympathy for their rule by exploiting the fact that the United States installed and then supported the hated Somoza dynasty for half a century prior to their successful revolt in 1979.

Reagan's request for aid to the contras only hardens this perception of the United States as a reactionary, imperialist bully. It gives the Sandinistas a ready excuse to suppress

individual liberty, draft young people and silence the opposition for the sake of "national security." U.S. involvement gives them a convenient bogeyman on which to blame their limping economy. They have even laid guilt for an outbreak of dengue disease on alleged "bacteriological warfare" by the United States. The specter of another U.S.-imposed regime enables the Sandinista state to divert attention from its failures and to rally Nicaraguans around itself with nationalist slogans. U.S. government aid to any contra activities not only won't work, it will hurt their efforts. By seeking and accepting CIA backing, the Nicaraguan Democratic Force does little to help its cause and much to aid the government it is fighting. If I were a Sandinista, I would privately welcome Ronald Reagan's proposal to "aid" the contras, while--of course--publicly denouncing it as further evidence of the United States' imperialistic designs on Nicaragua.

Spread the Idea of Freedom

In the end, it is the ideas that people hold about social

life, and not the force of arms, which make for permanent change in any society. Supporters of freedom for Nicaraguans would do well to avoid all connection with the U.S. government, and to focus their energies instead on offering Nicaraguans an alternative better than the neo-feudalist Somocistas or the discredited socialist economics of the Sandinistas.

Ironically, in calling for forcibly taking \$100 million in taxes from us in order to "fight for freedom," Ronald Reagan is following the same policy of government control over the individual that he presumably dislikes in the Sandinistas. Americans concerned about the spread of communism would do better to spend their own money exporting ideas of freedom than lobbying to spend taxpayers' money to murder civilians. Then, perhaps, peace and freedom will have a chance in Nicaragua.

(Jorge Amador is a freelance writer and editor of The Pragmatist, a current-affairs commentary newsletter. A Cuban exile, he has lived in Latin America and holds a B.A. degree in Politics from St Joseph's University.)

"Peace, commerce and honest friendships with all people, entangling alliances with none."

Thomas Jefferson

LIBERTARIAN PARTY PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE(S?) TO COME TO LPP CONVENTION

American Indian Movement leader and candidate for the Libertarian Party Presidential nomination Russell Means, will come to State College, PA in April. He will be addressing the Libertarian Party of Pennsylvania annual State convention, which will take place in the Penn State Holiday Inn on April 4th and 5th. Means led a celebrated occupation of Wounded Knee in 1969, and has been a strident critic and opponent of Federal Government policy toward American Indians. He joined the Libertarian Party in February because of the party's position on American Indian rights (which he played a major role in formulating) and because the Party's strong stands in favor of individual liberty matched his views of the traditional political (or anti-political) thinking of

American Indians. Means' recent visit to Philadelphia generated a lot of interest from local Libertarians and listeners to a local call-in radio show on which Means was the featured guest.

Another possible visitor to the LPP convention is Ron Paul, a former three term Republican Congressman from the Houston area. Easily the most libertarian member of Congress in recent years, Paul consistently received the best scores by far from the National Taxpayer's Union in its Congressional Reviews. Paul retired from Congress in 1984, after losing the Texas Republican Senatorial nomination to former Boll Weevil Democrat Phil Gramm. He has been a libertarian since studying the works of various free market economists in college, but joined the Party just in the last month in order to run for the Presidency.

For details about the LPP convention call 215-963-0127, 412-241-5810, or 814-237-1572.



PENNSYLVANIA LIBERTY

published by the Libertarian Party of Pennsylvania
Box 41827
Philadelphia, PA 19101
Circulation: 10,000

The views of the authors are their own and not necessarily those of the LPP.

Permission to reprint articles is granted, provided customary credit is given and one copy of your publication is mailed to us at the above address.

Subscriptions are free with membership in the Libertarian Party of Pennsylvania. One-year trial subscriptions are available by sending your name and address to the above address.

Please write for ad rates. Donations are gladly accepted to defray the costs of publication. If you would like quantities of this newspaper to distribute in your area, please call 215-963-0127.

THE DRAFT

(continued from page 1)

Hart's dovish tendencies on foreign policy lead him to downplay the militarism of his scheme, but they don't lead him to respect individual rights. After running through a list of "vital needs" that Hart thinks are not being adequately met - from "tutors in Appalachia and health clinics in Harlem to day care for the poor and companions for the elderly" - the neoliberal senator, true to the collectivist faith, takes it upon himself to determine how young men and women should serve others. Needless to say, the fact that he invokes the idealism of Franklin Roosevelt's Civilian Conservation Corps and John Kennedy's Peace Corps (both completely voluntary efforts) does not make his forced labor scheme any less invidious than the Vietnam draft.

Socialist Herding Instinct

But Hart and Senator Ernest Hollings of South Carolina and former Virginia Governor Charles Robb are not just emblems of a devastated Democratic party chasing after the political center. In promoting universal compulsory service, they represent the

socialist "herding" instinct - an urge to enlist individuals in a centrally planned campaign without regard to their consent. For example, in an article last year in Mother Jones titled "Let's Draft the Yuppies", Pete Hamill argues that "the ideal draft would be a valuable instrument of a true democracy. If all Americans from age 18 to 25 were subject to the draft, this would be a social and racial equalizer". After proposing his own version of the Solomon Amendment to deny any aid for the education of those who refuse service, Hamill argues that the draft would break the "domestic umbilical cords" and provoke conscripts to "learn about the diversity of their own country and understand the vast range of the outposts of the American empire". To top it all off, he writes that draftees will - in the spirit of revolutionary solidarity - teach each other how to read and write using, of course, "the literacy campaigns of Cuba and Nicaragua as models."

Although most "progressives" - especially Quakers - would disagree with Hamill's specific proposal, his totalitarianism is hardly at odds with the leftist mentality. So long as the draft is serving noble and "democratic" goals - to be determined by them of course - liberals, Democrats, and socialists are no more opposed to it than are conservatives. Only libertarians consistently and unequivocally fight all forms of conscription. They see the draft for what it really is - a naked power grab by the state.

(Drew Clark is a student at Swarthmore College, and an editor of The Phoenix - the student newspaper. This article appeared previously in The Phoenix, and in the Orange County Record.)



"No sweat...He assured me he has no intention of sending us to market—he just wants to know how much meat is available!"



"THIS NEW TAX PLAN SOUNDS PRETTY GOOD... WE GET A 9% CUT AND BUSINESS PICKS UP THE BURDEN..."



FYI: CONTACT

Want to know more? Attend one of our friendly, informative and stimulating discussion groups. Call for more information.

Philadelphia: Ralph Mullinger 215-963-0127
 Pittsburgh: Henry Haber 412-241-5826
 State College: Ray Caravar 814-237-1876
 York: Gary Shoer 717-792-1005

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

LPP Memberships, John Famularo, 1420 Locust St.
 BOX 36D Philadelphia, PA 19102

YES: I want to join the Libertarian Party in the membership category I've checked below. Enclosed is my check or money order for the indicated amount.

NAME _____ PHONE # _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ COUNTY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

Occupation or School _____

New Member's Pledge: "I hereby certify that I do not believe in or advocate the initiation of force as a means of achieving political or social goals."

SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____

National & LPP Dues
 \$24/year

LPP Only:
 Student \$3/yr.*
 Regular \$12/yr.
 Lifetime \$100 or \$10
 for 12 months

*add \$12 for National LP dues

LIBERTARIAN PARTY OF PENNSYLVANIA
 P.O. BOX 41827
 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19101

NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION
 U.S. POSTAGE
 PAID
 Philadelphia, PA.
 Permit No. 609

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED