

# FREE LIBERTARIAN

MONTHLY NEWSLETTER  
FREE  
LIBERTARIAN  
PARTY, INC.

## GENERAL MEETING: CAMPAIGN RECAP

BY JOHN CAULFIELD

It was long, it was tedious, it was sometimes repetitive, and the subject matter was not the most pleasant. And nearly a hundred Free Libertarians attended, the bulk of them remaining until the conclusion of the four-and-a-half-hour session.

Any attempt on my part to offer an objective news account of the March 2nd FLP general meeting, convened for the purpose of discussing "The Campaign," would be sheer pretense; as much so as attempting to offer an objective news account of the campaign itself. What follows, then, is just the stuff I remember, folks. The style is editorial, but the intent is informational.

### PERCY GREAVES ON THE FLP

The meeting began with Ray Strong's reading of his correspondence with Prof. Percy L. Greaves. The audience seemed genuinely glad (as evidenced by its good-natured response) to have the benefit of Prof. Greaves' advice on a number of matters; in particular, his earnest suggestion that the Free Libertarian Party rid itself of the "dissidents" within its ranks. Among the other items received in a similar vein were Prof. Greaves' stern disapproval of party members associating themselves with the publication *New Libertarian Notes* (which had run a critical editorial) and the revelation that he had been told that anarchists were "only 15 to 20 percent of the party." In the former case, one can only wonder how he happened to come across *NLN*. And in the latter, just who gave him this particular statistic. (Gary Greenberg ventured that it might have been offered as a rough guess at a national LP figure.)

But forgive me: among ourselves, it is all too easy to be flippant about Percy Greaves' obvious unfamiliarity with certain FLP peculiarities. But Greaves' unfamiliarity with the FLP is scarcely as amusing as the FLP's unfamiliarity with Greaves is amazing. Ray Strong concluded his reading with the admittedly modest comment that we should not nominate candidates for office about whom we know so little.

### THE FLP ON PERCY GREAVES

But, what I find truly remarkable is the very *fact* that so few FLP members had ever heard of Greaves, prior to his nomination. Hospers, Tuccille, and Greaves are the only "name" candidates the LP has ever had. Roy Childs was in the audience, and he touched upon this point: Percy Greaves, he said, was a student and friend of Mises, is probably the foremost authority on the Pearl Harbor coverup, and has been writing in behalf of the libertarian cause for well over thirty years. All of what Childs said would have been common knowledge among any group

of libertarians gathered five years earlier (regardless of age—many libertarian "veterans" are barely old enough to vote). This seems symptomatic of the emergence of a "new breed" within the movement—a good thing, to be sure, though sometimes a little unsettling to "old-timers" like Percy Greaves and Roy Childs. Murray Rothbard can only do so much to bridge the gap.

But this only suggests part of the problem. Granted, had party members been better acquainted with Greaves' impressive credentials, they might have reacted to him differently (they would perhaps have been more "honored" by his candidacy, as, in one of his letters, Greaves suggests they should have been), and consequently much of the ensuing tension would have been somewhat mitigated.

But no matter how familiar we might have been with Greaves the libertarian, no matter how well aware of his one or two "deviations" on the issues (which were discussed at the nominating convention), we could not have foreseen the difficulties we would have encountered with Greaves the *person*. "He's rather sensitive," said Roy Childs. "He seems to have some personality quirks," said Gary Greenberg. "The guy's not wrapped too tightly," said someone in the back of the room.

Gary echoed the sentiments of many with one thought: that it's not that Percy Greaves wasn't libertarian enough. We could have got the purest, most consistent libertarian in the world as our candidate, and if he had those sorts of problems, the same thing would have happened.

Sandy Cohen, though, took strong exception to this view, and said with angry disdain, "We nominated a *conservative*"; at which calumny, Harry Middendorf looked around with the most sheepishly innocent expression I have ever seen.

### BUT JUST WHAT DID HAPPEN?

What was the "Greaves affair" all about? If a newsletter article were sufficient to fully catalogue all that was involved, there'd have been no need for the meeting. I'll only summarize what I learned.

Who instigated the Greaves candidacy, and why? No one present at the general meeting, it would seem. Most people agreed that Murray Rothbard was pleased to see his friend endorsed. Some mentioned that they'd heard the Greaves candidacy talked up (by Jerry Klasman and others) as an excellent means of giving Gerry Cullen a campaign to manage. Others seemed to think Greaves, himself, was the most ardent exponent of his own can-



didacy. Several people seemed to recall murmurs about Greaves having wealthy friends ("but it turned out they'd both been dead twenty years").

When, and in what company, was it agreed that Greaves would run? The decision was the culmination of two meetings. The first was during the convention's Saturday supper break, and included Greaves, Rothbard, Greenberg, Millen, and Youngstein, who were joined at the end by Howard Rich. The second meeting—apparently more conclusive—occurred early the next morning. (Murray was not at *this* meeting, needless to say.)

Fran and Andrea both indicated that they hadn't exactly been dying to have Greaves on the ticket, and Gary said he had privately voiced his opposition to the nomination. It was generally agreed that Howard Rich had also spoken against the idea, in private. (Jerry Tuccille jokes that he has already met 50,000 people who claim they voted for him. Similarly, it seems that, had all the people who now say they were *really* against Greaves voiced their opinions then, the nomination would have failed for lack of a second. This is the observation of one who voted for, even spoke in favor of, the nomination.)

#### THE "BROKEN PROMISES"

Be that as it may, what was all the hubbub about?

Repeatedly in his letters, Greaves spoke about the failure of the FLP to live up to certain "promises" that were supposedly made to him; he noted that he had agreed to run, only on the understanding that these "conditions" would be met. Specifically, he wanted to know why he had not been provided with a campaign staff; why fund-raising efforts in his behalf had not been initiated; and why no new campaign manager had been named, so long after the departure of Gerry Cullen. He complained that the party officialdom was making scarcely any effort to maintain communication with him (he said he'd not even received a membership application), and he let it be known that he thought it most discourteous of them not to arrange to pay his plane fare to the Dallas Convention.

Greaves' letters also mentioned the decision to separate the fund-raising activities of the Greaves and Tuccille campaigns—particularly as this related to the Rothbard-MacBride letter—and the lack of communication between the campaigns on this matter. While discussing this question, many in the audience expressed regret that neither of the then-campaign managers (Cullen and Lee Schubert) were able to attend the meeting.

#### AND GREAVES' EXPECTATIONS

But to rise above these murky specifics and get down to some hard generalizations, the cause of the breach with Greaves was essentially this: Greaves expected to win the election. (In behalf of this expectation, he noted in one letter that the Conservative Party had nominated "only a token candidate" for the Senate.) He compared himself to James Buckley—and apparently envisioned a campaign of similar proportions. He contended that he'd made it clear at the outset that this was the sort of campaign that would have to be waged, if he were to run at all; and he stressed that he'd been quite candid about his inability to supply the resources that would be required for such an effort. He said that it was only with the assurances of the "party leaders" on both these scores that he'd agreed to run. And now: by failing to provide him with funds, with a staff, with a membership application, the FLP was going back on its promises.

#### THE STRONG ANSWER

Ray Strong, in reply, wrote Greaves that he was looking for a new campaign manager, enclosing a membership

application, and, protesting that he knew nothing of any "promises," attempted to explain the relationship between the FLP, its candidates, and their campaigns. (Touching on this latter point in his answering letter, Greaves intimated that the FLP was the strangest sort of political party he'd ever had anything to do with—and those who are familiar with our erstwhile candidate's political past will know that this is saying very much, indeed.)

#### THE PROBABLE EXPLANATION

The "party leaders" all denied that any promises had been made during their extended supper with Prof. Greaves. One can readily imagine assurances to the man that he could run whatever sort of campaign he wanted; and that "the campaign committees of FLP-endorsed candidates" enjoyed an encouraging record of past success in enlisting funds, paid staff, and volunteers. From these modest assurances, Prof. Greaves may have drawn certain exaggerated inferences. "There's a lot of revisionist history goin' on here," commented Andrea.

#### THE RECESS

I've spent too much time on Percy Greaves. But, then, so did the meeting that I'm reporting. Following this portion of the proceedings, there was a short recess, during which several individuals made announcements. Among the more interesting was Paul Streitz's pitch for a seminar he'd be offering, centering on his conviction that LP candidates can actually *win* major elections—given professional public relations techniques. Also, Roger Eisenberg took an informal poll of the gathering to gauge sentiment for the adoption of a platform at this year's state convention, and for discussion of the possibility of changing the party's name. There was very little sentiment for the first idea, and the attendees were about evenly divided on the second suggestion.

#### TUCCILLE ON HINDSIGHT

By the time the meeting resumed, Jerry Tuccille had arrived.

"It's all the fault of Roger Eisenberg; that's all I came here to say," he announced. But as long as he had come, he might as well save us several hundred thousand dollars by advising us not to bother hiring big-league P.R. firms. He reiterated his opinion that, given his campaign's resources, the maximum number of votes he could have received would have been about 20,000.

This prompted a couple of comments to the effect that, given this limited sort of margin, it probably would have been better to concentrate on the quality of our message, rather than the quantity of votes. Jerry alluded to the omniscience of hindsight, but did say that it was important for the party to adopt standards other than just vote totals for measuring its progress and success.

#### GREENBERG ON RIGHT AND LEFTSIGHT

Most of the questions and comments directed to Gary Greenberg, the next speaker, dealt with the questions of who voted for us, who didn't, and, most importantly, why or why not? Much attention was focused on the surprising drop in the FLP vote in "left-wing neighborhoods" (where the victims of victimless crimes live) from the Youngstein totals, without an appreciable gain in "Middle America" (read: Borough Park, Woodside, etc.). At the same time, it appeared that it was in the more eccentric (well, least conservative, which is not quite the same as most liberal) areas that our most reliable source of voting strength lay. There was a lot of banter about the respective merits of "right-wing" and "left-wing"



campaigns—much of it disposed of by Mark Dane's comment that it is ridiculous to try to formulate firm *a priori* policies on questions like these; that the extent to which we pay attention to one element of the public, or to another element, the extent to which we concentrate on piling up vote totals, or on educating the voters, depends entirely on the time, the place, and the political climate. And Gary added that at least we now know that we can't lose any votes by being "hard-core."

#### KEELEN ON BLACK & WHITE AND COLORSIGHT

Carolyn Keelen made a short presentation, dealing mostly with the TV commercial. Those of us who know Carolyn were not at all skeptical when she related how she had decided to find out how the ad was being received by that great anonymous mass "out there," by walking up to people in restaurants and asking, "Have you seen the Tuccille commercial?" This inquiry would usually be answered by a stunned silence (or, if asked in the automat, the diner would often move to another table). Then, without so much as blinking, Carolyn would continue, "You know, the funny ad about taxes, where the guy gets all his clothes ripped off by the government bureaucrats." A faint smile, a glimmer of comprehension, and—oh, of course—everyone's seen *that* ad!

There ensued much discussion of diverse ideas for future TV messages. Most speakers seemed to feel that two or three different commercials in a campaign would be best: "Oh, here's a new commercial for that broad who's running for whatsit; wonder what she has to say now." (It was widely agreed that, all things being equal, women candidates attract more attention.) [*It's working in Dutchess County. See separate story.*] However, a couple of people countered that lasting impressions on the public are most effectively made by the repetition of a single message: "We all remember we're not supposed to squeeze the Charmin."

#### KLAR: MEETING'S END IN SIGHT

Bob Klar had the unenviable assignment of being the last speaker at this marathon. But he was really the ideal choice. He reviewed some of the campaign's highlights and more interesting moments, and reminded us all what fun it had been. A very appropriate note to end on.

This meeting attracted people from all over the state—Westchester, Poughkeepsie, Ulster County, Albany and vicinity, and the farthest reaches of Long Island. Everyone seemed keenly interested and alert (most more so than your reporter, I fear) and yet there was very little anger or bitterness anywhere in evidence. Most of the talk I heard in the small groups that clustered before and after the session revolved around the school board elections in the City, the Carole Cohen-Ellen Davis campaigns in Dutchess, the Presidential Convention over Labor Day weekend, and various local activities of libertarians in the outlying counties.

## FROM THE CHAIR

Last month I promised a discussion of the office of chairperson. Such a discussion is especially appropriate since this will be my last "From The Chair." This month I will reveal a hitherto closely guarded secret concerning "why everybody should want to be chairperson." But, before I do, lest anyone get the idea that the life of a chairperson is the antithesis of "grief and woe," I will detail some of that life.

I took office amid heightening anticipation for the biggest campaign in FLP (actually, libertarian) history. When I found myself spending much more time on the campaign than I had planned, I quickly learned the first lesson of delegation: there must be a delegatee before the delegator can delegate. Many a chairperson has been heard to say, "A volunteer! A volunteer! My kingdom for a volunteer!" But there are always those who are eager to run for the other offices of the FLP. We even have two vice chairpersons. These could certainly be assumed to have volunteered. Early in my reign, Fran Youngstein even volunteered to help find volunteers. What more could I ask?

The campaign was mostly a good trip. I resolved early to confine myself to one specific part and not worry about the whole picture—that's what campaign managers are for. Unfortunately, it's not always that easy for chairpersons to specialize. People keep insisting that the FLP collectively do this or that, and you know whom they insist to. There is even some legitimacy in requests that the chairperson somehow mediate disputes between campaigns—a task at which I have been singularly unsuccessful.

It is a campaign manager's job to come up with a strategy and execute it, making unpopular decisions and sticking to them under fire. This is exactly what Laura Wertheimer did and did well. Even with hindsight, I have no overall better strategy to propose for the 50,000 vote goal. I would have done some things differently, so would lots of others; but I could not have managed the campaign. It was more than a full time job, and I already have one of those.

During the campaign my job consisted almost entirely of delegating. I think I must have talked to every member of the FLP at least once. I could mention the whole organization chart for the campaign; but the two I talked to most, who were out getting things done, were Charlie (Tuccille balloons and Tuccille dollars) Blood and Bob (demonstrations) Klar.

Well, the campaign finished like a championship pole vault, when, after a beautiful run-up on third try, the vaulter comes down with the cross bar in his arms. The campaign organization folded its tents and vanished into the night, and the party organization was left to clean up the mess. Fortunately, these were practically the same people. But this suggests some advice to future chairpersons: at the start of each campaign, appoint a campaign clean-up crew.

On the subject of advice to future chairpersons, I think it would be a good idea to periodically remind people that there is a national Libertarian Party and it has a chairman [sic] to whom many suggestions could be profitably passed. It might even be a good idea to publish his or her name, and address, and telephone number: (Ed Crane, National Libertarian Party, 550 Kearney St., San Francisco, CA 94108, 415-986-1834).

Except for the campaign work, chairperson is much like other positions of royalty. It has its perquisites and its responsibilities. Its perquisites are, of course, obvious; so I will dwell a little longer on its responsibilities. Take this newsletter. Although we have a surfeit of talent lurking in the wings, lured by such titles as Royal Calligrapher, Editor Extraordinaire, Dictator of Esthetics, and Associate Editor, production and distribution still remain problems. However, with a little bit of delegation and a handy vice chairperson (Mike Nichols), such problems can be solved. Then there is the party office, that Stygian Stable which daunts even the efforts of



Hercules Hauptman. (Actually, he did get it straight once, before our other vice chairperson, Bill Lawry, organized the crew to bring in the booty from the Tuccille campaign.) Again, with a little bit of luck and a lot of delegation (via our Office Manager, Susan Corkery) the office has been kept running, if not straight. And then there was the time that the rent was due, the final threats from the phone company and Con Ed were received, the Tuccille campaign creditors were knocking at the door, and Dolores Grande reported our treasury seriously depleted. Most of you received letters from Dolores describing our plight. Some received the letter directed to Tuccille campaign workers, composed and signed by Andrea Millen (another eager office seeker and Vice Chairwoman [sic] for national) although she accidentally spelled her name like mine. Then it came time to count our members for purposes of determining our representation at the national convention. As all these events came to a head, who was hard at work in the throne room? Andrea and Susan were. Through the wonders of delegation, your chairperson was off enjoying a ski vacation in Colorado.

The only other responsibility worth mentioning is meetings. Here it may seem that I have let things slip a bit. Why haven't I delegated the chairing of State Committee and General Meetings? The answer is simple: here lies the true reward of chairpersonship—power. Think of the power involved in chairing a gathering of free libertarians. I'll never forget that ecstatic feeling of power I experienced in Guy Riggs's basement, wielding the meat tenderizer to bring the State Committee to order. At last I am revealing the secret known only to the few who held the office before me. This is the reason you should all want to run for chairperson, though only one of you can win (at a time). There is nothing like being chairperson of the Free Libertarian Party.

Yours in Liberty,

Ray Strong

## NO FLAP...

### At Lame Duck State Committee Meeting

BY MURREL DeFRANCE WITH ANDREA MILLEN

The last meeting of the current State Committee convened at noon LT (Libertarian Time), March 2, in the Williams Club. Members attending were Dolores Grande, Steve Schneider, Andrea Millen, Bill Miller, Murrell De France, Mike Nichols, Bill Lawry, Ellen Davis, Fran Youngstein and Chairperson Ray Strong. Also present were John Deane, Don and Andrea Feder, Carolyn Keelen, Kurt Gurman, and Sandy Cohen.

**Counties:** The Capitol District FLP, Don Feder reported, plans a chartering convention for its next meeting, a street demonstration on National Tax Protest Day, and a press conference on March 7. The press conference will be used to introduce the CDFLP through their new LOSE button ("Liberate Our Statist Economy") as a starting point to present libertarian alternatives to Ford's economic programs.

Bill Miller announced that the next meeting of the Manhattan organization will be held on Sunday, March 23, 2:30 p.m. at Laissez Faire Books, 206 Mercer Street.

Virginia Walker will speak on "Is Your Property Safe from the State?" Also scheduled are a tax protest demonstration and a May county convention.

Ellen Davis noted the Poughkeepsie area FLPer are considering a multi-county organization, but this consideration depends on by-laws changes at the upcoming State Convention. Ellen has announced for Dutchess County Executive and Carol Cohen for the Poughkeepsie mayoral race.

**Appointments:** The State Committee unanimously appointed Ralph Raico as Temporary Chairman of Erie County FLP. Welcome!

Ray Strong officially notified the Committee of Howard Katz's resignation. It was decided not to fill the vacancy as no further State Committee meetings will be held before the convention.

**State Convention Rules:** Suggestions should be directed to Dolores Grande, Chairperson of the Convention Rules Committee. Andrea Millen mentioned a regional distribution system for electing National Convention delegates. In a sense-of-committee poll, such a system was rejected 5-3-1 on grounds that quota systems are unacceptable. The FLP can send nineteen to twenty-one delegates and unlimited alternates to the National LP Convention.

**Treasurer's Report:** The coffers protect \$923.85. Dolores noted that our office rent has increased by approximately \$20 per month.

**National Convention Arrangements:** An initial planning committee for the national LP Convention, to be held Labor Day Weekend in New York City, has been formed. It consists of John Doswell, Ray Strong and Andrea Millen, with help from Carolyn Keelen and Dolores Grande.

## \$\$ REPORT BY DOLORES GRANDE

March 2, 1975

balance (1/19/75) .....	738.86
income .....	624.00
	1362.86
expenses (checks 290-296) .....	439.01
balance (3/2/75) .....	923.85

### income

memberships .....	610.00
subscriptions .....	14.00
	624.00

### expenses

rent .....	166.66
electric .....	5.56
newsletter	
printing .....	76.14
postage .....	45.00
	121.14
stationery .....	8.52
printing .....	34.13
postage .....	55.00
loan .....	18.00
miscellaneous .....	30.00
	439.01



# STATEMENTS

## of Candidates for FLP Office

### ZACHARY ROUSSO, Candidate for Treasurer

I wish to declare my candidacy for FLP treasurer. I have a B.A. in economics and political science and was graduated cum laude, with honors in economics.

During the summers of 1973 and 1974, I worked as a full-time FLP petitioner. This involved working six or seven days a week, sometimes as much as twelve hours a day. In the fall of 1973, I was Bronx coordinator of the Youngstein campaign, while attending college full-time. Approximately 20,000 leaflets were distributed—including 10,000 by me.

The job of FLP treasurer should be more than one of a bookkeeper. I feel that election to and acceptance of a position as party officer implies a quasi-contractual obligation to the membership. Should I be elected, I intend to solicit and be responsive to the opinions of grassroots FLP workers. I feel that those working out in the streets are more often aware of what's happening and often provide constructive and practical ideas to advance libertarianism.

Finally, I wish to take this opportunity to commend Dolores Grande for her diligent and effective service as FLP treasurer. Her successor will find it difficult to match her record.

### CAROLYN KEELLEN, Candidate for State Committee Person-at-Large

I'm running for StateCom for several reasons, but mostly because I think direct contact between the newsletter staff and the Committee is essential. If the proposed by-laws changes decreasing the importance of the State Party and increasing that of the county organizations are passed, it will become even more important, as the newsletter will become *the* vital link between the various areas of the state.

I also think that the StateCom has desperately needed (at least for the past two years) someone who can cut through the bullshit. I'm good at that, even if the inclusion of the following boring list (apparently required of every candidate) doesn't bear out my claim:

I've worked on Fran's, Jerry's, Sandy's, Guy's, Virginia's, Mary Jo's and Ken's campaigns; I've designed letter-heads and other goodies for the FLP; and I'm Art Director and Associate Editor of the Newsletter.

What else? Well, I love to go to parties, will forever refuse to "Wipe That Smile," and, if elected, I will demand (request? ask pretty please?) that I be called a committee WOMAN-AT-LARGE (!), as a matter of principle, of course.

### JOHN CAULFIELD, Candidate for State Committeeperson-at-Large

As I've said in the past, I believe the prime function of the party should be to provide a common vehicle for

libertarians, in the effort to keep the libertarian approach in the public mind; to remind people that when, for instance, Gerald Ford and the Democrats are bickering over the respective merits of oil import quotas vs. rationing, there is at least one alternative. The extent to which our success in this endeavor will translate into votes for us—and the extent to which we should be concerned about this question—must depend on circumstances. Right now it doesn't appear to matter too much. But it could start to matter very soon—with the talk of third parties emerging on both the right and left; with libertarian congressional aides (!) "coming out of the closet," etc.

When politicians in the major parties (however many such parties there may prove to be) start wondering how the libertarians will react to this or that position of theirs—that is when our vote totals should be among the matters of major concern to us. And when that time comes we should be ready; which means that until then we should be building, talking to people, explaining our outlook to them, slowly but surely chipping away at the statist assumptions on which the present political dialogue is predicated.

## OFF 'N' RUNNING

### CAULFIELD & FELD ANNOUNCE

John Caulfield and Sandy Feld have announced their candidacies for school board in Manhattan's Second District.

"I would hope the campaign would have a 'consciousness-raising' effect," said Caulfield. "The message I'd like to get across is: that schools are not good places for people to learn; that it serves very little purpose to compel an individual to spend six hours a day in the same room, with the same people, listening to the same person, and, for the most part, enduring the same routines—other than to dull the enthusiasm of that individual, and create a class of people (teachers and administrators) with a vested interest in maintaining the system; that there are as many ways of learning something as there are learners, and any program of compulsory instruction must necessarily prejudice all but a select few of these ways as invalid; that most of the so-called educational reforms of recent years, supposedly intended to remedy these problems, have been so much cosmetic illusion; in short, that learning is easy, that the schools make it hard."

The district includes all of Manhattan's West Side south of 59th Street. And with the exception of one portion of the Lower East Side, all of the East Side south of 98th Street. Both candidates are anxious to hear from anyone interested in helping in the campaign. Write or call John Caulfield, 325 East 54th St., New York, 10022, telephone: 212-838-4059; Sandy Feld, 123 Lexington Ave., telephone: 212-685-5748.

### STEINIS & TODESCHINI RUNNING

BY BOB KLAR

Having had no luck as spectators, Bob Steinis and Dave Todeschini will attempt to "Stop The Destruction of East New York" from within, by running for their local school board.

(continued on page 6)



On May 6th, a few hundred registered voters in the community will decide which 9 individuals will represent them on school board #19. Officers of the board are then chosen amongst themselves by the 9 members. Bob and Dave must first get 400 valid signatures each on a petition (remember those?) by April 13th, in order to run.

Steinis and Todeschini face an uphill battle to gain recognition in the community for their efforts. It seems that the local newspaper is owned and published by the current leaders of the school board, and the "Urban Renewal Coalition," a gang not exactly in sync with our guys' views. Press coverage is expected to approximate that of *The Daily Worker* on the advantages of *laissez-faire*.

Thus, legwork and effort in knocking on doors and standing on street corners will constitute the battle plan for the next two months. Any libertarian with some free time on evenings and weekends, who wants to stay in shape for our next petition drive and leaflet distribution should contact Bob at 212-498-3697, or Dave at 212-277-3868.

## POUGHKEEPSIE POLITICAL VETERANS FORGING AHEAD

BY CAROLYN KEELLEN

Libertarians in Dutchess County like to get started early, so Ellen Davis has announced her candidacy for Dutchess County Executive and Carole Cohen has declared for Mayor of Poughkeepsie. They intend to run on the FLP line and as Independents, thus assuring two lines on the ballot. Also, Ellen is planning to seek the Democratic nomination and Carole the Conservative, which offer third line possibilities. (That '74 ballot position just ain't *never* going to happen to Poughkeepsie folks again—they're making sure of it!)

Favorable publicity has already been generated—with long articles published on each of the candidates, a totally amazing editorial ("New Candidate") on Ellen's entry into the race, and another mention of Ellen in an editorial about other candidates (implying her legitimacy), all in *The Poughkeepsie Journal*.

Sample lines from the "New Candidate" piece: "The race . . . is insured of a new look with the entry of Ellen Davis. . . . She represents not only the first woman to run for the country's highest administrative post but also the first affiliated Libertarian as well. . . . she can be expected to advocate the reduction in size of county government with an aim toward economizing and reducing taxes."

Some really creative publicity ideas have already been generated by the campaign organizations, headed by campaign manager Sandy Cohen.

Carole Cohen suggested that \$10.8 million in federal funds that were returned to the City of Poughkeepsie—slated for "community development"—be returned to "those people who earned it in the first place—the taxpayers." (There are a lot of taxpayers out there who just might like that idea, folks.)

Ellen Davis accused the County Board of Representatives of having "comic strip mentalities." When they rejected a \$6 million County Building Project and instead settled for a \$2.2 million compromise, Ellen noted that they would undoubtedly attempt to pass off the expenditure as a "money-saving" move. She asked, "How can the politicians be 'saving' money when they are prepared

to spend another \$2 million? . . . . When Blondie proudly tells Dagwood that she just 'saved' \$40 by buying a \$20 hat instead of a \$60 hat—we all laugh. We laugh even harder when Blondie describes the \$40 dress she was able to buy with her 'savings.' " (There are a lot of people out there who read comic strips, too.)

And, most recently, the combined campaign organizations have cashed in on the publicity generated by Sandy's "Rent-a-Kid" legal problems by announcing that Candidates for Liberty (the FLP slate) will seriously consider violating the minimum wage laws. They said they "will offer kids who have their parents' permission to work anywhere from fifty cents to one dollar an hour." The legal minimum wage is \$2.10 per hour, or \$1.80 for kids if you get special permission.

The libertarian candidates explained how minimum wage laws cause unemployment, especially among the young, poor, and unskilled, and got in a plug for the free market: "Ideally, people should be able to hire and work without coercion and interference from the government. This state of affairs would be known as FREEDOM."

They ended the statement by advocating the repeal of minimum wage laws and suggested that, "It is time to ration politicians, not jobs." (There are a lot of unemployed and "unemployable" people out there too, who just might be happy with whatever they can earn—kids seem to get hungry a lot.)

There are seven months till the election. Candidates for Liberty is already moving at a faster pace than their opponents. Of course, they need all the help they can get, so if you have good ideas for publicity, time to help, or money to give, write Sandy Cohen at Candidates for Liberty, Box 1776, Poughkeepsie, N.Y. 12601, or call him at 914-471-8771 or 914-454-1677.

# SPEAK FOR YOURSELF

## NOTES ON THE WRITING OF REBUTTALS

[The following article by Steve Nelson, Illinois LP Chairman, is reprinted from the Illinois Libertarian.]

Of the various activities of LPI, none is more important than the broadcast of Libertarian radio and TV editorial rebuttals, for it is here, more than anywhere else, that the Libertarian Party meets the public. The largest conference is utterly dwarfed by the audience for even an obscure radio program; prime-time TV audiences run into the millions. And yet these rebuttals are available quite readily, at a price of a few hours of effort.

Let us imagine that one has heard a broadcast editorial that advocates statist ideas (one must disagree with the editorial; there is no mechanism for broadcasting assent). One then notes the station, time, and date, and phones the station during the next business day (time is important: most stations very much prefer rebuttal broadcasts within ten days) to ask if there is a rebuttal scheduled for the editorial. If there is not, ask for a written copy of the editorial to be sent to you quickly.

The next step is the actual preparation of the rebuttal. Most usable rebuttals follow a formula—the first para-



graph is a concise, accurate recapitulation of the original editorial to remind the regular audience. The second paragraph is a critique of the proposed action, and it is usually the longest of the three. The third is a brief description of the libertarian way of dealing with the original problem.

Your first draft should be written double-spaced, and, when it is finished, read it aloud rather slowly while timing your reading. If it runs more than ninety to one-hundred seconds, it will have to be cut. Tongue twisters of any kind must be eliminated. Libertarian and economic jargon should not be used. View all adjectives with suspicion, and adverbs with twice as much suspicion as adjectives. Read it and time it until you have a piece of satisfactory to yourself and the rules.

Then prepare a "fair copy" to send to the station. This should be in a business-letter format directed to the editorial director of the station and begin with the sentence, "The following is a rebuttal to your editorial number such-and-such, dated such-and-such." The number and date come from the copy they sent you. Skip a line, and then write your rebuttal single-spaced in perfect typing. If you have followed the rules, the resulting copy will be slightly more than three-quarters of a page. Close with "Sincerely," signature, typed name, "Libertarian Party" (with title, if you have one in either a state or country organization), home address, and daytime telephone number. [Note: *Current FLP by-laws provide for suspension and/or termination of the membership of one who "claims to represent the FLP while knowing that this is not the fact." However, this does not preclude expression of libertarian—with a small "I"—views, nor mention of the FLP, as a source of "further information," etc.*]

If the editorial board of the station decides against using your piece, they will send you a polite note by mail. If they decide to use it, they will phone you in two or three days and ask you to appear for taping. The taping sessions are usually on a weekday afternoon, so be prepared either to ask for an afternoon off or to find someone else to do the actual delivery. The station will give you twenty-four hours or so to find help if you need it, but they won't tape in the evenings or weekends as a rule. If you take your own taping, show up promptly, don't wear white clothes or glittery jewelry for TV, and remember that one of our biggest assets is the cordial relationship we enjoy with the press.

## CASES IN POINT

Last issue we reported an editorial reply by Don Feder over WAST-TV, Albany, on the subject of blue laws (he was agin 'em). In February, two NJLP members went on the air. Fred Stein, State Vice Chair, appeared on Channel 9 (WOR) to criticize President Ford's economic program. About the same time, Ralph Fucetola spoke on WINS Radio. In his capacity as a Director of the Federation of New Jersey Taxpayers, Mr. Fucetola called for state constitutional amendments to ensure local control and funding of education.

We also have reports of broadcast rebuttals by Illinois LP Chairman Steve Nelson and by David Sutton, for the Santa Barbara (Cal.) Libertarian Alternative.

## LITERALLY SPEAKING

Letters to Editors are another way to get ideas across to the masses — and may be preferred by those who hate bright

lights, cameras and microphones. Two NJLP activists have seen their letters in print recently, one attacking the post office, the other the welfare state. Then a crisp, concise epistle by Brooklyn FLP Chairperson Elliott Capon found it way into the *Long Island Press*. But the real coup was a denunciation of government intervention in the economy, published in *The New York Times* and signed, "Andrea Millen, Vice Chairwoman, Libertarian Party."

All four letters are fairly brief, capable of being understood and appreciated by the "average" person (i.e. they don't wallow in libertarian dogma but are rather plain-spoken), and, of course, all are inescapably logical. Reprints follow:

From the Newark *Star Ledger*, January 19, '75

### POST OFFICE ACTION CALLED SHAMEFUL

The U.S. Postal Service should be ashamed of itself. While a couple of kids dare to compete with the Post Office monopoly, the government tries to smash down these entrepreneurs by government fines.

In the last several years many companies that depend on first class mailing were driven out of business due to the ever increasing postage price. The U.S. Post Office has a monopoly of first class mail. This monopoly raises its prices and worsens its services without fears of competition. The poor consumer, businessman and taxpayer has no other choice.

To help create jobs, lower prices and provide efficiency, Congress should repeal the government's monopoly of first class mail and allow the free market to take its place.

Fred Stein, Maplewood

From the *Asbury Park Press*, February 11, '75

### SOCIETY WITHOUT DIGNITY

The great increase in people on the public dole in recent decades has been accompanied by an increase in violent crime. Could it be that our welfare state is destroying human dignity? At one time a dignified person would not accept that which he did not earn. People did not make a moral claim to the earnings of others. But politicians, seeking the support of pressure groups, have spread the idea that the dignity of earning one's way is not important. We see airlines, the milk industry, railroads, and other pressure groups getting subsidies extracted from other industries and individuals without earning them.

This idea that society (other people) owes us a living is wrong. If people believe that society owes them something, they will feel morally justified in taking it. Mugging, burglary, and rape can almost be condoned by a society that believes people deserve something merely by wanting it — a society without dignity.

When our politicians set examples for taking what they do not deserve, through graft and corruption, they reinforce this immorality by setting the standards.

Until Americans can hold their heads up and say "I don't want anything from the government (other taxpayers) except to be left alone," we will continue to see a decline in dignity and an increase in crime.

Tom Palven, Howell  
Township

From the *Longs Island Press*, March 6, '75

### TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT

George Meany and the AFL-CIO in executive committee want the government to run the oil business. "If it's nationalization, then so be it," were Meany's words. I would like to ask Mr. Meany if this is the same "government" as the one that delivers my mail; makes my city's streets safe



after dark; drags school children across town because of their skin color; got us into Vietnam; engaged in "diplomacy" with the Arab governments, and regulate my life?

That mass of incompetency and bureaucracy that is the federal government will handle our oil needs just fine! Pardon me, Mr. Meany, while I sell my Mustang and buy a tricycle.

Elliott Capon, Brooklyn

From *The New York Times*, March 15, '75

### TOWARD TOTALITARIANISM

Your two-part editorial of Feb. 23, "The Need to Plan... For Economic Policy," correctly admits that the Government is now enormously involved in the marketplace "through taxation, public expenditures, regulation, subsidies and foreign economic policy. Government is involved, in fact, in virtually all aspects of the economy in this country..."

The Times' solution to our economic ills is to turn over full control of the economy to the very institution which has caused our problems — through taxation, public expenditures, regulation, subsidies, and foreign economic policy.

The seeming naivete of the assertion that "industries would still be free to make their own investment decisions, but they would do so on the basis of more complete information about long-term trends as affected by government policies" is astonishing. No civilization in history has operated under such a system.

Nobel Prize-winning economist Frederich von Hayek, in "The Road to Serfdom," wrote: "Planning leads to dictatorship because dictatorship is the most effective instrument of coercion and the enforcement of ideals..."

Rather than giving Government more control over the economy, which it is already destroying, we must insist that Government completely withdraw from intervention in the marketplace so that it can function in a healthy manner. We need more freedom to regulate our own lives, not further steps toward totalitarianism.

Andrea Millen,  
Vice Chairwoman, Libertarian Party

(Dr. Hayek is scheduled to appear on *Meet the Press* on April 6th, and will speak at New York University on the 7th.)

### AND SPEAKING TO THE UNDECIDED

John Locke wrote, "New opinions are always suspected, and usually opposed, without any other reason but because they are not already common." He also noted, "Virtue is harder to be got than knowledge of the world; and, if lost by a young man, is seldom recovered."

With both of these thoughts in mind, many libertarians have begun to spread their views among those still sufficiently young and open-minded to consider radically different concepts. Some of this effort has taken the form of extensive research and development of sophisticated educational materials. At the same time, libertarians in several states have been talking to school and college groups.

The January appearance at Michigan State University by Harry Veryser drew the biggest crowd of any LPM-sponsored talk to date, with over fifty coming to hear his address on "The Petrol Dollars." Mr. Veryser is Board Chairman of the Institute for Economic Studies, a speakers bureau designed to advance the free market economic

philosophy. (There is also a National Libertarian Party Speakers Bureau, headed by Toni Nathan.)

LP members in California, New Jersey, and Minnesota are among those attempting to compete with standard indoctrination at the high school level and below. Paul Gunert has presented libertarianism to a number of high school classes in the Santa Cruz area. Bob Steiner has spoken to several high school history classes in Maplewood.

Of particular interest is the work of Jack Buxell and the School Presentation Program of the Minnesota LP, whose *Reasonable Answer* counts over forty school appearances to date. Buxell's approach usually consists of introducing himself, then explaining the party's principle of non-coercion, with specific examples to illustrate its application. Then he opens the floor to questions, "and that's when the fun really begins."

Teachers report that most classes retain interest in libertarianism after presentations. (One high school student who was impressed by a talk last spring is now an active LP member in college.) Buxell has found high school and junior high students far more receptive than those already in college.

Most of the teachers, themselves, have shown considerable interest, several inviting the speaker back again. (One religion instructor was sufficiently affected by a talk on Objectivist ethics that he went out and bought several of Ayn Rand's books and asked Buxell to address his other classes, for a total of six appearances.)

Teacher response can be viewed both as a calibre of immediate success and as a vital part of the long-range goal of making a lasting impression on the students. Commented one instructor, following a presentation by Buxell, "What you're really advocating is something that brings out the best in people."

## IN DEMAND- FLP'ers on the State Convention Circuit

**Oregon:** Sandy Cohen, 1974 FLP Congressional candidate, addressed the state LP convention on January 25th at the Congress Hotel in Portland. Sandy and Tony Nathan, 1972 LP Vice Presidential candidate, drew enthusiastic responses from delegates and media people, and were the subjects of several press and broadcast interviews. Sandy reports receiving phone calls from interested people as far away as Washington State.

**New Jersey:** Lee Schubert, 1974 FLP candidate for Attorney General and National Execom Region Eight Representative, keynoted the third annual NJLP state convention in East Brunswick on February 8th. Some forty attendees also heard an economics talk by Alan Reynolds, Associate Editor of *National Review* and Contributing Editor to *Reason*, and a dinner address by Roger MacBride, the 1972 Presidential Elector who voted for the Libertarian ticket.

Adopting the slogan, "One Percent for Freedom," the convention resolved to work for a one percent reduction in state expenditures in fiscal 1975, and to try to elect a Libertarian Assemblyman to the legislature this year. The 1974 National LP Statement of Principles was adopted as the state platform.



On a recommendation from the assembled delegates, the State Committee designated **Kathleen McAdam** to be the new newsletter editor. Kathy, who belongs to the NJLP, FLP, National LP, Society for Individual Liberty, National Taxpayers Union, and Federation of New Jersey Taxpayers, was also elected Recording Secretary by the convention. Other new officers are: **William Schetlick**, Chairperson; **Fred Stein**, Vice Chair; **Jane Rehmke**, Treasurer; **Tom Palven**, Executive Secretary; **Ralph Fucetola**, **Richard Solyom**, **William George**, and **Dan Piro**, all State Committee Representatives.

**California:** **Dr. Murray Rothbard**, economist, editor of *Libertarian Forum*, and author of *Conceived in Liberty*, *For a New Liberty*, et al, spoke to over two hundred attending the state LP convention banquet at the Surf-Rider Inn in Santa Monica, Sunday, February 16th. **Roger MacBride** also chose the occasion to announce his candidacy for the 1976 Libertarian Presidential nomination.

Among convention business: **Bill Westmiller**, current National LP Secretary and editor of *LP Action*, was voted to succeed **Ed Clarke** as State Chairman. Newly elected Vice Chairs are **Ray Cunningham** and **Susan Love Brown**, for the Northern and Southern Regions, respectively. Ms. Brown is a former Kentucky LP Chairperson and current activist with the Campus Studies Institute. The convention resolved to mount a massive registration drive, hoping to sign up enough (61,000) people to obtain California ballot status.

**Massachusetts:** **Fran Youngstein**, 1973 FLP New York City mayoral candidate, will keynote the third annual commonwealth LP convention, on Saturday, April 26th, at the Lenox Hotel in Boston. In addition to the standard convention doings, the itinerary includes a raffle, the prize to be "A first edition of *Atlas Shrugged*, autographed by the author" (whoever he was).

## POLITICS...

### ... AS ADDICTION

BY VIRGINIA SHIELDS WALKER

[Editorial Note: Ms. Walker was the 1974 FLP-Conservative Candidate for Assemblywoman in the 1st A.D. in Suffolk County.]

Losing an election I never expected to win is curiously deflating—I was astonished to find that underneath it all, I did expect to win and see the FLP get on the ballot—after all, we were (are) right. And campaigning is fun, once you accept exhaustion as a constant.

**Some real pluses for libertarianism developed out of the campaign.** . . . Whether it was Duryea's name or Burland's, I got dragged in with their publicity and coverage and made some of my own. A good interview on channel 8 TV from Harford (which beams over Long Island Sound); another spot on the WOR Sherri Henri Show, in which I managed to cram so many libertarian ideas into radio time, that it must be a first; a great write up in the *New York Times*; a particularly good live radio debate (at the John Drew Theatre in East Hampton) with Duryea and Burland, in which they argued (actually shouted and screamed) with each other and I talked to the audience about matters of importance; some good meet-the-candidates nights—in one I really zonked Big

D on some points and he knew it and got so flustered that everybody else knew it, too; a radio show at Southampton College and another at Sachem High School produced many libertarian-type contacts. One little gem of the campaign was an editorial in a local paper a week before elections, which said that my ideas were right and ethically correct, *but* impractical since patronage was the backbone of the American system and was the cause of democracy's strength!

**The real impact of the campaign** . . . was the introduction of libertarianism, albeit sometimes distorted, to the East End of Long Island. We made many new contacts, including at least fifteen FLP prospects, recruited workers, and libertarianized conservatives!

**There are some things I'll never forget.** . . . The night our little group procured the ED books necessary to wage a Conservative Party primary battle, followed by our dashing thither and yon, from district to district, before the opposition knew what we were up to. They didn't catch on till two days before the end of the petition drive—primarily because they were a lazy bunch.

The the long haul—1627 signatures, 1600 of which Alex Walker and I gathered, going door to door, according to voter registration lists that we computerized, block by block. Our signatures were literally perfect; they had to be to get by the Suffolk Board of Elections. But each signature took up to twenty minutes to get. These were not passersby, anxious to be rid of the petitioner by signing; these were people who insisted you come in, sit down, and convince. One day I hit a really lucky house—a birthday party was in progress, and one of the guests recognized me as the lady who spoke against a government low-income housing project—all eight partygoers signed. And of course, hundreds turned us away.

**Echoes from the campaign** . . . The man who kept repeating, "I know you are a liberal; don't give me that libertarian stuff, I know a liberal when I see one." . . . The family that wouldn't let me in at 10:30 p.m. on a lonely country road, but kept hurtling through the screen at me—while mosquitoes buzzed round my head—"Who do you think you are *girlie*? Who are you to change anything?" . . . The man who kept smiling at me and nodding, while I glanced round the room at his wall to wall collection of Grove Press books and samurai swords, a quick exit on that one. . . and all those people who insisted on talking for twenty minutes and then said, "Come back next week."

**More echoes.** . . . Speaking to 500 people, then having only four people come up afterwards, but hearing them say; "We'll vote for you; you are the only one worth voting for." . . . Our tax protest demonstration—I gave out apples and potatoes, "the only free thing I'll ever promise you, and there ain't no such thing, etc." One of our brilliant posters: "WALKER'S NO SMALL POTATOES—SHE WILL MASH TAXES!" . . . The cat, Snowball, we found in the last weeks of the campaign, took care of, and returned to the owners, who wanted to pay us. I suggested they give out my literature instead. Turned out the husband was an ardent socialist. He nearly had apoplexy when he saw the words "free enterprise system." Big argument ensued with the wife. "She took care of our cat—to hell with your politics! We'll give out your literature." And so they did.

**More.** . . . The students at Southampton College, all eager over my ideas, all unable to vote. . . Rosemary Gunning and James Buckley coming out to endorse



Duryea; Buckley to endorse Big D at a meeting of *Conservatives for Duryea*, a group of Jim Drew's cronies (I beat Jim in the primary)... Buckley contacted, promising only to attend a Republican function in honor of Duryea, not to endorse him... Buckley's plane grounded that day, never getting to Long Island! Gunning adamant, will not be stopped. On the phone she tells me: "Duryea represents good government. Are you stupid? Why are you running against him?" Gunning with a big C, remember.

**And then came the day of reckoning...** I pulled between 10 and 17 percent of the vote in my local community, around 10 percent in Brookhaven Town, and 6.3 percent over the entire Assembly district. Close to home where I had petitioned heavily and where I was well known for certain issues (airport condemnation and school taxes, neither too controversial), I did very well. All totaled, I pulled 3208 votes, 85 of which were on the FLP line.

My handicaps were many. The 1st Assembly District is over 60 miles in length and takes in both the north and south forks of Long Island; it includes half of Brookhaven Town and all of Riverhead, Southold, Shelter Island, Southampton and East Hampton Towns. I was considered a westender, unlike my opponents who live way out in the district: (westenders are as bad as city people). Two women in a race cancel each other out. Before the primary, I was unknown to most. I had adverse publicity in *Newsday*, in which I appeared to be a junkie who loved to watch porn. And then there were all those rumors circulated by Drew's faction, my favorite of which is that I was in the pay of the Kennedy family and intended to destroy the Conservative Party on Long Island, as a first step toward the Kennedy family taking over the world—NO KIDDING! And need I mention our financial situation?

**Afterwards...** I AM A CELEBRITY. The League of Women Voters invites me to give my "different views" on land use planning to a round table discussion of the subject. The local newspapers call me for my New Year's Resolutions. If I attend a local hearing and happen to say something, next day's newspapers carry: "Virginia Walker, unsuccessful candidate for the State Assembly, said...."

At a Conservative Dinner Dance, the Republican Town Supervisor, an old enemy, trying to court Conservative endorsement, does his best to make me laugh at his jokes. (I don't.) I am invited (and accept) to be Corresponding Secretary of the leading civic council, ABCO, in Brookhaven Town. I am made Secretary of a Conservative Club. I am involved in court suit with New York State, which charges I owe it \$120 in fines for failing to file something I filed! Action pending investigation.

I receive overtures from an insurgent Republican group out to clean up Brookhaven Town—a coalition coming up? The Liberal candidate who ran against Duryea two years ago invites me to be on a committee to incorporate our local communities into a Village, semi-independent of the Town. I accept and suggest that we secede altogether and form a new Town, recent legislative action making Village status impossible. And so on.

**On the Libertarian front...** The Suffolk Libertarian Organization is meeting again: we've got some new faces and we are planning a Tax Seminar and a Land Use Planning Seminar for the Spring.

**The Future...** Could it be I'm hooked? Will I run again? Look at all the experience I and my fellow workers gained this past year. Should we waste it?

Do you think the Conservatives would accept my candidacy for Town Tax Collector on the platform, "I won't—taxation is theft"? Well, I could give it a try, and I do have that poster, WALKER WILL FREEZE TAXES AND MELT THEM AWAY. I could run on the Libertarian line alone... Heigh Ho! I'll just have to keep it from Alex. He did say: THIS SUMMER WE ARE LIVING A NORMAL LIFE!

Of course, I could manage someone else's campaign; now, who?

## ...AS PLAYED IN BROOKLYN

BY ELLIOTT CAPON

The Kings County FLP general meeting, held at Elliott Capon's digs on Saturday, March 1st, began only ten minutes after the scheduled starting time, thus setting a new FLP record.

The meeting opened with a long discussion of Bob Steinis' upcoming bid for election to the District 19 school board. Steinis assured the meeting that his petition drive was well-manned (well-personned?), well-planned, and assuredly successful. He indicated strong community support for his race. [See separate story.] The subject of a Steinis-for-School-Board fund-raising party was brought up by Joe Gentili and discussed in detail. The party was set for Saturday, April 5th, with hopes of raising a sum large enough to wage a decent campaign—or at least enough to rent a horse and a naked lady.

Planning for the time the FLP becomes a "real" party was not overlooked. Bob Steinis was chosen District Leader of the 40th A.D., and Dave Todeschini Co-Leader in the 38th.

The meeting then voted to empower the county chairperson to introduce an amendment to the state by-laws at the upcoming convention that would delete Article 5, Section 4. This is the one that limits an elected official to two terms in office, and was labeled anti-dynastic and beyond all comprehension. Chairperson Capon (don't that sound bee-youtiful?) then announced his candidacy for delegate to the National LP convention, to a brief though warm and sincere burst of applause.

The meeting then lapsed into an informal discussion of Steinis' race, until the chairperson moved to adjourn. Gentili proposed an amendment to the motion, that the meeting should adjourn to the Burger King on Knapp St. and Ave. K. The motion as amended passed unanimously and we went for burgers, leaving someone's living room a godawful mess.

## NOTICE!

**Manhattan FLP General Meeting:** On Sunday April 20, 1975 at 2:30 p.m.—the third meeting will be held at the Laissez Faire Bookstore, 206 Mercer Street. A debate will be held between Gary Greenberg and Samuel Edward Konkin III on the subject: "Does a Libertarian Belong in a Political Campaign?" Refreshments will be served. Donation: \$1 from members, and \$2 from non-members.



## IF YOU'D LIKE TO DO SOMETHING MORE THAN TALK ABOUT POLITICS...

... well, maybe this seminar is for you.

It doesn't discuss the virtues of gold.

Or the foolishness of the Federal Reserve.

It's not a seminar for beginners.

It's not a seminar to convert the already converted.

No, this seminar is for people who want to learn how to shake things up a bit by getting people elected to office.

It's a seminar devoted to the practical side of advertising political candidates that answers questions like this:

What's an advertising strategy? Why is it important?

How should a candidate pick a slogan? What is a slogan?

What questions must every candidate ask himself? What is the role of market research in politics?

**ADVERTISING AND MARKETING THE LIBERTARIAN CANDIDATE** is a seminar that explains what the guts of advertising is all about. And why every candidate must understand advertising to be elected.

It's based on my experience on Madison Avenue with J. Walter Thompson and Gray Advertising, the world of communication and persuasion. And it applies this experience to help those interested in winning elections understand this world.

This seminar isn't for everybody. It's not for those who want to sit around and endlessly discuss politics. It's not for people who want to spend every November trying to figure out what went wrong.

It's for those who want to spend their Novembers explaining how they won.

Yes, I would like to attend this seminar. Please make a reservation[s] for:

☐ Tuesday, April 8th  
at 8 p.m.  
Unitarian Church  
67 South Randolph St.  
Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

☐ Saturday, April 12th  
at 10 a.m.  
Williams Club  
24 East 39th St.  
New York City

Enclosed is \$4.50 for each person attending (\$5 at door)

Name[s] \_\_\_\_\_

Send to: Paul Streitz  
Titanic Advertising  
174 Lexington Avenue, 1-A  
New York, N.Y. 10016

## FEEL FREE

Address correspondence to: Newsletter Editor • Free  
Libertarian Party • 15 West 38th St., Rm. 201 • New York,  
N.Y. 10018

Dear Mr. O'Sullivan:

The following are my comments on the recent election campaign and suggestions for improving the party's impact.

In the recent election the Tompkins County electorate learned that the FLP was the "Party of Principle." Through letters to local newspapers we attempted to

stress the civil and economic virtues of individual liberty. The electorate also learned that the FLP was a party without significant issues to attract broad support. One central purpose of the upcoming State Convention should be to establish a platform consisting of positions on a limited number of public issues. These positions should be ones that propose change toward the direction of libertarian principles and not the imposition of libertarian solutions. The latter approach, I believe, will not attract very much support.

I will suggest one position on the issue of taxes which represents a small step toward greater choice. I propose that the FLP pursue in the State Legislature a procedure for taxpayers to indicate how they wish their taxes to be allocated among government programs. This could be implemented on the State Income Tax Forms where the state indicates its proposed budget allocation and space is provided for individual taxpayers to indicate the distribution of their taxes. The wishes of the taxpayers will then determine the final budget allocation. Call this the "Taxpayer Budget Plan."

This does not reduce the total tax burden but injects greater individual choice. The impact may be that some government programs will be cut back as taxpayers so indicated. Even this small step will require considerable lobbying. Yet, perhaps, its success will make future lobbying that much easier.

Sincerely,

William K. MacReynolds  
114 Park Lane, Ithaca, N.Y. 14850

*[Professor MacReynolds teaches economics at Cornell University.]*

To the editor;

I have heard some unpleasant rumors that several groups around the country are going to try to push an anti-abortion plank into the National LP platform. Besides my personal concern as founder of LAAG, I feel it is crucial to our presidential platform that we emphasize the points that differentiate us from the conservatives. At the FLP convention, when we vote for delegates to the national convention, it is important to remember that the people elected will decide on the national platform. I hope it will continue to say that we have the right to control our own bodies.

Fran Youngstein

*"Dear 1974 member of the FLP: It costs \$10 to continue your FLP membership through 1975." So began a recent form letter on FLP stationery. The letter went on to review the adventures of the past year, then listed reasons why "you can't afford to pass up the '75 edition." It concluded:*

*"If you have recently sent in your \$10 renewal, you can either ignore this letter or send in another \$10 and become a sustaining member. For their extra \$10, sustaining members receive the honor of having paid \$10 more than any of the regular members.*

*"In any case, your prompt attention is to your advantage and will be appreciated.*

*"Yours in liberty, H. Raymond Strong, State Chairperson."*

*Before he could say "GIGO," Mr. Strong received the following reply:*

(continued on page 12)



**FREE LIBERTARIAN PARTY**  
15 West 38th Street, Room 201  
New York, N.Y. 10018

**FIRST CLASS MAIL**

(continued from page 11)

Dear 1975 State Chairperson:

Aha! I knew it would happen. Bureaucracy has caught up with the Libertarian Party.

I am a lifetime member of the party, having paid an initial membership fee of \$100, or whatever it was at the time. At the moment I don't think I can afford to become a life-time sustaining member (thus achieving the distinction of having paid over \$100 more than a regular member).

I knew a bargain when I saw one. In ten years, when everybody else will still be paying inflated dollars to continue their memberships, I will still be paying nothing. In 20 years, I will have "made" double my money, not factoring in inflation. Boy, I feel terrific.

But the best is yet to come. According to Tuccille, immortality is almost upon us, I can hardly wait. See, I knew what I was doing back in '72.

Tanstaaf! Schmanstaaf!

Sincerely,

John Doswell  
1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978 and so on  
member of the Free Libertarian Party

**ADVERTISEMENT**

**WILL YOU SURVIVE ANARCHY?**

**You may have to, soon. Countercon II, three-day Memorial Weekend Conference (May 23-26) at Camp Mohawk in the Berkshires. Seminars on Hyperinflationary Depression, Coming Mideast War, Tax Resistance, Alternatives Enterprises, Self-Liberation.**

**Speakers: Robert LeFevre, Charles Curley, Dennis Turner, Sam Konkin, Abby Goldsmith, Kenneth Kalcheim.**

**\$75 per person including room, board, snacks, parties, all camp recreation facilities. 10% off for registration with \$35 deposit received or postmarked by May 9th.**

**Make checks payable and mail to J. Neil Schulman, 180 West End Ave., Apt. 7-C, New York, N.Y. 10023.**

**EDITORIAL INFORMATION**

Newsletter Staff:

Arthur O'Sullivan, *Editor*  
Carolyn Keelen, *Art Director and Associate Editor*  
Gloria J. Rotunno and Tom Avery, *Typesetters*  
Mike Nichols, *Production Manager*

Articles and letters should be addressed to:  
FREE LIBERTARIAN PARTY, INC.

15 West 38th Street, Room 201  
New York, N.Y. 10018  
Att: Newsletter Editor

The rate for classified ads is \$1.25 per column inch, \$1.25 minimum. Full page ads (20 column inches) are \$25., half page ads, \$12.50, quarter page ads, \$6.25.

*Special thanks to:*

Jean Graphics, 215 East 89th Street, NYC 10028  
for the free use of their typesetting equipment.

**SUBSCRIPTIONS & MEMBERSHIP**

The *Free Libertarian* costs money to print and mail. There ain't no such thing as a free newsletter, although there is such a thing as the *Free Libertarian*. The newsletter subscription fee is \$7.50 per year for non-members of the FLP. (The fee is included in the yearly dues of members.) Friends of libertarianism who wish to continue receiving the newsletter on a regular basis are urged to fill out and return the coupon below. (The cost of a subscription will be applied to membership dues if the membership application is received within 30 days of the subscription.)

- ☐ PLEASE ENTER A SUBSCRIPTION FOR:  
☐ \$7.50 (one year)    ☐ \$14.00 (two years)

- ☐ PLEASE SEND A MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION TO:

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY AND STATE \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

Enclosed is a ☐ check or ☐ money order for \$ \_\_\_\_\_