

CALIBER

CALifornia
LIBERTarian
NEWS

May 1978

Volume VI, No. 4

Yes on 13 Committee

FIGHTING THE BIG LIE

If Proposition 13 passes in the June election, you will have *no police protection, no fire protection, and thousands of teachers will be fired from the public schools!*—this is the message you are going to hear repeated *ad nauseam* between now and June 6. Sometimes it will be subtly insinuated; sometimes, stridently proclaimed in an atmosphere of panic and emergency. Either way, the effort will be made (likely paid for by taxpayers) to sell this message and its implication: Proposition 13 equals chaos.

This is the big lie promulgated by those whose interests are opposed to a constitutional limitation on property taxes. “Yes on 13” committees are organizing all over California to fight this lie. But how do you fight something “everybody knows” because it’s been repeated so often that people believe it *must* be true?

Yes on 13 groups have plenty of ammunition; but they are short on organization, funds, and volunteers. If the meeting of the Yes on 13 Committee of Santa Clara County that we attended is representative, they are about half as well organized as the LPC and twice as fired up.

The people at that meeting were clearly fed up with the frighteningly rapid rise in property taxes in the State of California, and had

“It takes a two-thirds vote to increase taxes—this is probably the most important part of the amendment.”

decided to do something about it. It was a high energy meeting, with a pervasive tone of contempt for government officialdom. It appeared that nearly all the 30 people attending were committed activists busy distributing literature door to door, speaking to local groups, writing letters, raising funds, staffing their donated office, registering voters and contacting neighborhood small businesspeople. We took away hundreds of brochures for distribution in our neighborhood as well as other literature and bumper stickers.

The Yes on 13 Committee has a couple of good pieces of literature and a number of others which are not as effective. Best is a simple

Meeting Change

The tentative schedule for the next Executive Committee Meeting of the LPC has been changed from that published in the last CALIBER. The meeting is now scheduled for Saturday and Sunday, April 29 and 30, at the El Rancho Inn, 1100 El Camino Real, Millbrae, CA 94030. Free transportation is available from San Francisco Airport. The meeting convenes at 2 p.m. Saturday.

8x9½ piece folded into thirds titled “Proposition 13 (Jarvis-Gann Initiative) It Will Work!” What follows is the text (but not the layout) of its centerfold.

“What is the real cost of Proposition #13 to government? Total property tax collections in California last year were \$9.368 billion. (Source: State Board of Equalization.) Average property tax percentage rate: 2.8% of full cash value. The 1% limit would be a reduction

“Do not believe the \$7-8 billion propaganda figures.”

of 64%. Gross loss to local governments: (64% of \$9.368 billion) \$5.995 billion. Savings to state government (via lower subventions) \$800 million. (Source: State Finance Director.) *Net cost to government of Proposition #13—\$5.195 billion.* These are the true figures of the cost. Do not believe the \$7-8 billion propaganda figures.

“Where is the money coming from to replace that money? The true question should be: Where is the government going to save that amount of money? If we, the people stand firm in our resolution that money will *not* be replaced. It will be saved by cuts in *excessive, wasteful spending!*”

continued on page 8.

Inside this CALIBER

Yes on Prop. 13. The Jarvis-Gann Initiative has a chance if we get busy and become involved in educating the public. Story on page 1.

Cliff-hanger for S. 1437. It may have passed by the time you read this, but we hope not. Background story and status at press time on page 4.

Ed Clark Speaks to the Voters. An edited collection of quotations from candidate Ed appears on page 5.

Hal Jindrich withdraws. Hal Jindrich has withdrawn from the race for State Superintendent of Public Schools. Story on page 6.

Outlaw Houseboats of Sausalito. Sally Foster asks where are the libertarians in the houseboat controversy on page 6.

Departments:

From the Editors, on page 7.

From the Chair, on page 3.

From Our Readers, on page 2.

Brief Notes, on page 2.

Brief Notes

Michael Zeldis has resigned as Treasurer of the LPC. The position will probably be filled at the next Executive Committee Meeting, scheduled to be held April 29 and 30.

Local libertarian candidates we have heard about so far are:

- Bernie Perra, Assembly 70th District
- Jim Gallagher, Assembly 73rd District
- Paul Beaird, Congress 39th District
- Edward Ogawa, Assembly 42nd District
- Mike Grotke, Assembly 66th District
- Ernst Gherman, City Council, Culver City
- Sam Sewall, City Council, Redlands
- Dave Merrick, Supervisor, Santa Cruz
- David Bergland, Assembly, 72nd District

Will all local candidates out there please let us know your plans?

For several months, the LPC has not been receiving mail at its northern headquarters. Apparently the change of address notice mailed to our old post office was promptly deposited in our old post office box along with *all the mail*. Thus no mail was forwarded. Suspiciously quiet mails finally alerted LPC officials to the problem and now several months of accumulated and unanswered mail is being processed. Please note that we have a new address for northern headquarters and new telephone numbers for both headquarters.

Local contact people are needed for The Committee Against Government Drug Abuse, formed recently to fight the poisoning of marijuana crops. For information contact Steve Sparling, 124 Boulder St., Nevada City, CA 95959.

Over 100 persons were on hand at the Crescent City annual crab race and feed, to watch a Libertarian crab by the name of "Crusader Crab" come in third in his heat, making him (or her) ineligible for the finals. Dave Maxwell, LIBRE coordinator for Del Norte County, entered the crusty crustacean on behalf of the Libertarian Party. Dave assured us that next year's performance will be better. (Source: *North State Libertarian News*.)

In northern California, the Santa Clara County Libertarian Party has joined the Bay Area Coalition to Stop S.1437 and has made a contribution to that organization. Contributions toward literature and bumper stickers may be made to "Coalition to Stop S.1437" and sent to the Libertarian Party of Santa Clara County, 811 Castro So., Mountain View, CA 94041.

LIBRE, the Libertarian Registration Effort, plans an advertising campaign in specialized professional publications instead of costly, time-consuming direct mail campaigns. Send suggestions and/or donations to Rain Blockley, 800 Bush St., #102, San Francisco, CA 94108, or call (415) 928-4330.

No successor has been found to fill the position of Region 6 Chair left open by Peter Van Sant's resignation. This leaves both Regions 6 and 7 operating under what Northern California Vice Chair Cynthia Hilton calls "experimental anarchy." (Source: Bill Carson, Region 6 Secretary-Treasurer.)

All libertarian candidates for local office should contact Cynthia Hilton at 1428 Jackson St., #108, Oakland, CA 94612. In her capacity as chair of the Campaign Strategy Committee, Cynthia will act as a clearinghouse for information on libertarian campaigns.

For information on current activities against S.1437 and HR.6869, write Sally Foster, 14636 Moorpark Ave., Sherman Oaks, CA 91403, or call Dale Burrow in San Jose at (408) 294-6931.

LETTERS

Turned On

If there are many more CALIBERS as exciting as the April issue, they may turn me on to party meeting attendance.

I have thought of myself as a libertarian for over half a century, and have been a card-carrying, dues payer for several years. Also, my spouse and I have registered Libertarian as voters.

The definition of Libertarianism on page 8 seems simple, logical and clear. It is fine that, "Libertarians seek nothing more than Liberty." I suspect that a party-wide poll would yield many divergent opinions as to how Liberty should be defined.

The strong emphasis libertarian literature places upon property rights has been troubling to me. Underwear, neckties and dresses are property. Certainly the owners of such items should not be deprived of them. However, reference to property rights usually relates to land. This is nature's gift to posterity. I have not understood how any red-blooded Libertarian could presume that he/she has the right to acquire and hold land—for no purpose other than to deprive people who need it—until those in need feel compelled to pay the holder a profit-yielding price. Obviously, this "free enterprise" position tells us that landholders are entitled to profit for rendering disservice to the community (the buying and neighboring taxpayers who are subject to reassessment).

Suppose an inventor devises a way to confine and control the atmosphere. Is it the Libertarian position that he who conquers the atmosphere establishes a property right which entitles him/her to restrict breathing rights to those who can pay him/her the going price for air?

I shall eagerly look forward to the official wording of the "Return of Ownership" Resolution to be provided by the LPC Executive Committee, after May 7th.

Roland Ballen
Palo Alto, CA

Ed Clark T-shirts

One of the side benefits of signature collecting for Ed Clark's gubernatorial campaign is the opportunity to advertise his candidacy.

If inexpensive T-shirts are printed with the message "Ed Clark, Libertarian for Governor" (front) and, perhaps, "We want a choice" (back) and worn by every signature collector, then all of these people become walking advertisements for Ed's candidacy.

Liz Jacobsen
San Jose, CA

Happy 10th Anniversary to REASON Magazine!

“Go Forth and Multiply”

By Bruce Lagasse

TALKING TO OURSELVES—INCESTUOUS INTERCOURSE

Perhaps the archetypal exercise in futility is one libertarian telling another libertarian about the virtues of freedom. How many times have you heard the exasperated rebuke, “We’re only talking to ourselves!”—a charge often leveled, both within and without the movement.

There are a hell of a lot more non-libertarians than libertarians; if we’re going to have any social impact at all, if we’re going to avoid the charge of talking to ourselves, we must talk to someone else.

A number of ways of accomplishing this are already in use in the libertarian community—speaking to organizations, editorial replies, testimony before government bodies, etc. A shortcoming of these approaches is that they are essentially one-shot occurrences. You get up, make your pitch, and leave. It would be desirable to have a continuous forum, over time, to make libertarian views known to the same group of people.

There *is* a way to do that; and it ain’t that hard.

JOIN NON-LIBERTARIANS—INFILTRATE

I would like to discuss the importance and advantages of getting actively involved in non-libertarian organizations.

In these days of more and more government interference in all aspects of our lives, goodness knows there is no lack of special interest groups with legitimate gripes. It would be very profitable for LPC members to seek out one or more of such groups. Try to find ones whose cause is compatible with libertarian principles and is congenial with your own personality and interests. In addition, try to affiliate with an organization/coalition that has an asset, or assets, which would be valuable to the LPC, if it could be utilized (e.g. mailing list, volunteers, fund raising potential, etc.).

What’s in it for you and the LP? Just this. The possibility of leverage: with a little bit of effort, you can achieve significant influence.

VOLUNTEER AND INFLUENCE

One of the outstanding characteristics of the Libertarian Party is a chronic shortage of workers. *This characteristic is true of almost every ad-hoc, special interest organization.* It is almost universally true that in such organizations, *anybody* who volunteers and is willing to work can rise in that organization.

Murray Rothbard has written of “The Iron Law of Oligarchy.” In any organized activity, a small number will become the leaders and the others will follow. If you volunteer to do something, you will become known. As confirmation of that, consider your own experience in the Libertarian Party.

DON’T BLOW YOUR COVER

OK, you’ve found an organization that you can really get behind. You’ve gone to one of their meetings, you’ve become a member, and you’ve offered your services (as an envelope-stuffer, speaker, pre-

cinct walker, or whatever). How do you spread the message of libertarianism to your new companions? I offer the following suggestions.

The key factor is to *first* build a reputation as a worker, as a responsible thinker, as reliable, trustworthy, and valuable; *then* you can trot out your LP connection.

Try to become accepted as a *person*, a human being, with concerns in common with your new allies. Do *not* become identified as a walking, talking ideology machine.

You are attempting to make use of the “Halo Effect”—your ideas being accepted because *you* are accepted as a reasonable, responsible, likeable person.

It goes without saying, so I’ll say it anyway, that in such organizations, you should be on your best behavior; people will be judging the Libertarian Party, and the libertarian movement, by your demeanor.

SPREAD THE WORD WITH SUBTLE PERSISTENCE

After you’ve become influential in the organization (and your opinion is valued), look for *natural* opportunities to promote LP ideas, and/or schedule LP speakers (for example, at a forum sponsored by the organization at which political candidates are invited to express their views on matters germane to the group).

But don’t forget—even after an LP speaker comes and goes, *you’ll* still be there in the organization, promoting its goals, while at the same time showing its members how libertarian ideas can work to their benefit.

You will remain, over time, proselytizing libertarian solutions, both by argument and example. This is not the place for overnight conversion to your views; you should be prepared to let your arguments develop slowly, to germinate. The whole point is that you’re going to be there for a while among your new companions; since you don’t need instant assent, you can afford to take your time.

PARTICIPATION IS ITS OWN REWARD—AND THEN SOME

Joining, and working with, a non-libertarian organization can have the following positive fallout: The goals of the organization, by definition worthwhile, will have been furthered; the LP may be able to make use of the organization’s assets; and perhaps most importantly, a group of politically aware people will have been exposed to libertarianism in a gradual, long term, non-threatening and easily assimilated manner.

And because you’ve been able to stick with a person for some period of time, and he’s gotten to know you as a human being, he may turn to you some day and remark, “Hey, that’s not such a crazy idea, after all!”

Stocks • Bonds • Mutual Funds • Tax-Shelter Plans
IRA-Keogh Pension-Profit Sharing

American Investors Company

JOSEPH H. LEONARD
Registered Principal

Member Boston Exchange
Associate Member
All Major Exchanges

5043 Graves Avenue, Suite A
San Jose, California 95129
(408) 252-0911

ALL LINES OF INSURANCE
Personal • Auto • Home • Life • Business

JOHN “DOC” COXFORD
AUCTIONEER

SPECIALIZING IN SALES OF UNLICENSED
PERSONAL PROPERTY ON YOUR PREMISES

213-697-4123
714-623-0946
714-525-4358

ESTATES, CHARITY
HOUSEHOLD GOODS, SMALL
BUSINESS LIQUIDATIONS

S. 1437—The Death of Liberty In Our Time?

By Dale Burrow

The Federal Criminal Code is a disorganized hodgepodge, loaded with obsolete sections and contradictory sections—an administrative and civil liberties nightmare. The legislative “roots” of what is currently known as S.1437 date back to the Johnson administration when the Brown Commission was appointed to study the law and develop a proposed recodification.

The Commission was composed of three “liberals” including Don Edwards of California and two “conservatives” including the late Senator John McClelland. The Majority report of the commission, while not a perfect libertarian document, generally respected civil liberties and would have been a vast improvement over existing law. The first attempt to enact a reform of the law took the form of S.1400 in early 1973 under the Nixon administration. Unfortunately, S.1400 was modeled on the minority report of the Brown Commission and was regarded by the ACLU to be a blueprint for a police state.

Congress adjourned before taking action on S.1400. In an embellished form it was reincarnated as S.1 early in 1975. This was about the time that the Nixon administration was being bombarded by information leaked to the press—Watergate, Daniel Ellsberg, Deep Throat, etc. Nixon had a staff of lawyers draw up a shopping list of legislation to be included in S.1. S.1 was so blatantly repressive that grass-roots coalitions sprang up all over the country and even the press recognized the threat to its first amendment rights. The outcry of opposition nearly killed S.1.

After Congress adjourned again without taking any action on the Bill, Pat Brown, Sr., former Governor of California, wrote a letter to the *New York Times*. He suggested that the offensive and controversial sections of S.1 could be modified or eliminated but urged that the main body of the legislation be salvaged. The same task force that worked on S.1 for the Nixon and Ford administrations went to work for Griffin Bell and wrote S.1437.

S. 1437 is not as flagrant as its predecessors, *but the substance remains*. On the last day in the Senate, over 300 pages of conforming amendments were moved and passed unanimously—without even being read. As passed by the Senate, S.1437 is a dark cloud on the future of liberty. Under S.1437 the following provisions would exist:

- It would become an offense to lie to, mislead, or deceive a government official or agent or to impede or disrupt the orderly conduct of government functions. (Picketing, demonstrating, or tax protest would be undertaken at great risk.)
- *Information* would be defined as property and unauthorized dissemination of government information would become a federal felony.
- Sabotage sections would make it a federal crime to: with intent impair military effectiveness; or with reckless disregard that one's activities may impair military effectiveness, impede the production or delivery of raw materials, or the manufacture or delivery of *anything* needed by the U.S. government or associate nations to prepare for war, engage in war or defense activities.
- The government may end any labor dispute, demonstration, or any activity it may declare impairs military effectiveness.
- It would be a felony to interfere or incite to interfere with recruitment or conscription for induction into the armed services. (This would mean no more campus demonstrations against recruiters and no more draft card burning.)
- The dissemination of obscene material would become a federal offense. (Information on birth control, abortion, and contraceptives are defined elsewhere as “obscene.” *continued*)

S. 1437—Opposition Grows

By Sally Foster

Committee hearings are continuing on HR.6869, the House of Representatives' version of Senate Bill 1437. [See related article for background information on this dangerous bill.] It has essentially the same language as S.1437, *before* that bill's amendments. Originally eight hearings were scheduled for March. It was assumed that it would then be voted out and presented to the House. However, due to increasing “interest” (outrage?), several additional hearings have been scheduled through the first two weeks of April.

Opposition is becoming better organized, with California and New York apparently the major agitation centers. On March 16, Ted Weiss (D-NY) introduced a resolution (House Resolution 1066) urging the House to “Stop the Criminal Code Reform Act.

The resolution condemns both S.1437 and HR.6869 for failing “to maintain and preserve the Constitutional rights of all Americans,” and further demands that the House “conduct full and complete hearings regarding the US Criminal Code.” Eleven Congressmen have already signed the Weiss resolution, and four are from California. They are:

Henry Waxman, District 24—Los Angeles (Beverly, Fairfax)
Ronald Dellums, District 8—Berkeley, Oakland
Phil Burton, District 6—San Francisco
John Burton, District 5—San Francisco (northwest)

They deserve our thanks and support on this issue. Could *your* Congressman be persuaded to add his name to this list?

An Ad Hoc Committee to Oppose S.1437 and HR.6869 has been formed, composed mostly so far of California groups, and local chapters of national organizations, such as the Los Angeles chapter of the ACLU, the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, Screen Actors' Guild, and the Citizens Commission on Human Rights. The Libertarian Advocate, a registered libertarian lobby headed by Alan Bock (who writes *Reason* magazine's monthly column “Washington Watch”) and based in Washington, DC, has also joined.

Genuine discussion and study of what has been termed “the first major revision and consolidation of 200 years of US criminal law” (*Congressional Quarterly*, Feb. 4), and which co-author Ted Kennedy himself has declared to be “the cornerstone of the federal government's law enforcement policy,” was disgracefully shackled. The full Senate debated only eight days on this huge and important legislation. Maybe it won't be all that easy to get it through the House—especially if “full and complete” hearings are held.

Death of Liberty

continued from previous column

The enactment of S.1437 would lead to an enormous expansion of federally prosecuted crimes. It has been estimated that such prosecutions would jump from about 40,000 cases last year to over 200,000 cases per year. The FBI would increase by 500% and become a national federal police force. A look at history might cast light on potential activities for such a force. Between 1966 and 1976, the FBI spent \$2.5 million for paid informers in organizations. The Bureau defends itself saying that they spent \$400,000 of this for informants *continued on page 8.*

Proposition 13 Update

Citing “runaway government” the board of trustees of the Cupertino school district voted April 11 to support the Jarvis-Gann initiative, Proposition 13. One trustee, David Cayton, said “If my kids had to spend a year out of school, they'd be better off than they are now.” (Source: *San Jose Mercury*, April 15, 1978.)

Ed Clark Pushes Tax Credit Theme

As the number of public appearances in Ed Clark's gubernatorial campaign grows, the primary emerging theme is tax credits to cure the ills caused by government.

Ed presents the libertarian message that "government is the problem, not the solution" as the reasoning behind a set of concrete proposals for immediate change. By themselves, the proposals are not particularly radical; but, if accepted, the reasoning behind them could take us a long way toward a free society. In this article we present a collection of excerpts from Ed's recent speeches and interviews, to give our readers the flavor of his campaign.

In his recent first speech as the official candidate of the Libertarian Party for governor of California, on February 20, 1978, Ed set the stage for his tax credit proposals. Referring to the present state of public education induced by government promotion of egalitarianism, he said, "we may have egalitarianism, but it's at a tremendously low level, and nobody wants their children at that level." At this point he introduced his program of tax credit to allow parents a choice in the education of their children.

During March, Ed accompanied Dr. Thomas Szasz on a speaking tour sponsored by the Citizens Commission on Human Rights [see February CALIBER]. They appeared in San Diego, Los Angeles, Palo Alto, and Sacramento, speaking against compulsory psychiatry to small (300-400 in Palo Alto) but appreciative audiences. In his introductory remarks in Palo Alto, Ed described the Libertarian Party as "a party to defend individual rights" with the political philosophy of "classical liberalism."

The libertarian message was presented in a simple question, "Is life better for Californians as a result of the one thousand laws passed in Sacramento last year?", and in a statement of the Libertarian Party position on the subject of Dr. Szasz's lecture, "We . . . demand an immediate end to all nonvoluntary commitment and an end to nonvoluntary treatment." Ed reiterated his tax credit proposal for public education in the question and answer period following the speeches.

The best example we have so far of Ed's approach to an extended speaking engagement with a nonlibertarian audience, is an interview on radio station KGO in San Francisco on March 21, 1978. The interviewer was Ray Talliaferro, who was taking the place of Jim Eason on the Jim Eason Show. Mr. Talliaferro apparently had a minimal acquaintance with libertarianism. The KGO audience is probably the largest afternoon radio audience in the Bay Area. What follows is a series of excerpts from the interview and listener question period.

INTERVIEWER: Ed, you're running for governor of the state of California. Why?

ED: I think the major parties have really lost track of what people want in their lives. They've lost track of individual freedom and they're afraid to address many important issues that are before the people. I can address issues that the major parties will not address—for instance public education. Most people think public education is a disaster. It can't provide minority education. It can't provide bilingual education. It can't provide even good education. What should be done is to provide tax credits for parents so they could send their children to private school. . . .

INTERVIEWER: If you're going to be governor of this state, why don't you as governor do what you can to upgrade the public education?

ED: I think that that should be done as well, but I think the problem is so big that it has to be approached from both viewpoints. . . . A tax credit program would put private and parochial schools within reach of the great mass of people in California, not just the rich.

INTERVIEWER: OK. That's education. What else can we look for in your plank?

ED: I think that the greatest thing that can be done for poor people in California is more jobs. And I have several programs to do that.

One is the Jarvis-Gann Tax Initiative. . . . The minimum wage law as applied to teenagers is a terrible. . . crime.

INTERVIEWER: Are you against the minimum wage law *period*?

ED: As a long range result, as a long range program, I think probably the minimum wage law should be abolished; but its real vicious impact is on teenagers, particularly minority group teenagers. . . . We should give business tax credits to encourage them to employ teenagers.

INTERVIEWER: OK. Now you talked about education and jobs. Is there another?

ED: A third one is victimless crimes. Just take marijuana for example. . . . People ought to have the right to use it. And we shouldn't spend valuable police resources trying to catch people who sell it or bring it into the country. We ought to use the police to stop the rapists and the murderers—the real crimes—not this victimless crime. . . . And there are many others—for instance cocaine which is a very mild drug. I think that should be legalized. We shouldn't spend police time locking people up for doing that which is like having a couple of beers.

[Listener asks position on gay rights.]

ED: Gay people should be treated before the law exactly the same as any other citizen and there should be no legal discrimination against gays in the military, in the police, . . . with one possible exception in the public area, and that is public education. And I really have a problem here.

Gays are forced to pay taxes, and they pay very heavy taxes, and the taxes go to support the public schools. And that leads me to the conclusion that gays should have a right to teach in the public schools. . . . But the thing that bothers me is what about the rights of the parents? The parents are taxed so heavily now that generally they cannot—except for the rich—send their children to private or parochial schools, so they have to send their children to public schools. And if for reasons that I don't find sound, they don't want any gay teachers in the public schools, don't they have some right nevertheless to exercise their own judgment over who the teachers are? And I can't find any resolution for that problem in the public school area.

[Listener agrees with Ed on marijuana and cocaine but asks "what about heroin?"]

ED: Well, those who would favor legalization of heroin would say that the reason that the heroin addicts. . . rob people. . . is because it is illegal. The drug is very, very expensive and the only way most of the people who take it can support their habit is to steal. . . .

LISTENER: Well, would you put the law enforcement. . . off of marijuana and cocaine and put it onto heroin? What are your views about that?

ED: With respect to heroin, as a basic philosophical concept, I think there's a lot to be said for not having the present laws against it. However, I don't think that. . . that's an issue in this campaign and that's not one of the victimless crimes that I'm going to talk about.

[Listener illustrates confusion between tax credits and subsidies and asks "why should we believe you?"]

ED: Well, the Republicans have clearly established that they believe in subsidizing big business. . . . It's wrong to redistribute a lot of money to lower income people. What you should do is try to help them find jobs. But if it's wrong to give money from the tax system to the poor people, it's obscene to give it to big business. . . . We are absolutely against any subsidy of business. It's clear in our platform; it's clear in everything we say; and everything we've done is consistent with that.

LISTENER: So, let's say you were in Congress, you would have voted against Lockhead?

ED: Absolutely.

Where the Hell are the Libertarians?

By Sally Foster

"The houseboat community in Sausalito is being developed toward death. The bulldozers and protesters and cops are 50 yards from our door. Where the hell are the environmentalists?"

Steward Brand poses this question in an article titled "Houseboaters Fight for Freedom" which first appeared in the *Co Evolution Quarterly*. Mr. Brand edits this publication which is available at \$12 per year from Box 428, Sausalito, CA 94965. My source is an excerpt in the January 1978 issue of *Preservation News*.

In answering his rhetorical question, Brand makes some excellent observations on the mentality of certain environmentalists—observations rather applicable to certain libertarians as well.

Describing the specifics of the political scene in Sausalito, Brand writes:

"The houseboats of Sausalito are an outlaw area which is not zoned, up to code; policed particularly, connected to the city services or occupied by entirely law-abiding citizens.

"We are implacably not tidy, and there lies, I suspect, the reason why some environmentalists fall on the wrong side of the issue. The same environmentalists who inveigh against unsightly (energy-conservative, low environmental impact) trailers, or Christo's Running fence or outhouses, also usually want to eradicate houseboats. They are enforcing taste and calling it ecology.

"Marin County, a famous environmentally conscious principality, has been at work with the Sausalito houseboats since the late '50s, primarily on the issues of tidiness (permission, safety, uniformity, sewage, predictability)."

Here's a real issue, a cause dear to libertarians—zoning vs. non-zoning. Why do we not rush to the scene with our slogans, placards, citizens' petitions of support, and other ritual paraphernalia of contemporary urban warfare? Where the hell are the libertarians?

I suspect their absence is accountable for the same reasons that Brand indicts the environmentalists: a matter of taste. Brand observes that "There is an unacknowledged division in the environmentalist world between the garden (nice view) environmentalists and ecology (whole system) environmentalists. A friend of mine once drew a distinction between "concrete libertarians" (condominiums, fascination with computers) and "Thoreauian libertarians" (explanation necessary?). It is not easy if you are a "concrete libertarian" to get really excited, at a gut level, about the plight of the "untidy" houseboat owners, who are not only untidy, but even let their property deteriorate. You think, with a shiver, of Dagny pulling up that weed.

Brand terms the division between "garden" and "ecology" environmentalism a false division for, he says, "through the vigorous gene pool of 'weeds' the creative possibilities of exploitable plants and disciplined landscapes are kept open." Similarly, a distinction between the two types of libertarians is, perhaps, also false. It is through a wide variety of personalities, life styles, and neighborhoods that interesting and creative environments, disciplined and undisciplined can emerge.

Now—what can we do to help those houseboat dwellers?

**Register
LIBERTARIAN**

Jindrich Withdraws, Urges Support for Ed Clark

As some CALIBER readers have already learned, Hal Jindrich has chosen not to run for State Superintendent of Public Schools this year. After considering various strategies, Hal believes that it is more appropriate this year to put all statewide libertarian campaign efforts behind the Ed Clark for Governor campaign. Hal said, "I urge all of you to get behind our campaign for governor."

Hal has asked that those libertarians with a special interest in education contact him soon concerning long range planning for the 1982 Superintendent's race. (Write to 555 W. Middlefield Ave., # S-201, Mountain View, CA 94043.) The 1982 election will present a special opportunity for libertarians, since the incumbent Wilson Riles, who is expected to win reelection this year, will be stepping down.

Acknowledgements

We would like to correct a serious lack in recent issues of CALIBER by acknowledging all the people responsible for getting your CALIBER to you.

Thanks to secretaries **Michelle Kurtz** and **June Genis** who have been producing the mailing labels and processing all the subscriptions, renewals, complaints, etc.

Our special thanks to the members of the **Libertarian Party of Santa Clara County** who have been folding and labeling CALIBER since we took over as editors.

All photographs in the last issue except that of Ed Clark were done by **Don Smith**. Ed's photo was in the CALIBER files and was probably taken by **Bruce Lagasse**.

Ms. Atlas Press has been the printer for all CALIBER issues in Volume VI.

S.A.P.P.H.A. Enterprises is under contract to handle CALIBER advertising.

Jean Graphics and Typesetting Co. sets the type for each issue at cost.

Finally we would like to acknowledge ourselves for putting it all together. All the editing, layout, mechanical work, and much of the writing is done by your volunteer editors, **Gloria Rotunno** and **Ray Strong**.

IRS Finally Gives Up

After two hung juries, Morgan Hill "tax rebel" Charles Reitz has had charges against him dropped. Reitz filed returns for 1970 and 1971 but refused to answer any questions on income. While courts have ruled that the Fifth Amendment is not a defense for failure to file income tax forms, Reitz used his "good faith claim of Fifth Amendment privilege" as a defense against the charge of "willfully and knowingly" failing to file. (Source: *San Jose Mercury*, April 13, 1978.)

LLOYD TAYLOR

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT

256 MONTGOMERY ST.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94104

TELEPHONE
982-8880
OR 788-1140

What is a Libertarian Position?

Libertarians do not share a common ethics: we don't agree on what is good and bad, right and wrong, for individuals or groups. The Libertarian party (or the libertarian movement) is an alliance of individuals with very little in the way of shared beliefs or culture or values. What we do share is a limited but growing system of ideas about how people should interact with each other. We propose to look at the limits and suggest future directions.

LIMITS OF LIBERTARIANISM

Libertarians agree "that the only proper use of force in society is self defense" (*Libertarianism*, by Roy Childs, Libertarian Party Position Paper #1). Or do we? Right at the beginning of this most narrow definition of libertarianism we run into twin problems: (1) what is force? and (2) what is society?

IS IT FORCE?

Is it force when an employer fires an employee or when a retailer refuses to sell to a consumer? We quickly restrict our usage to active, physical force employed by one individual against another. As libertarians, we don't take a stand on the propriety of various exercises of what is sometimes called economic force. We may personally abhor employment discrimination on the basis of racial characteristics or sexual preferences; but, as libertarians, we agree only that physical force should not be used or threatened to prevent such discrimination.

Is the victim of an abortion a member of society? What about the child who is physically forced to quit playing in the street? Libertarians have not been so clear in their answers to these questions. Some hold that the initiation of physical force against any human being (including a fetus or a dependent child) is wrong. Some get lost trying to argue that fetuses and children are not human beings. Some argue that abortion is self defense. We are only agreed that the initiation or threat of physical force is improper among independent adult human beings.

ROOM FOR GROWTH

A libertarian cannot (consistently) advocate the use of force to interfere with an action just because he believes it wrong. We believe this notion can form the basis for a wider libertarian consensus. Libertarians actually agree now on positions not directly deducible from our limited nonaggression principle. The Libertarian Party seems to have achieved a consensus in opposition to employment discrimination when practiced by a government. There is a growing libertarian acceptance of the idea of allowing children to declare their independence and become members of society. We can even hope for eventual agreement that, while abortion may be wrong, it is improper to use force to interfere.

People have reached libertarianism from a multitude of positions, philosophies, and belief systems. Our agreement rests, not on hope for utopia, but on desire for civilization. As we grow in numbers, let's grow in acceptance of each other as well.

Libertarianism

Libertarianism is nothing more nor less than the politics of Liberty. While other parties and groups seek to use the tools of politics to give some groups power over others, to enrich some at the expense of others, or to impose some set of values on those who disagree with those values, Libertarians seek nothing more than Liberty.

In economics, Libertarians advocate the establishment of the purely free market, that is, a market unhampered by government intrusion.

In the field of civil liberties, Libertarians hold that individuals must respect the right of others to live different lives, to read and enjoy different commodities, to shape their relationships, sexual and other, in their own way, to live their lives in their own way, at their own ex-

pense and risk, never forcing others to pay for their mistakes

Americans two hundred years ago knew that eternal vigilance was the price of liberty, and were prepared to pay that price. Whether we are willing to pay that price today is a question which must be answered individually, by each of us. But we of the Libertarian Party have made our choice. Moved by a passion for justice, by compassion for those oppressed by State power and privilege, we have raised the banner of Liberty

Adapted from *Libertarianism*, Libertarian Party Position Paper #1, available at \$5/100 from Libertarian Party National Headquarters, 1516 P Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

LIBERTARIAN PARTY OF CALIFORNIA Membership Application

Southern Headquarters: P.O. Box 71383, Los Angeles, California 90071 (213) 240-2556
Northern Headquarters: P.O. Box 2375, Stanford, California 94305 (415) 386-3115

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

Phone _____ Unlisted, do not release

Send me _____ voter registration card[s].

I hereby certify that I do not believe in or advocate the initiation of force as a means of achieving political or social ends.

Date _____ Signature _____

- Student. Name of school _____ \$ 6.00
- Regular \$ 15.00
- Sustaining \$ 25.00
- Sponsor \$ 50.00
- Life \$250.00

The above amounts all include a subscription to CALIBER, the LPC state newsletter.

- Dues only—exclude newsletter (deduct \$5.00 from above amount) _____
- Newsletter subscription only \$ 5.00
- Voluntary contribution to help build the LPC _____

Total _____

Fighting the Big Lie

continued from page 1.

Supporters of Proposition 13 are backed by some prominent local economists. Winner of the Nobel Prize in Economics Milton Friedman, now of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, endorsed the initiative in March saying, "One thing I really like is the provision that it takes a two-thirds vote to increase taxes—this is probably the most important part of the amendment. [The Behr Bill] is clearly a panicky reaction to the chance passage of Jarvis-Gann . . . The Behr bill returns to the people only a fraction of the surplus which has automatically accumulated from the effect of inflation on the tax yield." UCLA economist Neil Jacoby says the Jarvis-Gann initiative will provide "more than sufficient revenue" to pay for "property-related" services including police and fire protection and street and light maintenance.

Yes on 13 groups are not limiting their activities to handing out literature. They are busy *registering voters* before the May 8th deadline for eligibility to vote on the initiative. We talked with one active member of the Santa Clara Yes on 13 Committee, William Paul Mahrt, who can be found handing out Yes on 13 literature and registering voters (by postcard) every weekend. [Note: It is both necessary and possible to obtain permission to disseminate literature and register voters in shopping centers.] Libertarians could become involved in such an effort, convincing people to vote yes on Proposition 13 and registering people to vote Libertarian. Fight the big lie by contacting your local Yes on 13 Committee or Joseph J. Micciche (Mitch - e - ky) the State coordinator, at Joseph J. Micciche & Associates, 1320 Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, CA 90013, (213) 626-7678. Watch for extensive television coverage of the battle coming soon on CBS's "60 Minutes."

Libertarianism

Libertarianism is nothing more nor less than the politics of Liberty. While some other parties and groups seek to use the tools of politics to give some groups power over others, to enrich some at the expense of others, or to impose some set of values on those who disagree with those values, Libertarians seek nothing more than Liberty.

The position paper entitled "Libertarianism," is available from from the Libertarian Party National Headquarters, 1516 P Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.

Death of Liberty

continued from page 4.

in terrorist groups. That left over \$2 million that they spent on informants in other organizations, *including* the Libertarian Party.

What can be done? Congress responds to pressure. S.1437 is a complex 700 page bill that destroys the Bill of Rights with great subtlety. Consequently, there has been little public pressure against the bill. A number of political heavyweights are pushing for its passage. President Carter wants the bill. Edward Kennedy and John McClelland joined to hold back liberal and conservative opposition. However, Rep. Kohen has introduced HR.2311 into the House following the original proposals of the majority report of the Brown Commission. As an improvement over both existing law and S.1437, it has the support of groups and organizations that have opposed S.1 and S.1437. Libertarians may want to support HR.2311 for the same reason. When you write or call your representative ask him to consider HR.2311.

CALifornia LIBERTarian NEWS is published monthly by the LIBERTARIAN PARTY OF CALIFORNIA.

For information, subscriptions, or address changes write to:

CALIBER Subscription Department
c/o Libertarian Party of California
P. O. Box 71383
Los Angeles, CA 90071

One year subscription is \$5.00; \$6.00 for first class mail delivery. Individual copies are \$.40 each.

Send all editorial correspondence to:

CALIBER
c/o Jean Graphics
Almaden Business Center
6455 Almaden Expressway
San Jose, CA 95120

Send display advertisements, or requests for information regarding advertising in CALIBER to:

CALIBER Advertising Department
c/o S.A.P.P.H.A. Enterprises
2000 West Hedding, Suite #F
San Jose, CA 95128
Telephone: (408) 241-3336

CALIBER

CALifornia
LIBERTarian
NEWS

Published monthly by
THE LIBERTARIAN PARTY OF CALIFORNIA

Northern Headquarters:
P.O. Box 2617, San Francisco 94126

Southern Headquarters:
P.O. Box 71383, Los Angeles 90071.

DAVE NOLAN
1818 S. JASMINE
DENVER CO 80224
NLN-DNV JAN 1999

Bulk Rate
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 3382
San Jose, CA