

# LIBERTARIAN NEW JERSEY

## GAS VS. WIND

The Supreme Court recently confirmed its 1954 decision that established federal rate regulation on interstate sales of natural gas. Few policies have been so universally condemned by economists of all shades of opinion. The latest Brookings Institution budget study, for example, says "such a policy to limit prices only creates unsatisfied demand now and real scarcities and very high prices later." But S. David Freeman, director of the Ford Foundation energy policy project, disagrees. His many years of experience as a lawyer and administrator with the TVA and Federal Power Commission give him a, well, unique perspective. They also give him access to the pages of the New York Times.

The increased demand for natural gas, says Freeman, is entirely due to air pollution legislation: "It has nothing to do with price controls." That is, households and industries would want the same amount regardless of price. So much for demand curves. "Furthermore," Freeman goes on, "natural gas is still primarily a byproduct of the search for oil, and it is no coincidence that natural gas production has paralleled crude oil in peaking out in recent years." This argument cuts both ways. Industry is less apt to search for oil when one of the products of that search is priced below the cost of exploration and development. "But FPC prices for new gas have already been increased in recent years," says Freeman, "from about 20 cents in 1970 to about 40 cents now." It wasn't until 1973 that the FPC raised prices in the Permian Basin to 35 cents for new gas and 23 cents for old gas. From 1961 to 1966, the real price for natural gas (adjusted for inflation) fell 20 per cent. The recent price relief has not had much effect on profits or consumer prices, because most gas is sold under fixed price contracts (usually 20 years), and the field price for natural gas amounts to only 17 per cent of the consumer's bill. The rest goes to pipeline companies and local distributors. If wellhead prices are kept low, pipeline companies might well have to raise consumer gas prices in order to stay in business with the reduced supply of gas.

Another Brookings study, by Steven Breyer and Paul MacAvoy, finds that pipeline rates are so far no lower than they would have been in the absence of regulation. The only difference is the growing shortage of natural gas. MacAvoy notes that corpo-

rations moved into areas close to the wellhead to gain secure access to gas—at a price above the regulated interstate rate. As a result, new build-ings in many colder parts of the country cannot get natural gas at any price, and this has contributed to the need to import crude and residual oil. Professor MacAvoy estimates that the Stevenson bill (S.2506) to freeze gas prices would generate a national shortage in the Midwest. The gap might be filled by imported liquified natural gas from Algeria and Russia, but this would again leave us vulnerable to a boycott, would present a serious safety hazard, and the stuff would cost at least \$1.50. Gasification of coal would be even more costly.

"FPC price controls on natural gas have been the target of a 20-year decontrol effort by the petroleum industry," says Mr. Freeman. He neglects to mention that all competent authorities agree on this issue—including the chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

Alan Reynolds

## DOCTORS

### & THE WHIMS OF HEW

A compulsory federal monopoly of health insurance could infinitely expand the already ominous powers of Professional Standards Review Organizations. Physicians were partially regimented by PSROs earlier this year, under a little-noticed rider to the 1972 Social Security bill (P. 92-603). The objective of the legislation was to establish "norms" for medical services paid for by Medicaid and Medicare, and to withhold payment or impose fines (retroactively) on doctors who deviated too far from the norm. The PSROs have physician and "consumer" representation, but remain empowered only so long as they conform to the whims of HEW. For all practical purposes, it is a step toward treating medicine as a regulated utility, like Con Ed or the Post Office.

There are a number of potent objections to the PSRO legislation, none of which was heard in congressional hearings because no hearings were held. It obviously imposes standardization, for one thing, and discourages excellence or innovation. The administration costs will probably far outweigh any possible benefits. Norms could easily become floors under fees (like SEC, CAB, and ICC), rather than ceilings above them. And the law is wide open, leaving most details to be "determined by the Secretary."

But most important is the invasion of privacy. The PSRO and HEW are granted unlimited access to "the pertinent records of any practitioner or provider of health services." To grasp the significance of this, one need only consider the interest inspired by the medical records of Daniel Ellsberg and Senator Eagleton. Covert homosexuals might well be blackmailed or blacklisted. And doctors need to know many very private and personal matters in order to practice the subtle art of medicine—i.e., to deviate from the mechanical "norm." How much good advice could priests give if the confessionals were bugged? The confidentiality of the doctor-patient relationship is nothing to be trifled with in a hasty amendment, without even so much as a public hearing.

Opinion polls confirm that the American people are far less concerned about the professional standards of physicians than they are about the professional standards of congressmen. If PSRO is a promising idea, let's test it first by establishing a PSRO to look over the shoulders of lawmakers and bureaucrats.

Alan Reynolds

# LETTERS

I am writing this letter because I cannot allow anyone to assume that I condone the editorial policy of the current editor of the N.J.L.P. Newsletter.

I thoroughly disapprove of the following editorial policy as expressed in the August-September newsletter: "...while I'm doing it this is the policy: personal attacks,..." "...When I can no longer offend anyone, I will resign..."

When this disapproval was expressed at the last State Committee meeting on October 18, the editor attempted to justify her policy by stating that it is just a matter of literary style, of sense of humor, of "being funny." But she also admitted that she is deliberately fanning the fires, deliberately trying to stir up controversy.

I totally disapprove of this policy. Personal attacks are not just a matter of "being funny." Personal attacks are attacks whatever the supposed motives of the attacker.

The newsletter of the N.J.L.P. is not a private vehicle to be used by anyone for the purpose of making personal attacks.

Kathleen McAdam  
Secretary, NJLP

Your newsletter, Madame, is superb.

most articles in it are  
insightful and well written.

All of which is to ask you to join the staff of LP News as our roving East Coast commentator. Your writing style is very entertaining and your thoughts on LP activities and/or political developments in general would be a significant addition to the national newsletter.

Regardless of your decision on the above, please accept my sincere congratulations on your newsletter.

Edward H. Crane III  
Chairman, National LP

Ed. note: a. Thank you. b.

has forgiven me, dammit. c. While I usually prefer to reign in hell over serving in heaven, I'd be delighted to try my hand at gumming up the works of the LP News. d. Please take note of Kathleen McAdam's grotesquery and have her defrocked....I cannot abide dissent.

I have wanted for some time to write and tell you that I think you are the most beautifully irreverent, reverent person I've read in a long time. I haven't written—because I am no longer state chair here and didn't want to bring myself to your attention and be taken off the mailing list!...

Regarding your mention of me in the October...I believe you may have misunderstood Mr. Royce. The word is properly spelled "bitch"—not "witch." If I was a witch I might long ago have turned Mr. Royce into a rat or a worm. Any reports that I have already done so are completely without substance, and too absurd really to answer.

Kathleen G. Harroff

Ed. note: Bitch is accurate? What would a bitch do/have done to him? Never mind, I've heard the salacious story. Will someone please RELEASE THE TAPES?

Fear not, I would never expunge you from the mailing list. Call me reverent and I'll follow you anywhere.

To the Editrix:

Re: the editorial in the October '74 issue...

(1) What is "the meaning and purpose of justice?" The phrase has all the revelation of "the warmth and dignity of humankind."

(ed.: I assume that my readers have the ability to understand concepts and everything these concepts imply. I do not regard my reader—as you imply I should—as a being who has failed to advance beyond the perceptual level of consciousness to the conceptual level. Not as a being who can only deal with the immediate, the concrete, the now, but as one able to deal with abstract ideas in their relation to the concrete.)

(2) Should we be outraged that "President Ford went beyond the Constitution, beyond the law of this land?"

(ed.: Yes.)

As I understand it, this is precisely what tax evaders do.....are they to be criticized on the same grounds?

(ed.: No. Tax evaders are not Presidents—whose job is to uphold the Constitution, or if he disagrees with certain parts of it, to try to change those parts. In order for the man elected President to become President, he must, as stated in the Constitution, "solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President....and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution..." It is obvious that you, Mr. Longinotti, do not realize that a natural-born citizen of the U.S. need not state this oath nor abide by it or any other part of the Constitution—that is your own choice. Your analogy is quite absurd.)

(3) Would "obstruction of justice" be a crime in a libertarian society?

(ed.: Yes.)

If so, how would it be defined, and what would be the "punishment" for transgressors?

(ed.: Justice is the maintenance or administration of what is just, i.e., that which conforms to fact or reason; not false; right, true, accurate. Obstruction of justice is the obliteration of and/or volitional choice to withhold fact, truth, etc. To put it in a single concept, obstruction of justice is perjury. As to the "punishment for transgressors," it would be directly relative to the crimes involved; if one perjured himself in a murder case, thus sending an innocent man to prison or whatever, the "punishment" should be much greater than if one perjured himself in a case of someone stealing a watch.)

(4) Is it true that the editorial was "written" by randomly interspersing paragraphs from editorials in the 'Times', 'Post' and 'Star-Ledger'?

(ed.: Yes, of course. - BNG ) David Longinotti

I thoroughly enjoyed your exquisite publication, especially the ironic editorial interpolations and tantalizing twists of phrase, truly worthy of a Mencken or perhaps even Bierce. I myself have been known to employ similar devices with notable effect, although I could never waste them on the delectations of politicians, even those statisticians who are falsely yclept libertarians. A tour de force, shall we say...

Care to cleanse your soul, quit the evil party, and write for us?

Sam Konkin

You're a marvelous gadfly; I hope you stay with the LP through bad times and worse. And perhaps enjoy victories won. I intend to read through every one of your newsletters. It would be good to learn of heroes as well as villains...

Paul L. Siegler, Chairman  
LP of Kentucky

## LETTERS

I was in California last week campaigning with and for John Hospers, during which trip I visited the National LP Headquarters. Ed Crane showed me a copy of your Newsletter; since it was the only one he refused to let me take it home.

I was delighted! What a fine style you have. And your penetrating observations---I must say it took me several meetings with Mr. Royce to grasp as much as you evidently did on one meeting.

I wonder if you'd be kind enough to send me a copy of that Newsletter--- I don't recall a date on it, and put me on the mailing list to receive future newsletters. Of course I'll be happy to pay whatever charges made both for that issue and for a subscription.

Roger Lea MacBride

Ed. note: Someone said, I think it was about the author of Generation of Vipers, "Put out the lamp of Diogenes, for here by God in the plain light of day, is an honest man." Well, folks, here's a guy who's put his money where his mouth is.

Evidently? Actually, it was the second meeting. The first was a bland how-do-you-do which left so little an impression that I began to wonder if I had developed a block. Now I realize that Mr. Royce wears an expression like most people wear clothing, and that is why he was so forgettable.

Dear ~~Mr~~ (certainly a sign of distinction!):

I have never read a more delightful, scathing, penetrating, sharp, honest, effervescent, independent, insightful, courageous, comprehensive, creative and unique "newsletter" than the October LIBERTARIAN!

(Any good editor strikes superlative adjectives.)

I was entranced by your commentary on Phil Manger's plight, empathetic with your Meritorial, astonished at The Crystal Bull and enlightened by On Brutality.

Therefore, I must side with those who recommend you resign. Such talent should be justly compensated, not devoted to an organizational information sheet whose major purpose should be improved motivation for Party members. (However bland and platitudinal that may be to knowledgeable and consistent libertarians.)

...The sole function of the Libertarian Party is to educate the public in the rudiments of proper social and political action. The solitary goal of the Party is to obtain, with some security, political liberty. In no way does this exclude parallel philosophical activity--in a different context and organization. An L.P. newsletter ought to be the vehicle for arming libertarians with effective arguments on political issues, and reinforcing their abilities and confidence in political action. Whenever the Party, in its official functions, goes above - or below - that purpose, it defeats itself.

The articles I have sincerely praised should not be in an L.P. Newsletter, because their content (subject) is detrimental to the functions of the Party. Your literary skills and keen perception should not be confined to the boundaries of a newsletter, they should be applied to the conquest of libertarians! The articles you've written should have been published and sold for profit to all libertarians in a magazine, "letter" or commentary format. The proper content for a political newsletter is issue analysis and membership motivation. If you feel distraught in such confines, you should BREAK FREE! I would be pleased to enter the first ten year subscription to your publication.

Bill Westmiller  
L.P. National Secretary

Ed. note: Are you saying I'm too good for the party? You are saying many things and I'll answer them in another issue, because despite these 4 pages, there is such a thing as space limitations. That's why I haven't (far as I know) any articles in this issue; but the letters are so captivating, who cares?

[Abby Goldsmith is] not really a monster; weird, yes; overly fond of leftist rhetoric and trappings, yes; but nonetheless a hardworking libertarian.

As you probably know, your n'letter is among the best written and informative of all. I would like to continue receiving it....please let me know the cost of a 2-yr subscription.

Where can I get some of those snail mail bags?  
Charles Breeden  
Florida LP

Ed. note: The rate is \$3 yr., \$4 for autographed copies. The bags come from an outre outfit known as WRETCHED MESS NEWS. (P.O. Bag 68, West Yellowstone, Montana, 59758), who are responsible for the famed Siamese kitten poster ("Hang in there, baby"), and other atrocities. I forget what the bags cost, but they will send you prices with their catalog.

All the flap about the NJLP State Committee "censoring" you in regard to editorials in the last two newsletters indicates a misunderstanding of the concepts involved. They are:

1) Ownership. The NJLP owns the newsletter and, like any prudent owner, must make rules for its property. We did so at an open meeting without your objection. When you did object, in the newsletter, the rules were changed, and, had I been at that meeting, I would have gone along with the changes.

2) Censorship. This word, as I understand the libertarian lexicon, means a coercive violation of someone's property rights in their own media of communication. This almost exclusively applies to the State, and certainly not to the NJLP action.

Ralph Fucetola III

Ed. note: I had quite a few objections at that open meeting. You suggested that letters-to-editor be printed on a "first-come-first-served" basis; I said it was egalitarian. What if all the "first" letters were dull? You suggested I send all unprinted letters to the State Com for final review. I said it was impractical. You said editorials should be written by the State Com, to be sure they were pure party line. I told you the definition of the word editor. You insisted. The resolution came to a vote; I didn't care for it, and attempted to pursue discussion. The attempt was blocked with a hasty turn to other business at hand. Rather than argue, I decided to shut up and have my say on paper.

When I was appointed editor, I was given trust. That is, it was implied that you trusted my judgment; all "conditions" imply that you don't. But this is not "censoring;" it is simply a matter of the State Com looking highly foolish, especially considering their loud espousal of the concepts of freedom, laissez faire, individualism, and reason.

The spectacle of a Libertarian party taking pains to stifle its editor, in order to make the party look peachy-perfect in the eyes of the "idiot" public, is shabby hypocrisy.

WHEREAS, an independent team of 35 respected psychologists have found my personality to be flawless, and  
WHEREAS, objective analysis proves me to be a trooly rational person:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: I hereby cannot in any way, shape, manner or form condone your attacking me. ALSO BE IT KNOWN THAT, if you do attack me, that it will recommend paying your such an exhorbitant salary that we will feel obliged to monitor your every breath and will have you by your figurative balls. FURTHERMORE, I will, with the advice of my vast legal counsel, consider making a Federal case of it (I believe Bob has this in mind re Bill George) as this would seem to present a trooly rational alternative.

Tom Palven

## LETTERS

There has been much howling and gnashing of teeth in the Royce camp since your slanderous article about me appeared in the last issue of LNJ. We are still reeling from the series of foul blows you dealt us. We are amazed that anyone could manage to put such a piece together. Even my Lefevrian associates are muttering that certain forms of "coercion" appropriately applied might not be out of line.

Egad, young lady! I barely know you, yet you ramble on as though you know all my innermost thoughts. How you get away with such articles is beyond my comprehension.

I feel compelled to ask why you waste your time and talent attacking outstanding libertarian leaders when you could be using the literary knife on the likes of Steiner, Hospers, and MacBride.

Needless to say, I shall never admit you to any meeting in my campaign headquarters.

E. Scott Royce

Ed. note: What a phony letter! You blew it in the second paragraph, but you go on for two more with all the indignation of a raped nymph.

Obviously your mind has recovered from the shock and has returned to its normal state---- wherein any publicity is considered good publicity. So say what you mean, or shut up and leave the two-edged penmanship to me. The more I hear, the more I wonder how you got your sleazy reputation; in the field of deceit you are a ridiculous amateur.

Milady exorcist,

Let me congratulate you on your latest journalistic effort. As always, it is a classic example of literary genius applied improperly: In all seriousness, anyone who can write as well as you do is wasting her time doing a newsletter for the ungrateful and the undeserving. If AMERICAN MERCURY had not turned to publishing anti-semitic rubbish, I would notify them that you were Mencken's reincarnation so they could take you on as editor...

E. Scott Royce

Ed. note: Purr.

Although I suspect we would differ on a good many issues, I can't say enough for your literary style. Trying to keep my bias under control, I very much enjoyed the Crystal Bull in your last copy. Again, not sure yet whether I agree on your analysis of Royce, it is highly readable. May I forever manage to evade your verbal arrows...

John Kraft  
Treasurer, National LP  
Vice-President, Wisconsin LP

I have just received your note asking for addresses of the Fla. LP and editor....The editor is one of those "monsters" you'd "like to have a word with," Abby Goldsmith. Her address is 434 SW 2nd St., Gainesville, Fla.

Since I've known Abby for years and know that her credentials as a monster are not impressive, I asked her if she could explain this in terms of some past run-in with you. She didn't remember ever having met you.

I'm forced to conclude that you take random potshots at good libertarians and just happened to be working her part of the alphabet that day.

The Libertarian Party seems to have more than its share of internal strife. I gather from a perusal of the Oct. 1974 issue of your newsletter that asking you to direct your hostilities at the state would be futile. However, could you at least fight with libertarians that you know?

Brian Donerly

Ed. note: Having read some of Goldsmith's work, I credited her with sufficient intelligence to withstand one of my attacks. If you are suggesting she has not, she deserves neither my apologies nor my further attention.

Ms. Mason:

-The meritorial is silly. Either the satisfaction of doing the newsletter is worth the effort (in which case no complaints) or it isn't (in which case quit). Or do you desperately need praise?

-Censorship is an important question, but the lead article seems to go on forever, and is almost as unreadable (and uninteresting) as Mr. Fucetola's of the previous issue. Unless you have been consigned in hell to produce a newsletter X pages long every Y months, I suggest brevity.

-The reply to Mr. Fucetola's poem was, as they say, 'right-on'.

-The portrait of Mr. Royce was much too favorable, and I don't understand the impression you leave of his magnetism ("an arresting face"), but perhaps the reason is our differing hormones. I also believe you mistakenly credit him with some efficacy. That a man who could not, and has not, organized a state party should be a 'regional chairthing' with aspirations to national chairmanship is appalling.

-Your letters to Goodson were characteristic of effrontery which is usually associated with an embarrassed ineptitude. From such an introduction, I did not expect the Newsletter to be readable or even, in spots, amusing. (muffled applause)

-If you print any of this, I shall deny writing it.  
[Unsigned]

Ed. note: The main point of the meritorial was that I had enough to do without being "helped." I have become settled in the job, established a pace and a pattern. There was no complaint, nor did I ask for praise. This editor doesn't have to ask. Until now the unanimous opinion (as it reached me) was that LNJ is an improvement on the previous newsletters. Even when they don't agree on certain pieces, they agree easily on that.

Of course you weren't "interested" in the lead article. Only an editor would be. And had you ever been one, you would have found it "readable."

Thank you for the crumb of praise on the Fucetola reply. Perhaps you have heard I am not the first to cross pens with Ralph---your spelling of his name indicates this. And despite your obvious prejudice against me (doubtless based on the pleasant certainty that I cannot fill the majestic boots of my predecessors) you take my side against him: thus you must have a more solid gripe against him. Yes, the reply was good, and I'm sure you'd have done the same in my place.

To my knowledge you are the only one who thinks the Royce article favorable to him. Royce himself did not find it so. At the MLP Convention, the only value judgment of me which I heard from him was not at all a kind one. It consisted of the adjective "abominable." Yet surely he can read between the lines as well as anyone. Why then did he find no "too favorable" praise? Because I did not write any.

Wise up. Royce's antics are not the Enright House, and I am not the Francon fluff (nor is Kay Harroff, to be sure); so get your nose out of the Fountainhead. Life is not like that. (muffled beehive noises)

VOTE

NO

CASINO GAMBLING

# PALVEN LETTERS

Never let it be said that Tom Palven doesn't know how to treat an editor. He has sent enough material to make an entire newsletter. This is partially due to his new-found career in politics, and partially because he's full of opinions. The following are press releases and letters-to-editor of LNJB; I believe they give the reader an adequate impression of the scope of Palven.

I would like to report that after agitating my father for years he seems to be becoming a libertarian. Actually I think he was always a libertarian resigned to creeping statism. As a grade school principal he is now actively trying to change the name of the school lunch program to something other than "free." Anyone with suggestions might write him at Wattsessing School, Prospect St., Bloomfield, N.J. 07003. You might also write to school supers.

I think that much of man's spirit is a refined animal spirit, i.e., the joie de vivre when I let my dogs out of their pens. I don't think that instinct negates brains, but that each complement the other.

Your impression of Scott is the same one I get. However, any belief that all libertarians are 100% rational sweetness and light is a crock of shit. We are all individual human beings with individual "weaknesses." If psychologists delved deeply enough into any person capable of putting two thoughts together they could probably find some personality defect "proving" that everybody is screwed up beyond all repair. If Scott is ambitious, better that he be an ambitious libertarian than an ambitious statist. If there are flaws in his personality that are self-defeating, then constructive criticism and advice would be in order for his own good and the good of the cause. All of us have the ability to adapt and change and grow. Scott is a very young, possibly brilliant man, with great potential. Like Ralph Fucetola, I believe we should save our villifications for the statist.

Tom Palven

## PALVEN CALLS OPPONENTS "ECONOMIC ILLITERATES"

Tom Palven, Independent libertarian candidate for Congress from the 3rd district, today labelled Democrat James Howard and the Republican candidate as "economic illiterates."

"They sound as silly as Joe Rogers and his Anti-Monopoly Party," he said. "All of them are talking about the effects of inflation, not the cause. The dictionary defines inflation as 'an increase in the money supply,'" Palven noted. "Only government, through its Federal Reserve System, can print paper dollars. Rising prices are the result of the government's creating money out of thin air, and that's no different than counterfeiting."

"The Anti-Monopoly Party blames it all on business. Howard and Clark tell us that it's everybody's fault and nobody's fault, as if inflation were some natural disaster," Palven charged. "I'm not going to tighten my belt for more giveaways."

"Inflation is a government-created disaster, brought about by the government's attempt to give something to everybody. The only promise I'll make is to freeze government, not the economy," Palven stated.

"The only role for government in a free society is to protect each individual from those who would use force or fraud against others. Government is the biggest user of force and I will vote against any legislation that would increase the size of government."

Palven charged that "Mr. Rogers and his Anti-Monopoly Party call for more government control and force to eliminate 'monopolies.'" What is the largest monopoly in America? The federal government," Palven concluded.

---Ron Wishart

## PALVEN SUPPORTS LOCAL POLICE

Tom Palven, Independent libertarian candidate for U.S. Congress said today that a strong local police is vital to a free society. "It is the last organized armed force between the citizens and a possible federal gestapo," Palven said. "As a Congressman I would urge local governments to provide adequate pay and benefits for their police forces, but I would oppose any federal aid which might lead to co-mingling of federal and local police and reduce the autonomy of local police. I would also seek to mollify so-called 'victimless crime' laws. This would include any violations associated with marihuana, gambling, and pornography which can be shown not to lead to major crimes, and which are clogging our court system and making it difficult to swiftly prosecute real criminals and remove them from the streets. Through these actions I would work to restore our local police to their rightful position in our communities as highly respected defenders of personal freedom and stalwart protectors of the individual citizen against force and fraud."

"Compelling our local police to enforce the types of prohibition which are largely unenforceable reduces the manpower available to combat robbers, muggers, and other hardened criminals, and can lead to a general disrespect for law enforcement. It is extremely important to the continuation of our free society that our young, our minorities, and all our citizens give full respect and support to our local police, and I will continue to work to bring this message to all."

It would not surprise me if the government wages an all out campaign against goldenrod, especially as ragweed is the principal offender.

If individuals wish to keep pets and spend their earnings on pet food, is this not their own personal choice and right? If the state can allocate food away from pets, is this laissez faire? Pet owners down this way are a rather hard pressed group as zoning regulations are getting more and more repressive. People have spoken at our town meetings about being hassled by the statist because their kids have a baby duck, or more than three dogs, or a pony on less than five acres. Cruelty to animals is often cited as a reason for the state to keep pets out of the hands of children.

While I certainly don't like to see animals abused (or children abused), I believe in liberty, and also believe that the development of the child takes precedence over the possible abuse of the animal.

Ed. note:

My earliest recollection of the concept "state" goes back to the Year Five. I wanted a pony real bad. Our land was 75x300 in a residential area which was fast becoming business. I was told it was against the law---what? a law over parents?---and after suggesting there was plenty of room back there to hide it, I heard it wouldn't work, the law would find out anyhow. So I figured they must be talking about God, because there couldn't possibly be TWO unknowable, all-seeing/powerful whatsis. By and by they told me about zoning, which I assumed was controlled locally by a minor Saint. Today it is Mary Tappen in our area, saint of property and appliances. A gum wrapper tossed speedily onto the left side of your garbage area protects you from police harrassment and fines. A ten foot fence does not.

---MM

I almost forgot---the line "The government is too much with us" is priceless. I made it up in '06 and have a patent to prove it.

One last aside: I have been listening to Bircher arguments lately about "Support your local police and keep them independent." It is all the more appealing as I have long been cowardly about hating them.



LIBERTARIAN NEW JERSEY

444 NEW BRUNSWICK AVENUE  
FORDS, NEW JERSEY 08863

## PLATFORM of the NEW JERSEY LIBERTARIAN PARTY

### THE PARTY OF PRINCIPLE

We, the members of the Libertarian Party, challenge the cult of the omnipotent state, and defend the rights of the individual.

We hold that each individual has the right to exercise sole dominion over his own life, and has the right to live his life in whatever manner he chooses, so long as he does not forcibly interfere with the equal right of others to live their lives in whatever manner they choose.

Governments throughout history have regularly operated on the opposite principle, that the State has the right to dispose of the lives of individuals and the fruits of their labor. Even within the United States, all political parties other than our own grant to government the right to regulate the life of the individual and seize the fruits of his labor without his consent.

We, on the contrary, deny the right of any government to do these things, and hold that the sole function of government is the protection of the rights of each individual: namely (1) the right to life -- and accordingly we support laws prohibiting the initiation of physical force against others; (2) the right to liberty of speech and action -- and accordingly we oppose all attempts by government to abridge the freedom of speech and press, as well as government censorship in any form; and (3) the right to property -- and accordingly we oppose all government interference with private property, such as confiscation, nationalization, and eminent domain, and support laws which prohibit robbery, trespass, fraud and misrepresentation.

Since government has only one legitimate function, the protection of individual rights, we oppose all interference by government in the areas of voluntary and contractual relations among individuals. Men should not be forced to sacrifice their lives and property for the benefit of others. They should be left free by government to deal with one another as free traders on a free market; and the resultant economic system, the only one compatible with the protection of man's rights, is laissez-faire capitalism.



THERE AINT NO SUCH THING AS A FREE LUNCH

FIRST CLASS MAIL

OBJECTION

Keim College  
Standard of  
Objectivism

inf. Bill Schlichter  
(201) 374-4627



### S. I. L. CONFERENCE

Saturday, November 16; 9 am to 5 pm  
Room 123, Scott Hall, Rutgers University Campus\*

#### Speakers:

Dr. Tibor Machan, on "Building a Libertarian Alternative"

Dr. Eric Mack, on "A Survey of American Libertarian Influences"

Dr. A. Weintraub, on "The Costs of Fighting Inflation"

Dr. Louis Folino, on "The Myths and Realities of Allende's Chile"

Also, workshops and open form discussions featuring:

Sam Konklin on SciFi, Ralph Fucetola on Amnesty,

Dr. Bob Borden on National Health Care, & others

Local contact: SIL (215) 672-4133

Price of Admission: \$7.00 for SIL members (in adv)

\$8.00 for non-members (in adv)

\$10.00 at door for everyone

\*to Rutgers: from Rte. 1 or NJ Turnpike, north on Rte. 18 to Albany St. in downtown New Brunswick, left on Albany to George St., right on George St. to campus.