



# NEW JERSEY LIBERTARIAN

NEW JERSEY LIBERTARIAN PARTY, P.O. BOX 56, TENNENT, N.J. 07763

\* \* \* JANUARY 1985 \* \* \*

## CALENDAR OF EVENTS

January 12, 1985-- State Committee meeting, 2:00 PM at John Schafer's home. Take 287N to Boonton Exit 40B (Wooten St.); turn Left and go to 2nd light (blinker); turn Right onto Boonton Ave. (511); pass reservoir and take 1st Left onto Fayson Lakes Rd.; pass 2 steets then 3rd house on Right is John's--#24 Fayson Lakes Rd. (201/492-1234). All NJLP meetings are open to members, so come and join in on the action.

August 14-18, 1985-- National Libertarian Party Convention in Phoenix, Arizona.

Every Monday-- Libertarian Discussion Club, 6 PM, Patti's Restaurant, 37 Bartlett St., New Brunswick. For info and directions call 201/751-2824 (Danny) or 249-7649 (Rick).

Every Monday-- Free public meeting of NJ Americans for Constitutional Taxation (ACT); 7 PM, Queen Diner, Route 18, East Brunswick.

Every Tuesday-- NJ ACT free public meeting, 7 PM, Moffa's Farm Restaurant, Almonesson Rd., Blenheim. Call 609/HAD-ENUF for info.

Every Wednesday-- Activist and campaign strategy meeting at Richard Duprey's home. Everyone welcome. For directions or info, call Rich at 201/445-6098.

2nd Thursday of each month-- Constitutional Freedom Committee meeting, 8 PM, Ollie's Restaurant, Route 9 and Tilton Rd., Northfield, NJ. Guest anti-tax speaker at each meeting. Call 609/927-2320 after 5 PM for details.

## HEROES OF THE REVOLUTION

By Len Flynn

A continuing series dedicated to the unsung heroes of the Libertarian Revolution, people whose daily efforts swell the ranks of libertarians everywhere and assure the ultimate victory of our noble cause.

### PART II--"INDOLENTS FOR LIBERTY"

Libertarians are a profoundly productive and hardworking group who have little use for the "looters and moochers" who infest the modern welfare state. But our contempt for America's parasites should not blind us to their great usefulness as recruiters for liberty and "workers" for the destruction of the welfare state which breeds them.

What greater lesson for the modern tax slave than to witness the long lines for food stamps at his bank, when he tries to squeeze in a deposit during his frantic lunch hour. Or let the executive on the way to work see a smiling booze-sodden bum, then read his New York Times editorial calling for more welfare handouts for America's "underprivileged." Let a housewife ponder the "justice" of the redistribution of her family's earnings when she tries to make ends meet in the supermarket, where she sees welfare recipients loading their shopping carts with food stamp paid groceries.

Surely such observations will raise questions both about the "work ethic" (WHY should I bother working?) and the altruism of government welfare aid (Why do they DESERVE it?). Both liberals and

See INDOLENTS....Pg. 2

# INDOLENTS....

conservatives grant the "justice" of aid to the "less fortunate" but libertarians alone wholly reject the morality of enforced tax-funded looting of anyone for anything. As Ayn Rand has stressed, one's misfortune--whether poverty or sickness or handicap--does not justify a claim on another's resources.

Another useful characteristic of welfare loafers/looters is that they provide no resources to our rulers, i.e. they are not taxpayers. Welfare chiselers may work occasionally "under the table" or else earn just enough to qualify for and collect unemployment insurance. In both cases their net contribution to the state is a minus.

The parasites may provide votes for politicians but they come at a price. When the looters and moochers become numerous enough, then the welfare state comes tumbling down. (In 1976 the number of tax consumers were estimated to outnumber the number of taxpayers, and the tax consumer group has been steadily growing.)

And let us not forget the impact on the productive workers of our country of the bankrupt and fraudulent Social Security system. Retired, elderly voters are notoriously well organized and effectively press for expansion of this criminal welfare scheme at the great expense of America's younger workers. Neither the Republicans nor the Democrats have the gumption to confront this class robbery and destruction of our future. But libertarians are outspoken opponents of Social Security.

Will the libertarian positions really be appreciated thanks to welfare loafers/looters? I think so. Take this recent incident at a supermarket.

The checker, a 32 year old working mother of a 5 year son, heard a retired woman loudly complaining of her inadequate "fixed income" in the checkout line. Finally losing patience with the obnoxious woman, she asked if

the woman had a mortgage to pay ("no") or a child to raise ("no"). Then she asked if the woman HAD to work when her children were small like she did (again "no").

The clincher was the checker's observation that she had no guaranteed "fixed income" at all, the free ride the complainer was bitching about did not exist for the checker and her husband. A valuable libertarian lesson--in a supermarket!

PART III--"Bungling Bureaucrats" to come

PATERSON NEWS  
11/1/84

**Last week we asked readers, "Do you believe the forecasts that the economy will continue to get better?" Seven people said no, five said yes, and one said perhaps. Here are some of their replies. The rest will run tomorrow, space permitting.**

No, What both Mondale and Reagan fail to tell the American people is that their policies (which aren't all that different) can't cure economic ills. Only a radical departure from government involvement in economic affairs as rapidly as possible can undo the damage of years of interventionism. But rather than take a quick and no doubt painful cure (true laissez-faire capitalism), Mondale and Reagan prefer putting off the day of reckoning with some more collectivist tinkering. Vote Libertarian, America, or lose your freedom!

**Mark Richards  
West Milford**

**RICHARD D. KRAUS**

COUNSELOR AT LAW  
245 MAIN STREET  
RIDGEFIELD PARK NEW JERSEY 07660

(201) 641-8880

# Major Parties Find Three's a Crowd

By RICHARD WINGER

The Nicaraguan sham election next month at least is an all-comers meet, with eight parties opting for the hollow opportunity of ballot status. In the far freer atmosphere of our own national balloting the same week, the entry stakes have been raised to where only Democrats and Republicans can readily qualify. Ballot access for third-party and independent candidates used to be quite easy in almost all states, but in the '80s this is no longer true. For example, John Anderson, who in 1980 won over 20% of the vote in many early polls, spent nearly \$6 million in legal and other expenses to jump through hoops erected by arcane state ballot laws.

Of course, alternative candidates have long complained about ballot laws. Some of these people enjoy little public support and might not comply with the most lenient of ballot laws. But restrictive laws have also barred several genuine alternatives. Mr. Anderson blames restrictive ballot laws in large part for his decision not to run as a National Unity Party candidate this year. The Libertarian Party, which like Mr. Anderson was on all 50 state ballots, won nearly one million votes for president in 1980 but will be on only 39 state ballots this year. The Citizens Party, despite an infusion of federal campaign money during the primaries, will be on only 18 state ballots.

States with restrictive ballot access laws include:

- **Florida:** 145,970 signatures needed to get a third-party candidate, other than a presidential one, on the ballot. There is no ballot "clutter" in Florida. In most of the state's legislative races in 1980 only one party filed candidates.

- **California:** 115,591 signatures needed for a statewide independent candidate.

- **Oregon:** requires 50,745 signatures for a statewide third-party slate.

By contrast, New Jersey, the ninth-largest state, requires only 800 signatures. Yet there is no ballot "clutter." Only seven third parties met the requirement this year.

Why do certain states require so many signatures? History makes it plain that the most restrictive states became so because some third party, or a mass movement that might have become a third party, frightened or offended the politicians who write the election laws. The response? New legislation to keep the "undesirables" off the ballot.

In the 19th century, there were no ballot access laws, because there were no state-printed ballots. Voters were free to pre-

pare their own ballots, but most voters used those printed by the political party of their choice. They could strike names they didn't wish to vote for, and could substitute the names of their opponents. The state had no power to determine which parties could compete in any election, or how a voter could vote.

Governments took over ballot-printing in the 1890s, but the first ballot access laws were lenient. As late as 1928, a third-party or independent presidential candidate (using the easier of the two designations) needed 123,838 valid signatures to get on the ballot of all 48 states, or 0.34% of the number of votes cast that year.

Then the Great Depression struck. The social order of the country appeared shaky, and there were fears that radical third parties might capture the public's imagination. Ballot access laws quickly began to change. For example, the Florida legislature in 1931 redefined "political party" to mean one that had polled at least 30% of the vote in either of the past two presidential elections, and removed all access for new parties and independent candidates. When even the Republicans were thrown off Florida's ballot after the 1936 election, the law was revised.

By 1952, third-party ballot access requirements had risen sharply, so that 902,681 valid signatures, or 1.46% of the vote cast that year, were needed to qualify a new party in all states—about five times the 1928 percentage. Lawsuits by George Wallace in the 1960s and Eugene McCarthy in the 1970s improved matters somewhat so that this year only 729,042 signatures are needed to win nationwide ballot status. But many states persist in having outrageous requirements. For example, seven states even refuse to allow any write-in votes in general elections (another four prohibit them in presidential elections). Yet, two sitting House members and one senator (Strom Thurmond, R., S.C.) were first elected by write-in votes—proving it a useful device for frustrated voters.

Also, since the rise of black voting in the South, attempts have been made to curb ballot access for black independent and third-party candidacies. In 1983, North Carolina increased the number of required signatures seven-fold while a black third party was circulating a ballot access petition. In 1982, a new Virginia law effectively crimped a black state senator's independent bid for the U.S. Senate.

Although Democratic and Republican legislators in certain states are willing to saddle third parties with excessive signature requirements, they have never re-

quired such hurdles for themselves. In 1984, no major party candidate with any media recognition needed more than 5,000 signatures to be part of any state's presidential primary (except that New York requires 10,000 signatures for access to the Democratic presidential primary). Gary Hart, Walter Mondale and Jesse Jackson could appear on the primary ballots of all states that had them, with a national total of only 25,500 valid signatures.

In his 1983 State of the Union message, President Reagan listed "free elections" as a bedrock of American moral strength. The 1984 Democratic convention "recognized the right to vote as the most fundamental of all rights in our democracy. And no duty of the Party is more important than protecting the sanctity of this right." If this only meant that all our political banners might wave.

*Mr. Winger is an election law specialist in San Francisco.*

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL  
Friday, October 26, 1984



**Last week we asked readers, "Should repeat offenders accused of crimes be allowed to plead guilty to lesser offenses?"**

Yes and no. That depends on what the so-called crime is. For victimless crime law violations (which shouldn't be, since such laws should be repealed) like drugs, prostitution, gambling, they should be able to plea bargain. With violent crimes — murder, rape, armed robbery — I would say no. If we were able to defend ourselves with guns most violent crimes would shrink drastically. That madman in McDonald's a few weeks ago wouldn't have killed as many as he did if some of those patrons had been armed!

Mark Richards  
West Milford

**"Should flood victims get buyouts from the federal government?"**

No. There is absolutely nothing in the U.S. Constitution authorizing the federal government to be involved in disaster aid of any kind. These "buyouts" simply mean that some of us will be coerced into giving up our money to supposedly "aid" another. This is just so much collectivist claptrap. True charity must be voluntary and from the heart in order to mean anything to the giver or the recipient. A Libertarian Congress would not even consider such a confiscatory measure.

Mark Richards  
West Milford

**Last week we asked readers, "Is a verifiable nuclear freeze possible?"**

No. The nuclear freeze and other disarmament proposals are "pie in the sky" dreams which will never be attained as long as the criminals and thugs of both Washington and Moscow remain in power! What people don't realize (except for maybe John Birchers, Revisionist Historians and Libertarians) is that our leaders and the Soviets are two sides of the same conspiratorial coin. The U.S. keeps Russia and the entire Communist world going with subsidized trade. We must cut that Export-Import Bank umbilical cord, withdraw from all entangling alliances and allow true free trade...then maybe peace will have a chance!

Mark Richards  
West Milford

# Famine: a libertarian view

THE BERGEN RECORD  
12/6/84

Editor, The Record:

In the article "Many share the blame for catastrophic famine in Ethiopia" (The Record, Nov. 18), writer Ray Mosely puts the blame everywhere except where it belongs: on the socialistic government of Ethiopia.

The policies of Colonel Mengistu call for death for anyone who saves food from good harvest years (he calls it hoarding); saves money from past harvests (capitalist accumulation); or earns a living from transporting food (exploitation). The forced redistribution of food supplies turns an act of God into a calamity.

Farmers on the fragile soils and in the violent climates of Africa know that local droughts are followed, as they always have been, by local food shortages. Left to themselves, the farmers save in good seasons for the bad that are bound to come. But the government has forbidden that.

That was how Stalin so effectively choked off farming in the Soviet Union, where it still has not recovered. Mr. Mosely fails to connect chronic food shortages with socialization of agriculture. Only free-market, libertarian policies will produce abundance.

The question now is whether it should be the responsibility of the United States to supply aid to Ethiopia, now that the famine has come.

Food is the only thing that will save the starving people, but it should come through private relief organizations, not through wealth stolen from American taxpayers. Television has shown the vital role it can play in helping relief groups raise money, and the American people have shown that they are only too willing to help those in less fortunate circumstances (even though they are already heavily taxed for such programs).

And the money coming from the private groups gets into the hands of those who need it, while government-sponsored programs put the money into the hands of bureaucrats. One has only to look at our welfare programs to see evidence of that.

Free food can also be harmful, though. Outside of emergencies, it deters farmers from producing more. Given normal rains, relatively free husbandry, and basic natural rights, almost every country in Africa could amply feed itself. Political incompetence creates shortages. The United States should not add to Africa's self-inflicted misfortunes the burden of harmful handouts.

RICHARD L. DUPREY  
Waldwick

Mr. Duprey is Bergen County representative to the Libertarian Party's state committee.

**Readers were asked recently,  
"Should Treasury Secretary  
Donald Regan's tax-reform plan  
be enacted?"**

Yes and no. "If the tax reform actually cut taxes, then yes. However, without any real corresponding spending cuts, it is meaningless."

Mark Richards  
West Milford

THE BERGEN RECORD  
11/6/84

# To buckle up or not

Editor, The Record:

Putting a new set of teeth in our Passenger Automobile Mandatory Seat Belt Usage Act will only put the bit on supposedly free Americans. It is sufficient that seat belts be solely a safety mechanism, and not also a literal device of government bondage.

As you admit (editorial, Oct. 17), there are some instances in which it has been beneficial to a person *not* to wear his seat belt. Thus the proposed law condemns some to death through a dogmatic view of personal safety. The justification that "on balance, more lives are saved" is a descent into the business of computing lives as if they were some commodity subject to government regulation.

It should be clear that nonaggressive behavior of individuals is not a subject open to government. Each individual should be free to evaluate his own risks and benefits, and pay the costs or reap the benefits. That is the only rational approach.

It is also the only moral approach. For if men and women are not permitted to decide how to control their own lives, then they are not free, but are wards, indeed the property of the state. This flies in the face of every libertarian principle upon which this country was founded and for which it supposedly stands.

The state legislature, in passing the compulsory seat-belt law, has affirmed not that they are our public servants but our masters. That this legislative arrogance proceed no further, Governor Kean must veto this bill.

RICHARD L. DUPREY  
State Committee Representative  
Bergen County  
New Jersey Libertarian Party  
Waldwick

In order to differentiate Democratic from Republican goals; to revitalize the Progressive Era, the hope for the nation's downtrodden which Franklin Delano Roosevelt once offered, and the dream of equality inspired by the Great Society and Martin Luther King, Jr., the Democrats have selected a new key issue.

The anguish, disaffection, and loneliness surrounding our sexual lives are a growing national scandal. We have become a nation divided into "haves" and "have-nots", or more properly "gets" and "get-nots". How much longer can this sexual inequity continue without fundamentally threatening the national polity? The "invisible hand" which supposedly governs the sexual marketplace is simply no longer working, and our totally unregulated free enterprise system for meeting and mating has become as antiquated as the unchecked industrialism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

No civilized country today assumes that those who can't fend for themselves should starve on the street; yet we callously disregard the needs of those unfortunate citizens who are starving for the food of life — love (or its nearest approximation, sex).

A few grim statistics tell the story. A recent Harris poll noted that on any given Saturday night, over 75% of Americans will either not have a date, be stuck with someone they can't stand, or have to go home alone after spending too much money.

## Democrats plan "equal sexual opportunity"

But what is truly appalling about today's crisis is the persistence of wide spread sexual inequities. There are only a limited number of compatible, eligible, and attractive partners available at any one time, yet the odds against finding them have risen from one in ten in 1950 to one in 5,000 today. The disparity can also be found in the U.S. Bureau of the Census report: **SEXUAL INCOME, 1980**. This scarcity of sexual resources is compounded by the disparities in their distribution. Not unlike the laissez-faire economy of the late 1800s, today's sexual marketplace is plagued by "robber barons" who monopolize the sexual action.

We have yet to confront seriously the existence of a sexual underclass in this country, seething with deep-seated frustration and anger which takes a toll in everything from random violence to alcoholism. The underclass includes not only those whose physical or mental handicaps prevent them from forming relationships, but those who are too boring, unattractive, or shy. The number of Americans who are currently unable to find sex may be as high as 20 million — the highest figures since World War II — not counting Andy Warhol, Jerry Falwell, Richard M. Nixon, and others who have dropped out of the sex force on their own.

This underclass is a time bomb ticking away in our society. Hitler capitalized on just such sexual frustrations in working his crowds into a vicarious orgasmic frenzy. Unless more Americans have satisfying orgasms, we are thus surely headed toward totalitarianism.

In a just society, people with true romantic merit would be expected to do very well. In fact, today's unregulated marketplace allows fly-by-night operators with little more than some fast patter and a few gold chains on their hairy chests to dominate the scene. As a result, innocent, gullible, lonely women are defrauded by fast-talking con men who lure them with promises of a "serious relationship," fabulous wealth, or unusually large anatomical assets. Often, these victims find their hopes dashed, and with no recourse to civil or criminal remedies.

In short, no one is adequately served by this free market run amok. Yet our laissez-faire policy responses remain stuck in the nineteenth century. It is time to launch a bold program which deals realistically with the sexual inequities in our society — a program which can serve as the cornerstone of a new progressive coalition.

First, we need to create a "safety net" which guarantees to each American, as a MATTER OF RIGHT, a minimum amount of sexual pleasure. Guaranteed Annual Intercourse is one sane and compassionate approach which deserves serious consideration. At least once a year, even the most unattractive citizen would have to opportunity to enjoy sex with a partner. The actual mechanics of such a program need to be worked out, but some options include government vouchers which would allow people to purchase sex, or a redefined Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) which would build on current volunteer activities.

This spirit might best be aroused by reviving the draft, but a draft which offers today's young people a range of public service options. Predictable slurs, such as "Whore Corps", should not deter our nation's leaders from doing what is right.

Another approach is the National Sex Insurance concept. Unfortunately, the cost to the government of picking up the tab for restaurants, theater tickets, taxicabs, and motel rooms every time a citizen wanted sex might prove prohibitive and inflationary.

Some forward-looking companies are beginning to provide dating services and on-the-job socializing in order to spur worker productivity (e.g. IBM's "Friendly Worker" program). But promoting corporate initiatives isn't enough — the government should be the "pimp of last resort."

In addition, our legal system needs to protect against fraud and to provide a fair "sexual wage". Prenuptial agreements are a step in the right direction, but the contracts would be better. Both parties would be entitled to a sexual response by the other person no later than the third date, else they could sue. Relief would be granted on the basis of florist receipts, ticket stubs, etc.

We should also mandate minimum garment-removal standards. On top of this bare-bones federal standard, states could add their own requirements.

The government, which has helped bring a couple together, should also help during the post-breakup period. Unloved Compensation Assistance would be available only to those who had been involuntarily dismissed from a relationship. The qualified heart-broken would have to provide documentation showing a good-faith effort to find new lovers on their own.

## NJ LIBERTARIAN

254 Tennent Road  
Morganville, NJ 07751

Editor: Ginny Flynn

201/591-1328

### **\*\*ADVERTISING RATES\*\***

Full Page	\$25
Half Page	\$13
Quarter Page	\$7
Eighth Page	\$4
Business Card	\$3

Inserts      \$10/sheet

These rates only apply to ads submitted camera-ready. Extra will be charged for any necessary extra preparation.

Material must be received by the 23rd of the month to be in the following issue.

### **\*\*\*\* MEMBERSHIP RENEWAL \*\*\*\*** A letter from the NJLP Treasurer

Hello friends!

er...your money. I want it. There, now that I've blurted it out, let me assure you that (a) it's for the worthiest of causes. (b) I'm not asking for much & (c) it's totally up to you whether to give or not.

The worthy cause is LIBERTY.

The amount I'm asking is your membership dues.

The mode is voluntary.

So come on Libertarians! Give, so a starving volunteer can have the means to the office materials & literature he needs to convert fellow Americans tired of wallowing in statism.

Give, so we can keep the NJLP News coming to you. A vital link that keeps us Libertarians in touch with each other. Where else are you going to find out about all the Libertarian meetings?

Unsure how much your dues are? - The minimum is on the letter I sent you a few weeks ago with the table on the back. Now on mine...if I can find it...well anyway, if you really don't know, why not be generous? Say \$20.00 wrapped up in the membership re/application form at the back of this newsletter. Or (seriously) call me up.

But PLEASE, do it soon. TANSTAAFL. I'm trying my best to make a tough task (asking for money) sound like fun, but some of you are perilously close to (uh oh) having your subscription stop.

I'd be sorry to lose touch with a friend...& the NJLP News & NJLP membership is a good xmas present either to yourself - or someone else.

Don't mi\$\$ out!

Rick Hoegberg

## **NEW JERSEY LIBERTARIAN PARTY**

### **MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION**

Name: _____	NJLP Dues	Membership Category
Address: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> \$250.00	Lifetime Sustaining
City/State: _____ Zip _____	<input type="checkbox"/> 150.00	Lifetime
Telephone: (h) (____) (b) (____)	<input type="checkbox"/> 35.00	Sustaining
Occupation: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> 15.00	Regular
<input type="checkbox"/> I am eligible to vote in _____ County	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.00	Student (School _____)
<input type="checkbox"/> I am registered to vote in NJ	A subscription to the members' newsletter, the NJ Libertarian is included with the above dues	
<input type="checkbox"/> Please do not include my name if the NJLP list is rented to other Libertarian organizations	<input type="checkbox"/> Monthly pledge for each of the next 12 months	<input type="checkbox"/> \$100 <input type="checkbox"/> \$50 <input type="checkbox"/> \$25 <input type="checkbox"/> \$10 <input type="checkbox"/> \$5 <input type="checkbox"/> Other
"I hereby certify that I do not believe in or advocate the initiation of force as a means of achieving political or social goals"	<input type="checkbox"/> \$15 Libertarian National Committee 1 year dues	
Signature _____ Date _____	<input type="checkbox"/> NJ Libertarian Subscription only \$10	
(Signature indicating acceptance of above statement required for membership)	<input type="checkbox"/> I am not the first member at this mailing address and do not wish to receive a copy of the newsletter (\$10 may be deducted from Regular membership dues only)	

Make checks payable to "NJ Libertarian Party"

Send To: P.O. BOX 56, TENNENT, NJ 07763

New Jersey Libertarian Party  
P.O. Box 56  
Tennent, NJ 07763

TO:

**VOTE  
LIBERTARIAN**