

THE

Libertarian Forum

Joseph R. Peden, Publisher

Murray N. Rothbard, Editor

VOLUME II, NO. 20

OCTOBER 15, 1970

35¢

POLARIZATION

The "radicLeft" (to coin a phrase) is getting what it wants: polarization. And so Bernardine Dohrn, the Voice from Underground, sounds the trumpet call for the Mad Bombers and their supposed legion of supporters; while, on the other side, Vice-President Agnew tours the country having great success in mobilizing Middle America to smash the Left. I will give you one very swift guess which side the vast majority of the American people are going to join, ever more vociferously out for blood.

Let's look at the matter for a moment from the point of view of the "average American", now known as the "Middle American", the average, sober, industrious Forgotten Man of William Graham Sumner who pays but pays uncomplainingly in taxes and inflation for all the mixed-economy, welfarist, and subsidy programs of government. He is the Forgotten Man who works hard, improves his lot but finds much of the improvement taken from him by taxes and rising prices, goes to Church with fair regularity, and puts his overwhelming trust and devotion in the American flag and the Constitution. Beset by problems but correctly convinced that his lot is the best on earth, our Forgotten Man finds his greatest joy in what Left-intellectuals savagely deride as "bourgeois culture": in Lawrence Welk, in drinking beer in front of televised football on Sunday afternoons. Now, in the last several years, the Forgotten Man looks around him and finds all of his most cherished values, his devotion to thrift, cleanliness, hard work, improvement of his material standard of living, and "bourgeois" enjoyment in his leisure standard of living, and "bourgeois" hours, derided with great savagery by what looks like the whole mass of the younger generation. And he finds his most cherished moral precepts derided also. The Forgotten American has always been, in theory, in favor of the virtues of chastity, decency, and fidelity. He had never completely cleaved to them in practice, but his missteps were always furtive, shamefaced, and therefore kept hidden, so that while he had sometimes deviated from the rules in practice, their theoretical purity remained unsullied. Now he finds the Youth Culture openly proclaiming and flaunting the rupture of all the rules, for the youth now proclaim that what he had thought were vices are now really the New Virtues: promiscuity, pornography, drug addition, obscenity, bisexuality, total disrespect for private property.

And he finds his own cleaving to the rules derided by the young as "hypocrisy"; the fact that few people, no matter how high-minded, can be 100% perfect in cleaving to moral rules is now used by the young to damn him self-righteously while they proclaim the old hated vices to be the True Morality. He finds cleanliness replaced by filth, virtue by vice, movies with an enjoyable plot and identifiable

heroes replaced by pornography and morbid irrationality.

And then, to top it off, the Forgotten American finds this generation of youth trampling on property, destroying colleges, and burning and defiling the symbol he has been taught to revere most highly--the American flag, as well as calling for defeat in wars in which his country has engaged. And when he looks to find the focus for this monstrosity, he finds it in the nation's colleges. He had always vaguely distrusted the intellectuality and the seeming bent toward some sort of subversion of existing values and institutions among academics. During the "consensus" world of the 1950's and early 1960's, when intellectuals had rediscovered America and found power positions in the system, this suspicion was overlayed; but now it was back in full fury. It particularly hurt that the sons and daughters of upper and upper-middle classes, the ones who had enjoyed the advantages of affluence and education which the Forgotten American had always vainly desired for his own children, that these were the heart and soul of the new horror. And furthermore, the Youth Culture is clearly in league with the accelerating drive toward ever greater welfare handouts, with what he sees as the pampering of the blacks and their ever-increasing commission of crime, and which are far more visible to him than the equally increasing handouts to the military-industrial complex.

Amidst this continuing and increasing assault on everything which he holds dear, the Forgotten American has been almost remarkably patient. Part of this patience has undoubtedly been bewilderment, bewilderment at the fantastic rapidity of social change in the last few years, and because he is far less articulate than the youth and their host of "radiclib" supporters among the *intelligentsia*. Alone, the Forgotten American cannot rouse himself to action; he needs a leader, a man who can articulate his anguish, who can mount a vociferous counter-attack upon his enemies. In Vice-President Agnew he has at last found such a leader; hence the great success with which Agnew, a man hardly possessed of magnetism or inner charisma, has been mobilizing Middle America. Middle America has at last found a champion, and God help the Left if ever the Nixon Administration should abandon its shilly-shallying stance of 90% rhetoric and 10% action and actually devise a comprehensive program of action. For the Young Left has spat in the face of Middle America for a long time now, with surprisingly little retaliation. What will happen when that sleeping giant awakens, and gets in some blows of his own, especially now that Mr. Agnew has articulated his resentment?

The Middle American backlash against the left youth has already begun. The famous books by Kevin Phillips, and more

(Continued on page 3)

O CANADA

Recently Americans have become more aware than usual that something exists to the north of us besides Alaska and the North Pole. To some it is a happy refuge from the long arm of the draft board; to others a last frontier where rugged individualism can express itself creatively and successfully; some wish to enjoy life at a pace thirty years behind that of the Pepsi generation; others look to exploit a cornucopia of natural riches for the benefit of God's chosen ones--the Americans. Yes, Canada is, at last, penetrating the consciousness of the American public--and to the Canadians nothing should be more frightening than that!

Canada, compared with the U. S., is an underdeveloped country; larger in area, it has but a tenth the population of its aggressive neighbor. In the nature of things, the two nations have been linked economically, and to a great extent culturally. Only within French Quebec does an American feel himself a foreigner--and the English-speaking Canadian has felt the same. Canadian national culture may have deep roots but the leaves of the plant are rather fragile, and the flowers are often cut and shipped to market in New York, Boston and California.

Apart from the perennial questions of bilingualism and Quebec separatism, the most ubiquitous concern of Canadians is the quest for economic development. Acutely conscious of their lower standard of living, rural poverty, and dependency upon American capital and markets, Canadians see industrialization as the magic formula for catching up with America in terms of modernity and prosperity. In their desire for speedy progress, they have, unfortunately, been persuaded to rely on the use of governmental coercion to accumulate capital and direct its allocation. The chief instrumentality of this policy is the so-called development plan and the development corporation. While the plan establishes how and in what areas capital is to be allocated, the development corporation gives or lends capital taken from the taxpayers to corporate capitalists unwilling or unable to risk their own funds on the government's plans. While the transfer of capital from one group--the taxpayers--to another--subsidized private corporation--is well known in the United States (the World Bank, AID and Small Business Administration to mention but a few examples), the practice has recently accelerated rapidly in Canada at the federal, provincial and even municipal levels, and in the last few years the inevitable results are beginning to appear.

Let us confine our attention to the Maritime Provinces--Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, a region which suffers endemic unemployment (10.8% against the national average of 6.7%) and a per capita income of \$1712 compared to the national average of \$2317 (1967). Between 1961-1966 the region lost through migration 103,000 persons--leaving behind less than two million inhabitants. (We will exclude Newfoundland which entered the Canadian confederation in 1949 and suffers the same ailments as the older maritime provinces). The outmigration includes people of all social classes and educational levels, including university graduates who find that the newly attracted industries tend to draw their managerial and technical personnel from their home bases in the United States, Europe or Toronto. Even local governmental bodies hire outsiders to an inexplicable extent. The Halifax city council recently planned to hire as city manager an American from Oklahoma! Only the protests of the city's small black population who learned of the American's reputation as a racist ended the negotiations.

Yet despite these economic conditions, the region is blessed with great natural riches: fine harbors, good fishing grounds, bountiful forests, a good mixture of fine pasture and croplands, an energetic and intelligent people,

and a nearness to both European and American markets. Why then the lack of material prosperity?

Part of the answer lies in events which occurred a century ago but still dominate the economic condition of the Maritime provinces. There were very grave reasons why the Maritime provinces should never have joined Canada in the first place. The trade of the provinces was almost wholly directed to the United States and Europe; its products were not needed in upper Canada, and the manufactured goods made there could be purchased more cheaply in the U. S. The only economic reason for joining the Canadian confederation was that the Maritime provinces, particularly Prince Edward, had developed a mania for building railroads--the costs of which far exceeded the potential revenues of the governments. The Canadians offered to absorb the large public debts of the provinces and link the Maritime provinces by rail with upper Canada. Anti-confederation feeling was so strong that for years after Confederation (1967-73) the Maritime governments were controlled by anti-confederate political parties--but they had so few members in the Ottawa parliament that they could safely be ignored. However, the region's trade was now subordinated to the economic interests of upper Canada which used Confederation to raise tariffs on manufactured goods coming from the U. S., thus increasing the cost of living of the Maritimers without any noticeable advantages to its inhabitants.

This unfavorable trade situation persists and is well illustrated by the recent announcement that railroad rates in the Maritime region are to be raised 25% and in Sept. 1970 a further rate increase is planned. But, the increases do *not* apply to shipments of grain and flour, meat, zinc fertilizer, potash, sulfur, phosphates, nickel concentrate, or butter; some iron and steel products, trailers on flatcars and all freight carried between the U. S. and Canadian depots are also excluded. Manufactured goods shipped from West (Ontario) to East (Maritimes) also enjoy special discounts, which do not apply to such goods moving from the Maritimes westward. As can be clearly seen, the railroad rates reflect the economic needs of upper Canada, and discriminate against the local products and manufactures of the Maritime provinces, which serve simply as a bridge for goods being imported and exported by upper Canadian interests. The building of the St. Lawrence Seaway was but another blow to local Maritime interests, which have continually been sacrificed by federal laws favoring upper Canadian capitalists.

Since the mid-sixties, the Maritime provincial governments have sought economic prosperity through provincially-financed industrial development corporations. As in the U. S., all the political parties espouse this approach and differ only in their claims to be more efficient, farseeing and honest servants of corporate capitalism. The New Democratic party, which is routinely described as Canada's socialist party, has at least one leader, Premier Schreyer of Manitoba, who boasts that the New Deal is his model. Apparently there is no vocal libertarian criticism or analysis of the Canadian scene, although three new publications in the Maritime area have recently begun to zero in on the development corporation boondoggle (*The Mysterious East*, Fredericton, N. B.; the *Fourth Estate*, a newspaper published in Halifax, N. S., and *The Square Deal*, a monthly paper concerned with affairs on P. B. I.) But the tone of these is reformist and muckraking rather than analytic and ideological.

What has the development corporation achieved so far?

Without any appreciable increase in population, the Maritime Provinces have greatly increased their public debt: between 1962 and 1969 the debt of Prince Edward has risen from \$36m to \$78.3m; New Brunswick's from \$195m to \$323m and Nova Scotia's from \$220 to \$329.5m. New

(Continued on page 3)

O CANADA — (Continued from page 2)

Brunswick is having considerable difficulty in finding new tax sources due to concessions given to industry and a retail sales tax already at the prohibitive rate of 8%. If this indebtedness continues to rise it may well end in the termination of all provincial autonomy. How did this come about? And is this the end of it?

In 1963, despite a decision by federal authorities not to invest in it, the Nova Scotian development corporation at government bidding agreed to finance the construction of a "heavy water" plant in cooperation with an American inventor-entrepreneur Jerome Spivack. It invested \$12m in 51% of Spivack's Deuterium Corp. of New York on the understanding that Spivack would raise the remaining \$18m needed to construct the \$30m project. The American firm of Brown and Root were to do the construction. By 1966 the costs had risen to \$40m due to labor disputes with B&R, Spivack had failed to raise the \$18m and the development corporation decided to buy him out for \$2m and become sole owners of the uncompleted plant. Two years later, still incomplete, it was decided to double the plant's capacity, raising the estimated costs now to \$83m without producing an ounce of heavy water. Shortly after, it was discovered that someone had left salt water stagnating in miles of tubes and cylinders which had ruined them through corrosion. The Nova Scotian government now came to the rescue of its own development corporation by buying 51% of its shares in Deuterium; it then hired consultants who reported that it would take at least two more years and another \$30m to complete the work. The cost to the Nova Scotian taxpayers now has reached the staggering sum of \$110m with \$700,000 interest paid annually. The population of the province is about 756,000. At the present time the plant is still not in production and the Premier, Mr. Smith, admits it will probably operate at an annual deficit of \$5-6m. This is but one example, albeit the most spectacular, of progress via development corporations.

Puny by comparison is the Nova Scotian loan of \$18m to two Toronto businessmen to build a plant for their Clairtone Sound Corp. at Stellarton, N. S. The new plant was to bring work to at least 640 local people. Three years after construction, the owners suddenly sold out to the development corporation for \$2m. A few weeks later it was revealed that Clairtone had lost \$800,000 during the first half of that year. The plant is still producing with a work force of less than 100, its deficit has now risen to \$18m, and the value of its stock—wholly owned by the development corporation—is now one-tenth the price paid to the carpetbaggers from Toronto.

In New Brunswick the development corporation has achieved comparable successes. It planned to make the town of Dorchester an industrial center by financing the building of a fertilizer plant, and eventually subsidiary facilities, in the Westmoreland Chemical Park; electric lines, roads and railways were built to link the park with the floating dock to which ships would bring the raw chemicals through the Bay of Fundy, noted for its herculean tides. Today the \$6m park lies idle; the Fundy tides make it impossible to dock the ships that carry the vital raw materials.

When in 1966 an election brought to power the Liberal party led by young Alex Campbell, Prince Edward Island's 108,000 people were still without the benefit of an industrial development plan. The new premier soon created the Economic Improvement Corp., which hired experts who took three years to tell the islanders what they already knew—that their economy was based solely on agriculture and fishing, that their real income was declining, and that they needed an industrial development corporation. It was suggested that the government invest \$750m over 15 years

POLARIZATION — (Continued from page 1)

recently by Scammon and Wattenberg, have enraged the liberals, but none has successfully refuted their observations: that the wave of the political future lies with the Middle American who is fed to the gills with students, youth, bombings, crime, and the blacks.

The Democratic National Committee, adopting Scammon-Wattenberg as their text, and alive to these "social issues", is moving to purge the liberals of their influence in party councils.

Why, we might ask, is Agnew having more success in his campaign than did Joe McCarthy in his attempt in the 1950's to rouse the masses in populist fashion against the liberals? The main difference is that in the 1950's the Establishment *was* liberal, and McCarthy therefore found himself trying to lead a populist assault against the Establishment, including such a mighty symbol as the American Army itself. Now Mr. Agnew is using all the resources of the Executive branch, and therefore of the Establishment, against the liberals and the Left. As a result, the press and media, which while centrist is far less liberal than in the 1950's, have been effectively neutralized by the pressures inherent in a Vice-President, whereas they were able to gut McCarthy (and Goldwater, for that matter) savagely with blessings from the federal government.

As for the radical Left, they have only just begun to pay the price of their years of arrogant self-isolation from Middle America, of their total failure even to try to convince the man whose values they so utterly despise. Their increasing radicalization has only served to demoralize and confuse their own supporters, while mobilizing the mass of the American people against them with accelerating intensity. In their insulated and hopped-up frenzy, the Weathermen have totally forgotten the strategic advice of their own supposed mentors: Mao, Fidel, and Che—the warning that

(Continued on page 5)

to encourage the establishment of new industries, consolidated farms (clear the land of people) and processing plants, and encourage tourism. The key to industrialization must remain better communication with the mainland, but proposals for a bridge across the channel to New Brunswick were laid aside. In summer, motorists wait four and five hours to cross on the ferries and until something can be done to make access of people, cars, and freight easier, it is difficult to believe that the \$750m will be well spent. But the plan has been accepted by the electorate and we may await the almost certain recurrence of the Nova Scotia-New Brunswick experience.

About 5% of our subscribers are residents of Canada, and it encourages us to hope that we might hear from them in future regarding developments in their own provinces. With so much to offer its people, Canada should become one of the most prosperous societies in the world, if it can avoid wars, and the waste and theft of its people's capital and talents. This can only be assured by the operations of the free market; we see them, in Canada, a magnificent opportunity for libertarians to alert their countrymen to the real character of corporate capitalism, its alliance with the state to rob and pillage the people through taxation to enrich the few who can make the right political connections; its inevitable destruction of local economic interests in favor of national or international elites. We would hope that our readers across the border would enter into dialogue with the dissenting voices that are appearing in the pages of the *Last Post*, *The Mysterious East* and *Canadian Dimension* so that libertarian ideas may enter the consciousness of the thinking Canadian public.

--J. R. P.

Gun Laws

The indifference which seems to pervade many libertarian circles regarding recent gun control laws—laws which are likely to forge the final links on the chains shackled to the average American citizen—is dangerously surprising. Apparently no one perceives the importance of what has occurred.

Few realize the extreme shackles placed on actual or potential gun owners by the acts snowballing into the Gun Control Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-618). To purchase a gun one must make a sworn statement of identity, which is sent to the local police chief—who decides whether the applicant may own a gun on the basis of whether he is a "law-abiding" citizen (i.e., if he obeys every order of the power elite). Firearm ownership is denied to convicted felons, dishonorably discharged veterans, aliens illegally in the U. S., and former citizens who have renounced their citizenship, viz., *all potential opposers of the Establishment*. Users of "dangerous drugs" like pot, anyone under 21, as well as many others are also denied the right of ownership. Ownership of fully automatic, large caliber, or other firearms is absolutely prohibited to everyone but the State.

Even those qualified to own an arm are hampered by total registration, a fact unknown to the general public. Besides direct registration of newly purchased guns, "back-door registration" of all other guns occurs due to the requirement that merchants record the name, address, etc., of all buyers of ammunition. These records are subject to police and Federal snooping. All producers and retailers are also fettered by high license fees and other outrages.

Some state and local governments have gone even more berserk. In many areas, anyone possessing a firearm is under constant harassment by the police. Complete registra-

tion, as well as the charging of atrociously high license fees, have left many with the necessity of surrendering their guns. The states of New York, New Jersey, and Illinois are particularly oppressive in this regard.

On the local level, the situation in Miami reads like a chapter from 1984. To apply for gun ownership, one must submit to the police extensive personal information. While at this point they have not gone quite as far as Rhodesia, where 32 blacks were recently sentenced to death for the "crime" of possessing firearms, anyone who is caught carrying a "dangerous weapon" without police approval gets a minimum of 6 months or \$1,000 in fines. To help enforce these repressions, a \$100 bounty is paid to anyone who is willing to squeal on his neighbor for firearms violations. Other cities are on the same road.

The ultimate goal of the power structure is the total abolition of private (non-ruling class) gun ownership. In mid-January 1969 the Illinois Academy of Criminology spoke favorably of this goal, and hundreds of other groups and individuals openly admit similar ambitions. The minimum they will settle for is complete police control of all firearms as is the case in Soviet Russia.

The masses are taught to believe the lie that such laws will reduce crime. Nothing could be further from the truth, because gun ownership by the general population simply does not cause crime. In 1966, twice as many guns per home were owned in Canada as compared with the U. S., yet the gun homicide rate of the former was only one-fifth that of the latter (*American Rifleman*, Aug., 1968, p. 46). And surely, if one wants to kill another, the absence of a gun will act as no safeguard; in Japan, where civilian guns are outlawed, the murder rate without guns is almost twice as high as the U. S. rate without guns (*American Rifleman*, Nov., 1968, p. 17).

(Continued on page 5)

Annual Festival Of Liberation

November 14 - 15, 1970

BOVARD HALL

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Sponsored By Rampart College in Cooperation With California Libertarian Alliance and Action Coalition for Freedom

"Authoritarianism vs. Libertarianism"

SPEAKERS: Murray Rothbard (First time on West Coast)

Paul Goodman
Dr. Thomas Szasz
Dr. Joel Fort
Robert LeFevre

TWO FULL DAYS OF

SPEAKERS — PANELS — WORKSHOPS

Stressing ACTION programs of self-liberation and creative alternatives to authoritarian structures.

SAVE 20% ON ADVANCE SALE TICKETS

Students

Non-Students

Reserved Section \$8.00

Reserved Section \$16.00

General Admission \$4.00

General Admission ... \$ 8.00

Rampart College

104 W. 4th Street, Santa Ana, California 92701
ORDER NOW BEFORE TICKET SUPPLIES ARE EXHAUSTED

GUN LAWS — (Continued from page 4)

On the contrary, gun ownership by the immense majority serves to prevent crime. Criminals have second thoughts regarding killing and plundering peaceful individuals who may be armed. But they have no hesitations when they are confident that their victims are helpless. Since criminals will always have guns (no criminals would register their guns, and besides, zip guns are easy to make), it is necessary that potential victims be able to arm themselves to prevent crime. Each month the *American Rifleman*, under the column "The Armed Citizen", cites numerous instances in which private guns have prevented crimes.

Thus the avowed goal of State gun control is false. What,

POLARIZATION — (Continued from page 3)

one does not go over into guerrilla action until one is supported by the mass of the population. In their fanaticism, Bernardine and her comrades believe that a few "exemplary" bombings will arouse the masses to their call; the masses will be aroused alright, but in the opposite direction. Every new outrage by the Left brings us a giant step closer to fascism, a fascism which will inevitably fall not only upon those who have been continually trying to provoke it but upon many innocents as well.

If President Nixon were only smart--which he gives no signs of being--he would get us pronto out of Vietnam and abolish the draft. This would totally defuse the major political issue of the Left, neutralize the liberals, and allow the Administration to smash the then totally isolated radicals with a minimum of fuss or "spillover." In their blindness, the conservatives fail to see that Vietnam is the only issue on which the Left can hope to mobilize any sort of mass support, and that deprived of that issue, the Left Revolution would crumble completely.

In the meanwhile, however, the exuberant hopes of the new Peace Politics of last spring have been dashed on the rocks of the accelerating polarization between the bombers of the campus and the bombers of Vietnam. President Nixon's meretricious gestures in the direction of peace have temporarily defused the Vietnam issue. Still, the only sane political course is to try to preserve and strengthen the peace bloc in Congress. This means to support in particular the races of Duffey (D.) in Connecticut, Metzenbaum (D.) in Ohio, Grossman (D.) in Arizona, Hoff (D.) in Vermont, Sesler (D.) in Pennsylvania; and the re-election attempts of Hartke (D.) in Indiana, Hart (D.) in Michigan, Burdick (D.) in North Dakota, Williams (D.) in New Jersey, Moss (D.) in Utah, Proxmire (D.) in Wisconsin, and Goodell (R.), in New York. All of these men voted correctly, from the libertarian viewpoint, on the three most important votes of the current Congress: No on the ABM, Yes on the Hatfield-Goldwater bill to move rapidly toward raising the pay of GI's so as to abolish the draft, and Yes on the McGovern-Hatfield resolution to pull totally out of Vietnam by mid-1971. Particularly important (though not very likely) would be the re-election of Senator Goodell, as a reward for his courage and independence in bucking a Republican President on the Vietnam War, and thereby earning the bitter attacks of the Vice-President; in Charles Goodell lies the lingering hope for Peace Republicanism, and that is precisely why the Administration and the Conservative Party want him retired.

At this point, however, support for Peace Politics seems as dim a hope within the libertarian movement as it is in the nation at large. To some this would be an interruption in their task of "making revolution" in a couple of weeks; to others it would sully their sectarian purity; to still others it would interfere with their personal careers. And so confrontation and repression loom around the corner, with few caring about any last-minute attempt to steer our nation onto a saner course.

then, is the real reason why the power elite wants to leave the people defenseless?

It has already been observed that guns are necessary for peaceful individuals to protect themselves from criminals. But who has been the most ferocious criminal in history? It is obvious: *the State!*

The U. S. Government, though they trust themselves with the largest arsenal the world has ever known, including everything from napalm and M-16's to tanks and H-bombs, will not trust its thralls with .22-cal. revolvers. Why does this trust not exist? The people want to be free, a great number of blacks as well as many non-ruling class whites desire self-determination, and the Establishment must frustrate these movements. *Laissez-faire* gun ownership is feared for the same reason that Hitler would have been afraid of a gun-owning Jewish population or Stalin a bunch of pistol-packing Ukrainians. Well does the State know Mao's dictum: "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." The rulers realize that the only way to retain their control

(Continued on page 6)

NOW! AT LAST!

The long-awaited work by

Murray N. Rothbard

The sequel to "Man, Economy, and State"

Is Available!

IT IS CALLED

POWER AND MARKET

POWER AND MARKET demonstrates how a free market can be *truly* free, providing protection and defense *without the need* for coercive, monopolistic government.

POWER AND MARKET analyzes all forms of government intervention and their consequences, focussing on intervention as a grantor of monopolistic privilege, direct and hidden.

POWER AND MARKET dissects the rationale and effects of every kind of taxation, including the poll tax and the "Randian" voluntary taxation solution.

POWER AND MARKET provides the first thorough critique in years of the Henry George "single tax".

POWER AND MARKET exposes the inner contradictions of the theories of democracy.

POWER AND MARKET extends praxeology to a critique and refutation of important anti-market ethical doctrines, including: the problems of immoral choices, equality, security, the alleged joys of status, charity and poverty, "materialism", "other forms" of coercion, human and property rights. Also an exposition of libertarian social philosophy in refuting a book solely devoted to attacking it.

Available in paper (\$3.00) or hard-cover (\$6.00).

From:

Institute For Humane Studies

1134 Crane St.

Menlo Park, Calif. 94015

Recommended Reading

Out in Paperback:

John Womack, Jr., *Zapata and the Mexican Revolution* (Random House, Vintage, \$2.95). See *Lib. Forum*, Sept. 15.
 H. L. Nieburg, *In the Name of Science* (Quadrangle). Incursions of the U. S. Government into science.
 Arno J. Mayer, *The Political Origins of the New Diplomacy, 1917-18* (Random House, Vintage, \$2.95), and *Politics and Diplomacy of Peacemaking, 1918-19* (Random House, Vintage, \$3.95). Brilliant two volumes on the development of Wilsonian imperialism after World War I. A truly trans-national history that deals with the American and various European internal political struggles as well as with conventional diplomatic history. A work of historical tapestry that ranks with Robert R. Palmer on the age of the French Revolution.

Conservation.

E. F. Roberts, "Plead the Ninth Amendment!", *Natural History* (August). A law professor at Cornell urges the use of the highly libertarian Ninth Amendment by citizens who sue polluters in the courts.

The Middle East.

Uri Avnery, *Israel Without Zionists* (Macmillan, \$6.95). An anti-Zionist work by the leader of the Israeli "New Left."

Women's Lib.

Perhaps the backlash against Women's Lib has at last begun. Midge Decter's "The Liberated Women", *Commentary* (October, \$1.00), is a devastating portrait of the typical woman's libber, who scorns her true freedom of choice in order to agitate for a "freedom demanded by children and enjoyed by no one: the freedom from all difficulty."

Left/Right.

It is a measure of the parlous state we are in that some of the sanest comments on social and ideological matters can now be found in such (formerly despised) Social Democratic organs as *Commentary*, *Encounter*, *Public Interest*, and *Dissent*. Thus, Nathan Glazer, in "On Being Deradicalized," *Commentary* (October), affectingly relates his hegira from "mild radical" in the late 1950's to "mild conservative today. Glazer's "radicalism" was his attraction to the libertarian, anti-war, and decentralization positions of such as Paul Goodman and Dwight MacDonald; his shift "rightward" came not so much from a basic change of view as from his realization that the radical Left has become bent on destroying the university, and from his growing awareness that no society can survive without the inner self-disciplines of hard work and without modern technology and the industrial system, all of which our Youth Culture Rousseauists are out to destroy.

GUN LAWS — (Continued from page 5)

over the people is to monopolize the firearms. The powers-that-be perceive that the people can never exercise their right to be free if they have no might to be free. Thus it is in part by gun control that Big Brother perpetuates his hegemony.

Besides those already mentioned, one of the most important steps taken by the U. S. Leviathan has been to forbid the importation into the U. S. of surplus military rifles. American gun manufacturers, including Winchester-Western, Remington, and Savage gave tremendous support to the passage of this act to prevent competition from old and low-priced but reliable foreign arms. The State's motive is evident too: these inexpensive guns were within the buying power of everyone, and outlawing further importation prevents the many who cannot afford expensive American guns from acquiring a means of self-defense.

Understanding the political (or rather, the *anti-political*)

utility of guns for the people, it is deplorable that the police can know who owns which firearms. But unless present trends are reversed, these quasi-private guns will not be around to worry about—they will be confiscated, leaving the people with no protection whatever.

There are few methods available to prevent this. The National Rifle Association has been a somewhat effective lobbyist in Congress to preserve the Second Amendment freedom to keep and bear arms, but it is likely that such efforts will only delay confiscation. The best mode available seems to be that employed by the people of Chicago last fall: only one-third of the city's 1,200,000 firearms were registered in accordance with the ordinance requiring total registration, and of the two million gun owners in Illinois, less than one-fourth obtained the required license (*American Rifleman*, Dec., 1968, p. 6). Only mass civil disobedience can prevent Big Brother from totally disarming his serfs.

— Stephen Halbrook

SUBSCRIBE NOW

Please enter a subscription for:

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Subscription is \$7.00 per year.
 Student subscription \$5.00 per year.

Bulk Rates: 20 or more, 10¢ each; 50 or more, 8¢ each.
 Libertarian Forum Associate subscription is \$15.00 or more

THE LIBERTARIAN FORUM
 Box 341 Madison Square Station
 New York, New York 10010

The Libertarian Forum
 BOX 341
 MADISON SQUARE STATION
 NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10010



First Class