ARE WE BEING BEASTLY TO THE GIPPER? — PART II

3. Macro/Reaganomics: Taxes

If Deficits Do Matter, this does not in any sense mean that they should be rectified by tax increases. Taxes should never be raised under any circumstances. They should always be cut, anywhere and everywhere. Why? First and foremost, because taxation is theft, and the more people are allowed to keep their own money the better. Second, because a price, no matter how high, is always better than a tax. Consumers paying high prices, no matter how distraught by inflation, are at least getting some goods and services for their inflated money. But the taxpayer gets nothing from his coerced payment except grief and the buildup of an oppressive State Leviathan. Taxes are never justifiable. And third, strategically, as Milton Friedman often points out, the only way the government can be forced to reduce its spending is by cutting off its water and lowering taxes.

Deficits, therefore, should be eliminated by drastic slashes of government spending. But where and how? The answer: anywhere and everywhere. There is no mystery about it. Just slash with a hefty meat axe. Go down, for example, the Eisenhower budget and reduce every item back to it. Or better yet, the Roosevelt budget of the 1930s. Still better, the Grover Cleveland budget. Still better yet, return to the average annual budget of the Federalist period of the 1790s: $5.8 million dollars. If that was good enough for the statist Alexander Hamilton, it should be good enough for our “libertarian” Reagan Administration.

Of course, my most preferred position is that the United States budget go back, or rather go forward, to a nice round Zero. But, to demonstrate my devotion to moderation, I could live with a transitional level of $5.8 million for a year or two.

At any rate, none of this needs a young blow-dried Whiz Kid with a magical facility with “the numbers.” All we’d need to effect this program is a genuine devotion to liberty and a modicum of guts.

Getting down to cases, shouldn’t we be hailing, at least as a first giant step down the road to a taxless society, the “massive” and “historic” Kemp-Roth income tax cut we are all now enjoying, plus the other cuts in business and capital gains taxes? The answer is: We should if there were such a thing, but the problem is that there is no income tax cut. The “tax cut,” like the non-existent “budget cut,” is a gigantic hoax.

Forget that the original 30% cut in three years was postponed, and reduced to 25%. The important point is that the income tax “cut” for 1982, which is supposed to spur work, thrift, and investment, is not a cut but an increase. Projected tax revenue for 1982 is about $50 billion higher than 1981, reflecting not Lafferite voodoo but an increase in income tax rates far offsetting the puny but extravagantly publicized “cuts.” For two massive increases in rates every year consist in (a) a programmed increase in Social Security tax rates; and (b) “bracket creep.” Social Security is an admitted sacred cow of the Reagan Administration, even though all sides admit that the Social Security program is bankrupt, and will have to be drastically amended in years to come. But tax rates for this fraudulent program (undoubtedly the biggest single racket imposed by the New Deal) continue to rise every year.

“Bracket creep” is the sinister process by which the federal government gives a devastating one-two punch to the average American. The first punch is the Federal Reserve printing more money every year, thereby driving up prices and extracting more resources from the private and productive sector. The second punch comes as Fed-created inflation raises prices and incomes across-the-board. For as it does so, the average person is wafted up into a higher tax bracket, and has to pay a higher percentage of his income in taxes.

Thus, suppose that a number of years ago, the average American was earning $10,000, and that now he is earning $20,000 but that prices have more or less doubled since then. In “real” terms, he is no better off, since the purchasing power of his income is the same as before. Everyone now understands this sad fact. But what is still not fully recognized is that he is now in a higher tax bracket, and will be socked a considerably higher percentage of his income in taxes. He is worse off than he was before.

It is estimated, then, even by the Administration, that the average person will be paying considerably higher income taxes in 1982 than he did last year. Misled by Administration
The advice of J. Paul Getty on how to become a billionaire — “inherit a lot of money and invest it wisely” — is applicable to those who run political campaigns. Pick the best possible candidate and have them name you campaign manager. In the case of the Alicia Clark race for National Chair of the Libertarian Party, this was essentially the basic component.

A. PRE-CONVENTION

There were three candidates running when Alicia Clark finalized her decision in April of this year. All three, John Mason, Kent Guida, and Dallas Cooley, had been running for several months. None of them had emerged as a front-runner among delegates or potential delegates. Most were unknown to the average Libertarian who would become a delegate. Further, it looked to many like Mason and Guida would wage a divisive campaign over whose supporters would “control” the LP, a situation further accentuated by Cooley’s withdrawal at almost the same time as Alicia’s entry. The situation at that time boded well for Alicia’s candidacy based on the following suppositions, almost all of which were borne out by further developments:

(1) While almost the entire leadership of the NatCom and the intellectual leadership of the party, or would, support either Guida or Mason, most of them would be incapable of delivering the votes of the average Libertarian delegate at a National Convention. Libertarians make up their own minds, one at a time. While the others felt they had a great advantage, they only had as big a lead as their “big name” supporters had in their own delegate badges, no more no less.

(2) Alicia’s non-divisive ecumenical approach to the entire campaign was much closer to where the average Libertarian was than Mason’s “purity” or Guida’s elitism.

(3) Alicia’s grass-roots decentralism was similarly far more identifiable to most Libertarians — an area both the Mason and Guida campaigns spent much time attempting to adapt themselves to.

(4) Alicia never pretended to be what she wasn’t and she made clear that she wanted people to vote for ideas and not for personalities.

(5) Alicia would be able to outwork both opponents in sheer energy and time, and was clearly the best-liked person. Guida and Mason ended up working much harder at being candidates than either would have had they only faced each other, and both had to re-adjust their plans to keep up with her. It should be mentioned that both Mason and Guida, particularly Mason, improved greatly as the campaign went on.

(6) Most Libertarians respected Ed Clark, even though they had various degrees of problems with those who ran his campaign. This simple fact, assumed by us going in, was totally mis-read by both opposition camps until far too late.

(7) It was evident that Alicia would have to start immediately proving to the entire country that she was more than Ed Clark’s wife — something already known in those areas she had previously visited. As she had already visited during 1980 more states than Mason and Guida combined, she had a residual group of friends among those who would become delegates that was underrated by her opposition.

(8) The campaign hierarchy was quite simple — originally Alicia and myself. We both trusted each other’s instincts and judgment. When we disagreed, or honestly felt unsure, we test-marketed our ideas on close friends until we found a consensus. We also paid heed to diverse field reports, gathered by Alicia in person and me and others by phone. Having no hierarchy enabled us to communicate directly with those who would do the voting without the built-in information filters long-established networks suffer from. As a result of this lack of hierarchy, our campaign intelligence was probably the most accurate of any camp.

(9) Our direct mail program was more intense than either opponent. Mason sent one early mailer, Guida one early mailer and one late Alaska endorsement. We sent a total of four pieces — Alicia’s announcement letter and bio, the Buck Crouch cover letter with brochure and miscellaneous, the Alicia Clark program book, and the Ed Clark endorsement, plus a separate piece to State Chairs on decentralization. All of these brought us in somebody before the Convention, making convention structure easier. All five matters stressed the same things — decentralization, administrative competence, and party unity. Libertarians like to read and should be given sufficient time to do so. Long tomes like the Guida blueprint handed out at the Convention are superficially impressive for about half a day, but nobody at a convention has time to read them. They should be mailed (expensive, but more effective) at least three weeks before the Convention opens.

B. CONVENTION

(1) Psychology. Past history indicates that if a candidate has 100 hard commitments going into the first day, 25 of them will not show up, 10 of them will bail out to another candidate, and 15 more will waffle. We expected this and were not panicked. I’m not sure others can say the same.

(2) Hierarchy. Again, hardly any. Most of our key players were picked at the convention as many of those with pre-assignments didn’t show up. Again, we expected it and adapted. Our structure was simple — Ed and Alicia talking to delegates and constantly being fed information; myself working the floor through key people in each state while first Mimi Esser and then Kathy Franzi handled the detail logistics such as getting the printing done, setting up the party, etc.; yeoman service by folks like Tyler Olson and others. This kept the external folks — Ed, Alicia, myself, and each state coordinator — able to concentrate on their primary role: getting votes and talking to delegates.
(3) Meetings. We had our first meeting on Wednesday, August 26th at 9 pm. We had our last meeting on Wednesday, August 26th at 9 pm. Meetings waste time, encourage pontification, ego-gratification, and the "Chicken Little" syndrome. Their two primary uses are communicative: receiving data and making assignments. Both of the latter can be accomplished without meetings IF (and it is an important IF) someone is willing to assume the role of data gatherer and distributor to all who need to know and perform this role completely, a role I assumed. Floor personnel and others must be able to both talk and listen. They don’t need a room full of each other to do so.

(4) Use of Suite. Suites are expensive but necessary adjuncts to convention campaigning. They need to be almost constantly open and serve two vital functions besides a place for meetings and parties. They are a communications center and supply depot, and they are an excellent gathering spot for stray delegates who have no place else to go at odd hours, or who want to rap about whatever. They should always be wide open to anyone who comes by, and not closed up for “secret meetings.”

(5) Use of Printed Materials. Most of our hand-outs were written, and some printed, before the convention. We located a Copy-Boy three blocks from the Hotel prior to our arrival, rented an IBM Selectric for the entire week, and were prepared to issue as many more one-page flyers as were necessary. We rotated colors so that each piece was obviously different from the others, to differentiate somewhat from the reams of paper being disgorged upon the multitudes from various sources. It turned out we needed little more, but were prepared if it became necessary.

(6) Use of Buttons. As most of the members of our right-knit clique didn’t know each other prior to the convention, we used three colors of buttons: yellow for supporters; green for floor leaders and state coordinators; and gold for those working literature distribution, HQ duty, etc. This was somewhat complicated by my color-blindness, but it did simplify internal communications.

(7) Hotel’s Physical Layout. In reviewing the hotel plans prior to the convention, it appeared that everything was vertically stacked, making movement easy. I verified this by walking the hotel Monday night with a stop watch. Other hotels are not so easy, and things need to be planned based on time. Fortunately, the Denver Hilton was a piece of cake.

(8) Summary — Strategic Rigidity/Tactical Flexibility. All of the following strategic decisions were made well before the convention and strictly adhered to:

(a) That the campaign would stress grass-roots decentralism.
(b) That the campaign would be positive and never attack either candidate.
(c) That the campaign would stress Alicia’s administrative competence and personal, non-LP track record.
(d) That Alicia would write most of her own material and speeches and that they would only be edited by Ed Clark and myself (emphasis important).
(e) That Ed and Alicia would talk to as many delegates as possible one on one, as opposed to groups and caucuses.
(f) That we would go for “second choice commitments” from as many Mason and Guida delegates as possible.
(g) That geography was to our advantage, Guida clearly being weak in the West, Mason less so in the East and South, Alicia with no inherent geographical problems.
(h) That uncommitted delegates were the prime target, delegates committed to Guida or Mason secondary for the second ballot.
(i) That our main theme of party unity would carry us far enough on the first ballot to pick up a majority on the second ballot.
(j) That we would not run a complete “slate” for the other offices, but would support some candidates who supported us and some who didn’t support us, allowing the NatCom to become representative of all factions and personalities.
(k) That Libertarians are the supreme individualists and that we would treat all of them with respect and go for each vote as an individual vote. (See e.)

All of the above left a great deal of room for tactical shifts such as timing and use of different personnel in different ways.

(9) Guida Camp Mistakes. Going into the convention, we felt Guida was the strongest opponent for several reasons. His campaign was apparently well-organized and staffed by experienced people. He had what appeared to be a tight geographic base in the Mid-West and North East. And his campaign inherited most of the structure that nominated Ed Clark two years before. This lead collapsed for several reasons, and by Friday, Guida appeared to be running third because:

(a) The Guida campaign was unable to read the mood of the delegates. This was clearly displayed the first day with a kamikaze attempt to move the election from Sunday back to Saturday, but manifested itself elsewhere in various ways.
(b) Guida’s leadership was presumptuous. See above. Some key Guida folks absolutely reeked with an elitist attitude of “we know best.” Many delegates perceived this and were turned off by it.
(c) Guida’s organization was not well-administered. Example: While the Guida campaign spent many hours tracking each delegate’s arrival through credentials, they missed the golden opportunity to add three de facto proxies in Alabama. All they had to do was produce four bodies. They produced one. Likewise, they had other opportunities for “alternate packing” which they blew. Why bother to paper up Rhode Island with five out-of-state residents before the convention, and only have two of them voting in the election? Apparently the Guida campaign had no bodies to spare from any place (a serious pre-convention mistake) or else they missed several opportunities through sloppy work. This alone cost them more than the margin between themselves and Mason.
(d) Guida’s campaign never understood Regionalism. (Continued on page 6)
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and media hype about alluring tax "cuts", he will deservedly be bellowing with rage at the government when he finds out that his tax bill is going to rise not fall.

But this is not all. For the increased taxes will fall exclusively on the poor and the middle class, while the wealthy will enjoy a hefty tax cut. Why? Because (a) the Social Security tax is a regressive tax, so that the wealthy pay a lower proportion of their income to Social Security than the poor or middle class. And (b) because bracket creep of course cannot affect the highest bracket, since that bracket cannot rise with inflation. When we also consider that the Reagan tax package lowered the top-bracket income tax on dividends and interest as well as on wages from 70 to 50 percent, and also liberalized depreciation requirements and cut the capital gains tax, we see that the wealthy and business received substantial tax goodies, while the rest of the population has been squeezed further. Not only is this unjust, it is clearly political suicide for the Reagan Administration.

Now don't get me wrong: I'm all in favor of drastic tax cuts for business and the wealthy, the more the better. But it is both unjust and politically moronic to couple that with tax increases for everyone else. The only way to get the public to agree to tax cuts for the wealthy is to give them hefty tax cuts as well. In this way, there would be sizable tax-cut goodies for everyone, and we could build a coalition for freedom, a coalition based on morality as well as self-interest for all the coalescing groups. Thus, we could "buy" votes for freedom instead of for statism. But if, instead, the average American is socked still further, the result can only be political disaster.

In an illuminating article in the Business Review of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, Stephen A. Meyer and Robert J. Rossana estimate the tax impact of the Reagan program on various income groups, conservatively assuming an 8% inflation rate this year. On this assumption, they demonstrate that marginal income tax rates at the $13,000 level (in 1978 dollars) remain about where they were - about 24%, while households with incomes from $13,000 to $40,000 (the broad middle class) will suffer rising marginal tax rates. Thus, families earning $22,500 who itemize deductions will suffer a rise in marginal tax rates from 24% to 35% in 1983. Those who itemize deductions will suffer a jump in the marginal tax rate from 32% to 40%. Families who take the standard deduction earning $40,000 will find marginal taxes rising from 39% to 49%, while those who itemize will remain the same at about 43%. However, very high income families will enjoy a substantial drop in their marginal tax rates.

The only really important tax cut in the Reagan tax package passed in 1981 was forced upon the Administration by the Southern Democrats (the "boll weevils") in Congress. That was to index income taxes for inflation so as to eliminate bracket creep. Unfortunately, however, indexing is only slated to begin in 1985, based on 1984 income and tax levels, and hence so far off it is just pie-in-the-sky promised for the future. The way things are going, I would not bet my life savings that the indexing provision will still be there when 1985 rolls around.

The media, led by supply-siders Evans & Novak, are now filled with the saga of the heroic President Reagan manfully resisting the urgings of all his top advisers to raise taxes. "I will seek no tax increases this year", proclaimed the President in his 1982 State of the Union message on January 26. But the President lied. He is seeking tax increases, to the tune of $32 billion over the next two years, and his tax raises are more pernicious than mere figures indicate. It is true that the President decided not to follow the full Thatcher route immediately, as his advisers urged, and therefore not to recommend the doubling of excise taxes on liquor and tobacco, or an increased 4 cents a gallon tax on gasoline. Neither has he succumbed to Senator Baker's monstrous proposal for a national sales tax.

Reagan tries to cover up his lie by semantic trickery, calling his proposed tax increase "revenue enhancement," and merely "closing loopholes." Under this camouflage, Reagan has decided to recommend: acceleration of business and corporate tax payments, cutting back tax exemptions on industrial development bonds, and the elimination of energy tax credits for businesses. Moreover, the President proposes substantial increases in the minimum tax paid by corporations, and he urges delay of corporate writer offs of interest and taxes incurred for construction of commercial buildings. All these tax increases will cripple business recovery and economic growth. Already, furthermore, the excise tax on coal has been doubled at the behest of the Administration.

The pernicious concept of "closing loopholes" echoes the old liberal notion that any amount of one's earnings that the government graciously allows one to keep is a "loophole" which deserves to be "closed" by Uncle Sam. Ludwig von Mises pointed this out decades ago, and one would expect the President, who claims to be a devoted student of Mises' writings, to be aware of this fact. (see A. Director, ed., Defense, Controls, and Inflation, University of Chicago Press, 1952, pp. 151-152).

Another noxious device of the 1982 Reagan budget is to raise taxes but to call them "user fees." In some cases they are simply taxes outright. Others might not be called taxes, but they have the same effect of shifting money from private producers to the State apparatus, raising charges for services monopolized by the government. Thus, while the Administration abstained from an increased gasoline tax, it proposes a savage multi-level assault on an airline industry in deep recession by (a) increasing the federal tax on airline tickets from 5% to 8%; (b) tripling the four-cent-a gallon tax on general aviation gasoline, then raising it by another two cents a year for four more years; (c) imposing a new 5% freight waybill tax; and (d) a new $3 international departure tax.

In addition, navigation and boat and yacht fees are supposed to raise an additional revenue of almost $2 billion in the next two years. Nuclear waste fees are to be imposed on electric utilities, to the tune of $800 million in two years. Passport fees on the public are to be doubled, and immigrant visa fees to be quadrupled; this is supposed to raise $100 million a year. Fees are to be levied for various mediation and arbitration "services" provided in labor disputes by federal mediation agencies. And worst of all, the commodity futures market is to be forced to pay a user fee of 25c per contract to pay for its own regulation by the government.

But the most malignant aspect of Reagan's revised "non-increase" tax package for 1982 is his idea that the federal government launch a withholding tax of 5% on interest and dividends. This evil notion was suggested by President Carter, but was fortunately defeated by the lobbying of the elderly.
In my last column, I cast the spotlight on Big Ken Fanning, our newly-elected Alaska State Representative. But the great Hero of the Alaska Party, and of much of the LP in general, is State Rep. Dick Randolph, our first elected LP member. Dick is running hard for Governor this year, and recently conducted a fund-raising tour in the Lower 48. Until very recently, Randolph's campaign outside of Alaska was totally Craniac-run, and for a while it looked as if it would be run similarly within Alaska during next summer and fall. The Craniacs have been talking grandiosely about Randolph's campaign as being "winnable," which in my book means a "good chance of being won." One more Craniac shuck is anyone prepared to make a substantial bet, even-money, on Randolph's alleged victory?

At any rate, in the course of his triumphal tour, Randolph gave an extensive interview to Free Texas. The interview, published in the Winter, 1981 issue, is unremarkable enough. Far more interesting are the suppressed portions of the Randolph interview, which have come into our hands. Let it be pointed out straightforwardly that editor Mike Grossberg was not responsible for the suppression, which was insisted on by the Randolph camp. Unlike Grossberg, however, the Lib. Forum is not bound by any contractual obligations to Randolph.

It is no wonder that Randolph suppressed parts of the Free Texas interview, because they are quite revealing. First, he asserts that there should be little or no relationship between libertarianism and libertarian principle on the one hand, and the Libertarian Party on the other. When asked about Jeffrey Hummel's brilliant article advocating unilateral nuclear disarmament, for example, Randolph replies: "I believe there are at least two parts to libertarianism. There are the philosophical positions that we all come from and then there is the Libertarian political party. I think that much of what was in the article was very appropriate for libertarians and libertarianism but I don't think it's appropriate for a political party . . . So while I think that the article is apt and accurate for libertarianism, I don't believe it's realistic at all for a political party, which the Libertarian Party is." [Chalk yet another one up for George Smith/Sam Konkin!]

When asked about the Lib. Forum editor's concept of libertarian strategy, Randolph's answer displays a contempt for the intellect similar to that of his legislative colleague: "I don't know if Rothbard has planned out a structure of how we will get there or not. What I understand of his thinking on how we're going to get there — I think there's no chance of us getting there that way. I haven't spent a great deal of time philosophizing on how we are going to maintain a libertarian world or how we're going to get to a libertarian world. [Evidently!] I have spent a great deal of time trying to deal with specific issues in the political arena in which I find myself, to try to get that area to a far more libertarian society than it presently is."

One of the problems with Libertarians elected to office is that they will be taking tax-stolen funds as government officials. This is a grave problem for Libertarians; Randolph himself was appointed to a NatComm subcommittee to look into ways of voluntarily funding officials elected on the Libertarian ticket. What we found out was that such voluntary funding is illegal under the monstrous and fascistic "election reform" laws. But when asked about this crucial problem, instead of pointing this out and calling for an LP drive to repeal such laws, Randolph was flip indeed: "I think you have to realize that you're in the world you're in. [Thanks for that instruction, Dick.] There's no way that you're going to get in a position where you're going to be able to do anything about anything if you tie your hands behind you and blindfold yourself and cut your tongue out. I think you are where you are."

And again, after conceding that taxes are compulsory and pernicious, Randolph fell back on LP "Gallup Polling": "I have talked to literally hundreds of Libertarians and neither of these issues [taking tax-supported salaries and taking an oath of office] ever come up. [One of the things very wrong with the Party!] There are a few people, the ivory tower philosophers who worry about these things a lot and they spend a lot of time writing and putting what they're thinking into newspapers and party publications. [Here we go again; how come he didn't attack Ph.D's, too?] I believe that their thoughts and the controversies that their thoughts keep on the surface are not widespread concerns of 90% of the people who consider themselves Libertarian Party members. I have never gotten the feeling at national conventions or the various state party conventions that I have been at that anyone, with the exception of a very small handful of people, is the least bit concerned about whether a Libertarian takes his salary or not. [Me neither.] I think that most Libertarians involved in the political party understand the realities of where they are."

Again, Randolph wrapped up his point about political party versus principle: "There's nothing wrong with having a libertarian educational organization or a philosophical debating society or whatever you want to call it [Well, thanks a lot, Dick!] but we are a political party and we have to exist within reality."

When asked about the LP platform, Randolph sneered at the platform committee as a "relatively small group of folks who I think had a different orientation. [True, indeed!]

(Continued on page 6)
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Libertarians are as regionally bigoted as any other group. Westerners, and to a lesser degree Mid-Westerners and Southerners, dislike and distrust people with East Coast (and sometimes West Coast) mannerisms.

(c) The biggest one of all — The Guida campaign completely underrated their opposition. They underrated Alicia’s campaign for too long because they were hierarchically oriented and Alicia’s campaign had little “big name” support. They totally underrated the ability of Bill Evers to run Mason’s campaign until too late. When the dawn of realization finally broke upon some of them, it caused both panic and demoralization, something that was evident throughout the Convention. They began making desperate moves such as the phony Guida “announcement” on Friday, which compounded the problem, caused many delegates to feel their intelligence was insulted, and lost them votes.

(10) Mason Camp Mistakes. It must be mentioned that along with Guida, we too underrated Bill Evers. Bill is that rare commodity — a bona fide intellectual with real political instincts who can play in either ball park. If there was any doubt, his handling of the Mason campaign flushed it for good. Nonetheless, the Mason effort had some problems, namely:

(a) The campaign started on a big negative and, although it shifted later to a more positive note, the negative image of Mason was never completely shed. I believe Evers understood this and did much to counteract it, but not enough.

(b) Despite the constant discussion of “principle,” Mason never really specified what all his principles were. Anarchist or minarchist? In the LP context, hawk or dove? Decentralist or centralist? He was long on stressing experience, but vague on specific proposals. He was the only candidate who did not spell out his program. This both got him votes and lost him votes.

(c) The Mason Campaign, while more adaptable than Guida’s, needed more tactical flexibility.

(d) They ground too hard for votes. Some delegates, particularly older people, need a low-key sell. Mason and Guida both pressured too many people and turned them off. Too many people in both camps confused Libertarian delegates with fraternity rusees and tried too hard to put the pledge pin on. It lost both groups votes.

(e) They, like Guida, missed shots at filling up friendly delegations. They had plenty of Colorado people available, so bodies were no problem. There were vacancies in solid Mason states — specifically Washington, Idaho, and Wyoming. Why weren’t these filled up?

(f) Mason waffled on Eric O’Keefe. Both Alicia and Kent Guida announced he would be retained by them. Mason made no such clear statement. When Guida dropped out, Eric was an issue with many of his friends who may have otherwise voted for Mason.

While the Alicia Clark Campaign also made some mistakes, I will graciously not mention them and hope that others will point them out on their own. Noblesse oblige and the privileges of the victor.

C. SUMMARY

Alicia Clark won because people trusted and liked her, because she was closest to the most delegates on the most issues, because she was consistent, because her campaign laid out a broad game plan and stuck to it, because she never panicked, because she was never negative about anything, because she treated everyone with respect, and lastly because she was much more than Ed Clark’s wife. Among other things, she was Ed Clark’s candidate. If anyone has earned the support of most Libertarians in this country, it is clearly Ed Clark. The 1981 LP/10 Convention in a variety of ways was a vote of confidence in his leadership.

*Mr. Franzi, NatComm representative from Arizona, was Alicia Clark’s campaign manager in the race for National Chair.

CURMUDGEON (Continued from page 6)

Certain folks try real hard to get on the platform committee and I think it’s obvious that the platform committee did not reflect what the body in general thought.” When pressed about the platform itself, Randolph did not exactly repudiate it, but he warned that the platform and the committee must begin to “mirror the broad spectrum of Libertarian thinking,” else the platform will “begin to be used to discredit . . . to at least defeat Libertarian candidates . . . the platform ought to be couched in palatable terminology.”

Randolph’s vision of the future of the LP, not surprisingly, is that we have to begin electing people. For “one elected official in a state will do more to educate the people in a month than has been done by all the philosophers in a long long time.” But “educate” them to what, Dick? To Chop Wood Now?

This whole thing — this blatant and cynical call for opportunism and for the ditching of principle — reads like a hilarious George Smithian parody. Unfortunately, it’s all too true. Is it becoming impossible to parody the Movement? And after this performance by our premier “winnable” candidate, fellow libertarians, how many shekels do you want to kick in for the noble cause of Randolph for Governor? What I want to know is, who are the other candidates in the race?

Politics: the conduct of public affairs for private advantage.
— Ambrose Bierce
EXIT MARTY ANDERSON

The sudden departure of my old friend Martin Anderson as top domestic policy adviser at the White House should put paid to the flirtation with Reaganism on the right-wing of our movement. A conservative libertarian, Marty was, to the extent that anyone could ever be, Our Man in the White House, and probably responsible for the handful of libertarians and quasi-libertarians that now reside there.

A calm, thoughtful, studious man, Anderson’s exit could never be attributed to personal abrasiveness or, as in the case of ultra-hawk Richard Allen, the public embarrassing of Queen Nancy. A foreign policy hawk like his colleagues, Anderson never faced the problem of working within a foreign affairs matrix which he detested. A keen analyst of movement strategy, Marty was the quintessential theorist and practitioner of gradualism. He saw and embraced a broad conservative-libertarian movement, all working together for a common objective, with libertarians as radical point-men aiding conservatives in a common gradual rollback of the State. Even anarcho-capitalists had their place in his movement. (You wouldn’t believe who have been offered jobs in the Reagan White House!)

But now it’s all over. Even though a top Reagan aide in the 1976 and 1980 campaigns, stories began to appear in the press that he “lacked clout,” and pretty soon he was gone. As White House aide in the unlamented Nixon Administration, Marty had plenty of clout, being largely responsible for the end of the draft and the blocking of the pernicious MacArthur Family Assistance Program. But now, despite his characteristic care in picking his spots for battle, Marty indeed lacked clout. Despite what I am sure were his valiant efforts, he failed to persuade Reagan to follow his campaign promises and abolish the infamous draft-registration program. Until near the end, his only accomplishment was to block a Reaganaut proposal for forcing ID cards on every immigrant alien. Then, it was reported that, among the top White House advisers, only Anderson opposed raising income taxes in 1982. And then, despite his victory on this point, Anderson was suddenly gone.

With the departure of Martin Anderson, we should hear the last in our movement, not only of any Reaganite yearnings but also of all impulses to gradualism and to ecumenical embrace of the right-wing. With the enforced disappearance of the master of gradualism, all hopes for a gradualist strategy must now be seen as a snare and a delusion. □

MOVEMENT JABS

Knit One, Purl Two. Leslie Key, the Madame DeFarge of the libertarian movement, stung to the quick by our analysis of LP/10 in the August-January issue, has penned a lengthy critique of little over a page of the Liber Forum issue. This samizdat of seven single-spaced pages, sent out to her penpals, is a Farragut compounded of equal parts of hysteria, distorted serioso pedantry, and billingsgate. Tut, tut, Madame, you are about to lose your legendary cool. Watch out, you’ll drop a stitch!

Only one point of ironic interest in this kitchen-midden: That La Key, editor of the Craniac smear sheet UpChuck, the National Enquirer of the libertarian movement, presumes to instruct us in journalistic punctilio.

ARTS AND MOVIES

by Mr. First Nighter

Absence of Malice. Dir. by Sydney Pollack, with Paul Newman and Sally Field.

This tough, well-crafted movie has raised a storm in liberal circles. The liberal media have come down hard on this movie, claiming that it constitutes a Reaganite smear of our free press; the shades of Spiro Agnew are conjured up to horrify the reader. In reply, the redoubtable and consistent civil libertarian Nat Hentoff has waged a campaign of vindication of Absence of Malice, pointing out the civil libertarian stance of the picture, and chiding liberals for seeming to maintain that the press is supposed to be above criticism, even if they use unethical and despotic methods.

It is easy to see why Absence of Malice is goring some left-liberal oxen. The press is shown to be dumb, callous, unethical, heedless of the lives they damage — and, in this case, in league with a vicious “crusading” FBI man willing to persecute an innocent man to try to find the goods on a Mafia chieftain. And so this tough, trenchant movie is outspokenly pro-civil libertarian, anti-FBI, anti-muckraking press, and at least mildly pro-Mafia.

Even more pointedly, the movie is frankly and boldly anti-feminist, as the naive, suckered female reporter is constantly and arrogantly put down for her sexual aggressiveness. The splendid irony for liberals to follow is that the leading pro-civil libertarian, pro-Mafia anti-feminist is none other than Paul Newman, long-time darling of left-liberalism. So it is not as if these frankly male chauvinist attitudes (“I’m old fashioned; I like to do the asking”) are being expressed by some latter-day John Wayne. Paul Newman yet! It’s all made worse for our poor liberals when impeccably liberal Sally Field succumbs (“You do the asking”).

Aside from the point of view, this is one of the better pictures of the year: lean, hard-bitten, suspenseful. The seamy side of the press is shown up, and Paul Newman is at his splendid best.

The reception given to Absence of Malice reveals, too, the increasingly thin-skinned nature of our society and the decline of genuine wit and perspective on one’s foibles. It was not always considered a mortal sin to criticize the peccadilloes of the press. Forty years ago, Cary Grant and Rosalind Russell said it all in the magnificent and hilarious His Girl Friday, a remake of the savage but accurate Hecht-MacArthur satire of the Chicago press of the 1920s, Front Page. The cynicism and callousness of the press was brilliantly shown up then, and no self-protective howls of indignation rose to high Heaven. □
who get a large proportion of their income from capital and endowment income.

Officially, of course, the withholding tax involves no tax increase, but everyone knows, in fact, that the monstrous withholding provision (put in during World War II as a "wartime emergency" measure, the details of which were worked out by Milton Friedman, then in the Treasury Department) is the key to the success of the income tax plunder. In practice, the withholding tax on interest and dividends will not only be costly in terms of red tape, but will also cripple savings by greatly increasing the tax burden on savers. What price supply-side now?

Monstrous as this is, it should not be a surprise to anyone, for it was the self-same "libertarian" Gipper who, as governor of California, imposed the withholding system for the state income tax.

If Reagan had any libertarian instincts, the very least he could do about the income tax would be to weaken the IRS, by drastically lowering its budget and its personnel. But what is our Gipper doing? Quite the contrary: he is proposing adding 5,000 employees to the IRS bureaucracy so that more taxes can be collected. This is not only raising taxes, it is doing so with a vengeance.

It is, finally, characteristic of this Administration that the only hope for its proposing decontrol of natural gas prices is if it can be coupled with a whopping "windfall profits" tax (in fact, a graduated excise tax at the wellhead) on natural gas.

Look for Part III in the next issue of Libertarian Forum.

ERRATA

Several typos need correction from our August 1981-January 1982 issue. First, as was indicated in our annotated Roll Call appendix, the attempt to suspend the rules in Motion 10 at the Bethesda meeting was to try to block the appointment of John Mason as Chair of the Internal Education Committee. Motion 10 was not, as stated in the text of the article, to "overthrow the (Leslie) Key defeat."

Second, a couple of typos in the vote tabulation at Bethesda. There were 11 votes, so that Leslie Key's score was, of course, not 12-9, but 2-9. Also, the perfect scorers, myself and Dale Pratt (Hawaii), should have gotten an 11-0, not a 12-0 score. It was not intended, as one wag inquired, to give the two of us a "bonus" vote for getting a 100% rating.

Finally, the ebullient Mary Gingell was not a "recent but convert" but rather a "recent convert" to the Mason cause. As far as I know, Mary has never had anything to do with a convent. [1]
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