

Ten Years After

editorial

Since this issue marks REASON's 10th year of publishing, it seems appropriate to review the events of the past decade. REASON was founded in order to popularize certain ideas—rationality, individualism, liberty—in an era in which they had fallen increasingly into disfavor. How far have we come in 10 years? Is America any better off for 10 years of effort by REASON and our intellectual allies?

It's easy to sink into pessimism. The past decade has, after all, witnessed a tremendous growth in the magnitude of the federal budget, to the half trillion dollar level. Large budget deficits are accepted as a matter of course. The role of the State has continued to grow, with several very powerful new federal agencies coming into being—EPA, OSHA, and the Department of Energy among the worst. The inflationary bias built into the economy has ratcheted upward, to the point where 6-7 percent annual inflation now seems to be accepted as "normal."

These facts are undeniable, but focusing on them alone gives us a very misleading picture. All of the above reflect simply the ongoing momentum of the juggernaut set in motion in previous decades, the logical consequences of a philosophy of collectivism. To understand what's really going on, you have to look at what the *new* ideas are, where the *initiatives* are coming from. And it is here that a libertarian trend is unmistakable.

Consider the past decade's progress in the area of civil liberties. That ultimate expression of State coercion—the draft—has been abolished. Ten states, encompassing one-third of the US population, have abolished criminal penalties for marijuana possession. Laetrile has been decriminalized in 14 states. Laws restricting sexual activity between consenting adults have been struck down or repealed in most of the states where they were still on the books. "Protective" legislation discriminating against women has been abolished in many states, even without passage of the still-uncertain Equal Rights Amendment.

Significant initiatives have occurred in the realm of economic freedom, as well. Deregulation—a word unheard of in 1968—has become a vital part of the political lexicon. The case for airline deregulation has been made so persuasively that the CAB itself is turning handsprings to introduce price competition while Congress is about to pass legislation significantly reducing the agency's control. Cargo airlines have already been deregulated. Trucking deregulation is on the horizon, and removal of subsidies to barge operators is imminent. The entire Communications Act of 1934—the basis for FCC regulation—is being reviewed, and talk of radio deregulation is in the air. Significant new competition in telephone service has been permitted by the FCC in the past decade. Some form of natural gas price deregulation will probably have been enacted by the time you read this.

Studies showing the harmful effects of state licensing laws and bans on advertising are having an effect. Anti-competitive restrictions are being overturned in state after state, and sometimes by the Supreme Court. Price advertising has come to the professions—engineering, law, medicine, dentistry—offering new choices and services to consumers. Some licensing boards have already been abolished (e.g., in Colorado) thanks to sunset laws, and proposals to extend licensing to new fields are being defeated (e.g. in Louisiana).

We have also seen the restoration of the right of individuals to own gold, and more recently, to insert enforceable gold clauses into contracts. Economist Art Laffer's influential

studies of international monetary affairs suggest strongly that a new gold standard may be the only effective way to combat inflation.

Advocates of freedom—libertarians and free-market economists—have been influential in accomplishing all of these changes. Aiding them in this task has been a growing public (and intellectual) disenchantment with the State as the universal problem solver. The Vietnam War, the failure of Great Society programs, the Watergate affair—all have contributed to shattering the myth of the benevolent State. As a result, political candidates—from Jimmy Carter to Jerry Brown to Ronald Reagan—all find they must run *against government*, at least rhetorically, if they hope to win.

This anti-government mood is more than just a fad; it extends deep into the grass roots. Serious state tax limitation efforts are under way in Massachusetts, Michigan, and California. Some 23 states have passed the National Taxpayers Union resolution to amend the Constitution to require a balanced federal budget. The "tax revolt" movement opposing the income tax continues to grow.

In Washington the anti-government mood has gone beyond rhetoric, as witness the recent defeat of the consumer protection agency proposal, the continued failure of national health insurance proposals, and the blunting of most of Carter's energy package. Liberal columnist David Broder recently pointed out that Carter's 1978 budget "marks the first time in this century that a newly elected Democratic President has failed to ask for major funds for a single significant new domestic welfare program." As Broder sees it, public "fear of a meddlesome, bureaucratic big government" lies behind the rejection of further statism by Congress.

Outside the political realm, have our ideas of freedom and individualism had much effect? Again, there are many encouraging trends. The past decade has seen numerous media breakthroughs—Karl Hess in *Playboy*, Murray Rothbard in *Ramparts* and the *New York Times*, REASON articles reprinted in the *Congressional Record* and major newspapers. Two free-market economists have been honored with Nobel Prizes—F. A. Hayek in 1974 and Milton Friedman in 1976. Philosopher Robert Nozick set the intellectual community buzzing with his pathbreaking *Anarchy, State and Utopia*, winning a National Book Award in the process.

In the personal realm, individualism has made a come-back, so much so that Tom Wolfe calls the 1970's the "me decade" and Peter Marin puts it down as the "new narcissism." But despite some inevitable faddishness, the new emphasis on individual fulfillment and rational self-interest bodes well for the future. In psychology the trend is exemplified in Nathaniel Branden's popular books and intensives. In the self-help field, the success of books by Robert Ringer and Harry Browne—both clearly pro-self interest and anti-State—is very encouraging.

We have, in short, a social and political environment in 1978 vastly more hospitable to our ideas than anyone could have imagined in 1968. And it is *we*—the advocates of the individual, of liberty, of rationality—who are taking the initiative, rather than the apostles of statism and collectivism. How much progress we can make in the next decade no one can predict. But if the momentum of *our* ideas continues to accelerate as it has since 1968, the America of REASON's 20th anniversary will be a far better place than that of its 10th.

Robert Pool, Jr.

Biophysicist Carey Reams says:

“Heart attacks can be foreseen from minutes to months in advance—and prevented”

Biophysicist Carey Reams has spent much of his life in research of nutrition and heart disease. His reputation for successfully helping heart patients has grown to international fame. People with heart problems fly to visit him from Africa, Australia, Korea, Japan, Germany, Spain, Italy, England, Ireland, Alaska, Canada, Mexico, South America and other parts of the world. His classes in nutrition are attended by medical doctors who come from all over the globe. Since 1970 alone, Carey Reams has designed special nutritional programs for over 8,000 heart patients.

Now in an exclusive interview with *The Healthview Newsletter*, Carey Reams discusses his unorthodox and controversial views on detecting oncoming heart attacks—and how to prevent them.

What makes Reams say that heart attacks can be detected in advance?

“Heart attacks do not suddenly jump on anyone. Like other diseases, heart attacks have symptoms that can be detected in advance.”

How can oncoming heart attacks be detected? Reams Answer:

“There is a urine test that can pick up the heart attack danger zone. It is very accurate. Anyone found in the danger zone who ignores the warning is virtually committing suicide.”

Can a person usually feel the symptoms of an oncoming heart attack?

“Not necessarily. You can feel as if you are in excellent health and yet be in imminent danger of a massive and perhaps fatal heart attack.”

How to prevent an oncoming attack

In this exclusive interview, Reams describes in

detail how the urine test works, what it can tell you about your heart's health, and where you can conveniently take it.

Furthermore, he explains his views on . . .

- Two common body toxins that he believes cause most heart attacks. How to flush them out of your system.
- How to de-clog your arteries of cholesterol gently, naturally and safely.
- A special health product that can remove you from the heart attack “danger zone” in only 24 hours (it's not vitamin E). Where to buy it.
- Simple, enjoyable steps you can take to strengthen your heart and lessen the risk of heart attack, including 7 common, delicious foods that build your heart's strength naturally.

This exclusive interview with heart researcher Carey Reams is yours as a BONUS with a 6-month Introductory Subscription to *Healthview*. *Healthview*, a monthly newsletter, is designed for people seeking intelligent guidance on how to get better results from a nutritional program or how to get relief from a specific ailment. So it concentrates on specific nutritional advice that you can put to use immediately—advice about how to *improve your metabolism*, how you can *gain more energy*, and how you can *lose weight naturally*.

It tells you what you should do to prevent colds and the flu, how you can gain relief from the pain of arthritis, and how you can retard (and sometimes even reverse) hair loss. It gives you advice for constipation, diarrhea, bowel problems, benign tumors, low blood sugar, skin problems—and much, much more. In sum, *Healthview* is designed to bring you all the information you need to live longer and better—naturally. Send in the coupon below to get your bonus report and your Introductory Subscription.

Healthview Newsletter

2677 State Highway 70, Charlottesville, VA 22906

Please rush my bonus copy of the interview with Carey Reams and start my subscription at once.

I understand that if within 60 days I am not completely delighted with the *Healthview Newsletter*, I may cancel for a full and prompt refund. In any case, the bonus interview with Carey Reams is mine to keep.

Please enter my subscription for:

☐ 12 issues, 1 year: I enclose \$18. (I save \$2) ☐ 6 issues, 6 months: I enclose \$10.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY/STATE/ZIP _____

Liberty Coin Service



"Foremost in the purchase and sale
of precious metals."

- Lowest Prices
- Prompt Service
- Serving the Libertarian
Community since 1971

For information on investing in
silver or gold, or for current
quotes, call L C S at 517 351-3466.
Or fill in and return the coupon
below.

Liberty Coin Service
300 Frandor Ave Lansing, MI 48912

Name _____

Address _____

City, State, ZIP _____

"a full scale tax revolt is underway,"
says Washington, Newsletter

now, if **YOU** are ready to consider a little
tax terminating of your own

..... be sure **YOU** attend:

TAX LIBERATION CONGRESS

at the **HYATT HOUSE HOTEL** at
Los Angeles Int'l Airport

**April 14, 9 a.m. - 10 p.m., &
April 15, 9 a.m. - 5 p.m.**

Speakers will include leading tax repealers
and bureaucratic tamers: Dr. Martin Larson,
Howard Jarvis, Dr. John Richardson, Art Porth,
Ardie McBrearty, Bert McCarty, Charles Rietz,
Dr. Frank Brockway, Armin Moths, and others

Advance registration (includes two deluxe
luncheons):

Single: 39.00 Couple: 59.00
(add 5.00 if you register at door)

Send registration to:

UNITED STATES TAXPAYERS UNION
Box 2757, El Cajon, CA. 92021
Ph: 714-442-8045
also: 714-879-3657

letters

(Continued from p.4.)

that I would not want to live in a capitalist community if I could choose, instead, to live in a co-operative community. My personal interests, which do not include management and administration, center on art and science, areas in which, as a careful and not cursory study will show, competition has not been a driving force. (Individual inspiration and open discussion, shared knowledge, etc., play key roles.)

Those are trivial distortions, however, compared to what I personally regard as an actual libel. If actionable, I shall certainly take the advantage of Miss Efron's own ethics and seek redress from state law. The statement that so offends me is her declaration that I have called myself a Maoist. I have certainly expressed interest in and support of those developments in China which, during the Maoist period, permitted development of some self-reliant communities, encouraged some decentralization, and made it possible for research in biology to advance as rapidly as research in physics had advanced elsewhere. I am not a Maoist. The only other place beside Miss Efron's article that I have been described as a Maoist, so far as I know, is in the intelligence files of the FBI, parts of which I (and perhaps Miss Efron) have recently obtained under the Freedom of Information Act.

Karl Hess
Kearneysville, WV

Gratitude

I am grateful to Ms. Efron for proving that there is no such thing as unprintable rubbish.

Bill Birmingham
Santa Barbara, CA

Smearing Anarchists

While I agree in essence with Edith Efron's column I must take strong exception to some of her other statements, but especially to her smear against anarchists.

As an anarchist, I resent being lumped together with those anarchists who style themselves as libertarians while often seeming to forget the basic philosophy of libertarianism. The anarcho-capitalistic position is not the negative one of opposition to the State, *any* State, as Efron implies. Indeed, that is simply a derivative of

the anarchist's *positive* statement, that voluntary means of social organization based in property rights is the only *moral* form of social organization as well as the most practical and most efficient, for *all* forms of social organization.

I, with Efron, am also sorry that the limited-statist/anarchist debate has been "suspended" within the libertarian movement. It seems that the positive elements of the anarchist position have been forgotten. Efron certainly makes no attempt to rebut the anarchist position. She simply smears all of us while attacking one person, Murray Rothbard, who makes statements she abhors while incidentally perhaps, being an anarchist as well.

Let me disassociate myself and, hopefully many other libertarian anarchists from Rothbard's non-contextual statements and from Efron's smear.

There are a number of other statements in Efron's article which sound distinctly non-libertarian to me. For example, her assertion that the affirmative aspects of the limited statist position include "the value of the nation, the necessity of a national culture...."

What is a "national culture" and who imposes it? If it is simply the result of the nature of a society, then the concept can apply to any form of society, including the anarchist variety. If it is something that results from freedom, then it is obviously a value of an anarcho-capitalist society as well as the limited statist version.

"The value of the nation" is a similar concept. However, such concepts can be treacherous. They can lead to the idea that a government must support these values by affirmative action, like promoting competition with anti-trust laws. I trust on these and similar points I am seeing something that Ms. Efron did not intend to be there.

Mark Tier
Hong Kong

Cheers

Bravo for publishing Edith Efron's article. I don't have the multi-millions of the foundation which supports the other "libertarian" publications, but enclosed is a check to help you keep afloat.

REASON is really a magazine of reason. As you stated, consider the alternatives.

I can see that your latest literary contributors do not: (1) rejoice in the communist takeover in Vietnam because it reduces the number of States in the world; (2) become overly happy with the leftist anti-semitic separatists in Quebec because they would *increase* the number of States in the world; (3) become indifferent

to the plight of Russian intellectuals.

Simply stated, your present contributors do not appear to be happy with events which benefit only the communists and end up in massive blood baths. Nor do your contributors give the communists any sanctions.

Mike Oliver
Carson City, NE

Libertarian Liberation

I was rather shocked by Edith Efron's column in the February issue of *REASON* magazine. Among the half-truths and distortions in that piece I found the following:

"Libertarians running for office have blindly supported every 'liberation' movement—Gay Lib, Transvestite Lib, Women's Lib, etc.—although each of these movements actually advocates coercive egalitarianism, collectivism and statism."

I have been active in New York's Free Libertarian Party for almost six years, was once a Party candidate for public office and am an active member of the Association of Libertarian Feminists and Libertarians for Gay Rights. As many veteran libertarian activists know, I (and other Libertarian candidates much more prominent) have explicitly and publicly opposed coercive "liberation" measures of any type. The LP Resolution condemning Anita Bryant's crusade (which resolution was publicly endorsed by all four former LP Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates) expressly states its opposition to the Dade County Ordinance because of its coercive intent. And let's not forget the excellent gay rights pamphlet distributed by the MacBride for President Committee and written by the Senior Editor of *Inquiry* magazine. After listing 10 anti-statist planks for libertarian gay rights activists to support, the author clearly and forthrightly argues against the coercive "gay rights" measures put forward by many non-libertarians.

And then there is the Association of Libertarian Feminists. ALF literature lists a statement of principles that includes presenting "a libertarian alternative to those aspects of the women's movement that foster dependence and collectivism." For reasons of her own, Ms. Efron apparently decided that these and other facts were not important enough to mention in her article.

There is also the curious statement that *movements* advocate something although—one shouldn't have to point this out to a libertarian—only *individuals* advocate things. It is true, of course, that

many individuals in the various liberation movements *do* advocate State coercion, but it is not true that libertarians have embraced their statism. We have joined the "lib" movements to work for *genuine liberation*—supporting other liberationists when they battle against coercion and opposing them when they clamor for it.

Ms. Efron may choose not to associate with us. That is her right. But her misleading statement about libertarian feminists and libertarian gay rights activists does a disservice to us and to the cause of liberty as well.

Thomas Avery
New York City

Ideological Hari-Kari

Hats off to Edith Efron for her "Warning to Constitutional Republicans." As a recent (and grateful) refugee from the statist Left (including three years in the Young Socialist Alliance), I have never understood supposedly rational libertarians fawning over that pack of philosophical morons.

As a lesbian feminist, I participated in the various leftist controlled liberation movements mentioned by Ms. Efron, both as a leftist and recently as a libertarian. I must agree with Ms. Efron—the

Now Available:

The Servile State By Hilaire Belloc

A perceptive warning, first published in 1913, of the consequences of statism and the effect of socialist doctrine on capitalist society. With an introduction by Robert Nisbet. "A landmark of political thought in this century"—Walter Lippmann. Hardcover \$8.00, Softcover \$2.00.

Popular Government By Sir Henry Sumner Maine

A classic inquiry into the conditions necessary for the success of representative government, by the author of *Ancient Law*. This edition includes Maine's famous essay on "The Constitution of the United States." With an introduction by George W. Carey. Hardcover \$7.95, Softcover \$1.95.

Arator By John Taylor

The most popular and influential work by John Taylor of Caroline, foremost philosopher of the conservative Jeffersonians. This edition includes sixty-four essays, practical and political, on farming and the social order of an agricultural republic. Edited and with an introduction by M. E. Bradford. Hardcover \$9.00, Softcover \$3.00.

LibertyPress LibertyClassics

We pay postage on prepaid orders.
To order these books, or for a copy of our catalog, write:
LibertyPress/LibertyClassics
7440 North Shadeland, Dept. J8
Indianapolis, Indiana 46250

Left is adamantly statist and anti-capitalist. Attempting to work with such a group as a libertarian is to commit ideological hari-kari. These proponents of State-enforced egalitarianism are not above placing a (worker's) boot in the face of an honest libertarian (or a gun in the ribs ala Murray Rothbard) to emphasise they mean business.

California Libertarians for Gay Rights (LGR), attempting to work with a California-based gay coalition to defeat the Briggs initiative, suffered such a fate. (If passed, the Briggs initiative would outlaw the hiring of homosexuals as public school teachers).

LGR's workshop was scuttled, our resolution shelved, and our presence ignored. When the final general session of the coalition degenerated into a plenary session of the workers' state, we packed up our principles and walked out. (Incidentally, when the proletariat finished dictating, over 40 resolutions [excluding LGR's of course], most unread, *all* undebated, were passed; they ranged from advocacy of federally funded abortions to support of forced busing). The libertarian departure from the "coalition" was accompanied by a tumultuous ovation. Ideological buddies on the Left? Nonsense!

I concluded that the only principled position for libertarians when dealing with the Left, is to unashamedly denounce their immoral premises; refuse to make unholy alliances with them; and concentrate instead on building our own principled, vocal and aggressive counter movement. If a group of pragmatic anarchists is obstructing such a movement, then let the debate begin. I would rather participate in a smaller, but principled organization of only limited government advocates than be suckered into being a flunko for the Left.

Valerie J. Valrejean
Los Angeles, CA

Single Issues

Edith Efron, in saying that libertarians "have absorbed the counter-culture's notion that nothing has higher priority for lovers of liberty than the right to take dope, to contemplate pornography and to enact the full repertoire of Kraft-Ebing.... By now, there is scarcely a counter-culture crusade or a leftist ideological bastion that libertarians have not embraced" seems to imply that one must not work for causes unless they are socially respectable.

As a libertarian who was involved for several years in a "counter-culture crusade"—the successful movement in

1964-70 for the abolition of the draft—I must disagree with this implication.

As the president of the Metropolitan Young Republican Club of New York City and chairman of its Committee for the Abolition of the Draft, I appeared on many college campuses on panels opposing the draft—panels whose members included, beside Quaker pacifists, members of SNCC, spokeswomen for the Women's Strike for Peace, and members of the New Left. At Princeton, Tom Hayden was so embarrassed to be appearing on the same side as a Young Republican that he successfully avoided speaking to me for an entire weekend. It was very clear that although we all had a political alliance on this specific issue, the alliance did *not* imply, as Miss Efron puts it, "that the critics share one's values, one's view of the social good, and are moving towards the same political goals."

Miss Efron might respond that working against the draft was socially respectable, to which I can only reply that it would not have been so without the widespread opposition to the war in Vietnam, largely organized by what she calls "the Left." We could not have ended the draft during World War II, and those who opposed it then were ostracized and powerless. I did not oppose the war in Vietnam at the time, but if we had kept silent on the draft because those who were against it also criticized the war effort, the draft might never have been ended. More, since I know that the efforts of our Committee for the Abolition of the Draft came to the attention of those who later advised President Nixon, it might be said that the presence of libertarian constitutional republicans (and Republicans) in the anti-draft movement helped keep that movement respectable in the eyes of a Republican president who had the power to end it.

The Left is good at picking issues. If we want to accomplish any changes, libertarians must be willing to work on single issues with people that they do not fully agree with. I hope to see libertarians at the forefront of every counter-culture crusade that involves individual rights, as well as at the forefront of every call for economic freedom.

David J. Dawson
Stockbridge, MA

Fellow Travellers

I'm a little puzzled by Edith Efron's fears of the libertarian movement being publicly besmirched by a "grotesque libertarian-leftist alliance." For the same issue of *REASON* includes the following articles: an interview with William Simon, who endorses the GOP; attacks on zoning and

national health insurance; support for large farms; and a memoir by a founder of *Human Events*—in short, just the stuff to incite the revolutionary fervor of dangerous leftists like, say, Bill "Che" Buckley and Ron "Mao" Reagan.

Even though I might be categorized as a "slightly to the left" libertarian, *REASON*'s rightwing emphasis bothers me not in the slightest. Why not? Because I'm aware of a tactical principle that Ms. Efron has evidently forgotten in the last few months. As the November Efron put it so eloquently, "A libertarian must... look for fellow travelers.... People who are walking in the direction of liberty should be joined. One should not repudiate fellow travelers because of philosophical similarities.... (L)ibertarianism isn't... a bible; it isn't a spiritual state; it isn't a chastity belt. It is a *compass*." (Viewpoint: "Secular Fundamentalism," November 1977.)

As I see it, the great practical advantage libertarianism has over other ideologies is the attraction its central principle holds for everyone, left and right: "Everyone should be free to run his own life." This freedom includes taking dope, contemplating pornography, and living as a tribal termite collectivist, as well as building skyscrapers and Rearden-metal rails. Thus no cultural outlook need be aprioristically drummed out of the libertarian movement; both left-oriented journals such as *Libertarian Review* and *Inquiry* as well as the right-oriented *REASON* are valid tools for attracting fellow travelers and building a vital, broad-based movement.

One final comment: the February Efron calls for a reopening of the hoary anarchy-limited State debate preparatory to a purge of the anarchists. As Michael Emerling reminds us, the reason the debate was discontinued in the first place was that the anarchists won! If Ms. Efron would like, I am sure any number of anarchists are willing to refresh her memory on that point.

Aaron Leonard
Tucson, AZ

Libertarian Publications

Edith Efron's February "Viewpoint" shook me up to say the least. I agree with most of what she wrote, but I don't plan on canceling my subscriptions to *Libertarian Review* and *Inquiry* because she has proscribed them. If the latter doesn't stop being cute and dishonest, I won't renew my subscription next fall, but not out of a desire to do it in. It's just that its dishonesty negates its intellectual value.

I don't know what will happen to *LR*. I

hope it survives. Hopefully we will end up with more than one major libertarian publication. I don't care too much for Murray Rothbard, but he's feisty and does stir things up. If it weren't for the likes of him and the assault on Miss Efron's sensibilities by these new publications, it is doubtful that she would have written her valuable column, and to me *that's what's important in this situation*. The anarchists have been with us for years, but only now does she sound the tocsin.

Edith Efron has continually displayed a rare and courageous intelligence and I hope to see much more of her work in *REASON*.

Brant Gaede
Park Ridge, NJ

Libertarian Magazines

I suppose it had to happen sooner or later. Nonetheless, I think Ms. Efron is somewhat premature in her vilification of *Libertarian Review* and *Inquiry*.

One would have hoped that she would have at least waited until that latter magazine had appeared before reading it out of the movement. The first five of its issues that I have received have not had anything as distasteful as, say, an interview with Bill Simon in which he tells us that government policy on gold has nothing to do with inflation or that "obviously" government has a responsibility to help those people who cannot help themselves.

Nor, for that matter, have I seen since the old *New Individualist Review* a better single issue of a libertarian publication than the October 1977 issue of *Libertarian Review*.

Of course, the difference is this: While *REASON* is telling us that non-zoning is great in Houston (at least as long as strict building codes are maintained), Childs is exhorting us to throw the tea into the harbor. I can stand both, but I can not help feeling that some self-styled libertarians would be happier with Reagan's Citizens for the Republic.

Jule R. Herbert, Jr.
Tuscaloosa, AL

Need for Debate

I should like to congratulate Miss Edith Efron and *REASON* on her perceptive and disturbing "Warning to Constitutional Republicans." Knowing a couple of the people associated with *Inquiry* and having recently subscribed to that journal and *Libertarian Review*, I had tended to

suppress the worries that kept creeping into my mind about seeking an opening to the New Left; yet Miss Efron is right: those worries should be aired and debated.

Leland B. Yeager
Professor of Economics
University of Virginia

Unprofessional Journalism

Columnist Edith Efron's outpouring of invective was a rather disappointing show. For someone who prides herself on being a journalist, it was a very poor and shoddy display of professional ethics to lash out at a magazine (*Inquiry*) she had never seen, much less read. In place of reasoned analysis, we are treated by Ms. Efron to a lengthy distortion of facts, unsupported innuendoes and a knee-jerk reaction to matters she failed to investigate with any of the vigor befitting a journalist.

To begin with, Ms. Efron confuses "movement magazines" like *REASON* and *Libertarian Review* with *Inquiry*. *Inquiry* seems to be a magazine of analysis, news, and commentary of interest to libertarians. It does not purport to be a *libertarian* magazine, though libertarians are

Are You Seeking at Least 50% Annual Increase for Your Risk Capital Investment?

If you can afford a minimum investment of \$10,000, you'll want to know about the REVMAC SYSTEM™ portfolio approach to as many as 25 commodity futures markets.

REVMAC is a personalized, professional management program which has been thoroughly tested and constantly refined. It combines REVersals, Moving Averages and Computer discipline in guiding trading decisions.

Here is a way to seek unlimited profits while avoiding margin calls, forced liquidations, and unlimited losses. Since 1973, the REVMAC SYSTEM has averaged 74% annual increase. During the last quarter of 1977, equity increased 27% after brokerage, management and profit incentive fees.

We can't guarantee your investment will have the same results in the future, but we can guarantee your risk will never exceed your original equity, and probably only 50% of it. Send for our free brochure and recent position reports.

COMMODITY INVESTMENT COUNSELORS

1622 Wadham Court, Wheaton, IL 60157

Name

Address

City State Zip

Phone Call: AM PM

Registered with Commodity Futures Trading Commission as advisor and pool operator.

R5

BECOME WELL-INFORMED ON GOLD

Understanding gold will become more and more important in coming months. Do you have necessary and current knowledge to make intelligent decisions that could mean survival in the future? **AMERICAN GOLD NEWS** is the only publication dedicated totally to reporting on gold. In fact, we have been reporting on gold, silver, and uranium for over forty-five years.

Readers gain knowledge of gold related national and international news that may affect the mining industry, the dollar, present investments, and future survival. We cover known and unknown companies, run a column on South African gold, and feature an exclusive "INVESTOR'S PERSPECTIVE" which is like a home study course for pro and neophyte. There are quarterly reports, hard-to-find stocks, excerpts from leading newsletters, articles on coins, hard hitting editorials, and much more.

With this ad only, ask for free copy of "EVERYTHING YOU WANTED TO KNOW ABOUT GOLD AND OTHER PRECIOUS METALS" a \$5 value.

Send \$10 for 12 monthly issues or charge to Master Charge or Bank Americard numbers.

AMERICAN GOLD NEWS

P.O. Box 457, Dept. D, Lone CA 95640,

or call toll free (800) 824-7866.

In California: (800) 852-7757, ask for operator #84-D.

involved with it in various ways. Rather, it seems that it has the potential to be one of America's finest forums for investigative journalism, maintaining a probing and iconoclastic view of government machinations. But then, Ms. Efron would not know this, even though several issues had come out before her attack was sent to *REASON*. Had she bothered to read them, she would have found some truly searching and revealing analyses of Soviet and American psychiatry, the bankruptcy of gun control, the Panama Canal Controversy, the need to de-regulate the professions, and the like. Ms. Efron was right in maintaining that *Inquiry* is far from "reverent" about the CIA, FBI, IRS, Pentagon, et al, but for reasons which should be obvious to anyone who reads the newspapers. As a journalist, Ms. Efron should understand better how a magazine works. To list someone on a brochure as a writer does not imply that he exercises editorial control. Ms. Efron's partially inaccurate and unfair blasts at Marcus Raskin seem to have little relevance to what I have seen of *Inquiry* so far.

With respect to *Libertarian Review*, it is true that it has run articles on women's liberation, drug and sex laws, and the like (in addition to other topics), but what's wrong with that? *REASON* is not attacked for doing so. And, I must add, *LR*'s articles have always pointed out the

uniquely free market libertarian alternative, though Ms. Efron's column leaves her position on these issues unclear. I doubt that her position on alcohol prohibition would have been equally ambiguous during the 20's and 30's. But of course, that is a middle class vice and one that Ms. Efron is probably more tolerant of. *LR*'s articles on government and business have always focused on government power as the problem, not on business *per se*. However, it is hardly socialist to claim that many businessmen approach government for special favors and subsidies. Has Ms. Efron never read Adam Smith and the classical liberals whose praise she rightly sings in her column?

Ms. Efron should stick to *TV Guide*, where her articles are often informative, entertaining, and accurate.

Tom G. Palmer
Annapolis, Maryland

Personal Attacks

I was greatly disturbed to read Edith Efron's article. My disturbance came not from the fact that I disagree with some important points she makes, but rather from the way she wrote the article.

Efron's reasoning errors were easy to take compared to her tone, the name

enough. His domestic policies were worse: he treated Americans as if he were their lord and they were peasants to be looted for his crusades. His supposed love of the poor was not supported by charity but by expropriation. For 30 years he was a leader of the contemptible movement to turn all Americans into federal serfs. He showed his lack of regard for the worth, industry and intelligence of his fellow citizens by encouraging Congress to put more people on the debilitating dole, enact more anti-entrepreneurial legislation, and cause more people to look to Washington instead of themselves for answers to problems.

Humphrey could never be typecast as "Big Brother." But his ideas find their home in a totalitarian "1984" society. That he was so widely loved bodes ill for the resurrection of a free America.

David Walter
Warminster, PA

REASON subscribers are encouraged to write letters to the editor of their favorite newspaper, magazine, or journal, and to submit replies to TV and radio editorials, presenting libertarian views on topics of current interest. Each month the editors of REASON select the most notable published letter or broadcasted reply for republication in this space, and honor the writer by a six-month extension of his or her REASON subscription. Send copies of your published letters or broadcasted replies to Reason Comment of the Month, Box 40105, Santa Barbara, CA 93103.

calling, inaccuracies, misrepresentations, unbacked assertions, discussions of other people's discriminatory faculties, motivations and emotions, and her narrowly biased view of what a libertarian is.

Is this serious scholarship, worthy of the pages of *REASON*? I think not.

By all means do publish articles putting forth Efron's position, but please choose pieces where the author makes an attempt to stick to the cognitive content of the issues.

The Objectivists, I'm convinced, were never taken seriously by most intellectuals because they attacked and condemned people who disagreed with them instead of attempting a genuine dialogue. Let's not, as libertarians, repeat this mistake.

Ann Kotell
Editor

Massachusetts Liberty

Naive or Malicious?

I cast my vote with Edith Efron; I agree that *Libertarian Review* is so anti-American and anti-defense that it's pretty difficult for me to believe that they're committed to the long-term survival of liberty. They're either downright naive, or terribly malicious.

Robert Sheaffer
Silver Spring, MD

Libertarian Aristotle

One can only admire the force with which Edith Efron wields the polemic sword, but her aim is so misdirected that she, rather than her target, is made to look pathetic.

Efron's article is basically an attack on Murray Rothbard's influence in the libertarian movement, an influence she depicts as a degeneration of libertarianism into a "hippie movement." For some mysterious reason, the bearers of light and truth—the "reverent revolutionaries" who are still "traumatized" by the Objectivist split—have abandoned the intellectual arena to the forces of Satan and Rothbard.

In fact, the reverent revolutionaries—who still yearn for the good old days, when one or two moral denunciations would save one the trouble of ascertaining the facts—have not abandoned the arena; they have been driven out by a superior force of theory and scholarship. Rothbard is influential because he has brought remarkable integrative powers to bear on libertarian theory. In this sense he is the libertarian Aristotle, who has stressed the need for a well-integrated theory combined with painstaking empirical re-

comment of the month

The letter below, by subscriber David Walter, appeared in the Jan. 26, 1978 issue of the *Philadelphia Enquirer*.

Humphrey and Liberty

The eulogies for the late Hubert Humphrey would lead one to believe that anyone opposed to his policies was in league with the devil. May I have the temerity to suggest that American liberty and progress would have greatly benefitted if Mr. Humphrey had kept to running his drugstore in Minnesota.

Notwithstanding his welcome defense of free speech, assembly and press, on balance the Senator's career was one of total disregard for individual rights. His support of imperialistic adventures in Vietnam was bad

search. Rothbard and those around him have set a high standard for future generations of libertarian scholars; and they have warned against the crude fallacy of rejecting solid research merely because it may emanate from an "anti-anti-Communist." As for the suggestion that Rothbard wages a hate campaign with no regard for the positive aspects of the American heritage, one need only glance at his magisterial *Conceived in Liberty* to see the utter ridiculousness of such a claim.

As one who "grew up," intellectually speaking, in the Objectivist movement, I still retain high regard for what I understand to be the basic precepts of Ayn Rand's approach—i.e., unswerving dedication to facts and to reason. Insofar as I agree with Rothbard, I do so because he offers a persuasive defense of his views. But, agree with him or not, even a modicum of respect for fairness must lead one to the conclusion that we are here dealing with a mind of the highest caliber. Efron's treatment of Rothbard and his influence does not speak well for her analytic powers.

George H. Smith
Los Angeles, CA

Take-Over Dangers

Thank you, Edith Efron, for risking vilification for publicly naming the truth. You accuse Rothbard and associates of not being open with us about their cooperation with the New Left, whom they intend to take over. But their present power to offer the name of the whole libertarian movement in trade for leftist friendship is the result of an already successful take-over by means of the same tactics.

Fundamental to the New Left is opposition to private property, capitalism, and rights for "reactionaries." Their hatred of the US government is derived from that. Fundamental to libertarianism is the implementation of individual rights in property rights. The question whether it is anarchist opposition to all governments or the advocacy of voluntarist government that is consistent with liberty is a derivative issue. How is the Rothbard anarchist to win the cooperation of the New Left intellectuals and activists? By negotiating on grounds of shared interests: attacking the US government. If he counts on taking the leftist's eyes off their fundamentals, he must not call attention to his own. That is why his success precludes ever persuading the New Left to libertarianism, and why their shared success can only be the destruction of the US government. But since the leftists are not trying to win libertarian favor, they will not be backward about their principles and will

insist on writing policy to govern any such successes. Remember Lenin and his anarchists—and their deaths?

My article "On Proper Government" (published in *Option* magazine) is one evidence that not all of us were demotivated by the Rand-Branden split and gave up analysis of issues such as the government-anarchist dispute. In it, I show

that fundamental to voluntarist government theory is the mutual consent of all the governed, while fundamental to Rothbard's defense agency society is each person's contracting with an agency whose every act of force is on third parties who never consented to its form of justice nor jurisdiction over them. (The replies of Roy (Continued on p. 72.)

Run the USA on chicken manure?

Do you believe an industrial giant can be run on sunbeams, summer breezes, fumaroles and chicken manure? Or that the answer to the world's ills is the de-industrialization of America? If so, our newsletter is not for you; your mind will be changed in the early 1980's, when the electric power begins to run out.

But if you are interested in the latest scientific and technological developments in the energy field, and in the economic and ideological background of energy issues, then we invite you to subscribe to

ACCESS TO ENERGY

A pro-science, pro-technology, pro-free enterprise monthly newsletter

Access to Energy is edited and published by Dr Petr Beckmann, professor of electrical engineering at the University of Colorado, independently of the University or any other institution.

Access to Energy is fiercely independent and beholden to nobody. It accepts no advertising, subsidies, contributions, grants or dips into taxpayers' money. Its only income are subscription fees:

YOU ARE THE ONE who will not renew if it isn't good enough!

Access to Energy has been published every month since September 1973, when (6 weeks before the Arab embargo) it offered bumperstickers *Make America an Arab Sheikdom! Join the Sierra Club*. Since then, it has become an influential journal, widely quoted, widely read and, yes, widely resented, too.

Access to Energy does not aim to please everybody; if you believe in feudal energy sources, you will be much happier reading Ralph Nader's harangues or Amory Lovins' fantasies. But if you wish to improve your knowledge and powers of decision making, *Access to Energy* may be for you:

It only costs \$9 to give it a try for one year.

If Pulitzer prizes were given on an unbiased basis to outspoken and authoritative journals, one would certainly be given to *ACCESS TO ENERGY*. This newsletter is an incisively written tell-it-as-it-is journal that is fast developing a nationwide following.

A. Harrigan in synd. column *Sensing the News*

ACCESS TO ENERGY is the best single concise source of up-to-the-minute facts — facts to confound the anti-science, anti-technology, anti-free enterprise demagoguery of the eco-freak doom-criers. More than that, it is fun to read!

LIBERTARIAN REVIEW

ACCESS TO ENERGY is a ray of sunshine amidst the gloomy news. I look forward to every issue.

D.O.H., St. Paul, Minn.

Renew our subscription for ten (10) years. Should anything happen to prevent you from publishing *ACCESS TO ENERGY* prior to 1985, you owe us no refunds, as we have already received our money's worth many, many times over.

C.H., Lafayette, La.

The peppery, often acidly humorous *Access to Energy* blends science and technology with political reality... Beckmann cuts through ecology cant and propaganda with style as well as substance.

CONSERVATIVE DIGEST

A witty and profoundly informative newsletter.

COMMENTARY

Issue after issue, [the editor] cuts through the simplified thinking of the mass media. Technologically informed, he consistently explains the technical aspects into understandable English.

Cultural Watchdog Newsletter

Can't wait to read it every month. Thanks for the bright spot!

E.B., Beaverton, Ore.

I like your forthright style — coming out of the corner with fists flying, without this "yes, yes, but maybe" stuff. Keep swinging!

J.B.C., Beaumont, Tex.

"The Great Plutonium Scare" and "The Health Hazards of NOT Going Nuclear" have changed my mind. Please enter my subscription for the newsletter.

Mrs. V.A., Sheb., Wisc.

How come we offer for \$9 what others sell for \$50 up?

Because we are good enough to have the volume:

Our circulation exceeds 2,500 copies, many of them read by hundreds of readers!

To: Access to Energy

Box 2298-ER, Boulder, Colo. 80306

Enter my subscription at \$9 per year (12 monthly issues) beginning with the current month. My check is enclosed.

Send to:

brickbats

□ **I'd like to say something** about Mr. Bernard-Henri Levy's article on terrorism ("The War Against All," *The New Republic*, February 11) but he already said it all by listing it under the subheading: "Every man his own State."

□ **Disaster movies?** May is a disaster month. It was on May 3, 1802, for example, that Washington, DC was incorporated. The Lusitania sank on May 7, 1915, the Tennessee Valley Authority boondoggle was established on May 18, 1933, and Congress limited immigration to the land of the Anglo and the home of the Saxon on May 19, 1921. The first American land fraud was committed on May 24, 1626, when Peter Minuit was duped into buying Manhattan Island from the Canarsie Indians of New Jersey, and perhaps the greatest disaster of all was the US Constitutional Convention, which opened on May 25, 1787. (Patrick Henry also thought the Constitution was a disaster.) On the plus side; sometime in May (I forget exactly when; it used to be May 1) the average American stops working for the tax collectors and starts working for himself—the real Independence Day. And of course, REASON's Tenth Anniversary.

□ **Forced to kill by the government!** Kill caterpillars, that is. Airborne caterpillar hairs and skin fragments have caused an epidemic of skin rashes in Brussels. So the city fathers passed a law requiring city residents to destroy caterpillars, their eggs and their nests. According to the Associated Press, "showing mercy to a caterpillar can result in a fine or up to a week in jail."

□ **Religious Freedom Dept.:** Argentina has just arrested 15 Jehovah's Witnesses for practicing their religion, which was banned in 1976. . . . It is now a crime, in "brave little Israel," to offer anyone a "material inducement" to change his religion. If you find that vague you've got Israel's Christians for company. . . . The *National Lampoon* has dropped its annual Religion Issue in response to pressure from groups such as Citizens Against Sacrilege in Media, who objected to "Son O'God Comics" and the like. Also, the magazine had sizable legal expenses from fighting blasphemy indictments in Massachusetts and New Jersey. The combina-

tion of Bible-thumpers and statisticians was too much, so "at the *National Lampoon*," as a NatLamp editorial put it, "God remains a sacred cow."

□ **Praising with faint damns:** "Concludes a British diplomat in Tel Aviv: 'I would say that the Israeli security police don't behave any worse than our own do in Northern Ireland.'" (*Newsweek*, February 20). . . . "There were recently the dispatches of the wire services from Philadelphia, relating the unholy experiences in Belfast of a 17-year-old American, Pearse Kerr, who was arrested without any charges, tortured, his broken wrist handcuffed behind his back, forced to sign a false confession, and left to rot for months in a Belfast gaol until the Philly papers started making embarrassing parallels between British justice and a fellow named Franz Kafka." (Warren Hinckle, columnist for the *San Francisco Chronicle*, February 14.)

□ **The Treasury plans to issue** a new, one dollar cupronickel token coin, and some Treasury officials want a token woman on it. Many US coins featured anonymous women as personifications of "Liberty" or "Columbia," and one proposal would put an image of "Woman" on the new coin—with aviator style glasses, perhaps. Others call for Helen Keller (symbolic of our rulers, no doubt; deaf, dumb and blind to prudence), or Nellie Ross, the nation's first woman governor (1920's in Wyoming, you know. Oh, you didn't?) Nominations are still open if REASON's readers would like to suggest their candidate for Ms. Fiat Money. One requirement: she must be dead.

□ **Tropical Paradise Dept.:** Marijuana is now the largest cash crop in Hawaii; the 1977 harvest was worth an estimated \$360 to \$400 million, compared to the \$242 million sugar crop. With up to 100 inches of rain a year, marijuana plants routinely grow 10 feet high—and sometimes over 13 feet—in Hawaii's volcanic soil. The Hawaiian crop is also exceptionally potent; which is why some varieties, such as the renowned Kona Gold, command prices of from \$2000 to \$3000 a pound on the West Coast, and upwards of \$3500 in New York. Some enlightened legislators suggest that legalizing the dope trade would be the economic salvation of the

Aloha State; indeed, State Representative Ambercrombie calls marijuana "the only major unsubsidized crop in Hawaii. . . . It just goes to show how free enterprise can compete with a subsidized crop like sugar."

□ **Voices of Moderation:** *Village Voice* columnist Alexander Cockburn greets the NAACP's new free-marketish energy policy by saying, "The largest black organization in the country has placed itself beneath the boot of the most merciless defenders of corporate privilege both in the United States and abroad."

□ **Back in 1975,** *Counterspy* magazine revealed that one Richard Welch was the CIA station chief in Lima, Peru. The CIA objected to the revelation, but left Welch in place, blown cover and all. Sometime later Welch became station chief for Athens, and moved into the house his predecessor had used. CIA headquarters in Langley, Virginia, sent him a telegram warning that 1) just about everybody in Athens knew the house was the CIA chief's and 2) anti-American and anti-CIA sentiment in the city ran so high that Welch "risked assassination if he remained in the house." Remain he did, however, and Richard Welch was assassinated on December 24, 1975. CIA official Angus Thuermer then called up several Washington reporters to tell them *Counterspy* had exposed Welch and now he was dead—but Thuermer did not mention the warning telegram. And to make sure everyone got the point, reporters were provided with "a US Intelligence source" to quote as saying "We've had an American gunned down by other Americans fingering him as a CIA spy." CIA critic Morton Halperin revealed all this when he testified before Congress (see the February *More*, for more) and summed it up as "a deliberate CIA manipulation of the American press," which is a polite way of putting it. REASON was one of those manipulated: Edith Efron regurgitated the *Counterspy* myth whole in February, 1978, the better to revile (sight unseen) *Inquiry* magazine.

□ **Our Doublespeak Award** goes to Judge Donald T. Barbeau of Minnesota, who rejected Mr. Michael Dengler's petition to name (number?) himself "1069" on the grounds it was "an offense to basic human dignity and inherently totalitarian."

Bill Birmingham

"The reason a lot of people do not recognize opportunity is because it usually goes around wearing overalls looking like hard work."

—Thomas A. Edison