NJ LIBERTARIAN

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

JUNE 1979

NBC HAS SHELVED ATLAS SHRUGGED

Think of the impact a televised "Atlas Shrugged" would make on millions of viewers just before the 1980 presidential elections. A Libertarian fantasy? Unfortunately, unless you act now, it will turn out to be just that.

NBC has shelved plans to make Ayn Rand's "Atlas Shrugged" into an eight-hour series for television. Sterling Silliphant's screenplay is partially completed and has Pand's approval. The series was scheduled to be shown in the fall of 1980.

NBC's excuse for dropping it is that the thousand-plus pages of "Atlas Shrugged" do not provide enough material for eight hours of television! As anyone who has read the book knows, the more plausible problem would be condensing it into eight hours.

Televising "Atlas Shrugged" would be a tremendous impetus to Libertarianism - particularly if it is shown just before we run our third presidential candidate.

The only way to make NBC reconsider is to demonstrate the book's wide-spread popularity with a massive letter-writing campaign. We should get as many people as we can to write directly to the head of NBC:

FRED SILVERMAN
National Broadcasting Company
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, N.Y., 10020

Further information may be obtained by writing or calling the Committee to Save Atlas Shrugged, Richard Saum, chairman, 87 Mallard Ave., Goleta, California, 93017; (805) 967-9446.

A REMINDER

This month's NJLP Supper Club event will feature LP presidential nominee Ed Clark. Location: Howard Johnson on Route 1, Newark (near airport). 7 pm. Admission: \$3, \$10 with buffet. Anyone who intends to eat must order by June 8. Send checks made out to NJ Libertarian Party to P.O. Box 444, Westfield, NJ, 07091 (NOT the regular NJLP box).

"THAT GOVERNMENT IS BEST WHICH GOVERNS LEAST"
THOMAS JEFFERSON

Libertarians of Bergen County 278 Griggs Ave. Teaneck, N. J. 07666

(201) 836-6741

BOB SHAPIRO

Editor,

As 1 read Letters to the Editor in various newspapers, I have seen more and more calls lately for the government not to give us oil price decontrol but rather to protect us even further from robbery by the oil companies. This reaction is understandable given that the media tend to report what government officials say and little else. As a recent example, Senator Howard Baker, a possible Presidential contender, is quoted as saying that, even though he is a friend of private free enterprise, the oil companies had better watch out or else they might be nationalized!! In an effort to add some balance to the discussion, I present some additional ideas below.

- 1. Adjusting oil company profits for inflation, their profits this year are the same as in 1965.
- 2. Oil company earnings reports are artificially inflated to look good to the stockholders. This is done by a) figuring depreciation of plant and equipment on original cost rather than replacement cost, and b) figuring gross profit on sales on original cost of the oil rather than on replacement cost. The latter shows up as massive illusory profits on an inventory which must be maintained indefinitely; inventory profits cannot be realized unless the company goes out of business and sells off its inventory. Adjusting oil company profits for these factors shows earnings are actually lower this year than last year. The excess profits tax being proposed is just a dodge to get us to pay more in taxes. Besides, real profits provide jobs and new production while taxes only provide more government bureaucrats.
- 3. Domestic oil price controls don't significantly affect retail gasoline prices; the world market price for oil controls retail prices. To illustrate this point, assume you're a seller of widgets. The first 5 widgets cost you \$8 each to produce and each additional one costs you \$16. If somebody wants to buy 10 widgets, you'll base your selling price on the \$16 cost figure. This is exactly what happens in oil pricing. The first 50% of U.S. consumption costs a price controlled \$8 per barrel while the other 50% costs a world price of \$16. The \$16 cost price, the world market price, controls the retail price.

- 4. The "Entitlements" feature of oil price controls discourages domestic production and subsidizes imports. Most large oil producers have their own refineries. With wellhead price controls, a company's refinery division profits would offset lost drilling division profits and would provide ample profit incentives for new exploration. However, the government has neutralized these "excess windfall profits" (sic!) Since refiners importing oil at \$16 a barrel would be at a disadvantage relative to refiners with their own \$8 a barrel supplies, the government says that the importing refineries are "entitled" to some of that \$8 oil. Domestic producers are being forced to sell their oil to their competitors' refineries at \$8 a barrel. Importers' profits are being subsidized while domestic producers' profits are being lowered. And the domestic producers who seem to be getting hurt the most are the small independents. In California alone there are about 23,000 oil wells out of 66,500 which have closed down since 1971, mainly due to one aspect of controls or another.
- 5. While a dozen or so oil companies supply most of our needs, fully 1/3 of U.S. consumption is supplied by tens of thousands of stripper wells— those producing 40 barrels of cil or less daily. As the wellhead price of oil rises, more stripper wells will be able to generate the several hundred dollars a week in revenues needed to be profitable, thus increasing supplies for American consumers.
- 6. Profit potential encourages innovation. Two examples are a submergible pump and a new polymer which seperates oil from mud in the well. Both of these innovations have greatly increased the amount of oil recoverable from a well.
- 7. Higher prices encourage substitution. Many thousands of drivers have already modified their cars engines to run on propane. In addition, sorghum and corn are currently being used to provide the alcohol for "gasohol" and certain cactus species can supply a thick liquid which is being considered as a petroleum substitute.
- 8. The recent high prices were caused by the anticipation of tight supplies caused by the turmoil in Iran. These "premature" price rises served the purpose of holding some supply off the market until it would be badly needed-during the actual crunch we're having right now. These automatic processes of the Free Market help to smooth the transitions from abundant supply to tight supply and from one source of supply to an alternative source. Government actions which are successful in interfering with anticipatory price activity make the transition more abrupt and therefore worsen th impact of tight supply conditions.

9. Gasoline prices are affected by government actions. Fully 1/3 of the pump price of gasoline is taxes. In addition, the National Petroleum Stockpile Program has pushed prices up by siphoning off up to 5% of domestic production during the last few years (now that's a windfall for the oil companies) while the Department of Energy's budget at \$20 Billion equals roughly 20¢ per gallon for all the gasoline we use each year.

10. Government solutions to the energy problem only makes matters worse. Weekend closings and short hours for gas stations would only give stations the same business with less overhead (a windfall for them?) while consumers would face long lines while squeezing their purchases into the shorter available hours. While rationing has too many problems to detail here, one remark seems called for. Since government actions are mainly responsible for long lines at gas stations, it is especially outrageous for them to require us to ask permission to wait in those long lines.

While space does not allow the much more detailed analysis this subject deserves, these points should serve to improve the debate on this subject. When all information is considered, I'm sure you will agree with me that the government could best handle the energy problems by simply removing all controls, subsidies, and other restrictions and let the Free Market get back to the business of providing us with the most economically efficient supply of energy possible.

-Bob Shapiro

AGAINST THE WALL A magazine of self-liberation and voluntary alternatives. Sample \$1.00 postpaid. AGAINST THE WALL P.O. Box 444, Westfield, NJ 07091

-ADVERTISING RATES-

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

These rates only apply to ads submitted <u>camera-ready</u>. Extra will be charged for any necessary preparation.

PROPOSAL

will be:

As most party members can attest, persuading just one person to support the principles of Libertarianism is extremely difficult. Before one can even begin to present the philosophy, an interested listener must be found; this is usually the most frustrating task of all. As a result, the growth of the party has been very slow.

Rather than starting from scratch, however, many large corporations expand by acquiring already-established organizations, and I think an analogous process can be used by the LP. If we can identify organizations/groups that are pursuing an objective that has some common ground with the LP, these groups

-good sources of potential converts (we agree on at least one issue)
-ready to listen (not apathetic).
The common ground I refer to can be a similar philosophy (ACLU), similar objectives (NORMAL), or just a problem for which the LP has a solution (antinuclear energy proponents, solar energy advocates, environmentalists, etc.).

This approach has been tried sporadically in the past, but rarely in a carefully coordinated manner - usually the LP is caught unprepared. I propose that a committee be formed to prepare LP position papers for all current issues. When an organization arranges a demonstration (hearing, seminar), the relevant position papers can be quickly printed up and distributed to all attendees.

This committee can also consider a more elaborate strategy like sponsoring a speaker at the affair. If anyone is interested in this proposal, contact me (see LETTER POLICY) a/o come to the June 17 meeting at Len Flynn's.

-Dan Hurley

LETTER POLICY

The NJ LIBERTARIAN wants to hear from you. Letters and articles <u>must</u> be typed single-spaced in half-page (4") columns. Contributors will receive 1/8 page of advertising space for each page of material. Send to:

Dan Hurley 38 Maida Terrace Red Bank, N.J., 07701 ditor:

Your Wed. April 11, editorial calling for a return to the draft is as "misguided" as Rep. Fenwick's co-sponsoring of National Youth Services: a euphemism for youth slavery if there ever was one. Ms. Fenwick's bill would be fine for manning a ditler Youth contingent, but it has no place in the nation founded on "liberty and justice for all."

The editorial claims a "need" for conscripts to defend us from the alleged 'growing strength" of the Soviet Union, In fact, only 30 percent of our military budget is spent for the defense of the United States. The rest of our 2.1 million armed forces and \$130 billion budget supports a global military establishment which does little to enhance national security. Half this budget goes to defend Western Europe, countries with industrial and technological capacity equal or superior to the Soviets. Europe should pay to defend itself, and their citizens, not U.S. taxpayers, should provide for the men and material. Five billion dollars of the military budget goes to defend the corrupt and repressive dictatorship in South Korea, while another \$21 billion and much of our fleets and forces are earmarked for Asia, where we already have wasted billions of dollars and thousands of lives trying to subdue a small agricultural state.

Volunteer armed forces are easily capable of defending the United States, but they cannot support worldwide military adventures like Vietnam, Cambodia, Angola, Iran, etc. This is the great ADVANTAGE, not a weakness, of the volunteer army! If we had had an allvolunteer armed services in 1964, we would never have gotten into the Vietnam mess in the first place. With a captive army of conscripts in hand, our politicians can freely embark on whatever reckless scheme they please. Whereas, if they have to go to the people for an army and the taxes to support it, they will have to have a very good reason.

Your editorial asserts that all citizens owe a responsibility to defend their country. On the contrary, no person or state has any right to demand that a "youthful objector" take up arms against his or her will. Our young people have the same rights as anyone else to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To declare otherwise is to condone involuntary servitude. Neither plantation slaves in the pre-Civil War South, nor modern day conscripts coerced into the armed forces owe anything whatsoever to their masters — Jefferson Davis or Jimmy Carter.

The editorial is correct in one sense

when it says, "what is at stake is this country's ... survival." Will America return to a free society where our people, young and old, freely choose for themselves how to lead their lives and spend their money? Or will the government continue to try to be the "world's policeman" and wage distant wars which destroy the children in conscript armies and improverish their parents with ever increasing war taxes?

America does not need a larger miliary budget nor more bodies (draftees or otherwise) to defend this country; In fact, a total defense structure about 40 percent smaller would be both sustainable on a voluntary basis and more than sufficient to protect ourselves from attack. The issue is more than conscription; it is whether the U.S. armed forces should defend this country or try to police the world. If this nation learned anything from Vietnam, now is the time to prove it by rejecting the draft forever.

Leonard T. Flynn, Chairman New Jersey Libertarian Party We have 100,980 government *Regulators* (not elected but appointed) who have issued as many as 7,496 Regulations in one year alone, and many of these edicts carry the power to send us to jail if we don't obey them. The Code of Federal Regulations fills 60,000 pages, in 38 volumes—a shelf 15 feet long. What business or individual could possibly understand or live up to them all?

a

C

R

a

1

a

A

h

d

b

T

t

C

P

f

b

3

1

d

n

b

A recent survey shows that the government issues 9,800 different forms to be filled out by business and the public, calling for 556,000,000 responses.

No wonder we have inflation. deficits—and *disgust!*

Bus. (201) 780-1414 N.J. (800) 392-6810 RES. (201) 431-5557

N.Y. (212) 964-5130

ELIZABETH M. MACRON

SALES ASSOCIATE



STERLING THOMPSON & ASSOCIATES

REALTOR · INSUROR · APPRAISER RT. 9 HOWELL, N. J. 07731 (NEXT TO HOWELL LANES)

STATE COMMITTEE

LEN FLYNN, CHAIRMAN	201-928-0758
	" 540-8078
KEN KAPLAN, EXEC. SEC.	" 672-6692
JEANNE MACRON, TREAS.	" 431 - 555 7
BONNIE SWIRSKY, REC.SEC.	" 431-4491
BILL GEORGE, (At Lagge)	" 233-4082
JANE REHMKE, (")	" 540-8078
DALE SUTTHOFF, (")	" 638-6566

County Chairpersons:

BOB SHAPIRO, BERGEN	11	836-6741
BARRY SIEGEL, ESSEX	11	743-8686
RON WISHART, MONMOUTH	II	536-4950 998-6998
MIKE FIESCHKO, MIDDLESEX/	11	998-6998
SOMERSET		

ABORTION DEBATE

With an issue as complex as the legalization of abortion, complete a agreement among any group would be unexpected. And Libertarians are particularly prone to diversity of opinion. Rather than simply accepting this and and avoiding the topic, I think it's important to learn where and why we disagree, so I second Bob Shapiro's call for further discussion.

One of the reasons past discussions seemed to wander in circles is that Pro-Abortionists rarely attempted to answer the Pro-Life claim that the fetus is a human being - therefore abortion is mur-For instance, Pro-Life has often been accused of "legislating morality". This accusation is simply a misapplication of the LP's position on victimless By advancing this argument, Pro-Abortionists are implying that abortions are victimless crimes when, in fact, Pro-Life's entire argument is bas based on the opposite contention: there is a victim. Why Pro-Abortionists consistently fail to address this claim is not clear, but until they do, all attempts at debate are doomed to become shouting matches.

Similarly, when Pro-Life is accused of "bringing the state into the private lives of citizens", the accuser is insinuating the Pro-Life Libertarians don't understand and accept the libertarian 'rule of thumb' that states that government's role is to prevent - not initiate - interference in citizens' private lives. In fact, Pro-Life has no interest in protecting women from themselves; Pro-Life is simply defending the (human) baby's right to life. Until someone can establish that the fetus is not a human being, the privacy violation argument is also inapplicable.

To me, the question we must answer is: At what point does human life begin? Pro-Life has chosen conception, Pro-Abortion has chosen birth, but there are Since it is wellproblems with both. known that the fetus is biologically complete (with brain waves) before nine months, frequently surviving pre-mature births at seven months, birth cannot be considered our best choice. However. many people have trouble viewing the microscopic gamete as a human being, so Pro-Life's choice might also be question. ed.

Since, with this issue, it is far better to err on the safe side, I would prefer the outlawing of all abortions over the legalization of ALL abortions. (The argument that illegal abortions would still be performed is no more valid here than the analogous argument applied to the outlawing of murder.) But are there only two alternatives?

I recently read an article in a local paper quoting a Libertarian making a distinction between abortions during the first trimester, and abortions in later trimesters. I think this suggests a promising third alternative to blanket legality and blanket illegality: limit abortions to within two months of conception. Although this approach is rarely suggested in debates, I think it is more compatible with the complexities of the question and should be included in future debates if the debates are ever to reach a conclusion.

Dan Hurley

NEW JERSEY LIBERTARIAN PARTY GENERAL MEETING & PICNIC

Sunday June 17, 1979 starting at 2 PM--rain or shine At the Flynn's home in Cassville (Jackson Twp.), NJ

Lots of fun-

VolleyballBasketballSoftballFootballBadmintonCroquetHikingShade & SunRelaxationKitesFrisbeeHorseshoesTetherballPlaygroundChildren's Games

And Great Adventure Amusement Park is just 5 minutes away.

A little business (at 3 PM)-

Report from the NJLP State Committee Meet the 1979 NJLP candidates for Assembly and local offices Select one more delegate to the national LP convention

Plus a special guest (3:30 PM)

George Baier of the N.J. cnapter of the National Organization for the Reform of the Marijuana Laws (NORML) will speak on "The Infamous N.J. Drug Paraphernalia Bill" and what N.J. NORML is doing for marijuana reform.

PLEASE BRING--

Food for yourself and one dish to share. Charcoal grills will be provided.

DIRECTIONS (Call 201/928-0758 if you get lost.)

Find Cassville or Jackson Twp. on a map (it's between Lakewood, Lakenurst, Hightstown, and Freehold) and drive there. Now from the light at the intersection of Ocean County road #528 and road #571 (at the Cassville Tavern), travel two tenths (2/10) mile west on county road #528 and take the first paved street on the left (Park Ave.). Flynn's is the red house one half mile down Park Ave. on the left (#370).

Statement of Principles

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

We hold that all individuals have the right to exercise sole dominion over their own lives, and have the right to live in whatever manner they choose, so long as they do not forcibly interfere with the equal right of others to live in whatever manner they choose.

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

We, on the contrary, deny the right of any government to do these things, and hold that where governments exist, they must not violate the rights of any individual: namely, (1) the right to life—accordingly we support prohibition of the initiation of physical force against others; (2) the right to liberty of speech and action—accordingly we oppose all attempts by government to abridge the freedom of speech and press, as well as government censorship in any form; and (3) the right to property—accordingly we oppose all government interference with private property, such as confiscation, nationalization, and eminent domain, and support the prohibition of robbery, trespass, fraud, and misrepresentation.

Since governments, when instituted, must not violate individual rights, we oppose all interference by government in the areas of voluntary and contractual relations among individuals. People should not be forced to sacrifice their lives and property for the benefit of others. They should be left free by government to deal with one another as free traders; and the resultant economic system, the only one compatible with the protection of individual rights, is the free market.

Membership Application

Send to: N.J. Libertarian Party

Jeanne Macron
2 Bernice Drive

Freehold, N.J., 07728

		Date
Name		Phone
Address _		City
State	Zip	County
() ; () ; () ;	bership desired: Student \$5 Regular \$10 Sustaining \$25 ve any particula or organization	() Household \$15 () Lifetime \$100 () Lifetime sust. \$25
cate the		do not believe in or advo- orce as a means of achiev- oals."
		Signed
	iption to newsle	etter is included in all
	ke check or mone an Party".	ey payable to "New Jersey
		name to appear on a Liber-

JERSEY LIBERTARIAN 07763 PARTY

TO:



YOU MAY BE A LIBERTARIAN AT HEART WITHOUT EVEN BEING AWARE OF IT.

Do you believe in an economic system based on open competition instead of big-business-controlled government agencies? Do you believe, for instance, that the CAB should be stopped from restricting competition and fixing airline prices for the benefit of the giant airlines?

Do you believe the government-through its meddling, corruption, catering to special interests, awarding of subsidies and bail-outs and special bank privileges—has shown itself to be totally incapable or unwilling to control the declining dollar, or in fact, to act benevolently for the working person?

Do you believe that voluntary agreements between companies or individuals are none of the government's business-provided that no force or fraud is involved nor intended against anyone else?

Do you believe the government should stop trying to impose its morality on the American people, that no crime has been committed if there is no victim? Do you believe it is wrong to use the time, budgets and resources of our police, courts and prisons to persecute people who may be harming no one but themselves?

Do you believe government should leave the buying of seatbelts, motorcycle helmets or any other item designed for personal safety up to the individual?

Do you believe government spending and taxation should be cut?

If you answered "yes" to most of these questions, congratulations. You may be more of a Libertarian than you thought.

> The Libertarian **Party**