



# NEW RAMPART

Published by Rampart Institute

Vol. 3, No. 4 (Feb., Mar. 1983)

NEW RAMPART is published every two months. Subscriptions are \$10 for one year and \$15 for two years. Managing Editor—Lawrence Samuels; Assistant Editor—Sandra Sisson. Contributing Editors: George Smith, Robert LeFevre, Marvin Olsen & Butler D. Shaffer. Rampart Institute, Box 4, Fullerton, CA 92632 (714) 979-5737. Rampart Institute is a tax-deductible 501(c)(3), educational organization.



Lech Walesa (on the right of photo) was refused his old job in Gdansk.

## THE RIGHT TO WORK IS A MYTH IN POLAND

Government-created jobs in Gdansk, Poland are subject, it seems, to government-created rules. Rules were changed to accommodate a need for chastisement against Lech Walesa, so the ex-union leader claimed in a recent interview.

The leader of the outlawed Solidarity union was greeted with a dozen trucks and vans loaded with police as he tried to go back to work after being detained for nearly a year. He merely wanted to return to his job as an electrician.

Since Polish law allows labor leaders to be freed from their normal work to conduct union activities and officials have said that people detained under martial law may have their old jobs back, it was a shock for Walesa. In a statement for western reporters, Walesa said, "I must stand on the ground of clear formulations and moral principles." "Fighting for my rights, I am fighting for the rights of normal working people."

The 39-year-old labor activist was employed at the Lenin shipyard from 1967 to 1976, when he was fired for trying to organize workers. He won reinstatement in the August 1980 strike that led to the creation of Solidarity, and took a leave of absence in 1980 and 1981 as he rose to leadership in that union, the only independent labor federation in the Soviet bloc.

Solidarity was suspended with the imposition of martial law in December of 1981 and outlawed in October. Walesa spent 11 months in martial-law internment, but insisted that Polish law guarantees his old job at the shipyard.

Now the government is saying that there are "irregularities" in the union books which Walesa kept, and summoned him to testify, which he ignored. Walesa said ". . . some kind of special tactics are being used by the government in my case."

Obviously if the government creates the jobs, then the rules can be changed to accommodate the government, not the workers.

Wasn't it in the news recently that Reagan is going to "create" more jobs?

## Capitalist/Communist Enterprises Freshen up Vietnam Economy!

### Or . . . Can Entrepreneurs Survive Anywhere? It seems so!

In Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam there lives a fellow named Trieu Binh Thiet. This fellow has three American cars, two wives and assorted girlfriends—and lots and lots of money. One wife is out of the country as a business contact, as well as some of his mistresses. "What's going on?" you ask, well . . . read on!

Well, Thiet is the director of the Private-State Plastic Products Establishment No. 1, a partnership with the Vietnamese Communist Government which is mutually beneficial for all concerned.

This is all part of an experiment to join the State's many resources with available capitalists and their expertise in making it all work. The experiment shows us that the country is finding its way to capitalism through the door of fascism.

Many such enterprises have been set up to date and a whole lot more are in the planning stage, such as Bicycle Parts Establishment No. 5. (I wonder who stays up all night and thinks up those catchy names).

Before Saigon fell to the communists in 1975, Thiet was one of the city's native industrialists, having inherited a small business and having it grow into eight more which included iron foundries, metal works, rice processing, plastics, tin and import-export concerns.

While there was a mass exodus taking place at that time, Thiet decided to stay put and cast his lot with the socialists. "I volunteered to join the state," he said. "I gave them my factories."

Since it's hard to keep a good capitalist down, the state wanting his expertise, agreed to enter into a partnership with him in the bicycle factory. Since the arrangement is straightforward, the state provides raw materials, and Thiet provides the money and know-how. Usually ownership and profits are split 50-50. However, the state's representative in the operation is subordinate and largely a figurehead.

As this seems rather pragmatic, Vietnamese officials contend that the practice is consistent as a "transition phase" on the way to true socialism. (Say, what do they mean by that)?

"As long as the capitalist who holds the means of production doesn't use these means to exploit the masses, it's OK," said Le Minh Tam, director of State Plastics Manufacturers. (Oh, that's what they mean). Tam was present during an interview with Thiet at his plastics company, which was started with profits from the bicycle factory. As an enthusiastic Thiet was bragging about his con-

[continued on page 2

nuated affluence, Tam would reveal a somewhat pained expression from time to time.

Although Thiet's American cars are getting older, the future looks bright as the government just gave him permission to order a brand new Japanese car as well as arranged a brand new villa. "I probably live better than members of the Politburo," he said at that interview. (Again, Tam winced, it was noted).

By all accounts, he has been a very successful business man by outstripping production figures at similar state-run concerns, although officials are reluctant to give specific details for obvious reasons.

So again we see examples of the profit incentive in the most unlikely places . . . wonder if it will catch on.

## LEGISLATORS TAKE CARE OF THEIR OWN

### OR . . . Gravy Train Makes Tracks!

If it wasn't for good ol' Evelle Younger in 1979, applying for additional yearly pensions for various government jobs that he held, *The California Journal* may never have investigated the State pension give-away. As Younger was already eligible for yearly pensions totaling \$50,000, he went for another \$47,576 granted to him by a piece of legislation with an escalator clause which, when totaled, was a full \$5,000 higher than his salary as attorney general.

Jackson Rannels, author of the investigative piece and a reporter for the *San Francisco Chronicle*, scrutinized Legislators' Retirement System records to find that, thanks to the super escalator and a 1978 state Supreme Court ruling, a large handful of retired state officials have been hauling it in at the expense of the taxpayers. In his investigation he uncovered these interesting facts:

- Former Governor Pat Brown gets a pension of \$56,880, while son Jerry's salary for the same job is \$49,100.

- State Supreme Court Justice Stanley Mosk gets a \$47,340 yearly pension after less than six years' service as attorney general. (Incumbent George Deukmejian's salary was \$47,500.)

- Former state treasurer Bert Betts' pension has now hit \$52,900 yearly, triple the figure four years ago when Betts got the state Supreme Court to agree with his claim that whatever the lawmakers adopt for themselves applies to him in his political retirement.

- U.S. Sen. Alan Cranston, while accepting his \$60,660 federal salary, drags down a \$52,500 yearly pension for eight years as state controller.

- Clarence Alexander, a former Senate staff officer who never held elective office, receives a yearly pension of \$63,840, about double his former salary.

It becomes obvious then that if the state Supreme Court doesn't rescind its decision in a case like Betts', such individuals as Younger will be eligible for yearly state pensions of as high as \$110,000 this year.

So let's see how this actually works . . . The super escalator, approved by the Legislature in 1966 when inflation and salaries were relatively stable, made retiring state officials and legislators eligible for a rapid compounding of base-figure benefits using such multipliers as cost-of-living increases and years of service, plus salary hikes granted to *future* incumbents.

So again, thanks to Younger, the retirement system denied the former official's claim and is paying him only \$25,380 in yearly pension benefits to provoke a legal test in that the Legislature can sanction any lifetime benefits it desires.

Can we get rid of the parasites? Yes, but then they are retired, aren't they? So then a pension is appropriate! Even if "we" fired them as in this example: former Democratic Assemblyman Charles Meyers of San Francisco, age 60, has been drawing a state pension (currently \$31,750) the past 14 years—ever since giving up his seat in 1967 under charges of *alleged misuse of public funds*. Looks like he's still at it!

Ho hum, makes a person look at the whole structure and wonder who's kidding whom . . . only it's not funny, not one bit!

## INDIANS RESENT BEING IN CHARGE OF THEIR OWN

Government dependency is a way of life for the original Americans!

by Sandra Sisson

Reagan recently announced his new policy regarding American Indians, and all thunder and darnation broke out!

Watt opened his mouth to defend what is a major step for individualism and economy of government and received the same response.

Darned if you do and darned if you don't, Ronnie . . . trying to dismantle bureaucracy is a tough job.

1.4 million American Indians presently on reservations are affected by the President's federalism concepts. A policy designed "to strengthen tribal governments and lessen federal control over tribal affairs. To reduce their dependence on federal funds, although some funds would still be available."

The tribes are then in charge of how best to use the funds to meet their needs.

As for James Watt . . . all he said was "that Indian reservations are an example of the failure of socialism." Noting that the reservations are plagued by unemployment, divorce, drug-abuse, alcohol-abuse, and venereal disease, he said: "If you want an example of the failure of socialism, don't go to Russia. Come to America and go to the Indian reservations."

Editorials are coming thick and fast against Watt for his brashness—but what he is saying is true and should be reported for what it means . . . that the individual should be in charge of his or her own life and not dependent on some government.

Although Watt is a controversial spokesman for the White House, it is refreshing to hear a politician voice some real opinions instead of trying to be "all things to all men". In this case white man does not "speak with forked tongue".

Government interference to date has caused so much damage to the individual in the name of social welfare, that even the Indians can't see the positiveness that this will have on their once proud culture.

## GUEST COLUMN

# IT'S WASHINGTON WIZARDS WHO ARE OUT OF TOUCH WITH REALITY

by Butler D. Shaffer

I watched one of those televised interviews the other evening, featuring Sen. Robert Dole, R-Kan., chastising Arthur Laffer, principal architect of the "supply-side" theory of economic recovery, for his theoretical approach to the problems faced by the American economy.

Sen. Dole continually chided Laffer for his "theories" that might "work well in the classroom" but fail to respond to "the world of reality we must deal with in Congress."

I detest the notion that politicians have the thankless task of "dealing with reality," while those of us who criticize the political process are only indulging in the luxury of abstract, theoretical classroom games. Having long believed in the truth advanced by one of my law school professors, the late Karl Llewellyn, that "if it doesn't work, it isn't a good theory," permit me to respond to the Kansas wizard.

There is hardly a location on earth better equipped than Washington D.C. for a display of non-realistic behavior. Let us remember that the economic problems being addressed by Laffer, and being suffered through by middle-income taxpayers, the unemployed, and families unable to pay 14.5-percent interest rates to buy a home, have been imposed upon the nation by recycled gangs of politicians—whether of the left, right, or middle—have been united in a common conspiracy against the property and liberty of the rest of us.

When our unwanted tax bills became so unpopular as to threaten their elected positions, the politicians changed their tactic but not their purpose. Like pinwheels that simply revolve in response to prevailing winds, these "pragmatic," "practical-minded" politicians did what every deadbeat debtor has dreamed of being able to do: print up phony money to pay for their prodigality.

That such inflation has only imposed additional taxes upon all of us (by diminishing the purchasing power of our dollars)—and had been the principal contributor to the high interest rates, high unemployment, and low economic activity—has been brought to public attention over the years by a number of economists.

But Dole will have none of this. This pinwheel responds not to the winds that blow in from Kansas taxpayers and unemployed workers, but to the power interests of the federal government itself. Like asylum inmates who play out, in detail, the fantasies of their own warped minds, the politicians have no doubt managed to convince even themselves that *they* are the ones dealing with reality, that the complaints of over-bled taxpayers are but the voices of self-indulgent people who are ignoring their social responsibilities, and that the unemployed are only lazy shirkers who prefer the alleged luxuries of a life of government welfare.

Since Dole professes a preference for "reality," let him be made aware that our present economic problems are the

product of the refusal of politicians—himself included—to honor one of nature's most "realistic" laws: that of causation. The Keynesian alchemists and the corporate-State wizards have combined to carry off one of the most gigantic hoaxes in human history and, undertaking that, managed—for many decades—to gain popular acceptance for programs designed for no other purpose than the aggrandizement of power through the faking of reality.

While Dole and his co-conspirators advise the rest of us to eat cake, more and more people are becoming quite aware of the vicious game being played at their expense. Truck drivers, beauty-parlor operators, housewives, bartenders and farmers have long voiced an understanding that is only now beginning to be expressed in magazines, newspapers and college classrooms. In time, the truth may become so obvious to everyone that even the television news commentators may see it. When that happens, the politicians will have to beat a hasty retreat and put together a new and improved product for faking the real world.

## WASHINGTON? MOSCOW? Is There Any Difference?

by Robert LeFevre

Voices both shrill and rasping are now heard in protracted argument across the land. There's a debate over nuclear freeze as opposed to nuclear reduction. There's a debate over the size of military budgets and how much should be paid for this or that.

I tried for years to keep the matter quiet, but someone found out that I favor peace as opposed to war. I immediately became a center of controversy and those persons who hold me in disfavor point the finger of shame at me and call: "Pacifist!" The intonation is identical to what they would use if they said "skunk" or "traitor" or "murderer."

I have never thought of myself as a pacifist. I've had to fight and fight hard for everything I've ever attained. But I am strongly opposed to physical violence whether it is carried out under legal sanction, as in war, or without that sanction, as in mugging.

It has always seem to me that any normal person would automatically favor peace as opposed to war. But I have learned that such isn't the case anymore. Actually, we don't look at peace and war; we look at what are presumed to be causes leading to the one or the other.

Currently, for example, the American administration claims that this nation has fallen behind the Russians in stockpiling armaments, including atomic bombs. What this suggests is that prior to some unspecified date in the immediate past, America had more in its stockpiles than the Russians. So Reagan wants the Russians to back down so we can overtake and get ahead again, after which we'll agree to freeze things as they then become. There is also a very vocal group which wants to freeze first, after which reductions can begin.

This Brobdingnagian clash of wishes was first suggested by Jonathan Swift, in *Gulliver's Travels*, and would be equally ludicrous today if anyone had any sense of humor. Instead, a vast number of persons on both sides of each fence are now debating the effects of a nuclear war. Since none has ever been fought, no one knows anything about

it, but ignorance has never yet halted an argument.

So today if I say, "I favor peace," the reaction usually is: "So, you won't stand up for your rights at all! You'll let the Russians walk all over you!"

And were I to say, "How about freezing the creation of more armaments altogether . . . atomic bombs and rifles and bayonets . . . the works? I'm sure I'd be greeted with, "You're a dupe of the Russians."

My answer, which usually isn't listened to, since I've already revealed myself as a coward and, hence, not worth while, is: My rights aren't threatened by the Russians with the immediacy my rights are being subverted daily here in this country by my own government.

Yes, I favor peace. I don't even favor what is called "conventional" war. And I'm not convinced that the Russian government has anything but power and control in mind; power and control over me and everyone else. But, then, that's what I find in Washington D.C. as well.

Governments make all the wars after first creating the pressures and the situations which bring them about. And the old idea that I have to support my own government because of the way it protects me doesn't persuade me any longer.

What happens, in fact, is that government creates the cause of war and then drafts me so that I can go out and get shot at to protect it. When I was much younger, I could work up a lot of enthusiasm for such histrionics. No more.

I try to imagine the worst. A war occurs and the Russians conquer. Then what? Obviously, they'd have to send bureaucrats over here to run things. Do you think they could? Look at the mess they're in in Poland. What about Afghanistan? What about the other failures and disasters they are trying to cope with?

Consider the problem Reagan has here in this country, and most of us like him. Now, picture trying to manage American affairs with all the dissenting factions that are here and imagine that you are hated worse than Richard Nixon. You want the job?

As I said, I favor peace. Peace and freedom go hand in hand. We will never have the one without the other. How do we achieve freedom and peace? One step is to stop debating what kind of war would be acceptable and to agree that war is planned murder of fellow human beings on a grand scale, made possible by legal sanction. And then to say we don't favor it at all.

Robert LeFevre is a columnist for the *Santa Ana Register*.

## EDITORIAL

### EQUAL SEX EQUAL RIGHTS!

By Lawrence Samuels

Joseph Miranda in *The Dartmouth Review* (Nov. 1, 1982) wrote a very enlightening article comparing the inequalities of sexual activities with the inequalities of the free market.

Usually, articles on the free market can become rather boring, but Miranda decided to take another angle. He cited a report from the United Nations Permanent Committee on Sex that showed an astonishingly small number of people who engage in regular sexual activity. The United

Nations report argued that 20 per cent of the people have 80 percent of the sex.

The question now becomes, is it fair that only the young and beautiful should profit so heavily from sex? What about ugly, fat and shy people? Aren't they being discriminated against? And what about the poor who cannot afford to buy sex from the local streetwalker? Surely all this is unfair.

The problem with the free market activity, as any socialist would point out, is that it is in the hands of the individual, where it can be abused. But sex is also on a very individual level. Sex is not rationed by a government commission. It is agreed upon by individuals without a middleman (government). All parties voluntarily agree without concern for those who are sexually undesirable or impotent. In fact, our system of sex activity "glorifies the persons who are able to score, instead of exposing them as the exploiters they are."

How can such abuses be corrected? How can everyone get their fair share of sex? Well, perhaps several laws similar to laws of taxation forcing the "sharing of the wealth" could be enacted. These laws could be called "Sharing The Sex" with stipulations that would give people a right to orgasm on demand. Or perhaps if too many people ignored these laws, sex could, with one signature from the president, become nationalized.

Sure, some people would fight against the nationalization of sex, but "private sex" would be considered as extremely selfish. Anyway, how else would everyone be given the same ability to enjoy sexual fulfillment without the control of some authority?

Now that nationalization is accepted, what about the bureaucracy to set up the regulation of sex. Remember, the quality of sex must be maintained by a Sex Quality Board, followed by a system to allocate sex equally (Department of Sex), and of course, if someone violated the Sex Laws, an enforcement agency (Sex Enforcement Agency) would be required. If too many people broke the law, sex jails or rehabilitation centers would have to be established which might require celibacy or sex with the grossly unattractive as punishment.

Continues on page 5

## CLASSIFIED ADS

**RATES:** 20 cents per word, \$5.00 minimum. Telephone numbers count as one word; box numbers count as two words. **Payment must accompany all orders.** Copy must be received by the first day of the month one month prior to issue date. Check or money order should be made to Rampart Institute, Classified Ads, Box 4, Fullerton, CA 92632.

**WHOLESALE MEMBERSHIP PURCHASES**—Save up to \$700 or more annual (average family of four). Finest of famous brand fully guaranteed home, family, personal care/nutrition/housewares Products, security devices, and more. NO gimmicks, NO subterfuge. One-time \$28 Membership fee. It's your choice—Would you like: 1) to buy at wholesale? 2) To buy at Wholesale and earn \$200-\$500/month extra? 3) To buy at Wholesale and earn \$2000-\$5000/month extra? 4) Develop an extra income of \$100,000 or more a year? Order just what you want. Reasonable availability wherever you are. Write or phone for FREE "Birds Eye View" membership information: Diamond Flock International Associates, (Mary Lou) Cam'Ilot Corp. 5160 E. Pima, Tucson AZ 85712; (602) 325-5824.

**WRITERS WANTED** for both *New Rampart* (short articles) and *Rampart Individualist* (long, scholarly articles). Write to Rampart Institute, 2727 S. Croddy Way, Suite J, Santa Ana, CA 92704, (714) 979-5737.

**TYPESETTING & GRAPHICS** Athena Graphics in Santa Ana has a fair selection of typesetters and graphic talents. Located near Harbor Bl. and Segerstrom (2727 S. Croddy Way, Suite J, Santa Ana, CA 92704 • 714-979-5737.

And what about sexual minorities that require kinky sex? The majority of people might object to masochistic sex with chains and whips, or other sexual minorities like pedophiliacs and necrophiliacs? Eventually, a whole legal system with expensive attorneys would grow into a huge business as the general public would look for "sex loop-holes" to avoid pairing up with a kinky sex partner. As the legal system develops, cries of "inequality" would be heard as people used sex loop-holes to partially escape the system. But, then of course, a nation wide effort would come to the rescue to enact an "Equal Sex Amendment" to protect the right to equal sex under the law.

And of course, what about the sexual inequality of Third World nations? Sexual foreign aid would naturally be sent free of charge. Men and women could be drafted into Sex Corps to spread the good word and to teach them about our sexual abilities.

Sex, like the free market, is unequal, and always has been. If we are unwilling to socialize private sex, although it is unequal, then one wonders why anyone would try to socialize private wealth. Perhaps those of the socialist persuasion are merely envious of those who have more than they do. It is perhaps more a question of impotence than of inequality.

Now that we have established that we have the capability to give everyone in the world sex, we cannot allow ourselves to be cheated out of it by those who see sex as something only for individual fulfillment.



## A Floating Island Is Not A Desert—In San Francisco!

In Sausalito, California—Richardson Bay to be exact, there seems to be a new island. This island is constructed of concrete and weighs 400 tons. It includes such amenities as a 50,000-gallon water tank, a self-contained sewage-disposal system, an electric generator, an 18-foot wooden bar, a wood-burning fireplace, two grand pianos and an organ, as well as an air-lock for scuba divers, underwater windows, at least 4 palm trees and a well-stocked wine cellar.

James Bond in the Bay Area, no doubt! But wait a minute . . . it's a guy named Forbes T. Kiddoo and he's not saying how much the whole thing cost, only that the launching ran to \$20,000.

(SOURCE: *San Francisco Examiner*, 5/16/82, p. A-1. Provided courtesy of Dustin Baker.)

## FREE CATALOG

### Rampart Institute's New Catalog

Books by LeFevre, Anthony Hargis, Robert Love, Rose Wilder Lane, etc. The catalog has the largest selection of tapes by LeFevre. Also, lapel pins, posters and bumper stickers.

Write: Rampart Institute, Catalog Dept., Box 4, Fullerton, CA 92632.

# CALENDAR

## FREE/NEW COUNTRY CONFERENCE

Is the adage true that death and taxes are inescapable? At least taxes are not, according to the leaders of a conference series dedicated to locating a land free of coercion.

Called the "New/Free Country Conference," scheduled for April 23 at the Long Beach Hyatt House (Marina Room, 9:00 am. to 5:00 pm.), the one-day conference will address those people who are tired of taxes, sick of regulations or paranoid about Big Brother. Sponsored by FREELAND and co-sponsored by Rampart Institute and Society for Libertarian Life, the conference will tell how, why and where to search for liberty in various projects such as: freeports, secession, floating islands, free market communities, space colonies, independence of California coastal islands, and immigration.

Confirmed speakers include James Gallagher, Anthony Hargis, Sally Foster and a luncheon speech by Robert LeFevre. Admission is \$12 before April 12, \$15 at the door. The luncheon is separate at \$12.75 before April 12, \$15 at the door (no host bar). Exhibit tables are \$20 before April 12, \$25 at the door. Write to FREELAND: P.O. Box 4, Fullerton, CA 92632, (714) 979-5737 (Athena).

## CONF. ON NON-VOTING Planned for May 7 at CSULB

The question of whether to vote or not to vote in political elections has always been an important issue in the libertarian movement. Since there are many libertarians on each side of the question, a one-day conference on May 7 at California State University, Long Beach (Student Union) has been set up by a joint venture of the Voluntarists and Rampart Institute.

Speakers will include George Smith and Wendy McElroy (leaders of the Voluntarists organization), who will oppose voting in political elections, and Jeffrey Hummel and Less Antman (Libertarian Party activists), who will support the issue of voting.

For more information, write to the Voluntarists, P.O. Box 5836, Baltimore, Maryland 21208.

Subscription Form

## NEW RAMPART

A Bi-Monthly (6 editions) Journal on Liberty & Intellectual Survival

Contributing Editors:

George Smith, Robert LeFevre, Marvin Olsen, Butler D. Shaffer and Caroline Roper Deyo.

NEW RAMPART: .....\$10/one year  
 .....\$15/two years

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY/STATE ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

NEW RAMPART • P.O. Box 4 • Fullerton, CA 92632  
 (714) 979-5737 (Athena Graphist)

## POT SHOTS

### GOVERNMENT POLLUTES THE UNPOLLUTED!

There's a place in Illinois where the water tastes so good that the EPA has commended the city for "providing safe drinking water which has met or exceeded the water-quality standards."

The place is Oregon, Illinois . . . the water is well-water. But now the plot thickens—"It's all very confusing," said Mayor James Barnes, "now the EPA wants to force us to add chlorine to our water supply."

Barnes said he and his four-member City Council don't like being forced to spend about \$60,000 to install chlorinators and \$50 to \$75 a day "for something we sure don't need."

However, Ira Markwood, manager of Illinois EPA's Division of Public Water Supplies, said that a complaint is being processed. This issue had been around for seven years and fines of \$10,000 and \$1,000 a day for the town's failure to comply with the state rules are being imposed.

Markwood said "We have a small number of communities that we are working with because they haven't chlorinated their water. In cases that appear to be futile, we have decided to take legal action. Chlorine is required as a public-health matter."

So if chlorine is so good for us, why can't we add a little to our coffee and tea and save the taxpayer's money? Then down the road we most likely will have stomach problems, and then we can recycle the money we save to the doctor's office!

### COMPUTERIZED OBSCENITY

It finally had to happen—computer obscenity. Some computer whiz has discovered how to connect with the computer controlling traffic-control signs on I-75 in Cincinnati and is displaying four-letter words for freeway commuters. The police are baffled.

### E.T. CENSORED IN SWEDEN

Sweden! That's impossible. Sweden is a liberal country, right? Wrong!

Swedish censors recently banned children under 11 from seeing the film "E.T. The Extra-Terrestrial," according to film critic, Vern Perry. This seems impossible because "E.T." is a children's film. Most censors look for obscene language, nude scenes or excessive violence. However, "E.T." had none of this. Even if "E.T." did have these traits, why would Sweden, a country known for turning sex into a national pastime, ban "E.T." Well, the logic goes this way. Apparently, the film, according to Swedish censors, characterized the adults in the film as "hostile" to both children and E.T. To present adults in this way, the censors believed, would be damaging to youngsters under 11. Typical government thinking?

Despite the ban, "E.T." is well underway to being the biggest box-office smash in Sweden, surpassing "Foul Play," which has pulled in more money than any other U.S. film to date.

Of course, any country that makes "Foul Play" its biggest-grossing film almost deserves a censorship board like the one in Sweden.

### NUDE BEER BANNED

Sweden is not the only country with censors. The promoter of Nude Beer, which has a topless woman printed on the beer label, has filed a \$100 million lawsuit in California in order to get permission to sell his beer in that state. The suit calls for the dismantling of the state Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC), saying that the department has held up a final ruling on the company's case.

Last November, the ABC ruled that Nude Beer labels were obscene and obnoxious to the public. The president of Nude Beer, William Boam, appealed that decision.

In the meantime, Boam has announced the distribution of his latest product, Nude Beer Nuts, packaged in 16-oz. glass containers displaying two photographs of bare-breasted women on the label. Asked if this was also obscene, Boam said "My 4-year-old daughter is exposed to far more offensive material in the magazine racks at the corner store."

**NEW RAMPART**  
P.O. Box 4  
Fullerton, CA 92632

Non-Profit Org.  
U.S. Postage  
**PAID**  
Permit No. 1869  
Fullerton, CA

**DATED MATERIAL**