

NEW RAMPART

PUBLISHED BY RAMPART INSTITUTE

VOL. 4, NO. 5 (April-May, 1984)



Gary Hudson addresses participants at FREELAND II

All This and Freeland II?

By Danny Tvedt

Remember Freeland I in 1983? Well, Freeland II has now come and gone with another dynamite line-up of thinkers on the cutting edge of new worlds of liberty. Not just conceptual worlds either, we're talking about finding the more private lands of earth, building floating ocean cities, homesteading the asteroids, perhaps even free starships to outrun (and possibly outlast) the forces of statecraft. As long as free people can think and create,

Swiss Vote Against Closing Loophole on Tax Evaders

Switzerland has the reputation of bank privacy. However in recent decades, Switzerland has surrendered much of its financial privacy to please other governments of the world.

For example, according to the Knight-Ridder Newspapers, "...it's no use asking them for an anonymous numbered account. They do not exist. Since 1977, all 564 Swiss banks have been demanding names and references, and they say no at the barest hint of impropriety.

Do not try to squirrel away hot funds from drug deals, insurance scams, embezzlements, extortions, bribes, numbers rackets, juice loans or 7-Eleven stickups. They have not been safe since 1983; if asked, banks will kiss and tell the cops everything."

Apparently, it is getting harder for Swiss bank officials to keep a secret. Despite these problems, another problem recently arose. A liberal organization in Switzerland put a national referendum on the ballot to halt one of the last vestige of Swiss banking secrecy—tax evasion.

The Swiss, for some reason, do not consider tax evasion as a major crime. And that is what the recently defeated referendum was all about. The liberals believe

that tax cheating is a terrible crime because it hurts the poor. That is, without more tax money going to government, the poor would become poorer. Of course, liberals have never recognized the fact that taxation is just plain stealing or that the poor rarely benefit from high taxation. In report after report from the U.S. government, most of the money earmarked for the poor is generally used to support the agency that distributes the so-called charity. The poor get little of the money.

The referendum had upset the bankers in Basel and Zurich, who said that Switzerland would suffer great financial loss if the referendum won. The U.S. government has put pressure on the Swiss to abandon their long tradition of protecting tax evaders. But it is not just U.S. authorities who have shown concern. Tax authorities world wide are not amused by this Swiss tradition.

If fact, the Swiss tax authorities are just as helpless in locating Swiss tax evaders. It is a criminal offense for banks to give financial details to foreign or Swiss tax authorities. It is punishable by up to six months in jail and a fine of 50,000 francs (about \$22,000), for any bank official to tell anybody anything in connection with a tax inquiry.

But a determined band of liberals managed to get 100,000 signatures to force a vote on whether to close the loophole in this nation of 6.4 million people.

The initiative would require Swiss banks to turn over to investigators information needed in the pursuit of revenue violators.

However, the referendum did allow for some exception. For example, for cases in which it seemed a person was being hounded by tax inquisitors for his political or religious beliefs or his race and journalists would not be allowed to pry into records.

The banks fought the referendum because they believe they have already done a great deal to eliminate the worst abuses. And that the other changes were made either by the banks themselves or in treaties with other countries. However, this recent change in Switzerland's banking system would be imposed at the ballot box, threatening Switzerland's reputation for stability. One bank official said that depositors would flee not because they had taxable money hidden here, but because they no longer felt comfortable. The issue is stability not secrecy, the bankers said.

Whether it is stability or secrecy, the Swiss voters defeated the referendum and Switzerland remains a financial paradise compared with most nations.

Freedom Folksong Contest

Rampart Institute is sponsoring a Freedom Folksong Contest. The winner will receive \$100 for the best original ballad/sing-along/folksong celebrating personal freedom and the spirit of individual liberty.

Winning entry becomes the property of Rampart Institute. Participants must include original words and music. Entry format may be manuscript or cassette tape or both. Deadline is Oct 1, 1984 postmark. Entries will

(The Register, April 16, 1984)

NEW RAMPART

NEW RAMPART is published every two months. Subscriptions are \$12 for one year and \$18 for two years. Managing Editor—L. K. Samuels; Assistant Editor—Sandra Sisson; 2nd Assistant Editor—Dan Twedt; Proof reader—Marje Spencer; Contributing Editors—George Smith; Robert LeFevre; Butler D. Shaffer; Caroline Roper-Deyo; Charles D. Van Eaton and K.E. Grubbs Jr. Rampart Institute is a tax-deductible, educational organization.
RAMPART INSTITUTE • P.O. Box 4 • Fullerton, CA 92632 • U.S.A.



Woman Helps Others, Attorneys Attacked Her

Alan Dershowitz in a recent newspaper column wrote about a woman in Florida, Rosemary Furman, who was jailed for helping people with legal forms.

Furman used to be a legal secretary in Jacksonville, Florida. As a legal secretary she quickly learned that the law profession charged high fees, often \$100 per hour, for their service. And the service often received was Furman's routine work filling out legal forms that almost anyone could do. These forms included simple wills, name changes, adoptions and uncontested divorces, etc.

Nowadays, these legal forms are stored on word processors and the legal secretaries only need to fill in the blanks.

Furman began offering legal forms in kits for only \$50 and under, a fraction of what lawyers charge.

Although Furman's customers were happy with this arrangement, the legal profession was not. The legal profession took her to court, charging her with contempt of court for practicing law without a license.

The charge of "contempt" allows the legal system to sit in judgement. In other words, Furman was tried by attorneys, not a jury of her peers.

Furman was convicted and sentenced to four months in jail. However, the Florida Supreme Court reduced the sentence to 30 days. Furman said she will take her case to the U.S. Supreme Court if need be.

Furman's case shows that the legal profession is a monopoly. Only lawyers can represent people before courts; only lawyers can help people prepare and file certain documents; only lawyers can give—sell—advice about legal issues.

It is about time this monopoly is broken.

they will persist in establishing new outposts of liberty against the rising tides of worldwide authoritarianism. (Pretty awesome job, eh?)

Gary Hudson, private rocket entrepreneur, was back this year to regale the audience with his impressions of how the pacific rim was rapidly becoming the center of high tech culture and future high frontier emigrants. Fill it to the brim with pacific rim!

Famed science fiction author Poul Anderson was the featured speaker on the programme, with a talk address-

We Welcome Letters to the Editor!

We will print most letters to the editor. Letters should be 400 words or less. In some cases we will allow longer letters. Write to: Letters, Rampart Institute, Box 4, Fullerton, CA 92632.

ing some of the promise and problems of space. While his talk at times seemed more or less tolerant of the U.S. space program (a sometimes alienating stance among libertarians) his charm and intelligence still shone through.

Terry Savage, longtime space organizer and activist, gave an enthusiastic chalkboard-aided talk about a realistic scheme for financing and building a libertarian/minarchist settlement among the asteroids. (Terry hopes to be it's mayor as a retirement job.) For more information on this or other local space activities he can be contacted at (213) 374-1381.

Other speakers and topics included Conrad Schneider speaking about "Liberty World", a concept for a refugee-



Part of the exhibitor area.

harboring, high-tech floating island. I found his ideas very timely. If you want more information you can get in touch with him at 165 Blackney Road, Ben Lomand, CA, 95005, (408) 335-7558.

World traveler Bill Pozzi spoke on finding the freest/best places on earth today, space lawyer (there aren't many of those) Wayne White related the nuances of property rights in outer space, and Barry Reid, paper tripper extraordinaire, explained the dimensions of dropping out of their systems. Howard Hinman was emcee.

By the way, if you couldn't attend the conference in Long Beach at the Golden Sails Hotel, fear not, your faithful technical advisor and his brother Paul were there audio and VIDEO taping the entire program. Look out Nova and 60 Minutes! The tapes are available for sale: \$45 video, \$6.50 audio. Contact Freeland, P.O. Box 4, Fullerton, CA 92632.

There was a banquet lunch and tables full of literature and books for the interested readers. At day's end most of the crew continued their debates and discussions at a residential site in Lakewood.

Unless there's a nuclear war or the sun blows up it'll probably happen again next year. We would like you to participate or encourage you to start your own Freeland project and then maybe you'll be one of the speakers I'll be taping for posterity. Or let's put it another way . . . you simply must come, or perhaps you might not get to "go".

Government Protection: no one prospers . . .

by Robert LeFevre

If any people or nation would prosper, economic freedom is essential.

What do I mean by economic freedom? I mean that persons engaged in economic tasks must be at liberty to select the task they wish to perform. Further, that in performing it they are neither compelled nor prevented from performing to the best of their ability. Finally, that others must be free to patronize or not according to their own evaluation of the merit of the task and performance.

This means that persons wishing to purchase the good or service are unprotected.

Examine the requirements of prosperity and where do you find this nation? A moment's attention should reveal that we no longer have a society where prosperity is possible. The very factors that built our nation and brought the highest standard of living known to man are no longer in evidence. The nation has changed from one striving for prosperity into one striving for safety and protection.

What about the freedom of the individual to enter into a business of his own choosing? Isn't it still true that anyone in this country can do that?

Most assuredly not. Disregard the difficulties that exist anyway — raising the necessary funds, finding the best location, and hiring an adequate staff. Consider that a number of goods and services for which there is strong demand are on the proscribed list. If anyone attempts to produce them, the government will put them in jail!

That is not the end of it. The government licenses virtually every business, which makes it possible for government to limit the number of persons getting into any endeavor. Even if you were the very finest producer of a given product, you could be prevented from producing it because government has already licensed someone else.

Further, you are barred from hiring the best, with excellence as the criterion. You must do what you can to hire adequate help by maintaining a race, color and sex balance. Then you must pay minimum wage the government demands and in some cases enter an arrangement with a labor union that will, with a governmental assist, remove some or all of your managerial function.

Having regulated producers, the government then refuses to let the consumer have a direct impact upon them. If a consumer is disgruntled or believes he is the victim of a raw deal, he no longer goes to the producer who would—and usually did—straighten things out. Instead, he goes to the government; brings a lawsuit — possibly a "class action" suit — wins in court and compels the producer to treat all his customers as if they all had had a raw deal!

In a free market (where prosperity is possible) customers will discipline businessmen and business will discipline customers. In such a market, customers can (and do) withhold patronage. When they do, the business fails. A business that loses customers has no income, its credit evaporates, its assets are drained and it goes under.

If a customer is unreasonable (and they sometimes are) the businessman tells the customer to go elsewhere. The

direct impact suppliers and demanders have on each other protects both. In such a market, prosperity is possible because a producer can conduct his affairs so that he attracts more customers than his competitors, treats them as they wish, and makes a fortune because he deserves the patronage. Customers profit because they buy better goods, and obtain better services — while prices go down!

With government protecting both sides, neither can prosper. No one can predict what the government will demand next. Businessmen begin playing their political cards, cozying up to politicians, trying to keep lawsuits at a minimum, and generally putting the customer in a position of secondary importance.

Isn't all of this done for the protection of customers?

Suppose a lawsuit is brought against a firm and the firm loses in court. Judgment is brought to the tune of \$5 million, which the firm must refund to its customers, most of whom didn't know there was a problem.

A loss of such magnitude is catastrophic. But wait! This is a licensed firm the government approves. Further, it employs several thousand workers and has been around many years.

When the manager tells the government of the serious loss, and how the firm may go bankrupt (and all the jobs lost — voters who will think badly of the government for killing jobs) the government will doubtless have some revised thoughts.

The government may reassure the businessman that he can raise his price to make up the loss. The government may let him borrow money for a bail-out and also let him raise his prices. All business costs are paid by the firm's customers.

What does that mean to the customers who have won a great victory in court? From that time forward, those who "won" will be made to pay for all the costs assessed, plus the costs of government intervention and regulation, plus any new costs that arise in process.

The prices of goods and services will rise. Fewer people will be able to buy goods or services. The population in general will be deprived of things it wants, the businessman dare not take much money out as dividends since he can be sued again any time and must have cash on hand. The customers pay for it all.

This is called: "protecting the customer."

This is the principal *modus operandi* in the American market today. Do you see why we are not prosperous and why it is unlikely that we ever will be again?

Robert LeFevre was the founder of Rampart College in the 1950's and has authored half-a-dozen books. LeFevre writes a weekly newspaper column for the Freedom Newspapers, Inc.

FARM SUBSIDIES ARE RIPE FOR HARVEST OF BUDGET SAVINGS

By Charles D. Van Eaton

What would happen to farming if the federal government quit subsidizing farm prices? The answer is that nothing would happen to farming. The end of price subsidies would, by definition, result in lower farm prices and some farmers would be forced to leave the industry. But — and this is a vital distinction — farming would continue quite nicely.

Continued on page 4

So why don't we get on with the business of ending farm price support programs and let farming be left to those who can do it most efficiently? Clifton B. Luttrell knows why.

Luttrell recently retired as chief agricultural economist for the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis and editor of the bank's Review. He was born and raised on a farm in Crockett County, Tenn. He earned degrees from the University of Tennessee, the University of Illinois and the University of Chicago. If you closed your eyes and listened to him talk you'd know from the sound of his Southern drawl that he was a man who truly knows and loves the rural South. He does. And he knows that all the government programs aimed at agriculture have done nothing to help the people he knows best — the small farmers.

In a little monograph entitled *Down on the Farm with Uncle Sam* (International Institute for Economic Research, Los Angeles, Calif., 1983) Luttrell makes it clear that federal government involvement in agriculture has always had a single purpose: "to raise the income of farmers above free-market levels without regard to consumers." Essential to this has been constant growth of the U.S. Department of Agriculture bureaucracy. The net result of this growth in spending and bureaucratic power has been higher prices for consumers, higher land values for large farmers, and more jobs for those connected with the USDA bureaucracy. It's a perfect world for everybody except taxpaying consumers and young farmers.

Luttrell reports that USDA expenditures, adjusted for inflation, increased at a 13.2 percent compound average rate from 1929-1982, with the rate exceeding 14.2 percent in 1982. In 1929, the USDA budget was less than 3 percent of net farm income (excluding expenditures on public roads, it was only 1 percent of net farm income). By 1982, the USDA budget equalled 240 percent of net farm income. Excluding the food stamp and nutrition program, it totaled 160 percent of net farm income.

From 1975-1980 the USDA budget grew three times faster than net farm income. Not bad for a farm bureaucracy in a period when the number of farms and farmers was declining.

Who benefits from this? Certainly not the taxpayer-consumer. The median-income family has lost \$700 to \$800 annually in recent years through higher food prices and higher taxes. In addition, the USDA's programs have tended to be self-defeating: in 1982, \$11 billion of taxpayers' money was spent on programs designed to reduce the supply of farm products while \$19 billion was spent on measures designed to increase the supply of farm products (soil conservation, low interest loans, etc.). Thus, \$30 billion (about \$500 per American family) was spent on activities that had little net impact, except to reduce taxpayers' disposable income.

USDA employees, however, gained — and so did big landowners, as these programs increased land rents and market values. Farm operators, on the other hand, have not gained appreciably. Younger farmers have been forced to pay higher prices for land — the capitalized value of which has been raised by these programs — so that net returns have not really been improved beyond what a free market would have generated.

So why not put an end to it and let the market reward those who can farm efficiently and eliminate those who cannot? Because the USDA bureaucracy knows a good thing when it sees it and won't give up anything without a

fight.

Reagan's 1985 budget calls for spending \$475.1 million on USDA soil conservation programs. That represents a cut of \$126.7 million from the 1984 budget. USDA bureaucrats have mustered their forces and mounted a heavy lobbying effort not only to restore the cut, but to expand spending an additional \$145 million to \$746.3 million. The challenge has been made.

If there is anything that is in the private interests of farmers to do for themselves, it is to use the knowledge freely available from the private sector to improve soil conservation on their own farms. The government has no need to be involved in such activity. On this issue, Reagan has a valid case to make. He must fight to make his budget cuts stick.

If he can't or won't, there is no hope for ending the scandal of the much larger spending on price support programs, and no hope for budget cuts of any type.

Charles D. Van Eaton teaches economics at Hillsdale College in Michigan.

IS PHILOSOPHY IMPRACTICAL?

By Butler D. Shaffer

Like chess, playing golf, or watching television, philosophic inquiries are often regarded as a diversion with which to pass the time, never to be taken so seriously as to disrupt what really is important, namely, the pursuit of material gain.

Men and women who hold this view are fond of calling themselves "pragmatists," i.e., people who judge things by their practical consequences. Many who consider themselves pragmatists, however, really are not, for they fail to consider all the implications of their actions.

If you were to ask even the most ardent self-styled pragmatist to identify the most important considerations in his life, he would most likely respond with a laundry list of philosophically-based factors. Religious values, obedience to authority, loyalty to the State and one's friends, a sense of honesty, not causing harm to others, being responsible to one's most strongly-embraced sentiments people would claim.

If you ask these same men and women to examine such notions — all of which are philosophic in nature — they will respond with their usual line: "I don't have time for such questions; I am only concerned with practical matters." The examination of what they profess to be their highest values is not, in other words, a "practical" undertaking!

Is it any wonder that our world is so confused and conflict-ridden? Is it not clear that we have greatly increased the costs of economic production, dulled the minds of our children, made city life all but unbearable, and are even on the verge of destroying the entire human race, all because we steadfastly refused to ask that most important of questions: "why?" In the name of being pragmatic, we are making it increasingly impossible for life to thrive on this planet, and we excuse our ignorance on grounds of being preoccupied with "practical" concerns.

If you were asked to create the most functionally-efficient social world you could imagine, would it look anything like the world in which you presently live? Would your blue-prints include having a rapacious political system that siphons off anywhere from 40 per-

cent to 50 percent of all you produce, or kills off between 100 and 200 million people each century, or conscripts your children into an ignorance-fostering school system or a military machine that will butcher or maim them?

By contrast, if you were trying to create a world that would have the greatest amount of suffering, conflict, economic dislocation, theft, and misery that you could imagine, could you improve upon the design of our present world?

We need to dismantle our institutionally-dominated, violence-ridden world, not out of commitment to some ideology or philosophic assumptions, but for that most practical of all reasons: so that human life might thrive. It is not pragmatism that keeps us from asking the kinds of questions we adamantly refuse to ask, but mindless ignorance. We continue — like Pavlovian dogs — to maintain our thoughtless routines, not because we have given careful consideration to our actions and decided that our lives can be made better by ignoring philosophic issues, but because we have been carefully conditioned to "keep our noses to the grindstone." We believe that in not asking the sorts of questions we are not supposed to ask, we are exhibiting the responsibility, manliness and maturity that comprises socially acceptable behavior.

Ignorance may be bliss to the mindless — and an ideal condition for the continuation of institutional power over our lives — but it is anything but "practical."

Butler Shaffer is an author and teaches law at Southwestern University in Los Angeles.

SPACE ENTREPRENEURS BEAM-UP WITH NASA

(Sorry Scotty . . . that should be Team-up!)

by Sandra Lee Sisson (space reporter)

American business people and the government are launching more than missiles these days . . . it seems that the first commercial products made in space are to go on sale later this year.

One of the items are perfect plastic spheres, each exactly one-one-hundred-thousandth of an inch in diameter, produced in weightlessness on a recent space shuttle flight. The spheres are being sold to laboratories for use in calibrating microscopes and other instruments.

An engineer for McDonnell Douglas Corp. is to fly on the next shuttle mission in late June to operate a machine that could lead to moneymaking drug-processing ventures in space.

These are just two out of 350 companies who are exploring the prospects for manufacturing products that can be made only in weightlessness and for running private transportation services into space. Shades of outland . . . Sean Connery where are you?

Philip Culbertson, of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, said the agency hopes for widespread orbital commerce in the next decade or so. Guidelines for incentives (tax breaks, low interest loans, etc.), will be announced in the next few weeks that are supposed to encourage privatization. Other questions that will be addressed are whether or not items that are manufactured in space are considered imports or not! Looks like the new frontier will have the usual boon-doggles set forth by our big brothers in the capitol.

Taking advantage of the opportunities however, is Astrotech International Corp. Its Vice President, Willard

Rockwell, disclosed plans to enter the space transportation business. The company based in Pittsburgh, is forming a subsidiary, called Space Shuttle of America Corp. in order to buy and operate a space shuttle. It would begin on borrowed money and later would consider offering stock.

At this time the only profit-making enterprises operating in space is in telecommunications, estimated to be a \$10-billion-a-year business. What's that Scottie . . . you say somebody is already on the beam?

THE PHILIPPINES— 51st STATE?

The Spanish-American war was not a beginning that you would liken to pro-American sentiment . . . in fact that 3-year bloody history is hardly mentioned in either country's history books. The .45-caliber automatic pistol was invented at the turn of the century to shoot fanatic Filipino guerrillas! But in spite of it all there is today in the Philippines lobbying by the newly formed "Federal Party" to become our 51st state.

The 51st-state party is a fringe movement that has a planned itinerary that starts in 1985 - to sponsor a plebiscite on statehood; 1985-87 - lobby in the U.S. Congress for statehood; 1988 - the Philippines then becomes our next state.

Pro-American sentiments were illustrated recently when Iranian students were beaten up at the University of the Philippines during the hostage crisis. During the 60's flower-children emerged and even named local rock concerts after Woodstock.

Today hot-dog stands, McDonald's, that "chicken place", Dairy Queen and Shakey's Pizza employ and dazzle the population with good ole' Yankee ingenuity and free enterprise. It's also a fact that Coke and Pepsi outsell the local soft drink and Kodak out sells Fuji!

There are a lot of Americans on the island at Clark Field and Subic Bay, 16,000 military and their 18,000 dependents. However, these bases also employ about 50,000 Filipinos. Ford Motor Co. did close down recently and put about 1,400 locals out of work but the event did nothing to quell the growing affection and identification between them and us.

American investment in the non-military sector amounts to about \$2 billion. It's no wonder that the natives such as Ding Cagata, 47, want to be "brown Americans". "We have no money and I can't afford to get my teeth fixed," . . . "we cannot make ourselves happy apart from America". Mr. Cagata obviously associates a good economy with the U.S. and not with the prevailing regime.

Only time will tell us if their hopes for statehood will be realized and it will be interesting to note how Washington deals with them.

L.A. SUPPER CLUB IS BACK

On Sept. 19, the L.A. Libertarian Supper Club under the leadership of Linda Abrams will sponsor a speech by Dr. Nathaniel Branden.

What Soviets Truly Fear at Olympics

By Sarah E. Foster

When the Soviet Union withdrew from the 1984 Olympics, the LA Olympic Organizing Committee expressed surprise, even bewilderment. Peter Ueberroth figures it is their way of getting even for the U.S. boycott of the 1980 Moscow Games. Soviet authorities say that neither the American government nor LAOOC can guarantee safety for Soviet athletes.

The question is, obviously, safety from what? Some commentators refer to Soviet "paranoia" and urge that we try to understand these fears. "Paranoia" refers to irrational fear — a fear of something that doesn't exist. If you try to see things "their" way, from "their" point of view — perhaps the fears are justified.

Consider this. Rather than being held in a central location, the events will take place all over Southern California, in existing facilities. This idea has meant considerable lowering of costs. But it is more than a money-saver. It's an expression — a symbol — of our diversified, open decentralized lifestyle.

Athletes will see a great deal — suburbs with neat houses and green lawns; supermarkets with shoppers pushing carts filled with groceries, and freeways. Such abundance, such affluence.

From the farms around Chino (shooting contests) to the elegant neighborhoods of San Marino and Arcadia (equestrian trials will be at Santa Anita), these young people will have more opportunity to see the host country than has been possible at other years' Olympics.

That's all to the good, isn't it? Not from the Politburo's point of view. The last thing they want is for Soviet athletes to see so much of beautiful California.

Then there's the matter of defection. Soviet teams have played in Los Angeles, and elsewhere, but it has been easy for coaches and "officials" to keep tabs on team members. This time it won't be so easy. At other Olympics, athletes have slept and eaten in villages near the game sites. In Los Angeles the LAOOC is using college dormitories at USC and UCLA. These will be surrounded by fences, but that's to keep dangerous people out. Access will be restricted for the safety of the athletes, who will be free to come and go as they choose. Nobody will be stationed to stop them from leaving their quarters.

So it would be possible for a would-be defector to walk out of a dormitory, into Westwood Village or the area around USC, and blend right into the street scene. These are cosmopolitan communities, and a person from anywhere in the world would hardly be noticed. It's enough to give the KGB nightmares. The most determined agent can't be everywhere at once. There's no way the KGB could "protect" all Russian athletes, and the LAPD could hardly be counted on to join that kind of safety program.

Having Soviet athletes return with a positive picture of Southern California — and defection — those are the real fears. But even if the LAOOC offered to baby-sit athletes, prevent their wandering about, promised to lock them in dorm rooms, and transported them in curtained vans — even if they did all this, the Games were marked for a

boycott for what may be the most important reason of all.

It is to Soviet advantage that these Games fail. They are funded and organized like no other Olympics; everything is being done exactly opposite to the way things get done in socialist countries. They have cost the taxpayers nothing. Everything is paid for through ticket sales, by private companies, and by contributions.

Official sponsors are supporting our athletes and building facilities — proving that government sponsorship is not necessary for the Games to be a success.

To raise part of the money, the LAOOC came up with private sponsorship of the Torch Relay. All across America, individuals and sponsors (mostly small companies and firms) have donated \$3,000 to have a person of their choice carry the torch for one kilometer. Men, women and children of every race and creed are even now passing the torch along.

Naturally, socialists and collectivists have raised the cry of "commercialization." Somehow it is considered more noble, more pure, for governments to sponsor such events, paid for with tax monies extracted by force. Was it, therefore, so surprising that as the torch was being carried through the streets of New York, the Soviets chose that moment to drop the first shoe? Next day, the second and third shoes dropped and East Germany and Bulgaria withdrew.

These Games will be not only the least costly in recent years, but in terms of participation, the most democratic ever. The free market works, and the 1984 Olympics clearly demonstrates this viability to the world.

Foster is a Los Angeles free-lance writer.

World Libertarian Convention

The Second World Libertarian Convention will be held in London at Royal Holloway College from Monday August 13th to Sunday August 19th.

Following the success of the first World Convention in Zurich in 1982 and the European Regional Convention in Brussels in 1983, even more Libertarians, both activists and academics, will be gathering to discuss ideas, strategies, disagreements and agreements — and simply to enjoy each others' company and a host of social activities.

In the "Orwellian Year" of 1984 and, coincidentally, the 40th anniversary of the publication of Hayek's *The Road to Serfdom*, the question of how far we have travelled on the road to totalitarianism, and how Libertarianism can reverse that journey, will certainly feature prominently. But other and diverse themes will also be explored.

(1) USA/Canada

The Libertarian International
Liberty Park, 4011 Creek Road, Youngstown, New York 14174, USA
Phone: 716-754-9240

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.

not be returned unless you provide SASE with adequate postage. The winner will be announced at the 1984 Future of Freedom Conference, scheduled for Oct. 19, 20 and 21 at Cal State Univ., Long Beach.
Write to Rampart Institute, Box 4, Fullerton, CA 92632.

The Power of Jury Nullification

By Stormy Mon

Since the English Magna Carta in 1215, one of the major purposes of a citizen jury is to not convict under laws they feel are unfair. Citizens can't assume the politicians are passing good laws and that unconstitutional ones have been weeded out by the courts.

Before the Civil War, there was a famous case, the Dred Scott decision, about a fugitive slave. The courts said he had to be returned to his owner like any other property. This judgment was unpopular with northern juries and they wouldn't convict others being prosecuted under similar laws.

The government saw that this could get out of hand, if the citizens wouldn't convict under the ever-increasing laws. The juries could veto political schemes. The authorities wanted to control and only wanted juries to decide the breaking of the law, not the law itself. Some judges said that since they were no longer the king's appointees, but now members of the democratic process, they could be trusted to have the citizens' best interests at heart; nullification of judge's instructions was no longer necessary. Also, it would put too great a mental strain on jurors.

This question was debated back and forth. Then in 1895 (Sparfv. U.S. 156 U.S. 51), the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that although juries have the right to ignore a judge's instructions on the law, the jury shouldn't be aware of it. The judicial hypocrisy started with this decision. If it seems strange that citizens have a right they aren't supposed to be aware of, it is strange.

Jury nullification is not taught in compulsory government schools. The term isn't in your encyclopedia or dictionary, and it's dropped from law schools and references. This is an example of George Orwell's 1984 "Newspeak" — the concept doesn't exist if the phrase is banned.

All judicial mention since the 1895 Supreme Court ruling acknowledges its existence only grudgingly, and judges refuse to tell juries about the power or to allow defense attorneys to refer to it. It's treated like a haunting, persistent ghost from the past, whose rare appearances are tolerated, deliberately ignored, and certainly not encouraged. This conspiracy of jury ignorance on the part of the judiciary is one of the strengths of government.

Many of the current powers of government could be abolished if juries knew their rights and responsibilities. We see the jury veto at work in modern times, naturally without being taught. In many areas juries won't convict for marijuana and other "morals" laws, so they aren't enforced. Critics fear this will lead to anarchy and chaos. Yet in Georgia, Indiana, and Maryland, the right to tell juries about nullification is a constitutional part of the state judicial process. These states haven't suffered, and can be leaders in a citizen reawakening.

One modern judge stands out in common sense on the subject. In a dissenting opinion, D.C. Appeals Court Judge David Bazelon shows considerable courage in challenging the two-faced judicial recognition of the jury veto power by his brethren, while refusing to tell juries about it:

Deliberate lack of candor... sleight-of-hand... a haphazard process. Is it true that nullification which arises out of ignorance is in some sense more worthy than nullification which arises out of knowledge? Nullification can and should serve an important function in the criminal process. Trust in the jury is, after all, one of the cornerstones of our entire criminal jurisprudence and if that trust is without foundation we must re-examine a great deal more than just nullification doctrine. The noble uses of the power provide an important input to our evaluation of the substantive standards of the criminal law. The reluctance of juries to convict under the prohibition and fugitive slave laws told us much about the morality of those laws. A doctrine that can provide us with such critical insights should not be driven underground. We should not be driven underground. We should grant the defendant's request for nullification instruction, or at least permit the defendants to argue the question before the jury. If revulsion against the government has reached a point where a jury would be unwilling to convict, we would be far better advised to ponder the implications of that result than to spend our time devising stratagems which let us pretend that the power of nullification does not even exist.

(Stormy Mon is a Libertarian activist from Colorado.)

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.

STAY INFORMED about events on the frontier. **LIBERTAS UPDATE** brings together calendar items from the libertarian, decentralist, science fiction and futurist universe. **GOT A LIBERTARIAN OR FUTURE ORIENTED EVENT YOU WOULD LIKE LISTED? IT'S FREE!** CONTRIBUTORS GET A FREE ISSUE FOR EVERY ACCEPTED EVENT. GET A FREE SUBSCRIPTION CONTACT DANNY AT 714-979-5737 or send them to: "LIBERTAS UPDATE" 2727 S. Croddy Way, Ste. J, Santa Ana, CA 92704. **LIBERTAS UPDATE** is published monthly and mailed first class. **SUBSCRIPTION RATES:** \$10/year, Lifetime: \$500. (Make checks payable to **FUTURIST MEDIA SERVICES**.)

Superhuman Ability Breakthrough Secrets Data (stamp). Modern Humans, 22511 Markham, Perris, CA 92370.

Subscription Form

NEW RAMPART

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

Contributing Editors:

George Smith, Robert LeFevre, Marvin Olsen, Butler D. Shaffer, Caroline Roper-Deyo, Wendy McElroy and Charles D. Van Eaton.

NEW RAMPART \$12/one year
..... \$18/two years

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ Zip _____

Date _____ / _____ / _____

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

NEW RAMPART

POT SHOTS

Rock Star Michael Jackson Criticized by the Kremlin

A lengthy article in the current issue of *Sovietskaya Kultura*, a weekly publication put out by the Communist Party Central Committee, criticizes rock's current superstar as an "imperialist tool" who secretly wishes he were white and whose music offers little that is original.

The article complains that millions of Jackson's records are being sold in Europe and Japan. And that along with T-shirts, cosmetics, clothing—all bearing Jackson's likeness—Jackson is trying to "impose the notorious American way of life on all nations..."

Next, the communist journal attacks Jackson himself. The journal said that the Black singer is a religious believer, a vegetarian, doesn't drink, doesn't smoke, doesn't use drugs, is sentimental, likes children and is apolitical. "Is that somebody to be imitated?" the journal asked.

Argentina's 500% Annual Inflation

Argentina's annual inflation rate is now 500%. How do companies and people survive in a hyperinflationary country? According to one Buenos Aires car dealer, Luis Bonamico, you can, but the world has turned upside down. It is a world, he said where it is "stupid" to save money, where restaurants are full and government promises are empty, where credit cards are prized and where in mid-June, one million Argentine pesos were worth \$1.68.

In fact, the world is so crazy that Bonamico wishes that he would not sell his cars because they appreciate about 2 or 3 percent a day. Yet, he says he needs the cash to buy more cars.

Before World War II, Argentina was the seventh wealthiest country in the world.

—A Modern Psalm

The government is my shepherd
Therefore I need not work;
It alloweth me to lie down on a good job
It leadeth me beside the still factories
It destroyeth my Initiative;
It leadeth me in the path of the parasite
For politics' sake.
Yea, though I walk in the valley of laziness and
deficit spending
I will fear no evil
For the government is with me;
It prepareth an economic Utopia for me
By appropriating the earnings of my grandchildren;
It filleth my head with false security
My inefficiency runneth over;
Surely the government shall care for me all the days
of my life
And I shall dwell in a fool's paradise forever.

—Source Unknown

from the *Libertarian Bulletin*—official publication of
the Progress Party, (S.A.) P.O. Box 216, Campbelltown,
S.A., 5074, (08) 337-4219

"Mini Libertas Update"—An eclectic libertarian calendar:

Ongoing Events:

- Every Tuesday... L.A. libertarian toastmasters, 7-9pm. LOC: Season's restaurant at 6th & Vermont, nr. downtown L.A. INFO: Dick Eagleson 213-780-8845
- Every Wednesday... Orange County libertarian toastmasters. LOC: La Grande Cafe, 7-9pm 2525 N. Grand Ave, Santa Ana. Guests welcome. INFO: Brad, 213-630-4398
- Every Thursday... LASFS, the L.A. Science Fantasy Society, Inc. (this world's oldest science fiction club) meets at 8pm, 11513 Burbank Blvd., No. Hollywood, CA 91601. INFO: 213-760-9234 or 213-838-0297
- Every Third Thursday... Liberty Forum—The Libertarian Supper Club of Orange County. LOC: 9550 Warner Ave. St. 250 Fountain Valley, CA 92708 LOC: The Revere House restaurant, 900 W. 1st St., Tustin, CA. COST: \$16 w/ dinner, \$7 for program only.
- Every Friday... HOUR 25-Science fiction/Science fact radio programming, 90.7 FM - KPFX 10pm-12 mid-night (news, great calendar, guests, open phones)
- Every First Friday of the month... The Alumni Group of the Henry George School presents F, Friday at the Press Club. Dinner, 7:15pm, Program 8:30pm LOC: The Los Angeles Press Club, 800 North Vermont Ave, LA, CA. COST: Dinner and program \$12.50, program only —\$4.00 NFD: 213-352-4141
- Every 2nd and 4th Sunday (except holidays) Political Economy Club of Los Angeles meets. Dinner at 6pm, COST: \$8.95 LOC: Miyama Japanese Restaurant, 14522 Vanowen St. Van Nuys. Meeting—7:30pm, COST: free. LOC: Sears Savings, 6750 Van Nuys Blvd, INFO: 213-761-1580, POB 478 No. Hollywood, CA 91603

NEW RAMPART

P.O. Box 4
Fullerton, California 92632

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