THE LIBERTARIAN REVIEW

September 1980
$1.50

LIBERTARIAN

Roy Childs on Reagan's Acceptance
Doug Bandow on the FTC's Abuses

AFGHANISTAN

by Earl C[illegible]



The New Cold War Zone

SYGMA

If you believe public policy studies have to be dull in order to be informative and valuable, then you haven't read these Cato Institute monographs:



BALANCED BUDGETS, FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY, AND THE CONSTITUTION
Richard E. Wagner and Robert D. Tollison

The authors examine the question of whether the United States should adopt a constitutional amendment to balance its budget. Wagner and Tollison analyze the economic arguments underlying the pro-balanced budget position and determine the idea of a balanced budget is both fiscally sound and democratically necessary.

Cato Public Policy Research Monograph No. 1

$4.00 Paper.
60 pages.
© 1980



RENT CONTROL: THE PERENNIAL FOLLY
Charles W. Baird

The author examines the rent control boom currently underway in the United States and finds that rent control measures universally fail to achieve their stated objectives. Beginning with the fundamentals of supply and demand for housing, Baird expands his analysis to include questions of equity, housing availability, and special interest manipulation of regulatory statutes. He shows that high housing costs do not occur in a vacuum but are related to many other governmental policies including zoning, housing codes, and environmental controls.

Cato Public Policy Research Monograph No. 2

$5.00 Paper.
112 pages. Bibliography. © 1980



THE REGULATION OF MEDICAL CARE: IS THE PRICE TOO HIGH?
John C. Goodman

The author surveys the ways in which the federal and state governments regulate health care and finds that virtually no aspect of medical practice is not significantly influenced by them. He shows that the government has permitted the AMA to become a successful cartel whose primary objective is to increase the incomes of doctors. Government reaches into hospital administration, nursing care, paramedicine, and medical insurance, and, as a direct result, medical costs have skyrocketed.

Cato Public Policy Research Monograph No. 3

$5.00 Paper.
120 pages (approx.). Bibliography.
Pub. date: Nov. 1980

To order, fill in this order blank and mail to: **Cato Institute, Publications Dept. LR, 747 Front St., San Francisco, CA 94111.**

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

Charge my ___ Visa or ___ Master Charge Acct.# _____

Exp. date _____ Signature _____

Quantity
___ Balanced Budgets
___ Rent Control: The Perennial Folly
___ The Regulation of Medical Care
Also send information on
___ The Cato Papers
___ Cato Public Policy Books

Amount enclosed _____

(Disc. Policy: 20% over $100; 40% over $500.)

THE LIBERTARIAN REVIEW

September 1980
Volume 9, No. 9

CONTENTS



The New Cold War

Foreign policy analyst Earl Ravenal (formerly of the U.S. Department of Defense, now of Georgetown University) and *LR* Editor Roy Childs explain why an American foreign policy of non-intervention makes *more* sense after Afghanistan—not less.

The Libertarian Review (ISSN 0364-0302) is published monthly by Libertarian Review, Inc. Editorial and business offices, 1620 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, CA 94111. Opinions expressed in bylined articles do not necessarily reflect the views of the editors or publisher. The Libertarian Review welcomes queries from authors but does not encourage submission of unsolicited manuscripts and assumes no responsibility for them unless accompanied by SASE.

FEATURES

DEPARTMENTS

Subscriptions: single, $1.50; 12 issues (one year), $18; two years, $30; three years, $45 U.S. and Canada, Foreign subscribers, $27.50 surface mail and $40 airmail.
Address Change: Write new address, city, state and zip code on sheet of plain paper, attach mailing label from recent issue of LR, and send to Circulation Department, Libertarian Review, P.O. Box 28816, San Diego, CA 92128. Second class postage paid at San Francisco and additional offices.

EDITORIALS



Where is Betty Ford now that they need her?

I ONCE WAS A REPUBLICAN. Now, the party that was formed to fight against slavery, and at one time promoted equal rights for everybody, has come full circle and gone on record as opposing full individual rights for women. And I must admit that I am sad. Somehow, although my mind had been frequently disillusioned, my emotions still clung to the idea that the Republican leaders wanted liberty *in their way* — that they wanted less government, not just for businessmen but for everyone.

All over the world, including in the United States, special laws tell women what they may or may not do. Protective labor legislation prohibits them from entering certain jobs, limits the times of day and the length of time they may work, and requires special facilities in places that employ them. Laws defining the family subordinate their persons and their property to their husbands, and in some countries, to their fathers. (Earlier this year, there was some controversy in this country about the showing of a film—*The Death of a Princess* — illustrating the Saudi Arabian tribal custom that permits a father, as the author of life, to have a daughter or granddaughter put to death.) And laws regulating sexuality and reproduction make women's very bodies the property of others.

For women the world over, the abolition of discriminatory laws and the right of a woman to control her own childbearing, including the right of abortion, are the two gut issues. Betty Friedan reported, in a discussion of the International Women's Year Conference in Mexico City, that there was a "curious alliance" of the Vatican, Communist countries, and Third World countries, to "oppose woman's right to control her own body and equality for women as 'irrelevant,'" while women delegates defied their governments to agree informally on the importance of these freedoms.

Well, we can add the Republican Party to the forces committed to controlling women. The Republican Party, which had supported the ERA since 1940, a time when Eleanor Roosevelt opposed it because it would wipe out protective labor legislation, has repudiated a constitutional amendment guaranteeing that neither the United States nor any State may "deny or abridge" equality of rights under the law, preferring to reserve the power of governments to discriminate against women if it seems in their interest to do so. And it is supporting a constitutional amendment to eradicate what was once woman's common law right, *even at a time when judges were all Catholic,* to abortion. Further, it is pledging a Republican administration to pack, not just the Supreme Court (as Franklin D. Roosevelt once threatened), but *all* Federal Courts with judges who agree that this right should be taken from women.

For Republicans, it seems, at least where women are concerned, the Constitution may not be amended to limit

governments; it may only be amended to limit individual rights.

No legal system has ever gone to the extreme of declaring the fetus to be a human being with full rights, partially because it would be necessary to enslave women in order to do so. Pregnancy is a unique situation, in that it is one in which two living beings require the use of the same identical physical body in order to survive—the woman's body. If, in case of a conflict, the ultimate control over her body is not hers, whose is it? The answer can only be that it is the State's, in the name of the fetus. But this means that the State has *carte blanche* to control all aspects of the lives of women: they may be pregnant, and wish to indulge in activities that could harm the fetus (already there have been some legal moves to have home births defined as child abuse); they may *have been* pregnant, and will therefore have to attempt to prove at an inquest that they have not murderously disposed of the fetus; or they may be *going to be* pregnant, in which case they must not subject themselves to any conditions that might damage a later fetus. Indeed, you could not have such a constitutional amendment at the same time that you had an Equal Rights Amendment—by implication it *requires* discriminatory legislation.

Only a little over four years ago, the wife of a Republican president spoke out bravely on these two issues, and Americans loved her for it. We need not expect this to happen again. Only one prominent Republican woman has spoken out against her party's attempt to turn the clock back to a time when women were totally, legally subject to men and to the State, and that is Mary Crisp, who resigned as Co-Chairman of the party over this issue. "There is a sickness in the party," she said, but her resignation got very little publicity until after the convention was safely over. On television news coverage during the convention, the comment made by Republicans in all levels of the hierarchy was, it's not a major issue. "It's not a voting issue," said one politician.

I think they are in for a surprise. Republicans may have ensured their defeat in November, by producing a platform that self-respecting women will not be able to vote for. There is no longer any reasonable ground for confusing Republicans with individualists, despite their free market rhetoric. Believers in individual liberty will have to pin their hopes on Ed Clark and the Libertarian Party, and I really am not sorry for *that*—even though once, long ago, I was a Republican.

—Joan Kennedy Taylor

The Speech

RONALD REAGAN CATAPULTED to national prominence in 1964 when, in the waning days of the Goldwater campaign for the presidency, he took to the airwaves in a brilliant, masterful speech on Goldwater's behalf. "A Time for Choosing," it was called, and it was, as commentators noted, the most exceptional political speech ever given on television. In it, Reagan lambasted the legacy of the New Deal, the welfare state which had grown to then-gigantic proportions, tying the hands of the American people with red tape and the rope of government regulation. The speech was militaristic, as has become traditional with the American Right, but its overall thrust was sharp and clear: *individualism* was its theme, and the state stood out starkly as our enemy. Since then, Reagan has given "The Speech," as it has come to be called, thousands of times. It is that speech which skyrocketed him to the governorship of California in 1966, gave him a shot at the nomination in 1976, and led to his nomination in 1980.

After President Ford's nomination at the Republican Convention in 1976, he delivered an acceptance speech which stood out as the best speech of his political career. Then something odd happened: the crowd saw Reagan in the gallery and began chanting for him. Reagan bowed, then sat down, but the furor mounted. In an unusual gesture, Ford asked him to come down to the podium. Reagan did so, asked if he could say a few words, and then delivered, in five brief minutes, the most eloquent speech heard at that or any other convention. The issue was freedom, he said, and the question was whether our grandchildren would live to see any of it left. He ended by referring, in terribly moving fashion, to the "shining city on a hill" that America once had been, and could be again. In those brief moments, there must have been hundreds of delegates who wondered if they had done the right thing in choosing Ford over Reagan. For he had simply taken the crowd into his heart. Even Walter Cronkite was moved nearly to tears.

Ronald Reagan has never been anything remotely close to a libertarian, but at his best he has always borrowed heavily from libertarian rhetoric, his speeches shining with concern for liberty, his practical political actions showing nothing but callousness toward that ideal and vision. Next month we will take up the Reagan record and the horrible truth about his actual positions on political issues. But for now, a word about the acceptance speech he was finally allowed to give at the 1980 Republican Convention in Detroit.

It has always been said among Reagan advisors that you can do anything to or for Ronald Reagan—except tamper with the original 1964 Speech. Touch that Speech, and you court trouble. Thus it is that the continued efforts (by John Sears and others) to "package" Reagan have usually broken down when their kind of campaign—moderate, centrist, offending no one — collided with that damned Speech. And Reagan's instincts have largely proven him correct: every time he allows himself to be "packaged," his candidacy begins to fade. But as he feels his campaign failing, he delivers The Speech, audiences rise in excitement, and he begins to gain. He lost to Ford in New Hampshire in 1976 because Sears did not want Reagan to give that Speech on television, lest voters be reminded of Reagan's past as an actor. His wife, Nancy, told Sears to go to hell, talked Ron into using the Speech on television in North Carolina, and Reagan swept to victory. He narrowly lost that campaign to Ford, but stirred excitement in the Republican rank and file by his promise to run a striking campaign; as he put it, he would unfurl a banner of bold colors, with no pale pastels.

In 1980, Reagan was given his chance. He threw off the early packaging of Sears, Sears resigned, and Reagan had it his own way, sailing to victory. He won the nomination handily. And he had the opportunity, before an audience of tens of millions of people, to give the speech which would, he hoped, launch not a *campaign* for the presidency, but a *crusade.*

Yet his acceptance speech was, arguably, the worst speech he has ever given. Gone was The Speech, and in its place a carefully crafted, politically centrist speech written, not by Rea-

gan, but by four neoconservative "ghosts."

It was a speech of pale pastels, and no bold colors. Few of Reagan's hard-hitting one-liners were present, even in the oblique warmongering sections of the address, and there was not one iota of fire, passion, or vision in the whole thing. Reagan's delivery was equally bad: he was tired and worn, his voice hoarse and dry, showing little emotion. He blew several lines, and stepped on his own applause. There was no ringing call to arms, nothing to get excited about, and, really, no *crusade* at all. Reagan's closing said it all. Instead of ending with his usual "shining city on a hill," an ending of vision, this acceptance speech ended with a moment of silent prayer. Silence was what that speech deserved, for it was cowardly, artificial and packaged to death. It was a business-as-usual speech, filled with cliches, talking about "family, neighborhood, work, peace and freedom," about a "shared community of values" (*what* values?) and concerned about doing something which he called "renewing the social compact." It ended with Ronald Reagan quoting Franklin Roosevelt, which is a disgusting indication of how far Reagan has travelled, spiritually, from that speech of 1964.

If Ronald Reagan is the knight of modern conservatism, then it is time someone pointed out that the armor is tarnished, the joints creaking, and the sword dulled. Conservatives have made their peace with the New Deal, with big government and the war economy. Sixteen years ago, at the age of fifteen, I was an anti-Cold War Goldwaterite who loved Goldwater's call to strip government to the bones, but was repelled by his sabre-rattling. I looked upon the 1964 Reagan speech as a call to arms. Now, I look upon him as I look upon that 1980 acceptance speech: tired, hackneyed, cliched, compromised, and deserving of contempt. He is an empty shell, symbolizing betrayal.

Those who support Ronald Reagan ought to do some soul-searching. Given the hawkish bellowing at the Republican convention this year—a convention whose theme should have been "War in Our Time"—we can only hope and pray that the conservatives' march to the grave doesn't drag the rest of us into the grave with them.

—Roy A. Childs, Jr.

The price of intervention

IN JUNE 1850, LORD Palmerston — the leading spokesman for an aggressive British foreign policy—gave one of his most eloquent (and most evil) speeches in the House of Commons. Amidst the hearty cheers and applause of his listeners, Palmerston proclaimed Britain's intention to police the world on behalf of British subjects everywhere. "As the Roman in days of old held himself free from indignity when he could say 'Civis romanus sum,' so the British subject, in whatever land he may be," said Palmerston, "shall feel confident that the watchful eye and the strong arm of England will protect him against injustice and wrong."

The occasion then was the Don Pacifico affair, and Palmerston had sent the British navy to blockade the Greek port of Piraeus in part because Greece would not pay compensation to Don Pacifico — a resident of Athens who had been born in the British colony of Gibraltar—for the looting of his house by a mob in 1847. Back then *Punch,* the famous British humor magazine, was moved to call Don Pacifico the greatest British subject, for he had none other than a Foreign Secretary (Palmerston) as his sheriff and a British admiral as his bailiff. Sheriff and bailiff meant different things in 19th century Britain than they do today in America, but the point of Palmerston's speech and *Punch's* quip is not lost on us in this time when Americans abroad are seized as hostages.

Palmerston's speech raised explicitly the question of jurisdiction — a question that is necessarily a central one in a world of territorial states. As in Palmerston's day, the world these days is divided up among states, each having control over its own territory. That territory the government claims as its own jurisdiction, where it can issue commands and lay down the law. Thus in regions and societies throughout the world the police, courts, and armed forces are an established monopoly rather like an established church, such as the Church of England. It has long been contended by the proponents of territorial states *per se* that the advantage of such a system was that it prevented wars over jurisdiction. On the other hand, critics of territorial states and monopoly police establishments think that if these institutions were dismantled, it would be possible to eliminate separate jurisdictions and instead have the writ of natural law and justice run throughout human society via a system of private-sector law enforcement. All points of disagreement between these views aside, it is important to recognize that the theories of both the proponents and critics of territorial states agree on one point: namely, that since the state is a unique social institution based on force, wherever states exist, they should be confined to exercising their power in their own geographical areas. Both theories also agree that Pinkerton and Burns detectives need not confine their work to only one territorial state. This recognition that governmental police power has to be confined to its area of jurisdiction is the source in moral and political philosophy of the libertarian foreign policy of nonintervention. The libertarian insight that nonintervention is mandatory becomes even clearer if you contrast it with interventionist views. Modern would-be Lord Palmerstons in America, Russia, China, Britain, France, Germany, and Japan would have to argue that their own country should control both its own territory and all situations anywhere its citizens or their interests are threatened. This would truly be a recipe for a Hobbesian war of all against all.

"Libertarians should oppose government bans on private diplomacy and travel bans to halt private negotiations."

Libertarians are not alone in possessing this commonsense insight; this same realization has led to the enshrinement of nonintervention in international law. But libertarians alone are consistent and thoroughgoing in applying the insight. Libertarians around the world are morally committed to seeing that their own government doesn't intervene abroad and to protesting the interventions of all governments everywhere.

No libertarian condones in any way the taking of innocent hostages. But it is interesting to note that the anti-U.S. rage of the Iranians

The Psychology of Freedom
Liberty and Love as a Way of Life
by Peter R. Breggin, M.D.

- **On love for self and others**
  - What is love?
  - Enjoying romantic love
  - Bodily sex and passion
  - Freedom versus love?
  - The fear of loving
  - Pursuing your self-interest
- **On self-determination**
  - Self-oppression – the key concept
  - Feelings of helplessness & fear
  - Supremacy of reason over emotion
  - Making insight work in your life
  - Personal freedom in everyday life
  - You own yourself
- **On parents and children**
  - Parenthood without force
  - Raising free & happy children
  - What parents owe children
  - What children owe parents
  - Origins of guilt & shame
  - Transcending your childhood

You don't have to "need help" to benefit from this book. The stronger, braver and more rational you are, the more it will make sense to you. Both an original theoretical work and a practical guide to self-determination and love, it has been praised by scholars and laypersons alike.

For the first time in modern psychiatry, human experiences such as guilt, shame and anxiety, depression, jealousy, alienation, and even the "unconscious," are made understandable in terms of human decision-making. Irrational, self-defeating reactions can be replaced with self-directed activities based on the principles of liberty and love for self and others.

"*The Psychology of Freedom* is a personal as well as a theoretical book. It draws on my personal experience, and tries to address yours. I hope it will put you into closer touch with yourself and with your own deeply cherished values of freedom, individuality, and a love for life."

Peter R. Breggin, M.D.



Peter R. Breggin, M.D. is a psychiatrist in private practice in the Washington, D.C. area, and the author of five books and many articles dealing with psychiatry. Formerly a Teaching Fellow at Harvard Medical School and a fulltime Consultant with the National Institute of Mental Health, he is now Director of the Center for the Study of Psychiatry. Internationally known as America's leading critic of oppressive psychiatric technology, he now responds to the question, "What have you got to offer that's better?" His answer is a systematic, yet common sense presentation of the psychology of self-determination.

A 254 page quality hardback, published by Prometheus Books, with discount distribution by Lake House Books, PO Box 5919, Washington, D.C. 20014. Discount Price $12.95

"Valuable for anyone who is involved in life. It confers an understanding of self and others. Truly a magnificent creation. Simple, yet brilliant."
Dallas Cooley, M.D., President, Libertarian Health Association, Fairfax, Virginia.

"This is a lovely book. It speaks to a yearning for self-determination and individual happiness that is the mainspring of today's three great grassroots movements – libertarianism, feminism and the human potential movement."
Joan Kennedy Taylor, nationally syndicated radio commentator (Byline), and co-author, *When to see a Psychologist*, San Francisco.

"A set of surprisingly rich and convincing personal guidelines, head and shoulders above most of the self-help books on the market today."
Roy Childs, Jr., Editor, *Libertarian Review*, San Francisco.

"His call for the end of oppressive parental control and manipulation of children and for the uncompromising recognition of the personal sovereignty of the child is breathtaking in its audacity but totally consistent in its logic. If we are ever to have a society of self-determining, free individuals, we need such insights."
Sharon Presley, National Coordinator, Association of Libertarian Feminists, New York City.

"Peter Breggin's conception of human consciousness makes more sense to me than anything else I have ever heard. His forceful and down to earth presentation provides a gut level understanding far more meaningful than abstract reasoning alone."
John Muller, President, Laissez Faire Books, New York City.

"You look and look for a book that you can suggest that will help both patients and students understand themselves. This book is it."
Richard Phillips, M.D., Associate Professor of Psychiatry, State University of New York, Syracuse.

Publisher's price, $15.95. Your price, $12.95.
We pay postage and handling in this special offer.
Please rush me _____ number of copies @ $12.95/book.
Enclosed is my check or money order for $ _____
Instead, please charge $ _____ to my ☐ VISA ☐ Mastercharge
Credit Card No. _____ expir. date _____
☐ Please have Dr. Breggin autograph my book at no extra charge.
☐ I have added $2 per book for first class mail.
Make check or money order to Lake House Books.

Mail this coupon to LR
LAKE HOUSE BOOKS
P.O. BOX 5919
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20014
DISCOUNT DISTRIBUTORS

Name _____
Address/Apt. # _____
City/State/Zip _____

Christmas in September?

Why not, when it means giving gifts fit for a prince at prices even paupers can afford? Use the special order cards in this issue of LR to buy up to six one-year gift subscriptions–and watch your average cost drop as low as $9 each. We'll send a handsome card announcing your gift to each of your designated recipients. Give your favorite people Christmas all year long!

and even the political career of Khomeini are intimately wrapped up in the question of jurisdiction. In the early 1960s, Khomeini first came to political prominence as an opponent of the extension of diplomatic immunity to American advisers in Iran. Khomeini and his fellow protesters at the time believed that this American demand for special status was a revival of the concessions that Iran had been forced to grant major powers like Britain and Russia in the 19th century. These 19th century "capitulations," as they are called in Iran, made all Russian-owned businesses off-bounds for Iranian officials and gave foreign consuls veto power in all trials involving their citizens. Roy Parvis Mottahedeh makes a very convincing case in the Spring 1980 issue of *Foreign Policy* that the militants' seizure of the American embassy, despite its contravention of Islamic law, is seen in Iran as a continuation of an old jurisdictional dispute with foreign governments and a continuation of a more recent struggle with the United States over the same subject, and that this is why the seizure has found favor with Khomeini.

Of course, it is a fundamental belief of libertarians that just because a government exercises jurisdiction doesn't mean it is legitimate for that government to aid and abet kidnapping. Libertarian doctrine does not approve of or excuse the hostage-taking; neither does it approve of any U.S. intrusion into Iran's jurisdiction in order to retrieve the hostages.

What would libertarian doctrine permit? Certainly in a world of territorial states, libertarian doctrine would have permitted the reciprocal internment of Iranian diplomats. (But libertarians do not countenance the mistreatment of Iranians who are here in a private capacity, for example the round-up and expulsion of Iranian students.) Libertarian doctrine would permit the hostages' families and friends to fund independent rescue teams (and would call for removing all legal impediments to such rescues). Libertarian doctrine also approves of all efforts at negotiation, whether by governments or by private parties. Therefore, libertarians would oppose the American government's use of the Logan Act (which bars private diplomacy) or travel bans to halt private negotiations. Thus, the libertarian position has its own specific constraints and options. Hostage situations are not easy for any political system to handle. The libertarian approach is not only morally sound, but as workable as any other.

Above all, libertarians need to avoid two serious mistakes: what might be called the Error of Marx and the Error of the Boxer Rebellion. The Error of Marx occured because Marx and Engels didn't believe in universal human rights. So during the 19th century they condoned and approved of American intervention in Mexico, French intervention in Algeria, and British intervention in India on the grounds that civilized countries should straighten out barbarous ones.

The Error of the Boxer Rebellion occurred when the Western powers invaded China in 1900 to relieve the foreign legations in Peking that were besieged by the anti-foreign Boxer rebels. The militia of the Boxer cult had risen in rebellion against the influence of foreigners after a long series of concessions by which China granted the foreign powers trading privileges and extraterritoriality, and the Boxers received the support of the Dowager Empress. When the Western powers invaded to rescue those trapped in the foreign quarter in Peking, they caused considerably more death, damage, and destruction than the Boxers ever had and then imposed a $300 million indemnity on the Chinese government. The result was a deep resentment toward foreign governments which still persists and which contributed to the success of the Communist Party in the 1940s.

Libertarians need to be aware that our doctrine has valuable insights on hostage situations and that we have practical options to offer. But above all, our policy of strict nonintervention will end U.S. meddling abroad and thus not only prevent hostage situations from turning into new international wars, but also act as a kind of preventive medicine that will remove the major sore spots that provoke such incidents.

—Williamson M. Evers

Williamson M. Evers, formerly the editor of *Inquiry* magazine, is now the Libertarian Party candidate for U.S. Congress in California's 12th District.

Khomeini's crimes

WHEN AYATOLLAH KHOmeini helped to inspire the people of Iran to overthrow the despised Shah of Iran, he did so in the name of simple justice. The Shah was a murderer, a thief and a despot, he said—and he was right.

Well, in the eighteen months since the Shah took flight, Khomeini and the government he has inspired have had ample time to demonstrate the kind of society they prefer as an alternative to the Shah's regime. The evidence is in: Khomeini may not be a thief, but he most assuredly *is* a murderer and a despot.

The latest series of crimes began on July 3, when, according to the *New York Times,*

> Four Iranians convicted of sexual offenses were buried up to their chests today and stoned to death, with the presiding judge of a revolutionary court casting the first stone.
>
> The executions, the first in memory to have been carried out in Iran under the traditional but rarely used Islamic code, took place in the southern town of Kerman. A court official, reached by telephone, said it took the condemned prisoners —two men and two women— 15 minutes to die.
>
> The official Paris press agency said the revolutionary court has convicted the women of prostitution and of deceiving young girls, one man of homosexuality and adultery, and the other of raping a 10-year-old girl .... Meanwhile, seven more prisoners were sent to firing squads in various parts of Iran for drug trafficking, sex offenses and murder.

Fifty more such executions have taken place since July 11, according to the *Christian Science Monitor,* after trials before "revolutionary courts" held in secret, with the accused denied defense lawyers or the right to present documentary evi-

Credit Secrets Your Banker Doesn't Want You To Know—

Today best-kept money secrets let you borrow below the Prime Rate, instantly and confidentially

We have just experienced the worst *credit crunch* in U.S. history. The Prime Rate—the interest charged major corporations—rose rapidly to 20 percent. Meanwhile, however, *insiders* were still borrowing thousands of dollars *far below* the Prime Rate! For the insiders, there was no credit crunch! You see, they had taken the proper steps before the crunch to establish their little-known sources for overnight borrowing power.

Now you can profit from these inside sources!

Whether you need money now or not, you must know about some incredible new sources, available nationwide, which will lend you thousands of dollars at only 12 percent interest!

You see, there's been a quiet revolution in the banking and credit world. Increased competition among lending institutions has opened up hundreds of personal credit opportunities—on amazingly favorable terms for the borrower. The result of this new era of "easy credit" is that it's possible to borrow hundreds of thousands of dollars—literally overnight and for any purpose whatever!

Let me list for you some of the tremendous benefits of the new sources of capital:

- Funds are practically unlimited. Raise $25,000, and even more, depending on your income.
- These loans are totally *unsecured,* and no cosigners are required in most cases.
- You can qualify for these instant loans without ever sitting down with a loan officer. Everything is done by mail! No demands for balance sheets, business plans, P&Ls, tax returns or other confidential documents.
- The funds are available at any time—even during periods of "tight money."
- It doesn't matter where you live—these loans are now available *nationwide.*
- These loans may be used for *any* purpose. The lender is completely unaware of their purpose. Use the money for capital outlays, paying outstanding bills, investments, consumer goods, cars, new office or plant space, a brand-new venture—you name it!
- Interest rates are extremely favorable—*consumer* rates for *business* loans! Business interest rates have been skyrocketing lately—but nationwide these unique loan sources begin at 12%! No points to pay either!
- You don't pay a penny in interest until you actually borrow funds. And even then, interest charges begin several days later. There's never a penalty for prepayment.
- The repayment schedule is extremely flexible. It's even possible to borrow the principal *and* the interest indefinitely if you're in a pinch—while *improving* your credit rating! and there are no penalties if you pay off the loan early.
- Last but not least, these amazing loans have tremendous tax advantages. The interest, of course, is tax-deductible. And by borrowing to pay business expenses early, you can simultaneously speed up deductions and defer tax liabilities into the next tax year!

THE SOURCEBOOK YOU NEED TO CAPITALIZE ON THE BANKING AND CREDIT REVOLUTION

But how do you track down these amazing new sources of capital? How do you discover the best opportunities—and avoid the expensive mistakes?

The answers are now available—for the first time—in one information-packed book: THE INSIDER'S BANKING & CREDIT ALMANAC, by Mark Skousen.

This newly revised manual tells you everything you need to know. Facts. Figures. Names of lenders. Addresses. The best opportunities. Pitfalls to avoid.

But that's not all there is to THE INSIDER'S BANKING & CREDIT ALMANAC. There is much more in this remarkable volume. Here's a brief sampling of the rest of the contents:

Interest-paying checking accounts. You probably keep your liquid business funds in a checking account that pays no interest. Well, here are complete details about eight different types of checking accounts that *do* pay interest—from 5% to 16% annually! (The interest on one kind of account is *tax-free!)*

Money market funds. These new mutual funds function like interest-paying checking accounts—and interest is usually 12% or more! (The one hitch: the checks you write must be for over $250 or more.)

Merrill Lynch's Cash Management Program. If you have $100,000 invested in stocks and bonds through Merrill Lynch, you can borrow up to $40,000 from them for any purpose! Interest rates ate competitive too. You always have an automatic credit line for half the cash value of your portfolio—and *there's no upward limit!*

Credit cards. Which credit card is best for your business? Are you aware of all the *new* features and benefits offered by the highly competitive credit card outfits? Check guarantees, free cash advance checks, free flight insurance and many more!

Financial privacy. How the privacy of your financial affairs if being threatened—and what you can do to protect it.

Foreign banks. U.S. dollar accounts in Canada. 20% interest in Mexico and Switzerland, and many other terrific opportunities abroad.

YOUR MONEY-BACK GUARANTEE

THE INSIDER'S BANKING & CREDIT ALMANAC has just been completely revised and updated. The price is $14.95 postpaid. (The cost is fully tax deductible if used for your business capital needs.)

The ALMANAC is a *complete* guide, containing page after page of expert guidance. It's fully indexed, and printed in a hardcover library edition.

You can try this information-packed book with no risk at all. Here is our *unconditional money-back guarantee:*

Read the ALMANAC. Share its insight with your colleagues. Try any of the techniques it describes. Then, if you're unhappy with the book for any reason whatever, simply return it within 30 days and we'll refund every penny of your $14.95. Fair enough?

Think of it: you may never again be turned down for a loan! That in itself will be worth far more than the low price of the book. Don't delay. Complete and mail the order form today.

Sincerely,

Robert D. Kephart
Publisher

HOW TO GET THIS BOOK FREE!

Send $65 for a full year of *Personal Finance,* and we'll send you THE INSIDER'S BANKING AND CREDIT ALMANAC FREE. Edited with the assistance of Dr. Skousen, *Personal Finance* is America's most widely read publication dealing with hard money and inflation-survival strategies. *Guarantee:* If *PF* doesn't pay for itself many times over, just cancel for a full refund for undelivered read issues and keep the ALMANAC for your trouble.



☐ I enclose $14.95. Please rush me, postpaid, Mark Skousen's THE INSIDER'S BANKING AND CREDIT ALMANAC. I may read and use the book for 3 weeks. If not pleased, I'll return it for a full and prompt refund.

☐ I enclose $65 for a full year (24 issues) of *Personal Finance.* Also send me my FREE copy of the ALMANAC. I may cancel at any time for a full refund for undelivered issues and the book is mine to keep. *E131*

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ Zip _____

Alexandria House Books
901 N. Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

SA973a

dence supporting their innocence. In America, these sorts of things used to be called Kangaroo Courts; in modern Iran, they pass for Islamic law. While earlier executions had been at least largely confined to agents of SAVAK and others of the Shah's regime who might have deserved their fate, increasingly, in recent months, the Kangaroo Courts have been putting people to death for simple victimless crimes which offend their Islamic sensibilities.

The inspiration behind these crimes against the Iranian people is Khomeini himself, who, at age eighty, has grown increasingly authoritarian and vengeful. Some months ago, Khomeini reinstituted the traditional Islamic dress code for women, banned the sale of records and tapes of "vulgar music" from the west, and has ordered imbibers of alcohol to be put to the lash.

The popularity of these autocratic measures seems questionable, to say the least, and to say nothing about the monstrous injustices involved. Some weeks ago, the word went out to Iranians that a "pro-Khomeini" demonstration was being called for—something for which, months earlier, millions had taken to the streets. This time fewer than 300,000 responded.

With its usual stupidity, the U.S. seems to do all that it can to help the increasingly unpopular Khomeini keep his hold on the Iranian people. In late June, according to the *New York Times*,

> American officials acknowledged ... that the United States was responsible for clandestine radio broadcasts aimed at undermining the Iranian rule of Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. The programs, broadcast in Persian from transmitters in Egypt ... were set up by the Central Intelligence Agency.
>
> The broadcasts included a call for 'liberation of Iran,' a description of Ayatollah Khomeini as 'racist and fascist,' and an appeal to Iranians to 'take guns into your hands' in preparation for action.

When will they learn? If the Iranian people are to be freed from Khomeini's autocratic rule, it will either be because they have had enough, or because the old man simply dies. They are not going to rise up in rebellion because of CIA broadcasts from Egypt. Indeed, in typical fashion, the CIA is simply playing into Khomeini's hands, allowing him to claim, quite correctly, that once again American agents are trying to determine the course of events in Iran. By pointing to a foreign enemy whose hostile actions can be read about even in the *New York Times*, Khomeini is able to mobilize his nation behind him to fight the foreign threat, thus quelling discontent and unrest.

Khomeini's slaughter of his own people has not yet reached the level of the deceased Shah of Iran—at the rate of 1000 murders a year, he would have to live to be at least one hundred and forty to reach the Shah's exalted level of criminality—but it is still an ugly crime against the people of Iran. The American government and the CIA ought to keep out of the situation and let the Iranians tire of the old man (as they will) and take matters into their own hands.

In the meantime, we should realize the unintended role the U.S. government has played in helping Khomeini come to power in Iran, just as it helped the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia and Fidel Castro in Cuba, and resolve to turn our backs on the interventionist foreign policy which all too often has helped lead to the triumph of murderers and despots. —RAC ❑

"The U.S. seems to do all that it can to help the increasingly unpopular Khomeini keep his hold on the Iranian people."

By the time you read this ad, this appliance could be banned.

It seems incredible, but there are laws pending which would try to make the MAXIMIZER™ automatic cooker the first banned home appliance in the country.

It's not what the MAXIMIZER™ automatic cooker does that has both sides after it. It's what else it does. We sell it as a versatile timed cycle automatic cooker that MAXIMIZES vitamin content by cooking gently with steam. It also does rice with warm heat, and is perfect for one or two person families. That's what it does.

WHAT ELSE IT DOES

Word has gotten about that this little wonder will also MAXIMIZE™ the quality of alternate smoking mixtures, loose or rolled. Very noticibly, or you can invoke our moneyback guarantee. We're not paraphernalia people, we're appliance people. We just happen to have a dual-nature appliance here, and we've sold over 8,000 to very happy customers. It's the only cooker that provides the munchies, too. Indeed, is **guaranteed** to.

PUT THAT BY US AGAIN, PLEASE?

In 1970, researchers at the Federal Marijuana Farm discovered a process that would free 98% of the THC from its original inactive state. Patents were applied for by the Cannabis Institute in 1971. And this year, the Institute made the process available to Universal Organics, the people making the cooker. It only took about $60,000 worth of engineering to make a good cooker do something else, too. Although we don't advocate or suggest anything like that.

SO WHO WANTS IT BANNED?

There has been a revival of the anti-marijuana scares of ten years ago by a few political pressure groups hungry for issues. They are running laws through that are worse than you're probably aware of. The Cannabis Institute is gearing up now to fight for the rights of the American public to know the truth about marijuana, from honest research rather than the *Reader's Digest*. That's why they decided to raise some money with their patents. And it's nice to know that's where your money is going.

Buy one today. It pays for itself the first time you stretch an ounce by cooking it the right way. Get the renegade appliance with the money-back guarantee. Get it while you can.

UNIVERSAL ORGANICS
Dept. 17, Box 748,
Cambridge, MA 02139

Rush me _____ MAXIMIZERS @ $29.95 (plus $1.25 packing and shipping for each).
Massachusetts residents add 5% sales tax.

☐ Send more information on
☐ Cooking ☐ Activation

☐ Send a copy of the Federal Farm research study (75¢).

Name _____
Address _____
State and Zip _____

☐ I am 18 or older
☐ Master Charge
☐ Visa

Card # _____
Expiration Date _____
Signature _____



THE MOVEMENT



Palestinian fantasy

DAVID BRUDNOY

AMONG THE ISSUES DIVIDING libertarians these days, that of our attitude toward the Middle East ranks near the top. So I intrude upon the front section of this magazine with a dissent from Bill Birmingham's sanguine call to American libertarians to "demand the U.S. end its support for Israel"—in effect, a call for the destruction of Israel. Mr. Birmingham's viewpoint arises out of his lengthy assessment ("The Revolution That Will Be," June *LR*) of Edward W. Said's recent book, *The Question of Palestine*. Nothing short of an entire issue of this magazine devoted to a minute examination of Mr. Birmingham's article would adequately contend with its many errors of fact and judgment; nothing whatsoever, I fear, can adequately contend with Mr. Birmingham's commitment to the Palestinian cause as enunciated by its apologists, among them the elegant Professor Said, among them, also, the not quite so fastidious Yasir Arafat.

I would like to recommend another lengthy review of Professor Said's book to *LR* readers: Hillel Halkin's "Whose Palestine? An Open Letter to Edward Said," in the June *Commentary*. *LR* readers whose only exposure to Professor Said's thought has been Mr. Birmingham's enthusiastic endorsement will find Mr. Halkin's article at least intriguing, and probably enlightening as well. I do not intend here to provide yet another review of the book, but, instead, a corrective to Mr. Birmingham's compendium of misinformation. I have the advantage of having participated in a recent two-week study tour of Israel. I have, as well, the disadvantage — at least I imagine that Mr. Birmingham will consider it a disadvantage — of a commitment of many years' standing to the survival of Israel.

Like Professor Said, Mr. Birmingham has based his argument on selective quotations coupled with unequivocal hostility to Zionism. Mr. Birmingham's Zionists thus stand in "enmity toward Islam" (to borrow a quotation from Professor Said employed by Mr. Birmingham), whereas the Zionism I have known for decades, and the Israeli sentiment I discerned in Israel this year, reflects a great respect for Islam. It is of course convenient, when constructing a case-book for the abandonment of Israel, to depict Israelis now and Jewish settlers prior to the establishment of Israel as woefully ignorant of the Islamic tradition and cynically oblivious to the legitimate aspirations of the Arab people, those who live (or lived) in what was once called Palestine and their cultural-linguistic-religious-ethnic brothers throughout the Arab world beyond Palestine. Convenient, but untrue.

The fact is that the only country in the Middle East demonstrating total respect for the holy places of all three great Western faiths, as well as the only country in which Christians, Jews, and Muslims are elected to parliament, is Israel.

Mr. Birmingham con-

tends that the claim that the Jewish settlers were "making the desert bloom" is a myth. Perhaps he could be prevailed upon to visit Israel and take a look; he would see that the claim is accurate; he would see the desert and he would see the orange groves, planted by Israelis, and the settlements in the desert where the Israelis have literally created life on the land. I have for decades heard the claim and I, too, wondered if it were more than a mere slogan. It is amazing what an impression upon the brain a close look with the eyes can bring. Somehow a thousand quotations from the enemies of Israel pale beside the considerably more persuasive weight of personal observation.

"The Arab citizens of Israel enjoy the highest standard of living of any Arabs in the world except a few rich sheiks."

Mr. Birmingham is impressed by Professor Said's argument that the Jews of Palestine, now of Israel, manifested a "systematic boycott of the Arab economy, and especially of Arab laborers." Somehow that statement jibes awkwardly with a couple of interesting facts: the Arab citizens of Israel enjoy the highest standard of living of any Arabs in the world excepting only the handful of oil-rich sheiks; and the Arabs living in the areas now under Israeli control since 1967 have also begun to approach that standard of living, enjoy practically no unemployment, and pay practically no taxes to Israel (which brings tens of thousands of them a demonstrably more pleasant economic life than is known by the bulk of the Jews of Israel itself, among the highest taxed people on earth).

Horror stories about Jewish atrocities committed against the Arabs of Palestine are part and parcel of the anti-Zionist case, and undoubtedly extremists among the Jewish settlers were in the past not wholly incapable of committing unspeakable acts against their Arab neighbors. But the predominant mode was, and is, consideration, tolerance, and (a much abused word, but it forces itself upon me after seeing what I have seen) brotherhood. I wish Mr. Birmingham had been with me and the nine other American journalists who accompanied me to Israel, as we wandered about and spoke with Arabs living under Israeli military control in the occupied territory as well as with Arabs who are citizens of Israel within the boundaries prior to the 1967 War. One need not be a card-carrying Zionist to find the sight of thousands of television antennas atop beautiful, modern Arab houses in Israel considerably more instructive than the propaganda pamphlets published by advocates of either side.

Throughout Mr. Birmingham's fantasy runs a *basso ostinato:* quotations from those who loathe the Jews of Israel function as "proof." I am as impressed by this technique as I am by that of those who have lately set out to "disprove" the Holocaust by asserting that it never happened. (I have also visited Dachau. Even the Germans—no, the Germans especially — know that the Holocaust happened.) But you can, if you like, *read* that it did not. And you can read in Mr. Birmingham's article page upon page of words set off by quotation marks which function as the little journalistic soldiers in Professor Said's (and, I'm sorry to say, Mr. Birmingham's) rhetorical war against the Jews.

I spent a day in the Gaza "Strip," as we call it, and I saw the hovels in which the refugees lived between 1948 and 1967, where the Egyptians kept them, permitting them neither to move to any Arab country nor to work, allowing them only to receive United Nations charity and to procreate and to develop zealous hostility to the Israelis, even as their Egyptian keepers choreographed that hostility; and I have seen the houses built with Jewish tax money, by the Israeli government, for the Arab residents of the Gaza, as well as the comfortable houses the Arab residents of the Gaza have since 1967 been able to afford to build for themselves, this because the Israelis have encouraged the Arab residents of the Gaza to work (usually alongside Jews in productive employment). I have been invited into an Arab home in the Gaza for coffee and conversation. Would you like to know what the attitude of that Arab family is toward the Israelis? Friendship, gratitude, affection, respect. Perhaps the Arab family is a troupe of actors hired by the Israeli government to fool American journalists; perhaps the hundreds of Arab children who waved and smiled at our Israeli bus, identified by the Israeli flag, as we passed through the Gaza are also actors; perhaps the Arab laborers building beautiful new houses for Arab residents of the Gaza were shipped in for the day to impress me and then went back to concentration camps at night to be tortured by Israelis. Somehow I doubt it.

I am intrigued by Mr. Birmingham's section on the "discrimination" faced by "Non-Jews" in "education, in politics, in virtually every field." Is Mr. Birmingham aware of the fact that every adult Arab in Israel votes, that Arab Muslims are Members of the Knesset (Parliament), that the Israeli government pays for the education of every Arab child in Israel in schools providing the same fundamental education as it provided to the Jewish children of Israel, as well as special emphasis on Arab culture, the Arabic language, and the Muslim religion?

Mr. Birmingham is also very anxious to tell us about Israeli censorship of Arab literature, including books and newspapers, and he is most anxious to instruct *LR*'s readers about the Israeli books depicting Arabs as "coward swine." I spent quite a bit of time in school rooms throughout Israel; I should like to assure Mr. Birmingham that no such children's books exist in Israel. None. The Israelis strictly forbid such instruction. I would be very interested to have Mr. Birmingham produce one Israeli children's book confirming his statements on page 38 of the June issue of *LR*.

Of course Mr. Birmingham will find books by fanatics, aimed at a readership of fanatics, espousing any vile viewpoint he might care to discover. The Israelis do not have a First Amendment but they come as close to it as any nation besides our own; and Mr. Birmingham will find fanatical Jewish publications in Israel despising Arabs and fanatical Arab publications easily available in Israel—in Israel!—despising Jews. But the schoolchildren of Israel, Jewish and non-Jewish alike, are not instructed by means of such books.

I cannot move sentence by sentence through Mr. Birmingham's Palestinian fantasy. Let us concentrate on his enthusiasm for the Palestine Liberation Organization, of whose National Council, the PLO's govern-

ing body, Professor Said is a member. Mr. Yasir Arafat, leader of the PLO, is amply on record calling for the destruction of Israel. But Mr. Birmingham writes: "The people who think the Palestinians 'want to drive the Jews into the sea' are generally those who believed—and perhaps still believe—that the U.S. was 'defending freedom' in Vietnam or Iran."

Here is Yasir Arafat in his own words:

1) "Our objective is the destruction of Israel.... No, we do not want peace. We want war and victory. Peace for us means the destruction of Israel and nothing else." *Esquiu,* Buenos Aires, 21 March 1971.

2) "We will not concede even an inch of Palestine. We will fight a prolonged people's war for the liberation of our territory. We will stand with our rifles in Haifa and Jaffa." (Haifa and Jaffa are cities on the coast of Israel, part of Israel from 1948.) Reuters, Beirut, 31 July 1976.

3) "Our activities will continue, in Tel-Aviv and elsewhere, until we achieve victory and hoist the flag over Jerusalem and the other cities in the occupied homeland." Reuters, Bahrain, 12 May 1978.

4) "The Israelis have to remember that their state will not exist more than 70 years ... and 32 years out of it are already gone." *Al-Hawadeth,* Beirut, 1 June 1979.

5) "The Palestine resistance will never agree to a cease-fire before the complete liberation of all Palestine." Radio Monte Carlo, 13 July 1979.

Permit me one quotation from George Habash, leader of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) faction of the PLO. "Yes, we will accept part of Palestine in the beginning, but under no circumstances will we agree to stop there. We will fight until we take every last corner of it." *Apoyevmatini,* Athens, 15 December 1979. ("Palestine," to the PLO, includes pre-1967 Israel as well as the occupied territories.)

In case anyone is confused by these statements, let me paraphrase them: *The PLO intends to destroy Israel.* Period. But Mr. Birmingham naïvely thinks that those who believe that the Palestinians "want to drive the Jews into the sea" are cuckoo.

I cannot clog the pages of *LR* with much more of this, out of respect for my fellow contributors to the magazine and to the patience of *LR*'s readers. But allow me one instructive contrast. When, in April of this year, seven Israelis were ambushed and killed, and several others wounded, presumably by Arab extremists, as the Israelis were returning from Sabbath services in Hebron, a city in the West Bank, the United Nations uttered not a word of condemnation. The world remained mute.

When, exactly one month later, the cars of three Arab mayors were bombed, presumably by Jewish fanatics, leading to the mutilation of two Arab mayors and the blinding of the Israeli bomb expert who was attempting to defuse the third bomb, the United Nations Security Council condemned the Israeli government. The world indulged itself in an orgy of tut-tutting.

And what did the Arabs and the Jews have to say about these incidents? From Damascus, and from the PLO leadership, came *high praise* for those, presumably Arabs, who killed the Israelis in April. From the Israeli press in May and June came virulent condemnation of those, presumably Jews, responsible for the attacks on the Arab mayors. And Mr. Menachem Begin, Prime Minister of Israel, said the following to me on the fourth of June, said the following very slowly so that I could get every word down without error: "Horrible crimes were perpetrated on Monday against the Arab mayors. Until the perpetrators of those crimes are apprehended we shall continue our investigations night and day. As a human being I express my deepest sympathy to the wounded men and to their families.... It is barbarism, genocide, neo-Naziism to praise such killers and would-be killers and to call for more of the same."

No, Mr. Birmingham, your Palestinians and your Israelis don't resemble very much the Israelis and Arabs I met, nor does your history of the struggle in the Middle East, and Professor Said's history of that struggle, bear much resemblance to the history of that struggle as I understand it.

No, Mr. Birmingham, I cannot agree with your last line: "We are all Palestinians." We are not all Palestinians, Mr. Birmingham; we are not all the gullible, merry followers of Professor Edward Said; nor, Mr. Birmingham, need libertarians feel any inclination to accept your conclusion, that American support of Israel "enables Israel to murder and oppress the Palestinian people."

David Brudnoy is *LR*'s film critic and a newspaper columnist. He traveled in Israel, southern Lebanon, and the Sinai from 25 May through 6 June 1980.

The Movement is an occasional **LR** *column of news on the movement for liberty: short items describing the activities of individuals and groups fighting the draft, high taxes, nuclear power, government regulation of the economy, oppression of minorities (including women, children, gun owners, drug users and homosexuals) and other official policies inimical to freedom; and short essays exploring controversies within the movement.* **LR** *welcomes contributions and will pay $20 for each short item and $75 for each short essay used.*

THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM IS IN TROUBLE...

This book tells WHY *and* WHAT *can be done about it.*

Social Security: The Inherent Contradiction by Peter J. Ferrara

Public policy observers agree that America's social security program — the most far-reaching and costly domestic welfare legislation ever enacted — is in deep financial difficulty. Beyond that there is little agreement. In this comprehensive and persuasively written study, economist-lawyer Peter J. Ferrara demonstrates that the seeds of social security's problems lie within the philosophical and economic contradictions written into the system by Congress. In addition to giving an overview of all the recent and important analyses of social security, the author shows us how we might extricate ourselves from a system with increasing problems... problems that could destroy our entire social fabric.

Publisher: The Cato Institute. 450 pp. $20.00 hardcover text edition (20% discount to libraries; 20% over $100.00, 40% over $500.00).

ISBN 0-932790-24-0. LC# 80-18949 Publication Date: October 1980.

Cato Public Policy Book #1. Index. Two Appendices 1) The Incidence of the Payroll Tax 2) 58 Tables (demographic and statistical).

"I know of nothing that brings together so many of the issues and so much of the discussion about social security. The book will have to be read by anyone who wants to know how social security became the biggest tax program we have and why it is rapidly creating the most important economic problem for the next generation. This book manages to get the important points across in an eminently readable style. It should have a wide audience."

—SAM PELTZMAN
Professor of Business Economics,
University of Chicago

"A provocative analysis that should stimulate a rethinking of the role of social security in our society."

—EDGAR K. BROWNING
Professor of Economics,
University of Virginia



Please send me ____ copies @ $20 each (less discount if applicable).

Mail to: Cato Institute, Publication Dept. LR, 747 Front St., San Francisco CA, 94111.

Name_____

Institution_____

Address_____

City_____ State_____ Zip_____

Amount Enclosed_____

Charge my ☐ Visa or ☐ Master Charge account.

Signature_____

Acct. #_____

Expiration date_____

PUBLIC TROUGH



Does America need reindustrialization?

BRUCE BARTLETT

CORPORATE AMERICA has recently launched a campaign to convince the rest of America that it needs "reindustrialization." The term has almost become a buzz-word, with *Business Week* running special issues on the subject (June 30) and candidates like John Anderson promising to work for it. Unfortunately, at the bottom, the whole thing is nothing more than an effort to enlist government subsidies by America's largest, wealthiest corporations for their least efficient business ventures.

The advocates of reindustrialization are persuasive. It is true that American productivity growth is less than that of some other major nations: between 1950 and 1978, for example, Japanese productivity increased an average of 7% per year, compared to U.S. productivity growth of only 1.8% per year. This is cause for concern, but not for alarm. The fact is that in recent years productivity growth in *all* nations has declined. Between 1965 and 1973 Japanese productivity increased an astounding 9.1% per year, but since 1973 has only increased 3.1% per year. A similar drop in productivity growth has taken place in West Germany (4.3% to 3.2%), Italy (5.6% to 1.3%), France (4.5% to 2.8%), Canada (2.3% to .8%), and Great Britain (3.3% to .9%), as well as in the U.S. (1.6% to .4%). Moreover, the U.S. still maintains a healthy lead in total productivity. The West Germans, for example, are only 85% as productive as Americans and the Japanese only 63% as productive.

What the reindustrialists are saying is that the U.S. should adopt the Japanese model, in which the government works in close partnership with the nation's largest corporations, pumping low-cost capital into growth industries, adopting protectionist trade legislation, and holding organized labor in check.

There is a lot we can learn from the Japanese in terms of increasing productivity and economic growth in this country—just look at how much more productive are those Japanese-owned and managed plants located in the U.S. as compared to similar American-run plants. However, we should not ignore some factors which have aided the Japanese in their efforts.

For one thing, Japanese taxes are much lower than those in the U.S.—especially Japanese taxes on saving and investment. For example, capital gains on the sale of securities generally are not subject to taxation in Japan. Japanese taxpayers may elect to be taxed separately on their interest and dividends at a rate of 25%; in America such income may be taxed at marginal rates of up to 70%. And a 5% to 10% credit on dividends received is allowed against taxes in Japan. As a result, it is estimated that the tax

burden on upper-income individuals in Japan—who do most of the saving and investment—is half of what it is in the U.S.

Moreover, one should realize that the quality of life in Japan suffers from its growth policies. Corporations are highly paternalistic, forcing a high degree of regimentation on their employees. And the heavy emphasis on saving leaves little income for consumption, which is the proper end of work and investment. As a result, the typical Japanese does not live nearly as well as the typical American.

But the advocates of reindustrialization look beyond these factors and instead talk about reestablishing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to pump billions of dollars of capital into U.S. industry. The problem is that capital doesn't come from the tooth-fairy; ultimately the government will have to draw it out of the existing pool of private saving, thus crowding private borrowers out of the market and forcing them to pay higher interest rates. Or the government will have to create forced saving by inflating the currency, which acts like a tax on cash holdings.

More important, the investment of this capital by an RFC would not be made on purely economic considerations but on political grounds. The result is that capital would not flow into high technology growth industries, as the reindustrialists claim, but into dying industries like steel and automobiles which still have a lot of political clout (remember the Chrysler bailout?). The RFC would just become a prop for perpetual money-losers, and rather than aiding in the rebuilding of America's capital structure it would lead to the squandering of scarce capital on projects that cannot be economically justified. ❑

CAMPAIGN '80



COURTESY CLARK FOR PRESIDENT

Libertarian Presidential candidate Ed Clark talks to students at the University of South Carolina in Columbia after a speech he gave there earlier this year.

Issues and images

JEFFREY FRIEDMAN

ON JULY 1, ED CLARK formally opened his full-time Libertarian presidential campaign with a Washington, D.C. news conference. That event drew publicity across the country, including major stories in the *Washington Post* and the *Los Angeles Times* and ambivalent treatment in the *Village Voice* at the hands of Alexander Cockburn and James Ridgeway, who apparently could not decide whether they were pleased by the progress of "the most successful third force in operation this year" or appalled that that radical force is so decidedly non-leftist. The following week saw the broadcast of the first two of at least 60 five-minute Clark commercials on CBS and ABC; in them, Clark advocated major tax and spending cuts along with a non-interventionist foreign policy and pointed out that none of his opponents came close to that program. And the *New York Times,* the paper reporters read to find out what's news, ran three long, favorable pieces on the Clark campaign and the libertarian movement. The last of the three, by syndicated columnist Tom Wicker, called Ed Clark "an alternative if ever there was one—although he and his party are not right-wingers, as you may have heard, and they certainly aren't left-wingers ... They are serious political thinkers who 'challenge the cult of the omnipotent state and defend the rights of the individual'—a stance long and honorably grounded in American history but disastrously abandoned, Libertarians say, by both main parties."

All the attention caused NBC and CBS News to ask to travel with the Clark campaign in late July.

The magnitude of media attention Clark suddenly received was unexpected even by optimists among his campaign staff. But the coverage, reminiscent of the beginnings of the "Anderson Phenomenon" last December, came none too soon, since most signs indicated that voters were still reeling from the choice they face in November. Only 48 percent of those surveyed in a *New York Times*/CBS News poll the week before the opening of Clark's campaign were satisfied with a Carter/Reagan choice; interestingly, only 59 percent were satisfied even with so-called alternative John Anderson included.

Even more interesting were the survey's findings about how voters' positions on the issues relate to their candidate choices. Fifty-seven percent of those who favored Reagan opposed a constitutional amendment to ban abortions, which Reagan supports. Forty-seven percent of Reagan's backers supported the Equal Rights Amendment, which he opposes.

The traditional model of how voters choose candidates holds that the electorate selects those candidates who most closely match its positions on the various questions of public policy. That's why journalists decry politicians who don't address themselves to "the issues." But "image-oriented" politicians have discovered that that's not what the voters want. Perhaps voters don't have the time—or the expertise—to evaluate every issue and learn each candidate's position. Perhaps they don't care enough to devote the time. Or perhaps they realize that politicians routinely lie about "the issues," so it doesn't really matter what their latest empty promise is. But the fact is that the traditional model doesn't hold, at least for large numbers of voters; that's why Ronald Reagan is supported by pro-abortionists and why John Anderson has been able to successfully build his entire campaign around an image of forthrightness, independence, and decency, rather than on a set of programmatic proposals.

This is not to say that issues don't matter to voters—on the contrary. But issues are used by voters—with the exception of single-issue voters — in a much more subtle way than a simple matching of their own positions with those of the candidates. Voters use candidates' views to construct broad generalizations about those candidates. These generalizations occur on a variety of levels. Closest to the traditional model—and to single-issue voters, who take that model to an extreme—are voters who use specific issues to gauge candidates' positions on more general themes, such as war vs. peace, civil liberties vs. "law-and-order" and so forth. In the coming campaign, Jimmy Carter will not attack Ronald Reagan for opposing SALT II as much as he will try to induce from that position that Reagan is a "hawk."

At a level of abstraction even further removed from the issue-by-issue approach are ideological judgments. Based upon a number of diverse issues, a candidate can be judged as "liberal," "conservative," or "moderate." In former days voters made candidate decisions primarily on this basis. But beginning with the election of 1896 and the demise of the Democratic Party as the "libertarian" party—i.e. the anti-tax, anti-tariff, anti-imperialist and pro-personal freedom party—the lines between liberal (classical liberal or libertarian) and conservative (statist) as well as Democrat and Republican began to blur. (Unsurprisingly, voter turnout began to decline in 1896 and has been dropping ever since.)

In the modern era the differences between "liberals" and "conservatives" have become so small, the mishmash of purely statist and rhetorically libertarian positions represented by those terms has become so incoherent, and the few coherent "liberal" and "conservative" ideas have been exposed as so bankrupt, that millions of Americans have abandoned the left/right political spectrum altogether. This is particularly true of liberals. Those who, ten years ago, would have automatically considered themselves to be liberals because of their concern for the poor, their respect for civil liberties, and their "dovishness" are coming to realize, in the midst of the collapse of liberal policies at home and abroad, that liberalism satisfies none of these concerns. In a widely discussed speech at the Americans for Democratic Action Convention/Ted Kennedy pep rally in June, Massachusetts Senator Paul Tsongas noted that "liberals are losing cause after cause ... liberalism risks becoming a relic of the 1960s. To someone choosing a set of values in that decade, liberalism provided the action and the passion. Liberals marched for civil rights and enlisted in a war on poverty. We volunteered to serve in the Peace Corps and organized against the war in Vietnam. Liberal programs," Tsongas insisted, "responded practically to urgent needs."

Tsongas accurately noted that "average young American[s] ... have not grown up confident in an ever-expanding economy," that "they have seen stagnating productivity, record interest rates, and foreign dominance in trade ranging from crude oil to efficient cars," but never wondered whether the liberal corporate state might be responsible for those problems. To him, "the soul of liberalism is intact: a conviction that government can and must help people achieve equal opportunity and individual dignity." So revivifying liberalism is just a matter of "escap[ing] the '60s time capsule and apply[ing] the sound values of our past to today's particular challenges."

But the young Americans of whom Tsongas speaks are not so sure; unlike Tsongas, they haven't the least enthusiasm for the candidacy of the other liberal Massachusetts Senator, Edward Kennedy. And the proportion of Americans who call themselves liberals (as of 1976, according to the University of Michigan's Center for Political Studies) has reached a mere 19 percent. Conservatism, on the other hand, still has a little life in it, as shown by Ronald Reagan's nomination — although surveys of voter attitudes reveal that aside from those who call themselves conservatives, people vote for Reagan mainly for lack of an alternative.

The pundits often suggest that the political parties are losing the loyalty of so many because they don't stick to their ideologies. Such pundits perennially call for a realignment to produce a Liberal party and a Conservative party. But they have things backward. The decline in party loyalty isn't due to the parties' lack of adherence to conservatism and liberalism; the decline in loyalty occurs to the extent that parties *do* adhere to those ideologies! The Republican party is *already* the conservative party — in 1976, only six percent of Republican adherents called themselves liberals — yet only 20 percent of the 1978 electorate, according to another *New York Times*/CBS News poll, identified itself as Republican. The more successful of the two parties is the *less* ideologically homogeneous. Only 26 percent of Democratic partisans called themselves liberals in 1976. Were it to become a "Liberal" party, where would the other 74 percent — the non-conservative non-liberals—go?

George Gallup tried to answer that question recently by asking who would support "a new Center Party that would appeal to people whose political views are middle-of-the-road, in between those of the Republicans and Democrats." Sure enough, 20 percent of the total sample picked the GOP, 36 percent picked the Democrats, and 31 percent picked the "Center Party." To Gallup, this indicated that a "'Center Party' ... has wide appeal to American voters." But he ignored the significance of the fact that, backed into his Democratic-Republican-Center corner, 13 percent of all Americans still had no preference. And among independents—eight percent of whom, confronted with this Hobson's choice, suddenly preferred the GOP rather than the Center Party and ten percent of whom became overnight Democrats—a whopping 25 per-

cent steadfastly insisted that none of the above was acceptable; that, in short, they were neither liberals, conservatives *nor* moderates. So even a left-right-center realignment would not end dissatisfaction with American political "alternatives." Nor would other recently popular suggestions of the establishment political commentators, such as giving tax dollars to the Republican and Democratic parties rather than to the candidates themselves; for neither campaign finance laws, television nor any other technicalities are responsible for the fix the two-party system is in. *The decline of the major parties is a reflection of the decline of the liberal and conservative (and moderate) ideologies they represent.* No amount of Tsongasian tinkering with liberalism (or conservatism) will change that situation. And making the parties adhere more closely to the discredited left-right spectrum will only exacerbate it.

The slow death of conventional ideologies is also responsible, at least in part, for the rise of single-issue and "thematic" (hawk vs. dove, etc.) politics, both of which replace ideology as a voter's guide to how to vote. But its most important consequence is the rise of "personality politics," voting for "the man, not the party" (i.e., not the ideology). This is how independents vote; and it is the factor responsible for John Anderson's success.

Politicians such as Anderson use issues to create the most abstract generalizations about themselves: what kinds of personalities they possess. Anderson has not attracted voters who agree with him about a laundry-list of issues because there is no traditional ideology extant which could put together such a list and command the loyalty of a majority, or a plurality, of voters. He has made only a feeble attempt, as yet, to set forth issue themes by conveying the impression that he is a liberal on social issues and a moderate in economic and foreign policy. It is on the level of imagery that Anderson is a master. He has deftly manipulated issues in order to create for himself the image of an honest, courageous and decent man. When Anderson went before that New Hampshire gun club and advocated gun control, he received his first major burst of media adulation. A study by the Russell Sage Foundation concluded recently that the media have been "infatuated" with Anderson ever since. Why? Because that one dramatic gesture (supposedly) demonstrated Anderson's fine moral fiber. And, while reporters and journalists attitudinally differ from the public-at-large, the success of Libertarian candidates in attracting media attention is only one indication that the primary difference is *not* that they're more liberal than the rest of us, which is the explanation the Sage Foundation Report gave for Anderson's media hype. While people in the media tend to have "progressive" attitudes, more often than not those attitudes are not wedded to liberal ideology. Media people tend to be much too disillusioned with conventional ideology for that. They are independents who are jaded by their daily contact with politicians. In short, they are precisely the kind of people to whom Anderson's image is designed to appeal (see "Campaign '80," August *LR*) — intelligent, non-ideological, disaffected progressive independents looking for new ideas—and to whom dramatic demonstrations of like-mindedness are especially alluring.

Ironically, the evidence which supports Anderson's image of intellectual honesty is his alleged willingness to deal with "the issues." Yet his supporters, as previously noted, do *not* base their support on his "issue" positions *per se*. What accounts for this inconsistency is the outdated idea that honest politicians should address "the issues," which was true in those long-ago days when their positions on those issues conformed to ideologies which meant something to the American people. Since it is the media which persistently call for "a debate on the issues" out of their sense of obligation to elevate politics above its current image-orientation, they were even more susceptible than the general public to being taken in by a candidate, like Anderson, who claimed to care only about issues. But the proof is in the pudding, and the fact is that media coverage of Anderson is just as image-oriented, and as concerned with the "horse-race" aspects of his campaign, as is media coverage of all the other candidates. When it comes right down to it, and despite their protestations to the contrary, the media are just as image-oriented as other Americans (if not more so, since the more disillusioned people are with conventional politics and ideas—as are media people — the more likely they are to pursue personality politics).

Anderson is but one example of the importance of political imagery and the increasing irrelevance of issues *as issues*. Another is the rise of Jimmy Carter in 1976 atop his image as an honest, pious outsider. He is in such deep political trouble now because of the erosion of that personal image; his resurrection will depend upon resuscitating that image or devising a new one (e.g., "Jimmy Carter, A Solid Man in a Sensitive Job," one of his primary campaign slogans). And Ted Kennedy failed because he depended on his outmoded liberal ideology, on "the issues," even as his image was shaped by Chappaquiddick and the implications of untrustworthiness played upon by the Carter TV campaign.

The schema presented here—that for eighty years, ideology in American politics has been in the process of being supplanted by thematic pseudo-ideology and personal imagery, and that voters now use issues to confirm themes and images rather than ideologies — is, obviously, more simple than the world actually is. Some voters remain loyal to liberalism and conservatism. Some issues, such as war and the draft, are important enough to some people that they almost assume the status of "single issues." Some issues weigh very heavily in many voters' minds but are not decisive. Some voters mix issues, themes and images. Some images backfire. But the fact remains that these days, issues are used as much more than items on checklists of agreement.

The Libertarian Party, of course, does offer a genuinely new ideology and ultimately will change the face of American politics by virtue of that fact alone. One might argue that Libertarians' approach should be to push what the voters hunger for — the straight ideology. But Americans are now so used to basing political judgments on themes and images that Libertarians must find a way to communicate their ideology by using those tools.

The Clark campaign hit on a thematic masterstroke by emphasizing tax cuts and foreign nonintervention. None of the other candidates is making a concerted appeal to the "doves," which Clark's Opinion Research survey suggests are a sizeable constituency. Furthermore, Anderson and Reagan, who favor more of the foreign intervention which makes conscription necessary, can be portrayed by Clark as cynically appealing to the youth vote without having the courage to en-

gage in the re-evaluation of foreign policy really necessary to end the draft once and for all. Similarly, Reagan, Clark's only competitor on the tax-cut issue, is vulnerable to the charge (which Anderson is already making) of dishonestly appealing to tax revolt sentiment without being willing to make the necessary cuts in military spending. And there, in the necessary link between foreign nonintervention and tax cuts, lies a more-than-philosophical unifying theme for the Clark campaign: the traditional theme of the 19th Century English liberals, that opposition to big government must entail opposition to foreign adventurism. On a campaign swing through Idaho in July Clark touched on that theme, noting that Reagan "supports a huge military spending program which centralizes the economy and makes businesses dependent on the government," and that the GOP platform calls for an immediate $15 billion to $40 billion increase in defense spending *as well as* lower taxes and a balanced budget. "I don't think they can pull the wool over the eyes of the voters," said Clark.

Establishing a positive image, however, is more difficult than is constructing campaign themes. One characteristic Clark automatically projects is intelligence and "reasonableness." His peaceful foreign policy can be used to reinforce that image, especially when contrasted with the foreign policies of Carter, Reagan and Anderson, the latter of whom was tarnished by the reckless pro-Israel bias he displayed during his recent trip to the Middle East. Another of Anderson's vulnerabilities is the fact that he changes positions on issues for political reasons. That charge, were the evidence which supports it more widely known (see "The Anderson Record," August *LR*), would spell disaster for Anderson's campaign, since the foundation of his image is his alleged candor. Anderson's stance on Israel, his opposition to the draft but not to foreign interventionism, and his waffling on nuclear power and a balanced budget leave him exposed on this count; when Reagan and Carter attack him for it, Clark's efforts to convince independent Americans that *he* should be their choice will be immeasurably helped. Thus, the elements of a very appealing image are already coming together in the Clark campaign: intelligence, sensibility, consistency and the courage to confront "the issues."

The main weakness of Libertarian candidates is that they might be misperceived as simply more extreme versions of Ronald Reagan (because of his rhetorical commitment to freedom). The Libertarian foreign policy will certainly help dispel that notion—as would emphasizing civil liberties issues—but the libertarian devotion to cutting taxes might still be misinterpreted as typical conservative selfishness and insensitivity. That would be catastrophic, since it would preclude an appeal to Anderson's constituency of progressives disenchanted with liberalism. But the Clark campaign's aggressive approach to the issue of poverty and unemployment shows signs of taking hold, at least among the media. Tom Wicker, for one, highlighted Libertarian opposition to "'racist' minimum-wage laws that prevent the hiring of unskilled young blacks" as one of Clark's major positions.

The rise of political imagery has made television the most important political medium because it *tells* about candidates' themes and personalities in a most effective manner, by *showing* images of the candidates on the campaign trail or relaxing at home, and pictures of what they envision or deplore. Only the most accomplished political orator — or actor, in the case of Ronald Reagan—can afford to go on TV and just talk. The Clark campaign has realized that fact and its five-minute anti-draft commercial, which included visuals of draft protests and of the Vietnam War, is a sign that the libertarian movement may succeed in communicating its ideology in an understandably anti-ideological age. ❑

LR summer intern Jeff Friedman is on leave from Brown University. He was previously the Eastern Director of Students for a Libertarian Society.

BLACK STAR

Earl C. Ravenal

AFTER AFGHANISTAN:

Sitting on Our Hands

There's a nice scene in "The Godfather" where one of the headstrong sons wants to confront a rival with some proposition and the old Don cautions him: "Mention it, don't insist." That would also be good advice for America in the aftermath of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, as an eerie war euphoria sweeps this country, like the one that inflamed Europe in August 1914. Don Vito's counsel didn't betoken cowardice—just healthy realism and an interest in staying alive for a while.

The significance of "Afghanistan"—the swift, brutal Soviet invasion of that country in December 1979, to install a complaisant regime and put down a host of rebellions against the Marxist central government—has been extensively canvassed in editorials, journals

SYGMA

of opinion, and political speeches since the winter of 1979-80. But curiously—or perhaps not so curiously—one position has hardly been expounded: non-intervention. That is, the case for doing nothing. Not symbolic measures, not oblique retaliations, not vague threats, not verbal doctrines, not basing and deployment schemes, but flat nothing.

The one thing that almost anyone (doves as well as hawks, liberals as well as conservatives) would say about Afghanistan is that we can't "just sit on our hands." I wonder: Why not? That sounds precisely like what we ought to be doing. If we can't prudently do something that is directly helpful—for example, free Afghanistan immediately, painlessly, costlessly, and risklessly, from Soviet occupation—then we should be making the least of it, not the most. And if we can't defend the Persian Gulf from halfway around the world—if all we have, in the first resort as well as the last resort, is the threat of blowing up the planet—then we should be hedging against the deprivation of oil, not planning to start a world war.

These are times that try the souls of non-interventionists. The spectrum of ordinary opinion is divided: There are, of course, the triumphant hawks. "I told you so," they crow. Edward Luttwak, who made the case for "Seizing Arab Oil" in *Harper's* in 1975 (under the pseudonym "Miles Ignotus" —Latin for "The Unknown Soldier") wrote in *Commentary*, April 1980, with a little strained modesty, that

> Those of us who have been warning for some years that the military balance was shifting in favor of the Soviet Union, and that the consequences would unfailingly become manifest in harsh reality, have been sufficiently vindicated by events to resist the temptation of celebrating successful prediction—especially since we failed to prevail over the counsels of passivity soon enough to avert our present, sinister, predicament. ["After Afghanistan, What?"]

The reaction of the hawks was to be expected. But it is the liberals who have been most discomfited by Afghanistan. First there are the chastened doves, now converted to fear and bellicose reaction. Then there are the other doves, the left-liberal remnant, embarrassed by the erosion of the factual basis of their position and straining to find another benign formula for avoiding a final slide into intervention. Worse, perhaps, than the vindictive hawks are the repentant doves, who feel personally outraged at the Russians for mocking their earlier notions of how the world works. "Betrayed, yes, that's the word," complains former Senator, now Secretary of State, Ed Muskie. Russia "just ran out on us." George Ball, the old reliable devil's advocate of "hopeful" diplomatic solutions, now wants bigger defense budgets, more airlift, sealift, Marines, and bases throughout the Middle East, revival of the draft, and urgent coercion of Israel into a settlement favoring pan-Islamic goals. Clark Clifford, who wisely persuaded Lyndon Johnson to abandon



Vietnam, is peddling American arms, and threats, around South Asia.

The sunshine non-interventionists (those who, by the 1970s, had somehow, remarkably, acquired the wisdom and the courage to oppose the "bad war" in Vietnam) have now turned, with Afghanistan as a pretext. One summer, it seems, does not make a dove; and a few doves don't make a summer, either.

Putative critics strain at gnats to delineate some difference in their go-along positions and the "Carter Doctrine." Here is an editorial in the *New Republic* entitled "Steady, Big Fella" (February 16, 1980): "We support many of the specific policies that make up Carter's born-again approach to the Soviet Union, but we are profoundly worried by the mindset that produced them—the emotionalism, the inconsistency, the moralism, the excessive swings in the president's mood from pacific euphoria to euphoric militance.... What the United States needs is a steady vision ... leadership—prudent and resolute leadership ..."

To document the point further, here is Anthony Lewis, writing on the *New York Times* Op-Ed page (February 14, 1980), qualifying his opposition to the Carter Doctrine, supporting the moves but striving to maintain an intellectual fig leaf of proportion and selectivity:

> Americans have reason for concern about the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, and reason to act against the potential threat to the Persian Gulf. But the action should be related to the threat. Demonstrations of a commitment in the Gulf, refusals to carry on business as usual with the Soviets and, most important, action to reduce our dependence on oil from the region: These are the kinds of steps that make sense. What does not make sense—what will indeed drain our economic and psychological strength—is undifferentiated militarism ... a blank check ... hysteria ...

"We should try to suppress commitments engendered by alliances, which are not barriers to war but transmission belts for war."

Even some old revisionist historians, such as David Horowitz, who in better times decried "The Free World Colossus," now castigate their erstwhile left-wing colleagues, the "veterans of the *old* anti-war movement," for showing "a reluctance to denounce the Soviet aggression outright." Horowitz, in his rather forced—but logically required—distinction between the "old" and the "new" Cold Wars, congratulates himself on his appropriately new position: "Some of us condemned the Soviet invasion unequivocally, and even welcomed the Carter Administration's strong initial stand against it, while dissenting from the hawkish exploitation of the crisis that followed." [*Mother Jones,* May 1980]

There we have it, the liberal syndrome: applaud the presidential actions, but "dissent" from the emotive aura, the nasty language, the "hawkish exploitation." Some dissent! We may recall similar critical noises that enveloped the Truman Doctrine in 1947: supposedly we needed the response, the commitment, but heavens! the indiscriminate rhetoric, the "universalism," the anti-communist "hysteria," the "blank check," the "mindset" that produced it. I would agree with such critics that the new policy would eventually lead to Korea, Dullesian brinkspersonship (I suppose you'd now have to call it), Kennedy's "finest hour" of near-extinction in the Cuban missile crisis, and finally Vietnam—but not because of all that dirty language in the Truman Doctrine; rather because this country had been set, in so many tangible ways, on an interventionist track, and every successive challenge had a certain irresistibly attractive aspect. That interventionist logic is what is being set in place again, now that the post-Vietnam debate appears to be resolving—or dissolving—into a fine belligerent froth. And we are seeing again the same parade of inconsequential critical nonsense, the vain attempt to maintain editorial credibility in a rising sea, not so much of "hysteria"—though we have that too—but of foolish policies and dangerous actions.

Carter vs. Carter

Jimmy Carter, of course, is also a converted dove. His State

of the Union message in January 1980 should have been billed as "Carter vs. Carter," since the President testified against the foreign policy of the first three years of his own administration. That policy had been non-interventionist, not through principle or design, but by indirection and default. At Notre Dame in May 1977, the administration was going to select new priorities — North-South instead of East-West, cosmic optimism instead of Spenglerian gloom, rampant moralism instead of cynical Realpolitik. The United States was summoned to give up its "inordinate fear of communism"—to have it replaced, as it turned out, with a sort of *ordinate* fear of communism. Foreign policy bureaucrats could put Soviet relations on the "back burner" (as bureaucrats are wont to do). Internal policy documents such as "PRM-10" proclaimed the advent of an "Era Two," in which we could presumably cash in our spiritual superiority for strategic advantage, define ourselves into another world. We could declare that we won the Cold War and quit.

But "revising priorities" is not foreign policy-making; it is speech-writing. In foreign affairs, you don't revise priorities; indeed, in a very real sense, you don't even "make" policy. You dispose your system to respond in some real way to possible challenges. And challenges there will be, but you can't determine—let alone dictate—what kind, from what quarter, how serious, how insistent. That is for the challengers, and they have their own priorities.

There was the first hint of nervous bellicosity in the presidential speech of March 1978, delivered, appropriately, at Winston-Salem, since Carter sounded like a tobacco man, not a medicine man. The imagination soars at the very mention of that peculiar setting in North Carolina for Carter's speech: Winston Salem... "It feels good like a foreign policy should." ... or, since at the time Carter was about to depart on a four-day, six-capital wonder-tour arranged by Zbigniew Brzezinski to impart some global savvy to the president: "You can take Jimmy Carter out of the country, but you can't take the country out of Jimmy Carter." At any rate, a season later, there was the two-toned incoherence of the draft Carter read at Annapolis in July 1978, offering the Soviets a bit of confrontation and a bit of cooperation, too.

The result of all this was a sort of catatonic inaction. The clinical definition of catatonia, by the way, is: "a syndrome seen most frequently in schizophrenia, with muscular rigidity and mental stupor, sometimes alternating with great excitement and confusion." Some would say that still sounds like an apt characterization of the foreign policy of the Carter administration. But if we can't have deliberate and consistent non-intervention, we must be grateful for incompetence, paralysis, and the babel of many tongues.

Perhaps we should not be too surprised by the conversion of the Carter administration, on the pretext of Afghanistan. The liberals sooner or later become the executors of the foreign and military policies of the Right—though always, they assure us, reluctantly, and always earning the contempt of the hawks for their pains.

But what has "Afghanistan" actually proven? Contrary to the belief and hope of the hawks, the egregious Soviet conduct has not invalidated the case for non-intervention. Afghanistan has simply stripped the veils from arguments that have passed for non-interventionist but were really evasions of choice or, worse, closet prescriptions for selective intervention. Indeed, the I-told-you-so hawks profit only in their selection of targets: the guilt-ridden moralists and some of the revisionist historians, who impugned so uniquely the motives of American leaders; the exotic exegetes of three decades of Russian behavior, who explained it as merely a lagged response to American strategic provocation; those who pronounced the Soviet Union a "status quo power," presumably so bloated and torporous after its thirty-year global lunch that it could hardly rouse itself for another course; the purveyors of Pickwickian definitions of "security" that failed to include any defensive component.

Most of those arguments would interpret "the threat" out of existence. In the case of Afghanistan, to those who asserted that the Soviets were pursuing their traditional push toward warm water ports and who saw them positioning themselves along the flanks of the West's oil lifeline, the others replied that they were just "rounding out a belt of satellites" or quelling Moslem unrest that could spill over into their own backyard. If some took Afghanistan as a token of Russia's inexorable quest for world dominance, the others insisted that it was merely an expression of Russia's continuing paranoia. Some said that Moscow's move reflected a tendency to exploit unrest along its borders, but the others judged that the Soviets did no more than we did fifteen years ago in Vietnam.

Afghanistan: The Limits of Soviet Power

Since their brutal invasion of Afghanistan last Christmas, the Soviets have found themselves increasingly bogged down in a quagmire. After an initial series of surprising victories, roughly six Soviet divisions slashed through the small nation, gained control over most of the major population centers and seemed to be in complete control of the situation. But as the weeks and months rolled on, the Russian troops have faced mounting difficulties in subduing the people of Afghanistan.

The early Afghan casualties were heavy, as Soviet tanks, MIG jet fighters and helicopters dominated Kabul and other Afghan cities and villages. But native Afghan soldiers then began to defect *en masse* to the rebel cause, taking Russian weapons and killing Soviet troops as they left. The Afghan army has shrunk from more than 80,000 to fewer than 30,000 in the past few months alone. A host of stories about the fighting have been published in the West, mostly from sources ranging from defecting Afghan soldiers, rebel fighters and refugees in Pakistan to reports of journalists from countries such as India, France and the United States. A few highlights will summarize the Soviet dilemma.

February 23: A huge protest erupted in the capital city of Kabul, the first of its kind since Soviet troops entered the country last December. "It began when several thousand demonstrators, ranging from boys to elderly men, began milling around a pole with a huge green Islamic flag.... Among the slogans the throng chanted were 'Death to the Russians' and 'Death to the socialist imperialists....' A helicopter gunship clattered over, and the protesters ... shook their fists and continued chanting." [*New York Times*] Fighting broke out, and many on both sides were killed.

March 2: "Officials in Washington said that the latest intelligence reports showed that nothing had gone right for the Russians since they moved into Afghanistan on December 24. The State Department also noted that with Russian troops so bogged down in Afghanistan, the risk of an invasion of Pakistan or Iran ... was receding rapidly." [*Manchester Guardian*]

March 7: Reports were received that the Soviets were to increase their military presence of 85,000 troops with a supplementary force of 30,000 new troops. American officials "said Soviet military leaders 'underestimated' the level of resistance Russian troops would encounter, particularly in urban areas.... The analysts estimated that Soviet forces were suffering 400 to 600 casualties a week.... The officials reported numerous instances in which Soviet

troops were ambushed in urban areas as they traveled alone or in small groups at night. Fifty-two soldiers were recently killed when they attended a sporting event in a provincial city...." [*New York Times*]

April 28: "Western intelligence experts estimated [that] the Soviets have suffered at least 8000 dead and wounded since last December's invasion.... In the capital city of Kabul, there were rumors that insurgents had caused a landslide, killing 600 Soviet soldiers in a mountain encampment and destroying 40 tanks. A band of rebels reportedly crossed the border between Afghanistan and the U.S.S.R. and managed to kill 200 Soviet troops. The rebels also claimed to have exploded a newly completed copper mine in the Logar Valley and coal mines in Badakhshan." [*Time*]

May 15: "Two months after launching their first major military offensive in Afghanistan, Soviet forces appear to be bogged down by mounting rebel resistance. Interviews with political and military analysts [in Pakistan] together with accounts of those recently arrived from Afghanistan strongly indicate that the Afghan government, with Soviet help, controls less of the countryside today than the Afghan army alone did before the massive Soviet invasion last December." [*Los Angeles Times*]

May 15: "The Soviet Union has found that its objective of bringing Afghanistan under political and military control has proved more elusive than it expected at the time of its military intervention in December.... [T]he Soviet Union has so far been unable to establish a staging area in Afghanistan from which to threaten or subvert the region around the Persian Gulf. To the contrary, Afghanistan has become a drain on Soviet resources.... Urban unrest continues to spread.... Many of the recent demonstrations have been reportedly led by university students, and, among them, young women have been in the forefront. The young women were said to have taunted Afghan soldiers with allegations that they lacked masculinity while the women were the defenders of the nation.... The Soviet army ... is said to have taken 10 percent casualties." [*New York Times*]

May 16: "Clandestine leaflets extolling the resistance of school children in Afghanistan and urging new defiance of Soviet forces and the Moscow-installed Afghan Government are once again being distributed nightly in Kabul despite a curfew and armed patrols." One leaflet, a letter which addressed President Babrak Karmal as "obedient slave of the Russians," said, "You should be cursed for using heavy guns, tanks and machine guns against our daughters and sons who had no weapons other than kerchiefs, books and pens. You fired upon them from the air with helicopters and spilled blood of hundreds of innocent girls and boys"—this after a massacre of protesting schoolchildren. "A number of travelers said that the spirit of defiance ... had become visibly heightened..." [*New York Times*]

June 4: "...Muslim insurgents have started receiving significant quantities of modern weapons. The new arms may include armor-piercing weapons able to bring down Soviet helicopter gunships.... Some rebel-held areas of Afghanistan now are considered invulnerable to helicopter attack." [*Los Angeles Times*]

June 11: "Reports of heavy fighting between Afghan guerillas and Soviet troops in the mountains around Kabul signal a new phase in the resistance to the Marxist regime of Babrak Karmal and the Soviet troops that keep it in power. The very location and intensity of the insurgents' new activity indicates the degree to which the resistance has mounted since the Soviet invasion late last December." [*Los Angeles Times*]

July 11: "Informed sources said the rebel groups are fighting more effectively now than at any time since the Soviet intervention ... because thousands of soldiers who have defected from the regular Afghan army are giving the rebels the latest model Soviet-made small arms and badly needed military training." [*Associated Press*]

July 15: "In whispered conversations in the dusty bazaars and crowded teahouses of Kabul, middle-class businessmen and students are talking about giving up their jobs and studies and taking up arms against the Soviet troops." [*New York Times*]

Finally, a report from *The Economist* dated June 14 and entitled "Stuck in Afghanistan" sums up the Soviet quagmire: "The Russians are in widening and deepening trouble in Afghanistan. Widening, as the rebels take their hit-and-run war against the invaders from the Iranian border to the Pakistani one, and into the capital, Kabul. Deepening, as the resistance is joined by schoolgirls, shopkeepers and estranged members of [the] government.... The Soviet force is increasingly overstretched ... [and] the 100,000-strong Soviet army is further today from imposing a Pax Sovietica on Afghanistan than it was at the turn of the year.... So the Russians are left with two choices. One is to continue reinforcing their troops in Afghanistan until they can crush the insurgency—which may be feasible, but could take half a million men—and then settle down to permanent occupation. The other is to negotiate a political settlement that would allow them to withdraw."

In short, without any foreign interference, and with only a trickle of weapons being smuggled in from outside their country, the Afghan people are waging a proud and heroic battle to bring down the Russian invaders. The Russians are reportedly having second thoughts, and there is no indication that the Soviet government will commit the more than half-million troops which would probably be needed to firmly establish control in a tiny country of fewer than eighteen million inhabitants. Afghanistan may well be the watershed of Soviet influence in the Third World. The Russians may be learning, as the U.S. did in Indochina, the limits of power.

—Roy A. Childs, Jr.

Actually, the "right" answer might be: all of the above. But does it matter? I would be impertinent enough to suggest that discerning the sources of this season's Soviet conduct doesn't prove a thing. For we are faced with the unfortunate coincidence that the countries that lie in Russia's path also happen to be part of a brittle crust of territory that we could plausibly have a war about.

What matters, then, is *our own* propensity to intervene, regardless of whether our intervention is holy or profane, whether we are welcomed or not, whether our aid is begged or disdained. What matters also is our own calculus of intervention—whether or not it is feasible within the constraints that beset our system and pervade the international system. In these respects the judgment of our recent experience remains that intervention is likely to be expensive, risky, and fruitless—not in all cases, to be sure, but generally enough so that the whole enterprise should not be undertaken.

The hawks have greeted the defections of the summer non-interventionists as proof that the nation is belatedly emerging from its comatose reaction to Vietnam—that "trauma," that "failure of nerve." But they miss the point. The real lessons of Vietnam are not the data of misplaced pop psychology; they are the things Vietnam proved about our system: the capabilities, the constraints (which are, in the last analysis, social and constitutional); its ability to respond, to persevere, to deliver sustained support to political authorities in obscure, intractable, precarious conflicts; and how much grace we will give our leaders to make good on their promises before we politically emasculate another president. These are objective matters and cannot be casually or willfully set aside. They tell whether an American president can credibly wield the threat of military intervention.

"Someday, Monsieur, You Go Too Far ..."

Some critics—generally within the left-liberal segment of the spectrum—reflecting on America's strategic predicament and their own logical predicament, have been led to benign and right-minded but essentially wishful calls for a new deal with the Russians, new rules of the game. (Able exponents of this position have been Richard Barnet in the *Washington*

Post on January 20, 1980 and the *New York Times* Op-Ed page on March 7, 1980, and Arthur Cox in *Newsday* on January 6, 1980.)

Sure, deals... But what would they consist of? Any imaginable starting point would be *post*-Afghanistan (some would call that the "someday-Monsieur-you-go-too-far" position), and the end would be a crass condominium of the two superpowers. They would be Nixon-Kissinger-type deals, to wit: we let you run your part of the world, you let us run ours. And we would still need the threat of American force to make them stick.

Actually, there's nothing particularly new about deals. Nixon and Kissinger thought they had a deal with the Russians, in Moscow 1972 and San Clemente 1973; it didn't last much beyond the Mideast war of October 1973. And the obsession with impressing upon our adversaries certain "codes" of conduct has, from the start, characterized the approach of Zbigniew Brzezinski: "What we have to establish is that the rules of the game have to be the same for both sides." (Interview by Elizabeth Drew, *The New Yorker,* May 1, 1978.) The kind of deal envisaged by Brzezinski inevitably incorporates the aspect of linkage—the contrived relation of various functional categories of the adversary's behavior and the American response: the balance of strategic nuclear forces, political and military ambitions in other regions of the world, trade and investment and technology, and the practice of human rights. Several administrations have been looking for ways to multiply linkages in order to re-establish American control over the conduct of other nations. The Carter administration first repudiated, then espoused linkage, but with a twist that reversed the emphasis of the Nixon-Kissinger regime. Nixon and Kissinger had attempted to entangle the Soviets in a web of useful commercial contacts that would not easily be broken for the sake of strategic opportunism. Carter and Brzezinski turned linkage from a carrot into a stick.

I say the less linkage the better. In a world interlaced with risks of nuclear destruction, where geopolitics is becoming a prohibitively expensive game, we should be looking for ways to *de*-link: to minimize provocations; to let regional conflicts burn themselves out; to suppress commitments engendered by alliances (which in reality are not barriers to war but transmission belts for war). We ought to "decouple" one stage of escalation from another, cutting the chain from conventional war to a strategic nuclear exchange. We should compartmentalize the world's troubles, for there will be many. We should de-link international functions such as trade, communications, cultural affairs, and yes, even sports, from matters of "high strategy." Indeed, we should keep "the national interest" out of the affairs of citizens and their private organizations. As Libertarians could have pointed out, the trouble with international as well as domestic politics is that, on both sides of the cold war, cliques that call themselves governments presume that they can appropriate and manipulate the activities of those who happen to live within their borders.

My formula would not exclude such specific and delimited compacts as a strategic arms limitation treaty. The case for SALT II—though never perfectly satisfying—is actually stronger now, objectively. The less we can trust others' conduct, the more we need a yardstick to calibrate it. But the best strategic moves are those we could make independently, to curtail expensive, destabilizing weapons systems such as the MX land-based missile and the long-range cruise missiles. Such moves must make sense on their own terms. If they do, we don't need Russian reciprocity.

"If we can't have consistent non-intervention, then we must be grateful for incompetence, paralysis, and the babel of tongues!"

With respect to American allies and clients, this is my prescription: disengagement for us, self-reliance for others. Others seem to understand this, much better than Americans. One who is in the line of fire is President Zia ul-Haq of Pakistan. He well knows that those who might have depended on the United States must now make up deficiencies in their own defensive posture, and perhaps simultaneously make some intelligent accommodation with powerful neighbors: "Given the new power equation in the world, self-reliance will be the key to our survival as a nation.... If you have to live in the sea, says an old proverb, you have to learn to live with the whales." (*Newsweek,* January 14, 1980.) Accordingly, Zia spurned the belated, desperately proffered American military aid package.

Finally, if we cannot dominate the present sources of our economic necessities, particularly energy, we must be prepared to substitute, to tide over, to ride out other countries' political manipulation of resources. But, contrary to the wisdom of many who are friendly to the non-interventionist position, this should not mean central "planning" and coerced conservation. We should allow our private commercial organizations to deal abroad as long as they are able, on whatever business terms they can get, commodity by commodity. And we should take advantage of the flexibility and intelligence that markets (even partially rigged markets) can provide, and the relatively smooth adjustments that the price mechanism can help to mediate.

In short, the trick is to learn to live in a world *without* deals, without rules—an asymmetrical world, an unfair world, if you will. Bleak as it may sound, we should observe a code of conduct that is constructive for ourselves, even if it is not reciprocated. For the key to a policy of non-intervention that is consistent enough to withstand a few tests by the Soviets and others in the months and years to come is acceptance of the costs of non-intervention.

Political Pornography

It's strange that the self-described "hardliners" rarely resort to equally hard data about the costs—and thus the attractiveness and feasibility—of the strategic moves they urge upon the American people. Never any numbers: with them it is all nouns, adjectives, and verbs—psychological metaphors, epic poetry, such as Norman Podhoretz's "undifferentiated fear, loathing, and revulsion," "native anti-Americanism," "self-hatred," and the like. Literary critics have become our mentors, our chaplains and confessors, in matters of national security and resource allocation.


SYGMA

But the real argument has always been about the requisites of peace in a nuclear age. More precisely, how can we gain for ourselves an interval of peace in an age of worldwide political, social, and economic chaos, but also an age of nuclear parity and nuclear "plenty" (to use Kissinger's perversely appealing term)? Those who search for these requisites of peace are not therefore a bunch of finks and faggots—as Podhoretz slyly intimated two years ago, in an article called "The Culture of Appeasement" (*Harper's*, October 1977) that has become a modern classic of political pornography.

I would not want to bat at that pathological wicket. The obsession with "culture" misses all the critical features of the situation, not just the strategic ones but the truly moral ones as well. What is relevant is not culture but structure.

That is, "isolationism" *is* the point, but the concept has to be endowed with more tangible meaning and more contemporary significance. It means, first, that we might have to "let" some countries be dominated, in the next decade or so, by our adversaries or their supposed proxies. And then, we might have to tell some importunate clients that they are on their own, that they will have to muster what internal support and scrape up what other external support they can to repel attack and repress subversion.

This may not be a very sympathetic position to hold. But the essential word in this formulation is not any of the long ones; it is the word "let." For if anything must change—if anything is in fact changing—it is the ability of the United States to do something effective about the rest of the world, and the presumption that we ought to do something to prevent one kind of outcome and promote another. That, I think, is the structural significance of what our false elites diagnose as a disease of the American spirit. And that is why the problems we face at this historic juncture are even more substantial, and the real alternatives are even more stark, than are posited by the sponsors of the new American Kulturkampf (there! at least one of those words can be spelled with a "k").

Rust or Explode

Who will still argue, "after Afghanistan," for a smaller military force and a reduced defense budget? Even George Kennan, whose sage (and safe) call for "mature statesmanship" was so gratefully received, hastens to grant the hawks the only practical measure of ability and intent: "These words are not meant to express opposition to a prompt and effective strengthening of our military capabilities relevant to the Middle East." As for the "big stick," he asks, "who could object?" Well, I could, for one. The case for military reductions is no worse than it was five years ago, when it was a lot more respectable and the defense budget was a lot lower; it isn't the Russians who have changed. And the case for arms expansion is no better now, suddenly, than it ever was. There are still only two things weapons can do: rust or explode—and we must pray that they rust.

What are the costs of defending the latest areas of American commitment—Southwest Asia, the Indian Ocean, and the Persian Gulf—against Soviet penetration and interdiction? How do they fit into the larger pattern of American strategic expenditure? And how do we get a "handle" on this relationship? First of all, the defense budget request of the Carter administration for fiscal year 1981 is $159 billion. At least partially "because of" Afghanistan and related challenges, the only debate in sight, with regard to this and future defense budgets, is between the five-percenters and the eight- or ten-percenters. Just an average of these tendencies, on top of a plausible expectation of inflation, gives us 20 percent annual increases—a defense budget of $329 billion by 1985, and over eight hundred billion dollars a year by the end of the decade. We already spend from $25 billion to $35 billion a year to support our interests in the Middle East, as part of the roughly 70 percent of our defense budget that goes, directly or indirectly, to defend other countries.

A strange thing has been happening to me lately, in presenting these kinds of figures—which might be taken as a token of the changing times. I find myself challenged by the hawks to spell out the costs of *non*-intervention—in effect to specify the costs of peace. Now I don't mind the burden of proof, but I don't know why the *unique* burden should be on those who would avoid war, to prove that we won't lose anything or that we can stand the loss of whatever the hawks are urging us to fight for. Presumably the hawks believe that deterrence is perfect so there won't be any costs of war, and that deterrence is free—a sort of "public good"—so the incremental costs of war preparation will be zero. They would take every plausibly threatened country, every possible loss of American interests—trade, investment, strategic position—sum them up, and multiply by a probability of 1.0 (that is, the certainty of total loss if we failed to defend).

To be fair, why shouldn't we throw the costs of war and war preparation into the balance against the costs of what we might lose if we failed to defend and "the worst" happened? On one side, aggressive deterrence—say, the Carter Doctrine, or even more—and the chance of a minor regional war and a major nuclear war besides, plus the constant costs, year in and year out, of additional defense preparations; on the other side, the chance of a Soviet invasion or a Soviet-sponsored coup, followed by the denial of oil and other materials. On both sides, you have monstrously large amounts, in the tens of trillions of dollars, multiplied by rather small percentages of probability. We are comparing, not precise quantities, but orders of magnitude; not absolutely certain costs, but "expected losses"—that is, costs cut by the fractional probability of their occurrence.

Surprisingly, when you do these calculations, the "expected losses" of war and peace are about equal. But what does that prove? Not much. In the last analysis, the costs of defending or abstaining are incommensurate: One way, we edge perceptibly closer to the devastation of nuclear war; the other way we may invite circumstances in the distant future where we live less well—but live. (The casualties of a general nuclear war might be 125 million Americans and the casualties of even a conventional regional war might be 50,000 to 100,000.) With absention, we might be colder and poorer; with intervention we would be a lot warmer—in fact rather toasty—and we'd lose the oil anyway, and much, much more.

Naturally, there are also some important intangibles that attach to the choice of peace or war. If we were to insist on peace even at the cost of appearing to default on our commitments, there would be the defection of some clients from our security protection, the dissolution of alliances, the loss of American control, a "looser" international system. That could be unnerving—if it weren't for the fact that it is happening anyway as surely as the law of entropy. On the other side, the preparation for war will be costly, in private and public welfare foregone, constitutional processes distorted, citizens and their assets mobilized, bodies and minds regimented. Those costs are borne year in and year out, whether this or that intervention is a quagmire or a piece of cake.

Isolationism

One of the bizarre items in the sociology of foreign policy is that so many manifestations of American opinion are labeled "isolationist." But the logic of non-intervention is ill-understood, even by those who are assailed by the defense claque for their pusillanimity. Those "ex-Carter aides," those "closet McGovernites" of the overheated imagination of Evans and Novak, those recent waves of boat people fleeing the newly pugnacious administration, the losers of the Special Olympics of bureaucratic rivalry (the only Olympics *we've* had this year) still speak in carefully hedged codewords, either so shallow or so contradictory as to be inconsequential for hard policy choice or contingent national action. In a typical statement (this one from a press conference on the Carter Doctrine by John J. Gilligan and Paul C. Warnke, as officers of "New Directions," reported in the *Washington Post,* February 20, 1980), they decry the "emotional pursuit of security through military means." They would include "economic, political and diplomatic *as well as military* components." In fact, they approve all manner of military measures—conventional forces, lift, instruments of deterrence—as long as these do not qualify as "massive." They do not deny security threats, only the "oversimplified view of security threats."

What does all this counter-rhetoric entail? Either nothing or anything—and that's just the trouble. It is posturing—or, in the parlance of Madison Avenue, "positioning"—not policy. It is not non-interventionism, let alone "isolationism." Indeed, the trouble with the quasi-non-interventionists, and the source of their inevitable conversion, the reason their arguments wither or freeze or whatever in the plains and hills of an Afghanistan, is not that they are too isolationist, but that *they are not isolationist enough.*

Not so long ago—and perhaps still, in the twilight of liberal policy analysis—one could win points by positing an important distinction, and consequently an essential choice, between the politics of "primacy" and the politics of "world order"—the title, in fact, of Stanley Hoffmann's most recent book. First year law students might call this a distinction without a difference. In fact, the kind of "world order" congenial to the liberal internationalists, the "managed interdependence" cherished by the would-be global architects of Council on Foreign Relations study groups, *depends on* the assertion of American primacy. Indeed, it is virtually synonymous with it, though sometimes attractively disguised by a few "North-South" tassels and a bit of "world's commons" embroidery. Making a common cause out of other people's business not only justifies but promotes intrusive and even aggressive state conduct.

That should bring us to a sense of our real choices at this poignant moment. It is easy to note, and regret, America's defeats and defaults of the past decade. It is harder to see that, in the aftermath of "Afghanistan" (the emblem for the half-dozen or dozen challenges and probes that America has

fielded and fumbled), the comfortable middle options have dropped away. We are left with the classic dilemma of the mature imperial power.

The liberals had better stop calling names, because the only alternative now to the official strategy of resuscitated military interventionism—as the Administration lapses into Cold War II (or into a cold war that really never ended)—is an "isolationist" foreign policy.

Adjustment

The largest question in the desultory, inconclusive public debate we are now having—that "great debate," disguised as often as represented by a succession of surrogate issues—is whether time and situation have outrun the thirty-year American foreign policy paradigm of deterrence and alliance, and whether a new orientation might be demanded. There would have to be an entirely new paradigm—a counter-paradigm—not just another oscillation within the old one.

Actually, a "methodological" issue is at stake here. Using the new paradigm, we would adjust our policies to evolving circumstances and shifting parameters, rather than try to shape those circumstances and move those parameters—or to affect the luxury of avoiding them. We would ask a different kind of question: not whether intervention is justified in terms of American interests (of course it sometimes is, but that is increasingly beside the point). We have to ask whether an object of our intervention is part of the irreducible core of our security. If it is, then I suppose we have "no choice." But if we can live without something—and in most situations, on cool reflection, we can—then we have to evaluate the costs and benefits of intervention, not just in that specific case, but more generally the costs of maintaining in perpetuity the means to execute interventions across a whole spectrum of technology and geography, since challenges will not occur in convenient forms and convenient places. And we had better begin to recognize which situations are which.

When we look at America's situation in this way—in terms of the objectives and constraints—we see that the cost-benefit ratio of attempts at control is tilting: it is costing more to achieve less. And the domestic acceptibility ratio—the costs and sacrifices and risks measured against the extent and probability of foreseen gains—is also tilting, in the opposite direction: the public will not pay as much, even if promised the same results.

The policies and actions of state are the output of our total system, not the imagined or promised responses of a handful of elites that purport to represent that system. Ordinary Americans might make some initial errors in reposing trust in and delegating power to their leaders, but they are constantly evaluating the question of whether the game is worth the candle. Not whether it is worth playing at all, in some absolute sense, but whether it is worth the requisite candle-power. The underlying question about "foreign" policy in our time is, therefore, whether American leaders can count on their own people to generate this candle-power—and not in placid and untested moments, but in critical moments of challenge and stress. That is why accusations of "failure of nerve" and invocations of "will" are so shallow and misleading. "Will" is not something foreign policy players can summon and shape and project, but is the complex of domestic constraints, which are not subject to their control at all. These domestic constraints, in the last analysis, are as "foreign" and inaccessible as the recalcitrant behavior of other countries.

"Peace for our time"

There is no doubt that the non-interventionist cause suffers from a lack of appealing labels. But let's be honest about it: Non-intervention *does* borrow from such antecedents as "isolationism" (if this is understood as disengagement), "Fortress America" (what else?), "America First" (now that was a coalition—from Norman Thomas to Charles Lindbergh), even Neville Chamberlain's "peace for our time" (how much worse is that than Richard Nixon's "generation of peace"?—and Afghanistan, too, is "a far-off country about which we know nothing").

In his celebrated diatribe on appeasement, Norman Podhoretz said: "I have been struck very forcibly by certain resemblances between the United States today and Great Britain in the years after the first world war." He reckoned, in that temporal analogy the hawks use as a benchmark of our own situation, that we had reached "1937." Two years later, if we have really reached "1939," we should re-think World War II, not prepare to fight World War III. You don't have to consider the Russians as cute Koala bears—just imagine Hitler with nukes. Who would fight and who would negotiate? Who would be the villains and who the heroes? The brave and the dead? Who would be ready to put 125 million of his fellow citizens' lives on the line to defend his own "values"?

If we have to find more positive images for non-intervention, maybe we should call it a kind of realism, even national maturity, in an evolving strategic universe. Call it learning to live in the world as it is, not as our leaders fantasize it to be. Call it minding our own business better, and becoming clearer about what that business is, and isn't. Call it a prescription for survival—for ourselves, at least, though perhaps for others, too—for another generation, just one generation at a time.

And if we need more rhetorical support, let it be from our proud and sensible native tradition. It was John Quincy Adams, as Secretary of State (an ardent continental expansionist, incidentally, one of the architects of the present American territorial state) who said, on the Fourth of July, 1821, speaking against intervention to help the Greeks throw off Turkish rule: "America ... goes not abroad in search of monsters to destroy. She is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own."

As President Carter looks out over the world, he sees "turmoil, strife and change." There's nothing wrong with his eyesight, but there is something wrong with his vision. For he assumes (and this is the heart of interventionism) that "the state of our union depends on the state of the world." In a way, of course, that proposition is a truism. But with the world increasingly out of our control, it is time we made it less true. ❑

Earl C. Ravenal, a former official in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, is Professor of International Relations at the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service. He has written frequently for professional and popular journals such as *Inquiry, The Nation, Foreign Policy, Foreign Affairs,* and *The Libertarian Review.* The second (paperback) edition of his book *Never Again: Learning from America's Foreign Policy Failures,* has just been published by Temple University Press. Professor Ravenal is foreign policy advisor to Ed Clark in his Libertarian campaign for the presidency. This article contains passages which have also been printed in the author's article "Doing Nothing" in *Foreign Policy,* Summer 1980.

Doug Bandow

Over the past century, a tide of bureaucratic tyranny has swept over the U.S., depositing an alphabet-soup conglomeration of federal agencies—ICC, FTC, FDA, CAB, EEOC, EPA, OSHA, CPSC—upon the average businessman and citizen.

However, this overregulation of American life, with its estimated $100 billion annual cost in money and inestimable cost in liberty, has sparked an even stronger tide of anger and resentment *against* government, a tide that is threatening now to overwhelm the Federal Trade Commission (FTC).

The FTC, a $60 million agency with some 1,750 employees, was created in 1914; its power has steadily expanded over the years. It is now divided into three bureaus: Consumer Protection (advertising and business practices), Competition (antitrust), and Economics (industry reports).

In 1969, the American Bar Association (ABA) concluded that the FTC should either be reformed or abolished. This and other criticism led to a drastic overhaul of the commission in the early '70s, changing its personnel, redirecting its purpose, and expanding its power.

The commission's activist revival was strengthened by the 1977 appointment of Michael Pertschuk, a former aide to Senator Warren Magnuson, as FTC chairman. Pertschuk pledged to be "bold, innovative, and risk-taking." And it is for risky innovations that the FTC has since invited attack.

Its most dramatic initiative is its proposal to regulate children's advertising, which one industry lobbyist called, with little overstatement, "perhaps the most blatant example ever of unsubstantiated bureaucratic overreaching and misuse of investigative power."

Indeed, it is this rule-making proceeding that has crystallized the opposition to the FTC, since, according to University of Virginia law professor Ernest Gellhorn, this "worst case provides a virtual catalog of the deficiencies often argued to be present in other FTC actions: a confused and confusing program is proposed even though it is inadequately supported and may be beyond the agency's authority or, for that matter, government's responsible role; although the rule is likely to have a profound impact on an industry, that possibility is not seriously evaluated and the proposal is passed with emotion and enthusiasm but with little attention to the basic requirements of fair play."

The FTC staff, in its 346-page report, recommended that all TV ads directed at children under the age of eight be banned; all ads for sugared products directed at children under the age of twelve be banned; and advertisers of highly sugared products be forced to fund health and nutritional messages.

The proposals are unprecedented, since the FTC is not dealing with advertising that can in itself be called deceptive. (The agency once tried to force Canada Dry to change its trade mark, as deceptively implying that its products were made in Canada.) Rather, the alleged problem, for which the advertisers would be held responsible, lies with those who are *receiving* the advertising.

The proposed regulations are built upon the claim that children are not sophisticated enough to understand the selling purpose of the ads. This contention is dubious at best—the evidence suggests that children are quite skeptical about advertisements.

More important, banning ads would trample over freedom of speech, and expressly empower bureaucrats to decide what information people were able to "cope with," and therefore what information they would, and would not, be permitted to receive. Indeed, the regulations would be an open invitation for the government to attempt to be a guardian for anyone else who the bureaucrats believe, because of excessive trust, gullibility, or naiveté, is incapable of making the "right" decisions.

The proposed rules also would interfere with the ability of children to develop, and of parents to guide the child's

RESTRAINING THE REGULATORS

development. Indeed, banning ads would arbitrarily over-"protect" children from the real world, causing other problems.

Moreover, the real receivers of the advertising are the parents—they are the ones who actually buy the toys, decide on the meals, and control the use of the television set. They, and not some officious public intermeddlers, are uniquely qualified to judge the individual needs, desires, and sophistication of their own children, and to respond accordingly.

Banning ads for sugar products is even more ludicrous. Ads, of course, do not cause tooth decay or malnutrition—inadequate dental care and bad eating habits do. If individuals are no longer responsible for eating sugared foods, then presumably they are no longer responsible for eating cholesterol or salt-rich foods, or using risky products, such as motorcycles. Thus, the logical next step would be to suppress virtually every form of commercial expression that encourages anything one of our self-proclaimed guardians thinks is bad for us (and indeed, petitions have already been filed with the FTC to ban advertising of salted foods, ice cream, and hamburgers).

The final proposal, to require sugar-food companies to fund "good nutrition" ads is also unfair, since the companies do not cause nutritional problems and have no responsibility to tell individuals what to eat. Indeed, the principle could as easily be applied to ice cream producers and car manufacturers.

This arrogant elitism—the belief that those annointed by God to protect the rest of us should have the power to mold us into their own image—and its threatening assault on freedom of choice and speech are not confined to children's TV ads, however.

For example, the FTC is nearing the conclusion of its seven-year implementation of industry-wide advertising rules. The proposed rules include requiring drug companies to include in their ads all warnings carried on the product's label; prohibiting advertising saccharin products unless saccharin's alleged health hazards are described; forcing advertisers to use medical terms, like sinusitis, instead of colloquial expressions, like runny nose; regulating discussions of fat and cholesterol; strictly curbing the use of the terms "natural," "organic," and "health food"; and prohibiting advertisements with a nutrient claim unless there is a description of the nutrient composition and value in terms of the U.S. government recommended daily allowances.

However, there has been no evidence of industry-wide deception. Apparently the FTC, by forcing advertisers to say certain things, is attempting to restructure a diverse and competitive field along its own paternalistic lines.

In fact, in reaction to severe criticism, the FTC announced in early April that it was dropping its attempts to force nutrition information into ads, and was reducing its plans to control the use of "health food," "natural," and "organic," and discussions of cholesterol.

But the FTC has not been content simply to make it dangerous to say anything meaningful in advertisements; the FTC deputy director of the Bureau of Consumer Protection, Tracy Westen, acknowledges that he is investigating "the nonverbal, noncognitive, pictorial" messages in commercials. In his view, ads with people smiling, laughing, or playing in the surf could be found to be deceptive if it was determined that they deluded people into thinking the product would make them happier or healthier.

Of course, FTC officials admit that it is difficult to agree on the meaning of a picture. Therefore, they are exploring the use of panels of consumers or media experts to judge the meaning of ads, and the possibility of gaining access to company studies of consumer reactions to the ads. This proposal would expand FTC power even further.



DESIGN PHOTOGRAPHERS

KENT RENO/JEROBOAM

Proposed FTC regulations of "Kid Vid" assume that children are helplessly manipulated by television commercials, and that their parents have no choice but to buy them everything they want.

Up until the revitalization of the commission in the 1970's, the FTC spent much of its resources attacking relatively picayune and frivolous matters. Lowell Mason, a former commissioner who dissented more often than all previous commissioners combined, wrote a book about the abuses of the FTC in 1959: *The Language of Dissent.* Among others, he cited the 1955 case in which the FTC ordered a Japanese sewing machine importer to change its "Made In Japan" label (which had previously been approved by the Bureau of

Customs of the Treasury Department). To insure that consumers were not deceived as to the place of origin, the FTC decided that the letters should be one-sixteenth of an inch larger and a different color.

To so protect the "public interest" the FTC sent seven attorneys to make 79 investigations involving 38 trips to 27 different cities, as well as sending its prosecutor and hearing examiner to three different cities for hearings, and hiring court reporters for each hearing.

The FTC has also angered many groups by attempting to control their business practices. For example, it originally proposed industry-wide rules for the funeral industry, including detailed disclosure and price itemization standards, as well as requirements to give information over the phone and not to disparage cheaper merchandise.

The commission finally dropped these proposals last spring. Chairman Pertschuk later admitted that some FTC staffers had had a "vendetta" against the funeral industry.

Similarly, the FTC has sought to control the business practices of the used-car market. The suggested rules, five years in the making, would require that dealers display information on an automobile's condition and defects, estimated costs of repair, prior ownership and uses, and warranties, if any.

These rules are a reaction to what the FTC estimates are the approximately 10 percent of the consumers who have trouble with used cars, trouble ranging from undisclosed defects to misunderstandings over warranties (and for which there are other legal remedies). Thus, the added cost of inspection and disclosure—estimates of which range from $15 to $30 according to the consumer-oriented Center for Auto Safety, through 3 to 4 percent of the vehicle's cost according to the FTC, to $200 to $600 according to used car dealers—would be involuntarily added to *everyone's* bill.

Moreover, most used car dealers, who depend upon reputation and credibility to build up a clientele, already list defects and offer warranties. It is this pressure, not federal rules that may be circumvented by the dishonest, that best protects consumers. But the FTC's staff report specifically attacked the idea of dealers relying upon reputation, despite its competitive value for consumers.

Finally, the Commission, after five years of preparation, adopted in December 1978 a rule requiring vocational schools to refund tuition to students who drop courses, created a 14-day "cooling-off period" during which the student may receive a full refund, and set specific disclosure requirements. The refund rule, in particular, would have significantly increased the costs to those students who completed their courses.

The Second Circuit Court of Appeals summarily overturned the regulations. Citing numerous "procedural and substantive errors," the Court found that the FTC had failed to comply with the legislation that created it, by not specifically defining abusive acts or practices, by promulgating remedies not rationally related to its goals, and by instituting requirements that were both inaccurate and incomplete.

However, though the so-called consumer protection activities generally draw the greatest public attention, according to one Congressional observer, the FTC's "greatest powers and greatest threat could come from its antitrust side. The FTC now has the authority and the ability to reshape the American economy."

Under Chairman Pertschuk, the FTC is threatening to do just that. In November, 1977, Pertschuk announced his new "competition policy," pledging to make the economic structure consistent with the nation's (meaning his) democratic, political, and social norms, to preserve the "human side" in business, and to consider "social and environmental concerns."

This gibberish is simply an attempt to justify the FTC in destroying consumer choice and restructuring the economy as it sees fit. Thus, even if a company is satisfying consumer demand by providing superior products at lower prices, the FTC may impose some arbitrary, and less satisfying, alternative.

Unfortunately, this threat is very real. For example, the FTC is now considering issuing a rule barring oil company ownership of some classes of oil pipelines. As bad as the proposed rule is, the more significant issue is the FTC's unprecedented attempt to issue rules in the antitrust field. Such authority, to control industry-wide prices and economic structure, involves awesome economic power.

Indeed, the FTC has been a strong supporter of a "no-fault" antitrust law, which would punish "good," as well as "bad," companies. This, too, would greatly expand the commission's power to remold the economy.

Even without these tools, the FTC frequently has attempted to punish a company for being too successful. For example, the FTC believes that some company trademarks become so successful that they inhibit competition, and therefore should be divested from the company. Thus, the FTC is seeking to revoke American Cynamid Corporation's "Formica" trademark, arguing that is has become a synonym for plastic laminate (however, Formica now supplies only 40 percent of the market, down from its original 100 percent).

This case follows the Borden ReaLemon case, in which the FTC decided that the trademark exercised a "magnetic pull on the consumer," thereby giving Borden an unfair advantage. (The theory is that the trademark allowed Borden to charge a little more than its competitors, thus allowing it to drastically cut prices, thereby pushing their prices below cost; since Borden was under no "compulsion" to respond to its competition, it had illegally maintained its monopoly. So goes antitrust logic!) This "magnetic pull" actually comes from the fact that trademarks embody the company's reputation for quality, providing valuable information to consumers. Arbitrarily divesting trademarks, besides violating property rights, will lessen the incentive of companies to develop identifiable quality reputations.

The FTC has also pursued, since 1972, a unique antitrust attack on the three major cereal companies—Kellogg Co., General Foods, and General Mills—that account for 82 percent of the cereal sold. The FTC is seeking either to break them up or to license their major brand names to competitors. These companies were chosen for political reasons—former FTC staffer Charles E. Mueller has admitted, "I didn't pick the auto or petroleum industry because they have too much political clout. The cereal industry didn't have the political muscle to muddy the water."

There is no evidence of company misconduct; the FTC is simply claiming that the companies maintain a "shared monopoly" through product proliferation (providing consumers with more choices) and advertising (providing consumers with more information). Thus, the companies are to be punished for being *too successful.* They have satisfied the demands of a diverse population for many goods at low cost, but the FTC has decided that more companies, though perhaps with fewer products at a higher cost, is what Americans really need, and therefore will have.

A similar case has been filed against Du Pont Co., which provides 42 percent of the titanium-dioxide paint pigment, for being a monopoly. The FTC wants to hold the company culpable because it *expanded production at a low price* to meet consumer demand, thereby maintaining its market share (somehow, consumers should prefer fewer goods at higher prices).

Finally, Pertschuk has talked of resuscitating the Robinson-Patman Act, which has lain dormant over the past decade. Termed "horrendous" by Gellhorn, this statute basically prevents "price discrimination," that is, selling similar goods for different prices to different customers. Since this Act actually contradicts the Sherman Antitrust Act, no one can do business at all without violating one law or the other. This makes *all* businessmen into lawbreakers, and which ones the FTC wishes to prosecute can therefore be selected by arbitrary standards.

The FTC has also consistently conducted media trials of businesses. Chicago economist Yale Brozen notes, "The FTC has come up with the technique of unilaterally deciding what is deceptive, conducting a trial by press release, and demanding that the advertisers run ads admitting the deception. The burden of proving innocence is left to the advertiser, if he can survive the trial by ... accusation and publicity—a complete turnabout from our judicial system, in which an accused is regarded as innocent until proven guilty."

Not infrequently, the FTC is found to be wrong; however, the publicity war can be devastating. In the summer of 1978, the FTC released a disputed evaluation of whole-life insurance, which greatly affected some companies' sales. Insurance companies found it hard to present their side of the controversy.

And among the most abused practices has been the FTC's information requests, some of which even the FTC admits were both costly and vague. According to the *Wall Street Journal*, "[t]he Commission's famous 'fishing expeditions' ... [depart] freely from the legal principal that subpoenas should state clearly what law violation has allegedly occurred. The agency has had a great appetite for the private files of the private sector in its search for litigation and publicity."

Finally, the FTC spends hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars to fund an intervener program, under which representatives of the "public interest" (primarily those who agree with the commission) are paid to testify before it. For example, the FTC paid $336,000 to witnesses who favored restricting children's advertising.

These and other abuses have created an army of adversaries intent upon controlling the commission. Judicial scrutiny is being increased; Gellhorn notes that "surprising numbers" of the FTC's actions are being reversed on appeal, and "judicial confidence in commission processes is at a low ebb." One example of this heightened scrutiny is District Court Judge Gerhard A. Gesell's decision barring Pertschuk from further regulation of children's advertising because of his predetermined position. Though overturned on appeal, the higher court did uphold review for such bias.



However, the most significant attack on the FTC has occurred in Congress, where the FTC's disparate opponents have coalesced to create tremendous pressure for restricting the FTC. In fact, the FTC has been getting along on only interim funding for two years, because of continuous, though then unsuccessful, attempts to regulate it.

The funding bill adopted late this spring imposes a variety of controls, which fall into two categories. The first consists of an amalgam of a dozen specific restrictions, such as halting rule-making proceedings on children's advertising and the auto industry, stripping the FTC of authority to cancel a trademark or take antitrust action against agricultural co-ops, and restricting the FTC's use of the subpoena. The second allows a congressional veto of any FTC rule or industry-wide decision.

These restrictive measures have won support even within the liberal, consumer-oriented, community—from Sentaor George McGovern, for example—and they present an important opportunity to rethink the entire concept of a "national nanny."

Private codes of conduct can, and do, protect consumers. For example, the Television Code of the National Association of Broadcasters regulates—voluntarily—the conduct of broadcasters. Indeed, the industry itself has reacted to the pressure from the anti-children's advertising groups by prohibiting host-selling (where the star plugs the product), cutting the volume of children's advertising, and controlling the advertisement of vitamins, toys, and certain foods.

But the greatest protection for the consumer comes from competition, with the incentive to expose any fraudulent and inaccurate claims of competitors. Former FTC commissioner Lowell Mason reflected on his experience with complaints of false advertising: "For the most part, the government wins because competition fights its battle for it. The greatest protection against false claims is the rivalry among merchants for the consumer's dollar."

Of note is a 1973 survey by the Marketing Sciences Institute, which found that 64 percent of the public preferred private solutions (consumer activities, consumers individually, and business) compared to 19 percent who preferred government solutions, when asked which group should be primarily responsible for getting consumers a fair deal. In fact, consumer activists and government consumer affairs personnel also prefer private solutions, by margins of 62 percent to 27 percent and 50 percent to 35 percent, respectively.

The FTC has become a force unto itself—lawmaker, prosecutor, jury, judge, and parole officer—busily substituting the personal whims of its officials for the decisions of consumers. Indeed, what these officials seem to detest most is individualism, diversity, and a competitive system that allows people to succeed. It is time to consider abolishing this run-away bureaucracy. Its attempts to control our lives make it a greater menace than anything which it purports to protect us from. ❑

Doug Bandow is a Contributing Editor of *LR*.

BOOKS AND ARTS



M. DOWDALL

Free to heal

LEE M. SHULMAN
& JOYCE SHULMAN

Anatomy of an Illness as Perceived by the Patient, *by Norman Cousins. W.W. Norton & Company, 173 pp., $9.95.*

THIS BOOK DESERVES A place not only in every library and home, but on every hospital nightstand as well. If you have a friend who is sick, don't bring flowers — bring a copy of this book. And bring it to your healthy friends as well, for it is the kind of reading you will want to share with everyone who cares about his or her life, including any doctor you may know. *Anatomy of an Illness* is one of the most important medical books ever written, and the astonishing thing is that it was written by a *patient.*

Norman Cousins, an international figure associated for most of his professional life with *The Saturday Review,* was told in 1964 that he was suffering from a severe collagen illness, a disease of the connective tissue of the body. Collagen is a fibrous substance which binds cells together. All arthritic and rheumatic diseases are collagen illnesses. Cousins's physician, Dr. William Hitzig, called in several specialists and experts, who confirmed his opinion and added that Cousins was suffering from ankylosing spondylitis, which would lead to the ultimate disintegration of the connective tissue of his spine. One of the doctors told Cousins he had "one chance in five hundred," and that he (the doctor) had never personally witnessed a recovery from this condition.

But Cousins recovered — with a little help from himself.

Anatomy of an Illness is the story of that recovery, and a tribute to the partnership of a doctor and a patient who were wise enough to combine traditional medicine with the holistic health principle. It has become far too easy in our modern world to hand ourselves over to the medical profession when we become

ill, saying, in effect, "Here I am, doc, fix me up." Cousins demonstrates the importance of the patient's assuming responsibility for himself, for his health, for his life. We all know we can make ourselves sick. Stress, tension, worry, problems of relationships and finances are but a few common causes of true physiological damage — problems of the mind which lead to physical impairment. If our minds are so strong as to cause physical damage, can the converse be true? Can we help heal ourselves? Cousins asked himself—and his doctor—that question and the answer was yes.

Cousins rejected much of the toxic medication being pumped into his body, he consciously fought depression, he began taking large doses of ascorbic acid (Vitamin C), he gave himself even larger doses of laughter (watching reruns of "Candid Camera" and old Marx Brothers films), he moved out of the hospital (so he could get some rest in an environment conducive to positive thinking and healing), and he relied on his marvelous will to live. It all worked.

"Seldom had I known such elation," he writes. Every ten minutes of laughter gave him two hours of pain-free sleep. The ascorbic acid and laughter lowered his sedimentation rate considerably. Without aspirin and other drugs invading his system, his body's own healing properties were allowed to function. He began to move again. His pain lessened. He regained his spirits and his energy. He went back to his job. Today, sixteen years later, he is radiant, vivacious, travels widely and plays a powerful game of tennis. He is in the best of health.

And he has caused a stir—a long-overdue one—in our approach to perceiving illness and recovery. In *Anatomy of an Illness,* he shows the world the power the body has to heal itself. He celebrates the greatness of man. He points out that we all have strong immune systems and that if we don't overstress and overmedicate our bodies, those immune systems will have a chance to work. Cousins explains that "scientific research has established the existence of endorphins in the human brain — a substance very much like morphine in its molecular structure and effects. It is the body's own anesthesia and a relaxant and helps human beings to sustain pain." He makes clear that the human mind has a role to play in the control of pain, just as it has a key role to play in combating illness.

"Norman Cousins shows the world the power the body has to heal itself. He celebrates the greatness of man."

His emphasis on the awesome power of the mind is compelling and inspirational. And nowhere in the book is that power so clearly and excitedly demonstrated as in his chapter on placebos, the finest treatment of the subject yet written.

"The placebo," he states, "is not so much a pill as a process. The process begins with the patient's confidence in the doctor and extends through to the full functioning of his own immunological and healing system. The process works not because of any magic in the tablet but because the human body is its own best apothecary and because the most successful prescriptions are those filled by the body itself." He informs us that enough evidence already exists to indicate placebos can be as potent and sometimes even *more* potent than the active drugs they replace, which proves the mind is "intimately and powerfully linked with the body."

His discussion of the placebo leads to his underlining of the importance of the laying on of hands, a vanishing part of modern medicine. He understands how important the element of compassion is to a patient, and the expectations a doctor gives the person he or she is treating. He also reminds us of the trust we place in those hands, and warns us to be cautious to the extent that we treat the physician not as God, but as a co-worker in this fight to get back to health. If we trust our physicians, we must remember to always trust our own healing powers as well.

Illness of any type is depressing, and Cousins makes clear how vitally important it is to fight that gloom with all we have. (His story of helping a woman in Atlanta overcome just such feelings is particularly encouraging.) The body's own healing capacity can be put into action only if we release the gears; in other words, to move toward health again, we must fight to look toward the sunshine. Prognosis for good health and cure depends to a great extent on the patient, and we must use all our resources to wage battle against the illness which is doing us harm.

Joy and pleasure, Cousins stresses, even just a smile, are important as part of the healing process. "It was easy enough to hope and love and have faith, but what about laughter?" He stresses that laughter is important to attitude. The patient must pursue it actively, consciously deciding that this is something he must do, not remaining passive and waiting for something funny to come along. After all, how many laughs does one get in a sick room? And hospitals are not known for providing chuckles, so he tells us to reach out and grab things that will help. "Nothing is less funny than being flat on your back with all the bones in your spine and joints hurting." In getting better, Cousins thought, "How scientific was it to believe that laughter—as well as the positive emotions in general—was affecting my body chemistry for the better? If laughter did in fact have a salutary effect on the body's chemistry, it seemed at least theoretically likely that it would enhance the system's ability to fight the inflammation." The drop in the sedimentation rate was more than encouraging, bringing Cousins to comment, "I was greatly elated by the discovery that there is a physiological basis for the ancient theory that laughter is good medicine."

(Recently, John Diamond, M.D., Head of the Institute for Behavioral Kinesiology in New York, discovered that when we laugh, the uvula vibrates and it stimulates the thymus gland, secreting the hormone which is a major part of the body's immunological surveillance system and raising the level of life energy. Laughter, does, in fact, produce a physiological response which aids in healing ourselves. Cousins's theory was prophetic.)

We are becoming very sophisticated about nutrition these days, knowing and caring more about foods which fuel our bodies. We are learning what is toxic and what is beneficial. But Cousins stresses the importance of monitoring what we are feeding our minds as well. It is astonishing the way we poison our bodies with self-deprecation and negativism. Too frequently we tend to say, "I am helpless, I'm sick, I'm hopeless," rather than, "I *will* get well, I *must* be healthy again." This

book urges us to become more sensitive to toxification of both body and mind, for there is an interaction between medicine and the human brain that is undeniable.

Cousins was blessed, it seems, with a doctor who understood and respected his patient and was willing not only to work with him, but to support him in his quest toward meshing the holistic approach with traditional medical techniques. Would that we could all be so lucky. The medical profession is by nature very conservative and cautious and extremely wary of the holistic movement. But this book, critical of medicine in many ways, invites doctors to join in the holistic approach rather than blaming them for opposing it in the past. Cousins is clear about wanting to function within the system; he says traditional medicine is a valuable and honored profession, but it is time for an expansion of the direction medicine is now taking. Three thousand letters from physicians which reached Cousins after the publication of the original version of *Anatomy of an Illness* (an article in the *New England Journal of Medicine*) reflected the view that one of the main functions of the doctor is to engage to the fullest the patient's own ability to motivate the forces of mind and body in turning back disease. "The new trend favors an understanding of the powerful recuperative and regenerative forces possessed by the human body under conditions of proper nourishment and reasonable freedom from stress."

But does the medical profession in general embrace this view? Not nearly enough. Cousins's book may help to change that. One of the beauties of the work is that a man who is recognized in the world community as an intellect is describing a very personal experience which has great significance and impact not only for the population as a whole, but specifically for the medical establishment. Because of his standing, he is now able to talk to doctors and give credence and respectability to the holistic movement. And he is having an impact. He teaches at the UCLA School of Medicine and doctors are constantly expressing their interest and support. In the book he quotes Dr. Gerold Looney of the Medical College of the University of Southern California, who wrote to him, "Nothing is more out of date than the notion that doctors can't learn from their patients."

And in case you have not been blessed with a doctor as supportive and open to new thoughts as Cousins's physician was, his book is a manual for patients wanting to know how to approach their doctors with concern for their own bodies. Cousins makes us see we have a right—indeed, an obligation — to participate in the decision-making process. "It's my body and I own it and I want to be in charge!" should be our battle cry. We each must take that demand to our physicians, and begin to participate with them in a non-hostile, non-threatening way, as a full partner.

All along, Cousins is careful to remind us that this is what worked for *him*. He makes no guarantees it will work for others. But he sets quite an example. "Not every illness can be overcome," he writes. "But many people allow illness to disfigure their lives more than it should."

Does it work for others, or is Cousins an isolated case which will remain merely inspirational?

We can answer with evidence from our private lives. We have a friend who has been battling pancreatitis for most of his 34 years — and winning. Not expected to live after difficult surgery six years ago, he, too, is playing tennis today. His surgeon has stated emphatically that the operation was the most trying and dangerous he'd ever performed but that his work in that operating room was only fifty percent of the total result. The young man's will to live and strong desire to heal himself did the rest. When it seemed clear that the young man was going to pull through, the prognosis for his future was termed "extremely guarded." But the patient simply did not want to be an invalid, could stand living as a sick person no longer, and today he is healthier than he has been at any other time in his life.

"The doctor's main function is to engage to the fullest the patient's own ability to motivate the forces of mind and body."

Even closer to home, the co-author of this review was faced with a trying situation just six months ago. During her visit to a well-known nutritionist who is also a physician of repute, the doctor discovered a lump in her breast. A mammogram indicated that "malignancy cannot be excluded." Several surgeons were consulted and the opinion was unanimous: surgery and a biopsy must be performed at once. The lump was not fibrocystic; it was not going to go away. And if it proved malignant, a modified radical mastectomy would be necessary. Refusing to submit to surgery before she gave herself a chance in the healing process and drawing upon her training with Carl Simonton and others working in cancer research, the patient began a determined effort to use the mind rather than the scalpel. Laughter, the modification of stress, meditation and visualization, massive doses of Vitamin C and a nutritious diet, plus a great deal of love and positive thinking, diminished the lump within ten days, and made it disappear completely within thirty — to the utter astonishment of all the doctors involved.

As Cousins states, "Undeniable evidence has emerged that the human mind can be trained to play an important part both in preventing disease and overcoming it when it occurs. The biofeedback movement, which has found that people can control their blood pressure, stop headaches, etc., simply by using the mind, is only one aspect of the research presently being done on this subject."

Anatomy of an Illness is bringing this evidence to a wide audience. CBS is producing a special based on the book, to be shown in the Fall; and, as we go to press, Bantam Books is publishing the paperback edition. Norman Cousins demonstrates that maintaining our own autonomy and integrity, valuing our independence and individuality as human beings (especially in hospitals, where we tend to become numbers, a phenomenon of which he is most critical), and assuming responsibility for ourselves is essential in maintaining our health. He is a prime example of never abdicating responsibility for one's own life. Though he may not have realized it when writing it, the book is a shining example of these libertarian principles at work.

Lee M. Shulman, Ph.D, and Joyce Shulman, Ph.D, are psychologists in private practice in Beverly Hills, where they head the Institute for Personal Development.

Bringing in the sheep

DAVID BOAZ

The Fleecing of America, *by Senator William Proxmire. Houghton Mifflin Company, 222 pp., $10.95.*
Fat City: How Washington Wastes Your Taxes, *by Donald Lambro. Regnery/Gateway, 405 pp., $12.95.*



IN 1978, HOUSING AND Urban Development Secretary Patricia Harris had new glass doors installed at the end of the corridor leading to her office because the existing door didn't fit the "image" of a Cabinet Secretary. The cost was about $60,000. Gold leaf lettering was added for another $1,000.

Extravagance is no monopoly of HUD, however. The National Institute of Mental Health recently spent $97,000 for a study of "The Peruvian Brothel, A Sexual Dispensary and Social Arena." And the Department of Health, Education and Welfare spent thousands of dollars to bring 142 consultants and bureaucrats to a luxurious resort in the Pacific Northwest, which had once been the estate of a wealthy shipping magnate, to discuss the problems of the poor—none of whom attended.

Horror stories like this abound in these two books about government spending. Sen. William Proxmire (D–WI), of course, is well known for his "Golden Fleece" award highlighting particularly outrageous spending projects, from National Science Foundation grants to the palatial new Senate Office Building (latest cost estimate: $241 million). Donald Lambro is a reporter for United Press International permanently assigned to uncover federal waste and mismanagement.

Each book will provide a lot of useful ammunition for the libertarian seeking to illustrate the problems of big government. Lambro's book is the more thorough and substantive, while Proxmire's is lighter and more enjoyable to read.

Besides the rather insignificant horror stories about worthless studies and lavish conferences, Lambro does have some substantial criticisms of government programs. More than half his book is devoted to a listing of "100 Nonessential Federal Programs," ranging from personal chefs for Cabinet secretaries to government filmmaking ($500 million a year) to the Council on Wage and Price Stability and the Department of Education. The programs listed add up to a total expenditure of about $36 billion, a substantial if not overwhelming budget cut. In the text of the book, however, Lambro estimates that "at least $100 billion too much goes to Washington in federal taxes." Interestingly, only about $1 billion of Lambro's $36 billion comes from the defense budget, and none of that is for program expenses.

Proxmire's book has some sections of value besides his recounting of past "Golden Fleeces." He has chapters on the fights against the SST and bailouts for New York City and Chrysler. He has several excellent criticisms of businesses that lobby for particular spending programs while proclaiming their support for reduced spending.

But ultimately neither of these books is really satisfying. Proxmire and Lambro both decry "waste" in government, but it doesn't seem to have occurred to them that waste is inherent in government. Any non-market institution, which gets its funds by confiscation instead of voluntary exchange, has no standard by which to judge waste or efficiency. One man's waste is another man's necessary expenditure, as long as both accept the proposition that government should confiscate some portion of our wealth to spend it in ways its owners would not have chosen.

Proxmire even tells us how some conscientious bureaucrats are "*measuring* productivity, just as businessmen do in the private sector." He reports that the productivity of 45 government agencies has increased at 2 percent a year. This is an absolutely nonsensical statistic, purporting to measure a meaningless concept. Government produces nothing; it only consumes, redistributes, and destroys the wealth produced by others. Would "increased productivity" mean that the Occupational Safety and Health Administration harassed and fined more businesses this year? That the Drug Enforcement Administration put more marijuana smokers in jail? That the State

Department interfered in more foreign quarrels? Or that the Army dropped more bombs on more people using fewer personnel? Yet all these activities add to our GNP, according to conventional definitions. What we should realize is that for any institution operating outside of and alien to the market, "productivity" is a purely mythical and a completely misleading concept.

Lest the reader think there's nothing good about the government, Proxmire is prepared to offer a long list of government programs which he supports: Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, the bulk of our military expenditures, environmental protection, consumer protection, the Department of Agriculture, unemployment compensation, the Smithsonian, the National Science Foundation, the Veterans Administration, and so on. One has to flip back to earlier pages to be reminded of what programs the Senator *doesn't* support. Lambro doesn't offer a laundry list of "good" programs, but he does mention a couple he likes: these include "many" Department of Agriculture functions, as well as a National Science Foundation study on how to get red food color from beets, "one example of useful, goal-oriented research worthy of the taxpayer's support." (Then why not let taxpayers voluntarily support it?) If this is what he considers useful, we can only assume that he would include most of the federal budget.

"Both Proxmire and Lambro decry government waste, but it never occurs to them that waste is *inherent* in government."

One of the problems with both of these books is that, like most Establishment figures, Proxmire and Lambro seem to consider the government an institution basically like other institutions —bigger than most, "democratic," unique in many ways, but still much like a big business or non-profit organization. Lambro, for instance, frets that the government doesn't collect many of the debts owed to it under the student loan, Social Security, and Veterans Administration programs. And, he says, the government doesn't charge any interest when oil and gas companies are late in paying their royalties for the "right" to drill on land the government holds.

These would indeed be signs of serious mismanagement in a corporation or other private organization. But the state is *not* a private organization; it is a criminal institution, getting its funds by theft and existing only as a means by which some people exploit others. Every dollar kept out of its clutches, by whatever means, is one more dollar used productively in the private sector — and one less dollar used to arrest pot-smokers, harass businesses, make war, or pay off special interests. Contracts with criminals are not valid, so those who have borrowed money from the government are under no moral obligation to pay it back. Better they should keep the money than contribute to the nefarious activities of the state. And since all government land is held illegitimately, the government has no right to collect any royalties from those who use such land. So, from a libertarian point of view, the oil and gas companies are hardly at fault for being slow with their payments. As a conservative, Lambro misses this basic point about the nature of the state.

Proxmire makes the same mistake, even more egregiously. Much of his book concerns "tax expenditures," a euphemism meaning the money *not* taxed away by government. This brilliant phrase, whose inventor has surely received the Order of Maximum Service to the State, is designed to equate government spending with not taxing. Proxmire refers, for instance, to the "home ownership tax expenditure" — that is, when government refrains from taxing people on the money they spend on home mortgage interest, it is in effect "spending" money on them. By this standard, all the money not taxed away should be regarded as an expenditure. Thus, someone who earns $15,000 a year and pays a federal income tax of $1500 is receiving a government "expenditure" of $13,500. This hideous concept apparently is based on the position that all income received by Americans is the property of the government until it decides to "spend" it by letting us keep it.

Despite these serious flaws, these books are useful. They will encourage people to be skeptical of the claims by statists that the budget cannot be cut. And perhaps they will call into question the very notion that free people should be forced to pay each other's bills—even for expenditures we value. They will also be helpful to the libertarian who wants some quick examples of unnecessary government spending for his debates with friends or the media. Read carefully, they will be an important part of the libertarian's current-affairs bookshelf.

David Boaz, a free-lance writer in Washington, D.C., is currently on the staff of the Clark for President Committee.

Night of June 23rd

JOAN KENNEDY TAYLOR

The Watcher, *by Kay Nolte Smith. Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, 327 pp., $10.95.*

A YOUNG INVESTIGATIVE reporter, Astrid Cain, has taken a job as secretary to the Director of the Institute for the Study of Cultural and Ethical Values, who is also an influential advisor to the favored candidate for President of the United States. During a violent quarrel between them on the night of June 23rd, he falls to his death from the balcony of his house. Did she push him? Will the police think she pushed him? Why is she acting so as to invite their suspicion? Why does she hate the dead man, Martin Granger, a highly respected humanitarian and advocate of The New Equality? (Admirers of the works of Ayn Rand will be able to figure *that* one out in less than three guesses.)

Most of all, who is the Watcher of the title? Is it Astrid Cain herself, as she tries to unravel the motives behind Granger's bewildering advice to his followers, who include Astrid's own husband? Is it Astrid's former lover, Paul Damon, the homicide detective who has tried to use his work to insulate himself from life—until he is assigned to Astrid's case? Is it one of the others whose lives were involved with Martin Granger's—his glamorous widow, his obese cook, his politician crony, the boy whom he persuaded to give up sculpture for a life of social service?

Experienced mystery story readers get so that they can predict "whodunit"—often they rate mysteries by how far into the book they get without guessing. I got all

the way, in *The Watcher;* I didn't unravel the central relationship until the characters did, which was, I am happy to say, in the middle of a big courtroom scene. But I shouldn't say more, lest I run the risk of spoiling it for potential readers. Suffice it to say that, for me, the story of *The Watcher* has a turnaround that works. I didn't expect it, but immediately saw that I should have; the author plays fair.

Former subscribers to Ayn Rand's magazine, *The Objectivist,* will remember Kay Nolte Smith as the author of several reviews of contemporary theater published in that publication between 1968 and 1971. So it's perhaps not surprising that this novel is very like a play. It is divided into three sections of approximately equal length; Act I is called "Image"; Act II, "Blindfold"; Act III, "Sight." The readers are moved from scene to scene (some of them flashbacks); we learn little of the characters' thoughts. As Aristotle suggested it should be in his definition of drama, the story is told "in the form of action, not of narrative."

When I was a student in drama school years ago, I was taught to prepare a part by looking at every scene I was in with one question: "What's my action?" The term *action* was not to be understood as meaning physical movement; rather, it referred to what the character was actively seeking to gain by everything she did in this scene. Was she trying to keep from showing that she was frightened? Was she trying to persuade someone to lend her money? Was she communicating love and understanding? Was she trying to impress? When an actor approaches a part in this way, it can give a sense of purpose to an entire performance. Ms. Smith, who is also the actress Kay Gillian, seems to have approached the characters in her book this way, and as a consequence, the events seem to come out of the characters' purposes, or out of clashes between their purposes.

Smith has clearly been influenced, both stylistically and philosophically, by Ayn Rand. Some readers will love this fact and some will find it a drawback, depending in part, I suspect, on how familiar or unfamiliar they are with some of the values expressed, and in part on whether they find characters who are preoccupied with verbally analyzing their ambitions and self-worth to be fascinating or unrealistic.

In other words, Smith has embarked on a dangerous and difficult course in attempting to embody Rand's theories of romantic realism in a mystery story. Admirers of Rand may find Astrid's love of classical music and the works of Victor Hugo and Edmond Rostand too predictable, and may feel it a drawback that the book does not attempt to be more "significant." And of course, those readers who find the whole romantic emphasis on values and self-determination implausible will find Smith's characters implausible, too.

But although Smith has done many things with her characters and story that Rand would have done, she has done other things that Rand would *not* have done —she is her own writer, and I predict that in subsequent books, that will become more and more apparent.

Under the influence of literary critics, many people who love to read novels develop a critical double standard; "good" books are the books that they can place in a literary tradition; the books that they actually find themselves devouring as fast as they can read them are "trash." How many times have you asked someone about the book he or she is reading and been told, "Oh, it's *just* a mystery," or a gothic, or a science fiction novel. These genre books are the novels that publishers can afford to publish today, knowing that they have an audience and will sell.

Some of them sell because they can coast along on the coattails of the genre, of course; the devotee will buy them because at least they will have something to recommend them: an interesting setting, atmosphere, characters with unusual occupations. But what sets the best of such books apart is an emphasis on the importance of story—the sequence of actions, taken by characters who interest you and whose fate you care about, leading to a discovery by the characters. Sometimes the characters discover something the reader already knows, and the suspense comes from not being sure *how* it is going to happen; but I have always preferred the story in which I, the reader, am genuinely surprised. This is the category into which *The Watcher* falls.

Although the mystery genre is a popular one, this does not mean that it is a trivial feat to have done as workmanlike a job as Kay Nolte Smith has done. When Barbara Walters interviewed Lawrence Olivier on a television special that was aired June 17, she asked him how he would like to be remembered, and he answered, as an "expert workman." She protested that that sounded prosaic. Not at all, answered Lord Olivier, there is nothing better to be. Poets are workmen. Shakespeare was an expert workman. "Even God, I think," he finished quietly, "is an expert workman."

Smith is neither Shakespeare nor God (nor Rand), but she has made an auspicious and workmanlike debut with this novel.

Kay Nolte Smith

COURTESY COWARD, MCCANN & GEOGHEGAN

Joan Kennedy Taylor is the Senior Editor of *LR.*

Song that's driving teachers up the wall

WILLIAM SIEVERT

"The Wall," *by Pink Floyd. Columbia Records, $15.98.*



We don't need no education
We don't need no thought control
No dark sarcasm in the classroom
Teacher, leave those kids alone.

—From the song "Another Brick in the Wall"

THE BRITISH BAND PINK Floyd's song "Another Brick in the Wall" has been banned in South Africa, ignored by some radio stations in the United States and attacked by schoolteachers all over the globe. Yet the song has become the world's most popular rock record of 1980.

"Another Brick in the Wall," sung as an eerie chant by a children's chorus that backs up the band, is the centerpiece of a gloomy concept album, "The Wall," in which Pink Floyd lyricist Roger Waters charges that Western society uses its schools and other public institutions to build an impenetrable wall of destructive social conditioning around the individual.

While the song is not the first example of the anti-education theme in popular music, it comes at a time when increasing numbers of students are questioning the value of their education. Thus, young people are responding to the song with uncommon—and unsettling—enthusiasm.

In May, the South African government banned the song—and the album—because "Another Brick" had become the anthem of a national strike of more than 10,000 colored (mixed) students and their white supporters.

The students had been protesting the inequality of spending on education for the various races, as well as "intimidation" by teachers, whose authority the Pink Floyd song challenges.

The government ban forbids radio stations to play the record, stores to sell it, and individuals to own it.

In the United States, educators in several states have tried—with some success—to have the song removed from the play lists of radio stations. Says Hope Antman of Columbia Records in New York: "The radio resistance has been surprisingly strong. Stations started getting angry calls and letters from teachers and principals and school boards claiming that 'Another Brick in the Wall' was creating a crisis in their classrooms."

In the San Francisco Bay Area, the record "is still very hot," said KSAN's Pierra Robert, a programming assistant, who said it was being played on "everything from rock stations to disco stations."

"We Don't Need No Education" graffiti has appeared on tunnel walls in the Sunset District of San Francisco, and its refrain has echoed through the lunch hours at private, Jesuit-run schools in the city.

Elsewhere, at least a dozen rock stations in major cities either stopped playing the record or refused to add it to their play lists. The resistance was even stronger in smaller towns, Antman says. One teacher in Chicago went so far as to cut his own record as a rebuttal to Pink Floyd, changing the lyrics to "We ALL need an education."

The rebuttal was an instant flop, while Pink Floyd's attack on schools has dominated the sales charts for months. According to the entertainment industry's trade paper, *Variety,* the Album was No. 1 in sales for twenty consecutive weeks last winter and spring, and "Another Brick" topped the singles charts for six weeks. Both have remained entrenched in the top five from February to June, although "Another Brick" never made the top five on *Variety's* list of the most-played records on radio.

Album sales have passed three million worldwide, with the single not far behind.

"That's an unprecedented accomplishment for a record that has received so little radio exposure," says Antman.

Teenagers, of course, have always had a distaste for school, and their defiant spirit has frequently been captured in the lyrics of rock 'n' roll songs. In the mid-1970s, Alice Cooper's "School's Out (Forever)" topped the charts; in the 1960s, it was Gary U.S. Bond's "School's Out (At Last)." Anti-education sentiment in rock dates to the very earliest days of the music, when Chuck Berry frequently contrasted the frustration of the classroom with the satisfaction of fast cars and music.

So why has "Another Brick" produced such an outcry? For one thing, it is far angrier in tone and content than its anti-school predecessors.

As *Rolling Stone* magazine's Kurt Loder put it in re-

viewing the record, Roger Waters is contending that "in government-run schools, children are methodically tormented and humiliated by teachers whose comeuppance occurs when they go home at night and 'their fat and psychopathic wives would thrash them within inches of their lives.'" This is very strong stuff, and hardly the hallmark of a hit album.

Teachers found such vehemence especially troubling. "Many educators, particularly in the urban areas, were not only angered by the song's attack on their profession, but were afraid it would lead to a wave of student protests this past spring," says an official of the National Education Association, who asked that his name not be used.

"Teachers were worried because their students were singing it in the corridors and quoting it in the classroom, and they felt a need to make some kind of response. The song has not led to any significant protests—at least in this country—because the current generation of high schoolers doesn't much believe in protesting. From the statistics we're seeing, they're more likely to drop out than to demand reforms when they feel they have been wronged in school."

According to Education Department figures, about one million teenagers of high-school age have quit school, leaving the average graduating class this spring with 25 percent fewer members than it had at the outset.

Interviews with numerous high school students indicate that the Pink Floyd song has struck a chord of anger and frustration with which many students strongly identify.

Says Mark Jenkins of Alexandria, Virginia: "Pink Floyd is talking to me in that song."

Pacific News Service

William Sievert is a former editor of the *Chronicle of Higher Education Arts* magazine.

On View

Only make-believe

DAVID BRUDNOY

MORE THAN ANY OTHER art form, movies respond to popular fantasy. Radio has long since become the forum for talk shows and music, television the medium of pseudo-realism, of the gingerly leap beyond normal life into sit-com asininity. But the movies still carry people into the loopiest regions of imagination. Only make-believe, I love you—the lyrics sound dippy in our sophisticated age, but the sentiment rides high on the silver screen. The summer glut of movies is just now behind us but its residue lingers on, and even in the deluge of trash of the early summer films some intriguing bits and pieces came to light.

Xanadu

My fondest movie memory of Gene Kelly is of a lithe young man dancing with a mouse; that of my closest lady friend is of Gene singin' in the rain. We would both have been better off never having heard of a repugnant, treacly thing called *Xanadu,* but in this business there's no escaping big budget films, like those starring that shapely bundle of perky blonde wholesomeness, Olivia Newton-John, whose name is apparently not *intended* to remind one of a laxative diet and its inevitable aftermath. Miss Newton-John appeared with John Travolta in *Grease,* the third most financially successful movie of all time, at least until we get the final score on *The Empire Strikes Back,* which will likely push *Grease* to number four. In any case, Miss Newton-John is highly "bankable," as they say in the industry, and so here she is, with Gene Kelly and Michael Beck (the lead flexer in *The Warriors*); here *she* is as a muse, a real daughter of Zeus (honest), come to earth to inspire a young graphic artist (Mr. Beck) to pursue his dream—he tires of painting oversized record jacket posters and aspires to Art. Sonny Malone (Mr. Beck) meets Danny Maguire (Mr. Kelly), whose dream leads him to establish a glorious new-old dance hall ("Xanadu"), and Sonny also meets this muse and they fall in love, which is against the rules, but Zeus, or Mrs. Zeus, lets her do what mortals do ("Remember, dear? We learned about 'feelings' in our Mortal Behavior class," says Mrs. Zeus to Zeus). The young lovers live and love loverly ever after, and our dear, grey, thickened hoofer bestows an additional twinkly smile upon them, and *he* no doubt also lives merrily until he gets his last check.

Xanadu is one of the most deadeningly stupid movies of this or any other year, unable to make anything of fantasy and unwilling to make anything of reality, though momentarily the moribund hulk shows signs of vestigial life, this when it presents a 1940's-style big band-cum-dance extravaganza merging with a 1970's variation on the same theme. For most of its two excruciating hours, however, *Xan-*



PARAMOUNT PICTURES

Urban Cowboy's *John Travolta, having traded one costume (disco) for another (macho), joins other "citified make-believe cow-children as symbols of rootlessness, aimlessness, and petrified juvenilia."*

adu subjects us to the hideous sight and sound of Miss Newton-John gallumphing about and warbling, the wistful sight of Mr. Kelly engaging in the same pursuits, and the puzzling sight of Mr. Beck, who is handsome in an unwholesome way and is the male equivalent of "stacked," trying to look love sick. In Xanadu, you'll remember, did Kubla Khan a stately pleasure dome decree; in *Xanadu* did several million dollars and many energetic people a crumbling dud erect.

Dressed to Kill

One man's Xanadu is another man's sex-change operation: the promise of escape from humdrummery into the *real* me (or he or she or we) that if only ... *Dressed to Kill* is the latest effort to scare us half to death courtesy of Mr. Brian De Palma, who showed a deftness for that trick with *Carrie*. Here we are introduced to a thoughtful shrink (Michael Caine) and one of his patients (Angie Dickinson), the lady a mother and wife with an occasional yen for something new in trousers. The movie opens with the lady imagining herself seduced by a pushy stranger in her shower while her husband is shaving two feet away at the mirror. Soon she has been picked up at the museum, taken off for an afternoon of bliss eternal, and then razor-slashed to death by a blonde person supposedly of the female persuasion who does the foul deed in the elevator. Very messy. Very effective, too.

We learn that the murderer is a male in transit to female. And soon we find this fiend pursuing a witness to the crime (Nancy Allen); the latest intended victim is befriended by the bright young son of the first murder victim (Keith Gordon) and also by the psychiatrist. The thriller ingredients are well handled, as De Palma adapts a few of his *Carrie* surprises and adds one or two new ones. The psychological ingredients are very awkwardly handled, unless we are *supposed* to guess early on who the crazed transsexual is. Once I had the criminal's identity figured out (and anyone who has ever decided to avoid psychiatrists at whatever cost will figure it out lickety-split), the movie reduces to an experience in count the thrills, enjoy the chills.

We are not exactly instructed, not in so many words, to come away from the movie believing that every transsexual, or would-be transsexual, is not only unhappy but homicidal, but this newest wrinkle in gender-fuck certainly suggests that conclusion. Moreover, we are clearly advised not to make-believe beyond a certain point, lest we, too, succumb to our most dreadful sexual hang-ups and get out the old razor for something more serious than shaving.

Urban Cowboy

Olivia Newton-John, recycled Doris Day though she be, couldn't have brought off the commercial miracle of *Grease* all by herself. She needed John Travolta, still sailing on the wings of *Saturday Night Fever* and not yet savaged by the critics and hooted at by audiences for his pathetic role in *Moment by Moment*. That fiasco so disoriented Travolta, and his mother's death so depressed him, that he pulled out of *American Gigolo,* leaving the part to Richard Gere, and withdrew to find a suitable vehicle for what the more bloodthirsty critics were already labeling Travolta's "comeback." He's come back, all right, as the *Urban Cowboy,* and he oughta had stood in bed, as I think they might put it down at Gilley's.

Gilley's is a gargantuan saloon in Houston where boys and girls who sell ribbons and insurance during the daytime come at night dressed in cowboy outfits that no self-respecting cowboy would wear. To Gilley's comes Bud (Travolta), hot off the farm and new in town, itching to drink and screw and prove something to himself (I think we are to accept the notion that his manhood is somehow up for testing) by becoming adept at riding a machine that bucks like a bull. One must resist the obvious pun, though James Bridges, who directed *Urban Cowboy,* has resisted nothing else. His citified make-believe cowchildren are his symbols of rootlessness, aimlessness, petrified juvenilia, and any other grand concept you happen to think of on your way to the john. And his Bud, our doe-eyed beautiful John Travolta, the heartthrob of the late '70s, stands for the quintessential modern young man constructing his essence out of denim, leather, and smouldering glances.

Gilley's actually functions, evidently rather much in reality as in *Urban Cowboy,* as an ersatz-Western counterpart of the glitter palaces of the disco set. Here the costume is everything, as there, back when Travolta scored so wonderfully in his white suit on the disco floor, costume and attitude, *image,* were all that one needed to make one's fondest dreams come true for a few hours. The horror of *Urban Cowboy,* and it is horrible not only for its pretentions but for its realization, is exacerbated by the depressing fact that we are indeed merely in the process, right now, of trading one stupid costume party (disco) for another (macho).

Can't Stop the Music

Village People, a group of six men who cannot sing but who try, nonetheless, to do just that, represents another facet of the macho masquerade. The group was developed as a sound by Jacques Morali before he filled in the sound with people: he wanted *types* — Indian, cop, GI, construction worker, truck driver,— and eventually found human beings to fit the slots. The not very secret twist to all this is that Village People was fabricated as a gay ensemble, or at least an ensemble tailored to appeal to gay people, and gay audiences made Village People successful, after which, as usual with such entertainers (one remembers Bette Midler coming to prominence as an entertainer at a New York homosexual bath house), straights took them into the mainstream.

Can't Stop the Music purports to tell of the creation and rise to stardom of Village People, but instead of using the interesting truth, it air-brushes that evidently still taboo success story out of existence. Here a nice young lady (Valerie Perrine) and her nice platonic roommate (Steven Guttenberg) and her nice new boyfriend (Bruce Jenner) and a not-so-nice record industry wizard (Paul Sand) do the trick. And for two hours, even when we are taken to the gym for "Y.M.C.A.," one of the Village People's early smash hit songs, and easily the most effectively staged musical number in the movie; even when we are taken to a gym populated entirely by the best-built and best-looking young men on earth; even *then,* not even the suggestion, much less the word, homosexual, is permitted to surface.

Which is very strange, even allowing for the fact that *Can't Stop the Music* is a musical comedy, whereas homosexuals are supposed to appear on film only as killers (*Cruising; Windows*), agonizing adolescents (*Happy Birthday, Gemini*), or screamers (*La Cage Aux Folles*). Might not even *one* of the movie's six Village People people be

ASSOCIATED FILM DISTRIBUTION

Can't Stop the Music *is the story of the creation of the group Village People, which curiously forgets to mention that they were developed as a gay ensemble.*

portrayed as homosexual? Sort of an updated Affirmative Action slot? The weirdest thing about this deliberate distortion is that nowadays the hottest trend in gay circles is macho drag. Swish is out, muscles are in. Of course it's all the same old make-believe (though much more frightening to homophobes because while queens in pastels can be snickered at and ignored, tough-looking guys with biceps, who look just like Real Men, hit too close to home, too close to the hetero-urbanized cowboys); only the outfits are changed to comfort the afflicted.

But what the hell; all the world loves a dreamer, so long as his dream is suitably conventional. All *Can't Stop the Music* wants to do is make an honest buck, and since wishing makes it so, who says you can't heterosexualize a gay fantasy and turn it into apple pie?

Bronco Billy

Billy McCoy (Clint Eastwood) sold shoes until, one day, he decided to become a latter-day Western trick rider and Wild West showman. No sooner thought than done; Bronco Billy is born and a shoe salesman puts away his shoe horn forever. Mr. Eastwood has also put away, at least for the time, his Dirty Harry persona, trading on his vast popularity—he's not exactly undernourished in the domestic market, but worldwide, he is the superstar supreme — for an adventure, a cinema lark, a lovely fling with bitter-sweet comedy. He is splendid in the part, craggy and a little cranky and a gentleman who waits until the lady (Sondra Locke, playing Miss Rich Bitch only grudgingly transformed into a pleasant friend of the common man and bedmate of the uncommon Bronco Bill) makes the first move before he shares his comfy little sleeping alcove with her.

Bronco Billy is the sort of fellow who intercepts a bank holdup, who does favors for the mentally ill, who rescues morbid Indians from themselves, who takes in rootless young drifters and makes them whole again, who puts on his show for all the "little pards"—the children—in his audience, and bids them goodnight after his little Wild West performance with tender words of advice: mind your mom and dad, go to school every day, and say your prayers. He's more wholesome in the telling than in the movie, but, amazingly, he isn't in the least cloying. All Billy McCoy wanted to do was live his one go-around on earth as something more true to his nature than purveyor of wedgies to irritable ladies in a New Jersey shoe store. Why not?

The movie is marred by a wretched meet-cute, and other holes puncture plausibility almost to the point of disaster. The back-up cast, however, including Scatman Crothers and Sam Bottoms, ably flesh out the tiny entertainment troupe that travels with Billy from town to town in search of little pards to make happy for a night under the tent. And Bronco Billy's dream becomes the audience's dream, not because it's sponsored by a muse from Zeus, not because it's kinky or psychotic, not because it requires monumentally self-deluding play-acting to carry off, and certainly not because it sanitizes anything. Billy's dream rings true; we can't all *do* it, as we all *can* saunter into a designer boutique and emerge in thirty minutes in spurs and boots and silver buckles and hope somebody thinks we're John Travolta's cousins; but we can all appreciate it. It's a simple dream, really, just as in one of the best of Disney flick songs: If you wish upon a star, makes no difference who you are ... Makes no difference if you only make-believe, especially if you make your make-believe come true. There's a moral buried somewhere not too far down in this not too profound but mightily satisfying movie. Anybody can figure it out. ❑

LR's film critic writes about movies weekly for *The Boston Herald American* and reviews films and theatre twice weekly on WHDH Radio and daily on WNAC-TV (CBS), in Boston. He is the host of talk programs on both stations, writes a thrice-weekly newspaper column, and reviews books for a number of journals. As Deputy Sheriff of Middlesex County (Massachusetts) he makes believe the job amounts to something, and he can wear a very impressive badge when he's in the mood to do so.

CLASSIFIEDS

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS are accepted at the discretion of the publisher of *The Libertarian Review.* 20 cents per word (minimum $5); six or more insertions: 10 percent discount; 12 or more insertions: 20 percent discount. Payment must accompany order. Address: Classified Ad Department, *The Libertarian Review,* 1620 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, CA 94111.

BOOKS

ORGANIZED RELIGION IS A GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIZED RIP-OFF! Learn the truth about how religion picks your moral pockets in 162 pages of searing insight into the churches' hypocrisy. $4.95 pp. Dr. Ross—Box 3405—Springfield, IL 62708.

THE PEOPLE'S GUIDE TO CAMPAIGN POLITICS, by Gary Robert Schwedes. Definitive work on local campaign techniques. Nominated in *Washington Monthly* for "Political Book of the Year" award. Send $4.95 to: Schwedes Campaign Consultants, 1725 The Promenade, #224-B, Santa Monica, CA 90401.

RESTORING THE AMERICAN DREAM by Robert J. Ringer. $8.95 pp. Make check payable to: Libertarian Review, 1620 Montgomery St., S.F., CA 94111.

USED AND NEW LIBERTARIAN/ CONSERVATIVE BOOKS. Economics, political theory, history specialties. Some fiction. Send inquiries to RF, 363 3rd Ave. #3, San Francisco, CA 94118

NATIONALISM AND CULTURE by Rudolf Rocker. A definitive libertarian study of the state's destructive influence on society. Hard cover, 614 pages $16. postage paid. From: Michael Coughlin, Publisher, 1985 Selby Ave., St. Paul, MN 55104.

NEW, USED AND OUT-OF-PRINT BOOKS on LIBERTARIANISM, REVISIONIST HISTORY, ETC. Free lists. Mike Timko, Box 25908, Los Angeles, CA 90025.

IS POLITICAL ACTION a necessary libertarian strategy or a betrayal of individual freedom? Read LIBERTARIAN POLITICAL ACTIVISM: PRO & CON, a hard hitting, reasoned debate between two libertarian Mensans—one a former Congressional Candidate, the other a student of Robert LeFevre. $4.95 plus $.60 handling (Californians add tax): Penseur Press, Box 659-A, El Cerrito, CA 94530.

PENNY GOLD AND SILVER MINING STOCKS have tremendous profit potential: a 1000% yearly price swing. New how-to-book by professor is the result of 20 years of research. Free details. PENNY STOCK PRESS, P.O. Box 430-B-1, Queens Village Station, NY 11428.

COMMUNITIES

EQUALITARIAN GESTALT COMMUNITY seeks additional members. Urban-based, specializing in gestalt psychology and "polyfidelity" (emotionally-committed, non-monogamous, family group within a democratic intentional community). Free handbook. Kerista Village, P.O. Box 1174-L, S.F., CA 94101. (415) 566-6502.

EMPLOYMENT

WANTED — 2ND INCOME PEOPLE—who are intelligent, aggressive, mature, to market an unusual product. Complete details will be given—but, we will tell you this much now, you can earn $8,640-54,900 per year—Those of you willing to spend 2 hours per day, send resume to: Mr. Z. A. Klemmer, P.O. Box 8371, Van Nuys, CA 91406. (213) 899-9484.

FREE MARKET

LIBERTARIAN ATTORNEY. IRS defense: audits, trials, and related proceedings, civil and criminal; Census Resistance defense; Wills and Trusts. John K. Cotter, Attorney at Law, 256 Montgomery Street, Suite 201, San Francisco, CA 94104. (415) 982-8880.

LIBERTARIAN-OBJECTIVIST REGISTERED COMMODITY BROKER. Trading in all major Futures Markets. Emphasis on Precious Metals, financials and Currencies. A Broker that understands the current crisis is necessary in these volatile times. To open an account or for information call Toll Free 800-821-3400. Ask for Ted Lenger.

FLATULENT? (FREQUENTLY) FEAR NOT! Read Benjamin Franklin's long-suppressed essay of 1780 on (believe it or not) farting. Hilarious! Frameable. $4. "Essay," Box 69-L, Carrboro, NC 27510.

BUY FROM LIBERTARIAN RADIO SHACK DEALER, Charles Blackwell. At *least* 10% discount, less shipping. (SC residents only: 4% sales tax.) P.O. Box 732, York, SC (803) 684-9980 or 6455.

NEED PRIVACY FOR YOUR MAIL? Use our address as yours. Keep your true location secret. Details: Buffalo Mail Drop, P.O. Box 8-R, Buffalo, NY 14212.

LUDWIG VON MISES T-SHIRTS. 100% cotton. S-M-L-XL. $7.50 postpaid. F.I.O.T. Enterprises, 2007A Round Top Dr., Honolulu, HI 96822.

"THE DRAFT IS A FORM OF SLAVERY ON A PLANTATION CALLED WAR" (Copyright © 1980 by William Van Doren). Beautiful four-color poster with photos, illustrations, inscription on drafting women, suitable for framing. $5. postpaid (+6% in Calif.) to W. Van Doren, 336 N. Oakhurst Dr., #2W, Beverly Hills, CA 90210. Refund guaranteed.

COUNTERFEIT GOLD? Comprehensive pamphlet tells, in detail, how to test GOLD purity with no special equipment. Send $2.00 to Cedar Mountain Trading Post, Precious Metals Department, Cedar Mountain, NC 28718.

SUPPORT FREE TRADE — SMUGGLE! THE STATE SUCKS! Over 50 buttons, bumperstickers, flyers and posters. Free catalog. SLL, Box 4, Fullerton, CA 92632.

FREE MARKET

BUSINESS LOANS. MONEY MARKET, P.O. Box 2228LR, Seattle, WA 98111.

LIBERTARIAN ANNOUNCEMENTS

FED UP WITH FETUS FETISHISTS? Systematic libertarian treatment of the moral case for the right to abortion, by Sharon Presley and Robert Cooke. Send 50¢ and long SASE to Association of Libertarian Feminists, 15 West 38 St., #201, New York, NY 10018.

ABOLITION OF THE STATE is the only honest objective of anti-statists. We have developed a basic program for abolishing the State. Those interested should send one dollar for introductory packet to: American Abolitionist Movement, P.O. Box 30681, Seattle, WA 98103.

IRS IS ILLEGAL. 10 years of Court Battles to prove it is expensive. Your Help is Needed. Contributions, Law Briefs, Donations, etc. Rt. Rev. Edward Wayland Ph.D., P.O. Box 1008, Lowell, MA 01853.

WANTED — Libertarian stances on the environment. I would appreciate *any* thoughts and theories on the subject. Please write Steven D. McGinley, 651 6th Street North, Hudson, WI 54106.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE—How much do you get? Violating individual property rights is a crime if you do it, a "service" if the government does it. Is there a responsible alternative? Send your ideas to Box 944-D, Yucaipa, CA 92399. (714) 797-4919.

WORLD WAR IV may be fought using women only. The men will be dead and besides—it's the women's

turn. For a War Stopper shoot a S.A.S.E. to: WINNERS — LOSERS, Box 2138, Youngstown, OH 44504.

BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES: Professionals, students, and laypeople interested in the application of psychological, sociological and anthropological research to libertarian issues, write Sharon Presley, 2442 24th St., Astoria, NY 11102.

NEED HELP IN ARGUING AGAINST THE DRAFT AND ABORTION? Intellectual ammunition: $1.00. Advice, speakers, available. Inquire: Libertarians for Life, 13424 Hathaway Drive, Wheaton, MD 20906.

PERIODICALS

the dandelion, a modern quarterly journal of philosophical anarchism. Subscription $4.50/yr. Sample copy send 25¢ to cover postage. Order from Michael E. Coughlin, 1985 Selby Ave., St. Paul, MN 55104.

ASSOCIATION OF LIBERTARIAN FEMINISTS sample literature 50¢. Complete set of discussion papers and sample newsletters $3.00. Write ALF, 15 West 38 St., #201, New York, NY 10018.

LOOKING for meaningful relationships? Read *Contact High,* the only national publication written by singles for singles. Intelligent, attractive, insightful. Free advertising policy. $15 per year or send for free brochure: Box 500-LR, 600 Main St., Mendocino, CA 95460.

LIBERTARIAN CONNECTION, 12 year-old open-forum magazine. Subscribers may (but needn't) insert four pages per issue free, unedited. LC had Rothbard, Hospers, Childs, Grinder, Block, before you ever heard of them. Read tomorrow's leading thinkers today. Eight issues (1 year) $10. Sample $1. 9850 Fairfax Square #232L, Fairfax, VA 22031.

CRITIQUE, a new quarterly journal exploring conspiracy theories, exposés, metaphysics, and the "American culture." Send for introductory issue ($1.25): 2364 Valley West Dr., Santa Rosa, CA 95401.

PERSONALS

BORED AGAIN? Why not rattle your cage? I propose a dialog of the disaffected, a conspiracy of the equals, a politics of pleasure. Ours is the *anomic power* of negative thinking and corrosive laughter. The unruly amongst the institutionalized have only themselves — and possibly each other. Let's confer. The choice is sedition or sedation. Any number can play. THE LAST INTERNATIONAL, 55 Sutter St. #487, S.F., CA 94104.

SINGLE MAN, European, age 31, self-employed, residing partly in California, partly in Thailand, wishes to hear from single woman who shares the libertarian philosophy. Other interests of mine include traveling, foreign languages (I know eight), Oriental cultures, archeology, psychology, etc. Please write to: Robert Weiser, G.P.O. Box 698, Central Post Office, Bangkok, Thailand.

TAPES

LIBERTARIANISM vs. COMMUNISM — a debate held at the Annual Gathering of Mensa. Robert Steiner is Chair of the International Libertarian Organization in Mensa, a founder of the New Jersey Libertarian Party, and a long-time activist in the LP. J. L. Lunsford is a long-time activist and an organizer for Communist Party, U.S.A. Said one attendee: "Those who witnessed the confrontation came away favorably impressed with the freedom philosophy. It was clear that leftist ideology is incapable of defending itself against a principled case based on individual liberty." Two cassettes totaling about two hours, $9.95 plus $.75 postage and handling. California residents add sales tax. Robert A. Steiner, LR090, Box 659 El Cerrito, CA 94530.

HOW AN ANARCHIST SOCIETY WOULD PROVIDE NATIONAL DEFENSE: THE SOLUTION TO LIBERTARIANISM'S HARDEST PROBLEM by Jeffrey Rogers Hummel, historian and former U.S. Army officer. Complete talk with questions and answers and further questions and answers on three 90-minute cassettes or one 7" reel—$15. plus $1. packing and handling. Texas residents include 5% sales tax. Order from: IMMORTAL PERFORMANCES, P.O. Box 8316, Austin, TX 78712.

NATHANIEL BRANDEN'S lectures on "The Psychology of Romantic Love," recorded a decade ago, present an interesting comparison with his treatment of the same issues in his new book of the same title. Thirty-two LP set, like new condition, $100.00. Also: THE DISCOVERY OF FREEDOM, by Rose Wilder Lane, 1st, good condition, no dj. $50.00. Write to Jeff Riggenbach at *LR.*

HOW TO REGISTER AGAINST THE DRAFT.



The Anti-Draft Card.

1. During the summer of 1980, every American male aged nineteen and twenty will be forced—under threat of imprisonment—to go to the local post office and register for the draft. But anyone, male or female, can register *against* the draft, no matter how old they are.

2. All you need to do is go to your local post office and buy a regular pre-stamped postcard. On the back, write "I am registering *against* the draft." Include your name and address. On the front, write "C.A.R.D., 245 Second St. NE, Washington, D.C. 20002."

3. Now drop your postcard in the mail. We'll add it to all the other anti-draft cards we've received from all across America and show President Jimmy Carter just how many Americans oppose registration and the draft. Needless to say, the more cards sent to C.A.R.D. the better.

4. When you register against the draft, urge your friends to do the same. Together, we can beat this challenge to our basic liberties and traditions. If you can't buy a postcard, write a letter instead. But whatever you do, make sure you register *against* the draft now!



LR

Make checks payable to C.A.R.D

Here's ____$10 ____$25 ____$100 ____more to help pay for your campaign against the draft.

____ Send me information about the legal status of draft-age registrants.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

C.A.R.D. Committee Against Registration & Draft
245 Second St.NE, Washington, D.C. 20002

C.A.R.D. is a coalition of 50 national organizations opposed to registration and the draft.

Prepared by Public Media Center, San Francisco