

## A Monthly Newsletter

THE

# Libertarian Forum

Joseph R. Peden, Publisher

Murray N. Rothbard, Editor

VOLUME IX NO. 7

July, 1976

US-ISSN0047-4517

## MacBride's New Book

Roger MacBride's campaign paperback book, *A New Dawn For America: The Libertarian Challenge* (Ottawa, Illinois: Green Hill Publishers, June 1976), has now been published. Its major function is to serve as MacBride's campaign statement of his ideology and policies, his "manifesto", his "Conscience of a Libertarian", in well-designed, highly readable, brief (97 pp.) and inexpensive (95¢) form. The book performs this vital task admirably. But it also performs two other, and at least equally vital, functions: (1) it should lay to rest, once and for all, the charge by libertarian skeptics and holier-than-thou "purists" that MacBride would compromise libertarian principles in his campaign; and (2) it fills a gap by providing an excellent and lucid introduction to what libertarianism is all about that we can distribute to interested neophytes. Despite the enormous growth in the literature of liberty in the last few years, there has been no one brief book that we could give to friends or acquaintances who have come brand new to an interest in our ideology — no one book that could provide a readable yet thorough overview of libertarianism, a book that could instruct the reader in the basics and stimulate interest in more detailed and advanced treatment. Roger MacBride's *A New Dawn For America* now provides us with such a book. It deserves the widest possible distribution.

MacBride begins the book with a concise exposition of libertarian philosophy and an attack on the growth of government power in modern America. He then proceeds to apply and elaborate his views in four more specific chapters: on the economy, on politicizing America, on foreign policy, and on the criminal law. Libertarians will be interested to know that in his economics chapter MacBride adopts wholeheartedly the "Austrian School" position. He explains how government-propelled expansion of money and bank credit causes inflation and leads to the boom-bust business cycle; and to cure these ills, he calls for a return to a hard, free-market commodity money such as gold and the total separation of money from the State. The latter includes a call for abolition of the Federal Reserve System. MacBride also urges early repeal of the income tax, a drastic cut in taxation and expenditures at all levels of government, and a "look into the feasibility of creating a truly voluntaristic society in which all goods and services are provided on the free market." (This is "compromising"?)

MacBride concludes his economics chapter with this ringing paragraph: "Contrary to the propaganda of expedience, there is no real conflict between the demands of moral principle and of pragmatic reality. There is no real conflict between the moral principles of individual liberty and private property on the one hand, and the requirements of economic health and prosperity on the other. Both require getting government out of our lives and out of our pockets."

The Politicizing America chapter applies libertarian principle to various key problem areas of existing government intervention. MacBride calls for the elimination of the postal monopoly and the sale of the Postal Service to private investors; the total deregulation of transportation; the end of FDA regulation of drugs and vitamins; and an end to all "corporation coddling" by government, including "favors,

subsidies, bailouts, tariffs, regulatory agencies, credits to exporters, loan guarantees, and so on." On television and radio, MacBride shows how the FCC's interference with freedom of speech is a direct and inherent result of the federal government's nationalization of the airwaves fifty years ago; MacBride retorts with a call for the abolition of the FCC and all of its powers. On agriculture, MacBride not only supports a free-market for food products, but he demonstrates how, for example, the government-created milk cartel not only restricts competition and raises milk prices, but also established the conditions which led to the milk-corruption scandal during the Nixon administration. Finally, MacBride courageously tackles the famous Social Security question head-on, showing that Social Security is bankrupt and should be abolished, and comes up with an ingenious and consistently libertarian plan to ease the hardships on the citizens who have been suckered into support for this racketeering program: older citizens could be exempted from all taxation and all restrictions on earnings; younger citizens could be freed from all Social Security taxes and encouraged to invest in (far more productive and profitable) private retirement plans (perhaps through tax exemptions), and for the middle-aged groups remaining, the promised benefits could be paid for by the United States Government's "systematic sale of all of its mammoth land and industrial holdings." Thus, at one and the same time, the onerous and fraudulent Social Security system would be abolished, the promised recipients would be helped rather than harmed, and we would see the de-socialization of the U. S. Government's vast holdings of land and other property!

Perhaps those libertarians who have suspected MacBride of "conservative deviationism" are still not impressed with his libertarian position on economics: what of civil liberties and foreign policy, where crypto-conservatives are much more likely to "lead". Well, we are happy to report that MacBride takes an uncompromisingly "isolationist" or non-interventionist position, and one, furthermore, that is unabashedly "radical" and revisionist. MacBride begins his foreign policy chapter by praising the traditional American foreign policy of political neutrality, and economic and cultural freedom of trade and travel. He then blisteringly indicts Woodrow Wilson for sabotaging that policy by maneuvering the U. S. into a "purely European war", over "the valiant opposition of such grand traditionalists as Senator 'Fighting Bob' LaFollette..." MacBride then states:

"We libertarians propose to reverse that vote and return to a strict policy of neutrality in other countries' affairs, of non-intervention in other peoples' wars, of free trade and travel throughout the world." And again: "After sixty years of crippling and brutally destructive wars, commenced with the wish to 'make the world safe for democracy', to 'end all wars', to advance the 'free world', and to 'spread freedom throughout the globe', what has the U. S. accomplished? What kind of world was wrought at the cost of close to half a million American lives, of over a million Americans wounded, of hundreds of billions in American economic resources, of producing a swollen government at home at the

(Continued On Page 2)

## MacBride's New Book —

(Continued From Page 1)

expense of the liberties and the property of the individual citizen? What has the U. S. Government accomplished at the terrible price of engendering a vast military machine, of enforced military service for American youth, of crippling American productivity with taxes, inflation, and controls, of diverting so much American investment and scientific personnel from peaceful production to the machines of war? If we look about us, we see a world where dictatorship has never been stronger, where war has never been more threatening or fearful."

MacBride then pinpoints not only the cost but the deceptions that took America into each of its wars in this century. For each of these wars, MacBride adopts the revisionist position. Thus, on World War II: Roosevelt "had by intervention in the Sino-Japanese struggle maneuvered United States entry into a war with Japan and Germany." On the Korean War, MacBride adopts the advanced revisionist position of I. F. Stone, pointing out that the start of the Korean War (and America's later intervention into it) succeeded by only one week the prediction in Tokyo by Secretary of State Dulles of "positive action by the United States to preserve peace in the Far East."

On the disastrous Vietnam intervention, MacBride's radical revisionist position points to "the support given to these presidents (Johnson and Nixon) by American businessmen from Standard Oil, General Electric, Ford Motor Company and so on. Is it coincidental that they profited generously from the massive defense orders generated by the years of intervention in the name of peace, aptly called 'perpetual war for perpetual peace'." Finally, MacBride blisteringly attacks President Ford's last-minute attempt to intervene yet again to save the tottering South Vietnam regime, while reiterating all the discredited interventionist shibboleths that had gotten us into the mess in the first place.

In contrast, MacBride proposes to replace the disastrous policy of government intervention with a libertarian foreign policy: "We must stop the interventionist policy of wasting American blood and treasure in an attempt to dictate to people and to nations all over the globe. . . . We can see that the indispensable corollary of rolling back government at home is rolling back government abroad. Getting the government out of our affairs at home is part and parcel of getting it out of the affairs of other peoples." Instead of conjuring up the spectre of foreign devils to justify such wars and interventions, "Libertarians argue that we need no more foreign devils, and the time has come to return home and get the politicians and bureaucrats off our backs."

More specifically and magnificently, MacBride looks to replace the current disastrous system by a nation in which **no foreign policy exists**, in which "Foreign relations conducted by the State will be replaced by foreign relations by individuals, groups and voluntary associations in an atmosphere of voluntary mutual exchange with their foreign counterparts." There will be a foreign policy of "strict non-intervention", with a "defense force which will **only** respond to foreign aggression aimed at the geographical territory of the United States." Furthermore, MacBride states that a Libertarian administration "would be alert for genuine possibilities for removing the spectre of nuclear confrontation through disarmament agreements" which would be consistent with maintaining such a geographical defense.

Moreover, a MacBride foreign policy would "quit meddling in the domestic politics of foreign governments and stop propping up foreign governments." Diplomatic recognition would — in the great non-interventionist tradition — be granted to all **de facto** governments regardless of their political system. Free trade would be strictly adhered to, and Americans would be able to invest abroad where they wish "but at their own risk, unprotected by the U. S. Government." All foreign aid, government-backed loans, and membership in international organizations, ranging from the UN to the International Monetary Fund, would be abolished. U. S. intelligence activities would be "limited to collection of signs of possible offensive action against the U. S." All "collective security" alliances abroad would be terminated, including NATO and SEATO, as well as the Truman and Eisenhower Doctrines. Also abandoned would be Presidential "police actions", CIA-funded wars, and secret executive agreements.

## News From Spain

There are still many libertarians who think of America's conservatives as "really on our side" if a bit more "practical". For a long time there have been a couple of quick acid tests that one may use to find out the libertarian quotient of Buckleyite conservatives: what is your view of Rhodesia and South Africa, and what do you think of Franco's Spain? The obvious love and admiration of conservatives for these fascist and racist regimes speaks volumes of just how libertarian these "libertarian conservatives" really are, of where their hearts really lie. It's true, of course, that these regimes are "hard-line anti-Communists", if that is one's only test of political virtue; but, then, so again was Adolf Hitler. In fact, in a way Hitler can be summed up as a "premature anti-Communist" of the 1930's. At any rate, this enthusiasm demonstrates — if such a demonstration is really necessary by this time — that the libertarian rhetoric of American conservatives is skin deep, and that their hearts lie elsewhere.

(Continued On Page 3)

MacBride also attacks the powerful military-industrial complex, "the biggest lobby for intervention and unchecked Executive power". MacBride points out: "Each year the Pentagon spends more than the annual income of every corporation in America. It spends funds upon twenty thousand business firms, which (with their employees) live off money taken from American taxpayers. The military-industrial complex is by no means a free-market phenomenon. Instead it resembles a royal court in which a king (the Pentagon) grants favors to his favorites (in the arms and military-support industries)."

Again, MacBride transcends the old "conservative"- "liberal" tags: "Unless we realize that the Barry Goldwaters and the Hubert Humphreys of American politics agreed all along on the need for a strong national-security state we will be unable to begin the search for alternatives beyond the old ideological labels of 'conservative' and 'liberal'".

MacBride concludes his foreign policy chapter with these noble aims: "We will replace intervention by non-intervention. Militarism by voluntarism. State agreements by individual agreements. Coercive political action by voluntary mutual exchange. The power of the state will be diffused and foreign affairs will be reduced to the decentralized voluntary affairs of individuals in a free society."

In his chapter on criminal law, MacBride comes out foursquare for the abolition of all victimless crime laws, of all laws restricting or prohibiting voluntary actions of consenting adults. Laws against prostitution, pornography, homosexuality, gambling, and drugs are attacked specifically and concretely. The crime problem arising from heroin is shown to emerge **not** from the addiction itself but from its prohibition, which makes the drug enormously expensive and leads the addict into crime to pay for his addiction.

Not the least charm of this book are the excellent quotes from libertarian writers and theorists that stud the book: quotes from H. L. Mencken, Ludwig von Mises, John Stuart Mill, P. J. Proudhon, Thomas Jefferson, Herbert Spencer, Murray N. Rothbard, Robert Nozick, and others that also lead the reader into plumbing more of the libertarian literature. There are also ads in the back for worthy libertarian groups and publications: including the Libertarian Review, Reason, the Libertarian Forum, the Center for Libertarian Studies, Free Life Editions, the Libertarian Scholar, Laissez-Faire Books, the Libertarian Party, and the MacBride-Bergland campaign. There is also an ad for the Young Libertarian Alliance, a rapidly growing group of campus affiliates of the national Libertarian Party, headed by Tom Palmer. The YLA can be contacted at LP headquarters at 1516 P. St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20005; it supplies organizing kits to campus chapters.

MacBride's *A New Dawn For America* can be purchased, either for \$95 a single copy or at bulk discount rates, from the MacBride for President Committee at the above 1516 P. St. address.

Let the griping cease. *A New Dawn For America* is clear evidence that Roger MacBride has come, not to betray the great 1976 LP Platform but to fulfill it. He is libertarianism's champion, our White Knight, in the political arena. May his impact and his votes multiply! ■

## CLS Booms!

In our February, 1976 issue we announced the formation of the Center for Libertarian Studies (CLS). In the last few months, the CLS has grown with remarkable rapidity and intensity, attesting to: the enterprise and vigor of its organizers, and the enormous growth in recent years in the quantity and quality of scholars in the libertarian movement. Surely the formation of a center for libertarian research and scholarship, actively encouraging development and communication between libertarian scholars and intellectuals throughout the country, was an idea whose time has come. A new and handsomely professional publication — the Center for Libertarian Studies Newsletter — has now emerged with its first issue, Summer, 1976, detailing the present and forthcoming activities of the new Center. The Newsletter also reports on other scholarly libertarian activities across the country, thereby serving as "an informal communication network for libertarian scholars." The Newsletter, edited by Peter J. Ferrara, Lawrence H. White, and Matthew Malkan, all of Harvard University, is sent gratis to Friends of the Center (those who have contributed at least \$100 per year to the Center), and is available to all other interested people for \$6 per year. The Newsletter is available at Box 220, Cambridge, Mass. 02138, or directly from the Center for Libertarian Studies, 200 West 58th St., Suite 5D, New York, N. Y. 10019.

The eight-page first issue of the Newsletter contains reports on two forthcoming conferences sponsored by the CLS, an article explaining the CLS concept and activities by Executive Director Walter Grinder, an article on Center fundraising by President John Hagel III, numerous news items on scholarly activities, including a report on the Austrian Economics Seminar held at New York University, and handsome profiles on two veteran libertarian intellectuals: Henry Hazlitt and Felix Morley, both members of the Board of Advisors of CLS. No one interested in the progress of intellectual and scholarly libertarian activities can afford to miss the CLS Newsletter.

One of the most desperate needs of the libertarian movement for many years has been a high-level scholarly journal, devoted to the advancement of the discipline of libertarianism — an inter-disciplinary body of thought that cuts across all the studies of human action: from political philosophy to economics to history to sociology to law to education to biology. Such a journal will now appear, under the auspices of the CLS, to be published by Pergamon Press, a distinguished publisher of scholarly journals, and to be edited by Murray N. Rothbard. The first issue of the new *Journal of Libertarian Studies: An Interdisciplinary Review* will appear in January, 1977. It will be a blockbuster, centering on several critiques of Robert Nozick's *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*, plus other goodies.

The annual Libertarian Scholars Conference has long been the cutting edge of developments in libertarian scholarship. From now on, many of its papers will be able to find a publishing outlet in the JLS. The Fourth Libertarian Scholars Conference, to be held jointly by the CLS and the Liberty Fund this October 22, 23, and 24 at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City, will feature an intriguing program. One panel will feature papers on conservative sociologist Robert Nisbet's latest work, *The Twilight of Authority*, by John P. McCarthy of the history department of Fordham University and Leonard P. Liggio of the history department of SUNY, Old Westbury. Robert Nisbet will be in attendance for a possible response. Another panel will discuss papers on "The Foundations of Libertarian Legal Theory" by Randy E. Barnett of Harvard Law School and Williamson M. Evers of Stanford University, with comments by Murray N. Rothbard and Roy A. Childs, Jr. Other panels will deal with "An Historical Inquiry into Nineteenth Century Libertarian Social Analysis"; "Liability, Economics and the Law — Two Problems: Pollution and Bankruptcy", and "An Analysis of the 'Southern Rim' Thesis". The banquet speech will be delivered by G. William Domhoff of University of California at Santa Cruz on "The Current State of Social Analysis in the United States." Speakers and participants will include: Mark Weinburg of the University of Chicago; David Osterfield of the University of Cincinnati; Joseph T. Salerno of Rutgers University; R. Dale Grinder of the University of Kansas; Lawrence H. White of Harvard University; William Beach of the University of Missouri; Walter Block of Rutgers University; Jonathan Marshall of Stanford University; John Hagel III of Harvard Law and Business Schools; Larry Shoup of San

Francisco State College; social analyst Carl Oglesby; Joseph Castrovinci of the University of Chicago; Eric Mack of Tulane University; William Marina of Florida Atlantic University; Karen Vaughn of Central Michigan University; and Harry Watson of the Council of Economic Advisors.

Next spring on March 5-7, the CLS and the Liberty Fund will hold another exciting conference on "Crime and Punishment: Retribution, and Law" at Harvard Law School. Topics will be: "Objective Crime and Objective Punishment: the Illegitimacy of Psychiatric Reasons for Imprisonment"; "The Crisis in the Criminal Justice System: An Examination of Causes and Consequences"; "Time Preference and Crime"; "Retribution as an Alternative to Punishment"; "Retribution: the Ethics of Punishment"; and "Some Treatments of Crime in History."

As if all this were not enough, the CLS is in the process of publishing two Occasional Papers, which should be out this summer, and which will be available to the public: Lawrence H. White's "The Methodology of Austrian School Economics", and a translation by Prof. J. Huston McCulloch of a classical gem by Gustave de Molinari, "The Production of Security" — the never-before translated essay by a prominent mid-nineteenth century French economist which was the first exposition and advocacy in all history of anarcho-capitalism!

Future plans include pamphlets and study kits on vital topics; so watch the Center for exciting developments, and, if possible, please contribute! □

## News From Spain —

(Continued From Page 2)

Libertarians, of course, can only rejoice at the loosening of the fascist dictatorship that Spain has seen since the death of Franco. Some of the fruits of the freer climate in Spain have just come to our attention. The Libertarian Spanish Group, which has translated and published over a hundred thousand copies of free-market books in Spain, now feels that with the new political climate they can translate and publish more of the philosophical and political aspects of libertarianism. Secondly, a new classical liberal, *laissez-faire* political group was formed this April: the Union Liberal Espanola, with hopes of becoming a political party. For forty years, the small band of Spanish classical liberals has been oppressed and ravaged by Left and Right; perhaps they will now be able to flourish.

But in stark contrast to the new freedom emerging in Spain, we have the very different view of Russian emigre Alexander Solzhenitsyn, whom not only American conservatives but even some libertarians have raised to the status of guru and folk hero. Solzhenitsyn, who in time-honored emigre fashion has been trying to heat up the Cold War against his own homeland, spoke recently over Spanish television in praise of the late fascist dictator and against the loosening of Spain's dictatorial bonds. The LP News (May-June 1976) reports:

"Alexander Solzhenitsyn, darling of conservatives because of his Cold War rhetoric, appeared on government-run television in Spain and praised the regime of the late fascist dictator Francisco Franco. Solzhenitsyn also told the people of Spain not to press demands for freedom to strike because this would lead to establishment of a Communist dictatorship."

It is one thing to hail Solzhenitsyn for his heroic battle against Soviet prison camps; it is quite another to think that this experience automatically qualifies him as a political philosopher or foreign affairs spokesman. In addition to the understandably warped perspective that all oppressed emigres have on foreign affairs, it is useful to remember that Solzhenitsyn is in no sense a libertarian. On the contrary, his perspective is that of an unreconstructed Czarist theocrat, and opponent of Western freedoms and Western technology alike. The LP News is to be hailed as virtually the only source, inside or out of the libertarian movement, where good sense can be found on the Solzhenitsyn question. □

## Democratic Convention Notes

Were you all impressed with the feast of Love at the Convention? Are you all sleeping better every night in the knowledge that Jimmy Carter loves each and every one of you? Apparently at least one convention delegate was, as witness a memorable TV shot of one Oriental-American with tears streaming down her face as Jimmy went on about love and unity. Of such stuff are these our rulers made. . . .

Meantime, the Northern Liberals, so suspicious of Carter not so long ago, are scrambling to get on the crowded Carter bandwagon. Shirley Maclaine opined that she liked Carter because he's a "man of the earth" (the Ecology note). Chi-chi hostesses all over town are serving peanuts at the In cocktail parties. . . .

Southern populism, however, still lives. In one interview, Cassie Mackin of NBC-TV asked young Hamilton Jordan, major architect of the Carter phenomenon, if she could "call him Ham." "My friends call me Ham," Jordan smugly retorted, "but you can call me Hamilton." But Jimmy loves each and every one. . . .

The highlight of the convention, understandably under-reported by the media, was the seconding speech of Alexander Garshin of Massachusetts for the nomination of young anti-bussing candidate David Benoit for Vice-President. Garshin used the opportunity to make a blistering right-wing speech, mocked by the delegates. The climax came when Garshin began to denounce the Council for Foreign Relations and its Rockefeller control; when he got to the point of attacking David Rockefeller for being head of the CFR, he was cut off by the chairman, who cited an old 1870's rule of Democratic conventions prohibiting any speaker from personally criticizing other nominated candidates. Unfortunately, in the brief flurry of excitement, neither Garshin nor anyone else had the wit to point out that David Rockefeller was certainly not being nominated for anything at the convention, and therefore that the rule could scarcely apply. But Garshin got off a few good cracks, such as "if this convention doesn't want to hear the truth, it's all right with me," and "I apologize to this convention. . . for telling the truth." Cutting off speech when Rockefeller and the CFR were attacked means, of course, that the Conspiracy Theory of History is alive and well. . . .

Since only the "extremes" of left and right are interested in ideas, the other high points of the convention were provided by the Left: by Ron Dellums' attack on war and militarism, and by young Fritz Efav, under indictment for draft resistance, pointing out the need for total amnesty for Vietnam War "deserters" and the less-than-honorably discharged. . . .

But there were some interesting nuances even in the Carter Center. There were the hosannas handed to Rep. Barbara Jordan, sounding for all the world like a basso Franklin Roosevelt, complete to the Groton accent and the whistled s's, whose call for a "national community" was strongly reminiscent of Adolf Hitler, though Hitler, of course, had a lot more pizzazz.

And then there was the unprecedented applause at Daddy King's stem-winding benediction: "The Lord make his face to shine upon YOU!", after which the assembled forces of left-liberalism clasped hands and swayed to the singing of "We Shall Overcome," as Jimmy Carter kissed Coretta King. Good God, you don't think that deep in their heart they really do believe? Let's hope not. . . .

In a desperate attempt to whitewash New York's image and in a grab for future federal funds, Mayor Abe Beame managed the enormous feat of turning Fun City into a Potemkin Village for one solid week. A special one-week anti-prostitute law was passed, two night shifts of sanitation men worked round the clock in midtown, a special detail of 1500 very friendly cops were all over the place (presumably they had gotten special Niceness Training), and who knows? maybe the authorities sternly told the muggers and rapists to Cool It for one week. The Georgia delegation, naturally, got the red carpet treatment and purred that "Oh, New Yawk is such a friendly place". Hah! Police even hailed cabs for delegates. Art Buchwald quipped that he had finally figured it out: all New Yorkers had been shipped to special detention centers in Staten Island for a week, while all the alleged New Yorkers on the streets were really imported from the Middle West for the occasion. . . .

The biggest word of the convention was "compassion." It is a

strange use of the word, though of course standard for left-liberalism. It means that A is a compassionate person if he steals money from B to give it to C. Not only is B the Forgotten Person in this equation but A's coercive behavior, along with a rakeoff for "handling" costs, hardly fits any sort of rational definition of compassionate. But it's all right folks, because Jimmy loves each and every one of you. . . .

## Arts And Movies

by Mr. First Nighter

Two current hit movies, of very different genres, both identify the prime evil as resting in government, and they do so with excitement and panache; hence, they deserve to be seen by every libertarian. One is the famous *All The President's Men*, superbly directed by Alan J. Pakula to provide the atmosphere and authenticity of the newsroom and of investigative journalism on the trail of the biggest story of our time, the Watergate. The uniformly excellent acting is a tribute to the direction; even Robert Redford is induced to forget his absorption in his own good looks to become Robert Woodward. Particularly good is Jason Robards' performance as *Washington Post* editor Ben Bradlee; Robards is able to convey irritation or elation in under-stated but finely crafted gestures. So absorbing and fast-paced is the action that the two-and-a-half hours seem like twenty minutes; and the abrupt and unsatisfactory ending leave the audience panting for More. Five hours would have been needed to bring out all the ramifications of Watergate; as it is, only the initial aspects of the story are developed. Perhaps there will be a sequel.

The other hit movie with libertarian implications, these totally neglected by the uniformly hostile critics, is *The Omen*, a fantasy horror movie starring Gregory Peck and Lee Remick. All too many horror films are so low-budget as to (correctly) seem to be made on some wood in the dead of night; produced with a lavish budget, *The Omen* can and does pull out all the stops to make a gripping and exciting picture. The theme is theological; and obviously the producers knew their *Revelations*. The picture is derived from *Rosemary's Baby*; but *The Omen* is not cramped by the static, filmed-play aspect of the former picture. Put simply, the plot revolves around the birth of a baby Anti-Christ, and the gradual revelation of this fact to its stunned and oppressed adopting parents.

The libertarian aspect of the picture stems from the repeated theological prediction that the Anti-Christ would in some way stem from government, and that government would be the instrument by which he would wreak havoc upon the world. Sure enough, the evil kid winds up in the bosom of a Kennedyesque President of the United States.

Joyce Maynard, in a frenetic attack on *The Omen* in *Newsweek*, denounces it as an attack on children per se. In the first place, in a culture that is excessively and sentimentally child-centered, in which children are automatically considered good and any evil emanating from them blamed on their parents, it is a pleasure to see a correction of this one-sided picture. (Here *The Omen* follows in the honorable path of the *The Bad Seed* and *Lord of the Flies*.) And secondly, the whole point of fantasy fiction is to suspend disbelief in one crucial axiom; once that often bizarre axiom is accepted, the rest of the plot should follow logically. In *The Omen* that axiom is the Christian prediction of the birth of the Anti-Christ, which is here intimately intertwined with government. What better blend than fun and anti-State?

"It is reason that produces everything: virtue, genius, wit, talent, and taste. What is virtue? Reason in practice. Talent? Reason enveloped in glory. Wit? Reason which is chastely expressed. Taste is nothing else than reason delicately put in force, and genius is reason in its most sublime form." —

M. J. de Chenier (1806).

# Foreign Affairs

## PALESTINE

By Leonard P. Liggio

Following the official visit to the UN of PLO leader Yasir Arafat, and the historic UN vote on Israel's racism toward the Palestinians, Israel has made a monumental contribution to the victory of the PLO. There have been massive riots, with Israeli troops killing Palestinian students, in the past weeks. The result has been the resignations of the mayors and administrations of nine Palestinian cities in the Israeli-occupied areas in Galilee, Samaria, and Judea. These are traditionalist Palestinian leaders who have tried to cooperate with the Israeli occupiers. The younger generation has expressed its support for the PLO, and indicates the future direction of the politics of the Palestinians. If after 1967 the Israelis had returned the area to the other illegal occupier of Palestinian lands against the decisions of the UN, — the Jordanian monarchy, or set up the area as a Palestinian puppet under the traditional leaders, the PLO would have been very limited in its future. But Israel has planted colonies in the occupied lands and allowed "unofficial" colonies to be founded. The final blow has been the issue of the Haram es Sherif, the Temple Mount. This is the place that tradition says that Abraham offered to sacrifice Isaac. Following the stateless epoch of the Hebrews, they sought the conquest of cities from the Philistines and the establishment of political power about which they were warned in the Book of Samuel. A temple was established on the hill of Jerusalem, which became the political capital. The temple was built by the great trading, building and artistic people, the Phoenicians (the ancestors of the Carthaginians of North Africa). The temple was destroyed in 70 A.D. Since the seventh century it has been the third most important religious site in Islam as the Prophet ascended to heaven from there, in addition to Islam's veneration for Jesus and for Abraham, patriarch of Semites. During the Crusades it was a center of the Latin Kingdom and of the Knights Templar. Jewish rabbis forbade Jews to enter the Haram es Sherif as it was the site of the Holy of Holies which may be entered only by descendants of Aaron; for any other Jew to enter it is a desecration. However, Israeli secular nationalists entered the Haram es Sherif this year to sing pro-government songs. The Palestinian riots were the result.

The attempts to establish Israeli colonies in Arab areas and the issue of the Temple Mount coincided with Israel's attempt to hold local elections in the Arab area. Israel was hoping to manage the election so that a more cooperative local leadership would result. However, the Israeli settlement attempts have unified support around the PLO. In Christian Arab Bethlehem, the university students ran up PLO flags on the university. Heretofore, Christian Arabs have been much less activist than the Moslems. In the March, 1976 UN debate, the PLO delegate was permitted to participate (despite the negative vote of William Scranton) in the role of a "UN member". The PLO delegate compared the anti-Israel riots to "the glorious Warsaw ghetto uprising" against the Nazis in World War II. This reemphasized the fact that the problem of Israel is a creation of European peoples who forced Jews to go to Israel in the World War II period rather than permit them to settle in Europe or America. The previous participation of the PLO delegate in the Security Council was in January to discuss the resolution concerning Palestine. Based on the November 30, 1975 resolution, the UN affirmed: "(a) That the Palestinian people should be enabled to exercise its inalienable national right of self-determination, including the right to establish an independent state in Palestine in accordance with the charter of the United Nations; (b) The plight of the Palestinian refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbors and the right of those choosing not to return to receive compensation for property; (c) That Israel should withdraw from all Arab territories occupied since June 1967; (d) That appropriate arrangements should be established to guarantee, in accordance with the charter of the United Nations, the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence within secure and recognized boundaries of all states in the area."

William Scranton in March UN debates called for the implementation of UN resolutions requiring an International Administration for Jerusalem, and noted that the Israeli colonizations were in violation of the Fourth

Geneva Convention. The debate was characterized by strong emphasis upon specific fulfillment of the United Nations General Assembly Resolution of November 29, 1947 (which is the legal basis for Israel's existence) creating borders for the Israeli and for the Arab states in Palestine; Israel's three decades' violation of its basis for legal existence has been the basis of its outlaw status. Israel's friends have been trying to end that outlaw status by immediate restoration of the conditions of the November 29, 1947 resolution.

The 1947 UN actions on Palestine were rooted in the conditions which had developed during the British occupation. George Antonius, in *The Arab Awakening* (1946) noted: "Zionist colonisation involved the actual wiping out of villages and the eviction of their peasantry; that the money which the Zionists brought and the resulting prosperity - if real prosperity there were - did not make up in Arab eyes for the loss of all that a peasant holds dear and sacred in his village surroundings; that the peasants were defenceless against the process of dispossession and the legalized but relentless pressure that went with it; that the sense of helplessness against the inexorable advance of Zionist colonisation had led to obviously unpremeditated outbreaks on the part of a population who are by nature peaceful and hospitable to strangers, and was bound, if allowed to continue, to cause unpredictable losses in lives and property. They learnt from actual experience that the policy they were carrying through by sheer force was, for all the optimism in ministerial speeches and official reports, a policy which was in effect laying in stores of dynamite."

Antonius commented on the partition plan: "It runs counter to the lessons of history, the requirements of geography, the natural play of economic forces, and the ordinary laws of human behavior. It reproduces some of the most discredited and dangerous features of the Treaty of Versailles. It pays scant regard to the doctrine of consent. In drawing it up, the Commissioners appear to have overlooked that it is no more feasible to drive a peasantry from its soil than to impose an alien government upon an unwilling population, except by constant resort to force; and that the use of superior force to hold down a nationally-conscious people, while it may for a time achieve its immediate purpose, is bound sooner or later to defeat its own ends.

"One of the most prevalent misconceptions is that the trouble in Palestine is the result of an engineered agitation. It is variously attributed to the intrigues of the effendi class, to the political ambitions of the Grand Mufti, to the agents and subsidies of Italy and Germany, to Communist machinations; and the opinion is commonly expressed — and sometimes quite genuinely — that, had the Arab masses been left unmisguided to reap the full harvest of benefits brought to them by the mandate, there would have been no trouble. The blindness of that view is clear today. Former outbreaks have similarly been explained; but, after inquiry by one or other of the commissions appointed by the mandatory Power, the underlying causes had always been found to have lain in the profound attachment of the Arabs to their soil and their culture. The rebellion today is, to a greater extent than ever before, a revolt of villagers, and its immediate cause is the proposed scheme of Partition and, more particularly, that aspect of it which envisages that eventual displacement of a large Arab peasantry to make room for the immigrant citizens of the proposed Jewish state. The moving spirits in the revolt are not the nationalist leaders, most of whom are now in exile, but men of the working and agricultural classes who are risking their lives in what they believe to be the only way left to them of saving their homes and their villages. It is a delusion to regard it as the work of agitators, Arab or foreign. Political incitement can do much to fan the flames of discontent, but it can not keep a revolt active, month after month, in conditions of such violence and hardship.

"Far from its being engineered by the leaders, the revolt is in a very marked way a challenge to their authority and an indictment of their

(Continued On Page 6)

## The Education Grab

The public school establishment has fallen on hard times lately. First it was struck a body blow by the criticisms of its role as an instrument of racism, class stratification, capitalism, and bourgeois values; then it was hit from the opposite direction by Jencks and others claiming that schooling was ineffective in doing more than reinforcing existing socio-cultural values. Public education's traditional purpose as an instrument of social, economic and cultural manipulation was documented by revisionist historians like Joel Spring, Michael Katz and even by more moderate scholars like Timothy Smith; while the radical libertarian Ivan Illich urged the "deschooling" of modern society. Then struck the greatest threat of all; the end of the gravy train. Inflation, recession, increasing resistance to ever expanding school taxes, the collapse of cheap credit through public bond issues, all of these were quite suddenly dovetailed with the ultimate result of the zero population craze — an absolute decline in the number of children of school age. The child-oriented industries faced an inelastic market in decline, and for the first time since World War II, teachers at all levels of schooling began to feel the grim shadow of structural unemployment, a certainty for increasing numbers in the next decade.

The situation in New York State is likely to be a model for the rest of the nation. As each year passes, the enrollments have been declining in the lower levels; the decline is now rippling upward through the system, and will reach collegiate levels in the early 1980's when the Regents of the State University predict a drop of perhaps 25% in college enrollments before 1984-85. Add to the natural decrease in births, the steady losses through emigration from the old Northeastern states, people seeking lower taxes, more jobs, better climate and more livable environment in the "sunbelt" region, and one can foresee an irreversible decline in the schooling industry in the Northeastern region. The near bankruptcy of New York City, and of the State as well, has already compelled unprecedented cuts in school budgets, mass cutbacks in personnel, and sudden decreases in the numbers of students training to enter the teaching field. For teachers, potential teachers, administrators, and college faculties in pedagogy, the crisis has one obvious and chilling meaning: actual or potential redundancy in mid-career.

While no one ought to rejoice over another's troubles, libertarians will certainly feel little sympathy for the teaching profession's response to the evolving crisis in New York. They have responded to their economic decline in much the same fashion as so many other industries — they have turned to the States to bail them out in every way conceivable, short of increasing the birth rate by act of the legislature.

The most subtle and devious proposal, because it seems to cost so little in immediate expenditures, has just been unveiled by the Task Force on Teacher Education and Certification. The Task Force was the brainchild of the New York State United Teachers (NYSUT), the state-wide teacher's union affiliated with the AFL-CIO and a tributary of the powerful and ambitious Albert Shanker, chief of the New York City United Federation of Teachers, the largest teachers' local in the labor movement. NYSUT's president, Thomas Hobart, reported to his constituents that fear that the State Regents might adopt the views of the national movement for "competency-based teacher education," and apply them to teacher education in New York, caused NYSUT to intervene in opposition to such developments. Hobart summarized NYSUT's successful intervention thus:

"One of the tenets of the original plan (for competency based teacher education) was to have life experience instead of a baccalaureate degree (as a qualification for certification). We were able to remove that. Another one was that a proficiency exam should be substituted for a baccalaureate degree. We were able to eliminate that. The evaluation of teacher competency was to be based on student performance, and we were able to eliminate that."

Following this victory, NYSUT and other special interest groups persuaded State Commissioner of Education Ewald Nyquist to appoint the Task Force on Teacher Education and Certification composed of 21 persons, all members of the education establishment except the

chairman, an attorney, Arnold Gardner, who was recommended for the position by NYSUT and was formerly president of the Buffalo School Board. Without the presence of anyone outside their own bailiwick, these educationists have now produced a preliminary report which has national implications.

If its recommendations are accepted by the New York State Regents and legislature, they will provide the needed model for similar action by educationists in other states.

What has been proposed? Nothing less than the creation of a system of licensing for teachers modelled on those of the other professions, law, medicine and accountancy. At the present time, the State department of education merely certifies teachers upon the recommendation of their various colleges and universities, based upon successful completion of specified courses of study and the granting of the baccalaureate degree. Though it still restricts hiring to those with the requisite degree, it is not particularly onerous as no further investigation is made into the potential

(Continued On Page 8)

## Foreign Affairs — (Continued From Page 5)

methods. The rebel chiefs lay the blame for the present plight of the peasantry on those Arab landowners who have sold their land, and they accuse the leaders of culpable neglect for failing to prevent the sales. The peasants have had no say in the great majority of the land transactions which have led to their eviction. The landowner who has the legal title disposes of the land at his discretion, and one of the provisions of the deed of sale is that the land is to be surrendered to the purchaser free from all occupants or rights of tenancy. The revolt is largely manned by the peasantry, that is to say by the people whose life and livelihood are on the soil but who have had no say whatever in its disposal; and their anger and violence are as much directed against the Arab landowners and brokers who have facilitated the sales as against the policy of the mandatory Power under whose aegis the transactions have taken place. The fact that some of these landowners have served on national Arab bodies makes them only more odious to the insurgent peasantry and has rendered it less amenable to the influence of the political leaders as a whole.

"In the first place, while it is true that Jewish capital and initiative have greatly contributed to the economic development of the country, to the enrichment of a number of Arab landowners and to a rise in the wages of Arab labour, it is also true that they have created new needs and new burdens. The public services called into being by the policy of the mandate — special services of public security, duplication rendered necessary by the imposition of Hebrew as an official language, swelling of the wages bill in public contracts solely in order to give employment to Jewish labour — have necessitated the setting up of an abnormally large and costly bureaucracy for such a small country, and the ear-marking of a considerable portion of the budget to unproductive expenditure. The establishment of Jewish industries, especially those which are artificial in the sense that they depend on raw materials imported from the outside, led to the imposition of protective tariffs and a consequent raise in the price of commodities. The rapid influx of population resulted in an abnormal rise in the cost of living everywhere, in the villages as well as in the towns. In the absence of full statistical data, it is impossible to tell to what extent the economic benefits have been offset by the corresponding burdens; but it is an undeniable fact, and one that is generally overlooked, that, save for the enrichment of a number of landowners and middlemen, the economic position of the Arab population as a whole, and more particularly that of the villages, is scarcely better or worse than it has been for generations."

"In the second place, the economic aspect is overshadowed by the moral and political issues. To the Arabs the problem is now essentially one of self-preservation . . . The disturbances have since assumed the character of a rebellion in which the leading part is played by peasants and labourers who, in despair, have resorted to violence as the only means left to them of resisting Partition." (George Antonius, *The Arab Awakening*, New York, Capricorn, 1965.)

# Russia!

By Justus D. Doenecke\*

Review of: Robert G. Kaiser, *Russia: The People and the Power* (New York: Atheneum, 1976, \$12.95)  
Hedrick Smith, *The Russians* (New York: Quadrangle, 1976, \$12.50)

In 1947 George F. Kennan wrote his famous "X" article, entitled "The Sources of Soviet Conduct." Here, in an essay mastered by generations of college students, the prominent diplomat claimed that Russia's tradition of absolutism, along with the new and militant ideology of Marxism-Leninism, had created an intolerant and isolated society. Kennan predicted, however, that Western containment would eventually lead to "the break-up or gradual mellowing of Soviet power." Because Russia's "tired and dispirited population" worked "largely under the shadow of fear and compulsion", their country remained economically vulnerable, and in some ways impotent.

One can now test Kennan's analysis. Few correspondents are better able to describe today's Russia than Hedrick Smith of the *New York Times* and Robert G. Kaiser of the *Washington Post*. Smith, co-editor of the *Pentagon Papers*, has won a Pulitzer for his Moscow coverage; Kaiser was given a correspondent's award in 1974 by the Overseas Press Club. Their books are extremely well-written, although Smith falls into an occasional cliché ("sauce to season the dry intellectual noodles") and Kaiser can jump too abruptly from one topic to another.

The authors pay few tributes to the planned society, at least to state planning as practiced in the USSR. The role of women are a case in point. Soviet boasting concerning female equality hides an oppression that would make the United States look like a NOW vision of utopia. Women in the USSR have the most low-paying and unskilled of all jobs, with many involved in physical labor.

Russian society frowns on candid discussion of sexuality, and the regime fosters marriage and large families. Many Russians, however, engage in pre-marital sex and find that budget and housing restrictions limit households to one child. Abortion is frequent, not because of any "liberation ethic," but because the supply of birth-control devices is limited. The much vaunted state nurseries give infants less care than they would receive at home; even respected Soviet scholars are voicing misgivings about group upbringing.

Both authors pay few compliments to Russia's centralized planning. The Five Year Plans, Smith and Kaiser admit, have modernized one of the most backward societies of the world, and have done so in less than five decades. Rigid adherence to longterm blueprints, however, has led to waste, featherbedding, doctored statistics, and lopsided development. The regime vigorously resists innovation, and one almost yearns for the economic world espoused by Milton Friedman, not to mention the more "hard core" Murray Rothbard, to whom the Friedmanian universe is like a timid sip of 3.2 beer.

Inefficiency is so great that even New Zealand and the Arab states rank ahead in per capita output. Goods are often too shabby to be sold on Western markets. Contrary to legend, laborers have little work ethic and take no pride in craftsmanship. Few Russians want to work in Siberia, a region rich in oil, gas, and other minerals; it is too bleak, too cold, too primitive for all but transient youth.

Collective farming is another sore point. Despite the rigorously collectivized agriculture, nearly 30 per cent of farm output is grown on private plots. Ironically, it is these free enterprise markets that help keep Russians alive. Crop yield is low, mechanization primitive, fertilizer and seeds poorly distributed. Much rural life remains shabby, drab, and isolated, with millions living at poverty level. The basic wages for collective farmers lag far behind those earned by factory workers.

Not all production problems lie in farm and industry, for science and technology reflect a most uneven development. The Soviet Union has more scientists than any other nation. Its physicists and mathematicians are among the world's most brilliant, and Russians have done significant work in steelmaking, electronic generators, and magneto-hydrodynamics. However, they have made little contribution to such fields as organic chemistry and biology. Kaiser shows that their

publicized space exploits draw attention from serious technological gaps: they never had the resources to fly to the moon, much less conduct extensive experiments outside the earth's surface. Here again, it is the closed nature of Soviet society that prevents the Russians from having the freedom they need.

Education shows up the same gap, indeed chasm, between rhetoric and reality. True the USSR has moved close to full literacy, but even over half its adults still have not advanced beyond the seventh grade. At an early age, poorer students are shunted off to vocational schools, a device that often preserves the class structure of Soviet society. The Soviets stress rote-learning and drill, with much time devoted to "patriotism" and "Lenin-worship." American scholars impressed with the "collective responsibility" Russian children take for each other merely betray their naivete, for the Soviet classroom has institutionalized a system of tattling.

The fact that many dissenters seek "real communism" and genuine "worker control" makes little difference: they want freedom of expression and hence constitute a threat to Russia's leaders. Both authors have superb accounts of writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn and scientist Andrei Sakharov, with Smith showing the provocative novelist as a man who hopes to restore Russia to its pre-industrial, Orthodox, isolated days.

The regime still fosters atheism, and does so aggressively. Some 30 million Russians, however, are believers — twice the number of Communist party members. True, religious observance can lead to professional setbacks and the Orthodox church faces many state restraints. In small towns, however, the priest is still a central figure and many members of the intelligentsia have turned to the church as a haven.

The status of some three million Soviet Jews remains in limbo. After the Revolution of 1917, Yiddish culture enjoyed a renaissance and some Jews, such as Trotsky, had extremely important positions. Stalin's anti-Jewish purges gave way to a far milder but pervasive anti-Semitism, one that included quotas in schools and colleges and the professions, and Judaism as a religion is dying. Yet, even now, Jews have succeeded far out of proportion to their numbers, particularly in the creative arts, and Smith claims that the renewed sense of Jewish nationalism "seemed less a zealous devotion to Israel than a drive for self-affirmation in Soviet life after decades of self-denial."

Smith and Kaiser devote much space to the ruling elite, a group that lives as a privileged class. The group can maintain substantial villas in the countryside, shop in special stores, watch foreign films forbidden to the rest of the population, and help their children get admitted to universities. If the ruling elite is not a monolithic group, it has still been able to maintain a united front. Cronyism, not ideological struggle, is the earmark of the leadership, and there are Russians who yearn for another Stalin to cut through the bureaucratic arrogance.

Ideology serves as a tool of the Kremlin's power brokers, and an individual can ignore it so long as he presents no open challenge. The dream of a "new Soviet man", unselfish and devoted, is contradicted daily publicized accounts of greed and scandal. "Don't make waves" appears to be the earmark of the ambitious functionary or "apparatchik," for promotion goes to the steady and unimaginative. Indeed, it is frequently the petty bureaucrats, self-appointed busybodies, who most erode the human spirit. Smith writes, "Soviet life often resembles living full time in the Army." The system is designed to bring out the worst, not the best, in people. Reform would necessitate decentralization, which in turn would make party control of the nation most precarious.

Only Kaiser systematically discusses foreign policy. The West, he says, has continually exaggerated Russia's military strength, while ignoring its

(Continued On Page 8)

\* Justus Doenecke is associate professor of history, New College of the University of South Florida.

## Education Grab — (Continued From Page 6)

teacher's competency or his particular educational philosophy. Also, certification is required only for employees of the public schools, and does not even extend to those employed by the New York City public system which has more onerous requirements including written and oral examinations for certification.

The new plan for licensing would make teaching a licensed profession. In Hobart's immortal words: "The greatest strength of a license is that in the licensed profession those who practice without a license go to jail." He is quite frank about this. No one will teach in New York without the permission of the profession's licensing board. That extends the state's power over public school teachers to those in private and parochial schools as well. It will also make it difficult for those coming from other states to qualify for employment in New York. It will inevitably restrict the potential supply of new teachers and thus support demands for higher wages and benefits. Under the guise of making a profession, the Task Force hopes to create a monopoly over labor supply.

Hopefully, this professionalization will create a new "criminal class" — the unlicensed teacher, restoring to us the historic days of 18th century Ireland where the penal laws forbade, under threat of deportation, any unlicensed teacher to instruct the children of Catholics. The Catholic response, the profession's response, was the "hedge school master", the man who risked his life and fortune to instruct children in the ditches and behind the hedges of rural Ireland, out of sight of the magistrate.

The new licensing will demand at least two requirements to be met: first, potential licensees must serve a one year's internship in a public school under the tutelage of a master teacher, and be responsible for a restricted, small number of students. For this he will be paid a salary, and if his evaluation is satisfactory, he will presumably be granted a license. This doubles the time of the present internship, makes it mandatory for all, and shifts the cost from the intern to the taxpayer. But with increasing pressure for cost efficiency, how many schools will wish to take on the burden of such costly internships? Probably few, reducing the opportunity of potential teachers to fulfill the license requirements. As in the skilled trades, internships will probably become valued legacies from fathers to sons, or mothers to daughters. The politicalization of access to the profession is bound to become more flagrant.

A second requirement will be success in passing an examination in both pedagogy and subject matter. Hobart's premise in demanding an examination in pedagogy is that it is "a body of knowledge which can be systematically categorized and learned." But this claim is ludicrous! There is hardly any area of pedagogical theory which is not marked by the presence of conflicting paradigms. As a science, pedagogy is a shambles of contrary theories. As an art, it has successfully been practiced by many highly talented artisans, and even has known a few genuine

geniuses. But the notion that one can categorize it for purposes of examination to test competency is likely to impose an orthodoxy unjustified by the nature of the art. The professionalization of teaching through examination makes as much sense as the professionalization of painting, sculpting, or salesmanship through qualifying examinations in these arts.

Finally, the Task Force has recommended the creation of a board to regulate the "practices" of the "profession," analogous to such regulatory boards in other licensed professions. While just what practices of teachers might constitute malpractice is left very vague, the Task Force chairman has noted that the board would almost certainly require continuing in-service training for teachers to upgrade the quality of the profession. Thus, the license would not be permanent, but presumably subject to periodic renewal, with those teachers uncooperative in undergoing further "upgrading" subject to loss of employment. In addition to the tremendous monopoly of power, and the control over individual teachers such a board would exercise, teachers would become a captive market for the declining schools of education, thus providing a continuing job cushion for the faculties of graduate level education departments. Needless to say, the board would be composed solely of "professionals" nominated by specified categories of professional associations, and thus not subject to control by laymen or even public officials.

This plan is just the product of a preliminary report; in the fall further "reforms" will be forthcoming. Friends of liberty and lovers of learning will need to organize in every state at the first sign of the spread of this latest manifestation of monopoly and the unholy alliance of the special interest group and the State. It will be a difficult and crucial struggle. The issues are basic; the forces agitating for licensing are politically powerful and financially strong. What role will libertarians play in the ensuing battle? ■

J. R. P.

## Russia! — (Continued From Page 7)

economic and technological failings. He stresses that the USSR is still living under the same "siege mentality" it first experienced in 1917; hence it seeks not so much to advance the cause of communism as to protect its own autocracy. It realizes that it cannot compete economically with the Western powers for Third World allegiance and is now finding the Arab nations singularly ungrateful. Detente reduces arms competition with the West while legitimizing the Soviet empire.

The Washington Post correspondent warns that Russia is "anxious to do us ill" but claims that the United States has the resources to cope effectively. George F. Kennan's prediction of Soviet decay appears farther away than ever; in the meantime, it is foolish to exaggerate Russian strength.

### SUBSCRIBE NOW

Please enter a subscription for:

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Street \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Subscription Is \$8.00 Per Year

\$15.00 Two Years

Libertarian Forum Associate Subscription \$15.00 Or More.

### THE LIBERTARIAN FORUM

Box 341 Madison Square Station  
New York, New York 10010

### The Libertarian Forum

BOX 341

MADISON SQUARE STATION  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10010

**First Class**

Published Every Month. Subscription Rates: \$8.00 Per Year; \$15.00 Two Years