

The Libertarian

Published by **The Libertarian Foundation**, #115-444 Robson Street
Vancouver • British Columbia • Canada • Phone 688-2308



Volume 1, Number 4

July, 1978

DEATH AND TAXES

Back around the time of the American Revolution, Benjamin Franklin coined the phrase, "Nothing is certain but death and taxes." The thought seemed appropriate for the times. Death often came early and taxes were what they always had been since we created rulers — oppressive and burdensome. Both were thought to be a part of life, unpleasant but inevitable.

Unpleasantries are to be fought if man is to progress. The certainty of death was challenged by the medical profession, to be fought head-on with reason, logic, rationality and the scientific method. Each victory over scourges such as polio, smallpox, diphtheria and typhoid fever added years to the life of the average man.

On the other hand the certainty of taxes was challenged by politicians — using wishful thinking, fairytale rhetoric, empty election promises and baby kissing. No wonder that today we have income tax, sales tax, liquor tax, tobacco tax, amusement tax, excise tax, auto tax, fuel tax, Canada pension tax, unemployment tax, property tax, import tax, and so on, *ad nauseam*. In fact, politicians have guaranteed that taxes have become a certainty for all of us to the tune of almost 50 cents of every dollar we earn. And this only makes sense, for although taxes are unpleasantries to us all, they are the life-blood of the political system.

The libertarian challenge is to face taxes as men of science face disease. Taxes are to be challenged and eliminated through a rational and logical program. Let us question the reason for every tax and consider the services provided by each. Then let us show how these services can logically be provided through free enterprise, leaving the choice up to each individual.

Taxes need not be certain. California's Proposition 13 has shown all of us that we can fight back. We have practical reasons to protest: we are quickly going broke paying for all levels of government. Libertarians must now stress the moral principle that we should not have to pay taxes. Taxes are immoral and taxes are impractical. Let us fight back. We have nothing to lose — and everything to gain.

THE LIBERTARIAN FOUNDATION: PROGRESS REPORT

Foundation activities over the past month have continued to focus on students and the media. While dramatic progress is not expected over the summer months, we are laying the groundwork for concerted action in the Fall.

High School Libertarians

The Foundation is working with Grade 12 students from Burnaby South Senior Secondary School to put together a Libertarian Club for the September school term. The club will serve as a focal point for generating interest in libertarian ideas in the school. The club will have an informal affiliation with the U.B.C. Libertarian Society. Members of the club will be contacting

friends at other schools for the purpose of starting similar clubs.

Media Attention

Ed Murphy had a libertarian update on his June 5 show. Rick brought listeners up to date on Foundation activities and fielded questions. Twenty of the listeners were interested enough in what was said to come out to the June 6 public meeting.

On June 19, Rick was seen on Barton & Co., a CHEK TV morning interview show from Victoria. Host John Barton covered a wide range of topics during Rick's twenty-minute interview. Early response from the show would indicate that regular viewers are not latent libertarians waiting to spring from their closets.

Mike was interviewed by CHQM business

IN THIS ISSUE:

"Tariffs: More Hands in Your Consumer Pocket," by Jerome F. Smith

commentator, Fred Cawsey, for two five-minute radio segments. The interview was very positive and should appeal to many of the regular listeners. And on July 9, Mike appeared on BCTV's News Hour, in a five-minute interview with Pamela Martin.

Dinner Engagement

On July 6, Rick spoke at a dinner meeting of the German-Canadian Business and Professional Association. His subject was "Libertarianism —an Answer to Canada's Problems." The speech was very well received by the 40 members present, and was followed by a lengthy question and answer session.

LETTERS

I have just finished reading the June issue of *The Libertarian* and would like to commend you and all the contributors on an excellent newsletter. Would you kindly send me single copies of Volume I, Numbers 1 and 2? I have enclosed a cheque in the amount of \$4.00.

Would it be possible to include a question and answer section in *The Libertarian*? Many people, particularly those who have only recently become acquainted with the Libertarian Foundation, would welcome some straight answers to specific questions on a variety of issues.

I am xeroxing copies of my newsletters and plan to distribute them to friends and associates. Hopefully this will result in new supporters for the Libertarian Foundation.

Mrs. Wilma Ross
Burnaby

(Mrs. Ross included a question in her letter, which will inaugurate a new column "Our Readers Inquire". We welcome further questions from readers.)

OUR READERS INQUIRE

"I cannot discern any basic difference between the three major political parties. How can I exercise my voting franchise in the next federal election without compromising my beliefs?"

You can't. All the major parties would pursue programs which are in varying degrees anti-libertarian. If the party you vote for gains a majority, your vote becomes your implicit sanction for any and all actions that party takes in office in the name of "the people." Insofar as those actions aggress against the rights of

UNITED RIGHT-TO-WORK ASSOCIATION

URTWA is concerned with a single issue: the right of an individual to join or not to join a union. Revitalized last December by Morvel Klause, the organization presently has 122 members.

Mr. Klause is self employed. His involvement in the right-to-work movement stems from an outraged letter he wrote to President Carter over his about-face on right-to-work legislation.

URTWA is currently examining the Labour Code of B.C. and intends to lobby for the removal of those clauses denying freedom of choice to workers with respect to union membership. "The elimination of forced union membership . . . will, in large measure, eliminate the callous disregard for the rights of individuals which is rampant throughout unionism today."

Morvel Klause and his group are fighting a principled battle at considerable cost and against almost overwhelming odds. To quote from the January/February URTWA newsletter:

To date no one has been paid for labour in this cause. All money spent has been in payment for printing costs, travel and the cost of postage. Some day we hope to have the kind of membership the National Right to Work Committee of the U.S.A. has acquired. It now exceeds 1.3 million ... One may wonder why it has taken us Canadians so long to wake up. There is in this country a kind of apathy about freedom that is very difficult to understand.

Those who wish further information on URTWA or who wish to join this organization in its fight for freedom in the labour field should write to

United Right-to-Work Association of B.C.

P.O. Box 405,
Surrey, B.C.
V3T 5B6
(Phone) 596-4446

others your beliefs are compromised: insofar as they aggress against your own rights, you are victimized.

On the face of it this is an unhelpful answer to those people who sincerely believe that it is their duty to exercise their franchise in the democratic process. But given the nature of the parties, there is no alternative.

Some would argue that a vote is not necessarily an endorsement of a party. Many elections have been regarded as a reaction against the incumbent party rather than an endorsement of its successor (the last election in B.C. was one

The Libertarian is published monthly by the Libertarian Foundation. Subscription, \$25 per year; individual issues, \$2.

Editor

Helen Yeomans

Contributors

Walter Boytink

Michael Crosbie

Richard Davison

Philip Mills

Jerome F. Smith

Dom-Em Services Ltd.

Typesetting

example). Today, there appears to be widespread feeling that on a national level any party would be better than the present government. Thus, a vote for the Conservatives or NDP would signify nothing more than a reaction against the Liberals.

But there is no evidence that the Conservatives, say, would be a discernable improvement over the present government. Thus, casting your vote for the "lesser of two evils" would solve nothing. The lesser evil is still evil — and you have no guarantee beforehand that it is indeed less evil, election promises or party platform notwithstanding.

So can you exercise your franchise at all? Other than standing for office and voting for yourself, the only action open to you is to vote for the man, not for the party. If your riding has a principled candidate whose position on key issues accords with your own — or if you live in a riding fielding a libertarian candidate — then it is just possible you may be able to vote without compromising your beliefs.

Provided the candidate is in your judgement a person of integrity you should be able to vote for him. But remember that even here, your vote still carries implicit endorsement of the political system under which that MP — like all others — must work. If you are prepared to accept that, vote — and good luck to you.

WHAT CAUSES INFLATION?

by Walter Boytink

"There is no subtler way, no surer means of overturning an existing society, than to inflate and ruin its currency. The inflation process engages all the hidden forces of economic law on the side of destruction and does it in a manner which not one man in a million is able to diagnose."

What is the cause of inflation? Is there a relationship between the amount, of money and the goods and services available at any one time? If the money supply is increased there is a resultant, although delayed, price increase. In simple terms, if there are one hundred bushels of wheat available and a

money supply of \$100, the price is \$1.00 per bushel. If the government arbitrarily prints another \$100 of money and puts it into the market, the price of wheat soon adjusts to \$2.00 per bushel. To say it another way, the price of goods adjusts (slowly but surely) to use up the amount of money available to buy those goods.

Another illustration may shed light on this rather difficult concept that high prices are the result, rather than the cause, of inflation. Let us say a family is living on a fixed income of \$1,000 per month and their gas bill is \$100 per month. If their gas bill is doubled to \$200 per month, is this increase a cause of inflation? No. Such an increase undoubtedly causes hardship, but it does not cause inflation. If the income of the family is fixed, they no longer have \$900 to spend on items other than gas, but only \$800. To the extent that the amount of money they have available for other items has been decreased, their demand for those items has also been decreased. A decreased demand will result in a lowering of prices for those other items. If it ended right here, there would be no resulting inflation.

However, with today's society and social pressures it does not end there. The man who has had an increase in his gas bill goes to his employer and demands a raise. When he has sufficient clout by virtue of belonging to a union or professional organization, the employer gives him the raise and in turn will probably have to raise the price of his product or lose money. Since ultimately the only way to raise the price of a product — all other things being equal — is to reduce its supply, which means reducing production, some unemployment is the usual result. This still does not cause inflation. Instead, because there are fewer goods available for the rest of us to purchase, it results in a lower standard of living.

The hardship and unemployment results in pressure on the politicians who, in order to get re-elected, think they must do something about the situation. Their normal course of action is to give relief in the form of unemployment payments or makework projects, both of which cost money. Even this program would not cause inflation if taxes were raised to pay for the program; but increased taxes would cause further hardship just as higher prices already have. Instead of raising taxes, they could borrow the money from private lending sources to finance the giveaway programs; but this would reduce the amount of money available to private industry, hampering this sector's ability to provide jobs.

The only other choice to finance the giveaway is to crank out additional money from the printing press, and this is the real cause of inflation. When

(continued on page 7)

THE WAR ON FREE TRADE

(An article in three parts*)

by Jerome F. Smith

(Last month, Jerome Smith traced the connection between trade wars and shooting wars. The greater the barrier to free trade, he argued, the greater the likelihood of war. Today we are witnessing "the most vicious trade war since the debacle of the thirties." In Part Two of this three-part series, Mr. Smith examines and refutes the traditional arguments raised by advocates of protectionism in support of these policies.)

II TARIFFS:

MORE HANDS IN YOUR CONSUMER POCKET

There are various pseudo-arguments put forth in favour of tariffs. They are as disparate as they are ingenious, but they all have one failing in common. All of them vainly attempt to prove that the benefits of the "protected" industries some- how occur by damaging foreign producers and that domestic consumers are not exploited by the tariff.

This is not so. It is only in the complete absence of tariffs and other trade barriers that consumers are not made to pay higher, uncom- petitive prices. When protectionist arguments are subjected to a close free-market analysis, their shallowness becomes obvious.

Cheap Foreign Labour

"We can't compete against countries where they pay their workers a few cents a day," says this argument. This wailing is usually accompanied by the recommendation that tariffs be levied to bring the landed costs of goods from such countries into line with domestic selling prices.

It is to all countries' advantage to trade with nations that have differing natural endowments and efficiencies. The more a nation's domestic price structure differs from others, the more it can gain from free trade. To illustrate, let us suppose that all tariffs were suddenly abolished on foreign-made shoes, and suppose further that the average price of shoes fell from \$50 a pair to \$35.

What is seen is that the lower prices would drive some of the hitherto protected domestic shoe companies out of business. The domestic consumer sees that he can now buy the foreign-made shoes for less than the domestic product. In economists say that the nation's balance of trade short, his standard of living rises. Undeniably, some domestic shoe workers will be put out of work.

**Adapted from World Market Perspective, Vol. XI, No. 2, February 16, 1978. Copyright © ERC Publishing Company West Vancouver, B.C. World Market Perspective is a monthly economic newsletter analyzing global economic forces and trends and their impact on international investors.*

What is not seen is that the combined savings that the consumers have made from their shoe purchases will add up to quite a bit and that this money now can be spent elsewhere. However it is spent, it will be in a more productive, more economic manner than on overpriced shoes. The industries now benefited (with the saved consumer shoe money) will expand and add new workers. Even if the money is not spent at all —i.e., if it is saved — it will still provide new jobs by financing capital investments. With a higher saving rate, interest rates will tend to fall, as there will now be more money in the banks. This is always beneficial for business, as borrowing becomes easier and cheaper. With the borrowed money, various businesses will expand and hire more workers.

And these workers will have "real" jobs; real in the sense that they are economic and productive not just jobs existing off the "fat" expropriated from consumers. The temporary unemployment would be no different and no more serious than the shift in employment constantly taking place within the domestic economy.

No business should be kept alive by a subsidy or tariff barrier when it becomes uneconomic; that is, when it becomes uncompetitive and stops serving the consumers' needs in the most efficient way possible. However painful the readjustment is, it is less so sooner than it will be later, and the event should not obscure the fact that the burden of guilt is on the government for offering a subsidy or erecting the tariff or other trade barrier in the first place.

The Trade Balance Argument

When a country imports more than it exports, economists say that the nation's balance of trade is in deficit. Some believe that an "unfavourable" balance is bad for the domestic economy because money that "could be putting locals to work" flows out to buy cheaper, foreign-made goods. Cries for restrictive tariffs (and/or domestic subsidies) become increasingly shrill when a nation's trade deficit grows especially large. That has happened in the United States recently. A

(continued on page 5)

large, \$6.3 billion deficit in 1976 soared to nearly \$27 billion in 1977, and is running at a still higher rate this year, totalling \$12.5 billion through April.

But the whole concept of "favourable" and "unfavourable" balances of trade must be called into question. It is a common fallacy to suppose that an excess of either imports or exports is bad. All underdeveloped economies tend to: (1) have a balance-of-trade deficit, and (2) be attractive to foreign capital investments (in the absence of political restrictions). The U.S. was an example of this throughout the last century. And, becoming developed economically in this century, the U.S. ran a trade surplus almost every year for a half-century prior to the mid-1960's

From the consumer's point of view, there is no such thing as a favourable or unfavourable balance of trade. "Unfavourable" is, in fact, a misleading term because any voluntary and unencumbered purchase is the most favourable action for that individual at that time. And, the same is true for whole nations when trade is unencumbered. National boundaries have no bearing whatever on the satisfaction to *both* buyer and seller in a free exchange.

The Infant Industries Argument

This fallacy demands that the government protect certain young industries. "Give them a chance to get established — then they can compete," the argument runs. We can reject this by pointing out that if the particular new industry involved is characterized by a declining long-run average-cost curve (due to economies of scale, and technological improvements in production efficiency), then the same industry in another country most likely will be also so characterized. In that case, the latter country could achieve still greater efficiencies if it is allowed to specialize and produce for both countries. Scarce resources would then be employed more efficiently in the original country in an industry in which that country holds a natural comparative advantage.

The fact that a new industry may be challenging an established foreign competitor (and thus may be hard pressed initially to be competitive) cannot be denied. We cannot change the fact that capital and skill may have long been invested in a foreign plant. Indeed, we would really not want to; technology is dynamic, old plants with old equipment become relatively less efficient — even obsolete — compared to new ones with more advanced equipment and methods. If this is the case in a given instance then the new competitor can attract private capital investment without a subsidy or tariff "protection". If this is *not* the case, the proposed new plant should not be built.

Subsidizing such new plants injures taxpayers by making them pay again for something which already exists and serves them from abroad. It is uneconomic, i.e., it draws away land, labour, and capital that could otherwise be used to satisfy more urgent desires of domestic consumers. And, of course, giving a tariff protection in such a case needlessly soaks domestic consumers with higher prices. We can also reject the "infant" argument merely by observing the number of grown-up "infants" hiding behind the skirts of the tariff boards (e.g., the U.S. steel industry).

National Self-Sufficiency

Many inefficient "protected" industries masquerade under a banner of "national self-sufficiency." Their proponents maintain that their goods are essential for the economy or for national defence and that "healthy" domestic industry can only be assured by subsidies or protective tariffs.

This argument proceeds from the assumption that the national objective is to become a fortress nation geared not for peace and prosperity but for war and destitution. This is a warmonger's argument.

The whole array of devious justifications put forward by "protectionists", the political success they have had and continue to have in achieving their short-sighted ends even in the face of a mountain of evidence against them, shows how one of the most fundamental, simple facts of economic life has been politically distorted — *consumption is the sole end of production, not the other way around.*

If the arguments for tariffs are so pernicious and motivated solely by vested interest factions, and the arguments favouring free trade are so positive, why then are we still burdened with tariffs? A partial, political answer to this is that consumers are not organized as a countervailing force against self-seeking union and industry lobbyists. And, power-seeking politicians are only happy to oblige these lobbyists — for a price. If there is any doubt about collusion, just observe those business and union organizations who contribute to opposing political parties in the same race to make sure, no matter who wins, they have backed a winner.

Another more important, reason that tariffs and other trade barriers persist is that nation-state officials themselves favour trade restrictions and regulations for the power it puts in their hands. Still more fundamentally, even those officials who understand the arguments against tariffs and trade restrictions, are afraid to publicly espouse these arguments because the same arguments are

(continued on page 6)

CAN WE AFFORD CANADA POST?

by Philip Mills

Canadian postal workers are being urged by left-wing extremists to help overthrow the federal government. That's how fertile Canada Post has become — it is a hotbed for fanatics.

Union hostility and brittle management-labour relations are cited as major reasons why the post office appears to be headed for financial ruin. Post office losses have climbed dramatically: Last year's deficit reached \$579 million, compared with \$91 million in 1973, and \$67 million a decade ago. Predicted losses for this year are \$650 million.

Postal unions must take their share of the blame: Man-days lost through strikes reached 6,355 for the first six months of last year, compared to 1,095 in 1967.

Canada Post is a financial sinkhole, and the question begging an answer is: How much longer can the public and the national debt sustain such a big loser?

For some, particularly the hundreds of businesses ruined in the last major postal strike in 1975, it's too late even to ask the question. Others have refused to wait for the answer and have withdrawn their patronage from Canada Post in favour of private couriers.

Estimates of revenue captured by the private sector from Canada Post run as high as \$100 million annually, even though these couriers are theoretically barred from distributing letters under the Post Office Act, which gives Canada Post a monopoly.

The government, ever anxious to protect its own interests before those of the public, is now trying to block any further intrusion by free enterprise into its cornered market. Canada Post is currently fighting a move by the American-owned United Parcel Service of Canada (UPS) to expand its lucrative parcel post business in Ontario to other provinces. UPS has applied to the Ontario Highway Transport Board for permission to use trucks instead of cars — an integral part of the expansion plan.

With the postal service in desperate trouble and the public pleading for a solution, the federal government is trying to prevent the only real solution: free market competition. With high inflation, multi-billion dollar trade deficits, retreating investment and a \$70 billion national debt, Canada simply cannot afford a government-run postal service that last year lost \$1.6 million every day — \$1,100 a minute.

Government, of course, is itself the root cause of the postal predicament. By passing legislation

that casts Canada Post in the mould of an unwieldy monopoly, government bestows upon postal unions the power to hold the country to ransom: Where can the public turn for first-class mail service during strikes or slowdowns?

If the federal government really had the best interests of the public at heart, it would withdraw from the business of postal services as quickly as it could.

Ottawa should float Canada Post on the open market, sell off installations, equipment and facilities, and repeal the Post Office Act. The government has to break the monopoly that it has created and allow competition.

Private postal services are constantly exposed to the threat of competition that requires prudence and demands reasonable union conduct — for the sake of survival.

Government has spent the last 100 years demonstrating how to drive a postal enterprise into a brick wall. Free enterprise surely couldn't do worse.

Philip Mills is a professional journalist.

HOSTING A COFFEE PARTY

Coffee parties are one of the best ways to spread libertarian ideas. Unlike formal meetings, they are friendly gatherings of perhaps 6 to 12 people. Their informality enables everyone to feel at ease and to take part in the discussion of the ideas and issues covered.

Anyone who has friends who might be interested in learning more about libertarianism can host a coffee party. If you would like to do so, then talk to your friends or your neighbours, and arrange an evening.

Rick and Mike are always happy to talk at these parties and require only a week or two of notice.

Tariffs (from page 5)

valid against all forms of taxes and trade restrictions, *domestic and international*, and hence are an intellectual threat to their institutional environment — the state.

There is no economic justification for tariffs, ever. And, there is no economic justification for taxes on domestic production or trade either. Both, in their net effects, are always destructive.

Jerome F. Smith, an Austrian-school economist, is editor of World Market Perspective and founder of Economic Research Counselors. One of the world's most highly respected authorities on silver investments, he is author of Silver Profits in the Seventies and Understanding Runaway Inflation.

TIPS FOR DELINQUENT TAXPAYERS

by Michael Crosbie

So you're behind on your taxes! Business, property, income, school, sales, hospital, import and export. You haven't paid the elevator license, the cat, the dog, the driver or the business license. All of them? You're out of work? Your marriage is on the rocks? Your children are in juvenile detention? Your wife is suing you, and you're flat broke? Smile. Cheer up because you're not alone. Here's some advice. Switch on the telly, get that last bottle of beer out of the fridge and during the commercial breaks, read on.

First of all, don't become angry, depressed or suicidal. Laugh, but laugh out loud. Take a look in the mirror, wink, pat yourself on the shoulder. Now proceed to the kitchen table, pick up the bundle of unopened envelopes and throw them in the fire. There, that didn't hurt, did it? Instantly you've got rid of all your bills. Mind you, don't fool yourself into believing you still don't owe a lot of money to the government. In a matter of days you'll have another stack of unopened envelopes to burn. Repeat your little ceremony in front of the mirror and burn the bills once more.

Irresponsible advice you say. Not at all. You see, I'm concerned about you, your life, your health, your happiness, your attitude to our society.

For the moment at least you're in full control of the situation. You owe money but you have no bills, so in a manner, however fleetingly, you're free of debt.

Soon the tax collectors will call, one after the other. As they hand you their embossed calling card, take them by the scruff of the neck and make a citizens arrest. As you drag them shouting and pleading to lock them up in the upstairs bathroom, say the following in a stentorian voice: "In the name of all taxpaying citizens of this country, I am hereby placing you under arrest in our family bathroom. You, as a representative of this government, are hereby charged with squandering the people's money and because of your policy of saturation taxation, you have caused me to go broke, lose my wife and suffer the loss of the love of my two children."

Now immediately you've locked up the tax collectors, phone the police and tell them what you have done and nothing else. Then run as fast as you can to the nearest courthouse and place the senior magistrate under citizens arrest. As you do so, say the following in a stentorian voice: "In the name of all taxpaying citizens of this country I hereby place you under citizens arrest for upholding the laws promulgated by a government that

has committed the crime of squandering and mismanaging the wealth of this land."

Now find a mirror, take a deep breath, smile, wink and pat yourself on the shoulder. Next dash helter-skelter to the nearest newspaper office and tell them what you have done. Then find the nearest radio station, break into the broadcast booth, give the startled D.J. a good firm rabbit punch (not too hard) and make the following announcement: "I hereby place the government of this country and all civil servants under the age of 97 under citizens arrest for squandering the people's taxes, and the wealth of this land."

Before leaving the station, revive the D.J., apologize profusely and step into the armoured police van waiting for you outside. Allow yourself to be handcuffed, blindfolded and gagged. One of two things will now happen to you. Firstly, you may be certified insane, in which case the government will forgive all your taxes and care for you for the rest of your life. Or alternatively you will be sentenced to a term in jail. While serving your sentence, write a book about your daring, single-handed defiance of a national government, sell it to a publisher, then to a movie producer, and finally to a T.V. network.

With the money that results you can pay all your back taxes, send those little tax collectors a dozen roses each and go and live the rest of your life in the tax-free Bahamas.

Michael Crosbie is a widely travelled freelance writer, composer and conductor, presently living on Vancouver Island.

Inflation (from page 3)

more money enters the market, the money already existing is devalued (and, as in the original story, the price of wheat goes from \$1.00 to \$2.00 per bushel).

The rate of inflation increases every time the amount of money is increased just as surely as night follows day.

Government officials continue to talk about controlling inflation, but it is unlikely that they will take the medicine — drastically reduced government spending — to cure the real sickness. It is far more popular to try to control high prices which, like fever, are just a symptom of the disease. To control the disease takes more political self-denial than most government officials are willing to use.

Walter Boytinck has his own law practice in Vancouver; he has for some years been fighting government encroachments on individual liberty.

BOOKS ... BOOKS ... BOOKS ... BOOKS

Planned Chaos by Ludwig von Mises (\$1.15). One of the more common reactions to libertarianism comes from so-called middle-of-the-roaders, who profess agreement with libertarian principles but say "we must not go to extremes" in these matters.

Such people are supporters of interventionism, of the mixed economy. They see the need to restrain, regulate and "improve" capitalism by means of government intervention. This widely held attitude has resulted in, for example, the welfare state, the Just Society, and the New Deal. All these are examples of interventionism.

The inevitable consequence of economic and social planning, of government force substituted for the voluntary choices of individuals, is chaos. This is the theme of *Planned Chaos* by the great, unheralded economist Ludwig von Mises.

Professor von Mises (1881-1973) was an uncompromising advocate of the free market. Throughout his distinguished career he repeatedly demolished the fallacies inherent in centralized economic planning. An outstanding representative of the Austrian school of economics, Mises spent twenty years at the University of Vienna, and subsequently lectured as a guest of universities in Great Britain, the United States, France, Italy, the Netherlands and Mexico. Along with Friedrich von Hayek and Murray Rothbard, he is largely responsible for the growing acceptance of free-market economics, especially in the United States.

A free market represents the individual choices of everyone. Those who seek to remedy perceived ills in society by intervening in the marketplace are simply imposing their own choices on everyone else. Furthermore, to quote Professor von Mises, such measures cannot work because they "result in conditions which from the point of view of their own advocates are more unsatisfactory than the previous state of affairs they were designed to alter."

At that point the government has a choice: it can either remove the first intervention and allow the market to function unhampered, or it can add further regulations and restrictions to remedy the deficiencies of the original measures. "Proceeding step by step on this way it finally reaches a point in which all economic freedom of individuals has disappeared."

Professor von Mises traces the growth of interventionism from its beginnings in Germany some 60 years ago to its pervasive presence in western societies today. *Planned Chaos* is invaluable in demonstrating how the doctrine of intervention in the economy is paving the way toward the ultimate horror of a totalitarian state.

HELP WANTED

Can you type? Do you have a car and some spare time? We need volunteers to assist in the production of *The Libertarian*. Typing, copy layout, mailing help — take your pick. There's lots to do. If you are interested, phone 688-2308.

APPLICATION FORM

<input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Mrs. <input type="checkbox"/> Miss <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Name _____ Address _____ City and Province _____ _____	Residence Telephone _____ Business Telephone _____ Postal Code _____ _____
--	---	---

(Please check applicable box on the following)

\$ _____ **CONTRIBUTOR.** Please accept this donation to assist the Foundation in conducting its activities.
 \$25.00 **SUBSCRIBER.** I wish to receive the monthly newsletter plus notices of special events being held throughout the province.