



WEST COAST LIBERTARIAN

The Newsletter of the Greater Vancouver Libertarian Association

November 1986

Volume 6, Number 5

MARSHALL FRITZ MEETS SUCCESS IN VANCOUVER

Marshall Fritz, President of Advocates for Self-Government, Inc., visited Vancouver in October, and his message was warmly received by all concerned.

Marshall presented his **How to Become a Black Belt Libertarian** workshop to eighteen enthusiastic libertarians on October 19, and his public outreach "Discovery" meeting to 82 interested libertarians and newcomers on the 20th. (This is a record number to be turned out to an introductory meeting on Marshall's first visit to a city.)

A number of libertarians signed up to participate in discovery teams, and a fair percentage of interested non-libertarians indicated that they would like to have more information. Video and audiotapes and manuals are in the hands of the GVLA, and may be borrowed by interested parties.

Two days after the introductory meeting, your editor presented GVLA President Jack Boulogne's Grade 12 Ethics class with Marshall's speech **Does Wrong Become Right if the Majority Approves?** Despite their having been heavily indoctrinated with socialist self-sacrificing ideas by years of other teachers, response was generally positive, and one student gave his name as being interested to learn more.

(A week or so after that, another guest speaker, a tax auditor from Revenue Canada was mercilessly grilled by the students on how it was that the coer-

cive things he was doing became right just because a majority of Canadians voted for the government in power.)

Marshall was so impressed with Vancouver and with the preparations we laid on for him that he is considering staging the 1987 Advocates Summit right here.

Congratulations and thanks are due to all those who sponsored and supported these events. In particular we thank Kurt and Edith Pokrandt who hosted the **Black Belt** workshop, and Heinz Holzschuher, who catered it, and Paul Geddes and Bill Tomlinson who organised the telephone evening which turned out the record attendance at the Introductory meeting. Special thanks go to Jack Boulogne, Lewis Dalby, Dick Davison, Paul Geddes, Wayne Marsden, Michael Martinoff, Kurt Pokrandt, and Bill Tomlinson, who invested the money to make Marshall's visit possible.

NEXT SUPPER CLUB

Saturday December 6th
Supper 6.30p.m., Speaker 7.30p.m.
The Colonial Room,, The Manor,
Arbutus Gardens, 4775 Valley Dr.

See Notice in this issue for particulars

ELECTION REPORT

The British Columbia Libertarian Party presence in the recent Provincial election amounted to three candidates. These were Mark Lane, who garnered 46 votes in Burnaby-Edmonds, Jack Boulogne, who received 56 votes in the Surrey-Newton riding, and Bill Tomlinson, with 193 votes in North Vancouver-Capilano.

Whilst these totals appear pitifully small in comparison to the total votes cast, it must be borne in mind that those people who cast a Libertarian vote, did so in the certain knowledge that their Candidate would not be elected. Media coverage was sparse, with the most space being in the local community newspapers. We received some mention in The Sun, practically none in the Province, and were totally ignored by radio and television. Once again, it seems that the only sure-fire way to get our message across is by working steadily at the grass roots level, discussing ideas with friends and neighbours, and with any willing listeners we happen across in our daily travels.

Three other potential candidates, Kurt Pokrandt, Lewis Dahlby and Percy Spillberg were unable to obtain sufficient signatures in the time available to qualify for nomination.

There is a need for Libertarians to cooperate to make sure that the problem of collecting the fifty signatures required for a candidate is not left solely to the candidate, and this requires quite a lot of effort and time. Elections are still probably the best and most economical way to make the general public aware of the Libertarian movement.

Bill Tomlinson

Bill's Parable No. 5

A cannibal went to the butcher's shop to buy some meat for dinner. On the wall was a sign; Special today, politicians brains. Libertarian \$5.00 per lb. Liberal \$150.00 per lb. He studied the sign and then asked the butcher, "How come the Libertarian is so much cheaper than the Liberal?" Replied the butcher "Do you know how many Liberals I have to kill to get a pound of brains?"

In appreciation

November 5, 1986

Dear Editor:

I would like to express a special thanks to the eight people who so generously invested their personal funds toward our recent visit from Marshall Fritz. Their names are listed in the lead article of this newsletter.

Without their support, Marshall's visit would not have been possible, and we would have missed out on two of the most informative and enjoyable events sponsored by the G.V.L.A.

Yours truly,

Mary Anne Nysten

Aldermanic Candidate in Vancouver

Howard Faulkner ran for Alderman as an Independent in the Vancouver Civic Election. Among many things, some Libertarian, some not, he favours a reduction of city planning.

The LP Campaign Everyone's Watching

Norma Jean Almodovar's Libertarian Party campaign for the lieutenant governorship of California is both the most visible and the most controversial of current libertarian political activities. Almodovar, once a Los Angeles traffic policeman, turned for a time to up-scale prostitution, wrote a book exposing corruption in the police department, was arrested and spent 50 days in solitary confinement after the book was released, and even before becoming an LP candidate had begun an active and highly publicized crusade against punishment for victimless crimes.

Criticism of her campaign and, particularly, of the almost-nude posters for which she has posed, centers on fear that having an ex-prostitute run as a libertarian will overly sensationalize the Party's stand against victimless crime while underplaying its positions on other issues which might be more attractive to more people.

Similar criticism has been launched against the all-Libertarian city council of Big Water, UT, because the mayor, Alex Joseph, is a highly publicized polygamist. Some have felt that this would make the council and, by association, the LP appear to be politically exotic rather than effective. Yet, the council's first major political act was the very practical one of repealing the local property tax.

Defense of Almodovar's campaign includes the fact that she has come to be seen as an articulate, witty, and convincing advocate of libertarian ideas, attracts large audiences wherever she appears, has access continually to the media, and has begun to speak of libertarian issues more wide ranging than victimless crime - most lately including strong statements against interventionist foreign policy.

She is said to be particularly effective before college audiences but also has been welcomed and earnestly listened to by such groups as Rotary clubs. The office for which she is running has traditionally been one through which California voters have expressed their discontent with old-fashioned party politics.

Her posters, viewed by some as exploiting her body rather than her brains, are, after all, of her own design, made on her own terms and for her own purposes. The pointed political messages of the posters are certainly not lost simply because of the physical attraction of the candidate.

Criticism or not, Norma Jean Almodovar has gone a long way toward making libertarianism a familiar issue in the crucial political climate of our most populous and trend-setting state. The following report is by her campaign manager, a veteran LP activist.

By John P. Robertson

At the 1986 California LP convention, Norma Jean Almodovar was endorsed by a solid two-thirds vote of the delegates. Her nomination was the only one contested and the only one for which a secret vote was asked. After the secrecy request was voted down, a third of the delegates voted for "none of the above" with the remainder supporting Almodovar.

Her endorsement by rank-and-file Party delegates seemed to me to be a statement of radical politics by a party of principle.

I believe that it is tragic that some LPers perceive Norma Jean as a threat to the Party and believe that her campaign can dim the LP's aura. One red light will not obscure the candle of liberty. A chilling wind of apathy could blow it out.

The original idea of her candidacy was to attract media attention and use that attention to deliver libertarian ideas to the public. One problem that the campaign has is just keeping her free. Although she has been released on probation, from charges that followed her book exposing police corruption, the district attorney's office is seeking to have the probation rescinded and to send her to prison for the full three years made mandatory under the state's pandering laws.

Rather than denying her past, Norma Jean has made it a cornerstone of her campaign. Often, in public appearances, she is asked if she regrets her "shady past." She replies that she certainly does have some second thoughts about having been a policeman. As for having been a prostitute, she quips that she was just doing openly what many politicians do in private.

Rather than denying that part of her past, she uses it as a base from which to launch a spirited defense of human sexuality as a human right that must not be legislated - an obviously real and compelling political issue in 1986.

A major concern for me, as manager, has been the financing of our campaign. We chose to use the methods of free enterprise, promoting the candidate and financing the campaign through the sale of explicit political statement posters. Rather than asking for donations to print endless unread tracts, we are selling our ideas in the marketplace and the requests are coming in from all over the world.

Most recently we have received word from the British Broadcasting Corporation of a 40-minute documentary about the campaign. Both Playboy and Penthouse have said they may cover the campaign in their November issues. Other media coverage has

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Our supperclub meetings have proven very successful in keeping our members active within the G.V.L.A. However, it is also important to draw new members into our group, and we must attempt to provide various outlets for potential Libertarians to become familiar with our philosophy.

Perhaps a less expensive and less structured activity is in order, and I would therefore like to invite anyone who is interested in discussing our philosophy with Non-Libertarians for coffee at my apartment the first Thursday of each month from 7 - 10 P.M., commencing December 4, 1986. Please bring your interested friends along.

Hopefully, interest will grow and we will be able to hold a number of open house evenings to attract new members.

Please call me ahead of time to let me know how many will be coming.

Mary Anne Nylén
#7 - 1546 Yew St.
(corner of York & Yew, Kitsilano)
736-2459

P.S. If you would like to offer to host an event, call Robin to get it listed on our new calendar of events.

Will Hafer, Advisor
Libertarian Discussion Group
FK-30/Box 176
University of Washington
Seattle WA 98195 206-543-9930(8A-5P M - F)
206-526-9696 (home)

Dear Robin,

I am pleased to announce the formation of the Libertarian Discussion Group (LDG) at the University of Washington organised by Greg Cancelada, a UW economics major. I will serve as interim advisor to the group until a faculty member is found to fill the position.

The primary purpose of the LDG will be to provide a University forum for the discussion of libertarian views on economic, political and social issues. Toward that end I would like to solicit your support, advice and encouragement during the coming school term. The LDG would appreciate being notified when libertarian scholars or activities will be in your area, so that we may arrange campus speaking engagements.

We look forward to a productive first year working with the West Coast Libertarian toward the advancement of libertarian ideas at the University of Washington.

Sincerely,

Will Hafer.

The LP Campaign:

Continued from page 3.

been substantial and constant - all on a budget of \$9,000 covering seven months. A rock concert on her behalf is scheduled in Hollywood.

Having begun to speak out against the involvement of U.S. troops in Central America, she is now considering a law suit seeking to prevent California National Guard troops from being sent to that embattled area. She has endorsed the Gann Amendment that would limit salaries of state officials, and has strongly attacked Lyndon Larouche's attempts to encourage legislation that would quarantine persons suffering from AIDS.

Norma Jean Amodovar is more than just a candidate for the libertarian Party. She is an example of libertarian principles in action.

For a copy of Norma Jean's Poster (in which Norma Jean is clad only in "red tape" send to:

Norma Jean Campaign Poster
U.S. \$20. \$100 signed.

Norma Jean Production
1626 N. Wilcox Ave., #580
Hollywood, CA
U.S.A.
90028

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

EDITOR

Dear sir,

Once again, British Columbians are being herded to the polls to choose between the lesser of evils. Slick ads, that cost taxpayers over \$8million for the last provincial election alone, announce, "Vote for the party of your choice, but vote!"

Once again, the winning party will claim a 'mandate from the people', and once again the non-voters will be in the majority.

The sad truth is that the "buck" stops not at the politician, but at the voter - both morally and literally. The Nuremburg trials established the former principle, Revenue Canada perpetuates the latter. Hence, the only meaningful vote is the one you don't cast. Then, when the hoopla is over, you can at least smile and say, "Don't blame me. I didn't vote."

Cordially,
The League of Non-Voters,
Sponsored by The VOLUNTARYISTS

Editor's Note: Unfortunately, most of the eligible voters turned out this time.

922 Cloverley St
North Vancouver,
B.C.
V7L 1N3

Mr Chuck Cook,
M.P. Ottawa,

Dear Mr Cook,

My first intention was to write to your Chief, Prime Minister Mulroney, but knowing how busy he is (see enclosed clipping), I decided maybe it might be best if I wrote to you instead, suggesting that you read the enclosed item titled Not Yours to Give, and perhaps some time, hopefully in the not too distant future, if you find yourself in conversation with Mr Mulroney, and having by this time read the aforementioned item, you could discuss it with him. You see Mr Cook, it is my considered opinion that the handing over by Mr Mulroney to Mr Hansen of ONE MILLION DOLLARS of Taxpayer's money is wrong in every sense of the word. Mr Hansens efforts, as a paraplegic, wheelchairs this way around

around the world, risking his health and safety to raise funds for spinal cord research, are indeed highly commendable, and he deserves all the encouragement and support that we can give him.

It is extremely unfortunate to say the least, that one of the primary reasons why Canadians are not able to give as much money to Charity as they would wish, thus forcing courageous people like Mr Hansen to take on this monumental task, is because they are subjected to the burden of such heavy taxation.

The coercive use of force to extract money from one person to give it to another cannot be justified, even for so worthwhile a cause, and so, Mr Cook, when hopefully you have that discussion with Mr Mulroney, would you please tell him that I would have been much more impressed with his generous action if he had donated ONE DOLLAR of his own money, instead of one million dollars of someone else's.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs Elaine Tomlinson

HOUSE OF COMMONS
OTTAWA, CANADA
K1A 0A6

Chuck Cook M.P.
Room 534-N, Centre Block
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario

Dear Mrs Tomlinson,

I wish to acknowledge receipt of and thank you very much for your letter of October 28th.

I must admit I had misgivings about the gift of \$1 million by Mr Mulroney to help in Mr Hansen's efforts.

I agree that the coercive use of force to extract money from one person to another cannot be justified, even if it is for a worthwhile cause.

I can assure you I will speak personally to Mr Mulroney about the matter and possibly write to you again depending on his answers.

The Prime Minister, myself and a great many others attended the banquet for Mr Hansen, which cost

each of us \$150.00 and did raise over \$100.00.00 for his cause.

Your point is well taken but, because it is such a worthy cause, it is difficult to really condemn the Prime Minister for doing such a good deed on behalf of all the people of Canada.

You do raise a worrisome moral point.

If I can ever be of service to you in any other way, please do not hesitate to contact me again.

Yours very truly,

Chuck Cook
M.P. North Vancouver-Burnaby.

KCTSeattle 9

September 18, 1986

Mr Bill Tomlinson
GVLA
922 Cloverley Street
North Vancouver, B.C.
V7L 1N3

Dear Mr Tomlinson,

On behalf of KCTSeattle/9, we would like to thank the volunteers from the Greater Vancouver Libertarian Association who participated in our recent Pledge telethon.

On the evening of Saturday, September 6, with the assistance of the volunteers, we had 180 new and renewed subscriptions to Channel 9 for a total of \$8,010.

We hope that everyone enjoyed their evening answering the phones as much as we did having them and we look forward to seeing you again.

Sincerely,

V.A. (Dolly) Rosen
Canadian Activities Coordinator
KCTS/Simon Fraser University
549 Howe St
Vancouver, B.C.
V6C 2C2

685-7375

Suite #705
6175 Nelson Ave
South Burnaby, B.C.
V5H 4E7

Letters to the Editor
West Coast Libertarian
Suite #363, 810 W. Broadway
Vancouver, B.C.
V5Z 4C9

In response to Kjell Nilsen's letter in your issue of September 1986, Volume 6, Number 4.

Behold the little mouse in its cage with its fellows; free to move the food and water dish about; free to run at whatever speed within the running wheel it wants to. But what freedom remains there when that cage is picked up and removed to a destination unsuitable for a little mouse . . . and that is a thought on mice (and men) !

When the process of Democracy is used to destroy Democracy, we should at least be aware of the method being used.

The intent of Democracy is to place a maximum value of freedom and to the individual, maximum freedom. This intent is compromised when a matter of principle or philosophy is put to the common vote rather than the common vote having to do with policy alone. Principle and philosophy have to do with the "Why" of any matter; policy has to do with the "how", "what" "where" and "when" - but never the "Why"! Take the example of a man joining a football team in order to play football, only to discover that it has been "voted" to have the team (club/association, etc.) converted to become a ballet company. Normally, in a society of free institutions such a man under the circumstances could opt out and pursue football. He would because of the freedom to choose his association! One commits oneself to the "Why" as he/she joins in association with other like-minded people. In association one goes on to mutually work out the "hows", whats, wheres and when" which are appropriate because one is there to do the activity of choice, perhaps even football! But if, at some time, ballet should become the activity of that majority (should that majority become so inclined) then the minority must have the right of option in order to preserve the Democratic intent. It is only that ability to choose association or by right of option within association that enables people to live within policy decision. The premise that "majority rules" is for conditional rather than universal application. Otherwise, Democratic intent

is lost and with it the freedom of the individual. If association is compelled and not free (for whatever reason), it is imperative that in order to preserve Democratic intent, any matter being put to any vote must be a matter dealing with policy alone. A decision which has principle or philosophic implication would deny freedom to the individual forced to abide by such a decision with might conflict with his/her ideological commitment or beliefs. Relating this to unions, it is a fact that association is rarely optional (if not membership, then economic association) and yet the union movement as a whole presumes that its collective members must demonstrate a socialist bias, shown through political donations and through union's social associations with groups who in turn express a socialist bias and in fact lobby for the socialist, collectivist cause on local, provincial, national and world scale. It is demonstrated again by government employees' unions such as the B.C.G.E.U. and N.U.P.G.E. when they arbitrarily begin speaking and acting for private sector workers for the sake of an expanded philosophic and economic base.

In a Democracy, it is choice of association (among other elements of freedom) which preserves the Democratic intent. Where association has been made compulsory then it is by vote on policy alone which preserves Democratic intent.

Yours respectfully,

Charles William Baldwin

Responses to the letter of Mr Paul Geddes in the last issue of West Coast Libertarian

To the Editor: West Coast Libertarian

Dear sir,

Your September issue contains an article by Paul Geddes entitled "Some Dangers of Forming Alliances with Special Interest Groups." First, I applaud Mr. Geddes for his personal philosophy of working with groups, whose philosophy he may partly disagree with, and of informing others of the existence of such groups. One of the strong points of the conservative/libertarian movement in this country is that over the past few years there has developed an encouraging spirit of co-operation. Diverse philosophical groups have agreed to cooperate where they agree and to quietly not cooperate on issues where they disagree. This is in marked contrast to the personality-ridden factionalism seen south of the border.

In his article, Mr Geddes mentions our group, Citizens for Foreign Aid Reform (C-FAR). While concurring with our opposition to the \$2.5 billion confiscated by the federal government and shipped overseas in the form of foreign aid, he vehemently disagrees with and, I believe distorts, several of our other stands. Ours is not a classic libertarian position on immigration, true enough. We believe that as long as Canada has 1.2 million people unemployed, there should be virtually no immigration at all. I hope I am not parodying libertarian views on immigration, but it is my understanding that many libertarians believe in completely open borders. This is repudiation of national sovereignty. Man is more than an economic creature. He also possesses a culture. While it may be possible to find tens of millions of hard working people of other cultures, such an influx would swamp us and destroy the culture we have. Geddes says C-FAR wants "the state to determine who should be allowed to live here and ... the racial mix of this country." That is precisely what we do not want. Up to now, the unrepresentative elite that governs us has done just that by radically altering our traditional immigration patterns. C-FAR believes that the will of the majority should determine who comes to Canada. Repeated public opinion polls demonstrate that Canadians want less immigration (many actually favour a complete halt) and most Canadians are less than enthusiastic about the radical

DOONESBURY



change from European to Third World immigration that has been engineered by successive governments since the immigration revolution of 1967.

Mr Geddes charges that C-FAR goes beyond defending the rights of Keegstra and Zundel to have their say to actually promoting some of their beliefs. I challenge him to show where we have done so. Neither Ernst Zundel nor James Keegstra has ever been a speaker at one of our meetings. We have repeatedly qualified our defence of these victims of statist censorship and minority tyranny by saying that whatever one thinks of their views, they nonetheless have a perfect right to hold those views and to express them in a non-violent way.

Finally, on South Africa, Mr Geddes accuses us of defending the South African government, rather than trying to end some of the socialist things it is doing to its people. In fact, we have concentrated our efforts on exposing the utterly hypocritical stand of the Canadian government, aiding, as it does, some of the worst Marxist tyrannies in Africa - Ethiopia, Angola and Tanzania come to mind - while declaring economic war against South Africa because it fails to live up to Ottawa's ideal of one-man-one-vote now! We have also pointed out the folly of curtailing trade with a paying customer to curry favour of the wretched dictatorships of Africa who are nothing but a drain on the Canadian taxpayer via the siphon of foreign aid.

C-FAR firmly believes in the motto, "No Enemies on the Right," and so will not indulge in the somewhat abusive language that Mr Geddes used against us. I compliment him for his past co-operation and urge him in the future to continue to co-operate with single-issue groups like ours, wherever our principles overlap. Only by such openness and by active networking have we any chance of defeating the formidable forces of collectivism and repression ranged against us all.

Sincerely yours,

Paul Fromm
Research Director

Box 431, Boston, MA, 02258
Oct 4, 1986

To the Editor

Paul Geddes (Sept. 1986), while acknowledging the value of libertarian alliances with "special interest groups," warns of the pitfalls. As a former anarchist with cordial relations with the libertarian lunatic fringe (but not the mainstream fat cats), I view the same phenomenon from the other side, drawing some different conclusions.

The Problem with an ideologue like Geddes is that, in the same breath that he discusses concerted action on the basis of limited areas of agreement, he refers to his possible allies as if they had no principles of their own. If you agree with libertarians on the issues 30% of the time, the only possible explanation is that you are three tenths of a libertarian - a fragmentary, a sub-libertarian - much as the U.S. Constitution once reckoned a slave as three-fifths of a man. He doesn't suspect that there are other, principled orientations - some freedom-oriented, some not - with an integrity of their own.

For a fringe ideology to put on such airs is ingenuous if not narcissistic. I for instance am inclined to view libertarianism as a "special interest group" pushing a (from my perspective) rather contrived conjunction of personal freedom, which I espouse, and capitalism, which I don't. But I think it's only fair for me to look upon libertarians as what they are - libertarians - not as well-meaning bunglers, failed adepts of my own nameless world-view.

Thus Geddes thinks it "hypocritical" for the Health Action Network Society to oppose the extension of bureaucratic controls to natural health products, while also opposing a food irradiation plant. This might not be hypocritical even if HANS (of which I know nothing except what Geddes tells me) were libertarian. "Force" and "fraud" are concepts elastic enough - given the right factual assumptions - to cover both these cases, and lots more. But the main problem is that, as Geddes himself announces, HANS is not libertarian and, I infer, doesn't pretend to be. So where's the hypocrisy? Hypocrites contradict their own professed values, not anybody else's. For all Geddes discloses, HANS has a single, coherent rationale for both positions - paternalism, perhaps. That isn't libertarian, but neither is Geddes' apparently unconscious ideological annexation of everyone who willy-nilly agrees with libertarians on anything as dependencies of his philosophical empire.

Sincerely,
Bob Black

"Isn't there more to life than libertarianism?"

Letter from Rob Sinclair

"You asked me how I justify the role of the state in our society. Like yourself, I would limit the state to the role so clearly spelled out in the Declaration of Independence. However, I also believe that true freedom is something which cannot be legislated by governments or institutions of men. Rather, I believe that true freedom is only possible for man when he has complete access to his right to mental freedom and opportunities for understanding and applying the spiritual laws that govern his existence.

This brings me to my criticism of the libertarian philosophy as I understand it: Because I do not believe individual rights can exist apart from natural (spiritual) laws and that absolute personal liberty is contrary to those laws, I cannot agree with your philosophy regarding these fundamental issues.

The Libertarian defense of absolute freedom of choice and action would be I suppose : ..."so long as the rights of others are respected also." My answer to this is that because libertarians (and most of the world for that matter) know little or nothing about the true essence of man, that is, man's mind: its creation, capabilities and ultimate purpose, then the fundamental right to learn to live according to one's; highest potential and purpose in life will continue to be denied regardless of what type of government we have; ie: until we understand mind.

If it were possible that the expression of one mind or many for that matter, did not influence and often interfere with another mind, a child's for instance, then there would be no need for discussion. However, this isn't the case, and the truth of the matter is not restricted to immature v's mature minds, but encompasses a much more fundamental and universally recognised problem: that each individual born into life has the obligation/opportunity to learn to know and fulfill his destiny - his reason of being. If one is offered the understanding and rejects it of his own free will that is one thing, but to deny others this right is the greatest crime one could commit. Can we seriously expect a society to progress above the plane of animals if it offers its children no concept of morality? When we define the procreative function of man simply as 'sexual preference' it is proof of complete confusion.

At the root of it all libertarian philosophy seems to

me to be espousing relativism ie: there are no absolutes, no good and evil, right or wrong etc.. anything goes. (so long as you respect the rights of others etc.) Have you heard the parable about the house being built upon shifting sand?"

Rob Sinclair

Rob is a student of Kabalarian Philosophy in Vancouver.

RESPONSE:

From Paul Geddes

I interpret your attack to be that Libertarianism has no central spiritual message and is thus an incomplete philosophy of life. I agree. But Libertarianism was never meant to be a complete philosophy of life. It is interested in only one small part of human life: "how should we get along with each other"?

In some ways you have put the cart before the horse. Accepting Libertarianism does not force you to join Objectivism, Buddhism, or any branch of Christianity. However, true believers from many of these philosophies have come to libertarian conclusions about man's relations with their neighbours. Almost all respected philosophies of life teach:

- 1) respect for personal autonomy (each person must choose their philosophy of life, each person must work out their own salvation, etc.)
- 2) respect for neighbours' property (do not steal, do unto others as you would have them do to you, good fences make good neighbours, etc.,)

Libertarianism does not provide a complete philosophy of life. Rather, consistent philosophies of life likely lead to libertarianism. Libertarianism does not oppose inner spiritual values. You are unlikely to get to libertarianism without some concern for them. Libertarianism opposes collectivism - the idea that other people, even society as a whole, is more important than the individual. Although few people espouse collectivism completely (they usually want exceptions in areas of life they know something about), it is still the dominant political philosophy in Canada. A major purpose of our local libertarian association is to point out the dangers of collectivism and show the merits of private alternatives. We have never pretended to be a religion.

SUPPER CLUB

Location:

The Colonial Room. The Manor, Arbutus Gardens, 9775 Valley Drive.
(follow the signs around to the back)

Date & Time:

Saturday, December 6th, Supper 6.30 p.m., Speaker 7.30 p.m.

Cost: \$2.00

Arrangements:

This is a "bring your own" informal dinner. Coffee will be provided. All other food and drink is your choice.

The Speaker:

Robin Gillespie

Robin, Editor of the West Coast Libertarian, is a long-time activist. He is a founder of the Libertarian Alternative, Canada's first libertarian political party. He was an LPC candidate in the 1974 Federal Election. He is currently the Pacific Northwest Representative of the Libertarian International, and a signatory to the North American Covenant.

Topic:

Some new ideas on how Canadians can have Free Trade. Robin will also be announcing a 1987 Free Trade Conference.

The Greater Vancouver Libertarian Association
922 Cloverley St.,
North Vancouver, B.C.
V5L 1N3

"Address Correction Requested"



Marco den Ouden

A 03/84

19519-115A Ave
Pitt Meadows, BC V0M 1P0