



Freedom Party of Ontario

Jan.-Feb. 1984

Freedom Flyer

First Issue!

The Official Newsletter

We're Organized! We're Hot! Ready To Fly!

Your

Freedom Party of Ontario Is Here!

Damn The Torpedoes...

Welcome to the first issue of **Freedom Flyer**, a newsletter published by the **Freedom Party of Ontario**. Formerly called **Unparty** and based in Toronto, **Freedom Party's** headquarters has now moved to London Ontario where it will continue to obtain memberships throughout the province. Its new president is Robert Metz, whose article elsewhere in this issue will further explain what **Freedom Party** is all about.

Before outlining our newsletter's format, let me first introduce myself. I'm Mark Pettigrew and for the last sixteen of my twenty years, I've been a resident of London. Since graduating from highschool, I've been working towards becoming a professional musician and composer. As an objectivist-libertarian (yes, these two terms are *not* necessarily in conflict!), my political activity has ranged from supporting **Freedom Party** to writing 'Letters to the Editor' and writing articles for the **London MetroBulletin**.

Now without much further ado, let's explain the function of **Freedom Flyer**. Basically and most importantly, its purpose is to inform members and others interested of **Freedom Party's** activities. We have, in addition, information in files, research, tapes, documents, speeches, and presentations available to members on request in the near future.

Freedom Flyer will also provide political instruction and direction through its articles, and indirectly through assistance (information and advice) to those who need help on strategies for entering political forums, election campaigns, debates, etc. Other very important functions of this newsletter will be to encourage lobbying on specific issues, to profile 'libertarians' who are *active* in the pursuit of freedom and liberty, to inform members of the input made by the libertarian movement outside the province, to distribute membership forms and issue papers as they are produced, and likely many other functions that have yet to surface. We'd be happy to consider any suggestions from our members of activities to be pursued.

Now, just a few words about what's in *this* issue: **Freedom Party** president, Robert Metz, outlines

some of the concepts of the party's goals, and has an article concerning Bill Davis and David Peterson reprinted from the **London MetroBulletin's** Fall 1983 issue.

Marc Emery, publisher and editor of the **London MetroBulletin**, proprietor of *City Lights Bookshop*, and whose reputation as a local political activist preceeds him, has written the first of a multi-part article on getting involved in *local* politics. And Mary Lou Gutscher, founder of the party, has a few words about recent events going on in Toronto and elsewhere. It's our expectation that Bob, Marc, and Mary Lou will be regular contributors to **Freedom Flyer**.

My own article concerns the best methods of discussing ideas with others. You will also find our first in a series of 'issue papers' that will become a regular enclosure accompanying this newsletter. You will also find our first in a series of 'issue papers' that will become a regular enclosure accompanying this newsletter.

A word about subscriptions: In addition to being distributed to all current subscribers of **Toward Liberty**, this first issue of **Freedom Flyer** is being distributed free of charge to as many of our past and current supporters (without subscriptions) as we can effectively reach. It is hoped that this will minimize the potential confusion caused by our party's name change and that it will re-introduce many past supporters to our current efforts. This means that for those of you who don't already have a current subscription (shame on you!), future issues will have to be paid for in advance. Those with current subscriptions, of course, will continue to receive our newsletter as per normal (you're safe, for now!).

To conclude, special thanks must be extended to **David Hogg**, whose effort and generosity were so instrumental in providing us with our newly acquired computer facilities (yay!). We gratefully acknowledge the **London MetroBulletin** for its original article, and of course, *you*, our faithful supporters, without whom such an effort cannot exist.

See you next issue!

...Full Speed Ahead!

Freedom Flyer

Published By: Freedom Party of Ontario

Edited By: Provincial Executive

Contributors: M. Emery, M.L. Gutscher, R. Metz, M. Pettigrew.

Secondary Contributors: D. Hogg, R. Smeenk.

Supported By: Subscribers

FREEDOM PARTY OF ONTARIO

P.O. BOX 2214, STN. 'A',
LONDON, ONTARIO
N6A 4E3

Phone: (519) 433-8612

LOCAL ELECTIONS: FIRST AVENUE TO SUCCESS

-by Marc Emery

Running as a candidate in local elections (school board or city council) is the best avenue open to any objectivist-libertarian wishing to influence his neighbours as to the practical validity of laissez-faire. It is the *only* way to go if a promoter of freedom wants to get *elected*.

In provincial and federal elections, the candidate for freedom must compete against a media barrage on billboards, TV, radio, newspapers, etc., which is certain to drown out his message. His effort expended in these areas will, let's face it, provide only a minor political impact in relation to the effort required --- that is --- compared to a *local* election campaign.

Results are important, because you will have invested time, money, and emotion into your campaign, and it's disheartening to feel that you should get 500 or 1,000 votes in a provincial election when you only receive less than 300. This usually overwhelms those 'rookie' candidates of any freedom movement and they simply disappear, concluding that it's 'hopeless'.

In a *local* election however, you are running to win! You are competing for one (or two, in some municipal wards) seat(s) (council, school board), and it's a one-on-one situation. No national issues or personalities, no party labels to compete with (except in Toronto; I'll get to that next issue), no 'you can't form a majority so why should I vote for you' crap, no national media campaigns to compete with. You can also find many people who are members of *other* parties to support your campaign, since in a local election, the personality and reputation of the *candidate* are most important.

This election is literally on your home turf!

You can set the ground rules of the campaign, influence the issues, introduce yourself to your neighbours, and deal with immediate concerns that affect your immediate neighbourhood. At worst, if you lose, your effort will go very far in promoting your *next* political campaign.

Issues that concern voters at the local level in cities of 15,000 to 300,000 are usually very pedestrian things like street lighting, curbs, roads, sidewalks, drainage, park facilities, snow removal, etc.

Most people's concerns are very reasonable. Since virtually all of the electorate *assumes* that the function of the city is to provide basic services (i.e., they feel that they ought to be receiving the services they're being taxed for), this will be the main focus of your door to door campaign. Sounds exciting, eh? Well, municipal campaigning *isn't* often exciting. It's nitty-gritty. People at their front door on a cold autumn night are not particularly concerned with talking about philosophy, the state of the universe, etc.

However, as we shall show in *Tactics*, (future issue), you will set the stage for each person you talk to, so that you address their 'needs' and 'views' in a distinctly objective way that will please them, and not

compromise your objectives as a freedom promoting elected official. And you'll find that special interest requests are very rare, i.e., people asking for more grants, hand-outs to the theatres, art galleries, museums, day-care, bus service, etc. Don't let news coverage of these groups intimidate you.

The people who hold the greatest potential to you as supporters are the people who *vote*, and you will be campaigning only in the areas where voter turnout is highest. Except for Toronto, this means ignoring low-rental areas, apartments, student areas, transient neighbourhoods. These areas garner a less than 10% voter turnout in municipal elections. You will be aiming at the straight, middle-class neighbourhoods, the 'bed-rock' of your community. The returns from the last election (which you can get from city hall) will tell you where the heaviest turnouts are, and where which candidates were strongest and weakest.

It is important to point out here that if you run as a municipal candidate advocating 'abolition' of government services like street lighting, sidewalks, curbs, roads, bridges, etc., you are no friend to freedom, and certainly no friend to your neighbours. A libertarian-objectivist candidate concedes, at this point in time (since you are by no means going to form a libertarian majority in council), the existence of these government services and the tax collection necessary to pay for them:

- (1) sidewalk repair and maintenance,
- (2) road repair and development,
- (3) garbage, police, and fire services,
- (4) street lighting,
- (5) drainage, curb, and gutter work, etc.

By all means, you are encouraged to research and advocate ways of contracting out these services on the free market, but due to the nature of your municipality being organized under provincial auspices (the Municipal Act), you cannot make any sense if you advocate turning the whole ball of wax over to the market (roads, curbs, etc.) and abolishing taxes. Not only can't it be legally done at this point in time, but it makes no sense to advocate such a position on a person's front doorstep for the five minutes in which you can only sketch out the barest of issues, etc. *Don't* be an ass. [cont'd next pg]

Candidates in bondage...

New provincial regulations now require that all candidates participating in provincial elections must post a \$200 bond and require 25 signatures from constituents. Previously, no bond was required, but it *was* necessary to obtain 100 signatures from constituents. The new bond is refundable to all candidates who manage to garner at least 15% of the vote. Incidentally, **Freedom Party** will post bond for all *approved* candidates running in any provincial election.

Freedom Fighters

4

But you *must* be against all forms of special privilege, that is, taxpayer money being spent on areas where a minority of people are to receive benefits at everyone else's expense. Whether you explicitly say this in your campaign (we'll deal with this in *Tactics*), or otherwise, when elected, you must be *against* the following things and *for* their free market alternatives:

- all grants to art institutes, museums, universities, tourist information, theatres, galleries, sports, etc.,
- all subsidies to day-care, corporations, etc.,
- all licencing and licencing fees,
- all zoning by-laws,
- all building restrictions,
- all and any pay increases to politicians,
- any increase in the hiring of municipal staff,
- all 'studies'.

You can phrase these things to sound positive, i.e., 'I'm *for* keeping your tax money on the things everybody in our neighbourhood uses, like good drainage, street lights, sidewalk repair, etc.', but this will be covered in *Tactics*.

If running for a school board, you must be *against*:

- teachers having the 'right' to unionize (though this has to be explained diplomatically),
- increasing the non-teaching staff,
- 'affirmative action' programs,
- special privilege classes designed for minorities of any kind.

You must be *for*:

- municipal credits for parents sending children to a school of their choice. (Legally and politically, this is untested, but it must be pursued; we'll show how in *Tactics*.)

Who should run for municipal or local politics?

Someone your neighbours trust. Someone who has an investment in that community. Someone who is already involved with the community. Someone who is going to stay in that community. Someone who, if they lose an election, will still be there battling in between elections, for the right things. Someone who looks presentable, respectable, and is respectful. Someone who believes he knows *how* to speak, both to audiences and to an individual on his front doorstep. Someone who works hard, never gives up, who won't crack.

Because this is a tough campaign coming up.

Specifically, if you're a student, *don't* run for office. If your employment is transient or insecure, *don't* run. If you live in an apartment, *don't* run for office. If you haven't established yourself in the neighbourhood yet, *don't* run. Build up your presence first.

Don't run for office if you don't like being involved with at least one of the following: area sports leagues, Optimist Club, area newspaper, area church group, area home and school associations, etc. Voters place more importance on your *commitment* to the *neighbourhood* than on any pie-in-the-sky theories on laissez-faire. Sincerity and commitment are worth more to them than issues, because in the long run, they all know it's a matter of *trust* anyway. A laissez-faire candidate could lie to them as much as any other candidate, so at the root of it, it's whether they believe in *you*, trust *you*, that counts. And *you* have to believe you *can* do the job for freedom. A libertairan philosophical revolution will not 'happen' even *after* you are elected.

Only a reputation and an excellent campaign can win you a local election. You must be building one up in your neighbourhood years in advance before you can expect to win public trust, support, endorsement, and *votes*, at election time. All successful municipal politicians, if you check, won their elections on perseverance in the community (i.e., home and school, area campaigns against developers, sports organizations, etc.), and the voters returned the favour. If you despise this kind of 'community membership', thinking that it is 'collectivist socializing' for the sake of what you may see as unrelated objectives, then consider yourself unsuitable to run for local office.

You may say, 'I want to get elected on *issues* and *principle*'. Well, that's just so much bull. You want to get *elected*. You *don't* have to compromise your principles, but you *do* have to understand why people vote and how they vote.

If a product sold by a merchant was the best available but he offered it by advertising the list of ingredients only, it would be unreasonable to expect that the market would buy his product in droves. *Voters will not flock to you on issues alone*. It is *you* that you are selling. *You* are the product. The ingredients inside that product are dependability, intelligence, trust, decency, and proof of performance. These are the qualities with which voters will measure you against other candidates.

Candidates running for local office should own their own home. This is your proof of 'middle-class' status, as well as your apparent commitment to the neighbourhood. (You aren't just going to 'pack up and leave after the election if you lose', is how the voter will see it.) Candidates should definitely be involved with area sports groups, clubs, etc. Of course, if you are married, have children, etc., these are assets, but not paramount.

[cont'd next pg]

Freedom File

SLS News...

...is published 6 times a year --- \$6 or donations welcome. Write SLS, 68 Wolfrey Ave., Toronto, Ontario, M4K 1K8, or contact Wayne Gerber at (416) 466-1914 or Dave McKinnon at (416) 979-1042 for more information.

Books & Pubs...

Students for a Libertarian Society [SLS] at the University of Toronto weekly sponsor a book table in the Sid Smith lobby. Their regular pub nite is held the first Monday of every month (7:00 P.M. start) at the Duke of York Tavern on Prince Arthur Street. Both are good opportunities for activists and newcomers to discuss libertarian ideas.

Freedom Fighters

5

PLANNING AND PREPARATION

A commitment to run for local office should ideally be made one year before the upcoming election, but up to a month before is acceptable. Once you say 'yes, *do it!*', begin to organize on paper the following things:

- Who can I hit for money?
- Who can I shanghai to work hard on this with me?
- Is my family firmly on my side on this? (wife & kids)
- Who do I know right now who would put a sign on their front lawn?
- How much cash will I need?
- If worse comes to worse, what am I personally prepared to sink (of my own money) into this campaign?
- How much will pamphlets cost? --- How many should be printed?
- How much will signs cost?
- Are there any shoppers, papers, or magazines that largely serve just my neighbourhood?
- Where will my campaign be run from?
- Where do I get maps, street listings, etc. from?
- What organizations do I belong to that I can sound out?
- What can I do to promote my name and reputation in my neighbourhood?
- How will I create a meaningful difference between myself and the other candidates?

- Will the incumbent candidate(s) run again?
- Who will be my other opponents?
- What ethnic, religious, club, sports bigwigs do I know? --- Can I get their endorsement?
- What kind of signs will I choose? What colours?
- Am I receiving the applicable city hall or school board committee and council agendas?
- How much time will I be able to take off work? --- The minimum? The maximum?
- What kind of volunteers are required?
- Should I alter my appearance? (Get rid of the mustache? Beard? Get contact lenses? Change hairstyle?)
- Do I own a respectable suit or two?
- Who would be my campaign manager?
- Am I reading the local newspapers, magazines, enough? Local open-line shows? Am I participating enough in them?
- What is my financial state right now? (Debts, obligations, mortgages, taxes, job security, etc.)
- What is my emotional state right now? Are there any foreseeable problems with my wife, children? Is there a divorce looming? Have I been under a great deal of stress? Will I be under a great deal of stress six, nine, twelve months from now?
- For answers to these and other questions, stay tuned to our next issue.

Freedom Fighting

Have Marc Will Travel...

Need a campaign organizer? Marc Emery has agreed to travel anywhere in Ontario (for up to three days) to assist any potential **Freedom Party** candidate who has displayed a sense of commitment and preparedness to his cause. Don't wait till the last minute --- contact us *when you decide to run*.

Freedom Party will supply sign designs, write literature, etc., while Marc organizes the campaign with your workers. By showing candidates the most effective campaign techniques to be employed on limited budgets, Marc guarantees that their campaign will be professionally run, regardless of scale.

Freedom File

Remodelling Parliament...

SLS members will be participating in a model parliament again this year (4 seats in '82 and '83). Mid-January elections will decide the number of libertarian seats at the February 4 event.

Word has it that notables like Jean Cretien will be acting as house speaker to ensure that the *Rules of Robert* are upheld. This will provide an extra challenge for SLS spokesmen, combined with an opportunity to reach the general public as well as students --- the press covers *people* more than *ideas* these days.

Just ask...

Inquires about *Objectivism* study groups or *SIL* [Society for Individual Liberty] *Principles of Liberty* courses are welcomed. Contact Lisa Butler, 68 Wolfrey Ave., Toronto Ontario, M4K 1K8 or phone (416) 466-1914.

and learn...

World Research Inc. films will be shown monthly (11 films in all), including *The Poverty Trap*, *The Incredible Bread Machine*, and *Inflation File*, with study guides for those who wish to learn more. Start date: Sunday, February 12. Contact Mary Lou Gutscher at Toronto's party address or phone number.

Selling Freedom

6

-by Robert Metz

In an effort to explain the difficulty encountered in promoting the concept and benefits of freedom, a past issue of **Toward Liberty** quoted the late Leonard E. Read's observation that 'ours is a learning problem and not a selling problem'. While Mr. Read's astute observation is undeniably true, let us not lose our perspective by assuming that 'selling' freedom is not an important function.

That freedom and liberty are so widely misunderstood and misrepresented is certainly evidence of a general failure to 'teach and learn'. But that freedom and liberty are so seldom even *discussed* as the issue of our day is evidence of a failure to *sell*. Whereas the process of teaching and learning belongs to the realm of *philosophy*, the process of 'selling' is what the *political* movement is all about.

Selling FREEDOM is what Freedom Party is all about.

In keeping with this primary objective, we have, of course, already adopted our new identity: (the) **Freedom Party of Ontario**. The name change is a *political*, not a philosophical tactic. Not only does the word 'freedom' identify our ultimate political objective, it also objectivises our product --- makes it marketable.

Do not make the mistake of assuming that the adoption of a sales approach to marketing freedom implies a separation of our philosophy from our politics. They remain as inseparable as the word 'freedom' is indivisible. Unquestionably, our philosophy is part of the product we're selling. But for the purpose of setting *political objectives*, it is indeed most necessary to *distinguish* between the two; a failure to do so will lead to unrealistic expectations, expectations which when unfulfilled lead to the unfortunate consequences of frustration and most critically, *inaction*.

Action is what selling and politics is all about --- specifically --- *physical* action. It is the type of action that must be directed toward the purpose of promoting and exposing the principles of freedom to the general public through concrete means, not towards philosophizing itself. If it's only your mouth that's moving, then you're engaged in philosophy. But if it's your finger moving on a pen, typewriter, wallet, chequebook, or telephone dial, then you're engaged in *political* activity.

Political activity involves physical action that yields physical results in the form of printed literature, promotional items, book distribution, money, members, supporters, activists, events. And it is physical results of this sort that will be the mainstay of **Freedom Party's** short-term political objectives and it is against such results that our progress must be measured.

Specifically, our current short-term goals can be divided into three basic categories:

(1) RECRUITING MEMBERS & FUNDRAISING:

In this area, our emphasis must be radically altered. There is a theory that basically states: 'A very small number of events --- 10% - 20% at most --- account

for 90% of all results, whereas the great majority of events account for 10% or less of the results'.

In our first year of operation as an **Unparty** constituency in London, we found that this rule held surprisingly true. A review of our cash contributions received revealed that 18% of our members contributed 82% of those contributions. Thus, our major effort will be to involve and communicate with that 18%, who, because of mis-directed efforts to simply increase 'support' through the 'numbers game', have been largely and unfairly ignored.

(2) LITERATURE:

Like the *Freedom!* pamphlet included with this issue, we intend to create a series of such pamphlets on various subjects which appeal to various interest groups. The important thing about *consistently* issuing new 'position papers' is that they will eventually become the most *tangible* evidence of the existence of the party. Naturally, this is a critical element of our third political priority:

(3) VISIBILITY:

It is not our intention to engage in 'political activity' by means of public protest, picketing, etc. If anything, this type of activity (so faithfully pursued by special-interest groups) will create more negative perceptions of our party than positive ones.

Rather, preferred forums of promoting ourselves (in addition to our literature), will include public meetings, debates, 'access' shows, interviews, talk shows, etc., wherever opportunities present themselves. Not only do such forums generate the greatest amount of attention (despite the usual small number of people involved), but they are also the least expensive, and they serve to maximize *political* results in proportion to effort (time & money) expended.

Our political efforts should be concentrated on goals with immediate objectives and immediate results. We should not be expending direct effort trying to 'convert' people --- that's the purpose of philosophical efforts. Our *political* priority is to seek out those who are basically already in agreement with us, and to make ourselves known to them. People don't join political parties to become converted. They only join *after* they have decided that they are in agreement and *only* if they feel that there is a viable return on their contributions and effort. Unrealistic expectations can destroy a political movement, leaving members and supporters with no objective way of measuring their progress.

Remember that *political power* is not our long term objective --- *political representation* is. And before we can ever expect to be political representatives, those whom we purport to represent must share our philosophy and ideals. By maintaining a constant awareness that our political success is entirely dependent upon a preceeding acceptance of our philosophy, we can avoid the pitfalls of unrealistic expectations and thus achieve true and measurable progress.

Avoid Wasting Time -Recruitment Do's & Don'ts

It is not the purpose of this article to discuss certain strategies of disarming the philosophical principles or your antagonist in a discussion. Neither is it a treatise on linguistics or phraseology that should be employed in the demonstration of your principles. These would take volumes of work. Rather, it is a brief guide one should follow when determining how much *effort* should be spent in attempting to convince others of the benefits of freedom (and its philosophical tenets). The title of this article, then, may be a bit misleading. Perhaps I should have retitled it: *When and when not to discuss politics with someone*.

Many of you may already know all this and are convinced that you know and legitimately use certain criteria in discriminating the people you enter into these conversations with. But experience shows (and I should know) that these claims are often ignored at the outset of a discussion. By the middle of a discussion, you become emotionally obsessed with the idea that somehow you are a master of debating, and that in just one more minute you'll have convinced the guy sitting across from you that your ideas are right. I know I have!

There *are* times when even flawless logic, rational principles, and mastered strategies, do nothing but deteriorate the level of discussion to petty insults and angry bellowing. I recall having an argument with one woman where it actually took me three hours to explain why I didn't want to discuss philosophy with her (oh Mark! How *do* you get into such messes!)). Even after a lot of experience, you can still get tied up in such unmemorable circumstances such as the above example. So I've devised a few helpful pointers to remember when faced with entering a philosophical discussion with someone.

Remember that the extent to which your discussion gets anywhere depends on the *values* possessed by the person you are talking to. It is also true that the reason the following points are so important is that many methods of recruiting members and gaining other people's interest in the party can be used during *informal* discussions you have with the people you meet everyday. It may be the chat with the restaurant waitress, the talk with your client at work, the evening you spend at your

new neighbour's, etc. These pointers, then, can be very helpful in saving you a lot of hassle with people who wouldn't believe the truth if it walked up to them and punched them in the nose.

First, here are times when you should *not* discuss ideas. When the other person:

- (1) refuses to define his terms,
- (2) constantly evades answering your questions,
- (3) limits his terminology entirely to out-of-context concretes,
- (4) condemns the employment of *ideas* in your discussion (a variant of (3)),
- (5) condemns the employment of *ideals* in same,
- (6) is highly mystical and bases his arguments on faith,
- (7) resorts to intimidation techniques,
- (8) constantly uses hackneyed phrases and clichés rather than reason, and
- (9) shows no enthusiasm to talk, or even seems perturbed by your presence.

Now here are times when you *should* discuss ideas. When the other person:

- (1) has fundamental principles in philosophy that agree in part or in whole with your own, but may differ in its evaluation (i.e., politics),
- (2) believes that there is a 'right' and 'wrong' in issues,
- (3) is young or is still groping for answers,
- (4) is a confessed idealist and believes in a morally just society (whatever it may be),
- (5) admits that something is wrong in government but doesn't know quite what it is,
- (6) voted for a party with an explicit or consistent platform (within reason), or voted for a specific *issue*.

Always seize the opportunity to discuss ideas with those whom you perceive are *looking for answers*, and avoid discussions with those who seem to already have their minds 'made up'. There are more examples on each side of the coin, but these are the critical ones. After all, why waste time on futile prospects?

Next issue, I'll conclude this article with elaborations on the above points. See you then.

Freedom, in a political context, means freedom from government coercion. It does *not* mean freedom from the landlord, or freedom from the employer, or freedom from laws of nature which do not provide men with automatic prosperity. It means freedom from the coercive power of the state --- and nothing else.

---Ayn Rand,
Capitalism, The Unknown Ideal

BILL PETERSON AND DAVID DAVIS

Leaders Of The Same Party



ROBERT METZ

Being a conservative Liberal like David Peterson is the same as being a liberal Conservative like Bill Davis. Both are really *socialists* in disguise.

Bob Rae, on the other hand, isn't in disguise.

It's not that I'm trying to imply that our three provincial party leaders are in some basic agreement on how to resolve basic socio-economic or political problems. Hardly. It seems that they can only agree on how to get us *into* these problems. But whether they are consciously aware of it or not, there is a *single* common denominator to all of their philosophies that makes them *politically* the same: it is their mutual contempt towards the word *capitalism* and the principles of *individual* rights that the word represents.

Bob Rae, of course, makes no bones about it. He's *proud* to be a socialist. His major complaint has been that it's the Conservatives and Liberals who are implementing socialism, and not *his* party. But it's something you might never guess in listening to Bill Davis or David Peterson publicly speak. They wear their socialist disguises so well.

"I believe in the risk-reward system and I believe in private enterprise," David Peterson told his Ontario Liberals at their annual heritage dinner last April. But despite the fact that the "risk-reward, private enterprise" system is known only as *capitalism*, Peterson qualified his support for such a system by saying "This is not an age of *unbridled capitalism* where wealth can be earned at the expense of one class or group in society. What we must achieve, we can only achieve *together*."

One minute it's *private* enterprise and in the next it's back to doing things *together*. Collectivist.

Another person who believes in "private enterprise" is Bill Davis. He believes in it so much that sometimes his socialist disguise slips off, like it did when his government invested \$650 million of *our* tax dollars in a *private enterprise* known as Suncor.

When his critics condemned his action as being "outright socialist", he toured the province boasting that "We're not a doctrinaire party like the socialists (NDP)." And anyone who would even apply the principles of *any other brand of conservatism* to Ontario's Tories, said Davis, "is hung up on a matter of theology."

If *principles* are only a "hang up" to Davis, he has made it glaringly obvious that his party's single "principle" is that of political expediency---anything to stay in power. And while accusing the Liberals of "following whatever policy meets popular approval on a given day," Davis defended the actions of *his* party by claiming that *they* discuss "each issue as it comes."

What he sees as the difference between these two approaches to government is anybody's guess. Same difference to me. Whether a *conservative* government steals my money to invest in "privately" owned Suncor, or whether a (federal) *liberal* government steals my money to set up a "publicly" owned Petrocan, the fact remains that my pockets are still empty and that I was given no choice in the matter.

Canadians have grown to believe that the ultimate struggle between *capitalism* (individual rights) and *socialism* (collectivism) is somehow being fought along political party lines. But such is not the case. The eternal folly in being forced into voting for "the lesser of three evils" (voting *against* instead of *for*) lies in the admission that one is still voting for "evil".

It is frightening to realize that, when David Peterson uses the term "unbridled capitalism", it is really the *recognition of individual rights* that both he and his *political* (not *philosophical*) adversaries mutually fear. This also explains why they use the term "*private* enterprise" in place of "*free* enterprise". After all, a society in which *individuals* were free (from government) to determine their own destinies would be an obvious threat to *those who hold collectivist premises*.

And the saddest part of it all is when all of their collectivist fantasies invariably fail, the public comes to assume that *their* failure is, in fact, a failure of *capitalism*. With all their talk about "private enterprise" and "risk-reward" systems, it's a small wonder.

Unfortunately, our political alternatives will remain in short supply as long as politicians and the public continue to share their mutual contempt and ignorance toward the *concepts* (*capitalism*, *free* enterprise, *private property*) necessary to implement any real change in the direction of modern-day governments.

Until then, we'll have socialism, socialism, and even more socialism.

NOTE: The following three documents were inserts to Issue 1 of Freedom Flyer.

Freedom Party of Ontario

P.O. Box 2214, Station 'A', LONDON Ontario, N6A 4E3

Phone: [519] 433-8612

Dear Friend in Freedom,

The fact that you are receiving this letter indicates that, at some time in the not-too-distant past, you have expressed interest in and-or given support to the cause of individual freedom. You are not alone.

Freedom Party has arrived!

Unlike libertarian movements in the past, we are dedicated to political *action* and to political *success*. In exchange for your support and involvement, we are making a commitment to *results*. We hope that our first newsletter (enclosed) is indicative of this new direction.

We want your help, suggestions, work --- and money!

Remember that we are a fully registered political party and that any donations received are *tax deductible* to those residents of Ontario who find themselves in the unfortunate position of being forced to support our ever-growing provincial government. But for the money you send to *us*, we offer an *action* oriented newsletter, campaign advisers, help, constituency organization, recruiting advice, literature, tapes, and other politically active weaponry.

Fill in and return the form below, and watch as your donations and support are transformed into *action*!

Sincerely,



Robert Metz

President, Freedom Party of Ontario

FREEDOM FUND

Name: _____

Address: _____

Apt. or Unit Number: _____ Phone: ☐ I'd like to help; please call.) _____

City, Province: _____ Postal Code: _____

Please check applicable box...

☐ Membership (includes 1 yr. subscription to **Freedom Flyer**) \$15

☐ Membership *only* \$10

☐ **Contribution*** (fill in amount) \$ _____

Where would you like to see your contribution spent? (We'll guarantee it!):

*Please check appropriate box...

☐ **General Operations** (includes all items below, as required)

☐ Phone expenditures

☐ Computer operation and maintenance

☐ Signs, letterhead, buttons, stationery, etc.

☐ Publicity campaigns and advertising

☐ Election Fund

☐ Issue Papers (Pick your issue! -\$30 ea.)

THE UNKNOWN IDEAL

—PUZZLE BY Mark Pettigrew

Find the listed words in the puzzle. [Words may be read left-to-right, right-to-left, top-to-bottom, bottom-to-top, horizontally, vertically, or diagonally. The only restriction is that they be read in a straight line.] Once the puzzle is finished, the remaining letters [i.e. those not circled or crossed out] read in consecutive order will reveal the mystery word.

P	K	A	N	T	I	O	P	M	S	I	T	A	T	S	M	O	N	E	Y
R	G	O	L	D	I	U	E	O	Y	T	I	S	R	E	V	I	N	U	S
I	B	T	E	T	B	R	C	R	A	L	I	V	E	R	N	A	E	J	E
C	N	A	N	L	R	I	E	N	I	L	T	R	I	E	I	T	L	P	N
E	L	D	I	E	E	U	A	H	A	A	F	C	L	R	A	G	O	U	Y
S	C	C	U	T	M	R	I	T	N	E	F	P	E	C	T	L	H	C	E
N	M	N	Y	S	C	Y	I	S	T	I	I	Z	U	L	I	U	I	T	K
O	S	C	A	H	T	P	O	U	M	H	V	D	E	T	L	M	E	C	S
I	I	O	Y	R	A	R	N	L	S	M	E	M	I	S	S	E	O	S	S
T	N	N	I	C	F	I	Y	R	P	C	S	C	A	I	S	N	T	G	E
A	O	S	Y	L	O	P	O	N	O	M	S	I	V	N	S	I	R	N	S
L	I	E	P	N	O	S	R	N	T	E	E	I	L	T	T	E	A	T	I
U	T	R	S	R	N	G	O	A	L	S	T	N	I	A	E	E	B	L	M
G	C	V	E	E	O	M	U	T	G	C	U	T	U	N	I	R	I	E	O
E	E	A	C	A	I	P	O	H	E	M	U	R	S	R	A	C	W	V	R
R	T	T	Y	C	G	T	E	L	A	T	A	P	T	N	A	A	O	E	P
L	O	I	S	A	S	A	L	R	I	O	A	T	D	I	G	L	S	S	M
A	R	V	S	I	D	O	N	O	T	N	C	E	I	E	T	R	L	O	O
W	P	E	R	E	C	O	N	O	M	Y	N	L	S	S	A	N	M	O	C
S	T	A	L	I	N	O	T	G	N	I	H	S	A	W	T	F	A	R	D

ALCOA
ALTRUISM
ANARCHY
ANTITRUST
ARISTOTLE

BRANDEN

CENSORSHIP
COLLECTIVISM
COMPROMISES
CONSERVATIVE
CONSTITUTION
CAPITALIST

DOLLAR
DRAFT

ECONOMICS
ECONOMY
EDUCATE

FRANCE
FREE

GREENSPAN
GOLD

HUGO

INTELLECT
IDEALS
INDUSTRY
INHERIT

KANT
KEYNES

LAISSEZ-FAIRE
LAWS
LENIN
LIVE

MONEY
MONOPOLY

POLITICS
PROTECTIONISM
PRAGMATIST
PROPERTY
PUBLIC
PUBLIC
PRICES

REAGAN
REGULATIONS
RIGHTS
ROOSEVELT

SOCIETY
SOCIALISM

STALIN
STATISM

TODAY

UNEMPLOYMENT
UNIVERSITY
UNIONS

VALUE
VIETNAM
VIRTUES

WAGES
WARS
WASHINGTON

FREEDOM!

Freedom is having the right to choose and it is our freedom of choice that is at the heart of every political issue.

Politicians who restrict our freedom usually justify their actions with the claim that their imposed economic and social restrictions somehow serve the 'public interest'. Then, as members of 'the public', we come to assume that we will gain by giving up some of our freedom as individuals. Unfortunately, this is not so.

Freedom reducing measures justified by the 'in the public interest' argument clearly favour the interests of one *group* of people over those of another group of people. Thus, for many, such measures not only restrict their freedom, but place them at a disadvantage with respect to those favoured or not affected by the restrictive measures.

The politicians who bestow a benefit on one group at the expense of another group expect, and often get, political support from the people who receive the benefit. At the same time, the punished groups seldom retaliate by withdrawing their support because they have been conditioned to believe that their 'sacrifice' is 'in the public interest'. But as they all eventually discover, 'the public interest' really means 'in the governing politicians' interests'.

All of Canada's large political parties recommend and follow policies that seriously restrict our choice of language, units of measurement, entertainment, products, services, employment, and a multitude of other things. The only difference between the parties is not whether freedom of choice should be limited, but *whose* freedoms are to be restricted for *whose* benefit.

Freedom Party

FREEDOM!

Freedom Party believes that the *purpose of government* is to *protect* your freedom of choice, *not* to restrict it.

If you want to make your own choices rather than have those choices made for you by 'public interest' politicians, then **choose Freedom Party**. After all, freedom of choice is what we're all about!

FREEDOM PARTY OF ONTARIO

P.O. BOX 2214, STN. 'A',
LONDON, ONTARIO
N6A 4E3