

CLEAR ETHER!

Personal-genzine of Samuel Edward Konkin III for distribution in Amateur Press Associations (with companion commentzine ...AND ON GREEN!), for trades, locs, artwork and even subscription. Address all correspondence to New Libertarian Enterprises, Box 1748, Long Beach, CA 90801; Personal: SEK3.

Volume Four, Number 2

July 1979

Published bimonthly

JE M'OPPOSE

ANTIPONTIFICATIONS

La Programme d'Espace

Space Cadet & Grubeater

Fans are sceptical, right? Just try to push a religion, ideology or philosophy to them and watch the resistance! Nothing can overcome the jaundiced eye of Fandom Assembled; nothing can command their unanimity: not ERA, libertarianism, Futurian Socialism, Claude Degler or what have you.

"Oh yeah? Mention the "Space Programme" and watch the Pavlovian salivation. Utter a cutting word against this Sacred Cow and watch the torches and pitchforks figuratively spring to hand! See the mob form, the gleam leap to the glassy eyes, and the stakes, gallows and guillotines surge upward in instant construction.

"Kill the heretic!" shrills from foaming mouths. Why?

Why are Science Fiction fans, often too damn sceptical for their own sanity and sense of purpose, so gullible when it comes to this billion-dollar, pork-barrel boondoggle which has been the greatest enemy that space exploration has faced since the Inquisition of Galileo Galilei?

This article is not going to try to turn you against the Space Programme; its goals are far more modest. What it will hopefully do is convince those of you with the lynching fever to stop and consider the following:

Those who oppose the Space Programme have a right to live; furthermore

Those who oppose the Space Programme are not morons, fools, traitors, or masochists, though some may be, just as supporters may be; moreover...

Those who oppose the Space Programme may be good fans, too; and, perhaps hardest of all to swallow,

Those who oppose the Space Programme may love space travel, space colonization and fervently desire to Get Out There themselves.

Then, if you wish, you can consider their arguments. Or keep to your own.

As the article alongside shows, libertarians have problems with their most likely allies in the marketing of space. But what is far more absurd, there are those within the Libertarian Movement who are blindly and stupidly opposing dedication to space exploration and development, and its associated literature.

Bear in mind that the author holds no brief for the Libertarian Party, that platypus of political logic which exists on the ridiculous premise that it is possible to vote politicians into positions of control to legislate freedom. Nonetheless, a few of the brighter members of this Party are smitten with Space and the Future. They actually wish to hold some programming at the LP's National Convention September 5 to 9 in Los Angeles concerned with futurism, science fiction and space—and not just how to run campaigns for "Libertarian" politicians.

Lo and behold, they are attacked with the epithet commonly heard on today's campuses for dopers and drop-outs: Space Cadets. No less a personage than Murray Rothbard, perhaps more deserving of the title of Founder of the modern Libertarian Movement than any other, has coined this term and denounced these futurists, fans and space visionaries. In *Libertarian Forum* (January-February 1979, "The Space War," page one!), his own publication, and also in party and non-party organs, he has attacked the Space Cadets whom he sees diverting attention away from the truly important tasks of building a Third Party, learning how to chase votes and manipulate the media like real politicians—"Real People" in his phrasing.

There have been counter-attacks from neo-Randists such as Tonie Nathan and others as well. Nathan selects one of Rothbard's statements that those who wish to live in trees and eat grubs for a living are entitled to freedom too. In true Randist fashion, she thinks these are no models for the builders of the free society of the future, and the "grub-eaters" have no need of freedom.

[Continued on page 2]

[Continued on page 3]

JE M'OPPOSE a La Programme d'Espace!

Continued from page one, column one

OUR RIGHT TO LIVE

A few of you more level-headed types may be chuckling at what appears to you to be verbal overkill. Far from it; there are fans who think that those who oppose The Programme will doom mankind to extinction, or at least savagery. Therefore, they believe stifling, suppressing—even killing—opponents is Good.

Undoubtedly, there are ecologists—*ecoloids* would be better to distinguish them from the scientific kind—who would like to see us slip back into a pastoral Stone Age. Some of them oppose the Space Programme. Some of them would oppose space exploration and marketing too. But even these people have a right to live. They have a right to be wrong. Furthermore, their support is not necessary to get into space.

If you believe we need a democratic majority to get into space, that's your problem. Shoot yourself, if you must shoot someone. But remove restrictions and controls on space marketing, and though 90% of the populace oppose it, there will be space travel.

If you are one of those who support government monopolization of space, you might be providing the margin of majority which is suppressing market space ventures. And if it turned out to be your fault that we didn't get out to space, would you do yourself in? Would someone else, seeing you as an obstacle, have a right to shoot you?

OUR RIGHT TO EARNED RESPECT

Most groupings of people contain their share of jerks. Assuming that anti-Programmers are morons, fools, traitors or masochists because they are opposed to the State's extraterrestrial bureaucracy is itself folly, bigotry, irrationality and self-destructive.

Suppose you are talking to a fan and he or she claims that he believes in space exploration. The reasons given are well-presented, scientific, romantic, and economic. This fan presents the case, as a matter of fact, as an imperative. And you decide that, if not brilliant, this fan is the salt of the Earth.

Then that same fan tells you the biggest obstacle to the colonization, exploration and marketing of space is the United States government. Suddenly, he is a fool? Yet the arguments he offers are the same that earned your respect.

Is he a moron? His reasoning is identical to that you approved before.

Is he a traitor? He remains firmly committed to the cause.

Is he a masochist? He continues to seek the same goal and is convinced the Programme is contradictory and destructive to your mutual aims.

I am indebted to David Klaus for bringing this issue to my attention, however inadvertently on his part. ■

Letters of Comment (LoCs) are very welcome. —SEK3

OUR RIGHT TO BE FANS, TOO

Fanzines and self-appointed spokespersons for science fiction fandom claim that fandom speaks with one voice on the Space Programme. As should be clear by now, this is patently false.

Do a majority of fans support it? At the time of this writing, a majority probably does. While many of them might indeed switch their allegiances if presented with an attractive market alternative to The Programme, the point is conceded.

But so what? Since when is fandom a majoritarian democracy? When Ellison decided to speak for all fandom in support of the Equal Rights Amendment, did he get away with it? Did the Futurians speak for fandom as committed to socialism in 1939? Never has fandom been found unanimous on any subject before this issue—not even on what constitutes science fiction, the very basis of our grouping.

There are other fans who agree with this author. Yet in fanzines have their views seen print. What incredible intimidation!

Surely, if fannish credentials are being issued, are not the anti-Programmers the truest of trufan, upholding the great fannish tradition of dissent, scepticism and naysaying to the anthill society of uniform opinion?

Are not the heretics our most cherished heroes?

OUR RIGHT TO SPACE, TOO

At this point, a distinction must be made between those who oppose the Space Programme for its alleged goals and those who deny that those goals are achievable by governmental methods. While all the aforementioned defenses may apply to the former group, the latter bear an extra burden.

Those of us who believe in D.D. Harriman and not John F. Kennedy as the model for space developers—Space Marketeers—are condemned with the genuine anti-space people in blanket.

The Space Programme claims that it will open up the boundaries of humanity past the surface of the Earth. Very well, suppose the claim is true.

Is that then the only way? Are opponents of the Programme anti-Space because they reject one method? If so, they every conscientious objector was a soldier for the enemy side.

Moreover, the anti-Space people (not the Market-eers) would be able to use the same argument against the Programme supporters. Many of the opponents claim that money for the Programme is taken away from programmes to save the starving, educate the illiterates, save the environment and enrich the culture. Are proponents of the Space Programme in favour of starvation, illiteracy, pollution and philistinism?

Of course not. Most supporters of the Programme honestly believe that reaching space will itself alleviate starvation, make learning easier and more enjoyable, remove polluting industries from the atmosphere or make them unnecessary, and give man greater goals, heroes and a far broader culture.

The Marketeers agree with them on that point. They differ in that they believe the Programme will set back or destroy that very goal, the goal of reaching space.

AN END TO INTIMIDATION

Let then the argument rest here for those only interested in the well-being of fandom. Let a dialogue open between the Programmers and the Marketeers. Let the great fannish spirit of tolerance and acceptance of divergent views on worthy goals and methods enter the question of space, its exploration, colonization and commercialization. Let all be heard and no voice be silenced.

Let there be an end to this unseemly, unfannish intimidation.

But if there are those who want to actually listen to the opposing view, not just grant them a grudging tolerance, then read on.

THE CASE AGAINST THE PROGRAMME

First, one must clearly define the goal. Let it be as follows: mankind living permanently on planets, artificial satellites, and even on vessels travelling between planets and stars. This is what we mean by "getting into space."

Very well, for mankind to live in the stars, he must breathe, eat, and inhabit. He needs property, trade, goods and services—a space economy. Mankind must be free to explore, innovate, invent, and exchange—the free market.

The State destroys incentive, stifles creativity, blocks trade, confiscates goods and property, controls and regulates human activity which has not yet had a chance to discover how best to act in unfamiliar environments.

Since 1776 we have known the State is the enemy of exploration, trade and development. The State's attempts to subsidize exploration and colonization have been self-defeating, from Port Royal, Jamestown and Botany Bay to Rhodesia, Indochina and Antarctica.

The market has succeeded, from the Hudson Bay fur trappers and the Rhode Island dissenters to the Gold Rushes of California and the Yukon and the Westward March of the homesteaders. The market by its nature rejects failures as unprofitable and rewards successful new attempts with profit. The State rewards those who follow orders and obey regulations—even unto the death and destruction of the outpost or colony. Which then shall develop space?

But it's not merely a set of alternatives. The market will work. The State will not only not work, but is an impediment to the market working.

Capital to finance space ventures are taxed away. Adventurous attempts to enter space are quashed by the State's regulations and controls. Bright young men and women who wish to devote their lives to space exploration are drawn into the dead end of the frustrating bureaucracy of the Programme.

The Market says, "Get their however you can. Be as ingenious as possible!"

The State says, "Follow our rules, do as you are told,

stick with the plan though it mean failure, scrubbed missions and lay-offs."

The Market says, "Pay your debts and insure your risks."

The State gave us Skylab's falling.

The Market is run by no one. Providers of capital say, "Give me a profit and I don't care how you do it."

The State is run by bureaucrats and politicians. They say, "Do it the way we have passed laws and issued orders for you to do, to get ourselves votes and funding." And if the votes want The Programme shut down, the Programme will be—and no alternative will be allowed.

All the State contributes to economics is monopoly. A State Space Programme demands that it be done one way, in one institution, under one supreme authority.

The Market says do it any and all ways you can. All alternatives are acceptable. Those showing highest returns are preferred, but other ways are acceptable if they may show longer-range returns or other benefits.

If a sizable part of this globe had enjoyed a free market for even this past century, we would probably be in space in force *now*. As long as this Programme exists and the iron fist chokes the life out of the economy, our efforts are hampered. Underground counter-economic space ventures are threatened with exposure and their members with arrest. Yes, they do currently exist!

Even above ground timid enterprises such as the West German OTRAG located in Zaire are at the mercy of the whims of foreign policies of the World's States. Perhaps the U.S. State Department may decide to sacrifice OTRAG to a strutting Idi Amin or Emperor Bokassa or some Marxist will nationalize it into impotency.

This is why I oppose the Space Programme. In any language, *ad astra! Je m'oppose a la programme d'espace!*

—SEK3

SPACE CADET & GRUB-EATER

Continued from page one, column two

Of course, Rothbard attacked her elitism and the Party is now divided into two camps each sporting their own buttons and slogans: Space Cadets and Grub eaters.

First, some hard facts: in the experience of this author, who has personally met thousands of libertarians, Partyarchs and anti-Party marketeers, at least nine out of ten libertarians at least read science fiction. Perhaps half of those are at least aware of fandom and approve. A very large overlap exists between fandom and libertarianism, going back to the beginning of the Movement started by readers of *The Moon Is A Harsh Mistress*, and similar works then and now: *The Great Explosion*, *The Syndic*, *The Dispossessed*, *Illuminatus!*, much of Anderson and Moorcock, and Rand's sf: *Atlas Shrugged* and *The Fountainhead*.

Second, should the Party become anti-sf it will only serve to destroy it. Perhaps we marketeers should wish

that Rothbard's view prevails and is imposed most brutally.

Even, so, it should be made clear to fans unaware of the peregrinations of Movement personalities and their cute little quirks, that *most* libertarians are not anti-space, anti-sf, nor oblivious to futurism. In fact, besides many sf pros, and fans such as Richard Geis and yours truly, being libertarians of one stripe or another, futurists like Robert Anton Wilson, Durk Pearson, and the founders of Alcor Life Extension are hard-core libertarians.

As long as it is clear that the Party (LP) is anti-sf but libertarians are not, no harm will be done.

Finally, though, logic demands that it be pointed out that the Great War between Space Cadets and Grubeaters is a false dichotomy. Space Cadets have no need to denigrate or bother those who wish to live in trees and eat grubs. Nor do Grubeaters and their defenders have reason to do ought but cheer others who pursue freedom for ends which may seem incomprehensible or fantastic to them.

Such rancour is counter-productive to Liberty, though perhaps underlines the great diversity among those who seek it and reaffirms the compatibility of all non-coercive interests in harmony in a free society.

And in a year, this whole nonsense will blow over. Let us minimise the damage and extract what gain we can from it until good sense returns to all. —SEK3

Alien by Dan O'Bannon et al. [Cinema] It's not *Star Wars*. Well-made, a definite science fiction setting, state of the art and successfully horrifying is it, all that. But, save for the heroic ending (feminist individualist, yet!), not a picture to see to become inspired and motivated by the future. My recommendation: see it once so you can say you have; don't force yourself the second time. ★★½

Note: *CE!* did skip the month of May. It has returned to bi-monthly or at least five times a year.

STFNAL

Destinies Edited by James Baen [Book/Magazine] With three issues out as of this writing, there is too much material for individual listing of stories and articles. With the exception of serials, Editor Jim Baen has accomplished all he had at *Galaxy* and more. Of course, with his quarterly schedule, serialization is a problem for readers' attention. Let us hope Jim gets "enough good material" to turn at least bi-monthly, introduce serials, and have the indisputedly best prozine—regardless of shape. (Baen for Hugo!) ★★

Castle Roogna by Piers Anthony. [Novel] Somehow, when we weren't looking, a fantasist has arisen into the top ranks. *Castle Roogna* is the third in Anthony's Xanth series. The first, *A Spell for Chameleon*, presented the magic world of Xanth and contrasted it to Mundania. The second, *The Source of Magic*, explained the reason magic worked. Both were quests of Bink, the hero whose magic was so powerful it prevented knowledge of its own existence!

The third book focuses on Bink and Chameleon's son Dor, at age twelve, who gets his education for magician-kingship by inhabiting an adult body (of a barbarian fighter) during a critical historical period in Xanth. Heinlein's juveniles now have a fantasy counterpart!

I wish particularly to commend Piers Anthony for his unswerving fealty to pure logic. The plots are elaborate, humorous, and as logical as the rules of magic. This is a perfect backdrop for a game far advanced from current D&D. The puns are thick but fit perfectly into the story. This is a blend of Lewis, Heinlein, De Camp and Pratt, Lewis Carroll, Leiber, Moorcock and maybe Bertrand Russell for the logic. ★★

Note A copy of the issue with your LoC will be sent free to you, so comment even if you are not in my APAs. —SEK3

