

# Liberty for America

## Journal of the Libertarian Political Movement

Volume 5 Number 6

November 2012

### Editorial Note

#### Partial Web Page Failure

Something has gone wrong with the lists software that lets us send issues to electronic regular readers. We are investigating the nature of the failure. A workaround may be employed for the issue this month.

#### Filling the LNC At-Large Position

Our Libertarian National Committee has a vacancy for an At-Large position, created when Wayne Root fled the Libertarian National Committee and our Party for the Republicans.

There are a variety of candidates. We express our opinions on several of them. Your mileage may vary.

Paulie (Paul Frankel) - **Highly endorsed**. If you read the Starchild LNC Reflector list groups.yahoo.com/group/LNCDiscussPublic you will soon notice that most of the sound political thinking is being done by one person, Paul Frankel. Paulie is also the person who was giving the LNC coherent updates on ballot access, something that the LNC Executive Director and ballot access committee seem not to be doing.

Mark Hinkle—**Unfit to serve**. Hinkle has already been rejected by the membership, by vote of the National Convention. He lost to a candidate who lost to NOTA. Under his leadership, national party membership fell, and at the end fund raising collapsed. Hinkle spent thousands of dollars of LNC funds on legal research on the Oregon issue, research that was then turned over to the people suing our party affiliate. He accused Rachel Hawkridge of being our source on the LNC.

David Blau—Dave is a good guy and a personal friend. He has been a respectable state chair. He has not been active in our party for very long, so he is less involved in (good) or aware of (less good) some of our more contentious issues. However, he is so far as I can tell supportive of buying a building.

Mark Rutherford, Emily Salvette, Aaron Starr, Rebecca Sink-Burris, Wayne Root, Alicia Mattson, Kevin Knedler, Scott Lieberman, Dan Wiener, Gary Johnson of New Mexico, Joe Buchman, and Ron Nielson—Do Not Elect. You have seen their records in this newsletter, including the Johnson campaign team. We can surely do better.

Gigi Bowman—has actually done a number of activist deeds.

Jim Duensing—A dedicated champion for his beliefs as to what is important. Unfortunately, these beliefs include a number of conspiracy theories that would distract from his role on the LNC.

### Wonderful California News

Abel Maldonado, the Republican enemy of liberty who gave California the fascist top two primary process, was crushingly defeated in his race for Congress. And his brainchild? The Arizona 'Top Two' initiative was crushingly defeated. With 85% of precincts reporting, there were 446,985 votes "yes" and 909,401 votes "no".

### Votes Still Being Counted

As we go to press, votes are still being counted across America. Gary Johnson would appear to have equaled, approximately, Ed Clark's performance in 1980, namely over a million votes and close to 1% of the vote. In several states, Johnson did better, notably New Mexico (3.5%), Montana (3%), Alaska (2.5%), and Maine (1.9%).

More detailed results await a future issue, but seven candidates apparently broke one million votes. Paulie reports:

#### U.S. PRESIDENT

Gary Johnson – 1,140,593 votes for 1.0%

#### GEORGIA

David Staples (Public Service Commission) – 1,086,916 votes for 34.1% (2nd in a 2-way race)

#### TEXAS

Jaime O. Perez (Railroad Commissioner) – 1,122,792 votes for 18.3% (2nd in a 3-way)

Roberto Koelsch (Texas Supreme Court) – 1,280,886 votes for 21.2% (2nd in a 2-way)

Tom Oxford (Texas Supreme Court) – 1,030,735 votes for 16.87% (2nd in a 3-way)

Mark Bennett (Appeals Court Justice) – 1,326,526 votes for 22.1% (2nd in a 2-way)

William Strange (Appeals Court Justice) – 1,313,746 votes for 21.9% (2nd in a 2-way)

In more positive news, advocates of equal rights under the law for gays and lesbians wishing to marry successfully carried referenda in Maryland, Maine, Washington, and Minnesota. Massachusetts Referenda on Right to Repair and Marijuana passed.

Two states apparently effectively legalized marijuana for recreational uses. One of our good friends recalls that several states, e.g., New York in 1930, simply repealed their state Volstead Act equivalents, and at this point Prohibition collapsed in those states, because there was no useful Federal response.

Libertarian Federal candidates in several races ran well ahead of the margin of difference between the Democratic and Republican candidates. Libertarian Dan Fishman ran for Congress in the Massachusetts Sixth District. The vote went Tierney-D (48%), Tisei (R) 47%, and Fishman (L) 5%. Republicans became distraught. You can hear one throwing a ranting fit at <http://audio.wrko.com/a/66156190/barbra-anderson-gets-bullbleep-at-libertarian-spoiler-dan-fishman.htm>. Fishman ran better in Democratic towns than in Republican ones.

Our message should be: If Republicans don't like losing, they should stop running candidates! They'll still be total losers, but they won't suffer through the reminder every election day. More important, they should stop stealing our Libertarian votes with their candidates!

In Montana, Senator Tester (D) received 48.5%, Congressman Rehberg (R) had 45%, and Libertarian Dan Cox had more than 6.5% of the vote.

## Near Miss in South Carolina

Some readers will already be aware of the state legislative race in South Carolina in which the only partisan candidate on the ballot was the Libertarian. There was also an independent. We are discussing a state with straight ticket voting, so large numbers of voters will pull the party lever, thus ensuring that they cast no vote in this race. The LNC, which had recently spent \$50,000 on a City Council race in Indiana, did nothing here. The Libertarian lost, 48%-52%.

## National Party Membership Up Sharply

National Party membership is up over the past three months, from 12960 three months earlier to 14070 at the end of October. The change is due in large part to a great increase in new members, not simply to more renewals.

## Anti-Libertarian Ads

A pseudonymous writer on Independent Political Report writes "Rand Paul/Todd Akin are running radio attack ads on KMOX in St. Louis against Missouri Libertarian US Senate candidate Jonathan Dine. Dine has been polling in recent weeks at 6-9%. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9A0He9TnpjI>"

When the Republicans show up in a few years, looking for Libertarian support for Rand Paul, just keep this in mind.

## Oregon Libertarians Launch New State Chairs Group

Oregon State Chair Wes Wagner has sent an electronic letter to his fellow state chairs, saying:

Dear State Chairs,

I am writing you because of the issues that have been facing the

LSLA. You may recall the resignation of previous LSLA chair Michael Johnston due to issues he had cited with the LSLA leadership. You may or may not be aware (as referenced in his letter) that I was removed from the state chairs mailing list by M Carling in 2011 and since then Mr. Starr has not added me back. I am the Chairperson of the Libertarian Party of Oregon according to the Oregon Secretary of State, the National LP (you will note they link the official LP Oregon website). This is of course not without controversy, but that controversy was started by Richard Burke, M Carling, and funded by Aaron Starr in an attempt to place a puppet regime into control of a state affiliate. I can provide this link if you really want to use it as a jumping off point to detail the entire Oregon affair so you can understand how deep the rabbit hole goes but that is not the core issue of this email, it is only the impetus for it.

Mr. Johnston's resignation came amid a flurry of different controversial items. In my opinion it takes a very special and talented set of people to take an organization whose charter is seemingly so benign and create so much controversy with it. Given that the organization has seemingly become a platform for the political ambitions of some of its principals as well as apparently the economic interests of some of their personal contacts, I believe it is important to do two things so that the purpose the LSLA once represented can be fulfilled:

- 1) A new mailing list with all participants is created and administered fairly.
- 2) A group of state chairs should create a new organization to fulfill the original purpose of the LSLA.

I am already doing #1 ([lpchairs@googlegroups.com](mailto:lpchairs@googlegroups.com)), and will pass control of it to whoever performs task #2. Anyone willing to do #2 and has assembled a small team to organize and call the state chairs conference for 2013 (sic), please contact me so I can discuss your budgetary needs for bootstrapping the organization. If you can provide the time, energy and honest intent, I will get you the resources you need to bootstrap it.

Sincerely,  
Wes Wagner  
Chairperson, Libertarian Party of Oregon  
[www.lporegon.org](http://www.lporegon.org)

## A More Complete Oregon Time Line

Oregon Party State Chair Wes Wagner has assembled a partial time line of events in Oregon as they happened and to date: <http://www.thirdpartyreport.com/2012/11/reeves-et-al-as-lpo-v-lpo-wagner-et-al-and-the-or-gop/>

**Liberty for America** is edited by George Phillies, 48 Hancock Hill Drive, Worcester MA 01609 (508 754 1859). To Subscribe, go to [LibertyForAmerica.com](http://LibertyForAmerica.com) and click on the 'subscribe' button. Subscriptions, sent by email to your computer, are free. Back issues of **Liberty for America** magazine are available on the web at <http://LibertyForAmerica.com/LFAMagazine.htm>.

## Where Your Money Went

For September, the LNC began the month with \$153,963 cash on hand. It had \$142,624 in total receipts, spent \$91,274, and ended the month with \$205,314 cash on hand and no debt. For the first 17 days of October, the LNC brought in \$99,536 and spent \$35,718, leaving the committee with \$269,131 cash on hand. Total income in 2012 for the first nine and a half months came to 1.38 million dollars.

In 2008, the corresponding income figures were \$172,292 for September and \$72,761 for the first 15 days of October. Total income in 2008 for the first nine and a half months came to \$1.43 million dollars.

For October, the Johnson campaign had income of \$274,785, spent \$297,954, and was left with 29,173 cash on hand. The committee acknowledged debts of \$405,907, up from \$175,087 the prior month. The debt included \$92,822 Senior Level Campaign Advisory, Campaign debt. Keep your eye on that number.

For the first seventeen days of October, the Johnson campaign had total income of \$203,809, of which it spent \$197,279. Its debts and obligations at the end of the campaign were \$227,202, a decline of more than \$178,000. And that Senior Level Campaign Advisory, Campaign? It was paid down to zero.

The Johnson campaign has issued a statement "for information-

**Sample—This is your sample issue of  
Liberty for America**

For more issues, **subscribe!**

**Subscriptions are free at no charge.**

To subscribe, go to [LibertyForAmerica.com](http://LibertyForAmerica.com)

And click on the Subscribe button

Join **Liberty for America**—\$15.

Donate electronically at [LibertyForAmerica.com](http://LibertyForAmerica.com)  
Checks, payable Liberty for America, to George  
Phillips, 48 Hancock Hill Drive Worcester 01609.

**Membership is not a subscription!**

**Newsletter is only available electronically**

If you **must** get a paper subscription, ask first.

Liberty for America will be performing political acts, and other activities that the Federal government calls "Federal Election Activity" and hence FEC-reportable. We must therefore funnel dues to our PAC, "Liberty for America". Dues will not be used to support candidates.

Your Donations are not tax deductible. Federal law requires us to request the occupation and employer of donors of \$200 or more in a year. Paid for by Liberty for America. Your donations may be used in relation to a Federal Election.

al purposes only" of how it spent its general campaign money. The statement covers May 6 to September 30, 2012. The campaign issued an image of the statement; we are going to round their stated numbers to the nearest thousand.

Media (radio) 147,000  
Ballot Access 148,000  
Printing (signs, posters, flyers, etc) 130,000  
Travel 110,000  
Mailings 46,000  
Email Marketing 30,000  
Web/advertising (FB, twitter, ...) 28,000  
General attorney fees 27,000  
Accounting 26,000  
Bank and credit card processing fees 23,000  
Vans leasing and wrapping 14,000  
Miscellaneous 9,000  
Staffing, office, computers, phones, general office supplies (29 paid staff) 398,000  
  
Total 1,156,000

Readers familiar with my coverage of past Libertarian Presidential campaigns may be staggered by the thought of 29 paid staff members, even though clearly many of them could not have been paid very much.

Remember that Johnson had campaign debts pre-nomination: As we previously reported, in a signed affidavit presented to the United States District Court for Eastern Virginia, Gary Johnson's campaign manager Ronald Nielson last Spring specified under penalty of perjury "...At present OAI [Ed: Our America Initiative, Johnson's political advocacy committee] is indebted to NSoN [Ed: Nielson's company] for services rendered and expenses advanced in the approximate amount of \$1.8 million. At present GJ2012 is indebted to NSoN for services rendered and expenses advanced in the approximate amount of \$676,000."

## Paul Frankel Advocates for 50-State Ballot Access

*Writing on the LNC Discuss list as forwarded to the Starchild Reflector, LNC Regional Alternate Paul Frankel defended the party's pursuit of 50-state ballot access against criticisms from thoughtful LNC Member Norm Olsen. We quote from a longer letter. Olsen's remarks are in italics. Paulie wrote:*

Insanity would be to cave in to what Republicans want when they have been playing dirty tricks to get us off the ballot by doing the job for them.

Insanity would be not learning from what caused us to become more successful for the decade of the 1990s than we were before or since.

Insanity would be to not learn from how falling off the ballots put the Socialist and Prohibition parties into downward spirals.

Insanity would be failing to realize that many donors who donate to ballot access will not donate to other projects.

That would be insanity.

*Again, I suggest that you have cause and effect confused. It is certainly expected that in the context of the demise of a political party that political party does not achieve ballot access. To automatically establish the lack of ballot access as the cause of the demise simply because of the coincidence of these events is a big stretch.*

I did no such thing. I've read history and discussed it with experts such as Richard Winger. Giving up on full ballot access was the cause. Downward spiral was the effect.

In the case of the LP the successful drive to get on 50 states and DC in 1992 was the spark that set of the growth of the 1990s. Seeking and getting full ballot access was the cause. Growth in many other areas was the effect.

*I have written the following before. I apologize if repeating it is getting to be boring.*

*It has become very clear to me that the general public is becoming more and more receptive to our principles, even including stopping the insane War on Drugs. (Even Pat Robertson is now in favor of legalizing pot. :>)*

*Our insignificance in the political arena is now largely due to fact that our candidates rarely win. If we are to achieve political significance, it must be by getting Libertarians elected. This can only happen from the bottom up. That means local affiliates at the county level must be strong enough to attract libertarian minded, electable candidates (yes, even if they are former Republicans or Democrats) to run as Libertarians and get themselves elected.*

And guess what? A party that is not on the ballot in a whole bunch of states is not taken seriously by anyone thinking about making a switch.

Ask yourself why Mike Gravel jumped into the LP rather than the Green Party in 2008. Not because of ideology. it was because of ballot access. If even someone who disagrees with us on most economic issues joined the LP due our ballot access what does that tell you?

The biggest thing we offer crossover politicians is that we are on in more states than any other party that is not one of the Top Two.

If it was not for that it is quite possible Bob Barr may have gone to the Constitution Party, for example.

And when Gary Johnson switched back to LP one of his main talking points was that he was going to be on in 50 states plus DC. Maybe he wouldn't have done it if he thought that was not going to happen.

Even now he points to having better ballot access than other alt

## Welcome to Liberty for America!

A magazine. A web site. An organization. **Liberty for America** has had several inquiries on launching **Liberty for America** Chapters across America. A draft set of state/regional By-Laws appears on the **LibertyforAmerica.Com** web site.

party candidates frequently in interviews.

In the recent debate between Jon Stewart and Bill O'Reilly, Stewart mentioned Gary Johnson by name when a generic third party was brought up by O'Reilly. Why didn't he say Jill Stein or Virgil Goode? Because of our ballot access, that's why.

And does it matter to our down ticket candidates?

Absolutely it matters.

<http://delawarelibertarian.blogspot.com/2012/10/libertarians-who-dont-get-it-or-who.html> [Ed: Following paragraph is a quote from this link.]

*This year Gary Johnson skyped into the Libertarian Party of Delaware convention, and Judge Jim Gray actually came to Delaware State University to address and excited crowd, doing radio and TV interviews while he was here. You can actually see Gary Johnson signs around the state (when embittered Ds and Rs don't knock them down, which has happened), and third party candidates are getting a "coat tail" effect. The Jewish Federation of Delaware reversed its longtime exclusion of third party candidates from its debate; state media has even covered the controversy of the University of Delaware holding to political apartheid in its debate.*

That would not be happening without Gary Johnson, and more specifically the Gary Johnson 2012 campaign.

Where do you think most of our members and candidates first heard about the LP from?

I bet in most cases it was a presidential campaign, sometimes live events but in most cases media coverage that it generates.

*Throwing \$500,000 down the presidential ballot access black hole every four years is not going to get the job done; especially when it takes three years to recover from the resulting financial shock.*

You're acting like the money belongs to the party.

It does not.

It belongs to the donors until and unless they choose to donate it.

Some donors care about ballot access.



Others have different priorities.

Cutting out ballot access does not make the money available to other projects. It means the donors keep it.

Being on the ballot in fewer states does not mean the LP gets more money for other things. It means we get less money for other things AND less money for ballot access.

The pie is not fixed.

Furthermore, I notice that you completely overlook all the ways I am suggesting to make it so ballot access can simultaneously be used to help us build the party in numerous other ways.

*It's time to create some electoral success in the 35+ states wherein ballot access is reasonable. This is also probably the best thing we can do for the Libertarians in states where ballot access is unreasonable.*

Those 35+ states would go downhill, and pretty soon they would be 25 states...then 15...then 5 or less. Just look at the other parties that travelled down this road. It started with ballot access.

*It is not my intention to suggest that we no longer have a good Presidential candidate or that we do not support that candidate.*

But, that's exactly what would happen even though it is not your intention. Quality presidential candidates would not want to run in 35 states. Media, donors and activists would be much more apt to ignore a candidate who is on in 35 states.

The party would go downhill and then next time it would be fewer states, and fewer still the time after that.

*I'm saying that the emphasis, as measured in budget dollars, needs to be switched to building organization structure and strength; especially at the county level.*

I'm saying we can do both at the same time. Ballot access should be transitioned to field organizing.

*There are some 3,000 counties in the US. We have a lot of organizing to do.*

That - I fully agree with.

## LNC Debates What To Call Each Other

For much of the month prior to the national election, the major topic of debate of our National Committee was what? Get Out the Vote? Advertising? No, the major topic of debate of the LNC was what names they should call each other.

How did this come to pass? Last spring, the National Convention elected Starchild as an At-Large member of the National Committee. "Starchild" is indeed the gentleman's legal name. At the last National Committee meeting, members of the National Committee took to addressing Starchild as "Mister

Starchild", as though "Starchild" were his patronym. The National Chair was particularly prominent in doing this, but other members we gather also did so. Each time this happened, Starchild objected, and asked to be addressed as "Starchild". There was a considerable use of time. Some LNC members leave us with the impression that the phrasing appeared to have been chosen to be antagonistic. We understand that there were appeals to Roberts. If you thought the Roberts infestation had been cured by canning a substantial section of the last National Committee, you may want to reconsider.

*We begin with a request by Mr Vohra to add to the Agenda of the next meeting the following gem:*

In order to not have this debate 200 times at the next meeting, I propose the following:

1. LNC members who request to be addressed without Mr. or Ms. should receive this courtesy from the chair.

I would like to set aside 15 seconds or less for discussion. The purpose of "Mr." or "Mrs." is to show respect to our fellow LNC members. If using one of those titles instead does not show that person respect, then it defeats the entire purpose.

We can get into all sorts of abstract discussion about the notion of gender itself being a socially constructed method to maintain the status quo, but I don't think we need to take it that far. If an LNC member makes a reasonable request for courtesy, it seems pretty obvious that we should honor that request.

*These remarks were soon endorsed by Starchild*

Thanks, Arvin. :-) It probably won't come as a surprise that I support your motion and the intent behind it, but would suggest adding the words "and other members" after "chair". Hopefully if there is any discussion, we can discuss it online now and not take up any time at the meeting (even 15 seconds, although I don't see what could possibly be discussed in such a short increment anyway!).

*Neale seems to have answered in opposition:*

I am kind of at a loss here. Why does this need to be a motion? Is there a penalty if the person chairing makes a slip of the tongue? How far am I required to go? If every person requests a deviant form of address, am I required to keep all of these straight? Myself, I do not confuse an honorific with respect. I would rather we just use first names in a respectful manner.

...Geoff

*to which he added:*

Starchild - I will be placing this item on the agenda, regardless of my opinion.

I also know that regardless of this motion, if I slip up and inadvertently address you as Mr. Starchild, that you will obsessively, perhaps compulsively, correct me, regardless of intent.

I just see this as another manifestation of your need to have

things your way.

Why should I care?

I also understand that just about everyone is tired of this.

*Meyers finally clarified what was going on:*

I personally felt that Starchild was being made to feel inferior by insisting to call him something he did not want to be called, with some even debating their "right" to call him what he didn't want to be called. I don't think this deserves a motion it just needs to be so. It was just one more additional feeling of animosity in a room filled with animosity. We should all address people how they want to be addressed.

*to which Neale added*

There is one other wrinkle to this issue, and it has to do with Robert's, and I am no expert here.

I know our Bylaws require us to use RONR in the absence of specific Bylaws and Policy, and I believe that RONR specifies the formal manner of addressing either by title or Mr. or Ms. and the last name.

I welcome clarification if I'm wrong. However, if I am correct here, it may very well be that we need a policy change to make this motion stick, and it most definitely should apply to all, not just the chair.

*We have omitted the massively silly part of the discussion from this request. For example, readers will have to go without learning which LNC member wished to be addressed as "Stallion", should we start using titles. However, you can read all of it at [groups.yahoo.com/group/LNCDiscussPublic](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/LNCDiscussPublic), with summary lists of messages at <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/lpusmisc>*

## How We Got Here The Spring LNC Debate on Wayne Root

*In past issues, we reported on calls from within the LNC that Wayne Root should be removed from the LNC for endorsing Romney for President. This debate predates Root fleeing the LNC and going over to the Republicans. The visible call had been supported by Mary Ruwart, who wrote*

"I will join you in asking for Mr. Root's resignation from all LP positions on the LNC, LNCC, the Gary Johnson Campaign, and Nevada LP. The LP cannot control what its members say. However, it should not tolerate such betrayal in its leadership."

*We now reach the point where LNC Root supporters, notably Scott Lieberman, began attacking Mary Ruwart's ethics.*

*Scott Lieberman attacks Mary Ruwart. He first quotes Ruwart's recent message:*

"In a pond as small as the one we figuratively swim in, COIs

are unavoidable. The proper question is not will we have them, because we will. The proper question is, IMO, have they been properly managed?

Indeed, many of our current committees do have members with long-term working relationships, including (I believe) intimate ones that are not declared.

Should such relationships be declared or are people entitled to their privacy?

*and then answers:*

"Just to use a total hypothetical: There is a difference between a member of the Platform Committee having a romantic relationship with a member of the LNC, and a member of the Judicial Committee having a romantic relationship with a member of the LNC.

The LNC can, I suppose, remove an LNC appointed member of the Platform Committee, but in general, the LNC has no other control over the Platform Committee.

However, the Judicial Committee can reverse decisions of the LNC. But - the LNC has zero control of the JC. This means it looks really bad when a member of the JC is the deciding vote when a member of the LNC who was on the losing side of a vote brings a petition on that matter in front of the JC.

*Lieberman goes on to quote Ruwart as saying:*

"I can tell you that COI's are often managed. I chair an IRB where financial conflicts, such as stock in a company under discussion, must be declared; in most cases, they are effectively managed by restrictions in how and when the stock is disposed of.

I had no input in the discussion or the decision that the JC made. One thing that Lee and I did do was avoid discussion about it once the case was underway. No one told us to do that, nor did we discuss NOT talking about it. It just naturally seemed like the right thing to do.

*and answers:*

Gee - Dr Ruwart complained bitterly when Mr. Root was assigned a speaking slot in St Louis that MIGHT HAVE BEEN just before the vote for LNC At-Large Representatives. Because of the **\*\*appearance\*\*** of impropriety, Mr. Root was removed from that slot. And then we saw that Dr Ruwart was awarded the honor of fundraising at the banquet in St. Louis - the night before the voting for LNC At-Large, for which she was running. I guess that doesn't have an appearance of impropriety.

*Lieberman then quotes an authority as saying:*

"The United States Supreme Court has long held that "[e]very procedure which would offer a possible temptation to the average man as a judge to forget the burden of proof required to convict the defendant, or which might lead him not to hold the

balance nice, clear, and true between the state and the accused denies the latter due process of law."2 A romantic relationship between judge and prosecutor would certainly constitute "a possible temptation ... not to hold the balance nice, clear, and true between the state and the accused."3 And, the Constitution requires that a judge "not only must be unbiased but also must avoid even the appearance of bias."

*and proceeds to attack Ruwart for having a romantic relationship with an elected party official:*

Does Dr Ruwart want to argue that having a romantic relationship with Mr. Wrights did not even have the appearance of bias?

Remember - Dr Ruwart had no trouble invoking the power of the state of Oregon when it involved deciding who was the legitimate set of officers of the LP of Oregon. So - I am perfectly justified in using the US Constitution as my standard for a legal conflict of interest.

And then there is this:

<http://www.ohio.com/news/attorney-judge-relationships-raise-ethical-question-s-1.266851>

"Ric Simmons, a law professor at Ohio State University and a former assistant district attorney for New York County, said it is "not only acceptable, it's common" for lawyers, prosecutors, judges and magistrates to socialize outside the courtroom. This includes political fundraisers, bars, restaurants and, on occasion, each other's homes. "Friendships between lawyers and judges are quite common. I guess you draw the line if it is more than friendship, if it turns into a romantic or sexual relationship, I think that means you shouldn't practice in front of that judge, or the judge should recuse herself," he said. "Anything else, I think, is not only acceptable, it's common."

Scott Lieberman

*Brad Ploeger responded:*

Scott,  
In Georgia, we frequently see members of the legislative minority file suit to stop legislation legitimately adopted by the assembly. Last I checked individual members of the LNC still have the ability to utilize any and all administrative remedies allowed to them in an effort to ensure the rules of the Party are properly followed. At least give the Pe credit for keeping all of this "in the family" if you will.  
Brad Ploeger

*Lieberman rephrases his claim:* "However, the Judicial Committee can reverse decisions of the LNC. But - the LNC has zero control of the JC. This means it looks really bad when a member of the JC is the deciding vote when a member of the LNC who was on the losing side of a vote brings a petition on that matter in front of the JC **and the member of the JC with the deciding vote is having a romantic relationship with the petitioner.** SL"

*Ploeger responds, noting that there were plenty of signatures to*

*take the LNC decision to the Judicial Committee, even without Mary Ruwart's signature. To this, Lieberman responded:*

I know exactly what the outcome of the Ruwart/Wagner petition to the JC was – the LNC vote was overturned.

"Brief by At-Large LNC Member, Mary J. Ruwart, in Support of the JC Appeal Submitted by Wes Wagner et al."

Scott Lieberman"

*Ploeger then wrote:*

Dr. Lieberman,  
So you are saying that this matter is entirely identical to the Oregon matter? The JC ruled in the Oregon matter that the LNC overstepped its authority. While I will state the JC's decision in Wagner v. LNC is a binding precedent; I have trouble believing one can make a hasty generalizations as to the outcome on the question currently before the JC. The matter presented is far different and as a signer to the petition I would hope for more than a 4-3 split decision on its merits.  
Brad Ploeger

*and Lieberman answered:*

Again, ???

I was not referring in any way to the pending Registration Fee Petition that is currently being considered for consideration by the JC. However, if Dr Ruwart is also involved in that one, one could make the argument that Dr Ruwart is a vexatious litigant J (since the Oregon matter is still very much undecided).  
Scott Lieberman

*Ploeger wrote:*

Scott,  
I tend to disagree with the statement that the Oregon matter is undecided. Absent a Bylaws amendment I'm pretty sure it has been settled. Regrettably, it was not satisfactory to all parties involved. You didn't answer my previous question. Would you feel better if Mary decided to rescind her signature? The matter presented is far larger than any individual signee. There are more than 275 petition co-signers. Let us not get lost in the minor details.

*Returning to the dispute over Root, Root supporter Lieberman again attacked Ruwart. He quoted Ruwart as saying:*

"If you have a problem with my association with Mr. Wrights, I'll say what I said the last time this matter was brought up months ago and what I repeated to Ms. Visek.

I was NOT the petitioner in the Wagner appeal. I was NOT allowed in on the discussions about JC members COIs. I had ZERO control over how they handled the COI petition.

If you have a problem with the JC's decision that the COI was properly handled, you need to talk to direct these comments to Bill Hall. If you continue to harp on this rather than take it to the people who DID have control, you will convince me that

this is a personal attack, rather than a principled one.

*Lieberman Again Attacks Ruwart on Ethics*

Dr Ruwart:

If you are going to call for Mr. Root's execution resignation from multiple LP leadership positions because he had a brain fart while he was being interviewed on a radio show, I would think that you would be perceptive enough to apologize for putting your name anywhere on a petition or brief that was going to be voted on by your significant other.

However, you seem to think that any time someone asks you why you hold other LNC members to a very high ethical standard, but you don't hold yourself to even a relatively low ethical standard, that somehow pointing that out is a "personal attack."

I understand that in the matter of the Oregon petition Mr. Wrights was the one who actually voted as a JC member, not you.

However, since you obviously knew that he was on the JC, you could have made sure to stay out of the Oregon matter.

Instead, you chose to put your name on this:

"Brief by At-Large LNC Member, Mary J. Ruwart, in Support of the JC Appeal Submitted by Wes Wagner et al."

Did someone commit fraud by putting your name on that document without your permission?

Scott Lieberman

*And now a discussion of convention speakers, closing with Stewart Flood defending Mary Ruwart.*

---- Mary J Ruwart wrote:

Scott,

Clearly you are either not reading or understanding what I've written.

Our Chair is going to chair the 2012 convention. He will then run for re-election as Chair. That is considered ethical. Ditto for our Secretary (I assume she too is running for reelection).

In 2010, I did the fundraising as a member of the LNC, which has, as one of its functions, raising money. I then ran for re-election for At-Large. If the above is ethical, so is what I did in 2010. If what I did wasn't ethical, then neither is it ethical for our Chair and Secretary to run the convention.

*And now Lieberman attacks Ruwart's ethics. He begins by quoting Ruwart:*

"This is the second time you've brought up the fundraising and the second time I've pointed out that you yourself have defined fund-raising as part of an LNC's member's job. Since we've

been over all this before, I can only assume that you either have had a memory lapse or you have less than honorable intentions.

*To this, Lieberman responded:*

Dr Ruwart:

Nobody has said that you should not have been permitted to do the fundraising at the 2010 Convention banquet.

Some of us are just pointing out that you should have EITHER done the fundraising at the banquet, OR ran for LNC At-Large. Not both. Especially after your loud and vociferous complaints about Mr. Root's speech possibly coming before the vote for LNC At-Large.

And that you should not have permitted your name to appear on a brief to the JC that supported the Wagner faction in Oregon because of your romantic relationship with Mr. Wrights.

By not being very cautious with your own behavior, you make it very difficult for us to take you seriously when you ask for Mr. Root's resignation from multiple LP leadership positions because he had a bad 45 seconds during an otherwise very good 15 minute interview.

Dr Ruwart: since you think you possess a very accurate ethical compass, I would hope that you would recognize when it is pointing North, and recognize when it is pointing South, when you are evaluating your own behavior.  
Scott Lieberman

*Kevin Knedler added:*

Well, here's another, in follow-up to Mary.  
If I am running again for At-Large, am I allowed to be on stage and manage the Awards?  
Just saying.  
I hope we are not digging into the weeds too much.  
KJK

*And Stewart Flood answered:*

This is a difficult question, but one that I believe I can answer since I am one of the few members of the LNC who served on the COC last term.

The decision to remove ALL potential candidates from advertised speaking positions was made after discussion by the committee. The breakfast and lunch speakers were to be featured prominently in the schedule, so it was felt that even if a delegate did not attend the meal events, he or she might be influenced by the promotion of a candidate.

As I can best recall, the identity of the person who was to handle the fundraising was not listed prominently, or for that matter may not have even been listed at all. The COC made every attempt to eliminate bias, but quite frankly...someone had to do it!

I may disagree with Dr Ruwart on methods of managing our party or on her level of involvement in JC hearings, but I will



certainly state that she not only did an acceptable job, but actually did an excellent job of handling the fundraising portion of the dinner in St Louis.

Stewart

## Howe Saves NC Ballot Access



A press release from the Libertarian National Committee reports the glorious news that Barbara Howe has saved ballot access for the Libertarian Party of North Carolina. They report:

The Libertarian campaign of Barbara Howe for Governor in North Carolina scored a major victory for the LP that will

save the LP over \$300,000 in future petitioning costs.

North Carolina is one of the most difficult and expensive states in the nation for getting Libertarians on the ballot. Now for the second time, the LP has secured ballot status, avoiding costly petitioning that would otherwise be required. She won 93,460 votes or 2.1% of the vote for governor, just over the 2% require in a statewide race to be a recognized political party.

Michael Munger first secured Libertarian ballot access in the state in his 2008 race for governor where he won 121,585 votes, or 2.85%. He was included in the gubernatorial debates.

Howe has now achieved the same, despite being excluded from the debates. Without this victory, the North Carolina LP would need to collect 88,608 certified signatures, or at least 126,000 raw signatures, in 2016 to make the ballot.

Barbara Howe ran hard - literally - running 5k races in over 96 counties throughout the state to reach voters and to give them a choice for less government, lower taxes and more freedom.

"I am pleased that we accomplished the goal of keeping the LP a legally qualified party in NC. Thanks to all the enthusiastic supporters who planted signs, passed out rack cards, and shared the message," she said.



## David Moran Wins WV Ballot Access

David Moran of West Virginia has secured ballot access for the Libertarian Party of West Virginia, for the next four years. West Virginia ballot access has always

been a challenge for our party, but now it is safe for four years.

Moran reportedly told his supporters: "I want to thank you sincerely for your belief, your work and your steadfast dedication

to our campaign. Winning Official Major Party Status is an accomplishment in which you can take great pride. I am proud to have been able to serve your objectives.

"We achieved our goal of exceeding the 1% of the gubernatorial vote (1.33%) on a budget of about \$3000. The principles for which we stand are our torch and beacon. We will take this forward into a new and grander campaign for liberty in our state in the future.

"The campaign for 2016 begins now. We will use the next four years to raise the awareness of our message to every person in the state. The policies that we have developed this year will continue to guide us as we move forward to make Liberty our foundation, and state prosperity our vision.

"I look forward to serving you and these objectives in every way possible."

## Brubaker Secures Wyoming Ballot Access

Richard Brubaker of Wyoming gained 3.4% of the vote in his race for U.S. Congress in Wyoming, thus securing ballot access for the Wyoming Libertarian Party.

## LAMA Saves Massachusetts Ballot Access

Astute planning, and a bit of luck, have saved ballot accessibility for Massachusetts Libertarians. Unlike 2008, in which Massachusetts Libertarians made the well-intended mistake of running a candidate for US Senate on the Libertarian line in order to boost votes for Bob Barr — which requires no effort, just a candidate to run with the Presidential candidate — in 2012 Massachusetts Libertarians left the US Senate line blank. By doing this, they as a practical matter ensured that "Libertarian" would remain a "Political Designation" rather than a "Party".

Under bizarre Massachusetts ballot access laws, it is far easier to put candidates on the ballot as a Designation than as a Party. Indeed, every single recent Libertarian candidate for partisan office has emphasized that running as "Libertarian" with "Party" status would have made it impossible for them to get on the ballot.



## Bruce Majors Wins DC Party Status

Libertarian Bruce Majors has won major party status for our party in DC. The DC Party, which was entirely defunct for a prolonged period, now has primaries.

Majors performed his feat by winning more than 13,000 votes and finishing in second place in a race against incumbent D.C. Congressional Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton. He finished in second place, ahead of Green Statehood candidate Natale Stracuzzi, who won party status for the Greens. Majors is already discussing the important part of the future, recruiting candidates for the next set of campaigns. Under DC ballot access rules, those candidates will need do almost nothing to get on the ballot; they can spend all their time campaigning.

## Liberty for America

Liberty for America is not currently a political party.

To subscribe: <http://LibertyForAmerica.com>

Liberty for America has a Federal PAC —we actually support real Libertarians when they run for Federal office.

**Two issues back: Root Flees LNC!**

Editorial Note—Filling the LNC At-Large Position

**Wonderful California News**

Votes Still Being Counted

Near Miss in South Carolina—Anti-Libertarian Ads

Oregon Libertarians Launch New State Chairs Group

A More Complete Oregon Time Line

Where Your Money Went

Paul Frankel Advocates for 50-State Ballot Access

LNC Debates What to Call Each Other

How We Got Here - The Spring 2012 LNC Debate on Wayne Root

**Great News on Ballot Access:**

North Carolina, West Virginia, Wyoming, Massachusetts, District of Columbia

First Class Mail

Liberty for America  
c/o George Phillies  
48 Hancock Hill Drive  
Worcester MA 01609