

Liberty for America

Journal of the Libertarian Political Movement

Volume 5 Number 7

December 2012

Vote Counting Nears Completion

While some votes are yet to be counted, so far:

Gary Johnson (Libertarian) received 1,267,432 votes or 0.99% .

Jill Stein (Green) received 461,766 votes or 0.36%.

Virgil Goode (Constitution) received 121,242 votes or 0.09%.

For more up-to-the-day results, see USElectionAtlas.org.

Johnson Campaign Ends \$197,000 in Debt

The Johnson 2012 Campaign, for the period around the general election October 18–November 28, reports having income of \$257,533, with spending of \$290,293 and remaining cash on hand of \$2943.

Campaign debts totaled just over \$197,000, including \$2500 for accounting and FEC reporting, \$21,166 to EH2 consulting for fundraising and accounting services, \$3166 to Hackstaff Law Group, \$10,475 to the Law Office of Douglas C Herbert, and to Political Advisors of Salt Lake City: 323 Ad Placement - Web, 4875.00 Legal Fees, 28784 Medial Purchases, 26711 Travel - Candidate and Staff, 440 Office Supplies, 4782 Shipping and Mailing, 4620 Email Marketing expenses, 4607 Printing expenses, 3665 Polling and Research expense, 33396 Mailing and advertising expenses, 4281 Mid-level management wages, 6500 Senior Political Advisor Wages, 7678 Clerical and General Wages, 16875 Advertising and Marketing Wages, and 12153 General Staff Wages.

Through late November, Johnson 2012 had total contributions of \$2,212,126, of which the pre-convention part was at least \$807,273, so that Johnson 2012 raised post convention about 1.4 million. Through the same closing period, the Barr 2008 campaign raised \$1,372,108, mostly for post-convention expenses. Recalling that there has been inflation in the intervening four years, it appears that for all the foofaraw the Johnson 2012 campaign raised about as much money as Barr 2008 did, and ended up (\$197,000 vs Barr's \$214,221) very nearly equally far in debt. The Badnarik 2004 campaign raised slight over 1 million post-convention, but ended the 2004 campaign debt-free.

Hinkle Back on LNC

The Libertarian National Committee has placed Mark Hinkle back on the LNC, barely six months after our National Convention delegates ejected Mark Hinkle from the LNC. Bruce Majors at the last LNC meeting reported that the first ballot was Hinkle 7, David Blau of Massachusetts 6, and others 1 or 2 with one abstention. Geoff Neale then called for a runoff with Redpath seconding Neale's motion. On the second ballot, Hinkle won with 10 votes, while Blau had 7.

Prior to Hinkle's election the LNC voted on making their votes a matter of record, namely from the LNC draft Minutes: Starchild moved that all voters sign their ballots for filling the At-Large vacancy. Mr. Cloud seconded the motion: On a roll call vote there were 9 votes for and 6 against so the motion passed. Voting aye: Neale, Wrights, Hagan, Bennett, Cloud, Starchild, Kirkland, Lark and Frankel. Voting nay: Wiener, Tomasso, Redpath, Olsen, Mack and Visek.

The first round ballot went:

Abstain—Neale

Hinkle—Bennett, Cloud, Redpath, Vohra, Kirkland, Lark and Frankel. (Frankel voted at the instruction of a majority of his state chairs).

Blau—Wiener, Pojunis, Mack, Olsen, Visek and Tomasso.

Johnson of Texas—Wrights, Hagan

Frankel—Starchild.

The second round ballot went:

Hinkle—Neale, Hagan, Bennett, Cloud, Starchild, Redpath, Vohra, Kirkland, Lark and Frankel. (Frankel voted at the instruction of a majority of his state chairs).

Blau—Wrights, Wiener, Pojunis, Mack, Olsen, Visek and Tomasso.

Hinkel won 10-7.

Good News from Missouri

A press release from LPMO State Chair Cisse Spragins:

Despite media blackouts and debate exclusions, the Libertarian Party nationally and in Missouri shattered several of its previous records Tuesday. The Johnson/Gray ticket garnered over 1.1 million votes, just shy of 1%, breaking the previous record of 921,158 set by the Clark/Koch ticket in 1980. Missouri delivered 1.6% for the Johnson/Gray ticket, breaking the previous record going back to 1980 of 0.7%, and four times the 2008 result of 0.4%.

The party ran candidates for all six statewide races, all congressional races and a number of lower level races. The party broke

its previous records in four of the six statewide races, including US Senate, Governor, Lt. Governor and Secretary of State. In the hotly contested US Senate race, Jonathan Dine garnered 164,991 votes (6.1%), a party record for number of votes in a single race, as well as the percentage record for that race. Sean O'Toole, the candidate for Treasurer garnered 108,780 votes for 4.1%, the party's second best showing for that particular race. The party had only broken the 100k mark once before, back in the 1992 race for Treasurer, the year the party first earned ballot status. In the 4-way race for Secretary of State race, Cisse Spragins garnered 70,539 votes, which was more than twice the difference between the top two finishers. The party's averages for congressional candidates has been trending upward the last three elections, with the high mark going to Kevin Craig in the 7th district.

This election, Missourians heard the first attack ad against a Libertarian candidate. In a desperate attempt to pick up last minute votes, the Akin campaign launched an attack ad via radio and robocalls against Jonathan Dine. "I was both surprised and amused when I first heard it," said Jim Higgins, the party's candidate for Governor, and a former state chair of the party. "It shows we've become a factor in Missouri politics."

In the federal and statewide races, a total of 665,616 votes were cast for Libertarians. "I used to think that the number of votes cast for Libertarians was a measure of our discontent as a nation," said the party's chair, Dr. Cisse Spragins, "but I now realize it's a measure of our courage." "Discontent is high - congressional approval ratings are in the toilet, yet virtually everyone was re-elected. And yet while millions of alleged fiscal conservatives wasted their votes on Romney and millions of alleged anti-war, pro-civil liberties voters wasted their votes on Obama, over a million people were willing to step up and vote their conscience for Gary Johnson, and millions more cast Libertarian votes down ticket," Spragins said. "That gives me hope. I'm really proud of our candidates and our voters."

Voters who recognize that the two-party duopoly has jointly led the country to the brink of economic disaster and who are tired of never-ending foreign wars and a ballooning Big Brother police state will find common ground with the Libertarian Party. The LP is America's third-largest political party and has been working for smaller government since 1971. The Missouri Libertarian Party has been a recognized party in the state, with continuous ballot access, since 1992.

Good News from Texas

A Press release from the LP of Texas: Tuesday's election showed significant gains for the Libertarian Party in Texas.

With 1,139,564 votes, Libertarian presidential candidates, Gary Johnson and Judge Jim Gray more than DOUBLED the 2008 vote total of Bob Barr and Wayne Root.

For the first time ever five Libertarians in Texas receive over 1 million votes:

Jaime O. Perez, Railroad Commissioner- 1,122,792
RS Roberto Koelsch, Texas Supreme Court- 1,280,886
Tom Oxford, Texas Supreme Court- 1,030,735

Mark W. Bennett, Court of Criminal Appeals- 1,326,526
William Bryan Strange- Court of Criminal Appeals- 1,313,746

Previously, only William Strange ever achieved 1 million Libertarian votes in Texas.

Lillian Simmons achieved 30% in her race for Texas House and David Kinney in Hockley County had a very competitive race for sheriff receiving 2,479 votes for nearly 42% of the vote.

In Lago Vista a Libertarian, Ed Tidwell, won his seat on City Council against a longtime incumbent.

Throughout Texas, Libertarian votes have spiked. For example, Travis County vote totals saw the following increases from 2008 to 2012:

President
2008: 1.23%
2012: 2.72%
121% increase

Straight-party LIBERTARIAN
2008: 1.34%
2012: 1.93%
44% increase

Best 2-way Statewide
2008: 37.15%
2012: 44.77%
20% increase

Best 3-way State Rep
2008: 4.29%
2012: 5.26%
23% increase

Tax Assessor
2008: 5.17%
2012: 6.91%
34% increase

Despite the confusing redistricting fiasco and attempts by the legislature to impair the Libertarian Party or remove candidates from the ballot, Tuesday's results show the party is getting stronger and is gathering more public support..

Good News from New Hampshire

From the New Hampshire State Chair: Thanks to the great work of membership director, Tom Sweeney, our membership is up 150% for the year! Our social media are buzzing. Our Facebook

Liberty for America is edited by George Phillies, 48 Hancock Hill Drive, Worcester MA 01609 (508 754 1859). To Subscribe, go to 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>.

group increased by 50% and our Twitter following doubled.

The bad: the major media and broken promises of support from Ds and Rs. We got the runaround again on the debates after we met criteria established in 2010. We bypassed some censorship with social media, our own videos and some friendlier minor media.

The good: more candidates and our most active congressional candidates (Brendan Kelly and Hardy Macia) in years, which built support and credibility. Gary Johnson was very well received. Our campaign office hosted weekly meetups and had yard signs available 24/7.

The crazy: every day of the campaign. We had fierce competition for money and volunteers. NH became a battleground state at all levels, pulling help and votes away. We had to get creative to reach voters. Libertarians were called the kingmakers of the election, which did generate some more media interest.

In the final week, people did break our way and news media paid attention, particularly to Johnson's impact on the election.

New Hampshire had the first good news of election day. Gary Johnson won votes from the towns that vote at midnight. He even got bonus news when his initial total was reported wrong, doubling his votes. For 12+ hours Gary had 4.5% of the popular vote!

We are very happy to report that ALL New Hampshire Libertarians increased the vote count and vote percentage compared

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

And click on the Subscribe button

Join [Liberty for America](#)—\$15.

Donate electronically at LibertyForAmerica.com
Checks, payable Liberty for America, to George Phillis, 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.

to the same seat in 2010/2008! Two candidates tripled the count and more than doubled the percentage, including Johnson! Even first-time candidates got as high as 10%.

There are now 30K Libertarian votes in NH, or 4.5%. We need to keep and push those votes up-ticket to regain party status. We're lining up sponsors for ballot access reform legislation.

There was a noticeable shift when news broke of Gary surpassing 1 Million votes, and after we reported our relatively good results. Several new members attended our post-election board meeting to help build on that momentum. They even helped us pack up the campaign office.

Looking ahead, our new member social is Dec 6, all members and prospective members our welcome. Our state convention will be in January. We plan on hosting an event at the NH Liberty Forum in February.

Local elections are in March. Since NH (re)elects Libertarians every year, our plan is to recruit as many candidates as possible, especially people thinking of state office in 2014. So if you want to run, please speak up ASAP so we can get started. Check with your town hall for the filing period.

Also, Starchild reports that Emily Sandblade, elected to a seat in the New Hampshire state house of representatives, is a former chair of the East Bay (now Alameda County) Libertarian Party in California and still fully libertarian in spirit, as can be seen in this video of her winning "rant" in the Soapbox Idol contest at PorcFest 2011: my2commons.wordpress.com/2011/07/09/the-top-ten-reasons-why-the-mafia-is-better-than-the-state-by-emily-sandblade/ Sandblade ran as a Republican.

Other Notes From The LNC Meeting Draft Minutes

The Starchild Reflector list groups.yahoo.com/group/LNCDiscussPublic/ has reported the contents of the draft minutes of the LNC November meeting, the budget meeting:

"...In this election cycle, the LP and the Johnson campaign combined spend \$572,726 on ballot access...There are still some petitioners who have not been paid. The Johnson campaign was to have paid them, but still has not. That total due is \$14, 555.43. Mr. Redpath moved that the LNC pay these petitioners. The motion passed with no objections." That required increasing the ballot access budget. Redpath and Hinkle moved to increase Ballot Access \$382,000. There was a 14-2 vote, Frankel abstaining because he is a petitioner. Yes - Neale, Bennett, Hagan, Cloud, Vohra, Redpath, Hinkle, Kirkland, Mack, Wiener, Pojunis, Tomasso, Lark, Visek. No-Starchild and Olsen. Abstaining: Frankel

Blau gave a report of his survey of the LNC on buying a building. Only 9 members bothered to answer. Of those 2 supported buying, 2 supported leasing and the other 5 provisionally supported buying.

The LNC got to the budget, proposed by Redpath to be 1.12 million. Starchild made a motion to allow all attendees to speak on the budget. His motion was rejected 7-8. viz, Yes - Wrights, Bennett, Starchild, Olsen, Kirkland, Mack, and Frankel. No- Cloud, Redpath, Hinkle, Lieberman, Pojunis, Blau, Lark and Visek. Abstaining: Neale, Hagan, and Vohra.

Redpath moved to allow Starr to address the Committee on cutting the budget. The motion passed, with no roll call. *Editor: And in the future, whenever there is a move to allow Starr to address the body like this, there should always be a roll call.*

The Minutes claim that Visek asked to let Aaron Starr express his opinions on the budget. Redpath made this a motion, but no one asked for a roll call before it was passed. Apparently Starr went on for a piece, because Cloud moved to give Starr two more minutes.

Redpath's motion to set the revenue at \$1.12 million passed 14-4. Yes - Neale, Wrights, Bennett, Hagan, Cloud, Vohra, Redpath, Hinkle, Olsen, Kirkland, Mack, Mr Pojunis, Lark and Frankel. No- Starchild, Wiener, Tomasso and Visek.

Redpath motion to set expenses at \$1.02 million passed 17-1. Yes - Neale, Wrights, Bennett, Hagan, Cloud, Vohra, Redpath, Starchild, Hinkle, Kirkland, Mack, Wiener, Pojunis, Tomasso, Lark, Visek, and Frankel. No- Olsen.

Redpath's motion to change Fundraising Costs to \$152,600 and Membership Fundraising costs to \$105,000 failed 5-10. Yes- Neale, Hagan, Starchild, Olsen, and Tomasso. No- Wrights, Bennett, Vohra, Redpath, Hinkle, Kirkland, Wiener, Lark, Visek and Frankel, Abstaining: Cloud, Pojunis and Mack.

Hinkle's motion to increase revenue by \$43,250 passed 12-6.

Yes-Neale, Bennett, Cloud, Redpath, Hinkle, Olsen, Kirkland, Mack, Pojunis, Tomasso, Lark and Frankel. No- Wrights, Hagan, Vohra, Starchild, Wiener and Visek.

We now quote from the Draft Minutes:

Pojunis moved to review all new budget items and move them into the budget. Seconded by Hinkle. Redpath moved to substitute a consideration of the 30 non-zero line items in the budget. The motion to substitute passed and became the main motion. The main motion passed.

Starchild moved that we take up item 8140 Travel, Meeting & Meal Expense for first consideration. Vohra seconded. The motion failed. Redpath moved that we jump to numbers 50-88 on the Summary Page of the Budget. Cloud seconded the motion. The motion passed. Redpath moved to extend time for 30 minutes. The motion passed. Wiener moved to call the question. The motion passed. The main motion passed to reorder how we take up items under consideration to start with item numbers 50-88 from the Summary Page of the budget.

Member Communication and Materials – Olsen moved to decrease this item by \$10,000 and Redpath seconded. This motion would cut the number of issues of LP News per year. Lark

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.

moved to substitute for Olsen's motion: to make Item 85 a total of \$28,000. Wiener moved all previous questions which passed.

The motion to substitute passed. The new main motion to change Item 85 to \$28,000 passed with 12 ayes and 5 nays. Cloud was absent. Yes- Neale, Wrights, Bennett, Hagan, Vohra, Redpath, Olsen, Mack, Wiener, Pojunis, Lark and Visek. No- Starchild, Hinkle, Kirkland, Tomasso and Frankel. Cloud was absent. (Vote 9)

Redpath moved to change Item 88 Outreach \$12,200 to \$4,000. Wiener moved to call the question. The motion passed to call the question. The vote on the main motion to cut Item 88 passed with 13 ayes and 5 nays. Yes- Neale, Wrights, Hagan, Cloud, Vohra, Redpath, Olsen, Mack, Wiener, Pojunis, Lark, Visek and Frankel. No- Bennett, Starchild, Hinkle, Kirkland and Tomasso. (Vote 10)

Redpath moved to change line item 8110 from \$14,400 to \$10,000. The motion passed with No objection.

Redpath moved to change Item 8120 to \$13,600 from \$14,100. Pojunis seconded. The motion passed with No objection.

Redpath moved that Item 8125 be reduced to \$10,200 from \$11,000. The motion passed with No objection.

Starchild moved that Item 8140 be reduced to \$22,700 from \$27,200. The motion passed with 15 ayes and 3 nays. Yes- Neale, Wrights, Bennett, Hagan, Cloud, Vohra, Redpath, Starchild, Kirkland, Mack, Wiener, Tomasso, Lark, Visek and Frankel. No- Hinkle, Olsen and Pojunis.

Frankel moved to end line by line review and institute an across the board cuts for all discretionary budget items. Cloud seconded the motion.

Hinkle moved to increase Revenue by \$143,000. Bennett seconded.

The motion to substitute failed with 6 ayes and 10 nays and 2 abstentions. Yes- Wrights, Bennett, Cloud, Hinkle, Olsen, and Frankel. No- Neale, Hagan, Vohra, Starchild, Mack, Wiener, Pojunis, Tomasso, Lark and Visek. Abstaining: Redpath and Kirkland.

We moved to the main motion to institute across the board cuts on all discretionary budget items which failed 2-16. Yes- Wrights and Starchild. No- Neale, Bennett, Hagan, Cloud,

Vohra, Redpath, Hinkle, Olsen, Kirkland, Mack, Wiener, Pojunis, Tomasso, Lark, Visek, and Frankel. (Vote 13)

Without objection there was a 10 minute break for lunch and the Committee reconvened at 1:57 PM.

Redpath moved that line 8160 Insurance be reduced from \$11,600 to \$10,000. Pojunis seconded the motion. The motion passed without objection.

Redpath moved that the Committee go into Executive Session to discuss Staff Compensation. Wrights seconded. The motion passed.

The Committee entered Executive Session at 2:10 PM. The Committee exited Executive Session at 2:38 PM.

Redpath moved that we cut line Item 7010 -20 Donor Renewal to \$37,900 from \$47,900. With the Committee's permission, Redpath withdrew his motion.

Redpath moved to adopt the budget as amended. Hinkle seconded.

Vohra moved to substitute: That line item 7030-10 be changed from \$36,700 to \$11,700. Redpath seconded the motion to substitute. The effect of this will be to have the website upgrade be self-funded.

Starchild moved to change 7010-30 but it failed for lack of a second.

Redpath moved to close debate on all motions, which passed. The motion to substitute passed.

Vohra's motion to change budget line item 7030-10 passed with 15 ayes and 3 nays. Yes- Neale, Wrights, Bennett, Hagan, Cloud, Vohra, Redpath, Starchild, Kirkland, Mack, Wiener, Tomasso, Lark, Visek and Frankel. No- Hinkle, Olsen and Pojunis.

Redpath moved, seconded Cloud, to rescind the motion limiting expenses to \$1.02 million. Motion passed 16-1. Yes- Neale, Bennett, Hagan, Cloud, Vohra, Redpath, Hinkle, Olsen, Kirkland, . Mack, Wiener, Pojunis, Tomasso, Lark, Visek and Frankel. No- Wrights. Abstaining: Starchild.

Redpath moved, Lark Seconded, to adopt the budget as amended. Passed 15-3 Yes- Neale, Bennett, Hagan, Cloud, Vohra, Redpath, Hinkle, Kirkland, Mack, Wiener, Pojunis, Tomasso, Lark, Visek and Frankel. No- Wrights, Starchild and Olsen.

Starchild Endorses New State Chair's List

In a message widely circulated to state chairs and others, Starchild seems to have written to Mark Axinn, saying:

Mark,
I believe Wes undertook to start a new state chairs' organization at least partly at my prompting. I suggested this course of ac-

tion when he let me know how he as the chair of the recognized LP affiliate in Oregon was being shut out of the current group, and subsequently as I became more aware of the problems with the organization. As a state level representative as well as an LNC at-large representative, I sought to be added to the list myself, but was either refused or my requests fell on deaf ears.

I would welcome and support an LSLA that provided an open, neutral forum for discussion, cooperation, and coordination among the state affiliates, but my impression is that as long as Aaron Starr controls who has access to the organization's email list, this will not happen. In his letter resigning his position as chair of the group, recent LSLA chair Michael Johnston wrote:

"As LSLA Chair, I have made inquiries about how the State Chairs list is maintained and how participation in that list is managed. In particular, I questioned the inequality of allowing one faction of the Oregon LP to have access to the list while not allowing the other the same access, thereby inserting the LSLA into this divisive issue. My requests for a list of the State Chairs list participants have been denied and the Oregon matter was removed from the agenda with no mention, continuing the inequality with no discussion. My attempt to resolve the issue by directing that both sides of Oregon be allowed 2 participants with read only access to the list was flatly refused."

Under the circumstances, the creation of a state chairs' group that will not be run in such a secretive and partisan fashion seems warranted. I encourage yourself and any other LP affiliate chairs interested in having an open, neutral forum to join the new group, as well as other state level officers and LP members who would like to participate in inter-state dialogue and cooperation within the party. Perhaps if the LSLA manages to reform itself, the two groups can eventually be merged back into a single organization.

LP Missouri State Chair Condemns LSLA Leadership

In a widely circulated message, LP-Missouri State Chair Cisse Spragins is reported by a fellow state chair to have said of the LSLA and its leadership:

"The genesis of this is the fact that Aaron Starr will not put Wes Wagner on the statechair's list and that he cannot necessarily be trusted to not moderate out messages counter to his agenda. After witnessing the ridiculous fiasco that occurred with the "emergency" 3-4 hour notice LSLA exec mtg to pass a bogus resolution aimed at promoting the Pojunis/Mack side of the pissing contest between the two of them and Michael Johnston, it became clear to me that the organization under the current leadership is at best a joke, and at worst a divisive force within the party. The fact that the officers were basically given complete control over the organization with the bylaws voted in in Las Vegas didn't help. I personally chose to simply ignore it after that, as I have no shortage of productive work to do. I haven't seen any evidence to suggest that it will improve under Brett Bitner - he was more than happy to vote for the bogus resolution (Pat Dixon and Michael Johnston opposed it).

"I'd prefer to have one statechairs list, which, while the matter is still in dispute, should include both gentlemen from Oregon,

and it should not be moderated by someone with a divisive agenda. Unfortunately, this is what happens when you have a divisive person with a personal agenda in a position of power. It's a shame, as I found the LSLA conferences I attended in Charleston and Austin to be worthwhile.”

Joshua Katz's Campaign Postmortem

Editor: We present here the opening segment of Joshua Katz's mostmortem on the Libertarian Presidential campaign of 2012. Katz is a successful Connecticut activist. His full postmortem is being included with our electronic edition, being sent to subscribers (Subscribe for free at LibertyForAmerica.com), and visible on our web site LibertyForAmerica.com.

Who Am I?

It is reasonable, when reading any post-mortem or attempt to suggest strategy, to ask – who is this person and why should I believe they know anything about the subject? So, I wish to begin by setting your mind at ease that I am not a person who enjoys standing on the sidelines shouting. I am not a naysayer who pokes holes in what others do while refusing to work myself.

I have been a libertarian since approximately the age of 15, and involving in libertarian projects since college. I've written for LewRockwell.com for close to 5 years now. I am Secretary of my state party, and have run for Comptroller as a Libertarian. I participated in the Ron Paul campaign, including traveling to New Hampshire to campaign door to door. I was CT co-director for the Gary Johnson campaign. What's more, I do not only advocate liberty when it is safe; I've gone to jail for arguing libertarian points in some dangerous settings.

What We Learned

No longer can anyone in the LP argue that all that is needed for us to succeed is to gain a high-profile, credible candidate to run for President, with the rest of the party succeeding on his coattails. In Gary Johnson, we had the most viable, most credible candidate imaginable. In the Johnson/Gray ticket, we had more experience than any other ticket. Had either of the two major parties run a 2-term Governor and a 28-year judge, we would have had endless media stories about how uniquely well-qualified and experienced this ticket is. In fact, the media would be running all kinds of stories about how the electorate is turning in favor of experience over ideology, etc.

This uniquely qualified candidate raised less than \$2 million and was on the ballot in less states than Ed Clark. He received a lower percentage than Ed Clark, albeit with more votes. He was not put into the debates, and his name recognition never moved into viable territory. Most importantly, he did not surpass 5% in any state, including New Mexico. This is particularly important in that he was a highly popular Governor in that state, and before running for President, had been the target of a large draft effort in the Senate race there.

Regarding coattails, there was almost no coattail effect. With the most qualified candidate we can ask for, we did not perform in any unusual manner in any race. Our lower-ticket races ex-

hibited almost no effect, despite a solid effort by the campaign to build the underticket. Gary Johnson's campaign made a serious effort to vet candidates for endorsement, to give and publicize endorsements, and to train and equip candidates.

The problem, then, is not the quality of our candidate. Nor is it the nature of the campaign. Never before, including 1988, has a Libertarian candidate put forth such an organized campaign. Gary Johnson 2012 had a central campaign with many full-time employees, managed through a successful public relations firm. The campaign manager had an unusually strong record; he led Gary Johnson to victory as a Republican in a 2-1 Democrat state; Johnson was a neophyte running for Governor at that time.

The campaign recruited state directors in every state, and finance chairs and campus coordinators in most states. Regions had directors and campus coordinators as well. The campaign managed an ambitious travel schedule for both candidates, putting together large campus rallies and speaking opportunities throughout the country.

The problem is not the candidate, nor the campaign. It must, then, be intrinsic to the party.

Our Problem

There are serious structural difficulties we face. That is, we face serious ballot access issues, and are horrendously (666 to 1, interestingly enough, in the Presidential race) outspent. There is little we can do about these issues. Importantly, though, we don't do what we can about them. In many states, all underticket ballot access comes with performance in the Governor's race, yet no candidate is run in that race. Think of it – any money spent on petitioning could be used instead to fund a race for Governor as a ballot-access effort. It isn't done. Many states gain lines, and then let them go by simply not running another candidate in that race. These are things we can do about ballot access, but the obstacle will remain intact. We cannot do anything to address the major ballot access issue. Thus, let's stop talking about it, and focus on obstacles that can actually be overcome. As far as money, Sheldon Adelson and the like are seeking candidates they can buy. We will never run a candidate who is for sale. So we can forget about raising the type of money other candidates can raise, at least until we rise to major party status – at which point, we will still not raise that kind of money if we maintain our principles.

For the remainder of this article, see pages 10-12 of the electronic edition, available on our Web pages : LibertyForAmerica.com.

Libertarian National Committee News

Starchild's LNC-Discuss Reflector list is giving detailed, extended insights into how our National Committee conducts its business. We lack the space to cover the voluminous tonnage of material printed there. I have taken to printing one-sentence (usually) summaries of LNC-Discuss messages on my LPUSMISC Yahooogroup; even those would strain our space capacity. I have recently taken to summarizing many messages as (LNC Member name) attacks (LNC Member Name).

You can read the messages at
<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/LNCDiscussPublic>

The summaries are at
<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/lpusmisc>

A typical batch of summaries reads:

3230 Forwarded letter from Ploeger, who does commercial contracts, and notes that the conditions in the motions make it hard for the title insurer to tell if the person signing for the LNC had legal authority to do so, and therefore the title insurer and seller may not be interested in advancing

3231 Mack endorses Ploeger that the current motions are unsound

3232 Lieberman tells off Neale, who had attacked Lieberman on the building purchase, noting that under Neale's leadership the number of elected Libertarians has fallen by 12% so far.

3233 Paulie suggests list of elected Libertarians is not that accurate

3234 Paulie more info on 3233

3235 Paulie thanks staff for information

3236 Lieberman offers bet with Paulie on number of elected Libertarians

3237 Lieberman forwards staff message "The elected officials list is down to 135. Quite a few chose not to run for reelection, a couple were defeated, and some were removed by the state party for some other reason, such as 2 officials in NV that were asked to be removed by the state chair."

3238 Paulie accepts bet, suggests need to clarify criteria

3239 Wiener defending his motion against Mack

3240 Olsen ridicules Hinkle attack on his position, claims LNC owns copier in main office.

3241 Paulie - still does not have committee reports

3242 Paulie enumerates multiple failings in draft minutes

3243 Redpath Yes on Chicago

3244 Wiener reminds people to vote

3245 Tomasso discusses purpose of motion Argues for NH office

3246 Paulie on why we want a DC office.

3247 MUCH WORTH READING Olsen suggests what was passed on data cleansing was a five minute extension, not a \$20,000 appropriation; you seem not to be able to tell from the minutes. He explains that the "surplus" for the year was in fact saving for 2016 ballot access.

LNC Motions on Buying a Building

As I type (subject to change) there are two of these. The first is from Dan Wiener of California. It reads:

"Moved, that the LNC approve the purchase of an office in the greater Washington, D.C. area, to be named in honor of David Nolan, contingent on the following conditions:

A minimum of \$400,000 shall be raised from dedicated contributions. If a portion of that is in the form of pledges, the pledges must be converted to cash before a purchase contract and mortgage agreement are finalized.

Any loan must be based on a minimum of a 30% down pay-

ment and a loan with options extending for a minimum of 10 years before a final balloon payment becomes due.

The most recent financial statement reported unrestricted general fund balance must exceed \$167,000 before a purchase contract and loan agreement are finalized.

Additional payments towards the principal loan balance of at least \$60,000 per year above the minimum loan requirement must be made, with this requirement structured in such a way that future LNC bodies cannot easily circumvent it. These payments shall be in the form of an additional \$5,000 per month paid out of the general fund, but reimbursable from dedicated building fund contributions.

This motion will constitute authority to incur a mortgage if the above conditions are met and if this motion passes by the necessary two-thirds vote as specified in the Libertarian Party's Bylaws."

Note that Secretary Bennett posted this motion incorrectly to the LNC Business list at least twice, and had to be corrected, repeatedly. Correcting the Secretary, and noting things that the Secretary has failed to do, is a significant use of LNC list time. Dianna Visek is doing a superb list of things that Bennett is not doing, or did incorrectly, leading, e.g., to wrong minutes being posted on LP.org, e.g., minutes that had not yet been approved by the committee.

Votes I have seen reported on this are:

Voting YES so far are LNC members Wiener, Neale, Visek, Vohra, Kirkland, Hagan, Lark, Mack, as well as LNC alternates David Blau, and Paulie Frankel. Voting NO so far are LNC members Olsen, Starchild, Hinkle, Bennett, as well as LNC alternates Lieberman and Goldstein. The Alternates' No votes are overturned by their representatives. Voting ABSTAIN is R. Lee Wrights.

Mark Hinkle has since made a motion on the same topic:

"Moved, that the LNC approve the purchase of an office in the greater Washington, D.C. area, to be named in honor of David F. Nolan, contingent on the following conditions:

A minimum of 20% of the down payment shall be raised from dedicated contributions. If a portion of that is in the form of pledges, the pledges must be converted to cash before a purchase contract and mortgage agreement are finalized.

The monthly payment of principle, interest, and OTM (Overhead, Taxes, and Maintenance) shall not exceed our current lease payments at the Watergate complex.

This motion will constitute authority to incur a mortgage if the above conditions are met and if this motion passes by the necessary two-thirds vote as specified in the Libertarian Party's Bylaws.

The final decision on what property to buy shall be ratified by the LNC's Executive Committee by a majority vote once the above conditions are met."

These motions have led to vigorous discussion: Here, for example, is a response from Geoff Neale to Scott Lieberman about buying a building. This message is #2837 on the Starchild Reflector list. Lieberman's message was "The Libertarian Party's edifice complex". Of particular interest is Neale's final para-

graph. Neale writes:

Date: November 19, 2012

I have no clue what happened at LNC meetings I did not attend, or what was discussed by the LNC, so I cannot speak to these assertions.

Fact - I was never in charge of the building team. I wasn't on the LNC.

Fact - I never made a motion to buy a building. I presented my analysis of the benefits of doing so. I volunteered to gauge donor willingness at no cost -nothing more. After getting pledges for about 100K from a handful of people, we were confident we could.

Fact - after hearing about the crap being brought up by your friends, I advised Mr. Hinkle to drop the effort in September, because I knew you and yours would keep moving the goal posts, which you did, such as requiring our donors to sign promissory notes.

Why not come clean and tell everyone that you and yours wanted a building - in Las Vegas, not in DC.

Geoff

Other LNC Business

The LNC has been bombarded by emails from a petitioner who wants to be paid, refuses to supply his Social Security number, and can't understand why the LNC is not interested in his legal analysis claiming he is not required to supply one before he is paid.

Pojunis Resigns from LP Nevada State Committee

The Starchild reflector list has supplied the letter. We quote from it:

Dear Executive Committee,

As an active member of the Libertarian Party, it saddens me to write you this letter. As you know, I have been a very active member of LPNevada as well as the National party. My personal goal is to build the Libertarian Party nationwide while building LPNevada into the strongest Libertarian Affiliate. I am fully committed to achieving these goals and made tremendous personal sacrifices to advance liberty, below is a list of some of my contributions. (For lack of space, we must omit an extremely impressive list of accomplishments. You can read them on-line by following the link at groups.yahoo.com/group/LNCDiscussPublic/message/2994)

I thoroughly enjoy fighting for the advancement of liberty and I have made significant career changes to enable me to dedicate even more time to building the Libertarian Party.

When I first met Chairman Joe Silvestri, he encouraged me to get involved with the party and I had high hopes for his ability to build LPNevada. We worked together and I greatly appreciate everything that he did to help me within the party.

However, over the past few months Joe Silvestri has made several very public attempts to remove me from the LPNevada Executive Committee and failed each time. Each attempt wasted a tremendous amount of time from not only Joe and me, but also our members. Each time this happened it distracted me from working on projects that help grow the Libertarian Party. He has attacked me personally and politically making false claims that have absolutely no relevance to my role as Secretary. It was shameful the way he tried to discredit me to fellow LPNevada members. When I asked him why he was so upset with me he told me that I "broke faction lines" and he no longer trusts me.

Our bylaws state that an Officer can only be removed for failure to perform his or her duties. He has tried to remove me by forcing an illegal vote without cause. Recently he has presented the other 3 Executive Committee members with ultimatums that it is either Joe or I that will have to go. Is this good leadership?

From the LPNevada By-Laws:

Section 2.

DUTIES

Should it be determined that any Officer is found not to be performing the duties of said office, such Officer may be removed by a simple majority vote of the remaining members of the Executive Committee, and a replacement may be appointed, by the Chair, with advice and consent of the remainder of the Executive Committee, by Pro Tem appointment, to serve until the next Convention.

C. The Secretary shall record and maintain Minutes of party meetings and conventions, and all non-financial records of the LPN including, but not limited to, these bylaws and all committee reports.

Joe Silvestri has alienated the majority of our supporters by disaffiliating the counties in Nevada and our membership and number of activists are at an all-time low. He does not let anyone he doesn't know take an active role in the party because he doesn't trust them. He has told me a few times that he would rather have people around him that he can trust who are not active, than build a strong organization comprised of people he doesn't know. There is little direct communication taking place between the party and its supporters. It is hardly surprising that much of the party's grassroots simply drifted off into a passive membership or have left completely.

Joe Silvestri has not presented a plan on how we are going to grow this party and in my opinion that is due to a lack of leadership. During his time as Chairman, the party has not grown (it has actually decreased in size and we do not have any county affiliates) and there is nothing significant he can point to as his accomplishments.

I will always do what I think is in the best interest of LPNevada. At this time, I think it would be best for LPNevada if I were

to resign as Secretary and help out LPNevada in other ways. Therefore, it is with much regret that I write to inform you that I have decided to resign as Secretary of the Libertarian Party of Nevada effective immediately. It is my intention to work with the new Secretary to ensure a smooth transition of all the files I created and maintained as Secretary. I will continue being an active member of LPNevada and serving on the LNC. I wish LPNevada success and I hope they can capture some of the momentum from the recent election to grow the party!"

Lest We Forget

Warning signs that Wayne Root was a Republican, from his book -- with thanks to an anonymous contributor. (Numbers are all page numbers from the book)

14-15: Solution to drug addiction -- Only a strong faith in God can save an addict.

15: Calls the current recession a depression.

18: States Rights are the solution to social and personal freedom issues.

24: "As a Libertarian, I believe that social and personal freedom issues are quite simply States' Rights' issues."

27: Quotes Ayn Rand that Constitutions are "not a charter for government power, but a charter of the citizens' protection against the government" but clearly doesn't get it, since he believes in States' Rights.

28: Real reason he left the GOP: "I left because of the willingness of a then Republican-controlled Congress (in 2006) to ban online poker" (a major income stream for Root).

29: "But, nothing made my decision clearer than the morning of October 19, 2008, when I heard the remarkable announcement that General Colin Powell was endorsing Barack Obama for President of the United States... I was finally completely at peace with my decision to leave the Republican Party..." October 19, 2008 was five months after becoming the LP Vice Presidential Nominee. Was he not at peace with leaving the GOP the entire time he was campaigning, nor even for the first five months he was the LP's VP nominee?

31: WTF? He's even anti-bicycle? Criticizing McCain: "He supported a bailout that provided tax breaks for bicycle commuters." He opposed a tax break for anyone? And it's just because they don't like to guzzle Middle Eastern petroleum like Root and his fellow Republicans?

44: "No, this doesn't mean I'm a fan of abortion or gay marriage or assisted suicide or online gambling."

50: Criticizing McCain: "supported amnesty for illegal aliens"

58: "The United States is a center-right nation."

69: Takes issue with Zogby/Cato poll where 44% of Americans called themselves "fiscally conservative and socially liberal" and claims "The United States is a center-right nation."

73: "This revolution cannot happen without the support of God-fearing religious Christians -- the biggest faction in the conservative movement."

74: "Like most people, I am comforted by the idea of our electing public officials who are religious God-fearing and loving men and women. That is generally good for the United States because moral people are less likely to bring about a corrupt government." i.e. religious = moral

75: "marriage was a religiously defined institution." Supreme Court's 1964 Loving vs Virginia decision striking down state bans on interracial marriage was "the wrong decision."

77: The Christian Majority

80: "If you want to smoke, drink, use medical marijuana, or play poker online -- none of that is any of my business." i.e. medical MJ is a vice like smoking, drinking, and gambling online.

83: "I'm a proud family man and patriot who strongly supports God, religion, and prayer. It's not that I endorse gay marriage. It's not that I endorse the right to die. It's not that I endorse medical marijuana."

118: Claims his now (2009) bankrupt business that he founded in 2000 after "High taxes chased me out of California" somehow "pumped more than \$60 million into the U.S. economy." This number is not substantiated by any public disclosures from his corporation.

124: "Obama's own CBO (Congressional Budget Office)." Setting aside that the CBO is non-partisan, the best one could argue is that it's "Pelosi's own CBO" -- how the heck does the Legislative branch's financial arm belong to any member of the Executive branch. Basic lack of understanding of how the federal government is organized.

148: "the ultraliberal Los Angeles Times" -- only a nutty fringe-right conservative would see the LA times as "ultraliberal"

184: "we must go back to the gold standard."

196: endorses term limits (a limitation on the right of the people to elect whomever they please)

203: General nutty ideas about changing Congress to a 3000-member House

204: McCain was "the lesser of two evils".

207: Proposals 5 (line-item veto) and 6 (strict adherence to Constitution) directly contradict each other.

213: "California is more like a drug-addicted hooker."

222: Militarize the borders: "We must secure our borders and bring illegal immigration to a screeching halt. How? By protecting our borders with all those troops we will bring home from ... around the globe."

224: No more low-wage immigrants

240: Obama (not Bush) broke the economy: "Because no matter how much he gives away, it will never be enough to fix the economy that he has broken with his irresponsible and unsustainable spending."

244: "Failing the adoption of a simple national flat tax, I would recommend a national sales tax (called the FairTax) to replace the income tax altogether."

257: "I believe that our national epidemic of autism and ADHD has a definite connection to the large-scale vaccinations required of our young children."

268: In bold: "Here's the message that politicians need to hear loudly and clearly -- it doesn't take a village or a government to raise a child -- it takes a mother and a father."

06: "We don't know if global warming really exists."

306: "despite the fact that cooling of the last few years would more likely indicate the start of a period of global cooling."

306: "There is little evidence that man-made carbon dioxide is causing a spike in temperatures worldwide. The biggest factors that may be affecting temperature change are actually solar spots, solar winds, solar irradiation, and even big weather events like El Nino (the warming of the ocean)."

314: "It is also a national security threat to heed environmentalists' demands for a ban on offshore oil drilling, thereby making us more dependent on nations that use our billions of energy dollars to fund a war on terrorism against us."

328: thinks Iraq was run by Islamic radicals

Electronic Supplement—Joshua Katz’s Campaign Postmortem

Who Am I?

It is reasonable, when reading any post-mortem or attempt to suggest strategy, to ask – who is this person and why should I believe they know anything about the subject? So, I wish to begin by setting your mind at ease that I am not a person who enjoys standing on the sidelines shouting. I am not a naysayer who pokes holes in what others do while refusing to work myself.

I have been a libertarian since approximately the age of 15, and involving in libertarian projects since college. I’ve written for LewRockwell.com for close to 5 years now. I am Secretary of my state party, and have run for Comptroller as a Libertarian. I participated in the Ron Paul campaign, including traveling to New Hampshire to campaign door to door. I was CT co-director for the Gary Johnson campaign. What’s more, I do not only advocate liberty when it is safe; I’ve gone to jail for arguing libertarian points in some dangerous settings.

What We Learned

No longer can anyone in the LP argue that all that is needed for us to succeed is to gain a high-profile, credible candidate to run for President, with the rest of the party succeeding on his coattails. In Gary Johnson, we had the most viable, most credible candidate imaginable. In the Johnson/Gray ticket, we had more experience than any other ticket. Had either of the two major parties run a 2-term Governor and a 28-year judge, we would have had endless media stories about how uniquely well-qualified and experienced this ticket is. In fact, the media would be running all kinds of stories about how the electorate is turning in favor of experience over ideology, etc.

This uniquely qualified candidate raised less than \$2 million and was on the ballot in less states than Ed Clark. He received a lower percentage than Ed Clark, albeit with more votes. He was not put into the debates, and his name recognition never moved into viable territory. Most importantly, he did not surpass 5% in any state, including New Mexico. This is particularly important in that he was a highly popular Governor in that state, and before running for President, had been the target of a large draft effort in the Senate race there.

Regarding coattails, there was almost no coattail effect. With the most qualified candidate we can ask for, we did not perform in any unusual manner in any race. Our lower-ticket races exhibited almost no effect, despite a solid effort by the campaign to build the underticket. Gary Johnson’s campaign made a serious effort to vet candidates for endorsement, to give and publicize endorsements, and to train and equip candidates.

The problem, then, is not the quality of our candidate. Nor is it the nature of the campaign. Never before, including 1988, has a Libertarian candidate put forth such an organized campaign. Gary Johnson 2012 had a central campaign with many full-time employees, managed through a successful public relations firm. The campaign manager had an unusually strong record; he led Gary Johnson to victory as a Republican in a 2-1 Democrat

state; Johnson was a neophyte running for Governor at that time.

The campaign recruited state directors in every state, and finance chairs and campus coordinators in most states. Regions had directors and campus coordinators as well. The campaign managed an ambitious travel schedule for both candidates, putting together large campus rallies and speaking opportunities throughout the country.

The problem is not the candidate, nor the campaign. It must, then, be intrinsic to the party.

Our Problem

There are serious structural difficulties we face. That is, we face serious ballot access issues, and are horrendously (666 to 1, interestingly enough, in the Presidential race) outspent. There is little we can do about these issues. Importantly, though, we don’t do what we can about them. In many states, all underticket ballot access comes with performance in the Governor’s race, yet no candidate is run in that race. Think of it – any money spent on petitioning could be used instead to fund a race for Governor as a ballot-access effort. It isn’t done. Many states gain lines, and then let them go by simply not running another candidate in that race. These are things we can do about ballot access, but the obstacle will remain intact. We cannot do anything to address the major ballot access issue. Thus, let’s stop talking about it, and focus on obstacles that can actually be overcome. As far as money, Sheldon Adelson and the like are seeking candidates they can buy. We will never run a candidate who is for sale. So we can forget about raising the type of money other candidates can raise, at least until we rise to major party status – at which point, we will still not raise that kind of money if we maintain our principles.

So, we need to focus on doing more with less.

However, our largest issue is our philosophy. I do not refer to libertarianism being unpopular. In fact, that isn’t the case. Philosophically, most people – outside of elections – identify with libertarian values. The major points of our philosophy are well-accepted. In fact, successful candidates receive their largest applause when making libertarian points during debates. Most criticism of incumbents from their own base revolves around a failure to be libertarian – witness the leftist criticism of Obama, which focuses on civil liberties and war.

Rather, our weakness is that our party is aligned with a philosophy, and that we run philosophical races, in an age where elections are not about philosophy at all. We enter elections speaking the wrong language. Most importantly, libertarianism is simply irrelevant to most major discussions in the US today. It is irrelevant because the debate centers around questions to which there is no libertarian answer. Our candidates must attempt to change the debate, which is a near impossible task without a platform to speak from.

Furthermore, a libertarian candidate who successfully changes the subject to one where he has something to say will still be in a weak position. Even when we have something to contribute to the discussion, it is rarely something people want to hear – or will vote for. We wish it were otherwise, but the fact is, our opponents are offering magic; we are explaining why miracles

are not attainable. The public, given its knowledge of economics, will vote for miracles. Platform planks are largely hopes and dreams, especially the ever-popular “more jobs.” This simply is not an action, and hence inadmissible by any serious-minded person. Yet it is the most popular plank a candidate can run on.

In such an environment, what can the libertarian offer? We march into the debate promising less while our opponents offer more. Our position often comes down to explaining why our opponent’s promises are impossible. By its nature, such an explanation is long, boring, and pessimistic. Certainly, it does not get people charged up.

So, what can we do? We can confine ourselves, unless directly asked, to topics where we do have something to say, and where our position comes down to more than “that’s impossible.” The Libertarian Party should be embraced by all as the party of opposition to massively unpopular programs – DHS and the TSA, checkpoints, the Patriot Act, and corporate welfare. Attacking jobs programs, however richly they deserve attack, will not gather attention or make a race viable.

In addition, we should focus on how we can do what our opponents promise. Our opponents might have a platform plank called “jobs” but we can, and should, have a platform plank explaining how to be more prosperous and happy.

Another difficulty we face is that elections are backward-looking. Nothing more clearly illustrates this point than the jobs debate. We are moving towards a future of greater entrepreneurship. We already live in a world, as Kevin Carson explains, where we have sufficient production for most of us to work only 4 hours per week, with the rest being suitably paid, and for such a workload to continue advancing our standard of living. Why doesn’t that happen? Parasitism. But you cannot make this argument in a debate; you can only make such stands by breaking free of the mainstream discussion. Most of our energy is spent trying to enter the discussion between two of our opponents; if we want to make truly unique statements, we must stand alongside that discussion, not enter it. How to do that? See the next section.

To sum up what is meant by backward-looking: Elections do not anticipate new ideas or major changes; they take for granted that the world will remain as it is. When major advances do take place, officeholders simply claim credit for them (see Gore/internet.)

The Wasted Vote Syndrome

The ‘wasted vote’ is not simply something our opponents dreamt up. Our responses are all rational and correct, but this effect is an emotional one. People want to feel they are participating in large-scale decisions; they will delude themselves into thinking that their vote matters. Once they have that delusion, they do not wish to throw their vote away. They are concerned that if enough people do what they are considering, their least favorite candidate may win. They do not think that, if enough people do what they are considering, the candidate they vote for may actually win. They don’t think that for a reason – they imagine enough people thinking about it to swing the election,

but not to win it. They are likely correct that not enough people like our candidate to win the election, but not incorrect that we can swing it, since such voters are split almost evenly as to which other candidate they would prefer.

However, we should not engage in this discussion. Such an argument is unwinnable; it is similar to attempting to argue someone into bed with you. The result you seek requires a passionate, emotional response; you are confined to logical means to make your arguments. We should instead sidestep the entire wasted vote discussion. The only way to convince people that a vote for us is not wasted is to win.

Voter turnout, for almost every major race, is less than 50%. We must appeal to those who cannot waste their vote on us – those who have no plans to vote. Nonvoters are our most serious constituency. Too often, we construct walking and mailing lists with a focus on registered independents. We must stop that. Registered independents, by and large, are like the undecided voters we see on news programs – unable to think outside the two major parties, and convinced that their vote makes a difference and must be cast responsibly. We cannot carry that demographic.

Instead, our walking and mailing lists must focus on the unregistered, and those who, despite being registered, have not voted in a while. They cannot worry about wasting their vote.

More to the point, such individuals are, likely, disgusted with the discussion. While many voters say “I don’t like either one” (and cause those who hear them to want to smash our heads into walls when they do not consider any alternative), the non-voter is not even participating in the same discussion as the mainstream candidates. Such individuals are already in a different paradigm; perhaps many of them are in the paradigm we are. So, we can reach out to such voters and, at the same time, control the discussion. As in the example above, we cannot excite such voters by opposing a jobs program, but we can engage them by going outside the box and imagining a free world in which the need for a job is diminished. Kevin Carson is of no help in a debate, but he is of great assistance in making arguments to those who have no faith in the discussion.

Messaging and Candidate Selection

So, my suggestions on messaging should be clear. Rather than simply standing in opposition, unable to keep the public ear long enough to explain what we actually want, we should bypass the mainstream discussion altogether. Rather than negativity, we should ask the non-voter to imagine what life can be with government out of the way. If we focus on “that job program won’t work” we are the party that, even more than Republicans, simply hate the poor and don’t want them to get richer. If, instead, we focus on an inspiring picture of the future, one that is possible not by doing half of what the GOP does and half of what the Democrats do, but by taking a different path altogether, we are exciting, new, and different.

This is exactly the effect that Ron Paul rode to far more votes than we’ve ever had. So, we need more candidates like Ron Paul – but not in the sense of strong borders and pro-life. Instead, I mean more candidates with credibility. The biggest stumbling block in asking someone to embrace a radically dif-

ferent vision is the fear that what we say is impossible. After all, if the candidate has not, to borrow from Obama, “built anything,” and has no political track record, why should anyone believe him? We know people say whatever they want to get into office. The non-voter believes all politics is corrupt. Why should he believe the Libertarian? In office, won’t he just sell out, like everyone else?

So, such a message must be carried by someone with credibility. Gary Johnson vetoed 750 budgets until he received a balanced budget. More to the point, Gary Johnson was a Governor. He knows how the levers work, and knows how to do the job, and furthermore, can point to actual accomplishments to show that he didn’t sell out in office, did not do what he needed in order to get corporate money, and so on.

Ron Paul was embraced for similar reasons. It is easy to say “I will get to Washington and be different,” even Linda McMahon says it. But 22 years of doing it cannot be easily dismissed.

Local Races

However, the fact remains – we don’t have such candidates. The few we do have come from other places. This isn’t necessarily bad. This is a large part of how minor parties grow – by bringing in constituencies from the collapse of major parties during a crisis. It was a Whig who led the GOP to its first major win – the Presidency. The recent defections to the LP are a sign of the future – which was a problem with the Johnson campaign’s focus on “just stand with me this once.” We are seeing defections because many members of other parties – Mike Gravel, Bob Barr, Gary Johnson, Roger Stone, Jesse Ventura – are noticing that their own positions are prohibited in the national discussion. Defections are a sign of a major paradigm shift coming. This adds an urgency to what we need to do – the populace may be shifting to a discussion in which the major contributors are us and the communists. If we are still working to enter a discussion between two viewpoints which will soon become irrelevant, there will be a vacuum in the place where we can and should be.

In any case, though, we will need home-grown candidates. We need not just one or two, but hundreds. Libertarians must run for local office. Such offices require, at most, a couple hundred signatures. The races can be won with low expenditures. A local race may only have one or two polling places, allowing the candidate and one or two supporters to greet literally every voter. Why do we not run candidates in these races? Because the discussion isn’t sexy. There is no foreign policy, taxation is a minor issue – the kinds of things we love to talk about just aren’t there. The libertarian needs to do the hard work of discovering issues that can excite voters, or to redirect the dialogue entirely. For instance, a member of the Zoning Appeals Board should not run, as every candidate does, on their ability to build a better city. Rather, appeals can be made to private property and, much more successfully, to combating eminent domain and corporate welfare. These are popular issues that are entirely outside of the ordinary discussion for this race. Similarly, the First Selectman candidate who shuns the popular discussion and reaches out to non-voters with promises to order the local police to protect citizens against the NDAA has at least opened a new viewpoint. He may be extraordinarily exciting to those who just don’t care about the candidates

arguing over the mill rate, or whether or not a new school building is needed. He certainly stands a greater chance than the Libertarian who curses a new stadium or endlessly repeats “it’s not the government’s business.” He enjoys an advantage over the Libertarian who lambasts public schooling or calls for the abolition of the police department – as correct as those positions are. The latter is an effort to introduce libertarianism into a discussion where no one expects to find it, the former is an effort to open a libertarian discussion.

Local officeholders face a unique challenge as well, though. In many towns, local government just isn’t that bad. The party of opposition to government has a challenge running in a race where people are, usually, pretty happy. In some towns, opportunities exist, but in many, the leaders are local, accessible, and overall fairly acceptable. Certainly it won’t work to run on a platform of abolishing the local school district, shutting down mass transit, and defunding the volunteer fire department. Local government is visible and not particularly tyrannical. This is not a reason to stay out, just an additional challenge to deal with. Messaging will be crucial in local races.

Local officeholders can run more credible races for higher offices. More to the point, local officeholders give the party a sense of viability, which translates into candidates for all offices. Additionally, their very presence on the ballot makes a difference – it is hard to vote for a candidate on an otherwise empty line.

Of course, such races also build local support. The donor list for a Selectman race becomes a potential volunteer list for a Congressional race. The person who holds, or has done well in a race for, a local office, does not start from zero in a later race.

Viable up-ticket candidates must appear with, and support, underticket candidates. Similarly, local officeholders must appear with, and endorse, upticket candidates.

Conclusion

Everything is sold in one of two ways. All people, ultimately, operate in one of two ways. Those two ways are – fear or vision. Too much of libertarian campaigning is an attempt to bring about, or reinforce, fear. This is precisely what the other parties sell – fear of each other. If we sell nothing but fear of both of them, we will remain marginalized. Instead, we must offer a vision, and a reason to believe in that vision. The libertarian view of the world is not “it sucks, it’s really screwed up.” Instead, it is that people freely working together can always make it better. Inspire them with a vision.

But do not do it alone. Sometimes we hear of LP members who show up at town meeting and speak – we congratulate them. This must not be an exception, it must be an expectation. All members of this party can and should speak at town meetings and become known in their towns. They should, ideally, be asked to run, by non-libertarians who think they sound exciting.

Libertarians should seek appointments to local boards and committees with mid-term vacancies; this country can then be blanketed with LP candidates running to remain in office.

Our Presidential candidate must be the standard-bearer, not our only hope. He must present the vision of freedom, backed and buffeted by a party that demonstrates viability and credibility.

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.

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

Vote Counting Nears Completion

Johnson Campaign Ends \$197,000 in Debt — Hinkle Back on LNC

Good News from Missouri — Good News from Texas

Good News from New Hampshire

Other Notes from the LNC Meeting Draft Minutes

Starchild Endorses New State Chair's List

LP Missouri State Chair Condemns LSLA Leadership

Joshua Katz's Campaign Postmortem

Libertarian National Committee News

LNC Motions on Buying a Building — Other LNC Business

Pojunis Resigns from LP Nevada State Committee

Let We Forget: He Was a Republican

Full Text, In Our Electronic Supplement, of Joshua Katz's Campaign Postmortem

First Class Mail

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