



November 2001



## Baptism of Fire

by Libertarian Candidate Michael Badnarik, [BADNARIK@BADNARIK.ORG](mailto:BADNARIK@BADNARIK.ORG)

### Inside

- 2 ..... Civil Rights – How Can They Prevent Terrorism?
- 3 ..... Letters
- 4 ..... Governments and Terrorism
- 6 ..... Our Power is Our Right
- 7 ..... Capsule Commentary
- 7 ..... New Operation Politically Homeless Coordinator for Texas
- 7 ..... Hide Inspector Positions
- 8 ..... Scenes from Plano Balloon Fest
- 17 ... Plano Balloon Fest OPH Booth Results
- 17 ... Wanted
- 18 ... Baptism of Fire
- 19 ... Around the State
  - On-line and Wired
    - Web Pages
    - Forums
    - Other Sites of Interest
    - Congress
  - Important Dates to Remember
  - State Officers
  - Standing Committees
  - SLEC REpresentatives
  - County Activities
- 22 Activist Registration
- 23 COUNTY UPDATE

September 11<sup>th</sup> is a date that has been burned into our memories forever. The collapse of the World Trade Center was a horrific event that held the entire nation spellbound in stunned disbelief. Within hours I had several eMail suggesting that we start wearing red, white, and blue, and flying the flag every day. I found these messages painfully ironic because I have been doing those things for years, being labeled “a radical and an extremist” because of it. Today there is no shortage of patriotism in this country. Only a shortage of American flags and red, white, and blue ribbon.

I’m pleased by this resurgence of national pride and American spirit, but for most people it has been a baptism of fire. I watched, embarrassed, as firemen prepared to lower an American flag from the roof of the still burning Pentagon. I was embarrassed because they were preparing to lower it incorrectly, with the blue field on our right as we viewed it. Apparently someone from the military was paying attention because the firemen quickly exchanged ends, and our flag was displayed properly, and with honor.

Flying the flag improperly is not my greatest concern when lives are hanging in the balance, however I think it dramatizes an important fact. Most Americans are clueless when it comes to the Constitution, our proper form of government, or the difference between rights and privileges.

Please notice that the Constitution is not supplemented by a “Bill of Privileges.” Freedom of speech and bearing arms are not privileges granted to us by Congress. They are rights, inherent in a sovereign people, that

were enumerated for the purpose of warning Congress not to overstep its authority. WE gave CONGRESS the Bill of Rights, not the other way around. Reading the Preamble to the Bill of Rights will eliminate any doubts.

Most of the people I talk to think that the United States is a democracy. Their confusion is understandable. Every president since Woodrow Wilson has publicly stated that our goal is “to make the world safe for democracy.” The United States is NOT a democracy! We are a constitutional republic. We sing the Battle Hymn of the REPUBLIC, and pledge allegiance to the flag, “and to the REPUBLIC for which it stands.” Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution states, “The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union, a Republican Form of Government...”.

So what’s the difference between a democracy and a republic? In a democracy, “the majority rules.” However, in a democracy it is also true that “the minority loses.” People have no rights in a democracy, only privileges granted to them by the will of the majority. Rosie O’Donnell thinks that she can gather a few million moms in Washington, and they can simply vote to “repeal the Second Amendment.” Using Rosie’s argument, another group could rush to Washington to vote away your “right” to go to church. Rosie can’t have it both ways. If I don’t need a permit to pray, then I don’t need a permit to carry a concealed weapon.

This is not a meaningless debate over semantics. It is far more than a game of trivia

*Continued on page 17*

# Civil Rights – How Can They Prevent Terrorism?

From Tom Kane,  
POLLEYKANE@HOTMAIL.COM, and  
Clyde Garland,  
CLYDEGARLA@AOL.COM

***Civil rights are the solution, not the problem. The World Trade Center and Pentagon fire bombings were created by taking away rights, and will be solved, and future occurrences prevented, by restoring them.***

1) Neither the Pentagon nor the World Trade Center would have been attacked if we, as a nation, had not infringed our airplane passengers' natural right of self-defense.

People were endowed with rights by their Creator for a purpose. Whenever you take away a natural right, this natural purpose is thwarted, and evil will eventually result. At the beginning, when you first take away the right, you cannot foresee exactly how the evil will come upon you, but it always does.

In this case, the payback for the evil of

taking away the natural right of self-defense was the fire-bombing of the Pentagon and the World Trade Center. Only Osama Bin Laden predicted the exact details of how the evil would come back; however, every time a natural right is taken away, some kind of evil surely results. The mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding fine. Since we did it to ourselves, there is no one to blame. But as long as we continue to infringe that right, the problem will continue, and there will be more incidents, although, once again, where we least suspect.

2) Our infringement on the right of self-determination for other nations, attempting to interfere in their squabbles and change or replace their governments, has motivated a group of suicidal terrorists. We even give them money, in the form of foreign and military aid, to train their people and build their networks. We thought we could interfere with other nations' natural rights with impunity, but eventually the evil "came back around", just when we thought we were safe.

A few mass-murder-suicides are inevitable, although honoring the natural right to carry concealed weapons does minimize their number. However, coordinated and secret mass-murder-suicides by groups of people require a strong motivation, which we provided by infringing on other nations' right of self-determination.

3) Our infringement on the right of non-violent persons to use drugs of their own choosing has helped finance terrorism (through opium and cocaine crops) and has distracted our police and military from their true business, defense against terror. Once again, when we do evil, it comes back upon us in the way we least suspect.

4) Infringement on the right to be secure in our persons and effects.

The fascination of our intelligence agencies with "effortless" electronic spying has weakened their attention to the basics of detective work and contributed to their not being aware of the terrorists coordinated plan. But you could always separate the two styles of spying, have one branch of the CIA & FBI do electronic surveillance, and another branch do infiltration.

I am inclined toward some solution regarding the spying agencies; somehow their infringement on privacy reduces the natural process of information exchange about undesirable people that naturally takes place among people interested in protecting their families from violence.

## Submissions Policy and Deadlines

Unsolicited manuscripts and submissions are welcome and will be considered for publication in upcoming issues of *Lone Star Liberty*. Manuscripts may be submitted via mail, fax or email. Length should be no more than 750 words per manuscript. We reserve the right to edit for clarity and length. Submissions are articles, letters to the editor, or information for the AAround the State@ column. Indicate in which category the submission is to be considered.

The deadline for a particular issue is the 25<sup>th</sup> day of the month, two months prior, i.e., for January, the deadline is the preceding November.

Late breaking news will be considered according to timeliness and relevance.

Advertising space is available in a variety of formats.

Send submissions, article ideas and requests for advertising rates to

Barbara Cunningham, Editor  
*Lone Star Liberty*  
301 Porter  
Caldwell, TX 77836-1825  
(979) 567-3313 fax  
CHARLESB@TCA.NET

We are hampered by the false sense of security that the government is protecting us from this kind of person. But that still is coincidental, tangential.

Losing this right will come back to harm us, because under authoritarian rule a citizen has no right to challenge the identity or effects of those in authority. They show us a badge, we must step aside and allow them to enter our house, our car our plane, our business.

So the enemy (or even a common criminal) becomes an expert at impersonating authority, making it easy for them to cause harm. In a society that respects property rights (to be secure in our person and effects) each owner has the right to refuse to be searched and any property owner has the right to refuse entry to his property to anyone for any reason, even to those that have a badge.

So a property owner, like an airlines in a free society, will be completely responsible for devising their own security, and they will devise a security system that they feel will

**Lone Star Liberty Staff**  
**Publications Chair and Editor**  
Barbara Cunningham  
**Fax:**  
(979) 567-3313  
**Email:**  
CHARLESB@TCA.NET  
**Submissions**  
301 Porter  
Caldwell, TX 77836-1825  
  
*For information about the Libertarian Party of Texas or to send contributions, please contact PO Box 56426, Houston, TX 77256-6426 or call 1-800-422-1776*

**Lone Star Liberty**  
Vol. 12, Issue 8  
*Published monthly by*  
The Libertarian Party of Texas  
PO Box 56426  
Houston, Texas 77256-6426

## Letters

Penny Hendrix, wrote in your last newsletter about pragmatism: "I consider myself to be very pragmatic, and my pragmatism is what makes me a Libertarian."

I would like to address this idea and the other very important concern regarding "new members" of the Libertarian Party and whether or not they are "real" libertarians.

President Ronald Reagan was pragmatic. While there are many who like to hold Ronald Reagan up as the hero of the conservative movement, he was in my opinion it's greatest recent disaster. In fact, I think he has done more damage to Republican ideas than even Nixon.

I don't know of very many who share my view on this and I know it will sound shocking. But I believe it was Reagan's pragmatism which was the downfall of the Goldwater conservative movement. Reagan talked an extremely good game but was willing to pick a short list of things he wouldn't compromise and sacrificed principle in the name of "accomplishments," getting that short list enacted.

Unfortunately for Ronald Reagan he soon found himself having to support things that he had vehemently protested in order to get elected. One of Reagan's most famous lines "the government can't solve the problem. The government is the problem" rings utterly hollow when you consider how much money was thrown at a government solution to the "Soviet problem." Or when you consider that he rarely vetoed the huge spending bills brought to him by the majority in Congress.

We've all seen famous republicans, including Rush Limbaugh and Pat Buchanan, make excuses for Republican Presidents who have gone along in order to "accomplish" this or that pet project. In fact the former has spent the last 7 years telling his audience that the Democrat leadership was lying when it claimed New Gingrich and his fellow majority members had planned to shrink the budget. Rush Limbaugh was OUTRAGED over that lie because in fact the GOP had planned on growing government.

It boggles the mind that the GOP would actually be insulted when accused of shrinking government but it is just that sort of denial and role switching that started during Reagan's tenure.

He was so loved by his supporters that every commentator and pundit from the right was spending an inordinate amount of time making excuses for a President who was allowing the budget to grow at an unprecedented rate.

The reason that pragmatism chaps the hides of some of us who've embraced libertarianism, is that in practice, pragmatism is a means to an end.

As was with Reagan, the end justified the means. The Wall came down. The Soviet Union collapsed. But at what cost to American liberties?

Government supposedly was the problem and yet Reagan started a 60 billion dollar per year nightmare imposed on the American people called the War on Drugs. A government solution that was doomed to fail from its inception.

I understand completely why Hendrix or any newly inducted libertarian would be miffed at having their credentials or principles questioned. However, I disagree that pragmatism has any place in politics. A clearly defined set of principles that must be followed is not idealism. It is a necessity. It is a basic fact of life which drives members of many religions and organizations around the world including the Boy Scouts.

I agree with Hendrix re Libertarians are not idealists. Libertarians are realists. You cannot hope to accomplish political change in this country without bold, principled and unwavering devotion to libertarian ideals. And you cannot hope to gain members by putting them to a constant litmus test.

The new members must do that for themselves. Our job is to recruit, teach and get our candidates elected. Part of the problem is that so much of our society is convinced that government is a necessity. Freedom sounds good but the thought of some government agency disappearing gives most who haven't discussed libertarian ideas at length, a great dread. The reasons for this are twofold: For one, the uninitiated are so ingrained into thinking that this would result in some child or weak American being left out in the cold, they dare not support such a thing. And for another, even if they were to secretly acknowledge the blessings of liberty, the ridicule which must surely follow for suggesting less government control would be hard to bear. That is a matter of propaganda. It is something that can be overcome with time.

I think that we have to do a better job of sticking to the ideas rather than beating up those who aren't all the way on board. We are not a debate society. We are members of a political party. The new members will come along nicely as the LP grows. There will always be newcomers who don't fully "get it." I think Hendrix performs a valuable service by pointing out how disconcerting it is to have newness thrust in one's face repeatedly as a club by well-meaning but abrasive libertarians.

We could stand to do much better in that regard. Being right is not always a virtue. Setting an example is a virtue and that should be our greatest strength. The examples set by libertarian office-holders will be what explodes our movement.

Let's concentrate on getting candidates elected rather than debating the merits of libertarian ideals. That just isn't our job.

Rick Fisk, [RFISK@CISCO.COM](mailto:RFISK@CISCO.COM)

Dripping Springs, Texas

\*\*\*\*\*

I refer you to "Constitutional Drift" by James J. Odie, *Lone Star Liberty*, Jan, Feb, Mar, pages 9, 16-18.

In column 3, page 17, "Throughout this century we have been led into war by one power-crazed president after another. Three have committed war crimes." Bullshit! At least five consecutive U.S. Presidents committed mass murder! On 2 October 1946, Harry S. Truman and Charles de Gaulle started the Vietnam War by shelling Haifong Harbor. The provisional government of Vietnam had not threatened France or the United States and were physically incapable of reaching France or the U.S. with any fighting force. The Vietnam War was a war of aggression. A war of aggression is, by definition, MURDER.

The United States Government furnished all the money and air cover (with U.S. pilots) for the "French Phase" of the Vietnam War. Therefore, it was a U.S. war from the very beginning. Over 58,000 Americans were murdered by U.S. presidents in Vietnam. Over 6 million Vietnamese were murdered by U.S. Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon!

Murder is not a misdemeanor.

Victor L. Morgan

Robert F. Lockhart,  
C.P.A.

P. O. Box 1398  
Pasadena, Texas 77501



(713) 475-0092

Paid Advertisement

# Governments and Terrorism

By Jack Gardner,

JGARDNER@GYLDAN.COM

As Ben Franklin warned, “They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.”

In the wake of the attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, we hear much about the *pragmatic argument* for limiting the activities and goals of government, pointing out that government programs are never carried out as promoters expect and the consequences are predominantly negative.

However, it is even more important to address the *moral argument* for proper governments, including responses to domestic and foreign terrorists. Moral fundamentals are needed for consistency in policies and actions. Some pragmatic arguments do imply the values of individual freedom, but do not justify them as a moral primary, nor offer guidelines for recognizing and dealing with moral and immoral governments.

## Overview and Theme

My position is that *individual sovereignty* is the moral primary for personal and political associations. Defining and defending this principle convincingly is not as self-evident as many people seem to assume, so they neglect this necessary step. Further, translating this into political policies, laws, and government actions is not a simple process in a complex world of supportive and hostile citizens, supportive and hostile foreign nations.

I present an approach here for rating governments morally and the implications for domestic and foreign policy. I compare the United States with other nations. I argue that only free market solutions can secure domestic protection. Lastly, I discuss the biggest dangers the United States faces and the approach to their solution.

My theme is that consistent moral standards are not only possible, they are necessary in every aspect of human interaction. They don't make life easy, they make it possible. *Straightening out domestic and foreign policy is a package deal.*

## Humans are Moral Animals

Identifying a moral primary is important because humans, both the good and the bad, are *moral animals*; i.e., they make *choices* based on *general principles*, not simply the immediately known factors of a situation, principles which they believe lead to positive long range

consequences for themselves.

Sometimes the consequences are very long-range and imaginary, such as the quality of life after death; and often the principles are not well thought out, but more emotional habits. Still, even criminal mentality rests on moral justifications, however mistaken (such as, it is a dog-eat-dog world, so do unto others before they do unto you; or, everything belongs to everyone, and I am being cheated out of my share).

## Moral Animals and Government

The significance of the human moral nature is often neglected by political leaders, including many Libertarian thinkers. They miss the point that principles such as freedom and rights are derivative, not primaries. Such principles are understood and applied differently by people with different justifications. This creates confusion for government policies. Pragmatic arguments, which attempt to formulate courses of action based on expected results without identifying moral justifications, are not practical, because they are never understood or applied consistently by large numbers of people.

Examples: Everyone is in favor of “freedom,” but some people think freedom occurs when you free yourself of your own judgement and desires and accept the will of society. Some people justify property rights because this maximizes productivity, then cannot defend such rights when a “higher” social need is perceived. The hidden fundamental becomes the collective good of society, not individual sovereignty, breaking, and in fact reversing, the logical link between these ideas.

Libertarianism, by far the best of modern political movements, generally tries to avoid the pitfalls of pragmatism by limiting government action to the minimum required for security and resolving conflicts. Unfortunately, this does not completely work, because humans are moral animals, and conflicting moral values, poorly understood, generate pressures for compromise and “special case” exceptions. Pragmatist arguments alone can never sway great numbers of people, nor even get them to understand the implications of the arguments in the same way.

## Rating Governments

Obviously, most people and governments today are inconsistent in their support of *individual sovereignty*; i.e., the “right to be let alone.” However, *those who partially support this principle are far superior to those who are totally opposed to the concept.* This allows ranking gov-

ernments, organizations, and people on a dimension of morality and provides objective, if imprecise, justification for preemptive or retaliatory actions against the gravely and predominantly immoral, justifications which may be challenged and discussed by all observers by the same criteria, known in advance. .

As far as I can tell, no culture today is making much progress in furthering philosophical or policy support for individual sovereignty. The support in most western nations has been deteriorating for decades, replaced by notions of group responsibility and collective management. Hopefully, the national and world-wide discussion sparked by this latest terrorist act will lead to a focus on the need to judge governments by the central importance of *natural* rights; i.e., based on human *nature*.

This hope is bolstered by the fact that Objectivist and Libertarian oriented thinkers have emerged with new strength during these past few decades and, with the aid of modern communication technology, are better prepared than at any time in history to champion the principle of individual sovereignty. For the first time in history, the whole world watches and rates the behavior of governments on a daily basis, news bypasses official channels, and the opinions of independent thinkers are immediately available.

## Individual Sovereignty

The justification for holding *individual sovereignty* as a moral primary is the recognition that individuals must be considered *ends in themselves*, not tools for the purposes of others. This is a primary because each human personality must think and act for itself in order to function and grow properly, in order to have a chance to achieve its full potential. The corollary of this principle is the principle of *self-responsibility*. An individual has no right to be taken care of by others, but only to be free to act for himself.

(These principles do not apply in the same way to children, in which the ability to grasp the principles of individual sovereignty and self-responsibility is limited or does not exist. That is, the principles do not translate into political rights for those who cannot follow them.)

Working in cooperation for mutually desired goals must be gained by trading value for value in the judgement of all involved, limited only by contractual agreements. Any attempt to force others to serve your ends is counter-productive by (1) avoiding your own

## Governments and Terrorism

*Continued from page 4*

growth in self-abilities, and (2) justifying initiation of force by others. (Criminals, in and out of government, are typically low in self-esteem and inept at personal productivity. They can only loot the productivity of others or force productive people to serve them.)

People with self-esteem naturally have a benevolent attitude toward others, a source of personal success and happiness, not a duty. Acts of charity and cooperation abound in a free society.

### Natural Rights

As we know, many people actually believe that their chosen purposes are so important that they are justified in forcing others to serve them. Generally, such people identify their purpose with the good of the "group", collectivism or religious variants. Crude individuals exhibit a dictatorial or elitist mentality in justifying their use of force. More sophisticated individuals seek to avoid responsibility in forcing others by using a majority vote.

No nation today has consistently moral policies in either domestic or foreign affairs. Yet, some nations are significantly more moral than others. The United States has historically demonstrated greater moral character towards its own citizens and toward other nations, the many lapses notwithstanding, because the Constitution of the United States, reinforced by the Bill of Rights amendments, was based on the moral principle that individuals are ends in themselves and have *natural rights*, which were the justification for *political rights* which no majority could vote away.

Unfortunately, this principle was so well established in the culture at the time that it was assumed in the document and not stated explicitly. Today it is being neglected due to the government influenced education establishment. Still, while the principle has been breached on many occasions, it must still be reckoned with in national debates and the legal structure.

The basic natural rights that the Constitution established were, if not in these specific terms, the rights to *Life, Liberty, and Property*, three ways of viewing the same issue, none of them being possible without the others. The whole document is permeated with the *fundamental right of people to be "let alone."*

### Implementation of Rights

Moral governments (laws and administrative rules for exercising force among individuals) are *established over territorial areas by force* by people attempting to enforce individual

sovereignty. Obviously, having a *natural right* and ensuring its operation as a *political right* are two different things. Moral governments do not require specific behaviors or participation, but only respect for the rights of others. They do not make life "fair" or prevent "free rides" by some, they simply preserve freedom of action and association *within practical limits* of cost, time, and technology. They do not prevent people from leaving the territorial boundaries.

Libertarians have long recognized that no one has so-called "positive rights" to have people behave in a particular manner, but only "negative rights" to have them *not* trespass on one's person or property by physical force or fraud. *Rights are violated only when physical force, threat of physical force, or fraud is used.* These are means of *making one act against one's own mind* and its free evaluation of reality.

### The Ultimate Moral Value

While achieving total justice is not possible, due to limitations of knowledge, material resources, human psychology, technology, etc., implementing the above principles is the goal to strive for, because these are the requirements for human nature to flourish. The ultimate justification for moral principles, as Aristotle explained to Ayn Rand and she explained to me, is found in holding *human life as the ultimate value, humans living as humans*, acting according to their own reason and choices.

Thus, the basic moral *principle* of individual sovereignty rests on the *value* of individual flourishing and is verifiable by reason, observation, introspection, and scientific investigation. Those who argue that something else should be the prime value (an imaginary collective will, serving the supernatural, egalitarian society, etc.), or that moral principles are better known by intuition, revelation, and emotions, eventually find that their ideas are unverifiable and in conflict with reality. They cannot demonstrate to an objective observer the validity of their position, and such conflict tends to lead to the initiation of force on some issues.

(Many religious thinkers manage to separate their faith from their politics in practice. However, the danger religious thinking poses is that during difficult times religious thinkers are apt to see the difficulties as due to the displeasure of the supernatural. They often see the supernatural as having standards contrary to human nature and as prone to punish the innocent along with the guilty, because the innocent should have *forced* the guilty to behave.)

*Holding a different moral view does not alone make a person evil, only mistaken. Attempting to force others to serve one's ends makes one evil, anti-individual, anti-human life.* This is why a minimal government (minimal laws and administrative use of force) is crucial, and why it must operate only for the purpose of preserving freedom and resolving disagreements by codified rules, not "taking care" of people.

(Those who voice moral support for government management of citizens and for the Castro's and Arafat's and Hillary Clinton's of the world, do contribute to the intellectual climate that makes such people and regimes possible, but their guilt is not the same as that of those who provide physical and financial assistance, and still less that of those who participate and see the oppression first hand. Many people are sympathetic out of ignorance. In any case, there are degrees of guilt and innocence.)

### Evaluating Nations

To evaluate the morality of nations, we may look at the legal structure, the political policies, and arguments by people in authority. When do they cross the line from mistaken opinion into criminality? At the same point that individuals cross the line, since governments are only people acting with force. Is the government force directed toward preserving freedom of action and association, or is it directed toward using some people for the purposes of others? Does it outlaw firearms for self-protection, control employment, regulate everything from life style to ideas (and to what *degree*)? It is always a matter of degree.

Evaluation involves finding objective measures of achievement and severity of behavior. Some objective measures of severity are imposing total censorship, killing people for victimless crimes, and preventing people from leaving the jurisdiction.

All governments have crossed the line into criminality at times, but some cross it inconsistently and with regret, as the result of losing their way among ill understood and conflicting principles. The principle of individual sovereignty is not obvious or easy to implement. It is the result of 2,500 years of human progress, stemming from the first stirrings among the ancient Greeks of individualism and recognition of reasoning as the source of knowledge. However, while some governments struggle with this idea, some governments and people make crossing this line their primary means of existence. From socialist and/or religious moral principles,

# Our Power is Our Right

by Sean Gruber,

UCHMGWUPIFMCDH@AOL.COM

Reprinted from *The Libertarian Enterprise*, Issue 142, 8 October 2001

“Notwithstanding all the proclamations we have made to mankind, within the last ninety years, that our government rested on consent, and that that was the only rightful basis on which any government could rest, the late war has practically demonstrated that our government rests upon force-as much so as any government that has ever existed.

“The North has thus virtually said to the world It was all very well to prate of consent, so long as the objects to be accomplished were to liberate ourselves from our connexion with England, and also to coax a scattered and jealous people into a great national union; but now that those purposes have been accomplished, and the power of the North has become consolidated, it is sufficient for us-as for all governments-simply to say Our power is our right.” Lysander Spooner, *No Treason No.1*, 1867

The higher members of the ‘government’ in this country never talk about their ‘authorities’ origin. Likewise, most people in this country never talk about where the ‘governments’ authority comes from. It seems to be taken for granted that the ‘government’ has the just authority to take however as much, of whatever it wants, from whomever it wants, for whatever reason it wishes. It just seems to be a fact of nature to these people. The ‘government’ can do *anything* it wants. There are no limits to its powers.

Waylay a family driving down a road without any specific cause, without any specific reason, stop them just because they are driving down a certain road at this particular point in time?<sup>1</sup> Absolutely.

Kill a man and his followers for possessing implements of self-defense considered ‘illegal’<sup>2</sup>, by a ‘government’ possessing weapons designed for nothing but indiscriminate, irrational, wholesale destruction? Absolutely.

Some of the people that work for the ‘government’ or support the ‘government’ are

intelligent enough to pretend that there is still a supreme ‘law’ of the land that even they must follow. But I doubt any of them believe it, and any that do, are so stupid as to be more dangerous than a person that just pretends to.

From the most morally lacking street cop in the lowest position, to the most morally lacking cop in the highest position, they know that their job is that of the enforcer. Their motto of ‘protect and serve’ needs to be changed to ‘enforce and control’. The patrolmen’s supreme ‘law’ of the land is their police chief. And the police chief’s supreme ‘law’ of the land is the politician. And as long as they follow that simple hierarchy they will be able to go on doing that which is the only validation for living to these ‘people’, controlling other people. The supreme law of the land to the politician say whatever you want about your political ‘enemies’, but never question that they have the just authority to rule, because the moment you question their authority, you also question your own. Follow that simple hierarchy and they will be able to go on doing that which is the only validation for living to these ‘people’, controlling other people

A bully is a truly disgusting person. He or she is a person that feels validated only when they are controlling. What would George Bush 2 do without power? I don’t think he could be happy without someone to boss around. And what is even better for Bush and all of his type, is that the very people whom they impose it upon, praise them for their tyranny. What could be better for a rapist, then to hear his victim scream out during the act, ‘you are such a noble rapist, for I could have never achieved this orgasm if you would have left it up to me to decide whether or not I would have sexual intercourse with you, for I am too simple of the mind to have decided for myself’? Or ‘you are such a noble leader for outlawing some drugs and taking the decision out of my hands, for I am too simple of mind to have decided whether or not I would have put them into my body’?

“Our power is our right.” So you say ... what if some other group held that power? What if some group that didn’t call themselves the ‘government’ purported to have the authority to ‘tax’ (steal) however much it wanted from whomever it wanted for whatever purpose it felt or thought worthy? If they told everyone, ‘that they must have a number to get a job.’ If they told everyone that they must have a license to use a road

that they have been forced to pay for. And they offer as their justification only, ‘this is the way it must be, for this is the way it always has been.’ They say, ‘if you violate our laws you are perpetuating anarchy! You will cause chaos! You will be a horrible terrorist that kills and maims children and elderly grandmothers with no cause.’

Would their claim that this is the way it must be, be sufficient? Will you follow anyone or do anything if someone or some group claims that it is necessary? If so, then listen to me because this is the way it must be and desist all attempts to register me. Stop attempting to rule me, in other words, stop trying to control what I do and do not put into my body. Stop trying to control how and for what I use my body and mind. Stop controlling what kinds of weapons I have accessible for defense of my life and property. Stop committing armed robbery against me.

I have a feeling that you will say something to this effect in response to my demands, ‘we shall not listen to you, for you are one, and we are many. We outnumber you, and therefore you have to do as we say, and if you do not, then you shall be treated just as any other criminal shall be treated... If you don’t like the law then talk to your congressmen.’

Well this is my response to your statement, ‘No, I am talking to you! You are just as responsible for the ‘governments’ aggression towards me as any politician or cop is. For example: If I hire a man to rake my front yard and he instead rapes my neighbor’s daughter then it is not I who am responsible. It is the rapist who is responsible.<sup>3</sup> But if I hire a man to rape my neighbor’s daughter, then I am responsible. You hire the government to rob, beat and ultimately enslave me; so you are responsible. You are just as guilty as the power hungry politician is. And just as guilty as the ‘well intentioned’ cop that throws a man in jail for a victimless crime. Whatever your motivation, whether it be that you think you are doing the right thing, or if you are just a sick, control freak fascist, you are going to be held responsible.’

No more of this tight rope walk that you do down the line of right and wrong. You now know that the ‘government’ in this country is acting completely without any legitimate authority; its only justification for their action is, “Our power is our right.” If you are on the side of the ‘government,’ if you choose to willingly help it to sustain its completely illegitimate power, you too are saying

## Capsule Commentary

by Jacob G. Hornberger, president, The Future of Freedom Foundation

Conservatives are fond of preaching the importance of taking "individual responsibility" for one's actions and beliefs. But when you ask them whether they're willing to take responsibility for the robberies and muggings that their beloved decades-long war on drugs have produced, they always and inevitably respond with, "Oh, no. We don't intend our policies to result in those things and therefore we're not responsible for them. Only robbers and muggers, with their lack of respect for liberty and private property, are responsible for their actions and beliefs." Today, when you ask conservatives whether they're willing to take responsibility for their beloved decades-long foreign-aid program and interventionist foreign policy that have produced so much enmity, hatred, and perverse consequences for our country, their response is, not surprisingly, the same, "Oh, no. We don't intend our policies to result in those things and therefore we're not responsible for them. Only terrorists, with their lack of respect for liberty and private property, are responsible for their actions." Question for conservatives: With respect to welfare programs, do you still feel that good intentions don't matter and that advocates of the decades-long war on poverty should take responsibility for its destructive consequences, or do you now feel that only the food-stamp mother in the grocery-store line is responsible for her actions and beliefs?

Mr. Hornberger is president of The Future of Freedom Foundation ([www.fff.org](http://www.fff.org)) in Fairfax, Va., and the co-editor of *The Failure of America's Foreign Wars*.

## New Operation Politically Homeless Coordinator for Texas

Hello All,

Just wanted to take a minute to let you know I have volunteered to be the Operation Political Homeless/Discover Liberty coordinator for Texas.

Please email me at [DAVE\\_SPALLER@YAHOO.CA](mailto:DAVE_SPALLER@YAHOO.CA) of any possible or planned OPH booths in Texas and any you have done since June of 2001. Specific booth information needed is: name of event, brief description, place (city), number of volunteers needed, (IF a completed booth, please also include number of volunteers showing, number of quizzes taken, number scoring LP, and num-

# LAW OFFICES OF STEPHEN H. GORDON, P.C.

CRIMINAL LAW



FAMILY LAW



PERSONAL INJURY

BANKRUPTCY

1818 S. New Braunfels, Suite 300

San Antonio, Texas 78210

Ph: (210) 531-9700 Fx: (210) 532-8664

Licensed to Practice Law by the Supreme Court of Texas  
Admitted in the Western District, U.S. Federal District Court  
Not Certified by the Texas Board of Legal Specialization

ber of names collected)

To view the Texas current standings, go to [WWW.DISCOVERLIBERTY.COM](http://WWW.DISCOVERLIBERTY.COM) and click on Texas. It shows our goal of 138 for the period of June 01-June 02. I have information on six booth days so far, with one planned and three more possible.

To volunteer, check the upcoming booth information, in the description will be whom to contact to work the booth, or you can always contact me, again at my yahoo email listed above and on the Texas Discover Liberty site.

Thanks in advance for 1) your patience as I figure what to do with this position and 2) your help with planning and manning the booths!

## Hide Inspector Positions

From Clyde Garland,  
[CLYDEGARLA@AOL.COM](mailto:CLYDEGARLA@AOL.COM)

There are 40 Counties in Texas with the position Hide Inspector. Six of those Counties have a County Chair, as follows

Andrews, Baylor, Blanco, Briscoe, Castro, Coleman, Concho, and Crane Counties have no chair.

Dawson County Chair is James Mitchell.

Duval, Edwards, Gaines, Glasscock, Hardin, and Haskell Counties have no chair.

Jefferson County Chair is Virginia Walker.  
Jim Wells County has no chair.  
Kerr County Chair is Kelly Scott.  
Kimble, LaSalle, and Lee Counties have no chair.

Liberty County Chair is Charles Wiggins  
McCulloch, McMullen, Martin, Menard, Mitchell, Ochiltree, and Presidio Counties have no chair.

Real County Chair is Letha Dunlany.  
Roberts, Runnels, and San Jacinto Counties have no chair.

San Saba County Chair is Marvin Foster.  
Sherman, Sutton, Walker, Waller, Wood, and Yoakum Counties have no chair.

If one of the six is interested in this position, I suggest you take the lead, read the code, share your information with the others and encourage them to share their info with you. Sharing info may lead to having several LP candidates for this position.

Per the Agricultural Code for Hides & Animals, Inspection, Sale, and Shipment of Hides and Animals in certain Counties, Subchapter C, § 146.052. Application of Subchapter. (b) This subchapter does not apply to horses, sheep, goats, or swine or to the hides of those animals. (c) Salted hides in packinghouses or slaughterhouses are exempt from inspection. (Sheriff assumes duties of Hide Inspector when there is not one.)

# Scenes from Plano Balloon Fest





# Winners Wanted!

Want to be a candidate? Just fill out this form, have it notarized, then give it to your County Chair. Or call George at (915) 698-3405. We'll take care of it.



You've thought about it. You know you are right. Now is the time to take action.  
**BECOME A LIBERTARIAN PARTY CANDIDATE  
 FOR OFFICE NEXT NOVEMBER**  
 (No previous election experience required)

Did you know that there were more Libertarians running for state wide offices than Greens? More than the Reform Party? More than the **Democrats**?

Amazed? What if you knew that every Libertarian candidate who ran last November was a winner.

They were!

Each was nominated by the party at a County Convention, District Convention, or at the State Convention. Each won a slot on the November ballot with the identification of **LIBERTARIAN**. A personal victory for each candidate, a big win for the Party.

Our 106 candidates earned us more press time, more public interest, and more votes

for each Libertarian. In addition to the Presidential ticket, we had;

- 1 US Senator
- 29 US Congress
- 24 State Representatives
- 2 State senators
- 3 Board of Education Seats
- 2 Railroad Commissioners
- 6 Public Weighers
- 37 Other County Seats

Some candidates ran serious races by raising money, making speeches, and having a presence in the media. But only some. Most were "PAPER" candidates.

They were in the race in name only.

98% of the voting public couldn't tell the difference between a paper

candidate and an active one.

The public wasn't looking.

But the press was. We saw a difference in how we were treated. In areas where we ran a full slate, the print and broadcast press sought out Party officials. We were interviewed, reported on, and asked to participate in events that had been previously reserved for only the two old parties.

None of this would have been possible, were it not for the paper candidates who lent their name to our party.

A simple loan, with substantial dividends. And the best part is, a paper candidate doesn't have to do anything to run\*. Zero investment! And every Libertarian Candidate was a **winner!**

## YOU COULD RUN FOR ANY OF THESE OFFICES

Texas Governor / Lt Governor

US Senate

32 US Congress

30 State Senators

150 State Representatives

State Courts / Administrators

400+ County Commissioners

40 Hide Inspectors

Constables / Justices / Judges



\* Each candidate must complete form C5PM (APPLICATION FOR NOMINATION...), and complete a financial disclosure form.

▼ - District residence required

CSPM  
 Prescribed by Secretary of State  
 Sections 141.031, 181.031, Texas Election Code  
 10/99

All information is required to be provided unless indicated as optional. (Se requiere toda la información, a menos que haya alguna indicación que no es obligatoria.)

<b>APPLICATION FOR NOMINATION BY _____ CONVENTION OF _____</b> <i>(APLICACION PARA NOMBRAMIENTO POR LA CONVENCION DE _____ DEL PARTIDO _____)</i> TO: State/County Chair <i>(A: Nombre o Título del Propio Oficial del Partido)</i>		
I request that my name be placed on the above-named convention as a candidate for nomination to the office indicated below. <i>(Solicito que mi nombre esté puesto en la arriba nombrada con la convención como candidato para la nominación al puesto oficial indicado abajo.)</i>		
<b>OFFICE SOUGHT / PUESTO OFICIAL SOLICITADO</b> Include any place number or other distinguishing number. <i>(Incluya cualquier número de lugar u otro número que hace el puesto oficial diferente a otros.)</i>	<b>INDICATE FULL OR UNEXPIRED TERM</b> <i>(INDIQUE SI EL TERMINO DEL PUESTO OFICIAL ES TERMINO COMPLETO O NO COMPLETADO)</i>	
<b>FULL NAME (First, Middle, Last)</b> <i>(NOMBRE COMPLETO (Nombre de Pila, Segundo Nombre, Apellido))</i>	<b>PRINT NAME AS YOU WANT IT TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT</b> <i>(ESCRIBA SU NOMBRE COMO DESEA QUE APAREZCA SOBRE LA BOLETA)</i>	
<b>PERMANENT RESIDENCE ADDRESS</b> Street address and apartment number. If none, describe location of residence (do not include P.O. Box or Rural RA) <i>(DIRECCION DE RESIDENCIA PERMANENTE: Calle y Número de Departamento; si no tiene, describa la localidad de su residencia. No incluya su caja postal o ruta rural.)</i>	<b>MAILING ADDRESS (if different from residence address)</b> <i>(DIRECCION POSTAL. Si es diferente a su dirección de residencia)</i>	
<b>CITY, STATE</b> <i>(CIUDAD, ESTADO)</i>	<b>ZIP</b> <i>(ZONA POSTAL)</i>	<b>CITY, STATE</b> <i>(CIUDAD, ESTADO)</i>
<b>OCCUPATION</b> <i>(EMPLEO)</i>	<b>DATE OF BIRTH</b> <i>(FECHA DE NACIMIENTO)</i>	<b>COUNTY OF RESIDENCE</b> <i>(CONDADO DE RESIDENCIA)</i>
<b>TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code) (Optional)</b> <i>(NUMERO DE TELEFONO - Incluir el código de la zona) (Facultativo)</i>	<b>Length of Continuous Residence as of Date Application Sworn</b> <i>(Tiempo en que ha Residido en un Solo Lugar en la Fecha en que Prestó Juramento Sobre la Solicitud)</i>	
<b>OFFICE:</b> <i>(DE SU OFICINA)</i>	<b>IN STATE</b> <i>(EN EL ESTADO)</i> ____ yr(s) ____ mos <i>(años) (meses)</i>	<b>IN COUNTY</b> <i>(EN EL CONDADO)</i> ____ yr(s) ____ mos <i>(años) (meses)</i>
<b>HOME:</b> <i>(DE SU DOMICILIO)</i>	<b>IN DISTRICT OR PRECINCT</b> <i>(EN EL DISTRITO O PRECINCTO)</i> ____ yr(s) ____ mos <i>(años) (meses)</i>	
Before me, the undersigned authority, on this day personally appeared _____, who being by me here and now duly sworn, upon oath says: "I, _____ of _____ County, Texas, being a candidate for the office of _____, swear that I will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States and of the State of Texas. I am a citizen of the United States eligible to hold such office under the Constitution and laws of this state. I have not been declared mentally incompetent as determined by final judgment of a court, nor have I been finally convicted of a felony for which I have not been pardoned or had my full rights of citizenship restored by other official action. I am aware of the apothem law, Chapter 573, Government Code.		
If using a nickname as part of your name to appear on the ballot, you are also signing and swearing to the following statements: I further swear that my nickname does not constitute a slogan nor does it indicate a political, economic, social, or religious view or affiliation. I have been commonly known by this nickname for at least three years prior to this election.		
I further swear that the foregoing statements included in my application are in all things true and correct."		
<i>(Ante mí, la abajo firmada autoridad aparece en persona la persona nombrada quien habiendo aquí y ahora prestado juramento debido, bajo juramento dice: "Yo, _____ del condado de _____, Texas, siendo candidato para el puesto oficial de _____, solemnemente juro que apoyaré y defenderé la Constitución y las leyes de los Estados Unidos y del Estado de Texas. Soy ciudadano de los Estados Unidos elegible para ocupar el puesto oficial bajo la Constitución y las leyes de este Estado. No he sido declarado incompetente de la mente como determinado por la decisión final de una corte, ni he sido probado culpable finalmente de una felonía por la cual no se me han restituido totalmente mis derechos de ciudadanía por medio de otra acción oficial. Yo tengo conocimiento de la ley sobre el apothem según el capítulo 573 de Código Gobierno.</i>		
<i>(Para poder incluir un apodo como parte de su nombre completo el la papeleta. Él deberá firmar la siguiente constancia: Además, juro que se me ha conocido por este apodo por más de tres años. Además, juro que el apodo no es un lema político ni una indicación de mis creencias o afiliaciones políticas, económicas, sociales o religiosas.</i>		
<i>Además juro que las precedentes declaraciones que incluyo en mi solicitud son verdaderas y están correctas en todos sentidos."</i>		
X _____ SIGNATURE OF CANDIDATE (FIRMA DEL CANDIDATO)		
Sworn to and subscribed before me at _____, this the _____ day of _____, _____. <i>(Jurado y suscrito ante mí en _____, este día _____ de _____, _____)</i>		
_____ Signature of Officer administering oath <i>(Firma del oficial administrando el juramento)</i>	_____ Title of Officer administering oath <i>(Título del oficial administrando el juramento)</i>	<b>SEAL</b> <b>(SELLO)</b>
<b>TO BE COMPLETED BY CHAIRMAN:</b>		
This document was received on this date _____, _____, _____. _____ Signature of chair		

## Governments and Terrorism

*Continued from page 5*

they take force as the primary means of achieving their social purposes, regardless of the cost in lives and suffering. Something other than human life is their moral standard.

### Anti-Rights Mentality

Such people behave as animals and lose any right to be treated otherwise. They reject the validity of individual purpose. Radical socialists insist you live for what they call society's purposes. Radical religious groups insist you live for what they call supernatural purposes. Radical environmentalists insist you live for what they call nature's purposes.

A common claim of terrorists and criminals in general is that they are retaliating against aggression. But they have an irrational view of aggression. Aggression, in the sense relevant here, is the *initiation of physical force or fraud* against the *natural rights* of others. It is *not* offering financial motivations, withdrawing assistance, presenting philosophical arguments, creating laws based on individual sovereignty, development and use of one's property, preparing for self-defense, engaging in trade and business arrangements, or demonstrating personal achievement and happiness derived from education and a free lifestyle. Doing some of these things may have some negative consequences for some of the plans and opportunities of others, but others have no more right for their plan's fulfillment than you. The electric light bulb hurt the sell of candles, but its invention was not aggression against candle makers.

The Unabomber, Palestinians, Green Peace, Bin Laden's organization, etc., try to claim that free-market industrialization and trade (civilization in general) is aggression against the planet and their preferred culture-political structure. They want to claim that they not only have a right to their preferred cultural-political structure, but a right to impose it on others. The Greens want to claim that all life belongs to the planet and that they are the spokespersons for the planet. Bin Laden and his ilk want to claim that all life belongs to God and that they are the spokespersons for God. Socialists want to claim that all life belongs to the state (collective will) and that they are the spokespersons for the collective. All are united in the belief that your life does not belong to you. They only disagree upon which alter you are to be sacrificed.

Nobody has a right to such goals. *There is no reason to respect the persons, borders, laws, or cultures of those who claim your life, liberty, and*

*property are not your own.*

### The United States

The United States Constitution recognizes that your life, liberty, and property belong to you. However, due to lack of argument by moral fundamentals, due to primarily pragmatic arguments, the implementation of the principles of the Constitution has not been consistent. Still, the United States is *The Place* to fight for these moral principles. It is here that they have their clearest statement and are most fully observed.

The first stirring of philosophy (the use of reason rather than myth to understand the world) began 2,600 years ago by a few Greeks. Around 300 years later, Aristotle identified the individualist foundation of morality. The concept of individual sovereignty emerged as a social force only about 1,900 years later in England, missing some of Aristotle's naturalist foundation and clouded in some religious underpinnings. So, perhaps it is not surprising that people are still struggling to perfect its philosophic defense and practical implementation. Only a small portion of the world's population, even a small portion of people within any country, at any time in history has been engaged in developing the concept of natural rights; yet, it has had powerful effects, *because it is consistent with human nature. Societies and groups attempting to defend these ideas, however imperfectly, are morally superior to those ignorant of them, and far superior to those opposed to them.*

The United States has strayed far from the Constitution's original intent. The FBI killed a boy and his mother at Ruby Ridge because the parents felt they should take responsibility for their children's education. They also killed parents and children of the Branch Davidians religious group for similar reasons. People are imprisoned for victimless "crimes;" which are not objectively crimes, but attempts by some people to prevent free choice by others (in such areas as gambling, prostitution, marijuana, unapproved medications, offering haircuts without a license, employment, anti-trust regulations, etc.). People cannot open a restaurant and allow smoking. Land is taken from people when others prefer different uses for it (for wetlands, urban development, etc.). The Department of Agriculture uses taxpayer funds to support the lifestyle of large scale farm interests. Forty percent of citizens' earnings is confiscated to pay for these and other programs that no reasonable person will support voluntarily, but which create special interest

power bases for politicians.

However, there are also emerging trends that may lead the United States back to its Constitutional limitations. The most promising is that the long history of forced public education is now being countered with a growing trend for home schooling. Equality under the law for races and sexes is improving, though it is still hampered by quota preferences and matrimony laws. The Internet is expanding communication options. Free market, Objectivist, and libertarian oriented think-tanks are growing, as is the number of university professors they have influenced. The Libertarian Party is influencing politics in all states.

Importantly, freedom of the press still exists for print media; though for the broadcast media freedom is limited by regulations and licensing, resulting in a uniformity of view point. The legal system, while philosophically corrupt, still offers legal safeguards of defendant's rights, trial by jury of one's peers, and choice of attorney (though he must be licensed).

A republican form of government, a Constitution limiting government, and, most importantly, a philosophy of natural rights create a powerful resistance and corrective force to oligarchical control and government excesses.

(Limited democratic processes are important, but universal democracy is counterproductive. Full democracy, in the sense of one-man-one-vote, shifts power into the hands of the incompetent. For example, India is a democracy and a socialist swamp of corruption, effectively denying freedom at every turn. That is the direction of democracies where the vote is not limited to property owners and significant taxpayers (as the United States did originally, if inconsistently). A better practice would be allotting votes proportional to taxes paid.)

### Foreign Countries

Most of the failings of the United States occur even more severely in other countries. Even in western Europe governments partially control broadcast and other news media. Their socialized medical programs control, rather than provide, medical access. England and Australia outlaw firearms in one's home for self-protection, resulting in rising crime rates. Socialists and communist countries add control of jobs and housing, impoverishing and starving those out of favor, and often kill people trying to leave. In countries where government is an extension of

## **Governments and Terrorism**

*Continued from page 12*

religion, death penalties may be applied for education of girls, paying wages to women, use of wine or tobacco, sexual activity, etc.

China regulates the number of children a woman may have (especially vile in an agrarian society where large families are necessary to support the lame and aged). The Soviet Union engineered the starvation of millions of its citizens as a control method. Saudi Arabia killed a young woman and her boyfriend in recent years for trying to flee their families and seek a life of their own. The chronic and extreme abuses of power by most governments of the world show those of the United States to be occasional and minor by comparison.

### **Judging Nations by their Wars**

Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima are frequently mentioned in commentaries concerning the terrorist attack on New York and Washington. Keeping in mind that the history of a nation gives only partial insight into the present day cultural values and policies of its citizens, it is useful to consider this example.

In the 1940's, Japan's business interests felt that their national economy was being harmed by United States foreign trade and political activities. While the United States has not always been completely moral in its use of military force in such matters, Japan was not the least interested in free trade or freedoms of any nature. It opposed individual sovereignty, forbade economic freedoms, was statist in philosophy, and enforced the view that the emperor was divine, a demigod of sorts. Based on this moral view, Japan wreaked atrocities on neighboring nations, used slave labor, and fostered the idea that dying for the emperor was a moral ideal, thus, maliciously sacrificing the youth that most accepted the philosophy. Japan was not fighting to promote individual sovereignty, but to stamp out any trends for it in southeast Asia. The United States, while inconsistent, tended to promote the ideas of individual sovereignty and economic freedoms around the world, especially through freer trade policies.

Before dropping the atomic bomb (on military centers, not the capital), the United States warned Japan of the destructive power of its new weapon, dropped leaflets on the city to warn the people, and only proceeded after Japan refused to surrender in a war it started. Were some innocent people killed; i.e., people who opposed the war? Certainly, but this must be balanced against the United

States lives to be lost in continued fighting, all of whom were innocent, all of whom were fighting in retaliation, not initiation of war. Can we measure the degree of innocence of some of the Japanese people? How many agreed with the predominant statist and religious views of the culture? Did even many women oppose sovereignty for women? Did the majority of people consciously support the philosophy and culture that justified the oppressive government? *There are degrees of innocence and guilt.*

After the surrender, the United States worked to ensure Japan had a better government, freer people, and the conditions for economic prosperity. Demonstrating benevolence and a sense of responsibility, the United States converted a barbaric culture into a civilized society.

### **Judging Nations by their Expansionist Policies**

Free societies do not find it in their interest, neither morally nor financially, to support oppression of others where they see other people as amenable to peaceful, law abiding co-existence. Free societies do require security and the right to access natural resources (either through trade or exploration) under a legal code. Some understanding of this issue is necessary for formulating proper government policies in dealing with primitive cultures and peoples unaccustomed to individualist economic freedoms; which still includes a good percentage of the world's population.

The expansion of the United States over American Indian territories, while occurring over one hundred years ago and largely irrelevant to our present culture, illustrates the problem. When disparate cultures interact, issues of property rights, contractual agreements, and other complexities arise. The best solution to these issues would have been for the Indians to become citizens of the United States. However, I believe neither group considered this seriously, as it would require a substantial change of philosophical outlook and life style for the Indians. The United States, with its superior philosophic and technological foundation, had some obligation to propose ways for bringing the Indians into the new culture, but there seems to be little evidence that this obligation was recognized. Actually, the full nature of the problem was not recognized by people at the time.

Even today, when the problem is clearer, a solution is not obvious. However, humans are intelligent, even when uneducated, and

are very adaptive when options and opportunities can be clarified. The benefits of new technologies and methods are readily recognized. (One approach, once territorial ownership is recognized, would be lease arrangements for land and resource use, with each tribal owner, not tribal leaders, receiving a proportional share of the rent income. Using this rent, other trade would be possible and property right taxes could be paid, adjusted for degree of land/resource usage. Not easy to implement, but understandable, with options for management.)

The overriding problem in such cases is the failure of primitive cultures to give up tribal collectivism and recognize individual rights. Property rights (land, livestock, children) in particular was foreign to much Indian thinking and unacceptable. This makes land ownership and trade agreements impossible. War among the various tribes was common, as was slavery. Even today, where Indians maintain tribal associations on reservations, many subjugate individuals to tribal goals, even opposing children seeking better education outside the tribal schools; i.e., seeking to live for themselves, not the tribe.

### **Judging Nations by Acts of Oppression**

Oppression occurs in many forms and degrees of severity as the negation of individual sovereignty. The history of slavery is illustrative. Practiced throughout history by all cultures, and still widely practiced today in various forms, slavery has only been eradicated in recent times where the emergence of the concept of individual sovereignty has taken hold. Neither the Bible nor Judaeo-Christianity nor any other major religion has opposed slavery, except when other cultural factors in modern times has prompted them to do so.

Slavery has been widely practiced throughout Africa, where it was even common for wives and children to be offered as collateral and for them to become permanent slaves when debts were not repaid. Widespread slavery of Africans by Europeans began with the 16th century voyages of exploration. After the Age of Enlightenment in the 18th century, plus the fact that slavery wasn't particularly profitable in more industrialized societies, Britain became the major political force opposing slavery in the world.

The crucial point is that in spite of the fact that slavery is a great evil, it is only in the early 19th century that even Britain legally abolished it. Why there? Because Britain is

## Governments and Terrorism

*Continued from page 13*

where the concept of the "rights of Englishmen," as opposed to rights of kings, emerged, where John Locke and others popularized the concept of "natural rights," and where the resulting legal structure made the Industrial Revolution possible. *This was a time of philosophical revolution concerning individual reason and rights, leading to a legal and technological revolution, which brought into focus the possibilities of accomplishment of individual men as opposed to collectivism.*

The United States was the logical place for slavery to first have been abolished, but leaders in the southern states thought that they were financially dependent upon it, and unanimity of all the states was deemed necessary to solidify a break from Britain and survive. Slavery cannot be reconciled with a moral nation. Yet, the new nation with respect to its other citizens was the most moral that ever existed, and has been the greatest symbol of moral standards to the rest of the world.

The particular repugnance of United States slavery was that it became racially based, unlike slavery in most societies throughout history. At the same time, because the legal structure was so clearly biased against only one race, all other peoples of the world could see the United States as a land of freedom, more free for them than any other nation.

Official slavery ceased in the United States over a hundred years ago, but official discrimination only slowly diminished until the 1960's. Organizations like the KKK and the American Nazi Party still want to deny rights to those with African ancestry, Jewish heritage, and other foreigners, and occasionally engage in terrorist acts against them and those who they see as supporting them. *In order to consider a nation moral, you must judge such groups to be marginal to the culture and counter to administrative policy. In fact, you must see administrative policy as actively trying to eliminate it.* In much of the world, this is not the case.

### **Moral Consistency and Censorship**

Effective opposition to terrorism requires *consistent domestic and foreign* policies. Consistency is not easy in a complex world. It requires constant re-evaluation and discussion. The freedom to think and speak one's mind is paramount. Governments or terrorist groups attempting forced censorship should be recognized as *enemies of the human mind.*

*(Only censorship by force is evil. Individuals*

expressing opposition to the promotion of certain ideas, private schools declining to teach certain ideas, and businesses refusing to sell certain products are appropriate exercises of choice, appropriate uses of private property, exercises in moral courage and self-responsibility, even when mistaken.)

All countries have social elements advocating forced censorship, but for some this is marginal, while for others it is a core activity of the government. Advocates of forced censorship fear that their ideas cannot withstand a free market in ideas, that the ideas they prefer are not supported by reality, reason, and human nature, that human nature is inherently evil in some degree and must be modified by those who know this. *These people do not value human nature, but are opposed to it.*

(Such people seek to escape from self-responsibility themselves (since their human nature corrupts them). In this, they have much in common with their supposed opposites, those who claim that all ideas are equally valid and that morality is relative, that no one should exercise their own judgement in condemning ideas and ways of life.)

As has often been noted, the power to tax is the power to destroy and censor. Postal taxes and regulations retard communication by raising the cost of magazine and newsletter circulation, political mailings, etc. Today, many politicians and bureaucrats throughout the world want to monitor and tax Internet and cell phone usage, precisely because they offer too much freedom of communication.

### **Domestic Protection**

How does a moral, technological nation protect itself from terrorism? By domestic policies that increase freedom, self-responsibility, and technological options, not by regulation of safety procedures, control of options, and restrictions on activities.

Most of the national security proposals making the news recently will result in further stagnation of technological innovations, uniformity of procedures, and loss of cultural freedom. We will become more vulnerable, not less.

Without the FAA, municipal ownership of airports, and other regulations which stagnate development of new technologies and procedures, the airline industry would evolve in coordination with the insurance industry to ensure passenger safety and protect property. Aerospace manufacturers, airlines, and airports, probably through consortiums, would buy, sell, and lease air space just as businesses do land. They would constantly

upgrade air traffic control and other safety procedures for efficiency as new technologies develop.

Especially after the first hijacking a number of years ago, liability laws and insurance costs would have inspired variations in security procedures and would be promoted to attract customers. Experiments in black box technology would likely have resulted in mechanisms that automatically alert ground authorities (perhaps, by live radio pickup) and turn on a backup if a box is turned off in flight. Pilots and attendants would likely have a variety of defensive weapons and training, varying from airline to airline. At the airlines' discretion, passengers would have their personal protection, from guns to mace. Hijackings have continued over the years because government has disarmed passengers and bared crews from fighting back.

Airlines have not pursued a course of self-responsibility, because government has relieved airlines of liability and prevented competition in this area. In fact, under the regulatory structure, initiatives by airlines would create liabilities. What is the point of private research and development of new innovations if acceptance does not depend on effectiveness, but on political factors and FAA approval?

Today the FAA is further disarming passengers in a silly attempt to appear to be doing something constructive. They are rendering passengers even more vulnerable to a few people of sufficient strength, size, and training. Only bureaucrats would think of removing plastic dinner knives, as if a broken spoon would not work as well, as if a mirror from a compact or restroom could not be broken and wrapped with adhesive tape, as if a thermos of acid will not do, or as if trained males could not simply grab a couple of women and children, break their necks and threaten more.

Since people are naturally of different size and strength, *security is achieved by arming with equalizing technology*, not disarming potential victims. That is why they called the six-shooter revolver the "equalizer" when it first became widely available.

### **Practical Foreign Policy**

How does a moral nation minimize the danger of becoming a target of foreign terrorist threats? By limiting activities to ensuring the security of its citizens within its territorial boundaries, and by foreign policies that discriminate consistently among countries by the degree of their morality.

## Governments and Terrorism

*Continued from page 14*

A nation without a constitution expressing valid moral principles has no means of consistently judging other nations. The United States has one, but our modern politicians, judges, and voters, products of our public education system, don't understand it. *The philosophy of a nation is only as valid as the education of each generation. A philosophy of individual freedom and responsibility is not instilled by compulsory education and government financing of universities.*

Military personnel of moral nations are volunteer participants in contractual agreements to ensure security. Placing their lives at risk must be justified on that basis. This does not mean that military action may not be taken on foreign soil, but that its purpose must be the elimination of threats, not management of, or protection of, territories not under the government's jurisdiction.

The purpose of government in foreign affairs is not to make trade treaties or military treaties, but to negotiate conflicts and borders involving its jurisdiction and extensions thereof. Military forces may be used to aid other moral nations under attack, when the elimination of the threat is judged to enhance one's own nation's security as well.

It is immoral to aid and trade with predominantly immoral governments and organizations China, Saudi Arabia, the Mafia, the Irish IRA, etc. (While Israel itself is fairly socialist, it is far superior to its neighbors in regard to censorship, social freedoms, and emigration polices.)

### **Establishing Government Jurisdiction**

Government authorities must make decisions about the extent of territory a nation can effectively protect and about the military threat other governments represent. A government that is motivated to extend individual sovereignty is justified in establishing constitutional administration over any territory and peoples that are under the jurisdiction of predominantly criminal governments, when the interests of its own citizens as a whole justify the cost.

Governments and groups do not have inherent right to lands by historical accident of political boundaries. Governments do not properly own land at all, any more than they own people. Governments are simply the administrative structure for ensuring the security of citizens and their individually owned land, ownership established by evidence of mixing their labor with the land in conjunc-

tion with evidence of prior claim according to the legal structure. (Once land is recorded and taxes are being paid, there is no need to actually work it. Nature preserves, holding for investment, etc. are valid activities.)

(When extending jurisdiction over a territory, the people already working the land have the right to establish their prior claims by recognized procedures. However, no one has a right to land simply because they want to hunt it now and then or their ancestors walked across it on occasion. If your property rights are to be protected, pay the taxes for that cost. No one has a right to any life style they wish, but only to life styles that are consistent with legal equality and property rights.)

### **Activity of Citizens on Foreign Soil**

Where a government cannot justify the morality, cost, and interest of its citizens in extending its jurisdiction, it must concentrate on ensuring an adequate defense. This does not mean that citizens should be prevented from acting on their own to fight for freedom in other territories, as soldiers of fortune, mercenaries, or volunteers.

Government authorities should maintain a list of countries or territories where its citizens are not allowed to operate militarily on their own. Excluded would be countries with either substantially moral governments or with sufficient military power to be a danger to the home country. The penalty for violating the guidelines would be loss of citizenship.

The issue here is that the government authorities must judge when citizens are behaving morally in foreign affairs and when they are creating a significant danger of retaliation on the home country. Yet, there should be no opposition to the right of citizens to fight against oppression and for the expansion of governments based on natural rights.

Such policies would minimize threats to the United States both by minimizing official confrontations and by reducing the growth of criminal governments by overthrowing them and/or draining their resources with local military actions. Citizens who operated anywhere in the world in violation of their nation's principles should face losing their citizenship at the least.

Similarly, those who trade (through construction projects, paying tariffs, contributing to the tax base, etc.) with governments that are deemed to be criminal should risk loss of citizenship, where such trade was

judged to strengthen the ability of the criminal government to continue its oppression (and, perhaps, become a significant military force). On the other hand, black market trading and smuggling that bypasses the criminal government might be allowed on the same basis as soldier of fortune military adventures.

Trade with significantly moral countries that do not themselves boycott criminal governments would have to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration the full range of the country's policies.

*Life is complicated, but formulating policies based on consistent principles is less complicated than range of the moment pragmatism.*

### **Terrorism and Individual Sovereignty is Civilization's Fight**

Afghanistan in itself is not a threat to the United States. The Taliban government is clearly criminal and the United States government should look favorably on anyone fighting it and unfavorably on anyone supporting it. Instead, until the September 11 attack, the United States had not even denounced the regime, but has donated aid that assisted its continuance. This has encouraged and assisted the Taliban in hosting Bin Laden's organization.

Now the United States has been attacked and President Bush has rightly recognized that, "This is civilization's fight." Further, he realizes that the government has the responsibility to do whatever is necessary to wipe out Bin Laden's organization and other terrorist groups likely to threaten the United States, without violating the rights of innocent people. He also recognizes that no one participating in the organization or the Taliban is innocent, whether they participated in this particular operation or not. He even recognizes that other governments and people in other countries that support these groups share their guilt, are also enemies of civilization. Using this moral stance, though he has not stated the fundamental principle that civilization rests on respect for natural rights, he has rallied nations around the world in opposition to both the Taliban and Bin Laden's organization. Unfortunately, the participation of many of these countries is shallowly pragmatic and not moral, and if their support is considered important to the President's goals, they will eventually undermine the consistency and morality of United States policy. Only by explicitly stating the moral principle involved will a coalition of the more moral nations hold together in the long run, beyond the immediate operations against the Bin Laden organization.

## Governments and Terrorism

*Continued from page 15*

The implications of the President's arguments apply to the Mafia, the KKK, criminal gangs, the Irish IRA, etc. Once an organization has been shown to engage in criminal activities and has been declared criminal by the courts, by dint of its stated policies and/or other evidence, all members should be considered guilty of any actions committed by the organization. United States citizens who are funding terrorist organizations overseas, like the IRA, should be held responsible. As the situation stands today, the United States cannot even eliminate criminal gangs within its borders, much less around the world.

Of course, the major problem with United States policies and the legal structure is that it cannot distinguish criminal from non-criminal activity. It finds crime everywhere, scattering its attention and resources. The United States spends more time and money attempting to deal with victimless "crimes" than with true crimes. Today's anti-drug operations, like the alcohol prohibition operations in the 1920's, are themselves violations of rights, make official criminals out of otherwise law abiding citizens, create financial incentives for criminal organizations, corrupt authorities from policemen to politicians, waste taxpayer money that would otherwise support the economy, and actually promote the proliferation of drug use. Without the United States and European "war" on drugs, punitive taxes on tobacco and alcohol, etc., smuggling operations would not generate the profits to fund criminal and terrorist organizations.

People living in villages and caves in Afghanistan are not a threat to the United States. A few key people may be harbored in those caves from time to time, but the people who carried out the attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon lived and studied in the United States, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, etc. The money they live on is oil money from the West.

How did Arab dictatorships get that oil and wealth? While they were operating their little, criminal dictatorships and riding camels, United States companies prospected, discovered the oil, drilled the wells, and built the refineries and pipelines, and created markets. The companies hired and educated the local people in operation of the facilities, helping them move into the twentieth century, and paid tribute to the local dictators. The weak, corrupt Arab governments, which

were not legitimate in any sense, but which the United States never condemned, saw their subjects growing in independence and education. So, they reneged on agreements and stole (nationalized) the oil properties and facilities at gun point, making jobs dependent on political-religious favor, again, without serious United States condemnation. In fact, instead of using military force to secure the contractual agreements and properties of the United States companies, or allowing the companies to secure their property with volunteer and mercenary forces, or even blockading or boycotting the attempts to sell the oil (which still required United States citizens to keep operating), the United States government stumbled over itself not to offend and to be allowed the privilege of buying the oil. When the Arab oil cartel created shortages, the United States passed emergency laws to prevent United States companies from earning any "windfall profits." Thus, destroying the oil companies' ability and incentives to expand exploration and bring new fields online, and ensuring the success of the Arab cartel. In other words, the United States found barbarians in the desert and gave them financial power and modern weapons of war. Today we are paying, along with the oppressed peoples of these countries, for decades of appeasement, both with the cost of the threats to Israel and in terrorist attacks against the United States.

Not that the Saudi dictators support Bin Laden's organization, but some Saudi elements and other Arab dictators do. In fact, Bin Laden and his ilk seem to hate the Saudi government as much as the United States for allowing more freedom in recent years, attacking the United States as much for its support of the Saudi dictators as for its support of Israel. Actually, it is civilization's values of individual freedoms and self-responsibility that focuses their hate, that threatens the culture they want to force on people.

In this regard, Arafat's Palestinian regime is clearly criminal and a threat to its own citizens, to Jordan, and to Israel. Appeasement supports this regime's evil. As Ben Franklin might say, *They that can engage in non-essential appeasement to obtain a little temporary safety don't deserve it and won't get it.*

### **The Biggest Danger**

In spite of the largely positive responses in terms of foreign affairs by our current leaders to date, I fear the government will be incapable of managing the task before us in the long run. After all, they have no under-

standing of how to manage anything else; least of all, understanding that they should not be managing the economy and our lives.

President Bush has done reasonably well so far in this situation in regard to foreign policy, but he has made two especially large mistakes in regard to domestic policieshis so-called faith based initiatives for funneling money through religious groups and support of the public school establishment. Colin Powell has likewise been a voice of reason on the foreign front, but on domestic issues he also has socialist tendencies. The administration is currently seeking to further erode liberties against the Constitution's limitations on search and seizure, imprisonment at the discretion of authorities without charges, etc.

The government is already exacerbating recession dangers with panicky "security" measures that are designed to impress the public, with no understanding of the damage they are doing to the economy and the resulting deaths that that will cause. The plane crashes could not wreck our country, but the politicians can.

Without the FAA and other government controls in the wake of this attack, the airlines and airports would not have shut down for days at a time. They would have immediately increased their armed security staffs on the ground and in the air, modified procedures, and one by one across the country would have reopened and started flying again within a day or two. Business travelers would have rushed to reschedule, reassured by the new security measures, and saved the nation from many bankruptcies, layoffs, delivery problems, and lost productivity.

Now the airlines will receive a financial bailout as a result of being shutdown, something that Bin Laden could not achieve, but the government has. The bailout is another example of irresponsible meddling by politicians and bureaucrats who know nothing about economics or business, which exacerbates problems created by previous meddling.

With a taxpayer financed bailout, the airline executives will continue to get their full salaries and have no need to scramble to recover their business operations. The airlines won't need to pool resources and assist each other, even the stockholders won't blame them for the losses. In the meantime, a nation that depends on modern transportation for business shipments and travel will be crippled.

Other government agencies are slowing down foreign trade with border delays; causing further rippling effects of bankruptcies

## Governments and Terrorism

*Continued from page 16*

and layoffs. No one in government or the news media gives any thought to the thousands of lives lost to economic setbacks, postponed medical treatments, delayed operations, conditions worsened by poorer nutrition, etc. Government posturing with ineffectual, disruptive controls and financial meddling costs lives.

In the meantime, the administration continues to squander tax money that is urgently needed for productive use in a faltering economy. Today they announced a grant of \$8 million for college professors to study why people drink alcohol.

With a faltering economy, rising costs of national security, cleaning up New York and the Pentagon, preparing for foreign military operations, etc., it is past time to eliminate the nonsensical, special interest spending. It is time to cut taxes, the only method of stimulating the whole economy. Cutting taxes also avoids the counter-productive inflation caused by government spending.

---

## Our Power is Our Right

*Continued from page 6*

“Our power is our right.”

Using your system of morality not mine, we shall have to see who has more power before you can decide who is right and who is wrong. In the end you may be ‘right.’ But then again, I could just sit on every congressman’s neighbor’s roof in this country with a hunting rifle and place a little ‘right’, right between each congressman’s ears... Hey, maybe some ‘righteousness’ might help you too. And there isn’t a thing you can say to me about it because I will only be using the moral system of the majority, and hey, who am I to go against the will of the majority?

I am one and you are many, so you shall not listen to me ... ‘wake up mother-f\*\*\*\*er, time to die!’

(1) I speak here of ‘sobriety checkpoints’.

(2) I speak here of the countless, and often unidentified cases of ‘government’ murder in the name of ‘gun control.’

(3) He would be responsible even if I had hired him to rape my neighbor’s daughter.

## Baptism of Fire

*Continued from page 1*

to see who can recite a long forgotten Amendment. We are losing the liberties that our ancestors fought and died for because we fail to understand how the government SHOULD operate, as compared to how it DOES operate. In the words of Daniel Webster, “I fear [the people] may place too implicit a confidence in their public servants, and fail properly to scrutinize their conduct; that in this way they may be made the dupes of designing men, and become the instruments of their own undoing. Make them intelligent, and they will be vigilant; give them the means of detecting the wrong, and they will apply the remedy.”

The disaster in New York was a violent wake up call. I hope that Americans will clear away their political blinders with the same rugged determination they are using to clear away the rubble that once stood proudly in lower Manhattan. For those who are interested, I teach an eight hour class on the Constitution. It is the personal effort that I am making to rebuild America to its former greatness. For those who would like to test their knowledge of the Constitution, I have an automated quiz on my website. Visit [HTTP://WWW.BADNARIK.ORG](http://www.badnarik.org) to find a link that will offer you twenty multiple choice questions. When you are finished, the computer will give you a score and an explanation for any incorrect answers you may have had. I think most people will be less than happy with their score, but I hope it motivates them to find out more about their liberties, and the Constitution that was designed to protect them.

---

## Civil Rights – How Can They Prevent Terrorism?

*Continued from page 2*

make them the most profit. If it involves requiring ID and searches, those who object have the right not to enter.

To be secure in person and effects refers to when you are on (or in) your on property. When you venture unto the property of others you are subject to their rules. When the government tells you what you can and cannot do on your own property, you become less secure.

## Plano Balloon Fest OPH Booth Results

From Dave Spaller,  
[LPTX\\_PBFEST@YAHOO.COM](mailto:LPTX_PBFEST@YAHOO.COM)

Day 1 (6 hours)

367 quizzes taken

54 scored LP

16 names collected

Day 2 (16 hours!)

1, 019 quizzes taken

161 scored LP

60 names collected

Day 3 (6 hours)

217 quizzes taken

29 scored LP

32 names collected

Grand totals for the Libertarian Party of Texas 3-day OPH booth at the 2001 Plano Balloon Festival

1, 603 Total quizzes taken

244 (15%) Total scoring LP

108 Total names collected

28 Total booth hours

---

## Wanted

I will pay a reward for a color photo negative of the Statue of Liberty, with exclusive use fee, for a Vote Liberty! Postcard project. I can use a professional service or reward a fellow Libertarian photographer. I will give name recognition. Contact Peter Elloway, PO Box 685, Houston, Texas 77001

B



# Around the State

## On-line and Wired

### Web Pages

State Web Page [WWW.TX.LP.ORG](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG)  
 County Chairs [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/COUNTY\\_CHAIRS.HTM](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/COUNTY_CHAIRS.HTM)  
 County Chair duties [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/COUNTY\\_CHAIR.DUTIES.HTM](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/COUNTY_CHAIR.DUTIES.HTM)  
 Press Releases [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/DATABASE\\_RO/PRS/INDEX.HTML](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/DATABASE_RO/PRS/INDEX.HTML)  
 Bell County [WWW.LPTXAS.ORG/BELL](http://WWW.LPTXAS.ORG/BELL)  
 Bexar County [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/BEXAR](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/BEXAR)  
 Brazos County [WWW.BRAZOSLP.ORG](http://WWW.BRAZOSLP.ORG)  
 Aggie Libertarians at Texas A&M [LIBERTARIANS.TAMU.EDU/](http://LIBERTARIANS.TAMU.EDU/)  
 Collin County [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/COLLIN/INDEX.HTML](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/COLLIN/INDEX.HTML)  
 Dallas County [HTTP://LPDALLAS.ORG](http://HTTP://LPDALLAS.ORG)  
 Denton County [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/DENTONINDEX.HTML](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/DENTONINDEX.HTML)  
 El Paso County [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/ELPASO/INDEX.HTML](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/ELPASO/INDEX.HTML)  
 Harris County [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/HARRIS](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/HARRIS)  
 Montgomery County [HTTP://LPMC.MAIN.COM/](http://HTTP://LPMC.MAIN.COM/)  
 Nacogdoches County [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/NACOGDOCHES/INDEX.HTML](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/NACOGDOCHES/INDEX.HTML)  
 Tom Green County [HTTP://TGCLP.TRIPOD.COM](http://HTTP://TGCLP.TRIPOD.COM)  
 Travis County [WWW.AUSTINLIBERTY.ORG](http://WWW.AUSTINLIBERTY.ORG)

### Forums

LP Texas: Email  
 LPTexas@LPTexas.org with "subscribe  
 lptexas" in the body.  
 ChristLib: Send an email to  
 MAJORDOMO@SWCP.COM with "subscribe  
 christlib" in the body.

### Other Sites of Interest

Incumbent voting records [HTTP:SCORECARD.TAXPAYER.NET/STATE.CFM](http://HTTP:SCORECARD.TAXPAYER.NET/STATE.CFM)  
 Texas Election Code [CAPITOL.TLC.STATE.US/STATUES.-ELTOC.HTM](http://CAPITOL.TLC.STATE.US/STATUES.-ELTOC.HTM)  
 District Boundaries [WWW.CAPITOL.STATE.TX.US/REDV/REDVIEW.HTM](http://WWW.CAPITOL.STATE.TX.US/REDV/REDVIEW.HTM)  
 Initiative for Texas [WWW.INITIATIVE.FORTEXAS.ORG](http://WWW.INITIATIVE.FORTEXAS.ORG)  
 Federal Election Commission [WWW.FEC.GOV](http://WWW.FEC.GOV)  
 The Separation of School and State Alliance [WWW.SEPSCHOOL.ORG](http://WWW.SEPSCHOOL.ORG)  
 Bill of Attainder Project [WWW.ISC-DURANT.COM/TOM/BILLOFTTAINDER/](http://WWW.ISC-DURANT.COM/TOM/BILLOFTTAINDER/)  
 League of Women Voters [DNET.ORG](http://DNET.ORG)

### Congress

Phil Gramm [PHIL\\_GRAMM@GRAMM.SENATE.GOV](mailto:PHIL_GRAMM@GRAMM.SENATE.GOV)  
 Kay Bailey Hutchison [SENATOR@HUTCHISON.SENATE.GOV](mailto:SENATOR@HUTCHISON.SENATE.GOV)

### Important Dates to Remember

29 Sept 2001 SLEC Meeting, Pflugerville

### State Officers

Chair:  
 Geoff Neale (512) 263-1681 home  
 12903 Grubstake Gulch (512) 290-0743 work  
 Austin, TX 78738 LIBER8OR@TEXAS.NET  
 Vice Chair:  
 Clyde Garland (979) 779-1775  
 3100 Rolling Glen CLYDEGARLA@AOL.COM  
 Bryan, TX 77807-3209  
 Secretary:  
 Stephanie Berlin (210) 603-5743  
 PO Box 4908  
 College Station, TX 77844-4908

AGGIELIBERTARIAN@HOTMAIL.COM

### Treasurer:

Bob Lockhart (713) 473-6284 home  
 PO Box 1398 (713) 475-0092 business  
 Pasadena, TX 77501-1398 BOBLOCK@FLASH.NET

### Standing Committees

#### Campaigns and Elections:

George Schwappach (915) 691-1776 home  
 8313 Saddle Creek Rd. (915) 698-3405 work  
 Abilene, TX 79602-5454 (915) 691-1943 fax  
 GEORGES@ABILENE.COM

#### Database:

Richard Walker (409) 866-2100  
 840 Lockwood Dr. WALKERRE@SWBELL.NET  
 Beaumont, TX 77706-5546

#### Finance:

Lance Smith (713) 869-1228 home  
 1010 Euclid (713) 880-1125 work  
 Houston, TX 77009 DOMESTIC@INSYNC.NET

#### Organizing and Outreach:

Christopher Jagge (979) 695-9646  
 PO Box 8064 C\_JAGGE@EMAIL.MSN.COM  
 College Station, TX 77844-8064

#### Publications:

Barbara Cunningham (979) 567-7262  
 301 Porter (979) 567-3313 fax  
 Caldwell, TX 77836-1825 CHARLESB@TCA.NET

#### Publicity and Advertising:

Nancy Neale (512) 263-1681  
 12903 Grubstake Gulch (512) 263-1684 fax  
 Austin, TX 78738 TORCHESS@TEXAS.NET

### SLEC Representatives

**District 4:**  
 Richard E. (Dick) Walker 409-866-2100  
 840 Lockwood WALKERRE@SWBELL.NET  
 Beaumont, TX 77706

**District 5:**  
 Barbara Cunningham 979-567-7262  
 301 S. Porter St. 979-567-3313 fax  
 Caldwell TX 77836-1825 CHARLESB@TCA.NET

Christopher Jagge 979-695-9646 home  
 1601 Brentwood 979-845-9755 work  
 PO Box 8064 C\_JAGGE@EMAIL.MSN.COM  
 College Station, TX 77844-8064

**District 6:**  
 Lance Smith 713-880-1125 home  
 1010 Euclid DOMESTIC@INSYNC.NET  
 Houston, TX 77009

**District 8:**  
 Gordon Mobley 972-527-0914 home  
 1402 Cherokee Trail 972-478-3407 work  
 Plano, TX 75023 MOBLEY1@AIRMAIL.NET

**District 9**  
 David Wallace Coft 214-731-9281  
 3119 Mayfair Dr. DAVID@CROFT.COM  
 Carrollton, TX 75007-3935

David Earney 469-585-0278  
 2801 Denton Tap Rd., #715  
 Lewisville, TX 75067 RES06BME@VERIZON.NET

**District 13:**  
 Peter Elloway 713-529-5208 home  
 PO Box 685  
 1245 W. Pierce (77019)  
 Houston, TX 77001-0685

John Kormylo 713-271-1776

9614 Oregano Circle ELFSOFT@MINDSPRING.COM  
 Houston, TX 77036

**District 14:**  
 Nancy Neale 512-263-1684 home  
 12903 Grubstake Gulch 512-263-1684 fax  
 Austin, TX 78738 512-294-4927 cell  
 TORCHESS@TX.NET

Marianne Robbins 512-989-0288 home  
 900 Broken Feather Trail #373 512-719-7259 work  
 Pflugerville, TX 78660  
 MARIANNESWEB@WEBTV.NET (text only)

MARIANNER@AUSTINSEMICONDUCTOR.COM (for attachments)

**District 16:**  
 Kendall Beerwinkle 214-341-2842 home  
 12032 Midlake MAXBRECHT@TEXOMA.NET  
 Dallas, TX 75218

Marshall Beerwinkle 214-341-2842 home  
 12032 Midlake MAXBRECHT@TEXOMA.NET  
 Dallas, TX 75218

**District 17:**  
 Paul Morris 713-280-8660 home  
 2130 Gemini St. PMORRIS@PDQ.NET  
 Houston, TX 77058-2048

Bill Myers 713-978-7369 home  
 1615 Bering Dr. #1507  
 Houston, TX 77057

**District 19:**  
 Cathy Harrell 830-683-5237 home  
 Route 1, Box 76B JHARR@RICC.NET  
 Mountain Home, TX 78058

James (Jim) E. Harrell 830-683-5237 home  
 Route 1, Box 76B JHARR@RICC.NET  
 Mountain Home, TX 78058

**District 21:**  
 Tom Kane 830-216-4664  
 912 4th Street FREEDOM2@FLASH.NET  
 Floresville, TX 78114-1802

**District 24:**  
 Steve Kirby 915-676-9026 home  
 850 Ross Kirby4Liberty@aol.com  
 Abilene, TX 79605-3237

George Schwappach 915-691-1776 home  
 8318 Saddle Creek Rd. 915-691-1776 work  
 Abilene, TX 79602-5424 915-691-1943 fax  
 GEORGES@SWCONNECT.NET

**District 25:**  
 Ray Jagge 830-931-2018 home  
 PO Box 582 RLJAGGE@hotmail.com  
 Castroville, TX 78009

Patricia Wedel 512-267-1843 home  
 18008 Easy Way CATW\_L1@SPRYNET.COM  
 Jonestown, TX 78645

**District 27:**  
 Mark Ciocheti 956-423-2522  
 609 East Filmore CIOCH@AOL.COM  
 Harlingen, TX 78550

John P. (Jack) McNally 956-423-7345 home  
 1205 East Polk Ave. 888-899-5095 work  
 Harlingen, TX 78550 JACKMC@LIBERTYSHOPPE.COM

**District 30**  
 James Gholston 940-382-1763  
 403 Bryan, #205  
 Denton, TX 76201-3983

JAMESG@DIMENSIONALITY.COM

Continued on page 20

## Around the State

Continued from page 19

Robert West  
1525 Lakeshore Dr.  
Little Elm, TX 75068  
WESTRL@MSN.COM

### County Activities

#### Aransas County:

Walt Hartlove (361) 727-0802  
1919 Hwy 35 N, PMB 326  
Rockport, TX 78382-3344  
ARANSAS@SWBELL.NET

#### Atascosa County:

Edward Elmer (830) 569-6006 night  
1240 W Oaklawn RD, #101  
Pleasanton, TX 78064-4302  
EBEMDPA@FLASH.NET

#### Bastrop County

Gary D. Hicks, Jr. 512-360-4134  
285 Pine Canyon  
Smithville, TX 78957  
BASTROP@LPTXAS.ORG

#### Bell County:

Penny Hendrix (254) 70-9582  
277 Woodland Point Rd.  
Belton, TX 76513-9749  
DIGITALCULTURE@EARTHLINK.NET

#### Bexar County:

Jay Moore 210-824-6242  
4414 Moana Dr.  
San Antonio, TX 78218-1241  
Jeffrey C. Blunt (vice chair) (210) 696-8756  
WWW.TX.LP.ORG/BEXAR  
JCBLUNT@JUNO.COM

Meeting: 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday, 7:00 PM, Unlimited Thought Bookstore, 5525 Blanco, Ste 107

#### Brazoria County:

Royce Mitchell Jr. RMITCHEL@FLASH.NET  
10231 Hanselman Rd.  
Manvel, TX 77578  
Information: GHARPER@COMPUTRON.NET  
Meeting: 2<sup>nd</sup> Tuesday, 7:00 PM, Golden Corral, Hwy 388  
Business, Angleton, TX

#### Brazos County:

Christopher Jagge (979) 695-9646  
PO Box 8064  
College Station, TX 77844-8064  
C\_JAGGE@EMAIL.MSN.COM  
WWW.BRAZOSLP.ORG

#### Brewster County:

Leo "Doc" Ofenstein (915) 837-5186 day  
601 N 7<sup>th</sup> St. (915) 837-1192 night  
Alpine, TX 79830-3515  
LEO@SCRCORP.COM

#### Burleson County:

Barbara Cunningham (979) 567-7262  
301 S Porter St. (979) 567-3313 fax  
Caldwell, TX 77836-1825  
CHARLESB@TCA.NET

#### Burnet County:

Ben J. Jones (830) 798-9051 night  
400 Parr Ave.  
Marble Falls, TX 78654  
CJONES@TSTAR.NET

#### Cameron County:

Jack McNally (210) 423-6030 day  
1205 E Polk St (956) 425-5064 night  
Harlingen, TX 78550-7223 (210) 423-7345 fax  
JACKMC@LIBERTYSHOPPE.COM (888) 899-5095  
Meeting: Once a month in Harlingen. Call (956) 423-7345 for the time and place.

#### Collin County:

Gordon E. Mobley (972) 527-0914  
1402 Cherokee Trail  
Plano, TX 75023  
MOBLEY1@AIRMAIL.NET  
party email: LPCCTX@YAHOO.COM  
WWW.GEOCITIES.COM/LPCCTX  
Meeting: 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday, Colter's BBQ, 921 N. Central Expressway (Collin Creek Mall)

#### Cooke County:

Matthew Murrell (940) 665-7528  
1302 Hillcrest Blvd.  
Gainesville, TX 76240  
MATTHEWMURRELL@HOTMAIL.COM

#### Crosby County:

Greg Fisher (806) 749-2010 Lubbock  
HCR 1, Box 12 (806) 263-4522 home  
Post, TX 79356 MEDAGGF@TTUHSC.EDU  
Meeting: Last Thursday, 7:00 PM; Llano Masked Rider Room Texas Tech University Center, 15<sup>th</sup> Street and Akron Ave., Lubbock, TX. *Campus Libertarians*, 1114 Ave. Q, Lubbock, TX 79401

#### Dallas County:

William B (Bill) Bunch  
6231 McCommas wbbunch@yahoo.com  
Dallas, TX 75214-3033  
LPDALLAS.ORG INFO@LPDALLAS.ORG  
Meeting: 2<sup>nd</sup> Thursday, Al's Pizzeria, 3701 W. Northwest Highway, Dallas, TX  
Activities and changes are posted on the website. Weekly public affairs program on the Dallas Community Television: "America - Outside the Beltway"

#### Dawson County:

James D. Mitchell (806) 872-5092 day  
PO Box 969 (806) 872-6017 night  
Lamesa, TX 79331-0969  
JAMESM@MAIL.PICS.NET

#### De Witt County:

Jeanie Blalock (361) 275-3275  
611 MacArthur St.  
Cuero, TX 77954-3128

#### Denton County:

James Gholston JAMESG@DIMENSIONALITY.COM  
403 Bryan, #205  
Denton, TX 76201

#### Fisher County:

Meetings: 2nd Monday, 7:30 PM, Farolito's Mexican Restaurant, 209 Cotton Wood, Abilene, TX (concurrently with Taylor County)

#### Fort Bend County:

Kevin Foto (281) 277-5886 day  
16338 Maple Downs Ln. (281) 879-2123 night  
Sugar Land, TX 77478-7101  
ALPINE@WT.NET

#### Galveston County:

Randall H. Waibel (281) 224-4098 day  
1902 Dove Ct. (281) 996-0527 night  
Friendswood, TX 77546-5884  
PSAMO@NETZERO.NET

#### Gregg County:

Judy Dailey 903-297-4475  
19 Rockwell mDAILEY@JUNO.COM  
Longview, TX 75604

#### Hamilton County Contact:

Tony Lee Belding TLBELDING@HTCOMP.NET  
PO Box 512  
Hamilton, TX 76531-0512

#### Harris County:

Laura Coker-Garcia (713) 271-1776  
9835 Sagedowne Ln. (281) 997-8141 home  
Houston, TX 77089-3517  
LIBERTY@NEOSOFT.COM WWW.TX.LP.ORG/HARRIS  
Meetings: Harris County LP Business Meeting, 1<sup>st</sup> Thursday 9614 Oregano Circle, Houston, TX; San Jacinto Supper Club, 3<sup>rd</sup> Thursday, 7:00 PM, Chan's Restaurant, Fairmont Pkwy @ Burke, Pasadena, TX; *Second Thursday Supper Club*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Thursday, 7:00 PM, Pappas Bar-B-Q, 7007 Hwy 59 South, Houston, TX

#### Hays County:

Ron Neal (512) 295-6817  
312 Windy Hollow Lane

Kyle, TX 78640-9271

#### Hidalgo County:

Dr. Donald L. Hall (956) 686-6616 home  
112 West Lex Ave.  
McAllen, TX 78504  
BHALL10113@AOL.COM

#### Hopkins County:

Warren (Hank) Vine (903) 866-3813  
Route 1, Box 262  
Sulphur Springs, TX 75482  
4-PINES@1STARNET.COM  
Information: HOPCO-LP@1STARNET.COM

#### Houston County:

James M. Lassiter (409) 636-2427 night  
PO Box 445  
LASSITER@LCC.NET  
Lovelady, TX 75851-0445

#### Hunt County:

Donald Lee Holloway (903) 356-4350 night  
PO Box 1382  
Quinlan, TX 75474-1382

#### Hutchinson County:

Cliff Collard (806) 866-4471 day  
PO Box 626 (806) 273-6345 night  
Berger, TX 79008-0626  
CCOLL79007@AOL.COM

#### Jefferson County:

Virginia G. Walker (409) 866-2100  
840 Lockwood Dr.  
Beaumont, TX 77706-5546  
WALKERRE@SWBELL.NET  
Meeting: 2<sup>nd</sup> Tuesday, 6:30 PM, Golden Corral Restaurant, 4145 College Street, Beaumont, TX

#### Jones County:

Lila Roberts (915) 672-7951  
40 Poverty Point Circle  
Abilene, TX 79601-8427  
Meetings: 2nd Monday, 7:30 PM, Farolito's Mexican Restaurant, 209 Cotton Wood, Abilene, TX (concurrently with Taylor County)

#### Kendall County:

Lawrence Ciano (210) 816-2140 night  
108 Ranger Ave.  
Boerne, TX 78006-8916

#### Kerr County:

Kelly Scott (830) 367-5021 home  
PO Box 291803 (830) 896-6464 work  
Kerrville, TX 78029-1803  
ELPATRON@MAVERICKBBS.COM

#### Kleberg County:

Frank Mullen (512) 595-7727  
525 E. Huische Ave.  
Kingsville, TX 78363-5644  
MULLENA@INTCOMM.NET

#### Liberty County:

Charles Wiggins 409-336-6956  
P. O. Box 3070  
Liberty, TX 77575  
CLETUS80@SWBELL.NET

#### Lubbock County:

David DeLamar (806) 795-6961 day  
PO Box 98131 (806) 795-5216 fax  
Lubbock, TX 79499-813  
(806) 773-6382 cell  
THINK@DOOR.NET

Meeting: Last Thursday every month, Texas Tech University Center, 7 P.M.

#### Madison County:

Lili Lyddon (936) 399-5000  
18696 Hwy 21 W  
North Zulch, TX 77872-7056  
LILI@TXCYBER.COM

#### McLennan County:

Vince Hanke (254) 776-1695, ext. 15  
PO Box 20667 (254) 751-1163 night  
Waco, TX 76702-0667  
VINCEBOOM@AOL.COM

#### Medina County:

Jean Kutzer 830-931-3871  
209 South County Road 5603  
Castroville, TX 78009

## Around the State

*Continued from page 20*

### Milam County: Contact

Casey Stanislaw (254) 605-0380 work  
PO Box 793 (254) 602-2060 mobile  
Cameron, TX 76520-0793

CSTANISLAW@EARTHLINK.NET

### Montgomery County:

Ron B. Hard 281-363-9211

24403 Pine Canyon Dr.  
Spring, TX 77380

ELLYHARD@EMAIL.MSN.COM

WWW.MAIN.COM/~MRBEAR/LIBERTAR.HTM

### Motley County:

Warner Sailsbury 806-348-7275

P. O. Box 58 SCRUBIT@CAPROCK-SPUR.COM  
Roaring Springs, TX, 79256

### Nacogdoches County:

Joe Allport (936) 569-8832 night

PO Box 632873 ALLPROPATRIA@HOTMAIL.COM

Nacogdoches, TX 75963-2873

WWW.TX.LP.ORG/NACOGDOCHES/INDEX.HTML

Meeting: 2<sup>nd</sup> Wednesday, 7:00 PM, Dr. Brad Wilson's of-  
fice, 1602 E Starr #100

### Navarro County:

Tommy Hart (903) 874-1387 home

1060 Oak Valley Lane (903) 872-4849 work

Corsicana, TX 75110 BREHART1@AIRMAIL.NET

### Nolan County:

Meets concurrently with Taylor County, Contact George Schwappach for information, GEORGES@ABILENE.COM, Meetings: 2<sup>nd</sup> Monday, 7:30 PM, Farolito's Mexican Restaurant, 209 Cotton Wood, Abilene, TX (concurrently with Taylor County)

### Nueces County:

Robert Powell (361) 850-9601 night

4622 Grand Lake Dr. REP@CIRRISS.NET

Corpus Christi, TX 78413-5246

Meeting: Thursday, 5:30 PM, Town and Country Restau-  
rant, Alameda/Everhart intersection

### Orange County:

David Constant (409) 822-0349

2913 Fairway Dr. (409) 882-0409 fax

Orange, TX 77630 CONSTANT@INTB.NET

### Palo Pinto County:

Lance Bailey (940) 325-8221 x 111 day

221 Country Club Parkway (940) 325-6079 night

Mineral Wells, TX 76067-8309

BAILEY@SEAMUX.COM

Meeting: 1<sup>st</sup> Tuesday

### Parker County: Contact:

Raymond Ford (940) 682-3308

315 Howard Rd.

Weatherford, TX 76088 FORD5@AIRMAIL.NET

### Parmer County: Contact:

Helen Precure (806) 965-2981

RR 1, Box 560

Muleshoe, TX 77347-9633

### Polk County:

Kris Overstreet (409) 685-2028 work

Rt. 14, Box 5560 (409) 685-4992 home

Livingston, TX 77351 REDNECK@DETNET.COM

### Randall County:

David K. Kelley (806) 355-1934 night

4404 Summit Cir.

Amarillo, TX 79109-5322

Meeting: Sunday 8:00 PM, irregular schedule. Call for in-  
formation

### Real County:

Letha L. Dulaney

LETHA@HCTC.NET

PO Box 221 (Live Oak Street)

Leakey, TX 78873

### Robertson County:

J. R. Prestidge

PO Box 40

Wheelock, TX 77882-0040

(409) 828-3398

THEHAVEN@TXYBER.COM

### Rockwall County:

Chuck Hampton

6806 Chimneywood Circle

Rowlett, TX 75089

(972) 412-4020 home

(214) 638-1301 work

YOU CRAZY KIDS@AOL.COM

### Sabine County:

John F. Ivy

HC 52 Box 553

Hemphill, TX 75948-9620

(409) 579-2034

(409) 579-2117 fax

### San Patricio County:

Terrance Stewart

1367 Oak Park Dr.

Aransas Pass, TX 78336-3207

(512) 758-5546

TCS\_VERMIN@HOTMAIL.COM

### San Saba County:

Marvin Foster

HC: 12, Box 105

Cherokee, TX 76803-9704

(915) 622-4572

JOAQUIN@CENTEX.NET

### Tarrant County:

Larry Nickerson

6055 Monte Vista Ln., #914

Ft. Worth, TX 76132

PO Box 953

Fort Worth, TX 76101-0953

*Tarrant County Libertarian News* PO Box 953, Ft. Worth,

TX 76101, (817) 329-5014 or (817) 370-0941

Meeting: 2<sup>nd</sup> Thursday, 7:00 PM

### Taylor County:

George Schwappach

8318 Saddle Creek Rd.

Abilene, TX 79602-5454

Meetings: 2<sup>nd</sup> Monday, 7:30 PM, Farolito's Mexican Res-  
taurant, 209 Cotton Wood, Abilene, TX

(915) 698-3405 work

(915) 691-1943 fax

GEORGES@ABILENE.COM

### Tom Green County:

Michael Brady

1921 Walnut St.

San Angelo, TX 76901

HTTP://MEMBERS.TRIPOD.COM/~TGCLP

Meeting: 1<sup>st</sup> Tuesday, 7:30 PM, Cheddar's Casual Cafe,  
1309 Knickerbocker Rd., San Angelo, TX

(915) 942-5636

WTGADFLY@CS.COM

### Travis County:

C. David Eagle

PO Box 49854

Austin, TX 78765-0854

WWW.AUSTINLIBERTY.ORG

*Austin Libertarian* WESLIBERTY@AOL.COM

Meetings: 1<sup>st</sup> Tuesday, 6:45 PM, Old Quarry Library, 7501

Village Center Drive, business meeting;

3<sup>rd</sup> Sunday, 4:00 to 6:00 PM, boardroom of the LCRA

Hancock Bldg., 3700 Lake Austin Blvd., outreach

Radio: KOOP 90.7 FM, "The Liberated Space", Thurs-

day, 6:30 PM

Television: Cable Channel 10: "Live and Let Live", Satur-

day, 8:00 PM, "Smash the State", Saturday, 9:00 PM; Cable

Channel 16: "LP TV," Sunday, 1:00 PM

See Website for continuing schedule of events

(512) 671-3765

MINGOVIA@WT.NET

### Upshur County:

Stanley Vance Lowry

707 Madelaine Dr.

Gilmer, TX 75644-3146

MACMAN@FLASH.NET

### Val Verde County:

Karl Bollmann, III

PO Box 421715

Del Rio, TX 78842-1715

(830) 775-7851

RCASS@DELRIO.COM

### Van Zandt County:

Gene Johnson, Sr.

RR4, Box 184B

Wills Point, TX 75169-9793

(930) 896-1654

### Victoria County:

Tim Purcell

PO Box 1174

Victoria, TX 77905

(512) 573-1885

DREAM3@WEBTV.NET

### Wichita County:

Mark Rippetoe

3000 Kemp Blvd.

Wichita Falls, TX 76308-1019

(817) 696-0829 day

(817) 592-2277 night

TORSHAMMAR@AOL.COM

### Williamson County:

David Carter

1108 Green Downs Dr.

Round Rock, TX 78664

DCARTER@IO.COM

### Wilson County:

Tom Kane

912 4<sup>th</sup> St.

Floresville, TX 78114-1802

(830) 216-4664 night

FREEDOM2@FLASH.NET

### Winkler County:

Steve Grupe

1055 S. Poplar St.

Kermit, TX 79745-5010

(915) 586-6018 night

(915) 661-1758 mobile

GRUPE@ULTRAVISION.NET

### Young County:

Grant Goble

1217 Texas St.

Graham, TX 76450

(940) 549-8945 home

(940) 549-5701 work

GLGOBLE@DIGITALPASSAGE.COM

Ad space \$5/column inch.

Other options available.

Call (979) 567-7262 for information

**LIBERTARIAN PARTY OF TEXAS**

**COUNTY UPDATE**

COUNTY:

---

CHAIR:

---

MAILING ADDRESS:

---

---

TELEPHONE NUMBER(S):

---

---

---

EMAIL ADDRESS:

---

---

WEB PAGE:

---

MEETING INFORMATION:

---

DATE/DAY:

---

LOCATION:

---

---

---

COMMENTS:

---

---

---

Return to: Clyde L. Garland  
3100 Rolling Glen  
Bryan, TX 77807-3209  
(979) 779-1775  
(979) 779-1775 fax  
CLYDEGARLA@AOL.COM

# Activist Registration

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

County \_\_\_\_\_

Phone \_\_\_\_\_

Fax \_\_\_\_\_

Email \_\_\_\_\_

Candidate \_\_\_\_\_

Office \_\_\_\_\_

Qualifications \_\_\_\_\_

Volunteer \_\_\_\_\_

Hours/Week \_\_\_\_\_

Skills \_\_\_\_\_

Comments \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Return to George Schwappach  
8318 Saddle Creek Rd.  
Abilene, TX 79602  
915-698-3405  
915-690-1943 fax  
GEORGES@ABILENE.COM



Non-Profit Org.  
U. S. Postage  
**Paid**  
Permit No. 06478  
Houston, Texas

Address Service Requested

## I Want to Join the Libertarian Party



- \$25 Basic LP membership (includes *LP News & Lone Star Liberty*)
- \$50 Sustaining LP membership (above plus Texas' *Insider's Report* and above)
- Check enclosed, total amount \_\_\_\_\_ (payable to "Libertarian Party") or
- I would like to charge my MC/Visa # \_\_\_\_\_ Exp \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

Phone #(s) &/or E-mail \_\_\_\_\_

Occupation & Employer \_\_\_\_\_

(Optional, Federal Election Commission requires we ask)

Send this form to:  
Libertarian Party  
2600 Virginia Ave., NW, Ste 100  
Washington, DC 20037

I hereby certify that I do not believe in or advocate the initiation of force as a means of achieving political or social goals.

(Signing the oath is required for national membership)

Signature \_\_\_\_\_