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LP CONTRIBUTIONS FOR JANUARY

- Direct Mail: 19.02%
- Memberships: 25.20%
- Miscellaneous Contributions: 5.75%
- Sales: 1.11%
- Monthly Pledges: 8.98%
- Telephone Fundraising: 39.94%

Total = $37,203.01

LP Contributions For February

- Direct Mail: 9.37%
- Memberships: 38.76%
- Miscellaneous Contributions: 6.56%
- Sales: 2.89%
- Monthly Pledges: 15.56%
- Telephone Fundraising: 26.86%

Total = $34,328.59

Lots of news this month and not much room, so I'll be brief:

The DG is up and running and so are we – better organized than ever.

Our database has been cleaned and now more than ever is synchronized with our telephone solicitor’s database – we have flagged thousands of records pertaining to our telephone fundraising effort.

With our database stored in both the DG and the Mac, we're much safer against computer failure than we were.

We've installed a media list on the Mac, and so far have over 700 key media outlets targeted for press releases; the top 100 (TV, radio and newspaper networks) have already received the latest issue of LP NEWS -- and congratulations to Karl Hess and his staff at Lysander Inc. for a great issue!

We've received alot of good clippings this month on libertarians here and abroad -- even Time magazine used the L word.

You'll find enclosed in this packet a tentative schedule of the announced candidates for LP nomination, provided by Mr. Mike Holmes of American Libertarian. Thank you Mr. Holmes.
Libertarian to Address Convention

SOUTH BURLINGTON — Dr. Ron Paul, a four-term Republican U.S. representative from Texas, will be featured speaker at the 1987 Vermont Libertarian Party Convention May 2.

In his eight years in Washington, Paul was an outspoken advocate of “sound” money, the free market and personal liberties.

In 1982, the “Almanac of American Politics” described him as “perhaps the member of the House most inclined to the Libertarian philosophy.”

Paul will address a luncheon meeting at the Libertarian state convention at the Windjammer Conference Center in South Burlington.

Herald/Rutland, VT

Ex-GOP legislator to seek Libertarian nod for presidency

Ron Paul, the former Republican congressman from Lake Jackson, plans to seek the presidential nomination of the Libertarian Party.

Paul, 51, an outspoken obstetrician who says he enjoys being called right-wing, quit the House of Representatives in 1984 to run for the Republican nomination for the U.S. Senate. He ran a distant second, getting 16.4 percent. Paul Gramm won the primary without a runoff and also won the general election.

“About a month or so ago, I resigned from the Republican Party — mainly out of total disillusionment with the Reagan attempt to cut anything,” Paul said in an interview. Despite President Reagan’s promise to balance the budget, “In the first six years, the deficit turned out to be greater than all the others put together.”

Paul said that Reagan had been the great hope of those seeking sound fiscal policy.

“From now on it’s downhill all the way,” Paul said. “Two years from now, we’re going to have someone like (Vice President George) Bush running against (former Democratic U.S. Sen.) Gary Hart of Colorado.”

After he dropped out of the Republican Party, Paul said, Libertarians approached him to pick up their banners. With the exception of his adamant opposition to abortion, Paul fits the Libertarian mold on most issues.

He’s definitely sour on Republicans.

“I want to totally dissociate myself from the policies that have given us unprecedented deficits, massive monetary inflation, indiscriminate military spending, an irrational and unconstitutional foreign policy, zoning foreign aid, the exaltation of international banking, and the attack on our personal liberties and privacy,” Paul said at a press conference Wednesday in Houston.

During his three terms and part of a fourth as a congressman for the 22nd District, Southwest Houston and Fort Bend and Brazoria counties, Paul became known for his opposition to many things other Republicans embraced.

He said the country should return to the gold standard for its money, for instance, and that federal policies toward banks and other big business interests are “welfare for the rich.”

He opposed some favorite Republican military hardware items, like the B-1 bomber and the MX missile, and indicated that Americans should cut out all foreign aid, military and otherwise.

He also opposed government’s enforcing personal morality.

“I think the principle of nonaggression and not initiating violence against somebody is a good one,” Paul said. “You shouldn’t be put in jail for doing something silly to yourself that doesn’t hurt somebody else.”

Paul said he has financial commitments approaching $50,000, He financed much of his races for Congress with contributions from right-wing political newsletter subscribers. That fact also gives him a ready base and some notoriety around the nation.

Though the Libertarians have yet to scratch deeply in races outside California, their effort in 1988 will be helped somewhat by the fact that they have already qualified for ballots in some states, including Texas. By virtue of having some candidates who got more than 5 percent of the vote in 1986 against otherwise uncontested Democratic nominees, the Libertarians gained automatic ballot status for 1988.

Paul said the only other person who has indicated an interest in the Libertarian nomination is Jesse Ventura, the Minnesota governor who said he would have run in 1988 but for the party’s presidential ticket being decided at its convention in Seattle in September.

Indian activist to run as Libertarian for presidency

MILLBRAE (AP) — Longtime American Indian Movement activist Russell Means has announced he is seeking the Libertarian Party nomination for president.

Apparling at the California Libertarian Party convention in Millbrae on Saturday, Means said his political platform will be based on civil liberties.

“I now realize that all Americans, not just Indians, desper-ately need to regain control of their own lives,” said the Sioux Indian who has acted as the spokesman for the American Indian Movement since shortly after its inception in 1968. The organization is now known as the Dakota American Indian Movement.

Means gained national attention through the group and its campaign to end racism against Indians.

The movement's most visible effort was a takeover in 1973 of a site in the small town of Wounded Knee on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota to protest government policies toward the Indian. Means and Dennis Banks led the violent siege in which two Indians were killed and one federal marshal was seriously injured.

Means was born on the Pine Ridge reservation but grew up in a suburb of Oakland.

"By running for president, I hope to show all Americans that the failure of socialism which former Secretary of Interior James Watt once pointed to on Indian reservations is a universal problem and that voting Libertarian is a very important way for people of all races to say 'We've had enough. Give us back our freedom,"” Means said.

He leaves California on Monday to travel to Michigan and Arizona, where he will work to ease state requirements for Libertarian party candidates to appear on election ballots. Means said he will set up his national campaign headquarters in Denver.

Means became involved with the Libertarian Party in 1983. He officially joined a week ago in Austin, Texas.

Evening Outlook/Los Angeles Co.
We're a third party!
The League of Women Voters claims it should be in charge of the presidential debates, among other reasons, its ability to "deal with third-party candidates" [Sponsorship of '88 presidential debates debated," Feb. 20].

In 1980, the Libertarian Party (LP) candidate, Ed Clark, finished fourth, with 1 million votes, but was denied participation in the LWV debate. Then, in 1984, when the LP's David Bergland finished third nationwide, he was similarly rejected. In an age when the choices between the major-party candidates are minuscule, it would be a real benefit to the voters to hear from third-party candidates. Unfortunately, the LWV is not prepared to expand their inclusion in the presidential debates.

David K. Walker
The Libertarian Party
Houston

Christian Science Monitor/Boston, MA

Libertarian candidates propose housing policy

American-Statesman/Austin, TX
By Robert Cullick
American-Statesman Staff

Two candidates for the Austin City Council on Wednesday announced a plan to provide affordable housing through voluntary contributions to a housing subsidy fund and by relaxing or repealing zoning laws.

Gary Johnson, who is running against Sally Shipman, and Fred Ebner, one of several people running against George Humphrey, held a press conference to explain their opposition to last Saturday's affordable housing bond election, which failed.

Johnson and Ebner are proponents of libertarianism, a political philosophy that stresses individual freedom and opposes government intervention.

"Some supporters of the bond wanted you to believe that the opponents were only against housing for the poor and had no plan of their own," Ebner said. "Do not be deceived. We have had a plan all along. They just were not listening." Johnson and Ebner said the city on utility bills should provide a dollar in their utility payment to subsidize housing for the poor. The bills were not specific on how the money would be spent, but said it could be used to subsidize rents for existing low-income tenants.

The city now collects about $60,000 a year in its "Plus One" program. Utility customers dedicate an extra dollar in their payments to help pay electric bills for the needy.

If the city collected a like amount for housing, it could serve fewer than 35 families a year, assuming the average needy family required a subsidy of $150 a month beyond what it could pay to meet the average cost of a two-bedroom apartment.

The Travis County Housing Authority has 2,000 people on its waiting list for subsidized housing. The Austin Housing Authority has 500 people on its list, for waiting for one of 1,200 units.

Johnson and Ebner also described an eight-point strategy to lower housing costs. "To make housing more affordable, part of the solution is to streamline and repeal the city policies that make Austin housing unaffordable," Johnson said.

The city should "let the marketplace determine densities," he said. Density — the minimum size of home lots — is set by the zoning ordinance for every parcel in the city.

Johnson said low density housing should be required only to protect underground water supplies, not "for the purpose of keeping neighborhoods at a certain level of housing."

"What we would like to see is the housing consumer have free choice," Ebner said.

Ebner advocated repealing the city zoning ordinance. Johnson said he would said he would set a less restrictive policy in dealing with zoning cases and with neighborhood groups who want to retain restrictive zoning in their area.

"You only have a right to control your own property. You do not have the right to control your neighbor's property," Ebner said.

"You didn't invest your money in it." He said zoning regulations are made "by a small group of elitist political activists who make the decisions for consumers."
306 Solutions to a Baffling Problem

A new book presents an intriguing scenario for the future

Since a solution to South Africa's grinding racial conflict seems to be beyond grasp, how about 306 solutions? That is exactly the suggestion made in a best-selling book that has raised a new controversy—and won some surprising backers—throughout the country. The book, South Africa: The Solution, proposes a Swiss-style confederation that would include a weak central government and 306 local bodies that could choose their own economic and social systems. Black radicals could set up Marxist cantons if they wished, and Afrikaner right-wingers could have their all-white enclaves. Everyone else could choose various systems somewhere between the extremes.

Sales of the book, in English and Afrikaans, have topped 25,000 and kept it on the nonfiction best-seller list for a year, a huge success in a country where nonfiction books usually sell no more than 5,000 copies. Husband-and-Wife Authors Leon Louw and Frances Kendall say they decided to write the book because those who oppose the apartheid system “know what they are against but need something to be for.” Says Louw: “The struggle in this country is over who should dominate whom—that is, who controls the very powerful central government. Our solution entails not having such a central government. We want to make it possible to let the tiger—the black majority—out of the cage without whites being eaten.”

Louw, a lawyer who heads South Africa’s Free Market Foundation, and Kendall, editor of a conservative newsletter, offer a libertarian plan that favors the least possible government and the freest possible enterprise. They point out, however, that their own preferences need not be accepted, since the cantonal system would allow residents of each local unit to select by vote the system they prefer. “All the existing political parties and movements would be likely to come to power somewhere,” Louw says. “Then we’ll be able to see what works.”

At the top level of government, the authors propose a two-house parliament based on proportional representation of the political parties in the cantons. The central government’s power would be limited strictly to essential national interests, such as the conduct of defense, national finance and foreign relations. Both houses, Louw and Kendall assume, would have a black majority. So too would almost all the cantons.

The cantons, the book suggests, should be the 306 magisterial districts that already exist in South Africa. Each canton would have its own parliament and possibly its own constitution. Every level of government would be barred from passing laws that discriminate on racial grounds and would be required to apply all laws equally to all races. “In other words,” write the authors, “government would be color-blind.”

In a more controversial passage, The Solution suggests that “all citizens would have the right to integrate or segregate voluntarily at their own expense.” While no laws imposing segregation would be constitutional, neither would any that forced integration. Thus private firms would be free to discriminate. For economic reasons, however, the authors believe very few firms would refuse to deal with or serve blacks.

Anticipating worries that the plan would result in a few rich white cantons and many poor black ones, the book observes that there would be free movement of people, goods and capital among the cantons. “What people probably think is that the whites would take over Johannesburg and the gold mines around it,” says Kendall. “No, that could not happen. There are so many black workers here that Johannesburg would have a black majority.” Louw adds, “It would be an unambiguous handover of the rich areas to blacks. The only places there could be all-white cantons would be in sparsely populated rural areas.”

The book’s proposals have received wide support among South African blacks. Winnie Mandela, wife of the imprisoned black nationalist leader, in a foreword to the Swedish edition of the book, says it offers a “broad alternative we have all been looking for.” Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi, chief minister of KwaZulu, rarely agrees with Mandela, but he also likes the idea. Says he: “Amid a sea of anger and tension, The Solution may prove to be a rational, workable answer to South Africa’s unique problems.”

Most South African whites are less enthusiastic but are nonetheless intrigued by the proposal. Eli Louw (no kin), the Minister of Transport, has called the book “worthwhile reading for those dealing with the future of our country.” Hendrik Verwoerd, son of the late Prime Minister who institutionalized the apartheid system and himself a leading right-winger, said that while he did not accept the canton system as proposed, the book “provided an important contribution in breaking away from the dangerous unitary state philosophy into a direction which will open eyes to other possibilities.”

The Solution has become something of a cause célèbre. With funding from several major companies, including the giant Anglo American Corp., the authors have set up Groundswell, a political-action movement. Groundswell hopes to raise $15 million for a two-year program of lectures, seminars, television and newspaper advertising. The book will be translated into eight African languages, and a U.S. edition will be published in May. Louw and Kendall candidly admit they do not expect the white-dominated government to embrace their proposals. Instead they put their faith in creating a grass-roots demand for change. “If we can get the crowd moving in the right direction,” Louw says, “the politicians will have no choice but to get out in front of it.” Even if it does not turn out precisely that way, the authors’ solution and their readers’ eager response to it demonstrate that not all South Africans are waiting numbly for chaos to sweep away the past and dictate the future.