

May 1992



LIBERTY PLEDGE NEWSLETTER

Published exclusively for members of the Libertarian Party's Monthly Pledge Program

Home stretch for 50-state ballot status New York, Missouri Laws eased.

We have entered the final "cash crunch" countdown to achieving ballot status for the Libertarian presidential ticket in all 50 states and the District of Columbia for the upcoming election. We are now in a race against time, hoping the contributions will come in faster than the expenditures come due.

We are pushing forward in all states where we are legally allowed to start petitioning. Last week Indiana and North Carolina were finally officially certified. We are now certified in twenty-six states. In fifteen states petition drives are still in progress, five states have only paperwork left to complete, and in four states (plus D.C.) petitioning cannot legally begin until later this summer.

The deadline of August 18th for our last "tough" ballot access challenge, New York, is less than three months away. New York Governor Mario Cuomo recently signed into law a bill reducing the valid signatures required from 20,000 to 15,000. This eases the pressure somewhat, but due to other arcane requirements, including a very tight time window for collection of signatures, New York remains one of our toughest drives.

A bill reducing restrictions in Missouri,

another tough state, has passed the legislature, thanks to super lobbying efforts by Libertarian Ken Bush. The good news is it is expected to be signed into law soon. The bad news is it will not take effect until next year.

In accordance with our budget projections, the \$64,000 cushion we began the year with has been spent. Your generous contributions have helped us get this close to full ballot status, and we continue to rely heavily on our pledge program to fund ongoing expenses. But pledge income alone won't be enough to complete the effort in all 50 states -- ANY additional contribution or increase of your pledge sent in NOW could well make all the difference!

Hot off the presses: Ballot Access T-shirts will be made available to petitioners and fundraisers who make significant contributions to our telephone fundraising efforts. Since many pledgers do not receive calls from us, we would like to make you a special offer as well. If you double your pledge today, you will receive your own commemorative one-size-fits-all "Ballot Blues Band 1992 Signature Tour T-Shirt". Just return your address slip in the enclosed envelope, with a note authorizing your pledge increase and requesting your T-shirt.

LIBERTARIAN PARTY NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

1528 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E. • Washington, D.C. 20003 • (202) 543-1988

JOSEPH SOBRAN

What is the purpose of government? I will tell you.

The purpose of government is to protect us from violence and fraud. And to ensure peace, not only here but around the world. And to manage the economy, promoting prosperity and full employment. And to abolish poverty. And to redress historical injustices. And to see to it that everyone is educated, preferably college-educated. And to make sure we don't ingest harmful substances. And to guarantee fair compensation for farmers and laborers. And to provide assistance for artists. And to care for the homeless. And to preserve the environment. And to guarantee safe working conditions. And to protect minorities from discrimination. And to manage parks and forests. And to foster scientific research. And to build streets and highways. And to subsidize small businesses. And to send people into outer space.

Joseph Sobran, critic-at-large for National Review, is a nationally syndicated columnist.

Freedom . . . with reservations

We are now living under exactly the sort of government the Constitution was designed to prevent: sheer amorphous power that can be put to any use by those who have the guns.

In short, anything and everything is the government's proper concern. Just the other day, for example, armed FBI agents raided five Indian reservations in Arizona to crack down on gambling. Thank heaven for the FBI. One of our government's many purposes — somehow I forgot

to include it in my list — is to protect us from Indian gamblers. Our astronauts will sleep better tonight.

I happened to be chatting yesterday with a young Italian immigrant who was amused at our national habit of singing that we are "the land of the free." He asked smilingly: "Where do they think I came from? Slavery? I was freer in Italy than I am here."

He is trying to start a small business here to support his American wife and two children. I wished him luck, but advised him to hold onto his Italian citizenship. He may want to reclaim his freedom some day.

No, America is not about to get a strong man with a funny mustache and soldiers goose-stepping in the streets. But there are other forms of tyranny, short of the bloody totalitarian versions. The essence of tyranny is government without carefully defined powers, powers whose limits can be invoked by citizens under the law. When the government can as-

sume any powers it pleases, that's tyranny.

We qualify. Alexis de Tocqueville visited this country in the 1830s and marveled at our freedom. Americans could launch their own enterprises of all kinds — businesses, charities, fraternal organizations, even religions — without permission from the state. Europeans could only envy us.

But Tocqueville wondered whether this happy condition could last. He forecast that democracy would devolve into bureaucracy, and we'd wind up with a "mild but extensive" sort of tyranny, "without tortures or terrors," but strong enough to control an essentially timid populace. That prediction was made long before anyone had heard of the FBI, IRS, CIA, HHS, HUD, DOE, DOT, FDA, EPA, OSHA, and a hundred other acronyms of unconstitutional power.

Land of the free? Home of the brave? Come now. Why must we be-

gin every ballgame with a sick joke set to awful music?

Just where does the government get the authority to invade private property and seize gambling equipment? It would take an ingenious logician to deduce that power from anything in the Constitution. But nobody really pretends it comes from the Constitution. The government just assumes any powers it pleases. Sometimes people scream in outrage, as the Indians are screaming now in Arizona. More often, they quietly submit, no questions asked.

The Constitution says plainly, in the Ninth Amendment, that we have many rights that aren't listed in the Constitution itself. But most abuses of power aren't direct violations of our rights. They are unwarranted assumptions of powers not assigned to the government. And the 10th Amendment says, just as plainly, that the powers not conferred on the federal government are reserved to the states and the people.

We are now living under exactly the sort of government the Constitution was designed to prevent: sheer amorphous power that can be put to any use by those who have the guns. And now, in their disgust with their own government, an amazing number of Americans are eager to invest dictatorial power in an American Crassus, a billionaire who regards the Constitution as an inconvenience. Crass indeed.

Americans who still remember their authentic tradition are known as "libertarians," and the media treat them as an odd splinter group. But it's worth noting that the Libertarian Party was the only party that rallied to the Indians' defense in Arizona. The Libertarians don't have much money, and they may not get even a million votes this fall, but they have a near monopoly of political principle.

If America can still produce a few such people, all is not lost. Maybe we should give libertarians a reservation of their own, where they could live under the U.S. Constitution. It should be an option for consenting adults.

Submitted by John Nemeth

26 GUNS & AMMO/MAY 1992

FROM THE CAPITOL

By Neal Knox



The inside story on legislation that affects your firearms ownership.

**BUCHANAN
CHALLENGE
BENEFITS GUN
OWNERS**

■ Pat Buchanan's 37-percent protest vote against President Bush in the New Hampshire primary caused a major reassessment of the president's reelection prospects and a scramble by the White House to repair damages with the party's conservative wing and the gun groups—which were critical to his first election. In 1988 candidate Bush sent a letter to the NRA declaring "Federal licensing, gun registration, background checks or a ban on firearms ... would only restrict the rights of the law-abiding..."

However, by executive order he permanently banned the importation of 43 military-pattern semi-auto rifles that the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms had for years declared suitable for sport. His administration introduced legislation requiring registration (at \$25 each) of over-15-shot rifle and pistol magazines, and he promised to sign the Dole-Metzenbaum version of the "Brady Bill" providing for a waiting period on handguns, followed by a background check on buyers of all firearms. Figuring that the president's violation of three of four campaign promises to the NRA was equal to "Read my lips, no new taxes," Gun Owners-New Hampshire endorsed Buchanan. (So did this writer, in the same New Hampshire ballroom where Buchanan later held his victory party.)

That retaliatory defection is being repeated in other primary states, and the White House is scrambling to mend fences. Their problem is: the president's marker is no longer any good. New promises won't do; there must be significant reforms of BATF and Justice Department policies and/or personnel prior to the election, and no more Bush administration gun bills, if he expects to avoid massive desertion by gun owners in the November elections. Since all the initial Democrat candidates and those waiting in the wings (like Cuomo and Gephardt) are, at best, no better than Bush on firearms issues, the likely beneficiary of gun owners' protest votes is Libertarian Andre Marrou—a solidly pro-gun native Texan.

Libertarian Jacobs second to challenge VanderJagt for seat

HOLLAND

By Chris Murphy
The Grand Rapids Press

porting the most recent congressional pay raise and for not opposing U.S. Rep. Bob Davis, R-Gaylord, when it was learned he was the third-worst check-kiter at the House bank.

VanderJagt, a 13-term Republican from Luther, has been attacked as out of touch from people both inside and outside his own party. Former state Sen. Melvin DeStigter of Hudsonville is challenging him in the primary, and an effort to draft state Sen. William VanRegenmorter ended only when the Jenison Republican declined to run.

Ottawa County GOP Chairman Thomas DePree said the Libertarian Party has never been a factor in the area, and he claims voters will see Jacobs only other credential — the term limitation proposal — would be bad policy for Michigan.

Another Republican county chairman said while the dissatisfaction against VanderJagt has not died out, he doubted it would mean votes for a third-party candidate.

"In Michigan third-party people don't garner very much support," Manistee County chairman David Smeltzer said. "Even though there's a broad base of people who identify themselves as independent, they tend to vote either Democrat or Republican."

Jacobs said in February he was not seeking political office but said Sunday he announced his candidacy at the urging of others. "I've had a lot of people say I should run, and this recent fiasco with Guy VanderJagt convinced me I would run," said Jacobs.

Jacobs has argued candidates should not be allowed to spend more than the job they are running for pays, so he pledges to limit spending to \$125,000 and not take more than \$100 per donor.



Jacobs

"I think Mr. Jacobs Perot, Libertarians and other third-party candidates will be seen as much more viable," said Jacobs, 53, who runs his own management consulting firm called Data Research.

The petition drive that put term limitations on this November's ballot was started by a non-profit group founded by Jacobs. The group, Taxpayers Association of Michigan, began in 1990 with a goal of limiting the role government. The association also is trying to add to the November ballot a constitutional amendment lowering and limiting income and property taxes.

In announcing his candidacy, Jacobs attacked VanderJagt for sup-

Now stop the government's looting

Ballot nomination Nov 5/1992



WILLIAM WALKER

Most Americans understand that looting is not a practical solution to life's problems. Most of us understand that if we all tried to steal from each other instead of working, that soon there would be nothing left to steal. Human progress depends on each of us recognizing the right of every individual to keep what he or she produces.

Unfortunately, there are two small groups in our society that do not understand this basic fact of economics and practical morality. One of these groups consists of a few irrational people, mostly living on the dole, who live in inner-city slums. The far more dangerous group is also irrational and lives entirely on the public dole. We call this second group "incumbent politicians."

Even before the ruins of small businesses in Los Angeles had stopped smoldering, politicians nationwide were calling for more looting. Never mind that our bureaucracies already spend more than \$80,000 per poor family. (Where does it go? Certainly not to the poor.) Never mind that the working, non-looting poor are already squeezed by taxes and regulations.

Never mind that our welfare system is designed to permanently trap victims into a non-productive lifestyle. Our politicians still support

the same old solution: loot — take the wealth from the working people and give to the non-working.

Thomas Sowell and Walter Williams are two of America's most prominent black historians/economists. Both of them repudiate the looting ethic. What do they suggest as the solution for America's poor?

In *Ethnic America*, Thomas Sowell traces the economic progress of various ethnic groups. He contrasts the success of recent penniless immigrants, such as the Vietnamese or the West Indian blacks, with the despair of Appalachians and inner-city blacks. His conclusion is that groups that trust in government anti-poverty programs are doomed.

Success can be achieved only by ignoring or evading the barriers which government places between poor people and the real world.

Yet most of the stories in *Ethnic America* are success stories: stories of people who worked hard and did without until they could save enough to open their own businesses. Many third-generation immigrant groups have higher incomes than the national average.

Walter Williams has taken up a similar theme in *South Africa's War Against Capitalism*. Mr. Williams shows that apartheid was dying under free enterprise: only the intervention of the South African government in the 1920s could prevent businesses from hiring blacks at high wages for skilled jobs. Apartheid was always

sickly, requiring constant intrusions of subsidies and regulations.

And now apartheid is dead. South African blacks are already the richest population of blacks in Africa.

For America, both Mr. Williams and Mr. Sowell make the same recommendations. They want government to let the poor make their own decisions, instead of teaching them to depend on bureaucrats. For example, they would:

- 1) Eliminate minimum wage laws. Minimum wage laws are not a magical way to raise worker's pay; if a worker can't produce as much profit as their wage costs, the employer is forced to lay him off. These laws simply prevent inner-city black teenagers from getting any employment experience.
- 2) Empower parents to choose their own children's schools with voucher programs.
- 3) Eliminate quota laws that force people to hire workers according to their skin color. (Which is supposedly what we're trying to get rid of, right? Besides, do we really want an 85 percent white NBA?)
- 4) Ditto for quotas on college admissions, which are now being applied to keep high-achieving Orientals out of prestigious colleges.

To sum up, the solution to the problem of racism is not looting. It is freedom.

William H. Walker is the libertarian candidate for U.S. House in Texas District 5.

OK, IF LYNDON LAROUCHE ISN'T A LIBERTARIAN, WHO AND WHAT IS ONE — AND WHAT DOES HE WANT?



JIM MONTGOMERY

Couple of weeks ago, Your Obedient Servant, in midst of discussing his own endlessly uninteresting political stripe, made reference to the fact that he'd probably be a libertarian if it weren't for the fact that the infamous Lyndon LaRouche has given the breed a bad name. Came back a letter in part:

"There is one problem statement: Lyndon LaRouche libertarian, never has been a liar and makes no claim to being politics have ranged from far-right. He has run on balloons under various third-party and independent labels including his own U.S. Labor Par-

Some answers were delivered by the signer of the politely protesting letter, one Daniel Tobias of Shreveport, vice chair of the Libertarian Party of Louisiana. They're right here among us, where we'd least suspect it, and they have a vision of a future in which they'd like to replace a tired old Democratic or Republican party on the American scene.

"It's the nihilist surface. Whereas many conservatives profess to want government to butt out, they also love government to butt into personal matters — shutting down movies or

those same freedoms? Easy, as Tobias explained it: "Liberals want government to be a social force ... to try to solve big problems with programs, most of which don't work as advertised." Liberals are forever working to cure the maldistribution of wealth, said, while ...

got a more exalted title right now, but it's too difficult to explain. My life is like that." There are probably certain ... have a ... run, it's to win elections and city councils, work their way up to legislative seats, then to national posts. Alaska has elected some Libertarians to the state legislature — one of them, Andre Marrou, is running for president this year — and a New Hampshire legislator elected as a Republican announced, once in office, that he was switching to Libertarian. Tobias claims, probably with some

other officials. "We have to think long and hard around (as a party) ... we may be building couple of times every ns to be a major parties. Now, things ... the Cold War is over. We have different enemies, different problems. We need different solutions." And if H. Ross Perot stays in the presidential race, it could eventually benefit Libertarians. Not that Perot is a Libertarian; "his political positions are kind of a mixed bag," said Tobias, but a Perot candidacy could make third parties more acceptable in American politics. Right now, in many places, a candidate can run as a Democrat, a Republican or an Independent (no party), but to run as a registered Libertarian or anything else other than a main-

The Times, Shreveport, LA - May 01, 1992 - Submitted by Daniel Tobias (Sorry, no room for article. You already know what a Libertarian is anyway. ed.)

Hindsight

More About Ross

by Joseph P. Tartaro
Executive Editor

Henry Ross Perot has become a political phenomenon in this presidential election year. He appears to be gaining much support without really saying where he stands on a number of important issues.

Despite this shortage of hard information about Perot and his plans for our nation, almost a third of the people say they would vote for him, according to some recent polls. This may not indicate that Perot is so well known and popular that he has about as much support as George Bush and Bill Clinton. More than likely it is an indication that the American people are less than enthralled with the candidates who are expected to be the Republican and Democratic standard bearers.

The public seems bored with politics as usual, and Tweedledee and Tweedledum choices, so that there is the possibility that a relatively unknown third party candidate could be a winner in November. It may sound far-fetched, but it is possible. Consider that a lot of Democrats won't vote for Clinton and that a lot of Republicans won't vote for Bush.

Third Parties

Historically, third parties don't do very well in presidential elections, at least in this century. This is as much a failing of the parties to raise sufficient funds as it is for the media to report on the candidates and where they stand. Additionally, some states make it hard, if not impossible, for third parties to get on the ballot. Still, it can be done, particularly if you have unlimited financial resources, and Perot seems to have the money to do the job.

Does this mean that you can buy your way to the presidency? In a way, yes; provided that you've got something to sell the voters. And so far, Perot is only a dream with a lot of dollars.

The Libertarian and other minor parties have fielded candidates for president in several elections. Some of them have been very attractive and articulate people, who had a firm understanding of the whole Bill of Rights as well as the Constitution, but didn't get many votes. The best a third party candidate has done in a recent presidential election was the showing by former Alabama Gov. George Wallace in 1968 when, as the American Independent Party nominee, he racked up 9,901,151 votes, carrying five states and winning 46 electoral votes.

At the risk of offending Libertarian supporters among my friends and readers, I would venture to predict that Andre Marrou, the Libertarian nominee this year, will not win the presidency. This is not because Marrou does not deserve to be president, or because he would not make as good a president, maybe better, than anyone else. It has to do with money, public exposure, and ballot access. (As things stand now, I expect to be one of those voting for the Marrou-Lord slate, because neither of the principal candidates has much to offer, and are bad news on the gun rights question.)

Money No Problem

Perot does not appear to have a money problem. He seems willing to bankroll his own independent campaign, and should have enough friends among the boardroom set so that additional funds won't be a problem. A humorous commentary from Late Night with David Letterman addresses this point. Letterman on a recent show took note of the record-setting Republican fund-raising dinner that brought in over \$9 million from the heavy hitters. "The record was broken the next night," Letterman quipped, "when Perot had dinner with himself and gave his campaign \$10 million."

It may be nice to dream of an independent candidate rising among the people, a political outsider in tune with the average citizen, who will suddenly set this nation right. But there are several things wrong with that kind of wishful thinking. First, Perot is not a common man. He may eat and sleep and work like everybody else, but he is not like you and me, and certainly not like the majority of the American people. You and I don't promise to give millions to the Republican Party like Perot did during the Nixon Administration just to gain access to the President. And you and I can't afford to hire out our rescue team to get workers, or friends, out of a revolutionary Iranian prison.

Money isn't a problem for Perot but clear-cut position statements seem to be. As the polls indicate that Perot can be a viable candidate, the press has been stalking him with questions and searching through libraries for any scrap of hard evidence. They have also tried to pepper him with tough questions.

Not surprisingly, *Gun Week* has been among those trying to get hard evidence about Perot and his positions, especially on gun rights. Weeks ago we attempted to get close enough for a detailed interview on all aspects of the gun rights issue. He wasn't available yet for an interview.

We collected some data, which was reported, and asked readers to send in more.

Jim Schneider, our legislative editor, made an attempt to get a clear gun issue policy statement from Perot's headquarters at the end of April and was told that "we're working on it." They promised it would be available in 30 to 60 days.

The gun issue is not the only question on which Perot has not produced details of his strategy if elected president. He's still a blank on most issues.

Bits and Pieces

So far Perot has qualified for an independent line in three states and his agents are still working to get him on the ballot in others. At this writing no one expects him to make it in all 50 states. While this process continues, and while we wait for the promised position statements, we can only deal with the bits and pieces which have surfaced with the help of *Gun Week* readers. On the gun issue these include:

From The New American, May 4, 1992—Perot says in an interview: "You're going to have to have a much tighter plan (than the Brady Bill). Let's go through the engineering process. Let's figure out what we have to do to really nail this thing...Get two or three plans. Experiment with those plans. See which ones really work. Come to the American people over the electronic town hall and television and say, 'All right here we are on gun control'—one, two, three, four, five—and we believe this is the answer..." Get the guns out of the hands of the bad guys. You don't care if people collect guns. You don't care if people have guns for hunting."

From a computer bulletin board report of a phone meeting with Perot by Neal Atkins, Apr. 8, 1992—Atkins reports that during a phone conversation with Perot, the candidate stated that he was not in favor of "gun control" per se. He advocated taking a business approach to the problem. Getting the involved parties (gun owners, collectors, gun control advocates, lawmakers etc.) into a room and designing a mutually agreeable plan, testing the plan to see if it does the task it was designed for and then putting the plan into action.

"I asked him about the bans being proposed on semi-automatic guns. He said that he would need to know more about the proposal. He also said he wanted to know why a 'hunter or gun collector' would need something like that. He then turned the discussion to full auto weapons and why anyone would 'need' them. I replied that I owned full autos and used them because I enjoyed shooting them and participated in competitive shoots." Atkins raised other points in his report, but Perot turned the conversation to other matters.

From a computer bulletin board of Chris Meissen, dated Apr. 6, 1992—Meissen reports, "If Ross Perot asks you why anyone would 'need' a full auto weapon, ask him to tell you. A gun dealer whom I have purchased several nice items from sold Mr Perot an American-180. That was the nice little full auto carbine that fired from a drum magazine of 180 rounds of 22 long rifle. The other interesting part to his purchase was that the police chief in Dallas was not signing papers for normal people at the time, but he went out to Ross Perot's house to sign the papers."

There are other fragmentary reports which range from a stated Perot support in vague terms for "gun control" to an opposition to the waiting period because it will not accomplish anything. In between, there are fragmentary statements that he doesn't care what arms people own if they don't misuse them, and that he only wants to prevent "the bad guys" from owning guns.

Submitted by Tom Glass



What about Dan?

Repealing the income tax and abolishing the Internal Revenue Service doesn't sound like such a bad idea.

In fact for anyone who has ever had a problem communicating with the faceless IRS of Andover, Mass. that runs its operation by spitting out threatening letters in a language of computerese and mans its telephones with a room full of machines, it sounds like a good idea. A very good idea.

That's what Andre Marrou, Libertarian presidential candidate wants to do. He wants less government intrusion.

This was the message he brought to Maine Sunday when he addressed a small group of Libertarians gathered for a state convention in Augusta.

No doubt about it, we'd have a lot less "intrusion" if Marrou could rid us of the necessity of paying income taxes and if he could take the IRS off our backs.

But it's impossible.

How could we ever pay off that S&L bill?

And what about the Defense Department? How could we afford any more of those \$1,865 toilet seats for Air Force transport planes or \$641 urinals for the Navy or \$435 hammers and \$6,000 coffee pots for the Pentagon?

Or where would we ever get all the money to pay for those congressional pay raises? Or for their pensions? To say nothing about all the perks.

And what about Dan Quayle's golf trips?

Nah! Sorry Andre — it would just never work.

