In its Pursuit of ‘Safety,’ the Government Is Sacrificing Freedom

By Gov. Gary Johnson; featured in the Daily Caller on Feb. 6, 2013

Immediately after the horrific attacks on America on September 11, 2001, President Bush and Congress went to work enacting laws they said would make us safer from such attacks in the future. That was not a shocking reaction — and their intentions were understandable. After all, even those of us who advocate the smallest government possible agree that the federal government has a fundamental and constitutional duty to defend us from harm.

But when politicians decide to make us safer, they too often get it really wrong. It is the very nature of government to solve a problem by making itself bigger and more intrusive, and to increase its power at the expense of our freedom and, yes, the very same rights that our elected officials are sworn to protect.

After 9/11, the president and Congress “protected” us with the Patriot Act, expansions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, an overreaching NDAA, and a host of other measures — both legislative and executive — that gave the federal government powers over our daily lives that would have been unimaginable to the Founders. Our library cards, our cell phones, our computers, our travel, and even our bank accounts became the business of bureaucrats and federal law enforcement.

It became OK to let the government put us on “no-fly” lists, to grope us at airports, and to be notified if we happen to move too much money around. Privacy? Well, that’s pretty much gone. And as laid out in a memo that surfaced in recent days, it even became OK for the government to assassinate American citizens who that same government had labeled as terrorists.

Gov. Gary Johnson was the Libertarian Party’s 2012 presidential candidate.

“It is the very nature of government to solve a problem by making itself bigger and more intrusive, and to increase its power at the expense of our freedom and, yes, the very same rights that our elected officials are sworn to protect.”

Today, in the wake of more horrific attacks — this time in the form of senseless shootings at schools and a movie theater — the politicians are once again rushing to protect us with more laws and more executive mandates. And once again, their “protections,” if adopted, will come at the expense of our rights and freedoms. That, sadly, is what government does.

We’ve seen this movie before. Violence and tragedy at the hands of gun-toting criminals begets a rush to make it harder for non-criminals to buy, sell, or even own a firearm. That pesky Second Amendment — the one about keeping and bearing arms — gets dismissed with claims that it doesn’t really mean what it says, and that the Founders never envisioned high-capacity magazines.

To be sure, it is difficult to find a politician who will say outright that we shouldn’t be allowed to own a gun. They all claim to have no problem with law-abiding citizens having a shotgun in the closet, and many even have photos of themselves engaging in shooting “sports.”

Those are the same folks who say they respect our privacy while authorizing drones to fly over our homes and assure us we are free to fly on planes, as long as we don’t mind dealing with the TSA and showing a government-approved ID.

It is government’s very nature to react to problems. But just as the War on Terror has resulted in the shredding of our civil liberties, today’s rendition of the War on Guns threatens to demand that we shelve a few more of our rights in the name of our own safety. But someone has to ask the tough questions: How can “universal” background checks be feasible without
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Beverly Libertarian Daniel Fishman announced this week his plans to get on the ballot for the upcoming special election for Senate.

The 44-year-old software architect started his political career last year when he decided to step up to the plate in the 6th District and run for Congress. That election earned him over 16,000 votes after months of campaigning for small government and basic civil liberties.

Fishman addressed a few close supporters this past Monday night after his announcement. “Frankly, I understand the reluctance of Scott Brown and Richard Tisei to run in this race. I too campaigned last summer and fall, and in November was relieved to be done with the rigmarole of politics. And I was also working an 8-6 job at the same time.”

As with his first attempt at office, Fishman said he is running because, “There is a large group of citizens in Massachusetts who are not being represented by the Democratic machine, which elects favorite sons time after time. Nor are they represented by the Republican Party, which is tied to a national platform a social tolerance policy from 1950.”

Fishman’s priorities during the Congressional race last fall centered around eliminating regulations on employment, stopping the subsidizing of foreign governments, and cutting back on anything that expands the country’s debt.

As a Libertarian, Fishman said he would be able to choose which way to vote, either with the Democrats or the Republicans, but more importantly, he could be a voice to drive the agenda of the people, not the party.

“We currently do not have a government of the people, nor sadly is it a government for the people. But it certainly is funded by the people. It is time for us to take up our civic duties. And part of those duties entails being willing to stand up when called upon.”

In a press release announcing his latest run, Fishman said, “Frederic Bastiat said, ‘The worst thing that can happen to a good cause is, not to be skillfully attacked, but to be ineptly defended.’ For too long we have seen the Republicans defending fiscal conservatism, while marrying it to social conservatism.

Likewise we have seen the Democrats insist that a large and powerful government must curtail individual liberties to achieve a greater equality. And both parties are happy to enlarge government, so long as it is in a direction that suits them. When the parties conspired against the public to suspend Habeus Corpus with the National Defense Authorization Act, we saw how much Republicans want smaller government and how strongly the Democrats want to preserve your civil liberties.

Fishman said he feels he is the most fiscally conservative and the most socially tolerant candidate in the race.

“There is an understanding in Massachusetts that government has become a tool of corporations to protect them,” he said. “So called ‘regulations’ on corporations often serve to protect corporate interests from the power of the people.”

Government can do better, he said.

“We currently do not have a government of the people, nor sadly is it a government for the people. But it certainly is funded by the people. It is time for us to take up our civic duties. And part of those duties entails being willing to stand up when called upon. I do not want to be Senator, but I am willing to serve should the people deem me worthy. And perhaps that’s the best that we can hope for in a politician.”
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first having a “universal” database — something that should make all Americans cringe? How can a “mental health” standard be imposed for gun ownership without the government somehow deciding who among us is healthy — or not?

And how can the government get around the fact that even the Supreme Court has affirmed that the Second Amendment really does mean what it says: That the right to keep and bear arms is not some outdated reference to state militias, but rather an individual right not to be taken away by the government?

Whether it is the First Amendment right to speech or the religious freedoms granted in the Constitution, we may all find the exercise of rights to be uncomfortable, painful, and occasionally even harmful. But our nation is founded — uniquely so — on the idea that individual rights are to be protected and shielded from government control. And just like the rest of the Bill of Rights, the Second Amendment doesn’t give anyone permission to commit murder. That is covered by a lot of other, perfectly constitutional, laws.

Let us hope, and let us work, to make sure that the politicians don’t decide to make us “safer” from gun violence by taking away even more of our freedoms. There are plenty of countries around the globe where people are denied individual liberties in the name of the state and their own government-provided well-being, and those same countries are full of people who would come to America in a heartbeat if they had the chance.

That is a reality we must not forget.

Gary Johnson, a former two-term governor of New Mexico, was the Libertarian Party’s 2012 presidential candidate.
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LP’s VP candidate Judge Jim Gray tells stories from the 2012 campaign trail

Excerpted from an article appearing on the Libertarian Party of California website on Dec. 31, 2012

Probably the most interesting experience on the campaign trail was when I was invited to speak at the Harvest Festival in Monticello, in upstate New York. Almost literally we were participating in Woodstock. The place was filled with hippies young and old in tie-dyed clothes with peace symbols and long hair. Our guide was a gentle middle-aged man who was wearing a leather vest filled with metal emblems and badges, and he introduced himself by saying that his real name was David, but everyone called him “Trashy.” I spoke on the stage after Pete Seeger, and it was a wonderful event. Lots of marijuana was being smoked on the grounds, but people were completely well-behaved with not a police officer in sight. It is not my lifestyle, but it was great to see people harmlessly enjoying themselves as they wished.

I also spoke at a lunch event in Spokane, Washington. Since I arrived a bit early I had occasion to meet and get to know Jake, who was three years old and had been brought along by his mother. Then, as I often did, I used his name during my presentation by saying that my generation had made a financial mess of our country, that our children would have to pay it back, and that people like Jake were bankrupt. Of course, little Jake had no idea what the word bankrupt meant, but it sounded bad, so he started to cry. So here I am as a candidate making three-year-old children cry. But as I tried to dig myself out of the mess I had made, I did say that if he actually knew the bad financial condition he was in, he would have every reason to cry!

At another event when I met a young girl and asked her how old she was, she responded by saying that “I’m pushing four!” So that made us laugh, which was a better result than with Jake.

I traveled so much that if I only flew on one airplane, that was an unusual day. As a result, probably the hardest thing that I had to do on the campaign trail was to remember my daily hotel room number. Each day the number changed, so I developed the habit of writing it down and keeping it in my pocket.

The most gratifying thing occurred when three students came up to me after my presentation at Stanford University and said that they were never so excited about voting. That was immediately followed by the most sobering event, which occurred when a young athletic man wearing Purple Heart and Bronze Star ribbons on the lapel of his suit coat came up to me after that same Stanford event. After saying that he had been in the Marines in the Gulf War, he looked right at me and said, “Judge Gray, please be our voice. Our troops are prepared to go where they are ordered and even sacrifice if we must, but please make it be to protect our country’s security.” I looked right back and vowed to him that I would do everything I could to do just that.

Jim Gray is a retired judge of the Superior Court in Orange County, Calif., and was the 2012 Libertarian Party candidate for vice president.