



# Free New York

Vol. 53, No. 11

The Official Newsletter of the Libertarian Party of New York

November 2024

## CHASE OLIVER/MIKE TER MAAT: NEW YORK AWAITS FULL WRITE-IN RESULTS



TABLE OF CONTENTS	
Oliver/ter Maat Write-In Results .....	1
The Election is Over, Fight Cont. ....	1,3
An Open Letter to the LP .....	2-3
Fred and Peanut .....	4
Family Restoration.....	5-9
Bad Law Threatens Guilford .....	10-11
NYS Only State with 2 Candidates ...	11
County Affiliate News .....	12-15
LPNY Directory.....	16

by Andrew Kolstee  
LPNY Secretary

The 2024 Presidential election is over, and Chase Oliver/Mike ter Maat surpassed over 600,000 votes, in the 5th highest vote total in Libertarian Party history, behind Gary Johnson (2012, 2016),

Jo Jorgensen (2020), and Ed Clark (1980). Results have not yet been certified, and so the final totals are not yet known.

The Libertarian ticket was on the ballot in 47 states, and so voters in New York, Illinois, Tennessee, and

Washington, D.C. could only write-in the ticket.

In New York, we do not yet know how many votes Oliver/ter Maat recieved of the more than 100,000 write-in votes, although we had results in several counties that have been posted, although these not yet official results. The December newsletter will feature complete results.

## THE ELECTION IS OVER, BUT THE FIGHT CONTINUES

by Mark Axinn  
LPNY Fundraising Director  
LPNY Chair (2010-2015)

I went to the polling place to vote for President and only saw Tweedledum and Tweedledummer on the printed ballot. It's pathetic; the

Demopublicans are so anti-choice that they will do whatever they can to protect their monopoly.

So what can we do?

First, of course I wrote Chase Oliver and Mike ter Maat in as my candi-

dates. We won't win the election, especially in rigged in New York where the entrenched powers will not even give us a seat at the table, but we can still stick our finger in the eye of the oppressor to let them

(continued on page 3)

---

# AN OPEN LETTER TO THE LIBERTARIAN PARTY IT'S TIME TO CHANGE COURSE

by Jim Ostrowski

It's midnight ET and the returns are mostly in. The LP got far less than its usual one percent of the vote, the percentage we got in 1980. At this moment, your candidate has 0.4 percent of the vote. After 44 years of hard work, tens of millions of dollars and many millions of hours of volunteer time, we are worse off than where we were 44 years ago. The finest men who ever ran for the LP, Ron Paul and Harry Browne, also got far less than one percent. I ran a fundraiser for my friend Harry in Buffalo and saw Ron speak in NJ in 1988.

Indeed, there is less liberty now than when the Party was founded in 1971 and government is much larger and more powerful and continuously growing all the time at every level.

It's time to change strategies and tactics and change them drastically and quickly. Politics is a rigged game. I know because I have been active in electoral politics for fifty years. I concluded a number of years ago that this was the case and began to write books proposing that the movement turn sharply towards direct citizen action. The first was *Government Schools Are Bad for Your Kids* (2009).

In light of another electoral failure, I now formally propose that the national and state parties consider this new strategy and vote to adopt direct citizen action as their main approach without completely abandoning electoral politics in selected instances. (For reasons I won't delve into today, I firmly believe that shifting towards direct action will actually improve the LP's electoral chances in the future.)

Direct action is the opposite of political action. Political action mainly includes voting, supporting candidates, lobbying and lawsuits. Each approach involves trying to get someone else to do something beneficial. Direct action does not require that we convince others to do something. Rather, we make choices that benefit ourselves but also tend over time to move society towards liberty. Prime examples are voting with your feet to move towards freer states, counties or towns and voting with your children by removing them from government schools. Each benefits you immediately but also tends to move society closer to liberty.

I have an extensive program of direct action ready to roll out with additional options limited only by the

creativity of party members. Major forms of direct action include:

Voting with your feet

Voting with your children  
(boycotting government schools)

Voting with your health

Voting with your verdicts  
(jury nullification)

Voting with your arms  
(get armed, get fit, get trained)

Voting with your wallet  
(buy local for liberty)

These programs are in various states of development but several are ready to roll out. These include:

\*Walk for Liberty, encouraging all persons able to do so (85% of Americans), to walk 7500 steps a day to drastically reduce mortality and morbidity and slash health care costs and taxes.

\*Voting with your feet. I already have a ranking of the 100 freest counties. With the talent and resources of the LP, we could easily roll out an app ranking all 3000  
**(continued on page 3)**

---

counties in the country. The county, not the state, is the relevant unit to consider when moving.

\*Grand jury education program. We did a pilot project in Niagara County, NY. It's ready to roll out in all 3000 counties.

\*Economics in five lessons. This is a thirty-minute presentation that is a primer on the five key principles of economics. The audience gets another thirty minutes for questions. This is ready to roll.

These and other ideas are discussed on my website, LibertyMovement.org and in my five books on direct action:

1. Government Schools Are Bad for Your Kids

2. Direct Citizen Action
3. Progressivism: A Primer
4. The Second Amendment Works
5. How We Can Revive the Liberty Movement

I also spoke to the LPNY on this subject.

I would be happy to speak to your committees and conventions in person or remotely to discuss this proposal further.

Just so you know, I want to list some of my activism on behalf of the LP in the last 44 years:

1. Voted for Roger McBride in 1976 (my first vote for President)
2. Chair of the Erie County NY LP 1980
3. Elector for Ed Clark for President

- 1980
4. Chair of the Erie County NY LP 1993-4
5. Candidate for the LP nomination for NY Governor, 1993-4
6. Attorney of record, Libertarian Party of Erie Cty. v. Cuomo, 970 F.3d 106 (2nd Cir. 2020), cited in New York State Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc. v. Bruen, 597 U.S. 1 (2022).
7. Former NYLP Attorney.
8. Attorney for NYLP and Green Party in Libertarian Party of N.Y. v. N.Y. State Bd. of Elections (2022). Argued the case in the District Court and U. S. Court of Appeals.
9. Won four election cases for Libertarians.

Thank you for keeping an open mind and let me know your thoughts.

---

# THE ELECTION IS OVER, BUT THE FIGHT CONTINUES

(continued from page 1)

know how much we object to the status quo.

Which gets me to the point of this letter. I have been voting for Libertarians for forty years and an active supporter of the Party for thirty. Was it a wasted effort? I think not.

We are a small sound of sanity in a symphony of statism, and it is important for us to keep at it to prevent the tyrants from imposing even worse big government nanny-state despotism than they already have.

Of course that takes money. Please join me and donate to the Libertar-

ian Party of New York today. You can do it easily on the website at LPNY.org, or snail mail a check to the PO Box below.

Please send a donation today. You will feel so much better than when paying taxes.

Thanks so much!

[LPNY.org/donate](https://LPNY.org/donate)

# FRED AND PEANUT

by **Pietro Geraci**  
**LPNY Outreach Director**

You may have heard the recent news regarding the murder of Internet sensation Peanut the Squirrel and fellow pet Fred the Raccoon at the hands of NYS officials. For those unfamiliar, a pet squirrel and raccoon were seized by the state after some woman from Texas (yes, Texas) who apparently had nothing better to do than cast misery upon people over a thousand miles away reported its owners for allegedly keeping the animals in unsafe and unsanitary conditions. Both animals were then euthanized after the squirrel bit one of the henchmen sent to seize it after it bit him. Why would a minor bite require killing? To test for rabies.

That might sound like a reasonable course of action - to anyone too dumb to take ten seconds to Google whether squirrels can become infected with rabies, which as it turns out is extremely rare. No human has ever been infected by a squirrel bite, but that didn't stop New York State from serving up justice by murdering an innocent, beloved pet. Nevermind that the raccoon did not bite anyone, and did not present any symptoms of rabies.

I don't know what Peanut's and Fred's living conditions were like, but I do know that there's no reason to kill an animal who spent the last seven years inside, making exposure to rabies impossible. The bitten henchman was never at risk,



and would never have been bitten if he wasn't blindly carrying out the State's bidding.

This might seem like an unfortunate but isolated incident, but the implications of this massive government overreach are horrifying. Anyone can get anyone's pet stolen, ripped from their loving family's arms by unfeeling bureaucrats, and if that frightened pet should react to this by biting one of these strangers sent to abduct it, then it's killed, in conditions I dare not imagine, far away from the people who loved and cared for it.

Is there nothing New York State will not strangle with its slimy tentacles? Are there any aspects of our lives free from Kathy Hochul's Big Brother regime? In the Empire State, you don't even have sovereignty over your own pets! They belong to the

Empress, to be handled and disposed of as she pleases. You keep yours with her permission, and she commands you to pray she does not alter the deal any further.

That might seem extreme, but not to Mark Longo, Peanut's and Fred's owner, who is living this very reality. Today, it's his squirrel. Tomorrow, it's your dog who barks a little too much for your prickly neighbor's liking. What are you going to do about it?

If you love your pets and you want justice for Peanut and Mr. Longo, then you can start by contacting your state legislators and the Governor's Office and demand accountability for Peanut's murder and action to ensure this completely avoidable tragedy never happens again.



---

# FAMILY RESTORATION: REPLACING THE WELFARE STATE WITH HUMAN ACTION

by Vincent O'Neill  
State Committee Member (JD10)  
LPNY Vice-Chair (2002-2003)

“In any case, it should be clear by now that most if not all of the moral degeneration and cultural rot—the signs of decivilization— all around us are the inescapable and unavoidable results of the welfare state and its institutions.”—Hans-Hermann Hoppe, “Democracy, the God That Failed”, p. 195-197

First of all, what is referred to as the ‘Welfare’ State is nothing of the sort. What exists is a state of slow suicide for civilization, and lately it has been accelerating. Dignity, Freedom, Responsibility and Voluntary Charity (Human Action, for short) will provide a solution to the problems the ‘Welfare’ state claims to address.

The following proposal addresses the Current Legal System and its relation to the Family. Particular attention is paid to the issues of Abortion, Adoption, Foster Care, Divorce, Child Custody and the misnamed ‘Welfare’ State. Human Action becomes the basis of improvement.

“For generations, Americans have lived under a judicial dictatorship that rubber stamps all expansions of federal power, no matter how at odds with they may be with the constitution itself. The body of “constitutional law” that has developed during this time is nothing more than a bundle of tongue-twisting legalese designed to subvert and destroy any lasting vestiges of consti-

tutional limitations on the power of the central state.”—Thomas DiLorenzo, “Organized Crime”, p.103

## 1. Abortion

The pro-life movement spent a lot of time attempting to bring a case to the Supreme Court which would lead to Roe vs. Wade being overturned, and thought they had such a case in 1992 with Casey vs. Planned Parenthood. The Supreme Court went out of its way to make sure this strategy was not a success.

Joseph Sobran described the 1992 Casey vs. Planned Parenthood decision as “the Supreme Court setting aside the arguments of the two particulars in the case, declaring itself a third party to the dispute, and ruling in its own favor”.

As a result, there was no honest debate occurring in this country regarding the abortion issue, and appealing to the Supreme Court was a waste of time.

Regulating abortion is not an enumerated power of the national government. Therefore, Roe vs. Wade was always blatantly unconstitutional.

At the time of Roe vs. Wade, all fifty states had accepted their responsibility in this matter, and all had laws regulating abortion.

Although state nullification of Roe vs. Wade could have been the proper action to take, it was not necessary and could have been count-

er-productive.

## A POTENTIALLY WELCOME CHANGE

A leaked draft of the decision in the case of “Dobbs vs. Jackson Women’s Health Organization” claimed Roe vs. Wade would be overturned after close to 50 years as ‘the law of the land’ and over 62 million abortions performed in this country alone.

The leak provided an excuse for the same dishonesty regarding the abortion issue to re-assert itself, including loud and large protests that disregard the real issues involved.

(The fact that no one has been fired for leaking this draft raises additional questions.)

Now that the Supreme Court actually has overturned Roe vs. Wade (and the 1992 Casey vs. Planned Parenthood decision), there is a possibility it will return to its proper role. There are many other unconstitutional actions that it has endorsed. A good example can be found in the fact that at least 75% of national government spending is unconstitutional.

Meanwhile, we should address the real issues regarding abortion, family, and the ‘welfare state’ now that Roe vs. Wade has been overturned.

The proper answer to the issues of abortion, families, and the “Welfare” state can now be found by addressing the issue of personal responsi-

(continued on page 6)

---

**(continued from page 5)**

bility. This will lead to a drastic reduction in the number of abortions performed in the states where it remains legal, a strengthening of the extended family, and also lead to a massive reduction in the size of the misnamed 'welfare' state.

## **2. Abortion, Adoption, and Arithmetic**

Arithmetic shows the size of the problem. There had been roughly a million abortions performed in the U.S. each year. On the bright side, the number had been declining slightly. However, over 62 million abortions have been performed in this country since Roe vs. Wade is a sign of how far this country and civilization has deteriorated. The Abortion issue, and related family and personal responsibility issues, are something many people wish to avoid but something that must be addressed.

Numerous American couples have also been resorting to adopting children from foreign countries. It is extremely odd that there are many couples who find adoptions from foreign countries to be cheaper and less of a hassle than adopting an American.

## **3. Reform and Replacement of the Current Foster Care System**

The Current Foster Care System is often little more than taxpayer-funded warehousing. Children are often shuffled around to assorted homes of unrelated people, usually to their detriment. A solution can be found by making a change to foster care systems across the country by

addressing the issue of parental responsibility.

The key to the reform is this:  
**THE CONSENT OF BOTH PARENTS OF THE CHILD WOULD BE REQUIRED IN THIS PROPOSAL.**

In place of the current system, a married couple, preferably but not required to be related to one of the parents, would agree to raise the child to the age of 17 only.

As far as visitation rights of the natural parents before the child reaches age 17, they would have the right to visit their child on his/her birthday only.

Anything more would require the consent of the foster parents, who would be the child's legal guardians until the age of 17.

Any living arrangement after this time would be based on consent of the involved parties.

This proposal would be equally effective in addressing the issue of children born out of wedlock, and children of divorce. (The issue of Divorce is addressed later.)

This will actually be a modernized version of the Celtic version of Fosterage.

The Celts believed adulthood to begin at age 17, and I agree with them.

I am not sure if the U.S. government believes there is a concept known as adulthood, but if they do, the policies they promote show they are opposed to it.

## **A brief description of Celtic Fosterage:**

I've seen two different descriptions. Either all children or some children spent some time living with another family between the ages of 7 and 17. The result was that the closest bond in Celtic society was the bond between foster brothers (and foster sisters.)

Contrast that with the United States, where foster children are outcasts.

## **4. Challenging the basis of the "Welfare" State**

The Free Market eliminates the negative intervention of the political establishment and replaces it with Human Action.

Ludwig Von Mises summed up the issue facing us over his entire career, and in "Human Action" he provided the foundation for the replacement of the 'welfare' state:

"Within the frame of social cooperation there can emerge between members of society feelings of sympathy and friendship and a sense of belonging together. These feelings are the source of man's most delightful and sublime experiences. They are the most precious adornment of life; they lift the animal species man to the heights of a really human existence."- Ludwig Von Mises,"Human Action", p. 144

4A. Taxation and Responsibility of Natural Parents, Payment of Foster Parents, Human Action and Eliminating a Portion of the Income Tax

**(continued on page 7)**

---

**(continued from page 6)**

Addressing one of the worst aspects of the 'welfare' state, there would be no welfare payments made to anyone who chooses to have a child out of wedlock and become a 'single parent'. If this is their choice, they are personally responsible for providing for the child, not the taxpayers.

THIS DOES NOT APPLY TO  
CURRENT RECIPIENTS, WHO  
ARE A SUNK COST.

They are addressed below in section #8."Sunk Cost and Current 'Welfare' Recipients"

(Children of Divorce can be easily accommodated by this system, and this is addressed in section #7C."Child Custody and Divorce.")

10% of the weekly income of both natural parents would be deducted weekly before taxes, and paid to the Foster Parents until the child reaches age 17. This income by the Foster Parents would be Free of the Income Tax.

Example: Natural parent makes \$600 in a week. \$60 dollars of this (\$60) is deducted and given to the foster parents. Taxable Income for the parent for the week would be \$540. (\$600-\$60= \$540)

If the natural parent made \$400 the next week, \$40 dollars would be deducted and paid to the foster parents. Taxable income for the week would be \$360. (\$400-\$40=\$360)

If the natural parent made Zero the next week, payment to the foster parents and taxable income for the natural parent would both be Zero

for the week.

### **5. Actions Outside the Scope of the Income Tax**

Any other person would also be allowed to give any amount of money to the Foster Parents, and it would be free of the Income tax for the Foster Parents. It would not count as an Income Tax charitable deduction for the giver, and there will be no government record of this action. It is simply an example of positive Human Action occurring outside the 'government' system.

### **6. More Human Action**

Humans tend to love their children, and have a strong desire to provide for them. This is not always financially possible. The 10% mentioned above is a minimum. More is allowed. Factors such as gratitude and personal responsibility would be a positive influence on the natural parents. They would have a lot to be grateful for, and would probably find a way to show it.

Also, any foster child in this situation would have up to 4 sets of grandparents, who also tend to love children.

Many domestic policies of the U.S. government encourage a slow suicide and actively oppose the use of Freedom, Responsibility and Human Action to solve problems. The individual, family and extended family are often targets. This proposal will limit or end one of the worst U.S. domestic policies.

Instead of having income taxed for a 'welfare' state which takes money from all and hands it in an imper-

sonal way to people who may or may not deserve it, people who utilize the Foster Care System outlined above would be taking personal responsibility for the child of a friend, relative, or fellow human being.

Another major improvement is that natural parents will not be abandoning their children.

### **7. Child Custody and Divorce**

The current U.S. judicial system (and many state systems) allows too many people to make an excellent living by parasitically feeding on the misery of someone else. An example is the way Child Custody is handled in Divorce cases.

For example, the way child custody is handled in many states is a complete disgrace where the children are used as bargaining chips. The following idea, already in use in some areas, would eliminate or limit that problem.

#### **7A. The 50/50 Child Custody and Assets/Liability Default Position**

Divorcing parents would be given a certain amount of time (one month, for example) to arrange a consensual child custody agreement. If they failed to do so, an exact 50/50 split would be imposed.

This would lead to a dramatic reduction in the amount of time it would take to settle a divorce.

A 50/50 split of Assets and Liabilities accumulated during the marriage would also be the default position in the absence of a Pre-Nuptial

**(continued on page 8)**

(continued from page 7)

Agreement.

### 7B. Divorce and Child Support Agreements

Ideally, this would be handled privately, and through pre-nuptial agreements. This is particularly important since it often happens that one spouse is making all or most of the family's money while the other watches the children.

In the absence of a pre-nuptial agreement, here are two important aspects to be addressed by the default position:

1. Any support agreement imposed by the court would be based on a percentage of income, not an absolute number. Basing this on a percentage means the agreement is more likely to arrive at a fair solution.

Judges often pick a number out of the sky based on someone's current income. If their income goes down, it becomes unaffordable. The American system then declares this parent a 'deadbeat', and either puts them in jail or starves them.

2. Any agreement can be reviewed every 3 years until the youngest child is 17.

Either party can request this, but BOTH PARTIES MUST AGREE TO A CHANGE.

### 7C. Applying Celtic Fosterage to Child Custody

The Foster Care system outline above can easily accommodate chil-

dren of divorce. The natural parents would have to agree on the choice of Foster Parents, who would become Legal Guardians of the Children until age 17. All other terms outlined in Sections #4 and #5 would apply.

### 7D. Other Issue: "Common Law Marriage"

There is no such thing as "Common Law Marriage". Marriage requires the consent of both parties. Any couple that wanted to get married could go before a Justice of the Peace and be married in about two minutes.

If two people live together, for any period of time, and do not take this step, there has been no mutual consent. Their relationship exists outside the laws of the state.

### 8. Sunk Cost and Current 'Welfare' Recipients

"It may be more noble to give than to receive, but the difficult thing is to give properly."-Friedrich Nietzsche

Current Recipients are a Sunk Cost, and there is no need to cut or increase their payment. It is important, however, not to add to the current number of recipients. It is also important to give current recipients a way to improve their situation through their own actions.

Anyone currently eligible for 'welfare' assistance will immediately become free of the Income Tax on any additional money they earn. This exemption from the Income Tax can be of limited duration, or longer.

Two possible choices would be In-

come Tax Exemption for 3 years, or extended up to and including the rest of their life.

Most will work at least some of the time at some job, and also discover they have friends and family who are available and willing to help them with things like child care while they are at work. The result will be stronger families, and a much better example being given to their children.

There are other benefits which will accrue. Henry Hazlitt spoke of 'the noble dignity of labor', and this will go a long way toward restoring it. It also is a step toward reducing and/or eliminating the Income tax for everyone else.

### Lump Sum Payments

There is an old saying that gives the excellent advice "Don't cripple someone and then criticize the way they walk".

Current Recipients should receive lump sum payments, and be allowed to spend the money as they please. They should not be degraded by allowing government bureaucrats to micro-manage their existence, or insult them on every decision they make, no matter how trivial. (When I walk through a supermarket I notice that only some items are 'wic allowed'...)

A person who is poor either short or long term should be allowed to retain their dignity. Private Charity, which is based on Human Action, has always been able to accomplish this easily.

(continued on page 9)



---

(continued from page 8)

## 9. Abortion

Once we begin moving in the right direction on the issue of “Replacing the ‘Welfare’ State with Human Action”, there are other issues to be addressed which follow logically. This brings us back to the issue of Abortion.

### A. End Taxpayer Funding of Abortion

Regulating abortion is not an enumerated power of the national government. National taxpayer funding of abortion should never have occurred, and should be ended immediately.

States are permitted to have the taxpayers subsidize abortion, but they should not.

### B. Liberty of Conscience for All

There are only 3 acceptable justifications for abortion.

The first is to save the life of the mother in a difficult pregnancy. This is the mother’s choice. Some will decide the risk of death is acceptable in order to bring a new life to the world, some will not. However, there is little doubt that the most important person in the life of a child for at least its first 5 years is the mother.

The other two acceptable justifications for abortion are in cases of rape and incest. Both involve the abuse of

the woman, and this is more likely to continue if they are required to give birth in these cases.

All 3 justifications have one thing in common. All 3 justifications involve sacrificing yourself for another person. Sacrificing yourself on behalf of another person is something that a person can CHOOSE to do, but from a moral standpoint, this choice cannot be forced upon them.

### C. Liberty of Conscience for Providers

Providers should be allowed to opt-out of all or most abortions if their conscience dictates this. They should be given the following choices:

1. Refuse to participate in any abortion for any reason.

2. Agree to participate only if the woman seeking an abortion and her doctor sign a statement declaring the abortion is sought either to save the life of the mother, or that it is a case of rape or incest.

The statement WOULD NOT have to say which of the 3 justifications were involved, and there would be no investigation of its factual basis. The word of the woman and doctor involved would be accepted, and regulated only by their conscience.

Also, their statement WOULD NOT be taken as proof in a court of law regarding a charge of rape or incest. They would have to provide additional proof in a court case.

The third choice available to providers will be to state that they would be willing to participate in any abortion for any reason.

## 10. Conclusion

As stated at the beginning of this proposal, the problems caused by the ‘welfare’ state and related issues are reduced and/or eliminated by focusing on personal responsibility instead of court rulings.

The family, extended family, and community will be strengthened, and a person’s conscience will allow them to make the correct decision.

This will in turn lead to Human Action replacing the destructive slow suicide for civilization known as the ‘Welfare’ State.

“No one can find a safe way out for himself if society is sweeping towards destruction. Therefore everyone, in his own interests, must thrust himself vigorously into the intellectual battle. None can stand aside with unconcern; the interests of everyone hang on the result. Whether he chooses or not, every man is drawn into the great historical struggle, the decisive battle into which our epoch has plunged us”.- Ludwig von Mises

---

See “Family Flourishing and State Denigration”-Samuel Peterson

---

# BAD LAW THREATENS SMALL RURAL TOWN OF GUILFORD

by Thomas Quiter

Former Chenango County Chair

The proposed Town of Guilford Local Law No. 01 of 2024, known as the “Town of Guilford Junk Storage Law,” aims to regulate the storage of junk, garbage, motor vehicles, and other discarded materials in the town. While the law’s stated purpose is to maintain a clean, safe, and attractive environment, its implications for the residents of Guilford, New York, could be harmful in several ways. My analysis of how this proposed law could adversely affect the people of Guilford follows.

Guilford is a rural community with a significant agricultural base. Farming operations, which often rely on the use of old farm equipment, machinery, and vehicles, could be disproportionately affected by the strict definitions and limitations set forth in the proposed law. The law’s broad definition of “junk” includes agricultural equipment such as tractors, harvesters, and other machinery, which might be stored on properties for parts or for future use. The law prohibits storing junk within sight of public highways and neighboring properties, which could make it difficult for farmers to store their equipment on their own land without facing fines or penalties.

Moreover, while the law does provide exceptions for “junk farm equipment,” these exceptions are conditional, only permitting such

storage when the equipment is not visible from the road. This restriction could prove burdensome for farmers who do not have enough space to hide their equipment from public view. The financial cost of compliance—either by building barriers, moving equipment, or disposing of usable items—could create a significant burden for these essential local businesses.

Furthermore, the proposed law outlines heavy fines for non-compliance, including penalties ranging from \$25 to \$250 day and 15 days in jail. These fines could accumulate quickly, especially for property owners who may not have the resources to immediately comply with the law’s storage requirements. For example, a person with several old or broken vehicles on their property might face daily fines until they can remove or store the vehicles out of sight. If the owner cannot afford to make the necessary changes, they may face escalating costs and even legal actions, further exacerbating financial hardship.

Additionally, the town has the authority to abate violations at the property owner’s expense, which means that residents could face costs not only for the violation itself but also for the town’s enforcement actions, including legal fees and administrative costs. If unpaid, these charges could be levied as liens against the property, further threatening the financial stability of residents. This provision could partic-



ularly harm low-income families or elderly residents who may not have the financial means to manage such expenses.

Guilford’s rural nature means that many residents rely on the ability to store items on their property, whether for personal, agricultural, or recreational use. The law’s sweeping restrictions on the storage of “junk” could restrict this practice, impacting people who store items such as old cars, appliances, or recreational vehicles (RVs) on their own land. While the law allows for some exemptions, it does not take into account the practical realities of rural life. Many residents may not have the means to conceal large items from the view of neighbors or passersby, which could lead to inadvertent violations and subsequent fines.

For instance, RVs and mobile  
**(continued on page 11)**

---

**(continued from page 10)**

homes are common in rural communities, often used for seasonal stays or as secondary dwellings. The law bans the use of these vehicles for junk storage, regardless of their condition, and mandates that they be removed from sight. For those who use these vehicles occasionally or have long-term plans for restoration, this provision could cause undue hardship by forcing them to either comply with expensive storage solutions or face penalties. The law's focus on aesthetic concerns over practical uses of space fails to recognize the more relaxed and utilitarian lifestyle that many rural residents enjoy.

The law designates an enforcement officer responsible for monitoring compliance, which could place a significant strain on the town's already limited resources. The enforcement officer would need to inspect properties, respond to complaints, and issue fines, potentially leading to an overworked department and inefficient use of public funds. This added burden could detract from other vital town services, as law enforcement and administrative staff would be diverted to policing minor infractions related to junk storage. Moreover, given that many residents may not fully understand the law's extensive requirements, the enforcement officer could face challenges in educating the public and ensuring fair compliance.

Another potential harm of this law is the strain it could place on relationships between the town government and its residents. While some people may support efforts to clean up their community, the broad and

somewhat ambiguous language of the law leaves ample room for interpretation and could be seen as overreaching. The regulation of personal property, particularly on private land, could foster resentment among residents who feel that their way of life is being unfairly scrutinized and restricted. Those who fail to comply could feel persecuted, especially if they believe that their practices are not harmful to the community.

As the law also allows for anonymous complaints, it could result in neighborly disputes and the weaponization of the law for personal grievances. This provision could lead to a rise in complaints that are not based on any actual harm or nuisance but are instead driven by interpersonal conflicts. In such a scenario, residents may feel targeted or harassed by both their neighbors and the local government, further eroding trust in local authorities.

While the law aims to reduce clutter and junk, it could inadvertently create environmental issues by encouraging the unnecessary disposal of usable items. As residents are forced to remove or hide old appliances, vehicles, and equipment, many may opt to dispose of them rather than repair or recycle them. This could lead to increased waste in landfills, which runs counter to broader environmental goals of sustainability and recycling. Furthermore, local businesses that could otherwise recycle or repurpose old vehicles or appliances may see a decline in business due to the law's restrictions.

Additionally, those without the financial means to comply with the law's mandates could resort to illegal dumping or burning of junk, which would lead to more environmental harm, rather than less.

While the law is meant to improve property values by reducing visual clutter, it could have the opposite effect in some areas, particularly for those with larger or rural properties. The law's focus on aesthetic concerns over the functional use of land could restrict how people utilize their property, potentially decreasing its marketability. Buyers interested in rural properties may be deterred by the heavy regulations and the associated costs of compliance. Moreover, the financial burden of forced cleanup could lower the resale value of properties, particularly those that require significant alterations to meet the law's standards.

While the Town of Guilford Local Law No. 01 of 2024 seeks to improve the town's visual and environmental standards, it could result in considerable harm to the residents, particularly those in rural and agricultural communities. By imposing strict storage regulations, financial penalties, and overburdening local resources, the law threatens to undermine the livelihoods of farmers, burden low-income families, and create unnecessary tensions between residents and the town government. Rather than enhancing the community, the law risks diminishing the quality of life for the people of Guilford, following in line with the Status Cuomo that still exists in Albany.

# COUNTY AFFILIATE NEWS

## ALBANY

**CONTACT:**

**Justin Carman, County Liasion**  
jcarman@lpny.org

## ALLEGANY

**CONTACT:**

**Jame VanDewalker,**  
**County Liasion**  
jvandewalker@lpny.org

**LEARN MORE:**

[fb.com/AlleganyCountyLP](https://fb.com/AlleganyCountyLP)

## CHAUTAUQUA

**NEXT MEETING:**

Tues., Dec. 10, 2024 @ 7:00 PM  
Shawbucks, Jametown, NY  
and Zoom

**CONTACT:**

**Andrew Kolstee, Chair**  
akolstee@lpny.org

**LEARN MORE:**

[www.chautauquaLP.org](http://www.chautauquaLP.org)  
[fb.com/chautauquaLP](https://fb.com/chautauquaLP)

## CHEMUNG

**CONTACT:**

**Craig Colwell, Chair**  
ccolwell78@gmail.com

**LEARN MORE:**

[lpchemung.org](http://lpchemung.org)

## COLUMBIA

**NEXT MEETING:**

Wed., Dec. 18, 2024 @ 7 PM  
Google Meet  
(third Wednesdays)

**CONTACT:**

**Scott Hoskins, Chair**  
scottdhoskins@gmail.com

## CLINTON

**CONTACT:**

**Zachary Remian,**  
**County Liaison**  
zremian@lpny.org  
(518) 310-6664

## DUTCHESS

**NEXT MEETING:**

Sat., Dec. 21, 2024 @ 5 PM  
Location Varies  
(3rd Saturdays)

**CONTACT:**

**Robert Cocomello, Chair**  
**Catrina Rocco, Vice-Chair**  
info@dutchesscountylp.org

**LEARN MORE:**

[dutchesscountylp.org](http://dutchesscountylp.org)

## ERIE

**NEXT MEETING:**

Held Monthly via Zoom

**CONTACT:**

**Duane Whitmer, Chair**  
chairman@eriecountylp.org

## KINGS (BROOKLYN)

**NEXT MEETING:**

Tues., Dec. 17, 2024 at 3 PM  
@ Fourth Avenue Pub  
76 4th Ave, Brooklyn, NY 11217  
(3rd Tuesdays)

**CONTACT:**

**Christopher Skelly, Chair**  
cskelly@cskelly.tech

## MADISON

**NEXT MEETING:**

TBD  
Hamilton Public Library

**CONTACT:**

**Mark Braiman, Chair**  
mbraiman@lpny.org



## MONROE

Contact the Monroe County Libertarian Party for meeting link. We also have monthly social meetings that you don't want to miss. There is also Google Group for announcements.

**NEXT MEETING:**

Thurs., Dec. 5, 2024 @ 7 PM  
(first Thursdays)

**CONTACT:**

**Steve Becker, Chair**  
drsbecker@aol.com

**LEARN MORE:**

monroecountylp.org

## NASSAU

**NEXT MEETING:**

Thurs., Dec. 12, 2024 at 7 PM  
@ Landmark Diner  
(2nd Thursdays)

**CONTACT:**

**Jon Gunther,**  
**Executive Committee Chair**  
jonguntherlibertarian@gmail.com

**Blay Tarnoff,**  
**County Committee Chair**  
LPNY@eblay.com

## NEW YORK (MANHATTAN)

**CONTACT:**

**Chance Haywood, Chair**  
chaywood@lpny.org

## NIAGARA

**CONTACT:**

**Wendi Szabo,**  
**Acting County Chair/  
County Liaison**  
wendiszabo@gmail.com

**NEXT MEETING:**

TBD

## ONEIDA

**NEXT MEETING:**

*Contact Keith for the link*

**CONTACT:**

**Keith Redhead, Chair**  
kredhead@lpny.org

## ONONDAGA

**NEXT MEETING:**

TBD

**CONTACT:**

**Rachel Becker, Chair**  
reb4128@rit.edu

## ORANGE

**CONTACT:**

**Juan Ayala, Chair**  
livefree@juanrayala.com

## PUTNAM

**NEXT MEETING:**

Thurs., Dec. 12, 2024 at 7 PM  
at McCarthy's  
374 Route 52, Carmel, NY 10512  
(2nd Thursdays)

**CONTACT:**

**Bill O'Donnell, Chair**  
billod10704@gmail.com

## QUEENS

**HOLIDAY LUNCHEON**

Sat., Dec. 14 at 12 PM  
Stamatis Greek  
and Mediterranean Restaurant  
at 29-09 23rd Avenue

**CONTACT:**

**John Clifton, Chair**  
mrjclifton@yahoo.com

## RENSSELAER

Since NOVEMBER 2022, the Rensselaer County Libertarian Party has been collecting food items and monetary donations to give monthly to StreetSoldiers Rensselaer.

**NEXT MEETING:**

Wed., Dec. 4, 2024 at 6:30 PM  
Alexis Diner, North Greenbush  
(first Wednesdays)

**CONTACT:**

**Jennifer O'Connor,**  
**Acting County Chair**  
joconnor@lpny.org

## RICHMOND (STATEN ISLAND)

**NEXT MEETING:**

Thurs., Dec. 19, 2024 @ 7 PM  
@ Coffee and Collectibles  
(3rd Thursdays)

**CONTACT:**

**Susan Overeem Cummings,**  
Chair  
susanovereem@gmail.com

## SARATOGA

**CONTACT:**

**Naz Garabedian, Chair**  
nazareth.garabedian  
@lawsonproducts.com

## SCHOHARIE

**CONTACT:**

**Lora Newell, Chair**  
lnewell@lpny.org

## SUFFOLK

**CONTACT:**

**George Ostrowski, Chair**  
gostrowskijr@msn.com

## TIOGA

**CONTACT:**

**Sara Price, Chair**  
sprice@lpny.org  
**Rich Purtell, Vice-Chair**  
rpurtell@lpny.org

## ULSTER

**NEXT MEETING:**

Mon., Dec. 9, 2024 at 6:30 PM  
Hickory BBQ, Kingston, NY  
(second Mondays)

**CONTACT:**

**Sam Kniffen, Chair**  
samkniffen01@gmail.com

**LEARN MORE:**

[www.UlsterLP.org](http://www.UlsterLP.org)

## WAYNE

**NEXT MEETING:**

Sat., Dec. 28, 2024 at 10 AM  
Yellow Mills Diner  
2534 NY-31  
Palmyra, NY 14522  
(last Saturdays)

**CONTACT:**

**Jim Dayton, Chair**  
jdayton@lpny.org

**LEARN MORE:**

[lpwaynecounty.org](http://lpwaynecounty.org)

## WESTCHESTER

**CONTACT:**

**Rajib Maitra**  
Acting County Chair/  
County Liaison  
rajib.maitra1@gmail.com

## YATES

**CONTACT:**

**Jeff Bradley, Chair**  
jbradley@lpny.org

# QUEENS LP HOLIDAY LUNCHEON

by Queens County  
Libertarian Party

Queens Libertarian members are finalizing choosing the best location to continue with in 2025 onward. Join us on Saturday, December 14, 2024 at 12:00 pm (noon) for a social meeting at our annual Christmas or Holiday Luncheon. The meeting will be at the Astoria venue we are trying again, Stamatis Greek and Mediterranean Restaurant at

29-09 23rd Avenue in the back area (menu details are at <https://stamatisrestaurant.site/>).

This talk will follow (as needed) a monthly business session, covering Queens LP planning and subcommittee updates. LPQC then tentatively plans to meet monthly at Tu Casa in Kew Gardens beginning in January going forward.

At the luncheon Chair John Clifton

will informally review local party development plans beginning in 2025, and citywide organizing for the LPNY city convention in the spring. Some plans may evolve around the potential decision of Larry Sharpe to run for NYC Mayor, college outreach, and building a fundraising machine to support a statewide petition drive in 2026. Those who have additional ideas or proposed projects are welcome to discuss them.

**Don't see your county listed?**

**We are looking for Libertarians  
to organize new  
County Affiliates!**

**Contact us for more details!**

**[affiliates@lpny.org](mailto:affiliates@lpny.org)**

# LPNY DIRECTORY

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Duane Whitmer** Chair  
**Daniel Castello** Vice Chair  
**Andrew Kolstee** Secretary  
**Chance Haywood** Treasurer  
**Christopher Skelly** Communications Director  
**Mark Axinn** Fundraising Director  
**Justin Carman** IT Director  
**Richard Purtell** Legislative Affairs Director  
**Pietro Geraci** Outreach Director  
**Paul Grindle** Political Director  
**Catrina Rocco** Volunteer Director

## COMMITTEE CHAIRS

**Daniel Castello**  
 Platform Committee Chair  
**Andrew Kolstee**  
 Rules Committee Chair

## STATE COMMITTEE

<b>Mark Axinn</b> (JD1)	<b>Andrew Kolstee</b> (JD8)
<b>Morry Davis</b> (JD1)	<b>Duane Whitmer</b> (JD8)
<b>Paul Grindle</b> (JD2)	<b>Vacant</b> (JD8)
<b>Gary Popkin</b> (JD2)	<b>Pietro Geraci</b> (JD9)
<b>Evan Lebrecht</b> (JD3)	<b>Catrina Rocco</b> (JD9)
<b>Justin Carman</b> (JD3)	<b>William Schmidt</b> (JD9)
<b>Vacant</b> (JD4)	<b>Jeffrey Denecke</b> (JD10)
<b>Vacant</b> (JD4)	<b>Jonathan Gunther</b> (JD10)
<b>Vacant</b> (JD4)	<b>Vincent O'Neill</b> (JD10)
<b>Daniel Castello</b> (JD5)	<b>Christian Padgett</b> (JD10)
<b>James Fitch</b> (JD5)	<b>Robert Schuon</b> (JD10)
<b>E. Rose Leatherman</b> (JD5)	<b>Blay Tarnoff</b> (JD10)
<b>Mark Braiman</b> (JD6)	<b>Francisco Olvera</b> (JD11)
<b>Charles Dorgan</b> (JD6)	<b>Irwin Mark Weinblatt</b> (JD11)
<b>Samuel Hordeski</b> (JD6)	<b>Vacant</b> (JD12)
<b>Steven Becker</b> (JD7)	<b>Susan Overeem-Cummings</b> (JD13)
<b>Justin Pelletier</b> (JD7)	<b>Chance Haywood</b> (ex-officio)
<b>Sean Phelan</b> (JD7)	<b>Richard Purtell</b> (ex-officio)
<b>James Ziobro</b> (JD7)	<b>Christopher Skelly</b> (ex-officio)
<b>Maura Botsford</b> (JD8)	

[info@lpny.org](mailto:info@lpny.org)

[www.LPNY.org](http://www.LPNY.org)

866-336-3120