GOP leaders urge: Ignore ‘Challenge’

Ignore the Libertarian Party’s “Challenge to the Republicans” – that’s the word GOP leaders have been quietly spreading among House members on Capitol Hill.

“We’ve struck a nerve,” said Steve Dasbach, National LP Chair.

According to sources in Washington, the GOP’s powerful Congressional Campaign Committee told Republican House members to disregard the LP’s 21-item “hit list” of federal programs, agencies, and policies to abolish.

“Don’t take the Libertarians seriously because they are not capable of kicking us out of our seats” is the message that LP National Committee member Don Ernsberger said Republicans were hastily circulating on Capitol Hill in early February. Ernsberger said the story was confirmed by Republican House staffers. “Everyone was talking about [it],” he said.

Dasbach said the quick response to the LP Challenge proves that Republicans are worried.

“If they weren’t concerned, they would have ignored us,” he said. “In past elections, when Republicans didn’t stand up for less government, Libertarians have cost them their seats. Now that they’ve been elected on a platform of less government, if they fail to cut the size of government, they could face increasing numbers of angry voters in 1996. Of course they’re nervous.”

Dasbach also noted the irony of the situation: “The Republicans – who got into office on a pledge to cut government – are instructing their new Congressmen not to cut government!”

Ernsberger said that some Congressmen may ignore the orders from the CCC. At a breakfast meeting on Capitol Hill on January 24, Ernsberger handed out copies of the Challenge to dozens of Congressmen, and got a very favorable response, he said.

“Many said, ‘Great, here’s a list of specific things to target,’ ” he reported. “One Congressman said, ‘This is what I need – a shopping list.’ ”

The Challenge to the Republicans was delivered to GOP leaders in January. It demanded that Republicans abolish or defund 21 specific programs and policies, including Amtrak, the Davis Bacon Act, the gun ban, “War On Drugs” civil liberties violations, and UN expenses.

LP looks at headquarters move to Watergate Office Building

The National LP is in the final stage of negotiations to move its headquarters from one of Washington’s less desirable neighborhoods to one of the most prestigious addresses in the nation’s capital — the Watergate Office Building.

“That’s the building where Richard Nixon almost toppled the Republican Party. We’ll be proud to move in there and complete the job,” quipped LP National Director Perry Willis.

However, the move is not yet a “done deal,” cautioned Willis. “We’re still engaged in lease negotiations, and will then have to meet with an architect to design the floor plans. But, if everything goes as planned, we hope to move in by May 1, 1995,” he said.

The Watergate Office Building borders a pleasant, tree-lined neighborhood on Virginia Avenue, and is just blocks away from the Kennedy Center and historic Georgetown. “This is an office to which we would be proud to bring VIPs, contributors, and party members. It will also fulfill a promise the party made several years ago to move out of our current, inadequate headquarters,” said Willis.

The Wall Street Journal called the planned move “a sign of the times” that the LP’s fortunes are on the upswing. “It would be a major step up in the world for us,” agreed Willis.
Party files petition for rehearing with U.S. Supreme Court in election protest.

By CARL LANGLEY
Staff Writer

Aiken County Libertarian Party Chairman Tom King said his political organization is going to give the American legal system "one last chance.

King's remark was in reference to the party's going back to the U.S. Supreme Court on an appeal of a nearly two-year old election decision lost by Libertarian candidate Doug Greene. Greene was defeated by a 628-623 vote in the Aiken County Council District 3 election held in April of 1993. The winner was Democrat LaWana McKenzie.

But the Libertarians refused to yield, citing voting irregularities when dealing with challenged ballots in split precincts, and took to protest through county and state election commissions and state and federal courts.

The party was rebuffed at every turn, but on Christmas week filed a petition for a rehearing before the Supreme Court in what was declared as the final leg in their challenge.

"This is the last step in the appeal process," said James Leslie Jr., Greene's attorney. Leslie said the party could file another suit in federal court but the term of the office would have ended.

During hearings after the election the county and state election commissions refused to throw out the results and the state and federal courts refused to hear the Libertarian challenge.

The protest led King to say that "there is little hope of finding justice in the current politically appointed legal system, but we felt we must give the system one last chance."

In the petition for rehearing, the party wants the court to vacate its denial of a review of the state's voting system. At the root of the protest is the handling of challenge ballots in so-called split precincts.

The Libertarians say that at least six eligible voters were not able to cast ballots in the District 3 election because of the handing of split precinct votes.

Split precincts provide a common voting place, but individual electors, although living next door or across the street from each other, can be in different council, school board and House district boundaries.

The Libertarians claim the workings of the county's split precincts put an unconstitutional burden on voters and deprives them of the equal protection mandates of the Constitution.

Edward H. Crane

Give Me Liberty, Not Utopia

In his column on the libertarian undercurrents of the political change that is sweeping the country [op-ed, Dec. 6], E. J. Dione sets up a straw man when he writes that "the libertarians have also replaced the Marxists as the world's case. At the same time, there is mounting empirical evidence to support the libertarians' theoretical case that a mini-state presence in society increasingly to the idea that adults are responsible now for themselves is that they are also responsible adults. So is removing government desire to help orphans. But what could such activities, much less do a good job resulting in "universal education," as welfare state would be limited to just result of a nearly two-year old election process that led to a dominance of a "permanent" government.
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Less is More

Libertarian Impulses Show Growing Appeal Among the Disaffected

When the Government Fails, Many Voters Are Asking: Who Needs It, Anyway?

Mixed Blessing to the GOP

By GERALD F. SEIB

WASHINGTON — It just might be that Bill Flicker, not Steve Granger, best illus- trates why the American political system is quaking.

Mr. Flicker, a sometime McGovern Demo- crat, is today a libertarian. This Phila- delphia-area computer consultant doesn’t just want less government. He questions the very need for most of it. He figures that in a world in which computer wizards are close to creating their own private, encrypted digital cash system for making transac- tions without any government involve- ment, the need for centralized authority is shriveling. “Government isn’t simply irrele- vant,” he says, “it’s totally irrele- vant.”

Mr. Flicker, who actually classifies his thinking as “post-libertarian,” may be an extreme example, but his feelings help illustrate the powerful public passions driving the revolution in the new GOP-con- trolled Congress. Though many voters probably don’t even realize it, much of the anger, sentiment coursing through their veins today isn’t traditionally Republican or even conservative. It’s libertarian.

Down With Government

Libertarians believe there is a need for a government role in virtually every area of their lives, personal as well as economic. A traditional Republican, by contrast, wants to comb through the government from top down to weed out certain programs and beef up others, like those designed to enhance “family values.” But a libertarian, he says, would work from the bottom up, challenging everything the government does and finding little worth doing.

Because of their growing disdain for government, more and more Americans appear to be drifting—not unwillingly—toward a libertarian philosophy. That seems particularly true among baby boomers returning to the “do your own thing” ethos of their youth and among young people involved in the intensely independent computer industry. Indeed, when the Gallup Organization last year asked questions about government’s role that were designed to distill Americans’ political philosophies, 22% of the public said “libertarian.”

The drift, therefore, is substantial but hardly universal, and it isn’t organized. The actual Libertarian Party remains a tiny political organization. And there are lots of problems inherent in this drift. Many people, Republicans particularly, who are drawn to libertarian economics may have a hard time swallowing the same kind of hands-off-government approach to abortion and school prayer.

Link to Conservatives

Still, the thinking of many Americans is changing. There is a libertarian sentiment going on, in the sense of a greater movement away from government power at all levels, than at certainly any time in recent history, says Clint Bolick, a prominent Washington attorney who often works with conservatives but considers himself a lib- ertarian.

Shifting sentiments made Republicans’ basic antigovernment message so successful in the November election and, after- ward, that energized the 1992 explosion of Ross Perot voters. His people tended to be conservative on fiscal matters, hands-on social issues and utterly disdainful of government.

The desire to keep pace with such public sentiment is what has led some Republicans to try solutions that pure libertarian thinkers would recoil at—by even advocating efforts by some in the party to pass a school-taxer amendment or to restrict gay rights, just as surely as they might brainstorm Democrats’ efforts to raise taxes to pay for welfare.

A true libertarian would do away with all bans on marijuana or drugs, too – an idea that could set off a food fight at any Republican gathering. Many liber- 
tharians would like to see Social Security become voluntary. Libertarians see little need for foreign entanglements, so they see no need to pare defense spending.

Some of these ideas are too rich for the blood of even antigovernment Republic- 

cans, not to mention middle-of-the- roaders. Mr. Flicker, for example, is one of those who supports a “harm principle,” and supports the Internal Revenue Service, for instance, because he thinks it’s a good thing for the Internal Revenue Service, for instance, the burden of financing government func- tions that everyone considers essential – national defense, the courts and foreign policy – would fall inordinately on this sector of the population. In the same technologi- cal sophistication.

On a more practical level, Mr. Brown- back, the new congressman from Kansas, worries how voters will react if federal agencies designed to protect public safety are eliminated and some hibernating disaster occurs. And asked whether farmers are really ready to give up government subsi- dies, Rep. Brownback, himself a member of the new congressman from Kansas, re- plies that “a number of people are there,” but others aren’t.

Indeed, a new Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll, released last week, is drift- ing, but it also illustrates that the public still is wary about some cuts. Nearly half of all adults surveyed – especially those in the South, Republicans and white men – say that most government regulations are unnecessary and harm the economy. Some government agencies are widely regarded as unnecessary, too, but those guarding health and safety.

That the public wants change seems clear from the results of last fall’s elec- tions. But exactly what sort of change has yet to be spelled out. “In general, it seems like people have lost faith in government as the solution to problems in general, be they social problems or economic problems,” says Jeffrey Singer, a 43-year-old general surgeon from Phoenix who considers him- self a libertarian. He thinks people are now more disposed to do-it-yourself problem solving.

A sign of the times: The Libertarian Party, which has just elected a new national staff and moved out of its current, modest head- quarters on Capitol Hill. The Libertarians’ new home: the Watergate office complex, long the scene of the crime that brought down Richard Nixon.

But since many Americans don’t spend all that much time analyzing their political philosophies, it is likely that much of today’s antigovernment sentiment arises from what people see as the government’s trial and error. Voters feel government has tried to solve problems but has been ineffi- cient or ineffective in doing so. “It’s not do- 
cratic,” says J.D. Hayworth, a fresh- man Congressman from Arizona who analyzes his constituents’ views. “It’s in- herently practical.”

What Goes Government?

Many analysts, in fact, think it was President Clinton’s ill-fated health-care reform proposals, widely supported at first but then abandoned by many voters, that sparked a rethinking of government’s role. “People were saying, ‘We don’t want you to run our health care. And come to think of it, we don’t want you to run much of anything else for us,’ ” says Edward Edward, president of the Cato Insti- tute, Washington’s bastion of libertarian thought.

Similarly, the demise of an overarching national security threat from Moscow has inspired many Americans to reconsider the need for a big government to protect them.

Whatever the cause, the signs of a drift toward libertarianism are everywhere. Shifting sentiments made Republicans’ campaign for an orientation session sponsored by the con- servative Heritage Foundation, for in- stance, of some them immediately began backpedaling about a Heritage analyst’s proposal to phase out farm subsidies over a period of five years. The new lawmakers didn’t at all think the idea too radical. Some figuring it didn’t go far enough, and thus proposed a cold-turkey approach: Why not cut out the subsidies immedi- ately?

When members of the new House Ap- propriations Committee began to look for billions of dollars in spending cuts this month, they called in an analyst from the Cato Institute for advice.

And the tiny Libertarian party, which is the scene of the crime that brought down the Internal Revenue Service, for instance, the burden of financing government func- tions that everyone considers essential – national defense, the courts and foreign policy – would fall inordinately on this sector of the population. In the same technologi- cal sophistication.

One member of DigiLiberty is Bruce Fancher, a 23-year-old who in the late 1980s earned brief notoriety as a hacker who broke into computer systems, though he was never charged with a crime. He is president of a computer communications company called Phantom Access Technolo- gies Inc. “Being involved in computers or the Internet, you inevitably move toward being a libertarian,” he says. “It’s basi- cally possible to keep all of your secrets from prying eyes, particularly the prying eyes of the federal government.”

Mr. Fancher also is intrigued by anony- mous digital cash, a plan for creating electronic “cash” by stringing together bits of information that can be exchanged in place of paper currency, and electroni- cally encrypted so the transaction can’t be monitored by the government. That would include the government’s tax collectors, who would be powerless to exact a toll on this barrier in electronic play money.
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THE SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF SUCH IDEAS ARE ENORMOUS, PARTICULARLY TO THE TAX SYSTEM.
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What Libertarians stand for

By Kimberly Kauer
Northeastern News Service

The idea of no speed limit might be exciting, but what if all laws and laws grown up? And Social Security, welfare, and the post office, too? How would society survive?

Quite well, thank you says the Libertarian Party, which during the last election was able to receive the 1 percent of votes needed in Massachusetts to gain state recognition. Libertarians will now automatically be on the ballot.

What the Libertarians advocate is simple, yet extreme: the abolishment of government. Of course there would have to be some laws:

"Muder, for example, is not something we advocate," said Bill Wexler, spokesman for the national Libertarian Party. According to the Libertarian national headquarters, they oppose laws setting a minimum drinking age. Instead, they promote a legal environment where individuals may make the choice to drink.

A cornerstone of the Libertarian platform is the totally free marketplace economy. In fact, they say that a free market will stimulate a boom in new business, creating more jobs, and eliminating the need for welfare.

In fact, it was a reaction to Nixon's Administration policies regarding wage and price controls which encouraged a group of Republicans to form the Libertarian Party in 1971. Libertarians ran for president in several states and they received one electoral vote from Vermont, according to Roger McKibben, who replaced Nixon as he was supposed to do.

The party gained popularity, although relatively small, among college students during the 1970s. "The Libertarian push for freedom across the board, and our emphasis on individual rights attracted many," Wexler said.

During the late '70s, Students for a Libertarian Society and other political parties were financed by Charles and David Koch. During David Coke's campaign for vice president of the United States in 1980, he contributed $2 million to the Libertarian campaign, boosting the party's national profile at least until the election. Following the 1980 election performance (Libertarians only won 1 percent of the vote), many left the party, including its two main supporters: the Coke brothers.

More than 20 years later, the party seems to be coming back. According to the Secretary of State's office, Massachusetts has now has 423 registered Libertarians. A small number compared to, the 1,266,358 registered Democratic, Republican, and Libertarian voters, but enough to obtain major party status.

During the past election, 98 Libertarian candidates ran for all types of offices in New Hampshire, and many won. According to Libertarian national headquarters, there are 100,000 registered Libertarians in 50 states. Twenty-two states, including Massachusetts, included, are not included in that number because of lack of all major party status. Massachusetts will be added to that figure, as well as other states, according to Wexler. Libertarians became official third party this month:

"We've had problems gaining ballot status due to some very restrictive laws," Wexler said. "Of course Republicans and Democrats don't want any more competition than they already have, so they have worked very much to stop these laws from being overturned in our state," he said.

The anti-established party control of elections was a theme of Andre Marrou, the Libertarian candidate for president's 1992 campaign. One of four presidential candidates on the ballot in all 50 states, Marrou was excluded from presidential debates while independent candidate Ross Perot was included.

"The Democrats and the Republicans don't want the Libertarian message to be heard," Marrou said in 1992. "And they don't want the Libertarian movement to grow." Yet, Wexler did credit Perot with helping Libertarians.

"I believe there were choices other than the Republicans or Democrats," Wexler said. The Libertarians see the presidency, the ultimate goal, as their objective. "We think they have the right person on their side: God. "I believe in the Libertarian message to be heard," Marrou said in 1992. "And the Coke brothers played a role in this." Yet, Wexler did credit Perot with helping Libertarians.

According to Libertarian headquarters, they oppose federal authority. "I'm going to hold you personally responsible," he said.

Robert Edwards / News-Leader

Libertarian leader takes on two tasks

Libertarian leader Bill Johnson of Springfield expects to wear two political hats into 1996 — one as the U.S. Senate candidate, recently was chosen party executive director with the aim of boosting membership and finding candidates at all levels for next year's elections.

We'll do the Libertarian organizing work for free, said Johnson and state Libertarian Chairman Phil Horras of Springfield.

Johnson said he would try to earn a salary through fund-raising efforts for the 100 Amendment Committee he set up in Missouri.

The committee will be a part of a loose association of like-minded groups springing up in other states.

"It's a good issue to get identified with, and no one is carrying the ball for it in Missouri," Johnson said. And he believes the effort can spark interest in the Libertarian Party, he said.

The aim is to recruit legislative candidates who will push the issue in their campaigns and will now other candidates to stand on it as well, Johnson said. The idea is for states to reassert their sovereignty under the 10th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and to work for limited federal authority.

The party's support of legislating against a drug that turns people off, he said, so that should not be first thing Libertarians ought to put forward. "I want a foot in the door," Johnson said. "The car salesman's not going to show you the sticker price first."

Dare-paying Libertarians number about 206 in Missouri, Horras said. Johnson, who came in a distant third in the Senate race in November, won 10,000 votes.

Horras said he was one of the few legislators who voted against Nixon's dual position when the issue was discussed in a meeting in Columbia two weeks ago. He said he voted the role more defined and needed more detail on what materials would be used and what party principles would be emphasized. Still, Horras said he wants the project to work and will support Johnson. But he said mainstream voters, who gather in organizations like Rotary Clubs and Chambers of Commerce, should be targeted.

"If the party's going to grow, it's got to go after the center," he said

Johnson said he agreed with the need to reach out to the broad middle range of Missourians. But he said he won't ignore some groups that may be concerned fringe because they seem more active and could be allies.

Horras said whatever becomes the Libertarian presidential candidate in 1996 will still have difficulty becoming known and winning votes. The 1992 hopeful received less than 1 percent of the vote.

"We didn't have a gimmick or money," he said. For example, a political stunt like driving a car in reverse across the country to show how backward the system might be.

But Horras said if Clinton runs, he'll be so unpopular, the Libertarians could gain a greater following. "I'm going to hold you personally responsible," he said.

By Kimberly Kauer
Northeastern News Service

The Libertarian Party was officially recognized earlier this month as the third party in Massachusetts. The party can now hold primary elections, and voters may register as Democratic, Republican, Libertarian or Unenrolled (Independent).

Horras said whoever becomes the Libertarian candidate might work in the Libertarians' favor, too? How would so-called Contract With America work? Libertarians may be partly responsible. Houtras said he was one of the few Republicans to form the Libertarian or Unenrolled party in 1971. Libertarians are a project to work and will support Johnson. But he said mainstream voters, who gather in organizations like Rotary Clubs and Chambers of Commerce, should be targeted.

And he believes the effort can stimulate a boom in new business, creating more jobs, and eliminating the need for welfare.
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Libertarian hopeful to visit San Diego

By Chris Moran
Staff Writer

Harry Browne has even beaten Texas Sen. Phil Gramm to the punch. The 61-year-old investment advisor has his sights set on the White House and could cut the budget overnight, said Browne in a telephone interview Friday as he drove Interstate 800 near his home in Lafayette.

By cuts, Browne means something a lot different from the Republicans' "Contract With America".

"I believe the president should just say he will not sign the budget unless it is one-third the size of the present budget," Browne said. This would allow the federal government to get by on Browne's proposed remap of the tax system: either a 10 percent flat income tax or 10 percent sales tax.

The "Contract With America" may be worthwhile for candidates, but it may not be for voters, Browne said. He said Browne means something more from the Republicans' "Contract With America".
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