



# May 2001

## “2001: LPT Odyssey” State Conference, Houston, July 13-15

by Nancy Neale, TORCHESS@TEXAS.NET

### Contents

- 2....Legislative Update
- 2.... Letters
- 2.... Campaign 2002
- 3....The Future of Freedom Foundation
- 3....Kill the Death Tax
- 3.... Theatre of the Absurd
- 4.... Are You Shirking Your Duty to Help Keep America Free?
- 5.... Miscellanea
- 5.... The Lie of Cannabis Prohibition
- 6.... News from National
- 7.... The Same Roots
- 8.... DEA – DOA
- 9.... A Surprising Quiz: Bush's First 100 Days
- 11..Dr. John Turnbow Makes Impact On Local Politics.
- 13..Around the State

We have great plans for Texas Libertarians the weekend of July 13-15. Make sure to block off those dates in your calendar now and make your hotel reservations at the fabulous Hyatt Regency Houston Airport Hotel.

As this is not an election year, there will be no “party business” at the conference – just great guest speakers with wonderful stories and valuable information, training and motivation. You can look forward to a rewarding weekend and come away energized and proud to be a Libertarian, armed with ammunition to take on the world.

Conventions and Conferences are a terrific way to meet and spend time with your fellow Libertarians, exchanging tips and tales, and meeting some of the Libertarian luminaries. If you've been to one before, you know what I mean. If you haven't, then you must come to Houston on July 13, 14 and 15 and see what you've been missing!

Some of those luminaries you'll see and hear this year are American Indian activist and actor **Russell Means**, 2000 US Senate candidate from Massachusetts **Carla Howell**, Advocates for Self-Government founder **Marshall Fritz**, motivator

and Harry Browne campaign manager **Michael Cloud**, Texas' (new) “favorite daughter” **Dr. Mary Ruwart**, U.S. Congressman **Dr. Ron Paul**, plus other locals like **Gil Guillory**, **Dr. Debra Monde**, IRV (instant runoff voting) advocate **David Cobb**, DPFT president **Dr. Al Robison**, etc., etc.

The conference prices are just a little higher than in the past few years, but still much lower than you could expect to pay for a conference of this caliber. And we got rock-bottom prices for the guest rooms at the Hyatt, so it's a real steal.

Here's a run-down of the general schedule. The registration will start around 3:00 or 4:00 on Friday afternoon. There will be a Welcome Reception on Friday evening at around 6:00, co-hosted by **Carol Jones** of the Texas CSE (Citizens for a Sound Economy). On Saturday there will be a breakfast with Ron Paul, lunch with Marshall Fritz and the banquet featuring Russell Means. In between the meals there will be workshop/speaker sessions. On Sunday there will be a breakfast with Carla Howell followed by more workshops, ending around

*Continued on page 12*

# Legislative Update

From Barry Smith,  
BXS8401@DCCCD.EDU

See details at [HTTP://WWW.CAPITOL.STATE.TX.US](http://www.capitol.state.tx.us). See discussions of bills by joining [HTTP://GROUPS.YAHOO.COM/GROUP/LPTexas-Watchdog/Join](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/LPTexas-Watchdog/Join)

SB129 and SJR3, providing appointment of appeals court judges, were reported favorably by committee.

SB1074, prohibiting racial profiling, was passed in the Senate with several amendments and sent to the House April 5.

SB866, a long, detailed Texas Privacy Act which appears to restrict government handling of personal information (I haven't read it in detail), was passed by the Senate, with many amendments, and is now in the House State Affairs Committee.

HB1501 requiring officers to restore premises after a search was reported favorably by committee with what appear to be minor amendments.

HB2696 exempting small amounts of cash from civil asset forfeiture was reported favorably by the Criminal Jurisprudence Committee. It was amended and the amendments haven't been posted yet.

SB242 to outlaw pretext searches was a weak bill which was amended in committee to water it down even further.

HB588 to require DNA testing of anyone convicted of any felony was watered down somewhat in committee to reduce the amount of testing.

HJR56 setting a moratorium on executions was considered in a hearing April 3, and no action taken.

HB2353, a bill originally to allow rural principals to carry guns, was amended to allow people authorized by the school district to carry guns only at sporting events.

SB85, creating a penalty of life imprisonment without parole (an alternative to the death penalty) was considered in hearing April 4, and no action taken.

SB116, making draft registration automatic on applying for a driver's license, was reported favorably by committee and sent to the Local and Consent Calendar for "non-controversial" bills.

HJR22 to abolish sovereign immunity was considered in hearing and no action taken on April 4.

HB84 forbidding felons to own body armor was passed by the House on April 5.

HB617 allowing cities to use neighborhood associations to enforce housing codes was passed by the house on April 5.

## Letters

In the latest *Lone Star Liberty*, Clyde Garland writes about how leafletting in some precincts in his new home county produced an upturn in the percentages drawn by LP candidates.

What he was probably too modest to mention is that he has had similar results from such an effort in his former home county, Harris.

Several years ago, Clyde obtained the list of registered voters in his precinct. Narrowing it down to those he considered the best prospects, he sent out a mailing on the LP. Based on the response, he winnowed the list again, and followed up with mailings on various referenda that came up, as well as one promoting LP nominees at the next General Election.

While the effort made a modest improvement in percentages for the candidates, it produced a significant upswing in the pro-Liberty/anti-statist percentages of his precinct's vote on the referenda.

This is why grass-roots work is so important. And why each of us should be, for

## Submissions Policy and Deadlines

Unsolicited manuscripts and submissions are welcome and will be considered for publication in upcoming issues of *Lone Star Liberty*. Manuscripts may be submitted via mail, fax or email. Length should be no more than 750 words per manuscript. We reserve the right to edit for clarity and length. Submissions are articles, letters to the editor, or information for the *Around the State@* column. Indicate in which category the submission is to be considered.

The deadline for a particular issue is the 25<sup>th</sup> day of the month, two months prior, i.e., for January, the deadline is the preceding November.

Late breaking news will be considered according to timeliness and relevance.

Advertising space is available in a variety of formats.

Send submissions, article ideas and requests for advertising rates to

Barbara Cunningham, Editor  
*Lone Star Liberty*  
301 Porter  
Caldwell, TX 77836-1825  
(979) 567-3313 fax  
CHARLESB@TCA.NET

**Lone Star Liberty Staff**  
**Publications Chair and Editor**  
Barbara Cunningham  
**Fax:**  
(979) 567-3313  
**Email:**  
CHARLESB@TCA.NET  
**Submissions**  
301 Porter  
Caldwell, TX 77836-1825  
*For information about the Libertarian Party of Texas or to send contributions, please contact PO Box 56426, Houston, TX 77256-6426 or call 1-800-422-1776*

**Lone Star Liberty**  
Vol. 12, Issue 3  
*Published monthly by*  
The Libertarian Party of Texas  
PO Box 56426  
Houston, Texas 77256-6426

give the somewhat corny term, "ambassadors for Liberty" on a day-in, day-out basis. Someone you talk to today might be swayed to vote our way on an issue, even if not on all issues, if you take the time to plug that position, however briefly.

A thumbs-up to all who participated in the leafletting Clyde wrote about, and to Clyde, for his work here in Harris County a few years ago. Let a hundred Garlands bloom!  
From Jeff Daiell, JEFFDAIELL@YAHOO.COM

## Campaign 2002

### David Hutzelman Latest Daiell Campaign Honorary Co-Chair

I am proud to announce that David Hutzelman, longtime libertarian advocate and our 1982 gubernatorial nominee, has become an Honorary Co-Chair of the Daiell For Governor Campaign.

Dave also ran twice for a seat on the Texas Railroad Commission, on a platform on "Sunsetting" that agency. For those of

# The Future of Freedom Foundation

## Kill the Death Tax

by Sheldon Richman

Are we supposed to be impressed that some of the country's richest men want the government to continue taxing estates? I don't see why their opinion on this matter is worth more than that of anyone else. After all, just because someone is good at making money, that doesn't make him an authority on economics or ethics.

But Warren Buffett, George Soros, David Rockefeller, William Gates Sr., and several others with deep pockets say the Republicans are wrong to phase out the death tax, which can take up to 55 percent of an estate and force the liquidation of businesses and farms. These men fret that repealing the tax would reduce charitable giving, impose burdens on the nonwealthy, and establish a plutocracy by letting the rich pass their wealth on to their children.

Do these arguments have any merit? None at all.

Buffett *et al.* claim that if estates are not taxed, people like themselves won't give as much to charity. In other words, charity is merely a tax shelter. Perhaps they should speak for themselves. In the nineteenth century, before there was an estate or income tax, the wealthy gave huge sums to charitable

causes of all kinds. In the 1980's, when top income-tax rates were cut substantially, philanthropy soared. Apparently, rich folks give money out of generosity, tax considerations or no tax considerations.

But even if it were true that giving would drop with repeal of the death tax, so what? In a free society the government should not use the tax system to manipulate the people. Stimulating charity is a poor reason to impose or maintain a tax. The argument that getting rid of the death tax will burden the rest of us is also weak. True, if other taxes are raised to make up the revenue, that would be harmful. But there is no need to raise other taxes. Surpluses are anticipated, remember? Moreover, the federal budget, approaching \$2 trillion, should be slashed dramatically. And finally, the estate tax really doesn't bring in much money, because people like Buffett hire lawyers to find ways to avoid it.

Finally, the rich defenders of the tax fear that if the wealthy can pass all their money on to their kids, no one else will be able to get rich. This is the most ridiculous reason of all. It is so riddled with fallacies that one hardly knows where to start.

The most basic fallacy here is that the amount of wealth is fixed; that if Buffett can give all his money to his children, someone outside his family will be deprived of an opportunity to get rich. To see how absurd this is, all you have to do is read up on how life changed in the United States between 1800

and 1900, when there was no estate or income tax. Living standards for everyone improved substantially. Why? Because new wealth was created at an unprecedented rate. In the following hundred years, material well-being accelerated at an undreamed-of rate. It had nothing to do with taxes. Rather, it had everything to do with freedom and entrepreneurship. That Warren Buffett leaves his fortune to his children in no way impedes a scruffy, ambitious kid in a garage from working his tail off to launch a possibly world-changing enterprise.

In fact, the opposite is the case. Without a death tax, great fortunes remain in the private sector to be invested in new products and services. The next Bill Gates, Jr. has a better chance of getting rich without an estate tax than with it; not because he can inherit all his father's money, but rather because no estates would be diverted to wasteful government spending schemes. (Gates, Jr. obviously did not have to inherit money to become the world's richest man.) The idea that the government will make better use of those fortunes is demonstrably wrong.

If the economics of the death tax is flawed, the ethics is worse. The question that always gets lost is whose money is it? If the creators of wealth aren't entitled to dispose of it, no one is. And if their designated heirs aren't entitled to own it, one is hard pressed to understand how the government or "the people" are. Is this a free society or not?

Sheldon Richman is senior fellow at The Future of Freedom Foundation ([WWW.FFF.ORG](http://WWW.FFF.ORG)) in Fairfax, Va., and editor of *Ideas on Liberty* magazine.

## Theatre of the Absurd

Do we live in a police state?

The Supreme Court recently ruled that a police officer can arrest and take to jail someone who is not wearing a seat belt. Their ruling was that it is not a violation of the Constitution to be arrested and jailed for a crime for which the maximum punishment is a fine, unless the individual state legislatures passed laws expressly prohibiting it.

So, you can be jailed for not wearing your seat belt, even though you endanger no one but yourself. You can be jailed if your passenger does not wear a seat belt, even though your passenger is an adult who refuses to wear a seat belt and cannot be made to wear one without the use of force.

The list of crimes for which we can be punished grows ever longer, while the list of "permitted behavior" continually shrinks. More and more, the state usurps our status as adults, reducing us to the level of incompetent children who need permanent keepers. Is this what our ancestors fought for in

1776? Did our founding fathers take on the super power of their age so that we can be numbered, taxed and controlled? Would George Washington approve of a government dictating our behavior down to the minutest detail? Would Thomas Jefferson allow our government to mandate incarceration for what is, at best, behavior the government has no business dictating?

I don't think so. But I've long since decided that our government does not really care what our founding fathers stood for. I've come to the conclusion that the Constitution is an inconvenient piece of paper to be ignored as much as possible while giving lip service to it in order to lull the masses away from the truth. If I am mistaken, someone please correct me. Show me where I am wrong.

You can go to jail for not wearing a seat belt.

So, do we live in a police state? You tell me.

**Robert F. Lockhart,  
C.P.A.**

**P. O. Box 1398  
Pasadena, Texas 77501**



**(713) 475-0092**

**Paid Advertisement**

# Are You Shirking Your Duty to Help Keep America Free?

by Vin Suprynowicz, VIN@LVRJ.COM  
Reprinted from *The Libertarian Enterprise*, Issue 114, March 26, 2001

Given the number of unconstitutional enactments blithely put into force in this country in recent decades, the most common defense in any federal courtroom should be:

1) The Declaration of Independence instructs us that legitimate governments are instituted among men to “secure the unalienable Rights” with which we are “endowed by our Creator,” among these being “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,” necessarily including an unalienable right to retain and profit from the fruits of our labors.

2) Following logically from this precedent, the U.S. Constitution creates a government of sharply limited powers, such powers being limited to those specifically listed.

3) The Ninth and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendments, still part of the highest law of the land, superseding all subsequent enactments, further assure us that the people have many rights “not enumerated” in the Constitution, and that “any powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution” are reserved to the states or the people.

4) In his definitive 1803 ruling in the watershed case “Marbury vs. Madison,” Chief Justice Marshall instructed us that any unconstitutional enactment must be treated as though it never existed.

5) Therefore, since the statute, regulation, ordinance, edict, or “interpretation of code” under which the defendant now stands accused, represents an attempt by the federal legislature and/or bureaucracy to meddle in an area where it has no constitutional authorization (trafficking in constitutionally protected firearms, trafficking in medicinal plant extracts, declining to “volunteer” to pay unconstitutional direct federal taxes or to participate in a federal retirement pension or “payroll withholdings” scheme; “money laundering” to facilitate such commerce, etc. etc. etc.)

6) These charges should be dismissed; and the defendant declared innocent.

The reason this widely appropriate and fully adequate defense is seldom heard, of course, is that the black-robed lawyers who today masquerade as “judges” in our court system will not permit such things to be spoken. Defense attorneys are actually threatened

with jail if they so much as dare to advance such an argument, the rationale being that “We’re only here to decide the facts of the case. If you want to argue unconstitutionality of the underlying statute, the time to do that is years from now at the appellate level, after the defendant is bankrupt, has lost his home and family, and has been infected with a fatal disease by being gang-raped in the prisons for a couple of years.”

This is a lie, of course, and any judge who says such a thing should him (or her)self be indicted for violation of his oath of office (treason), and for depriving a citizen of his civil rights under color of law. If and only if unanimously convicted by a randomly selected jury, such judges should be stripped of their office for life, imprisoned, and, in cases where such misconduct has had a particularly egregious effect on the life of an innocent defendant, executed.

That’s not going to happen any time soon, of course. So decadent has our nation become that our lawmakers laugh scornfully at the notion that there are any restrictions whatsoever on how much they can tax or what they can spend it on, while the cynical, ambitious lawyers who staff our prosecutors’ offices would never dream of enforcing the Bill of Rights by indicting most of our sitting politician/judges for violating their oaths.

Does any constitutional safeguard remain? Actually, yes. Though the Constitution is primarily a bill of limitations on government action, it does create through strong implication a few duties for the citizen. Since no fewer than three of the first 10 amendments deal with the right to a trial before a randomly selected citizen jury, there must obviously be some duty for citizens not only to serve on juries when called, but also to remain knowledgeable about their duty to stand as a last line of defense for fellow citizens being railroaded under unconstitutional edicts.

One searches the writings of the founders in vain for the notion that jurors should “decide only the facts and not the law”, in fact, constitutions of early states like Maryland specifically mention that jurors must be allowed to decide the law as well as the facts of the case. Nor will we find any mention of “runaway juries” or “rogue juries” to describe jurors who acquit despite a judge’s instructions that the law gives them “no choice but to convict if you find that the defendant acted as charged,” in fact, America’s freedom of the press was born in

New York’s John Peter Zenger case, where the jury acquitted under just such circumstances.

Poisoning the language of freedom

Similarly, today’s champions of tyranny, and the victim disarmament which is a necessary condition for the advancement of any enduring tyranny, have been busy for some years attempting to demonize the term “militia.”

What does “militia” actually mean? Richard Henry Lee, who drafted the Second Amendment as well as the rest of the Bill of Rights, gave us a definitive answer in 1788: “A militia, when properly formed, are in fact the people themselves. ... The Constitution ought to secure a genuine [militia] and guard against a select militia, by providing that the militias shall always be kept well organized, armed, and disciplined, and include ... all men capable of bearing arms, and that all regulations tending to render this militia useless and defenseless, by establishing select corps of militia, or distinct bodies of military men not having permanent interests and attachments in the community [are] to be avoided. ... To preserve liberty, it is essential that the whole body of the people always possess arms, and be taught alike, especially when young, how to use them.”

But mention “militia” in polite company today, and many folks, having been fed regular doses of the aforementioned carefully crafted collectivist propaganda, automatically think of some small band of racist skinhead kooks in Montana or Idaho, embracing the laughable racism of “The Turner Diaries” and preaching some deviant doctrine of white supremacy and racial separation.

Yet the arguments of these gun-grabbers quickly turn in on themselves, “as dogs upon their masters,” in Shakespeare’s phrase. They have long assured us, despite the firm disagreement of such well-known left-wing legal scholars as Lawrence Tribe, that the Second Amendment doesn’t mean what it clearly says (“The right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed.”) Why? Because those of us who would honor our Constitution and do our duty to defend it (and the free country it created) supposedly ignore the introductory clause of the amendment, to wit, “A well regulated Militia being necessary to the security of a free State ...”

Well, what’s the plain meaning of this clause? Note the use of the word “free.” A well-practiced citizen militia is not necessary to the security of a police state, since police states have droves of uniformed bully boys

## Miscellanea

Whatever happened to the concept of restitution?

Once upon a time, if I injured you (stole your property, maimed you, killed you, whatever), I had to pay you (or your family) restitution to make you whole. There was a connection between crime and punishment, between criminal and victim. This connection did not deter the hard core criminal, but it did deter the casual one. And it allowed for redemption.

Now, the state assumes the role of victim and exacts retribution which often has no connection to the original crime. And the authentic victim is left wounded and cannot be made whole. There is no connection between criminal and victim, between crime and punishment. There is no redemption. So there is nothing to deter the casual criminal, much less the hard core one.

There is no justification for the state to usurp your place as the victim of a crime. There is no reason for the state to exact vengeance in your name. Because the vengeance the state exacts is not for you, it is for the state. And if you do not believe this, then look at the prisons filled with people who have committed crimes against no one but themselves. If there is no victim, why is there a crime?

Our criminal justice system is no longer what it is supposed to be. Prosecutors today like to think of themselves as “the people’s attorney,” but they’re not; they are the state’s attorneys. Our laws today are based upon the concept of the people belonging to the state rather than the state to the people. Once, when crime was local, punishment was local. Now, both crime and punishment belong to the state. Restitution is a forgotten concept. And redemption is impossible.

We used to understand that life has an economic value. Now, because crime and punishment flow through the state, life has no value. We are wounded and cannot be made whole.

Our platform calls for a return to the concept of restitution. People who have suffered loss through criminal action understand this concept far better than we realize. They desperately desire healing but the state denies them. We have the opportunity of reaching out to them with the promise of restitution.

If you are the victim of a crime, why should you then become a victim of the state?

Whatever happened to restitution?

## The Lie of Cannabis Prohibition

by Bill St. Clair, [BILL@BILLSTCLAIR.COM](mailto:BILL@BILLSTCLAIR.COM)  
Reprinted from *The Libertarian Enterprise*, Issue 113, March 19, 2001

Why is marijuana illegal? Why is it called marijuana instead of its proper name of cannabis hemp? In the 1930’s, a new machine was invented that made it much cheaper to use the pulp from the cannabis hemp plant. This threatened the profits of William Randolph Hearst from his forest paper pulp business and the DuPont company from their bleaching and plastic making chemical processes. They teamed up with Harry Anslinger in the U.S. government and invented marijuana out of whole cloth. Hearst’s newspapers ran sensationalist stories about the harms of this evil weed, and those stories were used as evidence in congress to pass a tax on marijuana. The congress people who voted for this legislation didn’t even realize that marijuana was the same cannabis hemp that they were growing in huge quantities in their states.

This disgusting, criminal lie started the cannabis prohibition industry. Prohibition has continued based on more lies. There is not a shred of truth in any of it. In fact, smoking or eating cannabis is nearly harmless, as anyone who has used it knows from personal experience. In the history of the world, no one has ever died from a cannabis overdose. In every way, cannabis is safer than alcohol, tobacco, and aspirin.

Not only that, cannabis hemp has a myriad of useful industrial and medical uses. It makes cheaper and better paper than trees, it can be used to make building materials, you can burn the seed oil as fuel and eat it on your salad or in your baking. The seeds are a complete protien on a par with or better than soy as a vegetable source of protien. Cannabis is the best known medicine for treating nausea due to cancer or AIDS drugs. It not only eliminates the nausea completely, it restores appetite (you know, the munchies). And the list goes on. I have only scratched the surface of its uses.

By any rational standard, cannabis should be available over the counter, in bulk in your local health food store for a few bucks an ounce.

This is not the point, however. Even if cannabis were a potent poison, adults have

the absolute right to put anything into their bodies that they please. Doing so is not a crime. It has never been a crime. It will never be a crime. Crimes have victims. Smoking and selling cannabis has no victim. Only the initiation of force against another person or their property is a crime. Crime may not be legislated into being.

So who are the criminals here?

Criminals [are] the legislators who make the prohibition laws. Criminals [are] the lie [sic] enforcement officers who arrest people for possessing vegetables. Criminals [are] the judges who disallow medical evidence and jury nullification. Criminals [are] the juries who convict these peaceful people. Criminals [are] the jailors who lock them up. They are all guilty of assault and kidnapping or conspiracy to commit assault and kidnapping. Serious felonies. Kidnapping is a capital offense...

But even this isn’t the point. The war on some drugs has nothing to do with drugs. It is a war on freedom. A war on the Bill of Rights. A war on America’s soul. Drug sellers and users are to modern-day America what the jews were to Nazi Germany. A focus for hate. A reason to make fascist laws that are rapidly destroying our constitutional republic. Stop this madness before Amerika’s final solution makes the holocaust look like a romp in the woods.

End the war on freedom. End it today. Stop the lie while you still can.

---

*Continued from page 2*

## Campaign 2002

you who do not live in Texas (or Florida), the Sunset Law requires periodic review of State agencies by the Legislature, and allows for the abolition (“Sunsetting”) of an agency following such review.

Dave joins Allan Vogel (the LPT’s 1978 nominee for governor); Gary Johnson; Tonic Nathan; and Richard Winger in the ranks of Honorary Co-Chairs.

Send inquiries to  
Individuals For Jeff Daiell  
Suite 126  
15213 Southwest Fwy.  
Sugar Land, Texas 77478

# News from National

## U.S. House planning “sneakiest pay raise in history”

The U.S. House is planning to give itself “the sneakiest pay raise in history,” a tax-free, \$165-per-day payment that would be activated the moment an obscure House panel declares their colleagues are “eligible.”

Just two months after accepting a raise to an exorbitant \$145,100 a year, House representatives are working behind the scenes to enact a “per diem” expense allowance of \$165 per working day. With about 151 legislative days per year, the raise would amount to a \$25,000-a-year, tax-exempt pay hike.

But as the public finds out about the maneuver, House leaders “are getting nervous,” according to Capitol Hill sources, and the proposal could be shelved, or enacted, at any time.

Steve Dasbach, Libertarian Party national director, predicted that taxpayers would have difficulty deciding what to dislike most about “the sneakiest pay raise in history” the sneakiness itself, the greed, or the hypocrisy.

\* “The Sneakiness” To avoid publicity, Congressional leaders agreed to delegate the power to approve the raise to the House Administration Committee, a low-profile panel that administers payroll and accounting, Dasbach said. “The panel of six Republicans and three Democrats can trigger the \$165 per diem by simply declaring that their House colleagues are ‘eligible’ for it.

\* “The Greed” If they pile a tax-free \$25,000 raise on top of their lavish salaries, they will be raking in the equivalent of a \$190,000 taxable salary, not including their lucrative pensions, a \$3,000 tax exemption for a second home, and other benefits,” Dasbach said.

\* “The Hypocrisy” A \$25,000 raise isn’t enough for these money-grubbing politicians; they want a \$25,000 tax-free raise!” Dasbach said. “It’s obvious that House politicians have a love-hate relationship with the income tax. They love it when you pay yours, but hate having to pay theirs. You know the government is corrupt when an activity that can make politicians rich, in this case, income tax evasion, can get ordinary Americans thrown in jail.

“That’s why every American should help us combat Congress’s latest salary grab. Think of it as preventing a Capitol crime.” (21 Mar 2001)

\*\*\*\*\*

## A surprising outbreak of common sense: State legislatures kill 30 car-phone bills

State legislatures around the USA have killed 30 bills designed to regulate or prohibit the use of cell phones in cars, which is a good thing, since you’re more likely to get killed by lightning than by a distracted cell phone-using driver.

“When and where you responsibly use your cell phone is your own business, so state legislatures have done the right thing to kill these busybody laws,” said Steve Dasbach.

“After all, back in the early days of automobiles, state legislatures debated whether to ban car radios on the grounds that they were dangerous, and raised fears that windshield wipers would hypnotize drivers and cause crashes. Legislators rejected that exaggerated fear-mongering, just as they have done now with today’s cellular hysteria.”

Over the past few weeks, legislators in 15 states have killed 30 different bills that would ban, restrict, or regulate the use of cell phones in automobiles.

Another 69 cell phone-related bills are still winding their way through the legislative process in 23 other states, so it is important to continue to make the case against such laws, said Dasbach.

“Cell phone use in cars is just the latest fear de jour, touted by politicians who want another excuse to run our lives,” he said. “However, if you look at the facts, there is little reason why any legislature should make cell phone use a crime.” Specifically

- The dangers of cell phone use are grossly exaggerated.

“There are now 100 million cell phone users around the USA, and yet according to a new federal analysis of 1997 crash data by the National Highway and Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), cellular phones were a possible factor in only 57 deaths that year,” said Dasbach. “By comparison, an average of 89 people are killed by lightning every year, according to the Statistical Assessment Service.”

- Politicians get nervous about every new car technology.

“When the windshield wiper was invented in 1903, several automakers refused to install them, on the grounds they might hypnotize drivers,” said Dasbach. “And some states once drafted legislation to ban radios from cars, according to Tom Wheeler, president of the Cellular Telecommunications

Industry Association. Perhaps those anti-radio legislators have been reincarnated as today’s anti-cell phone politicians?”

- Driving recklessly is already illegal, as it should be.

“If you cause an accident because you’re distracted by your cell phone or because you’re fiddling with your CD player or yelling at the kids in the back seat, you’ve already broken the law,” said Dasbach. “Another law making an already illegal activity more illegal won’t accomplish anything except to give politicians an inflated sense of accomplishment.”

- There are three decades’ worth of evidence that people can drive safely while using communications devices.

“Hundreds of thousands of police officers have used car radios for decades without any indication that they caused traffic accidents,” noted Dasbach. “And millions of people used CB radios in the 1970s, while traffic fatalities steadily fell. Politicians should explain why police radios and CB radios are safe, while cell phones are supposedly causing carnage.”

For all those reasons, politicians in the 23 states with pending cell phone bills should do the right thing, and, legislatively speaking, hang up on any remaining anti-cell phone laws, said Dasbach.

“Let’s not make DWT, Driving While Talking, a criminal offense,” he said. “Let’s trust people to use their cell phones in automobiles responsibly. And let’s not trust politicians to pass more laws to save us from their latest Crisis-of-the-Day.” (20 Apr 2001)

\*\*\*\*\*

## The Top Fifteen Stupidest Ways Politicians Are Wasting Our Money

If there’s anything worse than being forced to fork over your money to the IRS at tax time, it’s thinking about all the ridiculous ways that politicians will squander it.

- (1) A retirement program for chimpanzees. To care for animals formerly used in government research, Congress created the Chimpanzee Health Improvement, Maintenance and Protection Act (CHIMP), which will spend \$45,000 per animal in 2001.

- (2) Turning your money into dung. Congress voted to give \$4 million to the International Fertilizer Development Center for waste research.

- (3) Subsidizing politicians’ erections.

- (4) Trying to convince teenagers not to have sex. An “emergency” spending provi-

# The Same Roots

Reprinted from *The Federalist*(<sup>c</sup>) *Digest*,  
*The Conservative e-Journal of Record*  
30 March 2001, Federalist #01-13/  
14.dgst, Combined Edition

In recent years, *The Federalist* has editorialized against restricted resource exploration by “the stroke of a pen,” such as Bill Clinton’s restriction of coal mining in Utah’s Escalante Monument under the obscure Antiquities Act. Recently, we reported on Leftist opposition to President George Bush’s proposals to allow resource exploration on “protected lands,” leading one to ask, “What should a constitutional conservative’s position be on nationalized land and resources?”

We first note, simply, that the root word, “conserve,” from the Latin “conservare,” meaning to keep, guard, observe, is common to both conservative and conservation. To conserve means “to keep in a safe or sound state,” or “to maintain constant during a process of ... change.” Central to both conservative politics and conservation policies are tradition and handing down to posterity a country safe and sound in its governing system and its physical state.

In a precise theory of property rights, governments can “own” nothing, as ownership requires direct or indirect use of one’s personal labor, and governments have no labor or exchangeable goods except those taken from their citizens. This relationship is especially so for landed property, as the original title of a just and legitimate property right in that land is established when a person works the land, removing it from its “natural” state. Nevertheless, although our nation has approximated that ideal of property rights more closely than has any other nation, within the rubric of our constitutional order the government is permitted to lay limited claims to property.

The Constitution contains one explicit reference to central government land holdings, in Article IV, Section 3, “The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States....” Other “public lands” explicitly mentioned as being under congressional control are for forts and military facilities “purchased by the consent of the legislature of the state in which the same shall be” (Article I, Section 8). The 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment implies that the government through properly drawn legal action may take property, in stat-

ing that “no person shall be deprived of ... property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.” And the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendments taken together surely suggest that citizens may authorize states to purchase and maintain lands for the purpose of conservation.

During the early history of our country, lands held within the “public domain” were considered only temporarily lodged in the custody of the national government; the intention was that such land should soon be embedded within the federal system through private acquisition and formation into states that would then enter the union. More recently, though, we’ve seen an inversion of this intent, with the central level of government holding “public lands” apart from any free use by the public.

A brief history of public lands in the United States illustrates the reversal. The original states and territories, acquired by treaty with Great Britain in 1783, comprised 888,685 square miles. The initial continental expansion occurred in 1803, when the Louisiana Territory was purchased from France for \$15 million, adding 827,192 square miles to the total. The Federalists at the time opposed the purchase, arguing that the Constitution granted no power for the central government to buy land from a foreign nation. However, President Thomas Jefferson, typically a strict constructionist, championed acquisition of the new territory, later commenting, “I am persuaded no constitution was ever before as well calculated as ours for extensive empire and self-government.” In 1812, Louisiana, the first state formed out of the purchase, was admitted to the union. From that point forward, no serious reservations hindered U.S. territorial expansion across the continent; today the 50 states stretch over 3,623,420 square miles.

The Library of Congress dates the beginning of the American conservation movement around 1850. The Home Department was created within the executive branch in 1849, consolidating operations of the General Land Office and related functions; this later became the Department of the Interior.

“In Wildness, is the preservation of the World,” proclaimed Henry David Thoreau, ushering in a new view of U.S. wilderness lands. In 1864, the Senate authorized a grant of Yosemite Valley to the state of California, as the nation’s first public park. Legislation in 1872 set aside Yellowstone as the first

national park. (After complaints about California’s maintenance of Yosemite, these lands were returned to federal control as Yosemite National Park in 1905.)

In the early 1900’s, likely the greatest conservationist president, Teddy Roosevelt, stated that private property is “subject to the general right of the community to regulate its use to whatever degree the public welfare may require it.” Whatever degree? This position was perhaps sensible during the age of robber barons, but now “the public welfare” claims of government action themselves know few if any limits.

“Conservation means the greatest good to the greatest number for the longest time,” wrote early environmentalist Gifford Pinchot in 1910. Nearly a hundred years later, the balance has assuredly tipped; “public land” decisions are now made by the few, to benefit the few, contrary to the good of the many.

Indeed, in the midnight hours of his administration, Mr. Clinton unilaterally designated over one million acres off-limits to the public as “national monuments.” And Tom DeWeese, president of the American Policy Center, estimates that when all currently proposed environmental policies are fully implemented, more than 50 percent of the land in the entire United States will be cordoned off not only from private ownership but also from any human activity.

Is there cause to question the validity and usefulness of government holding of land on behalf of the people, in that private ownership might be a superior means of conservation? Yes, and no.

As economist Thomas Sowell notes, “Ironically, what the rich are often praised for is likely to do more harm than what they are condemned for. ...Buy up land and donate it for ‘open space’ and an idle heir or heiress will be forgiven for all the money that some ancestor of theirs earned by providing goods and services to millions. ...The less land is available to build on, the more people are going to be crowded in the remaining land that is available, and the higher rents are going to be on that land. Should people packed into slums be grateful that the actions of the rich are driving up their rents and preventing them from getting a little elbow room in what the anointed like to call ‘urban sprawl’?”

True conservation, like virtue, pays its own rewards. But most of today’s environmentalism relies on forcible imposition on those who would not otherwise comply, and is intended to set land apart from any activity that would constitute true ownership. And

# DEA – DOA

Reprinted from *THE FEDERALIST(r) DIGEST, The Conservative e-Journal of Record*, 27 April 2001, Federalist #01-17.dgst

“If the zeal to eliminate drugs leads this state and nation to forsake its ancient heritage of constitutional liberty, then we will have suffered a far greater injury than drugs ever inflict upon us. Drugs injure some of us. The loss of liberty injures us all.” Chief Justice of the Florida Supreme Court

Events this week have brought the “war on drugs” to the forefront of national attention. The Bush administration appears poised to name John Walters director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy. Walters is reportedly a “hard-liner” who favors stringent enforcement of drug laws and long prison sentences for drug users.

Last Friday, missionary Veronica Bowers and her 7-month-old daughter were killed in Peru when their aircraft was mistaken for a drug trafficker’s plane and shot down. The deaths of these two innocents are heartrending, raising hard questions about the cost-benefit calculations for the drug war.

Just what are the real costs of the war on drugs, in terms of social divisions, criminal gang facilitation, criminal justice system costs, costs of increased public and private security, military interventions, and costs to families caught up in the drug war?

The Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) reports arrests of 40,383 offenders in 1999. The central government spends about \$18 billion a year in the drug war. Americans spent approximately \$66 billion on illegal drugs in 1998, the price of those drugs inflated by their illegality. Drug users committed millions of crimes to fund their drug habit. The Wall Street Journal reports “The federal prison population in the U.S. is expected to soar by 31.8% by the 2006 budget year, driven by mandatory drug sentences, even as the state prison population levels off.” The Department of Justice notes that in 1998, drugs directly claimed the lives of 15,973 children. And the number of drug gang involved young people killed, together with their innocent victims, is perhaps equal to that figure. U.S. Customs estimates that only 5 percent of the illegal drugs entering the United States are intercepted.

(A footnote: If drug/gang-related murders committed with guns were removed from our national mortality statistics, the

Left’s trademark “gun problem” argument would lose its “statistical credibility” as the number of deaths drops below even those in some European nations that have outlawed handguns entirely.)

Current drug laws follow the Prohibition model, an experiment that failed miserably with alcohol in the 1920’s, after enactment of the 18<sup>th</sup> Amendment in 1919. That misguided endeavor was repealed by the 21<sup>st</sup> Amendment, ratified in late 1933, leaving the Constitution silent on matters of drug use. (In fact, the Constitution lists only three federal crimes: treason against the United States, piracy on the high seas, and counterfeiting.)

Nevertheless, principles to guide law-making on the subject may be derived from general powers assigned constitutionally to the Congress, to the several states and to the people of the United States. The Constitution’s Article I, Section 8, assigns Congress the “power to .. regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes,” and “to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the Law of Nations; to ...make rules concerning captures on the land and water...” These assigned powers place Congress fully within its constitutional perimeters in making laws restricting importation of drugs across U.S. borders and across state boundaries within our nation. And defining international drug trafficking as illegal is clearly within Congress’s proper constitutional purview.

All other aspects of lawfulness of citizen drug use are left to the state and local levels of government. This is assured by the 9<sup>th</sup> Amendment’s guarantee that rights not enumerated in the Constitution are retained by the people, taken together with the 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment’s statement on federalism.

However, the DEA, with its existing activities, is incompatible with this model of federally distributed drug policing powers. The DEA’s current structure dates to 1973, as the organization serves to enforce the Controlled Substances Act passed by Congress in 1970. And the DEA targets citizens who never themselves cross state or national borders, or deal directly with others who do. Drug enforcement officers, most of whom are competent and professional, are thus tasked with prosecuting the drug war in a manner absolutely doomed to failure, because fundamentally mismatched with our constitutional system of government.

While the deaths of Veronica Bowers

and her infant daughter have received international attention, there is little coverage of the people wrongly killed in our own country during drug raids. Criminal justice professor Peter Kraska, of Eastern Kentucky University, has found that police deployment of paramilitary squads has increased over 900% since 1980, and that local law enforcement agencies often rely on federally affiliated military-style commando units to execute drug warrants. Kraska has noted that over the last five years, more than 230 episodes have resulted in death or serious injury from drug enforcement actions involving SWAT team raids on private homes, often at wrong addresses or with unnecessary use of paramilitary forces.

Illustrative of these domestic drug enforcement tragedies is the death of 11-year-old Alberto Sepulveda on September 13<sup>th</sup> in Modesto, California. After a 19-month federal drug investigation, combined raiders from the DEA, the FBI and the Stanislaus County Drug Enforcement Agency burst into the home Moises Sepulveda shared with his wife and two sons. Alberto quickly complied with orders to lie face down on the bedroom floor. Within seconds, a SWAT officer’s shotgun discharged into Alberto’s back, killing him. “[I]f the SWAT team is there, tragic accidents like this are much more likely to happen. Is it worth putting an entire family at risk, for what is sometimes a small amount of drugs, or small-time dealers?” asked criminologist Kraska. (No drugs or weapons were discovered in the Sepulveda home, and only \$3,000 in cash.)

Among similar controversial incidents, in September 1999, SWAT team members fatally shot Denver resident Ismael Mena, 45, while forcing their way into the wrong house. In Southern California in a 1999 nighttime raid, Compton resident Mario Paz was shot in the back by SWAT officers from nearby El Monte. Police later admitted they had no evidence that the Paz family was involved in trafficking; they merely had information the home had been used by a drug suspect.

And in Lebanon, Tennessee, five “intruders” broke through the front door of the home of Mr. John Adams, 64, and his wife, in the middle of the night. Mr. Adams did what most Americans would do under similar circumstances, he attempted to defend his wife with a weapon he had at hand, a shotgun. The intruders returned volley, shooting Mr. Adams multiple times. He died shortly thereafter. That was the third incident in a span of mere weeks, in which paramilitary police teams executed narcotics search war-

# A Surprising Quiz: Bush's First 100 Days

By Steve Dasbach, Libertarian Party  
National Director

To celebrate President George W. Bush's first 100 days in office, let's conduct a modest thought experiment, shall we?

Imagine, if you will, that you were whisked out of the country on November 7, 2000, as the outcome of the presidential election hung in the balance.

Imagine that for the past six months, you've had no access to any news source. No newspapers. No TV. No internet. No political discussion with friends.

Now, imagine that on Sunday, April 29, exactly 100 days after the new president was inaugurated, you were plunked down in front of a television as the usual crew of talking-head pundits debated the new administration's record.

If those pundits didn't mention the president's name, would you know whether Bush or Gore had won the election?

"What a foolish question!" most Republicans and Democrats will sputter. "Bush and Gore are as different as, well, Bush and Gore. Their records after 100 days would be so utterly and so radically different that no one could confuse them!"

Really? If that is the case, take this quick 12-question quiz to see how different the Bush administration has been from the could-have-been Gore administration

1) If elected president, which one, Bush or Gore, would boost spending for Bill Clinton's AmeriCorps program by \$282 million?

- Al Gore  
 George W. Bush

ANSWER: George W. Bush. Some conservatives had predicted that Bill Clinton's "domestic Peace Corps" program would be quickly abolished, but, instead, Bush has requested a funding increase of \$282 million. [Source: *USA Today*, April 10, 2001]

2) Which one would continue the Clinton administration's lawsuit against tobacco companies?

- George W. Bush  
 Al Gore

ANSWER: George W. Bush. Not only is the Bush administration not ending the legalized extortion against the tobacco companies, Attorney General John Ashcroft boasted that the Justice Department plans to spend as much as Janet Reno did to proceed

with the suit. [Source: *The Washington Times*, April 27, 2001]

3) Which one would increase federal spending on elementary and secondary education by a whopping 72%?

- Al Gore  
 George W. Bush

ANSWER: George W. Bush. Although Republicans had previously promised to abolish the federal Department of Education, Bush requested \$18.6 billion more in spending for elementary, secondary, and vocational education, a 72% increase. [Source: *USA Today*, April 10, 2001]

4) Which one would maintain the so-called "Gore Tax," a hidden \$2.3 billion-a-year levy on telephone bills, used to wire schools to the Internet?

- George W. Bush  
 Al Gore

ANSWER: George W. Bush. Three years ago, conservatives blasted the "Gore Tax" as an unconstitutional tax, since it was imposed by the Federal Communications Commission. But instead of repealing it, the Bush administration has been working to halt any attempts to limit it. [Source: *Cato Institute Daily Commentary*, April 9, 2001]

5) Which one would request a 3.6% pay hike for all federal workers?

- Al Gore  
 George W. Bush

ANSWER: George W. Bush. The average federal civilian employee already makes \$50,000 a year, but Bush doesn't think that's enough. His pay-hike proposal would increase federal wages even faster than inflation. [Source: *The Washington Post*, April 10, 2001]

6) Which one would impose by White House decree the Clinton administration's medical "privacy" rules, which give control of Americans' medical records to the government?

- George W. Bush  
 Al Gore

ANSWER: George W. Bush. After Clinton proposed his so-called "privacy" rules, the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services was flooded with 24,000 letters opposing them. In response, Bush ordered the HHS to disregard the public comments, and implement the rules immediately. [Source: *The Wall Street Journal*, April 13, 2001]

7) Which one would boost spending on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting by \$10 million?

- Al Gore  
 George W. Bush

ANSWER: George W. Bush. For years,

conservatives have asked why the federal government funds a radio network with tax dollars, since tens of thousands of free-market stations compete for listeners. Bush's response was to request a \$10 million funding increase. [Source: *USA Today*, April 10, 2001]

8) Which one would bar development on privately owned wetlands, and promised environmental policies that will "continue and complete the work of [the Clinton] administration"?

- George W. Bush  
 Al Gore

ANSWER: George W. Bush. Here, surely, there's a difference between Bush and Gore! Not as much as you might think. Not only did Bush refuse to overturn a Clinton-era ban on wetlands development, he boasted he would continue the Democrat's environmental programs since "this is the way environmental policy should work." [Source: Syndicated columnist Robert Novak, April 26, 2001]

9) Which one would vow a "renewed commitment" to enforcing America's 20,000 gun laws, and budget an additional \$158 million for that purpose?

- Al Gore  
 George W. Bush

ANSWER: George W. Bush. And you thought Al Gore was anti-gun? Attorney General John Ashcroft said there was "no question" the Bush administration needs a "renewed commitment" to enforce America's myriad anti-gun laws, and has requested \$158 million more for that purpose. [Source: *The Washington Times*, April 27, 2001]

10) Which one would spend an additional \$46 billion on a new federal program to give low-cost prescription drugs to seniors?

- George W. Bush  
 Al Gore

ANSWER: George W. Bush. During the campaign, both Bush and Gore promised to dramatically increase the role of the federal government in the prescription drug business. The cost to taxpayers of Bush's program \$46 billion over five years. [Source: Associated Press, April 27, 2001]

11) Which one would delay any effort to privatize Social Security retirement accounts for younger workers by deferring it to a federal commission for more study?

- Al Gore  
 George W. Bush

ANSWER: George W. Bush. As a candidate, Bush made the partial privatization of Social Security a cornerstone of his campaign. But as president, he has drop-kicked

## Are You Shirking Your Duty to Help Keep America Free?

goose-stepping about in fancy black uniforms and willing to follow the Emperor's orders to arrest and imprison anyone who refuses to Get With the Program.

What the founders meant by that "militia" which must be maintained as our main source of armed men for national defense, if we are to remain a free country, are companies of citizens like the farmers and tradesmen who picked up their rifles and swarmed to Saratoga in the fall of 1777 to ambush Gentleman Johnnie Burgoyne's foraging parties, eventually bringing the invading redcoat regulars to battle and defeating them under the ad hoc leadership of one of America's great combat heroes, New Haven store-keeper-turned-soldier Benedict Arnold (yes, I know he later messed up), thus guaranteeing the colonists' triumph by drawing France into the war on our side.

As Americans have a duty not merely to show up for jury duty but to understand their right and obligation to acquit any defendant on trial under an unconstitutional statute, or any defendant who has clearly been refused his right to present a principled constitutional defense at trial, so do Americans have a strongly implied obligation under the Second Amendment to stand ready to defend our freedoms (remember, "necessary to the security of a free state") by owning, maintaining and keeping in good practice with a firearm of "militia usefulness", that being, in this day and age, an M-16 or (preferably, in my opinion) a .308-caliber, M-14 combat rifle.

Now, there is a slight problem. The would-be tyrants on the Potomac have made it a federal crime for any American to build or import a military-style, select-fire M-14 or M-16 rifle for sale to a fellow citizen who does not wear a government uniform, the exception being granted for members of precisely the kinds of "special militias" and "standing armies" which the founders feared.

This leaves only a limited supply of "pre-ban" M-14s and M-16s still circulating. The laws of supply and demand thus mean I'm going to pay more than \$4,000 for my fully-automatic M-14, after I pay a \$200 tax and submit myself to fingerprinting and other clearly unconstitutional indignities and "infringements," once I finally get enough saved up.

In the meantime, I can proudly declare myself a member of Nevada's unorganized

constitutional militia, by dint of my ownership of the semi-automatic version of the military M-14, the semi-automatic civilian M-1A.

The M-16 (in the lighter .223 caliber) has a similarly more affordable semi-automatic civilian sister, the perfectly legal little AR-15 ... though fans of tyranny like Chuck Schumer and Dianne Feinstein and Ted Kennedy naturally seek to ban these slightly less useful militia weapons at every turn, lying and calling them "assault rifles" (an assault rifle must be capable of fully-automatic fire; these are not) and by, get this, trying to link them to "dangerous Militias" ... a word which originally defined precisely the kind of peaceful, armed citizens who might stand in the way of their plans for a massive, cradle-to-grave, welfare/police state!

(What do the massacres of the Armenian Turks in 1915, of the Ukrainian Kulaks under Stalin in the 1930's, of the Jews and Gypsies under Hitler in the 1940's, of the "landlords" under Mao and the "intellectuals" under Pol Pot all have in common? The victims were all disarmed, by law, first.)

Some duties cannot be delegated.

Have you ever shirked your jury duty? Does it make you proud to know some fellow citizen who never harmed anyone may now be serving time because you couldn't be bothered to go stand as his last line of defense against a bad law or overzealous prosecution, or, worse yet, because you followed some black-robed lawyer's "order" to convict, even though you couldn't for the life of you figure out who the defendant had hurt, and felt in your heart it was the overzealous cops, trampling our precious Bill of Rights to "build their case," who should really have been on trial?

And what about your obligation as a citizen to help maintain the militia, so "necessary to the security of a free state?" Have you bought into the hate-filled propaganda about "militia" being merely a synonym for racist rednecks? The absurdity that we "don't need militias any more; times have changed and the standing armies of the DEA and FBI and BATF and the National Guard," the guys who flew the helicopters that machine-gunned the babies and nursing mothers at Waco, "can do the job just fine?"

Oh, **there's** a good excuse to spend the weekend on the couch, watching the game.

Be wary of any attempt to propagandize concepts and words which the founders considered vital to instruct us about our freedoms and the tools necessary to preserve them, turning them into "hate speech" terms of scorn and derision.

John F. Kennedy said we should "ask not what our country can do for us, but what we can do for our country." That can be a dangerous doctrine, if it leads us to forget that in America the state exists to protect the people and their liberties, not the other way around.

But we do indeed have a few duties to our countrymen. Jury service is one. Owning a combat rifle is another. (No, you cannot "delegate" such a duty to the police or the National Guard, because your obligation to our progeny is precisely to own arms sufficient to discourage the police or the National Guard from ever getting too big for their britches.)

Have you shirked either of those duties, assuming "someone else will do it, someone better trained. I can't be bothered, and besides, what do I know?"

Sometimes, freedom requires a little investment, and a little work. If you can't afford a \$1,500 M-1A, a WWII surplus Garand can be found for \$500 ... or a WWI surplus Enfield for \$250.

So far as I know, all firearm sales at the Cashman Field gun shows in Las Vegas are now subjected to a federal background check, the back door to national firearms registration and eventual confiscation.

But Lou Fascio is running his big gun show at the Reno Hilton again April 6 through 8, no background checks or federal registration except those required by law for handguns sold by federally licensed gun dealers. Call 775-828-2350 for reservations, visit web site [WWW.GUNTRADE.COM/BIGRENOSHOW](http://WWW.GUNTRADE.COM/BIGRENOSHOW), or e-mail [BIGRENOSHOW@ACI.NET](mailto:BIGRENOSHOW@ACI.NET).

Maybe I'll see you there.

Vin Suprynowicz is assistant editorial page editor of the *Las Vegas Review-Journal*. Subscribe to his monthly newsletter by sending \$72 to Privacy Alert, 1475 Terminal Way, Suite E for Easy, Reno, NV 89502. His book, *Send in the Waco Killers, Essays on the Freedom Movement, 1993-1998*, is available at 1-800-244-2224, or via web site

[WWW.THESPIRITOF76.COM/WACOKILLERS.HTML](http://WWW.THESPIRITOF76.COM/WACOKILLERS.HTML)

## The Same Roots

increasingly, environmental policies are determined by international agreements giving sway to globo-utopians.

In our view, it's unmatched hubris to believe a smattering of elite humans can agree internationally on policies by treaty that will affect the planetary environment, and it's both evil and unconstitutional to enact takings of U.S. citizens' property rights in service to such hubris. This is not conservation of our heritage, but instead its destruction.

## Bush's First 100 Days

that potential hot potato to a federal commission for "study." [Source: Associated Press, April 27, 2001]

12) Which one would give the IRS more money so it can hire 4,000 additional tax collectors?

George W. Bush

Al Gore

ANSWER: George W. Bush. At Congressional hearings in 1998, Republicans harshly criticized the Internal Revenue Service for mistreating taxpayers and running roughshod over the law. Three years later, Bush has proposed a \$400 million budget increase for the agency. [Source: *USA Today*, April 16, 2001]

Shocked by the answers? Perhaps you shouldn't be, since President Bush made it clear, even during his days as a candidate, that making the federal government smaller, less expensive, or less intrusive was not on his agenda. Given that, is it a surprise that he is governing like Al Gore?

In fact, after looking at the record of President Bush's first 100 days, there's really only one thought experiment question left to ask Why was the outcome of the 2000 presidential election so fiercely contested, since it seems to have made no real difference who won?

Ad space:	
Full Page	\$100.00
Three Quarter Page	\$75.00
Half Page	\$50.00
Quarter Page	\$25.00
Eighth Page	\$12.50
Column Inch	\$5.00
Other options available.	
Call (979) 567-7262 for information	

## Dr. John Turnbow Makes Impact On Local Politics.

From David DeLamar,  
THINK@DOOR.NET

The Lubbock Libertarian Party has added to its string of successes with the defeat of a venue on Saturday, May 5, 2001.

Other recent victories include the no vote on a regional arts center, running a record number of candidates in 2002 and deadlocking an *ad hoc* committee considering a smoking ban as well as an editorial by County Chair, David DeLamar published monthly in the local paper.

The Lubbock County Libertarian Party has rocketed to become Lubbock, Texas' (pop 200,000) only party of opposition to the Republican establishment. The Democrats ran only two candidates in November 2002.

One rising star on the local scene is Lubbock physician, Dr. John Turnbow. The former Libertarian 19<sup>th</sup> congressional candidate, Turnbow formed a nonpartisan group called Lubbock Citizens For Private Property Rights to oppose a public smoking ban in Lubbock. The committee is now deadlocked. Turnbow has become a well known public figure in the last six months, receiving numerous quotes in the local paper, radio interviews, TV interviews as well as being published in the paper's editorial pages with his unwavering stand for private property rights.

Turnbow's legitimacy was cemented yesterday as he delivered 20,000 signed cards to Lubbock city council person, Marc McDougal, who is also the Lubbock County Republican chair. The delivery of the cards was greeted with a hand shake from the Republican leader and was shown by both the Fox and ABC news outlets.

A potential run for Lubbock city council in 2003 could make Turnbow the only elected Libertarians in a population base of 200,000 or more ( don't know of any others).

## DEA – DOA

rants at the wrong locations, with fatal consequences. In this case, the search warrant was for the house next door.

This latest victim's name, John Adams, is supremely ironic. Our Constitution's 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment established "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath and affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized." Several drug-related measures before Congress contrarily authorize warrant-free searches (for instance, S. 2516, "The Fugitive Apprehension Act").

As Rep. Ron Paul aptly summed up, "Despite the various pleas for federal correction of societal wrongs [including drug use and abuse], a national police force is neither prudent nor constitutional. The argument is that states are less effective than a centralized federal government in dealing with individuals who flee one state for another to avoid prosecution. The Constitution preserves the integrity of states, and provides the means for them to exact penalties from those who violate their laws, and the Constitution provides for the return of fugitives from one state to another. There is, of course, an inconvenience imposed upon states in working with one another, rather than relying on a national police force. But there is a greater cost to individual liberty from a centralized police power."

Upon review of the "total cost" of drug prohibition, and the constitutionality of this futile exercise, The Federalist takes the position that the current "war on drugs" presents a far greater risk to liberty than the use of drugs ever has or ever will. We favor restoration of federally separated and distributed drug laws and policing authorities, with nuanced, rational dispensing of proportionate justice that distinguishes addicts or abusers who harm only themselves from those whose drug profiteering injures or endangers others. As columnist Deroy Murdock observed, "The alternative is to continue a War on Drugs that has torched \$146 billion since 1990 while rolling and smoking the Bill of Rights."

## “2001: LPT Odyssey”

noontime. (The exact schedule is, of course, subject to change.) We traditionally end around noon or 1:00 pm to give attendees time to get back home by Sunday night.

The Full Package, including all functions will be \$115. If someone wants to be there just for the meals that price is \$95. (This one is designed for spouses who don't want to go to all the other speaker events.) If someone only wants to go to all the talks (no food), including the “meal” speakers, the price is \$50. Individual banquet price is \$55. Individual lunch is \$30, and individual breakfasts are \$20. We will also offer those meal events without the food for \$10 for breakfast or lunch speaker and \$25 for the banquet talk. We have also decided to offer a “speaker block,” which would

give access to a block of talks, either between breakfast and lunch or between lunch and dinner for \$10 per block (of which there would be three all together). This might be of interest to locals especially.

You can expect to get a full brochure in the mail very soon with a registration form and more details. We are going to offer a “bonus” to registrations postmarked (or called in with a credit card) by June 22. For those “early bird” folks, you will get a raffle ticket. The raffle will be for guaranteed seating with one the several of our ‘celebrities’ at the banquet (e.g. Russell, Marshall, Carla, etc.). We have decided not to have a head table. You can also get an extra chance to win by booking your hotel room by this date.

Speaking of hotel booking, you can go ahead now and book your room at the **Hyatt Regency** by calling **(281) 987-1234** or **(800) 233-1234**.

Make sure you tell them you are with the *Libertarian Party of Texas* to get our reduced rate of only \$69/night for single or double, \$79 for triple and \$89 for a quad. (At these prices even locals from the Houston area should stay in the hotel and save the commuting!) And I must add that their rooms are *really huge*, with very large desk areas and all the modern hookups for your telecommuting needs. The hotel offers free parking for those driving in, and is just outside the “George Bush” Intercontinental Airport on “JFK” Blvd., with free shuttle service for those flying in. (Won't it be nice when things are named after prominent Libertarians?!)

So bring the family (the Hyatt has a lovely pool area) and we'll see y'all in Houston in July. Please feel free to contact me at (512) 263-1681 or at the e-mail address above if you have any specific questions.

## News from National

sion in the 2001 military construction bill includes \$20 million for a teenage abstinence program.

(5) A Dr. Seuss memorial. The HUD funding bill contains \$400,000 for a memorial to the author of *Green Eggs and Ham* and other children's books, a classic case of *Pork-I-Am*.

(6) Trying to convince fat people to walk up stairs. The Centers for Disease Control spent \$14,900 to redecorate a stairwell to encourage obese employees to walk, rather than taking the elevator.

(7) Spying on your e-mail. The FBI's Carnivore computer snoop ware program threatens to take a bite out of your privacy and devour the Fourth Amendment.

(8) Subsidizing religion.

(9) Welfare programs in Chukotka, Russia. The 2001 foreign aid bill contains \$3 million for a University of Alaska program designed to “improve social conditions” in the eastern Russian province.

(10) Subsidizing a bug lab. Republican Thad Cochran stung taxpayers for \$5 million when he inserted money into an agriculture

bill to build an insect laboratory in his home state of Mississippi.

(11) Research on peanut allergies.

(12) Paying medical schools not to train doctors. In an attempt to relieve a doctor glut without reducing funding for teaching hospitals, Congress agreed to pay medical schools \$400 million, not to train doctors.

(13) Looking at you, naked. U.S. Customs officials at dozens of airports are now using the high-tech Body Search scanner, which can see body contours right through your clothes.

(14) Protecting people with “odd” ideas. According to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, people with odd scientific notions, such as a belief in mysterious messages from UFOs, may be entitled to anti-discrimination protection on the same basis as religious belief.

(15) Giving you wrong answers when you ask the IRS tax questions. A new study by the Treasury Department found that IRS employees gave incorrect answers in response to questions from taxpayers a whopping 47% of the time. And the ultimate indignity, If you follow their erroneous advice, you're still liable for back taxes, interest, and penalties.

(17 Apr 2001)

# Around the State

## On-line and Wired

### Web Pages

State Web Page [WWW.TX.LP.ORG](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG)  
County Chairs [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/COUNTY\\_CHAIRS.HTM](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/COUNTY_CHAIRS.HTM)  
County Chair duties [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/COUNTY\\_CHAIR.DUTIES.HTM](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/COUNTY_CHAIR.DUTIES.HTM)  
Press Releases [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/DATABASE\\_RO/PRS/INDEX.HTML](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/DATABASE_RO/PRS/INDEX.HTML)  
Bell County [WWW.LPTXAS.ORG/BELL](http://WWW.LPTXAS.ORG/BELL)  
Bexar County [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/BEXAR](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/BEXAR)  
Brazos County [WWW.BRAZOSLP.ORG](http://WWW.BRAZOSLP.ORG)  
Aggie Libertarians at Texas A&M [LIBERTARIANS.TAMU.EDU/](http://LIBERTARIANS.TAMU.EDU/)  
Collin County [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/COLLIN/INDEX.HTML](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/COLLIN/INDEX.HTML)  
Dallas County [HTTP://LPDALLAS.ORG](http://HTTP://LPDALLAS.ORG)  
Denton County [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/DENTONINDEX.HTML](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/DENTONINDEX.HTML)  
El Paso County [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/ELPASO/INDEX.HTML](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/ELPASO/INDEX.HTML)  
Harris County [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/HARRIS](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/HARRIS)  
Montgomery County [HTTP://LPMC.MAIN.COM/](http://HTTP://LPMC.MAIN.COM/)  
Nacogdoches County [WWW.TX.LP.ORG/NACOGDOCHES/INDEX.HTML](http://WWW.TX.LP.ORG/NACOGDOCHES/INDEX.HTML)  
Tom Green County [HTTP://TGCLP.TRIPOD.COM](http://HTTP://TGCLP.TRIPOD.COM)  
Travis County [WWW.AUSTINLIBERTY.ORG/TCLP/INDEX.HTML](http://WWW.AUSTINLIBERTY.ORG/TCLP/INDEX.HTML)  
or [WWW.LPNN.COM](http://WWW.LPNN.COM)

### Forums

LP Texas: Email [MAJORDOMO@IO.COM](mailto:MAJORDOMO@IO.COM) with "subscribe lptexas" in the body.  
ChristLib: Send an email to [MAJORDOMO@SWCP.COM](mailto:MAJORDOMO@SWCP.COM) with "subscribe christlib" in the body.

### Other Sites of Interest

Incumbent voting records [HTTP://CORECARD.TAXPAYER.NET/STATE.CFM](http://HTTP://CORECARD.TAXPAYER.NET/STATE.CFM)  
Texas Election Code [CAPITOL.TLC.STATE.US/STATUES.-ELTOC.HTM](http://CAPITOL.TLC.STATE.US/STATUES.-ELTOC.HTM)  
District Boundaries [WWW.CAPITOL.STATE.TX.US/REDV/REDVIEW.HTM](http://WWW.CAPITOL.STATE.TX.US/REDV/REDVIEW.HTM)  
Political Contributions returned by zip code [POLITICALJUNKIE.COM/MAIN.INDEX.HTM](http://POLITICALJUNKIE.COM/MAIN.INDEX.HTM)  
Federal Election Commission [WWW.FEC.GOV](http://WWW.FEC.GOV)  
The Separation of School and State Alliance [WWW.SEPSCHOOL.ORG](http://WWW.SEPSCHOOL.ORG)  
Bill of Attainder Project [WWW.ISC-DURANT.COM/TOM/BILLOFTTAINDER/](http://WWW.ISC-DURANT.COM/TOM/BILLOFTTAINDER/)  
League of Women Voters [DNET.ORG](http://DNET.ORG)

### Congress

Phil Gramm [PHIL\\_GRAMM@GRAMM.SENATE.GOV](mailto:PHIL_GRAMM@GRAMM.SENATE.GOV)  
Kay Bailey Hutchison [SENATOR@HUTCHISON.SENATE.GOV](mailto:SENATOR@HUTCHISON.SENATE.GOV)

### Important Dates to Remember

9 Mar 2001 SLEC Meeting, Austin  
13 July 2001 State Conference, Houston

### State Officers

Chair:  
Geoff Neale (512) 263-1681 home  
12903 Grubstake Gulch (512) 290-0743 work  
Austin, TX 78738 [LIBER8OR@TEXAS.NET](mailto:LIBER8OR@TEXAS.NET)  
Vice Chair:  
Clyde Garland (979) 779-1775  
3100 Rolling Glen [CLYDEGARLA@AOL.COM](mailto:CLYDEGARLA@AOL.COM)  
Bryan, TX 77807-3209

Secretary:  
Stephanie Berlin (979) 847-8340 home  
PO Box 4908 (210) 387-9926 CELL  
College Station, TX 77844-4908  
[AGGIELIBERTARIAN@HOTMAIL.COM](mailto:AGGIELIBERTARIAN@HOTMAIL.COM)

Treasurer:  
Bob Lockhart (713) 473-6284 home  
PO Box 1398 (713) 475-0092 business  
Pasadena, TX 77501-1398 [BOBLOCK@FLASH.NET](mailto:BOBLOCK@FLASH.NET)

### Standing Committees

Campaigns and Elections:  
George Schwappach (915) 691-1776 home  
8313 Saddle Creek Rd. (915) 698-3405 work  
Abilene, TX 79602-5454 [GEORGES@SWCONNECT.NET](mailto:GEORGES@SWCONNECT.NET)

Database:  
Richard Walker (409) 866-2100  
840 Lockwood Dr. [WALKERRE@SWBELL.NET](mailto:WALKERRE@SWBELL.NET)  
Beaumont, TX 77706-5546

Finance:  
Lance Smith (713) 869-1228 home  
1010 Euclid (713) 880-1125 work  
Houston, TX 77009 [DOMESTIC@INSYNC.NET](mailto:DOMESTIC@INSYNC.NET)

Organizing and Outreach:  
Christopher Jagge (979) 695-9646  
PO Box 8064 [C\\_JAGGE@EMAIL.MSN.COM](mailto:C_JAGGE@EMAIL.MSN.COM)  
College Station, TX 77844-8064

Publications:  
Barbara Cunningham (979) 567-7262  
301 Porter (979) 567-3313 fax  
Caldwell, TX 77836-1825 [CHARLESB@TCA.NET](mailto:CHARLESB@TCA.NET)

Publicity and Advertising:  
Nancy Neale (512) 263-1681  
12903 Grubstake Gulch [TORCHESS@TEXAS.NET](mailto:TORCHESS@TEXAS.NET)  
Austin, TX 78738

### SLEC Representatives

**District 3:**  
Joe Allport (936) 569-8832 home  
PO Box 632873 [ALLPROPATRIA@HOTMAIL.COM](mailto:ALLPROPATRIA@HOTMAIL.COM)  
Nacogdoches, TX 75963-2873

Kris Overstreet (409) 685-4992 home  
Route 14, Box 5560 (409) 685-2028 work  
Livingston, TX, 77351 [REDNECK@DETNET.COM](mailto:REDNECK@DETNET.COM)

**District 4:**  
Richard E. (Dick) Walker 409-866-2100  
840 Lockwood [WALKERRE@SWBELL.NET](mailto:WALKERRE@SWBELL.NET)  
Beaumont, TX 77706

**District 5:**  
Barbara Cunningham 979-567-7262  
301 S. Porter St. 979-567-3313 fax  
Caldwell TX 77836-1825 [CHARLESB@TCA.NET](mailto:CHARLESB@TCA.NET)

Christopher Jagge 979-695-9646 home  
1601 Brentwood 979-845-9755 work  
PO Box 8064 [C\\_JAGGE@EMAIL.MSN.COM](mailto:C_JAGGE@EMAIL.MSN.COM)  
College Station, TX 77844-8064

**District 6:**  
Lance Smith 713-880-1125 home  
1010 Euclid [DOMESTIC@INSYNC.NET](mailto:DOMESTIC@INSYNC.NET)  
Houston, TX 77009

**District 8:**  
Gordon Mobley 972-527-0914 home  
1402 Cherokee Trail 972-478-3407 work  
Plano, TX 75023 [MOBLEY1@AIRMAIL.NET](mailto:MOBLEY1@AIRMAIL.NET)

Kelly Rush 214-902-9669  
3767 Forest Lane #124-1277  
Dallas, TX 75244 [RUSHK@MAIL.COM](mailto:RUSHK@MAIL.COM)

**District 10:**  
John Doeblner 817-801-1207 home  
875 E. Lamar Blvd. [AMONSTERTRUCKER@YAHOO.COM](mailto:AMONSTERTRUCKER@YAHOO.COM)  
Arlington, TX 76011

**District 11:**  
Bob Smither 281-331-2548 home  
2600 Ware Dairy Road 281-331-2744 work  
Friendswood, TX 77546 281-331-4616 fax  
281-685-5658 cell [BOB@SMITHER.NET](mailto:BOB@SMITHER.NET)

**District 13:**  
Peter Elloway 713-529-5208 home  
PO Box 685  
1245 W. Pierce (77019)  
Houston, TX 77001-0685

John Kormylo 713-271-1776  
9614 Oregano Circle [ELFSOFT@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:ELFSOFT@MINDSPRING.COM)  
Houston, TX 77036

**District 14:**  
Nancy Neale 512-263-1684 home  
12903 Grubstake Gulch 512-263-1684 fax  
Austin, TX 78738 512-294-4927 cell  
[TORCHESS@TX.NET](mailto:TORCHESS@TX.NET)  
Marianne Robbins 512-989-0288 home  
900 Broken Feather Trail #373 512-719-7259 work  
Pflugerville, TX 78660  
[MARIANNESWEB@WEBTV.NET](mailto:MARIANNESWEB@WEBTV.NET) (text only)  
[MARIANNER@AUSTINSEMICONDUCTOR.COM](mailto:MARIANNER@AUSTINSEMICONDUCTOR.COM) (for attachments)

**District 16:**  
Kendall Beerwinkle 214-341-2842 home  
12032 Midlake [MAXBRECHT@TEXOMA.NET](mailto:MAXBRECHT@TEXOMA.NET)  
Dallas, TX 75218

Marshall Beerwinkle 214-341-2842 home  
12032 Midlake [MAXBRECHT@TEXOMA.NET](mailto:MAXBRECHT@TEXOMA.NET)  
Dallas, TX 75218

**District 17:**  
Paul Morris 713-280-8660 home  
2130 Gemini St. [PJMORRIS@PDQ.NET](mailto:PJMORRIS@PDQ.NET)  
Houston, TX 77058-2048

Bill Myers 713-978-7369 home  
1615 Bering Dr. #1507  
Houston, TX 77057

**District 19:**  
Cathy Harrell 830-683-5237 home  
Route 1, Box 76B [JHARR@RICC.NET](mailto:JHARR@RICC.NET)  
Mountain Home, TX 78058

James (Jim) E. Harrell 830-683-5237 home  
Route 1, Box 76B [JHARR@RICC.NET](mailto:JHARR@RICC.NET)  
Mountain Home, TX 78058

**District 20:**  
Robert Powell 361-850-9601 home  
4622 Grand Lake Dr. [REP@CIRIS.NET](mailto:REP@CIRIS.NET)  
Corpus Christi, TX 78413

**District 21:**  
Tom Kane 830-216-4664  
912 4th Street [FREEDOM2@FLASH.NET](mailto:FREEDOM2@FLASH.NET)  
Floresville, TX 78114-1802

**District 24:**  
Steve Kirby 915-676-9026 home  
850 Ross [Kirby4Liberty@aol.com](mailto:Kirby4Liberty@aol.com)  
Abilene, TX 79605-3237  
[Libertarian4sure@aol.com](mailto:Libertarian4sure@aol.com)

## Around the State

George Schwappach 915-691-1776 home  
8318 Saddle Creek Rd. 915-691-1776 work  
Abilene, TX 79602-5424 915-691-1943 fax  
GEORGES@SWCONNECT.NET

### District 25:

Ray Jagge 830-931-2018 home  
PO Box 582 RLJAGGE@hotmail.com  
Castroville, TX 78009

Patricia Wedel 512-267-1843 home  
18008 Easy Way CATW\_L1@SPRYNET.COM  
Jonestown, TX 78645

### District 27:

Mark Ciocheti 956-423-2522  
609 East Filmore CIOCH@AOL.COM  
Harlingen, TX 78550

John P. (Jack) McNally 956-423-7345 home  
1205 East Polk Ave. 888-899-5095 work  
Harlingen, TX 78550 JACKMC@LIBERTYSHOPPE.COM

### District 28:

Robert K. Restivo 915-465-4422 home  
7517 Billo Dr. RESTIVOLAW@NETZERO.COM  
Grape Creek, TX 76901

John Turnboro, MD 806-745-3701 home  
3315 81st St., Ste A 806-793-6200 work  
Lubbock, TX 79423 806-793-6319 fax  
JMTURNBOW@POL.NET

## County Activities

### Aransas County:

Walt Hartlove (361) 727-0802  
1919 Hwy 35 N, PMB 326 ARANSAS@SWBELL.NET  
Rockport, TX 78382-3344

### Atascosa County:

Edward Elmer (830) 569-6006 night  
1240 W Oaklawn RD, #101 EBEMDPA@FLASH.NET  
Pleasanton, TX 78064-4302

### Bell County:

Penny Hendrix (254) 70-9582  
277 Woodland Point Rd.  
Belton, TX 76513-9749  
DIGITALCULTURE@EARTHLINK.NET

### Bexar County:

David Alter (210) 637-0989  
PO Box 39241 DAVYDOODLE\_@HOTMAIL.COM  
San Antonio, TX 78218-1241 WWW.TX.LP.ORG/BEXAR  
Jeffrey C. Blunt (vice chair) (210) 696-8756  
JCBLUNT@JUNO.COM  
Meeting: 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday, 7:00 PM, Unlimited Thought Book-store, 5525 Blanco, Ste 107

### Brazoria County:

Royce Mitchell Jr. RMITCHEL@FLASH.NET  
10231 Hanselman Rd.  
Manvel, TX 77578  
Information: GHARPER@COMPUTRON.NET  
Meeting: 2<sup>nd</sup> Tuesday, 7:00 PM, Golden Corral, Hwy 388  
Business, Angleton, TX

### Brazos County:

Christopher Jagge (979) 695-9646  
PO Box 8064 C\_JAGGE@EMAIL.MSN.COM  
College Station, TX 77844-8064  
PAGES.TCA.NET/JVANBEEK/BCLP.HTM

### Brewster County:

Leo "Doc" Ofenstein (915) 837-5186 day  
601 N 7<sup>th</sup> St. (915) 837-1192 night

Alpine, TX 79830-3515 LEO@SCRCORP.COM

### Burleson County:

Barbara Cunningham (979) 567-7262  
301 S Porter St. (979) 567-3313 fax  
Caldwell, TX 77836-1825 CHARLESB@TCA.NET

### Burnet County:

Ben J. Jones (830) 798-9051 night  
400 Parr Ave. CJONES@TSTAR.NET  
Marble Falls, TX 78654

### Cameron County:

Jack McNally (210) 423-6030 day  
1205 E Polk St. (956) 425-5064 night  
Harlingen, TX 78550-7223 (210) 423-7345 fax  
JACKMC@LIBERTYSHOPPE.COM (888) 899-5095  
Meeting: Once a month in Harlingen. Call (956) 423-7345 for the time and place.

### Collin County:

Gordon E. Mobley (972) 527-0914  
1402 Cherokee Trail MOBLEY1@AIRMAIL.NET  
Plano, TX 75023  
Hotline (972) 517-1789  
party email: LPCCTX@YAHOO.COM  
Meeting: 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday, Paesano's Restaurant; Party email  
LPCCTX@YAHOO.COM

### Cooke County:

Matthew Murrell (940) 665-7528  
1302 Hillcrest Blvd.  
Gainesville, TX 76240  
MATTHEWMURRELL@HOTMAIL.COM

### Crosby County:

Greg Fisher (806) 749-2010 Lubbock  
HCR 1, Box 12 (806) 263-4522 home  
Post, TX 79356  
MEDAGGF@TTUHSC.EDU or GFISHER@TTU.EDU  
Meeting: Last Thursday, 7:00 PM; Llano Masked Rider  
Room Texas Tech University Center, 15<sup>th</sup> Street and  
Akron Ave., Lubbock, TX. *Campus Libertarians*, 1114  
Ave. Q, Lubbock, TX 79401

### Dallas County:

Bill Bunch  
6231 McCommas wbbunch@yahoo.com  
Dallas, TX 75214-3033  
LPDALLAS.ORG INFO@LPDALLAS.ORG  
Meeting: 2<sup>nd</sup> Thursday, Al's Pizzeria, 3701 W. North-  
west Highway, Dallas, TX  
Activities and changes are posted on the website.  
Weekly public affairs program on the Dallas Commu-  
nity Television: "America – Outside the Beltway"

### Dawson County:

James D. Mitchell (806) 872-5092 day  
PO Box 969 (806) 872-6017 night  
Lamesa, TX 79331-0969 JAMESM@MAIL.PICS.NET

### De Witt County:

Jeanie Blalock (361) 275-3275  
611 MacArthur St.  
Cuero, TX 77954-3128

### Denton County:

James Gholston JAMESG@DIMENSIONALITY.COM  
403 Bryan, #205  
Denton, TX 76201

### Erath County:

Tommy Richardson (254) 968-4636  
307 N. Dale  
Stephenville, TX 76401  
Meeting: 2<sup>nd</sup> Tuesday

### Fisher County:

Meetings: 2nd Monday, 7:30 PM, Farolito's Mexican  
Restaurant, 209 Cotton Wood, Abilene, TX (concur-  
rently with Taylor County)

### Fort Bend County:

Kevin Foto (281) 277-5886 day  
16338 Maple Downs Ln. (281) 879-2123 night  
Sugar Land, TX 77478-7101 ALPINE@WT.NET

### Galveston County:

Randall H. Waibel (713) 280-1500 day  
1902 Dove Ct. (281) 996-0527 night  
Friendswood, TX 77546-5884 PSAMO@NETZERO.NET

### Gregg County:

Judy Dailey 903-297-4475  
19 Rockwell MDAILY@JUNO.COM  
Longview, TX 75604

### Hamilton County Contact:

Tony Lee Belding TLBELDING@HTCOMP.NET  
PO Box 512  
Hamilton, TX 76531-0512

### Harris County:

Laura Coker-Garcia (713) 271-1776  
9835 Sagedowne Ln. (281) 997-8141  
Houston, TX 77089-3517  
LIBERTY@NEOSOFT.COM WWW.TX.LP.ORG/HARRIS  
Meetings: Harris County LP Business Meeting, 1<sup>st</sup>  
Thursday 9614 Oregon Circle, Houston, TX; San  
Jacinto Supper Club, 3<sup>rd</sup> Thursday, 7:00 PM, Chan's  
Restaurant, Fairmont Pkwy @ Burke, Pasadena, TX;  
*Second Thursday Supper Club*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Thursday, 7:00 PM,  
Pappas Bar-B-Q, 7007 Hwy 59 South, Houston, TX

### Hays County:

Ron Neal (512) 295-6817  
312 Windy Hollow Lane  
Kyle, TX 78640-9271

### Hidalgo County:

Dr. Donald L. Hall (956) 686-6616 home  
112 West Lex Ave. BHALL10113@AOL.COM  
McAllen, TX 78504

### Hopkins County:

Warren (Hank) Vine (903) 866-3813  
Route 1, Box 262 4-PINES@1STARNET.COM  
Sulphur Springs, TX 75482  
Information: HOPCO-LP@1STARNET.COM

### Houston County:

James M. Lassiter (409) 636-2427 night  
PO Box 445 LASSITER@LCC.NET  
Lovelady, TX 75851-0445

### Hunt County:

Donald Lee Holloway (903) 356-4350 night  
PO Box 1382  
Quinlan, TX 75474-1382

### Hutchinson County:

Cliff Collard (806) 274-2781 day  
PO Box 626 (806) 273-6345 night  
Berger, TX 79008-0626 CCOLL79007@AOL.COM

### Jefferson County:

Virginia G. Walker (409) 866-2100  
840 Lockwood Dr. WALKERRE@SWBELL.NET  
Beaumont, TX 77706-5546  
Meeting: 2<sup>nd</sup> Tuesday, 6:30 PM, Shoney's Restaurant,  
3825 College Street, Beaumont, TX

### Jones County:

Lila Roberts (915) 672-7951  
40 Poverty Point Circle  
Abilene, TX 79601-8427  
Meetings: 2nd Monday, 7:30 PM, Farolito's Mexican  
Restaurant, 209 Cotton Wood, Abilene, TX (concur-  
rently with Taylor County)

### Kendall County:

Lawrence Ciano (210) 816-2140 night  
108 Ranger Ave.  
Boerne, TX 78006-8916

## Around the State

### Kerr County:

Kelly Scott (830) 367-5021 home  
PO Box 291803 (830) 896-6464 work  
Kerrville, TX 78029-1803 [ELPATRON@MAVERICKBBS.COM](mailto:ELPATRON@MAVERICKBBS.COM)

### Kleberg County:

Frank Mullen (512) 595-7727 night  
525 E. Huisache Ave. [MULLENA@INTCOMM.NET](mailto:MULLENA@INTCOMM.NET)  
Kingsville, TX 78363-5644

### Liberty County:

Charles Wiggins 409-336-6956  
P. O. Box 3070 [CLETUS80@SWBELL.NET](mailto:CLETUS80@SWBELL.NET)  
Liberty, TX 77575

### Lubbock County:

David DeLamar (806) 766-7288 voice  
PO Box 98131 (806) 766-7288 fax  
Lubbock, TX 79499-813 (806) 795-6901 day  
[THINK@DOOR.NET](mailto:THINK@DOOR.NET)

Meeting: Last Tuesday every month, Texas Tech University Center, 7 P.M.

### Madison County:

Lili Lyddon (936) 399-5000  
18696 Hwy 21 W [LILI@TXCYBER.COM](mailto:LILI@TXCYBER.COM)  
North Zulch, TX 77872-7056

### McLennan County:

Vince Hanke (254) 776-1695, ext. 15  
PO Box 20667 (254) 751-1163 night  
Waco, TX 76702-0667 [VINCEBOOM@AOL.COM](mailto:VINCEBOOM@AOL.COM)

### Medina County:

Jean Kutzer 830-931-3871  
209 South County Road 5603  
Castroville, TX 78009

### Milam County: Contact

Casey Stanislaw (254) 605-0380 work  
PO Box 793 (254) 602-2060 mobile  
Cameron, TX 76520-0793  
[CSTANISLAW@EARTHLINK.NET](mailto:CSTANISLAW@EARTHLINK.NET)

### Montgomery County:

Scott Gordon (713) 767-8416 day  
15 Raintree Pl. (281) 367-1283 night  
The Woodlands, TX 77381-5152  
[SGORDON@MAIN.COM](mailto:SGORDON@MAIN.COM)

[WWW.MAIN.COM/~MRBEAR/LIBERTAR.HTM](http://WWW.MAIN.COM/~MRBEAR/LIBERTAR.HTM)

### Motley County:

Warner Sailsbury 806-348-7275  
P. O. Box 58 [SCRUBIT@CAPROCK-SPUR.COM](mailto:SCRUBIT@CAPROCK-SPUR.COM)  
Roaring Springs, TX, 79256

### Nacogdoches County:

Joe Allport (936) 569-8832 night  
PO Box 632873 [ALLPROPATRIA@HOTMAIL.COM](mailto:ALLPROPATRIA@HOTMAIL.COM)  
Nacogdoches, TX 75963-2873  
[WWW.TX.IP.ORG/NACOGDOCHES/INDEX.HTML](http://WWW.TX.IP.ORG/NACOGDOCHES/INDEX.HTML)

Meeting: 2<sup>nd</sup> Wednesday, 7:00 PM, Dr. Brad Wilson's office, University Drive

### Navarro County:

Tommy Hart (903) 874-1387 home  
1060 Oak Valley Lane (903) 872-4849 work  
Corsicana, TX 75110 [BRHART1@AIRMAIL.NET](mailto:BRHART1@AIRMAIL.NET)

### Nolan County:

Meets concurrently with Taylor County, Contact George Schwappach for information, [GEORGES@SWCONNECT.NET](mailto:GEORGES@SWCONNECT.NET), Meetings: 2nd Monday, 7:30 PM, Farolito's Mexican Restaurant, 209 Cotton Wood, Abilene, TX (concurrently with Taylor County)

### Nueces County:

Robert Powell (361) 850-9601 night  
4622 Grand Lake Dr. [REP@CIRRIIS.NET](mailto:REP@CIRRIIS.NET)  
Corpus Christi, TX 78413-5246

Meeting: Thursday, 5:30 PM, Town and Country Restaurant, Alameda/Everhart intersection

### Orange County:

David Constant (409) 822-0349  
2913 Fairway Dr. [CONSTANT@IJNTB.NET](mailto:CONSTANT@IJNTB.NET)  
Orange, TX 77630

### Palo Pinto County:

Lance Bailey (940) 325-8221 x 111 day  
221 Country Club Parkway (940) 325-6079 night  
Mineral Wells, TX 76067-8309  
[BAILEY@SEAMUX.COM](mailto:BAILEY@SEAMUX.COM)

Meeting: 1<sup>st</sup> Tuesday

### Parker County: Contact:

Raymond Ford (640) 682-2006  
315 Howard Rd.  
Weatherford, TX 76088 [FORD5@AIRMAIL.NET](mailto:FORD5@AIRMAIL.NET)

### Parmer County: Contact:

Helen Precure (806) 965-2981  
RR 1, Box 560  
Muleshoe, TX 77347-9633

### Polk County:

Kris Overstreet (409) 685-2028 office,  
Rt. 14, Box 5560 (409) 685-4992 home  
Livingston, TX 77351 [REDNECK@DETNET.COM](mailto:REDNECK@DETNET.COM)

### Randall County:

David K. Kelley (806) 355-1934 night  
4404 Summit Cir.  
Amarillo, TX 79109-5322  
Meeting: Sunday 8:00 PM, irregular schedule. Call for information

### Real County:

Letha L. Dulaney [LETHA@HCTC.NET](mailto:LETHA@HCTC.NET)  
PO Box 221 (Live Oak Street)  
Leakey, TX 78873

### Robertson County:

J. R. Prestidge (409) 828-3398  
PO Box 40 [THEHAVEN@TXCYBER.COM](mailto:THEHAVEN@TXCYBER.COM)  
Wheelock, TX 77882-0040

### Rockwall County:

Chuck Hampton (972) 412-4020  
6806 Chimneywood Circle [YOUNCRAZYKIDS@AOL.COM](mailto:YOUNCRAZYKIDS@AOL.COM)  
Rowlett, TX 75089

### Rusk County:

Donna Howeth 903-898-2383  
8051 County Road 3125 [DEHOWETH@TYLER.NET](mailto:DEHOWETH@TYLER.NET)  
Henderson, TX 75654

### Sabine County:

John F. Ivy (409) 579-2034 night  
HC 52 Box 553 (409) 579-2117 fax  
Hemphill, TX 75948-9620

### San Patricio County:

Terrance Stewart (512) 758-5546 night  
1367 Oak Park Dr. [TCS\\_VERMIN@HOTMAIL.COM](mailto:TCS_VERMIN@HOTMAIL.COM)  
Aransas Pass, TX 78336-3207

### San Saba County:

Marvin Foster (915) 622-4572  
HC: 12, Box 105 [JOAQUIN@CENTEX.NET](mailto:JOAQUIN@CENTEX.NET)  
Cherokee, TX 76803-9704

### Smith County:

Shirley Coscione (903) 581-5867  
400 Grande Blvd., #1115 [CODEMAXSHIRLY@AOL.COM](mailto:CODEMAXSHIRLY@AOL.COM)  
Tyler, TX 75703

### Tarrant County:

Larry Nickerson (817) 329-5014  
5725 Oakleaf Dr., #2105 (817) 762-8616 day  
Ft. Worth, TX 76132-2427 (817) 370-0941 night  
PO Box 953 [LNICKERS@CSC.COM](mailto:LNICKERS@CSC.COM)

Fort Worth, TX 76101-0953

Tarrant County Libertarian News PO Box 953, Ft. Worth,

TX 76101, (817) 329-5014 or (817) 370-0941

Meeting: 2<sup>nd</sup> Thursday, 7:00 PM

### Taylor County:

George Schwappach (915) 691-1776 home  
8318 Saddle Creek Rd. (915) 698-3405 work  
Abilene, TX 79602-5454 (915) 691-1943 fax  
[GEORGES@SWCONNECT.NET](mailto:GEORGES@SWCONNECT.NET)

Meetings: 2nd Monday, 7:30 PM, Farolito's Mexican Restaurant, 209 Cotton Wood, Abilene, TX

### Tom Green County:

Michael Brady (915) 942-5636  
1921 Walnut St. [WTGADFLY@CS.COM](mailto:WTGADFLY@CS.COM)  
San Angelo, TX 76901

[HTTP://MEMBERS.TRIPOD.COM/~TGCLP](http://MEMBERS.TRIPOD.COM/~TGCLP)

Meeting: 1st Tuesday, 7:30 PM, The Kettle, 1811 South Bryant Blvd., San Angelo, TX

### Travis County:

C. David Eagle (512) 671-3765  
3133 Wavcrest Blvd. [MINGOVIA@WT.NET](mailto:MINGOVIA@WT.NET) or  
Austin, TX 78728 [EAGLE@EARTH.COM](mailto:EAGLE@EARTH.COM)  
[WWW.AUSTINLIBERTY.ORG](http://WWW.AUSTINLIBERTY.ORG)

Austin Libertarian: [VMAY@WT.NET](mailto:VMAY@WT.NET)

Meetings: 1<sup>st</sup> Tuesday, 7:00 to 8:30 PM

Radio: KOOP 90.7 FM, "The Liberated Space", Thursday, 6:30 PM

Television: Cable Channel 10: "Live and Let Live", Saturday, 8:00 PM, "Smash the State", Saturday, 9:00 PM

### Upshur County:

Stanley Vance Lowry [MACMAN@FLASH.NET](mailto:MACMAN@FLASH.NET)  
707 Madelaine Dr.  
Gilmer, TX 75644-3146

### Val Verde County:

Karl Bollmann, III (830) 775-7851 night  
PO Box 421715 [RCASS@DELRIO.COM](mailto:RCASS@DELRIO.COM)  
Del Rio, TX 78842-1715

### Van Zandt County:

Gene Johnson, Sr. (930) 896-1654 night  
RR4, Box 184B  
Wills Point, TX 75169-9793

### Victoria County:

Tim Purcell (512) 573-1885  
PO Box 1174 [DREAM3@WEBTV.NET](mailto:DREAM3@WEBTV.NET)  
Victoria, TX 77905

### Webb County:

Michael Oleniczak (956) 645-2662 cell  
5908 San Bernado #47  
Laredo, TX 78041

### Wichita County:

Mark Rippetoe (817) 696-0829 day  
3000 Kemp Blvd. (817) 592-2277 night  
Wichita Falls, TX 76308-1019 [TORSHAMMAR@AOL.COM](mailto:TORSHAMMAR@AOL.COM)

### Williamson County:

David Carter  
1108 Green Downs Dr.  
Round Rock, TX 78664 [DCARTER@IO.COM](mailto:DCARTER@IO.COM)

### Wilson County:

Tom Kane (830) 216-4664 night  
912 4<sup>th</sup> St. [FREEDOM2@FLASH.NET](mailto:FREEDOM2@FLASH.NET)  
Floresville, TX 78114-1802

### Winkler County:

Steve Grupe (915) 586-6018 night  
1055 S. Poplar St. (915) 661-1758 mobile  
Kermit, TX 79745-5010 [GRUPE@ULTRAVISION.NET](mailto:GRUPE@ULTRAVISION.NET)

### Young County:

Grant Goble (940) 549-8945 home  
1217 Texas St. (940) 549-5701 work  
Graham, TX 76450 [GLGOBLE@DIGITALPASSAGE.COM](mailto:GLGOBLE@DIGITALPASSAGE.COM)



Non-Profit Org.  
U. S. Postage  
**Paid**  
Permit No. 06478  
Houston, Texas

Address Service Requested

## I Want to Join the Libertarian Party



- \$25 Basic LP membership (includes *LP News & Lone Star Liberty*)
- \$50 Sustaining LP membership (above plus Texas' *Insider's Report* and above)
- Check enclosed, total amount \_\_\_\_\_ (payable to "Libertarian Party") or
- I would like to charge my MC/Visa # \_\_\_\_\_ Exp \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

Phone #(s) &/or E-mail \_\_\_\_\_

Occupation & Employer \_\_\_\_\_

(Optional, Federal Election Commission requires we ask)

Send this form to:  
Libertarian Party  
2600 Virginia Ave., NW, Ste 100  
Washington, DC 20037

I hereby certify that I do not believe in or advocate the initiation of force as a means of achieving political or social goals.

(Signing the oath is required for national membership)

Signature \_\_\_\_\_