For a libertarian, there's only one valid reason for the United States to go to war: self-defense.

The party platform makes that clear. It states: "Any U.S. military policy should have the objective of providing security for the lives, liberty and property of the American people in the U.S. against the risk of attack by a foreign power."

Such a "risk of attack" must obviously be immediate, grave, and unequivocal. Otherwise, the government could point to almost any risk — no matter how unlikely or insignificant — as a rationale for war.

Given this straightforward self-defense mandate, is the United States justified in going to war against Iraq?

The Bush administration says it is. It argues:

1) Iraq possesses nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons of mass destruction (WMD) that threaten the security of the United States.

2) Saddam Hussein is a past and future ally of terrorists who threaten the United States.

Below, we will address each of these arguments.

The Bush administration has offered other rationales for war: Saddam is a thug who oppresses his own people and threatens his neighbors. He has violated U.N. and international agreements. And he has hindered U.N. weapons inspections.

These accusations all seem to be true. But for a libertarian, they are not valid reasons to go to war, since they go far beyond any proper defensive role for the U.S. military. It is not the job of the United States to liberate the oppressed people of the world, nor to defend Arab or Persian Gulf nations against aggression, nor to enforce international treaties, nor to compel Hussein to open his borders to U.N. weapons inspectors.

U.N. report?

What about the U.N. report that says Iraq did not prove conclusively that it dismantled its weapons of mass destruction? The mere possession of weapons is not a valid reason for the U.S. to invade a sovereign nation. After all, Iraq is not the only nation with such armaments. Accord-
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Oregon voters have rejected a temporary income tax surcharge — handing a major victory to the state Libertarian Party, which led the fight against the proposed tax hike.

On January 28, in a statewide referendum, voters rejected Measure 28 by 55%-45%. Had it passed, the initiative would have raised taxes by $725 million over three years.

"When the numbers came up on election night, and I realized we would win, I felt a mixture of relief and exhilaration," said Oregon LP Executive Director Richard Burke, as the magnitude of the anti-tax vote became clear. "The Libertarian Party won the campaign, and it was the sale of the tax — we weren't just tagging along or riding someone else's coattails."

To close the call

Just eight days earlier, a statewide poll by Portland's KATU Television had suggested the vote was too close to call.

But on the evening of the vote, about 60 Libertarian state party members gathered in Beaverton to applaud and cheer as TV news reports showed Measure 28 decisively falling behind.

About 65% of the state's registered voters cast a ballot for or against Measure 28 — one of the largest turnouts for a special election in state history, reported the Salem Statesman Journal.

Measure 28 would have increased the state's top personal tax rate from 9% to 9.5%, and the top corporate tax rate from 6.6% to 6.9% in 2002, 2003, and 2004. It would have cost the average Oregon taxpayer about $114 per year.

The state legislature had voted to put the measure on the ballot in September.

To fight Measure 28, the Oregon LP had launched a vigorous "Turn The Tide" campaign, visiting 27 cities and towns in 17 days to offer arguments against the tax hike.

"I and other Libertarians put over 4,000 miles on our cars visiting newspapers, radio stations and TV stations all over Oregon," said Burke.

A January 6 press conference in Salem to kick off the effort garnered statewide media attention.

See OREGON Page 7
Libertarian Party applauds U.S. Senate measure that halts TIA system funding

Continued from Page 1
authorizing its use. However, the measure contained one loophole: It said TIA research could continue if the Department of Justice and the U.S. Attorney General certify that the program was necessary to protect the national security of the United States. Nonetheless, the vote indicated that the government is reacting to the anti-TIA lobbying by Libertarians and other civil-liberty activists, said Neale.

The public's input has changed some minds on Capitol Hill, he said.

The TIA program, which has a $137 million budget in 2005, will create a massive new database for federal law enforcement and public service, and use it to try to "detect patterns" of terrorist activity. When completed, it will feature a database of information on citizens' bank, and medical records of every American, as well as airline ticket purchases, educational records, gun purchases, donations to defined domestic nonprofits, ATM transactions, rental car contracts, arrest records, flying lessons, phone calls, and e-mails.

TIA spokespeople said the database will allow them to spot "suspicious" activity — such as a person who purchases explosives and then buys a one-way airline ticket — that might indicate a terrorist plot.

Police stakeout

It was that potential of ubiquitous surveillance that prompted Neale to call the TIA "the electronic equivalent of ordering a 24-hour police stakeout on every American, even though they're not suspected of doing anything wrong.

Eventually, the TIA database is scheduled to be connected to a system of "automated identification" technology, such as face recognition technology or digital fingerprinting. The project is being developed by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) and is being directed by former Navy Rear Adm. John Poindexter.

In November 2002, the Libertarian Party joined an emergency coalition of more than 30 organizations to try to scuttle the project.

Online Petitions

There are at least two online petitions that Libertarians can sign to show opposition to TIA:

- www.thepetitionsite.com
  (click on "Politics & Gov't - USA", then "Stop Big Brother - shut down Total Information Awareness")
- www.PetitionOnline.com/
  privacy/petition.html

The coalition — which included the Electronic Privacy Information Center, the Free Congress Foundation, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Eagle Forum, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, and others — sent a letter to then-Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott and Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle, urging them to support an amendment to the Homeland Security Act that would have halted the program. But the Senate rejected the amendment, and President Bush signed the bill into law on November 25.

Senator Wyden said he introduced his amendment to block the TIA because "as originally proposed, the Total Information Awareness program is the most far-reaching government surveillance plan in history.

As an amendment to a spending bill, the anti-TIA provision will now go to a House/Senate conference committee. If it survives the committee, it would bar both the House and Senate for another vote.

Two weeks after the Senate vote, the Pentagon named two boards to oversee the TIA program, to ensure that it "develops and disseminates its products to track terrorists in a manner consistent with U.S. Constitutional law, U.S. statutory law, and American values related to privacy."

The oversight boards, announced February 7, would consist of an internal panel and an outside board of specialists.

The Pentagon said it was working with the Senate/House conference committee, and said it expected the added language to "come with a compromise that is acceptable."

Despite the promised oversight panels, Libertarians need to remain vigilant about the Total Information Awareness system, said Neale — and should continue to pressure politicians to permanently end it.

Step up pressure

"Now that politicians have been put on the defensive over this un-American spy scheme, it's time to step up the pressure and bury it once and for all," he said.

Libertarians should call their U.S. House Representatives and U.S. Senators, and ask them to support any bill or amendment that would block the TIA program, said Neale.

To contact Congress, call the U.S. House switchboard toll-free (888) 449-3511. For e-mail or mailing information, visit: www.congress.org.
Libertarians rally against war with Iraq

Libertarians, in at least five states, participated in protests against the U.S.-led war with Iraq—hoping to show that Libertarians oppose an interventionist foreign policy.

Libertarians in California, Oregon, the District of Columbia, Nevada, and Illinois joined anti-war protests in January and February, according to reports from around the country.

The activity by Libertarians allowed other anti-war demonstrators—many of them leftists—to hear the “libertarian spin on foreign policy; [that] asking government to do something can have all kinds of unintended consequences, mostly bad,” said Nevada LP activist Bob Tregillus.

Highlights of Libertarian anti-war activities included:

■ Washington, DC: Libertarians took part in a major anti-war march on January 18.

About a dozen Libertarians carried signs and chanted slogans as they marched with more than 100,000 demonstrators from the National Mall to the Navy Yards in Southeast Washington, DC.

“We can’t let the liberals and lefties be the only ones getting the message out,” said Carol Moore, who co-ordinated the Libertarian effort with Aaron Biterman.

The goal of the march was to show opposition to “[President George W.] Bush’s criminal war that seeks to conquer the oil, land and resources of the Middle East,” according to the group that organized the rally, A.N.S.W.E.R. (Act Now to Stop War & End Racism).

Speakers at the march included Rev. Al Sharpton (National Action Network), Jessica Lange (actress), Ron Kovic (author, Born on the Fourth of July), Physicians for Social Responsibility, the Free Palestine Alliance, the New York Youth Bloc, and the Partnership for Civil Justice.

The march included “lots of peaceniks who’d be open to libertarian ideas if anyone ever told them they exist,” said Moore.

■ Nevada: Libertarians joined more than 500 other protesters at an anti-war demonstration in Reno on January 18.

The rally, sponsored by the Reno Anti-War Coalition, was held at the Manzanita Bowl at the University of Nevada.

The purpose of the demonstration was to show opposition to an American invasion of Iraq, said Nevada LP State Chair Brendan Trainor.

100 countries

“I got the message out in a four minute speech,” he said — pointing out the fact that the U.S. has troops stationed in about 100 countries.

“We have troops in Iceland. Are we protecting them from Greenland?” he noted. “The military shouldn’t protect foreign investments.”

If some Americans want to topple Saddam Hussein, they should volunteer to fight the Iraqi dictator, as individuals did with the Lincoln Brigade to fight fascism in Spain from 1936-1939.

Protesters at the rally carried signs that said, “Americans don’t shoot first,” “Peace is patriotic” and “War doesn’t decide who’s right, only who’s left.”

Also in Nevada, Tregillus built a website for the Reno Anti-War Coalition.

New York ‘Guns for Tots’ effort attracts attention

Tories firmly in check, the Manhattan Libertarian Party organized a “Guns for Tots” drive to protect a new city gun-control bill.

Toy guns, that is.

On February 6, Manhattan LP members distributed toy guns—including water pistols and cap guns—at R.S. 72 in Harlem.

The giveaway was designed to draw attention to a bill that would make it illegal to sell or possess any toy gun in New York City, said Manhattan LP spokesman Jim Lesczynski.

City Hall spoilsports

“Playing with a water pistol is one of the most cherished rites of childhood,” he said. “We want to give that experience to New York’s children before the spoilsports in City Hall take it away permanently.”

The Guns for Tots drive got underway on January 22, when the Manhattan LP publicly announced the “philanthropic” campaign.

The campaign was a response to a bill (Int. O298), sponsored by city council members David Weprin (D-Queens) and Albert Vann (D-Brooklyn) that would prohibit the sale or possession of any toy gun.

Currently, it is legal in New York to sell toy guns.

See ANTI-WAR Page 7

California LP officeholder survives union-led recall

A Libertarian officeholder in California has survived a recall effort.

Salinas resident Mark Dierolf will remain a member of the Hartnell College Board of Trustees because leaders of a recall effort failed to file the required paperwork to unseat him.

On January 6, Monterey County assistant registrar of voters Janele Davidson belatedly announced that recall supporters had missed a November 18 deadline to show proof that a formal announcement of the recall effort had been published in a local newspaper.

Public relations ploy

In response, Dierolf changed that the failed recall effort was a “hoax” — a public relations ploy designed to help defeat an anti-tax measure he had sponsored in 2002.

“I was targeted because I support low taxes and responsible spending,” he said.

Dierolf, 39, had spearheaded Measure O, an initiative that would have phased out Salinas’s 6% tax on gas, electricity, cable, and water over a three-year period. It would have saved taxpayers about $8 million.

After Measure O qualified for the ballot, Local 817 of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) announced it would try to recall Dierolf, charging that he had “used his public office to pursue personal agendas and enhance his own political career at great harm to the people he is sworn to represent.”

The SEIU opposed Measure O, said Dierolf, because had it passed, some local government services would probably have been privatized, costing union members their jobs.

Although the tax repeal represented only 12% of the Salinas city government’s $69 million budget, city officials said the passage of Measure O would force them to lay off police, paramedics, and school crossing guards, and close public libraries, and the city-run swimming pool.

The initiative was defeated 65% to 35% on November 5, 2002.

Dierolf is serving his third term on the Hartnell College Board of Trustees. He was first elected in 1993.

Dierolf also serves as the Chair of the Monterey County LP.
Suit against airline ID regulation survives first courtroom challenge

**National LP Treasurer Deryl Martin resigns**

Liberary National Treasurer Deryl Martin has resigned, citing the “all-consuming” nature of the job and a desire to spend more time with his family.

Martin announced his resignation on January 29, effective immediately. He had assumed the treasurer’s position in April 2001, and been re-elected for a two-year term in 2002.

However, the time required for his current job and “the amount of time it has taken to steer the party through its current financial woes has been an all-consuming affair,” said Martin. “I could not fulfill all the duties that fell to me.”

Martin is taking a one-year sabbatical from teaching to work with the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) to reduce its debt.

“I could not have anticipated how much time away from family (the TVA position) would take,” he said. “Except for a three-month period in 1994, I have been an officer at some level for over a decade and that’s enough.”

LP National Chairman George Neale said he regretted Martin’s decision.

“I will sorely miss his great efforts, diligence, and most of all, his counsel,” he said. “He’s a great guy.”

The Libertarian National Committee has approved Bill Redpath as acting chairman of the National LP, pending a resolution that requires Americans to show ID before flying, now that a federal judge refused a government motion to dismiss the case. On January 17, U.S. District Court Judge Susan Illston agreed to hear the lawsuit, which Gilmore had filed against Attorney General John Ashcroft, Southwest Airlines, and United Airlines.

“These aren’t made-up issues,” said Gilmore about his case. “We free citizens have not only a Constitutional right to travel throughout the U.S. without government-imposed restrictions, but also a Constitutional right to refuse to identify ourselves to government agents unless there is probable cause to suspect us of a crime.”

At a preliminary hearing in San Francisco, Gilmore’s attorney William Sipinich, argued that requiring individuals to show identification or be frisked by airport security violates the Fourth Amendment’s protections against unreasonable searches.

It also creates a de facto “internal passport” that allows federal authorities to track Americans’ domestic travel, and prevents individuals from traveling freely, he said.

In addition, Gilmore charged that the ID requirement is the result of an unpublished, “secret” directive from the Transportation Security Administration (TSA).

“If there’s a law that requires the public to show an ID, we ought to know about it,” he said. “We citizens have a right to know what the laws that affect the general public.”

Joseph Lobue, an attorney for the Justice Department, disputed Gilmore’s claims, and said the ID rule is necessary to protect passengers and airline companies from acts of terrorism.

“The only way airlines can compare passenger lists with terrorists is by asking for an ID,” he said.

Lobue also said the regulations didn’t affect Gilmore’s right to travel, since he could have taken another form of transportation.

“The right to travel does not necessarily include the most convenient way to travel, if you wouldn’t show an ID,” he said.

And searching airline passengers for weapons did not violate the Fourth Amendment, argued Lobue, because such a search was not “unreasonable.”

Gilmore, the co-founder of the Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF), said he was inspired to file the lawsuit because of an incident on July 4, 2002, when he was prevented from boarding a flight from Oakland to Baltimore-Washington International Airport.

Gilmore was stopped by Southwest Airlines employees who demanded to see his identification. Gilmore declined to do so, saying, “It’s Independence Day. It’s good time to exercise some freedom.”

He was then given conflicting information about whether the ID was needed.

**DC Libertarian named ‘Hero of the Week’**

Washington, DC Libertarian Carol Moore has been named the 2003 “Hero of the Week” for fighting against the “perfect peace activist.”

“When it comes to opposition to state violence, Moore must be ranked among the most consistent voices against the U.S. government’s peace and war policies, both domestically and internationally,” reported PressAction.com, which bestowed the honor.

Moore was honored on January 17 for “protesting against U.S. military adventures abroad, advocating nonviolent public action against state terror” and for “her actions for peace and freedom.”

“Moore recognized a long time ago the destructive nature of Washington’s war addiction, but she refuses to relinquish hope that the government will end its bullying ways,” wrote PressAction.com.

For example, Moore participated in the January 18 Washington, DC demonstration against the looming war with Iraq. At the rally, the LP activist sold buttons “promoting love, peace, and liberty.”

“I ran to commit vehement capitalist acts in the midst of the anti-capitalists leading the antiwar movement!” she said.

Moore is the author of The Return of Street Fighting Man: The Pathology of The New Progressive War: An e-book that challenges the status quo; she was the 1999-2001 Libertarian National Committee chair.

A co-founder of Libertarians For Peace, Moore has also criticized the Libertarian Party and “less committed or aware Libertarians” for not being “vocal enough on the non-intervention and peace issues.”

Moore, a legal secretary, served as Chair of the District of Columbia LP from 1999-2001. She also works on the Committee for Waco Justice.

The Arlington, Virginia-based Press Action publishes online investigative news and commentary “from a libertarian point of view.”

**San Jose Libertarian is new rent board chair**

Liberary Scott Lieberman has been elected Chair of the San Jose (California) Advisory Commission on Rents. Lieberman was elected by his fellow commissioners on January 16 and will serve until December 2003.

Although he is opposed to rent control, Lieberman said he thinks he was elected because he was “polite to city staffers and my fellow commissioners, even when I felt they were not acting in the best interests of the city’s landlords and tenants.”

As chairman, Lieberman said he hopes to schedule a debate between a pro-rent-control spokesman and an anti-rent-control expert at the commission’s annual retreat in March.

The Advisory Commission on Rents advises the San Jose city council on the Rental Rights and Referrals Program, which oversees landlord-tenant disputes related to the city’s rent control ordinance.

In San Jose, landlords are allowed by law to raise rent by only 8% per year—or 21% every two years—for apartments built before 1979. Rents are not subject to rent control.

Lieberman, a member of the commission since 2000, is also an Alternate Representative (Region 2) on the Libertarian National Committee, Inc. Professionally, he is a doctor.

Montrose, Colorado LP collects petitions to repeal city’s $2.5 million grocery tax

The Western Slope LP has launched a petition drive to repeal a tax on groceries in Montrose, saying that the tax is a hardship for poor families.

Libertarians need about 450 signatures to bring a measure before the city council, which can act on the proposal or call a special election to allow voters to decide.

If the grocery tax is repealed, Montrose residents would save about $2.5 million a year.

Limited incomes

“We’re in tough economic times here in Montrose, and the city needs to realize that, and do what’s right for the elderly and people on limited incomes,” said local Libertarian Tim Jacobs.

The 3% tax applies to all food purchased for consumption at home, and generates about 24% of the city’s sales tax revenues.

Montrose residents said if the tax is repealed, the city will have to “cut some services” — perhaps the police department — or it could spend the money the Montrose Pavilion community center, or grants to local non-profit groups.

Libertarians dismissed that claim.

“Our position is that there are several ways to save money instead of spending it all of the time,” said Tim Jacobs.

Western Slope LP Chairwoman Jo-jo Ping, “There are certain places in the budget where they are overexpending.”

For example, the city could restrict the number of city-owned vehicles, and postpone or cancel $52 million worth of expansions and new building projects, she said.

Ping added, “It’s the hard impact of the grocery tax on the poor and fixed-income residents outweighed the city’s need for money.”

The city of Montrose claims it needs the money, but Libertarians say citizens on fixed and low incomes need the money the most, she said. “The smaller the income, the bigger percentage of it goes towards groceries. In a $17-an-hour town, that tax is a substantial part of poor people’s incomes.”

A food tax is an especially onerous tax, agreed Ping, since it hits the poorest hardest.

 “[A] sales tax on food is the most regressive of all taxes; those least able to pay must pay a higher proportion of their limited incomes,” she said.

“Taxing food puts the poor and elderly at a disadvantage. [Repealing the tax would be] a gift which will keep giving.”

**The City of Montrose claims it needs the money, but citizens on fixed and low incomes need the money more.** — Tim Jacobs.

180 days

Libertarians have 180 days from the date they started the petition drive to collect signatures — giving the city’s mostreddit deadline.

However, they hope to collect all the required signatures by the end of the year. Ping, then, the city clerk will check the signatures to ensure that only city residents signed the petition.
Airline ID lawsuit gets go-ahead from district court

Continued from Page 4 requirement was a government regulation or an airline policy, he said. "It felt like I was in a maze," he said. "I was just being harassed unless I followed their orders, which I wouldn't do."

Gilmore went to the San Francisco airport, where he tried to buy a ticket from United Airlines. He was again informed that he could not fly without showing identification unless he agreed to undergo "an intense search of [his] person and bags."

As intrusive

"I wasn't about to let the airport workers rif through my private property," he said. "That would have been at least as intrusive as requiring me to show my ID."

After Gilmore refused, he was informed by a security agent that the airport was following directives from the Transportation Security Administration. However, he was told, the directives were transmitted orally, and were not available in writing.

The TSA was created after September 11 to regulate airport security and to implement the provisions of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act. That bill was signed by President Bush in November 2001.

Gilmore, who had arrived in the courtroom wearing a button on his lapel with the words "suspected terrorist" over the image of an airplane, has argued that checking ID cards is not an effective way to deter terrorism.

"If we knew who the terrorists were, we could just arrest them all," he said. "But they have a right to fly, and I have a right to prevent them from flying."

Checking IDs is an exercise in futility that provides a false sense of security.

—John Gilmore

rather than stopping them when they try to fly," he said. "The people who hijacked the planes on 9/11 also showed their IDs. Professional terrorists have great access to fake IDs."

"There are many ways to deter terrorism, but checking IDs is not one of them. It is an exercise in futility that provides a false sense of security."

Gilmore acknowledged that some people might say his lawsuit demonstrates an obsessive concern about civil liberties, given the threat posed by terrorists.

But, he said, "no security threat is as important as the threat to American society caused by the erosion of Constitutional rights."


Dear Freethinker

You've probably heard people refer to you as "a loner" or "peculiar" just because you spend your free time as you choose—and because you choose to spend your free time with only the few persons you really like.

Maybe people have even called you "odd" or "weird" or "crazy" just because you find solitude and your own thoughts to be the best of all companions.

Possibly, during a mellow moment of concern for your fellow man, you have considered the unthinkable making a public apology for your unique lifestyle.

Then, you'll undoubtedly welcome a unique book:

MATHESES LANE

penned by Wanda Logan

Matheses Lane is a fictional work of satire. It is both controversial and revolutionary. It exposes all so-called mental illness as nothing more than a delusive state of consciousness.

It associates the laws of genuine metaphysics with the teachings of original Christianity — the Doctrine which clarified a crucial point: "God gave man a sound mind," as explained by an Apostle.

Matheses Lane will not leave you where it found you.

Vermont LP raps Brady gun report

Vermont Libertarians have blasted the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence (BCPGV) for giving Vermont a "D-" for its gun laws — even though the state has one of the lowest rates of gun deaths in the country.

"Vermonters should feel insulted by [this] attempt to spread misinformation about gun-related deaths in order to generate support for greater gun control laws in our state," said State Chairman Brendan Kinney.

In January, the BCPGV, a notorious anti-Second Amendment group, issued a "Report Card" that graded efforts to shield children from guns.

Vermont received a low grade because it lacked laws that "protect children" from gun violence, such as gun-lock laws and restrictive concealed-carry laws, said the BCPGV.

"The report implies that Vermonters don't care about protecting children, and makes it appear as if there is an epidemic of gun-related deaths among children," said Kinney. "But the facts tell a different story."

In fact, he noted, there were only 63 gun-related deaths in Vermont in 1998 — of which 57 were suicide, four were homicide, and two were unintentional. None of the dead were children under 14.

"Vermont has some of the least restrictive gun laws in the country, yet we have a very good record when it comes to gun-related deaths and injuries," said Kinney. "Why doesn't the Brady Campaign conduct a study based on those facts?"
Fight terror (grow your own pot!) and the real truth about fat kids

**Vitamin junkie**

A third-grader at Pauline O'Rourke Elementary School in Mobile, Alabama, was suspended for five days for violating the Mobile County system's zero-tolerance policy for substance abuse. The boy's crime? He took a multivitamin with his lunch.

— JAMES TAKANO
OpinionJournal.com
January 31, 2003

**Why are kids fat?**

Every weekday at lunch, courtesy of the federal government the 72 mil-

lion schoolchildren sit down to the nation's largest mass feeding. If we
took a giant snapshot of their trays on a typical day, here's what the con-
tinent-wide photo would look like:

In Lynnwood, Washington, we would see kids eating sausage with
waffle sticks and syrup. In Clovis, California, bacon cheeseburgers. In
Bryan, Texas, cheeseburgers, chicken-fried steak and pie. In Pine Bluff,
Arkansas, country steak with creamed potatoes.

In Lafayette, Indiana, beef sausages with cheesy broccoli. In Kings
tee, South Carolina, sloppy joes with onion rings. In Gateville, North Car-
olina, three-meat subs with Fritos.

Public schools serve more than 4 million meals every year — and
officials say that at least some are contributing to the growing health cri-

sis among kids.

At a time when weight-related ill-

liness in children is escalating, schools are serving kids the very foods that lead to obesity, diabetes, and heart disease.

— BARRY TOoman
Mother Jones
January/February 2003

**Jesus hates SUVs**

"What would Jesus drive?" asks the Rev. Bill Ball, director of some-
thing called the Evangelical Environmental Network. "Jesus wants his
followers to drive the least-polluting, most efficient vehicle that truly
meets their needs."

The media, which ate this guy up, report Ball plans to spend $65,000 to
convince the federal government that a car with salvation lies in selling their SUVs.

Some rather obvious questions, of
course, come to mind.

First, how does freedom of

speech and religion apply? Second, how is it possible for someone to be a

Christian and not like a car that

Jesus didn't drive?

— STEVE MCCONNELL
Page Six
February 2003


— JERRY TAYLOR
Environment & Climate News
February 2003

**Growth your own!**

Ludicrous comments from the Office of National Drug Control Policy as-

sert that anyone who uses drugs is helping support terrorism.

[However], Americans who get locked up for growing marijuana plants in their basements have not given any aid or comfort to interna-
tional terrorists. Yet somehow, 1 doubt that we'll see an ad campaign with the slogan, "Fight terrorism — grow your own pot!"

— CATRY YOUNG
The Boston Globe
January 13, 2002

**Pointless keg law**

If you buy more than four kegs of

beer at one time in [Columbus] Ohio, you must have your driver's license.

Vit telling liquor control agents the time and place of your party and al-

lowing police to enter without a warrant to check ID.

The ACLU challenged the law as unconstitutional — and pointless,
since police have never acted on the more than 300 affidavits filed since the statute went into effect. A federal judge agreed, pointing

out that the law doesn't prevent any-

one with half a brain from buying four kegs of beer multiple times.

— FLAPB, February 2003

**To BB or not to BB**

The Baltimore City Council has

made it illegal to sell a BB gun to

anyone under 18. Juvenile homicides were up 50% in 2002 from the previ-

ous year [but] none of those people were killed with a BB gun.

— BY CHARLES OLIVER, Reason.

**Who is hungry?**

Liberal advocacy groups, stuck in a gruesome nostalgia for a bygone era of deprivation, still talk of hunger as if it stales every poor household in

the country. They maintain that there are 13.6 million children hungry or at

risk of hunger in America — one of the great boogey statistics of our age.

As poverty expert Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation explains, malnutrition, understood as a signifi-
cant dietary deficiency, essentially doesn't exist in America except in small pockets of the population with other prob-

lems, e.g. drug addicts or anorexics.

Hunger, defined as going without a meal at least once in the past month, is also extremely rare, accord-

ing to the Department of Agriculture, affecting roughly one-half of 1 per-

cent of American children.

— RICK LOWRY
TownHill.com
January 21, 2003

**Draft folly**

Rep. Charles Rangel (D-NY) wants to
draft young people into the com-

ing conflict [with Iraq] to ensure that Americans "shoulder the burden of

the war equally." Alas, conscription of young people is more likely to blow

up in the White House than in the Pentagon.

— JERRY TAYLOR
Environment & Climate News
February 2003

**Have a Million-Dollar Tax Day Outreach?**

W hat to add some fun and success to your 2003 Tax Day rally! Want to generate more prospects? Want to make your rally credible? Need to bust the "$1 Million Bill" will do the trick! Printed in green ink, the front looks like a Fed-

eral Reserve Note $1,000,000 note. The verse explains that the federal government spends $1 million every 3.5 seconds — and only the LP is trying to change that.

There's a reply coupon, the LP phone number, and our website. It's an Ideal Tax Day outreach tool! Million Bills are available for immediate shipment. Costs: $5 per 100. See ad on page 13.

**Doping children**

The number of young children hooked on powerful narcotics has

skyrocketed over the past 15 years, but the Drug Enforcement Agency isn't doing anything about it — some state officials say that drug use among children has more than tripled since 1987.

As shocking as it is to see that more than 6% of children are pop-

pying pills on a daily basis, the study clearly confirms that what has been ap-

parent for years now. Parents of dif-

ficult children are lured into drugg-

ing their kids with the seductive promise of a quick fix.

Doctors and teachers (perversely) parents to ditch discipline in favor of the "modern" approach. The child may not learn how to modify his be-

havior, but he is hooked up long enough that he can no longer be a "problem."

Children are being Ramseyed through a one-size-fits-all pipeline by the educational establishment. Schools all over the country monitor drug use by students — not to keep them from smoking a joint, mind you, but to blow the whistle when the kids aren't doped up.

"Teachers" unions continue to fight — sometimes successfully — to block children from attending school if they haven't taken their drugs. The trend has become so pervasive that law make-

rs in Vermont last year intro-

duced legislation to prevent schools from requiring kids to pop pills.

— JOEL MOWBRAY
TownHill.com
January 15, 2003
Oregon LP leads fight to kill $725m tax boost

Continued from Page 7

The Libertarians made a simple — and apparently compelling — argument against the proposed tax increase.

"We’ve got a state government that is too big," said Tom Cox, the Oregon LP’s 2002 gubernatorial candidate. "Voters should stand up and demand fiscal responsibility."

Joining the Oregon LP in the campaign against Measure 28 were the Taxpayer Association of Oregon and Citizens for a Sound Economy.

The Oregon Republican Party never took a formal stand on the measure.

A coalition of public-employee unions — including the Oregon School Employees Association and the Oregon AFL-CIO — campaigned for Measure 28, using radio ads, telephone calls, e-mails, fliers, and public meetings to build support for the tax hike.

Committed suicide

A number of newspapers editorialized in favor of the tax increase, and some even reported that two people had committed suicide when they received notice that their state-funded psychiatric and health benefits might be cut.

Measure 28 was also endorsed by outgoing Governor John Kitzhaber, who said it was "just common sense."

In all, the pro-Measure 28 groups spent $490,000, while Libertarians and another anti-tax group spent about $30,000.

When Measure 28’s defeat became clear, state and local government employees threatened "diastic" cuts in services.

For example, the Multnomah County sheriff said he would release 114 prisoners because he couldn’t afford to keep them locked up. Portland Public Schools said it would trim 24 days off its school year. The Oregon State Police said it would lay off 277 officers.

The state court system said it would go to a four-day work week, and stop processing misdemeanor crimes like shoplifting. And the state legislature said it would eliminate medical benefits for 8,000 elderly and disabled people.

But Burke said such threats were designed to chastise voters for rejecting the tax increase.

Punish people

"If they do this, it is only to punish the people for not voting for taxes," he said. "These people are using scare tactics to extort money. We don’t think the cuts will happen the way they’ve been threatened."

During its “No on Measure 28” campaign, the state LP had said the state government could avert the so-called crisis by going on a “fiscal diet,” and could cut the budget by reforming the state workers’ pension system, laying off 2,000 middle-level bureaucrats, and eliminating the Oregon Liquor Control Commission.

The victory dramatically increased the political clout of Oregon Libertarians, said Burke.

"The Libertarian Party has now made a quantum leap in Oregon," he said. "For the first time, the Oregon LP was recognized by the statewide media as leading the opposition campaign against a statewide tax proposal.”

We are now consulted by legislators from both major parties, the media and the governor’s office on state budgetary matters. We needed a win to establish the Libertarian Party as a politically relevant player and secure a seat at the table of public discourse."

Make decisions

The defeat of Measure 28 is also “an opportunity for the legislature to finally make the budget decisions they should have made years ago,” Burke said.

The Salem Statesman Journal had said if Measure 28 passed, it would have sent “political ripples across the nation” — and possibly inspired politicians in other states to raise taxes, too.

The newspaper quoted initiative expert Dane Waters, who said, “I really think this will be a template. If the voters do adopt this in Oregon, I think that will embolden lawmakers in other states.”

But now, with the defeat of Measure 28, the message has been sent that Oregon and other states “can reverse the course of government growth,” said Burke.

How the Oregon LP did it

Editor’s note: Below, Oregon LP Executive Director Richard P. Burke outlines the tactics used by state Libertarians to defeat a proposed $725 million income tax increase. He says: “You might want to use these same tactics the next time voters in your state face a tax proposal.”

1. FIND A “POLITICALLY RELEVANT” MESSAGE.

Philosophical campaign messages rarely move large blocks of voters. Campaigns on platforms like “Income Tax Is Theft” may be emotionally satisfying, but are politically ineffective. Most people are concerned about how tax proposals will affect their day-to-day lives — that is where elections are won and lost. Answer the practical concerns of voters and you can win.

2. DEVELOP AN ALTERNATIVE TO TAXES.

Any tax opponent is obliged to provide alternatives which deal with the problems that would allegedly be “solved” by the tax proposal. Your alternatives should be aggressive, but politically plausible. In Oregon, we presented a series of alternate budgets and identified wasteful programs. Because the major parties are reluctant to offend campaign contributors who defend wasteful programs, Libertarians can stand out by identifying waste. And we can be specific about it.

3. DO YOUR HOMEWORK.

To make your anti-tax campaign credible, you must be able to defend your proposals and back up your claims. Get presentable and articulate people involved in your campaign who have a mastery of the numbers. Such people must be accessible to the media and be prepared to answer questions (and deal with unexpected challenges) on the fly.

4. CHOOSE YOUR PLAYING FIELD.

Plan media campaign tours in areas you are likely to have a bigger impact. Initially, stay away from big cities where it is hard to get press. Small town newspapers, radio, and TV stations are often starved for news and will be more eager to meet with your people. Make appointments in advance, dress properly, and provide people with a full briefing. Creating a buzz in rural areas often attracts the attention of big city media outlets, letting you access big markets on the cheap. Launch your campaign with a press conference describing your campaign and its message.

5. CONCENTRATE YOUR RESOURCES.

Concentrate your resources on your strategy. Don’t encourage people to “do their own thing.” By concentrating your resources in support of a well-laid plan, you will project a clear and consistent message. You will also maximize your impact against the tax you are fighting. Cap your campaign with a victory party where you can recognize volunteers, solicit potential contributors, and be accessible to media covering the election. Good luck!
LP affiliates knock tax-happy Republicans; blow whistle on phony state budget crisis

- COLORADO

Liberation work to stop caucus legislation

A bill that would force minor parties to participate in caucuses and primaries would "steal people's choices" when it comes to candidates, said state LP has charged.

"This bill is aimed at the Libertarian Party," said State Chair John K. Burton. "Republicans blame us for thwarting the State Senate to the Democrats in 2000. Now they are in power, and want to stop any possibility that 2000 could happen again."

The bill, HB103-1142, filed by Bill Crane (R-Arvida, HD27), is before the Colorado Legislature. It would require minor parties to use the same caucus and primary system as the major parties to select candidates. However, because minor parties have fewer registered voters, it would be difficult for them to turn out enough caucus participants to meet legal requirements. The result would be fewer third-party candidates on the ballot.

"This bill would force most minor party candidates off the ballot," charged Burton. "Republicans can't stand a little competition [so] they are trying to steal people's choices.

- GEORGIA

LP hits GOP governor's proposed tax increases

The state LP has blasted Governor George "Sonny" Perdue for asking for almost $500 million in higher taxes during his first week in office.

"It should surprise no one — but disappoint everyone — that Perdue has already started proposing tax increases instead of spending cuts," said LP State Chair Helmut Forren.

Perdue, the state's first Republican governor in 130 years, asked the General Assembly to raise the tax on cigarettes by 48c a pack, a six-pack of beer by $1.44, a bottle of wine by $1.54, and a bottle of liquor by 50c. He also asked for a cut in property taxes related by $115 per homeowner. If approved, the tax increases will cost taxpayers about $490 million over the next 18 months.

Noting that Perdue ran for office as a fiscal conservative, Forren said: "Voters know what they asked for: Smaller government. They should look now at what they got: A pitch for higher taxes."

- IDAHO

State LP wins promises from secretary of state

State Libertarians have won a promise from the secretary of state's office to oppose an effort to remove minor parties from the state's primary system.

Instead, the secretary of state will endorse retaining primaries for any party with a contested election for precinct committeeman, while eliminating primaries with only one candidate — regardless of party affiliation, said Idaho LP State Chair Ted Dunlap, who met with Secretary of State Ben Yount and staff members on January 22.

"I was pleasantly surprised that they appreciated my opinions and suggestions, and that we got most of what we wanted," he said.

Dunlap had requested the meeting after hearing about proposed changes to Idaho election law.

During the wide-ranging discussion, the secretary of state's office also agreed to try to reform a law that regulates how parties can form county, legislative district, and state central committees, said Dunlap.

"We came up with agreeable compromises that solved nearly all of the concerns," he said. "They seem very supportive of every party in this state."

- ILLINOIS

State budget 'crisis' is a sham, says Jim Tobin

The so-called budget "crisis" in Illinois is actually a big sham — because state revenue is up by 11% over the past year.

In January, Jim Tobin, the LP's 2002 candidate for lieutenant governor and president of the Illinois Taxpayer Education Foundation, said: "The claim that tax revenues are down is ridiculous," said Tobin on January 23. "Revenue is not down. It's up and it's up significantly." As of December 31, 2002, total Illinois state revenue was up $4.1 billion over what it was the previous year.

That's on top of a 47% increase in spending over the past five years, he said.

However, state politicians say the state faces a $1.4 billion to $2.5 billion budget shortfall this year.

Nonense, said Tobin: "There is no deficit right now. The only way there's going to be a deficit is if the governor and the legislature increase spending by five, six, $7 billion. Lawmakers' addiction to taxpayer money is the real problem. We need fiscal restraint in the government."

- ILLINOIS

Proposed tax will hurt seniors, says state LP

A proposed new statewide service tax will hurt senior citizens, the state Libertarian Party has charged.

"If this is how [Governor Rod Blagojevich] is starting out his administration, Illinois taxpayers are in for a gloomy four years," said LP Executive Director Jeff Trigg. "[Blagojevich] needs to stick to his promise to cut the budget."

Under a new plan proposed in early January, the state may start taxing about 200 services — including health care, lawyer fees, EPA tax preparation work, and auto repairs.

But the new tax will "hurt the hardworking retired residents of Illinois, and will be especially hard on our fixed-income senior citizens," said Trigg. "This wasn't the type of change people were looking for when they voted for [Blagojevich]."

Instead of a new tax, "I'd like to see Springfield bureaucrats cut their pay by 20%, cut their staffs by 20%, and cut their pensions by 50% as a good start," said Trigg. "If [Blagojevich] wants to change business as usual, he should start with the legislators who spent us into this mess, not with families that are already scraping by."

- ILLINOIS

It doesn't take millions to find state corruption

The Illinois government is corrupt — and it shouldn't need the new $6 million agency to figure that out, say Libertarians.

Governor Rod Blagojevich "needs to use a little more common sense before wasting more money trying to reduce the 'corruption tax' Illinoisans are paying," said LP State Chair Austin Hough. "We'll be watching what the return is on this $6 million investment."

In mid-January, the governor announced a new state agency that would provide ethics training for state employees, and root out corruption.

However, Libertarians say an agency isn't needed to find corruption, since the Chicago Tribune has already reported that state employees illegally worked to try to deny Libertarians a place on the ballot in 1998 and 2002.

If the Illinois government has "employees who don't know the difference between political campaigns and working for the taxpayers, maybe the best thing to do is just get rid of those hapless employees," said Hough.

- INDIANA

State LP helps squash new electioneering bill

The state LP has helped kill a bill that would have extended state law to prohibit electioneering within 100 feet of polling places.

Last fall, the Indiana House Committee on Elections and Apporitionment voted, 7-3, to reject HB1550, sponsored by John Frenz (D-Valparaiso).

Brad Klopfenstein, executive director of the Indiana LP, testified to the committee that the bill would hurt smaller parties.

"The ability of candidates to get before voters would be severely reduced, especially the smaller parties and candidates in smaller elections," he said. "Sometimes, the only
opportunity voters have to meet candidates on Election Day.” In some locations, said Klopfenstein, LP candidates tripped their vote totals at polling places where they handed out literature and met voters. Klopfenstein was the only person to testify against the bill.

Currently, state law bans election activity — candidate signs, personal contact, and distributing campaign literature — within 50 feet of polling places.

**INDIANA**

LP targets newspapers with Writers’ Bureau

The state LP has created an Indiana Writers Bureau, which will produce regular op-ed columns designed to bring “Libertarian voices” to state residents.

“Every Monday, the Writers’ Bureau will send newspapers a new column about issues affecting Hoosiers,” said Kenn Gividen, who is coordinating the effort.

The program targets Indiana’s 61 largest periodicals, including 47 daily newspapers, the two largest weeklies, and five weeklies. Columns will also be posted on the Writers’ Bureau website at: www.lpwriters.cb.net

The Bureau distributed its first column on January 6, and it was immediately picked up by the Vincennes Sun-Commercial, said Gividen.

The pool of Libertarian writers includes Andrew Hornig (2002 candidate for Congress), Sherron Conover Sharrow (state LP communications coordinator), Kurt St. Angelo (Chair, Marion County LP), Kenn Gividen (Chair, Bartholomew County LP), and Mark Schreiber (state LP Vice Chair).

Columns will include such topics as the need for simpler laws and proposed reforms for the state’s General Assembly.

**NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Libertarians work to improve ballot access

Granite State Libertarians have launched a campaign to reform New Hampshire’s ballot access laws.

“This is our main legislative goal for the year,” said Rich Tomasso, who is coordinating the effort.

Currently, to gain major party status, a party’s gubernatorial or U.S. Senate candidate must win 4% of the vote.

A bill to ease that requirement is now being drafted by sympathetic legislators, said Tomasso, with a goal of making “it easier to get [major party status] back and to make it easier to get our candidates on the ballot,” he said.

Once the bill is introduced, Libertarians “will testify at the hearings [and] talk to legislators,” he said. “We’ve already had a meeting with the Secretary of State.

Tomasso said he gives the effort “even odds” to succeed.

“Several legislators support our effort,” he said. “But a legislature can do all sorts of things to a bill.”

**NEW MEXICO**

Exec. Board endorses the Free State Project

The New Mexico LP has endorsed the Free State Project (FSP), and will now work to try to get 20,000 freedom-loving Americans to move to the Granite State.

On January 17, the New Hampshire LP’s Executive Board voted unanimously to support the project. It also created a “Welcome to the Granite State” Committee to promote New Hampshire as the destination state for the FSP, said Executive Board member Rich Tomasso.

"We’re convinced that New Hampshire is the best choice for success of the FSP’s goals,” he said. “The attraction of New Hampshire is the respect by our residents for the ideals of individual liberty and small, decentralized government.”

The Free State Project (www.freestateproject.org) is a nationwide effort to convince 20,000 small-government supporters to move to a single state, where they will work to implement libertarian reforms.

About 2,400 people have signed on. New Hampshire is among the 10 states being considered as the FSP target state.

**NEW MEXICO**

LP draws up ‘wish list’ of targeted legislation

The State Libertarian Party has created a legislative “wish list” that will focus on ballot access, gun and smoking rights, drug laws, and fiscal responsibility.

In January, the Central Committee of the New Mexico LP approved “its official legislative agenda for 2003,” said State Chair Joseph Knight. “The party wants action in five areas.”

Electoral and Democratic Process: The party opposes any attempt to restrict ballot access, and endorsed Instant Runoff Voting.

Concealed Carry: The party supports legislation recognizing the right of citizens to carry concealed weapons for protection.

Property Rights: The LP supports the right of business owners to determine their own smoking policies.

Drug Policy Reform: The party opposes the War on Drugs as “immoral, unconstitutional, unworkable, and expensive.”

Fiscal Responsibility: The party opposes any “plunder” of the state’s Permanent Fund.

During the 2003 legislative session, the New Mexico LP will track bills and lobby for and against legislation that impacts its agenda, said Knight.

**SOUTH CAROLINA**

Clemson City Council nixes sign law reform

In a surprise turnabout, the Clemson City Council has rejected a change to the city’s political sign law — squashing a reform championed by a deceased LP candidate.

On February 3, the city council, on a 3-3 vote, defeated a proposal to make it legal to post campaign signs more than 30 days before an election.

Pickens County LP Chair Peter Newell said he was “flabbergasted” by the vote, and said, “I guess I’ll have to start talking very seriously with legal counsel on the issue.”

The proposal had been pioneered by State House (District 3) candidate Carl Lindemeyer, who had chided the city about the sign ordinance before suffering a fatal heart attack in September 2002.

Lindemeyer said the ordinance, which prohibited campaign signs more than 30 days prior to Election Day, violated his free speech rights. As a result, the city council had voted to suspend enforcement of the provision until after the 2002 election.

In mid-December, the city planning commission approved a plan to permanently end the anti-sign regulation, and the city council’s approval had been considered a formality.

Republican councilman from Costa Mesa joins Libertarian Party

Costa Mesa City Councilman Allan Monsoon (left) signs an LP membership form while California State Chairman Bruce Beubier watches.

Monsoon joined the Libertarian Party — while retaining his Republican registration — in San Juan Capistrano on December 29. He was attending a speech by 2002 LP Iowan gubernatorial candidate Clyde Cleveland, hosted by the Orange County LP at the Clao Pasta Restaurant.

At the same event, California Natural Law Party gubernatorial candidate Iris Adam also signed up as a Libertarian. Starr said the two become LP members simply because he asked them to join.

“The way I said these two was by telling each they can start off as a supporter, not a member,” he said. “When they’re ready, they’ll get a free upgrade to full member status by simply signing the [LP membership statement] and changing their voter registration.

“What’s important is that they were asked to join. As a rule, people do not join unless you ask them to do so. And they are flattered that you think highly enough of them to ask them.”

**TEXAS**

3 LP candidates named in ‘muddling’ lawsuit

Three Libertarian candidates are getting muddy — thanks to Republican and Democratic “muddling.”

In early January, Michael Badnarik and two other Libertarian candidates were named in a federal lawsuit by the Texas Association of Businesses (TAB).

The suit was apparently a counterpunch to two lawsuits filed by Democratic candidates, who had charged the Republican-leaning organization with violating campaign ethics code. However, the Libertarians had no involvement in the lawsuits against the TAB.

“Michael is a victim of big-party politics,” said Travis County LP Chair Patrick Dixon. “Merely having a candidate on the ballot has gotten us in the middle of never-ending Republican and Democratic muddling — and this time some of their mud got slung at the Libertarian Party.”

The candidates are considering how to respond to the suit, said Dixon.
Alaska Libertarians file lawsuit to get hemp measure on ballot

**Alaska Libertarians and other anti-drug war activists have filed a lawsuit against the state’s lieutenant governor for rejecting an initiative to decriminalize hemp.**

On January 28, the Free Hemp in Alaska (FHA) organization filed a lawsuit in Superior Court in Anchorage to force the state to place the initiative on the August 2006 ballot.

In the lawsuit, FHA attorney Ken Jacobs argued that initiative backers filed enough signatures to qualify the measure, even though they failed to follow all of the state’s record-keeping rules.

"Why disenfranchise thousands of voters?" asked FHA Chair Scott Dunnachie. "Maybe it’s because the lieutenant governor is afraid of letting the democratic process work.”

Regulate and tax

If passed by voters, the initiative would legalize hemp farming and end the prosecution of adults for marijuana offenses. It would also allow the state to regulate and tax marijuana like alcohol or tobacco.

FHA activists had turned in 51,000 signatures — compiled into 484 petition books — on November 14, 2002. According to state law, only 28,782 signatures are required to qualify an initiative.

However, Lt. Governor Loren Leman notified the FHA on January 14 that the initiative had been rejected, saying the state Division of Elections could not verify 194 of the 484 petition books. That left the FHA 7,045 signatures short of the legal requirement.

The Division of Elections said the FHA did not file so-called accountability reports with the 194 rejected petition booklets. The reports identify the person who circulated the petitions contained in that booklet.

But the FHA argued in its lawsuit that such accountability reports have been rendered moot by the U.S. Supreme Court.

"Originally, sponsor accountability forms were important because they let initiative backers know if anyone circulating a petition was not a registered voter," said Alvin A. Anders, the FHA treasurer and past LP candidate for lieutenant governor.

"But in 1999, the U.S. Supreme Court in Buckley v. American Constitutional Law Foundation ruled that they do not have to be a registered voter to petition your government," he said. "This ruling makes sponsor accountability forms a waste of tax payer money, a waste of election officials’ time, and a ridiculous reason to disenfranchise thousands of voters.”

In addition, the Constitutional right to petition the government trumps the state’s requirement for accountability reports, argued Jacobs.

“When you balance this Constitutional right against an administrative requirement, the Constitutional right wins,” he said.

Had the Division of Elections checked the remaining 194 petition books, the initiative would have almost certainly qualified, since the other petitions had a validity rate of 78%, said Anders.

**Chance to decide**

That’s why “voters should be given the chance to decide,” said Tim Hinterbsperger, the primary sponsor of the initiative and an associate professor in the Department of Biological Sciences at the University of Alaska (Anchorage).

Listed as plaintiffs in the lawsuit are Hinterbsperger, Anders, and Dunnachie.

**Is Abortion Aggression?**

Scientific & Philosophical Arguments Show Why It Is

Go to: http://www.I4I.org

For a literature list, send a S.A.E. to: Libertarians for Life, 13424 Hathaway Drive #18, Wheaton, MD 20904•(301)460-4141 libertarian@iol.com
R. Scott Bludorn's Buffalo Grove (Il) campaign focuses on property rights
First-time Libertarian candidate hopes to make a 'lively election'

By Bill Winter
LP News Editor

It's the private property rights, stupid.
That's not R. Scott Bludorn's campaign slogan — but it could be.
In his race for Buffalo Grove Trustees in Illinois, the 39-year-old Libertarian candidate said he will be a "strong advocate for property rights of town residents."

"The current Village Board struggles with the concept of property rights," he noted. They are not the same. Buffalo Grove deserves an uncompromising advocate for the rights of all property owners.

His bold defense of property rights isn't the only way Bludorn promises to shake up the race. When he filed 528 signatures on January 13 to earn a place on the ballot, he ensured that Buffalo Grove would have its first contested race for Trustee in four years.

With Bludorn's entry, "it promises to be a lively election," said the local newspaper, the Daily Herald.

Bludorn, who also serves as the Chair of the Cook County LP, is one of four candidates for three trustee positions in the village, a northwest suburb of Chicago with a population of about 42,000.

The first-time candidate for public office will be facing two incumbents and the Village president in the April 1 election — which presents a challenge for the campaign, he acknowledged.

"High-visibility"
However, he hopes to overcome the advantages of incumbency with a "high-visibility" campaign that will include door-to-door campaigning and yard signs.

While the race is non-partisan, Bludorn said he will always proudly promote Libertarian ideas.

"My political philosophy would always refer to free market solutions rather than governmental," he said. "If I were to win, I will work to restore government to its proper role of protecting our persons and property, and allowing business and commerce to flourish."

■ R. Scott Bludorn: "Buffalo Grove deserves an uncompromising advocate for all property owners."

"The legitimate desires of homeowners to improve their property outweigh the personal fancies of a politically appointed zoning board."

Bludorn said he will also work to stop the Village Board from "obstructing" what businesses can do with their property — such as the time a Trustee attempted to prevent a Dairy Queen from locating in the town because it would have enough ice cream shops.

"If the residents of Buffalo Grove did not patronize the new Dairy Queen, it would close — and the market would provide the answer as to whether Buffalo Grove was saturated with ice cream shops," he said.

■ The over-regulation of local businesses.

"The Village Board should restrain itself from micromanaging the affairs of business and commerce, and allow the self-regulating workings of the market to serve the needs of the community," he said.

For example, Bludorn said he would work against zoning laws that allow the Village Board to impose its "personal taste" on businesses.

"Whether it is rezoning buildings, shrubbery, or addressing the dullness of2002"

[now] tolerates the additional expense of redesigning their projects multiple times," he said. "It is the free market that should be the final arbiter of whether the aesthetics of the project fit within the community."

■ The privatization of municipal services.

The Buffalo Grove operating and capital budget for fiscal year 2002-2003 is $1,100 over every man woman and child in the village. This imposes a huge tax burden on rates. Public utilities whose services present the best opportunity to rein in expenses.

For example, noted Bludorn, Buffalo Grove owns the Buffalo Grove Golf Club and the Arboretum Golf Club — and just spent $6 million to build a new, larger Alien Driving Range.

"The village (government) should focus on providing municipal services noteworthy businesses of operating golf courses," he said.

A comprehensive program of privatization could trim the village's budget by 10%—12%, he estimated.

Bludorn said he will also oppose any new or increased taxes.

"The tax first ask questions later" brand of municipal government creates an unfair tax burden on our village residents, and weakens our community," he said.

In addition, Bludorn said he will also try to make more abstract points in his campaign, like pointing out the power of the free market in building a thriving "civil society."

Caring community
"It's the neighborhoods that make a community," he said. "We have a unique ability to demonstrate how market-based reforms such as privatizing residential zoning laws can lead to a more close-knit, caring community."

Libertarian candidates for municipal government can strengthen our ties with each other."

If he wins election as a Buffalo Grove Trustee, Bludorn said he may try for a higher-level office — like the state legislature — in the future.

Bludorn works as a district manager for a software company in Chicago. He is a member of the National Alliance for Independent Professionals and the Staffing Services Association of Illinois.

He has been married to his wife Dana for 12 years; they moved to Buffalo Grove from Chicago, Illinois about two years ago.

For information about the Bludorn for Trustee campaign, visit: www.bludorn.com.

■ Russel Means: Gets GOP pardon.

■ Russell Means: "It's the neighborhoods that make a community," he said. "We have a unique ability to demonstrate how market-based reforms such as privatizing residential zoning laws can lead to a more close-knit, caring community."

Russell Means was pardoned by President Clinton. Means had been convicted of committing murder in 1974.

■ Snarker websites, hipsters, and a pardon

In Massachusetts, Kamal Jain has become the Acting State Chair. In Michigan, the Oakland County LP elected Nathan Allen as Chair. In North Dakota, Keith Hanson was elected State Chair. In California, Saul Rackackauskas was re-elected Chair of the Ventura County LP. In Oregon, Tom Robertson has been chosen as Chair of the Oregon LP, University Libertarians (in Caravallis), while Jim Lindsay was elected Chair of the reorganized Clarkamas County LP. In Illinois, David Hughes was elected president of the Libertarian Club of DuPage, and Scott Bludorn was elected president of the new Cook County LP.


■ In California, a quirk in the election law resulted in Lynne Blatter being belatedly winning a position on the Pine Valley Community Planning Area board (Mount Laguna seat). This makes her the California LP's 97th winner from the November 2002 election, and the 44th around the USA. In Oregon, Helen McDaniel was appointed to the Astoria City Budget Committee. In Hawaii, Jeff Mallon won 58 votes (0.8%) in a January 3 election to fill a vacant seat in the U.S. House (District 2). Mallon ran in 199th of 43 candidates in the multi-party election.

■ Think tank news: Traffic to the Reason magazine website (Reason.com) has doubled over the last year, to 545,000 visits a month. The reason. The "Suckification of Reason," theorizes a January 22 article in the Village Voice. In 2001, Reason editor Nick Gillespie hired Tim Cavanaugh, the former editor of the online pop-culture magazine Suck.com, to give Reason.com a "snarkier, punkier attitude." Cavanaugh has added more hip cultural coverage, punning headlines ("Axes of Evil"), and a daily Reason staff blog.

■ Political tidbits: New Jersey Assemblyman Matt Ahearn quit the Democrats and joined the Green Party. The January 24 defection gives the Greens their second State Rep. (They elected one in Maine in November 2002.) In South Dakota, Republican Governor Bill Janklow pardoned sometime-Libertarian Russell Means in January. The pardon wiped clean a felony conviction from a 1975 trial in the Minnesota District Court. And Means was freed to run for office. In 2002, Means had said he would run for New Mexico governor as a Libertarian, but changed his mind and tried to run as an independent. However, he was kept off the ballot because of his felony conviction. Some in the state theorized the pardon was political, since Means has "spoken out on behalf of the Republican Party."

■ In Illinois, Joseph Schreiner filed petitions to run for Chicago Alderman (44th Ward). In South Carolina, the LP nominated candidates for two special elections: Stephen Cain (State Senate, District 18) and Michael Gingrich (Richland County Council, District 1).

■ In Illinois, Jeff Trigg has been hired as the state LP's executive director. In Tennessee, Mike Croteau was elected Chair of the Hamilton County LP while Bill Bollo was elected Interstate Coordinator for the Valley Region. Also in Tennessee, the Bradley County LP re-elected Ray Ledford as Chair. In New Hampshire, John Babiars is the new State Chair. In California, Catherine Harding was appointed Chair for removal of the Yolo County LP. In Oklahoma, the Tulsa Area Libertarians elected Angela O'Dell as Chair.

■ Legal news: The Oklahoma LP lost a lawsuit that would have opened its primary to all registered voters. On January 24, a U.S. District judge upheld a state law that limited primary participation to one party's registered voters (Bowen v. Johnson). In Georgia, the state LP appealed its Court ruling against a lawsuit against the Georgia Democratic Party to the U.S. Supreme Court on February 16. The suit seeks to overturn the state's ballot access laws, which have kept all third-party U.S. House candidates off the ballot since 1943. No word on whether the Court will hear the case.

Richard Dooling, one of the nation's 'finest novelists,' says he's libertarian

A bestselling author has had a brainstorm — and publicly declared he is a libertarian. Richard Dooling, whose novel Brain Storm was named a New York Times Notable Book in 1996, made the announcement in an interview with Christianity Today on January 6.

When asked about his political beliefs, the Nebraska-born author said, "I'm a libertarian. The only thing more offensive than a Trent Lott Republican is a Bill Clinton Democrat." This wasn't the first time Dooling had declared his affinity for libertarianism. In 1999, he published what he called "a libertarian's take on the Clinton mess" in the New York Times.

In the op-ed, he argued that "the root of the [Bill Clinton/Monica Lewinsky] scandal lies in the surfeit of intrusive laws that would make criminals of almost anyone the government decides to investigate."

Dooling noted that Clinton faced legal action only because of the nation's "expanded interpretations of the sexual harassment laws."

Unforgivable law "If we are to be a nation of laws and not men, then perhaps we should pause before we attack yet another social malady or human weakness by passing yet another unforgivable law," he wrote.

In 1997, Dooling published Blue Streak: Searing, Free Speech, and

Richard Dooling: "The only thing more offensive than a Trent Lott Republican is a Bill Clinton Democrat."

Sexual Harassment, a collection of essays about "the politics of offensive language," speech codes, and the First Amendment. While not yet a household name, Dooling has quietly built a reputation as a thoughtful, entertaining, and provocative writer. In fact, Stephen King called him "one of the finest novelists now working in America."

His 1998 novel Brain Storm was an Amazon Hot 100 bestseller, while White Man's Grave was a 1994 National Book Award Finalist and a New York Times Notable Book. In addition, Dooling wrote Critical Care (1996) and Bet Your Life (2002).

An attorney and developer of "web-based legal products" for a St. Louis law firm, he has also written for The New Yorker, The Wall Street Journal, George magazine, National Review, and Esquire.

Kingdom Pool

Dooling is currently collaborating with Stephen King on Kingdom Pool, a television series scheduled to air on ABC in 2003. Dooling joins a number of other popular writers who have identified themselves as libertarians, including Nelson DeMille (The General's Daughter), David Brin (Stardrive Rising), John Rosmond (Parent Power), Stuart M. Kaminsky (The Dog Who Bit a Policeman), and Joan Didion (Glaucous Towards Bethlehem).

Libertarian Viewpoint

Because of a mail house error, a complimentary copy of the Libertarian Viewpoint was not enclosed in most copies (outside of California) of the February issue of LP News. So, it is enclosed in this issue. To order additional copies of the 8-page Libertarian Viewpoint, see the full-page advertisement on page 13.

http://www.ClickAndPledge.com

"Click & Pledge allows you to pay for online services for a very low cost, and it easily integrates with our web site! Our favorite thing about Click & Pledge is that there are no monthly fees." — James Everett, Libertarian Party

Call us Toll Free: 866-556-CLICK (866.999.2542) for a demo

Secure Online Donation

- Accept secured donations & dues online with Visa, MasterCard, Discover, AMEX.
- Pay no setup, monthly, or annual fees.
- Offer premiums, sell items, tickets, and accept donations/dues all in one package.
- Take 5 minutes to set up your own web site.

Web Content Management System

Special Free Offer to Libertarian Chapters & Candidates

- Web Content Management System for web site creation.
- Email with virus & spam protection.
- Real-time donation and credit card acceptance system with discounted rates.
- Free use of You.4Libertarian.com or You.4Libertarian.org domain.

eNewsletters & Newspapers

Electronic Newsletter

- Design & broadcast your eNewsletter to your mailing list.
- Provide links to documents and forms directly from the email.
- Accept donations via the eNewsletter directly from the email.

In Print Newspaper

- Lower your newsletter printing cost by moving to a newspaper format.
- Let us help you design, edit, print, and distribute your publication.
- Simply upload your content and let us do the rest.
**Million-Dollar Tax Day Kit!**

Maximize the success of your Tax Day rally on April 15: Order the complete "$1 Million Tax Day" Kit! It includes:

1. A 16-page booklet explaining how to use the $1 Million Bill to maximize the membership-building potential of your Tax Day rally. (Also: How to organize a successful rally, how to get publicity, and so on.)
2. 50 copies of the "$1 Million Bill" literature.
3. Two versions of camera-ready mechanicals to print the $1 Million Bills: One with the National LP's return address and phone number, and one with a blank area to personalize them with your local LP's contact information.
5. Price for the complete package: $10. (The $1 Million Tax Day Kit will be sent via Priority Mail.)

Also, order a generous supply of the popular $1 Million Bills! They are available for immediate shipment. Cost: $5 per 100. (Call for rush shipping details.)

---

**2-COLOR ★ LIBERTARIAN PARTY BROCHURES ★ 4-COLOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2-COLOR</th>
<th>4-COLOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making Your Neighborhood Safe Again</strong></td>
<td><strong>This is the New Political Party You've Been Looking For</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending the Welfare State</strong></td>
<td><strong>Working to Cut Your Taxes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have What Happened To Your Family Budget?</strong></td>
<td><strong>It's Time for a More Sensible Drug Policy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equal Rights for America's Gun Owners</strong></td>
<td><strong>Libertarian Party: Pro-Choice on Everything</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-color brochures: Sample: 50¢ ★ Or $7 for 100
4-color brochures: Sample: 50¢ ★ Or $10 for 100

---

**Bumperstickers**

- $1 each; $7.50 for 10; $50 for 100. Size: 11" x 3½" ★
- ENOUGH IS ENOUGH/VOTE LIBERTARIAN
- I'm Pro-Choice on Everything (Red, white, & blue)

**Leather Booklets**

- "Fact Sheets": Updated for 2000. 2-page LP history (with political highlights, accomplishments, and victories from 1971-2000) and a comprehensive two-page bibliography (featuring more than 150 books about liberty). Sold as a set. Cost: Sample: 50¢ or $10 for 100

**Buttons**

- Cost: $1 each; $7.50 for 10; $50 for 100
- Don't Blame Me, I Voted Libertarian (Blue and white)
- Voted Libertarian/800-ELECT-US (Blue and white)
- Libertarian Party: Pro-Choice on Everything 1-800-ELECT-US

**Tools for Campaigning**

- Libertarian Political Action: Techniques for Effective Campaigning: 32 pages. Comprehensive exploitation of winning campaign techniques for Libertarian candidates. Includes everything from creating a campaign timeline, deciding on issues, raising money, working with volunteers, dealing with the media, and organizing a Get Out The Vote (GOTV) effort. A must read! Cost: $3.00 each
- LP Statue of Liberty Logo on CD disk. 3/2-inch D5S-compatible computer disk. Cost: $3 each

---

**Yard Sign**

- ENOUGH IS ENOUGH/VOTE LIBERTARIAN. Red, white, & blue sign. Great for displays. Measures 24" x 18". Perfect for campaigns. Cost: $8.00 each

---

**OUTREACH TABLOID!**

The Libertarian Viewpoint:

A brand-new, 8-page, full-color outreach newspaper idea! Ideal for leaving at your local coffeehouse, supermarket, student union building, or community center. Contains the same text as the "New Vision" brochure—articles on corporate welfare, crime, poverty, foreign policy, and more... along with brief "Fact Files" that offer fascinating soundbites, factoids, and perspectives. Includes a membership response form. Sample: $1 each ★ $100 for $250, 1,000 for $100 ★ Call for bulk qty prices (5,000+). Prices include shipping.
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ing to the Pentagon, 12 nations have nuclear weapons programs, 13 nations have biological weapons, 16 nations have chemical weapons, and 28 na-
tions are armed with ballistic missiles. But no other of those nations is facing the fact of having its lead-
ership overthrown [by armed inva-
sion],” wrote Ivan Eland and Bernard Gourley in a briefing paper for the Cato Institute (December 17, 2002).

In a similar vein, most of the more
colorful anti-war allegations of the Left are also irrelevant: That is a ploy to capture Iraq’s oil fields for
Bush’s oil-tycen, or to dis-
trust attention from a frail economy, or a move’s effort to finish what Bush Senior started. Those allegations
distract from the central ques-
tion: Is the war worth it for the
security of the United States?

A clear answer
An examination of a Libertarian
perspective of the arguments for
war presents a clear answer: No.

The evidence makes it clear that
Iraq does not pose an immediate
great, and unequivocal threat to
the security of the U.S. B.

Eland and Gourley sum up the
view of most libertarian defense
experts. “Hussein’s threat to the United States has been overstated,” they write. “The campaign to war
against Iraq rests on a flimsy foun-
dation,” they write. “Americans
should understand that a compelling strategic rationale is absent.”

Summarizing the research of these
and other foreign policy experts, here are five reasons why the U.S. should
not go to war with Iraq:

1. Even if he does have nuclear
weapons (or other weapons of
mass destruction) Saddam
Hussein would not risk using
them on the United States.

While there is clear evidence that
Iraq possesses a variety of chemical
and biological weapons (including mustard gas, sarin, and anthrax) — and while he may be working to
build nuclear weapons — there is
almost no chance that Hussein would
turn them on the United States. Why?
Because Hussein has no reason
to die. The Iraqi dictator understands that if the United States attacks,
he faces devastating retaliation.

Hussein had an opportunity to
use chemical weapons against U.S.
troops during the Persian Gulf War,
and he did not,” note Eland and
Gourley. “The lesson to be drawn is
that if Hussein could have used
chemical weapons against an adver-
sary capable of massive retaliation.”

Given the non-alliance between
Hussein and al Qaeda, an invasion
of Iraq would represent a setback in the U.S.’s efforts to seek justice for the September 11 attacks, argue Eland and
Gourley.

“Instead of being part of the war
on the terrorist network that remains
viable and is still attacking the United States, an unprovoked invasion of Iraq would distract from it,” they
write. “Scarce intelligence resources,
special operations forces, and the
attention of policy makers would
need to be shifted (away from al Qaeda) to an attack on Iraq.”

Hussein has given aid to Islamic
terrorists — most recently, to the
families of Palestinian suicide bomb-
ers — but “the terrorist groups that
Iraq supports do not focus their at-
tacks on the United States,” writes
the Cato Institute’s Ivan Eland
(August 19, 2002). “Such groups concen-
trate their attacks on targets in the
Middle East.”

3 Hussein is extremely unlikely
to give WMD to al Qaeda for fu-
ture attacks on the United States.
Hussein would not give al Qaeda
nuclear or chemical weapons because
doing so would pose a danger to the
Iraqi dictator’s favorite cause: The
longevity of Saddam Hussein, argue
Meanheimer and Walt.

“Saddam could never be sure the
United States would not incinerate him if it merely suspected he had
made it possible for anyone to strike the United States with nuclear
weapons,” they write. “The U.S. govern-
ment [is] already deeply suspicious
of Iraq, and a nuclear attack against
the United States or its allies would raise that hostility to fever pitch.”

“Do no one knows how few Americans might feel if WMD were ever
used against the United States. Indeed,
nuclear terrorism is as dangerous for
Saddam as it is for the U.S. against
Iraqis, and he has no more incentive
to give a Qaeda nuclear weapons than the United States does.

So, they conclude, even if “Saddam thought he could covertly
smuggle nuclear weapons to bin Laden, he would be unlikely to do so.”

There’s another reason, too, write Eland and Gourley: Al Qaeda is so
“ideologically incompatible” with Hussein that the dictator fears the
terrorist group “could ultimately turn on him and use [WMD] weapons
against him.”

4 The one thing that might
convince Hussein to use WMD against
Iraq is a U.S. invasion of Iraq.

Given that he faces certain anni-
hilation if he uses nuclear, chemical,
or biological devices against the
United States, what might convince Hussein to employ such ghastly weap-
ons?

Only the belief that he has noth-
ing to lose. In other words, an
invasion by the U.S. that Hussein
knows will topple and kill him.

“In the face of a threat to his
own survival, Hussein will have little in-
centive to do anything but lash out,”
write Eland and Gourley. “Under those circumstances, Hussein is very dan-
gerous.”

After all, they note, with an in-
vasion looming, “the message to Hus-
sein is, no matter what you do, the
U.S. government is coming to elimi-
nate you. That only gives Hussein
more incentive to plan a counteract-
tack — in the event of a U.S. inva-
sion — using WMD against U.S. forces,
Israel, or Saudi oil fields.”

Even the CIA acknowledges this
nightmare scenario, write Eland and
Gourley.

The spy agency reports that Hus-
sein is “unlikely to use WMD against
the United States unless he feels that
the forcible hilt of his political con-
trol over Iraq is going to be brought by a U.S. invasion.”

Then he could commission Islamic terrorist
groups to use such weapons in the United States — “the very threat the United Statestopples by attacking
Iraq in the first place.”

5 Invading Iraq will make Mus-
lims hate us more — increasing
the risk of future terrorist
attacks on the United States.

President Bush has made the case
that toppling Saddam Hussein is part of
a far-reaching War on Terrorism.

But the invasion with Iraq is likely
to increase the threat of terrorism, not decrease it.

“An invasion of Iraq would play right into al Qaeda’s hands,” writes
Ivan Eland. “Occupation of an Islamic country by the United States could be a recruitment tool for terrorist
organizations. We should remember the worldwide mobilization of Islamic radicals to fight the Soviets in Af-
ghanistan.”

A U.S. attack, they bluntly warn, “will inflame radical Muslims around
the world and ‘actually cause more retaliatory terrorist attacks against
U.S. targets.”

Furthermore, writes Eland, “A U.S.
invasion of Iraq could destabilize or
topple friendly governments in Tur-
key, Jordan, Egypt, Kuwait, and Saudi
Arabia. Enraged Islamic populations could rise up against those regimes,
which are closely aligned with
the United States.”

6 Iraq is a greatly diminished
military power, and poses little
threat even to its neighbors.

In the 1991 Gulf War, Iraq was able
to field only a “Third World military”
that quickly crumbled before the
U.S. technological and psychological
edge, notes Owen Cote, Jr., associate director of Security Studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in the

Since then, he says, “the Iraqi military
does nothing except decline in size and degrade in capability.”

The numbers are stark. In 1990,
Iraq had 1 million men in its armed
forces, backed up by 5,500 tanks. By
contrast, the Iraqi military today has
only 400,000 men in arms and 2,200
tanks.

But even those numbers are de-
creasing, says Cote. The Iraqi tank
forces, for example, are primarily
formed from the pre-1973, T-54, and
T-62 models — some of which date to
the 1940s. The Iraqi air force is equally weak, backed only by a handful of Soviet MiG-29s and French Mirage F-1s.

“Iraq’s military has been deva-
teated by the U.S. military’s ‘template
made of sanctions,”” writes Eland. “Ameri-
cans should ask why the United States
— half a world away — is more concerned about the Iraqi than
See IRAQ Page 15
War with Iraq?

Continued from Page 14

are Iraq's neighbors [who oppose a U.S. invasion].

7 A war against Iraq is unconstitutional.

The U.S. Constitution (Article I, Section 9) clearly states: "The Congress shall have power ... to declare war." "Congress, not the president, has the power to declare war," writes William Raspberry in the Washington Post (January 6, 2003). "Nor do I find anything to suggest that Congress may delegate its war-making authority to the president."

On October 11, President Bush did receive Congressional "authorization" for military action against Iraq, but not the declaration of war the Constitution requires.

The Bush administration has tried to sidestep this formality, invoking what Vice President Dick Cheney calls the "inherent presidential power" to defend the national interests.

"Bush's lawyers have assured him he may start dropping bombs on Baghdad anytime the urge strikes, without the bother of getting approval from ... the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue," writes Steve Chapman on TownHall.com (September 2, 2002). "If the founding fathers were to hear all this, they would wonder how their cherished republic fell back under the rule of the King of England. They took care not to give the executive a free hand to initiate armed hostilities."

Eland and Gourley warn bluntly: "An unprovoked attack on another sovereign state...undermines the principles of a constitutional republic."

8 A war against Iraq will be enormously expensive.

How much will a war with Iraq cost?

"Although it is difficult to predict how much Americans would pay for a new war with Iraq, one fact seems indisputable: it will be many times more than the cost of the last [Persian Gulf] war," writes Michael Dobbs in the Washington Post (December 1, 2002).

Given all the variables, even federal bureaucrats don't know how much Gulf War II could cost. "It is impossible to know what any military campaign would ultimately cost," acknowledges Trent Duffy, a spokesman for the White House Office of Management and Budget. "There is no way to do accurate 'best-guess' estimates by Congressional staff, it could cost as much as $100 billion to $200 billion to invade and occupy Iraq."

And, if "Iraqi President Saddam Hussein blows up his country's oil fields, most economists believe the indirect costs of the war could be much greater, reverberating through the U.S. economy for many years," writes Duffy.

Ivan Eland agrees that an expen­sive war poses a danger to the U.S. economy, given the growing federal budget deficits and sluggish economy. "An invasion and long-term occupa­tion of Iraq could ... bust the budget and throw the U.S. economy into a tailspin," he writes.

9 A pre-emptive strike is unAmerican.


Under this policy — which repre­sented a sharp break from the past and served as the strategic underpinning for the war with Iraq — the U.S. can attack another nation if there is evidence that it is building or trying to obtain WMD.

The policy does not require those "enemy" nations to possess working weapons, or to even explicitly threaten the U.S. security. Indeed, the U.S. military is now authorized to "act against ... emerg­ ing threats before they are fully formed," writes President Bush.

The problem with such a shoot-first doctrine — besides the almost unlimited power it gives the U.S. government to wage war around the globe — is that it stands in stark contrast to American tradition.

While our nation has never fully lived up to its shoot-first-ideals (the U.S. attacked first or fabricated a pretext for the Mexican War in 1846-47, the War of 1812, and the Vietnam War), the U.S. has never seen itself as an aggressor in wars, notes Ken Ringle in the Washington Post (November 19, 2002).

"We have always told ourselves, Americans don't shoot first," he writes. "The no-preemptive-attack rule is as fundamental an American value as almost anything in our culture."

For example, the Declaration of Independence lists 27 accusations against King George III "in an effort to prove that the designs of those who started the American Revo­ lution," writes Ringle.

Many for years tell two centuries, John F. Kennedy said in a speech: "Our arms will never be used to strike the first blow in any attack. It is our national tradition."

Ringle quotes David Hackett Fischer, a history professor at Brandeis University, who says, "It has been an unwritten judgment to a nation that something as immensely serious as war should only be embarked on for very good reasons, and our culture tells us we depart from that judgment at our peril."

10 A war against Iraq is utterly arbitrary.

Iraq isn't the only nation with a nuclear weapons program, a bellicose foreign policy, and the potential to give WMD to terrorists: North Korea and Pakistan also fit those criteria. (North Korea, The exclusive communist nation, ruled by Kim Jong Il, has covertly obtained tools to produce weapons-grade uranium, according to the CIA. North Korea has been buying high-speed centrifuge machines, with which the communists can produce weapons-grade fissionable material from natural ura­ nium — enough to manufacture two or three nuclear warheads a year.

While the CIA is unsure whether North Korea has actually built nuclear devices, its weapons program violates international law and agreements with the U.S.

Given the United States' doctrine of pre-emptive strike against nations with WMD: Seymour M. Hersh (in the New Yorker, January 27, 2003) notes: "Logically, the new strategy, should the United States attack North Korea immediately, or at least as it has claimed, before the United States obtains evidence of North Korea's nuclear weapons program."

Conclusion

Reviewing the evidence, the "as­ sumptions that underlie the administration's [plans to invade Iraq] range from cautiously pessimis­ tic to outright fallacious," write Eland and Gourley. "His aggressive nature may be cause for concern, but it is not a threat to the United States."

The Bush administration's lack of a coherent plan, and its pursuit of NRC [nuclear, biological, and chemi­ cal] weapons may be a cause for con­ cern, it is not a sufficient reason for going to war.

If there is then, no solid ratio­ nale for an invasion, how should the U.S. government act? Or, in a worse case scenario, does this administration expect to use war as a ruse to get Saddam Hussein?

Drums of war

Even the Bush administration took this sensible position — before it started beating the drums of war.

In January 2000, national secu­ rity advisor Condoleezza Rice said that if Iraq did acquire WMD, "the first line of defense should be a clear and classical statement of deterrence. If it turns out that Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction will be unusable because any at­ tempt to use them will bring national obliteration."

The policy of deterrence worked successfully against the Soviet Union — a much more powerful adversary, note Eland and Gourley. "The United States deterred and contained a rival superpower, which had thousands of nuclear warheads, for 40 years: And if it could continue to successfully deter and contain a rela­tively small, relatively poor nation until its leaders die or is deprived."

Whether a war against Iraq is conflict is with Iraq is not necessary, write Eland and Gourley: "Despite the furor over Hussein in the world media, there is no reason to believe that removing him from power is critical to Ameri­ can national security."

Guns for Tots draws media, jeers

Continued from Page 3

City to sell toy guns that are brightly colored or constructed entirely of transparent materials.

The bill's sponsors said the law is needed because criminals can spray paint toy guns black or wrap them in black tape, to make them appear to be real guns.

According to the Weekly Standard. com, Councilman Vann "botched" his January press conference to promote the bill.

Embarassing

"He planned tolassen those in attendance with a water gun hidden in his pants, but the gun got stuck at the crucial moment," reported the website. "Vann was forced to conduct the rest of the press conference with an embarassing water marking on the front of his pants."

Legysynski dismissed the criti­ cism.

"We're doing this for the children," he said. "If we can bring a little joy into the lives of New York's youth — while such joy is still legal — then fine by us."

If nothing else, the "Guns for Tots" drive did generate media attention for the Manhattan LP: Libertarians appeared twice on CNN and several times on talk radio shows, and were written about in the online version of the New York City Police Department on hand to keep an eye on the proceedings, some parents chanted, "Get out of Harlem!"

An African-American city council­ man charged that libertarians were using children as "pawns in a politi­ cal fight," and shouted, "If you want to give out toy guns, go and give it out in your neighborhood!"

But Legysynski dismissed the criti­ cism.

"We're doing this for the children," he said. "If we can bring a little joy into the lives of New York's youth — while such joy is still legal — then fine by us."

If nothing else, the "Guns for Tots" drive did generate media attention for the Manhattan LP: Libertarians appeared twice on CNN and several times on talk radio shows, and were written about in the online version of the New York City Police Department's website. The toy gun giveaway even appeared in Canada and England.

"We're getting tons of coverage from the mainstream media, but strangely, no mention in any of our local outlets," said Legysynski.

The city council did not say when it will vote on the toy-gun ban bill.

The Manhattan LP's Jim Legysynski: "Playing with a water pistol is one of the most cherished rites of childhood."
Learning from LP candidates’ failures in the 2002 election

By Justin D. Somma

In other words, people don’t want a candidate who shows up for interviews in a Droid’s robe.

Before you, as a candidate, go on your first televised debate, have a few friends look you over to make sure that you fit the mold of an average citizen. If you can’t make sure your hair is neat and your suit is pressed, then you should think twice about running for office.

2. Carry Yourself Well: Ed Thompson ran a great campaign for governor in West Virginia and garnered over 10% of the vote. He did remarkably well, and used what he had going for him to the fullest extent. Sure, lack of exposure cost him many additional percentage points, but I think that Ed simply did not carry himself well during debates (and probably during other public sessions as well).

He’s a good man with some great ideals, but he does not articulate them well on camera. There is an unmistakable slur in his speech that a candidate cannot have, and no candidate should ever brush over the table during a round table discussion, especially when height is a factor.

If you can’t stand at attention, speak without slurring, and answer questions with fluidity, regardless of their content, then you should think twice about running for office.

3. Don’t come across as a party hack: When you’re running under the banner of a third party, people need to vote for you as an individual. When a candidate comes out and clearly brands him or herself as a spokesperson for the Libertarian Party, people turn a deaf ear to them. A majority of Americans don’t consider themselves politically Libertarian. The way to prove them wrong is not to alienate them with blanket Libertarian policies about “living your life, your way.”

Pennsylvania gubernatorial candidate and LP primary winner and many others failed in this aspect. Their debate answers were party-line responses. More often than not, they answered questions with the preface, “As a Libertarian, I feel...”

Instead, they should have stated: “What’s best for America is...”

Don’t try to sell the public on your ideas; act as though you already agree with you, and are just in need of a quick summary related to local issues. If you can’t sell Libertarianism without selling the party at the same time, then you should think twice about running for office.

4. Be Specific: As mentioned above, the Libertarian candidate is often forced to “sell” the platform to the people during debates, rather than selling his specific solutions to the problems faced by the people.

When the Republican and the Democrat supply to debates questions with specific references to local programs, and then the Libertarian replies with a party platform blanket answer, who do you think the audience is going to listen to? They know that Libertarians want freedom — they just need to see that freedom can be directly applied to their area.

You can’t drive into the specific programs related to your area, then you should think twice about running for office.

Shining example

Considering everything that I mention above, there is one shining example that we need to follow. Garrett Michael Hayes was the unfortunate third wheel in a competitive 2002 race.

Mr. Hayes was the apex of everything a Libertarian candidate should be. He carried himself as a politician, but maintained with an honesty that the other two candidates couldn’t match; he was well-dressed and groomed, looking like every voter, the political leader; he spoke clearly and concisely, addressing the people as if they were all Libertarians, and he did so by using platform statements with specific references to local issues.

Mr. Hayes was the ideal Libertarian, and anybody running for office under the Libertarian banner should study his debate tapes and learn just how it’s done.

About the author: LP member and marketing specialist Justin D. Somma lives in Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
Why the Free State Project is the best strategy

Why moving 20,000 libertarians to one state will help accomplish ‘liberty in our lifetime’

By Jan Helfeld

The Free State Project is the best libertarian strategy. The Free State Project (FSP) proposes to identify the easiest state of the union to free, and then relocate 20,000 people to implement the liberation. The people interested in moving will sign up with FSP and vote on the state selected to be freed. Presently, 3,560 have signed up. If half of one percent of the 3,912,814 people that voted for state libertarian candidates in the 2002 election sign up, that would be 20,000 people. Sounds feasible to me. If you think one out of every 200 Libertarians you know would be willing to sign up, then you agree that it is feasible.

15% of the votes

If 20,000 people move to a low-population state, they would already have around 19% of the votes necessary to elect a U.S. Senator or governor. We would also have as much money to spend on campaigns in that state as the Demopublicans and we would have far more activists. With all these resources focused on one state, we should be able to persuade enough voters to win two elections. We would certainly gain some real political power.

If 5% of the people that voted for Libertarians in the 2002 Election relocate, that would be 200,000 people, more than enough to elect a U.S. Senator and governor out right in at least five of the states. We should not underestimate people’s desire to be free. It is clear from our own history that millions of people have been willing to cross oceans in order to enjoy freedom. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to assume that a small percentage of present-day libertarians would be willing to cross a few state lines.

Why is the Free State project the best libertarian strategy?
The Free State project is the most efficient use of our resources. If you invest a given amount of time and money in the Free State strategy, it will produce more political power than if the same amount of these resources is invested in any other nationwide strategy. Simply put, the Free State strategy gives us more bang for the buck.

The Free State strategy permits us to pool our resources, thereby dramatically increasing the resources that can be spent on the elections in one state.

Secondly, the Free State strategy takes advantage of the fact that in some states you need far fewer votes to elect a U.S. Senator than in others. For instance, in California’s 2000 elections, Senator Dianne Feinstein got 5.3 million votes to win, whereas Senator Daniel Patrick Carper only needed 180,000 votes to win. Thus, libertarians need 29 times more votes to elect a U.S. Senator in California than they need to elect a U.S. Senator in Delaware.

Squandering resources
The bottom line is, if we can’t elect a U.S. Senator in Delaware why are we trying in California where it is 29 times harder? One reason is because we are overestimating our resources and understimating the difficulty of winning elections. As a result we are not tailoring our resources to achievable political objectives. Consequently, we are squandering our limited resources and have gained hardly any political power.

It is as if Delaware U.S. Senators were on sale, selling at a 97% discount to California U.S. Senators, but state libertarian parties are not interested, even though they could easily afford to buy a Delaware U.S. Senator if they pooled their resources.

The advisory opinion was a partial win for the Libertarian Party, which had petitioned the FEC to allow the party to continue to engage in some limited business activities.

Under the BCRA, political parties are prohibited from accepting so-called ‘soft money’ donations from corporations. However, the BCRA was so broadly written that normal business transactions such as list rentals and advertising sales could be interpreted as illegal “donations.”

In its decision, the FEC said it would allow mailing list rentals because it is easy to determine their “fair market value.” As such, it said, the FEC could determine if list rentals were really schemes to evade the BCRA’s ban on soft money.

However, the FEC declined to allow the sale of advertising, saying it would be impossible to determine if such transactions were fraudulent.

Confusing decision
LP Chair Geoffrey Neale said the mixed decision was “confusing.”

We will be allowed to rent our mailing list because a determination can be made if we charge a fair market value,” he said. “It seems to me that a similar value could be attributed to advertising [in LP News].”

Had the FEC allowed the sale of advertising, “I’d be much happier,” said Neale.

In recent years, the LP received about 2% of its annual revenue from renting its members’/contributor mailing lists to non-profit libertarian organizations like the Cato Institute.

Party wins minor BCRA concession from the FEC

The Federal Election Commission will allow national political party committees to rent their mailing lists — giving the Libertarian Party a small victory against the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA).

On January 31, a majority of the six-member Federal Election Commission (FEC) voted to allow political parties to rent contributor mailing lists to corporations such as businesses and think tanks.

THE VOLUNTEER

What does it take to make a state or local LP organization successful?

Based on my four years of experience as State Chair of the New Hampshire LP, and my interaction with all 50 state affiliates when I worked in the LP’s national office, I have come to realize that no one strategy or activity can create lasting success.

Instead, success comes from continuously doing a number of nuts-and-bolts activities to maintain your organization, perpetually working to acquire the resources you need to grow; and constantly staying politically active and visible.

I have distilled these concepts down to a “10-point checklist for success” — activities that every LP organization must engage in to flourish and achieve political victory.

Here it is: a successful LP organization:

1. Maintains an accurate, up-to-date database of members and prospects.
2. Sends out a prompt, professional information package to interested prospects, and sends out timely membership renewal notices to current members.
3. Engages in ongoing, constant, prospecting to increase the size of the organization.
4. Publishes a regular, decent-quality newsletter (print or e-mail) to keep members and prospects informed. Uses that newsletter to publicize activities and success.
5. Has a bank account, a treasurer, and an ongoing, implemented plan to raise money.
6. Runs candidates for political office whenever possible. Monitors elections (or registration numbers) that could effect ballot status, as necessary.
7. Is active on a regular basis in the political system: whether through elections, referendums, coalitions, lobbying, or whatever.
8. Has an organized media outreach plan that should not under include press releases, press conferences, and personal contacts to promote the party and earn publicity.
9. Has regular, publicized, productive, and interesting public meetings.
10. Has leadership dedicated to growth, success, and professionalism — and determined to avoid factionalism, assertion, and obstructionism. Party leadership has a solid, realistic vision for success.

Can succeed?
Can a Libertarian organization succeed if it ignores one or two of these items? Sure.

But, based on my experience with every state, county, or local LP organization that I have been in contact with, any Libertarian group that fails to engage in a majority (or all) of those 10 activities is doomed to stagnation or failure.

About the authors: Bill Winter was State Chair of the New Hampshire LP from 1996-1998. He is currently editor of LP News.

POLITICAL TIPS

Planning a large-budget Libertarian campaign? Visit http://PoliticalResources.com/. The site offers links to almost every service a professional campaign might require, including opposition research, polling, direct-mail services, printing, professional field training, campaign software, media buying, list rentals, yard signs, and buttons.

Need background or facts for a letter-to-the-editor? Just visit http://libertarian-organizations.com/letters. It has over 1,000 letters and articles for inspiration and information.

Want to win your 2004 election? The first step for any race, says the Project for California’s Future, is to figure out how many votes you need to win. To calculate this number, take the 2000 voter turnout percentage for your district and multiply it by the current number of registered voters there. This produces the projected turnout of the 2004 election. In a two-person contest, the number of votes the candidate needs is 52% of that figure (50% + 1, plus a safety margin).

HANDWRITING ANALYSIS

S1008. Send S.A.E. to: New Ways, 1624 Aquarena Springs, E137, San Marcos, Texas 78666
What the government did to the dairy industry (and how to fix it)

EDITOR’S NOTE: How can Libertarianism solve America’s problems? Each issue, LP News will showcase how “Libertarian Solution Bay State Steps” in a more libertarian direction — can help improve our nation.

By Bill Winter

LP NEWS EDITOR

Got milk?
If so, you’ve got higher prices, bureaucratic meddling, billions of pounds of surplus dairy products, and complicated mathematical formulas that define how much farmers can charge for the nutritious white beverage.

This because the production and sale of milk has been regulated by the federal and state governments since the 1930s. And 70 years of regulation has created a bigger mess than 10 gallons of spoiled milk on a shag carpet.

Take Massachusetts, for example. In October 2002, the Bay State Department of Food and Agriculture launched an investigation of Midland Farms, a small chain of grocery stores. Its alleged crime? Selling milk too cheaply.

According to regulators, the chain was selling milk for only $1.79 a gallon. That was far below the statewide average of $2.99 a gallon.

Raise its prices
The 70-year-old Massachusetts Milk Control Law bars retailers from selling milk below cost. So the Agriculture Department turned its lawyers loose, ordering them to force Midland Farms to raise its prices.

Midland Farms President Demetrius Haseotes was stunned. “We’re saving people money,” he noted. However, facing the prospect of losing his license to sell milk, Haseotes agreed to raise his prices. So the state government increased milk prices by 3¢ a gallon.

That’s not maximum prices. And in Connecticut and New Hampshire, legislators are considering bills to outlaw milk “price-gouging.”

Why all the laws regulating milk? After all, as James Bovard noted in a 1991 Briefing Paper for the Cato Institute, farmers who want the scale for beef — rather than for milk — labor under a negligible number of state or federal laws.

If the free market works for beef production, why should milk producers be treated differently? He asked.

To answer that question, we have to go back to the Great Depression.

Price-support program
In the mid-1930s, Congress was concerned that falling milk prices would bankrupt small dairy farmers. So it passed a “temporary” dairy price-support program.

Under the program, which was eventually formalized as the Commodity Credit Corporation, the federal government bought surplus milk, butter, and cheese from farmers who couldn’t otherwise sell them at sufficiently high prices.

Congress also passed the first “federal milk marketing orders,” which required wholesalers and retailers “to pay a different price in each region of the country.” Wrote John McClaughry of the Vermont-based Ethan Allen Institute. The program was designed to keep lower-priced milk (from, say, Wisconsin) from being sold in states with higher milk costs (say, Florida), and thus driving out local dairy farmers.

Eventually, the program grew to include 31 federal milk territories.

Finally, to complete its toxic trifecta, Congress passed “strict import controls to keep foreign products from coming in and driving down the price for cheese and butter,” wrote McClaughry.

Not surprisingly, to anyone who understands economics, problems soon developed in the heavily regulated industry.

Inexorable surpluses
With prices guaranteed by Uncle Sam, dairy farmers produced more milk. Farms got bigger, more productive cows were bred, and equipment became more efficient. And since the market could not respond to this overproduction with lower prices, milk, butter, and cheese surpluses grew inexorably.

In response, the federal government passed an increasingly desperate series of measures. It was, wrote Bovard, “a classic case of politicians’ reacting to the failure of existing government controls by demanding far more intrusive controls.”

In 1981, the federal government passed the 1981 Milk Page 22
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Getting on the scale with state budget cuts
It's almost enough to restore your faith in the media.

In the front page of USA Today, the headline proclaimed: “State, local spending up despite downturn.”

In just 589 words (and in a related article on page 3), USA Today matter-of-factly demolished the myth that state governments face dire budget deficits and are being forced to “cut” spending.

In fact, wrote reporter Dennis Cauchon: “State and local governments are spending more money and hiring more people than last year, even as governors warn of draconian cuts in public services.”

Wait a second: State spending is up?

That’s right, writes Cauchon: “A USA Today analysis shows that most of the budget cuts are not declines in spending from last year’s level, but increases in spending in other areas.”

Oh, this is too good. A major newspaper has finally noticed that when politicians talk about “cutting” a budget, they really mean, “We can’t increase spending as fast as we want to.”

For example, in Minnesota, tax revenues are expected to rise 5.6% over the next two years. But politicians want to increase the budget by 13.4%. So, they lament that they must “cut” spending by $4.6 billion. “But these cuts would be from planned spending: actual spending is still expected to rise,” notes USA Today.

Or take California: Governor Grey Davis claims it has a $5 billion budget deficit. But the legislature plans to increase general fund spending from $78 billion this year to $91 billion by 2005. Presto: A $13 billion spending increase becomes a $15 billion “deficit.”

Minnesota and California aren’t alone. Around the USA, inflation-adjusted spending by state and local governments rose 3.3% in 2002. That’s on top of the 6.2% spending increase over the past decade by the 50 state governments. By contrast, inflation was 3.5%.

“Spending by state and local governments has grown nationwide without interruption for decades, in good times and bad times alike,” reports USA Today. “It has grown faster than the rate of inflation every year since 1983.”

Amidst this spending spree, the governors of 31 states bemoan billion-dollar deficits — and warn about budget cuts. Heretofore, tax increases are necessary they insist. But, notes USA Today, state tax revenue was up 1.4% nationwide during the third quarter of 2002.

But wait: It gets worse. Since 2001, state governments have actually hired 31,000 more workers — an increase of 6.6%. During the same time, private companies, reacting to the soft economy, laid off 457,000 workers — a decrease of 4.6%.

“Cuts” that are really increases. “Shashing” government while hiring new employees. Bemused you of anything?

How about: “We’re at Peace?” Freedom is Slavery?”

In his novel 1984, George Orwell wrote about Newspeak, a language that contained such mind-numbing contradictions that citizens were unable to articulate opposition to government policy.

“The whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought,” wrote Orwell, and make dissent “literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it.”

With the Great State Budget Crisis of 2003, we’re hearing Newspeak. As in 1984, it’s designed to make opposition to government growth impossible. It’s designed to shut you up.

After all, when Libertarians argue that government spending should be cut, politicians react in a cascade of Newspeak: “Cut spending? We’re already slashing the budget!”

Libertarian wordsmith Michael Cloud has a response. He calls it “Government 101.”

“Let me give you one on the first time you go to Weight Watchers, he notes, you get on the scale. Your weight is recorded.

The following week, you’re asked to get on the scale again, to see if your weight increased or decreased.

“Weight Watchers doesn’t want explanations,” says Cloud. “They don’t want to hear, ‘Well, I planned to gain 8 pounds, but only gained 5 pounds, so it’s like I lost 3 pounds.’ They just say: ‘Get on the scale.’

You gained weight or lost it. Let’s find out. Get on the scale.”

So it is with government. Numbers don’t lie (even if politicians do). Put your state’s budget “on the scale.” It’s either larger or smaller than last year. Ultimately, only facts can beat government Newspeak.

Bradley spokesman of state spending increases is a splendid “get on the scale” weapon for Libertarian activists.
When in doubt, poll

Survey says: Survey! That's the solution when the LP grapples with the most divisive political issues, said a plurality of LP News readers.

In response to this month's unscientific Pulse question — "How should the Libertarian Party decide its official positions on tough, potentially controversial issues like a war on Iraq?" — 32% said the party should conduct a poll of members. Such a system, said one, "would promote true democracy."

In second place, with 24%, were readers who said the party should take no position on issues that are not "easily addressed by application of libertarian principles." Rather than risk splintering the party, the LP should "remain neutral," they said.

Nonsense, said 20% of the respondents — there's no issue so tough that the proper LP position can't be ascertained by rigorously applying "core libertarian values." Take any other approach, they warned, and the LP could "compromise its principles in response to every crisis."

In a distant fourth place (with 8% of the vote) was allowing the Libertarian National Committee to decide. Here is a representative sample of the different responses:

- Put issues to a ballot of all dues-paying LP members. What better way to promote democracy? I sure would like to have my voice heard.
  - Barry Rowe, Melbourne, Florida

- Controversial issues should be judged by the gold standard: The libertarian non-aggression principle. The U.S. military bombing Iraq and taxing its own citizens to do so violates this principle.
  - Michael R. Edelstein, San Francisco, California

- We as a party cannot afford to risk our existence by taking a stand on divisive issues that can be argued either way without violating our principles. If significant minorities — say, one in four — of the membership take opposing stands, the party should remain neutral.
  - Mark Pharm, Denver, Colorado

- The official position on tough issues should be determined by basic libertarian principles. If the party is going to compromise its principles in response to every crisis, then what differentiates it from the Democrats and Republicans? Since non-aggression is the most fundamental libertarian principle, the position on attacking Iraq should be clear. Sticking to this principle may result in the defection of members not fully committed to the libertarian philosophy, but failing to do so will imperil the party's long-term survival.
  - David Ferriero, Dallas, Texas

- Poll the membership and publish the results showing the range of responses. That is, the party takes no "official position" per se.
  - Richard Kotler, Pacific Palisades, California

- As far as forming an official party position on the "intervention" in Iraq, the Libertarian Party did not create the problem and therefore does not need to maintain any official position on the subject.
  - James M. Young, Reno, Nevada

- The question about war in Iraq should be handled locally, or at most, at the state level. This is one of those controversial questions (read: abortion) that polarizes even the major parties. Let individuals within the party decide how they want to "vote" for this issue. There are plenty of liberal anti-war and conservative pro-war groups out there we can hold coalitions with.
  - Brett Porter, Lexington, Ohio

- On questions where the party membership is clearly divided (i.e. Iraq, abortion) the party should not take an official position. Some issues, such as these, are not easily addressed by application of libertarian principles.
  - Stu Young, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

- Allow a vote by all dues-paying members. The technology exists for us to use direct democracy via the Internet. The best way to define a political party is to ask its members what it stands for. If we truly want to know what we stand for, we must ask every member, not just a few.
  - Francis Klinkner, Mankato, Minnesota

- The National Committee should make the decision. If there is serious division of opinion among the state executives, there should be a vote. With e-mail, this should not be difficult. It would be unwise for the party to refuse to take a position on very important issues, such as the unnecessary war with Iraq. We will not be perceived as a serious party if we do not take a stand.
  - David Macko, Solon, Ohio
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■ Embarrass the issue and put our internal debate. Debate the issue in full view of the media and public at large. Let the public see how libertarians think and see that libertarians don't all agree on all issues. Let there be a press release about how the party is surprisingly divided on the issue with a war on Iraq, and that like the abortion and death penalty issues, the Libertarian Party survives.

[Signature] RANDY HALL II, San Diego, California

■ The Libertarian Party should genuinely refrain from taking official positions on divisive issues. Taking positions in this way only makes any problems worse. Instead, the LP should concentrate on what the vast majority of libertarians agree.

NICHOLAS L. WOLFE, Urbana, Illinois

■ We should refrain from taking a stand on such a divisive issue. The Party of Principle must limit its stands to those that follow directly from our basic principles. In cases like this where we are so far from having a consensus, the connection between those principles and either stand is clearly on shaky ground.

[Signature] RANDY HALL II, San Diego, California

■ Allowing all dues-paying members to decide difficult issue positions would subject us to all the limitations of a democracy. Having the INC decide these issues, via platform-defensible resolution, more closely resembles the wisdom embodied by a constitutional republic. Since all issues can't be potentially "difficult" it is fair to decide arbitrarily that some will have no official position.

— JEFF A. SMITH, Angola, Indiana

■ My preference is for polling of the paid members by e-mail. Polling members might encourage more members to pay their dues and remain members. It's another benefit of membership.

— VINCENT J MAY, Elgin, Texas

May Question: Favorite for Prez?

S syndicated radio talk show host Gary Nolan has already an

ounced, Fast Pennsylvania gubernatorial candidate Ken

Krawchik is reportedly thinking about running, as is 2002

Massachusetts gubernatorial candidate Carlos Howell. And the word on the street is that a California judge may toss his hat into the ring. Of course, we're talking about the 2004 LP presidential nomination. But as a handful of candidates start the arduous trek towards the LP nomination, we have to ask: Who would you like to see as the party's 2004 presidential candidate? Who would represent the party best, or run the best campaign, or win most votes, or attract the most attention? You can choose someone who is already running, or who has said they're thinking about running. Or, you can select someone who ought to run. (Clint Eastwood? Dan Barry? Walter Williams? Neal Boortz? Bob offline? Ken, who is your ideal LP presidential candidate?)

■ QUESTION: Who would you like to see seek (and win) the Libertarian Party's 2004 presidential nomination? And why?

(Please keep answers to 100 words or less.)

■ DEADLINE: April 8, 2003

April Question: Target one race?

I t's a suggestion that comes up after every election — especially when the LP didn't win any significant offices. The suggestion is simple: The LP should pursue resources into one important race, and win. Typically, the argument goes, the LP dissipates its resources in dozens of races around the USA, and loses most of them. A better strat¬

ey, say some folks, would be for Libertarians to decide which one race (or small handful of races) is winnable, and direct their contributions to just that race. It should be a major race: U.S. House or governor. With a coordinated national effort, they say, the LP could elect a Congressman or governor. Others disagree, saying that cantankerous Libertarians wouldn't be able to select just one race, or that LP members prefer to support many local elections. And, they say, even contributions from around the USA wouldn't be enough to guarantee a win for Congress or for governor in a typical state. Who's right?

■ QUESTION: What did the Libertarian Party put all its resources into winning one important race in 2004? If so, what kind of race? And why? (Please keep answers to 100 words or less.)

■ DEADLINE: March 8, 2003

ENTRY GUIDELINES: Include your name and your city/state; anonymous answers won't be tallied. Enter just once per month.

[Signature] John (b@h) E-mail: [email protected] (in subject line.)

[Signature] Fax: (202) 333-0072 [Attn: The Pulse]

[Signature] Mail: Bill Winter, Attn: LP News/The Pulse, 1640 Worcester Road, #335-D, Framingham, MA 01702
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$10,000 to the Libertarian Party in order to escape the false left-right, Democrat-Republican bipolar lottery. LP keeps moving in the direction it is, its purpose for existing will be made clear.

— MARK ANDERSON

Brooklyn Center, Minnesota

■ Don't buy it


Marcia sounds like an ultra-con¬
servative Republican! If she doesn't like the [Ladies of Liberty] calendar, don't buy it. Simple! Did Marcia forget that freedom is freedom of choice? And, if she feels that this is a "bad" thing, she can start her own nation and market that!

— A. R. MIKLOS

Warren, Michigan

■ Libertarian magic

Take 21 cards and deal them out into three columns by seven rows. Deal that the cards across for the first row left to right. Next, deal the sec¬

ond row of three cards on top of the first row in the same manner, mak¬

ing sure that the first row of cards remain visible. Finally deal all remain¬

ing rows in similar fashion on top of each other.

Now ask someone to think of one of the 21 cards and tell you what the column the card is in. Pick up one of the other columns, then the column that the person chose, followed by the third column so that the column the person chose lies between the other two.

Deal the cards out like before, and again have the person guess which column the card is in. As before, pick up the columns so that the column the person chose lies between the other two. Finally, deal the cards out again for a third and last time and repeat the entire process.

With any 21 cards face down in your hand and ask the person to spell the magic word "LIBERTARIAN." For every letter spoken, place one card face down on the table. After the fi¬

tal "N" card, pick up that card and turn it over. It is the chosen card.

I have researched this amazing card trick in great detail and can as¬

sure you that neither "DEMOCRAT" nor "REPUBLICAN" works, only the magic word "LIBERTARIAN."

— DR. JERRY ZIEMKE

Greenbelt, Maryland

■ Milsted: No dogma

Kudos to Carl Milsted for this Fu¬

forum column ["Three Kinds of Freedom that Libertarians Shouldn't Pi¬

one"] in the January 2003 issue of LP News. His thought-provoking com¬

mentary reminds us that the "Party of Principle" should never become the "Party of Dogma." Most Libertarians think of liberty and rights as roughly synonymous. But as Thomas Hobbes pointed out in his magnum opus, Leviathan, they are, in fact, opposites. My right to life means that you do not have the liberty to kill me. Complete liberty would mean anarchy.

Like everyone else, we are striving for the best civil society. In our noble quest, with our principles to guide us, we must never stop con¬

templating and debating what this means, and by what means it may be achieved.

To this end, I offer one improve¬

ment to Mr. Milsted's agenda. Rather than both a wealth tax and pollu¬

tion taxes, combine them into an environmental consumption tax.

The danger of a simple wealth tax is that it provides a strong disincentive to savings and investment. We would have to be on guard, however, one of the logical consequences of such a tax: the combination of the IRS and EPA into a single government agency.

— MARK W. ZACHARIAS

Langhorne, Pennsylvania

■ Milsted: Disturbed

I was disturbed by Carl Milsted's Forum article where he advocates moving the Libertarian Party farther to the left to attract leftist support. To summarize if I can, he wants us to embrace an egalitarian agenda, ban big business, and propose new wealth taxes and pollution taxes. He equates employer-imposed dress codes to tyranny, and he accuses cor¬

porations of "tyranny." As a Libertarian I defend laissez faire capitalism. Without government intervention, corporations have no power. So to limit corporate power, you have only to limit government power. To do that, you must limit the amount of money flowing into govern¬

tment, not invent new or replacement taxes. And if your boss is a ty¬

rant, you can quit.

Carl "wealth tax" idea shows that he does not understand that people become wealthy by creating wealth, not by stealing it. Such a tax would reduce wealth creation, a very bad idea, but typical from the left.

Our mission should be to educate people to the left, not stoop to their level. Libertarians like Mr. Milsted discourage me from believing any¬

ting that anyone other than libertarians ever do gain power.

— DAN FERNANDES

La Verne, California

■ Milsted: Big concern

Regarding "Three kinds of freedom that Libertarians shouldn't ignore," Carl Milsted, Jr.

An excellent article with lots of food for thought. I do, however, have a big concern with his suggestion to, "Replace the income taxes with wealth taxes. Income taxes hit those who are getting wealthy the most. Wealth taxes hit only those who are already wealthy."

In my mind, this translates as "while I am paying for my house, you cannot tax me but once it is paid for, it is up for grabs."

Just how would "wealth" be defined? I have a right to what very little wealth I have because these "things" (house, car, etc.) are unique in that I have paid my labor into them in order to acquire them.

Thus, I don't understand what the difference is between "getting wealthy" (whatever that is?) and being wealthy (whatever that is?). In one case, I am in the act of mixing my labor into the "thing" I am acquiring, and in the other instance, I have finished mixing my labor into the "thing" I have acquired. In ei¬

ther case, they are unique due to mixing of my labor into the "thing."

— LARRY STONE

North Bend, Oregon

■ What works?

In the January 2003 Mailbox, a writer makes some suggestions to improve the Libertarian Party's performance: Change the party's name, run as a party, and get a well-known or well-funded candidate for President.

These ideas are new. Being a Libertarian can be frustrating, and when our candidates lose, it's natural for us to look for something that will help us win. However, at other third parties can offer clues about what might work, and what might not.

The U.S. Taxpayers' Party had a great name. Everyone could under¬
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stand what the words meant. And yet, the party was not particularly successful. It ended up changing its name to the Constitution Party. The name change did not have a noticeable effect on the party's success.

More importantly, the Constitution Party does what many Libertarians think the Libertarian Party should do: tout smaller government while avoiding issues like drug legalization. One would think that their platform would appeal to a large number of Americans. Even so, the Constitution Party gets far fewer votes than the Libertarian Party.

The fate of the Reform Party is also interesting. Ross Perot's money gave it its day in the sun, but it could not take advantage of that. If we were to find a Presidential candidate with money, it's not certain that the party would benefit in the long term.

How about a famous candidate? Pat Buchanan had excellent name recognition and a large following in Republican primaries, but he did little more than put another nail in the Reform Party's coffin.

But on the bright side, the New Alliance Party, the Reform Party, Lyndon LaRouche, and others have come and gone during the 30-year history of the LP. So far, we seem to have staying power.

The simple fact is, building a major political party is hard. No one has been able to do it for several decades. If not 130 years. Sometime feel like giving up. But when I see the Republican or Democratic politicians on TV, I realize I simply have no choice. Win or lose, I will continue to support the Libertarian Party.

- Bob Alexander

Bedford, Massachusetts

**Stoppers' fault**

When 47% of respondents to the Pulse question [January 2003] on attacking Iraq say they support an attack on Iraq — even though the Libertarian philosophy and platform are clearly against such an attack — could it be because for the last 10 years the party leadership and staff have failed miserably to educate members, especially through LP News, as to the libertarian position on non-intervention?

Otherwise, this is a difficult issue for many new Libertarians and therefore it is one that should be emphasized in order to educate them — not ignored in fear of driving new Libertarians away and perhaps losing their membership and other financial contributions?

Hopefully, future LP staff will be more diligent in informing members about the libertarian non-interventionist stance.

- Carl Moore

Washington, DC

**Questionable**

I couldn't help noticing there were a number of questionable answers made by readers in January's The Pulse that exhibited a very high degree of biased thinking.

For example, Robert Joseph Underwood tells us that: "Libertarians are living in a fantasy land where the Moslems are concerned. The Kosovar is rife with clauses against Christians and Jews. There are also clauses that instruct the believer to kill non-Moslems."

Now while I think Mr. Underwood paints a somewhat distorted picture of what it actually says, I won't deny that the Koran contains some troubling passages.

However, I would like to ask him to spend more time reading the Bible with that same eye for detail. It contains a great deal of violence and intolerance, but we never seem to hear about that. We would also point out that it is only because we have become more secular in the West that we have been able to purge our culture of much of the intolerance, violence, and fanaticism that many now like to point to in the Muslim world.

I can't say that Mr. Underwood and his like-minded friends have convinced me to support attacking Iraq, but they have done a good job of reminding me why it is important to keep Church and State separate, and why we do not want religious dogma of any kind to creep into our foreign policy making process.

- Robert Fisher

Kansas City, Missouri

**Discouraging**

Reading the January issue of The LP News was discouraging. If some of the answers for The Pulse question and letters you published were "typical" of Libertarians, I would be ashamed to call myself a Libertarian. We must insist that Congress declare war on Iraq before allowing any military action. Otherwise our military is nothing more than a band of terrorists, and our president is nothing more than an Osama bin Laden.

Some call for a preemptive strike, even if no weapons of mass destruction are found. They forget that the most successful preemptive strike in history at Pearl Harbor led to the defeat of the nation that made it.

They also do not realize that countries of the Arab world don't need weapons of mass destruction. With our addiction to petroleum, all that they need to do is withhold oil exports to the western world for a short time. The result would ruin our economy quicker than a major nuclear attack. As things are, if American troops invade Iraq we can probably look forward to $5 a gallon gasoline.

The who call themselves "Libertarian," but support a war with Iraq do not realize that they are only supporting policies that will create many more future terrorists and greater government power. I hope that they learn the error of what they support before it is too late.

- Diane Grindstaff

Kent, Washington

**LP News Corrections**

- In the January issue, the person in the page 2 photograph identified as William Cole was actually William Mark Clifford, who was elected to the Seminole County Soil and Water Conservation District board.

- In the February issue, the Bill of Rights rally shown in two photographs on page 9 was mistakenly identified as having taken place in Nevada County, Nevada. In fact, it was Nevada County, California.

- In the February issue, in the page 1 article, "National Committee passes frugal $1.4 million budget," several budget line items were incorrectly listed. Two items — $71,000 for bill access and $80,000 for candidate support — are conditional upon money being raised to fund those activities. Two items had incorrect amounts: $191,400 for direct mail, pledge, and major donor fundraising costs should have been $97,500, and $168,574 for printing/distribution of outreach materials (should have been $56,038). And one item was improperly identified: $64,000 for National Committee expenses. In fact, this is the broader category of "governance," and will fund the LNC, a State Chair's conference, volunteer expenses, etc.
Understanding federal milk regulations: The Mafia meets the Soviet government

Continued from Page 18
ment began distributing billions of dollars of surplus cheese, butter, and nondry milk by the 1980s. Despite the giveaways, the feds still had 577 million pounds of butter, 280 million pounds of dry milk, and 38 million pounds of cheese (all sold in warehouses for a few cents a pound).

In 1983, Congress launched a dairy buyout, paying farmers to retire their cows from production. By 1985, it had paid $955 million to retire 10,000 dairy cows — at an average cost of $100,000 per cow. Meanwhile, other dairymen simply increased their production levels.

In 1987, Congress paid dairy farmers $1.3 billion to slaughter cows. Again, other dairy farmers simply increased their production, leaving total milk production exactly where it was before the buyout: 250 million tons. Each cow, fed to produce 16 million dairy cows sent to slaughter caused beef prices to plummet, "bankrupting some cattlemen," wrote Bovard.

In 1991, the USDA started paying U.S. farmers a $1 per pound bounty to sell that butter in foreign countries and for 604 a pound. At a time when some American couldn't afford to buy milk, "the USDA [spent] over $50 million to dump 140,000 tons of U.S. dry milk on world markets," wrote Bovard.


In 1999, the Secretary of Agriculture announced "reforms" to the federal programs. He reduced the number of federal milk territories from 31 to 11, and announced a new method to compute the "basic formula" price for milk.

And what a formula it was! Get out your calculator. It went as follows: "Basic Formula Price (BFP) = (last month's average price paid for manufacturing grade milk in Minnesota and Wisconsin) + (current grade A butter price x 0.8) + (current Grade A dry milk price x 0.807 - current dry buttermilk price x 0.42) + (current cheese price x 0.42) + (current Grade A butter price x 0.238) - (last month's Grade A butter price x 0.27) - (last month's nondry milk price x 0.80) - (current Grade A butter price x 0.238)."

Where, it was, opined Ed Hudgins of the Cato Institute, "a cross between something invented by the Mafia and the Soviet government."


The results of decades of federal meddling in the milk market have been devastating:

• It cost American consumers billions of dollars in higher prices. By the early 1990s, Bovard estimated that "import quotas, price supports, and marketing restrictions cost consumers between $5 billion and $7 billion per year." In fact, he noted wrongly, "For the cost of the dairy program, each American family could have bought its own dairy cow."

—James Bovard

For the cost of the government’s dairy program, "each American family could have bought its own dairy cow."

• It encouraged inefficiency in the dairy business. For example, farmers in Australia and New Zealand "can make more than half the cost that the average American farmer can," noted Bovard. However, Americans can’t benefit from foreign efficiency because import restrictions allow the import of the equivalent of only one teaspoon of foreign ice cream and one pound of cheese per person per year, he wrote.

Ironically, the labyrinth of laws and surfeit of subsidies hasn’t even accomplished its original Depression-era goal of protecting small dairy farmers.

Since 1930, the number of American dairy farmers has decreased by 95%, noted Bovard. As larger farms became more efficient, smaller dairy farms couldn’t compete (even with federal subsidies.) And as subsidies expanded, vast tracts of farmland became more valuable to developers and homeowners than they were to farmers.

Higher prices. Massive surpluses. Fewer farmers. Seventy years of federal intervention has demonstrated that the federal dairy program is "a total incompetence at managing the dairy industry," wrote Bovard.

Simple solution

That’s why the solution to the milk mess is quite simple, he writes: "Congress should abolish dairy price supports and milk-marketing regulations at once. The federal government should allow the free market to determine milk prices."

At the same time, state government should get out of the business of setting prices, and stop prosecuting stores that commit the "crime" of selling milk for too much (or too little) money.

Can the free market provide perishable dairy products to consumers at reasonable prices? Absolutely, said Bovard: There are no federal laws governing the production and sale of eggs, which "share many of the market characteristics of dairy products, including perishability." Yet, over the past three decades, the "real price of eggs has fallen, while the price of milk has changed little."

Dairy farmers would have to adjust to the new free market system. The most efficient ones would flourish, while the least efficient would go out of business. But that isn’t necessarily bad, wrote Bovard. "If the same way that there is nothing inherently wrong with the decrease in the number of grocery stores or village blacksmiths."

That’s why, wrote McNam, "Congress could help consumers and efficiency by eliminating the federal dairy program."

Got milk? Since you couldn’t get it cheaper with a free-market system.
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**Medical Savings Accounts**
Cut your health insurance premiums in half...
Additional tax deductions of 65% for individuals and 75% for families. For a free quote, call: Bernhard Jaffe M.B.A.
1-800-916-5525
LIC. #023974 • FOR CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS ONLY
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**Safe Legal Plans**
- Unlimited phone consultations
- Letters and phone calls on your behalf
- Traffic ticket representation
- 60 hours of trial and pretrial attorney time if you face civil or criminal charges
- 50 hours of attorney time for IRS audit
- Spouse and children are covered

Only $16.00 per month!
Corporate and small business plans also available.
www.safelegalplan.com or call 1-888-213-4462

---

**Legalize Freedom**
LEGALIZE FREEDOM
TEE-SHIRTS AND BUMPER STICKERS!

When it comes to freedom, silence is neither golden nor wise. Express Yourself. Legalize Freedom Bumper Stickers: $2.00 each. Legalize Freedom Tee-Shirts: $10.00 each. Sticker: Black lettering on white vinyl. Tee-Shirt: Black lettering silk-screened onto Hanes 100% Cotton Beefy Tee. M/Lg/XL. Shipped P.O. Priority Mail: $2.00 postage each. Expect 4-6 week delivery. Make checks payable to: Martin Bellkin, P.O. Box 350357, Brooklyn, New York 11235

---

**REACH 27,000 LIBERTARIANS FOR ONLY 1/4¢ EACH!**

**POLICE OFFICER WANTED: UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY!**
Work with Libertarian administration of Big Water, Utah (pop. 400) by scenic Lake Powell and red rock country. Low crime, low stress, small town environment. Rookies or retired officers welcome. Please tell your libertarian-leaning police friends. Call 435-675-3760 or email willystarman@hotmail.com
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**Want to show your support, or warn the other drivers?**
Try the Libertarian window sign!
Mounts on the inside of any car window.

Liberatarian On Board

---

**Federal Reserve Newsletter**
www.federalnewsletter.com

Mail to: F.R.N. Subscription Dept.
1359 Chandler Ave.
Lincoln Park, MI 48146-2009

---

**BILL OF RIGHTS SHIRT**
Make a statement wearing this quality gray t-shirt with red "VOID WHERE PROHIBITED BY LAW" Over the Bill of Rights in block.
HeavyWeight Pre-Shrunk 100% Cotton t-shirt Sizes M,L,XL,XX
Order by Mail Send 16.95 To: Libertarian Party P.O. Box 20015 Greenfield, WI 53220
Order over the Web at www.lpwi.org or by Phone at (800) 226-6136
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**Learn the Truth About the Income Tax!**
and Reclaim your Rights with a little light reading at losthorizons.com
(OK, it's not so light... but it's not Rocket Science, either, and it's worth it)
NOTHING TO BUY NO REGISTRATION REQUIRED
The Power that you will gain on our site is provided as a Public Service
www.losthorizons.com

---

**Politicians Should Sell Contract Insurance To Us — Not Tax Us.**
Please contact me for a free prospectus, or my booklet is $2. Thanks,
Dave Hollist
(909) 980-4198 • constitution@compuserve.com
Libertarian Candidate for President
P.O. Box 1414, Alta Loma, CA 91701-8414
http://L.A.m/reading

---

**A New Vision for America**
Gorgeous 24-page booklet with vivid color photographs. Presents the LP's positive vision for a better America. Only 25¢ each in bulk. See order form on Page 13.
UPCOMING

■ February 28–March 2, 2003
Illinois LP Convention, Four Points Sheraton Hotel, Oak Brook.
Speakers include Justin Raimondo (www.antiwar.com), Ed Thompson (2002 Wisconsin gubernatorial candidate), Dr. Mary Ruwart (author, Healing Our World), and Bill Masters (sheriff and author, Drug War Addiction). For information, visit: www.ll.lp.org/2003convention/.

■ March 1, 2003
New Jersey LP Convention, Trenton Marriott Hotel. Trenton. Speakers include Jack A. Cole (executive director, Law Enforcement Against Prohibition). For information, e-mail Robert Jacobs at: Robertj1@yahoo.com.

■ March 1, 2003
Iowa LP Convention, Hotel Fort Des Moines, Des Moines. Speakers include Bill Masters (sheriff, San Miguel County, Colorado). For information, visit: www.lpia.org.

■ March 4, 2003
Patrick Henry Supper Club, China Buffet Restaurant, Richmond, Virginia. Speaker is John Berthoud (president, National Taxpayers Union). For information, e-mail L.T. Harris at: leonard@richmondliberty.org.

■ March 13–16, 2003
Reason Weekend 2003, Hotel Del Coronado in San Diego, California. Reason's annual event for major supporters. Speakers include Virginia Postel (author, The Future and Its Enemies) and Penn Jillette (magician). For information, call Donald Heath: (310) 391-2245.

■ March 22, 2003
Wisconsin LP Convention, Mr. Ed's Tee Pee Supper Club, Tomah. Speakers TBA. For information, e-mail: director@lpwi.org. Or visit: www.lpwi.org/.

■ March 29, 2003
Minnesota LP Convention, FSC & Community Center, New Brighton. Speakers include Jack Tomczak (Let Minnesota Vote), Livisa Runbeck (Taxpayers League), Dan McEnty (Minnesota Commission of Finance), and Ed Thompson (2002 Wisconsin LP gubernatorial candidate). For information, e-mail Colin Wilkinson: CWilkinson@RiverWarren.com. Or call: (612) 825-5100.

■ April 4-6, 2003
Colorado LP Convention, Ramada Inn, Colorado Springs. Speakers include Ed Thompson (2002 Wisconsin LP gubernatorial candidate), Gary Nolan (candidate, LP's 2004 presidential nomination), Vin Supporev (columnist, Las Vegas Review-Journal), Dr. Robert Zubrin, (author, The Case for Mars), and Suzanne Shell (founder, American Family Advocacy Center). For information, e-mail: lpco2003@psys.net. Or call: (719) 310-9444. Or visit: www.lpcolorado.org/.

■ April 4-7, 2003
Pennsylvania LP Convention, Ramada Plaza Hotel, Wilkes Barre. Speakers include Marty Thomas-Brumme (Rose Center on Conflict Resolution and Restorative Justice) and Dr. Imad-ad-Dean Ahmad (Minaret of Freedom Institute). For information, call Betty Summers: (570) 822-9194. Or e-mail: summers@usnetway.com.

■ April 5, 2003
Michigan LP Convention, Eagle Crest Conference Center & Resort, Ypsilanti. Speakers include Ron Crickenberger (LP Political Director) and Rob Kampa (executive director, Marijuana Policy Project). For information, e-mail Emily Salvette at: salvette@ameritech.net. Or call: (734) 668-2607. Or visit: www.mi.lp.org.

■ April 12, 2003
Massachusetts LP Convention, Sheraton Tara Hotel, Framingham. Speakers include Bill Masters (sheriff and author, Drug War Addiction), David Rothstein (organizer, CounterAttack 2003), Sue Blevins (president, Institute for Health Freedom), and Bill Winter (editor, LP News). For information, e-mail: convention@lpma.org. Or visit: www.lpma.org.

For more Upcoming Events, see page 22

LIBERTARIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE, INC.
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■ PAGE 1 Oregon Libertarians defeat $725 million tax
■ PAGE 1 Ten reasons why the U.S. shouldn't go to war with Iraq
■ PAGE 3 California LP officeholder beats recall effort
■ PAGE 4 Airline ID case gets court hearing

FIRST WORD

"The Libertarian Party has spokespeople who can defend a philosophy of being a free nation... As a Christian, there are some things about the Libertarian Party with which I disagree, but not as much or as deeply as I disagree with the hypocrisy of both Republicans and Democrats — the two faces of American politics on one coin. Both parties have overridden the Constitution and Bill of Rights, but for different reasons."
— DOROTHY ANNE SEESE, SierraTimes.com, January 12, 2003

"The Libertarians believe in liberty [and] believe drugs should be legalized. Though Libertarians may not have the perfect solution to [the problem of] drugs, at least they have a reasonable approach, and one thing is for certain. The Libertarians offer a solution when all the major parties do is follow failure with more failure."
— MICHAEL HOLMEISTER, Lamar Daily News (Colorado), Nov. 5, 2002

"Libertarians add [a] welcome dimension to the election. [They have] got ideas, and that should be worth something to voters."
— ANDREA REAL, Indianapolis Star (Indiana), October 30, 2002