



www.lpct.org

The Connecticut Libertarian

The Official Newsletter of the Libertarian Party of Connecticut

October 2006

Libertarian from the Constitution State

Why is Connecticut called the Constitution State? It wasn't the first to ratify the American Constitution; that was Delaware. It wasn't the first to adopt its own state constitution as part of the United States; that was New Hampshire.

Connecticut is the Constitution State because back in 1639, it was the home of the first written constitution in the history of the world. It was called the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut.

Before the Fundamental Orders, all constitutions were oral or only partially written. But the people of Connecticut wanted to protect the rights of the individual for all time. At the opening session of the general court in Hartford to draft the historic document, Reverend Thomas Hooker famously preached that "the foundation of authority is laid in the free consent of the people."

That axiom has remained the bulwark of written constitutions ever since. It would infuse itself into the American Constitution, which was adopted a century and a half later and based in large part on the principles encoded in the Fundamental Orders. It would even show up in Section One, Article Five of the latest Iraqi constitution, ratified last year: "The people are the source of authorities and its legitimacy."

Those Connecticut visionaries proved correct: writing down rights gave them longer life. The individual rights spelled out in the Fundamental Orders nearly 400 years ago are still included in the current Connecticut constitution, adopted 1965, in the very first article as a Declaration of Rights.

But what then has happened to our liberties and our rights? If the foundation of authority truly is in the free consent of the people, then how could we have gotten where we are today?

Have we truly and freely consented to the ever-expanding and over-reaching authority of the federal government? To the warrantless wire taps, the excessive taxation, the wars being fought halfway around the world? To the limitations on what food we can eat, what pills we can take, what medical treatment we can pursue? To what kinds of toilets and showers we can use in our own homes?

Or have the politicians in office pulled the wool over our eyes? Have they convinced so many of us that the Constitution is a "living, breathing document" to be brushed aside when inconvenient that we have not the numbers to fight back?

What's really happened is theft on a grand scale. The two ruling parties have colluded to split our freedoms and the costs. Americans are all, at heart, libertarians. We all believe in freedom. We all believe we should be responsible for our choices and our lives, both economically and personally. Even the very few who profess to be authoritarians, who argue that we need central planning and collectivism to achieve certain goals, believe that it is they who should be in charge of the central planning, and they who should choose the goals. In other words, they believe in their own freedom, just not in yours.

And it is that thinking that "if only we could elect the right people from the right party to the right offices" that has caused much of our mess. The largest benefit of having only two parties is extreme loyalty. It becomes almost a sporting event. When you watch a game between your team and the opponents, you excuse cheating by your team and vilify it when by the opponents. You pray for your team to win, not necessarily because they're better, but because they're yours.

Democrats and Republicans have split the natural libertarian beliefs of a free people.

The Democrats try to hold all the people who believe strongly in personal liberty. To pay the bills, they pass economic regulations that limit everyone's freedom but bring money to the labor unions, federal employees, and other traditional Democratic contributors. This wins them contributions and entire voting blocs.

The Republicans try to hold all the people who believe strongly in economic liberty. To pay the bills, they pass personal regulations that limit everyone's freedom but bring money to the big businesses, military complex, and other traditional Republican contributors. This wins them contributions and entire voting blocs.

Both parties take away rights from everybody to give money and power to special interests. What's worse is both fail to even achieve the limited liberty they profess to offer.

Both parties vote for the Patriot Act. Both parties vote to increase tax revenue, spending, and the debt.

Only Libertarians combine the best of both worlds and deliver on their promises. But in trying to hold all the people who believe both in personal liberty and economic liberty, and every other kind of liberty, we have no natural special interest groups. We would never sell the liberties of the many for the benefit of the few. We are America's only consistent political party.

So how can we win an election and start putting our country back on the path to liberty? Is it impossible?

The two ruling parties would like us to believe it is. They would prefer if we went away, to be replaced by smaller, more focused parties that have only one or two issues. That would make us easier to control.

They've instituted campaign finance laws whose primary effect is to discourage third parties. How does it work? They set limits on contributions. A soft limit at \$200 after which point the name of the donor becomes public knowledge and therefore open to public or private intimidation, and a hard limit at \$2,100 after which point it becomes illegal for the campaign to accept funds. How does the hard limit hurt third parties? After all, it applies to all candidates of all parties, doesn't it?

Here's how. The major backers of the two ruling parties contribute to lots of different candidates. They often back candidates in all fifty

See Libertarian on page 2



Phil Maymin

Libertarian *continued from page 1*

states. Suppose there are a hundred such large backers for each party. Without the campaign finance restrictions, perhaps each backer would choose two candidates in each state and contribute \$100,000 to each of them. Now, they can't. So what do they do? They can each contribute to every candidate. Because each of their many large contributors does this, the total amount raised for the candidates of the two major parties doesn't change. But because there are fewer third party candidates and fewer large contributors, their source of funds dries up.

Currently, the only way around the restriction is for Libertarians to donate significantly more per person than the average Democrat or Republican. Right now, the average contribution for them is in the small hundreds of dollars. For Libertarians to make a dent, they need to contribute the maximum whenever they can, or at least into the races they feel can make a difference.

I am running such a race.

I am running for U.S. Congress on the Libertarian ticket from the Constitution State. I am the only Libertarian candidate running for federal office in Connecticut.

My campaign has already had some influence. We've had more than 20 articles written specifically about the campaign. I've interviewed with half a dozen radio stations, including one 20-minute interview that you can listen to on the web site. We've been on News 12 television. We've appeared in trade journals. We've been on the front page of a newspaper five times.

We've even influenced the opposition. I am running against Shays/Farrell. Shays is the ten-term incumbent Republican and Farrell is the two-time Democratic challenger. When I announced that we had broken through the ballot barriers with a successful petition drive, and were officially on the ballot, Farrell's campaign manager said, "I'm not surprised the Libertarians have a candidate here... People are committed to change -- they're passionate about it. This is a referendum on the status quo." Indeed it is. And Farrell is part of that status quo.

Last week, I issued a position paper on Iraq. I described how Iraq was becoming a Communist country, why setting a specific date for a deadline would ensure American safety and Iraqi stability, and why that date should be July 4 of next year. I immediately became the only candidate in the race to call for a deadline. Both Shays and Farrell opposed it at the time.

Yet within three days, Shays had flip-flopped. For the first time in the 1,245 days since the invasion began, Shays said he would now favor a timeline. In his statements to the press, he used my phrases and arguments nearly verbatim. My position paper is online at <http://www.MayminForCongress.com>. You can compare for yourself Shays' remarks and mine. Bear in mind I emailed my position paper to Shays/Farrell and challenged them to debate the issue three days before Shays changed position.

I often refer to my opponents as Shays/Farrell because there is not much difference between them. Shays/Farrell ran against each other in 2004 and Shays barely won. Would it have made a difference if he'd lost?

Shays/Farrell increase tax revenue, spending, and debt. Farrell increased her town's debt by 600%. Shays has watched the federal debt increase by 250% from the time he took office.

Even their stance on Iraq is not that different. Both would have voted, as virtually every politician of both ruling parties did, to allow the Iraqi invasion, though Farrell has said she would have waited for the UN to support it first, which from a Libertarian point of view, is even worse. Both want a gradual pullout of troops now based on achievable benchmarks.

Shays/Farrell are as different from each other as night and later that night.

I would have voted to cut spending, decrease the debt, and slash taxes. And I would not have voted to go into Iraq in the first place. But you know all that already, because I am a Libertarian, and, unlike "Republican" or "Democrat," that word actually means something. Libertarians always maximize freedom. Members of the other parties have nothing more in common with each other than they are both rooting for the same team.

But who am I to run against such established machine politicians as Shays/Farrell? Am I a spurned Republican or a disappointed Democrat? No. I've been a Libertarian my whole life, for as long as I can remember. My family immigrated from Communist Russia when I was five, because we were looking for liberty. I've worked in the free market my whole life. I graduated Harvard University with both a Bachelor's and a Master's. I have also successfully proposed my Ph.D. in finance at the University of Chicago. I am a founder of my own financial management firm.

I'm running now on the Libertarian ticket because it is the party of principle. And the principle is what it has always been: "the foundation of authority is in the free consent of the people."

Nearly four hundred years ago, Connecticut led the world by writing down principles that were not to be violated, principles of freedom that government dare not encroach on. Now Connecticut can lead again by sending a representative to D.C. who understands that the proper role of government is securing the rights and freedoms of the people. Not launching offensive wars. Not redistributing income to special interest groups. Not legislating what faucets and toilets we can have in our own bathrooms.

It is time for Connecticut to lead again.

I urge you to visit our campaign website at <http://www.MayminForCongress.com>. There are several ways you can help. You can upload a digital photo of yourself to show your support. You can contribute immediately online. You can participate in the free and open public forum. You can add to the list of Libertarian quotes or invasive government examples. You can volunteer. You can sign up for the email list.

You can make a difference.

Phil Maymin is the Libertarian Party candidate for U.S. House of Representatives in Connecticut's 4th District

Phil Maymin in the Debates

Libertarian Phil Maymin will debate incumbent Republican Christopher Shays and Democrat Diane Farrell in at least seven October debates:

- Oct. 4 at 11:30 a.m. in the Stamford Marriott Hotel, sponsored by the Business Council of Fairfield County. (\$55 fee, tickets at <http://www.sacia.org/Debate06.htm>)
- Oct. 5 at 7 p.m. at Norwalk Community College, sponsored by the League of Women Voters. FREE.
- Oct. 8 at 7 p.m. at the University of Connecticut, Stamford campus, sponsored by the World Affairs Forum. FREE.
- Oct. 11 at 7:30 p.m. at Congregation B'nai Israel in Bridgeport, sponsored by the Jewish Center for Community Services. FREE.
- Oct. 15 at 7:30 p.m. at Temple Israel in Westport, sponsored by Temple Israel. FREE.
- Oct. 16 at 8 p.m. at the Regina A. Quick Center for the Arts at Fairfield University, sponsored by the university. FREE.
- Oct. 17 at 7:30 p.m. at Wilton High School, sponsored by the League of Women Voters. FREE.