

Let Freedom Ring!

Volume 6 Number 5

Available electronically at www.cmlc.org/cmlc/pubs.htm

May 2004

Let Freedom Ring! California, Oregon, Hawaii for Region—Text of their Agreement, About California, Neoconservatism Versus Libertarianism, Where Your Money Went.....1 Letter.....2 Being Credible as a Party...7

Let Freedom Ring!/Libertarian Strategy Gazette are edited and published by George Phillips, 87-6 Park Avenue, Worcester, MA 01605, who is solely responsible for the contents, for the Pioneer Valley Libertarian Association (www.pvla.net) and others. Subscriptions are available from the PVLA, c/o Carol McMahon, 221 Bumstead Road, Monson MA for \$15/year to Activists, \$20/year to others. Checks payable "PVLA", please.

California, Oregon, Hawaii Form Region

Text of Their Agreement

The Libertarian Party of California (LPC), the Libertarian Party of Hawaii (LPH), and the Libertarian Party of Oregon (LPO) agree to form a representative region as defined by Article 10, Section 2(c) of the bylaws of the Libertarian Party for the purpose of selecting two representatives and two alternates to the Libertarian National Committee (LNC).

The term of this agreement shall be from the close of the 2004 Libertarian Party Regular Convention until the close of the 2006 Libertarian Party Regular Convention.

The LPC shall select all representatives and alternates in conformance with LPC bylaws. The LPC shall be free to elect, remove, replace, suspend, or

[New Western Region] (Continued on page 7)

Neoconservatism Versus Libertarianism

They're polar opposites

by Justin Raimondo

[As published on Antiwar.com. Reprinted by permission.] Oh, how the neocons are squirming, and turning somersaults over Iraq, a performance the sight of which would be almost a pleasure to behold if not for the steep price of admission. New York Times columnist David Brooks' shoddily defiant mea culpa – which we covered in the last installment of this column – was preceded by the editors of National Review, who claim to have now gotten "a glimpse of the abyss in Iraq," as their editorial of April the 16th put it. In a line that begs the question "look who's talking," they had the nerve to complain that: "Since the conclusion of the war, the Bush administration has shown a dismaying capacity to believe its own public relations." And, they

[Neoconservatism] (Continued on page 2)

About California

by Sean Haugh Abridged from Liberty for All! <http://Libertyforall.net> Reprinted by permission (slightly updated by editorial insert)

Below, I will quote several very good people who have done many great things for the Libertarian Party. I still consider many of them to be dear friends. I do not wish to say anything that will take away from their great accomplishments. Still, we all make mistakes, I have certainly made my share of publicly examined mistakes, and am a better person for it. It allows me to do a better job for the cause of Liberty in the future.

Joe Dehn was Robbed

First, a quick primer on regional representation to the Libertarian National Committee (LNC): Ten percent or more of the membership may form a region, which sends a rep and an alternate to the LNC. The term is defined in the national party bylaws as the period between national conventions. If states that exceed 20% of the membership form a region, they get two reps and two alternates. California, having about 17% of the national membership by itself almost always joins with other states.

For the most recent term, California joined with Arizona and Hawaii. These states agreed that Arizona would supply one rep California would supply

[California] (Continued on page 7)

Where Your Money Went

The Badnarik, Nolan, and Russo Campaigns

We now have first quarter reports for the Badnarik, Nolan, and Russo Presidential campaigns, and can report how much money they raised and how it was spent.

For the quarter, the Badnarik campaign received \$7987 and spent \$8240, with \$300 for website work, \$1750 to Lorrie Kopp for contract services, and the remainder for travel and telephone expenses. The Nolan campaign had income of \$19411 in January, \$10963 in February, and \$15,351 in March. It spent \$9489, \$21548, and \$14239 in the same months. Its money went substantially to travel expenses and airline tickets, minimal sums to people regularly seen traveling with Nolan, \$7000 to Advocacy Ink for 'media services', and under \$3000 to Steve Dasbach for 'campaign management'. The Russo campaign took in \$13628 and spent \$15918, including \$3300 for web site support. The rest went for travel-related expenses. If you are looking for people raking it in out of political campaigns, you will need to look elsewhere.

In other news, the Libertarian Party of Massachusetts in its first quarter started with \$7295, had

[Where Your Money Went] (Continued on page 12)

Letter

I would think at this time a year getting candidates on the ballot would be a top priority. I received a letter from the LNP stating that they need a \$90,000 new system to manage their membership database. They would be able to "fire off" mailings to special interest groups.

Here in the Ninth Hampden House District the number of useful registered Libertarians could easily be managed with less than a dozen index cards. Needless to say I am not motivated to donate to the management of what I and others have found to be a rather useless list.

In my case all but two Libertarians have refused to sign my petition (one of the signers was my wife) I am also hearing the same thing from other people, the list of registered Libertarians is useless. The LNP should be encouraging people to help candidates get on the ballot and collect signatures. Not in providing distractions.

I am not sure whether the regional make up of the state committee make it more effective one way or another. Every time I mention something that the state party could do to help, I am usually told that it is not the function of the state committee. Looking at my own experience, most of the things I have done to help elect Libertarians were done independently of the State Committee. Hopefully that will change and the new state committee will see themselves more as missionaries, rather than a high priest sitting in a temple.

One can go a long time here and not have anyone say to vote Libertarian, or explaining what the party is. Usually they say "Vote for Me," as though one Libertarian dictator will change things. I am just using this as an example, but Kemal Jain was the top vote getter in Springfield. People who voted for him did not vote for other Libertarian Candidates. In other areas with other candidates it was pretty much the same story. In many cases there were no other Libertarian Candidates to vote for because of the belief that local races should succeed or fail on their own merits, so with few exceptions, everyone failed.

Somehow we are not connecting the issues to a group of candidates. Nor are we getting the message through as to how to achieve change. Pot heads fill out their Libertarian self assessment, maybe register Libertarian, and then gawk at the petitioner in a fog. People voted against the income tax, then voted for people who want an income tax. This is one area where a state wide effort might connect the party with the platform.

...Robert Joseph Underwood
PVLA Member

Now Available in Paperback

George Phillis' books *Stand Up for Liberty!* on the Local Organization Strategy for the Libertarian Party, and *Funding Liberty* on the 1996-2000 Presidential campaign anomalies, are now available in paperback and ebook format. For more information <http://www.3mpub.com/phillis>

(Continued from page 1) [Neoconservatism]

complain, "Every piece of good news has been hailed as turning the corner, even as the insurgency has remained stubbornly strong."

This from a magazine that has consistently served as a conduit for administration propaganda, that constantly plumbed for war, and that, a year ago, ran an article by the classicist scholar and warmonger of note Victor Davis Hanson, in which he wrote:

"In general, the media has now gone from the hysteria of the Armageddon of Afghanistan to the quagmire of Iraq to the looting in Baghdad – the only constant is slanted coverage, mistaken analysis, and the absence of any contriteness about being in error and in error in such a manner that reflected so poorly upon themselves and damaged the country at large at a time of war. It is as if only further bad news could serve as a sort of catharsis that might at least cleanse them of any unease about being so wrong so predictably and so often. "

Whose analysis is "mistaken" now? Whose errors have damaged the country at large? Every bit of bad news, over the months, all the indications of impending disaster, have been routinely dismissed by National Review's writers as due to "media bias," the consequence of an antiwar conspiracy to hide the real truth about our supposed success in Iraq.

Ah, but suddenly there appears an abyss....! I'd like to push Victor Davis Hanson and the editors of National Review into it head first. The editors of National Review led a smear campaign against conservatives and libertarians who opposed the war, deeming them "Unpatriotic Conservatives," and yet now these same people are repeating the arguments of Patrick J. Buchanan, Lew Rockwell, myself, adopting the paleoconservatives critique of "democratic" imperialism. Like Brooks, the National Review editorial makes some minor criticisms of the Bush policy as imperialism "on the cheap," but the main problem, as far as they are concerned, is:

"An intellectual mistake made prior to the occupation: an underestimation in general of the difficulty of implanting democracy in alien soil, and an overestimation in particular of the sophistication of what is fundamentally still a tribal society and one devastated by decades of tyranny. This was largely, if not entirely, a Wilsonian mistake. The Wilsonian tendency has grown stronger in conservative foreign-policy thought in recent years, with both benefits (idealism should occupy an important place in American foreign policy, and almost always has) and drawbacks (as we have seen in Iraq, the world isn't as an hardly find anything in this with which to disagree – except to note that one of the biggest and most energetic promoters of this mistaken Wilsonian tendency has been none other than National Review.

What else is one to make of Michael Ledeen's constant paeans to the glories of what he calls "creative destruction" in the Middle East, and countless articles in that magazine urging the extension

Web Pages:

Worcester wcla.tripod.com
Western Massachusetts pvla.NET
America and the World www.cmlc.org (Now in Spanish)

of the war into Syria, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and beyond? Wasn't it Rich Lowry, the editor of National Review, who infamously suggested the nuking of Mecca as a prelude to the occupation of Saudi Arabia. I suppose one could claim that the mindset of Lowry and his co-thinkers and fellow editors owes more to Dr. Strangelove than to Woodrow Wilson, but this hardly exculpatory. Second only to The Weekly Standard, none have been louder or more consistent in calling for war in the Middle East than National Review.

What is appalling is the utter dishonesty of their arguments: yesterday, Pat Buchanan was an "unpatriotic conservative" for making the very same arguments against the neoconservative's democracy fetish as National Review now borrows and claims as its own. It was Buchanan, after all, who recently wrote:

"Bush's world democratic revolution is Wilsonian imperialism, which contains an inherent and perhaps fatal contradiction. Imperialism means we decide the government a nation will have and how its foreign policy shall be oriented. Democracy means they decide. What do we do if we impose democracy on Iraq, and the Iraqis use their freedom to vote to throw us out and confront Israel and claim Kuwait as their long-lost province?"

Buchanan wrote that in the beginning of April, but he had been saying it long before the wisdom of the principle ever dawned on the editors of National Review. In 1999, he outlined what he called a "New Americanism":

"We need a new foreign policy rooted neither in the Wilsonian Utopianism of the Democrat Party nor the Pax Americana of the Republican think tanks and little magazines, a policy that reflects the goodness and greatness of this Republic, but also an awareness that we were not put on this earth to lord it over other nations. The true third way is a New Americanism that puts America first, but 'goes not abroad in search of monsters to destroy,' that defends America's freedom, frontiers, citizens, security, and vital interests, but harbors no desire to impose our vision on any other people."

Yet, for embracing this anti-Wilsonian skepticism, Buchanan was smeared by David Frum, in National Review, as a "defeatist" and I was attacked by Frum as a spoke on the axis of evil, who wrote that the paleoconservative critics of Bush's war policy are "yearning for defeat." He cites a piece by Eric Margolis, and then goes on to attack me:

"Raimondo was more explicit still on March 12, 2003. Speaking of the negative consequences he foresaw of even a successful American campaign in Iraq, he wrote: 'It is a high price to pay for 'victory' – so high that patriots might almost be forgiven if they pine for defeat.'"

Having pushed America into the Iraqi abyss, Frum and his neoconservative buddies blame me for making the prescient point that the only direction we can go is rapidly downward. Of course, they bear no responsibility. It's the Iraqis' fault – they aren't civilized enough to appreciate their own liberation. The White House is to blame: The President isn't sending enough troops, he isn't spending enough money. It's the Penta-

gon that's at fault: the generals aren't expending enough American – and Iraqi – lives. The solution, as the editors of National Review aver, is to hunker down and fall back on the principle of naked brutality:

"In light of recent events, however, we should downplay expectations. If we leave Iraq in some sort of orderly condition, with some sort of legitimate non-dictatorial government and a roughly working economy, we will be doing very well. The first step toward that goal is dealing harshly with our enemies."

The National Review solution is blood and iron. They entitled their manifesto "An End to Illusion," but whose illusions are they talking about? Theirs? Ours? Perhaps both. Reconciled to the reality – that our crusade in Iraq is a futile one – the last remnants of what had once been the conservative movement are reduced to the simple pleasures: "dealing harshly" with their perceived "enemies." Especially their enemies on the home front.

And that, I'm afraid, is really the whole point.

What, one has to ask, was the purpose the Iraq war, if not to neutralize Saddam's weapons of mass destruction, or to punish him for his alleged links to Al Qaeda? Why are we in Iraq – and poised to enter into Syria, Iran, Lebanon, and the steppes of Central Asia?

The rising tide of bloodshed, the spiraling costs, the atmosphere of anticipatory terror in which we all live – what is it all for? I would suggest that, of all the items at the top of the neoconservative agenda – the defense of Israel, the elimination of the so-called "Vietnam syndrome," the goal of "benevolent world hegemony," as Bill Kristol describes the goal of American foreign policy, the defeat of an amorphous "terrorist threat" that seems to include any and all who resist the advance of American power – the real goal is much closer to home. What the neocons are after is the final overthrow of our old republic, and the completion of the transition to Empire.

I have spoken, today, of the neocons, short for neoconservatives, as if their identity and politics were not problematic. But who are these guys, anyway – and what do they believe? I have covered this topic not only in my columns, but in my first book, *Reclaiming the American Right: The Lost Legacy of the Conservative Movement*. (A book that is now, alas, out of print.) And so I won't repeat myself here, except to say that this small but very influential sect of public intellectuals traces its origins to the radical left-wing of American politics. They started out as Trotskyites, morphed into Scoop Jackson Democrats, and, in the 1980s, found themselves in the right wing of the Republican party. Their theme, as long as the cold war lasted, had always been a bellicose foreign policy, animated by an obsessive hatred of their old enemies in the Kremlin. But with the implosion of the Red Empire, their *raison d'être* was radically abbreviated: adrift in the post-cold war era, the neocon movement seemed to wither on the vine, and was fast losing ground to a new "isolationism" – that is, a new awareness that it was time to the U.S. government to start putting America and Americans first. The Republican leadership opposed the Kosovo war, and was critical of every one of Bill Clinton's foreign adventures.

Let Freedom Ring!

Many conservatives were close to endorsing non-interventionism in principle.

Then came 9/11.

Their foreign policy, an unrestrained push for American dominance, had been a hard sell in the initial years of the post-cold war era, and their domestic agenda – dubbed "national greatness" conservatism, seemed far too grandiose for most. America, they argued, was enjoying what the columnist Charles Krauthammer called "the unipolar moment," that is, unrivaled power on the world scene that caused the French to invent a new and slightly derisive label us: the hyperpower, i.e. a power that was so far above all others that it ascended to a whole new level. The US, argued Krauthammer, and others, had to seize this moment before it passed. Global hegemony was within our reach: we had only to reach out and grasp it. to realize all the dreams of Alexander, Caesar, and Napoleon combined.

This mindset was ready – nay, eager! – to embrace the post-9/11 principles of preemptive warfare and civilizational conflict, having formulated them long before. They moved with stunning speed to secure public support for policies that would normally be considered outrageous, and, while the nation was still numb with shock, started planning the Iraq war before the smoke had cleared from the skies over lower Manhattan.

Both Bob Woodward and former counter-terrorism czar Richard Clarke, in their respective books, detail the story of how Cheney and Wolfowitz wanted to strike Iraq immediately after the World Trade Towers were hit, and the war planning began soon afterward, in November of 2001. Woodward details the testimony of Colin Powell, who was shocked to find that Che-

ney and his neocon minions had set up what Powell called "a separate government," bypassing the elaborate system of institutional checks and balances, as well as congressional oversight, and manufactured the case for war out of whole cloth.

In a fascinating article in the New Yorker, Seymour Hersh described the mysterious origins and functions of a semi-secret Pentagon sub-agency, the "Office of Special Plans," that fed raw intelligence of dubious provenance to a complicit White House and an even more gullible public, in what amounted to a systematic campaign of lies designed to push, cajole, and ultimately trick us into war.

This is all coming out now, and one big benefit to my job as editorial director of Antiwar.com is that I get to read the news of this as it comes off the wire. The neocons are – finally – getting their come-uppance. To which one can only add: Glory, glory, hallelujah!

But it's too early to celebrate quite yet. The neocons may be discredited, that is, exposed as lying manipulators with a positively creepy obsession with bloodlust and a fixation on the Middle East. But they are far from defeated. Their main mission –getting us into Iraq – has succeeded. The United States is in there for at least a decade, if not more – and the terrorist threat is not ameliorated, but increased.

The sense that we are living in an emergency, in the midst of a crisis, is essential to the strategy of the neocons in gaining and keeping power. In the realm of foreign policy, it justifies our rampage through the Middle East, and all the aggressive posturing that they love. The end of history is postponed indefinitely.

It is on the home front, however, that the real battle is being waged, and it is on this battleground that the neocons show their true colors, coming out of the closet, so to speak, as what Claes Ryn and Paul Craig Roberts describe as "neo-Jacobins." The original Jacobins were the most radical – and bloodthirsty – faction of the French Revolution, and when they gained power they set up the guillotine in the public square, created a police state, and launched a furious pogrom that ended only when Robespierre met his end on the very guillotine to which he had condemned thousands.

As the Robespierre of the neocons, George W. Bush is leading the charge to abridge if not abolish the Bill of Rights – and sweep away the last remnants of constitutional government in America. Pushing the lie that our government didn't have the authority or the resources to stop a terrorist conspiracy that was years in the making, Bush not only wants to renew but to extend the odious "Patriot" Act, which translates the principle of preemptive war to the domestic scene. Government snoops can now read your email, as well as your snail mail, secretly search your home, lock you up without pressing any specific charges and hold you indefinitely – all without judicial oversight, which is merely perfunctory mandates acquiescence in the name of the "national emergency."

The state of permanent emergency, created by a foreign policy that makes enemies aplenty, justifies, in turn, a rollback of

Continued on page 5)

Show Your Liberty Spirit!

Become

yourname@4liberty.net

Now \$14/month

for Libertarians

excell.net/excellnet_national-dialups.htm

Dialup in most states and Canada.

**Libertarian Owned
Libertarian Operated
Supporters of the
Pioneer Valley
Libertarian Association**

(Continued from page 4)

civil liberties on the home front – and, of course, crushing taxation. War is the health of the State – this libertarian maxim, originally penned by the great turn-of-the-last-century classical liberal, Randolph Bourne, is grimly illustrated by recent events.

This is why libertarians oppose the war plans of our leaders, and why libertarianism is the polar opposite of neoconservatism. The tendency of war is to centralize economic and political power, to intrude the long arm of government into every sector of the private sphere, to militarize and regiment society and enforce uniformity of thought. George W. Bush's program of perpetual war, in effect, means the overthrow of our old republic. In sounding the call to do battle against an amorphous and omnipresent enemy that cannot be defeated for at least a generation, he is sounding the death knell of the American political idea, which is of a government strictly limited by custom and the Constitution.

We are the last defenders of that idea left standing. I say we, and let me take a moment, here, to explain where I'm coming from. I was a libertarian before there was a libertarian party, recruited to the movement in the days when libertarianism existed as a small but energetic faction of the larger conservative movement. We didn't have any magazines, or any thinktanks – aside from the relatively small Foundation for Economic Education – or any real national group. All we had were a few newsletters, most of them mimeographed, not printed, and a large group of us, mostly students, were in the conservative Young Americans for Freedom (known as YAF), where we were a vocal and visible presence.

We saw how the George W. Bush of our era – Richard M. Nixon – escalated the war in Vietnam even as he instituted wage-and-price controls. The Republicans, we learned back then, were the party of war and Big Government – and the two inevitably went hand-in-hand. Today, history is repeating itself – and, if the first time was as tragedy, then the second time is farce of truly monumental proportions.

Although I am no longer a member of the Libertarian Party, I was active in the party for roughly a decade, from the presidential campaign of Roger MacBride to that of Ed Clark, the mid-Seventies to the mid-Eighties, and so being invited to speak here is, for me, a special treat. It gives me the chance to say what I have always wanted to say to my – well, I won't say comrades, because that word has unfortunate historical connotations – but you get the idea. And what I want to say is this:

This country needs a strong libertarian party, a party of liberty, as never before in its history. Perhaps not since the first American libertarians decided they'd had enough of the English King and decided to venture out on their own. Whether we have to take the course they took, at Lexington and Concord, and take back our country from a conniving cabal through means not limited to the ballot box remains to be seen. That, however, is the worst case scenario, and, I am more of an optimist, by nature, than that.

The American people are not easily pushed around, or at least

not so easily as the neocons seem to think. The conniving cabal that pulled off a veritable coup d'etat, and dragged us into war, is now being exposed, and one thing they don't like is the spotlight. That is one of Antiwar.com's greatest achievements, I am proud to say: the perfidious role of the neocons, formerly obscure, is now common knowledge.

My very first article posted on Antiwar.com, back in the early 1990s, was a screed exposing their key role as the sparkplug of the War Party, the energizing factor behind the push to involve us in conflicts from Kosovo to Cairo. Back then, hardly anyone knew what I was talking about. Today their history as the troublesome catalyst for much of the conflict in the world is well-known. While the neocons deny their own existence, generally, and deride such political folklore as a "conspiracy theory," and worse, the degree to which our present peril has been traced back to them was brought home to me the other day when I was talking politics with my mailman.

"Oh, this war," he said – it was all the handiwork of "those neocons!" Yes, the world doesn't want for bad guys, these days. There seems to be an oversupply of evil on the market. But who are the good guys? Or, rather, where are they?

For the most part, I am sad to say, libertarians have not played the key role they ought to be playing during this crucial time. As we face the greatest threat to our liberties since the Alien and Sedition Acts, and the machinations of the Federalist Party, a few have played exemplary roles as individuals. I am thinking here of people like James Bovard, whose book, *Terrorism and Tyranny*, has done much to expose the statist agenda behind the War Party's fulminations. I am thinking of Karen Kwiatkowski, whose inside account of the shenanigans engaged in by the Office of Special Plans preceded the revelations of Richard Clarke and Colin Powell via Bob Woodward. I am thinking of the dedicated staff and governing board of Antiwar.com, which gave libertarians a platform from which to address an audience of 50,000-plus daily.

But as an organized movement, a party – the party of liberty – libertarians have taken no leadership role in the fightback. At a time when libertarians ought to be providing political as well as ideological leadership to the variegated forces that oppose this war, our voice has sometimes been equivocal. The Libertarian Party has acted as if all issues are equally important, and given the question of war and peace no more attention than they would the privatization of garbage collection or the abolition of local sales taxes. If any war has seemed to concern them above all others, it is the so-called "war on drugs."

In short, libertarians have good ideas, but they lack any strategic sense. They don't know how to prioritize, and often they just refuse to. A good example is the decision to invite noted warmonger and Bush defender Neal Boortz as a major speaker at the LP National Convention – on the grounds that his general opposition to government regulation, and especially gun control laws, overrides (or renders irrelevant) his disagreement with the official position of the party on the war, the PATRIOT Act, and the growing prospect of future overseas conflicts.

This is a grave error, one that will ensure that the great oppor-

Let Freedom Ring!

tunities presented by the current crisis will pass us right by. We aren't Republicans, and haven't been since Nixon bombed Cambodia, cut the last links between legal tender and gold, and ushered in the era of Republican Big Government, and we have to stop pretending otherwise. Of course, we aren't Democrats, either, but their constituency – antiwar, pro-civil liberties, anti-neocon – is clearly up for grabs. John Kerry is positioning himself to the right of Bush on foreign policy: he not only refuses to call for an exit strategy in Iraq, but talks about how we're "trying to do it on the cheap." We have to really get in there and "nation-build," he says. But the whole point is that it isn't our nation to build.

Americans don't want an Empire on which the sun never sets: they broke away from such an entity on the occasion of their birth as a nation, and it isn't in their character to want one of their own. Opposition to this war, and the foreign policy that made it inevitable, is running high: more than half the people oppose it. Yet both "major" party candidates support the war, the "nation-building," the pernicious idea that we can or should "pay any price, bear any burden," as John F. Kennedy put it during the cold war era – pernicious because the price is our liberty, our unique identity as Americans.

Ralph Nader shows some promise: he has started out his campaign by attacking Bush as a "messianic militarist," and calling for "a date certain" for a US withdrawal from Iraq, suggesting that we set a deadline of six months from now. This is derided by the "majors" as hopeless radicalism, and both Bush and Kerry denounced it as irresponsible, yet it is a stance taken by as much as half the voters, whose position goes unrepresented by either of the two parties.

Where is the Libertarian Party in all this? If the LP is going to survive well into the 21st century, it must make a focused and energetic appeal to antiwar sentiment, and the growing number of voters for whom this is the most important issue, some 35 percent. But Nader is stealing what ought to be our thunder. While the LP engages in a protracted internal discussion and nominating procedure, Nader is already on the campaign trail, tying up the third party vote.

Okay, so the presidential sweepstakes is largely symbolic, a publicity-generating device which is supposed to benefit local candidates. But what kind of local races is the LP running? In California, where I've lived for the past 30-plus years, the party is fielding a full slate of candidates for ... local Water Boards, local Community College Boards, and a host of other obscure elected offices – hardly the sort of races that lend themselves to discussions of foreign policy. But why not run for Congress, in races where both "major" candidates represent the two-party consensus on the war and our interventionist foreign policy? During the Vietnam war era, independent peace candidates running in general elections as well as Democratic primaries gained a real electoral foothold and, with a little sustained effort, might have cultivated a solid political base.

Certainly the Libertarian Party represents nothing if

not a sustained effort. What is lacking is political imagination, and a basic strategic sense. For over 30 years, the LP has held high the banner of liberty every election season, hoping against hope that, this year, they'd make the big breakthrough and garner national attention. It has yet to happen, but if it ever does, it is bound to be in a time of tumult very much like the year 2004. The opportunity is there, but is the leadership?

The answer is not yet clear.

Outreach – it's on the agenda at all the national and state LP committee meetings, but it has no living embodiment. The primary party publication, the LP News, a monthly newspaper, is typically devoted to the arcane world of the party itself: so-and-so did this, that party official said this, blah blah blah, of no possible interest to anyone unless they are already a member – and to a precious few of those.

To read the LP News, you'd never know there was a war on, You'd never know that this has been the bloodiest month of the war so far, with the prospect of more looming as an immediate likelihood. In the literature and public pronouncements of the LP there is scant mention of the most important issue we are all facing, and that is the question of war and peace.

Most people don't sit down and decide which ideology to adopt, like buying a new suit and trying on different styles systematically and consciously. People are rarely recruited into an ideological movement on the basis of pure abstractions. What actually occurs is that they gradually come to accept its precepts and authority as they see the power of its ideas in action.

There is only one way forward for the libertarian movement, and that is as the catalyst of a mass-based, non-leftist antiwar movement, fiercely dedicated to the defense of civil liberties and organized outside the two "major" parties – albeit not without making inroads on each. We also have to begin to recruit from the Left as well as the Right. Young people today are not attracted to Marxism, but to anarchism of the left-wing variety. The question of how these young lefties are going to achieve a society that is at once property-less and State-less is a conundrum that ought to baffle them, if only it is brought to their attention. Unfortunately, they never get to hear such arguments, since libertarians are so busy playing footsie with Neal Boortz and the Republicans.

Libertarianism, as it comes of age politically, is bound to reassert itself as an ideology that goes beyond "left" and "right." These archaic categories, based on the seating arrangements in the French Parliament circa 1790, serve only to mask the real ideological divide in this country – but that is another lecture altogether, and, I fear, a much longer oneJustin Raimondo

Let Freedom Ring!

(Continued from page 1) [Neoconservatism]

censure any of the region's representatives or alternates at any time in any manner consistent with LPC bylaws. The LPC shall notify the LPH and the LPO by email of any changes in representatives or alternates within 72 hours.

The LPC agrees to report to the Chairs of the LPH and the LPO following each LNC meeting. The LPC further agrees to solicit the opinion of the LPH and LPO chairs prior to LNC votes of major consequence whenever practicable.

The LPC agrees that one of the representatives will visit HI and OR at least twice during the term of this agreement and be available to answer questions from any members of the LPH or LPO invited to such meetings.

The LPH and LPO Chairs may contact either representative or either alternate on any matter of LNC business.

Being Credible as a Party

In response to the remarks of Chuck Muth "...Too bad the Libertarians can't get their political act together and actually offer credible alternative candidates at the state legislative level (the operative word here, LP'ers, is "credible")..."

Ken Sturzenacker proposes what 'credible' means:

The operative word is indeed "credible", meaning, at the very least: 1) Both well-known and well-respected in one's local community.

2) 'Active' in one's own community - thru charities, neighborhood organizations, sports leagues, etc, etc. - sufficiently to have a base of support.

3) Being prepared: Having volunteers who help you get the sigs you need in your district within the first couple of weeks. NO credible LP candidate in PA, even at the statewide level, should ever have to 'go down to the wire' with signature collection. EVERY Pennsylvania candidate for state rep/state senate should be finished with sigs no later than Memorial Day.

4) Being prepared: Knowing cold their list of the three top priorities for the campaign within a week after the required sigs are gathered, including having rehearsed how to respond to hostile questions at their initial news conference.

5) Being prepared: Having 2-3 individuals who are committed to the fundraising necessary to run a competitive campaign. They should be in place and contacting people as soon as the petition drive starts.

6) Being prepared: Knowing not only LP solutions, but also how to explain to non-LPers concisely and precisely how and why the current government "solutions" are not solutions at all.

The operative phrase, this year, is "state legislative level." In 2005, it will be municipal and county elections.

We are the party of entrepreneurs, folks: after 30 years, ballot access should not be a problem, IF we were properly prepared at

the appropriate time - early enough to get that task completed quickly. In essence, that means starting January 1 of 2005 for the 2006 elections. Otherwise, why would an individual successful in his or her own region be willing to associate publicly with a group which routinely gives off the impression of not being able to get its act together - including biting off, in terms of campaigns, more than it can chew?

And, yes, in my opinion, we do have to be more prepared and, if you like, "superior" to most of the candidates the Ds and Rs put forward. They have vast advantages in organization, name recognition, personnel and financial resources, plus years and years of habit and inertia on their side - pulling one or the other party lever, putting volunteers outside most of the nearly 10,000 voting locations on election day.

In order to overcome all of that, we have to work much more efficiently at giving voters sufficient reason to abandon and ignore all of what they have done in the past - to give it up both mentally and emotionally—in order to support us. We have the far superior product, liberty; but we have done a dismal job of marketing it. Fundamentally, we are asking people who have supported the vast welfare state and believe that it works to admit that they have been mistaken about that, that they are wrong - as the necessary pre-condition before they can genuinely support the LP and its candidates, rather than just cast a protest vote.

Looking ahead....go back to your recycle bins, and get out newspapers from Thursday and Friday, when the press tried to analyze where the Specter-Toomey votes came from. In the strong Toomey areas, emphasize the economic side of our platform, school choice, the right to keep and bear arms. In the strong Specter areas, talk mostly civil liberties, including the failures of the drug war at home, and opposition to the military's wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

(Continued from page 1) [About California]

one rep and the two alternates.

For the upcoming term, California has a tentative agreement with Oregon and Hawaii, but California gets all the seats. California Chair Aaron Starr claimed this agreement was a done deal, while Oregon Chair Adam Mayer and Executive Director Richard Burke originally reported that no such deal is in place. Such a deal has now appeared. This matter was not discussed at the recent state conventions in Oregon or Hawaii.

California, believing that they had a deal, held an election at their most recent convention on March 14th to fill these seats. M Carling and Aaron Starr were elected as reps, as reported to the national committee by Scott Lieberman on March 15th as being effective at the beginning of the next LNC term.

On March 22nd, a week later, I received the following reply from Mr. Carling:

"Thank you. Actually, while Aaron's term will start at the end of the national convention, I have already replaced Joe Dehn as regional rep."

I forwarded this statement to the LNC the following day. I accepted Carling's claim at face value. It turned out to be news to everybody, especially Joe Dehn.

On March 23rd, Carling asserted, "I was elected March 14.

Let Freedom Ring!

Per the LPC bylaws and RONR, that took effect immediately." Later that day, Mr. Starr sent his reasoning, which stated that LP of California bylaws are silent on the term for this particular office, and thus Roberts' Rules of Order governs. Roberts' states: "An officer-elect takes possession of his office immediately upon his election's becoming final, unless the bylaws or other rules specify a later time."

After some extensive wrangling, the upshot was that on March 28th, fully two weeks after the LPC Convention, Starr finally provided enough requested information that LNC Secretary Steve Givot could rule in favor of unseating Joe Dehn and replacing him with M Carling immediately.

Here is where I shift from narrative to opinion:

It would have been simpler if Mr. Starr had been ready to supply sufficient documentation at the time of the election. It also would have been simpler if he had brought it to our attention directly. Someone who lives by the rules should follow them all the time. If Mr. Starr wanted Mr. Carling on the board immediately, he should have told us at the time. Such important decisions should be made by the state convention, or similar expression of the will of the membership, with full knowledge of their options and the facts, and not by a state Chair interpreting the meaning of votes days after the fact.

This act may well have been done completely by the book, yet it is most dishonorable. Starr and Carling together took a course of action that belongs to the membership. They stole two months of Joe Dehn's term from him, and stole his chance for an honorable exit from the LNC after over a decade of service.

Being legal doesn't make it right. We have seen the rule of law as an instrument of theft in our government, and now we witness it within our own party. This incident shows much about the difference between being correct and being right.

The California Judicial Committee Agrees

On April 18th, LNC Chair Geoff Neale shared with the LNC the following statement from Ray Strong, speaking on behalf of the LPC Judicial Committee:

"LPC Officials and interested parties,

"On Saturday, April 17, after a hearing, the LPC Judicial Committee ruled in the negative on the following question:

"Is it consistent with the governing documents of the LPC that the term of an LNC Rep who is elected at an LPC Convention begin immediately upon election as opposed to beginning with the LNC meeting at the end of the next National Convention?"

"The vote of the Judicial Committee on this issue was three negative and two positive.

"A report from the Judicial Committee on its reasoning and recommendations will be produced within a couple of weeks.

"The Judicial Committee wishes to thank each of you for your assistance in our reaching this determination."

To this, Neale replied:

"I want to state to everyone on the LNC that the fact that I received notice that the California Judicial Committee made this ruling does not constitute sufficient grounds for me or any member of the LNC, including the Secretary, to reverse the prior direction of the California Chair.

"I am copying Aaron Starr, Chair of California, on this email. The responsibility to report this decision is his and his alone."

The same day, Starr replied to Neale:

"I'm waiting for the formal report of the LPC Judicial Committee to analyze their opinions. I expect to talk to you shortly thereafter."

As of this writing there have been no new developments. I believe that the act of a State Chair refusing to immediately accept a ruling from his state's Judicial Committee speaks for itself. Again, people who live by the rules must be consistent in their application, or they should not be in leadership positions.

To his credit, Carling quickly informed us that he had offered his resignation from the LNC to the LPC Executive Committee, and moved its acceptance.

Motion to Remove Starr and Carling from LNC Committees

On April 3rd, I requested a mail ballot on the proposition "that Aaron Starr and M Carling be removed from the Audit and Bylaws Committees." (Both men serve on both committees.) This motion was seconded by Lee Wrights, Steve Trinward, and Mark Nelson. (There were others, but these were the first three to meet the required number for a mail ballot.) The following day, Neale recognized the motion.

Mr. Nelson offered to resign from his position as Chair of both committees in light of his support of this motion. To date, thankfully, Neale has not taken him up on that offer.

I offered the following reasoning for my motion: "I believe this action is necessary to retain the confidence of the board and the membership in the reports of these committees. They must be free from the appearance of conflict of interest, or any other suspicion that their recommendations are tainted by personal interests. I want the debate on these reports to be solely about the merits of their proposals, and not about the personalities of the people who produce these reports."

The incident described above points out a flaw in the national party bylaws. If the Bylaws Committee report recommends closing the loophole exploited by Starr and Carling, and those two names are on the report, I fear the recommendations no matter what they are will be viewed with suspicion by many convention delegates. For separate yet similar reasons, the report of the Audit Committee could receive the same unnecessary extra scrutiny.

The mail ballot vote was delayed for two reasons. One is the resignation of LNC Secretary Steve Givot (see below). The other is that we were persuaded to split the motion four ways and conduct an informal straw poll, which was administered by Mid-Atlantic Regional Rep Fred Childress.

On April 12th, Childress reported the straw poll results

"Should M Carling be asked to step down from the Audit Committee for the good of the LP? Yes = 5, No = 4, *Abstain = 7

"Should M Carling be asked to step down from the Bylaws Committee for the good of the LP? "Yes = 8, No = 1, Abstain = 7

"Should Aaron Starr be asked to step down from the Audit Committee for the good of the LP? "Yes 7, No 2, Abstain 7

"Should Aaron Starr be asked to step down from the Bylaws Committee for the good of the LP? Yes 6, No 3, Abst 7

Let Freedom Ring!

"* Reminder that the straw poll email stated: Members that remain silent will be treated as abstentions. One member stated that his silence did not mean an abstention. Another member said he would recuse himself from the vote."

The day before the straw poll results were released, Neale began the 15-day voting period on the four motions. That means the results should be available on or about April 26th. [Editor: I understand that the motions failed for lack of a quorum.]

Tricky Dick's Dirty Tricks - Lite

I have been quite outspoken within the confines of LNC discussion on these matters. But what I say to them I generally try to keep in that room. It does not suit my sense of decorum to go to people or groups outside the LNC to lobby for my positions there. In my meeting reports, I try my best to fairly report all the issues, and to clearly label my opinion as such when I give it.

However, in this case, others have taken my words and those of others in that discreet forum (I know better than to think it is private) and spread them around liberally. I no longer have any reason to withhold any of this from you.

This is a lesson for future Libertarian office holders. You should expect the kind of behavior described below from your political opponents as you try to find your voice in a legislative body. I made the above motion on April 3rd. Less than one hour later, Scott Lieberman forwarded it to the State Chairs' email list, lobbying hard against it. I do not mind people knowing what I am doing on the LNC, but I did find this tactic inappropriate.

Apparently most of my posts on the LNC list on this topic have been circulated to the LPC (California) Executive Committee. Several of them have attempted to use my efforts to cause trouble for me at home, most notably Bruce Cohen, a regional rep to the LPC Executive Committee.

I solved this problem by forwarding all their communications in their entirety to my state's Executive Committee, the LPNC email discussion list, and the LNCSouthEast chairs' and activists' list. I am grateful to report that of the dozen or so responses I received, only one took issue with my actions.

On April 6th Cohen wrote the LPNC Executive Committee:

"It brings me no pleasure to write this letter. Mister Haugh has always been kind, helpful and polite to me.

"However, I must formally complain about his recent actions in regards to an internal California LP Party matter. Sean has no reason, right nor cause to involve himself in another state's business, specifically the election of our new representative to the National LP. He's stirred up a hornet's nest of internal controversy, privately lobbying LPCA members to object to our seating Mister M Carling, our new LP representative, in a timely and proper fashion.

"I don't understand why he might do this, but it's clearly so improper, I feel Mister Haugh should be admonished and censured at the very least.

"Do I, as a member of the California LP have standing to bring a complaint before your Judicial Committee, or would I need to join the Carolina LP?

"I thank you for your time and attention to this matter."

The following day, after I had politely informed him that you have to be a resident of North Carolina to join the LPNC, and even if he had standing this is still not within the jurisdiction of our Judicial Committee, Cohen followed up with this message to our Executive Committee:

"Unhappily, I have now found out the improper behavior and action of Mister Haugh runs both deeper and wider than I originally knew. What originally was a case of Sean involving himself where he clearly didn't belong, has developed even further.

"As I understand it, your Executive Director is now objecting to Aaron Starr keeping his seat on the LP Audit Committee. The logic for removing of Mister Starr is so clearly incorrect; one must wonder what Sean's motivation is. Some have suggested this is to prevent discovery of cooking the books at National.

"Sean is making the case that Aaron is too controversial to sit on the Audit Committee, due to the question of when California could seat its new National Executive Committee representative. Considering that Mister Haugh was the creator of this controversy, and is bent on perpetuating it, I find his reasoning not only unacceptable and unethical, but plain old counter-productive.

"I again call for the North Carolina LP's attention to this matter and for Mister Haugh's admonishment and censure at a minimum."

To these missives, LPNC State Chair Barbara Howe replied:

"While I am trying very hard to appreciate your concerns, I find no information in the correspondences I have been privy to suggest that anything Sean has done in this matter is in any way related to his position as the Executive Director of North Carolina. If I find out something otherwise, rest assured I will investigate the matter.

"As it stands now, Sean's actions are strictly in his capacity as a member of the LNC. He continues to represent this region well. His involvement in the matters of other regions concerns me only if he is acting in a manner that is illegal or unethical, or if he is neglecting the duties of this region which he represents. So far, I see no evidence of that.

"I hope the current situation in California will be worked out to everyone's satisfaction soon. But the North Carolina Executive Committee is not involved.

"Thanks. And good luck."

Again, I thank God I live in North Carolina.

I must address Mr. Cohen's statements:

First of all, if this simply was an internal state party matter, he's right, it would be none of my business. However, this is a matter of who sits on the national committee, and is thus a national party matter. As a member of the LNC, I cannot in good conscience sit idle when the credentials of our members are called into question. If they were elected through fraudulent means, then it is my duty to investigate, and take action if necessary.

The controversy was not started by me, but by those in California who improperly twisted the rules to commit a fraud against their own state party members. It is a common tactic in politics to blame the whistleblower.

The most egregious lie is the suggestion that "this is to prevent discovery of cooking the books at National." Anyone who has paid even the slightest attention to my record on the LNC would recognize this as slander. I have been a strong advocate of transparency, and working with others on the board we have opened our financial records to the members to an unprecedented degree.

If I am engaged in a cover up, then I must be covering for someone higher up than me. So, who is Mr. Cohen accusing of "cooking the books"?

Let Freedom Ring!

Here's the truth of the matter. There is an issue of how we account for memberships. In the past, we have simply spent the dues money as it comes in. Yet by accepting memberships, we are committing to services, such as LP News, usually for a year but sometimes for life.

Geoff Neale and former Treasurer Deryl Martin recognized early in this term that this is a dangerous method of accounting. We took action in late 2002 to make our accounting practices compliant with industry standards, which includes counting promised services as future liabilities. This was detailed in one of my meeting reports published here, and picked up by LP News.

Our woefully inadequate database has complicated this transition. As you probably know, replacing our database software has been a top priority for some time. First we had to pull out of our financial crisis to purchase it, and now we are in the process of cleaning up our unkempt data and transferring it to the new system. We can't create reliable reports with bad data. So it is with the precise figure of our liability from promised member services. We could release an estimated figure now, but we know it would be a best guess.

The fact that we aren't quoting numbers is not because anybody is trying to hide anything. It's because we just don't know what the numbers are yet.

The independent auditors we hired did say we need to finish addressing this issue. Starr, in his role on the Audit Committee, has taken it upon himself to complete this effort, even to the point of requesting that the entire LP member database be released to him.

While his zeal may be laudable, it's also inappropriate. The work of correcting our data and putting it into usable systems is already being done by Neale and staff. Also, his actions go beyond the charge of the Audit Committee. The audit is supposed to be independent. The role of the committee is to oversee the auditors and review their work, not to perform any aspect of the audit themselves. Otherwise, it wouldn't be independent.

Starr has continued lobbying for his direct involvement even after the LNC Executive Committee ruled that the Audit Committee must stick solely to the requirements handed to them in our December LNC meeting. This behavior makes the case that he has no business on that committee more than anything I could possibly say.

We also heard from Mark Selzer and Lawrence Samuels in California, who sent essentially the same message, but did not follow up as Cohen did. Both also hold positions on the LPC Executive Committee.

Now, does anyone else see the irony in someone running to another state executive committee to ask them to take action against someone because they are allegedly interfering in the affairs of another state party? Sorry, but if what I am accused of doing is inappropriate, then these actions are just as inappropriate for the exact same reasons.

Cohen attempted to justify his behavior in correspondence with Lee Wrights, LPNC Vice Chair, by saying, "The way Sean contacted us could be construed as the same. He certainly did contact LPCA ExCom members."

The actual extent of my communications with LPC members was:

1) When investigating the question of voter intent in the LPC regional rep elections, I posted to the CA-Liberty email list:

"There's a debate on the national committee about who is the current regional rep from your fair state, and I'd like to hear some

information directly from y'all on this. Some say that Joe Dehn remains your rep until the end of the LNC term (the next national convention), while others contend that the results were effective immediately, and so M Carling as your top vote getter has already replaced him.

"My question is for those who attended the LPC state convention. When you voted for your LNC regional reps, was it your understanding that the results of the election would take effect at the beginning of the next term, or, did they take effect immediately?"

I received three replies, all off list, including one from Mr. Cohen.

2) I responded to the letters of Cohen, Samuels, and Selzer. I guess you can also count the debate on the LNC list with Lieberman, Hinkle, and Carling, sometimes copied to Starr.

3) I responded to some few calls and emails from LPC members (not on their Executive Committee) asking for information. I freely gave that information, just as I do to any party members on any topic, along with a caution that any action about this must come from within California and could not be taken by the LNC.

It is not true that I addressed the LPC Executive Committee the way these gentlemen approached the NC ExComm.

Givot Resigns as Secretary, Replaced by Sullentrup

One completely unexpected response to my motion was the resignation of Steve Givot as LNC Secretary. Now, I love Steve Givot. He is one of my very favorite people on this planet. So I do not wish to jump on him for this action, although I do find it distressing. He wrote:

"Sean Haugh's proposed mail ballot has been requested by Mark Nelson, Lee Wrights, and Steve Trinward as well.

"This meets the requirement to place it before the LNC.

"I decline to participate on a board of directors that has the time and inclination to waste time on petty infighting - which goes against the spirit and intent of the organization's strategic plan. Therefore, I hereby tender my resignation, effective immediately.

"I have distributed DRAFT minutes from our last meeting. Since - as usual - no recordings of the meeting have been provided to me - I will not be providing revised minutes for consideration at the May LNC meeting.

"Here is a complete list of what I believe I owe to complete my obligation:

"1. Minutes of the 2002 national convention. These have been prepared, but I am having difficulty locating them. If I cannot locate them by April 15, I will create them again from notes.

"2. Final, revised minutes of our February 2004 LNC meeting.

"3. A revised Policy Manual showing all changes made through February 2004.

"4. The results of the mail ballot regarding a life membership for Andre Marrou.

"If there is anything else that you believe is owed to the LNC, please advise me by April 15.

"This LNC has been the least capable, least focused, least professional, least deliberative, and most disruptive board I have ever served on - related to the LP or otherwise. How many times have motions been made and passed only to be reversed subsequently - only after serious internal disruption which took focus off our mission and placed it on personalities and motives? If any

Let Freedom Ring!

of you think this is an appropriate and prudent way for a board to operate and demonstrate teamwork for the rest of an organization to see as a role model, I think you are mistaken.

"I find it hypocritical that individuals who - themselves, on the LNC - have used the Bylaws and Roberts to (fully legally) narrowly push through motions on short or little notice that were highly controversial and divisive, now express criticism of Aaron Starr and M Carling who - at worst - did the same thing and - at best - were entirely correct and above board in what they did. Why is it right for certain LNC members to do so, but wrongful for others to do so? The hypocrisy makes me want to scream.

"Many of the members of the LNC have a notion of the responsibilities and rights of board member which is uniquely their own and bears no similarity to how those responsibilities and rights are viewed in the real world of governance. As a result, much of what the LNC had done in the past term was haphazard, imprudent, and sloppy. I have no further stomach to participate in the destruction of the LP. You can finish the job without my participation. You are doing an excellent job thus far.

"The injection of internal politics into matters of governance in this term has been disgusting. Yet the LNC has shown little desire to give serious consideration to its own governance structure. For this reason, it seems clear to me that this LNC is content to be followed by successive LNCs which micromanage staff and disrespect the autonomy of our affiliates. That path is not a productive path, and it is not a legacy that I would choose to pass on.

"One final note. I have little respect for those few LNC members who want to take credit for turning around the Party in the current term. Credit for that rightfully belongs to three individuals, in my opinion: Geoff Neale, Deryl Martin, and Joe Seehusen. The rest of us - myself included - empowered them to do what they asked us to empower them to do. They did the heavy lifting. I believe that it is completely disingenuous for any of the rest of us to claim any credit for turning around the party's finances. They did the work; they deserve the credit.

"For all of these reasons, I have tendered my resignation.

"I wish the LP success in achieving its mission, while noting that I am more discouraged about its ability to succeed than I have ever been before.

"Will the last one of you out the door, please remember to turn off the lights. At least that will be productive.

"Steven I. Givot

"Former LNC Secretary"

Suffice to say that my perception of the functionality of this current LNC is about the exact opposite of Givot's. I hope it is clear that Givot's resignation was fully his decision, made for his own reasons. The part of this that I regret the most is that Steve denied to himself the same honorable exit from many years of diligent service on the LNC that was stolen from Joe Dehn.

"Uncle Dad"

I have saved the most offensive part of this sad tale for last.

On April 9th, M Carling sent the following sarcastic message to 14 members of the LNC, excluding those of us who are from southeastern states:

"I would like to let you all know how much I'm enjoying being on the LNC. It's not just lots of fun, but I really appreciate the warm welcome, the kind words, and all the help getting up-to-speed.

"In particular, I appreciate the affections of those members from states where Hallmark sells greeting cards for 'Uncle Dad'. I had never previously experienced the full depth of southern hospitality. It is an experience for which I had not dared to hope and it has enriched my life in ways I had not dared to imagine."

I was sent the subsequent correspondence by a recipient. Such vile remarks against people from a particular region are as unacceptable as those made about one's race, religion, or gender. I do not feel any reaction short of violating that pledge I signed when I joined this party would be inappropriate in light of such an appalling statement.

Carling further compounded his bigoted remarks by defending them. When Lee Wrights, who had also been forwarded this message, took him to task, Carling answered:

"Please don't put words in my mouth or quote me out of context. I didn't write that that was the only thing I wrote. I wrote that that was the only thing I wrote regarding southern states or members thereof. I certainly did write the remark about Hallmark greeting cards. What does that have to do with southern states? Are you suggesting that southerners practice incest?"

"If you want to read the sentence about Hallmark greeting cards as a preface to the sentence about southern hospitality, all I can say is that that is your interpretation and you are entitled to your own opinions. However, if you cannot establish a nexus more solid than your opinion that it is a preface, then I request from you a retraction and an apology."

If Carling was not accusing Southern states of having a bunch of Uncle Dads running around, then to whom was he referring? This kind of hateful bigotry has no place in civil society, much less on the Libertarian National Committee. Permitting an unremorseful bigot to continue in a leadership position speaks ill of the organization that allowed it.

Final words

The great lesson of all this, is that just because somebody does some things well, that does not necessarily mean they belong in leadership positions.

We learned that lesson the hard way in NC. We took our best ever gubernatorial candidate and made him our Chair. He had done did a brilliant job with his campaign. But as Chair he was an autocrat who caused the only schism in our state party's history. It took us a couple years to recover.

So it is also with these gentlemen. Aaron Starr is one of the architects of Operation Breakthrough. M Carling is a very generous donor. Mark Selzer has shown great leadership in public access television, which I have actively promoted to the rest of the country. Efforts by Bruce Cohen and Lawrence Samuels have been the focus of very positive articles I have written for Liberty for All!

Nothing can diminish all these wonderful accomplishments.

However, none of these activities require that these gentlemen be placed in leadership positions. As we found with our own best ever candidate, sometimes the best activist in one area makes the worst possible leader of the whole party. True leadership requires a different set of skills.

Considering the egregious nature of the actions described above by these men, as long as these men remain in top leadership positions in the California LP it brings shame upon the entire state party. If Aaron Starr and M Carling are allowed to take seats on the LNC, that shame will extend to the national party.

[**Editor:** Despite the above, given the two current candidates for Treasurer, I personally prefer Aaron Starr to the alternative, because he has shown—for example, in his highly insightful questioning of Deryl Martin at the 2002 convention—that he has a real grasp of the financial issues that the LNC must face.]

Let Freedom Ring!

(Continued from page 1) [Where Your Money Went]

\$4071 of income, and spent 11,026, leaving it with \$340 cash on hand (and \$1400 in additional first-quarter UMP payments). The debts from the past to Kamal Jain and to Edward McCormick were paid off; the State Committee also donated \$4750 to Michael Cloud's U.S. Senate Campaign to help discharge campaign debts of Michael Cloud's Senate campaign. The State Party also paid \$250 for web site maintenance and \$412 for producing the February Newsletter.

Those of you who did miss the April State Party Board meeting missed the virtuoso performance of Walter Ziobro in not taking a nomination for State Committee. The word 'decline' never passed his lips but his meaning was transparent.

Mass Liberty is again appearing. Reporting on the MA Convention: Gary Nolan rated a paragraph of laudatory adjectives: 'bold, principled..favorably compared to Gene Burns...'

Michael Badnarik gained eight lines of factual description 'has traveled over 25,000 miles...said there should be no compromises for liberty'.

And I was given two and a fraction lines: "On behalf of presidential candidate Aaron Russo, Dr. George Phillies, Senior advisor for the Russo Campaign, gave a speech." If you wondered, it was a speech supporting Russo's nominating campaign.

The more things talk about change, the more things stay the same.

Stand Up for Liberty!

George Phillies on Political Strategy

*Read how Local Organization
can save the Libertarian Party*

Funding Liberty

a new book by **George Phillies**

Party of Principle or Party of Principal?

You be the judge!

Now available as paperback and electronic downloads from Third Millennium Publishing, <http://3mpub.com/phillies>.

Pioneer Valley Libertarian Association

Meets the Second Wednesday of the Month

7PM, Bickford's Family Restaurant, Springfield

Corner of Old Boston Highway and Pasco Roads

(Mass Pike, Exit 7, south on 21 to Old Boston Highway, and three blocks to the Right)

Our Web Pages

<http://www.pvla.net> <http://www.cmlc.org>

<http://wcla.tripod.com>

Brought to you by **www.excell.net**.

Libertarian owned—Libertarian operated

Provider of internet services

Associated Organizations

Log Cabin Libertarians— <http://www.logcabinlibertarians.org>

Coming Soon: Freedom Ballot Access freedomballotaccess.org

Anti-War <http://www.bringthemhomealive.org>

Anti-Draft: <http://www.freedomnotconscription.org>

Pro-America <http://www.revokethepatriotact.org>

