

Liberty for America

Journal of the Libertarian Political Movement

Volume 3 Number 5

October 2010

Table of Contents

Support Ballot Access—2010

Libertarian Donors Club

LNC Rejects Anti-War-On-Drugs Resolution

LNC Debates Issues

LNC Changes the Rules

Who May Be On the

Convention Oversight Committee?

Unfortunate Press Release

Root Raises Money for Republican

LNC Finances Improve

Support Ballot Access—2010

There are four states in which the 2010 elections can have a positive effect on Libertarian ballot access: Illinois, Iowa, New Hampshire, and New York.

The only candidates who can affect ballot access in New Hampshire are John Babiarz (Governor) and Ken Blevens (U.S. Senator). In 2008, Blevens ran for Senate and got 3.1 % of the vote; 4% is needed. New Hampshire is the smallest of the states in question, and has had an influx of potential LP voters thanks to the Free State Project.

To support Ken Blevens, your only available path at this point is to support the
Liberty for America Political Action Committee
LibertyForAmerica.com/NHFundraising.htm

We are running Facebook ads, and will expand to AdWords ads if the money arrives. (We would expand further to radio ads, but don't see that the money will be available).

The Illinois candidate most likely to be able to succeed in Illinois is Julie Fox, who is running for

Comptroller. Foxforcomptroller.com. To have an effect in Iowa, the candidate for Governor is Eric Cooper; his running mate is Nick Weltha coopersmallergovernment.com. The only candidate who can change ballot access in New York is Warren Redlich. He needs 50,000 votes, an absolute number. Wredlich.com/ny/ gets you there.

For general ballot access in future years, support Freedom Ballot Access
<http://FreedomBallotAccess.org>.

Libertarian Donors Club

A very important bit of Libertarian Party discussion:

Dear Fellow Libertarian,

You probably have never heard of the Libertarian Donors Club, and you are probably very busy and in a hurry to delete anything you can in your inbox to save time.

Please Don't.

Please take the time to read this letter.

Now - I am NOT running for national LP Chair, nor for the National Committee, nor for the LNCC, nor for the LP nomination for President. I'm not running for public office. In fact, I'm not running for anything at all. You've probably never heard of me, though I first joined the LP in 1980, and I don't want to be famous. And I'm not going to ask you to send money to me or to buy anything from me.

What I'm going to do is tell you a short story - you see I've had a very hard time giving away some money, thousands of dollars in fact, to worthwhile Libertarian campaigns ...

... and then I'm going to ask you to join me in helping to find the best LP campaigns in 2010 and in 2012 and beyond so that I can give my money away more easily ..

... and then I'm going to ask you to join me in donating to some LP campaigns that I have found and the ones that you have found, that offer the LP a significant opportunity in the 2010 election cycle, and to get busy doing the same for 2012 and beyond ...

First, my story: Two years ago, in 2008, I decided I would help out and donate to some LP candidates. I looked around, called several people, but it was difficult. I wanted to find LP campaigns where my personal donations could make a difference - where a serious candidate could win or obtain ballot status for the LP, where the campaign would use my donation for TV or radio ads - for outreach, where my donations would help build the party and have some payoff.

Well, after a great deal of effort, I found the Munger for Governor campaign in North Carolina. There may have been other great candidates and campaigns going in 2008 ... in fact I'm sure there were ... but I just didn't have the time, information or contacts to find them.

So, in 2008, I gave the maximum, \$4000, to the Munger for Governor campaign. It paid off as they used that money, and the donations of numerous other generous Libertarians to buy radio ads across the state and win ballot status for the North Carolina LP. This donation represents a victory to me and everyone else who donated and volunteered for the Munger for Governor campaign. An investment with a massive payoff. Their total campaign budget was small, much smaller than the total cost of just getting on the ballot.

Of course, Mike Munger is a great speaker, debater and great candidate... He campaigned tirelessly across the state ... and hundreds of other dedicated LP members, donors and petitioners made this happen

... but I was glad to do my part.

Now, it's 2010. Once again, I've decided to help out by donating what I can. And once again, it has been very difficult finding the best candidates with the best opportunity to make a difference. So far, I have found four campaigns that I think are important for the future of the LP, four campaigns that could make a difference in 2010 ... and on Monday, three days ago, I sent off four checks to help these campaigns

... and below I will give you a list of the campaigns, how much I have sent and why they represent important opportunities for the LP.

But, first I need your help. I need you to help me find up to six more campaigns that represent important opportunities for the LP in 2010. I'm asking you to write back and let me know the best campaigns, with the best candidates, where there is a real chance for victory, or obtaining ballot status, or some other significant payoff for the Donors.

So, you see, all I want to do is help some serious LP candidates who have a real shot at winning some significant office - State Rep, for example, or to help the best state-wide candidates to obtain ballot status for the LP in places where it is difficult but possible. There may be other campaigns with other important goals for building the LP as well. So, I'm giving as much as I can to accomplish these goals.

At the same time, we all know that we cannot do these things alone. The LP has over 800 campaigns across the US. I don't have time to call every state LP or to check out every race. And funding a winning campaign takes the help of hundreds or even thousands of donors. So, I'm hoping to find a group of people who can see the advantages of helping in this effort. An organization of dedicated Libertarians who will work together to find and fund the best campaigns with the best opportunities to win, build the LP and move our party forward.

To do this, of course, we must all recognize that our own campaigns and our own state LPs and our own personal favorite candidates may not represent the best opportunity. And we will not all agree on which candidates, campaigns and state LPs are the best to be selected. But, to achieve our long range goals, we must put our own personal favorites aside and work together for the future.

We should also recognize that there are many donors, like myself, who will give much more, sometimes hundreds of times more, if there is a worthwhile chance to spread the LP message, build the party, and achieve a worthwhile payoff - a return on invested political capital. And that's just how I view my LP donations. They are an investment, an investment in the future of the LP, an investment in the future of Liberty ... and we should all maximize the re-

Liberty for America is published by George Phillis, 48 Hancock Hill Drive, Worcester MA 01609 (508 754 1859). To Subscribe, go to LibertyForAmerica.com and click on the 'subscribe' button. Back issues of **Liberty for America** magazine are available on the web at <http://LibertyForAmerica.com/LFAMagazine.htm>.

turn on these political investments by making sure that the best LP candidates and campaigns have adequate funds to carry our message, to obtain ballot status, to win elections.

This is exactly what happened with the North Carolina campaign of Mike Munger, whose success will save over \$100,000 in ballot drive costs for at least four years, and will bring in thousands of dollars in additional funds to the NC LP through the voluntary income tax checkoff that now includes the North Carolina LP as an option.

Now, as promised, my list so far. Please note that I do not live in any of these states (I do not live in any of the 50 states at present) and I had never met or talked to any of these candidates prior to this campaign. I am including what I feel is a reasonable and possible goal for each candidate's campaign. Obviously, many of you cannot donate such large amounts and may not agree with my list.

I suggest that you send as much as you can, to each of these candidates, scaled to your own ability to give. And for those of you who can do more, please send more, (up to the legal maximum).

John Babiarz NH
Warren Redlich NY
Nicholas De Laat WY
Brendan Kelly NH

[Long section on candidate details omitted.]

**Sample—This is your only issue of
Liberty for America**

For more issues, **subscribe!**

Subscriptions are free at no charge.

To subscribe, go to LibertyForAmerica.com
And click on the Subscribe button

Join **Liberty for America** — \$15.

Donate electronically at LibertyForAmerica.com
Checks, payable Liberty for America, to George
Phillies, 48 Hancock Hill Drive Worcester 01609.
Membership lets you call yourself a member.

Liberty for America will be performing political acts, and other activities that the Federal government calls "Federal Election Activity" and hence FEC-reportable. We must therefore funnel dues to our PAC, "Liberty for America". Dues will not be used to support candidates.

Required Federal Notices:

Your Donations are not tax deductible. Federal law requires us to request the occupation and employer of donors of \$200 or more in a year. Paid for by Liberty for America. Your donations may be used in relation to a Federal Election.

The 2010 elections are coming fast, and there are many exciting Libertarian campaigns. But in order for the LP to obtain ballot status, win elections and grow, we need to work together. For too long the LP has managed to get numerous candidates on the ballot - we're pretty good at ballot drives - only to leave our candidates swinging alone in the wind with ineffective, under-funded campaigns.

So, I'm looking for a group of donors to join me. We should form a donors club. Not a PAC. Not to raise and spend money as a group, but a private association of donors who will pool our efforts to find, research and inform ourselves about the best LP candidates with the best chances to reach our goals - be it victory, ballot status, or some other goal. We can then discuss and make a list of our best options. It will be up to each individual to choose which campaigns to support and how much to give. In this way, though, we should be able to work together to provide the funding needed to build the LP and provide our best candidates with the serious funding they need to be competitive. We can donate funds individually, directly to each candidate, with no fundraising costs, and we can, through our recommendations, help to assure that the best campaigns will receive a large infusion of cash. Further, having a Libertarian Donors Club, in place, and with a track record of helping to focus attention that results in major funding to the best campaigns, should encourage the best candidates to come forward with serious campaigns to win - knowing that funding will be available.

This year, 2010, there is really little time left before election day.

We don't have time to build a discussion website or engage in lengthy deliberation. So, here's what I'm hoping you'll do:

- 1) Write back if you are a serious LP donor and you want to help find and fund the best LP candidates and campaigns in 2010 and beyond. We need to build some kind of discussion group to help us fund our serious candidates - a Libertarian Donors Club - for the successful future of our party.
- 2) Forward this letter to anyone you know who has been or could be a serious LP donor, now or in the future, and encourage them to join us, participate and donate.
- 3) Send me the names of any LP candidate that has a serious chance of winning their race for State Rep. or other significant office this fall, or any campaign that has a serious chance of securing ballot status for the LP in one of our difficult states - I'm still looking for up to six more, and there's little time left.
- 4) Please donate whatever you can, as quickly as possible, to the four campaigns I have listed above - for only by hanging together can we accomplish our goals. And send me a letter when you do, and I'll send along (hopefully) up to six more hot campaigns for 2010 that all of you have sent in.

There it is. Please join me in this project and join me in donating. It's time we provided adequate funds to our best and most

important campaigns. And, if anyone wants to help out in building a successful donors club, then please write and offer your services. I'm hoping that many of you will come forward and build this group. You see, I don't want to be famous and I have no free time. I'm an American teacher in South Korea. Eight years ago I founded a private school with a Korean partner. I teach 50 to 60 class hours each week. Then, as an entrepreneur - I have to hire and train teachers, develop the curriculum, design tests, create teaching materials and oversee the financial management of the school. I really have no free time, and I don't want anything other than to donate to our best candidates and see them win elections, win ballot status, build our party and work for our libertarian vision of liberty.

So, that's it: Please join me. Please forward this letter to every Libertarian donor that you know. Please send me the names and details of the best winning or ballot status campaign that you know of. And please, please, let's all donate something to the four campaigns listed above.

Thank you for your time and help.

Sincerely,

Nick Youngers

LNC Rejects Anti-War-On-Drugs Resolution

Courtesy of Liberty for America's usual sources: It's a fairly bland resolution, too. Voting largely closed on Wed, Aug 4, 2010.

Voting against the resolution were Flood, Knedler, Mattson, Root, Rutherford, Wolf.

Voting for the Resolution were Craig, Eshelman, Hawkridge, Oaksun, Olsen, Redpath, Ruwart, and Wiener.

That's an 8-6 vote, but 3/4 in favor was required under LNC rules. The Resolution was:

Sponsor: Chairman Mark Hinkle

Motion: Whereas, the Libertarian Party Platform calls for the "repeal of all laws creating 'crimes' without victims, such as the use of drugs for medicinal or recreational purposes,"

And, whereas, the Libertarian Party supports an end to Drug Prohibition, both domestically and abroad,

And, whereas, the Libertarian Party is very concerned that such drug prohibitions have helped spread HIV and AIDS by preventing or inhibiting needle exchange programs,

And, whereas, the XVIII International AIDS Conference, meeting in Vienna, Austria, created a Vienna Declaration document calling "...for an acknowledgment of the limits and harms of drug prohibition, and for drug policy reform

Welcome to Liberty for America!

A magazine. A web site. An organization. Liberty for America has had several inquiries on launching Liberty for America Chapters across America. A draft set of state/regional By-Laws appears on the LibertyforAmerica.Com web site.

to remove barriers to effective HIV prevention, treatment, and care,"

And, whereas, the Vienna Declaration further declares "The evidence that law enforcement has failed to prevent the availability of illegal drugs, in communities where there is demand, is now unambiguous."

Therefore, the Libertarian National Committee endorses the above aspects of the Vienna Declaration and the implementation of its recommendations with private, as opposed to government, funding."

LNC Debates Issues

The LNC had a great tonnage of debate, much quite dismaying. The ability of the LNC-Discuss list and the secret LNC lists to generate material far exceeds our ability to print it. We'll summarize and give a few selected debating segments.

The star of bright thought from the LNC Treasurer James Oaksun read

P.S. We are now 41 days from Election Day. While I always enjoy a good academic debate, isn't there something we, as a collective committee, can do/discuss/vote on that might... you know...

- help push one of our candidates over the finish line in first place?
- help one or more of our candidates to a more-than-symbolic vote total?
- generate some buzz in the media/blogosphere/etc?
- better position us as we move to 2012?.

Response to his position was a bit limited.

On the other hand, there was:

(1) The rules change to assist the faction that wants the 2012 convention in Las Vegas.

(2) The parliamentary attack on the proposal to appoint an LNC alternate to the Convention Oversight Committee.

(3) The painfully homophobic press release on gay marriage -- in fairness to the original author of the release, there is no sign that he realized that there was an issue, or that he might usefully consult with our GLBTQPL affinity group Outright Libertarians.

(4) LNCC Chair Wayne Root raising money for a Republican.

In addition, one of the LNC officers has launched a new super-double-top-secret mailing list whose debate is, well, from what we have seen and heard, even less worth reprinting than debate on the LNC-Discuss list. The purpose of the new list, say our usual sources on that list, is to keep the contents of the debate secret from the person much of the LNC thinks, in the complete absence of material evidence, is our usual source for the LNC-Discuss list. As a guide to some clues that may help some readers tell the difference between our source and Rachel Hawkridge, note (1) Rachel is a girl. (2) Rachel is married. (3) Rachel does not dye her hair. This secret list run by an LNC officer should not be confused with the other secret lists, some of which we have previously noted. Also, noting the vast turnover in LNC membership and the continuance of Titanic-size leaks, we will neither confirm nor deny the suggestion from a correspondent that it is LPHQ and not an LNC member who is forwarding us all this stuff.

LNC Changes the Rules

'Not our usual sources on the LNC' believe that the point here is that the majority of the Convention Oversight Committee wants to put the convention someplace other than Las Vegas, and the pro-Root faction on the LNC is changing the rules to favor Root's 2012 Presidential nomination. The two convention sites with support are believed to be the Hyatt Regency at the San Francisco Airport and the Red Rock in or near Las Vegas. In considering hotel prices, look at their restaurant menus. Your mileage may differ.

The key change was the group that chooses the actual convention site, to be the LNC not the Convention Oversight Committee. The new sentence reads "The Convention Oversight Committee shall make recommendations for convention sites to the LNC, but the LNC shall choose the site. "

People voting for this motion were: Flood, Karlan, Knedler, Lark, Mattson, Olsen, Root, Rutherford, Wiener, Wolf

LNC members voting against this motion were Craig, Hawkridge, Nolan, Oaksun, Redpath

With a final vote tally of 10-5, the motion PASSES.

Why is this matter of interest? There is a faction on the LNC that wants to make sure that the 2012 National Convention is in Wayne Root's home town. Evidence? Consider the following exchange on the LNC-Discuss list:

From: Dave Nolan <dfnolan@gmail.com>
I have no doubt that the Red Rock is the nicest of the hotels we are considering for our 2012 convention. And after seeing Jim Oaksun's analysis of the cost factors for the various cities, there's not enough difference among them to really matter. People who want to attend a national convention aren't going to make their decision on whether or not they will participate based on a \$37 price difference.

The real issue here, for a lot of people, is whether having the convention in Las Vegas creates a huge "home field" advantage for Wayne Root if he chooses to seek our presidential nomination in 2012. So here's my question to Wayne: Will you state unequivocally, here and now, that if we hold our 2012 nominating convention in Las Vegas, you will neither seek nor accept the Libertarian Presidential nomination? No exceptions, no "ifs" no "buts" -- a flat-out statement that you will not run if we hold the convention in Vegas.
DFN

with answers including:

From: "Mark Rutherford" <rutherfordlaw@indy.rr.com>

David:

Are you suggesting that wherever our presidential convention is held, that Libertarians who reside in or near the host city should be barred from seeking our presidential nomination? What are the parameters? 100 miles from the convention hotel, 250 miles from the convention hotel, etc?

What if you work there but live outside the host city?

If not, why the exclusion for Wayne?

MWR

From: William Redpath <wredpath@bia.com>

David: I really don't know to what extent there would be a "home field advantage," if any, but your request of Wayne, in my opinion, is unfair. Bill Redpath

And

If I remember right the Barr Root ticket got very few Nevada votes last time. Doug Craig

Readers will recall that being in a place means that you can bring in outsiders who can be added to state delegations of states permitting carpetbaggers, and they will vote as directed. We saw this in 2010 and before that in 2002.

To which the home region of the 2010 Carpetbaggers answered:

From: <kknedler@columbus.rr.com>

No votes. Wayne wasn't even in the NV delegation.

Mary Ruwart tried to be the voice of reason:

From: "Mary Ruwart" <mary@ruwart.com>

Fair or not, a decision to have the convention in Vegas is going to be viewed by some as showing favoritism to Wayne. It's not going to matter how many votes he got in 2008 from Nevada. A pledge by Wayne not to run for the nomination is about the only thing that would prevent such criticism.

From the Southeast we get:

---- Stewart Flood <sff@ivo.net> wrote:

A half-dozen delegates. Wow, some home advantage. I don't recall Wayne Root getting any votes from Nevada in

2008, but even if he ran -- and got every vote from Nevada -- you're worried about home field advantage for a half-dozen votes?

Will you demand that Dr Ruwart refuse to run if we have the convention in Texas? Should Mr Kubby be required to renounce any intention to run again if we hold the convention in California? And what about the fact that we already have a candidate from Texas with an exploratory committee? There has been no outcry from you demanding that Mr Wrights drop out of the race. Both California and Texas field delegations that are much larger than Nevada.

I'm certainly not going to suggest that Mr Wrights be asked to drop out, even if we end up with a convention in his home state. It would be just as unfair to ask Mr Wrights or any other potential candidate from Texas or California to drop out as it would be to ask Wayne Root to leave a race he hasn't even entered!

This is just one more reason why the convention site selection process should be working at least two conventions ahead. Once we have 2012 chosen, we should immediate focus on the selection of the 2014 host city. Members of the board during the next LNC term should select both 2016 and 2018. After that, each elected board would be selecting the location for the convention four years in the future. If we do that, delegates will always know where the current convention and the next two will be held. This would be a huge step toward eliminating political machination from the process."

Writing against was David Nolan

"I urge each of you to vote down the proposal to turn the final decision back to the entire LNC. If you've already voted in favor, I urge you to change your vote. We really don't need to spend two weeks doing behind-the-scenes lobbying, and that's what will happen if the motion passes. We're in the final month of an historic election season, and we all have better things to do with our time.

And if the motion passes, I urge you to simply ratify the Oversight Committee's choice; overturning a 4:1 vote will look politically motivated and will create unnecessary divisions within the LNC."

and in favor was Scott Lieberman

"If the LNC's vote earlier this year to overturn the Convention Committee's decision to charge a mandatory Registration Fee was not politically motivated, then an LNC vote to overturn the Convention Committee's choice of a 2012 Convention venue will not be politically motivated, either.

And I say this without knowing which way the Convention Committee is leaning - for all I know, I might agree with the Convention Committee's decision.

However - I think the LNC should be making the final decision on such an important matter. Although this decision should be made soon, at this point another two weeks is not going to matter.

Scott Lieberman"

Meanwhile, there is a move that the current LNC should sign the contract for the 2014 convention. And Ohio says it is already and the LNC should take note of its bid.

Who May Be On the Convention Oversight Committee?

Progress loses to parliamentarianism.

From: Mark Hinkle<mark@garlic.com> to the LNC:

Please vote on the following motion:

I move: add "or Alternates" to the table in Section 1.03
The effect of the motion is to allow Regional Alternates to sit on the Convention Oversight Committee.

Dan Karlan objected, referring to rules that allow Alternates to vote on the LNC itself:

I don't see any problem with this change for the IT Committee.

But for the Convention Oversight Committee, there is a serious problem. While I had slight misgivings earlier today, when I thought out the objection to this change just a few minutes ago, I realized it might even be disallowed.

The LNC, in accordance with the Bylaws, has delegated certain privileges to the Convention Oversight Committee WITH POWER -- that means, the Committee is authorized to sign contracts in the name of the LNC. (Last term, a decision of this Committee caused a serious issue to develop, and the LNC was able to defuse the crisis only by overriding this Committee (which it could do because the delegation of authority does not prevent the LNC from exercising that same authority directly). ED: Karlan is referring to the delegate voting fee.

But this proposal from the Chair aims to change the potential makeup of this Committee -- in such a way that the LNC would delegate some of its authority to a body that includes potential non-voting members of the LNC. In other words, we might be out-delegating our authority. That could very well be improper. The Bylaws specify under which conditions an alternate might vote -- and this proposed change violates that stipulation by allowing an Alternate to vote in other circumstances. The LNC is not allowed to invite an Alternate to vote (without the permission or absence of the corresponding Regional Representative) on a matter before the LNC, but this change would

allow an Alternate to vote on a matter delegated to this Committee by the LNC.

I think this is highly improper. And because the proposal yokes the two changes together, I think I will have to vote No. I await further discussion, however, before formally casting my vote."

Mark Hinkle defended his right as Chair to appoint the committee. There was a long debate.

In the end

Voting in favor of the motion were: Flood, Knedler, Nolan, Oaksun, Redpath, Ruwart, Wiener, and Wolf. Voting against the motion were Karlan, Lark, Lieberman, Mattson, Olsen, Root, Rutherford, and Visek. Craig claims he voted in favor, and that Lieberman's vote is invalid. Wiener and Lieberman both voting is a bit odd as a rules interpretation.

Unfortunate Press Release

Wes Benedict writes:

Recently we released a press release...I have been notified that one phrase in there has particularly offended some people:

* "The Libertarian Party neither supports nor opposes gay relationships."*

I am interested if you found that wording particularly offensive. Parts of the press release were intended to be offensive, but not that part. I actually still don't think that phrase is offensive, but will avoid it in the future if it offended others too much. It could be expanded to say "The Libertarian party neither supports nor opposes gay or heterosexual relationships." While my mother wishes I'd get married, I personally don't want the Libertarian Party telling me they support me getting into a relationship.

Also, feel free to forward this to others, particularly Libertarian members of the LGBT community, and have them send feedback to me if they would like. I would appreciate it. Incidentally, I got plenty of positive feedback on this from self-identified gay Libertarians. ...

If you found the phrase* "The Libertarian Party neither supports nor opposes gay relationships"* offensive, let me know and I'll consider an apology. It was not intended nor expected to be offensive.

Sincerely,
Wes Benedict, Executive Director

And LNC comments included

Perhaps I'm just ignorant or insensitive or politically incorrect, but I fail to see why anyone would consider that sentence to be a problem.

Dan Wiener

Alicia Mattson expressed broadly similar statements. Another LNC member posted an long claim, apparently from a constituent, claiming that we had DADT to protect American soldiers from sexual assaults by gay men serving in uniform. After he was roundly criticized, he published a fairly abject retraction.

And Mary Ruwart gave us the observation:

More than 50% of Americans vote for Republicans or Democrats Does this mean we should try to identify ourselves with them?

In marketing, there is a concept known as the Unique Selling Proposition or USP. Businesses spend hundreds of thousands of dollars trying to imprint their "uniqueness" on the American public. "Reagan libertarian" is telling people that our USP is "Republican-like". That does NOT distinguish us from Republicans and it will discourage Democrats who might be considering us.

Once again, I'd like to remind the LNC that Mr. Root's strategy has not gained us more members. I'm sorry to say that membership has actually declined during the time Mr. Root has been putting his message out on the mainstream media. Clearly, we need a different strategy.

Root Raises Money for Republican

In another issue, Wayne Root urged people to support the Republican Senate Primary Campaign of Peter Schiff. The core text from Root went "*I enthusiastically endorse Peter's candidacy. His wisdom, guidance and steadfast commitment to the values that built this nation and enshrined by our founders in our constitution, are badly needed in Washington. I urge you to give generously to his campaign. He needs your financial support and your time*"

Schiff is a Republican. (He lost.) Some LNC members called Root on it. Mary Ruwart wrote:

This is an egregious conflict of interest for any LNC member, but especially for the Chair of the Libertarian Congressional Committee, which is supposed to fundraise for Libertarian Party candidates. This conflict of interest, to the best of my knowledge, has not been reported by Mr. Root.

On the other hand, California Regional Representative Daniel Wiener wrote

"Okay, Mary, I read through Wayne's endorsement of Peter Schiff, and I'm not finding any conflict of interest. What am I missing? Nowhere do I see anything which identifies Wayne as a member of the LNC or Chair of the LNCC or past VP candidate or even the word "libertarian".

I assume you are not happy that Wayne is endorsing someone who is running for the Republican nomination, even though Schiff has strong libertarian views and was the keynote speaker at the 2009 Connecticut LP convention, and even though there is no Libertarian candidate in

the race that he's running against. You also know from our last LNC meeting that Wayne thinks the LP should be expanding its influence by selectively endorsing candidates from the other parties. You two have a strong disagreement over that issue. But a disagreement over tactics is not the same as a conflict of interest. As long as Wayne is doing this on a personal basis and not as an LP representative, I see nothing in either the Bylaws or the Policy Manual which precludes it.
Dan Wiener"

To which Mary Ruwart replied

There would be nothing wrong with Wayne fund-raising for Schiff if he were not 1) raising money for a competing party's candidates while Chair of the committee that is supposed to be raising money for Libertarian Party candidates; 2) an LNC member, with a fiduciary responsibility to the Libertarian Party, helping candidates from a competing party get elected; 3) calling himself the spokesperson for the Libertarian Party, yet endorsing Republicans.

Doing for a competing political party what you've pledged to do for the LP is a HUGE conflict of interest, not a "tactical disagreement."

And David Nolan responded

"Nice try, Dan. A few days ago, Wayne described himself on this very discussion group as "the face as voice of the LP on Tv and radio across the country." If that's the case, then everything he says and does will be viewed as representing the LP - especially since he's on the LNC and chair of the LNCC. Let's not be disingenuous.

When anyone on the LNC makes a public statement regarding a candidate, people will reasonably assume that the person making the statement represents some kind of "official" party view unless they take pains to declare otherwise. If and when I ever endorse a Republican candidate, I will make it clear that I am not representing the party with that endorsement. I would hope that you'd do likewise."

and on the other hand

"All,

I specifically asked Mr. Schiff in a rather lengthy one-on-one conversation at FreedomFest 2009 (not 2010) if he would consider running as a member of the LP after he loses the GOP nomination (CT is a state that does not have a sore loser law - that's how Lieberman got elected). Schiff was pleasant to me, but dismissed the idea as silly. I don't care how good of a friend Wayne is with him, it is totally inappropriate for the chairman of the LNCC to advocate or fund raise for a member of the GOP. No wonder nobody takes the LP seriously.
Don Wills"

LNC Finances Improve

Other sources call to our attention trends in LNC financing over much of this decade. LNC Income by year and month:

1,389,579 — for 2005
1,089,394 — for 2006
1,579,821 — for 2007
1,601,471 — for 2008
1,076,459 — for 2009

And for this year:

105,026 — January
93,396 — February
110,985 — March
123,286 — April
106,840 — May
140,973 — June
84,802 — July
103,449 — August

This year the National Convention made nearly \$70,000. That is an enormous improvement over some years past, as in past times the National Convention sometimes lost so much money that the National Party lost much of its ability to act.

On the contrary, a reserve fund has been established, so that if there are interruptions or anomaly the reserve fund will allow the LNC to continue to function. The current fund approaches having a quarter of a million dollars in it, which corresponds to three month's operations. Treasurer James Oaksun wants to increase this total until it covers about six months operations. As he notes, the reserve fund also means that if some incredible opportunity comes along we will be able to take advantage of it, rather than being in the embarrassing circumstance that the opportunity is there but the paths to exploiting the opportunity sit closed.

For the first eight months of the year, major changes accounting for the improvement in financial reserves include an extra \$60,000 in pledge income and an extra \$50,000 in solicitation of major donors. \$170,000 of the increase of 2010 over 2009 comes from the National convention, but it made money.

LNC expenditures for ballot access in 2010 included \$25,000 opposing the top-two primary, \$21,000 for the Nebraska Auditor, \$25,000 for a candidate for governor in New York, \$30,000 for Illinois petitioning, and unspecified aid for PA expenses.

As a policy matter, the LNC routinely quits when the candidate is on the ballot, even though the point of the effort is to gain ballot access via a successful campaign, not to have one candidate on the ballot.

National Party membership counts are absolutely flat, membership being stuck just under 15,000 with no sign of any change as the months go by. On the bright side, membership lapse rates have returned to normal or even somewhat less following their 2006 and 2009 peaks. Interestingly, there is a record here; In late 2007 the lapse rate went below zero; it might be worthwhile to reactivate those policies if they can be used twice.

Support Liberty For America!

Mail form to Liberty for America c/o George Phillies, 48 Hancock Hill Drive,
Worcester MA 01609 or email to phillies@4liberty.net

Join!

Sign me up as a member of *Liberty for America*.

Liberty for America dues are \$15.

Name _____

Address _____

City, State, ZIP _____

Phone _____

Email _____

Subscribe!

Subscriptions to Liberty for America, the Journal of the Libertarian Political Movement, are *free*. Send your email address to phillies@4liberty.net and prepare to be sent monthly PDFs containing our newsletter.

Donate!

Your generous donation will be used to advance the Libertarian political movement.

Donate on the Internet

You can donate to our PAC "Liberty for America" at <http://LibertyForAmerica.com/>

Donations are not tax deductible and may be used to advocate for the election of particular candidates to public office.

Donors specify that they are American citizens, not a corporation or a labor movement, that they are not Federal contractors, and that they are donating their own money.

Volunteer!

Because Volunteerism is the backbone of political action
I Want to Volunteer to Help the
Libertarian Political Movement

I am prepared to (circle all that apply) :

Help organize state
or regional groups

Help organize affinity groups

Provide art/graphics support

Make public statements;
internet, newspapers, talk
radio

Provide web support or advice

Help with fundraising

Become a political
activist volunteer

Provide writing/editing support

Run for office

I have special skills or suggestions, namely:

To Send Money:

Liberty for America
c/o George Phillies
48 Hancock Hill Drive
Worcester MA 01609

Payment may be made by check payable "Liberty for America".

Our Web Pages

Liberty for America <http://www.LibertyForAmerica.com>
complete with Liberty for America back issues, policy
statements, press releases, and draft state by-laws.

Liberty for America
Liberty for America is
not currently a political party.

But you can join — \$15 per year.

<http://LibertyForAmerica.com>

Liberty for America has a Federal PAC —we actually support
real Libertarians when they run for Federal office.

In this issue:

Support Ballot Access—2010

Libertarian Donors Club

LNC Rejects Anti-War-On-Drugs Resolution

LNC Debates Issues

LNC Changes the Rules

Who May Be On the

Convention Oversight Committee?

Unfortunate Press Release

Root Raises Money for Republican

LNC Finances Improve

Address Corrections Requested
First Class Mail

**Liberty for America
c/o George Phillies
48 Hancock Hill Drive
Worcester MA 01609**