

# Liberty for America

Journal of the Libertarian Political Movement

Volume 3 Number 6

November 2010

## Table of Contents

Oregon State Party Officers Blast LNC  
For Disrupting LP Oregon State Convention  
LP-Oregon Convention Events  
Antiwar.com Needs Your Support  
Bovard Wins Suit!  
Liberty for America PAC  
LNC Acts

A special in our electronic edition only:  
Hawkridge Responds to Being Fired from  
the Convention Oversight Committee

## Oregon State Party Officers Blast LNC For Disrupting LP Oregon State Convention

Background for new readers: On November 6 the Libertarian Party of Oregon tried to hold a state convention. It would have been the best attended state convention they have had in a long time. There appeared at the State Convention LNC Officers with the claim that the convention lacked a quorum, thus preventing the convention from meeting. The claims were allowed to carry, so after a half-hour of a two-day event, the convention was adjourned for lack of a quorum.

Videos of the convention, such as it was, and a post-convention interview with State Chair Jeff Weston and State Vice Chair Wes Wagner appear on Justin.tv, at the URLs listed below. The text after that is a transcript of the interview with Westin and Wagner with the LNC7 justin.tv commentator.

<http://www.justin.tv/lnc7/b/273320282>  
<http://justin.tv/lnc7/b/273320390>

Transcript:

**Interviewer:** We are in Portland, Oregon with Jeff Weston, the State Chair of the Oregon Party, and Wes Wagner, Vice Chair of the Oregon Party. Gentlemen, why don't you tell us what happened here today.

**Oregon State Chair Jeff Weston:** Today we tried to hold a convention to revise our Constitution and Bylaws of the Libertar-

ian Party of Oregon. Basically, our party structure is completely broken and what happened today only reinforces that.

*We had two visitors from the National Libertarian Party show up, Mark Hinkle and Alicia Mattson, who appeared to be here to cause trouble and make it impossible to get work done.* Basically, they pointed out, Mark didn't point it out but Alicia and another LP member [GP: former LNC Parliamentarian] M Carling pointed out that we had a quorum problem at this convention and as a result we were unable to make this quorum and unable to get any work done.

This actually is a serious problem for the Libertarian Party of Oregon. We current have about 145 dues-paying members so to make our quorum requirement we would need 73 members to show up. We had 45 members show up today; that is the largest number of members which has in a very long time been at our conventions.

I don't see how we're going to get over this quorum requirement. We're studying; other issues can make the quorum requirement worse. It would be impossible to change our bylaws to fix this problem. It would be impossible for us to nominate candidates for public office.

Since we have about 13,000 registered Libertarian voters in Oregon, the quorum for a nominating convention would be 7600. I can't imagine getting 7600 individual people for a convention to nominate candidates, so the Libertarian Party of Oregon will not be nominating any people for political office until this problem is fixed.

We do have a Judicial committee that has tended to have its own issues. Our Judicial Committee currently has four people on it. It is composed of two people on two different factional sides. As a result it is deadlocked. We cannot meet our quorum requirement for conventions, so we cannot elect new members to resolve this issue.

The Libertarian Party of Oregon is deadlocked and we're struggling to figure out how we're going to solve the situation.

**State Vice Chair Wes Wagner:** As far as the bylaws proposals that we were trying to put forward, the purpose of the bylaws proposals was to solve a lot of structural issues, a lot of things that caused party infighting. From all appearances, it would seem that there was a miscalculation on the part of National and that they came in to support the more aggressive faction that has basically been responsible for breaking rules, arbitrarily deleting members, bankrupting the party,

protecting people who took money from the party coffers without authorization, signing leases for heavy equipment without authorization, a lot of various issues that have built up over the course of the years.

From all appearances to me it would seem that they came to support that particular faction, which probably only really represents one of about seven factions in the LPO, but they happen to be the Republican faction. They're made up of people who are from Republican organizations. Some of them are paid and came down here with that agenda and that's indisputable.

**Oregon State Chair Jeff Weston:** I don't know how we're going to recover from this situation. It's a very dire situation for us. If it can't be resolved, the Libertarian Party of Oregon will be completely ineffective. I'm trying to figure out the resolution--we'll have to figure that out.

**Oregon Vice Chair Wes Wagner:** I haven't been a member of the National Party for a long time and I certainly would not advise anybody to come back if they're going to spend their funds sending Republican agents down to the state parties in order to try to disrupt their conventions for the benefit of the GOP.

## LP-Oregon Convention

On-Scene Correspondent Rachel Hawkridge Writes:

In 2009, a semi-poorly attended convention way out by nowhere (Newport, OR is 3 hours of dark, wet, windy and winding two lane highway from Portland), LP Oregon adopted Robert's Rules of Witchcraft as its default rules.

Until then, OR didn't have a quorum requirement. They had held conventions or business meetings with required notice, and things pretty well worked. That 2009 convention had about 18 attendees, and they changed a lot of the bylaws. We had 52 credentialed today.

<http://justin.tv/lnc7/b/273304427>

Things haven't been so good in Oregon for the LP for several years. There have been several warring factions, a couple of bad actors, and the party has ended up with something like \$16,000 in debt, little income, an office they couldn't afford, an overdrawn bank account, and way behind in their state election disclosure filings.

Last spring, a group of people who had been officeholders in the past got together, made a plan, and were elected to the offices of LP Oregon. That convention wasn't well attended either - 20-24? - including 4 of us from Washington.

Since then, they've gotten some of the debt paid off, more negotiated away, and have been running candidates, doing politics.

Since Gene and I are members of LP Oregon, Wes Wagner called me several weeks ago to ask me to attend this conven-

tion.

They had some changes to make to their bylaws, and felt that with the new bylaws there should be new officers, and as many members as possible buying in.

Yesterday afternoon, I got an eMail from Wes saying that the Chair, Secretary and Parliamentarian of the national party were planning to attend the convention today. Hinkle, Carling and Mattson went out with LPOR Chair Jeff Weston and Vice Chair Wes Wagner. The two noteworthy parliamentarians told LPOR that their rules (RONR) had a quorum requirement of 50% of membership. The three LNC members told Weston and Wagner that they had to follow their own rules. [Editor: Hinkle has advised the LNC he did not attend this dinner. His statement is on Page 8. Wes Wagner says that Hinkle's presence had been expected and last-minute regrets were received.

They will be. Jeff Weston and Wes Wagner are honorable and ethical men.

Unfortunately, in this case following the rules means they are officers for life. They'd have to gather 76 Oregon Libertarians to vote new bylaws, new officers, or a new JudComm. JudComm is currently deadlocked - two and two.

Can't replace their missing member, because they're deadlocked. Can't reverse any actions of the ExComm.

And until they can change the bylaws, they won't be doing politics. No one has ever gathered 6750 Libertarians in one place . . . and that's the quorum requirement for a nominating convention.

Even the 2008 Presidential nominating convention in Denver was only 10% of that.

I'm saddened - Wes and Jeff, along with Treasurer Mark Veta-  
nen and Secretary Richard Skyba have been working hard.  
Now the party is dead in the water. For the foreseeable future.  
<http://justin.tv/lnc7/b/273320282>  
<http://justin.tv/lnc7/b/273320390>

This is the situation as I understand it. Any errors are, well, errors.

In Peace and Liberty,  
Rachel Hawkridge

Liberty for America has learned that there is now discussion within the LP-Oregon Party of disaffiliating from the current national party.

**Liberty for America** is published by George Phillies, 48 Hancock Hill Drive, Worcester MA 01609 (508 754 1859). To Subscribe, go to [LibertyForAmerica.com](http://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>.

## Antiwar.com Needs Your Support

Angela Keaton writes

Antiwar.com is struggling, and we are in dire need of your help. The good news is there are some pretty pain-free ways to lend a hand. Open a Randolph Bourne Capital One Credit Card <http://tinyurl.com/antiwarcard>

shop Amazon.com <http://tinyurl.com/2eo5pd2>  
using these instructions, buy Antiwar.com merchandise <http://tinyurl.com/l5j3j>

encourage your friends to subscribe to our newsletter, <http://antiwar.com/newsletter> or contact Angela (323-512-7095, [akeaton@antiwar.com](mailto:akeaton@antiwar.com)) to make a tax-deductible donation <http://antiwar.com/donate>

or purchase Web, radio, and newsletter ad space.

They also take donations:

<http://antiwar.com/donate>

## Bovard Wins Suit!

Jim Bovard has won his lawsuit against the Barr 2008 campaign, for the \$47,000 he is owed for his ghostwriting. Barr 2008 has next to no money — its FEC reports show \$3564.77 cash on hand and \$170,310.95 in debts.

Its other assets are exceedingly limited.

**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](http://LibertyForAmerica.com)  
And click on the Subscribe button

Join **Liberty for America** — \$15.

Donate electronically at [LibertyForAmerica.com](http://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.

## Liberty for America PAC Acts

The Liberty for America Political Action Committee tried to raise money to support Libertarian candidates this election. Mindful that we haven't done this before, and that there were going to be some learning experiences along the way, we started small: we tried to boost LP New Hampshire vote totals to get them ballot access.

Alas, as LPNH State Chair Rich Tomasso remarked: 'This was a total wave election and we got washed away'. A number of long-time libertarians and Free Staters did get elected to the Staet Legislature by running as Republicans or Democrats.

What did we do to raise money?

Your editor's face to face contact brought in \$500. A direct mail piece (3 page letter, LPNH trifold, return envelope) went out to about 500 NH Libertarians, at a cost of \$325. Most of the mailing cost was covered by a targeted donation. We made a deal with Libertarian Lists, doing an e-mailing to their entire list. LL experience is that asking people for money for one state tends not to bring in much, and their experience was confirmed. LibertarianLists and other costs came to \$50. \$1105

How did we spend money? The plan was to run Facebook ads and, if the money came in, Adwords ads. The Facebook ads rolled through and ran smoothly. Targeting almost entirely the over-18 population of New Hampshire, we eventually ran 4.8 million impressions of 40 different ads targeting 600,000 Facebook users. At a guess, a third to half of those users are actually active. Facebook ads came to \$483.98.

We had planned to spend the remaining money on AdWords ads. If Facebook ads were very smooth to launch, AdWords ads were anything but. The AdWords staff was always polite. The ads were placed, and nothing happened for three days. Our ads were held for special examination. I finally created a new gmail address and adwords account, and after several days of prodding the second account launched; the first ad campaign never did. Facebook ad approval was smooth; AdWords ads sometimes hung for several days without being approved. The AdWords ad whose core was "candidate for small business-women. Anti-Tax. Pro-Choice. Pro-Peace" was only approved for non-family viewing; other anti-war ads took their time about being approved. Finally, the Adwords placement rate fluctuated from day to day, so it was difficult to predict what we would place. Adwords eventually generated 225,000 impressions for \$147. Facebook ads were placed to the penny in a predictable way. A final \$100 in allocated AdWords funds were not spent, leaving \$100 in the kitty. Practice with AdWords may yet make perfect.

Oh, the vote totals: Gov: John Babiartz 10,089 (3-way race)  
Senate: Ken Blevens 4,753 (four-way race)  
Congress: Philip Hodson 7966 Howard Wilson 4796  
State Reps: Wilber 1,316 Kelly 890 Couture 114 [NH State Rep Districts are **way** different in numbers of voters and representatives.]

## LNC Acts on Motions

**LNC retakes control of convention siting.** The motion reworded the Convention Oversight Committee rules to read The Convention Oversight Committee shall make recommendations for convention sites to the LNC, but the LNC shall choose the site. On other matters concerning the Party's conventions, the committee shall act on behalf of the LNC, including:

Voting "aye": Flood, Karlan, Knedler, Lark, Mattson, Olsen, Root, Rutherford, Wiener, Wolf

Voting "nay": Craig, Hawkridge, Nolan, Oaksun, Redpath

**Motion from Mark Hinkle** to add "or Alternates" to the table in Section 1.03 so alternates could serve on

1. Convention Oversight Committee
2. Information Technology Committee

This motion apparently passed.

**LNC votes to postpone convention site decision to the New Orleans meeting**

Voting "aye": Flood, Knedler, Lark, Mattson, Olsen, Redpath, Root, Rutherford, Visek, Wiener, Wolf

Voting "nay": Craig, Hawkridge, Hinkle, Nolan, Oaksun, Ruwart

**Motion from Chairman Mark Hinkle:** Shall the LNC hold it's 2012 national convention in Dallas, TX at the Hyatt Grand Regency Hotel over the weekend of May 19/20 2012?

Voting "aye": Craig, Nolan, Oaksun, Ruwart

Voting "nay": Flood, Knedler, Lark, Mattson, Olsen, Redpath, Root, Rutherford, Visek, Wiener, Wolf

**Hinkle defends his motion in a statement to Kevin Knedler:**

Kevin,

You do have a choice and you made it. You voted no.

That is a choice.

The LNC also voted NOT to have the COC make the choice.

That to is a choice.

And every day we delay, another choice will likely be made for us as convention dates at specific hotels are sold to other customers.

Delay is also a choice. Not a good one, but still a choice.

When I appointed the 5 members of the COC, my sense of the LNC was that we were already late in making a choice for the 2012 convention.

That was 3.5 months ago.

And still no choice has been made.

Last Thursday the COC held a tele-conference call that was "suppose" to make a choice of the last 3 sites.

The COC failed to make a choice by voting 2-2 between Vegas & Dallas.

A week went by with no action by anyone on the LNC.

## 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.

So, I'm forcing the LNC to make a decision.

Of the final 3 hotels, SF Hyatt, Dallas Hyatt, and the Red Rock, all of them would suit our purposes just fine.

David Nolan has outlined his reasoning for choosing Dallas. All of which are valid.

My first choice was San Francisco with Dallas a close second.

But, why I submitted a motion picking Dallas was because Nancy Neale will be running the convention. And had the Policy Manual allowed it, I would have appointed her to head the COC back in St. Louis, MO.

My overriding goal, regardless of the city chosen, is that we have a competent team and a proven convention manager (Nancy Neale) at the helm.

If the LNC chooses San Francisco, who's going to run the convention?

If the LNC chooses Vegas, who's going to run the convention?

If the LNC chooses Dallas, who's going to run the convention? Answer: Nancy Neale.

Everyone reading this email is going to attend the next convention, even if it's held in Nome, Alaska.

The real question should be is who else is going to attend?

With Nancy Neale, I think we've got the best shot at maximum attendance.

And from that, more money for the Party. More media attention for the Party and our Presidential ticket. More future candidates attending training seminars, speeches, etc., etc., etc.

I've spent 30 years in customer service in the hi-tech world and another 6 years now running my own business.

When we choose a site for our customers, we should also keep them in mind first and foremost.

Dallas is the most convenient of the 3 sites, the cheapest of the 3 sites, and will undoubtedly be the best run convention of the 3 sites.

Sure seems like a slam dunk to me.

Remember, our customers are the ones that allow to do everything that we do. They fund everything. They are the candidates, the activists, etc.

Ignore them and they will go elsewhere.

Cater to them and we'll keep them for a lifetime.

That to is a choice.....Mark Hinkle, LNC Chair



Statement from Dan Wiener on Nancy Neale as a convention organizer volunteer: Sat, 16 Oct 2010

I have much the same reaction as Kevin did. It's obviously important to recruit an experienced and competent person to coordinate the convention, but it's hard to believe that Nancy Neale is the only such person available. It would be nice to find a pure volunteer, but if we need to pay the Coordinator a reasonable amount (in addition to covering any expenses), that seems perfectly acceptable to me.

Still, for the sake of argument, let's assume that Nancy Neale is the best person to do the job. Why can't she do it for any convention site, and not just for Dallas? There's no reason that the Coordinator must live at or very near to the convention site in order to perform all of the myriad preparatory work leading up to the convention. Admiral Colley didn't live in St. Louis, and I don't think Nancy lives in Dallas. The Coordinator just needs to go to the site a day or two ahead of time and then be there to handle things throughout the convention.

Whatever procedure we use to decide among Dallas or Las Vegas or San Francisco as the 2012 convention site, I don't think that the identity of the potential Coordinator should have any bearing.

One further caveat: It is possible that Nancy Neale has indicated that she will only agree to coordinate the convention if it is held in Dallas, because that's where she wants the convention to be held. I sincerely hope that's not the case. Because if it is the case, and if she is trying to use her availability for the job as leverage to dictate the convention's location, then I would strenuously object. It would be outrageous for the convention decision to be held hostage to the whims of a single individual who isn't even a member of the LNC.

.....Dan Wiener

And David Nolan notes the elephant in the room. Is there an elephant? Sources on the LNC assert that Wayne Root had stated to them that Peter Schiff will be Wayne's Treasurer in his Presidential campaign.

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.

Mark Rutherford writes...

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

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

From: "Mary Ruwart"

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.

Stewart Flood

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.

...Stewart

Of course, once upon a time the LNC adhered to higher ethical standards. Here's a 2006 email from Wes Benedict:

Wed, 5 Jul 2006 From: Wes Benedict  
To: SouthwestRegionLNC@yahoo.com

Jim and others,

I basically agreed with the sentiments expressed by Jim below. While I would be proud for Texas to host the convention, I understand the concerns that having a convention in Texas might appear to put Badnarik in a decidedly advantageous position in the '08 Presidential race and that might deter other candidates. If Badnarik was certain not to seek the Presidential nomination in '08, then I think Texas could be fairly considered as a location.

I don't want to put myself in a position of having to speculate on Badnarik's Congressional race outcome or future plans. Under the current conditions, I'd either vote for having the convention somewhere else, or abstain from the vote on the location. I do welcome further discussion.

--Wes Benedict

The Benedict email was based on an email from Jim Duensing, who wrote on 7/5/2006

All,

After the convention, I stuck around for the LNC meeting. The biggest topic of the meeting was the planning for the 08 convention. The previous LNC made a large mistake in not planning the 08 convention. There are several cost savings and marketing reasons to plan these things at least two convention out. That means this convention should plan the 08 and 2010 convention. Geoff Neale strongly recommended Austin as the site of the next convention, because TX hasn't had a convention since the 74 Dallas Accord convention. Also, TX has been very successful recently and we should be showcasing successful affiliate parties for the benefit of everyone. The problem I see with having the 08 convention in Austin is that it would virtually guarantee Badnarik the Pres. nomination. Whatever you think of Badnarik, this is a dangerous prospect. This last convention was very contentious. I expect the 08 convention to be even more so re: both the platform and the nomination of Pres. If it looks like members from TX are trying to pack the convention, it will add to the contentiousness. I proposed to the LNC during open comment that Austin be given the 2010 convention by this LNC. They should be planning that one too. The 08 convention should be in some other city. The LNC discussed Chicago, DC, and Denver as options. I talked to several members of the LNC after the meeting, Most seemed concerned about the appearance of impropriety that an 08 Austin convention would have. I also talked to Wes privately, but I don't feel it is appropriate for me to reveal the contents of a conversation we had in private. I don't think there was anything in there that he wouldn't have said publicly, but I want to err on the side of privacy. Wes, feel free to divulge anything I said to you during that conversation. I'd like the other states in the region and Wes to make their positions clear on this issue to

this list. I'm hopeful that the LNC seriously considers bringing the Party together at the next convention.

Jim Duensing  
State Chair of Nevada

And the Convention Oversight Committee made no recommendation. Note that some of my LNC contacts learned from me, not from any of the LNC lists that Rachel had been tossed off the Convention Oversight Committee by National Chair Hinkle.

The non-recommendations of the CoC included:

From: Dave Nolan

The Convention Oversight Committee, consisting of myself, James Oaksun, Alicia Mattson and Stewart Flood, has spent an immense number of hours investigating possible venues for our 2012 presidential nominating convention. We were assisted in this process by several other people, including Michael Colley, Vicki Kirkland, Nancy Neale, John Spivey, Dan Wiener and Robert Kraus. We looked at airfares to various cities, hotel costs and amenities, local affiliate strength, and endless minutiae. At the end of the process, we took a vote among the four committee members, and the result was a tie. Two people (myself and Mr. Oaksun) voted in favor of the Hyatt Grand Regency in Dallas, Texas. The other two (Ms. Mattson and Mr. Flood) voted for the Red Rock Resort outside Las Vegas, NV.

Below are my reasons for choosing Texas, which I regard as compelling. This is not an official COC report; it is my own perspective. Those favoring the Red Rock will undoubtedly offer their own observations in the near future.

**CENTRAL LOCATION** - Dallas is located right in the center of the country. There are non-stop (and low priced) flights to DFW Airport from practically every major US city, and many smaller cities as well. Holding our convention in Dallas equalizes the travel burden on delegates from the Eastern and Western US.

**MEDIA COVERAGE** - Dallas is the 4th-largest metropolitan area in the USA. It is a major media center; most national news media have reporters in the area. Las Vegas is #30, and except for sports news, generates practically no national news coverage.

**LOCAL AFFILIATE STRENGTH** - The Texas LP is our second-largest state affiliate, and one of our strongest parties. The Nevada LP is among our smallest, and did not even field a candidate against the notorious Harry Reid this year. In terms of organization and getting things done on-time and efficiently, Texas is a far better bet!

**LOWEST HOTEL ROOM RATE** - We can get a block of rooms for the weekend before Memorial Day for only \$99/night. This is the best rate we were able to find at a "nice" hotel anywhere we looked. And the Hyatt Regency is a nice hotel; check their website—<http://www.dallasregency.hyatt.com/hyatt/hotels/index.jsp?null> It's not as new or luxurious as the

Red Rock, but it's nice. It also offers more nearby, off-site dining opportunities.

#### James Oaksun advised:

A couple datapoints:

1. Had a long discussion with a friend who has owned a travel and meeting planning agency in a major city for many years. (Not a Libertarian.) Didn't tell him the specific facilities under consideration, or any of the terms or dates offered... just the locations.

His perspective: from the point of view of a generic meeting attendee, Dallas would be best. It's easiest to get to, shortest travel time on average, more nonstop flights, and intown locations are generally more desirable. He said Las Vegas - even some distance off the strip - was not unreasonable, provided there was ample shuttle service available or that people were aware they would need to rent a car. San Fran Airport he considered least desirable, pain to get into town, 747s headed to/from Asia overhead all the time, etc etc.

He did suggest being very aggressive in negotiating, wherever we end up. He said for a large block of rooms they ought to give us a "Priceline"-like rate, maybe \$75/night.

2. Conducted a "focus group" with my executive committee of LP-Maine. All of them favored Dallas strongly. (Understand we are sitting here in the far northeast.) I did not tell them my preference until the discussion ended.

Reasons cited were as follows:

- a. Perception that the convention locations, generally, have been skewing/drifting west over the last 10 years. (This, actually, is true. Looking at the sites beginning in 2000 the geographic center of them is in northwest Kansas. See <http://www.geomidpoint.com>)
- b. Much less travel time to get to Dallas from here. Wouldn't have to take a redeye, or waste a day in travel, to get back here.
- c. Having a nicer/posher/larger room was not a selling point. "How much time do you spend in your room at the convention anyway."
- d. Onsite gaming was considered a distraction.
- e. Two said San Francisco was "too liberal". (!)
- f. On the other hand, some saw San Fran as desirable insofar as planning vacationing in wine country or Monterey/Carmel around the convention.
- g. Cost. These folks were very cost sensitive, moreso than I expected. Even \$50 less in airfare was a tipping point.

Just offering as data points from (a small number of) the "faithful".

...James Oaksun

And one LNC member used the debate to criticize the notion of running candidates for Senate (following is snipped from a far longer letter):

#### Alicia Mattson : (in a note speaking to James Oaksun):

There are 8 candidates running for Nevada's U.S. Senate seat this year. Off the top of your head, without researching, can you name any of them besides Reid and Angle? Some of you might be able to come up with the name of the guy running on the Tea Party of Nevada line...he's gotten some press for allegedly being a Democrat plant and for recording a phone call. And the other 5?

The Reid/Angle race is likely the most watched race in the nation, but the other candidates are unknowns. If the LP of NV had put a 9th candidate into the race, do you really think he would have been any more than a popcorn vendor in the media circus that is the Reid/Angle race? There were only the predictable two participants in the Senate candidates' debate last week. The NV LP candidates are instead in more practical races where it costs less to compete and there are fewer competitors.

On October 26, Vicki Kirkland was appointed to the Convention Oversight Committee.

#### LNC Budget?

So where is the budget planning process?

Mon, 25 Oct 2010 From: "James Oaksun"

Subject: budget preparation

Was assuming this was going to be on the November agenda, and was preparing to share thoughts on it with Wes and Mark H this week.

...James Oaksun

That is, the LNC is five months into its two-year term, and consideration of 'what are we going to do for political action?', which couples heavily to 'how shall we spend out money?' is not yet under way. Readers should in fairness recall that James Oaksun has had multiple recent deaths in the immediate family, but what ahs the rest of the LCN been doing?

LNC Debates a \$2500 CPAC Booth, CPAC being a conservative conference.

#### Wes Benedict wrote:

CPAC registration forms are attached. There's a discount if we sign up by October 29. I believe rates go up \$500 after that. Vendor registration is \$2,500. Affiliate registration is \$4,500.

As affiliates, we could be listed in their program, and could also reserve rooms to make presentations such as "How the Libertarian Party makes a difference," and perhaps be fortunate enough to raise funds, but that's hit and miss.

If we go with the \$2,500 vendor option, it's possible, but not at all certain, that another group, such as Students For Liberty, might split the cost with us, leaving us with only \$1,500 to pay. I say \$1,500 instead of \$1,250, because if our name is the one to be listed as the vendor, I expect we need to pay more than half.

I reviewed emails from a year ago regarding CPAC and there appeared to be people who donated specifically for this in the

past. It looks like LNC representatives personally pledged funds for this and/or helped raise money to cover the cost.

We're in far better financial and organizations shape than a year ago, so I'm more comfortable participating in the upcoming event, whereas I was opposed last year.

My suggestion is to forward this email to the LNC. If LNC representatives are able to raise \$1,250 for this, we go forward with the vendor option (recognizing we might have to pay another \$1,250 out of existing funds to cover the total).

Mark, the ball is in your court.

As usual, the intelligent comments are from James Oaksun who on Sun, Oct 31, 2010 at 2:54 PM wrote:

All well and good to have wealthy donors willing to pony up money specifically to send us (who exactly staffs these events anyway) hither and yon.

The more important question, in my opinion, is, given limited resources, where do we get the biggest return? For example,

- What has been our experience at such events in the past?

- What are our objectives in going -- member recruitment?

Donations? Publicity?

- What is the range of possibilities in terms of such events?

Where are we most likely to have the biggest impact?

- How does participating in these sorts of things compare with other things we could be (theoretically anyway) doing?

All, in my opinion, questions of strategy, focus and disciplined execution.

...James Oaksun

And here is the note from Mark Hinkle to the LNC saying he did not attend the Oregon Friday evening dinner.

Dear LNC,

Rachel Hawkridge Quote: "Hinkle, Carling and Mattson went out with LPOR Chair Jeff Weston and Vice Chair Wes Wagner. The two noteworthy parliamentarians told LPOR that their rules (RONR) had a quorum requirement of 50% of membership.

The three LNC members told Weston and Wagner that they had to follow their own rules."

I can't speak for M Carling & Alicia Mattson, but I was visiting a long time Libertarian friend Friday evening. I did NOT go out with LPO Chair Jeff Weston nor V.C. Wes Wagner Friday evening nor since then. That just never occurred.

I did make some opening remarks at the LPO convention Saturday morning, thanking them for attending, working on behalf of the LP and the freedom we all seek and gave a brief update on what the LP HQ is doing, but gave no instructions to anyone regarding any LPO issues.

I was asked to attend the LPO convention by Dan Karlan, their Regional LNC Rep.. And, as I recall, the other Rep. Dr. James

Lark also suggested it would be a good idea for me to attend. [Emphasis added]

At their suggestion, I made my plans to attend and observe.

And, because the issues at hand are and were largely Bylaws and RONR issues, it was suggested to me that Alicia Mattson attend as well. I called Alicia Mattson to support that idea. Furthermore, LPO member M Carling flew in from Vienna to attend of his own initiative. As I understand, both are Professional Registered Parliamentarians.

It's my understand that they met w/ Jeff & Wes Friday evening.

Since I wasn't there, I can't report first hand what went on.

What I observed on Saturday morning was that the convention opened, Jeff made an announcement that some members, whose membership status were held up, were in fact recognized and allowed to be delegates.

Shortly after, a quorum call was made, and Chairman Jeff Weston announced that a quorum was lacking, a motion was made, and passed, to adjourn.

I stayed around for about an hour afterwards to listen to the concerns of the people in attendance, and left around 11 AM.

And for those interested, I had a nice introduction and conversation with Orrin Grover, the attorney who's handling the Top Two lawsuit in the state of Washington. It looks like we'll get some kind of ruling in January.

The LNC has helped defer some of the legal expenses associated with this lawsuit.

There are significant issues that divide the LPO membership. While those issues weren't resolved today, I think the attendance of Alicia Mattson, M Carling, and myself indicated to all parties involved that we're watching and observing.

As I see it, the LPO rules were followed regarding this convention, so there was and is no reason for the LNC to intervene. We hope that is also the case for their regular scheduled convention next March.

They do have a tall hurdle to overcome regarding a quorum (of all members).

However, that should give all sides a big incentive to bring in new members and get them to attend the next convention.

And if they jump that hurdle in March, they just may find that with a 2/3 vote requirement to pass Bylaws changes, they may be "forced" to work towards a solution that all or most of the factions can abide by.

I wish them all the luck in the world.

Yours in liberty.....Mark Hinkle, LNC Chair  
P.S. we'll be watching.



# 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](mailto: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](mailto: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

Make public statements;  
internet, newspapers, talk  
radio

Provide art/graphics support

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:

Oregon State Party Officers Blast LNC  
For Disrupting LP Oregon State Convention  
LP-Oregon Convention Events  
Antiwar.com Needs Your Support  
Bovard Wins Suit!  
Liberty for America PAC  
LNC Acts

A special in our electronic edition only:

Hawkrige Responds to Being Fired from the  
Convention Oversight Committee

Address Corrections Requested  
First Class Mail

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

## Hawkridge Responds to Being Fired from the Convention Oversight Committee

Both the LNC Chair and the COC Chair have stated that I was not participating on the COC, that I wasn't answering eMails, and that I wasn't on conference calls. Below is just \*some\* of the evidence that I was doing both of these things. In addition, my LSLA conference call this afternoon produced a summary of the call, and the first 5 or 8 digits of the phone numbers of everyone who called in. Have either David or Mark seen those? I'd suggest that you do. Until you fired me, I had missed exactly one call, and was late to one other. I was mute on most of those calls – on the first one, they all had a giggle fest when I came on and didn't immediately identify myself – I was in a loud place, and had to go out – saying “Hi, George!”, “I guess we'll see this on IPR tomorrow”, etc. Before I got where I could unmute, I wasn't going to.

I continued to listen to the calls without identifying myself, as I was generally eating dinner during them, and had nothing to add. They were information sessions, and there was no reason for me to chime in. I had no questions. I checked air fares, comparable hotel prices, etc., while on the calls. Often David or someone else was also checking out travel costs, etc and shared that info before I had any chance to, so again, no reason to unmute.

This is not all the conference calls I was on, but some of them – I clipped these out of some of my bills.

08/24	05:08 PM	206-852-1255	SEATTLE, WA
08/24	06:11 PM	503-767-1200	STAYTON, OR
08/24	08:02 PM	206-852-1255	Incoming
09/07	06:29 PM	206-522-0846	Incoming
09/07	06:42 PM	503-767-1200	STAYTON, OR
09/30	09:14 PM	503-767-1200	STAYTON, OR
09/30	09:58 PM	503-767-1200	STAYTON, OR
09/30	10:01 PM	805-360-1000	LOS ALAMOS, CA

The Stayton, OR number is the one that was used for conference calls. On that 3<sup>rd</sup> clip, the number was changed last minute, and so I had to go look for the number. Mark mentioned that I didn't check out any hotels – the people in the places in question did that. John Jay Myer in Dallas. Mattson in Vegas. Yes, Mark and Dan Weiner went to check out a hotel in SF area. Their home turf.

They say I didn't participate in eMail discussions, that I didn't answer eMails. (I did answer him – he didn't like what I said, so he just ignored it, IMNHO.)

## Here are extractions from some of the emails:

*Dave Nolan*

*Kevin Knedler queried the state chairs about their preferences regarding a da...*

*Aug 11 Hawkridge wrote:*

*Mid May or early May works for The Real Washington (TM), and that's the largest group. I REALLY like TX for it - weather is decent that time of year.*

*I hate Vegas as a convention/conference location. It's too expensive, there are too many people, and too much smoke. The hooker hustlers weren't an attractive part, either, even tho the only ones who bothered me were the women. The men didn't approach me. I don't know whether to be glad or annoyed. ;o)*

*Aug 11*

*Vicki Kirkland*

*Our Florida State Chair doesn't read his e-mails so as Vice Chair I'm going t...*

*Aug 12*

*James Oaksun*

*I have not offered any specific thoughts on the 2012 convention previously to...*

*Aug 19*

*Dave Nolan*

*James, you make some interesting points, but because you missed a lot of the ...*

*Aug 19*

*Vicki Kirkland*

*I like Dallas/Fort Worth. I see lots of positives and no negatives. As I said...*

*Aug 19*

*Rachel H. for LPWA Communications , dfn Sep 7*

*I haven't seen the SF numbers. Would you pls send those?*

*Thx,*

*Dave Nolan*

*to Convention Sep 30*

We are making progress. A consensus is emerging that the SFO (Burlingame) Hyatt in late June is our best bet overall, balancing costs, location and facilities. It's not my first preference, but I can certainly live with that choice if it's the one we make. I'm concerned that by giving the LNC the final say in the matter, we are adding two weeks to the decision-making process, but hopefully we can get whatever hotel we favor to hold our chosen date for us during that two weeks.<snipped>

*Rachel H. for LPWA Communications Oct 1*

I'm also concerned that the Vegas location will draw a firestorm of criticism - holding a presidential nominating convention in the hometown of \*one\* of the candidates.

Does no one else see this as a problem?

Our membership will.

**Alicia Mattson** Oct 1

Nevada gets a whopping 14 delegates to the convention. If 14 delegates were enough to control the convention, George Phillies would have been elected chair in St. Louis.

**Robert Kraus** Oct 1

Not too mention one could have the same "problem" with TX but she failed to mention that!

(Rachel's note – huh? Since when does staff get snide and snarky with LNC?)

**Nancy Neale** to conventions Oct 1

Didn't Mr. WAR have to get seated as a delegate from Indiana in St. Louis? Hardly an endorsement from his home state. Texas was 'disqualified' for the 2008 convention in the minds of many on the LNC because it was thought that Badnarik would run a second time. (And yes, Robert, there's a prez candidate from Texas now.) You never know who will come out of the woodwork, so who may or may not be running for prez should never be a consideration on convention location. They may or may not enjoy "favorite son" status; Al Gore comes to mind. Hey, Hinkle may run for a second term; that means we shouldn't have 2012 in San Francisco!

(Rachel's note – huh? I'm not sure I've ever had a conversation with Ms. Neale. My point was that Root is on the LNC – the only declared candidate from TX (Wrights) is not.)

**Dave Nolan** to me Oct 1

**PRIVATE REPLY**

**Rachel H. for LPWA Communications** to dfn Oct 1

I acknowledge and agree to your stipulation of PRIVATE.

David also worries that I didn't vote on the Convention location vote.

**Alicia Mattson** to LNC Oct 30

Voting has ended for the email ballot shown below, regarding selection of Dallas as the 2012 national convention site.

Voting "aye": Craig, Nolan, Oaksun, Ruwart

Voting "nay": Flood, Knedler, Lark, Mattson, Olsen, Redpath, Root, Rutherford, Visek, Wiener, Wolf

With a final vote tally of 4-11, the motion FAILS.

Alicia Mattson  
LNC Secretary

What he didn't bother to tell you is that some time ago, the LNC overwhelmingly passed a motion that made the entire LNC responsible for choosing the convention site. **It had already been decided to choose at the NOLA meeting.**

Either the Chairs (LNC and COC) overlooked this, or they

thought that it wouldn't matter . . . but this vote was a non-starter. The Chair made this [the Texas] motion after the motion to allow the entire LNC to choose convention site was made. 5-11 is no better than 4-11, and frankly, I have very little desire to support either Chair at this point. Both have attacked me here, while KNOWING that the Secretary was withholding information. If they didn't know it before, I informed them and the Sec confirmed it on the last conference call before I was fired. I also sent 2 eMails about needing info, and they ignored those.

Both have accused me of lying, while lying about me. They allowed staff to attack me on COC eMail list, without any reaction from them, and while the Chair of the LNC was talking about collegiality and us all getting along on LNC Discuss, he was on here trashing me. Yet he's never had a conversation with me about it. His only communication has been . . .

**mark@garlic.com** to me Oct 4

Rachel,

It's clear to me you're too busy to dedicate any serious time to the Convention Oversight Committee.

I'll give you until midnight tonight (Monday) to resign. Otherwise, in my capacity as LNC Chair, I'll remove you from the COC.

I want someone on the committee who's going to give some serious time, talent, and energy to the serious task at hand.

It's your choice, but I suggest you resign rather than me removing you for inaction on the COC.

FYI & RSVP.....Mark Hinkle, LNC Chair

**Rachel H. for LPWA Communications** to mark Oct 4

What exactly is it that you have wanted me to do that I haven't done?

My knowledge and evaluation of the hotels is entirely dependent on the calls, as I haven't gotten a spreadsheet since the first version, I believe.

I have informed you of this at least twice, and it has continued.

You can't just cut off a member of a committee, and then say "you aren't participating".

And what difference do you think it makes whether I resign or you remove me? It's the same thing. Threatening me with removal is the same as removing me.

What is it, Mark - have you totally bought Starr's accusations about me?



Rachel,

I have not spoken a word about you to Aaron Starr. Zip. If he has an opinion about you, it's a mystery to me.

As I recall you've been on exactly 1 tele-conference call, which you were mostly silent. (Rachel's note: Largely silent? I spoke a lot at the first call in Oct, including saying I hadn't been getting spreadsheets.)

You (to my knowledge) have contacted zero hotels as potential 2012 or 2014 convention sites. I don't recall more than 1 or 2 emails on COC business from you.

Simply put, you have not been participating and this is a very important committee and I don't think it's fair that you get an equal vote with everyone else who's done significant work on behalf of the LNC COC.

As I said, you can quit or I'm going to remove you.

I would think resigning would be the best course for you, but it's your choice. I think there is a difference between quitting and being fired. Perhaps you don't.

I recommend you resign.

It's your call.....but by midnight tonight please.

FYI.....Mark Hinkle, LNC Chair

Also, the Chair apparently has no idea what goes into a convention – this (choosing a site) is just one tiny part. Last time, I busted butt selling the damn thing, which was a hard job, after the “floor fee” fiasco. And the floor fee issue didn't consume a little bit of time, it ate a lot.

There is also going to be deciding whether there will be more than a business meeting (an education track?), choosing speakers and meals, costing, volunteer help, costing, ribbons, awards, binders, etc.

The Chair also told you all that I “didn't do anything” last time, either. He said “Ask anyone who was on the committee last time”. That is not what the Admiral says. (He was Chair.)

**Here is my recent exchange with the Admiral:**

*Rachel H. for LPWA Communicationsto Michael Oct 17*  
*Dear Admiral -*

*Last spring, I missed one of your conference calls. You scheduled Thurs afternnon, to be held on Sun evening. I never saw that note until Monday morning, as that was my convention weekend. I was totally tied up that weekend, holding a state convention.*

*I understood your anger and frustration at that time, and hope that you are not still angry. It has been reported to me that you*

*may have been dissatisfied with my participation. Would you please clarify?*

**Michael Colley** to me Oct 26

*NO! I was only concerned that you had an overflowing plate of commitments (you surely do - and I admire your support for the causes you have adopted), and could not be a regular participant in our effort - continuity counts!*

*Best,  
MCC*

**So, this is how I'm feeling about this:**

**Remember this – if you ever get sideways of the Chair, I feel like he will lie about you to others, all the while patting himself on the back about collegiality.**

This all started because they chose to believe Aaron Starr and Alicia Mattson's allegations that I was “leaking” LNC Discuss material to George Phillies. No one even bothered to ask me, until I accused David of not asking – he then asked, and I replied that I would neither confirm nor deny. If they had asked me at Vegas, I might have answered differently, but since then I have come to believe that Andy Wolf's “I hope the person doesn't confess” opinion is the right one.

During that meeting, Starr put his arm around Visek and walked her down the hall, whispering in her ear. Just a few minutes later, she came to me and told me that I was never going to get anything accomplished if I kept this up. Despite my informing her that . . .

1. George has had a leak on the list for years, if not decades, before I got on it, and
2. He often sends me an eMail to offer his perspective on something that has happened on the list before I get down the queue to that Discuss eMail. IOW, he knows before I do, and I keep up with the list pretty well, even before they started the Super Secret List. These days, there is little traffic on the official list.

She then called George and harangued him about it for some time. She apparently wanted him to stop printing stuff, and told him that my “body language confirmed I was guilty”. I suspect that no matter what my body language was, something would have “confirmed I was guilty”.

None of the above should be taken as “evidence”, confirmation or denial from me. I suspect that there is more than one person who leaks stuff, depending on the material. No one has accused me of leaking Olsen's gay post to Brian Miller, who pitched an absolute bitch and published that thing far and wide.

Should LNC Discuss be confidential? Ask yourself . . .

If the LNC is doing stuff on eMail that they shouldn't, or that they don't want anyone to know about, **should they be doing it?**

**We take votes there. Per our Policy Manual, that makes it a meeting, which is required to be open to the membership.**

Do you think LNC Discuss subverts our “Open Meeting” rule?

(Section 2: MEETINGS)

#### B. OPEN MEETINGS

Except as expressly provided below, LNC meetings are open to Party members. However, participation is not permitted except by majority vote of the committee.)

**How long** do you want **your** governing body to be warring amongst itself, doing things that they don't want you to know about?

In the Vegas meeting, they spent quite some time venting about “this is fraud” (Stewart Flood), “I'm the one who's been wronged, and someone must pay” (Root).

If you'll remember, the stuff George published was a fairly uncivil back and forth between Root and Nolan. If I remember correctly, Root attacked Nolan particularly viciously, and the Chair ignored it. Nolan attacked back. The current LNC has been real fun about personal attacks. Let's berate our fellow committee members, and then spend the rest of the time praising ourselves. LNC Discuss has been a real fun place since June.

This is not about confidentiality. **It's about secrecy.** There is no legitimate reason to say that LNC Discuss should be held confidential.

It's about secrecy and operating in the dark. Hiding what we do from you. Fighting and preening, and calling it “confidential”.

I'm not participating any longer. I will NOT PARTICPATE in any more illegitimate Executive Sessions, where secrecy is used to bash activists or other party or LNC members, as has been done several times in the last 2 years. I will leave immediately and report it to the membership.

The only time I have “broken confidentiality” was my report on IPR about the attack that was launched on me in secret in St. Louis – Starr called it a “staff matter”. I am NOT staff. I reported it after I had been accused of crap on IPR, and I signed my name to it. I've never denied it. It was illegitimate ExSess.

I am sick over this. My Hugs (32 year member) is finished. Cancelled his pledge, and is only sticking around until my term is over. I have promised to serve out my term - that was my commitment to my states. I'm a 15 year member, Life Member who loved this party and still loves most of the people.

In Peace and Liberty,  
Rachel Hawkrige

Unpaid Volunteer  
Chair, Libertarian Party of Washington  
Co-Chair, Libertarian State Leadership Alliance (State Chairs)  
Region 2 Representative to the Libertarian National Committee  
Proudly representing Alaska, Washington, Idaho, Tennessee,  
Florida, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Vermont