

Liberty for America

Journal of the Libertarian Political Movement

Volume 5 Number 5

October 2012

Libertarian Donors Pay Johnson's Republican Campaign Debts



As we previously reported, in a signed affidavit presented to the United States District Court for Eastern Virginia, Gary Johnson's campaign manager Ronald Nielson last Spring specified under penalty of perjury "...At present OAI [Ed: Our America Initiative, Johnson's political advocacy committee] is indebted to NSoN [Ed: Nielson's company] for services rendered and expenses advanced in the approximate amount of \$1.8 million. At present GJ2012 is indebted to NSoN for services rendered and expenses advanced in the approximate amount of \$676,000."

We are led to believe by sources on the LNC that Johnson promised the LNC that his Republican campaign debts would be paid out of Federal campaign matching funds.

In the August FEC Report, covering July, Johnson received Federal campaign matching funds totalling \$130,058.91, and other donations totalling \$202,921.89, and paid his debts down from \$431,722.03 to \$296,201.47. The decrease in Johnson's debts was a few thousand dollars larger than the Federal matching funds he received that month.

We now come to Johnson's August spending. In his September FEC Report, Johnson reports paying his campaign debts down to \$175,087.91, a drop of over \$121,000. However, for this same period his Federal Matching Funds income was only \$73,692.29. Included in the payoff were the Johnson 2012 campaign debts to Jonathan Bydlak, who prior to the nomination had already sued Johnson 2012 for nonpayment of these Republican campaign debts

If \$73,692 of the debt reduction came from Federal campaign matching funds, this month more than \$47,000 did not. That \$47,000 inescapably came from money raised from Libertarian donors during Johnson's Libertarian Presidential campaign.

Editorial Note

Our classic printer Xerox Phaser 8560 reached the end of days, and they are no longer being made. The next step is under consideration.

LNC Votes Against Voting to Replace Root

Last month, Wayne Root fled the LNC and the LNCC to join the Republican Party. It was, to paraphrase Winston Churchill, one of the few instances in history of a rat being seen to swim toward a sinking ship. Root's departure led to a vacancy appearing on the LNC, a vacancy that under party by-laws is to be filled by vote of the National Committee.

At first, it appeared that the decision would be made at the November LNC face-to-face meeting. Then Ruth Bennett offered a motion to do the vote by mail in the near future. After a certain amount of back and forth, the Secretary's record of all votes was fixed, so that the outcome of the motion was clear. The motion was rejected by the LNC, which finally sent out a letter to members urging them to consider applying.

Our analyst interprets the motion for a mail ballot as a failed scheme to install Mark Hinkle on the LNC as an At-Large, after he and Mark Rutherford were rejected for LNC membership by the National Convention. The list of motion endorsers and people voting in favor speaks for itself. Other actors supporting the move included Wes Benedict, who endorsed Hinkle.

The following used the Starchild reflector list as its source. Italics set off out comments and quoted text. The Bennett motion is:

I move that we fill the At-large vacancy as follows:

Self-nominations are currently open. An additional announcement will be sent to the State Chairs list. Nominations are closed as of OCT 5, 2012.

Each nominee is encouraged to submit a one page "application" to the Chair and the Secretary to include:

- Name
- Address
- Telephone number/s
- Email address/es
- Year joined the National LP and member number
- Any Party offices - national or state - ever held
- Any candidacies for public office
- Any potential conflicts of interest
- An acknowledgment that all travel expenses are the responsibility of the nominee

All applications must be received by the Secretary and the Chair by OCT 5, 2012

Additional resumes or CVs may be included. The Secretary

shall distribute nominee information as received. The Secretary will make available an instant run-off voting procedure no later than OCT 6, 2012. Balloting will end on OCT 16, 2012.

As always, Regional Representatives will coordinate voting with their Alternates.

Motion made by Ruth E. Bennett
Co-sponsored by Michael Cloud, Tim Hagan and Vicki Kirkland

Her defense of the motion was:

Dear LNC members,

In thinking about filling this position and seeing the names of the folks self-nominating, I realized that there is no logical reason to ask anyone interested to spend the time and money to fly to D.C. to make their case to us. I would much rather that we make our selection and then urge the others to make a donation of the money they've saved to the NLP or the Johnson campaign.

Realistically, most of us have probably made our decisions or at least narrowed it down from the list. I am just proposing that we make the decision now, let the new member get all the necessary reports and get up to speed.

Please, also remember, that we have such a limited amount of time together and it seems like a mis-allocation of those limited hours to make a decision that most - likely all - of us have already made. Let's say that we have just these 8 candidates. If each is allowed just five minutes to make her/his case, that is 40 minutes at best. Plus wrangling over a voting system and voting and counting ballots. We will have spent a minimum of an hour and a half out of our total of 12-14 hours together - about 10% of our meeting! It just does not seem like a good use of our time - when we can have a decision in the next couple of weeks.

Currently I have these names - and more are likely coming: (in no particular order)

Carl Person	Paulie Frankel
David Blau	Mark Hinkle
Bill Still	Gary Johnson (TX)
Gigi Bowman	Guy McLendon

So please vote AYE on this motions as quickly as possible and we can proceed to a vote on our new At-Large member.

Thank you for your consideration.
Ruth

At some point Dan Wiener reportedly said ".... The website Ruth is using to tally the votes (opavote.org) does support Condorcet as well as traditional IRV and Single Transferable Voting (STV), so one method would be just as easy to select as any other. And even if we defeat this motion and decide to conduct the election at our November meeting, there's no reason why we can't do it electronically on the spot via the OpaVote web

site. ..." *He then apparently added: "3. The Opavote.org web site appears to provide good security for balloting secrecy, including encryption, so that specific ballots cannot be traced back to individual voters. I think that's excellent. But in light of the previous disagreements we've had on the topic, I want to make sure everyone understands this feature up front."* *The curious part of this is that there is no sign of where Wiener got his information that Bennett was proposing the opavote site, though he was not disputed in his claim. Perhaps a few messages are out there someplace.*

However, here is the proposal to elect the new member by secret ballot, to hide who is voting for whom. The LNC discussion then raised an extended series of questions about the Bylaws propriety of the proposal. In the end, Neale appears to have said, among other things.

"Therefore, it is my position that this motion is out of order, but I am not clear if I have the authority under RNR to make an official ruling outside of a meeting." and voting continued.

On Mon, Oct 1, 2012 at 5:53 PM, Ruth Bennett seems to have written :The votes I have are:

AYE - Wrights, Bennett, Hagan, Cloud, Myers
NO - Olsen, Mack, Pojunis, Visek

However, a bunch of votes cast earlier had somehow been overlooked, so the vote was not 5-4 but led to the following discussion seen on the Starchild reflector list:

James Lark: At 12:11 a.m. EDT on Sept. 28 I sent two messages to the LNC Business list; you were copied on both messages...the second message conveyed my "nay" vote.

Sam Goldstein: I seem to remember that our chair also voted against this motion.

and several more in the same light, followed by

On Mon, Oct 1, 2012 at 6:24 PM, Daniel Wiener <wieners@...> wrote: Ruth, Based on the emails I've seen, the vote totals are as follows (not including Alternates whose Representatives have voted): AYE -- Bennett, Hagan, Wrights, Redpath, Cloud; NAY -- Vohra, Pojunis, Mack, Wiener, Neale, Kirkland, Lark, Visek, Olsen, Myers (changed his vote); NOT VOTING THAT I KNOW OF -- Starchild, Tomasso (Blau has abstained).

On Mon, Oct 1, 2012 at 6:35 PM, Ruth Bennett wrote:

*I found some more votes - with Vicki's help.
Voting Aye - Wrights, Bennett, Hagan, Cloud, Redpath, My-*

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

er; Voting Nay - Neale, Vohra, Olsen, Kirkland, Mack, Wiener, Pojunis, Lark, Visek. *Note that in the Secretary's version Myers' name is spelt differently, and he is said to be voting in favor of the motion.*

and Lieberman commented "I thought we had agreed that balloting would be open until Midnight on the evening of the tenth day. Doesn't that mean that balloting should have been open until 11:59pm Arizona Time on October 1? (10 days after Sept 21)."

The motion appears at this point to have sunk into defeat.

Meanwhile, there remains a vacancy on the LNC. Geoff Neale did urge, back in early September, that the LNC should discuss in advance what voting scheme it would use at the meeting, so this would be settled before the meeting. No progress is seen here. On September 9, Neale sent a notice to State Chairs that there was a vacancy on the LNC. At the start of October, the notice was finally sent, by email, to national party members.

Other LNC events

The LNC received an extended missive about a petitioner who, so far as I could tell, wished to be paid without supplying a Social Security number. There was then some question as to whether the signatures could be submitted or not. This went on for a piece. The nominating papers were in the end turned in for reasons Paulie explained.

**Sample—This is your sample 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
Phillips, 48 Hancock Hill Drive Worcester 01609.

Membership is not a subscription!

Newsletter is only available electronically

If you **must** get a paper subscription, ask first.

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.

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.

Ballot access was attained in state after state. Time after time, Paulie was the fellow who told the LNC about it, including access in CT, KY, AL, and RI (his message also had a detailed report on the situation in other states, including how other candidates were doing, and comparisons with 2008). Indeed, there is one LNC member keeping the LNC up to date on ballot access issues; that member is Paul Frankel.

Brett Pojunis opined that our data files are of very low quality, but did not offer a motion for LNC action correcting the matter. He does have his company looking at the question of list generation. He did advocate for his Double the LP scheme.

The Double the LP Plan appears in the Files Section of the Starchild reflector pages <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/LNCDiscussPublic/files/> It is 28 pages of things that are supposed to happen by mid-October this year, culminating in a one-day effort to double the size of the National Party. Many of them, like radio ads, are significant efforts to accomplish, ignoring the question of raising and appropriating the money to pay for those ads, with no discussion of personnel, efforts to make things happen etc. In short, it is the names of a plan, but not a plan. Doing the plan by 2016 would be good. I write as someone who ran a Congressional campaign that did radio advertising, a major Federal campaign that did street signs, and advertising, not to mention having been the National Volunteer Coordinator for the Badnarik 2004 campaign.

Buried in the message of "Double the LP" is "Agree to a performance based commission to cover the costs associated with the campaign." That was something for the LNC to do.

What has instead happened is that the LNC Chairman reportedly agreed to go ahead with the scheme, including spending LNC, Inc.'s money without LNC approval. *According to the Starchild reflector list, message 2298 near the bottom, Neale wrote:*

"I have given this proposal a lot of thought, and talked extensively with Brett, and with other LNC members. I have decided that to fully endorse and embrace this project.

"My first concern over this project was whether or not I have the authority to approve it without either the EC or LNC voting on it, and I have decided that I do, provided that the agreement that will be required does not violate our standard practices or established policies (or the Bylaws, for that matter). I believe that the agreement we will need can be so crafted.

"Given that, I asked myself a simple question: "would our ED have the authority to do this without LNC or EC approval". I answered myself "As long as an agreement is established that protects the interest of the LP, and does not violate anything, yes she would." Well - if I would back our ED for making the decision to proceed with a project like this, I can't see a reason why I would not be able to do so.

"My second concern was with crafting the agreement to properly protect the LP. I believe every detail can be worked out, and the details will have to be worked out.

“My third concern was with the cost (in terms of money and staff time), especially if it ends up with a budgetary impact, but I believe that this project can be accomplished with no LP expense upfront, and minimal staff cost. The only caveat I see is that if this project meets its objectives, then staff will have to deal with handling more monetary transactions and a lot of new members. Hopefully no one objects to that cost, and that we can accommodate necessary budget changes to spend a small portion of new revenues. Additionally, I have been told that staff bandwidth is limited, so I will be mindful of coming up with a solution that minimizes staff impact.

“My fourth concern was voiced by some that we cannot afford to take our eyes off of the election. I have come to the conclusion that if we wait until after the election, the public's eyes will not be on politics. The best time is now - not later.

“My fifth concern was the appearance of conflict of interest, because we would be paying a commission for new member acquisition. At this point, this appears to be around 25%, but we don't have a solid agreement yet. I am willing to pay this commission rate for new members, because our historical costs for new member acquisitions during successful campaigns like "Project Archimedes" dwarf this costs. In fact, any party that comes to us and asks for a 25% commission on new members will be most welcome. Also, we are already paying commissions to another LNC member for performance based fundraising activities. This is not new ground.

“My sixth concern was whether or not the approach of this project makes sense, and I determined that I cannot let my historical knowledge be the judge of current success. I live in a very different world today than the last time the LNC actively pursued a robust member acquisition project, and I don't really get it completely. I understand the strategy of direct mail approaches, but I fear that we would only get new members from my generation - or older. We need youth, and I am not an expert in how to reach them. In short, I hope to be an old dog that is capable of learning new tricks.

“My final concern was whether or not this project will actually work, and I do not know. I do know that doing anything is far more likely to be successful than doing nothing. I've tried to see a downside to doing this project, and the only downside I can see is that it will not create as many new members as targeted. Even if it brings in no new members, the only thing I end up with is egg on MY face. I am willing to risk that. The potential is unknown and possibly quite large. So, I am going to proceed with working out the details with Brett and Jillian. I will coordinate with staff. I may remain skeptical about doubling our membership, but I will remain hopeful also.

“If you have other concerns whatsoever, please feel free to share. Geoffrey Neale

Readers will note that our National Party has clear Bylaws on how much money the Chair may spend on his own behest, and that amount might be said to be extremely small relative to these 25% commissions on any significant number of new members. We would be interested in finding out which LNC member is being paid for doing fundraising, what his or her

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.

commission rate is, and how the National Committee approved this activity.

Starchild opined to the LNC, referring to the 2008 ticket:

“...Better to wait and let convention delegates at our next convention address the issue more comprehensively by simply adopting a resolution publicly repudiating our 2008 presidential ticket and humbly apologizing to the American people for our mistake. Like removing an elected at-large representative, this seems like something that should come from the party as a whole, not just from those of us on the LNC...”

John Jay Myers Condemns Root

From a longer missive to the LNC, as reported on the Starchild reflector list: “Unfortunately [Root] had put his claws into us pretty good, as I mentioned many times he made us look really bad. It has kept us from being a part of the Liberty movement in the way we should have, he really turned that many people off. ...Unfortunately he had some die hard supporters who gave him more power here than he should have ever had. Hopefully when we choose a new LNC member we can find someone with the energy, but not the ideology...Anyway, his exit letter was gracious, for a letter from someone whose time had come...Wayne used this party for his own personal gain in attempt to change it for his own personal use. Good riddance to bad rubbish.”

Olsen Attacks Myers Re: Root

According to the Starchild Reflector list, LNC Member Norm Olsen denounced John Jay Myers, allegedly writing:

“To all to whom these presents shall come . . .

“Ordinarily, I would simply ignore a message such as the following. Wasting time responding would be a greater sin than that of wasting time reading it in the first place. Since LNC Discussion list to which this message was posted is now public, I am compelled to respond.

“I, and I'm sure several of my LNC colleagues, are shockingly embarrassed and totally appalled by this public statement made by a member of the LNC. This statement demonstrates a complete lack of class, decorum, manners, maturity, and gentility. I ask all readers to accept my apology for this totally inappropriate conduct by a member of the LNC and ask that you realize

that this type of base conduct is not typical of your LNC representatives.

“It cannot be denied that Mr. Root’s activities on behalf of the LP were controversial. However, it was widely recognized that a majority of the LP were in support of his efforts on our behalf. Contrary to the commentary below, the entire membership, gathered in convention, selected Mr. Root to represent them on the LNC being fully aware for not less than four years of who he was and how he used his skills and talents for the benefit of the LP.

“Mr. Root worked as hard as any volunteer I know for the Party using his skills and talents in a well intentioned way to make something of the Libertarian Party, and for that I thank him and extend my great appreciation for his efforts.

“The base conduct evidenced by the offensive, pejorative commentary which appears below, its intentional publication to a public forum, by a member of a body which represents a large number of people, is inexcusable. This I find embarrassing. I hope you will accept my apology. “

Neale corrected Olsen, noting that a moderate minority of the delegates could cast enough votes to elect an At-Large member, indicated that Root was only the choice of some delegates. (In fact, Root received 143 of the 1904 ballots cast for at-large, meaning about a third of the delegates voted for him.)

Ryan Attacks Myers Re: Root

According to the Starchild Reflector list, LNC Member Tony Ryan denounced John Jay Myers, allegedly writing:

“Good job, Norm- well said. I've been gritting my teeth over Mr. Myers' running at the mouth about Mr. Root since this LNC term began. Talk about lack of civility! What a public display of a combination of hatred and envy. Talk about messages to our public! Let us NOT let this man speak for us about this. He is exactly what the Rs and Ds would love. I apologize in advance for my own seeming incivility, but enough already! TR

Vohra: Myers Saved the Libertarian Party

According to the Starchild Reflector list, LNC Member Arvin Vohra praised John Jay Myers, reportedly writing:

Hi all,

You'd think hindsight would be 20-20, but apparently not. Let's look at the obvious strategy:

1. During the last 4 years, Wayne has promoted himself as a kind of spokesperson for the Libertarian Party.
2. During the latter part of this time, he has only attacked Obama, creating the idea that Libertarians should be just voting against Romney.

Liberty for America

3. Now, still touting his Libertarian credentials, he is formally endorsing Romney. In other words, he is trying to hand the LP over.

Wayne has made a clear and obvious attempt to throw the party under the bus in order to further his professional career. He's attempting to hand the party to the Republicans, in exchange for their favor.

The good news? That plan is going to fail. And one of the big reasons that it is going to fail is John Jay's work over the last years in thwarting Wayne's misrepresentation of the party, and misrepresentation of the ideas of libertarianism. Whether Wayne was misrepresenting our foreign policy stance, suggesting that Senators run cities, or putting forth that foolish bit about college records, John Jay was the first to point out to everyone what was going on.

Now we know beyond any question that John Jay was right. And because of his work, Wayne cannot hand the party to the Republicans. Why? Because he is leaving without the Libertarian credentials to do so. The whole party knows that Wayne is a Republican in Libertarian clothing, and a ton of that is because JJM repeatedly warned us.

Does no one else see this? What JJM warned us about again and again, has happened? And that John Jay's actions have mitigated the consequences?

I think we should take some of John Jay's advice to heart. First, it's not okay to allow party representatives to misrepresent our stances. It is our job to challenge them when they do. When someone calls themselves a pro-interventionist libertarian, we should all say, "There is no such thing as a pro-interventionist Libertarian." When someone suggests that a senator can run a city, we should all point out "That's false. The Party of Principle does not do our outreach by trying to bend the truth."

On a personal level, I like Wayne. We have a lot of the same background. We're both Ivy grads, both small business owners, both don't drink or smoke, and both are passionate about education. But we have a responsibility as LNC members to not allow our personal relationships to get in the way of our duty. I have no choice but to admit that I turned a blind eye to Wayne's actions many times. Sometimes I told myself, "at least he's getting our name out there." Sometimes, I just let personal feelings get in the way. I did speak out on his more egregious actions, but I obviously wish I had spoken out far more often, and far more vociferously.

John Jay, on the other hand, stuck to his guns every time. He saved the Party of Principle--by sticking to his principles. I'd say he deserves our thanks, not our condemnation.

-Arvin

Other LNC Notes

In a message forwarded to the Reflector list, State Chair Lupe Diaz of Illinois is quoted as saying “-Arvin, I have not spoken to or with our National Chair since his election to the LNC. I

Page 5

am one of 50+ State Chairs. I have spoken to Governor Gary Johnson a couple times, and Judge Jim Gray. But, one of the first things I would do as National Chair is contact all of the State Chairs after elected to see what the LNC, or I can do to assist each State Affiliate. We have to much disconnect from our National Party, as State Affiliates. The only way to build a unified brand is all involved get on the same page. It starts with our National Chair and the rest of us State Chairs.

Yours Truly,
Lupe Diaz, State Chair
LP Illinois”

In a message appearing on the Starchild list, identified as coming from Geoff Neale and going to State Chairs list, a response appeared. We quote parts:

“I apologize in advance for interjecting into your discussion group. I have always intended to listen more than talk, and really do not want to debate on this list with the representatives, so I will not....

“My second feedback relates to the fact that after barely FOUR months of being Chair, I indeed have NOT called every state chair. I respect that Mr. Diaz would have, and I urge him to do so if he decides to run for National Chair, and subsequently wins. However, there are many reasons why I have not, and some may not be obvious, so I will explain. The Bylaws specify that we have Regional Representatives on the LNC. Their job is to represent their regions, which are comprised of one or more state affiliates, each with its own Chair. This representation should be bi-directional. Additionally, the LSLA exists as a body to represent the combined affiliates as a whole. I say this not with any imposition of expectations upon the LSLA, but as my perspective of former State Chair of Texas, at the time when the germ of the LSLA was planted. Additionally, we have a committee of the LNC which is called the Affiliate Support Committee, and is comprised of both LNC and LSLA members, that is directed to coordinate affiliate support. I think all ideas should be considered, and more than open to talking to any state chair that wishes to, but I will avoid at all costs working outside of the existing structures that are in place. There is no reason to do so. If you'd like me to call you, just drop me an email at chair at lp.org or liber8or at austin.rr.com and we'll work out a mutually acceptable time. For the record, I also want to state to those who are unaware, that I do not get paid. I am also not independently wealthy. If I win the lottery soon, I will stop working, and just be the Chair - all the time - seven days a week. If that happens, the amount of things I could do, or should do, will still fall very short of what I can do. I have to decide on a day-by-day basis what I think I MUST do. Perhaps a few personal assistants would helpful, but we don't have the budget to hire them for me.”

Your Editor, who has run for National Chair, recalls saying that he viewed calling state chairs as a critical National Chair activity, and a critical activity for the Party's Executive Director. The Party membership has received that for which it voted.

Neale also claims the LSLA represents the interests of our affiliates. In fact, the LSLA is actively working against our na-

tional Party: They recognize the Reeves faction as the Oregon affiliate. Indeed, Neale identifies the State Chairs list as communicating with Chairs of states. Claims that the LSLA represents our state parties are thus simply false: They refuse membership to at least one of them, and here is the LP National Chair implicitly endorsing their action, saying that Reeves in fact the Oregon State Chair.

Paulie offered the LNC a motion on crowd-based fundraising, one I wrote. Apparently the LNC was too busy voting not to vote to consider my motion, as it was neither moved nor seconded by the needed voting members:

“Here is a draft motion for crowd-based funding that avoids most of the objections that have been raised.

In my opinion "it should be able to raise money for everyone not just the LNC" is just a scheme to block passage by complicating what needs to be done.

Moved:

1) The National Committee shall promptly establish a web-based system for collecting funds for projects that members choose to support.

2) The system will use features believed to be current available in LNCHQ computer systems. If the staff finds that those features are not when put to the test actually adequate to implement the directives of this motion, they shall so advise the National Committee and get on with other business.

3) The system will collect funds solely for the national committee. Staff will ensure that FEC rules on raising funds are obeyed.

4) To be supported by this system, a project must be endorsed by at least four members of the national committee and approved by the APRC.

5) To be supported by this system, projects may not require a startup expenditure larger than \$500. All funds beyond that limit must go to the continuous operation of the project.

6) 15% of all funds raised through this system will transfer to the general funds of the LNC to cover operating expenses and be appropriated as the LNC sees fit.”

The LNC had no interest in the proposal.

Oregon Law Suit

Our reports indicate that the lawsuit in Oregon by the Reeves group against our Party affiliate has now had its next hearing postponed to late October. So far as I can tell, they have not yet reached disputes on what may be properly procured via depositions and requests for documents, etc., not to mention that there are legal processes that may yet change the list of litigants on the two sides, which has a cascade of other effects.

How We Got Here

I thank my LNC sources for forwarding this exchange from last spring, on Mr. Root and the LNC. Here is where we left off.

Stewart Flood made his remarks on Root. Flood chose not to run for re-election and then was nominated for At-Large.

"I have seen no apology, no admittance that [Root] violated his fiduciary responsibilities, and in fact have only seen further bragging on his part about how he believes his actions help us! This has got to stop: Mr Root does not appear to be considering resigning from the LNCC. He does not admit his actions were wrong, and unfortunately some on this board have been drinking the "Root-aid" for so long that they can do nothing other than defend a man who uses this organization for personal gain and position in the media, while at the same time publicly stating that our cause is ineffective and our candidates cannot win!

Stewart Flood"

Here Scott Lieberman attacks Stuart Flood. Lieberman is still on the LNC.

Mr. Flood:

I assume the Libertarian Party of South Carolina has been in existence for over 30 years. But after all that time, your only incumbent elected officials are a husband and wife team.

Wayne Root is an appointed state level official. I think there have been fewer of 10 of those in the entire history of the Libertarian Party.

But Mr. Flood wants to waste the LNC's precious time and emotional resources trying to destroy one of our At-Large Representatives, instead of trying to elect Libertarians in South Carolina, or anywhere else, for that matter.

I agree that Wayne Root has a big ego, and that rubs some people the wrong way. However, Mr. Root makes up for that by getting many, many mentions of the Libertarian Party in national and local media.

If you expect Mr. Root to be as effective a spokesperson for the Libertarian Party as say, Karl Rove is for the Republicans, or Bill Clinton is for the Democrats, then you have to give Mr. Root something to work with.

The LP does not have any elected State Representatives right now, much less any members of the US House.

That doesn't exactly give a media pundit like Wayne Root the opportunity to plug Libertarian successes at the state or federal level.

If you want to get mad at Mr. Root for not being an LP shill, then elect at least a dozen Libertarians to the US House of Representatives.

Then - if Mr. Root does not lavish sufficient praise on them when Mr. Root is being interviewed, THEN you can get mad at him for not plugging the Libertarian Party to your level of satisfaction.

Scott Lieberman

Alicia Mattson denied that Root had at that time endorsed Romney. Mattson was defeated for re-election to the LNC. She is said to have written:

At the end of the interview, the last question asked by the host was basically: If Romney could beat Obama, would things be any better, or is it doom either way? In Wayne's answer, he said he didn't think we could survive either Obama or Romney, that someone has to fundamentally restructure the system to save it. If that's an "endorsement" of Romney, then Wayne spent much more of the interview "endorsing" Obama. :-)
-Alicia

And Stewart Flood responded:

I believe that some people are confusing what happened. Speaking for myself, I never said that Mr Root endorsed a candidate of another party. But he did, very clearly, state that the "only choice" was the candidate expected to be the nominee of another party.

That action directly conflicts with his responsibilities as a member of this body, as well as the chairman of the committee that this body created to assist our candidates.

I have seen no apology, no admittance that he violated his fiduciary responsibilities, and in fact have only seen further bragging on his part about how he believes his actions help us!

This has got to stop: Mr Root does not appear to be considering resigning from the LNCC. He does not admit his actions were wrong, and unfortunately some on this board have been drinking the "Root-aid" for so long that they can do nothing other than defend a man who uses this organization for personal gain and position in the media, while at the same time publicly stating that our cause is ineffective and our candidates cannot win!

Mr Root alternates in his interviews and commentary between calling himself a Reagan libertarian, a tea party conservative and various other permutations of self created labels designed to forward his ratings with listeners and readers.

Mr Root is not a libertarian, but he does try to play one on radio and tv. Are we to sit by and encourage bad acting?

Stewart Flood

Dan Wiener maintained that the criticism of Root was overstated. Wiener is still on the LNC. Wiener wrote:

Stewart,

You say "I have seen no apology" from Wayne. But if you read Wayne's statement (at <http://www.independentpoliticalreport.com/2012/04/wayne-roots-clarification-of-cunningham-show-comments/>) he explicitly says "I do apologize for any confusion my words caused." He also admits that his choice of words was poor: "once in a while you'd like to reword a sentence or two. This is one of those times."

So I think the level of criticism you and several others have delivered over that one or two sentences is a bit over-the-top. When someone makes a mistake, recognizes the mistake, and apologizes for it, it makes no sense to keep beating them up over it. The proper response to a mistake is to fix it to the extent possible. Wayne says he is now going to try "turning lemons into lemonade" by scheduling another interview with Bill Cunningham to promote Gary Johnson and the Libertarian Party. To me that sounds like an excellent "fix".

Dan Wiener

Stewart Flood defended himself, saying

Hmmm...how to respond...

Can you name ANY elected libertarians in Nevada?

Your response clearly shows the discoloration of your tongue from sipping so much Root-aid.

First, as you are well aware, Bill Woolsey was doing such a good job as Mayor of his town that the republicans and democrats in our state legislature helped to disband it!

I do not know the entire list of elected libertarians over the history of our state party, but the Woolseys are not the only ones ever elected to office.

We don't count "appointed" libertarians in our state, so I can't speak directly to who may currently be one or everyone who has been one in the past. I can state that one member of the LP who lives in Charleston recently served a term on the Disability Board. His term ended in January, but since we don't list appointments as "elected officials"...

My concern over Mr Root's actions do, in fact, relate directly to the election of libertarians to partisan office in our state. His actions work directly against the interests of our candidates and our state party's argument to voters that voting for the lesser of two evils is a wasted vote.

I am not trying to "destroy" Mr Root. I am trying to defend our party against the irresponsible and damaging statements he has made. If Mr Root is "destroyed", it is through his own actions.

I am not "mad" at Mr Root, nor do I believe we want or need any "shills" representing us. But I do believe, and I would expect every other member of this body to agree, that anyone representing us should not be representing us in a negative manner or openly stating that our candidates cannot win.

We will never elect a dozen members of Congress if Mr Root continues to encourage support for other parties' candidates over our own.
Stewart Flood

And to Wiener, Stewart Flood responded:

An apology for "confusion" is not an apology. He is like a little boy caught with his hand in the cookie jar and crumbs on his face, who tries to say that we don't understand...he was just putting the lid back on the jar!

I am not delivering criticism over one or two sentences. The entire interview was bad. I have commented in the past on his use of terms like "Reagan Libertarian" and other misrepresentations of libertarian positions.

This is not the first interview or commentary of his that I have found problems with, but it is the first one I have heard while he has been serving on the LNC in which he openly encouraged support for another party's candidate.
Stewart Flood

Rebecca Sink-Burris proposed an answer. Sink-Burris was not returned to the LNC in 2012.

Stewart,

Some of what you object to seems to be what others would call marketing, reaching out in a way that will speak to groups other than the LP.
Rebecca

Root responded to Mary Ruwart. Ruwart chose not to run for the LNC again.

Mary anyone can waste their time complaining...

Results are what matters. I just checked--You have 883 Twitter followers. I have about 64,000. And growing fast. I'm gaining about 1000 every week or two. Add in about 20,000 fans at my Facebook pages. And about 30,000 at my web site. That's 115,000 people. That's called progress. None of them care about a sentence in one interview I did. You hang onto this sentence...because it's all you've got.

Your time would be better spent getting in the media so you could grow your following....So you can help the LP. It's Easter. I will not answer anything you write again. I have family, egg hunts and a huge dinner with family. After a beautiful day at church. I'd rather talk to my 65,000 Twitter fans. Someday they may come in handy for Gary Johnson, or my next Presidential run. With all your talk...you can't help Gary...or Lee Wrights. Because 883 people is so small it is meaningless.

Results are what matters. What? 30 years of LP activism and you have 883 Twitter followers to show for it? My 115,000 all came in last 2 years...most of them in past year. At this pace, by 2016...I'll have well over 500,000 fans...wanting to hear my daily opinions...wanting to help me run for office. That's from guesting on 1000+ shows a year. If I land a national radio show...that number will jump to over 1,000,000.

Results talk...your complaining obviously does not bring fans or voters or contributors to LP, or interestingly to you personally either. Just more proof that my strategy works. You want a small tent party...with almost no one in it. Just you and your tiny circle of friends who can live up to your harsh ideals. I want no part of it. I won't rest until this party is big...and makes all of us unimportant. Fresh blood is the future. We are all dinosaurs. I'm busy making it happen. All your work...all your talk...and all your harsh standards... 883 people.

That just about says it all. There is a market for your pure beliefs Mary. 883 people strong.
Wayne

David Blau answered Root's message. Blau is now on the LNC.

Wayne:

I have refrained from entering this discussion until now because I find this bickering pointless and unproductive on both sides. You misspoke on the radio, and it was a whopper, but I fully expect you'll correct the statement at the next opportunity. I've said things that didn't come out right, and I know how hard it can be to repair the damage afterward, so I'll cut you slack to fix things.

However, I do take issue with your comment that 883 Twitter followers is meaningless.

As chair of the Massachusetts party, I have been busting my ass posting on Facebook and Twitter for months now, trying to build a following. Along with making sure we publish a

monthly newsletter. And answering media inquiries. And information requests. Working with local colleges. Attending rallies with thousands of people. Waking up early to lug a heavy tent to a field in the rain so we can have a presence. Spending long, painful hours on my feet talking about liberty with hundreds of people in the sweltering heat.

But my affiliate doesn't have thousands of followers on Twitter. By your count, my work is meaningless. I haven't done a survey of the other affiliates, but my guess is that very few if any of them have thousands of Twitter followers either, so all of their hard work must be meaningless as well. Heck, only California has more than 1000 sustaining members, so most of our affiliates must be wasting their time.

I'm here as a volunteer, because I love the message of liberty and because I believe in the party. No one is forcing me to do this work. It's taken countless hours out of my personal life, and earned me quite a bit of derision. My parents would much rather that I spend my time trying to start a family than work on hopeless causes for a third party, but I'm here anyway. I'm not a self-made millionaire with a beautiful wife and a girl in Harvard, but I'm here anyway. I don't have all day to spend doing media interviews because I work long hours to pay the bills, but I'm here anyway.

I spend on this party most of what little time I have outside of work, and largely give my own personal enjoyment short shrift. However, it seems that isn't good enough for you because I don't live up to your popularity metric. Maybe I'm not as successful as others at spreading the message, but that doesn't mean I'm a failure, and it certainly doesn't mean that what I'm doing is meaningless.

I am profoundly insulted that you would so easily dismiss my hard work and sacrifices, and those of so many others for so many years, whether by implication or otherwise. And I'm sorry that I have to make my feelings known in this way. You may not have directed your comment at me personally, but you caught me in the crossfire, and I have been injured as a result.

I await your response.

Guy McLendon, who at one point was a candidate for At-Large to replace Root, wrote:

Here's the spin control: "is that if the only choice were Obama versus Romney". In my read of the transcript, I've not yet detected evidence that assumption was present. However, Mr. Root no doubt felt a need to explain the gaffe SOMEHOW, and his clarification is close enough to an apology to satisfy me personally ... assuming there's zero recurrence. Look ... we old timers who attempt to manage newbies dreams of victories are well aware of the wasted vote syndrome. IMHO, Mr. Root let slip a statement that's common knowledge to us all. Considering that we're all human, speaking only for myself personally while considering his apology, I'm not inclined the "throw the first" turd at Mr. Root. Given his "energizer bunny" speed of delivery during dynamic public presentations, it's not unexpected he'd err on occasion. However, I do believe Wayne should be on strict guard to not permit a recurrence.

To which Root answered with an attack on Ruwart:

Guy,

In no organization in the history of politics or anywhere else has anyone ever made such a big deal over a poorly worded sentence. Last I heard 4 years ago, Mary was in far bigger trouble over some words in her book involving age of consent. That's the real issue here. The pot calling the kettle black. Hypocrisy. If I ever listened to one of Mary's media interviews, I'm betting the hair on my neck would stand up...and half of America would scream and demand protests. I'm certain if the NY Times ever reported on certain opinions in her books, the whole darn country would be in an uproar.

Yet no one is trying to drum her out of the party.

I guess we've all said some things we'd like to take back. e shouldn't be on witch hunts trying to destroy each other. circular firing squads won't get Gary or anyone else elected. My how we forget the crisis's and scandals from only 4 years ago...yet they will live forever in writing.

This party has allowed criminals to stay heavily involved. But the crime that outrages this party is...gulp...God forbid...Wayne said if there was no other choice...

I like Romney better than Obama the socialist. Oh my God. So do many many people in this party. If there was no other choice. But there is another choice. This week on that same show...with millions listening...I'll be introducing a third option to beat Obama...

Gary Johnson. And without me...that choice of Gary would not be introduced to that gigantic audience.

Sorry Guy, but if you ever want GOP votes for Gary...and there is no way to win a Presidential election without GOP votes/ converts to the LP...it can only come from someone they know and like...that's me...who has won them over...who they feel they can trust...introducing them to Gary. And I will do that. end of story.

Good night & Happy Easter to you too.
Wayne

And here comes Dianna Visek attacking Mary Ruwart. The reference is to an issue on which Ruwart presented to the Judicial Committee when Lee Wrights was on that committee. Visek is still on the LNC.

Hi Mary,

I'm glad you feel board members should speak up about what they perceive as breaches of trust. I feel there was a huge breach of trust and conflict of interest when you brought a complaint to the JC and your significant other refused to recuse himself after being asked to do so. To my mind, this is a large blemish on both of your reputations.

Dianna

Following the above message there was a substantial dispute on this topic, to which we will turn next month.

Liberty for America

Liberty for America is not currently a political party.

To subscribe: <http://LibertyForAmerica.com>

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

Last issue: **Root Flees LNC!**

This Issue:

Libertarian Donors Pay Johnson's Republican Campaign Debts

LNC Votes Against Voting to Replace Root

Other LNC Events

John Jay Myers Condemns Root

Olsen Attacks Myers Re: Root

Ryan Attacks Myers Re: Root

Vohra: Myers Saved the Libertarian Party

Other LNC Notes

Oregon Law Suit

How We Got Here

First Class Mail

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