

# Liberty for America

## Journal of the Libertarian Political Movement

Volume 5 Number 10

March 2013

### James Libertarian Burns Elected

Former candidate for our Presidential nomination James Libertarian Burns has been elected to the Beatty Water & Sanitation District. He took the oath of office on February 7, 2013 and will serve until January 2015. He is now seeking a seat on the party Bylaws Committee. He reports endorsements by Mark Axinn (Chair, Libertarian Party of New York), Al Terwelp (Chair, Libertarian Party of Kansas), Jay Polk (Chair, Libertarian Party of Tennessee) and Ken Moellman (Chair, Libertarian Party of Kentucky).

### Johnson Ducks Campaign Finance Question

Former Presidential candidate Gary Johnson appeared on reddit.com [http://www.reddit.com/r/AMA/comments/18endz/i\\_am\\_gov\\_gary\\_johnson\\_honorary\\_chairman\\_of\\_the/?sort=top](http://www.reddit.com/r/AMA/comments/18endz/i_am_gov_gary_johnson_honorary_chairman_of_the/?sort=top) to take questions. Johnson appears to be reactivating his Our America Initiative, perhaps to develop his presence in preparation for a future run for political office. The top question was a request that he explain and defend his campaign spending arrangements, which according to the questioner sent \$2.3 of \$2.5 million raised into the campaign manager's company. He did not answer the question.

Johnson was also asked "...what is your justification for spending only ~\$165,000 on media out of your ~\$2.3 million budget?" Johnson answered "We raised and spend 1/1000th of the amount spent by Obama and Romney, and financed substantial travel, grassroots development, social media presence and an aggressive email campaign. We put as many resources as possible on the air in advertising, but appropriately spent much on developing the base that will be able to go forward."

The question "...do you plan to instruct Ron Nielson's company to release receipts so we can prove campaign donations were actually spent campaigning instead of just paying Ron Nielson?" was not answered by Johnson.

### FEC Inquires; Johnson Responds

The FEC sent the Johnson campaign a series of requests for additional information. They did not like the detail in Johnson's original reports. The Johnson Campaign responses have just appeared on the FEC web site. The "Senior Political Advisor" was billing at \$325 per hour. The mid-level people were billing \$30-\$75/hour. A few representative invoices are listed on page X. We will try to make a detailed analysis in future issues.

### LPUS Membership Up

The end-of-February national party membership report shows that the national party has 13957 sustaining members, people who have paid at least \$25 during the past year, up from 12870 in June 2012. The pre-election increase phase seems to have come to an end, the party having gained 1000 members as a result of the election cycle. The national party has a current total of 127552 members, people who have signed the pledge, no matter whether they have recently paid money or not.

The staff report from Executive Director Howell to the LNC on approximately the same date claims 15130 members. There is a very large mismatch between this number and the numbers cited in the previous paragraph. The mismatch arises because staff is claiming that donors who have not signed the pledge can be reported as members. Hopefully LNC members will not become confused by this issue, which becomes significant if there is a Judicial Committee appeal on some matter.

### LP Arkansas Seeks Ballot Access

The Libertarian Party of Arkansas, which in 2012 gained full party status, is seeking to renew their position for 2014. Renewal requires a petition with 10,000 signers, but the signatures can be gathered this year. Party Status means that the LPAR can put people on the ballot as libertarians without needing to collect any signatures. This past year they were able to run 15 candidates; they report electing former State Chair Frank Gilbert as a township constable. To donate to their efforts: [lpar.org/ballotaccess2014/](http://lpar.org/ballotaccess2014/)

### Myers Resigns from LNC

Regional Representative John Jay Myers has resigned from the Libertarian National Committee. The five state chairs of his region have elected former National Secretary Gary E. Johnson of Texas as Myer's replacement. Paul Frankel of Alabama continues to serve as the region's regional representative.

Sources forwarded to various places including IndependentPoliticalReport quote two statements, in the course of which Myers is quoted as saying:

"Tonight I resigned from the Libertarian National Committee. I am sad to have to do it. Unfortunately I just have not had time to do the job I was elected to do well. Someone who has more free time should take over my position.

I am proud of running Wayne Allen Root off of the committee and right to where he belongs... I am proud of the facebook page being much more edgy, and grateful to Arvin Vohra for being instrumental in that.

I am proud that we are going to buy a building and name it after David Nolan the founder of the party who became a close friend of mine in the 2 years before his death.

Unfortunately those are basically my list of accomplishments, I wish I had time to do more. I still very much support the party and believe that it needs to exist. If just to give people someone to vote for... even if it's just to say "no" to the two major parties that seem to be completely full of vermin. A libertarian vote, a vote against war, a vote against corruption, may help to get the other two major parties to straighten up their act... or at least you would hope.

During the past 6 months I have been struggling to get all of my business affairs in order, I am proud to say that I have. However, in doing so I have completely neglected the business of this party. I have neglected my family and other key parts of my life.

Even though things are now running smoothly I want someone to represent this region who is going to be very enthusiastic, and have the time to put into it.

At least someone that won't vote twice accidentally on every motion.

Arvin and I really kicked off the Facebook, but to be fair that's about all I did, Arvin has been the main content manager on facebook for at least 5 months. He is the greatest thing since sliced bread.

I know there are plenty of people on this list who will be glad to see me go. To them I say, sorry I ruffled your feathers. I hope we can all work towards liberty in the future.

I am just about 100% sure that Gary Johnson of Texas will take my place. That is not for me or you to decide, but the chairs in our region.

I will continue to fight for and with the Libertarian Party, which is why I must resign, I feel like I have not done the party justice since elected."

## Mattson Withdraws As Secretary Candidate

Former National Secretary Alicia Mattson has with drawn from her campaign to be re-elected to the post. The need for the campaign was created when prior LNC Secretary Ruth Bennett resigned as Secretary. Under LNC Bylaws, the vacancy is filled by vote of the LNC. Mattson's withdrawal came in the form of a short message to the LNC, in the course of which she endorsed David Blau as the better candidate.

## Blau Elected LNC Secretary

As of the close of the voting period at 12:00 p.m. EST today (Wednesday, Feb. 20), the vote totals for the second-round voting for election of the new LNC Secretary were:

Blau: 10 votes (Blau, Cloud, Hinkle, Kirkland, Lark, Mack, Neale, Pojunis, Vissek, Wiener)

Moulton: 6 votes (Frankel, Hagan, Olsen, Starchild, Vohra, Wrights)

Abstention: 1 (Redpath)

Blau had a majority of the vote and therefore was elected. Candidate Alicia Mattson had already withdrawn (see prior story) and endorsed Blau.

## Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania State Chair Tom Stevens has announced that he will not be seeking re-election as Pennsylvania State Chair, come April 27 and the next Pennsylvania State Convention. To our knowledge, the only current candidate for the PA State Chair position is Montgomery County Chair Steve Scheetz. Scheetz reports he has recruited like-minded Libertarians to run with him, including Ed Reagan for Eastern Vice Chair, Ivan Glinski for Secretary, and long-time Libertarian activist Richard Schwarz for Treasurer.

Stevens' announcement was preceded by a vigorous debate on the pages of Independent Political Report, the thread beginning under <http://www.independentpoliticalreport.com/2013/02/ed-reagan-the-libertarian-party-of-pennsylvanias-liberty-lyin-roars-again/>, including extensive discussion of what were claimed to be bad petitioning arrangements that in 2012 led to major challenges of Pennsylvania ballot access. Readers are urged to consult the original source for more detail.

In our last issue, we reported plans of some Pennsylvania Libertarians to hold an organizing meeting at the Valley Forge Beef and Ale. No sooner had they arrived than a fire broke out, forcing them to evacuate the building and relocate the event. Our sympathies of course go to these brave Pennsylvania Libertarians and to the building owners. Under modern conditions, it is uncommon for a building to have a significant fire; the timing of the fire was remarkably coincidental.

In other Pennsylvania news of about the same date, Pennsylvania State Chair Tom Stevens was in a serious car crash. Stevens reports that he was forced off the road by an unmarked blue van that gradually drifted into his lane, despite his efforts to evade. So soon as Steven's car hit an obstacle and the crash took place, the van sped off. One of our sources reports meeting Stevens a few hours after the crash. As has not been reported elsewhere, according to our source Stevens indicated that the

**Liberty for America** is edited 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. 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>.

unmarked van had been in the parking lot from which he began his fateful trip, and that it had followed him onto the Pennsylvania Interstate before the crash took place.

## How Johnson Spent His Money

At the end of February the Johnson campaign filed a full set of amended FEC reports, showing how they spent their money and ran up their debts. There may yet be additional FEC inquiries, but what is already visible is interesting. For starters, annualized hourly rate, Johnson's campaign manager ("senior political advisor") appears to have set the all-time Libertarian Presidential Campaign Manager record for pay rate. Untangling the numbers to see which got paid and which are still owed will be interesting. I did not find any broadcast ads, but they may be there; it is a real tangle and difficult to track though.

The clerks got \$22/hour.  
The midlevel managers got \$30-\$75 an hour.  
Creative advertising got \$225 an hour.  
The Senior Political Advisor got \$325 an hour (\$650,000/year, annualized rate)

Here is a very short sample from the amended June report. I converted some of the hours and dollars to dollars/hour.

Invoice # 105083 May 1-4, 2012 -  
Mid-Level Management Hours 36.58 Hrs/\$1,829.00 -> \$50 hr  
Mid-Level Management Hours 143.55/\$10,766.25 -\$75 hr  
Senior Political Advisor 10 Hrs/\$3,250.00 - \$325 hr

**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](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  
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.

Creative Advertising 30 hrs/\$6,750.00 - \$225 hr  
Outside subcontracts per agreement \$3,525.00

Invoice # 105110 June 2012 -  
Mid-Level Management Hours 600.43 Hrs/\$18,012.90  
Mid-Level Management Hours 20/\$600.00  
Mid-Level Management Hours 160/\$4,800.00 -> \$30/hr  
General Clerical Hours 52.31 hrs/\$1,150.82 ->22/hr  
Creative Advertising 50 hrs/\$11,250.00  
Outside sub-contracts per agreement \$3,110.00

Invoice #105109 June 2012 -  
Ad Placement Web \$1,818.70  
Travel - Staff and Candidate \$8,961.15  
Miscellaneous/supplies/office \$595.66  
Shipping \$3,419.87  
E-mail Marketing Costs \$1,698.03  
Printing Costs \$4,820.43  
Vehicles-Lease/Wrap Costs \$3,958.00

## Chuck Moulton on the LSLA

Sound advice from the LP Virginia State Chair, as publicly revealed on the LNC-Discuss Yahooogroup Reflector list. Readers will note that the Libertarian State Leadership Alliance is not the organization of state chairs, because certain elements in the LSLA leadership refuse to admit the Oregon State Chair, Wes Wagner, as the State Chair of his state. The core background on this is that Geoff Neale has proposed a constructive, positive approach to writing an LNC Affiliate agreement, namely a clear and coherent statement by the LNC of exactly what it will or may supply to its affiliates. Moulton wrote:

"Essentially the problem is as follows:

The LSLA was created to run a yearly conference and an email list. A lot of people seem to think that somehow entitles the LSLA executive board to speak or negotiate on behalf of the state chairs, but that's without foundation and it's nonsense.

The LSLA executive board cannot speak for the state chairs on this issue. Its bylaws have clear delegated authority, and this is not in it.

The LNC can communicate with state chairs directly or through regional reps.

Anyone can give suggestions for what to put in an affiliate agreement (including the members of the LSLA executive board). The danger though is that the LNC might be left with the mistaken impression that the LSLA executive board represents the state chairs and that by talking with the LSLA executive board they were talking with an agent of the state chairs. An even bigger danger would be if the LNC and the LSLA executive board actually voted on and approved an affiliate agreement, because state chairs would not be anywhere in that process.

In contrast, at the state chairs conference (the LSLA confer-

ence) there will be a meeting of the state chairs. That meeting indeed does represent the state chairs and can provide feedback or vote on an affiliate agreement (though the state chairs in assembly can't enter individual states into that agreement, they can just give a stamp of approval to language in the document). I think the LNC (perhaps through the affiliate support committee) ought to come up with an affiliate agreement in consultation with whoever it wants (individual state chairs, LSLA executive board members, etc.) but not vote yet on adopting it. Then let the state chairs at the LSLA conference make suggestions on it. After that the LNC could vote to adopt it integrating those suggestions as appropriate. Individual state chairs would then decide whether their states should sign on or not. That's just my opinion on a process; there are other reasonable ways of going about it.

Another separate issue is that any contract must have consideration. Responsibilities that are already enshrined in the bylaws aren't really part of an optional agreement (you can't turn rights into privileges). It's a good idea to clarify the required responsibilities for both parties. It's also a good idea to offer a contract for services both parties can promise each other beyond that. Conflating those things can create misunderstanding though rather than making things clearer.

Chuck Moulton  
Chair, Libertarian Party of Virginia"

## LNC Migrates Web Site Positive News on a More Stable Public Web Presence

The following as released by Starchild is the LNC Executive Director's report on steps the LNC and its staff undertook to give the Libertarian Party a better LP.org. I view it as being more notable not for the positive steps now being taken but for the steps that past LNC CEOs had not taken, so as to ensure that the site was properly upgraded as DruPal was improved. In particular, we spent a very considerable amount of money for web site maintenance, but apparently security scans and system upgrades were not in the contract. Note also that there was a dramatic improvement in costs here, a step that some readers will recall was recommended in 2010 by the New Path LNC slate. Starchild quotes Carla Howell as writing:

"The LP.org website was built in Drupal 5.7 about five years ago, and during the time since then a number of security vulnerabilities have been reported. Some of these vulnerabilities have been used to attack the LP.org site. Our server at Rackspace was compromised twice in a 12-month period, and under the terms of our service agreement with Rackspace, when this happens they consider the website to be vulnerable and in need of upgrade or replacement.

It's important to clarify that after our website was attacked in late November and early December with DDOS (distributed denial-of-service) attacks, and Rackspace discovered that security vulnerabilities in our Drupal installation had allowed spammers to hijack our outgoing mail server, they considered this the last straw. In other words, they were no longer willing

## Welcome to Liberty for America!

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

to host our site as it was then configured and would drop us as a client unless we acted ASAP to upgrade Drupal and migrate to a new Rackspace server, or rebuild the site on a new CMS platform.

Being dropped as a hosting client altogether was unacceptable, because the LP needs a consistent web presence, and rebuilding the site in a different CMS like WordPress would take much too long with the short window of time we were granted by Rackspace to shore up our existing server and site configuration. Merely moving our then-existing site to a different hosting company would also be problematic because any new host would want to be sure we were installing a secure website platform -- not our already years-old and out-of-date Drupal configuration, which would be subject to the same vulnerabilities at a new host as it was at Rackspace.

Rackspace granted us a few weeks to leave the existing LP.org site in place while we arranged to get everything upgraded and migrated, as long as we ran a thorough security scan on the existing server to test for vulnerabilities, identify any viruses, and clean out any problems. This cost \$1,000, and had to be done prior to the transfer of our website and data to the new server. It is probably a good idea to have this type of scan done every year, but we had never done it before.

Because we had to act quickly, before Rackspace terminated our old web server for good, our available options were narrow. Our best bet appeared to be to upgrade our existing Drupal installation from Drupal 5.7 to Drupal 7.17. Terra Eclipse, the firm that originally designed the site, had not kept the installation upgraded for us and charges an expensive \$400 per hour for website and server work, significantly more than we wanted to pay. Instead, Rackspace recommended a firm that they often work with in handling these types of server upgrades and migrations, Website Movers. We contacted them and found that they are friendly to libertarian ideas, and as a result they bid to us a discounted "friends and family" rate of \$95 per hour.

It may have been possible to find a lower price by expanding our search for a firm to upgrade the website and move it to a new Rackspace server, but time was of the essence, Website Movers had a strong recommendation from our web host, and the hourly cost amounted to more than four times less than what Terra Eclipse would have charged to provide a similar service. Spending time to optimize the cost of the transition would have compromised the speed of completing it, and the clock was already ticking. Website Movers appeared to be our best choice.



In order to keep all our modules, forms, content, and contribution system running smoothly, the CMS had to be upgraded in stages, from Drupal 5.7 to Drupal 6.x, and then to the current stable release of Drupal 7.17. Most of the old modules we used on our site, like the events calendar and the contribution and membership forms, had long since been deprecated and also needed to be replaced or upgraded to work with Drupal 7.17.

We have been operating with the upgraded Drupal installation on the new server since Feb. 8. Our new server is much more stable and secure than our old server, but that can't prevent malicious people from attacking it. We've continued to have DDOS attacks, which are orchestrated by some unknown malicious person or group who controls a swarm of hijacked computers located around the world, all sending traffic simultaneously and as quickly as they can to our server in order to knock it offline. A new set of attacks in mid-February caused more down time on the site, and Website Movers and Rackspace both suggested that adding a few more gigabytes of RAM to the server to accommodate extra incoming traffic, as well as implementing some custom IP-blocking rules on our firewall, would help deal with this better in the future. We did that, and although we've had a couple of additional attacks since then, which caused relatively brief down time, overall our new server is holding up well.

In late November when the first DDOS attack happened, we suspected it may have been somebody retaliating because our site's outgoing mail server had been hijacked to send spam. It seemed likely that they may have been trying to take the site down without really knowing who we are. Continuing attacks since the launch of the new site -- especially the one coinciding with our publicized release of the State of the Union response video -- may well be an indication that it's somebody who dislikes libertarian ideas or the LP itself and is actively seeking to harm our cause.

Although we can't prevent people from trying to attack the site, our new configuration makes it less likely that they will succeed in either knocking it offline or compromising the security of the system by gaining unauthorized access. It's important to note, though, that the best and most robust sites in the world can still be knocked offline by intensive DDOS attacks. No completely invulnerable system exists, but we do now have a website that is much better at rolling with the punches."

It is reported to us that the migration cost \$6000, which included several Drupal upgrades, and that donors are being solicited

## LNC Discusses Drugs Plank

Arvin Vohra wrote: "Brett earlier pointed out that, from a marketing perspective, not having a specific plank for drugs is a bit odd. I agree. It strikes me as bizarrely unstrategic to bury it under personal liberty."

Lee Wrights responded: "

I have to agree, as well. So... remembering we cannot amend the Platform as only a national convention of delegates can do that...

What do we do about this? Do we actually need a "plank" in

order to take a "position" on an issue?

Right is right even in the absence of a platform plank stating it is so.

Starchild to the LNC, as part of this longer discussion:

[The lack of an explicit plank on ending the war on drugs] is perhaps the most egregious example of how our party's platform was decimated in 2006 by people who exploited a kind of loophole in the process that made it relatively easy for an organized campaign to produce a vote of no-confidence in a whole lot of planks and get them tossed out. Restoring the 2004 platform is a definite priority for those of us who want to ensure the Libertarian Party remains libertarian, and who we put on the Platform Committee is very important in this regard. I agree with Geoff that Arvin would be a good person to have on the committee, because he is clearly someone who supports us standing behind a strong pro-freedom message that doesn't pull any punches.

In the meantime, our Platform still fortunately has the Preamble and Statement of Principles, which clearly support the idea that people can choose what they want to put into their own bodies so long as it does not involve initiating force or fraud against others:

"Consequently, we defend each person's right to engage in any activity that is peaceful and honest, and welcome the diversity that freedom brings. The world we seek to build is one where individuals are free to follow their own dreams in their own ways, without interference from government or any authoritarian power."

The fact that we don't currently have a specific plank talking about the harm that Drug Prohibition does and how the "War on Drugs" (really a war on people who use drugs) must be ended is a sad reminder of the real and ongoing threat we face from attempts to make the Libertarian Party into something more conservative, or less pro-freedom, than it is, but this is no obstacle to us adopting strong libertarian messaging on the drug issue in accord with the good language still embodied in the core of our platform as illustrated above.

In response to Starchild's comments, Lieberman wrote: "Fast forward to the 2012 Libertarian National Convention "NOTA campaign". This is perhaps the most egregious example of how the LNC was decimated in 2012 by people who exploited a kind of loophole in the process that made it relatively easy for an organized campaign to produce a vote of no-confidence in a whole lot of people and get them tossed out."

## LNC Debate on the Secretary Election

Geoff Neale made and Starchild has given us a revealing explanation of why he supported Blau"

I feel some sort of obligation to explain my vote for David Blau.

First off, I will willingly serve with any choice of the LNC, and

do not think that any of the current vote getters would fail to serve the LNC well. In fact, I think that Moulton, Mattson, Johnson and Blau would all perform the role of Secretary in a satisfactory manner. You see, my expectations of the Secretary are first that the business of the LNC are recorded properly, accurately, and in a timely manner. To be blunt, I do not think this is that difficult of a task, but it is important. Also, I am looking forward to a Secretary that is responsive to my needs, which I define as consistently and predictably returning emails and phone calls within a reasonable period of time.

Beyond that, my considerations are political. Of the four aforementioned candidates, Mr. Blau is the one that I am most comfortable with saying that I feel I am in sync with. The other candidates I do not have the same level of comfort with, and I'm voting for the devil I do know, rather the devil I do not know.

Additionally, Mr. Blau has been an active proponent of the building, is chair of the Building Fund, and I am sure will continue to work towards fulfilling this objective, which is very important to me. While he will continue in his current role regardless of the outcome, the difference is that I am not voting just for a Secretary, but for an EC member. When it comes to the EC, I have little interest in putting in a person whose position I do not fully comprehend and appreciate.

Another consideration of mine is that three of the four candidates are former officers of the LNC, and Mr. Blau is not. I am making a vote for "new blood".

Lastly, I have talked to more than just a few of you, and here is how I think things seem to be going on the vote count front:

Gary Johnson is the least likely of the four to not garner enough support, and is most likely to be the candidate dropped after round one.

David Blau is most likely to come in third, and survive for one more round. I believe that his vote count will not be indicative of his level of support, however, because I believe he is held in high regard by many LNC members. He just might be everyone's second choice.

Chuck Moulton has some strong supporters, and is most likely to come in second.

Alicia Mattson has more strong supporters, and is most likely to come in first, but I do not at this time think she has enough votes to win on the first ballot.

If we do not have a winner on the first ballot, we will move to a second, with a far reduced field that will probably be only three candidates. However, the dynamics of the support of these three candidates is somewhat problematic. Alicia and Chuck both have their supporters, but both also have their detractors. The question really will be if either Chuck or Alicia will pick up enough votes on subsequent ballots to garner a victory. Right now, I'm not sure that David can pick up enough votes in the second round to survive to a third round, unless the dynamic changes. More on that later.

Assuming that on one of our ballots that either Chuck or Alicia wins, I will proudly serve with whichever one you choose. However, I am concerned with the opinions expressed by many of you over exactly how you would feel if the one that wins is the one you don't want. I think it would be safe to say that the election of either Chuck or Alicia is potentially divisive. Whichever one of these two wins, there will be unhappy LNC members.

So I am making a pitch for political peace – choose a candidate that the greatest number of us can get behind, and I think the candidate is David Blau. To me, he is the only "consensus" candidate in the field.

Geoffrey Neale

A longer discussion on this theme led to an exchange between Starchild, Hinkle, and Neale, was posted by Starchild. According to Starchild, Starchild wrote:

"I agree with Paulie that it's better if people voice their concerns publicly. I suspect most of our membership prefers "straight talk" over "political savvy" when it comes to communication among their elected representatives.

Speaking of which, I don't necessarily see David Blau as being any less controversial than Chuck Moulton (not that I see Chuck as controversial). From where I sit, anyone who argues to uphold LNC secrecy outside of a secret meeting that we have taken a proper vote to convene as described in the Policy Manual (<https://www.lp.org/files/PolicyManualupdated12NOV2012.pdf> -- see "executive session") is problematic to serve as secretary. For that office in particular I think it's important to have someone who believes in sunshine and open communication.

Since there's always a heightened potential for misinterpretation via email, I'll add that this is strictly a political concern (i.e. the kind of concern that I think properly dictates my votes as an elected representative). Personally I have nothing against David, and like Geoff I am willing to work with whoever is elected."

to which Hinkle supposedly responded:

" Starchild,

Oh, the irony.

I hope you understand that in your zeal to have "transparency" on the LNC, that exactly the opposite is what's occurring.

Because you re-broadcast everything written here to the entire world, there is less open communication on this list.

I warned the entire LP convention delegation that this is exactly what would happen.

You know the quote: "be careful what you want, you might get it". Unintended consequences strikes again.

Yours in liberty.....Mark Hinkle

Starchild wrote in response: "Is it really too much to ask that elected Libertarian representatives have the courage of their convictions and let people in the party know where they stand, and why, on issues that come before us? I don't think so. I think it's vital to good governance. Washington D.C. is filled with people who I'm sure are way more "politically savvy" than we are, and mostly a lot less publicly candid, and look what a disaster it is!

I also think it's possible to disagree without being disagreeable (not that I feel you are being disagreeable here, despite your strongly worded disagreement, I just mean in our communications with each other in general). My strong preference is to have friendly, cordial relations with everyone on the LNC, without feeling that I have to change my positions or refrain from speaking up for what I believe in order to have other committee members interact with me in a polite and respectful manner.

But if I have to choose one or the other, I intend to choose speaking my mind in a polite but straightforward manner, even if it means some people treat me worse as a result. To the extent I fail to do this, I think I'm failing my responsibility, and should be replaced in office if there is someone else of sound libertarian convictions who is willing to give it a go and shows the potential to do better.

Obviously I can't force anyone to be publicly candid, but if some prefer to hide in the shadows, that is not the fault of the sunshine. With less sunshine, the shadows grow a lot longer and easier to hide in. So I must disagree with your contention that we need secrecy in order to prevent secrecy."

Neale responded by attacking Starchild: "Starchild - you want us all to speak plainly and openly. Okay, here goes.

You are so far off of this planet when you construe that anything said or done by any member of this body should be publicly disclosed, no matter when, no matter where. When elected to this body, no one is required to give up their right to privacy. Requirements that we have open meetings are fine, and I agree with that, but when two or twelve LNC members get together outside of a formal LNC meeting, these are NOT meetings in the sense intended by or to be interpreted by the Bylaws. Just as when I sit at a bar with a friend or three that happen to serve on the LNC, I can tell interlopers to go to hell, whether politely or bluntly.

I routinely discuss things with multiple members of this body, and I do NOT disclose everything on this list. Some of it is because people ask my advice, or cry on my shoulder, or berate me for screwing up, or whatever. You may think you have some "natural right" to know this stuff, and you do not. How do I know? Because there is no way, come hell or high water, that you can possibly compel me to tell you what I talk with others about. You may think that we'd all be better off if we all knew what others were thinking and saying, and I would say that you are nowhere near being naïve, as naïve would be a significant advance over wherever you are right now. Most people do not really want to know what everyone is thinking or even saying. People would stop talking to me if I violated the trust they put

in me when they confide in me.

You see, to me it is all about trust. If you do not trust me, that's fine. Please feel free to not trust me. But I will tell you that it has been my observation in life that people with trust issues - that cannot and do not trust others - do so primarily because they themselves are most definitely not ever to be trusted, and most definitely cannot be trusted.

Are you telling me you have trust issues?

Geoffrey Neale"

LNC debate, which covered a great deal of other ground at the same time, drifted back to a discussion of the merits of the candidates. Arvin Vohra is shown as writing: "Just using deduction here:

If you want to keep someone out, you probably have a reason. What we know about Chuck? He's principled, strategic, competent, and generally associated with radicals.

1. If the opposition stems from the first, someone is planning something unprincipled, of a type that Chuck would stop and Dave would allow. I can't imagine what that is.
2. If it's the radical: it's probably to try to use Ruth to paint radicals as generally idealistic but incompetent. Chuck's competence would make that impossible.
3. If it's the strategic, that means that someone wants to get away with something, and thinks they'd have an easier time slipping it past Dave than Chuck. In that case, we'd have to look at anyone who has some potential secondary gain (e.g. compensation, contracts, etc.) Since that is currently like half the LNC, that's not particularly helpful.

I'd say we should be extremely vigilant about internal threats right now. In the past, we did not strongly enough respond to Wayne (except JJM).  
-Arvin

Then Myers changed his vote back to Moulton, writing

"Chuck, Arvin and Paulie have all painted a very compelling case as to why Chuck Moulton is the best person for the job.

That ALONE is the right reason to vote for Chuck.

However, during the course of talking to some of my fellow LNC members the term "We want to wait until Tuesday to see if WE have the votes"

It struck me that I don't have a "we", and if I am not part of the "we" and there is a we that I am not part of... then they must be working together to do things that I am not going to favor. This was my problem with the last LNC. It is time to stick a fork in that "we" and call it done.

I know that Chuck is not part of a "we".

So I am confident in my vote for Chuck.

John Jay. (Myers)”

to which Neale responded:

John Jay – you are free to change your vote as many times as you want, for whatever reason you want.

I understand the wish to avoid the “we” thing you’re talking about, but there are multiple “we” groups right now on this election. Those actively endorsing, promoting and supporting Chuck are just as much a “we” as those who like David, or those that like Alicia. Of course Chuck is part of a “we”. They may not have formal meetings and a secret handshake, but that “we” exists too.

I’m also not clear on what “waiting for Tuesday” would matter, anyway. This vote cannot end until all members have voted, or ten days has passed.

I hope you can avoid being so jaded that when you see two people talking, it becomes a conspiracy. Sometimes people just work together for a common cause.

Geoff”

And after another round between Starchild and Neale, this over possible uses of volunteers and competitive bidding and contracts, Paul Frankel gave the friendly advice

Geoff,

You and Starchild are both correct.

We should make greater use of volunteer resources, interns and competitive bidding where there is time to do so.

We also have to realize when we are in situations where there is not enough time, and have money in the bank to deal with such situations quickly and efficiently.

As far as people unsubscribing from email lists that is a valid concern.

Perhaps we could give people more options as to which kinds of email they receive and which ones they do not?

One other thing about this discussion - I think it's unnecessarily and counter-productively caustic.

Please let's find ways to disagree without being disagreeable whenever and wherever possible.

I can understand why you don't agree with Starchild but why belittle him in the process? He has ideas which are good in principle, and may or may not be in practice. I think some of them may well work in practice, although in some cases in a watered down or compromised form. Some may not work at all. Others may work far better than you are willing to conceive being possible, if implemented correctly.

I don't know for sure unless we try.

But regardless of what we ever agree to try - I hope we can be friendly to the degree that we take the time to even discuss any of these ideas or how to implement them.

Paulie

## LNC Member Questions Fundraising

In a superlative example of a board member doing one of the things that Board members should be doing, Regional Alternate Scott Lieberman has raised serious questions about the veracity of a recent LNC fundraiser. We quote his remarks as forwarded to us: Lieberman wrote:

“From the January 2013 LNC, Inc. direct mail fundraiser:

“Based on past-prospecting efforts, every \$51 you donate up front will bring in one new LP member. However, during the next 3 years, that new member donates over \$153 dollars to [sic] Libertarian Party. Plus votes Libertarian. And supports Libertarian candidates. A triple win.

There’s one more big benefit. Every 25 new LP members results in one additional Libertarian candidate on the ballot during the next election cycle.

It’s an investment with a big payoff for liberty.

More candidates means more yard signs. More Libertarians on the ballot. More media coverage. More Libertarians in debates. More LP brochures. And, most importantly, more elected Libertarians. Why? Because elected Libertarians can repeal laws and roll back Big Government.”

(italics, boldface, and underlining were in the original [Ed: but were lost in final transmission.]). Lieberman continued:

“I suspect that Michael Cloud wrote the above fundraising letter. Regardless of who wrote it, I have two questions.

1. Where did you get the \$51 figure? I would really appreciate it if the author of the letter can show us the data that backs up that number. If the LNC is to make reasonable decisions regarding membership prospecting, we need to know that such claims are justified by the data. I remember a figure that is more than double the \$51 figure cited in the fundraising letter. Also, releasing that data to our affiliates will help them in their fundraising efforts.

2. If the National LP is going to claim that more members equals more elected Libertarians, then the National LP is taking ownership of the age-old problem of trying to get our affiliates to push running for local offices over running for state and federal offices. I would love to see us do that, but some of the members of this Board have expressed reservations over trying to urge or cajole our affiliates into doing anything at all.

Why is the National LP promising more elected Libertarians unless we are willing to motivate, cajole, and jawbone our affil-



iates into running a higher percentage of local candidates vs. state and federal candidates than they have in the past?

98% of all of the elected offices in this country are at the county and local level. IIRC only something like 30% of our candidates run for county and local offices. If our fundraising letters are going to claim to elect more Libertarians if only our members will donate more money to our august organization, don't we have an obligation to goose our affiliates into helping the National LP to fulfill that promise?

...Scott Lieberman”

## LNC Sets July Meeting For Las Vegas They Will Assemble Near FreedomFest

And if I appear somewhat short on reporting the LNC's positive activities, that is because I had problems finding things to report.

### LNC Debates Myers-Root Split

On the other hand, the LNC did debate John Jay Myers' statement that he was proud of having run Wayne Root off the LNC. Scott Lieberman opened with

“ Does John Jay Myers really think that "running" a person off the Libertarian National Committee is something to be proud of?”

to which Lee Wrights responded:

“Why are you not asking Mr. Myers? Why ask a body of people to suppose on something when you can go straight to Mr. Myers himself? Mr. Myers is not known for being shy about how he feels, so I am certain you will get a direct and honest response from him.”

and Starchild answered

“I might not have used the term "running him off", but I think most Libertarians agree that it's a good thing Wayne Allyn Root is no longer in the leadership of the Libertarian Party. In the GOP, he will have the opportunity to help take an organization in a more pro-freedom direction, rather than the opposite, and I think that's best for everyone including Wayne himself. To the extent that John Jay, as the LNC's most vocal and persistent challenger of W.A.R.'s un-libertarian messaging using the name of the LP, played a part in bringing about that result, he does deserve credit.”

and Geoff Neale responded to both of them, saying “Mr. Lieberman - I think your first post asking the question below was probably not the question that should have been asked. After all, if John Jay says he's proud of this, I'm going to assume he is.

Then you get to the second question I think you're asking, about the decorum of a board member being proud of this.

I think John Jay showed a sufficiency of decorum by waiting until AFTER his resignation to publicize his opinion to this extent. Board decorum cannot apply to ex-board members.

As to perhaps the REAL question, which I presume is whether or not it's appropriate for a board member to attempt to drive another board member out, I cannot envision or comprehend a stance that I could universally support. It is our duty to "drive out" individuals who act contrary to the best interest of the LP. It is also advisable for us to foster an environment of constructive disagreements. Somewhere between those two statements is fuzzy territory, and each of us will draw the line differently.

For the record, there are individuals who were considered WAR supporters who were beginning to actively pursue having WAR removed from the LNC because he had, in their opinions, gone too far when seemingly supporting Romney. This discord was not isolated to a few individuals on the board. I will not disclose their names - their communications were made in confidence. His resignation ended action to have him removed for cause.

However, WAR is not in the LP, or on the LNC at this time. The past is past. Is anyone on this board really gaining from bringing this up - again?

Starchild - do we really need to go into this again?  
Geoffrey Neale

to which Starchild answered: “Scott brought the issue up here, so perhaps your question is better addressed to him than to me. However I'll note that while Wayne Allyn Root himself is gone, the kind of misplaced priorities that undoubtedly helped make the Libertarian Party seem like fertile soil to him remain, and this circumstance represents a standing threat to our party.

As Scott's example of the 1997 meeting in Texas illustrates, we have long been sending the message, in various ways, that being "effective" is more important than being "right" -- with being "effective" defined in terms that could just as easily apply to Democrats or Republicans (getting more members, getting more people elected, raising more money, etc.). Is it any wonder that after diligently sowing such seeds, we found ourselves saddled with someone who openly proclaimed "Winning is everything!" and was able, on the basis of his "success" to win a favorable enough reception in the LP to capture the party's vice-presidential nomination along with the carpetbagger Bob Barr?

I don't think we have to worry about having another extended debate over Wayne Allyn Root now, since I doubt many of his former supporters besides Scott are very interested in defending him at this point. However I do think it behooves us to consider what we've been doing as a party that resulted in us sinking to a condition in which two people who would quickly turn around and endorse Mitt Romney were invited into the top levels of our leadership, and even selected as our 2008 presidential ticket. Until the LP formally repudiates that ticket, hopefully at our 2014 convention, it will remain a stain on the party's reputation. As of yet we have not taken any significant steps to reduce the likelihood of something similar happening again.

## 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.

James Libertarian Burns Elected — Johnson Ducks Campaign Finance Question

## Johnson Answers FEC

Johnson's Senior Political Advisor Billed His Time at \$325 an Hour.

LPUS Membership Up — LP Arkansas Seeks Ballot Access

Myers Resigns from LNC

Mattson Withdraws As Secretary Candidate

Blau Elected LNC Secretary

Pennsylvania — How Johnson Spent His Money

Chuck Moulton on the LSLA

LNC Migrates Web Site — LNC Discusses Drugs Plank

LNC Debate on the Secretary Election

LNC Member Questions LNC Fundraising Practices

LNC Sets July Meeting for Las Vegas

LNC Debates Myers-Root Split

First Class Mail

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