

# Liberty for America

## May 2015 Volume 7 Number 12

### Contents

#### Change in Life Style

Your editor has indicated to his university that he prefers to retire at the end of the current academic year, which happened last week. The sign on his office door, the office being completely cleaned out, reads

RETIRED

GONE WRITING

FOREVER

and notes in closing that almost 40 years ago I had been living in Santa Monica CA and working at UCLA. One morning I walked three blocks south to Wilshire Boulevard and my barber, tried to open the door, and found that it was locked. Peering through the glass, I realized that the barbering equipment was gone, the interior being stripped down to the linoleum. There in the door, a little lower than I had been looking, was a sign “Retired. Gone fishing, forever”. This seemed to be an excellent way to end that part of my career, so I put up a slight variation on the sign, which likely is also a memorial to my former barber, who saw his chance to change his career, and did so.

#### Editorials

##### Note to Media: Please Stop Calling Rand Paul a Libertarian

... Thomas Knapp

“They thought all along that they could call me a libertarian and hang that label around my neck like an albatross,” Rand Paul said in 2010 during his Republican primary campaign for US Senate, “but I’m not a libertarian.”

Paul prevailed, beating GOP establishment favorite Trey Grayson in the Republican primary and Kentucky Attorney General Jack Conway in the general election. Now he’s preparing a 2016 presidential campaign and everyone, Paul included, seems to want to forget that disclaimer.

But it was true then and it’s true now. Rand Paul is no libertarian.

What is he? Among other things, the poster child for adopting a strict “no backsies” rule in American presidential politics.

Writing in the Los Angeles Times, Justin Raimondo of Antiwar.com puts his finger on the problem with Paul: “For the life of me, I can’t figure out what he really believes — where he really stands, especially when it comes to foreign policy.”

Paul wants to avoid war with Iran. No, wait, he’s for wrecking any chance of avoiding war with Iran. No, wait, he just wants to “negotiate from a position of strength” with Iran — by signing a letter telling the Iranians that the US can’t be trusted to stick to its agreements.

Paul supports “respectful” relations with Russia, because unlike other politicians he understands that the Cold War is over. No, wait, maybe it isn’t over after all. We need to “isolate” Russia and “punish” Vladimir Putin.

Paul supports eliminating foreign aid, including aid to Israel (because strings attached to that aid tie Benjamin Netanyahu’s hands). No, wait, let’s just freeze foreign aid at current levels. No, wait, let’s increase foreign aid to Israel.

Paul opposes US airstrikes on Islamic State forces. No, wait, he supports airstrikes on Islamic State forces.

Paul opposes abortion, except when he doesn’t. Paul opposes same-sex marriage, except maybe not. Paul opposes marijuana legalization, except when he thinks it might be OK.

Libertarians argue constantly over what it means to be a libertarian. I bet I’ve heard a hundred definitions. All of those definitions describe consistent defenders of liberty. None of them describes someone who always says whatever he thinks the crowd he’s talking to wants to hear.

Some of Paul’s defenders claim he’s a “stealth libertarian,” pretending to be a conservative — but that once he’s in White House, he’ll reveal his true principles. They’re selling a pig in a poke. Buyer beware!

What is Rand Paul? A politician. A chameleon. A pander bear. The 2016 edition of Mitt Romney (you may remember how that turned out for Republicans).

Rand Paul is many things, but one thing he’s consistently not is a libertarian. Please stop calling him that.

Thomas L. Knapp is director and senior news analyst at the William Lloyd Garrison Center for Libertarian Advocacy Journalism ([thegarrisoncenter.org](http://thegarrisoncenter.org)). He lives and works in north central Florida.

## A Vision for the Libertarian Party

...Joshua Katz

To the editor:

Thank you for this space to lay out a vision for the Libertarian Party and for enhancing freedom in our lifetimes.

I'm bothered by the amount we rely on dues for our revenue, and about the fact that too many of our votes come from our own members or other committed libertarians. In a time when libertarian sentiment is growing, the key is generating votes from those who are not committed libertarians, certainly not Libertarians, but have some libertarian sentiments.

I raised the issue at the last LNC meeting of Coke and Pepsi. If we smash the Rs and Ds together and call them Coke, then we are Pepsi - albeit the distances are wrong. Coke has, since the Coke/Pepsi challenge, consistently advertised with things irrelevant to Coke - dancing, singing, a Coke lifestyle, etc. Pepsi has continually claimed to taste better. I happen to think Pepsi does taste better. The LP, like Pepsi, expects the superiority of our policies to stand on its own. This is not the way the world works.

What can Libertarians do to enhance their competitiveness and to get non-base votes? In a word - credibility. We, as a group and as individual candidates, must give voters reason to believe that Libertarians will govern effectively and achieve what we say we will do. If the LP were, in some manner, put in charge of a town council tomorrow, is it likely that the town would immediately become a libertarian paradise? I suspect that such a town would be more libertarian on average than most, but not as libertarian as we would like it to be, unless we seriously study governance first.

Sure, you can say "but we don't want to govern effectively, we want to let things go" but problems arise. First, the ability to govern translates rather directly into the ability to effectively manage the scaling back of regulations and the establishment of a libertarian regime without a collapse of the city. Second, since we are not the Anarchist Party (even though I'm an anarchist) we will, want to or not, need to effectively govern and accomplish those tasks that the government either is assigned under minarchist libertarianism, or that cannot, as of now, be safely discharged because of existing state and federal regulations preventing the market from handling them. We'll also have to deal with responsibilities assigned to municipalities by state and federal law. Finally, we'll need to consider the boundaries of our city. We can have pretty arguments about crime falling in a free city, but neighboring cities will have criminals who see our city as easy prey if our police department is not managed very carefully.

Our ideas are clear. Our ideas are in the mainstream now, and it is well-known, among large segments of the voting public, what we stand for. Additionally, there is widespread sympathy for our concerns. The ball is now in our court to gain the trust of the voters and convince them that we can govern, that we can work with our colleagues who disagree, and that we can effectively pursue our policies without destroying the safety and security they hold dear. We know this is possible - we know that freedom works, and that pursuing freedom is not antithetical to governing well. Now we need to convince others.

We have a remarkable opportunity to do this today. Our opponents consistently refuse to behave like grown-ups. Every event is, to them, an opportunity to put out a message that flows with the wind. Let Libertarians be the grown-ups in the room, those who do not respond to every event with a blindly ideological statement, but with a practical demonstration of the benefit of freedom.

To use a current example, consider the recent shooting in South Carolina. In many past police shootings, the justice system has not been permitted to judge the case - leading to the

public taking the case to the streets. Ideological behavior, right or left, that does not engage with the facts of the case, leads only to chaos and violence, not to justice. In the case of Walter Scott, though, there will be no rush to judgment. A judgment will be rendered by an adversarial system designed, and shaped over centuries, for this very purpose. I am not here criticizing protesters, certainly - I am criticizing a governmental attitude in which the police can do no wrong, and which leaves little options other than violent protest. The interests of freedom are aligned with the interests of peace: not only in this case, but in all cases. This case is simply a particularly stark illustration of the principle that, when the aim of governance is the protection of the individual from abuse, public or private, peace and prosperity, not charred cities, result.

Credible governors who love freedom, who can govern effectively and shift public policy in a libertarian direction, are desperately desired by our fellow men in this age of polarization in place of actual policy dispute, of showboating in place of governance, of entirely unserious politicians. Let us fill this void - and stop relying on the purity of our words to do our campaigning. The public is not interested in knowing exactly how clean our candidates can keep their hands, or how well we can recite the catechism of our faith, but in our ability to actually govern and advance these interests. Our opponents have steadily declined in this ability - it is time for the grown-ups in the room to step up.

**Long-time Libertarian activist Marc Montoni has editorialized in Independent Political Report** [independentpoliticalreport.com/2015/05/marc-montoni-how-to-maximize-the-lp-presidential-campaign/](http://independentpoliticalreport.com/2015/05/marc-montoni-how-to-maximize-the-lp-presidential-campaign/) for an alternative approach to running Presidential campaigns. He observes “The only times in LP history when the LP was smaller at the end of the election than at the beginning were during the campaigns of two “well-qualified”, “credible”, and “electable” candidates: Bob Barr and Gary Johnson.” He urged choosing a candidate who “will make the best possible presentation of consistent Libertarian ideas; and, is committed to growing the Party.”

### **Youth Outreach Through Fiction**

On a completely different note, your editor has tried a piece of very gentle sort-of-libertarian educational messaging to young people. My young adult novel *Mistress of the Waves* is pro-capitalist and pro-liberty, but not by indulging in paranoid ranting about occult forces threatening our liberty. We have quite enough real forces doing that. No, *Mistress of the Waves* has as its heroine someone whose major challenges are with finance and business, with just a touch of piracy, giant squids, assassins, and other bits of ineffective violence that show the superiority of peaceful business methods over totalitarian schemes. You can find it on Amazon Kindle, Smashwords, and Third Millennium.

### **Johnson 2012 Financials**

In February 2015 the Johnson 2012 campaign filed with the Federal Election Commission yet another completely new set of financial disclosures. Your editor finally got around to noticing them. For the second quarter of 2011, which is when the campaign began, the Johnson campaign originally reported a campaign debt of \$227,360 . Their 2013 filings showed a debt of \$403,644. The new 2015 filing shows a debt of \$419,694, the new debt being \$16,050 to ThoughtLab for website development and web hosting.

For the third quarter of 2011, the campaign originally reported a debt of \$240,066. Three amendments later, the most recent amendment being filed this year, the debt at the end of that quarter had increased to \$639,911.

For the fourth quarter of 2011, the campaign originally reported a debt of \$203,761. The latest filing acknowledges a debt of \$858,458, more than four times as much.

In 2012, the campaign went to monthly filings of campaign expenditures. The last disclosure that would readily have been seen before the national convention was the April monthly, covering the month of March. In the original filings, the campaign admitted to a debt of \$152,373. That's not trivial, but the candidate was inheriting campaign debts from his totally unsuccessful Republican presidential nominating campaign. Unfortunately, the most recent amendment shows that the actual debts of the campaign at the end of March 2012 amounted to \$1,078,371.16, more than seven times as much.

A reasonable reader might propose that if the national convention had been aware of the Johnson 2012 campaign's massive debts, before voting on the nomination, they might've had serious second thoughts as to whether or not Johnson and his campaign team were a good choice. At the end of March, 2012, the Johnson campaign admitted to net contributions not including loans of \$747,825. That's entirely respectable for a libertarian presidential campaign, the difficulty being that the campaign had spent, including actual disbursements and debts and other obligations, something over 1 3/4 million dollars.

We now advance to the 2012 post-general campaign disclosure, including income and expenditures through November 26, 2012. This is as close as you can get, based on FEC disclosures, to the actual campaign spending through the day of the election. **According to the original 2012 filing, the Johnson campaign had \$197,002 of debts and obligations, and had spent \$2,326,614 of net operating expenditures. However, if we advance to the 2015 filing, we find that the reported debt at the end of the post-general campaign period has become \$1,202,486.** Readers will note that over the period of the campaign Johnson 2012 ran up close to \$120,000 of additional debt.

By the end of 2013, the Johnson 2012 debt had increased to \$1,220,500.

By the end of 2014, the Johnson 2012 debt was up again, this time to \$1,387,743. A substantial part of that increase appeared in the last quarter of the year, in the form of new debt to Bellatrix PC of San Diego California for monthly primary retainers and wind down.

We advance to the end of the most recent quarter, the first quarter of 2015, in which there was a further modest increase in the campaign debts, this time to \$1,395,093. In analyzing the debts, we find several items that readers will not recall from our previous discussion of the Johnson campaign, including \$46,296 of fundraising commissions owed to Political Advisors, and more than \$28,000 in wind down staff hours.

The Johnson 2012 campaign thus piled up a debt larger than almost every previous Libertarian presidential campaign managed to raise in their entire post-nomination fundraising effort.

It is not quite obvious how this level of financial management can be defended as credible behavior on the part of a Libertarian presidential candidate. Not knowing how deeply in debt your campaign is at the time of the nominating convention, not even within a factor of seven, does not speak well for your ability to represent yourself as the candidate of the party that advocates reality-based politics.

Yes, there can be mistakes and managing a campaign. Balancing FEC reports, income and expenditure data, and bank balances to the nearest penny is a bit of a chore. I've done that repeatedly. However, when you tell the people voting on your nomination that your campaign is an eighth of a million dollars in debt, when you are actually over \$1 million in debt, your position is simply indefensible. And, yes, your FEC filings are public information and do indeed count as things that you told the convention delegates.

## News Notes

Former LPNH State Committee officer Avens O'Brien, who currently resides in California, has launched a new [YouTube video series The Avens Show](#), dealing with libertarian issues from her perspective. See [youtube.com/channel/UCA9j-KjQ2il3h6OY6qyO0aw](http://youtube.com/channel/UCA9j-KjQ2il3h6OY6qyO0aw)

Brett Bittner Recommends *101 Ways to Win an Election* by Mark Pack <http://www.amazon.com/dp/1849543127>. The author is English, but the UK Liberal Democrats are a third party running on occasion successfully in a first-past-the-post system.

In Presidential campaigns, [Marc Feldman](#) appeared and campaigned at the LPIN and LPWI state conventions, among other places. Rumored candidate [Jesse Ventura](#) said he would consider running on a date after the nominee has been chosen. His supporters may yet take the hint. [Daryl Perry](#) has issued a Presidential campaign platform; the last candidate to do this was perhaps Harry Browne. [Steven Kerbel](#) is reported to be recruiting a campaign team. [Gary Johnson](#) seems to be running up more campaign debt.

[National Chair Nick Sarwark](#) appeared on Washington Journal, a television program on NPR. <http://www.independentpoliticalreport.com/2015/04/nicholas-sarwark-on-washington-journal-this-sunday/>

## Oregon Party State Convention

[Wes Wagner writes](#): We had a well attended convention but we came up a bit short of our quorum requirement. As a result most all business has been referred to mail ballot.

The newly elected members of our board met immediately after the convention and we have a new chairperson and vice chairperson. (their email addresses are cc-ed here so you can change the list membership).

Our board is responsible for electing officers from amongst themselves. Lars Hedbor was elected chair vs Kyle Markley in a vote of 5 to 3 Kyle Marley was elected vice chair vs Jeff Weston in a vote of 7 to 1 Kyle and Lars have been members of our board and involved in our party for a significant period of time and should represent a smooth transition.

While I remain on the board, my personal efforts will be mostly focused on recruiting candidates. **I have a personal goal of our party having more candidates for the 2016 election than the Oregon Republican Party.** So far I have a team of 4 that has signed up to help with that goal located in different geographies in Oregon.

Wagner wrote to the State Chairs email list: Importantly, I won't be doing it alone... I have the start of an excellent team of people who have experience being candidates. Our efforts won't require significant money, but let me tell you a story about someone who could use a lot of help who is trying to support the candidates we will be recruiting.

Kyle Markley also started **a PAC for helping with and funding voter statements ...** in Oregon we are all vote by mail, and something as simple as a \$300 voter statement that is exceptionally well written can garner you a 5% base in a 3 or 4 way race for State House of Representatives. Oregon also has unlimited campaign finance limits and you can send money from out of state, so I will leave with one last shameless plug:

Send outrageous amounts of money to the following PAC if you want to see a state in this country to actually start possibly electing state legislators in the next 6-8 years - the leverage of exposure vs cost is incredible and the people heading up this organization have already been getting 8.5-9% in recent 3 way races where their opponents spent 2-3 million dollars.

Statements For Liberty  
P.O. Box 3223  
Hillsboro, OR 97123 - 1938

Statements For Liberty has no paid staff or overhead - like most everything we do in this state.

In other Oregon News, **the lawsuits** between the two factions claiming to be the Libertarian Party of Oregon **are continuing.** **New Libertarian State Chair Lars Hedbor is running for water board against incumbent Richard P. Burke, who is active in what until recently could be described as the Reeves faction of Oregon Libertarians.** Reeves is no longer their asserted state chair. There has been a major postcard mailing in the race, paid for by Oregon Party activist Jeff Weston. Reeves faction former Vice Chair Eric Saub has reportedly been arrested in Virginia / and charged with murder and other crimes [independentpoliticalreport.com/2015/05/former-burkereeves-group-lporegon-vice-chair-eric-saub-arrested-charged-with-murder](http://independentpoliticalreport.com/2015/05/former-burkereeves-group-lporegon-vice-chair-eric-saub-arrested-charged-with-murder).

The issue concerning **Oregon crept onto the State Chairs email list.** Scott Lieberman posted a complaint that Richard Burke was not listed as an elected Libertarian, even though he is elected and is registered Libertarian. There was a response from the National Chair, namely that no one had told the National Party about it before. He also suggested that raising the issue with the National Office was likely to be more effective than complaining on a list belonging to another group. State Chairs as a group were not impressed that they had to hear about Oregon again.

The **Ohio LP elected new officers** and had a political conference. The officers and events as reported by Sarah Bevins were  
Chair – Sarah Bevins

Vice Chair – Paul Hugenberg III  
Secretary – Daryl Olthaus  
Treasurer – Bryant Callaghan  
At-Large – Michael Segrest  
At-Large – John Deagan  
At-Large – John Fockler

The [2015 Ohio Conference](#) was May 1st & 2nd. Our keynote speaker was to be Bill Redpath. C. Michael Pickens was to speak on How to be a Super Recruiter and The Art of Fundraising. There were also training seminars, focusing on Running Effective Campaigns and Using Storytelling to Communicate Libertarian Ideals, as well as a seminar on the Lawyer's Role in Fighting Corruption and Protecting Constitutional Rights.

The [new Colorado State Chair is Lily Tang Williams](#) [xilong@earthlink.net](mailto:xilong@earthlink.net). Other Colorado officers include

Jay North, Vice Chair  
Amy Lunde-Provinces, Regions Director  
Jack Woehr, Campaigns Director  
Nathaniel Grabau, Communications Director  
Michael Stapleton, Legislative Director  
Alan Hayman, Membership Director

The [new State Chair](#) for the Libertarian Party of New Mexico is Marty Swinney. See LPNM.US. The new Wisconsin State Chair is Joe Kexel [chair@lpwi.org](mailto:chair@lpwi.org). The new Indiana State Chair will be Joe Hauptmann.

The [2015 Missouri LP officers](#) are:

Bill Slantz [chair@lpmo.org](mailto:chair@lpmo.org)  
Rick Vandeven [vicechair@lpmo.org](mailto:vicechair@lpmo.org)  
Randy Langkraehr [secretary@lpmo.org](mailto:secretary@lpmo.org)  
Sean O'Toole [treasurer@lpmo.org](mailto:treasurer@lpmo.org) (re-elected).

From the Maricopa, Arizona County Libertarian Party [lpmaricopa.org](http://lpmaricopa.org): Libertarian Party Closes Primary: [The Arizona Libertarian Party has voted to close its 2016 primary](#). This means that Independents can no longer request a Libertarian Primary Ballot. We now have our MCLP Speakers Bureau running. If you want to help as a presenter, writer or organizer please contact us [webmaster@lpmaricopa.org](mailto:webmaster@lpmaricopa.org). The goal of the speakers bureau is to present alternative methods to solve issues relying on voluntary association instead of coercion.

Readers interested in [grade school math teaching not to be confused with the Common Core curriculum](#) may find of interest :

Three prominent math curricula in the US:  
[http://sitemaker.umich.edu/carolinekeng/distinguishing\\_features\\_](http://sitemaker.umich.edu/carolinekeng/distinguishing_features_)

About Every Day Math curriculum (widely implemented):  
<http://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2014/04/confusing-math-homework-don-t-blame-the-common-core/360064/>

Summary of arithmetic algorithms in Every Day Math:  
<http://www.nychold.com/em-arith.html>

The **Libertarian Association of Massachusetts is about to launch a new issues-based party development campaign**, using Facebook pages, Facebook advertising, other advertising, press releases, Twitter, and other social media. The current plan is to roll out about one new issue a month, at least until the effectiveness of the operation has been tuned a bit. The first two issues are “No to Boston Olympics” and “Fathers’ Rights”. The rollout has somewhat been waiting for a series of back-office issues to be realigned, but that has at last happened.

## LNC In Action

**National Party membership** at the end of April was 11,837, down 8 from the previous month. The count of life members increased by 4. For the fifth month in a row, the count of new members was barely above 100. Membership renewals in the past six months were slightly above 3500. Apparently based on remarks of Alicia Mattson the count of members had been obscured in best Chicago style by counting dead people, but this has now been fixed. From the same remarks \$19,000 was or has been allocated to a telemarketing form to encourage renewals; I couldn’t tell if the money had been spent yet.

Sam Goldstein has urged the LNC to buy the .LIBERTARIAN terminator as a replacement for .ORG. It costs \$1000. Other members have differed. Norm Olsen argued in favor as a long-term investment.

The LNC engaged in a prolonged debate over the meaning of the **Bylaw "Sustaining member" is any Party member who has given at least \$25 to the Party in the prior twelve months, or who is a life member.** It seems that the LNC now has a date at which your membership expires, and an independent date at which your membership benefits lapse.

The issue arose over the question as to whether or not Doug Craig was actually a member of the national committee. The issue was that Craig had given more than \$25 in the past year, namely he had given some hundreds of dollars to the party for National Convention registration. **The claim was advanced that giving money for convention memberships did not constitute giving.** The Chair ruled that it did, but his decision was appealed by LNC members Mattson, Olsen, Wiener, and Hagan. On a vote, the Chair was overruled 5-11. Giving does not constitute giving. The voters were: Yes (Goldstein, Johnson, Kirkland, Sarwark, Vohra), and No ( Estrada, Feldman, Hagan, Katz, Lark, Mattson, McLendon, Olsen, Redpath, Reimers, Wiener). Craig had since paid another \$25, and was immediately re-elected as an At-Large LNC member.

The issue had some modest importance because there was an electronic meeting of the LNC while the validity of Craig’s membership was being disputed. At the start of the

meeting, say the LNC minutes: “At the time of this meeting, there were two ongoing email ballots dealing with questions concerning Mr. Craig's status as a member of the LNC. When the issue of that status arose during the credentials check, Dr. Lark requested that Mr. Craig refrain from participation in votes during the meeting.”

Additional LNC time was spent dealing with the complaint that some amount of spam was leaking through the LNC mail forwarders. The large LNC time sink for the month, however, was a debate about adopting a new logo. Your editor has very serious doubts that this extended debate is anything other than a complete waste of time, but to each their own.

The next LNC meeting is July 18 in D.C. The Sunday part of the meeting will be in the Headquarters basement, which is probably a bit small for this.

Scott Lieberman attacked Nick Sarwark: “Mr. Chair:

Why are YOU indirectly suggesting - publicly - that I resign from the LNC, while I am privately communicating with the LNC Officers regarding this matter?

Even though you don't use my name, nor quote my e-mail, it is very clear to everyone who reads this list what you are attempting to accomplish with the e-mail below.

I am very disappointed that the Chair has chosen to attack me publicly, while attempting to maintain plausible deniability by not coming out and actually using my name.

I apologize for using the word libel, since the Executive Director's comment does not meet the legal standard of libel.

Nevertheless, the ED's comment was extremely misleading, and it had the same effect as libel even if it did not meet the legal standard of libel.

I have every right to argue in favor of the LNC and staff following the Libertarian Party's Bylaws, which take precedence over any Special Rules, Standing Rules, or goals that the LNC might adopt:

“LP Bylaws

#### ARTICLE 3: PURPOSES

The Party is organized to implement and give voice to the principles embodied in the Statement of Principles by: functioning as a libertarian political entity separate and distinct from all other political parties or movements; moving public policy in a libertarian direction by building a political party that elects Libertarians to public office; chartering affiliate parties throughout the United States and promoting their growth and activities; nominating candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States, and supporting Party and affiliate party candidates for political office; and, entering into public information activities. “

The Executive Director of this organization publicly misstated my well-known opinion by stating that I advocate not running candidates for unwinnable offices, while leaving out the fact that I merely want to obey the Bylaws by having the Board and staff instead encourage candidates to run for offices that they can win.

I would hope that the Chair of the Libertarian Party would not feel the need to chastise a Board member publicly, but not mentioning the Board Member's name so as to be able to deny that the attack was directed against a particular Board Member.

Mr. Chair - I am happy to continue to attempt to resolve this matter via private e-mails. I am even willing to participate in a personal or 3-way telephone call, if you feel that will help fix this problem.

Scott Lieberman    Region 4 Alternate, Libertarian National Committee

Lieberman appeared to be responding to the Sarwark statement:

On Behalf Of Nicholas Sarwark: A short reminder regarding decorum

Dear All,

I expect that members of the Libertarian National Committee will disagree with each other with respect.

I expect that after the Libertarian National Committee comes to a decision on an issue, be it the purchase of an office or the choice to make a goal a certain number of candidates running for public office, that every member of the committee will either support the goal or at least stop trying to publicly fight against it after they've lost.

I expect that every member of the Libertarian National Committee will be polite and respectful to the rest of the members and to the national office staff.

If anyone is unwilling or unable to meet these expectations, I will happily accept your resignation from the Libertarian National Committee and wish you the best of luck in whatever future endeavors you choose.

Nicholas J. Sarwark  
Chair, Libertarian National Committee

As an editorial disagreement, we believe that LNC members who believe that buying an overexpensive DC headquarters building was a total waste of money, so that we should relocate elsewhere even into a new building far from DC, are entitled to keep trying to advance their position.

And now we have an interesting note, from long-time LfA and CMLC Liberator Reader Alvin See, on groups trying to take over a major party from the inside.

### 603 Alliance

How can a Conservative Republican have a chance of winning an election against a better known and much better financed left-leaning RINO?

Traditionally, the Iowa Caucus, the New Hampshire and South Carolina Primaries are key to gaining momentum for a candidate. A good showing in one of these first events is a must. But when there are several competing conservative candidates, the conservative vote gets split enough ways to allow the non-conservative to take an election, sometimes with less than 30% of the vote. A recent Presidential Primary in New Hampshire had seven conservatives take 70% of all the votes but none of them won.

This is the nature of the plurality voting system we have for elections. To attempt to improve the odds for a conservative candidate, a group of conservatives in New Hampshire got together to consider ways get around this problem. They came up with an idea and formed the 603 Alliance to implement it. The Conservative Business League of New Hampshire is the main support and the 603 Alliance is the working group.

The 603 Alliance wants to hold a caucus type convention in mid-October to select one candidate for all participants to get behind. The convention will hopefully have 500 to 1000 conservative participants. The plan is for caucus type of voting to find the best conservative to rally behind, even if it is not your first or maybe second choice. Participants must agree to support and vote for this choice. This support is hoped to achieve a ten-fold swing of other voters to also vote for this candidate in the February Presidential Primary in New Hampshire. It has not yet been announced how delegates to this caucus will be chosen.

Participants are encouraged to continue to support their current candidate of choice in whatever manner that they would have done anyway but after the caucus, to lend their support only to the winner of the caucus, even if not their first choice. The presumption is that this candidate will be close to what they would have wanted in a presidential candidate.

In a caucus, all delegates go into a large room, such as a gymnasium, where each candidate has a designated location. Delegates choose and go to one of the candidate's locations. At a designated time, the groups are counted and the smallest group dissolved. The delegates in the dissolved group go to another group. People in other groups can encourage joining their group. Then, twenty minutes later, another count of the groups and again the smallest group is dissolved with those group members moving to another group. This process is repeated until there is one group remaining. The winner is the candidate of the last remaining group.

Should this caucus work to get a conservative candidate for president chosen in the February New Hampshire primary, the news of this may well have an effect on later primaries in other states as well. This process may also be tried for the September 2016 state primary for the top of the ticket offices.

...Alvin See