

# LIBERTY PLEDGE

## NEWSLETTER

Libertarian National Committee, Inc. • 1444 Duke St. • Alexandria, VA 22314 • Phone: (202) 333-0008 • Fax: (202) 333-0072  
www.LP.org

November 2014

# New Hope for the LP?

By Andrew Ferguson  
Excerpted from *Liberty*  
Published on November 3, 2014

*In advance of Election Day, Liberty managing editor Andrew Ferguson spoke with new Libertarian Party chair Nicholas Sarwark about the state of the party, the prospects for 2014, and what can be done to fight for a future more free.*

**Liberty:** I get the sense of a more libertarian sensibility in the generation that's coming up now, but that to a lot of them the actual word "libertarian" carries some sort of a taint, or it's been caricatured so successfully that many wouldn't identify themselves as libertarian even if it matches their own conscience.

**Sarwark:** Right. And that's one of the reasons why we have to rebuild. The idea that we're either fringe or just some sort of weird branch of the Republican Party who votes along with them, we have to break that. And the only way to do it is to have strong messaging that differentiates us, that relentlessly focuses on what we will do and what we care about and how it is different.

I draw a lot of my inspiration from the abolitionists like William Lloyd Garrison and Frederick Douglass, and the idea that human freedom is the overarching principle that is above all others. Our cause is not only just, but of sufficient import that we need to be passionate, we need to be aggressive, we need to be respectful, but also make it clear that we're not comfortable with leftovers, or only being an option if there's no one else on the ballot. We're definitely not comfortable allowing Republicans or non-libertarians to define what "libertarian" means, which happens on the right and the left: you have Rand Paul being referred to as a libertarian while he's still supporting foreign intervention and a number of other things, but you also have the New York Times or Washington Post writing about this liberal-libertarian cooperation in Congress, but all the supposed cooperation are on completely anti-libertarian policies.

So it's a word that we don't own anymore and we need to show people that we're serious about showing up for elections and presenting options and a message that is both distinctive and, frankly, sensible. We've bought into the bullshit that the major parties have hit us with for so long that we're somehow the extremists. Anyone who wants to control your life is the extremist. We're the ones who want you to control your own life. And we need to hit them with that.

**Liberty:** So in terms of actually reaching out to generations of college students or other young voters who have affinities with libertarian ideals, what sort of outreach will reach them?

**Sarwark:** We have to lead by example. We are a party for a newer generation — I'm not quite 35 yet, and I'm the national chair. If you look at our candidates, we skew younger. So we show them that if you want a party that is not mean or bigoted, but also isn't going to try and take your money and give it to old people, then the LP is for you.

That's what the Pew study and the Reason study have shown about millennials: they're definitely liberal with regard to social issues like marriage equality or marijuana legalization or racial issues, but when they are polled and asked about government and welfare programs, they turn into super fiscal conservatives. They're behind the Democrats on being nice to people, but not on redistributing wealth or any of the Great Society programs. And they're behind the Republicans on a relatively free market and lower taxation, but they just think they're mean, and so they won't associate with them. We're going into a generation where, no matter how good your policy prescriptions are, if you don't come across as caring and sensitive, you will not win. We can seize on that and — not to take anything away from 2014 and 2016 as elections we will contest, and contest more strongly than we have before — but we can look at ten years out, where we become the second party in a number of states where things are lopsided and one of the old parties has become moribund, and we're on the ballot in all 50 states and people want our presidential nomination, instead of us having to hunt for people.

**Liberty:** It's been fun watching Hillary Clinton try to reposition herself as a real human being who actually cares and is sensitive to anything whatsoever.

**Sarwark:** Right.

**Liberty:** So you're recruiting candidates then, not only for the executive role but also for the downticket elections, who can come off as contribute some media savvy to their candidacy?

**Sarwark:** We can set the tone from the top, what our priorities are and what kind of message we send, about what libertarians are and what they do. I'm not trying to do any kind of purity purge, or kick candidates out because they're heterodox on certain issues, but it will be clear over the next couple of years what the libertarian position is on issues. And if there are candidates who deviate, then they will explain how they are different from the rest of the party. The party will not compromise our positions in order to make the candidates more comfortable.

It's going to be easier and better for candidates who are able to present that kind, caring, compassionate yet completely devoted

*continued on page 4*

# Wyllie questions relationship between Ridings, the FPA, Democrats, and Crist

By Brian Cole

Excerpted from *Examiner.com*  
Published on October 15, 2014

Adrian Wyllie, Libertarian candidate for governor of Florida, is calling into question the relationship between Dean Ridings, the Florida Press Association (FPA) the Democratic Party of Florida, and possibly Charlie Crist. On Tuesday evening, the Florida Press Association and Leadership Florida, two organizations for which Mr. Ridings serves on the board, were successful in federal court in efforts to exclude Mr. Wyllie from the largest televised gubernatorial debate in 2014.

These claims stem from the fact that Intersect Media Solutions, a subsidiary of the Florida Press Association, is conducting business with a well known Democratic consulting firm Greer, Margolis, Mitchell and Burns (GMMB) and their interactions with Democrat candidate Charlie Crist.

Intersect Media Solutions, who is owned by the Florida Press Association's for-profit company, Florida Press Services, provides marketing research and media advertising purchases for marketing companies around the state and country. One of their clients, Greer, Margolis, Mitchell and Burns is a political consulting firm located on

K Street in Washington, D.C., and is known for running campaigns for major Democratic candidates including Barack Obama and, most recently, Charlie Crist.

GMMB's partner, Brad Perseke said, "I call them for virtually all of our newspaper advertising. Working together with Intersect Media Solutions, our agency can focus on all aspects of a client's campaign while with Intersect Media Solutions' [sic] provides us with the necessary research and data needed for effective newspaper advertising," when speaking of their relationship with Intersect Media Solutions.

This election cycle alone GMMB has done extensive work with the Charlie Crist campaign and the Democrat Party of Florida. The company [Greer, Margolis, Mitchell and Burns] has been paid \$6,455,903.22 this election cycle with \$1,888,859.67 coming from Charlie Crist, \$4,101,653.40 from the Democrat Party of Florida and \$465,390.15 coming from SEIU of Florida. While it is unclear if GMMB used Intersect Media Solutions for either Charlie Crist or the Democrat Party of Florida in this year's gubernatorial election, it is clear that Intersect Media Solutions does, and has, profited from the Democrat Party and its candidates.

The Florida Press Association and Leadership Florida set debate

criteria in August of this year, after having the knowledge that Adrian would be polling at least as high as 12 percent, and, at the time, slightly hurting Charlie Crist. The person who makes that decision, and sits on both boards, is Dean Ridings, who is not only the president of the Florida Press Association and Intersect Media Solutions, but also sits on the board of directors of Leadership Florida.

"At this point, given the circumstantial evidence of an incestuous, multimillion dollar relationship between Dean Ridings, GMMB, and Charlie Crist, I have to call into question whether this was the ultimate reason for my exclusion in the debate," said Wyllie. "It is clear to me now that when Ridings set the debate criteria specifically to exclude me, it was not based on public interest — it was based on personal profit motive."

The Wyllie for Governor Campaign calls into question whether debate organizers can be a trusted source for the people of Florida when the president of the Florida Press Association, and the association itself, through its subsidiaries, profits from candidates and campaigns. While it does not change the outcome of Wyllie's exclusion in the debate, it is something that must be considered by the people of Florida.

---

## Carla Howell: GOP, Democrats 'rigged election process' to retain control

From *Examiner.com*

Published on November 5, 2014

Democrats and Republicans have "rigged" the US election process to retain control at all levels of government and maintain their status as the dominant political parties pursuing the same policies, says the political director of the Libertarian Party.

"The 2014 midterm election in the U.S. demonstrated once again that Americans are rejecting the political policies of reigning Democrats and Republicans which are virtually the same policies," Carla Howell told Press TV on Wednesday.

"Having essentially rigged the election process to a large degree, the two old parties retain control at all levels of government — but at a high cost.

"They had to spend an estimated \$3.7 billion, shattering previous spending levels for midterm. In spite of this, voter turnout was low and many Libertarian candidates who spent virtually no money show impressive vote totals.

"Democrats and Republicans spent \$3.7 billion attacking each other and avoiding substantive debate.

"Democrats and Republicans kept the election dialog on relatively trivial issues while avoiding discussion on issues of

*continued on page 3*

## GOP, Democrats ‘rigged election process’

*continued from page 2*

far greater concern to most Americans: mass surveillance, war, regulations that choke the economy, high taxes, Obamacare, government debt, and high government spending.

“They also put substantial energy into keeping the Libertarian candidates off the ballot. They launched frivolous charges backed by their allies in key positions on Election boards, in the judicial system, and in the media.

“While most Libertarian candidates survived the challenges, the Democrats and Republicans’ [attacks] served to distract Libertarian candidates from campaigning.

“They managed to throw two statewide candidates off the ballot in Ohio. And in a state Senate race in New York, while they failed to keep a Libertarian off the ballot for state Senate, they managed to mislead and confuse many voters into believing she was not in the race.

“We continue to see Libertarian candidates in highly contested races where they threaten to change the outcome of the election. For example, in Florida, Virginia, Kansas, and North Carolina, Libertarians won more votes than the spread between Democrats and Republicans in key Senate and governor races.

“While young voters remain notorious for sitting out midterm elections, those who do vote are voting Libertarian in much higher numbers. We’ll see their impact much more in 2016 when even more votes for Libertarians will show that Americans are demanding much less government, a non-interventionist foreign policy, and more freedom,” Howell concluded.

Republicans picked up at least seven Senate seats in Tuesday’s votes, securing a majority in the 100-member chamber. They also won more seats in the House of Representatives, further consolidating their power in the US Congress.

## New and renewing Liberty Pledgers

Jacob Ashmore	Andrew Johnson
Derek J. Balling	Joseph C. Johnson
Nelson M. Barnhouse	Richard K. Jones
Michael Baumann	Kevin Kauzlaric
Rodney Benker	Thomas J. Kern
Dwayne S. Borgstrand	Brian G. Kiernan
Judy Bowers	Russell Knight
Mathew J. Bradford	Kristin E. Kroeger
Eric J. Briel	John F. Lewis
Paul A. Brown	Jonelle Lewis
Christopher Cahill	Charles London
Michael J. Campolo	Stanley V. Lowry
Paul M. Carlson	Robin D. Maddock
Nicholas Celli	Joseph Marosek
Christopher Claytor	Eduardo Mena
Joseph Debrodie	Thomas Metrick
Jack E. Elder	Matthew Needler
Samantha Fairley	Robert Odden
Jason S. Farkas	Maxim A. Pruger
Jonathan Fenwick	James P. Rongstad
Brian W. Firth	Nicole Rossi
William J. Forte	Travis Rubeck
James G. Foster	Benjamin Russell
Joshua Fuller	John R. Siebken
June R. Genis	Scott J. Spencer
Richard Granson	Scott Stephens
Michael A. Gregory	Michael L. Stevenson
Tia A. Guerrant	Joshua Takacs
James H. Hammond	Kempes Trager
Thomas F. Hastings	Rollin Traver
Joseph A. Haynes	Sue Velie
Regan P. Hess	Janet B. Walker
Len Hofferber	Thomas E. Wendoll
Joseph Jager	Tony Whitaker

I would like to make a one-time donation to the LP:

- \$5,000       \$100  
 \$1,000       \$50  
 \$500           \$25  
 \$250     \_\_\_\_\_ Other

**I would like to increase my monthly pledge to this level:**

- \$2,500**       **\$100**  
 **\$1,000**       **\$50**  
 **\$500**           **\$30**  
 **\$250**     \_\_\_\_\_ **Other**  
 (minimum \$10)

(Please make checks payable to **Libertarian Party**.)

Please bill my  Visa  MasterCard  AmEx  Discover

Card number: \_\_\_\_\_ Exp: \_\_\_\_\_

Name on card: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City, State, Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Occupation\*: \_\_\_\_\_

Employer\*: \_\_\_\_\_

Home Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Work: \_\_\_\_\_ Cell: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

\* Federal law requires us to use our best efforts to collect and report the name, mailing address, occupation and name of employer of individuals whose contributions exceed \$200 in a calendar year. Political contributions are not tax deductible.

# Robert Sarvis Says Vote Libertarian to Stop the Next ‘Bipartisan’ Disaster

By Robert Sarvis

Excerpted from *Reason*

Published on October 28, 2014

Pick a problem. Any problem. There’s a pretty good chance both major parties—Republicans and Democrats—share responsibility for it.

The \$17 trillion national debt? Thank bipartisan overspending. Republicans love to highlight the explosion of the debt under Democrat Barack Obama, but they conveniently forget about the doubling of the debt under Republican George W. Bush.

The mass surveillance state? Thank bipartisanship. The so-called “Patriot” Act infamously sailed through the U.S. Senate in 2001 with only one dissenting vote. As Senate Minority Leader, Democrat Harry Reid (NV) bragged about “killing” the bill in a speech to party activists in 2005, though all he really did was temporarily delay reauthorization. Just six years later, with his party in control of the White House and the Senate, Reid let his true colors show when he accused Republican Sen. Rand Paul (Ky.) of endangering national security for seeking to have a debate about the bill.

Our unconstitutional, interventionist foreign policy? Thank both parties. Barack Obama is now the fourth consecutive president—two from each party—to initiate new bombing campaigns in Iraq. Back when Republicans were in power, then-Senator Barack Obama said, “The President does not have power under the Constitution to unilaterally authorize a military attack in a situation that does not involve stopping an actual or imminent threat to the nation.” His bombing campaigns against Libya and ISIS tell a different story.

The failed drug war? The highest incarceration rate in the world? Militarized police? Abusive asset-forfeiture regimes? Republicans and Democrats have staunchly supported all of it.

Rampant corporate welfare? In 2008, when Republicans were the ones supporting the Export-Import Bank, candidate Barack Obama called it little more than corporate cronyism,

but in 2014, it was Democrats lining up to support it. Virginia’s Democratic Senators Mark Warner and Tim Kaine introduced the reauthorization bill, and President Obama signed it. That’s just one issue among many. Cronyism is rampant in both parties, and its choking off our economic vitality.

Even the Defense of Marriage Act and Don’t Ask Don’t Tell were bipartisan schemes when passed.

George Carlin was right: “Bipartisanship usually means some larger-than-usual deception is being carried out.”

The two-party system isn’t working because both major parties are working against freedom and the public interest. Bipartisanship gets us nowhere when both major parties are part of the problem.

Luckily, there is a different option that is gaining more and more support every year. The Libertarian Party has been on the right side of issue after issue for forty years, and that’s for one simple reason—a principled commitment to America’s greatest political value: freedom. Candidates for elected office under the Libertarian Party banner are running for simple reason: We believe both major parties are broken, neither will protect ALL your liberties, and voters deserve a better option.

That’s especially true for nearly a quarter of the American public that leans libertarian. That’s one-fourth of the population without a natural home in either major party. They can find a home in the Libertarian Party.

The simplest reason, then, for a libertarian to vote Libertarian is to vote according to their conscience. People like Adrian Wylie (Governor in Florida), Sean Haugh (U.S. Senate in North Carolina), John Buckley (U.S. Senate in West Virginia), Andrew Hunt (Governor in Georgia), and the late Douglas Butzier decided to run as Libertarians for the right reasons—not for self-aggrandizement or personal gain but to spread our message of personal and economic liberty and to give voters something to be proud of voting FOR.

The two major parties got us into the messes we face. Libertarians can get us out of it. Wherever you are, vote Libertarian.

---

## New hope for the LP?

*continued from page 1*

to freedom message than in the past, we had libertarians who had taken extreme positions for philosophy’s stake, without being able to communicate the human element to those policies. And that’s not what we’re going to do.

We’ve been coming up into this term focused on the idea that human progress comes from cooperation

and the free exchange of ideas, and it’s government that holds us back. So our candidates are focused on making concrete proposals where they can say, “If elected, I will cut these programs and thereby increase your freedom.” Whether it’s reducing military spending by 60% or sponsoring legislation to eliminate the Department of Education, we’ll be making testable campaign promises. This flips on its head the approach of old-party candidates who

are always afraid there’ll be a hot mic at a fundraiser, and they’ll get caught out saying they’ll do something and then not do it. We’re very purposefully going out and publicly saying, “If elected I will do this thing,” and then going to the old-party candidates and saying, what’s he promising you? Nothing, just empty platitudes. And that’s where we show the voters that if they want something done to actually make their life better, then they need to vote Libertarian.