

LIBERTY PLEDGE

NEWSLETTER

Libertarian National Committee, Inc. ♦ 2600 Virginia Ave, NW, Suite 200 ♦ Washington, DC 20037 ♦ Phone: (202) 333-0008 ♦ Fax: (202) 333-0072
www.LP.org October 2013

Libertarian Party to incumbents: Defund Obamacare now — or risk voter backlash in 2014

From the *Westmoreland Times* (Penn.)
Published on September 20, 2013

The Libertarian Party published this press release on Sept. 19, and distributed it to media outlets throughout the United States. The following day, the Westmoreland Times, a daily newspaper in Pennsylvania, reprinted the entire release:

The Libertarian Party is calling on members of the U.S. House and Senate to defund Obamacare now. “Incumbent politicians — especially Republicans with a majority in the House — will have no excuse if they refuse to fully defund Obamacare,” said Carla Howell, political director for the national Libertarian Party. “Now is the time. The president’s approval ratings are low, and voters are learning that Obamacare will impose shockingly high costs and debilitating regulations on taxpayers, businesses, and medical consumers if it takes effect.”

“If Democrats and Republicans fail to do the right thing and stop this disastrous program from unfolding, the blame for patients’ suffering and for striking a fatal blow to the fragile American economy will rest squarely on their shoulders,” she warned.

The Libertarian Party says that as members of Congress negotiate spending during the next few weeks, special interests that profit from Big Government will guide the actions of Democratic and Republican lawmakers.

Among the groups that donate generously to their campaigns while pushing to keep Obamacare in place are: pharmaceuticals and other medical suppliers, insurance companies, cartels, and the Service Employees International Union, which is rapidly unionizing the health care industry.

As powerful as these special interests are, their force may be dwarfed by the growing number of private sector workers and taxpayers — all potential voters — who have suffered the devastating effects of Big Government health care:

- radically increased drug prices and medical insurance premiums
- rationed care in the form of denied treatment; those who are “insured” often cannot get the care they need
- long waits for medical appointments — and doctors who don’t have time to give patients adequate care
- medical bankruptcies
- layoffs, reduced hours, and discontinuation of insurance plans by employers who can’t afford health care mandates

Despite President Obama’s tax-funded propaganda campaign to convince voters that Obamacare will not make things worse, Americans are seeing the truth. All these problems will become critical — and, in some cases, life-threatening — if politicians

Libertarian Party candidates are lining up now to challenge incumbents who refuse to defund and end Obamacare.

refuse to defund and block Obamacare.

Will either Democratic or Republican incumbents and their respective majorities in the House and Senate survive the 2014 elections if they continue to ignore the will of the people to stop this train wreck? Especially in the next few weeks when they have their best chance to derail it?

Libertarian Party candidates are lining up now to challenge incumbents who refuse to defund and end Obamacare.

Libertarian Henry Herford, candidate for U.S. House in Louisiana’s Oct. 19 special election, aims to “exempt everyone from Obamacare, not just Congress.”

“I will fight to repeal Obamacare and I will sponsor legislation to defund it,” he said.

Other Libertarian candidates who have declared their run for federal office include Matt Schnackenberg, Ray Netherwood, and Lucas Overby running for Congress in Florida; Chris Clemmons for Congress in Kansas; and David Patterson for U.S. Senate in Kentucky.

More Libertarians every day are expressing interest in running for office in 2014 who will campaign to nullify, defund, and repeal Obamacare. They will not seek to “repeal and replace” it with more Big Government alternatives — as many Republicans vow. Rather, Libertarian candidates will seek to replace failed Big Government medicine with low taxes and low-cost, high quality care delivered by the private sector.

The Libertarian Party advocates reducing and removing government mandates, taxes, red tape, and prohibitions that drive up the cost of health care, reduce quality, and put Americans’ lives at risk. This will enable medical providers to cut prices, improve the viability of their practices, and give their patients much better care. It will make insurance plans affordable and responsive to individuals’ needs. It will allow private practices and businesses to innovate and to provide safe, effective solutions to medical problems. Charities will abound, providing low-cost or free care to people in need.

“A free and unencumbered health care industry — with generous charity, and quality-controlling market regulation — will give Americans access to low-cost, accessible, and dignified care that relieves suffering and maximizes human health and longevity,” Howell said.

Libertarian Party in the News

Robert Sarvis: the Future of American Politics?

By Michael Cecire

From the *The National Interest*

Published on October 3, 2013

Traditionally, Virginia has never been fertile ground for third party candidates. Besides Independent Henry Howell's near miss in 1973 or William Story's fair showing in 1965—exceptions that seem to prove the rule—a non-major party candidate has yet to break 3 percent since the beginning of the twentieth century. This seems doubly true for libertarians, despite Virginia's conservative reputation. The only Libertarian Party candidate to register even a blip on the radar was Bill Redpath's whopping 0.77 percent in 2001. The late, great political scientist Daniel Elazar might have chalked it up to what he saw as Virginia's dominant "traditional," hierarchical political culture.

This is the context to consider the unlikely rise of Libertarian candidate Robert Sarvis, who has broken expectations in Virginia's gubernatorial race. Sarvis, whose curriculum vitae is very impressive, holds degrees from Harvard, Cambridge, NYU, and George Mason's prestigious Mercatus Institute. It's fair to say that he's the only mathematician-economist-lawyer-software developer in this year's race. He is also the only candidate not burdened with the extraordinary negativity that beleaguers Republican Ken Cuccinelli and Democrat Terry McAuliffe.

"The GOP and the Democrats nominated extreme candidates who [both] embody what's wrong with politics," explained Sarvis over the phone as he crisscrossed the Commonwealth. "You can only push people so far away before you cause disequilibrium."

Sarvis, presumably, is a byproduct of that disequilibrium. With both McAuliffe and Cuccinelli in a seeming race to the bottom and attracting stratospheric negatives in the polls, Sarvis' relative likeability and positive message is a breath of fresh air. In a break from the prevailing spiral of negativity enveloping Virginia's race, the Libertarian candidate has made the seemingly unfashionable choice of offering policy solutions and ideas. And despite being locked out of campaign debates and candidate forums, Sarvis still manages a very respectable 10-11 percent in several polls. He has even garnered almost 13 percent in one recent poll, which included a stunning 22 percent among 18-29 year-old Virginians.

For many Republicans, the attraction to Sarvis' candidacy is pretty straightforward. He wants to follow in Texas, Washington, and Nevada's footsteps and end the state income tax. He wants to slash red tape and regulations. He's a big supporter of gun rights and opposes the federalization of health care, emphasizing state-based catastrophic insurance, mental health care, and cash subsidies over leviathan bureaucracies.

At the same time, and despite gaining most of his support from disaffected Republican-leaning voters, Sarvis breaks from the mainstream GOP in major ways, especially in social issues. He's an active proponent of gay marriage, even recently showing up at a Virginia Pride Day event in Richmond, and strongly opposes the War on Drugs, which he says "has produced well-financed, well-armed, violent criminal enterprises." He also supports legalizing marijuana. Even his anti-regulation rhetoric is unconventional, speaking as

much to the generally unspoken realities of the carve-outs and crony capitalism that all too often accompanies incentives and regulation. Sarvis seems to be among the few to recognize a difference between big business and free markets.

It might seem easy to write off Sarvis' campaign as a one-time outlier borne from voters' palpable dissatisfaction with the major parties' meager offerings. But in many ways, Sarvis might represent a glimpse of Virginia's, and even America's, possible political future. Well outside the prevailing status quo, Sarvis actually embodies the kind of positive, policy-oriented, and post-partisan option that has been promised since the first *¡si se puede!* was uttered ahead of 2008.

Untethered from the litmus tests that strangle the two-party system, Sarvis' campaign appeals to those who have the temerity to support fiscal sobriety and gay marriage, charter schools and ending the drug war. Even Sarvis himself is emblematic of that future. A picture of multiculturalism—Sarvis is half-Irish, half-Chinese and married to an African-American—he and his family are a robust expression of the American Dream 2.0. It's no wonder that he's found a deep well of support among Virginia's young people—Millennials that see no reason to pigeonhole their political preferences by attaching themselves to a major political party.

Even with his good showing in the polls, few expect Sarvis to win. Barring a monumental collapse of one of the two major party candidates, Sarvis seems consigned to third place. But even a strong third place performance could signal a kind of sea change. Although the Cuccinelli campaign has warned that a vote for Sarvis is "casting a ballot for Terry McAuliffe," the reality is that voting for Sarvis is not only a vote for Sarvis, but against the two major-party candidates and for more choice in Virginia politics. James Bacon, a Virginia thought leader and publisher of Bacon's Rebellion, explains that a strong showing for Sarvis could shake up the Commonwealth's political landscape. Not only would the Libertarian Party be automatically entitled to a place on the ballot in the next election, but they would also win increased media exposure.

"Another advantage is that it would be more difficult for media and debate organizers to rationalize the marginalization of Libertarian candidates in electoral coverage and debates," notes Bacon, which he calls potentially "huge."

At the same time, the Sarvis campaign might just serve as a proof of concept for the political viability of contemporary libertarianism. While libertarian ideas have had the most national media exposure as a predominantly Republican or conservative phenomenon through the rise of the Tea Party or Senator Rand Paul, Sarvis offers a more explicitly independent variant untainted by the Republican Party's (fairly or unfairly) cranky reputation. Crucially, the Sarvis campaign well demonstrates that libertarianism can be realistic, pragmatic, relevant—and most importantly—can appeal to voters. With a good turnout for Sarvis, one can reasonably envision a Virginia where third-party candidates not only contend for the big races, but also begin to find their way into county boards, city councils, school boards and the state legislature. For a state that has long had a settled order, this could change everything.

Libertarians support Nullify Now conference

By Brian Irving

From *The Examiner*

Published on September 23, 2013

Nullification is not about states' rights or slavery, but about the fundamental principles of the American republic, said J.J. Summerell, chair of the Libertarian Party of North Carolina. The Libertarian Party is one of the sponsors of the Nullify Now conference scheduled for the Raleigh Convention Center Oct. 19.

"Libertarians believe the American system of government is founded on three basic and fundamental principles," Summerell said. These principles are: that the states formed the federal government, not the other way around; that the people are sovereign, not the states, nor the federal government; and that all government power is granted only by the "consent of the people."

"Since the people are sovereign, whenever the federal government exercises a power of dubious constitutionality on a matter of great importance, the people have the right to correct the situation," he said.

Summerell said that asking federal courts, federal bureaucrats or even federal elected officials to curtail or limit their power is useless.

"They have proven repeatedly that if they can get away with it, they will do it," he said. "Presidents and members of Congress from both major political parties have demonstrated over and over again that they are derelict in their duty to 'preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.'"

He also noted that the electoral process is so constrained and restricted as to effectively shut out dissenting voices.

"When federal elected officials fail to uphold the oath of office, and when federal courts are complicit in these usurpations

continued on page 4

New and renewing Liberty Pledgers

- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Karlos E. Abel | Charles Kewin |
| Keith Agosta | Susan Kewin |
| Claude A. Atkins | Ben Lake |
| James Atkins | Connie C. Le Compte |
| Adrian C. Banks | Jesse A. Lucy |
| Jerilyn K. Barthel | Kevin J. Lynch |
| Austin Bednar | Brendan M. Mai |
| Robert Blaszcak | Shmuel Malov |
| Neil Brown | Damon Marsden |
| Ted Brown | Mark Masters |
| Matthew Bryan | Gene McDonough |
| Imke Casey | Terri McLaughlin |
| David S. Cassarino | Joseph Moncato |
| Michael Cloar | Todd Overstreet |
| Nicholas Colangelo | Timothy O. Peters |
| Brian C. Cole | William Pharis |
| Dwight Conger | Lois E. Postel |
| Austin Cook | Erin Proctor |
| Kris Cope | Keith Quarles |
| Brent Cordes | Michael Raymond |
| Shane Coyle | Philip Ripley |
| Andrew J. Crisanti | Buddy Rodgers |
| Caroline Dobbs | Noah Rosenberg |
| Bill Dunlap | Brandon Ross |
| Calvin Ezell | Ryan Russell |
| Elizabeth Fann | John M. Sanders |
| Christopher Feeney | Scott A. Sanford |
| William Fischbach | William Sheppard |
| Jim Flatt | Patrick Shockey |
| Michael A. Fusaro, II | Peter Sifnotis |
| Scott Gesty | Bob Smither |
| Joseph Giofriddo | Wally A. Sneddon |
| Darrell Goldman | Gilbert H. Snow |
| Ashley Goodrich | Amberleigh Stipicevich |
| Richard F. Guill | Zack Storm |
| Marilee Guinan | John Swapceinski |
| Bryan Harper | Gary C. Tapert |
| Glenn N. Hartzheim | Robert W. Vance |
| Gene P. Hawkins | Michael Vechery |
| Joseph D. Henchman | Arch Wakefield |
| Chris Higdon | Irene Waller |
| James B. Hoffman | Mike Weinberg |
| Maxwell Hyman | Brian Whildin |
| Terri L. Jenkins | Jerry Williamson |
| Kerry Johnston | Brandon Wirick |
| Dorsett W. Jordan | John Wynne |
| Martin J. Keller | John M. Zaharoff |
| Holly E. Kemble | Sergey V. Zubkov |

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

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$5,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$100 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$1,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$50 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$500 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$25 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$250 | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ Other |

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

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$2,500 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$100 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$1,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$50 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$500 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$30 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$250 | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ 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.

Libertarian Party in the News

This third-party candidate could make a difference

By Joe Hallett

From *The Columbus Dispatch*

Published on September 29, 2013

I could build a beach if I had a grain of sand for every call I received over the years from third-party candidates for governor seeking publicity.

I've refrained from telling them: "Call back when you've raised \$1 million."

For sure, that's harsh, because the ideas of third parties deserve to be heard. Like it or not, though, money is a key indicator of political support, and if a candidate can't raise enough to be remotely competitive — which is true of almost all third-party candidates — then there is little use discussing what he or she would do as governor.

That's why it is tempting to blow off Charlie Earl, even though the Libertarian Party candidate assured me in an interview that he'll raise at least \$1.5 million, and more likely \$3.5 million, an amount he said would "slam dunk" him into the governor's office.

His bravado ignores that Republican Gov. John Kasich and his likely Democratic opponent, Cuyahoga County Executive Ed FitzGerald, each probably will run \$15 million-plus campaigns next year.

Still, it is unwise to ignore Earl, not as a candidate who actually could become governor (he can't). He merits notice because he could be a spoiler, particularly by cutting into Kasich's vote.

A portion of the Republican Party base — and nobody is certain how big it is — has rebelled against Kasich as a big-government traitor, for advocating the expansion of Medicaid to 275,000 more poor Ohioans. Tea party groups are vowing to stay home or find another candidate rather than support Kasich for re-election.

"We carried water for him in 2010, but we're not going to do that in 2014," said Tom Zawistowski, Ohio's most-recognized tea party leader.

Admitting that the tea party has no one to challenge Kasich in next May's GOP primary, Zawistowski said that he and like-minded folks might get behind Earl, who is counting on it.

"That's going to be our main emphasis going forward — trying to bring a coalition of Libertarians and tea party people who love freedom and who are not enamored with what's going on in Washington and Columbus," said Earl, 67, who taught mass

"That's going to be our main emphasis going forward — trying to bring a coalition of Libertarians and tea party people who love freedom and who are not enamored with what's going on in Washington and Columbus."

— *Charlie Earl, Libertarian Party candidate for Ohio Governor*

communication at Bowling Green State University and lives on a farm north of there.

But is a Libertarian really the tea party's cup of tea? Earl said he is a born-again Christian who strongly opposes abortion, "but if the people of Ohio believe otherwise, then I'll go along with it." He also sanctioned gay marriage, saying it is not "the government's business to determine who you love."

These positions won't sit well with the GOP's Christian right, which cross-pollinates with the tea party, and even Zawistowski says he's not sure if it's possible to get tea partiers to coalesce behind a Libertarian.

"We're just such a diverse entity. It is the penultimate herding of cats."

Zawistowski and Earl are unconcerned that Earl might siphon enough of the 2014 votes away from Kasich to make FitzGerald governor. "Whoopie!" Earl said.

But Mark Caleb Smith, director of the Center for Political Studies at Cedarville University, said it is not a given that Earl would cut into only Kasich's vote.

Libertarians, he said, "tend to cut across both Democrat and Republican support," noting that Earl's tolerance on social issues such as gay marriage could woo some Democrats, while his commitment to small government could entice Republicans.

"When Libertarians make appeals that lure members of both parties, their appeals also, by definition, repulse members of both parties," Smith said. "This makes it unlikely that even a strong Libertarian campaign that finishes above 5 percent would damage only one major-party candidate."

Earl, who has a likable, down-home manner, is eager "to stir the pot," adding, "We're going to let it rip and let the chips fall where they may."

Nullify Now conference

continued from page 3

of power, the 'rightful remedy' of the people is to act individually, and through their state governments, to render such unconstitutional actions 'null and void,'" he said.

Summerell said that since the American system is founded on the premise that the people must consent to all law, nullification is a "peaceful and lawful process."

"Nullification is, in effect, a peaceful and lawful process by which the people, and the states, can withdraw their consent, thus rendering an unconstitutional act of the federal government void simply by failing to obey or enforce it," Summerell explained.

The basic premise of libertarianism is that all people have the right to exercise sole dominion over their lives, and have the right to live in whatever manner they choose, so long as they do not forcibly interfere with the equal right of others to live in whatever manner they choose.

Summerell said that is why libertarians believe the only legitimate purpose of government is to protect the lives, liberty, and property of the people.

He noted that the national party platform echos the sentiments of the Declaration of Independence when it asserts: "Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of individual liberty, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to agree to such new governance as to them shall seem most likely to protect their liberty."