



Published for friends and supporters of the Libertarian Party

Liberty Pledge

NEWSLETTER

OCTOBER 1996

Libertarian National Committee, Inc. ♦ 2600 Virginia Avenue, NW, Suite 100 ♦ Washington DC 20037 ♦ (202) 333-0008

Browne shines in two national TV appearances

Libertarian presidential candidate Harry Browne “stole the show” during two national TV appearances this month when he went head-to-head with several minor party presidential candidates, according to campaign director Sharon Ayres.

Browne appeared on the popular Larry King Show on CNN on Sunday, October 6th, directly following the first presidential debate, and on a nationally televised debate from the National Press Club in Washington, DC on Monday, October 7th, broadcast by C-SPAN.

On the Larry King show, Browne appeared with Ralph Nader of the Green Party (on the ballot in 22 states), John Hagelin of the Natural Law Party (44 states) and Howard Phillips of the U.S. Taxpayer's Party (39 states).

Browne refrained from attacking the lesser-party candidates, and instead focused his rhetorical firepower on Bill Clinton's and Bob Dole's debate performances.

“[Clinton and Dole] were quibbling over nothing because they don't have any substantial proposals. They were quibbling while America burns,” said Browne.

Making a pitch to the three-quarters of Americans who “think government is way too big,” Browne urged: “Don't waste your vote. If you want government out of your bedroom, your bank accounts, and your life, there's only one choice — the Libertarian Party.”

The three-way debate broadcast on C-SPAN the next evening featured Browne, Hagelin, and Phillips — but was clearly dominated by Browne, said Ayres.

“No wonder Clinton and Dole refused to invite Mr. Browne to their debate,” said Ayres. “Based on his performance in this debate, he would have stolen the show.”

Browne dominated the debate, Ayres said, because he was the only candidate able to present a credible, consistent, persuasive case for smaller government.

“The other guys were all over the map,” she said. “Phillips argued for a government that enforced so-called Biblical rules of personal behavior, and Hagelin advocated a government that spent more money on so-called scientific solutions. Only Mr. Browne presented a credible plan to dramatically reduce the size and cost of government.”

The debate was sponsored by George Mason University School of Law and the International Center for Economic Justice. The two appearances generated more than 2,500 calls to the party's 800#, reported Ayres.

Browne picks up endorsements from gay newspaper, taxpayer's advocate

Harry Browne has won two more endorsements for president — from a leading taxpayer's advocate on the East Coast and a prestigious gay newspaper on the West Coast.

In an op-ed piece in the Quincy, Massachusetts *Patriot Ledger* on September 28th, Barbara Anderson, executive director of Citizens for Limited Taxation, wrote that she had voted for Browne in the Massachusetts primary — and told taxpayers, “He's on your side.”

Noting that she had been introduced to Browne in 1973 via his book *How I Found Freedom In An Unfree World*, Anderson wrote: “Harry Browne is running for president because time is running out for freedom in an unfree world. Harry does not just attack [big government], he has solutions, and he expresses them with optimism, hope, and confidence that it's not too late to recover the freedom that we had — and create the better world we all want.”

On the other side of the country, the gay newspaper *OutNow!* reached the same conclusion.

The San Francisco paper wrote on October 1st: “Harry Browne offers a vision of an America that's vastly different from those proffered by the Republicans and Democrats. His goal is to get the federal government out of our lives as much as possible. He doesn't promise an end to discrimination. But he does promise to get the government out of the business of regulating our lives. And while that certainly won't solve all of our problems, it's a good start.

“Make sure your vote for president is one that advances the goal of gay Americans becoming fully equal members of society — nothing more, nothing less. A vote for Harry Browne will do just that.”

Jorgensen: political 'dream woman'

Sure, Harry Browne has been praised by many political commentators — but he's never received the compliment that VP candidate Jo Jorgensen got this month.

Jorgensen isn't just “cool, intelligent, and aggressively opinionated,” wrote columnist Doug Vanderweide in the Waterville (Maine) *Morning Sentinel* on October 3rd, she's a political “dream woman [with] tremendous appeal for generation Xers — especially males.”

Noting that Libertarians have a reputation for being bookish, Vanderweide wrote: “Jorgensen's vitality and hipness bring the promise of breaking down that wall of elitism, and the chance to invite an entire generation to swell the Libertarian Party's ranks — and success.”

The Libertarians and Democrats spar over election symbols

By ERIC BERGER
Missourian staff writer

The Libertarians plan to use the Missouri Mule to give the Democrats a symbolic kick in the ass.

On Thursday, local Libertarians claimed a small victory when they gained approval to use a mule as their symbol on the ballot in the upcoming election.

"It's a no-lose situation for us," said Mitch Moore, the Libertarian candidate for the 9th Congressional District seat. "A mule is a highly prized animal. It helped people move West and helped to reconstruct the South — it's a heck of a symbol."

The Democrats, who use the donkey as their symbol on the national level, use the Statue of Liberty on Missouri ballots. But Lady Liberty is the Libertarian national symbol.

Jim Grebing, communication director for the Secretary of State's office, confirmed the Libertarians will have the mule on November ballots.

"The law basically says the only grounds we have to reject it is if the proposed symbol bears a resemblance to any other symbol that has been used in the past five years," he said.

The state Democrats have used the Statue of Liberty for years, Grebing said.

For that reason, Moore said his party went after the mule. Formerly, the Libertarians in Missouri had used the Liberty Bell.

So this November, Missouri voters will have to decide whether to vote for the donkey party by checking off the candidate with a statue by their name, or the liberty candidate with a symbol by their name that looks like a donkey.

"It definitely creates problems for us that

they have Lady Liberty," Moore said. "It's confusing when people go to the voting booth, but the Democrats are to blame for two things. First, they don't use the donkey, and secondly, they use our symbol."

One possible solution Moore suggested involved a possible swap between the Libertarian and Democratic symbols. Moore said the Libertarians were willing to work to facilitate the symbol swap.

"They have the power to legislate a change," he said. "They could work with us. We are reasonable people."

Whether or not reason prevails, Moore seems pleased to have the mule. But he did worry about one local problem. The candidate wondered whether the Muleskinners, a local Democratic organization, might want to reconsider their name.

▲ *The Columbia Missourian*, Columbia, Missouri, August 30, 1996

▼ *The Journal Gazette*, Mattoon, Illinois, September 7, 1996

Libertarian candidate for Senate wants 50 percent reduction of government

By M.K. GUETERSLOH
Staff Writer

CHARLESTON — The current political spectrum offers a set of false choices — either Republican or Democrat — said Robin Miller, third party candidate for U.S. Senate.

The 37-year-old East Peoria man is vying for the Senate seat that will be vacated by Sen. Paul Simon, a Democrat, in the fall. Miller, a Libertarian, is competing against Republican Al Salvi and Democrat Dick Durbin for the seat.

This will be the second campaign trail Miller has traveled. The first was a bid to be a University of Illinois Trustee in 1994.

"In the 1994 election, I was drafted," Miller said during a phone interview. "They (leaders of the party) came to me and said they were looking to broaden their influence downstate and they needed my help. I asked them what they wanted me to do, which was run for U of I trustee, I said, 'Great, I can do that.'"

Miller said he spent \$100 campaigning for the trustee position. Although he did not win, he did receive 200,000 votes, which gave the Libertarians a major-party ballot status in Illinois.

Because of the major party status, Miller has been included in the Chicago Senatorial debates

“
This country
was founded
by people who
wanted to get rid
of government.
Washington,
Jefferson,
Franklin, they
would be
Libertarians today.
— Robin Miller

sponsored by the League of Women Voters.

Although, he is happy he will be participating in the debate, he knows the competition is going to try to portray him as an extremist.

"My expectation is they will try to marginalize me," Miller said. "They will try to paint me as an extremist."

Miller used the issue of government growth as an example of how he could be considered an extremist compared to Salvi and

Durbin.

"The Democrats want the government to grow by 5 percent, the Republicans want the government to grow by 3 percent and the Libertarians want the government reduced by 50 percent," he said. "There is a 2 percent difference between those two parties. The Libertarians are the only ones offering a truly different option."

Although it is not as widely recognized as the two major parties, Miller said the Libertarian party is growing and, with 180 candidates in office across the nation, it is legitimately the third largest party.

"Ross Perot and his Reform Party do not have anyone holding office," Miller said. Growth in the Libertarian Party is due to citizens, especially members of the 'X' Generation, who are becoming increasingly unhappy with the choice between Democrats and Republican

"As Generation X gets more involved in politics, I do see the party growing as a result," said Miller who believes the Libertarian Party will also grow in two ways.

"It will grow now voluntarily while we all still have a choice and it will grow later when the crash comes and we can't afford to be a Republican or a Democrat."

Miller said he joined the party

after becoming dissatisfied with the political system.

"I was in the Anderson camp in 1980 and I had my fling with Reagan," he said. "Then I found this party. This country was founded by people who wanted to get rid of government. Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, they would be Libertarians today."

Topics such as smoking and abortion grabbing headlines in the political campaigns, Miller said, is a distraction from the real issues.

"While these issues are important, they will not have the effect that fiscal collapse will have on the country," he said. "We need to set priorities."

Miller said he knows that winning in November is a long-shot, but even getting votes will help facilitate changes within the current political system.

"A win would certainly help bring change faster, but even getting 10 to 12 percent of the vote will tell the other candidates, 'We're on to you guys' and the change will eventually come as a result," he said. "And there is an outside possibility that we can win in these elections. Who knows?"

If Miller does not win in November, he said he will go back to work at his technology sales and service company, Liberty Home Automation, in East Peoria.

Libertarian candidates on local, national ballots

While members of the news media are telling us more than we want to know about Bill Clinton and Bob Dole — and occasionally hyping Ross Perot — candidates from the third largest political party in America have been quietly campaigning, just as they have since 1971.

Those of you who watch C-SPAN or read more than the front page and comics already know Harry Browne is running for president as a



DAVID HUNTER

Libertarian candidate. But did you know that Greg Samples of Lenoir City, a Libertarian, is opposing Fred Thompson for the U.S. Senate?

You probably didn't know because most political reporters in America are focused on the most highly visible power brokers. And while it's obvious not everyone who decides to run for president can be touted by the press, Browne, on the ballot in all 50 states, most certainly has earned the right to be

treated seriously.

Not a personality cult founded around a George Wallace or a Ross Perot, not a one-issue tribe like the Green Party, Libertarian candidates have always run on clearly defined principles.

The central principle of Libertarianism is that the legitimate functions of government are few; most party members (but not all) grudgingly accept national defense, law enforcement and a court system as governmental functions. All other services, most party members believe, could best be provided by free enterprise.

Advocates of Libertarianism see themselves as the *only* real alternative party, firmly rooted in the U.S. Constitution, fervent champions of the Bill of Rights.

"The difference between Democrats and Republicans," said Preston Spaulding, who is running for the Fourth District seat, "is that Democrats rob you with the left hand, and try to manage your remaining money, while Republicans use the right hand and try to manage your morals."

In addition to the candidates mentioned above, I have also interviewed Libertarians Chris Dimit, Second Congressional District candidate; William Cole, running for the Third District seat; and Paul Schmidt, who is seeking the congressional seat for the First District. Dimit, Spaulding and Samples can all be called locally in the Knox County area.

Browne (unlike Mr. Perot) *really* doesn't want any campaign contributions from the U.S. government. All he wants is an equal opportunity to be heard.

Most Libertarians sincerely believe national exposure to the principles of their party will be all that is necessary to bring thinking people around to their way of looking at government.

While it has been said, in jest, that the way to run organized crime out of business would be to put the government in charge, Libertarians say the government *is* organized crime.

For every registered party member, there are numerous sympathizers who say they would vote Libertarian, but for fear of "wasting" a vote and perhaps helping to elect the "wrong" candidate. To this, Libertarians quickly point out moral principles, not immediate gratification, will change the world.

If you think Browne should be included in the debates, write a letter to: Commission on Presidential Debates, 601 13th St. NW, Suite 310-S, Washington, D.C., 20005.

Making the 'Big 5-0'

■ Since **Harry Browne**, the Libertarian Party candidate, is now on the ballot in all 50 states, he's ahead of Ross Perot, who is still having trouble in New York and Delaware.

"For 25 years, the Libertarian Party has had to overcome state laws that work to keep any third party off the ballot — as well as federal campaign-finance laws that bestow millions in taxpayer dollars on the two old parties while restricting what the Libertarian Party can raise voluntarily," Browne said in a statement. Kris Williams, who coordinated the ballot access drive, called it the first time a third party has achieved the 50-state status for two presidential elections in a row.

Libertarian Party's philosophy won over this son of a former state Democratic chairman

By **John R. O'Neill**
STAFF WRITER

About four years ago, Kurt St. Angelo kicked the habit.

He also stopped smoking.

But it was kicking the two-party habit that has landed him on the ballot in the 10th Congressional District.

St. Angelo, an Indianapolis attorney and businessman, was a lifelong Democrat until being won over to the Libertarian Party.

Frustrated with both major parties, he voted for independent candidate Ross Perot in the 1992 presidential election.

The conversion to his new party shortly thereafter "happened pretty quickly, when I heard the rightness of the Libertarian philosophy," which he described as "the political embodiment of the Golden Rule."

And so he left the comfort of a major party for the uncertainty of a political movement that must fight for the attention Republicans and Democrats take for granted.

But he wouldn't go back. "I have a very difficult time with the morality of the Democratic and Republican parties" because, he said, both favor using government power to enforce changes in personal behavior.

"I'm not against government. I just want it to be as limited as possible."

Interesting words from the son of the former chairman of the Indiana Democratic Party.

But Gordon St. Angelo, who led the state Democrats from 1965 to 1974, accepts his son's decision and said he's proud of him.

"That's the kind of children we wanted to raise: kids who could think for themselves, find their own philosophy and niche in life," said the elder St. Angelo.

"This has not been a family problem."

Unfortunately, he added, he lives in the 6th Congressional District so he can't vote for his son.

Kurt St. Angelo, now 40, spent his early childhood in Huntingburg before moving to Indianapolis in 1965 when he was 8. He graduated from North Central High School and attended Pomona College in California. After that, he held a variety of jobs.

He sold photographic equipment for a while, first in Bloomington and later in Hawaii. He returned to Indianapolis to attend Indiana University Law School. While in law school, he became manager and agent for a local singing group, The Fabulous Starlettes.

That's how he met Jim Albrecht, a partner in Gary James Productions.

"If Kurt can get behind a cause, he stands up for it. He's an advocate. It's in his blood," Albrecht said. "He has a lot of integrity. He will back it up."

Since graduating from law school, St. Angelo has practiced law part time and also worked in other business ventures. For a while, he handled local public relations for authors on book tours, including Marilyn Quayle.

Judge orders Libertarian party on the ballot

**By JACKIE HALLIFAX
News Chief news services**
TALLAHASSEE — The 5,000 registered Libertarians in Florida will be able to vote for their party's presidential nominee under a decision by a federal judge who said the state must put Harry Browne on the ballot.

But Florida's top elections official said Tuesday the state might ask U.S. District Judge Robert Hinkle to reconsider his ruling. "With the election looming out there, this would all have been conducted speedily," said David Rancourt, director of the state Division of Elections.

Hinkle's ruling is a victory for both the Libertarian and Reform parties in a dispute with the state over how a minor party gains ac-

cess to the Florida ballot.

State law spells out two choices, which both involve submitting petitions by mid-July. One option requires 1 percent of the signatures of the voters in the last election. The other requires 3 percent.

The state has argued a minor party can put a specifically identified presidential candidate on the ballot with 1 percent of the signatures. But to simply reserve space with a stand-in candidate and substitute the name of the real nominee later requires 3 percent, according to the state.

The Libertarian Party turned



► More Florida news ... Page 38

in some 72,000 petitions in the name of Ed Clark.

That's more than 1 percent requirement of 65,000 signatures but far less than the 3 percent requirement of nearly 197,000 signatures.

Hinkle ruled Monday the Libertarian Party could replace Clark with Brown under the plain meaning of a state law that governs what happens when a vacancy develops because of a candidate's death or withdrawal or for any other reason.

The vacancy law isn't inconsistent with the law that sets out the two different petition re-

quirements for minor parties, Hinkle wrote in his order.

The judge said the 1 percent option applied to presidential elections and the 3 percent option applied to a slate of candidates for any statewide election.

"The Libertarian Party seeks not to evade the 3 percent requirement applicable to all elections but only to take advantage of the lower 1 percent requirement the Legislature chose to adopt specifically for presidential elections," Hinkle wrote.

Officials of the Libertarian Party didn't return a phone call about Hinkle's ruling.

The Libertarian Party filed the original lawsuit and the Reform

Party later joined it. However, the issue for the Reform Party turned out to be moot because its eventual candidate, Ross Perot, had been selected as the stand-in candidate on petitions.

An eclectic mix of economic conservatives and social liberals, Libertarians want to eliminate taxes, legalize gay marriages and repeal the assault weapons ban. In early July, the party nominated Browne, an investment advisor from Franklin, Tenn.

Browne, 63, has made campaign promises to slash federal spending by 50 percent; end income tax and shut down the IRS; immediately balance the budget; refuse to take matching federal campaign funds.

▲ *The News-Chief*, Winter Haven, Florida, September 11, 1996

▼ (TOP) *The Arizona Republic*, Phoenix, Arizona, September 16, 1996

▼ (BOTTOM) *The Arizona Republic*, Phoenix, Arizona, September 15, 1996

Libertarian deserves spot in presidential debates, too

I got the chance to participate in an interview of the presidential candidate who visited Phoenix the other day.

No, it wasn't the incumbent, President "Bite My Lip," who flew into town on Air Force One and jammed up evening rush-hour traffic with his freeway motorcade. Or Bob Dole, who is scheduled into town during the next few days. This guy had hopes of being included in the televised presidential debates, but it wasn't Ross Perot, the wacky Texas billionaire whose act has become a kind of freak show to the electoral process.

I'm talking about Harry Browne, the Tennessee investment guru and author who if the election were held today on the Internet would surprise a lot of people with his strong



RAY ARCHER
Editorial Writer
The Arizona Republic

showing. While most of the nation, besides devoted radio talk-show listeners, has never heard of the Libertarian Party's 1996 presidential candidate, he's become a favorite of

the cyberspace set with his anti-big government views.

Browne told us that in presidential preference polling on the Internet he regularly comes in first with 40 percent or so of the vote. That's only mildly surprising, in that the techno-neards who surf the net are largely an individualistic lot that would be particularly receptive to the Libertarian message.

As one cyber-expert put it to columnist David Broder earlier this year, "People who use mathematically based systems think logically, and Libertarianism is a nice, clear set of propositions, logically linked."

I don't know about the arithmetic of all this, but Browne would live up the debates, and not with the

kind of crackpotism that Perot brings to the table. His message is precise and unwavering, radical when compared to the major parties' philosophies, to be sure. But not out there in loonyland where most fringe parties reside.

As Browne puts it, the American public, by a 75 percent to 80 percent margin, regularly tells pollsters they want smaller government. "I'm the only candidate of smaller government," he declares.

Even with all those "cuts" in government fat that the Republicans and Democrats alike say they support, he notes the federal government still will grow by leaps and bounds and by hundreds of billions of dollars in the next four years under either President Clinton's or a

President Dole's leadership

There might be more than a dime's worth of difference between the two despite Clinton's attempt to out-Republican his GOP contender during the campaign. But Browne's correct in his assessment of the public mood: No one expects much to change in Washington no matter which party is in the White House. Maybe that's a sign of a contented electorate. Or maybe it's simply voters resigned to the status quo.

Status quo is definitely not what Browne offers. He proposes to cut federal spending in half in his first year office by closing down tons of federal programs and agencies, scaling back overseas defense commitments and privatizing many

traditional government functions. He would pay for entitlements such as Social Security by selling off federal assets, including land, and buying private insurance annuities.

At the same time, he would eliminate the federal income tax. "Would you give up your favorite federal program if you never had to pay income taxes again?" is the key question of his platform. I'd like to see it asked during the debates, if only to see how Clinton and Dole would handle it.

But Browne, on the ballot in all 50 states, won't get the chance to intellectually spar with the major-party candidates. It's our loss, too.

E-mail: archercol@aol.com

Libertarian has an actual message

Forget Ross Perot. He's not the third party on the 1996 presidential ballot. Rather, he's the first *personality*, a spokesman for a cult of anger and frustration, a man who (in Lyndon Johnson's immortal phrase) is all hat and no cattle.

But there is a third party, and unlike Perot's wholly owned subsidiary, the Reform Party, it has been there for two decades, spreading its message.

The Libertarians, you see, actually *have* a message.

And when you sit down with Harry Browne, the 63-year-old investment adviser and best-selling author who's now the Libertarian candidate for president, you don't have to ask what he stands for. You don't even have to see his party platform. Year in, year out, the Libertarian message doesn't change.

"Individual liberty, personal responsibility and freedom from government," Browne explained its guiding principles. "I ask just one question: How can we make the federal government smaller?"

When Browne says small, he doesn't mean reducing the rate of growth: "I mean a government smaller than the one we have now, a lot smaller," he said during a recent stopover in Phoenix (with slightly less hoopla than the Democratic opponent who followed him a few days later). How much smaller? He'd cut the \$1.5 trillion federal budget to \$100 billion.

Not all at once, of course. He'd only cut it by half the first year, since "it would take some time to unwind all these programs."



JOHN KOLBE
Political Columnist

But he'd do it in three or four years, and balance it in one year.

And what *should* the federal government do? Defend the country ("a military that defends America and doesn't try to run the world"), operate the courts, and mint coins. He can't think of much else. And what about welfare, farm subsidies, public housing, education aid, Medicare, business promotion, transportation funding, crime control and public television? Gone. All gone.

Oh yes, and *no income tax*. And Bob Dole thinks his 15 percent cut and "getting rid of the IRS as we know it" is a big deal.

Browne and his party hold to a quaint notion that Washington should be limited to what is allowed by the Constitution, a restraint long forgotten on Capitol Hill. Ask a congressman if a program is constitutional, and he'll look at you as if you just stepped off a spaceship.

"Once you cross that line, you've started down the proverbial slippery slope," Browne said. "Each time you do it, it's a little easier, and before long, no one even raises the question."

But if voters think a Republican Congress that has barely scratched the existing bureaucracy has "gone too far," it's fair to ask whether the sort of government nuking that Browne proposes has even a remote chance of passing a Congress that's addicted to doing favors with our money.

In a perverse (and naive) way, Browne believes that the more radical the change, the better its chances of winning approval.

First, because of the change in the public's view of government: "Thirty years ago, people believed in government. Practically nobody believes in it today," and the two parties have proven they can't "be trusted to make it smaller."

Second, because the tactics for reducing government have been piecemeal, a program at a time. Program beneficiaries are reluctant to give up their goodies when "they know the money will be spent on something else, and government will just get bigger," he said. "But ask people if they'd be willing to give up their program if we repealed the income tax and replaced it with *nothing*, then the answer changes."

However, Browne (who admits he was so disillusioned with the inability of either major party to effect change that he didn't vote for 30 years) has no illusion about his chances of winning.

The key is being included in the presidential debates. But Browne and other third-

party candidates face the same Catch-22: A federal commission (which will meet this week) won't include a candidate unless he has a "realistic" chance of winning, as measured in the polls. And yet, no candidate shows up in the polls until he can get the kind of publicity that nationally televised debates bring — or that Perot's money can buy.

"If I were in the debates, those poll numbers would leap up overnight," said Browne. By the chance-of-winning standard, neither Perot nor Browne should be there. But by any other criterion but money, Browne's claim is far stronger than Perot's. He has a real party, not a personal cult, and a real message, beyond just unfocused anger and runaway ego.

He knows the decision is out of his hands (but he may have an ally in Clinton, who thinks Perot and Brown will diffuse the anti-incumbent vote), which is why he's intent on building an organization and financial war chest as big as the major parties "so we're campaigning on an equal footing" in future campaigns.

"Then the power of our ideas will sweep the country," he said.

Maybe, maybe not. Libertarians are nothing if not optimistic. But Harry Browne espouses coherent, if radical, principles that are more in sync with modern American skepticism about government than either Ralph Nader's devotion to massive federal regulation or Ross Perot's patented weirdness. He at least ought to be heard.

John Kolbe can be reached at 271-8143 or at gazedit@aol.com via e-mail.