

# 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 September 2013

## Libertarian Party in the News

### US must curb posture on Syria strikes

From RT TV

Published on September 11, 2013

The United States must stop its propensity for global military aggression and foreign entanglements, **US Libertarian Party Director Carla Howell** told RT.

Howell said despite the behavior of the US government, Americans do not want war in Syria, and US politicians should heed American public opinion after a decade of conflict.

**RT:** I know your party is against military involvement in Syria. What do you think of this proposal to remove chemical weapons held by the Assad government?

**Carla Howell:** On one hand, it's an improvement. It looks like it weakens the chance that the US military will actually strike Syria, which is good news. On the other hand it's also more entangling alliances where the US does not belong. The Libertarian Party calls for a complete withdrawal from the region.

Americans want to reduce government, both domestically and internationally, not increase it.

**RT:** But Obama's reacting to a humanitarian crisis, use of chemical weapons. So in the future, how should America act when another country reportedly uses chemical weapons, or if they're used again in Syria? Just stand back and do nothing?

**CH:** We should allow citizens individually -- representing themselves, not the country -- to do whatever they so choose, to donate if they want, to go and help one side or another, they should be free to do that. But no one representing the United States should be getting involved in a country where we have no interests and where we can expect, based on the results of our past interventions, more bad things to come

**RT:** You say no interests, Obama said this was a security interest to the US, the use of chemical weapons. This threatens not just people of Syria but of other countries, too.

**CH:** Invading is a security risk and possibly more of one. Look at what's happened. Our continual intervening in the Middle East resulted in the 9/11 strikes--very

possibly blowback from our intervention. This makes us less secure.

**RT:** Do you expect Obama now to change course away from calling for intervention in his televised address to the nation, not a U-turn but certainly a change in sentiment?

**CH:** I'm not sure what he's going to do. Certainly it's been embarrassing, him waffling the way he has been, that a so-called off-the-cuff comment by his secretary of state would change the course of events seems pretty amateurish. But more importantly, we're talking about lives at stake, we're talking about innocent people being killed if there are any kind of strikes, and that is not acceptable, and he needs to man-up and do the right thing, not the face-saving thing.

The right thing is to recognize our intervention is a mistake, our threats are a mistake and we need to take a neutral position on these issues and mind our own affairs, not intervene abroad.

**RT:** Are your thoughts echoed amongst many other American politicians? We know what some think in the House and indeed in the Senate. How do you think the vote really will go among the full spectrum of politicians there in the States?

**CH:** It's been changing. I think politicians are inclined to support the President and inclined to do whatever will spend more money because virtually all of them, or most of them, are invested in the military-industrial complex here in the United States. But they are also reacting to pressures from home, many of them are up for reelection next year, and the people don't want this.

People in the United States want peace despite our government's very different behavior around the world -- that is not what Americans want. Once they enter in a war, many in America tend to be silent because they don't want to put our servicemen and women at risk, so they will just stop talking about it once a strike occurs. We need to make sure that doesn't happen.

## Libertarian Party in the News

# Article exposes hypocrisy of media coverage of Libertarians

By A. Barton Hinkle

From the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, “The third-party Catch-22”

Published on August 15, 2013

News stories are supposed to report new information. By that standard, the recent Washington Post article “McAuliffe, Cuccinelli race drips with venom” failed. It reported in detail that which everyone already knew, while leaving out a key detail not many do.

The piece quoted Virginia political scientist Robert Holsworth: “What I hear just from ordinary folks is, ‘This is a tough choice — I wish I had a third choice. Are we really going to have to choose between these two?’”

The article then moved on with its main theme: the “negative tone” of the fight between Democrat Terry McAuliffe and Republican Ken Cuccinelli. It never pointed out that voters actually do have a third choice: Robert Sarvis, who is running for governor on the Libertarian ticket, will be on the ballot as well.

It’s not just the Post. National Journal committed a similar sin two days later. “Pity the Virginia voter,” began a piece on the “historically unpleasant” contest. The article quoted an unnamed voter thoroughly disgusted with the Cuccinelli and McAuliffe: “Jesus, who the hell am I supposed to vote for?” It also quoted Leslie Campbell, a 53-year-old homemaker: “I wish I had more than two candidates,” she said. “I wish there was a third choice.”

The article doesn’t mention Sarvis once.

This isn’t just bad journalism. It makes for bad politics as well.

Last month, Cuccinelli declined to participate in a debate sponsored by the Virginia branches of AARP and the League of Women Voters. He called it a “left-wing, stacked debate.” The groups chided Cuccinelli for ducking out. According to League president Ann Sterling, “all voters in Virginia deserve a chance to see the candidates who want to be their governor debate.”

So the two groups invited Sarvis to participate, right? Wrong.

Their rationale: They invite only candidates who are polling at least 15 percent. (Virginia Tech, which will host an October debate, sets the bar at 10 percent.) According to AARP, this ensures only “viable candidates” debate in “cases where many” candidates are on the ballot.

Ignore the dubious notion that three equals “many.” Never mind that in 2011 the Republican Party managed to hold presidential primary debates with as many as nine candidates at once. Instead, consider the Catch-22 this puts third-party candidates in: They are denied the public exposure they could receive in debates until they reach a level of popularity they can scarcely attain without first getting more public exposure. They don’t get into debates or news stories because

*“On a host of issues — from gay rights and marijuana legalization to school choice and deregulation — the Libertarian Party often has been not on the fringe, but on the cutting edge — with the other two parties playing catch-up.”*

their poll numbers are low, and their poll numbers are low partly because they don’t get into debates or news stories. (Incidentally, The Times-Dispatch has run several pieces about Sarvis, including a front-page Sunday profile.)

It’s bad enough for the AARP to take such a position. For the League of Women Voters, it is inexcusable. The group considers voter education essential to its mission. Well, then: A debate between Sarvis and one or both of the other two candidates would be highly educational. Clearly, many Virginians not only know nothing about Sarvis — they do not even know of him. Yet given that he is on the ballot, shouldn’t they?

At least the AARP and the League can cite an objective standard. Not so the Fairfax Chamber of Commerce, which will host a gubernatorial debate Sept. 25. It has not invited Sarvis, either. Why not? “It’s our tradition,” says a Chamber spokeswoman, that these debates “include the two major party candidates.” Isn’t there some other reason — any other reason at all? “Nope, no other reason other than our tradition to provide a forum for the two major party candidates.”

That won’t do — not when many Virginians are so fed up with the other two candidates but haven’t even heard about the third one.

The only other potential rationale for excluding a candidate who will appear on the ballot is that the Libertarian’s ideas fall so far out of the mainstream they must be shunned. This is wrong for two reasons.

First, Sarvis’ platform combines the social views of liberal Democrats with the economic views of conservative Republicans. That’s it. No conspiracy theories, no birtherism or trutherism, no alternative history or racial bigotry. And on a host of issues — from gay rights and marijuana legalization to school choice and deregulation — the Libertarian Party often has been not on the fringe, but on the cutting edge — with the other two parties playing catch-up.

That is a contingent argument. Here is an unconditional one: Even if debate organizers think Sarvis’ views fall beyond the pale, denying him a place on the stage denies the voters the opportunity to hear and consider those views. The organizers have every right to do that if they wish. But if they do, then they cannot claim to be merely neutral facilitators of the democratic process. They are, instead, activists trying to influence the outcome of the election for their own ideological reasons.

Now that’s a stacked debate.

# Libertarian court victory throws recall elections into turmoil

By Tessa Cheek

From *The Colorado Independent*

Published on August 13, 2013

Monday evening, Denver District Judge Robert McGahey ruled that the secretary of state unconstitutionally barred Colorado's Libertarian party from including the name of its candidates on the September 10 recall-election ballots for Pueblo and Colorado Springs state senate districts.

The ballots for the hot-button elections have already been printed for delivery to overseas voters, and the money for the elections already allotted by the county clerks, giving the decision a shock value the judge took pains to demonstrate he understood. Constitutional provisions governing the matter of whose names are included on the ballot have to take precedent over more recent statutes passed by the legislature and rules made by the secretary of state, McGahey explained to the reeling parties to the suit.

The recall elections being run by Pueblo and El Paso Counties, came in response to gun control legislation passed in the spring, which stirred up a hornets nest of opposition among gun-rights advocates. Directed at Colorado Springs Democratic Senate President John Morse and Democratic Pueblo Senator Angela Giron, these are the first-ever recall efforts in Colorado history, and Coloradans have seen legal battles erupt around them at almost every stage so far.

The case decided by McGahey on Monday centered on the would-be Libertarian candidacies of Richard Anglund, a Democrat from Pueblo, and Gordon Butt, a Libertarian from Colorado Springs. They argued they should have had until 15 days

*continued on page 4*

## New and renewing Liberty Pledgers

- |                     |                         |
|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Stephen C. Allison  | Joseph Lazaro           |
| Richard Bash        | Connie C. Le Compte     |
| Maurice Beldon      | Shawn S. Levasseur      |
| John Berntson       | Brad Lorenzen           |
| Joseph Blancett     | Ryan Luepke             |
| Mark Borner         | Travis Maynard          |
| Laurie Buckland     | Robert Miller           |
| Gary Capik          | Christian Minnich       |
| Ricky Chuter        | Donald Nakelski         |
| Claud Craig         | Justin R. Niceswanger   |
| Anneliese M. Crosby | V. Kenneth Norris       |
| Upton Dabney        | Donald Oshields         |
| Michael De La Marre | Nathaniel W. Owen       |
| Glen A. DeShaw      | Bryan Owens             |
| Jeremy L. Dixon     | Wendy Padilla           |
| Randolph C. Dounce  | Michael T. Penrow       |
| Scott Eisenmann     | Timothy O. Peters       |
| Craig S. Fassler    | Jeffrey T. Russell      |
| Michael Feudale     | Michael Ryan            |
| William J. Forte    | Darlene Sartore         |
| Alfred M. Garcia    | Stephen R. Schulte      |
| Steven M. Gilbert   | Patrick-Andrew F. Shuey |
| Michelle Goodwin    | John R. Siebken         |
| Sharon N. Hansen    | Warner Smith            |
| Robert Heinonen     | Cisse Spragins          |
| Marc Herzog         | Kevin N. Tucker         |
| Richard Hoffer      | Kermit C. Wallace       |
| Len Hofferber       | Bill Wareham            |
| Michael A. Jacobsen | Rebecca L. Wheeler      |
| Douglas W. Jones    | Robert White            |
| Tamela L. Jones     | William T. White        |
| Patrick B. Keller   | George R. Whitfield     |
| Jospeh Kirkenir     | James Wilds             |
| Wayne E. Klemme     | John D. Williams        |
| Samuel A. Lakey     | Nicholas Zwileneff      |
| Brandon Lawrence    |                         |

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.

# Libertarian announces District 24B candidacy at Steele County Free Fair

By Derek Sullivan

From the *Owatonna People's Press*

Published on August 15, 2013

Deb Salonek, a Libertarian from Faribault, is running to represent District 24B.

Salonek announced her candidacy at noon on Wednesday inside the Libertarian Party booth at the Steele County Free Fair. She hopes to be the Libertarian Party candidate for an election which won't take place until Nov. 4, 2014. Because the election is 445 days away, Salonek doesn't know for sure who she will run against for the seat, which has been represented by Patti Fritz, DFL-Faribault, since 2005. Salonek said she's ready for any opponent.

Fritz and her last GOP opponent, Dan Kaiser, both announced their candidacies in the *People's Press* on March 13, 2012.

Salonek said she is worried about corporate welfare, government intrusion and taxes.

"We pay too much in taxes," she said. "We pay taxes from the school board, the city, the county, the state and the federal government, and when Obamacare kicks in, we're really in trouble.

"Seven of 10 people live paycheck to paycheck. That means they are one paycheck away from disaster. And that to me is one of the main problems that we have right now."

Last year, Salonek ran for the Faribault school board. With three open school board positions, she placed fourth out of five candidates.

Salonek said Wednesday that she didn't campaign for the school board spot, but spent most of 2012 trying to get people to vote against the Faribault school district's ballot initiative to increase Faribault's current \$385 per pupil operating levy by \$600 per pupil. The initiative failed.

"(Defeating the levy) was to me the most important because all of the things that they put out as scare tactics were reinstated," she said. "They all are back now, and guess what? Nine months later, they are asking for another levy this fall. What do you need more money for? They are asking for millions upon millions of dollars. I want a good, quality education for all of the kids, but



how many millions of dollars is it going to take for them to be satisfied. I want an answer to that."

Salonek also campaigned to be a Republican delegate in 2012, although in the end, she voted for Libertarian presidential candidate Gary Johnson over GOP nominee Mitt Romney. Salonek said she decided against running as a Republican because she doesn't believe local Republican leaders will support her, and she, more and more, finds a connection with the personal liberty message of the Libertarian Party.

"We don't want you to get involved in our life, and we don't want to get involved in yours. We want everybody to live their lives as they want. That doesn't mean that we don't want the mass murderer down the street brought in. It's just that I don't care what you do as long as it's doesn't cause a legal problem," she said. "I don't care if you are gay, straight, bi-sexual. That stuff doesn't matter to me. That's your private business, and it should stay your private business."

The Libertarian Party has been quiet in recent years. According to the Libertarian Party of Minnesota website, there were only one mayoral and one city council candidate who ran as Libertarians in 2012. There hasn't been a Minnesota Libertarian candidate in a U.S. House race since 2000, when there were four. Salonek expects the party to be active in 2014.

"I won't be alone," she said. "There are going to be a lot of House candidates, Senate candidates, candidates for mayors. People are going to see what this party stands for and support it."

---

## Libertarian court victory

*continued from page 3*

before the special election to round up enough signatures to qualify for the ballot. But the secretary of state's office, working to effect changes in election administration put in place by a law passed in the spring,

said the candidates only had 10 days — and that the Libertarian candidates didn't make the cut off.

The County Clerks acted on the Secretary's ruling and the ballots were written and approved and printed. Now, apparently, they have to be tossed.

The El Paso and Pueblo clerks now would appear to face a daunting task.

They said they're not logistically prepared to handle all in-person elections.

George Rivera, who's running against Giron to represent Pueblo, blamed the new election administration law, sponsored in the Senate by Giron.

"This suit just points to the problems we end up having when legislation is passed too quickly," he said.