



Published for friends and supporters of the Libertarian Party

Liberty Pledge

NEWSLETTER

FEBRUARY 1995

Libertarian Party National Headquarters ♦ 1528 Pennsylvania Avenue SE ♦ Washington DC 20003 ♦ (202) 543-1988

GOP leaders urge: Ignore 'Challenge'

Ignore the Libertarian Party's "Challenge to the Republicans" — that's the word GOP leaders have been quietly spreading among House members on Capitol Hill.

"We've struck a nerve," said Steve Dasbach, National LP Chair.

According to sources in Washington, the GOP's powerful Congressional Campaign Committee told Republican House members to disregard the LP's 21-item "hit list" of federal programs, agencies, and policies to abolish.

"Don't take the Libertarians seriously because they are not capable of kicking us out of our seats" is the message that LP National Committee member Don Ernsberger said Republicans were hastily circulating on Capitol Hill in early February. Ernsberger said the story was confirmed by Republican House staffers. "Everyone was talking about [it]," he said.

Dasbach said the quick response to the LP Challenge proves that Republicans are worried.

"If they weren't concerned, they would have ignored us," he said. "In past elections, when Republicans didn't stand up for less government, Libertarians *have* cost them their seats. Now that they've been elected on a platform of less government, if they fail to cut the size of government, they could face increasing numbers of angry voters in 1996. Of course they're nervous."

Dasbach also noted the irony of the situation: "The Republicans — who got into office on a pledge to cut government — are instructing their new Congressmen *not* to cut government!"

Ernsberger said that some Congressmen may ignore the orders from the CCC. At a breakfast meeting on Capitol Hill on January 24, Ernsberger handed out copies of the Challenge to dozens of Congressmen, and got a very favorable response, he said.

"Many said, 'Great, here's a list of specific things to target,' " he reported. "One Congressman said, 'This is what I need — a shopping list.' "

The Challenge to the Republicans was delivered to GOP leaders in January. It demanded that Republicans abolish or defund 21 specific programs and policies, including Amtrak, the Davis Bacon Act, the gun ban, "War On Drugs" civil liberties violations, and UN expenses.

LP is America's fastest growing party (again)

It's official: The Libertarian Party is (again) the fastest growing political party in America.

According to figures issued by ballot access expert Richard Winger, the number of registered Libertarians increased by 8.57% from November 1992 to November 1994. There were 108,993 registered Libertarians in 1994, compared to 100,394 in 1992.

By comparison, the Republican Party registrations grew by only 0.21% over the same time, and the Democratic Party registrations fell by 2.71%. The number of independent voters also fell by 1.57%, and Green Party registrations dropped by 12.67%.

"We grew faster than the Republicans, and everyone else shrank. The Libertarian Party is the fastest growing party in America!" said LP National Director Perry Willis.

LP looks at headquarters move to Watergate Office Building

The National LP is in the final stage of negotiations to move its headquarters from one of Washington's less desirable neighborhoods to one of the most prestigious addresses in the nation's capital — the Watergate Office Building.

"That's the building where Richard Nixon almost toppled the Republican Party. We'll be proud to move in there and complete the job," quipped LP National Director Perry Willis.

However, the move is not yet a "done deal," cautioned Willis. "We're still engaged in lease negotiations, and will then have to meet with an architect to design the floor plans. But, if everything goes as planned, we hope to move in by May 1, 1995," he said.

The Watergate Office Building borders a pleasant, tree-lined neighborhood on Virginia Avenue, and is just blocks away from the Kennedy Center and historic Georgetown. "This is an office to which we would be proud to bring VIPs, contributors, and party members. It will also fulfill a promise the party made several years ago to move out of our current, inadequate headquarters," said Willis.

The *Wall Street Journal* called the planned move "a sign of the times" that the LP's fortunes are on the upswing. "It would be a major step up in the world for us," agreed Willis.

'One Last Chance' For Libertarians

▶ Party files petition for rehearing with U.S. Supreme Court in election protest.

By CARL LANGLEY
Staff Writer

Aiken County Libertarian Party Chairman Tom King said his political organization is going to give the American legal system "one last chance."

King's remark was in reference to the party's going back to the U.S. Supreme Court on an appeal of a nearly two-year old election decision lost by Libertarian candidate Doug Greene.

Greene was defeated by a 628-623

vote in the Aiken County Council District 3 election held in April of 1993. The winner was Democrat LaWana McKenzie.

But the Libertarians refused to yield, citing voting irregularities dealing with challenged ballots in split precincts, and took to protest through county and state election commissions and state and federal courts.

The party was rebuffed at every turn, but on Christmas week filed a petition for a rehearing before the Supreme Court in what was declared as the final leg in their challenge.

"This is the last step in the appeal process," said James Leslie Jr., Greene's attorney. Leslie said

the party could file another suit in federal court but the term of the office would have ended.

During hearings after the election the county and state election commissions refused to throw out the results and the state and federal courts refused to hear the Libertarian challenge.

The protest led King to say that "there is little hope of finding justice in the current politically appointed legal system, but we felt we must give the system one last chance."

In the petition for rehearing, the party wants the court to vacate its denial of a review of the state's voting system. At the root of the protest is the handling of challenge

ballots in so-called split precincts.

The Libertarians say that at least six eligible voters were not able to cast ballots in the District 3 election because of the handling of split precinct votes.

Split precincts provide a common voting place, but individual electors, although living next door or across the street from each other, can be in different council, school board and House districts because of geographical boundaries.

The Libertarians claim the workings of the county's split precincts put an unconstitutional burden on voters and deprives them of the equal protection mandates of the Constitution.

Edward H. Crane

Give Me Liberty, Not Utopia

In his column on the libertarian undercurrents of the political change that is sweeping the country [op-ed, Dec. 6], E. J. Dionne sets up a straw man when he writes that "the libertarians have also replaced the Marxists as the world's leading Utopia builders." In fact, libertarianism—or what might better be called market liberalism or the Jeffersonian vision—is very much grounded in reality.

Will a society in which government is limited to its appropriate role as protector of life, liberty, and property be a perfect society? Given the foibles and folly of humanity, that can hardly be the case. At the same time, there is mounting empirical evidence to support the libertarians' theoretical case that a minimal government will yield a better society than alternative models, including the so-called mixed economy.

Indeed, the litany of liberal reductions that Dionne dusts off to justify a massive state presence in society increasingly rings hollow. What, for instance, is wrong with "the notion that all individuals are entirely responsible for themselves"? Dionne answers that some individuals are children and don't have the resources or ability to be responsible for themselves. No, but an obvious corollary to the idea that adults are responsible for themselves is that they are also responsible for their children. When they are not, the Boys' Town model suggested by Newt Gingrich (and so ridiculed by liberals) is clearly a preferable approach to subsidizing the irresponsible adults. So is removing government restraints on adoption, particularly transracial adoption.

Dionne writes of the "initial impulse behind the welfare state" arising from a desire to help orphans. But what could be more utopian than to think that the welfare state would be limited to just such activities, much less do a good job caring for children?

Turning over our educational system to a near-government monopoly has resulted in "universal education," as Dionne claims, only in the sense that we're forcing children to spend time in

buildings we call schools. And "spending time" is an apt description, given the fact that many inner-city schools are not much more than day-care prisons. All socioeconomic levels of society were more literate prior to the lamentable process that led to a dominance of

Taking Exception

government-run schools in America, which took control of our children's education from them and their parents, turning it over to bureaucrats.

Also, there's nothing inconsistent with a clean environment and libertarian legal theory, properly construed. Indeed, it is the lack of clearly defined private property rights with respect to air, water, and public lands that leads to environmental degradation. The more economically advanced a society, the cleaner the environment. And economic performance is inversely related to the level of government involvement in the economy.

The free market, Dionne argues, cannot lead to "full employment." But it can and it would absent counterproductive government intervention in the form of unnecessary business regulations, a 15 percent tax on employment (the payroll tax), the minimum wage, and destabilizing monetary and fiscal policy.

Finally, the day of Social Security's being a trump card for advocates of big government is over. While the "initial impulse," as Dionne might put it, for Social Security was the idea of helping the indigent elderly, it is today a full-fledged socialized retirement system for America. As a pay-as-you-go system, it robs the economy of savings and is headed for financial catastrophe when the baby boomers start getting close to retirement. A system of private pensions is likely to have the occasional failure—although private insurance can and would do much to mitigate that risk—but our government controlled retirement system is on the path to failing an entire generation. It's no wonder a

recent Gallup Poll found that 54 percent of Americans favor making Social Security voluntary.

There are, at bottom, essentially two ways to order societal affairs: coercively through the mechanisms of the state—political society—or voluntarily through the private interaction of individuals and associations—civil society. The 20th century has been marked by a grand experiment in the former approach, and it is a failed experiment.

It's worth noting, too, that it is the utopians of left and right, faced with a justly skeptical public, who invariably reach for the levers of government power to force their vision of perfection on society. When the new House minority leader, Richard Gephardt, said on a recent Sunday morning talk show, "We're sent here, Democrats and Republicans, to solve problems for the American people," he was speaking from a paradigm whose utter rejection he still does not comprehend. Americans are looking for politicians to leave them alone, not to presume to be able to solve problems for them. They are looking for a government, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, "which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned."

There is reason to believe that the November elections were less a rejection of the policies of Bill Clinton or even the Great Society than they were a rejection of the New Deal. The resurgence in respect for the Fifth and 10th Amendments is nothing if not a rebuke of New Deal jurisprudence. November's results were the political manifestation of that rebuke. Americans of all stripes are coming to the conclusion that the voluntary approach is invariably the best way of dealing with the very practical problems we confront in our day-to-day, non-utopian lives.

The writer is president of the Cato Institute.

JON COON CARES: In something of a surprise, last fall's unsuccessful



Jon Coon

Libertarian U.S. Senate candidate, Jon Coon, announced last weekend that he plans to run in 1996 for the 24th district Michigan House seat held by Rep. Joe Palamara, D-Wyandotte.

Coon made the announcement on WXYZ-TV's Spotlight on the News program. Asked why he chose the downriver district, Coon, who used to live in the small Shiawassee town of Henderson (before he and his wife separated), said: "Well, because the young lady who I care very deeply about happens to live in Southgate. That's the main reason."

For the record, Palamara, who won re-election by a whopping 70 percent last fall, says he plans to run again in '96, Coon or no Coon.

▲ (Top) *The Aiken Standard*
Aiken, South Carolina, January 5, 1995

▲ *The Detroit Free Press*
Detroit, Michigan, January 19, 1995

◀ *The Washington Post*
Washington, DC, January 11, 1995

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Less Is More

Libertarian Impulses Show Growing Appeal Among the Disaffected

When the Government Fails, Many Voters Are Asking: Who Needs It, Anyway?

Mixed Blessing to the GOP

By GERALD F. SEIB

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

WASHINGTON — It just might be that Bill Frezza, not Newt Gingrich, best illustrates why the American political system is quaking.

Mr. Frezza, a onetime McGovern Democrat, today is a libertarian. This Philadelphia-area computer consultant doesn't just want to cut government: He questions the very need for most of it. He figures that in a world in which computer wizards are close to creating their own private, encrypted digital cash system for making transactions without any government involvement, the need for centralized authority is shriveling. "Government isn't simply irrelevant," he says, "it's *totally* irrelevant."

Mr. Frezza, who actually classifies his thinking as "post-libertarian," may be an extreme example, but his feelings help illustrate the powerful public passions driving the revolution in the new GOP-controlled Congress. Though many voters probably don't even realize it, much of the angry sentiment coursing through their veins today isn't traditionally Republican or even conservative. It's libertarian.

Down With Government

Libertarians question the need for a government role in virtually every area of their lives, personal as well as economic. A traditional conservative might want to comb through the government from top down to weed out certain programs and beef up others, like those designed to enhance "family values." But a libertarian works from the bottom up, challenging everything the government does and finding little worth doing.

Because of their growing disdain for government, more and more Americans appear to be drifting—often unwittingly—toward a libertarian philosophy. That seems particularly true among baby boomers returning to the "do your own thing" ethos of their youth and among young people involved in the intensely independent computer industry. Indeed, when the Gallup polling organization last year asked questions about government's role that were designed to distill Americans' political philosophies, it categorized 22% of the public as "libertarian."

The drift, therefore, is substantial but hardly universal, and it isn't organized. The actual Libertarian Party remains a tiny political organization. And there are lots of problems inherent in this drift. Many people, Republicans particularly, who are drawn to libertarian economics may have a hard time swallowing the same kind of hands-off government approach to abortion and school prayer.

Link to Conservatives

Still, the thinking of many Americans is changing. "There is a libertarian revolution going on, in the sense of a greater movement away from government power at all levels, than at certainly any time in my life," says Clint Bolick, a prominent Washington attorney who often works with conservatives but considers himself a libertarian.

Shifting sentiments made Republicans' basic antigovernment message so successful in the November elections and, before that, energized the 1992 explosion of Ross Perot voters. His people tended to be conservative on fiscal matters, hands-off on social issues and utterly disdainful of government.

The desire to keep pace with such public sentiment is fueling a drive by many of the 73 freshman Republicans in the House of Representatives to mow down government programs. "There would be a good number of people out there who would be ahead of us" in chopping down government, says Rep. Sam Brownback, a Republican freshman from Kansas.

He sits in his new office, worrying not that ambitious young House Republicans may scare people by moving too fast in attacking government, but, rather, fretting that the novice lawmakers can't find enough fully cooked plans for dismantling agencies.

Government and the Individual

The problem for Republicans is that pure libertarian thinkers would recoil at efforts by some in the party to pass a school-prayer amendment or to restrict gay rights, just as surely as they might blanch at liberal Democrats' efforts to raise taxes to pay for welfare.

A true libertarian would do away with laws banning marijuana and hard drugs, too — an idea that could set off a food fight at any Republican gathering. Many libertarians would like to see Social Security become voluntary. Libertarians see little need for foreign entanglements, so they see ways to pare defense spending.

Some of these ideas are too rich for the blood of even antigovernment Republicans, not to mention middle-of-the-roaders. "I do not for a moment pretend or believe that what is taking place in the Republican Party has any semblance of libertarianism," asserts Gordon Black, a politically independent pollster who considers himself a "free-market civil libertarian."

But some conservative Republicans are starting to move away from wanting to see government action on social questions and toward neutral government social policy. The Christian Coalition, for instance, is playing down, for the time being, its advocacy of a constitutional amendment allowing school prayer and focusing instead on pushing laissez-faire economics and tax cuts. It is placing more emphasis on issues such as "school choice," in which the government steps aside and allows parents to divert their tax dollars to private schools.

Some Americans, no doubt, are drifting toward libertarian thinking because of careful analysis. "People are starting to at least consider the idea that many of their problems come when they start thinking of the government as their own agent of change, or their major agent of change," says Gregg Gaylord, an Indiana physician and Jimmy Carter voter who now regards himself as a libertarian.

Less Is More: Libertarian Impulses Are Spreading Through the Land

But since many Americans don't spend all that much time analyzing their political beliefs, it is likely that much of today's antigovernment sentiment arises from what people see as the government's trial and error: Voters feel government has tried to solve problems but has been inefficient or ineffective in doing so. "It's not doctrinaire," says J.D. Hayworth, a freshman GOP lawmaker from Arizona, as he analyzes his constituents' views. "It's inherently practical."

What Good Government?

Many analysts, in fact, think it was President Clinton's ill-fated health-care reform proposals, widely supported at first but gradually abandoned by many voters, that sparked a rethinking of government's role. "People were saying, 'We don't want you to run our health care. And come to think of it, we don't want you to run much of anything else for us, either,'" says Edward Crane, president of the Cato Institute, Washington's bastion of libertarian thought.

Similarly, the demise of an overarching national-security threat from Moscow has inspired many Americans to reconsider the need for a big government to protect them.

Whatever the cause, the signs of a drift toward libertarianism are everywhere. When freshman Republicans attended an orientation session sponsored by the conservative Heritage Foundation, for instance, some of them immediately began complaining about a Heritage analyst's proposal to phase out farm subsidies over a period of five years. The new lawmakers didn't at all think the idea too radical. Some figured it didn't go far enough, and thus proposed a cold-turkey approach: Why not cut out the subsidies immediately?

When members of the new House Appropriations Committee began to look for billions of dollars in spending cuts this month, they called in an analyst from the Cato Institute for advice.

And the tiny Libertarian Party, though widely viewed as a minor political force, has experienced an 11% jump in both contributors (to 20,000) and enrolled members (to 11,000) in the past year. The party still suffers from an oddball image. But Perry Willis, national director of the party, says that "the more intellectual component of our society is thinking its way toward this. There's probably another, larger segment of American society that's stumbling its way."

The Microsoft Connection

Mr. Willis says the libertarian concept has particular appeal to people in the computer industry. "We have more members in one computer company in Seattle than in some whole counties, and that company is Microsoft," he says.

Indeed, when Mr. Frezza, the Philadelphia computer consultant, last month launched a computer network of like-minded thinkers called *DigitLiberty*, he was so overwhelmed with responses, especially from college students, that he had to temporarily shut down the group's electronic mailbox.

One member of *DigitLiberty* is Bruce Fancher, a 23-year-old who in the late 1980s earned brief notoriety as a hacker who broke into computer systems, though he was never charged with a crime. He is president of a computer communications company called *Phantom Access Technologies Inc.* "Being involved in computers or the Internet, you inevitably move toward being a libertarian," he says. "It is basically possible to keep all of your secrets from prying eyes, particularly the prying eyes of the federal government."

Mr. Fancher also is intrigued by anonymous digital cash, a plan for creating electronic "cash" by stringing together bits of information that can be exchanged in place of paper currency, and electronically encrypted so the transaction can't be monitored by the government. That would include the government's tax collectors, who would be powerless to exact a toll on this barter in electronic play money.

The social consequences of such ideas are enormous, particularly to the tax system. If the electronically empowered were able to amass income beyond the reach of the Internal Revenue Service, for instance, the burden of financing government functions that even libertarians consider essential — national defense, the courts and foreign policy — would fall inordinately on those who don't have the same technological sophistication.

On a more practical level, Mr. Brownback, the new congressman from Kansas, worries how voters will react if federal agencies designed to protect public safety are eliminated and some hideous disaster occurs. And asked whether farmers are really ready to give up government subsidies, Rep. Brownback, himself a member of a farm family, replies that "a number of people are there," but others aren't.

Indeed, a new *Wall Street Journal/NBC News* poll shows how American thinking is drifting, but it also illustrates that the public still is queasy about some cuts. Nearly half of all adults surveyed — especially those in the South, Republicans and white men — say that most government regulations are unnecessary and harm the economy. Some government agencies are widely regarded as unnecessary, too, but not those guarding health and safety.

That the public wants change seems clear from the results of last fall's elections. But exactly what sort of change has yet to be spelled out. "In general, it seems like people have lost faith in government as the solution to problems in general, be they social problems or economic problems," says Jeffrey Singer, a 43-year-old general surgeon from Phoenix who considers himself a libertarian. He thinks people are now more disposed to do-it-yourself problem solving.

A sign of the times: The Libertarian Party is about to double its national staff and move out of its current, modest headquarters on Capitol Hill. The Libertarians' new home: the Watergate office complex, the scene of the crime that brought down Richard Nixon.

What Libertarians stand for

By Kimberly Kauer
Northeastern News Service

The idea of no speed limit might be exciting, but what if almost all laws were thrown out? And Social Security, welfare, and the post office, too? How would society survive?

Quite well, thank you says the Libertarian Party, which during the past election was able to receive the 3 percent of votes needed in Massachusetts to gain state recognition. Libertarians will now automatically be on the ballot.

What the Libertarians advocate is simple, yet extreme: the abolishment of government. Of course there would have to be some laws.

"Murder, for example, is not something we advocate," said Bill Waxler, spokesman for the national Libertarian Party.

According to the Libertarian national headquarters, they oppose laws setting a minimum drinking age or banning concealed weapons or restricted immigration or interventionist foreign policy.

A cornerstone of the Libertarian platform is the totally free market economy. In fact, they say that a free market will stimulate a boom in new business, creating more jobs, and eliminating the need for welfare.

In fact, it was a reaction to Nixon Administration policies regarding wage and price controls which encouraged a group of Republicans to form the Libertarian party in 1971. Libertarians ran for president in several states and they received one electoral vote from Vermont elector Roger McBride who opposed voting for Nixon as he was supposed to do.

The party gained popularity, although relatively small, among

college students during the 1970s.

"The Libertarian push for freedom across the board, and our emphasis on individual rights attracted many," Waxler said.

100,000 registered Libertarians in 24 states. Twenty-six states, Massachusetts included, are not included in that number because of lack of major party status.

Massachusetts will soon be added to that figure, as well as other states, according to Waxler. (*Libertarians became official third party this month: Ed.*)

"We've had problems gaining ballot status due to some pretty restrictive laws," Waxler said. "Of course Republicans and Democrats don't want any more competition than they already have, so they aren't much help in overturning these laws."

'The Libertarian Party was officially recognized earlier this month as the third party in Massachusetts. The party can now hold primary elections, and voters may register as Democratic, Republican, Libertarian or Unenrolled (Independent)'

During the late '70s, Students for a Libertarian Society and other party activities were financed by Charles and David Coke. During David Coke's campaign for vice president of the United States in 1980, he contributed \$2 million to the Libertarian campaign, boosting the party's national profile at least until the election. Following the poor 1980 election performance (Libertarians only won 1 percent of the vote), many left the party, including its two main supporters: the Coke brothers.

More than 20 years later, the party seems to be coming back. According to the Secretary of State's office, Massachusetts now has 423 registered Libertarians. A small number compared to the 1,266,358 registered Democrats, 419,120 registered Republicans, and 1,466,555 unenrolled, but enough to obtain major party status.

During the past election, 98 Libertarian candidates ran for all types of offices in New Hampshire, and many won.

According to Libertarian national headquarters, there are

The anti-established party control of elections was a theme of Andre Marrou, the Libertarian candidate for president's 1992 campaign. One of four presidential candidates on the ballot in all 50 states, Marrou was excluded from presidential debates while independent candidate Ross Perot was included.

"The Democrats and the Republicans don't want the Libertarian message to be heard," Marrou said in 1992. "And the stooge media played along."

Yet, Waxler did credit Perot with helping Libertarians.

"He convinced people that there were choices other than the Republicans or Democrats," Waxler said.

The Libertarians see the presidency as their ultimate goal and they think they have the right person on their side: God.

"God was the original Libertarian," Marrou said. "He gave us freedom of will. He gave us a few simple rules to live by — the Ten Commandments, And he said, 'I'm going to hold you personally responsible.'"

Libertarian hopeful to visit San Diego

By Chris Moran
Staff Writer

Harry Browne has even beaten Texas Sen. Phil Gramm to the punch. The 61-year-old investment writer is running for president.

Almost two years before the 1996 presidential election, Browne brings his campaign for the Libertarian Party nomination to San Diego tonight for a speech before the county's annual Libertarian convention.

"If the right person were in the White House you could cut the budget overnight," said Browne in a telephone interview Friday as he drove on Interstate 680 near his home in Lafayette.

By cuts, Browne means something a little different from the Republicans' "Contract With America."

"I believe the president should just say he will not sign the budget unless it is one-third the size of the present budget," Browne said. This would allow the federal government to get by on Browne's proposed revamp of the tax system: either a 10 percent flat income tax or a 10 percent sales tax.

The "Contract With America" may work in the Libertarians' favor, though. He hopes the cutbacks in government spending proposed by the new Republican Congress are all approved.

If that happens, Browne said, "A year from now people will realize that their taxes are still overwhelming, government is still intrusive."

It can be done, he insisted. Rather than piecemeal budget cuts in which each program's constituency puts up a fierce fight to save its funding, Browne recommended a huge, comprehensive slashing of the budget. A single swift blow to the country's spending package, he theorized, will make the cost savings so apparent as to draw support even from constituencies whose programs will be cut.

Browne said he is just the man to make it happen, partially because of his political experience, which he described as "absolutely none. I have not voted in 30 years. I saw no reason to."

He does have experience as the author of nine books. For 20 years he has also written "Harry Browne's Special Reports," a newsletter of commentary on the economy, investments and politics.

Browne is the keynote speaker at the San Diego County Libertarian Party's annual convention at the Kings Inn in Mission Valley. The convention for the county's 9,300 Libertarians includes a talk by San Diego's Richard Rider about his 1994 campaign for governor, a panel discussion to introduce attendees to libertarianism and a debate on whether political action is morally defensible.

Libertarian leader takes on two tasks

Robert Edwards / News-Leader

Libertarian leader Bill Johnson of Springfield expects to wear two political hats into 1996 — one as the party's chief recruiter and the other as head of a movement to strengthen states' rights.

Johnson, the Libertarians' 1994 U.S. Senate candidate, recently was chosen party executive director, with the aim of boosting membership and finding candidates at all levels for next year's elections.

He'll do the Libertarian organizing work for free, said Johnson and state Libertarian Chairman Phil Horras of Springfield.

Johnson said he would try to earn a salary through fund-raising efforts he'll conduct for the 10th Amendment Coalition committee he is setting up in Missouri.

The committee will be part of a loose association of like-minded groups springing up in other states.

"It's a good issue to be identified with ... and no one is carrying the ball for it in Missouri," Johnson said. And he believes the effort can spark interest in the Libertarian Party, he said.

The aim is to recruit legislative candidates who will push the issue in their campaigns and force other candidates to take a stand on it as well, Johnson said. The idea is for states to reassert their sovereignty under the 10th Amendment to the



Johnson

Horras

U.S. Constitution and work to limit federal authority.

The party's support of legalizing drugs often turns people off, he said, so that should not be first thing Libertarians ought to put forward.

"I want a foot in the door," Johnson said. "The car salesman doesn't show you the sticker price first."

Dues-paying Libertarians number about 200 in Missouri, Horras said. Johnson, who came in a distant third in the Senate race in November, won 80,000 votes.

Horras said he was one of the few party leaders who voted against Johnson's dual position when the issue was discussed in a meeting in Columbia two weeks ago. He said he wanted the role more defined and needed more detail on what materials would be used and what party principles would be emphasized.

Still, Horras said he wants the project to work and will support Johnson. But he said mainstream voters, who gather in organizations

like Rotary Clubs and Chambers of Commerce, should be targeted.

"If the party's going to grow, it's got to go after the center," he said.

Johnson said he agrees and plans to reach out to the broad middle range of Missourians. But he said he won't ignore some groups that may be considered fringe because at least they are politically aware and active and could be allies.

Horras said whoever becomes the Libertarian presidential candidate in 1996 still will have difficulty becoming known and winning votes. The 1992 hopeful received less than 1 percent of the vote.

"We need either a gimmick ... or money," he said. For example, a political stunt like driving a car in reverse across the country to show how backward the system might garner public attention, he said.

But Horras said if Clinton runs, he'll be so unpopular, the Libertarians could gain a greater following among those seeking an alternative.

Clinton's State of the Union speech was a good presentation, but it showed where the president had waffled, Horras said. Clinton campaigned on welfare reform, for example, but set it aside for two years until bringing it up again in his address Tuesday, Horras said.

"I thought it was just basically putting a new coat of paint on an old car," Horras said of the speech. "Clean it up and make it look good for the next campaign."

▲ *Georgetown Record*
Georgetown, MA
January 5, 1995

► *The North County Blade-Citizen*
Oceanside, California
January 14, 1995

◀ *The News-Leader*
Springfield, MA
January 29, 1995