



June 2001

Inside

- 2.... Campaign 2002
- 2.... Venue Tax Proposal Fails
- 2.... The Morality of the Welfare State
- 3.... America's Five-Foot Giant: James Madison
- 4.... Light of Liberty Awards
- 4.... Cities First, Then Counties
- 4.... Comal County Election Report
- 5.... Comal County Election Report Analysis
- 6.... Denton County Organizes for Campaign 2002
- 6.... Opportunity Abounds in 2002
- 6.... Support New Libertarian E-Column
- 7.... Wal-Mart, Immigrants and Thomas Jefferson
- 8.... News from National
- 9.... Close the Department of Education
- 9.... April Fools
- 10.. House Bill 187 (Local Government Code 152.052):
- 12.. Tea Party, Anyone?
- 15.. Rabblersing 101
- 16.. News Releases by Candidates
- 17.. Around the State

Speaker "Windfall" at LPT State Conference:

National LP "Big Wigs" to Share our Weekend
July 13, 14, 15 - Hyatt Regency Houston Airport

by Nancy Neale, TORCHESS@TEXAS.NET

Get ready for the best State Conference the Texas LP has ever known! Mark your calendars and make your reservations right now to be at the Hyatt Regency Houston Airport for the Libertarian Party of Texas State Conference July 13-15.

We have recently learned that the "Strategic Planning Team" of the national LP has decided to hold their July meeting at the Hyatt, in conjunction with our State Conference! This impressive team boasts such VIP's as National Chair **Jim Lark**, National Director **Steve Dasbach**, National Political Director **Ron Crickenberger**, and former New Hampshire House member and 2000 LP presidential hopeful **Don Gorman** for starters, plus most of the LNC members, including all the officers. (check out WWW.LP.ORG)

They will be meeting all day on Saturday and Sunday. We plan to steal some of them away from their meeting for shorts times to speak to us, and we may observe their meetings. Hopefully some of them will attend some of our conference events as well. We hope at least that they will attend our Friday evening reception and be around to mingle with us.

And, you won't want to miss this opportunity to meet Indian rights activist actor and author **Russell Means**. His

major movie credits include the title character in *Last of the Mohicans*, and (the voice of) the father in Disney's animated *Pocahontas*. He came to national prominence in 1973 when he and AIM (American Indian Movement) co-founder Dennis Banks headed up the standoff at Wounded Knee in South Dakota. He has traveled extensively around the Americas defending the rights of native peoples. (He has some very impressive 'war stories') Mr. Means ran for the 1988 LP presidential nomination, losing to Ron Paul. We hear that he may be considering a bid for the 2004 nomination. His autobiography, *Where White Men Fear to Tread*, was published in 1995. (check out RUSSELLMEANS.COM)

Carla Howell doesn't seem to have slowed down a bit since her intensive campaign last year against that Kennedy person in Massachusetts. She made a very impressive showing, getting 12% of the total votes, just one point less than the GOP candidate! I'm sure that the recent growth in MA LP's membership is in large part due to her highly visible campaign. She is now thinking of running for governor in 2002. She has developed a talk that "Boldness is the Key to Libertarian Success". Sounds like an

Campaign 2002

Robert West Named Denton County Coordinator for Daiell Campaign

Robert West, Vice-Chair of the Denton County LP, has become Denton County Coordinator for the Jeff Daiell gubernatorial campaign.

Robert will be focusing on folks who are not strongly committed to either of the two larger parties. He lives in Little Elm and is an often-decorated veteran of the U. S. Navy. He now makes his living as an avionics technician. Married to Carole Diane Knudson, Robert has two small children.

Robert is currently running for office himself, seeking the LP nomination for State Representative in what is currently District 65.

He may be contacted at WESTRL@MSN.COM, (972) 668-0753 (7-10 pm weekdays, anytime on weekends), 1524 Lakeshore Drive, Little Elm, Texas 75068

I look forward to working with him for a Free Texas.

Keary Ehlers Newest Honorary Co-Chair

Keary Ehlers, the LPT's 1994 gubernatorial nominee, has joined those lending their names to the Daiell For Governor campaign as an Honorary Co-Chair.

In 1990, Keary helped arrange several functions for me in the Dallas-Arlington-Fort Worth area, extended the hospitality of his home to me, and provided transportation to and from events.

He has also agreed to try to arrange some functions in that area for this campaign.

Jeff Daiell
c/o Individuals For Jeff Daiell
Suite 126
15213 Southwest Freeway
Sugar Land, Texas 77478

Venue Tax Proposal Fails

From David DeLamar,
THINK@DOOR.NET

Voter turnout was low, as expected. Only six percent of registered voters in the city of Lubbock cast their ballots, which translates to about 7,700 people. Here's the break down.

Under proposition one, 43 percent voted for the championship softball complex and 57 percent voted against it. Under proposition two, 43 percent voted for the two little league fourplexes and 57 percent voted against it. For proposition three, 42 percent voted for a community events area at the Buddy Holly Recreation Area and 58 percent voted against it. City Manager Bob Cass says it's too early to tell if the city will go ahead and build the projects on its own. Cass says it depends on how much money is available in the city's budget, and we won't know that until several months from now.

Submissions Policy and Deadlines

Unsolicited manuscripts and submissions are welcome and will be considered for publication in upcoming issues of *Lone Star Liberty*. Manuscripts may be submitted via mail, fax or email. Length should be no more than 750 words per manuscript. We reserve the right to edit for clarity and length. Submissions are articles, letters to the editor, or information for the AAround the State@ column. Indicate in which category the submission is to be considered.

The deadline for a particular issue is the 25th day of the month, two months prior, i.e., for January, the deadline is the preceding November.

Late breaking news will be considered according to timeliness and relevance.

Advertising space is available in a variety of formats.

Send submissions, article ideas and requests for advertising rates to

Barbara Cunningham, Editor
Lone Star Liberty
301 Porter
Caldwell, TX 77836-1825
(979) 567-3313 fax
CHARLESB@TCA.NET

The Morality of the Welfare State

by Jacob G. Hornberger

As a compassionate conservative, President Bush wants to give federal aid to faith-based organizations. His plan has drawn attacks from religious leaders on the right and civil libertarians on the left.

Religious leaders object to Bush's plan on the ground that it will lead to governmental interference with religious organizations. The point they make was summarized by the Supreme Court in 1942 in the case of Wickard vs. Filburn "It is hardly lack of due process for the government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

Those on the left end of the political spectrum are complaining that federal aid to religious groups would breach the wall of separation between church and state that is guaranteed by the First Amendment.

Lone Star Liberty Staff

Publications Chair and Editor
Barbara Cunningham

Fax:
(979) 567-3313

Email:
CHARLESB@TCA.NET

Submissions
301 Porter
Caldwell, TX 77836-1825

For information about the Libertarian Party of Texas or to send contributions, please contact PO Box 56426, Houston, TX 77256-6426 or call 1-800-422-1776

Lone Star Liberty
Vol. 12, Issue 4
Published monthly by
The Libertarian Party of Texas
PO Box 56426
Houston, Texas 77256-6426

America's Five-Foot Giant: James Madison

by Vin Suprynowicz, VIN@LVRJ.COM
Reprinted from *The Libertarian Enterprise*, Issue 115, April 02, 2001

America's Constitution is not perfect, nor were the Founding Fathers who drafted it.

That document and its authors created a strong framework for central governance. But building a strong government isn't so hard, great captains from Caesar to Napoleon managed to do that. The challenge was, and remains, to build into the very framework of government some mechanism for granting primacy to the principles of individual liberty.

The great secret of America's Constitution, the reason it managed to preserve this balance between strength and respect for individual rights (except under the tyrant Lincoln, and always excepting that chattel slavery thing) for well over a century lay in the adoption of a scheme of "balancing" opposing powers.

Most schoolchildren can still explain how the powers of the legislature, the executive, and the judiciary are limited and designed to serve as checks, one upon the other.

Fewer remember today the other balancing forces acknowledged in the text of the Constitution and its Bill of Rights, among them the power of a free press as guaranteed in the First Amendment, and the power of citizen jurors (mentioned in no fewer than three of the first 10 articles of amendment) to block the enforcement of bad laws.

(Citizen juries, for instance, were the reason it was virtually impossible to win convictions under the Fugitive Slave Act in the northern states in the 1850's, no matter how overwhelming the evidence of "guilt" under this widely unpopular statute.)

But America's Constitution is no perpetual motion machine. It cannot long protect us in a land where a dumbed-down, propagandized populace has been gulled into rationalizing any usurpation by piteously mewling "They must have a good reason, just shut up and show your ID card."

The founders warned us that we could expect to survive as a free nation only so long as the public at large remained educated to the reasons for America's complex and sometime frustrating form of government,

declined to trade their freedoms for a bowl of porridge, and remained ever vigilant in their defense.

A current report card on how well we're following that advice would verge on the depressing.

Leave aside for a moment the massacres of 1913, ending the state legislatures' vital veto over the federal Congress by stripping their power to appoint senators; replacing sound gold and silver coin with endlessly inflatable Federal Reserve confetti; launching the first "modest" federal venture into what would become the liberty-devouring War on Drugs; effectively bypassing the brilliant 125-year ban on direct federal taxation (except as apportioned by census) through the deadly and deadening Income Redistribution Tax.

How many Americans today blithely assert that America is a pure democracy, a condition the founders would have condemned as mob rule, rather than a constitutional Republic, guaranteeing virtually limitless personal and privacy rights, even in the face of a "vote" of 1,000-to-one?

How many of our delegates to Washington today will acknowledge that their oath to "protect and defend the Constitution" sharply limits the areas in which they can even consider legislating or allocating funds, to those specifically listed in Article I, Section 8? (Would "campaign finance reform" even be an issue, if Congress routinely refused to meddle in the affairs of the businesses who now consider it a wise investment to send courtiers bearing bags of such "protection money" every election cycle?)

Do we still jealously guard the separation of powers, or do we shrug and say "whatever works" when unelected bureaucrats usurp lawmaking authority with their endless piles of regulations; when presidents wave thousands of acres off limits for human use with a flourish of their pen, when our legislatures are full of "citizens" drawing regular paychecks from executive-branch police departments or school districts?

Whenever some functioning of our system is criticized as inefficient, how quick are we today to endorse further "streamlining" through elimination of the Electoral College, or removing "recalcitrant" jurors to make conviction easier in some high-profile trial?

Perhaps that's why the 250th birthday of James Madison, now widely regarded by many historians as the Founding Father, chief engineer of the Constitution, chief promoter and one of the authors of the Bill of Rights,

passed largely unnoticed on March 16 (March 5, by the calendar in use at the time).

Madison served as Jefferson's secretary of state at the time of the Louisiana Purchase, of course, later assuming the presidency himself from 1809 to 1817. But his greatest legacy remains his success, at the Constitutional Convention of 1787, in steering a middle course between the emphasis on states' rights of his friend Thomas Jefferson (in hindsight, I think Jefferson was probably right), and the downright despotic vision of a central government promoted by the Hamiltonians, as seen in their passage in 1798 of the Alien and Sedition Acts (the outrage and catalyst that brought Madison back into public life.)

Only that compromise, and his agreement to add a Bill of Rights, closed the deal. (No second and ninth amendments, no United States.)

"He now appears so central that he has been called 'the founding father,'" Lance Banning, a professor of history at the University of Kentucky and author of a 1997 book on Madison, told a Library of Congress symposium on March 16.

Five-foot-four and a mere 100 pounds, Madison gave up an early ambition to become a minister because of a weak speaking voice. In an era when our national politics seem to meld ever more interchangeably with "show biz," it's sobering to think how little chance such a figure might have at a role of national leadership today, even after graduating Princeton in two years, successfully but

Continued on page 12

**Robert F. Lockhart,
C.P.A.**

**P. O. Box 1398
Pasadena, Texas 77501**



(713) 475-0092

Paid Advertisement

Light of Liberty Awards

From George Schwappach,
GEORGES@SWCONNECT.NET

The Taylor, Jones, Nolan and Fisher Libertarian Parties held a banquet to recognize their Light of Liberty award winners for 2000, and to thank all the Local Libertarian candidates who ran in last November's election.

The Light of Liberty awards are a national recognition program sponsored by The Advocates for Self-Government, an educational organization headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia. Awards are given to individuals who complete a required number of tasks that promote the self-governance philosophy. Awards are given for published writing achievements, public speaking engagements, and direct outreach activity via the Operation Politically Homeless (OPH) program.

In 1999, 192 people received Light of Liberty Awards in the United States, including 5 Triathlon winners who qualified in all three categories. Sharon Harris, The Advocate's Executive Director, reports that there were close to 250 Award Winners nationally in 2000, including Dr. Debra Monde, who was the District 17 Congressional Candidate for the Libertarian Party; and George Schwappach, who is the Taylor County Party Chair. Steve came up one speech short of achieving Triathlon status.

In addition to Dr. Monde, candidates who were recognized are Frank Kluza and Steve Kirby, who each ran for County Commissioner (District 3 and 1, respectively), and William Brin, who ran for Justice of the Peace.

The Advocates for Self-Government host a Light of Liberty web site where all the present and past year winners are recognized, WWW.SELF-GOV.ORG. In addition to continuing with the Light of Liberty program, the organization is also promoting the Discover Liberty outreach project beginning in June, 2001.

Locally, the Libertarian Party hosted several OPH booths last year, and hope to do the same this year. Persons interested in seeing one of the outreach included in their events should contact George Schwappach, Party Chairman, at (915) 698-3405.

Cities First, Then Counties

Posted on LPTexas by Tom Kane,
FREEDOM2@FLASH.NET

People need to get into politics at their level of interest.

For example, one local Libertarian ran for County Commissioner, and several thousand dollars and handshakes later got a mere 100 votes. But he rarely, if ever, attended a Commissioner's Court meeting, and I always was a little troubled by that and encouraged him to attend one, as an aid to his campaigning and general knowledge, all to no avail.

A local conservative, on the other hand, faithfully attended City Council meetings for about two years, and knew more about it than those who sat on it (except for what went on in the illegal secret meetings, which we broke up, but that's another story). She ran and won despite being bypassed when she was the logical choice to fill a vacant seat, and despite the Chamber encouraging a third candidate, Hispanic, to run and pull her Hispanic votes. He beat the incumbent, but she beat him. The people could tell she knew what she was doing, despite her reputation for being pushy and hot-tempered. This time around she was unopposed; no one dared to challenge her, despite a year-long search for an opponent by the in-crowd.

Back to the Libertarian, he got involved with his rural fire department and rapidly reorganized it, forced out an elitist group that excluded people like himself, did his vote-counting well and is now fire chief and the main political force in his unincorporated hamlet. And he loves it. Probably still hasn't gone to a County Commissioners meeting. But who cares? He loves local politics, and the fire department, and that's where he wants to serve; he naturally rose quickly to the top of the town he loves.

I think the way to recruit winning candidates is to start them out as watchdogs in an area of interest. If we have a nurse, maybe the hospital board. An accountant, maybe the appraisal district. A jock, the school board. If you don't have the time or inclination to sit in on a council's meetings regularly, then you don't have time to sit on that council. If you do have time, and you are moderately talented, you have a good chance of winning the election after you "pay your dues" by watchdogging the council for a year or two. Most local politicians aren't

that bright; it's easy to beat them. You just get to know their job better than they do.

I did not make this up. It is from Communities Organized for Public Service (COPS) in San Antonio, which used it to take over city government in the 80's. It is supposed to have been invented by grass-roots Chicago Populist/Communist Saul Alinsky. But it works no matter who invented it.

For legislature, of course, you would have to follow on the Internet unless you lived in Austin. So Barry Smith, by that logic, is our best choice for legislator.

Those who do not have time to attend or follow a political body's meetings for a year or two should serve as paper candidates for higher offices, filling up the top slots in the ballot first and then working their way down.

In the meantime, let's not get too frustrated over not having enough serious candidates. Let's just take the ones we have a place them on the ballot appropriately. In the long run, most of our candidates will be converts from conservatism and liberalism, when they realize the bankruptcy of these strategies and turn to us. Then we will have plenty of candidates to choose from who really want to serve.

There are some decent people who just want to serve, and are determined to win office and lead, and philosophy is just not that important to them; they are practical, gregarious extroverts. If the voters want a Libertarian, these people will become Libertarian. People like this will eventually come into the party and run for us. Meanwhile, we need to keep the party going.

I predict our breakthrough for 2005.

Comal County Election Report

From Bill Utterback,

BILL.UTTERBACK@UNLIMITED-THOUGHT.COM

The Bulverde, Texas, city election was held on May 5, 2001. 229 people voted; 168 voted for my opponent; 55 voted for me; 6 did not vote for Marshal. I feel that the vote count was accurate. Any way you look at it, 229 votes cast out of a population of 3200+/- is a sad commentary on the citizens of Bulverde.

I placed full page ads in both local weekly newspapers that came out on the Thursday preceding the Saturday election. The ads referred people to the WWW.DNET.ORG website.

Comal County Election Report

The information is still on that website; select Texas, City wide offices, Bulverde, and City Marshal. I personally handed out 1,000 flyers during the last week of the campaign with the same information as the ad contained. I put out about 50 yard signs, some of which disappeared. I had magnetic signs on my car. I talked to hundreds of people, spoke at the league of Women Voters' Candidate Forum, and was quoted in several articles in both local newspapers. I had a long list of people endorsing my campaign in the newspaper ads and on the website.

I have been told that what cost me the election was an intense verbal smear campaign which was mounted by the local establishment after I started passing out flyers. The phone lines must have been overheating. The report was that people were saying don't believe what Utterback says, his real agenda is XXX. I have no proof of what was said, so I will not repeat what was reported to me.

I was expecting the vote to be about 355 to 168 in my favor. It was actually 55 to 168 against me. In any case, I can say that I ran an honorable campaign and said nothing that was not 100% factual.

I would like to again thank those listed on the website as endorsing my campaign for Marshal. Especially the local endorsers [who] may now catch some flak for endorsing a non-establishment candidate. It takes courage to stand up and make a statement for what you know to be right.

Life goes on after elections.

Comal County Election Report Analysis

From Clyde Garland,
CLYDEGARLA@AOL.COM

Thanks for your election report. Your efforts and your report will help other Libertarians win nonpartisan races.

Calling people on the phone with a pitch that attempts to run down the opponent almost always fails. The voter will be more suspicious of the caller and the candidate he represents than the opponent. Exception 1, the voter knows and respects the caller. Exception 2, the caller attacks the candidate's issues not the candidate. Say, the caller points

out that you are too soft on crime, especially drug violators, while your opponent is tough on crime. This may cost you a few votes.

It would take 18 highly organized volunteers calling four hours a night for seven days to call 3,000 answering machines and people. More likely what happened is that your opponent called only the 200 people that voted which I discuss below.

It looks like you did everything right (ads, signs, fliers, person to person), if your strategy was to get people who never vote in May elections to vote. Your expectation that 523 people would vote indicates that this was your strategy. My guess is that your research showed that about 200 people voted each May and that almost all of them would vote for your opponent, to guess again, because he is well known and your are the outsider.

It is good that you made the effort. It shows that once again it is very difficult to get people to change old habits, to get those that do not vote to vote.

Losing by such a large margin after so much effort, probably means nothing you could have done would have made enough of a difference to win. But if you are still interested in running and winning nonpartisan races in the future, I would like to suggest the following strategy.

Concentrate 90% of your effort on those that VOTE but have NOT made up their minds yet. Your town is so small, that means you can go and talk to them personally three times during the month before the election and drive many of them to the polls to vote.

Here is the procedure.

1. Get a list of registered voters from the county.
2. Go to the City Clerk and ask to see the voter sign in sheet for the last election that happened a few days ago.
3. Note on registered voters list those that voted last May, and for those that voted, note if they voted early (30% do) and note if they are R or D. These are your hard core voters. This means half of them voted in past primaries so the registered voters list will have an R or D by their name. If you have the energy for it do the same thing for May 2000 and 1999. This will give you a list of 250 people for your size town.
4. Consolidate List and add phone numbers. You will note that many people live in the same household. This means your list is now 180 names long. You, or anyone who has this list, can run for office and win.

Side notes

a. Most Republican and Democrat Parties do this for partisan (November) races. This gives those that have the best List a slight edge. The List of Voters is only a slight edge for partisan races because half of all registered voters vote in partisan races. Therefore, mass advertising is usually more cost effective than trying to target only those that vote.

b. Almost no one does this for nonpartisan races, especially for small cities. The List is a tremendous advantage because only 8% of all registered voters vote in those races. Therefore, targeting those that vote is very cost effective.

c. The vote totals and your comments indicate that your opponent is one of the rare few who use the "List" strategy. It is important to try and find out why your opponent won.

d. Just for fun, you may want to compare the names of all those that endorsed you to your List. You will discover that those that did not vote in past May elections also did not vote in this May election. Yes, I know they looked you in the eye and said they would vote for you. And they will vote for you next time, if you drive them to the poll.

OK, a year has passed and you sign up to run again. Organize your list as follows:

E Early voters, 30% vote early. You have to contact them first.

R Regular (Election Day) voters. (You have more time for these.)

These two groups are broken down into three more groups

R Voted in Republican Primary. 25%

D Voted in Democratic Primary. 25%

N Did not vote in Primary. 50%

You may want to have a different pitch for each group.

First Round

Pitch your List (180 households) at least twice with a flier or post card or letter of person to person.

Second Round

Two weeks before early voting starts have volunteers call 180 households and ask, "Whom do you plan to vote for?"

If more than 40% say they plan to vote for your opponent, stop campaigning, you have lost, rest up for the next election. But hopefully the results will be something like this

A 40 for you. Spend almost no effort on this group.

B 100 undecided. Spend almost all effort on this group.

Denton County Organizes for Campaign 2002

Posted on LPTexas by Robert West, WESTR@MASCORP.COM

The Denton County LP has started organizing a party structure for 2002 and beyond. The basic plan calls for knocking doors in each precinct until we find someone who agrees with most of the LP's reasoning and is willing to be a Precinct Captain. We will then assist this person in recruiting ten assistants.

The PC will attend monthly meeting/training, put in progress reports and continue with the next stage of recruiting, 10 activists per assistant. The rest of us move into the next precinct and start knocking doors again. When the precinct is up to full strength they can assist in starting new precinct organizations/campaigning etc. We envision a phone tree where the County Chair can make 10 calls, these people will make 10 calls and so on.

On election day each county member will have a small number of people who were identified as "LP votes" or "potential LP votes"(perhaps 30). It will be their assignment to call these people, provide transportation to and from the polls if required and so on. In the days following the election this organization can be put to work recruiting candidates for the next election and signing up more members. Monthly events, such as door knocking, voter registration drives or rallies/fundraisers, along with local meetings will be used to keep the groups together year-round.

In keeping with LP principles and common sense, the majority of the funding will be kept and used at the precinct level. Ideally, each campaigner will pay for flyers out of his or her own funds and avoid the party getting involved with those funds in any way.

I admit it's ambitious and has not been done yet but hey, even if we fall on face we should have one or two new members right?

Opportunity Abounds in 2002

From Robert Restivo,
VOTE4FREEDOM@NETZERO.NET

For those planning ahead, there is plenty of opportunity to run in 2002

Offices Up For Election in 2002

All 32 United States Representatives 2 yr. term (two additional seats due to redistricting)

Governor 4 yr. term

Lieutenant Governor – 4 yr. term

Attorney General – 4 yr. term

Comptroller of Public Accounts – 4 yr. term

Commissioner of General Land Office – 4 yr. term

Commissioner of Agriculture – 4 yr. term
Railroad Commissioner: Michael Williams – 6 yr. Term

Chief Justice, Supreme Court: Tom Phillips – 6 yr. Term

2 members of the Supreme Court: James Baker

Deborah Hankinson – 6 yr. Term

1 member Supreme Court: Wallace Jefferson – Unexpired Term 4 year term

3 members of the Court of Criminal Appeals:

Sue Holland

Paul Womack

Tom Price – 6 year term

All State Senators will draw lots to determine term

All 150 State Representatives – 2 yr. term

All members of the State Board of Education will draw lots to determine term

Various Court of Appeals Justices
Various District Judges, Criminal District Judges, Family District Judges

All Criminal District Attorneys

All County Judges

All Statutory County Court Judges

All District Clerks

All County Clerks

County Treasurers

County Surveyors

County Commissioners, Precincts 2 and 4

Justices of the Peace (except those with a place 1 designation)

Support New Libertarian E-Column

From Gary Reed,
GARREED@AOL.COM

My name is Garry Reed and I need all libertarians to support my new on-line column.

"The Loose Cannon Libertarian" appears twice monthly on WWW.NEWSGUY.COM. I'm writing an opinion column that takes on political and social issues from a hardcore libertarian viewpoint. The goal of my column is to arouse curiosity, stir controversy and spark debate with the web site's otherwise general interest readership. For some people, this may be their first encounter with libertarianism.

But the column may not survive beyond its infancy without your help. The purpose of my column, after all, is to attract traffic to the WWW.NEWSGUY.COM web site in the hope that you'll like what you see and sign up as a member. That makes it a win-win proposition for us and for them. They get increased exposure to their web site and we get another outreach venue for libertarianism.

This is a perfect opportunity for arm-chair activists. If you hate campaigning, petitioning or demonstrating and can't afford to donate money you can still support the libertarian cause by simply pointing and clicking your mouse. Go to WWW.NEWSGUY.COM, scroll down to the cannon icon and click it. Read the column. Click "View article archives" and read my earlier efforts. Click "Email the author" and send me your comments and suggestions.

Then check out the whole site and sign up for a membership if you like what they offer. And visit the other features, too. They're all free, just like mine. But most of all, bookmark the site and become a regular reader of "The Loose Cannon Libertarian" and help keep it alive. I submit new articles on the 14th and 29th of each month and they're posted soon after that.

Remember, in the war of ideas, every mouse click (and loose cannon shot) counts.

Wal-Mart, Immigrants and Thomas Jefferson

by Eric Miller,

EMPIREBUILDER@EARTHLINK.NET

Reprinted from *The Libertarian*

Enterprise, Issue 119, April 30, 2001

I have a friend who came to the United States from a South American country as a guest of Wal-Mart. It seems Sam Walton, in an effort to promote Capitalism in Central American countries, set up scholarships so students could come to Arkansas, become schooled in business, and return to Central America ready to make the poor agricultural nations more receptive to large-scale, super-discount retailing.

Today, my friend, who shall remain unnamed (I probably don't know his real name anyway), is one of the many people in the United States illegally. He has skills, an advanced degree and a willingness to work that could be used to produce in the United States, yet is confined to working at tasks far below his skill level in order to stay here.

My friend is not alone. San Francisco, Los Angeles, Miami and New York are filled with people who are contributing in some way to the local and national economy, but not recognized as legitimate members of our society. While it would seem there would be enough incentives in place to keep immigrants from coming to the United States, in reality they provide little deterrent. Those unable to get a job either pay for fake IDs and social security numbers that match a life-convict, missing child or deceased baby. The less savvy simply make them up.

Eventually they are caught, but that only means looking for a new job. Others work under-the-table independent of the workers' compensation, social security and income tax systems.

Many Americans see the situation as a problem of law enforcement and conclude stricter border control is the solution. They conclude that these immigrants take legitimate jobs from Americans, crowd the cities and overburden social systems.

There is both a moral and economic argument to be made for legitimizing the status of anyone who reaches American soil and opening the borders to all who wish to enter.

First, consider that in every census from 1880 to 1990, immigrants have been more likely to be self-employed than natives. Most

jobs in the United States are created by small business. Rather than taking jobs from native Americans, immigrants are likely creating jobs for native Americans. Still don't buy the argument? Consider that the cities that immigrants go to, San Francisco, New York, have lower unemployment and higher job creation rates than the ones they avoid, Detroit, Pittsburgh. Also consider that across the United States, regardless of population gains or losses, the unemployment rate stays basically the same. The conclusion, in a free economy, people create jobs, not the other way around.

Over-population is another concern of those who oppose immigration. While San Francisco may be more crowded because of immigrant arrivals, many cities in the United States have lost as much as half of their population in the last 50 years. These are places where the infrastructure and housing stock exists ready to accommodate new arrivals ready to pump new entrepreneurial economic energy into the local economies. Even in San Francisco, locals benefit from the rise in property values caused by immigration and an artificially static housing supply.

If you take the population of the United States as a whole, compared to Western European countries, our prosperity is directly tied to two things: immigrants and youth. Without immigration, the median age in the United States would be much older, and while older may be wiser, it's also cautious and cautiousness does not lend itself to starting businesses and taking risks.

If you take the world as a whole, it's the industrialized nations that have lower birth rates, and it will be further "industrialization" or move towards a technological and "knowledge-based" economies that will eventually bring the world population numbers into check.

Still, recognizing the economic benefits of immigrants, it's the moral arguments for immigration that are the strongest. We are, after all, dealing with people. We are debating from above. Our arguments and decisions determine people's lives and livelihoods. On what basis can we argue anyone should have that power over our fellow man?

The laws that work best are the ones that reflect the social contracts already established by people. Laws that seem to defy these contracts and be in defiance of reason, will not be obeyed and will not serve any constructive purpose. Laws that prevent

people from pursuing basic life-sustaining goals will not be obeyed at the borders or within the country.

Thomas Jefferson wrote that "All Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness." Unless you believe by "all men," Jefferson only meant those with legal residency in the United States, today's immigration laws do not reflect this principal. Do we not all have the same "creator" regardless of borders?

The Declaration of Independence refers to "The laws of nature and of nature's God." But what does this mean? According to the Clairmont Institute, a California-based political philosophy think tank, it means that nature encompasses laws, certain obligations are prescribed for all human beings by nature, or more specifically, by the fact that all humans share a common nature. Law is based on rights. The reason I cannot kill you is not the law that says I can't, it's because you have a right to life and that right is granted by nature.

Clairmont also explains that "laws of nature" are laws that can be grasped by human reason. The "laws of nature," the founders referred to are accessible in principle to any person anywhere in the world who thinks about the nature of human beings. Clairmont explains that "the American founding is not based on ideas specifically tied to one people, such as 'the rights of Englishmen,' but on ideas that are true for all people everywhere."

If we agree these rights are granted by a creator, then how can we, as men, justify taking them away? And by telling anyone they have no right to live and work in the United States, we are in effect saying to them, "you have not been granted the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness by your creator."

Jefferson did not intend for the light of liberty to dim at the nation's shores. But as long as it does, we, as Americans must be there to defend individual rights. It should not matter the benefits immigrants bring to the economy, though the economy will reap the benefits. It should only matter that we recognize the inalienable rights of all people; if we don't, what case can be made in defense of our own rights?

Eric Miller is Editor of
WWW.NEWCOLONIST.COM

News from National

U.S. drug “warriors” are to blame for murder of missionaries in Peru

The Peruvian air force or drug traffickers are not to blame for the tragic incident that killed a Baptist missionary and her child; the blame falls squarely on the U.S. government’s lethal and destructive War on Drugs.

Politicians have been pointing fingers about who is to blame for the incident in South America in which the Peruvian air force shot down a small plane carrying a family of Baptist missionaries and a pilot.

The Cessna was strafed and forced to crash land in the Amazon after a CIA-operated surveillance plane mistook the missionaries for drug smugglers.

Killed in the crash were Veronica Bowers, who friends said “died in pursuit of her life’s calling” and her 7-month-old daughter, Charity. Her husband, son, and the pilot survived.

In response, the U.S. government may send officials to Lima for talks with Peruvian officials about “what went wrong,” and Secretary of State Colin Powell suggested on Thursday that the blame lay with American celebrities like Robert Downey, Jr. who use drugs.

But Robert Downey, Jr. didn’t vote to start funding a program to encourage foreign governments to shoot down planes, or publicly describe that missionary-killing program as a “very successful policy,” countered Steve Dasbach.

“We don’t need a detective to figure out who’s to blame for this senseless murder,” he said. “All we need to do is look at U.S. House and Senate voting records.”

* U.S. politicians created the air surveillance and interdiction program in 1992, and since then the U.S. government has helped the Peruvian military shoot down or strafe more than 100 airplanes.

* The U.S. government now spends \$731 million a year providing military and other aid to South American countries for anti-drug operations.

* It was a U.S. Air Force jet, operated by CIA employees, that spotted the missionaries’ plane and called it to the attention of the Peruvian military.

* On Tuesday, Senator Lincoln Chafee (R-RI), chair of a Foreign Relations panel, bragged about the “shoot-first, ask-questions-later policy” that murdered the American missionaries. Chafee said giving Peruvian military officials the power to blast civilian planes out of the sky is “a very successful policy.”

Such comments amount to a frank con-

fession of guilt, said Dasbach.

“What could be more chilling, or more revealing, than to hear a U.S. Senator publicly applaud a policy that caused the deaths of two innocent Americans?” he asked. “Could a South American drug lord have a less wanton disregard for human life?”

“Unfortunately, shooting down civilian airplanes in South America isn’t a U.S. foreign policy mistake, it is U.S. foreign policy. And Veronica Bowers and her baby have become nothing more than collateral damage of that policy, and of their own government’s savage and senseless War on Drugs.” (27 April 2001)

U.N. bureaucrats are drafting treaty to declare ‘World War’ on cigarettes

United Nations bureaucrats are drafting an international treaty to try to get everyone on Earth to stop smoking, a troubling development that could mark the beginning of a “World War” against cigarettes.

Representatives from 190 governments met recently in Geneva, Switzerland to negotiate the terms of the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC), a multi-national treaty designed to battle what they call the “devastating” effects of tobacco around the world.

Cigarette smoking is such a global problem, say U.N. bureaucrats, that it calls for a “co-ordinated international response.”

The conference, sponsored by the U.N.’s World Health Organization, is expected to result in a treaty that will call for

* Dramatic increases in cigarette taxes to discourage smoking, and an agreement to make cigarette prices the same everywhere in the world.

* Severe restrictions on cigarette advertising.

* A ban on tobacco companies’ sponsorship of sporting events.

* Some undefined action, such as multibillion-dollar lawsuits, to hold cigarette companies “responsible” for tobacco-related health problems.

The World Health Organization says it wants the FCTC ratified by U.N. member nations and in effect by 2003.

But the Libertarian Party says that American adults have the right to decide whether they will smoke, without U.N. bureaucrats trying to make that decision for them.

The Framework Convention on Tobacco Control treaty is ironic, said Dasbach, given that the original intent of the United Nations was to help nations prevent war.

“It’s a classic case of mission creep,” he

said. “U.N. bureaucrats apparently don’t have enough real wars to keep them busy, so they have started declaring war on behavior they don’t like.”

“With this proposed international treaty, we’ve met the New World Order, and it’s a global nanny state with a ‘No Smoking’ sign in its hand.” (3 May 2001)

Do you hate those monster SUVs?

You should still oppose anti-SUV law

Even if you hate gas-guzzling, road-hogging, parking lot-jamming SUVs, you should still reject a proposed federal law that would shrink the popular motorized behemoths down to size.

Senators Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) and Olympia Snowe (R-ME) introduced a new bill to require auto manufacturers to boost the average gas mileage of popular SUVs and light trucks by one-third, from 20.7 mpg to 27.5 mpg, over the next six years.

The senators said the bill would reduce global warming and “save consumers at the pump.”

The real effect of the bill would be to force automakers to drastically reduce the size of large SUVs or construct them out of flimsier materials, since technology does not currently exist to allow hulking SUVs like the Lincoln Navigator or the Ford Explorer to get the same gas mileage as compact cars, said the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers.

But whether you love or loathe SUVs, there are numerous reasons to oppose the bill, said Steve Dasbach

* SUVs are already remarkably fuel efficient. The average SUV and light truck now gets 20.7 mpg, which is better mileage than the average car got in 1978 (18 mpg).

* Lighter and flimsier SUVs will cause more people to die in traffic accidents. According to a study by the Brookings Institution and Harvard University, current federal laws mandating higher gas mileage (and, thus, lighter cars) already cause 2,200 to 3,900 extra traffic deaths annually.

* It will have almost zero impact on global warming. If every motorized vehicle in America vanished today, it would only decrease human-caused worldwide carbon dioxide production by 4%, according to author James Johnstone.

* Consumers don’t need laws to protect them at the pump. “The fact is, anybody who buys a big SUV knows they will spend more on gasoline,” said Dasbach. “That’s a choice they made when they purchased their Chevy Tahoe or Dodge Durango.”

Close the Department of Education

by Vin Suprynowicz, VIN@LVRJ.COM
Reprinted from *The Libertarian Enterprise*, Issue 116, April 09, 2001

For all practical purposes, the federal Department of Education operates no schools, and educates no children.

Public schooling in this country got along just fine, some would say it got along much better, for more than a century before the federal department was created in 1979 by President Jimmy Carter as a patronage reward for the support shown the Democratic party by teachers unions and the rest of the “education establishment” in 1976.

Now, more than 20 years later, the federal department gathers in \$44.5 billion per year, supposedly doling out these tax dollars to state and local school districts to “help” in many areas.

In fact, all those moneys came out of local school districts in the first place, since that’s where the taxpayers live. The real effect of passing these funds through central government control (minus handling charges, imagine getting your drinking water by running a leaky hose from your kitchen sink to Washington and back) is to give the federal department, and the public employee unions that control it, the power to control local school boards and school systems, by constantly holding over their heads the threat of “withdrawal” of these funds.

Most taxpaying parents in this nation still imagine they’re the bosses, since they pay the bills. In fact, the opposite is increasingly true. Rare is the local school board that dares defy the federal DOE. The tables are now so far turned that teachers, our hired servants, even have the power to recommend children be removed from homes for an increasing range of non-conformist parental behaviors (gun ownership, declining to “volunteer” kids for immunizations known to cause death and permanent brain damage) creatively redefined as “child abuse.” Here in Nevada, there’s even a serious proposal now working its way through the Legislature that would allow teachers to issue “report cards” in which they would grade parents.

It is in this context that we must view the April 3 visit of the federal Education Department’s chief inspector before Congress.

Lorraine Lewis told the House Education investigations subcommittee her depart-

ment lost nearly half a billion dollars in the past three years to waste, fraud and errors. Her audit found 21 cases in which grant checks, totaling \$250 million, were issued twice to the same recipients.

The audit also found that, of 676 employee government credit card statements reviewed, 141 statements, with purchases valued at nearly \$1 million, were not signed by a supervisor. Several of the purchases included items that could be used for personal use, including computers. Department policy lists computers as items that shouldn’t be purchased with the credit cards.

About 230 employees had government credit cards in their names. Most had charge limits of \$10,000 per month, but two were allowed to charge up to \$300,000 per month.

“In many ways it starts to look like a Third World republic that we’re dealing with here,” said Rep. Pete Hoekstra, R-Mich.

Congress has been scrutinizing the department’s books since learning last year of a pair of theft schemes which diverted \$3 million intended for children who live on Indian reservations and military bases. In another case, six department employees pleaded guilty to stealing \$1 million in equipment and to falsely reporting overtime.

The standard answer to such tip-of-the-iceberg revelations is, “So you found a few bad apples; that doesn’t mean we throw out the whole barrel.”

In fact, the very purpose of the federal DOE is poisonous to crucial, local, parental control over our children’s education, as well as over taxation and government in general. It’s an asylum over which the inmates have had control from Day One. Better to dub it the Department of Stifling Central Control Over the Youth Propaganda Camps.

Once again, the government schools, for good or ill, and I’m on record as saying they should all be dynamited as soon as we can get the kids out, were already in place when the DOE was formed ... and had been for 100 years. The federal DOE was not necessary to establish any schools or to educate any children, and has never done either.

When we hand \$44 billion per year to paper-shufflers and educrats with no purpose but to expand and protect their own bureaucratic empires, waste and fraud are not merely an unfortunate side effect; they’re the name of the game, the agency’s very *raison d’être*.

Ronald Reagan ran for the presidency in 1980 on a promise to close the federal Department of Education. It’s time, long past time,

for someone to keep that promise.

Vin Suprynowicz is assistant editorial page editor of the *Las Vegas Review-Journal*. Subscribe to his monthly newsletter by sending \$72 to Privacy Alert, 1475 Terminal Way, Suite E for Easy, Reno, NV 89502. His book, *Send in the Waco Killers: Essays on the Freedom Movement, 1993-1998*, is available at 1-800-244-2224, or via web site

WWW.THESPIRITOF76.COM/WACOKILLERS.HTML

April Fools

by Lowell Potter, TWOPETE@FREE-MARKET.NET

Reprinted from *The Libertarian Enterprise*, Issue 118, April 23, 2001

O.K. Even I can admit it. Timothy McVeigh screwed up. Slaughtering innocents is messy, unproductive, and just downright beyond the pale. Not to worry, though, the guvvnies have plans to fix his wagon. The bitterest avengers bemoan the painless sterility of McVeigh’s planned May execution as unequal to the massive death and destruction caused by his hand, but by however method, the totalitarian finality of the expedient judaic laws of capital punishment must be an agonizing mental penalty, before the fact at least.

From the days of yore which gave rise to officially organized ancient rites of execution, like stoning, drawing and quartering, and burning at the stake, right up through the refined epochs of hanging and beheading, the traditional human passions for power and revenge are codified into law by guvvnies of every era, codes, uniquely in the American experience, which serve to replace ‘the consent of the governed’ as the derivation of government’s just powers.

So, even if by a blast of fast acting poison, the mega-state will exercise the ultimate sentence on McVeigh, the big snuff job, with all the spectacle and attendant manipulative media exposure it can possibly muster. Future historians will unanimously recognize controlled mass media as a weapon more powerful and effective than even the most horrible guns and bombs.

Perhaps the bitterest Oklahoma City avengers were right to bemoan the bomber’s punishment, not for want of a more spectacular execution necessarily, but maybe for a more christian-inspired, spiritually flagellating pennance of life in prison for McVeigh’s indiscriminate zealotry.

House Bill 187 (Local Government Code 152.052):

“Truth in Campaigning” or “Incumbents’ Protection Act?”

By Robert Paty

A Study in Legislative Chicanery

It must have been terrible. Though it is not widely known, about a decade and a half ago, the hapless fellowship of County Treasurers in this state suffered a vicious attack on their livelihoods and their dedication and service to the public good. In what seemed for all the world a vast anti-government conspiracy, candidates for that office were springing up all over the state hawking the blasphemous idea that the best thing to do with a County Treasurer’s office would be to deep-six it. An abolition movement had set in.

The mayhem began in Bexar County in the early 1980s, and by 1989 a total of nine county Treasurer’s offices had been abolished, with Andrews, Bee, Collin, Fayette, Gregg, Hunt, Nueces, and Tarrant counties being added to the casualty list.

One can only imagine the distress this caused in the 240 some odd surviving Treasurers’ office across the state. Just think about it. Suppose you had a nice cushy job on the county payroll (drawing about 30 grand a year), and all of a sudden there’s these yahoos going around spreading the notion that jobs like yours aren’t really necessary, cost the taxpayers too much money, and ought to be done away with. Worse, they were saying, if only the voters would elect them, that’s just what they’d do! And oh, gee, what might happen if somebody in *your* county were to run against you spewing that insidious anti-government stuff? Even though you just knew you were the county sweetheart, you could never tell what some of those more ignorant voters might do, what with these scalawags putting such ideas in their heads.

Oh, my. Would hubby have to sell his duallie? Oh my, what to do?

Well, they needn’t have worried, and they didn’t: They just went to work, behind the scenes. People with friends in high places, it seems, or in low places

like the Texas Legislature, rarely need to worry when mere ethical or constitutional considerations stand in the way of protecting the status quo. By 1990, even more suddenly than it had arisen, the abolition movement had come to a screeching halt, and in spite of the flurry of abolitions in the 80’s, not a single Treasurer’s office has been abolished in the last eleven years.

How did that happen? Let’s consider a little chronology.

In early 1989, according to her later testimony, State Representative Phyllis Robinson, D-Gonzales, attended “a meeting with the County Treasurers” in College Station. At that meeting, she was “made aware” of several instances of candidates running for the office of County Treasurer on the promise of working to abolish these offices. The horror of it all (as if the county treasurers thought it was perfectly all right to abolish their offices) was that the state was overrun by abolition candidates who were not keeping their campaign promises, but, instead, taking the offices and taking the money, too.

This, obviously, had to be stopped!

Local Government Code 152.052. Decision to Reduce Compensation or Not to Be Paid

(a) Within five days after the date an elected county or precinct officer takes office, the officer **shall** file an affidavit with the county payroll officer stating that the officer elects not to be paid for the officer’s services **if, during the person’s campaign for election to the county or precinct office, the person publicly advocated the abolition of the office.**

The affidavit must include a statement by the officer describing the method by which the officer intends to seek to obtain the abolition of the office for which the officer was elected and the date by which it is proposed to be accomplished.

Can’t have politicians renegeing on their campaign pledges, can we? So after learning of these evil doings, Representative Robinson headed back to Austin, apparently enlisted the help of Senator Judith Zaffirini, D-Laredo, and the two of them set about drafting legislation to remedy this heinous fraud. Their product, known as House Bill 187, was introduced in the legislative session of 1989 and, on subsequent passage, would become part of Local Government Code 152.052.

And what was the solution crafted by these good public servants sworn to uphold the Constitution? It was to require that any candidate, who in his campaign for a county office publicly advocated the abolition of that office, relinquish any pay he otherwise would have received for services in that office. [See Sidebar.] In other words, if, in campaigning, you ever quipped, remarked, exclaimed, mused, opined, wrote, said or otherwise communicated that the office might properly be abolished, then you, you smart aleck interloper, won’t get paid a dime for your work if you win the election. Even if the job has duties that by law must be performed. Even if, as in the case of a Constitutional office, it may take a year or more to set the stage for abolition.

That’ll teach ‘em to keep their mouths shut, won’t it?

When introducing this bill to the House Floor debate of March 1, 1989, Representative Robinson again based the need for the new law on the “fact” that candidates had run for office promising to abolish these offices only to change their mind when taking office. “The voters, she said, with a nearly straight face, “feel like they’ve been duped.”

Alas, the real “duping” had just begun.

House Bill 187 Suffers The Scrutiny Of The Five Minute Hearing

To support her legislation, Ms. Robinson brought a number of witnesses to the initial hearing on the bill; among them were Representative Henry Cuellar (D-Laredo), Adolph Thomae, Jr., County Commissioner of Cameron County and President of the Texas Association of Counties, and Vic Burgess, County Judge of Denton County.

House Bill 187

Again, the contention was that the abolitionists, once they had won office and begun receiving a salary, were conveniently losing interest in the abolition they had promised the voters. "Take the money and stay" had become an attractive alternative.

Supposedly.

Under questioning by Committee Chair Mark Stiles, however, Mr. Thomae, the primary supporting witness, let the cat out of the bag. Asked directly by Stiles how many instances we've had of "this problem," Mr. Thomae stated, "We've probably had a half a dozen Treasurers offices done away with."

"And people still receive the salaries?" the committee member asked.

"No, um," responded Mr. Thomae, "I don't know about that ... most of 'em, after they're termin...after they're terminated...they'll go ahead and run on that platform, they may draw a salary, but once it's voted on ...uh...and it becomes part of the con...like a constitutional amendment at a general election, then the office is abolished and you no longer have the office."

How's that again? Yeh, you got it: Thomae thought he was supposed to go before that committee and, of all things, tell the truth. Despite the claim of widespread lying to voters and renegeing on campaign promises, however, this primary witness acknowledged that candidates elected on abolition platforms had, in fact, *been carrying through with their stated intentions*.

In other words, the "problem" Ms. Robinson's legislation was designed to remedy did not exist; the entire rationale, in fact, was based on an utter falsehood.

In the end, neither Thomae nor any other witness could provide an example wherein a candidate advocating abolition had renegeed on his campaign promise.

This, unfortunately, did not register with any of the committee members.

Anybody Wanna Enforce This Turkey? Any Volunteers?

In a hearing of the Committee on County Affairs February 28, 1989, Ms. Robinson was asked by another Representative, a Ms. Greer, as to how this law would be enforced, strongly implying

that, for some reason, no county officer would want such authority. To this, Ms. Robinson answered that the Commissioner's Courts were to be informed they would have no authority in the matter. Under further questioning, she assured the committee that, indeed, no county officer would have authority to enforce this law; enforcement, it turns out, was to hinge solely on the candidate's voluntary compliance.

The Real Skinny

The enforcement question being laid to rest, Robinson was then asked whether the idea of the new provision was that "Candidates who might otherwise advocate abolition may not advocate abolition if they knew they might lose their money?"

"That's correct," replied Ms. Robinson, *inadvertently revealing the real intent of the proposed law*.

Then, as if to underscore the major concern of those College Station attendants, she explained that a candidate running on the platform of abolishing an office was a sure winner, and, somehow, unfairly so.

"They can't lose", she said. "They're going to get elected."

The Senate Steps Up and Strikes Out ,Too

In the Senate, House Bill 187 was sponsored by State Senator Judith Zaffirini. At the first hearing in the Committee of Intergovernmental Affairs, on March 21, 1989, Ms. Zaffirini's statement reiterated the claim that abolition candidates were, after being elected, failing to abolish the offices. Then, in a rather shrewd tactical move, Senator Zaffirini quickly changed to another point, wherein a county commissioner had pledged to contribute a part of his salary to the county. In that instance, it was found through an Attorney General's opinion that he could not do so because the county could not legally accept contributions. (In addition to adding the abolitionist provision HB187 included revisionary language to address this problem, not bad law, actually, but it served beautifully as a smoke screen for the less savory part of the Robinson/Zaffirini handiwork.)

Asked directly if there were any Constitutionality problems, Ms. Zaffirini said, "No, we have been working closely

with Legislative Council and the Attorney General and they have assured us there is no problem." When asked "what sanction is there for a person to file such an affidavit", her answer was "None. If there were, it might be un-Constitutional." This brought a round of chuckles from the senators in attendance.

Some joke. But we know from this exchange that (1) even the authors were aware that they were walking on the margins of the Constitution and (2) that they hoped to circumvent Constitutional objections by deliberately writing a law that provided no enforcement provisions.

In confirmation of this, a witness for the Texas Association of Counties also testified that the sponsors were aware there might be some problems with sanctions in the bill; but he said, the principle was good in making officers do as they say. (So good, might we infer, as to brush aside the constitutional questions raised?)

In the second Senate hearing of April 4, 1989, the witness finally came up with an officer who did not keep his campaign promise; however, the villain was this previously mentioned county commissioner who had promised to give back a portion of his salary to the county. Or was he a villain? Initially, they painted him with mud for not keeping his campaign promise, but then it was acknowledged that it was actually an opinion from the office of the Attorney General that kept him from keeping his promise. As noted above, it seems that prior to this instance it was illegal for a county officer to give part of his salary though he could give it all, but the county could not accept his contribution by law. So, also as noted above, the bill would rectify this problem by giving the officer a way to return any portion of his salary to the county, and allowing the county to accept it as a donation.

Still, no example of an abolition candidate renegeing on his campaign promises. And it might be noted that discussion of this case had no relevance whatsoever to the bill's provision to preemptively strip an abolitionist.

Except, welcome to the Texas Legislature.

James Madison

ting Patrick Henry to win enactment of Virginia's Statute of Religious Freedom, and gaining wide recognition as the ablest member of the Continental Congress by the age of 32.

"I believe there are more instances of the abridgement of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations," Madison told the Virginia ratifying Convention on June 16, 1788.

"The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny," he wrote earlier that same year in *The Federalist*, No. 47.

How diligently do Americans heed that advice, today? How many even remember who gave it?

Vin Suprynowicz is assistant editorial page editor of the *Las Vegas Review-Journal*. Subscribe to his monthly newsletter by sending \$72 to Privacy Alert, 1475 Terminal Way, Suite E for Easy, Reno, NV 89502. His book, *Send in the Waco Killers: Essays on the Freedom Movement, 1993-1998*, is available at 1-800-244-2224, or via web site WWW.THESPIRITOF76.COM/WACOKILLERS.HTML

News from National

* It could cost American autoworkers their jobs. In recent years, SUVs have accounted for about 19% of domestic vehicle sales, while trucks and vans account for another 22%. "Those are both markets where American-built vehicles dominate," noted Dasbach. "Any law that hurts the sale of popular light trucks or SUVs will put Ford, Chrysler, and General Motors employees out of work."

* It won't increase consumer choice. "There's already a vehicle that gets 27.5 miles per gallon," said Dasbach. "It's called a Toyota Corolla. Or a Dodge Neon. Or a Ford Escort. Americans who value fuel efficiency already have a multitude of choices, thanks to the free market, and no thanks to politicians."

If Feinstein and Snowe are convinced that consumers want more fuel-efficient, and therefore lighter and flimsier, trucks and SUVs, they should put their money where their mouths are, said Dasbach, and go into the auto-manufacturing business themselves. (4 May 2001)

Supreme Court on medical marijuana: AIDS and cancer patients can drop dead

The Supreme Court decision rejecting a "medical necessity" defense for medical marijuana users is a heartless assault on AIDS and cancer victims.

In an 8-0 ruling, the nation's high court approved a Justice Department injunction against a California cannabis cooperative which supplied medical marijuana to patients.

In the decision, the court rejected any medical necessity exemption to federal marijuana laws, ruling that "marijuana has no medical benefits worthy of an exception." Even if a state has legalized medical marijuana, the court ruled, the federal government can continue to prosecute people who violate federal marijuana laws.

The case, *U.S. vs. Oakland Cannabis Buyers' Cooperative*, arose from efforts by federal drug agents to shut down several clubs in northern California that provide the drug legally under Proposition 215, a state referendum that authorized medical marijuana in 1996.

The Supreme Court ruling means that the federal government "would rather let sick people die than make any exception to its War on Drugs," said Ron Crickenberger.

But despite the setback for the medical marijuana movement and patient's rights, there are still some reasons to be hopeful, said Crickenberger. Specifically:

* The Supreme Court decision only applies to federal law.

* The Supreme Court is out of step with public opinion.

* There is already legislation to overturn the Supreme Court decision. The bill, HR 1344 (*The States' Right to Medical Marijuana Act*) was filed by U.S. Rep. Barney Frank (D-MA), and would change federal law to allow doctors to prescribe medical marijuana if the state allows it, without the threat of federal prosecution. The bill would also reclassify marijuana as a Schedule II drug under federal law, which would formally acknowledge the drug's potential "medical utility."

So, while the Supreme Court decision was a setback, it doesn't necessarily mean the end of hope for sick people, said Crickenberger. (15 May 2001)

Tea Party, Anyone?

Reprinted from *THE FEDERALIST(r) DIGEST*, The Conservative e-Journal of Record, 04 May 2001, Federalist #01-18.dgst

"A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover that they can vote themselves largesse from the public treasury. From that moment on, the majority always votes for the candidates promising the most benefits from the public treasury with the result that a democracy always collapses over loose fiscal policy, followed always by a dictatorship. The average age of the world's greatest civilizations has been 200 years." Alexander Fraser Tytler

On "May Day," that day each year when Sociocrats around the world celebrate the suppression of individual, economic and political liberty, the U.S. Senate and House reached agreement on how to whittle President Bush's miniscule 5.7% tax cut over ten years down to a 3.5% tax cut over 11 years, and the "details" have yet to be worked out.

The projected surplus (taxes collected in excess of revenues allocated) over the next ten years is estimated to be \$5.6 trillion. Mr. Bush's original proposal of a \$1.6 trillion tax cut amounts to less than 29% of that projected surplus, only 5.7 percent of the estimated total \$27.9 trillion in tax revenues to be collected, too much for Senate.

According to the economic analysts at the Heritage Foundation, "The Bush tax cut, measured as a percent of GDP, is only about one-fourth as large as the Reagan tax cut and only about one-half as large as the Kennedy tax cut," both of which "triggered record periods of economic growth." To achieve similar results, the analysts estimate "the Bush tax cut should be...almost twice as large as [originally] proposed."

Unfortunately, the unfettered temptation to spend has already absorbed almost 80% of the projected surplus. Whether the micro-measure compromise of a 3.5% tax break will be enough to breathe any life back into a failing economy is doubtful.

Suffice it to say, the Left will play their class warfare ace and do everything they can to make sure their least favored citizens are bearing the greatest tax burden, thus avoiding the accountability that would follow if the tax burden were more equitably spread among all citizens. Under the current "progressive" tax

April Fools

The irony is, of course, despite the misguided and/or misdirected symbolic assault on the Murrah Fortress, that the official bloodletting ceremony is in retaliation for a retaliation of previous atrocities committed by guvvie officials themselves.

Make no mistake. The guvvies are players. The live-by-the-sword, die-by-the-sword types that are seemingly historically and inexorably inseparable from any evolving human society.

McVeigh became a player and not even when he bombed the feds and their kids, but way back when he first signed on with the guvvie's imperial armed forces.

The root of the evil, citizens, is the government. I know of no family Joe's or Jane's, or even of any maniacal lone wolves, that purposefully plot and commit martial political acts to raze and destroy city blocks, city-states, and whole nations, including women and children, do you?

The sad reality in America is that when atrocious acts against guvvies are resorted to by oppressed people in the face of guvvie usurpations, the whole damned country is no longer functioning under its own rules of law, specifically, the part about 'deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed.'

The real April Fools, I'm afraid, are not the guvvies or even the McVeigh's who lash out against them. They are merely the soldiers on the worldly stage of the great human passion play, fated players acting out the basest murderous impulses of political behaviour that man can muster against man. These fools are out there doing it! Death and destruction, murder and mayhem, for real! Players!

I fear it is we who are the real fools. We, the mundane and pedestrian everymen, who, weary from our well-intentioned servitude, behold the unceasing carnage in the name of America on our media screens with a mere blind indifference or a loathing silence.

Maybe I'm wrong (again), but I think you have to make a choice, then you get your fate.

Do we, the governed, give our consent to guvvies who claim a slavish and merciless imperial state is duly functioning within justly derived powers?

Do we, the governed, consent to a committee in a shining mythical city of monuments, senates, and courts to take possession of half of our life's work and keep it for themselves and their wards?

Do we, the governed, consent to a regime

which pampers murderers, thieves, and rapists while seeking to criminalize those holding disapproved personal moralities and exercising freedom of thought and expression, including dissent of official policy and conduct?

Critics and philosophers who point out government malfeasance are quickly branded by a reactionary corporate state as 'oversimplifiers' who cannot grasp the underlying 'complexities' of modern world politics. The fact is that any peace loving, law abiding person can see that when the streets are constantly running red with blood, there is a *de facto* mismanagement of deadly force occurring, no matter what the official spin is over at the so-called "Department of Defense."

Do we, the governed, want to answer the hard questions we must inevitably ask ourselves?

It may be a good time to start. If we don't soon, the next thing you know, they'll be officially changing April Fools Day to the 15th.

Continued from page 12

Tea Party, Anyone?

rates, 25% of income earners pay 83% of the tax burden, effectively protecting the tax and spend Republicrats from a majority tax revolt. Implementing Rep. Dick Armey's flat income tax proposal, or a national sales tax collected by the states, would spread the burden of the total cost of government over a greater number of people, putting great pressure on the "tax and spenders" to stop it!

Elimination of the current tax code would also limit the Sociocrats' ability to use tax law as a sledge hammer to "shape" the economy and redistribute income to their favored constituents. Mortimer Caplin, a former IRS commissioner under Democrats Kennedy and Johnson, notes "Our tax laws are riddled with an array of targeted tax preferences and so-called incentives, grievously complicating tax compliance, eroding our tax base and thus necessitating increased tax rates to meet revenue demands. The federal tax code is replete with special deductions and credits, exemptions and exclusions, deferrals and other preferred treatment for particular industries, groups or interests."

The most promising legislative glimmer of hope on the tax reform horizon (applying our "don't wound it, kill it!" principle) is HJR 45, a measure introduced in late April by Rep. Ron Paul (one of the few members of Congress who still attend to the letter of our Constitution). HJR 45 is a measure to repeal the 16th Amendment, which, upon its ratification

in 1913, allowed the federal government to do what the Supreme Court had always ruled unconstitutional: levy a direct income tax on individuals.

"The income tax has...enabled government to expand far beyond its proper limits, invade our privacy, and penalize our every endeavor," notes Mr. Paul. "The Founding Fathers never intended an income tax, and they certainly would be dismayed to know that Americans today give more than a third of their income to the federal government."

The central government's ability to impose direct income taxation is the single greatest threat to liberty, and as our liberties are progressively diminished by "progressive" taxation and the ever more powerful government it funds, we are reminded of Nikita Khrushchev's observation, "We can't expect the American People to jump from Capitalism to Communism, but we can assist their elected leaders in giving them small doses of Socialism, until they awaken one day to find that they have Communism."

Our patriot Founders cast off their government after its imposition of a tea tax exceeded the limits of their endurance. Today, however, virtually every purchase or transaction imaginable is taxed, in addition to the selective direct taxation imposed by the central government. We have, indeed, become a subservient and compliant people. But tax protest is no longer so easy as dumping crates into Boston Harbor.

The most logical way to protest income taxes is to stop paying them, but the central government has removed that option by making sure most Americans' income taxes are withheld, effectively keeping that portion of citizens' income claimed by the government from ever reaching their pockets. Withholding also lulls taxpayers into indifference because they never actually have to pay taxes, just wait for their refund from the previous year's withheld income as if it is some kind of bonus.

(Of note, Rep. Ron Paul has also introduced H.R.1364 "to restore to taxpayers awareness of the true cost of government by eliminating the withholding of income taxes by employers and requiring individuals to pay income taxes in monthly installments.")

But alas, as noted by Lord Tytler above, the fix is in. The redistribution of wealth in the form of politically directed government largess will continue unabated until the collection of taxes is democratized and "neutralized," spread equitably among all citizens. And, in reality, nothing short of disposing of the current tax code, or disposing of the current government, will achieve that end.

Comal County Election Report Analysis

C 40 for your opponent. Spend NO effort on this group.

You have two weeks before early voting to concentrate on the E List. Then, just before early voting starts, call all 180 again and ask, "Whom do you plan to vote for?" and adjust A, B, C ratings accordingly. You have the first week of early voting to concentrate on E list. And the second week of early voting to concentrate on R list.

As for radio and newspaper ads, you may not need to do any. If your local newspaper endorses candidates, and the race is close, you will need to bribe them with a large ad placed at just the right time, just before the editorial board interviews you. You may want to lessen the impact of your opponents' signs by putting a few by his signs and have a radio ad or two if he has many. But do not over do it. With the List strategy it is to your advantage if your opponent thinks he is out advertising you.

Continued from page 11

House Bill 187

As we have seen (although there is strong circumstantial evidence to suggest otherwise), it was argued by the sponsors of this statute, that the law is merely a "Truth in Campaigning" measure designed to enforce the campaign promises of wily politicians who say they'll abolish an office and then change their minds once elected.

Sounds like a good and reasonable goal.

But, no matter how noble the purported cause behind a piece of legislation notice should be taken of its accord with Constitutional principles. Under our system, means, supposedly, are not justified by ends, and however few they may have been, opponents of this bill in 1989 were correct to say, as reported by the House Research Organization, that:

[...] This bill proposes a heavy-handed infringement on the free-speech rights of candidates in a futile attempt to force office holders to carry out their campaign promises once elected. Proposing a monetary penalty in advance, for an alleged failure to live up to a cam-

paign statement *would raise serious constitutional questions about abridging freedom of speech and curtailing the free exchange of ideas during a political campaign.* The next step will be to enact laws penalizing all office holders for any alleged failure to keep any campaign promise.

There's little doubt that the scope of free speech protections under the First Amendment has expanded enormously over the past century, even so far as to cover speech and other "expression," such as pornography, exotic dancing and the burning of flags. However one may feel about these particular liberties (and, as a Libertarian, I am all in favor of them), Robert Bork is probably right about them: The notion of their being unalienable rights was never contemplated by the authors of our Bill of Rights.

The core protection of the First Amendment, however, has, from the beginning, extended to shield *political expression* from retaliatory action by government. That, after all, is its real reason for being: To allow for the *free exchange of ideas*. Without it, the notion of free, but peaceful agitation for change is a joke. In a *free society* the citizen must have a right *to advocate* for political change without being subject to (1) preemptive law that outright bans expression through active censorship, or (2) government actions that, after the fact, impose consequences for the exercise of free speech. The latter, in effect, chills a citizen's interest in that exercise acting on it. This is long-settled judicial doctrine.

It is in this context that HB 187 defines itself as unconstitutional; the very presence of the words "publicly advocated" is a flag that ought to raise the eyebrows of anyone remotely devoted to the principles of the First Amendment. To connect a consequence like denial of pay with what a person has said, in the open language of the law, makes it a brazen violation.

Sadly, if you approach the average person on the street with this statute he will very likely think this appropriate law. After all, you're just making the person do what he said he would do, aren't you? Some (even some libertarians who in their zeal to "stick-it-to-a-politician"

may not see past that immediate gratification to the long-term, precedential aspects of this) insist on viewing it from this contractual, "compact-with-the-voter" perspective. To them, I say, sit down with the language of the law, a dictionary and an open mind, and note: "To advocate" (v.t., *to plead in favor of, support or urge by argument, recommend publicly*) is no synonym for "to promise" (v.t., *to declare that something will or will not be done*). In short, there is no contract to perform implied by what one advocates.

Of course, there is a conspicuous absence here of any interest in applying the "truth-in-campaigning" principle to offices beyond those of minor league incumbents *whose positions were being threatened*. The law applies to no governors, lieutenant governors, comptrollers, secretaries of state or attorneys general who promise to produce, but don't.

Neither does it apply to the legislator who promises to produce, but doesn't. If it did, an analogous application to legislators might be to *proportionately to reduce their pay by the amount of tax increases they impose upon the citizenry while having campaigned against tax increases, or vice versa*. (Insofar as I am aware, no one has ever been denied remuneration for serving in office for publicly *advocating* the raising of taxes or *advocating* the lowering of them and then failing to uphold their promises.) No "Truth in Campaigning" measure, we may be sure, will ever take effect with such broad coverage. But, again, this begs the question of whether House Bill 187 was really a "Truth in Campaigning" law or whether it was, in fact, an "Incumbents Protection Act."

I would note that the bill passed the House with all but two voting for it. None voted against it, and it passed the Senate by acclaim. It troubles me that there was no voice to speak of Constitutional protections of speech and equal protection under the law, both of which this law denies. Tyranny won that day. A small tyranny, perhaps, but a tyranny, nonetheless.

I keep wondering what happened to those opponents.

Speaker “Windfall” at LPT State Conference

idea whose time has come. (check out CARLAHOWELL.ORG)

We are also honored to have with us one of the most dynamic personalities known to libertarians, *Advocates for Self-Government* founder **Marshal Fritz**. After getting that organization well established and turning over the reigns to Sharon Harris, he founded the *Separation of School and State Alliance*, which promotes the virtues of private schooling over government systems. Marshal can speak plenty all by himself and we are hoping to also arrange for a forum with him and some statist-types who favor publicly funded “education”. This event will be free and open to the public. (check out SELF-GOV.ORG and SEPSCHOOL.ORG)

Libertarian impresario Michael Cloud has been “front-man” and fundraiser for two Harry Browne campaigns. He is also well-known for his *Art of Political Persuasion* audio tape series, and his talk on why Libertarians should be “unreasonable” for it is always the unreasonable person who makes advances in society, not the go-along-er. He will deliver a sort of Keynote address and we’ll get him to do some other

entertaining things for us as well.

Executive Director **Dr. Al Robison** and President **Jerry Epstein** of DPFT (Drug Policy Forum of Texas) will talk to us about all sorts of things related to the horrible War on Drugs and how it has affected Texans. (check out DPFT.ORG)

Our U.S. Senatorial candidate **Dr. Mary Ruwart** (a member of the SPT) will update us on the revision of her book, *Healing Our World*, which covers a lot of ground! She has been one of the premier libertarian speakers to address the concerns of the left. (check out WWW.RUWART.COM)

1988 LP presidential candidate and again Congressman (Dr.) **Ron Paul** has promised to make an appearance. (check out RONPAUL.ORG) We will also have some great presentations by 2000 candidate for U.S. Congress district 8 **Gil Guillory** (GUILLORY.ORG), and Abilene’s own **Dr. Debra Monde**, who also ran an active campaign for the State House. And there will be many more, too.

The weekend will start off again with a wonderful Friday evening Reception sponsored by Texas CSE (Citizens for a Sound Economy) Field Director **Carol Jones**. This will include some great hors d’oeuvres and a cash bar.

A full package for everything is only \$115 and includes the Friday reception,

two breakfasts, one lunch and the Saturday Banquet, plus all those great speakers! It’s a great price for such a jam-packed weekend of Libertarian Luminaries! Send in the registration form today that’s in your brochure. Contact me if you need another one or if you’d like some extras to distribute, or with any other questions. E-mail me (address above) or call (512) 263-1681. (also, check out WWW.TX.LP.ORG)

And call the Hyatt right away to reserve your room at our super low price of only \$69/night. Their numbers are (281) 987-1234 or (800) 233-1234. Be sure to tell them you are with the “Libertarian Party of Texas” to get our special rate. They will not guarantee rooms for us beyond June 29. Also, if you reserve your package and/or your hotel room by June 22, you will have a chance to sit with one of our “VIP’s” at the Banquet.

Don’t delay. Do It Now, and we’ll see you in Houston in July!

Rabbleroising 101

The federal government taxes us and doles out the money, in part, to our school district. The state government taxes us and doles out the money, in part, to our school district. Why do we have to pay local school taxes?

The Morality of the Welfare State

Unfortunately, Bush and his critics on both the right and the left are missing a much more fundamental question: Why should government even have the power to take money from one person in order to give it to another?

George Washington is reputed to have said, "Government is not reason. It is not eloquence. It is force." By its very nature, government consists of laws and regulations that either mandate conduct or prohibit it. The rules are not advisory. They are compulsory, and they are enforced by the state's monopoly on the use of force in society.

If a citizen intentionally breaks a law or regulation, he must submit to the state's judgment or pay the consequences for resistance, because behind the state's judgment are armed law-enforcement officers, fines, and penitentiaries.

We regularly witness the state's use of force with respect to the enforcement of laws against violent crimes, such as murder, rape, and theft, and most of us favor the state's use of force in those cases. But the state also initiates force when people violate laws and regulations that govern peaceful behavior.

How does all this pertain to President Bush's plan to give federal aid to religious organizations? If the nature of government is organized force, then the collection and distribution of monies that are ultimately paid to religious organizations is itself based on force. Such being the case, how can force be reconciled with principles of morality and compassion?

Consider for example the U.S. federal income tax, which came into existence in 1916. Despite periodic IRS claims to the contrary, the payment of income taxes is

not voluntary. That is, the government does not give people a choice of paying their income taxes or not. Every citizen is required by law to file an annual report of his income and render payment for the taxes due.

What happens if a citizen refuses? Once the IRS targets him, the process of collection will begin with polite requests, but if the resistance continues, the state will ultimately resort to force. For example, the IRS will file a lien on the person's property and then ask a court to foreclose the lien. Once the foreclosure sale is completed, the court will issue an order commanding the tax resister to surrender possession of the property to the new owner. The order will be enforced by armed law-enforcement officers.

In fact, this is exactly what happened to a church in Indiana. Church officials stopped withholding federal income taxes and Social Security taxes from employees' salaries in 1984. The IRS filed a lien for \$3.6 million against the church property and secured a judicial foreclosure of it. Recently, at the point of armed force, church officials were compelled to surrender possession of the property.

I wonder whether any of the money that the IRS collected in the foreclosure sale of that church will be going to faith-based organizations.

So, who's the moral and compassionate person in all this? The taxpayer? The IRS agent? President Bush? Congress? The welfare official?

The answer is: None of the above. Because in the arena of peaceful behavior, morality and compassion mean nothing when they are the product of force. They are meaningful only in the context of vol-

untary, willing choices of individuals.

Equally important, it's only in a climate of individual freedom, not coercion, in the area of peaceful choices, that morality and compassion tend to rise in a society. When government forces people to help their neighbors, conscience atrophies. When people are free to choose whether to help their neighbors or not, conscience is strengthened.

Thus, if people care about morality and compassion, they should not only be opposing Bush's plan to distribute government aid to faith-based organizations. They should also be questioning government aid to anyone.

Mr. Hornberger is founder and president of The Future of Freedom Foundation (WWW.FFF.ORG) in Fairfax, Va., which published *Your Money or Your Life Why We Must Abolish the Income Tax* by Sheldon Richman.

News Releases by Candidates

Posted on LPTexas by Robert West,
WESTR@MASCORP.COM

Most small towns have the listing of new city laws in the classified section. If anyone, anywhere wants to build a relationship with their local paper, attend the council meetings and write a letter to the editor or even an article from the "Libertarian View." With small town papers, as long as you do not asked to be paid, it can become a regular feature of the paper. Including contact information for the people you "interview" is pretty standard and it might be an effective recruiting tool. Any LP press releases could of course, get special attention.

Around the State

On-line and Wired

Web Pages

State Web Page WWW.TX.LP.ORG
 County Chairs WWW.TX.LP.ORG/COUNTY_CHAIRS.HTM
 County Chair duties WWW.TX.LP.ORG/COUNTY_CHAIR.DUTIES.HTM

Press Releases
WWW.TX.LP.ORG/DATABASE_RO/PRS/INDEX.HTML

Bell County WWW.LPTXAS.ORG/BELL
 Bexar County WWW.TX.LP.ORG/BEXAR
 Brazos County WWW.BRAZOSLP.ORG
 Aggie Libertarians at Texas A&M

LIBERTARIANS.TAMU.EDU/
 Collin County WWW.TX.LP.ORG/COLLIN/INDEX.HTML
 Dallas County HTTP://LPDALLAS.ORG
 Denton County WWW.TX.LP.ORG/DENTONINDEX.HTML
 El Paso County WWW.TX.LP.ORG/ELPASO/INDEX.HTML

Harris County WWW.TX.LP.ORG/HARRIS
 Montgomery County HTTP://LPMC.MAIN.COM/
 Nacogdoches County
WWW.TX.LP.ORG/NACOGDOCHES/INDEX.HTML

Tom Green County HTTP://TGCLP.TRIPOD.COM
 Travis County
WWW.AUSTINLIBERTY.ORG/TCLP/INDEX.HTML
 or WWW.LPNN.COM

Forums

LP Texas: Email MAJORDOMO@IO.COM with "subscribe lptexas" in the body.

ChristLib: Send an email to MAJORDOMO@SWCP.COM with "subscribe christlib" in the body.

Other Sites of Interest

Incumbent voting records
HTTP://SCORECARD.TAXPAYER.NET/STATE.CFM

Texas Election Code
CAPITOL.TLC.STATE.US/STATUES.-ELTOC.HTM

District Boundaries
WWW.CAPITOL.STATE.TX.US/REDV/REDVIEW.HTM

Political Contributions returned by zip code
POLITICALJUNKIE.COM/MAIN.INDEX.HTM

Federal Election Commission WWW.FEC.GOV
 The Separation of School and State Alliance
WWW.SEPSCHOOL.ORG

Bill of Attainder Project
WWW.ISC-DURANT.COM/TOM/BILLOFTTAINDER/

League of Women Voters DNET.ORG

Congress

Phil Gramm PHIL_GRAMM@GRAMM.SENATE.GOV
 Kay Bailey Hutchison SENATOR@HUTCHISON.SENATE.GOV

Important Dates to Remember

3 Mar 2001 SLEC Meeting, Austin

State Officers

Chair:
 Geoff Neale (512) 263-1681 home
 12903 Grubstake Gulch (512) 290-0743 work
 Austin, TX 78738 LIBER8OR@TEXAS.NET

Vice Chair:
 Clyde Garland (979) 779-1775
 3100 Rolling Glen CLYDEGARLA@AOL.COM
 Bryan, TX 77807-3209

Secretary:
 Stephanie Berlin (979) 847-8340 home
 PO Box 4908 (210) 387-9926 CELL
 College Station, TX 77844-4908

AGGIELIBERTARIAN@HOTMAIL.COM

Treasurer:
 Bob Lockhart (713) 473-6284 home
 PO Box 1398 (713) 475-0092 business
 Pasadena, TX 77501-1398 BOBLOCK@FLASH.NET

Standing Committees

Campaigns and Elections:
 George Schwappach (915) 691-1776 home
 8313 Saddle Creek Rd. (915) 698-3405 work
 Abilene, TX 79602-5454 (915) 691-1943 fax
GEORGES@SWCONNECT.NET

Database:
 Richard Walker (409) 866-2100
 840 Lockwood Dr. WALKERRE@SWBELL.NET
 Beaumont, TX 77706-5546

Finance:
 Lance Smith (713) 869-1228 home
 1010 Euclid (713) 880-1125 work
 Houston, TX 77009 DOMESTIC@INSYNC.NET

Organizing and Outreach:
 Christopher Jagge (979) 695-9646
 PO Box 8064 C_JAGGE@EMAIL.MSN.COM
 College Station, TX 77844-8064

Publications:
 Barbara Cunningham (979) 567-7262
 301 Porter (979) 567-3313 fax
 Caldwell, TX 77836-1825 CHARLESB@TCA.NET

Publicity and Advertising:
 Nancy Neale (512) 263-1681
 12903 Grubstake Gulch TORCHESS@TEXAS.NET
 Austin, TX 78738

SLEC Representatives

District 3:
 Joe Allport (936) 569-8832 home
 PO Box 632873 ALLPROPATRIA@HOTMAIL.COM
 Nacogdoches, TX 75963-2873

Kris Overstreet (409) 685-4992 home
 Route 14, Box 5560 (409) 685-2028 work
 Livingston, TX, 77351 REDNECK@DETNET.COM

District 4:
 Richard E. (Dick) Walker 409-866-2100
 840 Lockwood WALKERRE@SWBELL.NET
 Beaumont, TX 77706

District 5:
 Barbara Cunningham 979-567-7262
 301 S. Porter St. 979-567-3313 fax
 Caldwell TX 77836-1825 CHARLESB@TCA.NET

Christopher Jagge 979-695-9646 home
 1601 Brentwood 979-845-9755 work
 PO Box 8064 C_JAGGE@EMAIL.MSN.COM
 College Station, TX 77844-8064

District 6:
 Lance Smith 713-880-1125 home
 1010 Euclid DOMESTIC@INSYNC.NET
 Houston, TX 77009

District 8:
 Gordon Mobley 972-527-0914 home
 1402 Cherokee Trail 972-478-3407 work
 Plano, TX 75023 MOBLEY1@AIRMAIL.NET

Kelly Rush 214-902-9669
 3767 Forest Lane #124-1277
 Dallas, TX 75244 RUSHK@MAIL.COM

District 10:
 John Doebler 817-801-1207 home
 875 E. Lamar Blvd. AMONSTERTRUCKER@YAHOO.COM

Arlington, TX 76011
District 11:
 Bob Smither 281-331-2548 home
 2600 Ware Dairy Road 281-331-2744 work
 Friendswood, TX 77546 281-331-4616 fax
 281-685-5658 cell BOB@SMITHER.NET

District 13:
 Peter Elloway 713-529-5208 home
 PO Box 685
 1245 W. Pierce (77019)
 Houston, TX 77001-0685

John Kormylo 713-271-1776
 9614 Oregano Circle ELFSOFT@MINDSPRING.COM
 Houston, TX 77036

District 14:
 Nancy Neale 512-263-1684 home
 12903 Grubstake Gulch 512-263-1684 fax
 Austin, TX 78738 512-294-4927 cell
TORCHESS@TX.NET

Marianne Robbins 512-989-0288 home
 900 Broken Feather Trail #373 512-719-7259 work
 Pflugerville, TX 78660
MARIANNESWEB@WEBTV.NET (text only)
MARIANNER@AUSTINSEMICONDUCTOR.COM (for attachments)

District 16:
 Kendall Beerwinkle 214-341-2842 home
 12032 Midlake MAXBRECHT@TEXOMA.NET
 Dallas, TX 75218

Marshall Beerwinkle 214-341-2842 home
 12032 Midlake MAXBRECHT@TEXOMA.NET
 Dallas, TX 75218

District 17:
 Paul Morris 713-280-8660 home
 2130 Gemini St. PJMORRIS@PDQ.NET
 Houston, TX 77058-2048

Bill Myers 713-978-7369 home
 1615 Bering Dr. #1507
 Houston, TX 77057

District 19:
 Cathy Harrell 830-683-5237 home
 Route 1, Box 76B JHARR@RICC.NET
 Mountain Home, TX 78058

James (Jim) E. Harrell 830-683-5237 home
 Route 1, Box 76B JHARR@RICC.NET
 Mountain Home, TX 78058

District 20:
 Robert Powell 361-850-9601 home
 4622 Grand Lake Dr. REP@CIRIS.NET
 Corpus Christi, TX 78413

District 21:
 Tom Kane 830-216-4664
 912 4th Street FREEDOM2@FLASH.NET
 Floresville, TX 78114-1802

District 24:
 Steve Kirby 915-676-9026 home
 850 Ross Kirby4Liberty@aol.com
 Abilene, TX 79605-3237

Libertarian4sure@aol.com
 George Schwappach 915-691-1776 home
 8318 Saddle Creek Rd. 915-691-1776 work
 Abilene, TX 79602-5424 915-691-1943 fax
GEORGES@SWCONNECT.NET

District 25:
 Ray Jagge 830-931-2018 home
 PO Box 582 RIJAGGE@hotmail.com

Around the State

Castroville, TX 78009

Patricia Wedel 512-267-1843 home
18008 Easy Way CATW_L1@SPRYNET.COM
Jonestown, TX 78645

District 27:

Mark Ciocheti 956-423-2522
609 East Filmore CIOCH@AOL.COM
Harlingen, TX 78550

John P. (Jack) McNally 956-423-7345 home
1205 East Polk Ave. 888-899-5095 work
Harlingen, TX 78550 JACKMC@LIBERTYSHOPPE.COM

District 28:

Robert K. Restivo 915-465-4422 home
7517 Billo Dr. RESTIVOLAW@NETZERO.COM
Grape Creek, TX 76901

John Turnboro, MD 806-745-3701 home
3315 81st St., Ste A 806-793-6200 work
Lubbock, TX 79423 806-793-6319 fax
JMTURNBOW@POL.NET

County Activities

Aransas County:

Walt Hartlove (361) 727-0802
1919 Hwy 35 N, PMB 326 ARANSAS@SWBELL.NET
Rockport, TX 78382-3344

Atascosa County:

Edward Elmer (830) 569-6006 night
1240 W Oaklawn RD, #101 EBEMDPA@FLASH.NET
Pleasanton, TX 78064-4302

Bell County:

Penny Hendrix (254) 70-9582
277 Woodland Point Rd.
Belton, TX 76513-9749
DIGITALCULTURE@EARTHLINK.NET

Bexar County:

David Alter (210) 637-0989
PO Box 39241 DAVYDOODLE_@HOTMAIL.COM
San Antonio, TX 78218-1241 WWW.TX.LP.ORG/BEXAR
Jeffrey C. Blunt (vice chair) (210) 696-8756
JCBLUNT@JUNO.COM
Meeting: 3rd Tuesday, 7:00 PM, Unlimited Thought
Bookstore, 5525 Blanco, Ste 107

Brazoria County:

Royce Mitchell Jr. RMITCHEL@FLASH.NET
10231 Hanselman Rd.
Manvel, TX 77578
Information: GHARPER@COMPUTRON.NET
Meeting: 2nd Tuesday, 7:00 PM, Golden Corral, Hwy
388 Business, Angleton, TX

Brazos County:

Christopher Jagge (979) 695-9646
PO Box 8064 C_JAGGE@EMAIL.MSN.COM
College Station, TX 77844-8064
PAGES.TCA.NET/JVANBEEK/BCLP.HTM

Brewster County:

Leo "Doc" Ofenstein (915) 837-5186 day
601 N 7th St. (915) 837-1192 night
Alpine, TX 79830-3515 LEO@SCRCORP.COM

Burleson County:

Barbara Cunningham (979) 567-7262
301 S Porter St. (979) 567-3313 fax
Caldwell, TX 77836-1825 CHARLESB@TCA.NET

Burnet County:

Ben J. Jones (830) 798-9051 night
400 Parr Ave. CJONES@TSTAR.NET

Marble Falls, TX 78654

Cameron County:

Jack McNally (210) 423-6030 day
1205 E Polk St (956) 425-5064 night
Harlingen, TX 78550-7223 (210) 423-7345 fax
JACKMC@LIBERTYSHOPPE.COM (888) 899-5095
Meeting: Once a month in Harlingen. Call (956) 423-
7345 for the time and place.

Collin County:

Gordon E. Mobley (972) 527-0914
1402 Cherokee Trail MOBLEY1@AIRMAIL.NET
Plano, TX 75023
Hotline (972) 517-1789
party email: LPCCTX@YAHOO.COM
Meeting: 3rd Tuesday, Paesano's Restaurant; Party email
LPCCTX@YAHOO.COM

Cooke County:

Matthew Murrell (940) 665-7528
1302 Hillcrest Blvd.
Gainesville, TX 76240
MATTHEWMURRELL@HOTMAIL.COM

Crosby County:

Greg Fisher (806) 749-2010 Lubbock
HCR 1, Box 12 (806) 263-4522 home
Post, TX 79356 MEDAGGF@TTUHSC.EDU
or GFISHER@TTU.EDU
Meeting: Last Thursday, 7:00 PM; Llano Masked Rider
Room Texas Tech University Center, 15th Street and
Akron Ave., Lubbock, TX. *Campus Libertarians*, 1114
Ave. Q, Lubbock, TX 79401

Dallas County:

Bill Bunch
6231 McCommas wbbunch@yahoo.com
Dallas, TX 75214-3033
LPDALLAS.ORG INFO@LPDALLAS.ORG
Meeting: 2nd Thursday, Al's Pizzeria, 3701 W. North-
west Highway, Dallas, TX
Activities and changes are posted on the website.
Weekly public affairs program on the Dallas Commu-
nity Television: "America - Outside the Beltway"

Dawson County:

James D. Mitchell (806) 872-5092 day
PO Box 969 (806) 872-6017 night
Lamesa, TX 79331-0969 JAMESM@MAIL.PICS.NET

De Witt County:

Jeanie Blalock (361) 275-3275
611 MacArthur St.
Cuero, TX 77954-3128

Denton County:

James Gholston JAMESG@DIMENSIONALITY.COM
403 Bryan, #205
Denton, TX 76201

Erath County:

Tommy Richardson (254) 968-4636
307 N. Dale
Stephenville, TX 76401
Meeting: 2nd Tuesday

Fisher County:

Meetings: 2nd Monday, 7:30 PM, Farolito's Mexican
Restaurant, 209 Cotton Wood, Abilene, TX (concur-
rently with Taylor County)

Fort Bend County:

Kevin Foto (281) 277-5886 day
16338 Maple Downs Ln. (281) 879-2123 night
Sugar Land, TX 77478-7101 ALPINE@WT.NET

Galveston County:

Randall H. Waibel (281) 224-4098 day
1902 Dove Ct. (281) 996-0527 night

Friendswood, TX 77546-5884 PSAMO@NETZERO.NET

Gregg County:

Judy Dailey 903-297-4475
19 Rockwell MDAILEY@JUNO.COM
Longview, TX 75604

Hamilton County Contact:

Tony Lee Belding TLBELDING@HTCOMP.NET
PO Box 512
Hamilton, TX 76531-0512

Harris County:

Laura Coker-Garcia (713) 271-1776
9835 Sagedowne Ln. (281) 997-8141
Houston, TX 77089-3517
LIBERTY@NEOSOFTE.COM WWW.TX.LP.ORG/HARRIS
Meetings: Harris County LP Business Meeting, 1st
Thursday 9614 Oregon Circle, Houston, TX; San
Jacinto Supper Club, 3rd Thursday, 7:00 PM, Chan's
Restaurant, Fairmont Pkwy @ Burke, Pasadena, TX;
Second Thursday Supper Club, 2nd Thursday, 7:00 PM,
Pappas Bar-B-Q, 7007 Hwy 59 South, Houston, TX

Hays County:

Ron Neal (512) 295-6817
312 Windy Hollow Lane
Kyle, TX 78640-9271

Hidalgo County:

Dr. Donald L. Hall (956) 686-6616 home
112 West Lex Ave. BHALL10113@AOL.COM
McAllen, TX 78504

Hopkins County:

Warren (Hank) Vine (903) 866-3813
Route 1, Box 262 4-PINES@1STARNET.COM
Sulphur Springs, TX 75482
Information: HOPCO-LP@1STARNET.COM

Houston County:

James M. Lassiter (409) 636-2427 night
PO Box 445 LASSITER@LCC.NET
Lovelady, TX 75851-0445

Hunt County:

Donald Lee Holloway (903) 356-4350 night
PO Box 1382
Quinlan, TX 75474-1382

Hutchinson County:

Cliff Collard (806) 274-2781 day
PO Box 626 (806) 273-6345 night
Borger, TX 79008-0626 CCOLL79007@AOL.COM

Jefferson County:

Virginia G. Walker (409) 866-2100
840 Lockwood Dr. WALKERRE@SWBELL.NET
Beaumont, TX 77706-5546
Meeting: 2nd Tuesday, 6:30 PM, Shoney's Restaurant,
3825 College Street, Beaumont, TX

Jones County:

Lila Roberts (915) 672-7951
40 Poverty Point Circle
Abilene, TX 79601-8427
Meetings: 2nd Monday, 7:30 PM, Farolito's Mexican
Restaurant, 209 Cotton Wood, Abilene, TX (concur-
rently with Taylor County)

Kendall County:

Lawrence Ciano (210) 816-2140 night
108 Ranger Ave.
Boerne, TX 78006-8916

Kerr County:

Kelly Scott (830) 367-5021 home
PO Box 291803 (830) 896-6464 work
Kerrville, TX 78029-1803 ELPATRON@MAVERICKBBS.COM

Kleberg County:

Frank Mullen (512) 595-7727 night
525 E. Huisache Ave. MULLENA@INTCOMM.NET
Kingsville, TX 78363-5644

Around the State

Liberty County:

Charles Wiggins 409-336-6956
P. O. Box 3070 CLETUS80@SWBELL.NET
Liberty, TX 77575

Lubbock County:

David DeLamar (806) 766-7288 voice
PO Box 98131 (806) 766-7288 fax
Lubbock, TX 79499-813 (806) 795-6901 day
THINK@DOOR.NET

Meeting: Last Tuesday every month, Texas Tech University Center, 7 PM.

Madison County:

Lili Lyddon (936) 399-5000
18696 Hwy 21 W LILI@TXYCYBER.COM
North Zulch, TX 77872-7056

McLennan County:

Vince Hanke (254) 776-1695, ext. 15
PO Box 20667 (254) 751-1163 night
Waco, TX 76702-0667 VINCEBOOM@AOL.COM

Medina County:

Jean Kutzer 830-931-3871
209 South County Road 5603
Castroville, TX 78009

Milam County: Contact

Casey Stanislav (254) 605-0380 work
PO Box 793 (254) 602-2060 mobile
Cameron, TX 76520-0793
CSTANISLAV@EARTHLINK.NET

Montgomery County:

Scott Gordon (713) 767-8416 day
15 Raintree Pl. (281) 367-1283 night
The Woodlands, TX 77381-5152
SGORDON@MAIN.COM
WWW.MAIN.COM/~MRBEAR/LIBERTAR.HTM

Motley County:

Warner Sailsbury 806-348-7275
P. O. Box 58 SCRUBBIT@CAPROCK-SPUR.COM
Roaring Springs, TX, 79256

Nacogdoches County:

Joe Allport (936) 569-8832 night
PO Box 632873 ALLPROPATRIA@HOTMAIL.COM
Nacogdoches, TX 75963-2873
WWW.TX.IP.ORG/NACOGDOCHES/INDEX.HTML

Meeting: 2nd Wednesday, 7:00 PM, Dr. Brad Wilson's office, University Drive

Navarro County:

Tommy Hart (903) 874-1387 home
1060 Oak Valley Lane (903) 872-4849 work
Corsicana, TX 75110 BREHART1@AIRMAIL.NET

Nolan County:

Meets concurrently with Taylor County, Contact George Schwappach for information, GEORGES@SWCONNECT.NET, Meetings: 2nd Monday, 7:30 PM, Farolito's Mexican Restaurant, 209 Cotton Wood, Abilene, TX (concurrently with Taylor County)

Nueces County:

Robert Powell (361) 850-9601 night
4622 Grand Lake Dr. REP@CIRRIIS.NET
Corpus Christi, TX 78413-5246
Meeting: Thursday, 5:30 PM, Town and Country Restaurant, Alameda/Everhart intersection

Orange County:

David Constant (409) 822-0349
2913 Fairway Dr. CONSTANT@IJNTB.NET
Orange, TX 77630

Palo Pinto County:

Lance Bailey (940) 325-8221 x 111 day

221 Country Club Parkway (940) 325-6079 night
Mineral Wells, TX 76067-8309
BAILEY@SEAMUX.COM

Meeting: 1st Tuesday

Parker County: Contact:

Raymond Ford (640) 682-2006
315 Howard Rd.
Weatherford, TX 76088 FORD5@AIRMAIL.NET

Parmer County: Contact:

Helen Precure (806) 965-2981
RR 1, Box 560
Muleshoe, TX 77347-9633

Polk County:

Kris Overstreet (409) 685-2028 office,
Rt. 14, Box 5560 (409) 685-4992 home
Livingston, TX 77351 REDNECK@DETNET.COM

Randall County:

David K. Kelley (806) 355-1934 night
4404 Summit Cir.
Amarillo, TX 79109-5322

Meeting: Sunday 8:00 PM, irregular schedule. Call for information

Real County:

Letha L. Dulaney LETHA@HCTC.NET
PO Box 221 (Live Oak Street)
Leakey, TX 78873

Robertson County:

J. R. Prestidge (409) 828-3398
PO Box 40 THEHAVEN@TXYCYBER.COM
Wheelock, TX 77882-0040

Rockwall County:

Chuck Hampton (972) 412-4020
6806 Chimneywood Circle YOU CRAZY KIDS@AOL.COM
Rowlett, TX 75089

Rusk County:

Donna Howeth 903-898-2383
8051 County Road 3125 DEHOWETH@TYLER.NET
Henderson, TX 75654

Sabine County:

John F. Ivy (409) 579-2034 night
HC 52 Box 553 (409) 579-2117 fax
Hemphill, TX 75948-9620

San Patricio County:

Terrance Stewart (512) 758-5546 night
1367 Oak Park Dr. TCS_VERMIN@HOTMAIL.COM
Aransas Pass, TX 78336-3207

San Saba County:

Marvin Foster (915) 622-4572
HC: 12, Box 105 JOAQUIN@CENTEX.NET
Cherokee, TX 76803-9704

Smith County:

Shirley Coscione (903) 581-5867
400 Grande Blvd., #1115 CODEMAXSHIRLY@AOL.COM
Tyler, TX 75703

Tarrant County:

Larry Nickerson (817) 329-5014
5725 Oakleaf Dr., #2105 (817) 762-8616 day
Ft. Worth, TX 76132-2427 (817) 370-0941 night
PO Box 953 L.NICKERS@CSC.COM
Fort Worth, TX 76101-0953
Tarrant County Libertarian News PO Box 953, Ft. Worth, TX 76101, (817) 329-5014 or (817) 370-0941
Meeting: 2nd Thursday, 7:00 PM

Taylor County:

George Schwappach (915) 691-1776 home
8318 Saddle Creek Rd. (915) 698-3405 work
Abilene, TX 79602-5454 (915) 691-1943 fax
GEORGES@SWCONNECT.NET

Meetings: 2nd Monday, 7:30 PM, Farolito's Mexican Restaurant, 209 Cotton Wood, Abilene, TX

Tom Green County:

Michael Brady (915) 942-5636
1921 Walnut St. WTGADFLY@CS.COM
San Angelo, TX 76901
HTTP://MEMBERS.TRIPOD.COM/~TGCLP

Meeting: 1st Tuesday, 7:30 PM, The Kettle, 1811 South Bryant Blvd., San Angelo, TX

Travis County:

C. David Eagle (512) 671-3765
3133 Wavecrest Blvd. MINGOVIA@WT.NET or
Austin, TX 78728 EAGLE@EARTH.COM
WWW.AUSTINLIBERTY.ORG

Austin Libertarian: VMAY@WT.NET

Meetings: 1st Tuesday, 7:00 to 8:30 PM

Radio: KOOP 90.7 FM, "The Liberated Space", Thursday, 6:30 PM

Television: Cable Channel 10: "Live and Let Live", Saturday, 8:00 PM, "Smash the State", Saturday, 9:00 PM

Upshur County:

Stanley Vance Lowry MACMAN@FLASH.NET
707 Madelaine Dr.
Gilmer, TX 75644-3146

Val Verde County:

Karl Bollmann, III (830) 775-7851 night
PO Box 421715 RCASS@DELRIO.COM
Del Rio, TX 78842-1715

Van Zandt County:

Gene Johnson, Sr. (930) 896-1654 night
RR4, Box 184B
Wills Point, TX 75169-9793

Victoria County:

Tim Purcell (512) 573-1885
PO Box 1174 DREAM3@WEBTV.NET
Victoria, TX 77905

Webb County:

Michael Oleniczak (956) 645-2662 cell
5908 San Bernado #47
Laredo, TX 78041

Wichita County:

Mark Rippetoe (817) 696-0829 day
3000 Kemp Blvd. (817) 592-2277 night
Wichita Falls, TX 76308-1019 TORSHAMMAR@AOL.COM

Williamson County:

David Carter
1108 Green Downs Dr.
Round Rock, TX 78664 DCARTER@IO.COM

Wilson County:

Tom Kane (830) 216-4664 night
912 4th St. FREEDOM2@FLASH.NET
Floresville, TX 78114-1802

Winkler County:

Steve Grupe (915) 586-6018 night
1055 S. Poplar St. (915) 661-1758 mobile
Kermit, TX 79745-5010 GRUPE@ULTRAVISION.NET

Young County:

Grant Goble (940) 549-8945 home
1217 Texas St. (940) 549-5701 work
Graham, TX 76450 GLGOBLE@DIGITALPASSAGE.COM

Ad space \$5/column inch.
Other options available.
Call (979) 567-7262 for information



Non-Profit Org.
U. S. Postage
Paid
Permit No. 06478
Houston, Texas

Address Service Requested

I Want to Join the Libertarian Party



- \$25 Basic LP membership (includes *LP News & Lone Star Liberty*)
- \$50 Sustaining LP membership (above plus Texas' *Insider's Report* and above)
- Check enclosed, total amount _____ (payable to "Libertarian Party") or
- I would like to charge my MC/Visa # _____ Exp _____

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

Phone #(s) &/or E-mail _____

Occupation & Employer _____

(Optional, Federal Election Commission requires we ask)

Send this form to:
Libertarian Party
2600 Virginia Ave., NW, Ste 100
Washington, DC 20037

I hereby certify that I do not believe in or advocate the initiation of force as a means of achieving political or social goals.

(Signing the oath is required for national membership)

Signature _____