Minutes of the Convention Submitted by Glenda Bull

# LIBERTARIAN PARTY OF CALIFORNIA Sacramento California August 16-17, 1980

- 1. DELEGATE CREDENTIALS
  - A Motion that the members appointed by the County Central Committee to fill vacancies in their county be appointed by the convention as members of the State Central Committee so long as all such members are registered Libertarians and the total State Central Committee members for each county do not exceed the number elected in that county Failed.
- 2. PRESIDENTAL ELECTORS
  The State Central Committee instructs electors to vote for Ed Clark and David Koch.

  Motion to vote for each elector up to 45 Passed.

  Motion to take a recess to list people interested in being Presidential Electors Passed.

  (See attached for results. Sample ballot on record\*.)
- 3. BYLAWS & RULES
- The report of the committee was adopted after deletion of VII-7 which read: "The Executive Committee may set dues for the State Central Committee".
- 4. ELECTION OF STATE OFFICERS
  The results were as follows:

Chair - Jack Sanders
N. Vice-Chair - Carolyn Felton
S. Vice-Chair - Ed Wolford
Secretary - Pat Buerger
Treasurer - Jeannie Martin

- 5. ELECTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

  A Motion to elect the 15 top voter getters from the executive committee list Passed.

  A Motion to get copies to all county chairs for dissemination to their regions Passed.

  (See attached for results.)
- 6. ELECTION OF JUDICIAL COMMITTEE (see attached for results.)
- 7, ELECTION CODE SECTIONS\*

  Motiom to ignore sexual quotas in the Peace and Freedom Party statutes Passed.

  Change #9875 to read: Each person receiving a Libertarian Party nomination for any partisan public office shall be declared elected as a member of the central committee. Each nominee so elected shall serve as a member of the central committee until the next primary election for the same office or until the office ceases to exist, whichever occurs first.

Add to #9882b the following: ....and has on or before the deadline for submitting nominating petitions filed a written declaration that his or her name appear on the ballot for member of the central committee.

Change #9930 to read: In each county a county central committee shall be formed. At its first meeting following each direct primary election, a county central committee shall consist initially of only those members of central committees elected pursuant to Sections 9872 or 9875.

A Motion that a committee be established to secure the modification of the California election code to include statutes relating to the Libertarian Party with this committee being granted full powers to take any and all actions to secure the passage of such legislation and shall have five members who shall be: Jack Sanders, Rich Winger, Ray Hendrickson, Eric Garris, and Bill White Passed.

8. RESOLUTIONS
(See attached)
Federal Land Grab in Big Sur
Just Compensation Initiative
Secession and Sovereignty of Vemerana
Peripheral Canal
Santa Clara Anti-Draft Measure
Opposition to Proposition 10

## PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS

DON ATKINSON 250 Pestana Ave Santa Cruz CA 95065

SARA BAASE 4250 Cobalt Drive La Mesa CA 92041

ELLEN BAKER
1138 Ninth St #A
Santa Monica CA 90403

MARTIN BUERGER 145 Hazelwood Ave San Francisco CA 94112

PAT BUERGER 145 Hazelwood Ave San Francisco CA 94112

GLENDA BULL 6701 Wilkinson Ave #3 No. Hollywood CA 91606

MICHAEL CHASTAIN 5631 Columbia St Richmond CA 94804

ROY CHILDS 1620 Montgomery St San Francisco CA 94111

BOB COSTELLO 1218 6th Ave #3 San Francisco CA 94122

DAN DOUGHERTY 3 Mann Drive Kentfield CA 94904

BILL EVERS
P. O. Box 4030
Stanford CA 94305

CAROLYN FELTON

MELINDA PILLSBURY—FOSTER 7019 Chimineas Reseda CA 91335

JOHN FUND 4524 Oak Glen Way Fair Oaks CA 95628 ERIC GARRIS

44 Prospect Ave

San Francisco CA 94110

JUNE GENIS Star Route Box 111 Redwood City CA 94062

SHIRLEY GOTTLIEB 8006 Hesperia Ave Reseda CA 91335

ALBERT K. HEITZMANN P.O. Box 2302 San Francisco CA

RAY HENDRICKSON 1401 Dove St #600 Newport Beach CA 92660

MARK HINKLE 7178 Via Colina San Jose CA 95139

KAREN HUFFMAN 8052 Park Villa Cupertino CA 95014

REID JUDD 13352 San Pablo Ave San Pablo CA 94806

BARBARA KAMM 6421 Sligo Circle Huntington Beach CA 92647

MICHELL KURTZ 9797 National Blvd Los Angeles CA 90034

BRUCE LAGASSE 4924 Sepulveda Blvd #6 Sherman Daks CA 91403

DAVID LAMPO 1620 Montgomery Street San Francisco CA94111

CLARICA DEE LAUBSCHER 3045 Hollycrest Dr Hollywood CA: 90068

DAN MAHAFFEY 6421 Sligo Circle Huntington Beach CA 92647 SCOTT OLMSTEAD 60 Roosevelt Circle Palo Alto CA 94306

LINDA RADER 1322 N Gardiner Hollywood CA 90046

JUSTIN RAIMONDO 199 Dolores St San Francisco CA 94114

ZACK RICHARDSON 827 So. Manhattan Pl #216 Los Angeles CA 90005

JACK SANDERS 708 Gage Dr San Diego CA 92106

JEFFREY SANCHEZ
P. O. Box 4101
Berkeley CA 94704

EARL SMITH 2806 So. Hobard Blvd Los Angeles CA 90018

STEVE SPARLING 10255 Harvest Way Nevada City CA 93945

BILL SUSEL 12248 N. Spring Trail San Fernando CA 91342

JOAN KENNEDY-TAYLOR 1620 Montgomery St San Francisco CA 94111

BILL WEBSTER 1322 N. Gardiner Hollywood CA 90046

B.J. WAGENER 927 S. Manhattan Pl Los Angeles CA 90005

CAROL ANN MOORE 23414 C S. Western Harbor City CA 90710

## PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS (CONT'D)

BILL WHITE 1220 Larnel P1 Los Altos CA 94022

KATHY WHITE 1220 Larnel Pl Los Altos CA 94022

DANIEL WIENER 4250 Yukon Ave Simi Valley CA 93063

ED WOLFORD
P. O. Box 168
Culver City CA 90230

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

DON ATKINSON 250 Pestana Ave Santa Cruz CA 95065

SARA BAASE 4250 Cobalt Drive La Mesa CA 92041

DAVID BERGLAND 854 Bear Creek Costa Mesa CA 92626

ROY CHILDS 1620 Montgomery St San Francisco CA 94111

BOB COSTELLO 1218 6th Ave #3 San Francisco CA 94122 ERIC GARRIS
44 Prospect Ave
San Francisco CA 94110

MARK HINKLE 7178 Via Colina San Jose CA 95139

CLARICA LAUBSCHER 3045 Hollycrest Dr Hollywood CA 90068

DAVE MERRICK 413 Marnell Ave Santa Cruz CA 95062

MILTON MUELLER 153 Divisadero San Francisco CA 94115 SCOTT OLMSTEAD 60 Roosevelt Circle Palo Alto CA 94306

JEFF SANCHEZ
P. O. Box 4101
Berkelsy CA 94704

EARL SMITH 2806 So. Hobard Blvd Los Angeles CA 90018

CORBY SOMERVILLE 641 El Monta Rd El Cajon CA 92020

B.J. WAGENER 927 S. Manhattan Pl Los Angeles CA 90005

#### JUDICIAL COMMITTEE

JACK DEAN 26 Black Swan Irvine CA 92714

BILL EVERS
P. O. Box 4030
Stanford CA 94305

BOB POOLE 1129 State St Santa Barbara CA 93101

BILL WHITE 1220 Larnel P1 Los Altos CA 94022 DAN WIENER 4250 Yukon Ave Simi Valley CA 93063

#### THE SECESSION AND SOVEREIGNTY OF VEMARANA:

#### A RESOLUTION

Whereas the National Platform of the Libertarian Party states that we, as Libertarians, support the recognition of the right to political secession, and

Whereas the National Platform declares that we recognize the right of all persons to resist tyranny and defend themselves and their rights, and

Whereas the National Platform calls for the repeal of the Logan Act which prohibits private American citizens from engaging in diplomatic relations with foreign governments, and

Furthermore condemns any intervening by the United States Government in the internal affairs of other nations, and

Whereas the people of the New Hebrides island of Espiritu Santo have declared that they wish to be a free and independent nation, to be known henceforth as Vemarana;

Therefore be it resolved that the Libertarian Party of California endorse the secession of Vemarana, and request the United States Government not to intervene in the internal affairs of Vemarana or any other island of the New Hebrides Group, either by force, threat of force, or promises of economic aid; and

Further be it resolved that we urge the United States Government to make no law and take no action against those individuals or groups aiding the people of Vemarana; and

Furthermore, we urge the United States Government to grant diplomatic recognition to Vemarana.

Above resolution has been passed by the Executive Committee of Region 14 of the California Libertarian Council and by the Libertarian Central Committee of Los Angeles County.

#### RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO PROPOSITION 10

WHEREAS, Proposition 10 is a costly, misleading, and unfair initiative that would dangerously infringe upon the individual rights of Californians; and

WHEREAS, Under Proposition 10 faceless bureaucrats and political appointees will be granted new powers to regulate our lives; and WHEREAS, The true and complete taxpayers' costs of enforcing this proposed law are hidden from the public; and

WHEREAS, California consumers will be faced with <u>higher</u> retail <u>prices</u> as business owners are forced to pass along the extra costs of having to comply with this law; and

WHEREAS, Our lives are already filled with intrusive and repressive regulations.

Now, therefore, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Libertarian Party of California goes on record in opposition to Proposition 10.

#### SANTA CLARA ANTI-DRAFT MEASURE RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the platform of the Libertarian Party of California states: "We oppose the draft, the registration for the draft and all other forms of involuntary servitude as a violation of individual rights. Therefore, BE IT RESOLVED, the Libertarian Party of California endorses a "yes" vote on the Santa Clara Anti-Draft Measure which reads: "Do the citizens of Santa Clara County, State of California, object to peacetime military conscription (the draft)?"

#### RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL LAND GRAB IN BIG SUR

WHEREAS, the Big Sur Coast of California is an outstanding area of scenic beauty, of spectacular views, of magnificent and undeveloped coastline, and of independent and self-reliant people and communities who have worked to preserve the unique qualities of this area; and WHEREAS, there is Federal legislation pending (HR 7380 and S2251) which effectively constitute a Federal takeover of privately owned land in the Big Sur for the alleged purpose of protecting it; and WHEREAS, the Federal government has an unbroken record of failing to protect the rights of property owners in similar efforts to preserve unique and beautiful areas, and of failing to, in fact, protect the uniqueness and beauty of such areas; and WHEREAS, the Libertarian Party opposes such government action on principle.

Now, therefore, BE IT RESOLVED by the Libertarian Party of California that, we support the Friends of the Big Sur Coast and residents of the Big Sur in their efforts to halt proposed Federal takeover of their property, and we oppose any and all such Federal programs in California and other states.

#### JUST COMPENSATION RESOLUTION

WHEREAS governmental entities in California have blatantly transgressed on property rights by taking action which is ostensibly in the interest of the public at large, but is in fact contrary to the public interest and imposes a disproportionate financial loss on persons with an interest in real property, and

WHEREAS such governmental action includes land-use regulation such as down zoning, billboard control ordinances, Coastal Commission controls and other action such as rent control;

WHEREAS present California law requires just compensation to be paid only in the event of a taking of property for public use, but not when property is impaired in value due to zoning or other land-use regulations nor deemed to be a "taking" within the meaning of the California Court:

WHEREAS the Just Compensation Initiative would amend the California Constitution to provide that - even if no taking within the meaning of Section 19 of Article 1 of the California Constitution has occured the value of private property shall not be substantially impaired by governmental action without just compensation;

Therefore, BE IT RESOLVED that the Libertarian Party of California endorses the passage of the Just Compensation Initiative.

# PERIPHERAL CANAL RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the proposed Peripheral Canal as passed by the legislature in SB200

1) Uses tax money for private benefit

2) Degrades the quality of water in the Sacramento Delta and the San Francisco Bay

3) Subsidizes Kern Valley farm owners

4) Subsidizes Southern California developers, and

5) Contributes to the degradation of the quality of the environment, such as marine life

We hereby endorse the referendum against this act passed by the legislature.

PASSED IN CONVENTION BY THE LIBERTARIAN PARTY OF CALIFORNIA SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

August 17, 1980

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE INTO THE MATTER OF THE ROBERT MURDOCH LAWSUIT

Submitted to the Executive Committee of the California Libertarian Council August 17, 1980

### I. INTRODUCTION:

The Committee found no independent evidence substantiating Murdoch's allegations that he suffered harrassment, job discrimination or termination of employment because of his sexual orientation, or that either Ed Clark or Atlantic Richfield was guilty of breach of contract.

The response of the Ed Clark for President Committee to the publicity arising from the case was less than adequate with respect to answering inquiries from the gay press or providing Libertarian activists with sufficient information to respond to inquiries from both the gay and non-gay communities.

## II. FACTUAL INVESTIGATION:

Individual members of the Committee have conducted an investigation into this matter to the extent permitted by circumstances, including discussing the case in some depth with Ed Clark, talking to Susan McGreivy, co-counsel for Murdoch, and reviewing the court file. We were prevented from speaking directly with Murdoch because his attorneys will not allow him to discuss the lawsuit with outside parties due to matters presently before the court. Similarly, Ed Clark is under instructions from defense counsel for ARCO not to discuss the facts of the case. This is common procedure in litigation, and appears further justified in this case based upon considerations of legal strategy.

The only evidence supporting Murdoch's case at this time is the unsubstantiated allegations of Murdoch himself. We have not learned of any other supporting evidence, even after discussions with Murdoch's attorney. Ed Clark catagorically denies the charges, both on behalf of himself and his employer, and has advised members of the Committee that the reason for Murdoch's termination was totally unrelated to his sexual preference. Indeed, documents in the court file indicate that at least one of ARCO's defenses to the lawsuit will be that Murdoch was terminated for cause due to his job performance.

There is evidence to challenge the assertion that Ed Clark and/or ARCO have pursued a policy of discriminating against gays in employment. Mr. Clark has informed members of the Committee that an openly gay attorney applied for a position in ARCO's legal department not long after Murdoch terminated his employment, advising ARCO that he was active in gay causes and intended on maintaining a high profile in such activities during his prospective employment; he was in fact offered a job, but refused the position. Additionally, as many Libertarian activists are aware, there are openly gay staff members at every level of the Clark campaign, and several of those spoken to by the Committee emphatically denied any evidence of prejudicial treatment by Ed Clark.

We can only speculate as to Murdoch's motivation(s) in bringing this lawsuit. It is interesting to note that, whereas the alleged acts of discrimination occurred during the period March through August, 1978, Murdoch did not bring his lawsuit until September, 1979, four months after the landmark decision by the California

Supreme Court in a case against Pacific Telephone which held that discrimination against gays by a public utility was illegal. Murdoch's suit attempts to come under that decision by alleging that a subsidiary of ARCO qualifies as a public utility, and further seeks to expand the decision to include private employers. It is also interesting to note that the case was originally filed in pro per, with Murdoch representing himself. Certain of the allegations in the original Complaint filed by Murdoch are unusual or even questionable on their face, e.g.: he alleges ARCO told him his only options were to "sell his antiques or commit suicide"!

We can also only speculate as to the motives of the ACLU in joining this lawsuit in February, 1980. From the standpoint of the ACLU's interest in expanding the scope of the Pacific Telephone decision to include private employers, the case in the logical next step. Indeed, being a large oil company, which in today's political climate is an unpopular defendant if ever there was one, ARCO is a target defendant. Further, from the legal standpoint, it is not necessary to prevail on the facts to establish a new legal principle that discrimination against gays by private employers is illegal; for example, the case against Pacific Telephone has not yet been decided on the facts. Secondly, in November, 1979, the ACLU of Southern California funded a new staff attorney position, that of Susan McGeivy, to handle gay and women's rights cases exclusively; therefore, the ACLU was actively seeking out such cases at the time the Murdoch case was brought to them. It is distressing to note that apparently the ACLU did not investigate beyond Murdoch's allegations before joining the case.

## III. PROJECTION:

The case is still in the beginning stages. With the present congestion of the court calendar of the Central District of the Los Angeles County Superior Court, it is doubtful any trial could occur before 1984. However, ARCO's attorneys have been following a strategy of attempting to have the case dismissed on procedural grounds. If this case were to follow the same course as the earlier one against Pacific Telephone, a decision on such grounds could possibly occur before the election in November, which would probably be appealed by the losing side, thereby generating new publicity.

#### IV. RESPONSE OF THE CLARK CAMPAIGN:

The Clark campaign issued a statement on March 20, 1980, approximately three weeks after the ACLU joined the lawsuit. (See attached). The statement catagorically denies the charges, but provides no further information regarding the lawsuit. Further, Committee members have been informed that the campaign has failed to respond to direct inquiries from certain of the gay press.\*

#### V. RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Committee recognizes the arguments in favor of downplaying the response to false accusations to avoid giving them greater publicity, which appears to be the strategy of the Clark campaign. However, Libertarian activists in certain areas continue to receive inquiries from members of both the gay and non-gay communities concerning the allegations of this litigation. Further, as stated above, there is the possibility of renewed publicity on this matter before the election. Ed Clark may also be questioned on the lawsuit during the course of the campaign by, among others, the gay press. Accordingly, it is suggested that the Executive Committee issue a resolution asking the Clark campaign prepare a more detailed response to the question of this lawsuit, possibly including some of the material included herein, which would allow both the campaign and individual activists to respond to possible future inquiries more thoroughly, vigorously and promptly.

\* Attempts by activists to set up a contact between the Clark comparing and the aff perso have been met with indifference and members of the comparing the flave expressed the attitude that the come is not important.



Ed Clark for President Committee 2300 Wisconsin Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20007 (202) 333-8263

Ray Cunningham,
Chairman
Jule R. Herbert Jr.,
Treasurer
Chris Hocker,
National Coordinator
Edward H. Crane III,
Communications Director
Kristina Herbert,
Headquaiters Manager

A STATEMENT BY ED CLARK
LIBERTARIAN CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT
MARCH 20, 1980

I am issuing this statement to reaffirm my commitment to gay rights and to categorically deny the charges of bias made against me and the company for which I work. I have no idea what motives prompted this former employee to make the claims he has. I can only say that there is no truth to them whatsoever.

My record in support of gay rights has been frank and outspoken. I campaigned hard in California against the Briggs Initiative, speaking out against anti-gay bigotry before radio and television audiences, in speeches to groups like the Kiwanis and Rotarians, in campaign advertisements, and before "No on 6" rallies.

Further, I completely support the Libertarian party's 1980 platform which calls for the repeal of all laws governing voluntary sexual or affectional behavior. This includes the right of gay people to full custody rights to their children, the right of gay people to adopt and care for children, retraction of all less than honorable military discharges extended to armed forces personnel for homosexual conduct, elimination of

the many regulations specifying homosexuality as a justification for denying or revoking licenses for various professions, an end to Immigration and Naturalization Service discrimination against gay people attempting to enter the United States, an end to all government employment discrimination on the grounds of sexual or affectional preference, and the release of all individuals presently detained or imprisoned for any victimless crime.

I am in very strong agreement with all of the gay rights stands that the Libertarian party has championed, and I have incorporated them into my campaign for President, just as I incorporated them into my campaign for Governor of California in 1978.

However, I would like to emphasize that my own beliefs go beyond the purely political. I find the notion that some people should take it upon themselves to pry into the lives of others and condemn them for their choice of affectional partners totally repugnant.

Among the first people hired on my full time staff were a number of openly gay people, chosen on the basis of their ability to promote the issues and beliefs of the Libertarian party through my candidacy. At a time when the Anita Bryants and so-called "pro-family" elements of the New Right are marshalling their forces in an attempt to return gay people to the closet, the Libertarian party is speaking out loud and clear in favor of freedom. Gay Libertarians are joined by straight Libertarians who know that freedom and justice do not exist in isolation, that an attack on the rights and freedoms of one person is an attack on us all.

