

California Freedom

September 2005

The official publication of the **Libertarian Party of California**

Everyone: "Hands Off My Home!"

by **Elizabeth C. Brierly**
Editor, *California Freedom*

The Supreme Court's recent decision in *Kelo vs. New London, Conn.*, which has devastated property rights nationwide by permitting seizure of private property for the purpose of economic development by another private party, has galvanized California citizens and activists. It seems that, for once, people of every political stripe are agreeing: local governments' abuse of the power of eminent domain—given carte blanche in the 5-4 *Kelo* decision—must be roundly rebuked,

then quashed.

A proper responsibility of government is to protect citizens' property from thugs. But to paraphrase State Senator **Tom McClintock**, what's a citizen to do when *the government has become the thug*?

With part of the answer to that question, the Coalition for Redevelopment Reform (CRR) sponsored a "Call for Action" forum and reception on Saturday, Aug. 13 in San Jose. The expert panel of speakers was composed of McClintock, state senator and Republican candidate for Lt. Governor, **Douglas McNea**, President of Silicon Valley Taxpayers'

Association, **Chris Norby**, Orange County Supervisor, founder of Municipal Official for Redevelopment Reform, and author of *Redevelopment: The Unknown Government*, and lead attorney in the *Kelo* case, **Dana Berliner**, a Senior Attorney at Institute for Justice.

Norby, as the first speaker in the line-up, identified the *Kelo* decision as "the *Dred Scott* decision of today...uniting people across the spectrum."

"Some say economic development is more important than private property rights," said Norby, "but economic development can occur *only* with private property rights." In his 18 years on Fullerton's City Council, Norby saw that as much as 10% of property tax revenue was



Photo: Elizabeth C. Brierly

• **Chatting at the post-forum reception is Allen Rice, Local Organizing Chair for LP of Santa Clara. (Downtown property owners Keith Watt in background and Elaine Evans at right).**

being diverted to redevelopment agencies (RDA's)—not to schools, bridges, or roads, projects that would rightly constitute public "use" as specified in the U.S. Constitution. "The premise of RDA's is that bureau-

crats will make better economic decisions than business owners and property owners."

Before delving into how eminent domain and taxes are

• See **Hands Off** page 3

His Loss is our Gain: Rider for Mayor Race Reaps Unexpected Rewards

With dozens of volunteers and over 500 financial contributors, it is clear that **Richard Rider** and his team ran a serious campaign for Mayor of San Diego. Although his name won't be gracing the runoff ballot in November, Rider reports that "there have been numerous

benefits from this campaign, and many lessons learned."

On Aug. 2, Rider, who was LPC's candidate for Governor in 1992, exuded in a letter to his supporters, "My heartfelt thanks for your contributions of time and/or money to my campaign. It was your generosity that made my race a joy to run.... I'm anything but discouraged—it was the most arduous but enjoyable campaign for office or initiative that I've ever done."

"Your money raised to a higher level the issue of government overcompensating its employees, and the need to go to extensive privatization to bring government costs under control," Rider continued. "While we did not win the election, the cause of freedom was advanced on many fronts."

The special election, held on July 26 with what appears to be the longest list of candidates since California's 2003 gubernatorial recall election, delivered a raft of opportunities



Photo: Ed Teyssier

• **Supporters bearing the campaign's signs gear up at the Independence Day parade in Mira Mesa. From left: Makenzie Stone and her mother, Kristi Stone, an LP activist and chair of the CALPiC candidate support organization, campaign manager Kim Gubala, and Makenzie's friend Gabby Pavoli. Perched on the front car are Richard and his wife, Diane, who was also active in the campaign.**

to Rider, who is also founder and president of San Diego Tax Fighters. Despite Rider's placement in the top half (5th of 11), and his having received more votes than the bottom five candidates combined, it's

only the top three who will be facing off in November's runoff election. Rider identified as one of the rewards of the race a plug for election reform: "With its anticlimactic runoff vote in November, [the race] is a

great example of why we need to implement 'Instant Runoff Voting' (IRV)."

Most libertarians understand that IRV would both eliminate the frustrating "wasted vote" argument and halve the number of elections, saving taxpayers money, but with his usual candor, Rider points out, "It [would keep] people from being bored to tears—listening to the same arguments and ads for another four months." Joining Rider in pushing for this system—already proven viable by another large California city, San Francisco—is **Ed Teyssier**, Chair of the LP of San Diego.

Public relations

In just 60 days of campaigning time in this, a special election, Rider had over 80 press interviews, debates, forums, speaking engagements, press conferences, parades, etc. In 39 of those events he

• See **Rider** page 2

INSIDE

New structure of party brings challenge to LPC **2**

Show us true, terrible price of war **4**

Russo's loss of 2004 LP Pres. nomination a blessing in disguise? **6**

Unmasking the menace of unknown government **7**

Sail with us Feb. 24 on LPC convention cruise **8**

California Freedom

Vol. 3 • Issue 9 • September 2005

California Freedom

is the official monthly newspaper of the Libertarian Party of California. Opinions, articles, and advertisements published herein do not necessarily represent official party positions unless so indicated.

PUBLISHER

Libertarian Party of California
14547 Titus Street, Suite 214
Panorama City, CA 91402-4935
Web site: www.CA.LP.org
Telephone: (818) 782-8400
Facsimile: (818) 782-8488

EDITOR

Elizabeth C. Briery
E-Mail: CaliforniaFreedom@CA.LP.org

STATE CHAIR

Aaron Starr, CPA
Telephone: (805) 583-3308
E-Mail: StarrCPA@PacBell.net

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Dave Ruprecht
E-Mail: Director@CA.LP.org

MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

Bruce Cohen
E-Mail: BruceDCohen2002@Yahoo.com

GRAPHIC DESIGN AND LAYOUT

Muffet Laurie Brown
E-Mail: Muffet@Earthlink.net

WEB SITE

Kevin Takenaga
E-Mail: WebTeam@CA.LP.org

ADVERTISING SALES

E-Mail: Advertising@CA.LP.org
Telephone: (818) 782-8400

CONTRIBUTORS

M Carling	Lawrence Samuels
Ali Meyer	Starchild
Chris Norby	Kevin Takenaga
Diane Rider	Ed Teyssier
Richard Rider	Dan Wiener

SEND ADDRESS CHANGES TO:

Libertarian Party
2600 Virginia Ave. NW, Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 333-0008 x223

SEND NEWS, LETTERS, ESSAYS, PHOTOGRAPHS OR ADVERTISING TO:

Elizabeth C. Briery
Editor, *California Freedom*
P.O. Box 611021
San Jose, CA 95161-1021
Tel./fax: (408) 272-3191
E-Mail: CaliforniaFreedom@CA.LP.org

SUBMISSION DEADLINES

All news stories, editorials, and announcements are due six weeks prior to the month of publication:

- November 2005: Due 9.20.05
- December 2005: Due 10.20.05
- January 2006: Due 11.20.05

Advertising orders and artwork are due eight weeks and four weeks, respectively, prior to the month of publication. We reserve the right to refuse advertising.

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

Articles, copyright 2005 by their author(s) and/or Libertarian Party of California, except where stated as a reprint. All rights reserved.

An Unexpected Challenge



FROM THE CHAIR



Our world just changed. Normally, I try to write about what's happening outside the party. Not this time.

I'm writing this column from the Kansas City airport on August 7. In addition to being state chair and holding a full-time job, I also serve as a representative on the Libertarian National Committee (LNC). And it's here in Kansas City that just a few hours ago we adjourned our quarterly meeting.

The LNC made a decision that places us on a path that I expect will affect—dramatically—how we run our state party. Prior to this meeting, we had what

was known as Unified Membership. This meant that being a member of the national party automatically

made you a member of the California party. This allowed us to take advantage of National's economy of scale. The national party would process renewals, recruit new members, maintain a database, mail out a national newspaper (with our state newspaper), and send us a monthly check for a portion of the dues raised, most of which we then would forward to our state's county parties.

Now the national party will no longer charge dues for membership in the national party, and no money will be forwarded

to the state party. You'll still need to contribute money each year to get the national newspaper.

The LPC is basically on our own. We're going to need to develop a database to track membership for the state party and counties; we're going to be responsible for all membership recruitment, renewal notices, and fundraising. We're also going to bear new costs for mailing *California Freedom* and processing thousands of checks each year.

Is this new independence from the national party a healthy development? I don't know. I can tell you that the two representatives from the LP of California did not support

the plan. I'm concerned that the national party's finances cannot support the transition to a new revenue model, and I'm concerned that most state affiliate parties are not equipped to develop their own infrastructure to implement the required changes. For our own state party, I expect this to be a rocky road, and it will be a distraction from some big projects on our plate, but I'm confident that we'll move forward. We are very fortunate to have a number of good people on our state party's executive committee, on whom I will be relying to make this transition easier.

—Aaron Starr
Chair

Executive Committee

LPC Leadership Update

• Mark Johnson



Photo: Elizabeth C. Briery

At their quarterly meeting on August 20, the LPC Executive Committee appointed **Mark Johnson** of Santa Clara County to fill the at-large representative seat previously filled by **Mark Whitney**.

Johnson had volunteered to assume responsibility for Whitney's subcommittee,

Marketing and Branding, when Whitney resigned a few months ago. Remaining open is chairmanship of the Legal Committee, also previously chaired by Whitney, himself a lawyer.

You may reach Mark Johnson at MJohnson@CA.LP.org.

Rider

continued from page 1

was in a debate or forum with his opponents. He did over 12 hours of live TV debates on the major stations of San Diego, plus a two-hour radio debate on the Roger Hedgecock show. He had TV cameras following him around to different activities—including precinct walking and even playing basketball! He feels that the extensive print stories covered his campaign fairly.

In spite of the crippling restriction of a \$300 maximum donor contribution, the campaign raised over \$62,000 from over 500 donors. Of course the top three candidates raised and spent far more than did the Rider campaign. The candidate who took third place spent over \$2 million. Reported Rider, "I was proud of the very significant grassroots support I got."

What did we reap?

The LP got very positive publicity. Despite this being a nonpartisan race, the press liked to bring up Rider's LP affiliation. "Oddly enough, my opponents did not," said Rider, who replaced the third-party fringe stereotype with the positive, serious presence of someone who knew the issues better than his opponents, while bringing to the race a sense of humor. Most voters—even many San Diego County people not voting in this city race—watched at least one of the live or taped TV debates.

After watching one of the debates, the head of a top political consultant firm in San

Diego asked Rider to sign the rebuttal argument opposing a California proposition backed by the labor unions—a measure that, if passed, will all but destroy the availability of many critical pharmaceuticals here, under the guise of helping people get discount drugs. "I've signed it," Rider reports, "and I hope to be active in the debates and speaking engagements on this issue."

"The day after the election," reported Rider, "City Attorney Mike Aguirre—a Democrat political maverick doing great work challenging the status quo—asked the City Council to appoint me to the contentious



Photo: Diane Rider

• **At an NAACP mayoral forum, Ted Patrick (left) shares with candidate Rider an initiative he tried to effect years ago, that would have eliminated San Diego's city manager form of government.**

San Diego Retirement Board, currently wrestling with the pension mess and the illegalities rife in this area." Conveying somewhat cautious optimism, he continued, "That appointment is

• See **Rider** page 8

Long Distance Calls for 2.75 Cents a Minute!



- **NO fees or monthly minimums. No "gotcha's"!**
- **Land-line quality. NOT Internet telephony!**
- **Billed in six-second increments!**
- **Optional toll-free 800 number with same low rate!**
- **Get paid for referring others!**

For more information and to sign up on-line:
www.EconomyTelcom.com/CA-LP

Offered by Richard Rider
President, Economy Telcom (800) 914-8466

Letters to the Editor



The "Fair" Tax Fallacy

Thank you for printing "Fair Tax' is an Oxymoron" by Ken Obenski of San Diego (Letters to the Editor, July 2005, p. 3). I treasure its logic and truthfulness. I intend to photocopy it and pass it out.

Argument closed! I keep getting tax solicitations asking for what I think and choices to check—since there is not a box for "None" of these so-called choices, I am forced to write "no tax" or to throw the questionnaire in the trash. People in Washington, D.C. just do not see the fallacy of their thoughts.

I am grateful for *California Freedom* and its willingness to keep on uncovering the errors and fallacies of convoluted thoughts regarding taxes.

—Mary E. Booth
Santa Monica

California's Real Estate Bubble

I found Fred E. Foldvary's article, "California's Real Estate Bubble," very interesting (*The Libertarian Perspective*, no. 11, on the Web at CA.LP.org/lp20050802.shtml, 8/2/05). It was filled with some great facts and figures, but I think his "blame government first" premise is misguided.

Sure, government intervention does help a bubble to grow to the fringes of where they might otherwise grow, but government doesn't cause the bubble.

I think most libertarians and people in my field (financial advising) tend to ignore the human element of the economy and focus on the numbers. Who buys homes? People do. That is why you need to look at underlying demographic and population trends when talking about real estate and economics. For the last 15 years, we have seen a dramatic increase in the number of people hitting the peak move-up-home age.

In 1990, only 3 million people turned age 43, the age when the average person buys the biggest home they will live in. Since that time we have seen a dramatic increase in people hitting the magic age of 43. In each and every year between 2000 and 2004, over 4.5 million people turned 43. This year will mark the peak of the [baby] boomers hitting age 43, and we will see a large decline, bottoming out in 2016, when only 3.5 million will hit that peak buying age.

Looking at Foldvary's chart (www.foldvary.net/works/cycle.html), I see the real estate crash of 1918 listed. That also



Welcome Aboard!

The LP of California would like to give a hearty welcome to these 54 new members who joined our ranks in July. Among them are Paul Oreto, a Stanford University student, retiree James Smith, Aaron Sokoloski, a software developer, Michael Ediss, an Aviation Machinist Mate in the U.S. Navy, and Michael Richardson, a PG&E engineer. Your county's Libertarians look forward to meeting you soon at a local meeting or helping out at LP booths at outdoor festivals this month!

Bruce Adams Simi Valley William Arend..... Oroville Brenda Balanda..... Livermore Nadine Betsworth..... Apple Valley Jason Bird..... Cameron Park Sidney Black..... West Hollywood Brad Burbin..... Los Angeles Carter Crilly..... Petaluma Jerel Crosland..... Carpinteria Paul Dempsey Davis Michael Ediss..... Visalia Linda Forrest..... Apple Valley Mark Foundos..... Carlsbad Lukas Fragodt..... San Mateo F. Hudnut..... Cupertino Robert Jacobs..... San Mateo William Kidder..... San Diego Kristin Koenig..... Fullerton Patrick Lavelle..... Camarillo Clyde Marsh..... Hollister Emily McGowan..... San Marcos Christopher Morton..... San Jose John Nugent..... Belden Paul Oreto..... Stanford Meg Palley..... Nevada City Joshua Parker-Roriz..... Sacramento Adam Parnell..... Turlock	Doris Presley..... Yreka Hollie Ramage..... Stanton Michael Richardson..... Grover Beach Dorothy Richmond..... Yucca Valley Albert Robbs..... San Diego Gregory Sanborn..... San Diego F. Seifried..... Oakland Eugene Sharee..... Berkeley Rodney Skager..... Salinas James Smith..... Bellflower Charlotte Snider..... Walnut Creek James Snodgrass..... Palm Springs Aaron Sokoloski..... San Francisco Edward Stanke..... Mountain View Bob Stevens..... Santa Barbara Olive Stocking..... Saratoga Jake Strieter..... Middletown Betty Stutch..... San Mateo Johnny Todd..... Costa Mesa Richard Tunder..... San Jose Hurd Twombly..... Cupertino Ian Wendt..... Loomis James Wilburn..... Auberry Frank Winnans..... Citrus Heights James Wirth..... Riverside Peter Worden..... Monterey Daniel Yeaw..... San Luis Obispo
---	--

was driven by supply and demand. In 1914 only 10% of all U.S. households owned cars; by 1919, that number had swelled to 50%. At the same time, over 8 million horses were eliminated from our homes and roads, which freed up over 25 million acres of land being used to raise food for those horses.

This drove real estate and the economy down until 1922.

So again, what drives a bubble? Good ol' supply and demand. Can government help shrink supply and increase demand? Sure, but they can't create it from nothing.

So please, when the crash comes, don't blame the market

or the government. Blame your parents for not having enough kids after 1964!

If you would like additional information, e-mail me at Hilgi@yahoo.com, I will forward you some good resources.

—Mark Hilgenberg
Financial Advisor
Simi Valley

Hands Off

continued from page 1

inextricably related, McNea welcomed the audience to San Jose, the "blight capital of Silicon Valley." As much as 1/3 of San Jose could be considered "blighted" under that city's RDA's loosely defined terms. "An area will be declared 'blighted' and then the city will issue bonds for a big project in that area," McNea lamented, adding, "While today appears sunny, storm clouds have been brewing, and the eminent domain lightning bolt could strike any one of us." He charged the attendees with a pointed call to action: "Are you willing to fight back?"

Berliner confided that when she got word that she and her fellow attorneys had lost their case by a mere one vote, she screamed. But a couple hours later, unscientific polls appeared on MSNBC indicating that as

much as 98% of respondents opposed the decision. She was heartened, especially as more reliable polls emerging later revealed no less than 89% support for the homeowners in the case. Berliner realized the galvanization of citizens which this outcome could produce. She confirmed that a state constitutional amendment is absolutely the best way to protect property rights now. States have been jumping on this already: although six states permit cities to take property for economic development, 34 or 35 now have protections in place.

McClintock elicited chuck-

• **Dana Berliner, who represented Kelo before the Supreme Court, spoke at the "Call for Action" forum in San Jose Aug. 13.**



les by pointing out that under California's definition of "blight," the White House itself would be jeopardized. He has submitted a California Constitutional Amendment bill to the Senate (SCA15), as have colleagues of his in the Assembly (ACA22). Unfortunately, his hope that it could be included on the November ballot wasn't to happen, since it was only on Aug. 15 that the legislature would be reconvening; now the target will be 2006's spring ballot. The proposed amendment is on the Web: visit www.LegInfo.CA.gov; click on "Bill Information"; and then follow the search instructions, typing in "SCA15."

Hosting the forum was **Keith Watt**, owner of Le Petit Trianon Theater, a victim of SJ Redevelopment Agency's eminent domain attempts. His case spurred the formation of CRR. Luckily, this elegant structure—with 106 points on SJ's historic resource rating system, where anything above 67 merits landmark status—was spared

• **This poster and other collateral materials are available from CRR.**



the RDA's axe, in great part through the work of CRR.

After each panelist had spoken and entertained this agitated audience's questions—kicked off by LPC executive committee member **Allen Hacker** (also local LP chair)—action steps were identified by **Ken Colson**, Chair of the Dept. of Administration of Justice at West Valley College, and thank-you's were extended by **Lorraine Wallace Rowe**, Chair of CRR.

You can help protect property rights in California. Get the word out by contacting your senators and assembly members. As McClintock encourages, ask them whether they support or oppose SCA15 and/or ACA22, and then write to your local

newspaper with their names and positions. McClintock advised that despite what we were taught in civics class, the most effective way to communicate with legislators is indirectly, through the press, rather than by contacting them at their Sacramento offices.

Alert everyone else, too—regardless of political party. CRR can provide information, yard signs, window signs, T-shirts, and more. Contact CRR by telephone at (408) 817-5678 or by e-mail at C2R_Coalition@yahoo.com.

Are you willing to fight back? ●

ELIZABETH C. BRIERLY has served as editor of California Freedom since 2003. She was a member of the LPC Executive Committee for five years, two of those as Secretary, and in 2002 was the LPC's candidate for State Board of Equalization (District 1). She is Vice President of Silicon Valley Taxpayers' Association, and works as a freelance editor, focusing on libertarian projects.



■ Youth Commentary

Show Us the Real War—Please

by **Ali Meyer**
High School Student

Everywhere we look, we see “support our troops” stickers, on cars, windows, shirts. I agree. We should support our troops. And what better way than to capture their courage in a camera and show it to all of America?

Equally as important, and by definition inseparable from this, though, is the suffering that the American soldiers must endure in Iraq. This too should be captured on film. This is the crucial material which should not be censored but which has been the reality of war.

Journalists must fulfill their duty as eyewitnesses. Photographs should be there to represent war fully.

Look at a headline that says: 1500 DEAD IN IRAQ. It has an impact, but the impression it creates is not even a fraction of the response that a photograph of a wounded or dead soldier would provoke. And that's only a picture of one soldier. Imagine how shocking it would be to see pictures of all 1500 of our Americans. The saying, “a picture is worth a thousand words,” has never been more true.

Another argument for printing photographs of the Iraq war is the fact that journalists in this area have to fulfill their duty as eyewitnesses. Their mission in going to Iraq is to portray the war as it is for the American public. Censoring images completely defeats this purpose.

Probably the most important reason not to censor images, though, is the constitutional right that Americans have: freedom of the press. As we all know, this is guaranteed in the first amendment. This begs the question of how any censorship is permitted at all. What we have now is blasphemous. The Pentagon has banned all photographs of coffins coming home covered in flags for the purpose of “protecting soldiers’ privacy.” Obviously, this is not an issue about the degree of privacy that corpses should or should not have, but a direct step by the White House to limit the number of pictures of dead Americans in the media, since in a coffin draped with flags, it is impossible to see inside to violate the corpse’s privacy.

Another measure the government and military have taken to restrict flow of potentially unpleasant photos is to force “embedded” journalists to sign documents, with both the troops they travel with and with officials, to prevent the printing of any photos of the dead or wounded whose faces are recognizable.

The government also requires newspapers and news magazines to contact the family of any recognizable soldier in pictures. Due to the extended time which this process sometimes takes, pictures grow obsolete and no longer of use to the newspaper, while attempts are made to contact the family.

The media also seem to have adopted this mantra as their own. Editors of newspapers and news magazines constantly decline to print photographs that are shocking or terrible, because of complaints from readers that they are too gruesome or too heart-wrenching.

Sorry, but this is war. War is heart-wrenching and gruesome and terrible. Photographs should be there to represent it fully, not just the stoic soldier

bathed in golden light. The view of Iraq that the American public has been shown is sanitized and relatively free of bloodshed. This needs to change, and all images that pertain to all aspects of the war should be printed, or at least available. Moral quandaries of editors should not stop the

full liberty that Americans should have available regarding all facets of the war.

Thus I propose that a full freedom of the press be enforced—no censorship of photographs of coffins, no restrictions on “embedded” journalists’ work, and no cop-outs by edi-



tors on the basis of objective morals. ●

ALI MEYER, who turns 16 this month, attends an all-girl private school in Los Angeles. Meyer wrote for California Freedom during her summer break, while also doing volunteer work at a local hospital; this enterprising teenager was “too young to work”—for money, that is, according to the law.

Paid Advertisement

Attention: Peace Activists

A Message From the Libertarian Party of California Peace Caucus
Web Site URL: <http://www.LPcalPeace.org>

We are a group of Libertarian Party of California activists who believe that support for aggressive warfare is incompatible with support for the libertarian principle of non-aggression.

After the last election, which saw a vocal minority of LPC candidates for political office take a stance in favor of the US invasion of Iraq (one of whom suggested the possibility of bringing back the military draft), we have become concerned about our party’s future and how the public perceives us. It is our belief that support by our candidates for aggressive warfare, which is contrary to the LP platform, can only hinder the progress of the LP, and, more importantly, the progress of liberty worldwide.

We are in the process of starting a project, the purpose of which is to make sure that every LPC nominee for partisan political office on the November 2006 ballot (and all subsequent ballots) takes a principled stand in favor of having the US government adopt a non-interventionist foreign policy.

This project entails the following six general areas of activity:

1. Identification of pro-war LPC candidates once they have announced their candidacies.
2. Finding principled anti-war candidates to oppose them in the primary election.
3. Sending out a mailing to every registered Libertarian voter in their districts informing them of the foreign policy positions of the candidates, and urging those who oppose aggressive warfare to vote, and to vote for the anti-war candidates in the primary.
4. Creation of a Political Action Committee (PAC) to assist in funding the mailings to the registered Libertarian voters (and possibly covering partial candidate filing fees).
5. Proposing, supporting, and publicizing the ratification of anti-war resolutions at the local and statewide levels of the LPC, with the intention of making it clear to the public that the LP is, always has been, and always will be a party of peace.
6. Electing principled, anti-war libertarians to positions of influence within the LPC.

If you wish to assist us, there are many things that can be done to help. Here are a few of them:

- Assist in the formation of the PAC. If you know the procedures and legal issues involved in forming a PAC, we need your help. We also need volunteers to assist in managing the PAC.
- Volunteer to run for political office. We welcome you doing this with or without the presence of a pro-war candidate in your district.
- Volunteer to propose and support ratification of an anti-war resolution by your local LP organization.
- Volunteer to run for a position on the LPC Executive Committee or in your local LP organization.
- Contribute financially to the effort.
- Give us input and ideas.

If you wish to help, contact one of the persons listed below:

(Northern California)
Mark W. Stroberg
(510) 895-8384
mwstroberg@comcast.net

(Southern California)
Mark Selzer (LPC Southern Vice-Chair)
(323) 633-6275
markselzer@sbcglobal.net

(Central California)
Jay Eckl
(559) 225-5443
Jae4free@aol.com

Paid for by the LPC Peace Caucus. Not an official body of the Libertarian Party.

**Safety First
Firearms Academy**
“Where Marksmanship and Safety are Paramount”

Richard B. Greger
Certified Instructor

ph 714.469.3990
fax 714.832.3392
info@safetyfirstacademy.com

www.SafetyFirstAcademy.com

■ Opinion

Protesters Aren't "Whiners"

by Starchild

Outreach Director,
San Francisco County LP

LP Chair Aaron Starr argues ("Winners or Whiners," June 2005, p. 2) that Libertarians should avoid being seen as protesters and complainers because "people like to associate themselves with winners," and "people who protest and complain do not have power." The piece had the rather offensive title, "Winners or Whiners."

Does Aaron believe that Libertarian activists like Paul Ireland, who was arrested at a Los Angeles County Post Office for bravely refusing to give up his right to free speech at an anti-tax protest, are "whiners?" Or does he merely want to distance the party from such acts of courage? Besides Libertarians like Paul Ireland, and Ron Crickenberger, a tireless crusader against the "War on Drugs," whose arrest in front of the Department of Justice was also held up as a negative example in his column, I

would like to remind Aaron of a few other people, who, by the standard he is promoting, would also be branded as "whiners" and "complainers":

- Lech Walesa (protested for the right to form independent unions, and played a key role in bringing down the Soviet Empire)
- Lady Godiva (rode a horse naked through town to protest taxes)
- Organizers of the Boston Tea Party (threw tea into Boston Harbor to protest taxes)
- Mahatma Gandhi (practiced

civil disobedience in protest of British occupation of India)

- Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. (jailed for advocating equal rights)
- Emma Goldman (deported for promoting birth control)
- Andrei Sakharov (sent into internal exile and went on a hunger strike to protest the Soviet regime)
- The nameless Chinese hero of the Tian'anmen Uprising (stood down a line of Red Army tanks)
- Galileo (arrested for daring to publish a book suggesting that the earth revolves around the sun)
- The drag queens and other patrons of the Stonewall bar in Manhattan (rioted against police in response to anti-gay raids)

What do these individuals have in common? Simply this: At the time they chose to stand up for freedom, truth, and justice, not one of them knew they would ultimately prevail, or that history books would look back on them as winners. (Historical vindication of the Chinese patriot's action is yet to come, but I have no doubt that it will. In the eyes of much of the world, he already has won.) No doubt their actions would have made professional market-



ers highly uncomfortable. No doubt in many cases their opponents, and members of the public, tended to view them as "whiners" or "losers," promoting extremist causes which would never succeed.

In some ways this comes down to how much faith you have in the libertarian cause. Do you believe that freedom will ultimately prevail, and that people like Paul Ireland and Ron Crickenberger will be remembered as the heroes they are? Or have you mentally "given up?" Are you assuming that our cause can prevail only if we turn our backs on the best and bravest among us; if we hide their noble acts like dirty secrets? Are these the actions of a winning team? Are winners obsessed with how their chances are viewed by others? No. Winners have confidence and faith in the future. Like Dr. King, like the Boston Tea Party patriots, we shall overcome!

Toward liberty, indeed! ●

STARCHILD is a former Chair of the LP of San Francisco County and a three-time candidate for public office. He is a recipient of the Advocates for Self-Government "Lights of Liberty" award. Currently he serves as a member of the Judicial Committee of the LPC, where he is a former Executive Committee at-large representative.

Paid Advertisement

Attention: Peace Activists

A Message From **Douglas Arthur Tuma**
Web Site: www.ArtTuma.us

A new anti-defense caucus aims to name American-defense Libertarian candidates for Congress as "pro-war." It faults them for favoring "the US invasion of Iraq." It seeks your help to defeat them in primary elections.

Mark W. Stroberg, 2004 LP candidate for CD13 in CA, called Iraq's liberation "a preemptive invasion of Iraq, a sovereign nation that has never threatened us."
www.stroberg2004.org/campaignsite/issues/warwithiraq.htm

"Iraq ... never threatened us" is an astoundingly absurd but critical premise for socialist protests against American pursuit of terrorists in Iraq. It is a false premise. It is fraud. It is deceit. Libertarians should expose socialist deceit and tell the truth: Iraq attacked America with false blame for genocide; Iraq helped terrorists attack America; and Iraq sheltered and rewarded terrorists who killed Americans.

Calling American-defense candidates "pro-war" for welcoming the end of Iraq's war on America is wrong. Calling America's liberation of Iraq "the US invasion of Iraq" is wrong. You can help right these wrongs.

The LP Platform <www.lp.org/issues/platform_all.shtml#iv> identifies peace and defense, guided by non-intervention, as objectives for foreign policy. American-defense candidates defend peace in America by pursuit of terrorists who intervened in the affairs of Americans with pain, death and destruction. You can help resist terrorist attacks on America by helping American-defense candidates win against anti-defense candidates and expose socialist, anti-American deceit.

American-defense Libertarians propose, support and publicize ratification of anti-war resolutions that call for more effort to counter anti-American deceit. Such resolutions will make clear to voters that the LP is honest as well as a party of peace.

American-defense Libertarians collaborate to elect principled, honest Party officers to better serve the LP membership with more support for American-defense candidates.

You can decide for yourself what is aggression and what is not. You should know fraud is aggression. You should know Iraq blamed America for the deaths of hundreds of thousands of Iraqi children. But you should also know Iraq is rich with children. Iraq lied. Americans died.

Be grateful Americans elected a Congress that defended America by restoring honesty to Iraq. Give America Libertarian Congressional candidates who will defend America from foreign aggression.

Please help your Party officials and candidates be honest about Iraq's liberation. Get free email alerting you to activities in support of American-defense Libertarian candidates. Send your name, home address and email address to tuma2k@hotmail.com.

Paid for by Tuma for Congress.

LPC Passes Resolution on Foreign Intervention

At its quarterly meeting on Aug. 20, the LPC Executive Committee passed a resolution entitled, "A Resolution by the Libertarian Party of California Executive Committee Affirming the National Libertarian Party Principles and Platform Concerning Foreign Intervention and the Invasion of Iraq."

The resolution affirms the National LP's Platform, which in part states: "The United States should not inject itself into the internal matters of other nations, unless they have declared war upon or attacked the United States, or the U.S. is already in a constitutionally declared war with them," and "End the current U.S. government policy of foreign intervention, including military and economic aid, guarantees, and diplomatic meddling."

It resolves that the LPC Executive Committee "formally petitions that the National Libertarian Party remain constant and adamant in demanding that the United States government cease and desist in the most safely expedient manner possible from all foreign economic and military interventions, Iraq in particular, and correct its international policies so that it may at last begin to facilitate world peace through the naturally benevolent function of the Free Market."

The resolution was passed by a vote of 8-2, with 5 committee members abstaining. For the full text of the resolution, visit www.lpty.net/nonintervention. ●



In Conversation with 2004 Pres. Candidate Russo

by Elizabeth C. Brierly

Editor, California Freedom

Although Aaron Russo was sorely disappointed to have lost the Libertarian Party nomination for President last year, 2005 has seen him pursuing with unflagging verve his next project toward helping Americans garner "all your freedoms, all the time," as his Presidential campaign slogan exhorted.

Today, part of that slogan, *All Your Freedoms*, is the moniker of Russo's company. He reports that what he terms his most important work (just to date, trust his supporters), the next great libertarian movie, is nearing its debut.

California Freedom caught up with the colorful, Oscar- and Golden Globe-nominated, and Emmy-winning movie producer at his office in Beverly Hills, where he spoke passionately about running for President, LP strategies and tactics, and the movie that he can't stop beaming about.

CF: Tell us about your 2004 loss at the Libertarian



Photo: Elizabeth C. Brierly

• Hollywood producer Aaron Russo shows off his Emmy award for Bette Midler's "Ol' Red Hair is Back."

Party Presidential nominating convention.

AR: I entered the race because I thought I could help; I felt that the LP needed a higher profile candidate. If I'd felt that Gary Nolan and Michael Badnarik could accomplish what I could, as a high-profile candidate, I wouldn't have run. But the bad part about it was that people in the Libertarian Party don't get it, you know? I think they missed a good strategy.

CF: You ran for Governor of Nevada [as a Republican] in 1998. You've made noises that you'd consider running again

for one of these offices. Any definite plans?

AR: Not yet. I'll wait for the response to my new movie before deciding whether running for office should be my next pursuit. This movie offers a chance to elevate the consciousness of Americans. [For now] I want to stay focused on that.

If I were to run for Governor of Nevada, it would not be as a Democrat or Republican; it would either be as a Libertarian or independent, figuring out which is the best way to win. In other words, if I ran for Governor as an independent and I won, obviously I'd be a libertarian governor.

I entered the race because I thought I could help; I felt that the LP needed a higher profile candidate.

CF: Just as Ron Paul [the LP's 1988 Presidential candidate] is a libertarian congressman [R-Texas].

AR: Exactly right. But the idea is to win. I don't want to run and waste my time. I think I would have a good shot at winning the governor's race in Nevada, actually. I don't yet know whether the strategy of running is better as an independent or a Libertarian. See, to me it doesn't matter whether I'm Libertarian Party or not. What matters to me is that the libertarian philosophy is at work.

I'm not big on political parties—any of them. I've never had a good experience with a political party. Even when I almost won the Republican primary for [Nevada] governor in '98, the Republican Party hated me. I never knew how much people lied and cheated before; I must say, I was much more innocent than I ever realized.

Even running for President in the Libertarian Party, I thought a lot of the stuff they did was wrong. For example, it was inappropriate to allow Gary Nolan [a rival candidate] to get up and speak [endorsing Badnarik] once the balloting was underway.

I'm not sure if I want to be involved in party politics. See, it's much easier to just be independent—just get out there

and do it! Live your philosophy and believe in it, rather than dealing with political honchos. Being in a party takes all your energy from what you really want to be doing. I thought the Republican Party was really bad; the Libertarian Party was better in terms of being decent, kinder. But people got so angry at me for running, for getting involved.

Michael's [Badnarik, winner of that LP Presidential nomination] a good guy, but I can't tell you how many phone calls I got saying that the Party had made a big mistake.

The Libertarian Party is the party with the correct philosophy. But I think the LP doesn't understand the importance of getting high-profile people involved to raise the awareness of the Party. If you had \$1 million in cash, and it sat in a room, and never got distributed, it wouldn't mean anything. If the LP stays [as] this little group of people, and all we do is talk to each other, and we don't get high profile activism going, it's meaningless—we're not going to get what we want to get. I think Ross Perot and Jesse Ventura proved that it can be done.

If you really want to fight for freedom, you want to do what Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison, and all those guys did: get out there and get active; you have to make it happen. [Libertarians] are always so busy fighting with each other, arguing and debating, with their egos so involved, that they miss the big picture.

CF: And [as a moviemaker] you know a "big picture" when you see it!

AR: [Laughing.] I do, actually.

CF: So, those higher profile libertarians you mentioned—how do we entice them to run?

AR: What we have to do is build [the party] up to a certain point so they can segue in easier. The party has to get a certain amount of respectability, so they can step into it. If somebody were to win a governor's race, say, or [to accomplish] what Ross Perot did, then [a celebrity] might step in. But to just step in the way it is now, the celebrity becomes it. They become the center of it—not the party—and they would be carrying the burden.

CF: The LPC's job is to increase the number of elected Libertarians by running candidates. But we're looking at accomplishing that a little differently, by getting already-

elected officials to convert to the Libertarian Party. What's your take on that approach?

AR: I think they're all good approaches; they should all be employed. Whether you can get elected officials to become Libertarian is another question. If they're really deeply libertarian, like Ron Paul, that'd be great. But I don't know that you want a guy like George W. Bush saying he's a libertarian, all of a sudden, as the President.

CF: Good point. George Bush would be bad for our image! So, we should convert only the ones who are exhibiting libertarian values.

AR: And who believe in libertarianism, freedom of the individual. To me, the most important thing that any politician has to understand is that everybody owns their own life, and are private property to themselves.

CF: Tell us about the film you're making about the IRS.

AR: The film is a documentary called "April 15th: the Real April Fool's Day." It came out brilliant! My test screenings in New York and Los Angeles with right- and left-wingers have gone through the roof. It's had standing ovations; the audiences, even in liberal New York—even a society lady—have been going crazy! It is probably the best libertarian movie ever made; people are saying it's the best documentary they've ever seen. One person even said it's like "Michael Moore x 10."

CF: But in a good way?

AR: Yes! His movie ["Fahrenheit 9/11"] was about [President George W.] Bush, but this movie is about the system, what's happening. People are seeking truth, and I think this movie is [going to give] it to them. This may be the best work I've ever done; it's certainly the most important. I'm more proud of this than of anything I've done in my life. This has a chance to make a difference in the world.

I'm more proud of this [documentary] than of anything I've done in my life.

CF: When can we see it?

AR: There'll be a big announcement. Right now I'm adding six or seven minutes to

• See Russo page 7

Shopping for a home?

Tap into the Libertarian Network of Realtors and help boost income to the LPC!

Longtime Libertarian and Chair of Calaveras County Libertarians, Al Segalla, with his 25 years of experience as a Realtor, has created a way for you to work with Libertarian Realtors while benefiting the LPC. It's a Libertarian Realty Network! As directed by you, their Libertarian customer, Network Realtors will donate 20% of their Network commissions to the LPC or any other Libertarian cause you endorse.

Tap in! Visit www.BambiLand.com/NetWork.html

With so many Libertarians in California, this could yield several hundred Network transactions each year.

Albert J. Segalla, Realtor
Chair, LP of Calaveras County



SEGALLA & ASSOCIATES

3224 Skunk Ranch Road • Murphys, CA 95247
(209) 728-2887 • alsegalla@jps.net
www.bambiland.com

The Unknown Government

by **L.K. Samuels**
Northern Vice Chair, LPC

What government entity can incur bonded indebtedness without voter approval? What government agency consumes over 10% of all Californian property taxes but is hidden under most citizens' radar? What government bureau has the power to give public money directly to business interests in the form of free land, cash grants, tax rebates, or civic improvements? It's not some super-secret military special-ops conducting missions in Area 51. No, this hidden spending comes from the various California Community Redevelopment agencies that purport to eliminate blight, encourage new development, provide affordable housing, and increase employment opportunities.

Often referred to by opponents of redevelopment as the "Unknown Government," these obscure agencies have been given even greater authority to steal private homes by the recent Supreme Court decision on eminent domain. Blighted neighborhoods and substandard housing are no longer factors. The tak-

ing of private land by another has no restriction except that it must provide more local tax revenues. But redevelopment laws entitle local governments to do more than order bulldozers to smash private homes into piles of rubble. Redevelopment agencies have far more insidious powers than just confiscating private property.

Lurking in a dark alley like a mugger, redevelopment laws can spring into action at any moment to prevent citizens from improving their homes, to devalue homes' prices, and even to turn neighborhoods into blighted areas. Under the cloak of complex and self-contradictory zoning laws, these agencies have acquired immense power. An example can be found in the city of Seaside, California, which has a regulation often referred to as "the 25% rule." It restricts homeowners from improving the value of their property more than 25% of its current assessed value.

As a Realtor, I once represented a client who fell victim to this never-ending horror story. She owned a home without concrete foundation on Elm Street, in the middle of the redevelopment "risk zone," which covers almost half of Seaside. When

she tried to sell her property, the planning department at City Hall told the buying contractor that he could not tear it down and build a new home. At this point, the owner considered installing a concrete foundation. Again, City Hall disallowed the improvement, afraid it would give too much increased value to the property. The owner became so frustrated that she often equated her problem with City Hall to the horror film "Nightmare on Elm Street."

During a meeting with Seaside's acting city manager, I asked about the harm redevelopment laws seemed to be doing to the community. He said that redevelopment policies had a common tendency to create slums. He pointed out that cities generally had no qualms about creating blighted areas. In fact, he acknowledged that they encouraged it. He said these policies provided developers with less expensive land in order to build retail centers. In return, local government would get more much-needed tax revenues. To him, this was business as usual.

In the case of Elm Street, the city had long-term plans to turn a whole residential neighborhood into a commercial center, even though there were many large vacant lots dotting the city's downtown section. When the buying contractor discovered this plan, he offered to put in a store instead. City Hall

still said "no." The reason: Elm Street was still zoned as "residential."

This Catch-22 situation illustrates both the irrational nature of city governments and the tremendous power that they have obtained under redevelopment laws. Local governments have regressed into little kingdoms. They have become the powerful landlords, and homeowners have become the serfs. A limited constitutional government was supposed to prevent such travesties. Today, there seems to be nothing off-limits to government.

One of the best booklets that deal with the dark side of redevelopment is former Fullerton mayor and Orange County Supervisor Chris Norby's *Redevelopment: The Unknown Government*. He tells of a secret and manipulative inner-government with a current total indebtedness of over \$56 billion in California. His book, available on line at www.Redevlopment.com, is sponsored by Municipal Officials for Redevelopment Reform. It should be required reading for every official in California.

Voters provide the ultimate check on the powers of rede-


velopment agencies. By finding out where their candidates and elected representatives stand on issues like eminent domain and redevelopment bonds, they can vote only for those which will respect private property. By our bringing the activities of the Unknown Government into the bright light of day, politicians and bureaucrats can be held accountable—as they must—to the people they serve. ●

Originally published on Aug. 16, 2005 as part of "The Libertarian Perspective" series of the Libertarian Party of California. You can read more "Perspectives" at www.CA.LP.org/perspective.shtml.

L.K. SAMUELS is editor and contributing author of *Facets of Liberty: A Libertarian Primer*, a collection of political, economic, and sociological essays. Samuels won honorable mention at the East of Eden Writers Conference in 2002 for his historical novel, *Ferret: The Reluctant King*. He is a member of the California Writers Club, and in the early 1980s was editor of *Rampart Institute's* quarterly magazine. Currently Samuels serves as Northern Vice Chair of the LPC.



Photo: Elizabeth C. Brierly



Municipal Officials for Redevelopment Reform

Russo

continued from page 7

the film, based partly on the response during the screening. Squeezing 100 hours of footage into a 95-minute movie is tough.

CF: What prompted you to make this film?

AR: Many people have been saying there's no law requiring Americans to pay income taxes. I said to myself, "I keep hearing all these protestors, a lot of whom seem to be very smart and sincere. They're not wackos, so what do they know that I don't? Let me go find out. I think it would make an interesting documentary, particularly if there is no [such] law."

I had to go back into time, to follow the history of the IRS in detail, examine it all, speak with people, and find out whether there is a law or there isn't a law. I decided to make the



Photo: Elizabeth C. Brierly

• **LPC Secretary Dan Wiener (left) accepts a Presidential ballot from candidate Aaron Russo. (LP national convention in Atlanta, 5/31/04)**

investment to find out whether there was something commercial there or not, by going in and talking to people, and seeing, and mining. The more I talked to ex-IRS agents, the commissioner of the IRS, press people from the IRS—the more I looked at the Constitution and Supreme Court decisions, and

started understanding the tax code and how it works—direct vs. indirect tax, etc.—I found it to be fascinating. I think it'll make a very, very commercial movie.

CF: There's an opportunity cost to one's time. If you'd been running the Presidential race, you may not have hit upon this movie project, which may end up having a much bigger impact on the libertarian movement.

AR: Absolutely. I believe that.

My whole life, it's—I was very successful as a movie producer, you know? Emmys, Academy Award nominations, Golden Globes—everything a man could want. And I gave it all up to get involved in politics, because I wanted to make a change in the country. From my point of view, it was an opportunity to go do that, and then when I lost—even when I lost the governor's race in Nevada (I

• See **Russo** page 8

Decisions, decisions

Businesses wonder how to become capitalized.

Writers wonder *whether* to Capitalize.


Brierly Services Company

Professional Editing and Communications Consulting

For your letter to the Capitol,
and your business plan to venture capitalists.

E-Mail: BrierlyServices@Netgate.net

Telephone & Facsimile: (408) 272-3191 • Mobile: (408) 930-4172



Russo

continued from page 7

came in second), I was wondering, "Why am I doing this? Why am I on this path?"

I believe in God—though I don't believe in religion—and I realized in many ways, it might be because of this IRS movie. I have a chance to demonstrate my movie skills, which I developed first, and my political knowledge, which came second, and then to combine them into making movies about things that are important. Maybe



Photo: Elizabeth C. Briery

• "Aaron Russo's Mad as Hell" poster with its proud namesake. In that hour-long video, Russo went after government abuses, including the IRS.

that's why I had to go through the process I went through.

That's what I've come out of it with, and I'm happy with that. ●

ELIZABETH C. BRIERY has served as editor of California Freedom since 2003. She was a member of the LPC Executive Committee for five years, two of those as Secretary, and in 2002 was the LPC's candidate for State Board of Equalization (District 1). She is Vice President of Silicon Valley Taxpayers' Association, and works as a freelance editor, focusing on libertarian projects.



From the Secretary National Dues, along with UMP, Abolished!

The Libertarian National Committee has voted to abolish the Unified Membership Plan and national dues. This drastic action will have far-reaching consequences. It could make for a leaner and more efficient national Libertarian Party, while encouraging greater independence on the part of state parties. Or, it could drive the national LP into bankruptcy. My personal guess is the latter, but I hope I'm wrong.

In any case, all LP members in California should immediately cease sending dues for membership renewals to the national LP! Instead, send all membership renewals (at \$25 per year) to:

Libertarian Party of California
14547 Titus Street, Suite 214
Panorama City, CA 91402-4935

Members should ignore any renewal notices from the national LP which still ask for dues to be sent to the national office in Washington, D.C.* From this day on, there is no guarantee that any money sent to the national LP will ever find its way back to the state or county organizations.

I'm sure everyone has a lot of questions about this upheaval. At this time, unfortunately, I don't have any answers beyond what I've stated above. We'll be spending the next few weeks and months trying to sort it all out.

—Daniel Wiener
Secretary, LP of California

* The LPC does encourage contributions, outside of membership dues, to the national, state, and local LP branches, for whichever projects members appreciate. —Editor



Rider

continued from page 2

anything but assured, but puts me in a high visibility position however it comes out."

Rider was able to expose to the public and the press a second, heretofore unknown pension plan the city workers receive: "It turns out that most city employees retiring after 26 years get a pension bigger than their highest salary! I will continue to dwell on this outrageous excess, and the general populace will get really mad when they learn more about it."

And the exposure won't be ending there. The managing editor of the San Diego Daily Transcript, which had not made an endorsement in this race,

offered his congratulations to Rider for his campaign, and said he'd be glad to run Rider's op-eds any time.

Invaluable volunteers

Yet another reward reaped during the campaign was the volunteer organization that came together, which will be useful in upcoming battles. It's likely that whoever wins November's mayoral runoff ("I'm endorsing neither candidate," said Rider) will, if voter resolve weakens, try to raise taxes. But such an increase will have to go to a vote of the citizens, and the new volunteer organization will be out front opposing that tax increase. Explained Rider, "While I'm active in the San Diego Libertarian Party (I'm on the local executive committee),

my primary role in upcoming battles will be [continuing to head] the nonpartisan San Diego Tax Fighters, and I'm sure many of our campaign volunteers will help out when asked."

Rider credited these LPC activists for much of the campaign's success:

Mark Selzer: "We put together a 30-second TV commercial on a shoestring, thanks to Mark Selzer, and aired it over 300 times on targeted cable channels—including CNN and ESPN."

Kristi Stone: "Our sign graphics were considered by our well-heeled opponents to be the best signs out there. LP activist Kristi Stone did the design—for free, as opposed to the big bucks our opponents were paying."

Doris and George Ball: "What a crew my volunteers were, mustered by Volunteer Coordinators Doris and George Ball. I had about 50 solid volunteers, working for me throughout the campaign. Even when it became apparent I wouldn't win—or even come close—they soldiered on."

Kim Gubala: "We had only one paid employee: Kim Gubala, my Campaign Coordinator. And, truth be told, she worked cheap—relative to the time and effort she put into the campaign. She worked seven days a week for almost the entire campaign. With PR experience, but not in campaigns, she did an incredible job, and always with an upbeat attitude. I can't convey how important she was to the campaign, and to my peace of mind."

Dan Graaff: "We established a classy web site using volunteers, and tried to keep it current and interesting. If you are interested in using this web site (www.Rider4Mayor.com) as a template for your campaign, get in touch with the webmaster: Dan Graaff at DGraaff@ar-den.com."

Regional Outreach



Photo: Lawrence Samuels

• The LP of Monterey County came out for the "Pride of Monterey County" festival on July 23. Travis Griffiths, David Henderson, and Lawrence Samuels, LPC's Northern Vice Chair, manned the booth. Samuels reported that the Operation Political Homeless quiz they conducted revealed a high portion of the participants scored as libertarian. "Pride" is dedicated to the celebration of those with unconventional lifestyles, a perfect constituency for the third party. The Libertarian Party defends the right of an individual's choice of spouse or life partner, and eschews government intrusion in marriage, whether defining it or licensing it. Pictured is Travis Griffiths (at right) shattering for one more citizen the myth of the two-party continuum.

Keep apprised of the latest shenanigans

Richard Rider provides a free political e-mail service to tax-fighting and libertarian allies—plus to the press and to hapless politicians. He distributes articles of interest, usually with his brief comments and critiques of the material. He offers a national e-mail list, a California list, and a local list; write to him at Richard.Rider@EconomyTelcom.com, letting him know which category you prefer. ●

Official Mayoral Results

Donna Frye	114,573	43.18%
Jerry Sanders	71,767	27.05%
Steve Francis	62,500	23.56%
Pat Shea	6,299	2.37%
Richard Rider	4,173	1.57%
Myke Shelby	3,881	1.46%
Shawn McMillan	619	0.23%
Jim Bell	529	0.20%
Ed Kolker	452	0.17%
Jeremy Ledford	425	0.16%
Thomas Knapp	109	0.04%

Source: www.SDVote.org/election/SANDIEG0072605.xml



Official Notice of the Libertarian Party of California
LPC Convention, Feb. 24–27, 2006

Something new is in store for the 2006 convention of the Libertarian Party of California, and the sailing date is Feb. 24, 2006.

That's right—we'll be boarding Royal Caribbean's cruise ship Monarch of the Seas, for a three-night excursion including a day's visit to Ensenada, Mexico. On board, we'll conduct the LPC's annual business and elections, while enjoying the amenities of this recently renovated luxury cruise liner. Family members not participating in convention business will find plenty of excitement on board and exploration on shore in Mexico.

The ship will sail from the Port of Los Angeles on Friday, Feb. 24 at 5:30 P.M., and will return on Monday, Feb. 27 at 8:00 A.M. Scheduling the convention for the weekend after the Presidents' Day holiday has enabled the LPC to negotiate very reasonable fares and keep the convention package price in line with that of our traditional packages in a hotel.

A raft of details, including prices and how to reserve your spot at the convention, will be announced in next month's *California Freedom*. In the meantime, contact LPC Executive Director Dave Ruprecht at the LPC office (1-877-884-1776) if you need more information.