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2006 election wrap-up

ELECTION NIGHT 2006 brought the usual mixed bag of joys and sorrows for Libertarian candidates. Now that most states have finished tallying the results, Libertarians can take much hope in what the numbers tell us.

Within days, many media reports took note of how two Libertarians (see lead story) exceeded the margin of difference in US Senate races where the Democrat beat the Republican with less than 50 percent of the vote. While Libertarians have had an impact on a top of the ticket race in each of the previous three elections, this is the first time it has happened twice in the same year. Certainly the Libertarian effect on the two seat Democratic majority in the Senate weighs heavily on GOP minds.

Libertarians also ex-
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Libertarian Victories Turn Senate Blue

Libertarians mourn the death of Milton Friedman

FAMOUS LIBERTARIAN ECONOMIST, Milton Friedman, passed away in his home in San Francisco, California on November 16th, 2006. Dr. Friedman died of heart failure at the age of 94.

Born in New York City in 1912, Friedman was the son of Jewish immigrants from Hungary. Mil-
ton attended Rutgers University for his Bachelors Degree and later the University of Chicago, where he attained a Masters Degree in 1933. Later, in 1946, after working for the U.S. Department of Treasury he received a doctorate from Columbia University for his outstanding work.

Friedman is renowned for his free market ideologies. His theories were groundbreaking and most are still widely accepted. He was a proponent of small government and argued that government spending should not be used as a tool to guide the economy. He once said, "The government solution to a problem is usually as bad as the problem." He served under Ronald Reagan, and many of his ideas about shrinking government can be seen in Reagan’s economic policies.

Dr. Friedman led the Chicago School of monetary economics, which claims that the supply of money controls inflation and in turn, can control the ups and downs of the business cycles. He believed that it was difficult to control the cycles, and that go-
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Meet The new bosses, same as the old bosses

While exit polling during the 2006 elections made it clear that the typical American voter desired change, actions of both the Republican and Democratic Party leadership indicate that neither major party listened to their constituents.

“In the ritual that are congressional leadership elections, just like those in student government, relationships and popularity trump all — ideology, public perception, and even competence,” wrote National Review’s Jonathan Martin when explaining why both parties selected their leaders based on “who you know,” as opposed to reasons about which the general American population cares.

GOP STAYS THE COURSE

Frequent opinion pieces and bestselling books were published prior to the election which suggested that the Republican Party was going to lose a significant amount of ground in both houses of Congress if they didn’t get back to their core fiscally conservative ideals. To be sure, quite a few Republicans who had reneged on their small government promises lost their individual races.

Surviving Republicans had a clear chance to inform the American public that they were listening during recent House and Senate leadership votes. Instead, they voted for some of their leaders. Recent leadership votes during recent House sessions seem to say that Pelosi and friends were determined to avoid a Tea Party type of revolt.

In the House, Rep. John Boehner defeated Rep. Mike Pence of Indiana and Rep. Joe Barton of Texas for the position of Minority Leader. On a Nolan Chart ranking recent congressional votes on economic issues, Boehner scored an abysmally low 20 percent while Barton scored 35 percent and Pence scored a near perfect 75 percent. All three Republicans scored incredibly low on the social scale, tying at seven percent.


Democrats follow suit

On the other side of the aisle, Rep. Nancy Pelosi was unanimously elected by Democrats to be the Speaker of the House, a post which will be officially confirmed when the new Congress convenes early next year.

While many pundits have attributed many of the 2006 Democratic electoral victories, especially in Western states, to candidates running on a somewhat libertarian agenda, House Democrats ignored the experts and chose the congresswoman who voted for the Patriot Act, Homeland Security and against a bill that condemned the torture of prisoners in Iraq. Pelosi routinely receives the lowest possible ratings from organizations like Gun Owners of America and the National Rifle Association.

Pelosi is already under fire from leaders in her own party for supporting Rep. John Murtha as Majority Leader. Murtha was heavily implicated and named an unindicted co-conspirator by the Justice Department in the ABSCAM investigation in 1980. He was recently listed as one of the 20 most corrupt members of Congress by the left-leaning Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics. Murtha lost despite Pelosi’s support and Tom DeLay-like tactics.

“She violated every conceivable rule of Boss-like behavior: she lost, she lost publicly, she lost after issuing useless and unenforceable threats to people she barely had, knowing (or having reason to know) that they would tell the world about her unsuccessful arm-twisting,” according to Newsweek’s Howard Fineman. “And she lost big: by 149 to 86 votes.”

While some might assume that Pelosi might have learned her lesson with that stinging loss, apparently she hasn’t. An editorial in the Bay area’s Mercury-News suggests that Pelosi planned to name Aliece Hastings as the chair of the House Select Intelligence Committee.

“(Hastings is) a former federal judge who was impeached and convicted by Congress for taking a $150,000 bribe and committing perjury,” wrote the editorial staff. “Putting a man with his shady history in charge of a committee dealing with highly classified information would be a huge mistake.”

IT’S NOT JUST THE LEADERSHIP

Anecdotal evidence presents a strong case that elected rank-and-file members of both parties are no less likely to change than their leaders. Recent lead stories about one recently elected Republican and one seasoned Democrat illustrate the point.

Republican Rep. Shelley Sekula-Gibbs is now in the majority in the House of Representatives. Gibbs has accused the staffers of deleting computer files.

Not to be outdone by a Republican, Democratic Rep. Charles Rangel is up to his old tricks again. He recently topped the weekend news cycle by announcing his plan to submit a bill calling for the re-introduction of military conscription. While Libertarian candidates eventually forced John Kerry and George W. Bush to publicly rebuke mandatory government service in a televised debate during the 2004 election cycle, apparently Rangel doesn’t care.

“In 2003, before the invasion of Iraq, Rangel proposed a measure covering people ages 18 to 26,” the Boston Globe reported. “This year, he offered a plan to mandate military service for men and women ages 18 to 42, but the bill went nowhere in the Republican-led Congress.”

While the Democrats may have taken charge of both houses of Congress, it doesn’t appear that much will change. Perhaps senior editor and correspondent Charles Madigan summed it up best in the Chicago Tribune:

“But maybe she is just like many of her predecessors, wearing a good government sheepskin even as she waits like a wolf for the K Street money to come prancing down the lane.”

The Mission Statement of the Libertarian Party: “To move public policy in a libertarian direction by building a political party that elects Libertarians to public office.”

“But maybe [Pelosi] is just like many of her predecessors, wearing a good government sheepskin even as she waits like a wolf for the K Street money to come prancing down the lane.”
ALTHOUGH THE 2006 CANDIDATES have been removed from the Libertarian Party Candidate Tracker program, the national office of the Libertarian Party has started highlighting candidates for the 2007 election cycle.

Currently, there are two candidates listed at Candidate Tracker, which can be viewed at www.LP.org. At the time this article was written, Arin Sime was in the lead with a total of 91 points. Sime is running for the District 24 seat in the Virginia State Senate and has been featured in LP News before.

He is a co-founder of VirginiaPropertyRights.org, a website devoted to changing Virginia’s Constitution to protect home owners from eminent domain abuse, a local leader in efforts to make sure eminent domains is not abused and to advocate for lower tax rates in Albemarle County, a member of Virginia Independent Consumers and Farmers Association, webmaster for Virginians Over-Taxed On Residences, and the current vice chair and former chair of the Jefferson Area Libertarians.

Sime is followed by T. Lee Horne, III, who is running for Governor of Louisiana. Rapper Lil’ Nuke just composed a song for Horne’s campaign, which is featured on the LP blog. Horne has a B.A. in Liberal Arts from Stetson University.

Candidate Tracker 2007

HORNE

T. Lee Horne, III - Running for Governor in Louisiana

Current CT Score: 59

SIME

Arin Sime - Running for State Senate District 24 in Virginia

Current CT Score: 91

Noteable quotes from the 2007 campaign trail

OVER THE LAST FEW WEEKS, there were so many Libertarians interviewed in the media or engaged in debates, it would be virtually impossible to cover them all in LP News. However, we thought we’d provide you with a few highlights from various Libertarian Party personalities, candidates and key supporters.

Arizona Libertarian Party gubernatorial candidate Barry Hess in his first televised debate of the 2006 elections:

“We’re going to have a Demo- crat and she’s going to tell you that she knows how to run your life, raise and educate your chil- dren, and spend your hard earned money better than you can. Now the Republican is going to be a Democrat and he’s going to tell you that only you and I, as responsible parents and community members, can do. No matter how much money we throw at it, now matter how much we wish it to be true, it still falls back to our personal responsibility.

As a Libertarian, I’m the keeper of a sacred trust between the people themselves and their servant government.”

Libertarian National Commit- tee Chairman William Redpath on C-SPAN:

“Sometimes it’s said that Re- publicans and Democrats are the best campaigners for us in that the more people see them, the more they begin considering a Libertarian Party candidate.”

Washington state Libertarian Party senatorial candidate Bruce Guthrie said in a televised debate responding to a Republican call for drug testing welfare recipi- ents:

“I’d prefer drug and alcohol testing of members of Congress and the Senate.”

Former U.S. Representative Bob Barr of Georgia accurately predicting Shelley Sekula-Gibbs general election loss in Tom DeLay’s former congressional district:

“Write-in campaigns rarely succeed, and that is also why I ask that you join me in supporting Bob Smith as the only can- didate who can defeat the liberal Nick Lampson.”

Connecticut Libertarian Party congressional candidate Phil Maymín to Tucker Carlson on MSNBC:

“Think about your children. Do you want your children to be welfare queens? Do you want them to be receiving handouts and being dependent on govern- ment? Or do you think your chil- dren are the kinds of people who can follow that American dream, can do what they want to do with- out having to file paperwork and ask for permission from Bush or Clinton or whoever is the Bush Jr. or Clinton Jr. at the time.”

Libertarian Party Executive Director Shane Cory in a C-Net interview which stated that LP candidates maintain higher web- site standards than those of the other political parties:

“We’ll be the first to admit that we do have a lot of geeks in the party, and I’m one of them. We take a look at the issues before us and try to find solutions to them, just like you’d troubleshoot a PHP script or HTML.”

Colorado LP gubernatorial candidate Dawn Winkler on a local NBC television station:

“As a married woman, I hold the institution of marriage sacred. However, sacred institutions are no excuse for policies of discrimination and intolerance. Positions that hold marriage exclusive to a man and a woman are in denial of the vast diversity of society, the very thing that allowed this nation to become prosperous. Consequently, just as religion has no business to interfere with governmental policy, governmental policy has no right to interfere with personal choices, especially on something as intimate as marriage between two consenting adults.”

Libertarian Party Communications Director Stephen Gordon on a C-SPAN televised panel about public financing of political campaigns:

“I don’t want the government to control how much money my campaign can take in or my po- litical party can take in. Here’s the reason why. When we give government the opportunity to control other things in the elec- toral system, what do they do? They mess it up! This is their pattern. So we want to trust the same government that gives us restrictive ballot laws with our purse strings?”

Alabama’s Loretta Nall had made the following comment about public education. Nall used her gubernatorial campaign as a springboard to run for U.S. Congress in 2008.

“I want you to look at the problem from the angle of maybe the system is failing and not the kids. Our society has changed and the public education system has not been able to adapt. It’s too big, too controlled by some Washington D.C. yahoo who doesn’t know anything about what teachers and kids… are like or what they might need to make sure the kids are receiving the best education possible.”

Indiana Libertarian Party congressional candidate Eric Shansberg when asked about healthcare reform during a televised debate:

“The problem with insurance, ironically, is that we have too much of it. It turns out, if you think about insurance, it’s usu- ally for catastrophic, rare events. Auto insurance, fire insurance, your house burns down, you have an accident. That’s when insur- ance kicks in.

“Health insurance is not really insurance, to an economist. It covers everything from allergy shots to cancer. Imagine auto insurance like that. Every door ding, every oil change, would be covered at 80 to 95 percent.

“And what would happen to the cost of an oil change? What would happen to the cost of a door ding? What would happen to the paperwork generated by auto in- surance companies? What would happen if your auto insurance came with your job and you were between jobs? You’d still have to worry about portability and pre-existing auto conditions. All of these problems happen from insurance covering too much.”

Libertarian National Commit- tee Chairman William Redpath when a caller suggested that Lib- ertarians should support Demo- crats on C-SPAN’s Washington Journal:

“Libertarians are going to be working for the election of Lib- ertarians.”

Libertarian Party gubernatorial candidate Garrett Michael Hayes in his final televised debate of 2006 election season:

“It’s even gotten to the point where there are now rumors out there that I’ve made some secret backroom deal to back one of my opponents in the future, and that’s simply not true. But when they get to the point where they have to start making up stories about me, somebody’s desperate and you bloody better well know that when they’re shooting at you, you’re doing something right.”
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The 2006 elections are now behind us, and I want to thank everyone who had anything whatsoever to do with the Libertarian Party campaigns across the nation (particularly, of course, the candidates and their campaign managers). While there were the usual election night disappointments, there were many bright spots for the LP.

One thing is for sure: the Libertarian Party again distinguished itself as the most vibrant and deep (in terms of number of candidates, variety of offices for which they ran, and the number of votes they earned) third party in the United States. Never forget that. It is very important. We are the most successful third party in the United States, and that is no mean feat. Indeed, we should be proud of that. Thank you for helping to make that happen.

As many of you know, I have long written and spoken of the importance of electoral reform to the future success of the Libertarian Party. On Election Day 2006, there were four electoral reform initiatives on the ballot in the U.S. They were initiatives for Instant Runoff Voting (IRV) in elections in Minneapolis, Oakland and Pierce County, Washington (County Seat: Tacoma), and a form of proportional representation called Single Transferable Vote (STV, sometimes called “Choice Voting”) for the City Council in Davis, California. All four initiatives passed, and that is good news for the LP. Reforms such as these will make elections more inclusive for the participation and coverage of third party candidates and Independents, and STV would make such candidates much more electable.

It’s now time to look toward future elections, and I am pleased that the Libertarian National Committee voted in November 2006 to make ballot access a core function of the National Party. Thanks to the hard work of Scott Kohlhaas and a number of petitioners, the LP petition drive was recently completed in North Dakota and petition drives are ongoing in Nebraska and Maryland. These three drives will likely be successfully concluded with no ballot access expenditures from the National Party, which I certainly encourage.

However, big petition drives lie ahead in 2007, and the total need for National Party funds to successfully complete them may reach $250,000. Probably the toughest of those petition drives is in North Carolina. But, it is possible that this may be our last petition drive ever in NC. While the legislature did not reduce the number of signatures required to get on the ballot, it did reduce the vote percentage required for President or Governor to stay on the ballot from 10 percent to 2 percent. The LP will probably be the only third party on the ballot in NC in 2008. And, Michael Munger, Chairman of the Political Science Department at Duke University, is seeking the LPNC nomination for Governor. If him at dinner after Harry Browne’s memorial service this past August, and I was very impressed with him. His campaign has already been covered by The Charlotte Observer. He will have a lot of appeal to women; I have been told that may of them request the opportunity to touch his hair. But, there is obviously a lot of substance to this man. I think there is a very good chance that he will earn the 2 percent to give the LPNC ballot status for the next four years in NC—and get the ball rolling for the LP in the Tar Heel state so that we will never have to petition there again.

But, as stated two paragraphs ago, that will take money. Please make your most generous contribution to the LP, so that we can get the North Carolina petition drive funded and completed ASAP in 2007. Becoming a monthly recurring donor (as I am at $83.34 per month, but please don’t consider that a ceiling) to the LNC might be the best way to do that. Please give Louise a call at (202) 333-0008 Ext 235, or send an e-mail to pledge@lp.org for a call back to set you up as a monthly recurring donor today. I will be forever grateful if you do.

And, speaking of which, with the last name “Redpath,” the most common question asked during the course of my life has been, “Are you an Indian?” No, Redpath is a Scottish name, and when it comes to saving a buck, my blood runs plaid, if you get my drift. And, no, you won’t be seeing my drumsticks anytime soon in a snappy looking kilt. However, should you be kind and generous enough to be a monthly recurring donor, I would like to ask the following favor: I recently switched my monthly recurring gift from being billed to my credit card to an Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT) from my checking account. Why? Because I learned that the transaction cost to the LNC is much less with the EFT. If everyone who gave a monthly recurring dona-

It’s now time to look toward future elections, and I am pleased that the Libertarian National Committee voted in November 2006 to make ballot access a core function of the National Party again.”
**ALABAMA:**
Arrests threatened at public forum

**LIBERTARIAN PARTY of ALABAMA members,** Dick Clark for State House campaign volunteers and the Auburn University Libertarians attended the AU College Republicans “Non-Partisan Voter Registration Concert” in front of Auburn University’s Cate Hall in October. After setting up a table in a back corner, the LP members were approached by several individuals wearing AU College Republican name badges. The College Republicans informed the Libertarians that they were not permitted to set up a table with “Republican” signs at the event, although a significant amount of Republican signs were present at the event.

State LP Chair Clark, AU Libertarians president Grace Stokes and others protested, alleged that the event had been promoted through the Student Government Association as “non-partisan.” The SGA announcement, a Facebook.com event listing and the AU College Republican website described the event as a non-partisan one, although that wording on the Facebook website was modified following the altercation, according to local Libertarians.

Eventually, the College Republicans agreed to allow the Libertarian table to remain where they had initially located it. Minutes later, when several uniformed Auburn police officers approached and demanded that the Libertarians leave, Clark asked what was wrong with the Libertarians campaigning at a supposedly open-to-all event.

One officer responded, “[The Republicans] have a permit.” When Clark explained that the permit was issued for a non-partisan event, he asked the officer if the Republican signs would be permitted even though the permit at issue clearly signified that the event was non-partisan. The officer then admitted that he had not personally seen the permit that he previously cited. He subsequently told Clark, “If you don’t leave you are going to be arrested for trespassing.”

Clark then inquired as to the boundaries of the “Free Speech Zone” the police were enforcing. Following police instructions, the Libertarian group relocated their signs and table. Two Auburn Plainman reporters interviewed many of the Libertarians present. Telling the excitement to be over, the Libertarian group distributed policy and campaign material to interested passers-by until a group of College Republicans approached the relocated table and began to verbally abuse the Libertarians.

“Libertarians calmly answered the heated objections raised by the Republicans,” according to Clark. One of the College Republicans reportedly grabbed Clark’s shoulder, who responded, “I’ll shake your hand, but don’t put your hands on me, please.” The police again became involved and one officer suggested that the Libertarians report any additional alterations to them. There were no additional disruptions reported at the event.

**ALASKA:**
Libertarians turn in petitions to repeal local smoking ban

Alaskans are working to repeal a smoking ban in Anchorage. Local television station KTVA reported: “They needed a little more than 7,000 signatures. On Monday they will be turning in more than 12,000 signatures in hopes of taking the smoking ban to the people this spring. According to Libertarian Party members, it isn’t about smoking and not smoking, it is about the rights of the people.

“It is not a smoking issue, it never has been. To us it is a property rights issue. It is about business owners’ rights issue. All about people’s choice to live and operate how they want to,” said Zach Keeton of the Libertarian Party.

Apparently, they turned in more than enough signatures, too. Again, from KTVA: “The petitions call for a referendum that asks voters whether the secondhand smoke ordinance should be repealed. Leaders of Stomp the Ban, a group formed by Alaska Libertarians just as much on Election Day as on the day they were un-booted off the ballot, are determined to restore their option.”

**LOUISIANA:**
Libertarians celebrate election results

While Rex Bell may have lost his race for Indiana State House District 54, his campaign led to the victories of two other Libertarians in the area.

“The support has been fantastic -- and resulted in two Libertarians being elected in Rex’s district to Township Advisory boards -- and very nearly a third one,” wrote Libertarian Party of Indiana Chairman Mark Ruthford. Rex Bell provided this campaign e-mail: “Conley Tillson in Greensfork and Steve Coffman in Millville won their township races, and Juli Stout missed a win by just 17 votes. And it’s going to be easier the next time around because Mike Kole kept us on the ballot with his showing in the Secretary of State race.”

**MISSOURI:**
Election results from the Show Me state

In the general election on November 7, Libertarian candidates in Missouri put out a great effort and achieved solid results.

The Missouri LP’s two statewide candidates - Charles Baum for State Auditor and Frank Gilmour for U.S. Senate - both surpassed the two percent base for maintaining the “established party” status of the Libertarian Party Missouri through the elections of 2010. Charles Baum earned 2.8 percent of the vote, the highest statewide percentage in over a decade. In the tightly contested race for U.S. Senate, where the two major party candidates spent over $30 million combined, Frank Gilmour broke the 12 percent running on a shoestring budget but with a lot of personal enthusiasm and support from all around the Missouri LP.

Their candidates for U.S. House also received solid support. Five of our nine candidates exceeded the two-percent threshold, and all of the others were close. With the help of vigorous campaigning and a solid support network, Randy Langkaehr earned 3.5 percent of the vote in the 5th district. Similarly, Kevin Craig received 3.1 percent in the 7th district.

In races for the Missouri State House, many of our candidates did exceptionally well. Several candidates in three-way races exceeded 4 percent of the vote. In some of the two-way races around the state, Libertarian candidates exceeded 10 percent (including two races in the City of St. Louis). In District 119, Ben Casebolt garnered more than 25 percent.

The Missouri LP wishes to thank all of their candidates for their efforts, and all of the voters out there who showed their support. These election results show that voters are becoming increasingly dissatisfied with the two major parties and are seeing Libertarians as an alternative. Libertarians can build on this support in future elections.

**GEORGIA:**
Libertarians celebrate election results

The 2006 candidates of the Libertarian Party of Georgia had a tremendous night on Election Day, according to party officials. They broke several previous records and are poised for continued growth. Jason Pye, Chairman of the Libertarian Party of Georgia, said: “More Georgians than ever before cast their votes for Libertarian candidates in 2006, representing a growing percentage of Georgians who want an accountable government that stands for smaller government, less taxes and more freedom.”

Garrett Michael Hayes received over 77,000 votes for Governor — more votes than any Georgia Libertarian gubernatorial candidate has ever received.

Allen Buckley received 20,000 more votes in his race for Lt. Governor than did the 2002 Libertarian candidate for Lt. Governor.

Kevin Madsen received over 81,000 votes for Secretary of State — the most votes any GeorgiA Libertarian running for Secretary of State has ever received.

Craig received 3.1 percent in the 7th district.

Paul MacGregor pulled 4.87% of the vote in Public Service Commission District 3 which forced the race into a run off between the Democrat and Republican.”

Kevin Madsen received over 103,000 votes in his race for State School Superintendent. That’s over 5% of the vote — almost double our 2002 vote total in the State School Superintendent race.

Rex Bell provided this campaign e-mail: “Conley Tillson in Greensfork and Steve Coffman in Millville won their township races, and Juli Stout missed a win by just 17 votes. And it’s going to be easier the next time around because Mike Kole kept us on the ballot with his showing in the Secretary of State race.”

LOOK, we ought to stand up to this and we need to stick together. We tried Republican; we tried Democrats

We need to make a stand and vote Libertarian

This is the thing that we need to be on
So make a stand and you’ll like to vote for Mr. Lee Horne

The entire video can be viewed at the Libertarian Party blog at www.lp.org/yourturn.

The Missouri LP wishes to thank all of their candidates for their efforts, and all of the voters out there who showed their support. These election results show that voters are becoming increasingly dissatisfied with the two major parties and are seeing Libertarians as an alternative. Libertarians can build on this support in future elections.

**APPRE LI’ NUKA wrote and recorded a song for the T. Lee Horne’s gubernatorial campaign in Louisiana. The campaign put the song to pictures of Horne on the campaign trail, which they’ve displayed on the Internet at YouTube.com. The opening lyrics provide:**

“Look, we ought to stand up to try to make the state better
Come on y’all, we really need to stick together
We tried Republican; we tried Democrats

The same thing that always happened, y’all know that

New Orleans should have been fixed
It’s been a about year since New Orleans got hit
We need to sit down and we need to think for a sec
Mr. Lee Horne could win Louisiana’s best
Here is the chorus:

We need to make a stand and vote Libertarian

Make a stand and vote Libertarian

The Missouri LP wishes to thank all of their candidates for their efforts, and all of the voters out there who showed their support. These election results show that voters are becoming increasingly dissatisfied with the two major parties and are seeing Libertarians as an alternative. Libertarians can build on this support in future elections.

**We need to sit down and we need to think for a sec
Mr. Lee Horne could win Louisiana’s best
Here is the chorus:**
NEW JERSEY:  
**Political alliance to challenge state election laws**  

When it comes to public policy, New Jersey’s three alternative political parties don’t agree on much. But the political-rival—the Green Party, the Conservative Party and the Libertarian Party—have put aside their differences to take aim at a problem they share in common: New Jersey’s discriminatory and unconstitutional election laws.

According to a lawsuit served on Monday, October 30, 2006 by New Jersey Appleseed Public Interest Law Center and Emery Celli Brinckerhoff & Abady LLC, counsel for the three parties, NJ’s “stiffest” hurdle places a huge hurdle—the most restrictive of all 50 states—on political parties seeking official state recognition. That recognition is what exempts the dominant Democrat and Republican parties from further restrictions involving access to voter registration, campaign financing and access to legislators.

“NJ election law is patently discriminatory against our clients,” said Renee Steinheigner, Executive Director of New Jersey Appleseed, “so much so, that we believe it is unconstitutional under both the federal and New Jersey constitutions.”

New Jersey’s narrow definition goes back to 1920 and New Jersey law defines a “political party” as a party that attains 10 percent of the total vote in a State Assembly race. Effectively, only the Democrats and Republicans have been able to meet this criterion since they themselves established it in 1920.

“No other state in the Union has such a restrictive definition of ‘political party,’” said Richard Winger, editor of Ballot Access News and a nationally recognized expert on federal and state election laws. “Some states provide for qualification of political parties by registration totals or petitioning,” he added. “Of those that use a percentage of the vote, the majority use 5 percent or less. Of the few that use more than 5 percent, all but New Jersey use a statewide race, such as the races for Governor or President.”

To overcome barriers created by two parties sustaining their monopoly in 1920 via the NJ Legislature under their control,” said George DeCarlo, Chair of the Green Party, “We recognize that the NJ Constitution gives the Court the power to challenge unconstitutional laws.” He added that the courts have a duty to “approve of laws which the Court has found to be in conflict with the U.S. Constitution.”

“Our clients are political parties under the common law,” said Eric Hecker, co-counsel with Emery Celli Brinckerhoff & Abady LLC. “Each of our clients has an organizational structure that includes many members; each has a body of political principles which they use to advocate for changes to public policy; and each has an established history of political activism, that includes running candidates and influencing legislation.” He noted, “By any reasonable standard, the Libertarians, Conservatives and Greens are political parties, yet New Jersey sees no difference between them and political action committees.”

“We’re not looking for special treatment,” said Ken Chazotte, State Chair of the Libertarian Party, “we want to level the playing field by ending ‘affirmative action’ for Democrats and Republicans.” He added, “the fact that the two old parties have withdrawn as intermediaries in this lawsuit means that even the Goliaths recognize that their statutory advantages over us Davids are indefensible.”

The State of New Jersey was forced to create a party affiliation with a list of parties that included a number of alternative political parties after it lost a 2001 lawsuit that challenged state law restricting registration of party affiliation to Democrats and Republicans. Because it did not participate in the 2001 lawsuit, the Conservative Party was not added to the list. Now, it wants to remedy that. Arguably, the Conservative Party is more qualified to be on the affiliate list than the Libertarian Party and Reform Party, which participated in the lawsuit but have since folded their tents.

“Just because the New Jersey Conservative Party didn’t participate in the previous lawsuit that won the right for alternative parties to register their members is no reason to prohibit our members from registering their affiliation with the New Jersey Constitution, National Law Party and Reform Party, which participated in the lawsuit but have since folded their tents.”

During the 2006 election, the “ plataforma” said Steve Spinosa, NJCP Secretary, “We are every bit as qualified as the other parties to be included on the affiliation form used by every County Clerk.”

The lawsuit filed on behalf of the alternative political parties seeks several avenues of relief:

1) To declare the state’s definition of political parties unconstitutionally for purposes of campaign finance and lobbying;
2) To strike down restrictions on ballot petitioning by out-of-district petitioners; and
3) To require the inclusion of the Libertarian Party on the State’s voter declaration forms, and to require a unified set of rules for updating the forms as alternative political parties qualify or fail to qualify for inclusion.

The State Attorney General is expected to defend the current statute as written.

NEVADA:  
**Rumors of our demise...**  

Despite media reports to the contrary, the Nevada Libertarian Party did not lose ballot status as a result of the 2006 elections.

Tom Koziel, candidate for Washoe County Assessor, pulled in 5,852 votes. According to Richard Winger of Ballot Access News, “The law required any nominee to poll votes equal to 1% of the total statewide congressional vote, which this year equaled 5,746.”

NORTH CAROLINA:  
**Most voters had no choices in state races**  

Most North Carolina voters went to the polls this year thinking that they will have an opportunity to choose who will represent them in the North Carolina state legislature. But in over half of the North Carolina House districts (53 percent) and almost half of the North Carolina Senate districts (44 percent) the voters were robbed of the ability to choose. In these districts, the ballot will contain only one candidate. The North Carolina Board of Elections will throw away any attempt by voters to cast a write-in vote against one of these privileged candidates. So voters will have absolutely no choice on their ballots for these offices.

Half of the North Carolina legislature is chosen before the voters even see their ballots. Who can decide to destroy our citizens power to choose in this way? It may come as no surprise to Libertarians that the laws which prevent most of the voters to unseat members of the North Carolina legislature were passed by the North Carolina legislature itself. As recently as the 2006 session, the legislature voted to retain the current ballot access law, even to make it slightly more burdensome, accepting the argument that loosening the requirements would lead to a “crowded” ballot. It should be no further surprise to Libertarians that almost all the pre-selected members of the legislature are incumbents.

Libertarians have been living with this up-hill, no-newcomers-welcome system of ballot access for years (since the early 1980’s). While North Carolina Libertarians may be disgusted by this process, they are not surprised. However, most voters have not been living with “new” parties (or even a truly new party) on the ballot, and will be completely unaware of how little choice North Carolina citizens are given in choosing who sets the rules which are supposed to give citizens some choice. As individuals, the disenfranchised voters may be disappointed that they have no alternatives for particular races, but will tend to believe that their case is an odd one.

Most citizens of North Carolina do not realize that over half of the ballots in the recent election contained no choices for representation in either the State House or the State Senate. One might think that this story would be interesting enough to warrant some coverage by the media, but that doesn’t happen to any significant degree. Those of us who want the story told will need to find ways to spread the story through other channels, if only by word of mouth. For the 2004 election, one of the North Carolina LP members, Seth Anthony, prepared a map which showed the districts where voters had no choices for the North Carolina legislature. A copy of this map was put into the booths at the State Fair and Dixie Classic Fair this year.

State chairman Phil Jacobson found it very useful in educating people who stop by, Petroition signatures were easier to get when people realized how little choice was being offered. But the map was small and out of date. Inspired by Anthony, and with the assistance of another citizen who prefers not to be named, he prepared two versions of Anthony’s map for unopposed races in the State House and State Senate. These maps will be suitable for printing on a letter-sized and larger-sized format.

Over half of the candidates for the North Carolina legislature, most of them incumbents, had no opponent on this year’s ballot. Yet as recently as this summer they voted to keep the current burdensome system of “new” parties in place, arguing that the ballot should not be “crowded.”

TEXAS:  
**Libertarians make record electoral gains**  

The Libertarian Party of Texas showed major improvement in the 2006 general election, relative to its performance in previous years. The LP had 168 candidates on the ballot, its highest count ever. By getting more than 5 percent in at least one statewide race, the Libertarian Party of Texas is constitutionally qualified for ballot access in 2008.

Overall trends indicate the following:

In 2002, Libertarian candidates in a three-way race for U.S. House received an average of 1.6 percent of the vote. In 2004, they received an average of 1.7 percent. In 2006, they received an average of 2.6 percent. (Note, “three-way” means a Libertarian running against a Republican and a Democrat, with no other candidates in the race.)

In 2002, Libertarian candidates in a two-way race for U.S. House received an average of 8.8 percent of the vote. In 2004, they received an average of 6.9 percent. In 2006, they received an average of 17.0 percent.

In 2002, Libertarian candidates in a three-way race for Texas House received an average of 2.4 percent of the vote. In 2004, they received an average of 2.7 percent. In 2006, they received an average of 3.6 percent.

In 2002, Libertarian candidates in a two-way race for Texas House received an average of 10.3 percent of the vote. In 2004, they received an average of 9.7 percent. In 2006, they received an average of 16.0 percent.

Libertarian Party of Texas Executive Director Wes Benedict said, “The results show that voters are no longer afraid to vote Libertarian. More and more votes...
ers know who we are and what we stand for.

In this 2006 election, 22 Libertarian candidates for federal and state offices received over 20 percent of the vote. The last time Libertarian candidates for federal or state offices earned more than 20 percent of the vote was in 1992: two Libertarians broke the threshold that year.

The election totals from individual races were interesting, Benedict said. “We’re very pleased with Bob Smithers’ results in District 22. Bob broke the Texas Libertarian record for a Congressional candidate running against a well-funded Democrat and Republican.”

Preliminary results showed Smithers with 61 percent of the vote.

U.S. Senate candidate Scott Jameson received 2.3 percent, the highest received by a Texas Libertarian for U.S. Senate since 1996.

Libertarians showed strength in local races, too. Travis County Justice of the Peace candidate Matt Finkel earned 34.5 percent of the vote against a Republican incumbent. In Brazos County, Linda Wilbert earned 18.5 percent in a three-way Justice of the Peace race. (These percentages are based on unofficial county results.)

Texas candidates played kingmaker in several races, too. It is very unusual in Texas elections for a federal or state candidate to win without a majority of the vote. However, apart from the race for Governor, several legislative races with Libertarians had winners who failed to obtain a majority. They included Texas House Districts 17, 32, 85, 93, 106, and 118.

In District 17, the Democrat led the Republican by 417 votes, while Libertarian Rod Gibbs received 1,281 votes.

In District 32, the Democrat led the Republican by 502 votes, while Libertarian Lenard Nelson received 2,026 votes.

In District 85, the Democrat led the Republican by 193 votes, while Libertarian David K. Schumacher received 798 votes.

In District 93, the Democrat led the Republican by 473 votes, while Libertarian Max W. Koch III received 753 votes.

In District 106, the Republican led the Democrat by 231 votes, while Libertarian Gene Freeman received 591 votes.

In District 118, the Democrat led the Republican by 904 votes, while Libertarian James L. Thompson received 1,699 votes.

“I’m pleased to see that we acted as kingmaker in several of these races,” said Libertarian Party of Texas Chair Patrick Dixon.

In 2004, Libertarian candidate Greg Knowles was credited with ousting incumbent Jack Stick from his District 50 seat. Stick lost by 569 votes, while Knowles received 2,390 votes.

Some other statistics are worthy of noting. On average, Libertarians running in two-way races for statewide judicial races received 24.1 percent of the vote.

In 2000, their average was 16.7 percent. (In 2002, there were no two-way statewide judicial races.) In 2004, their average was 15.1 percent.

In statewide races with both a Republican and a Democrat, the best Libertarian performers were Lieutenant Governor candidate Judy Baker, with 4.4 percent, and Railroad Commissioner candidate Tabitha Serrano, with 4.2 percent.

In Congressional races, the highest Libertarian result was 21.3 percent for Gordon R. Strickland, running in District 16.

For State Board of Education, the highest Libertarian result was 29.6 percent for Martin Thomen, running in District 10.

For State Senate, the highest Libertarian result was 22.2 percent for Phil Kurtz, running in District 17.

For State House, the highest Libertarian result was 24.0 percent for Kris Overstreet, running in District 18.

The highest Libertarian vote count was for Jerry Adkins (running for Supreme Court, Place 4), who received 830,331 votes (24.5 percent).

In District 106, the Republican led the Democrat by 231 votes, while Libertarian Gene Freeman received 591 votes.

In District 118, the Democrat led by 8 a.m. for registration and will run until approximately 3 p.m. The convention will consist of a business meeting and about three speakers. LPWI members George Meyers, founder of a new think tank in the Racine/Kenosha area, the Belleporte Institute, will be one of the speakers. Libertarian Party Communications Director Stephen Gordon is also tentatively scheduled to speak about the direction and future of the Libertarian Party.

For additional information, please contact Convention Organizer Julie Fox at (262)697-1874.
How can we win more races in 2007 and 2008?

Now that the 2006 elections are history, the obvious question is “Where do we go from here?” Many suggestions have been made about how Libertarian Party candidates might achieve a greater level of electoral success. Perhaps this is the time to take a hard look at some of the suggestions offered and open dialogue about how we might be more effective in the polling place in 2007 and 2008.

The January 2007 edition of LP News will be offering space for this discussion to begin. We would like to open up the topic by bringing up some of the suggestions we have received and then allow you to continue the discussion. We will be accepting your contributions in the form of letters to the editor on this topic and hopefully will be able to publish many of them.

In order to ensure that we print as many letters as possible, we ask that you keep your letter to 250 words or less. Submissions may be mailed or faxed to us, but we would prefer that you e-mail your letter to editor@lp.org.

Continued from Page 1

Analysis of 2006 Libertarian Party election results

continued from Page 1

ceeded the margin of difference in at least two US House races (Eric Schansberg in Indiana and Dan Warren in California), and in several down ballot races across the country.

The Texas Libertarian Party fielded six candidates for State House which resulted in three-way races where the winner took less than 50 percent of the vote. Five of these went to the Democrat, which is significant considering that the Texas Democrats won six seats that had been held by Republicans. Additional Texas results are detailed on page 6.

An even more exciting trend to emerge from the 2006 elections is that we appear to have doubled our baseline vote. The average percentage for Libertarian candidates in three-way races has moved from about 2 percent to 4 percent nationwide.

Much more remarkable is our leap forward in two-way races, from about 9 percent to 16 percent, or even more in some states.

In 2004, only a small handful of Libertarians got more than 20 percent in two-party contests. In 2006 it became a common occurrence.

Some Libertarians won not only moral victories but actual ones. The Indiana Libertarian slate scored two partisan wins. Steve Coffman was elected to the Liberty Township Board, and Conley Tillson took a seat on the Township Board in Clay.

In nonpartisan races, Sara Chambers won a hotly contested race for Juneau Assembly (Alaska’s equivalent of a city council). In California, Norm Westwell earned a seat on the Ocean View School Board.

Tom Clark, Chair of the Lee County Libertarian Party in Florida, defeated an incumbent to create a Libertarian majority in his county’s Soil and Water District.

Clark joins Libertarian incumbents Jack Tanner and Kim Hawk, who ran unopposed.

Overall it was a good day for Libertarian incumbents, as well.

Ballot access was at stake in several states. Candidates in Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, Nevada, Texas and Wyoming all won enough votes to keep the Libertarian Party ballot qualified through the next election cycle. Unfortunately we did not meet the standards to retain ballot access in South Dakota.

However, South Dakota, along with Kansas and Louisiana, has much to be proud of. All three states used a strategy of running a candidate in every race in the state. The Libertarian Leadership School of Colorado, in conjunction with the Libertarian Party of South Dakota, has led the way.

In November-December 2006, the Libertarian Party of South Dakota submitted the signatures needed to place the Libertarian Party on the ballot for the 2008 and 2009 elections.

While the Internet has leveled the media playing field to some degree, most Americans are still influenced by mainstream television news, their local newspaper and traditional radio and television advertising. To be sure, Libertarians were recognized this election cycle as being the most advanced on the Internet. What might Libertarian candidates do to obtain a greater level of media exposure?

Campaign organization is another key issue indicated by 2006 Libertarian candidates. Many candidates had no campaign staff and were responsible for all of the functions of campaign operations. One 2006 congressional candidate expressed, “It’s rather difficult to be stumping on the campaign trail when FEC reports are due tomorrow.”

Other candidates had part time staffers, but they were unable to complete all of the necessary roles required of a campaign organization in a timely manner. Many candidates desired staffers with a greater level of experience in winning actual campaigns.

A lack of local volunteer support was reported by some campaign staffs and candidates. Even campaigns with relatively large budgets for campaign signs had trouble finding enough people to ensure they were on the ground. A campaign sign in someone’s trunk or garage does no good on Election Day. Volunteers were also reported to be in short supply to man polling places on Election Day.

Candidate and campaign management training have been mentioned as possible solutions. The Libertarian Leadership School offers much of the desired training, however most 2006 staffers and candidates hadn’t taken a single course. Is there something which can be done to improve the LLS?

Of course, ballot access is an additional problem. At least two Libertarian candidates who had received a significant level of media exposure were unable to collect enough signatures to get on the ballot for their respective 2006 races.

There are both a lot of complaints and a lot of suggestions out there. Should we focus on lower level or higher level candidates? How do we provide candidates the resources they need to win elections? Are there additional resources which can be provided?

With several 2007 campaigns already started and many people already eying 2008, the time to begin such strategic discussions is now. The Libertarian Party is your party and LP News is your publication. We welcome your input into this important conversation and ask that you submit your perspective to us so we can publish it.
The Libertarian National Committee
welcomes our newest members*

*new memberships from September 22 to November 21, 2006
My recent community outreach experiences

by Michelle Shinghal

Collin County is probably one of the reddest counties in Texas. As Libertarian Party county chairman, I have witnessed media bias, voter apathy and even a Deadhold issue or two. I have complained, sometimes quite colorfully, about the issues facing not only Libertarians, but third parties in general. It is very easy, if one isn’t careful, to develop a fairly large chip on the shoulder. This past election season nearly created a monster, but something remarkable happened and I learned a very valuable lesson. You must show up to play!

It seems simple enough, right? Unfortunately, some of us are trying to catch tuna using a hook better designed for perch. I was guilty of it. I was angry that the Dallas Morning News failed to mention our candidates in races. I had an e-mail argument pages long with KERA’s spokesman about the exclusion of the Libertarian Party candidate in the Dallas gubernatorial debate. The only thing I got for my efforts was wasted time writing LTEs that went unpublished. Oh yeah, and KERA transferred the debate to Belo Corporation. Not win, zero.

Then I received an e-mail, forwarded from Dallas County Libertarians, from the Collin County Community College District, the e-mail invited libertarians to a gubernatorial debate watching party at the Spring Creek Campus of CCCCD. I was a bit put off by the timing. I had just returned from a vacation and the mail was received the day of the event. I still don’t know how the stars aligned that day, but we were able to get five of us together for the event. We were invited to set up a table and pass out literature before the event. I was a little disappointed that we had little traffic at our table. Friday night football is almost as big as God here, and of course, the event was on Friday night. When we moved into the auditorium, Collin County picked a table right up front.

The format was the debate viewing followed by one hour of discussion. Naturally, I stood up during the second discussion to point out that there were five candidates for governor - not the four who had spoken for an hour about a subject that probably engaged 200 people in attendance, the discussion was lively. Libertarian candidates kept with it, though I think we may have been microphone hogs.

After the discussion, Dr. Garrison, an Honors Government professor, approached me and thanked me for attending. He then invited me, along with the Republican and Democratic Party chairmen, to talk with his honors class about our roles in the county. I, of course, immediately accepted. Then I got home and talked [State LP Executive Director] Wes Benedict’s ear off asking for help.

On the day of the talk, I painned myself wondering if I would be able to contribute anything to the young intelligent audience. I tend to be nervous speaking in public, so my words are often peppered with “um” and “you know”. I wondered what to wear, and finally decided on a pair of jeans and a sweater. I am not too much older than the students with whom I would be talking, and I wanted to fit in. When I arrived at the school and learned that the Republican chair was tied up at another political rally, but sent a sitting judge in her place, I second guessed everything. I shouldn’t have.

I walked into the classroom, and a few students knew who I was. They had Googled me and found my blog entries on Hammertruth.com. This turned out to be funny when the other chairs (the Republican arrived late) told me they had a meeting about potential voting problems but couldn’t contact me for an invitation.

Honestly, I did not say anything noteworthy. I explained that Libertarians believe in personal freedom coupled with personal responsibility. I allowed the other chairmen to set the tone and it worked to my advantage. The Democrat talked about politics as a pendulum which swings left to right. She lent county chairs to a president of a large club responsible for a huge amount of money from the state.

The Republican talked about the need for immigration control and a border fence because her children need to be safe in the park. I talked about duty. I talked about America’s duty to keep her government accountable. Then the questions came.

One question was about whether it was only the well-off who could be candidates or officers of a political party. The other parties conceded that it could be that way, and I said that Libertarians make it a priority no matter their financial situations. I explained that we receive no checks from the state and therefore operate on our own work and charity. I said that it is not unusual for Libertarians to open their homes to others who travel. We talked about government’s proper constitutional role. We even talked about the fact that Libertarians are so individual that we often curse ourselves with infighting.

The class was over before I knew it, and as we were winding down, there were several students who had more questions. I was presented with the choice of talking to the other chairmen about possible voting problems, or speaking more to the students of the class. As I spent another hour in the hallway talking to some really bright students, I knew I had made the right choice. When I received and answered e-mails from some of them, I knew I had made the right choice. When Dr. Garrison e-mailed about future speaking opportunities, I knew I had made the right choice.

There is no denying that we often get the short end of the stick. But, when I reflect on the wasted energy spent trying to get the Libertarian message out through larger media outlets, I appreciate that I had the energy to go to a little community meeting. I now know that showing up and being fully involved is better than any newspaper mention. Oh, yeah, I also now know that jeans are the perfect attire for such a classroom talk.

Alternate voting systems win in four municipalities

Wikipedia defines Instant Runoff Voting as follows: "Instant runoff voting (IRV) is a voting system used for single winner elections in which voters rank candidates in order of preference. In an IRV election, if no candidate receives an overall majority, then second preferences are transferred to candidate with the fewest votes until one candidate achieves a majority. The term "instant runoff voting" is used because this process resembles a series of run-off elections. At a national level IRV is used to elect the Australian House of Representatives[1], the President of Ireland, the Fijian House of Representatives and, beginning in 2007, the National Parliament of Papua New Guinea. In the United States, it has been adopted by voters in eight local jurisdictions, starting with San Francisco, and, during the 2006 United States general elections, Pierce County in Washington state, Minneapolis and Oakland."

Ballot Access News reported that all of the four ballot measures to enact IRV or related voting systems passed.

"All four ballot measures to institute alternative voting systems passed on November 7. Oakland, California, passed IRV for city office by 68%. Minneapolis passed IRV for city office by 65%.

"Two more advanced forms seem to have passed narrowly. In Pierce County, Washington (that state’s 2nd most populous county, which contains Tacoma), all partisan county offices will apparently no longer have partisan primaries. Instead, there will be a single election in November, using IRV. Although ballot access will be easy for all candidates, party labels will be restricted to those candidates who had won their party’s nomination by convention, in advance of the election. Pierce County now more closely approximates the systems used by Ireland and the Australia than any other jurisdiction in the U.S. The Pierce County measure was the only one affecting partisan elections."

Ballot Access News also reported that voters in Davis, California approved of a Single Transferrable Vote electoral system.

"Finally, Davis passed advisory measure L (with 55%), which provides for Single Transferrable Vote for multi-winner offices such as City Council-at-large. Like all California elections for city office, Davis uses non-partisan elections. However, Davis will now apparently share the characteristic of Cambridge, Massachusetts, under which an organized minority of voters can place a candidate on the city council if that minority comprises approximately 25% (in Cambridge the threshold is lower than 25%, because Cambridge elects more members to its city council)."

Hopefully, we will be seeing more of these sorts of ballot measures in 2007 and 2008."
Letters to the editor

LP News will once again be accepting letters to the editor. We ask that your letters be kept to less than 250 words long.

Please keep in mind that LP News is used by many Libertarians as an outreach tool. While reasonable disagreement and debate are encouraged, letters which cast the Libertarian Party in a negative light won’t be published.

Submissions may be mailed or faxed to us, but we’d prefer to receive your letter by e-mail directed to editor@lp.org.

New LNC Treasurer

Geoffrey Neale resigned his position during the November meeting of the committee. Aaron Starr was selected by the committee to serve in Neale’s place.

Starr holds degrees in finance and accounting from California State University at Northridge. He is the Controller of a $700 million per year manufacturing company. He also serves as Chair of the Libertarian Party of California. He is a lifelong resident of Simi Valley, California.

Badnarik honored

Former Libertarian Party presidential candidate Michael Badnarik was awarded an honorary lifetime membership by the Libertarian National Committee.

Badnarik was cited for his ongoing and stellar work for the Party. The motion passed unanimously.

New webmaster

Corey Stern has taken over the reins at LP.org. Stern will be responsible for site development and maintenance at all of the Libertarian Party websites.

Stern has considerable Internet development experience and one of his sites was recently awarded “Site of the Day” by Politics1.com.

Libertarian elected

Congratulations are due to former LNC Treasurer Mark Nelson. Nelson has been elected chairman of the Davenport, Iowa Parks and Recreation Committee. The appointed committee elected its own officers.

Call for articles

We would like to spend more time over the next few months covering the topic of winning Libertarian campaigns from perspectives. The first perspective is to learn what winning Libertarian campaigns did that worked. The second is how to govern as an actual Libertarian Party member holding elected office.

If you have worked for a winning Libertarian campaign or been the winning candidate, we would welcome your article, interview or advice on how you won. Also, we’d like your input on what it is like after you assumed your office. Winners, please contact us at editor@lp.org.

Libertarian National Committee, Inc.

Watergate Office Building
2600 Virginia Avenue, NW, Suite 200
Washington DC 20037