

California Freedom

August 2009 ————— The official publication of the **Libertarian Party of California**

Fighting the Welfare/Warfare State

Tea Parties Brew Freedom and Controversy

by Lawrence K. Samuels

Libertarians and the LP originated the modern Tea Party movement years ago, yet this movement to lower taxes and reduce government didn't reach critical mass until April 15, 2009, when over 750 Tea Parties dotted the political landscape, scaring the bejeepers out of the political elite. Tea Parties have continued to spread quickly via the internet, numbering at over 1,500 by July 4, 2009.

In Monterey County, CA, a 9-board member Tea Party was organized in May under an alliance of libertarian and conservative leaders. Co-chaired by conservative Robin Kubicek and libertarian David Ramirez, the Monterey County Tea Party (MCTP) meets every two weeks.

This past July, the MCTP participated in the Monterey City-sponsored Fourth of July parade, one of about 100 entries that marched through downtown Monterey. Aided by a Pacific Grove seamstress, many MCTP participants wore handmade Revolutionary War

costumes. Another volunteer provided over 100 Revolutionary War flags on 8-foot poles.

After the parade, the community was invited to Monterey's Windows-on-the-Bay for a Freedom Rally and picnic. Crews cooked hot dogs for a crowd of 200 to 300 people. Petitions were gathered to oppose the Cap and Trade bill and Obama's government-run healthcare bill. Tea Party t-shirts were available. Over \$1,500 donated to the MCTP.

KION 1460 AM radio, led by Mark Carbonaro, broadcast the event live for two hours, interviewing participants and airing the speeches of five speakers, four of whom were LP members. Prof. David R. Henderson was the keynote speaker.

The biggest problem arose when the Monterey Parks Department, which issues park permits, refused to allow either a sound system or permission for KION radio to cover the event. This odd policy was inconsistent with past events. Libertarians for Peace, one of the event's co-sponsors, had

gotten permission for a rock band to play at an antiwar demonstration in 2007.

A MCTP leader argued that the Parks Dept. had no authority to ban a news agency from covering a news event, yet the agency refused to relent. The argument focused on free speech, but the Parks Dept. head denied that banning radio coverage in a public place was a free speech violation.

A talk with Jeff Haferman, a city council member who was scheduled as one of the keynote speakers, revealed that the police department next door had authority to issue sound and assembly permits. The paperwork was completed and the permits were quickly approved.

The next big Tea Party is scheduled for September 12, in Washington DC. Most local areas will simultaneously have their own separate Tea Parties.

Lawrence K. Samuels is Chair of the Monterey County LP. His email: lawsam1951@hotmail.com.



Photo: Lawrence K. Samuels



Photo: Lawrence K. Samuels

Los Angeles LP Convention Report

Strong Turnout for LPLAC

by Richard E. Venable

On Saturday, June 13, the Los Angeles County LP enjoyed an impressive turnout at West Hollywood's Taix French Restaurant for its annual convention, attracting not only Angelenos, but libertarians from San Bernardino, Orange, and San Luis Obispo Counties. Ed Clark served as guest speaker.

The meeting began with a public comment period. Manny Klausner related his favorite

sign at a recent Tea Party: *Stop 1984 with 1776*. Jay Jones discussed the benefits of doing outreach at festivals and street fairs. Christopher Agrella, LP candidate for the 32nd C.D. in a July 14 runoff election, related the difficulties of running a campaign without guidance. He suggests the party build a "template" for supporting candidates.

LPLAC Treasurer David Wire

continued on page 4...



David Wire, José Castañeda, Bruce Dovner

INSIDE

LPC Candidate
Tops 5% **2**

Ed Clark
on the Future **4**

Native Americans
Love Liberty **5**

Outright Libertarians
Meet **6**

Copyright Threatens
Online Freedom **6**

Photo: Gail Lightfoot

California Freedom

Vol. 7 • Issue 8 • August 2009

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

EDITOR

Thomas M. Sipos
E-Mail: Editor@CA.LP.org

STATE CHAIRMAN

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

GRAPHIC DESIGN AND LAYOUT

Brad Reynolds
E-Mail: BradleyYes@aol.com

WEB SITE

E-Mail: WebTeam@CA.LP.org

ADVERTISING SALES

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

CONTRIBUTORS

Lawrence K. Samuels,
Gail Lightfoot, Richard E. Venable,
Christopher M. Agrella,
Walks With Thunder,
Christian Engström,
Laura G. Brown, Jason Gonella

SEND ADDRESS CHANGES TO:

Libertarian Party of California
14547 Titus St., Suite 214
Panorama City, CA 91402-4935
(877) 884-1776

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

Editor, California Freedom
14547 Titus Street, Suite 214
Panorama City, CA 91402-4935
Telephone: (818) 782-8400
E-Mail: Editor@CA.LP.org

SUBMISSION DEADLINES

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

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. All contributions subject to our editorial guidelines.

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

Articles, photos, and artwork copyright 2009 by their author(s) and/or Libertarian Party of California. All rights reserved.

From the Editor

Big Media Pirating Your Copyrights

by Thomas M. Sipos

Even as they complain about students downloading music and movies from the Internet, record companies and film studios are pirating your copyrights—and Uncle Sam is helping them get away with it! Here's how:

• **Extension of copyright terms.** The U.S. Constitution says copyrights must expire after a limited time (Article 1, Section 8), whereupon the work becomes public domain. Then *you*, the public, are free to copy or download *Moby Dick*, write new Sherlock Holmes stories, or perform Shakespeare or Mozart.

Public domain is *your* copyright.

However, copyright's "limited time" has been repeatedly extended, often due to big media lobbying. The 1790 Copyright Act set copyright protection at 14 years, renewable for another 14. By 1909 copyrights lasted 28 years, renewable for another 28. In 1976 copyright was set for "the life of the author plus 50 years" or 75 years for corporate owners. In 1998 copyright was extended to "life of the author plus 70 years" or 95 years for corporate owners.

Jack Valenti had claimed the 1998 extension was necessary to bring U.S. law into conformity with the longer terms of the international Berne Convention. However, many Berne signatories also recognize Moral Rights, a doctrine that forbids buyers (such as record companies and studios) from altering an artist's work. Valenti always opposed U.S. adoption of Moral Rights, which might prevent studios and networks from changing directors' films and possibly even writers' scripts.

Curious, it being vital for the U.S. to adopt Berne's longer copyright terms but not its Moral Rights.

Artists should profit from their creations—but not 70 years into the grave. "Life plus 25" (50 years for corporate owners) is more reasonable. Anything longer doesn't benefit creators; it actually prevents their reworking old classics still under copyright.

Excessively long copyright terms only benefit authors' distant heirs and big media companies owning vast libraries. And long copyright terms pirate *your* public domain rights.



• **Perversion of trademark law.** Traditionally, trademarks identified the maker of a product. If there was no product, the trademark was void. But increasingly, trademarks are the product, providing a potential loophole around copyright's limitations.

Copyrights and patents expire, but trademarks can last forever. Thus, studios have trademarked Mickey Mouse, James Bond, Star Trek, and other characters and titles, preparing for when *Steamboat Willie* and *Casino Royale* enter public domain. They may lose those films and books and TV shows, but they'll be damned if they lose the characters.

Had Bram Stoker tried it, it's possible that today anyone might publish *Dracula*, but only the Stoker estate could create new novels, comics, or films featuring Dracula.

It remains to be seen if trademark law will subvert the Constitution's requirement for limited copyright terms. If so, big media will have pirated *your* public domain rights.

• **Erosion of Fair Use.** The Fair Use doctrine, rooted in the First Amendment, lets *you*, the public, copy excerpts from protected works for purposes of news, education, research, criticism, and commentary. It also permits parodies. It's a complex doctrine because the law only gives guidelines; you don't know if it's Fair Use until you're in court.

Which means Fair Use is often determined by who can afford a lawsuit.

In 1940 a N.Y. federal district court said it was Fair Use for authors to excerpt song lyrics in fiction (*Broadway Music v. F-R Publishing*). It's a way for authors to comment on pop culture. But today it is industry practice to pay a license fee for even *one line* of poetry or lyric. "Copying poetry or lyrics

continued on page 7...

Letters to Editor

continued from page 3...

they require about "not initiating force." Problem is, sometimes you must initiate force to defend yourself.

The bum who sneaks into the backseat of your car to sleep didn't lay a hand on you, but if you want him out of your car, you might have to pull him out—and when you do, you've initiated force.

The thief who steals your wallet off the table didn't touch you, but when you tackle him to hold him for the police -- you initiated force against him.

I read *Atlas Shrugged*. Rand spoke clearly about guns and the initiation of force, but she understood that life isn't as black and white as the LP seems to think. Rand showed us that sometimes force *must* be initiated to protect the innocent.

When Rand's hero, John Galt, was being slowly electrocuted to death, Rand didn't have her heroine, Dagny Taggart, stop and lecture a security guard about the concepts of the theoretical use of force. Dagny told the guard that if he didn't get out of her way and stop preventing her access to the building where they were torturing Galt, that she would shoot him dead. And she did.

That security guard never initiated force against Taggart. But had Taggart adhered to the LP oath, Galt would have died while Taggart and Reardon and D'Anconia debated the theory of the Libertarian oath in a parking lot downstairs.

There are times in the course of protecting the innocent that force must be taken. Rand showed us that. That's why Rand is one of America's most famous

authors and thinkers, and why the LP hasn't won any state-wide or national elections in nearly 40 years.

I will not take your oath which denies me the right to protect myself. As I will not, the LP has told me they don't want me as a member.

I'd go on national TV and swear to Rand's oath: "I swear on my life and my love of it, that I shall live my life for no man. Nor shall I ask any man to live for me." But don't ask me to surrender the right to protect myself, or the lives of the innocent.

Apparently, someone years ago read a couple of chapters of Rand's book. Unfortunately, they didn't read it thoroughly, and didn't really "get it." The LP pledge was then written. It was poorly written then, and it hasn't improved with age.

If I make an oath, I'll stand by it. But the LP asks that I lay down and surrender in certain cases, rather than defend myself.

Yes, I was told by LP members: "No one interprets the oath that way."

Well, words mean things. When you demand that someone take a pledge to never *initiate* the use of force, you are saying that under certain circumstances, people cannot defend themselves. I've given you examples.

I believe in the theories of the LP. I do not believe in its oath, and will not take it. I was told that since I will not take the oath, I cannot be a member of the LP. Since this is so, I cannot work for the LP—because you have rejected me as a member.

— Thomas K. Odell
Santa Monica, CA



Photo: Christopher M. Agrella

Libertarian Tops 5%

Libertarian Congressional candidate Christopher M. Agrella received 1,287 votes (5.21%) in the July 14, 2009 special election for the 32nd C.D.

Democrat Judy Chu won the seat with 15,238 votes (61.67%). Republican Betty Chu came in second with 8,185 votes (33.12%).

Eleanor Garcia, an Independent, ran as a certified write-in candidate.



Letters to the Editor

Party Loyalty

What's the easiest thing you can do to help?

Vote Libertarian!

Voting for our cause is the single most important and single easiest thing you can do to help the party and the freedom movement.

Many Libertarians, and others not among our numbers, vote for a candidate that is not Libertarian to prevent another party from taking office. Many of you voted for McCain to keep Obama out of office. This was a mistake. It did nothing but hurt our cause.

When you cast votes for any other candidate, you're telling everyone that you want more like him. You're telling the government that you support what they're doing. Generally, the candidates are supporters of big government, so you're supporting big government.

No Republican ever beat a Democrat by one vote, so why waste yours on one of them? They win because they get votes. You are giving them votes. You are helping them win and destroy this great nation.

The more people see that Libertarians have a real shot, the more likely they are to swing to our side and cast the right vote.

A lot of people support our cause, but aren't willing to volunteer or speak up about the party to friends and others.

I ask you to do the simplest and easiest thing possible to help: cast your vote for the political party you already support.

Your vote matters more than you realize.

— Logan Hinkle
Morgan Hill, CA

LP As a Religion

I received the *Los Angeles Libertarian* today. I would like to get something off my chest.

I have been a Libertarian for a long time, and an annual contributor to the Cato Institute. I have a weekly column in the *Country Journal* and the *Acton-Agua Dulce News*, with frequent letters to the editor published by the *Antelope Valley Press*.

I used to attend the Libertarian meetings in Palmdale, but they became boring, repetitious, and

even self-righteous to me. So I quit them.

Many years ago, I had a reader ask me about the LP, so I brought him to one of our meetings. On the way home he told me something I have never forgotten: "You guys are not a political party. You are a religion."

I was reminded of that when I read Herb Peters's letter [in the *Los Angeles Libertarian*] blaming Darwin for the downfall of America and advocating a "restoration of our faith in our creator God."

It would probably make Ayn Rand turn over in her grave, if she is not cremated.

I have also noticed that many prominent local Libertarians cannot seem to make a difference between socialism and Marxism, creating oodles of confusion.

There is a world of difference between advocating Ayn Rand's philosophy of rational self-interest, and of the "greed is good" philosophy.

Ed Clark and Herb Peters do not seem to belong to the same party, so is there a clear division among the party's members, and, if so, why?

— John van Huizum
Acton, CA

Editor's note: Because Mr. van Huizum is responding to Herb Peters's LTE in the *Los Angeles Libertarian*, I asked Mr. Peters for permission to reprint his LTE (below). Peters is a past LPC candidate for Congress and State Assembly. His website: www.herbpeterson.com.

It Began With Darwin

I believe that government has grown excessively since about the year 1900. Our so-called two party system of Democrats and Republicans has merged into one party of excessively big government.

The only solution is to register and vote Libertarian *and* to restore our faith in our creator God. We must each become personally responsible for our own selves and our families.

Our downfall started with people believing in Charles Darwin (*Origin of the Species* released in 1857). In two generations, we started electing representative that were Darwinists and progressives.

Their first victories started with Teddy Roosevelt and the origin of the seemingly good "Pure Food and Drug Act" and followed shortly by Woodrow Wilson's Income Tax and Federal Reserve System (FRS). The FRS enables our government to spend money without having it. Our current president is spending \$5 billion per day *more* than is taken in.

This is an unethical shame on what we were as a nation prior to 1900 when we had our best economy of all time.

— Herb Peters
Carson, CA

Outreach to Liberals

I am a longtime Libertarian who previously (before 1971) was a Republican.

Most of my friends are Democrats. In telling them about libertarianism I have a hard time finding supportive literature that backs what I say. Most LP books and articles are aimed at convincing Republicans, emphasizing things like less government interference and lower taxes. This leads liberals to think we're more conservative than Republicans, and to consider us to be selfish and cold.

We have just as much to offer liberals. We have to tell them where our goals are similar to theirs. They want to reduce the number of poor and disadvantaged people, to help those who can't help themselves, and to reduce discrimination against minorities. When I tell them that libertarianism would do a better job fulfilling these goals than liberalism has ever done, they are very skeptical and disbelieving.

Liberals, for the most part, still love Obama, but many are beginning to become concerned about the rapidly increasing debt that he is piling onto our children and grandchildren. Now is the ideal time to tell them (without bashing Obama, as that wouldn't be conducive to having them listen to us) that we can accomplish most of their goals without burdening future generations with debt.

The same arguments that work with conservatives will not work with liberals—we need to address their concerns about taking care of people. And we cannot do that if we ourselves come across as uncaring and intellectual.

Also, we need to get across that passing a law against something doesn't make it go away; it often just creates more problems.

Another selling point is the current prominence of corporate welfare in the news—we can assure liberals that we are against all of

that. Without input on our true position, liberals consider us to be pro-business and assume we support corporate welfare.

I have written a short book, *A Libertarian Primer for Disillusioned Democrats*. I will send a free copy via e-mail to anyone who writes to me at: libertarianprimer@gmail.com.

It is my first attempt at writing a book. It is personalized in a way that hopefully will engage the concerns of liberals.

Also, I suggest you check out Sharon Harris's *The Invisible Hand Is a Gentle Hand*, and Dr. Mary Ruwart's *Healing Our World and Secrets of Transforming Environmentalists, Judeo-Christians, Liberals, and New-Agers into Libertarians*. These are the only two prominent Libertarians I have found that seem interested in reaching liberals. Their work can be found at www.theadvocates.org.

— Elinor Brandt
Los Angeles, CA

Historical Anarchy

Logan Hinkle, in his letter, "A Case for Anarchy" [CF July 2009], makes compelling ethical and economic arguments in support of a state-free society. I wish to add an additional dimension, the historical.

Free-market law has flourished in a variety of regions throughout history, including Ireland (700-1600), Iceland (900-1200), and the U.S. West (1830-1900).

For a full treatment, I highly recommend *Anarchy and the Law* by Edward Stringham (ed.). In addition to historical case studies, this seminal work includes extensive sections on the theory, the debate, and the history of anarchist thought.

— Michael R. Edelstein
San Francisco, CA

Purity Brings Unity

I would like the LP to return to being a party of pure principle. We are drifting too far from our message: the self-ownership and non-aggression axioms.

The most recent issue of *CF* is a case in point. There was yet another "pro-war libertarian" (how sour that name tastes in my mouth) who voiced his opinion that we need a more pro-war stance. That being pro-war in this modern era is acting in a pro-liberty fashion.

I could not disagree more.

But the point I will address here is party division. When we have long-standing party members who sound more neoconservative than libertarian in their views and recommendations, we have to ask ourselves if our message is getting lost. We have to ask ourselves if our effectiveness as a party is being seriously compromised.

I recommend an uncompromising return to pure principle. Our message will be clear. Unambiguous. People will know what we stand for. We can be united on a single cause. People will not see us as compromising politicians.

If we compromise on the "libertarian-ness" of one issue, where do we draw the line? How far will we go in our willingness to compromise? How credible can we be?

I want this world of liberty, of spiritual and material possibility, more than just about anything.

When we witness such strong pro-war and antiwar sentiments in the same party, and *all* claiming to carry the libertarian message, it is time to reassess the value of pure principle. Of having a party of unity, because our message is clear.

I champion a party of pure principle.

— Tom Burlingame,
Riverside, CA

Won't Sign LP Pledge

After much soul searching, I changed my party registration to Libertarian last year.

I was excited beyond words to finally take that step. To give you some idea how long I had deliberated, I first discussed my desire to change to the LP in a meeting with Harry Browne in the 1990s.

Well, I did it. I registered Libertarian.

Then I found out you don't want me as a member. "Get thee out and stay out" was your message to me.

You see, the LP has this pseudo Ayn Rand wannabe oath

continued on page 2...

**YOUR Letters
Welcome!**

**But we can't publish
what we don't receive.**

**Please submit your
letters to:**

editor@ca.lp.org

Los Angeles LP Convention Report

Ed Clark Addresses the Future

by Richard E. Venable

[Excerpted summarizations, not exact quotes, from Ed Clark's speech at the June 13, 2009 LPLAC convention.]



Ed Clark

“In some respects the Obama administration has been more open to change than was Bush. His move to accept state laws on medical marijuana means more people will have access to medical marijuana, and Obama will release people from jail who shouldn't be in jail.

“During one caucus, the question arose about legalizing marijuana to raise money. Obama responded, ‘No, because that would open the debate.’

This modest step by Obama will open the debate, let more states authorize medical marijuana, and reduce penalties on possession of marijuana. That is one of the best things I can think of coming from the Obama regime.

“There is talk of allowing Americans to travel to Cuba, and to open more trade with that country. It is probably a minor step forward, but I don't expect much real change because the Castro brothers do not want a democratic society, and we will not recognize them until they do.

“In Iraq, Obama is going to get out faster and more completely than Bush ever would. That is a step forward. Most Americans think less troops will be killed and millions of dollars will be saved.

“I am a Libertarian who thinks the war in Afghanistan is legitimate. We were attacked, but it was undercut by Bush's attack on Iraq.

“The Iraq experience is getting behind us. Maybe there will be enough momentum to pro-

vide economic aid to achieve some kind of political settlement in Afghanistan. Maybe in Afghanistan we will be better off with Obama than we were with Bush.

“When you come to the domestic economy, we are in worse shape now than we were last year. We have a \$1.8 trillion deficit—12% of our gross national product, up 36% over the last eight years, a huge increase.

“Total debt will be \$12 trillion this fiscal year. Add to that the cost of Medicare, Social Security, and other programs of \$50 trillion. That makes a debt of \$70 trillion. And that's against a gross national product of \$14 trillion. At our current rate of paying down the debt, we'll pay it off in 293 years.

“Republicans, Libertarians, everyone, should discuss Obama's dishonesty. One of his campaign statements was that there would be no spending without some kinds of cuts. There have been no cuts that anyone can determine. So it was a bald-faced lie.

“The money supply is Obama's biggest disaster. Regarding the relationship of the money supply to prices: Money divided into the velocity of money equals the price level of the gross national product. If you increase one side, you increase the other side.

“But that won't likely happen, because what they'll probably do is squeeze down the money supply to counter that, which will likely produce a double digit recession.

“Taxes. No good news. All the Bush tax cuts will disappear. Taxes will increase because of more spending.

“Two real evil programs: one is Cap and Trade. A lot of you know about this fear of global warming, where they'll issue permits to major emitters of things that affect global warming, carbon dioxide, coal mining, very common things. The old Henry Waxman plan is to sell those permits at high prices to the emitters, and each year reduce the number of credits,

so people have to spend more for the same credit.

“This program doubles the

price of permits. It will increase the cost of everything, every store, every restaurant, every home, every factory, by radical amounts.

“This comes during a time of 10% unemployment and recession. But also at a time when we have had 11 consecutive years of cooler weather.

“The good news is that global warming proponents had trouble trying to push this program through Congress. Republicans, without Bush, are waiting for a consensus. And House Democrats under Waxman backed down and are going to give away 85% of the credits.

“This shows that if we unite at the grassroots level, and present as much opposition as there was to Cap and Trade, then we can stop things even though the party in charge of Congress wants it to pass.

“Health Care. This is the most serious issue of all.



Manny Klausner, Alicia and Ed Clark

Obama, during his campaign, made it clear that he wants a single payer program. Almost everything—medical care, hospital care, prescription drugs—will come under the federal government's control. That's 20% of the economy.

“There are two bills going through Congress now. They'll provide universal health care, covering everybody, whether they want it or not.

“One problem is in making health care so available that people will take advantage of it beyond legitimate demand. Instead of taking an aspirin, they'll go in for treatment—resulting in a huge jump in costs.

LPLAC

continued from page 1...

reported that current membership dues and donations barely cover expenses. The biggest expense is the county newsletter, which is the main communication source for members.

LPLAC Chair Bruce Dovner announced a 25% increase in membership over the past year. “Part of that,” he said, “was a more aggressive recruitment and renewal effort. A special restyled tabloid issue of *Los Angeles Libertarian* yielded 12 members and probably influenced others to renew. The tabloid edition was continued for two more issues, but cost considerations compelled us to go to a reduced dimension paper. Each issue continues to have at least two color pages. Thanks go to our publisher, Dick Venable, for the improvements at roughly the same cost.

“The web site was restyled somewhat, with capability added to register to vote online and to join the LP online. Annual meeting online registration was added. Tom Sipos added videos to the main page.

“The Chair [Dovner] appeared at El Monte Middle School and at the Junior State of America (JSA) meeting. Jay Jones represented LPLAC at several JSA events. Bob Weber appeared

at another middle school class. LPLAC members, especially those from South Bay/Region 66, staffed numerous outreach booths at various city fairs.

“I have researched the cost of advertising in local media and planned for college outreach. We are also looking into the possibility of having booths at Van's Warped Tour [rock festival] in Pomona on June 22, and in Carson on August 22. Booth space is free to nonprofits.

“Future plans call for continued efforts to retain and recruit members, college outreach, developing college voter registration and Libertarian club materials. There is a possible fundraising opportunity at Freedom Fest being held in Las Vegas, July 8 through 11. We will continue development of the website.”

Moving to the election of officers, Bruce Dovner, David Bowers, and David Wire were re-elected as Chair, Secretary, and Treasurer, respectively. José Castañeda was elected Vice Chair. Aside from NOTA (None of the Above), there were no opposition candidates.

Jill Pyeatt-Stone was re-elected to the Judicial Committee. She also serves on the LPC's ExCom. Audrey Carlin and Rose Weber—

continued on page 5...

“People said ‘No’ to Hillary's universal health care program in '92 and '93.

“Talk to your doctors, your friends, everyone you can to stop both Cap and Trade and Universal Health Care before it becomes part of the budget.”

Clark also discussed the LP's prospects. He suggested (1) alliances with Ron Paul's Campaign For Liberty and the Tea Parties, (2) capitalizing on the recent “No” vote on the ballot measures, (3) talking about the pitfalls of too much credit and too much debt, both by governments and individuals, and (4) urging a return to Reaganomics.

Clark asked: “What do we have to do to repeat 1980? The candidate must apply himself to talking to the public and the media. Build a staff who will do 90% of the work. Deal with issues people care about, within principle. The right candidate understands the ideology and knows the issues.

“You cannot promise you will win. But you will try your best.”

Richard E. Venable is editor/publisher of *Los Angeles Libertarian*, LPLAC's newsletter. His email: LPCNews@aol.com.

Photo: Gail Lightfoot

Photo: Lawrence K. Samuels

Guest Editorial

Freedom, Liberty, Justice: Basic Native American Rights

by Walks With Thunder

Yes, I know that is in the American Constitution, too.

Have you ever seen those shirts and posters that say "Fighting Terrorism since 1492" and then there is a picture of Sitting Bull in his war paint? It's a statement from a people who hold negative feelings.

It was not that long ago that African-Americans and Indians had to use the back door, not the front, that we could not walk as equals in America because our skin was not pink. Our people, the old ones and some middle-aged ones, still remember this. They hold hatred for the White people they feel took our way of life and our land.

I say it is time to let that hatred go. We are a conquered people and we should own that. As conquered people we should be like the Japanese. They are also a conquered people, but they are doing it with style.

Did you know that Japan owns much of the United States? Ever hear of Sony, Honda, Toyota, etc, and those Japanese companies that invested in real estate here in the United States? They may not have won the war, but they are certainly kicking American financial butts.

So yes, we Native Americans are a conquered people. So let's use that casino money and reinvest in our people and real estate here in our ancestral

lands. Let's buy our heritage back!

Stop drinking and drugging, and abusing. It is time to use our liberty, and hold our heads up because we are the Native Peoples of this land. Our spiritual way is a great way of life; embrace it once more.

You do not have to have Red skin to embrace this way. It was foretold that the children's children of our conquerors would embrace our spiritual ways while the parents looked on in wonder. That is happening right now.

Let go of our negative feelings about those who conquered our people. That is a past generation's burden, not ours. Okay, so they gave us firewater. We gave them tobacco; I think that makes us even.

We hold ourselves back; let's stop doing that and move forward into a future that embraces all the peoples and share our spirituality with those who want to learn. Let's send a message to those who would steal our sweat lodge for money that they are not welcome in our lodges. Only those who would follow the good Red road are embraced into our spirituality.

Let's own our Freedom to choose how to live. Let's stand up for our Liberty to become educated, own property, and have a voice. Let's find the justice our people deserve by standing up and being proud

of who we are.

Our peoples are from great nations, such as the Sioux, the Black Foot, Crow, Caddo and many more. The Code Talkers in World War II stood next to the White people and served our new nation.

I know it was not popular to be a Native American until Kevin Costner made *Dances With Wolves*, then everyone had some Indian in them because at long last it was cool to be Native. That movie began to heal our nations, and the prejudice that we had felt for decades started to ease. It helped but wasn't a magic cure.

You know what? It's still cool to be free, Native, and have the liberty, and freedom to walk in the front door. Take pride in yourself, your nation, and follow our good, wide Red road in style.



Walks With Thunder is a Native America Shaman who teaches in Puget Sound, WA. His grandfather was a Shaman for the Caddo tribe, and his father before him. His website: www.walkswiththunder.com.

LPLAC

continued from page 4...

Gonella are newly elected to the J.C. Again, there were no opposition candidates, aside from NOTA.

Ed Clark spoke after the elections.

Attendees included Ed and Alicia Clark, Beau Cain, Edward Bowers, Rick Bronstein, Ernst Ghermann and his friend Barbara, Bob Weber, Eric Fine, Don Cowles, David Wire, Manny Klausner, Ted Brown, Alan Pyeatt, Jill Stone-Pyeatt, Matthew Barnes, Bill Lopez, Aarde Atheian, Michael Everling, Lupe Kindel, David Bowers, José Castañeda, Rodger Rosie, Jay Jones, Zander Collier III, José Mariano, Tony Panto and friend, Dan Fernandez, Chris Agrella, Jason Gonella, Rose Weber-Gonella, and 4-year-old Arthur Gonella, Boomer Shannon, Mary Kindel Belcher, Richard Newhouse, Gail Lightfoot and this author.

Richard E. Venable is editor/publisher of Los Angeles Libertarian, LPLAC's newsletter. His email: LPCNews@aol.com.

Raise your Cup to Coffee Club Members!

We want to thank the following members who have stepped right up and joined the LPC Coffee Club since its kick-off. A Coffee Club member donates a minimum of \$42 per month or \$500 or more each year.

- | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Suzanne Bell | Curt Cornell | Alan Pyeatt |
| Mike Binkley | Don Cowles | Chris Rufer |
| Ted Brown, Jr. | Bruce Dovner | Lawrence Samuels |
| Beau Cain | Terry Floyd | Paul Sisoian |
| T.J. Campbell | John Inks | Paul Studier |
| Audrey Carlan | Sebastian Knowlton | Kevin Takenaga |
| Ed Clark | TAD Lumpkin | Charles Tolman |
| Alicia Clark | Carolyn Marbry | Robert Weber, Jr. |
| Zander Collier, III | Berkeley Martinez | |

Your \$\$\$ Buys Liberty

LPC activists are fighting statist repression and speaking truth to power—but LPC dues don't cover all expenses. We need YOUR \$\$\$ to kick statist butt!

Join our Coffee Club! Advertise in

California Freedom Donate!

Here's My Pledge to the California Coffee Club!

Yes! I'll donate the price of a cup of coffee every working day and pay for it with a monthly pledge.

- One cup a day = \$ 42 monthly
- Two cups a day = \$ 84 monthly
- Three cups a day = \$ 126 monthly
- Five cups a day = \$ 210 monthly

Political contributions are not tax deductible. Federal law requires us to report the name, mailing address, occupation, and employer of each donor who contributes more than \$200 per calendar year.



ENCLOSED: Check or money order Voided check for Auto Bank Draft
OR: Credit card number and expiration date

ACCOUNT # WE ACCEPT AMERICAN EXPRESS DISCOVER MASTERCARD VISA EXPIRATION DATE

NAME ON CREDIT CARD HOME PHONE

SIGNATURE FOR CREDIT CARD WORK PHONE

DONOR'S NAME E-MAIL ADDRESS

COMPANY OCCUPATION

ADDRESS

CITY STATE ZIP CODE

Make checks payable and mail to **THE LIBERTARIAN PARTY OF CALIFORNIA**
14547 Titus Street, Suite 214 – Panorama City, California 91402-4935
Toll-free 877-884-1776 Local 818-782-8400 www.ca.lp.org 08Q1

Please Join our Coffee Club

Guest Editorial

Copyright Laws Threaten Online Freedom

by Christian Engström

If you search for Elvis Presley in Wikipedia, you will find a lot of text and a few pictures that have been cleared for distribution. But you will find no music and no film clips, due to copyright restrictions. What we think of as our common cultural heritage is not "ours" at all.

On MySpace and YouTube, creative people post audio and video remixes for others to enjoy—until they are replaced by take-down notices handed out by big film and record companies.

Technology opens up possibilities. Copyright law shuts them down.

This was never the intent. Copyright was meant to encourage culture, not restrict it. This is reason enough for reform.

But the current regime has even more damaging effects. In order to uphold copyright laws, governments are beginning to restrict our right to communicate with each other in private, without being monitored.

File-sharing occurs whenever one individual sends a file to another. The only way to limit this process is to monitor all communications between ordinary people. Despite the crackdown on Napster, Kazaa, and other peer-to-peer services over the past decade, the volume of file-sharing has grown exponentially.

Even if the authorities closed down all other possibilities, people could still send copyrighted files as attachments to emails or through private networks. If people do that, should we give the government the right to monitor all email and all encrypted networks?

Whenever there are ways of communicating in private, they will be used to share copyrighted material. If you want to stop people doing this, you must remove the right to communicate in private. There is no other option. Society must make a choice.

The world is at a crossroads. The internet and new information technologies are so powerful that no matter what we do, society will change. But the direction has not been decided.

Technology could be used to create a Big Brother society beyond our nightmares,

where governments and corporations monitor every detail of our lives.

In the former East Germany, the government needed tens of thousands of employees to keep track of citizens, using typewriters, pencils, and index cards. Today a computer can do the same thing a million times faster. At the push of a button.

There are many politicians who want to push that button.

The same technology could instead be used to create a society that embraces spontaneity, collaboration, and diversity. Where citizens are no longer passive consumers being fed information and culture through one-way media, but are instead active participants, collaborating on a journey into the future.

The internet is still in its infancy, but already we see fantastic things appearing as if by magic. Take Linux, the free computer operating system. Or Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. Witness the participatory cultures of MySpace and YouTube. Or the growth of Pirate Bay, which makes the world's culture easily available to anybody with an internet connection.

But where technology opens up new possibilities, our intellectual property laws restrict them. Linux is held back by patents. The rest of the examples by copyright.

The public increasingly recognizes the need for reform. That was why Piratpartiet—the Pirate Party—won 7.1% of the popular vote in Sweden in the European Union elections. This gave us a seat in the European Parliament for the first time.

Our manifesto is to reform copyright laws and gradually abolish the patent system. We oppose mass surveillance and censorship on the net, as in the rest of society. We want to make the EU more democratic and transparent. This is our entire platform.

We intend to devote all our time and energy to protecting fundamental civil liberties on the net and elsewhere. Seven percent of Swedish voters agreed with us that it makes sense to put other political differences aside in order to ensure this.

Political decisions taken over

the next five years are likely to set the course we take into the information society, and will affect the lives of millions for many years into the future.

Will we let our fears lead us toward a dystopian Big Brother state? Or will we have the courage and wisdom to choose an exciting future in a free and open society?

The information revolution is happening here and now. It is up to us to decide what future we want.



Christian Engström is the Pirate Party's member in the European Parliament. His article first appeared in the Financial Times of London, July 7, 2009. The Swedish Pirate Party's website: www.piratpartiet.se/international.

Meet Ed Clark



A Harvard Law School graduate, Ed Clark was the LPC's candidate for governor in 1978, pulling 5.5% of the vote. In 1980 he received over a million votes as the LP's presidential candidate—the best showing of any LP presidential candidate to date!

Clark ran as the peace candidate, reaching out to liberals unhappy with Selective Service registration and the arms race. Senator Eugene McCarthy wrote the introduction to Clark's book, *A New Beginning*.

Reception: 5:30 - 6:30 p.m.
Catered Dinner: 6:30 - 7:00 p.m.
Introduction by Prof. David R. Henderson
Speech by Ed Clark: 7:00 p.m.
Fundraising Auction

Saturday, August 29, 2009

Location: Carmel-by-the-Sea (details provided with reservation receipt)

Donations: \$25 per person (\$35 after Aug. 22), \$40 per couple (\$55 after Aug. 22), \$75 per seat at Ed's table, \$100 per person for a private half-hour conference with Ed.

Call to RSVP: 818-782-8400. Or email Beau Cain: office@ca.lp.org. Or online: www.ca.lp.org/landingpage/edclark/20090829.php. Or make out checks to Libertarian Party of California and mail to: 14547 Titus St, Ste 214, Panorama City CA 91402-4935

Proceeds to benefit the Libertarian Party of Monterey County and the LPC. Co-sponsors: Libertarians for Peace of Monterey County and the Progressive Libertarian League.

Websites: www.Freedom1776.com or www.ca.lp.org



Outright Libertarians Meeting

Saturday, September 19, 2009 @ 12 noon

Abbott's Habit

7554 W. Sunset Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90046

323-512-5278

Cross Street: N. Gardner St.

All friends, supporters, and interested parties welcome. For more info about Outright Libertarians or Repeal Prop 8, please contact Elinor Brandt: ebelbrandt@gmail.com.

Film Review

Up With Property Rights

by Laura G. Brown

(Up, Animation, Directed by Pete Docter and Bob Peterson; Cast: Ed Asner, Christopher Plummer, and Jason Nagai. 2009)

It's worth seeing *Up*, if for no other reason than as a touchstone for pop culture. But there are other reasons to see this Pixar movie, including production values so lavish you'll be transported as well as entertained. You might even find yourself cheering for the unlikely hero, 78-year-old Carl Fredericksen—an individualistic character you'll swear you've met at a Libertarian convention.

Before you see *Up*, there's a bonus cartoon called *Partly Cloudy*. Its premise is that storks get the babies they deliver from fluffy cloud creatures who make round-headed, big-eyed humans and puppies at a great rate. In contrast, one gloomy, stormy cloud makes toothy crocodiles and prickly junior porcupines. The stork assigned to this gloomy cloud gets increasingly frazzled and beat up by the dangerous ba-

bies, yet he cheerfully keeps coming back for more.

At this point, I started to see an analogy of how Americans keep going back for more socialist government programs, despite dismal results. As the stork dons a football helmet and willingly returns for even more punishment, I thought: This creature is a literal birdbrain. Surely, Americans have enough sense to turn away from cobbled-together Frankenstein-like creations such as government health care.

In *Up*, Ed Asner voices the curmudgeonly Fredericksen, a widower who feels so strongly about his property rights that he lifts his house to the heavens with helium balloons to escape the authorities, and to find the South American paradise of his boyhood dreams.

Jason Nagai is the voice of Carl's adventurous stowaway, Russell, a persistent boy not

unlike that Libertarian candidate who gets a registered Libertarian voter to sign three or four petitions once he gets his foot in the door. Russell's earnestness and loyalty provide a conscience for *Up*.

Up borrows from the best children's classics: Carl's house rises aloft under brightly colored helium balloons, not unlike James's giant peach; the old man raps someone on the head with a stick and gets nabbed by The Man, as in *Miracle on 34th Street*, and the house flies through storms and lands in a colorful, exotic land, as in *The Wizard of Oz*.

But none of the classics had Pixar's modern ideas: Developers are faceless, evil mafia dons; villains hunt endangered species for their own gain; seniors can be productive adventurers; and parental roles can be filled by those willing to show up at important times in a child's life.

Disney/Pixar hasn't been known as a font of social awareness, but this film departs from the usual safe territory in depicting the infertility and death of a likeable character (Carl's wife) and showing Russell as a child of divorce who's repeatedly disappointed by his father. Even the brightly colored, gender-confused, tropical bird, Kevin, (stalked by the evil

Muntz, voiced by Christopher Plummer), has been co-opted by some in the Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender movement as being a heroic symbol of their persecuted minority.

There are even some modern Pavlovian ideas about how animal behavior is shaped by stimuli. The dogs, able to talk with scientific genius Muntz's collars, provide some of the most hilarious moments when they honestly explain their motives.

The director, Pete Docter, uses his own voice for Dug, the overly-friendly, nerdy dog. When Dug exhibits doggy ADD at the sight of a squirrel or tennis ball, and the evil pack leader's collar gets stuck in a

high helium voice mode, you'll feel you've got your money's worth.



Laura G. Brown is a teacher and writer living in San Gabriel. She is a veteran candidate for State Assembly. Her email: lauragbrown@sbcglobal.net.

Media Pirating

continued from page 2...

is never Fair Use," one editor told me. Rather than fight big publishers' lawyers, authors instead surrendered their Fair Use rights.

Erosion of Fair Use is erosion of free speech. When Alice Randell wrote *The Wind Done Gone*, she was sued by the Margaret Mitchell estate. Had Randell been unable to afford a legal defense, her parody of *Gone With the Wind* told from the slaves' perspective would have been suppressed.

The Electronic Frontier Foundation (www.eff.org) documents the ways in which Fair Use is threatened by big media. And curtailing Fair Use pirates your rights.

Pirating movies and music is wrong (though not as harmful

continued on page 8...

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

Let Economy Telcom handle your Telecommunications needs

- Land line top quality long distance for under 3 cents a minute.
- 800 numbers at same rates, including 800 numbers for cell phones.
- Astonishing international calling rates.
- Business local phone service, and high speed Internet access.
- Cell phone international calling at 90% off cell phone rates.
- Finest quality, fixed monthly cost conference calling.

Under 3¢
a minute

We are independent brokers, representing over 30 companies.

Call us for a quote: 1-800-914-8466.

Or e-mail owner Richard Rider: RRider@san.rr.com

Understanding Economics

Subcontracting is Not Privatization

by Jason Gonella

Recently, in an internet forum, someone cited subcontracting as an example of how privatization doesn't work.

But subcontracting does not work as an example of privatization.

The State of California, in trying to manage a state park, owned by the state government, hired AIG to manage the state park. AIG hired private firefighters to perform the firefighting service in the state park, at the behest of AIG, at the behest of the State of California.

Those private firefighters apparently didn't do a very good job. So after being paid by the state (ultimately) to do a state job, on state land, this effort is considered a failure of privatization.

A true example of privatization would be to not involve the state. Private firefighters would be hired, not by California (via

AIG), but by the private owner of the private land.

The two do not compare.

No matter how many intermediary agencies there are between the top and the bottom, the top level agency, the one that initiates the subcontracting, sets the rules for the entire chain downwards.

This is evident by how companies that get most of their business from government contracting are run. Those companies have an internal structure and practice that is in many ways as bureaucratic as the government. They may be a little less bureaucratic, since they do not have to follow the full range of regulations, but adherence to many government policies are written into contracts to ensure that subcontracting doesn't interfere with social planning objectives.

In the private sector, subcontracting likewise means that the goals of the top level

company are the goals that determine all contracts down the line. The difference is that private sector goals are all the same: best product for the lowest price.

Government contracts aren't written to make money for the government, but to adhere to some policy-driven standard, thus ensuring there will be conflicting goals in government contracting.

When a contractor fails to deliver what should be the desired result, but stays entirely within the contract, it is not the fault of a private system. It is the fault of a public system that, in this case, used a subcontractor. The fault remains in the public sector.

Subcontracting—the contracting out to private companies of government functions—is not an example of the free market at work. It's more correctly referred to as corporatism.



Jason Gonella is Chair of the Antelope Valley LP, one of the Los Angeles LP's eight internal regions. His email: AynRKey@aol.com.

Media Pirating

continued from page 7...

to many artists as industry accounting practices are). Apart from brief excerpts used for news, criticism, commentary, and so on, copyrighted works should not be taken without permission while the artist is alive and for some reasonable period thereafter.

But it's hard to sympathize with big media companies who've suffered piracy while they and their lobbyists and lawyers are pirating your rights.

This op-ed originally appeared in the LPC's *Libertarian Perspective*, August 23, 2005.



"If everyone demanded peace instead of another television set, then there'd be peace."

~ John Lennon

Libertarian Party of California
14547 Titus St., Suite 214
Panorama City, CA 91402

NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
INDUSTRY, CA
PERMIT NO. 4386



Photo: Lawrence K. Samuels

Lawrence K. Samuels joins a Revolutionary War Tea Party • Page 1

INSIDE	
LPC Candidate Tops 5%	2
Ed Clark on the Future	4
Native Americans Love Liberty	5
Outright Libertarians Meet	6
Copyright Threatens Online Freedom	6