

California Freedom

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

Party of Youth

LPC Wants YOU!—To Recruit Youth!

Youth Outreach

On May 2, 2009, Monterey LP Chair Lawrence K. Samuels, and ExCom Second Alternate Savva Vassiliev, addressed youth at a NORML rally held on the Cal State University campus in Monterey Bay—sharing the stage with four rock bands!

The two LPC activists excited the audience—roughly 30 young rock & rollers—by explaining the LPC's principles of decriminalizing marijuana and other drugs.

Although the event was sponsored by the CSUMB NORML campus group, no one from NORML spoke. Samuels and Vassiliev were the event's only speakers! Samuels is also Chair of FED-UP, a local anti-Drug War group in Monterey.



Photo: Lawrence K. Samuels



Lawrence K. Samuels



Savva Vassiliev

by Bruce Dovner

At Libertarian meetings I've attended over the last 10 years, the average age of attendees has been progressively increasing. Youth are becoming a smaller proportion of our party. The only exceptions are the occasional group of college libertarians and the Ron Paul campaign. The latter attracted a healthy youth presence.

No movement or organization can survive without passing the torch to the next generation. The survival and growth of the party and movement require that we recruit a new generation of Libertarians.

Happily, younger people are still forming their political beliefs and are more amenable to libertarianism than people who've already made up their minds.

Two general methods are available to us for recruiting youth:

1. Scan our membership lists for college students, and encourage them to start Libertarian clubs and recruit on campus;
2. Set up voter registration booths on local campuses, gather lists of interested students, and help them organize Libertarian clubs on campus.

College students are currently a small slice of our total membership, so the first method isn't too hopeful. The second method is more advantageous.

College campuses are a fertile ground to register young people to vote Libertarian, and are usually accessible to outside activists. Recruiting on campus will focus our efforts on students. The number of people recruited on campus will likely exceed our existing college members.

"The surest way to corrupt a youth is to instruct him to hold in higher esteem those who think alike than those who think differently."

~ Friedrich Nietzsche

What's needed?

1. Booths with banners, voter registration forms, displays, literature, Nolan chart quizzes, and sign-up sheets. Tables and canopies would also be nice.

2. Knowledge of campus regulations.

3. The student clubs will require manuals of operation, charters, educational materials, resources, lists of speakers and videos for presentations and programs, and faculty advisors.

Youth recruitment will also require YOU, the volunteer. You'll need to:

1. Research colleges on the internet to learn the regulations and contact info necessary for setting up campus booths.
2. Arrange permission to set up campus booths.
3. Assemble and finance those booths.

4. Collect materials, compile manuals of operations, and create programs with speakers and videos for college Libertarian clubs.

5. Staff those campus booths. Administer Nolan quizzes. Ask students who score libertarian to register to vote as Libertarian, join the LPC as a dues-paying member, and become involved.

6. Serve as a campus speaker.

Booth staff volunteers and campus speakers must be available weekdays, sometime between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m. This is ideal for retired people.

And it's an opportunity to interact with young people.

If you're willing to help with any of the above, please contact me at chair@lplac.org or bdovner@lplac.org, or at (562) 961-6919.

The recruitment of a new generation of Libertarians, and the future of the libertarian movement, is in your hands.



Bruce Dovner is Chair of the Los Angeles County LP. Some of the ideas in his article originated from his conversations with LPC Southern Vice-Chair Zander Collier III.

INSIDE

Outright Against DPI **3**

State Licensing Kills Jobs **4**

Saying No to War **5**

Govt Tanks Economy **6**

LPC Gains Voters **6**

California Freedom

Vol. 7 • Issue 6 • June 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,
Bruce Dovner, Pamela B. Maltzman,
Laurence M. Vance,
Jason Gonella, Laura G. Brown,
Ron Paul

SEND ADDRESS CHANGES TO:

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

Why Canadians Don't Fear Terrorism

by Thomas M. Sipos

I was recently in Winnipeg to organize the film festival for the World Horror Convention, which met in Canada this year. As I do at every convention, libertarian or otherwise, I spent a good portion of my time touring the host city. On May 3rd, I visited the Manitoba provincial capitol building, which is in Winnipeg.



Manitoba's provincial capitol in Winnipeg, Canada.

It was a Sunday afternoon. I didn't expect anything other than to view the capitol from the outside. I found a typical government building, massive and fronted by white columns. I climbed the steps to the entrance, not really expecting to gain admittance.

To my surprise, the door was open. Inside, I found a solitary security guard behind a reception desk. I asked if tours were offered. Not on Sundays, I was told, but I was free to browse the building.

The guard was pleasant and all smiles. He asked for my name and city of origin. He wrote it in a visitor's log—but he never checked my I.D. I didn't lie, but I could have.

I wore my usual weathered

khakis. A camera hung from my neck.

I passed through no metal detectors. No X-rays. No searches.

The guard gave me a clip-on Visitor's badge. Then I was let loose in the provincial capitol, free to wander, free to photograph. Unescorted.

The capitol was deserted on a Sunday afternoon. I explored all four floors, from the basement to the top, clicking away with my camera. Most of the time I was alone, no one in sight. If there were any security cameras, I didn't see them. Even if I were being observed, no one rushed to stop my taking pictures. The level of trust placed in me, a foreigner (I'd truthfully told the guard



The first floor, as seen from a second floor balcony. Not a guard or visitor in sight.



The empty second and third floors, as seen from a third floor balcony, opposite.

that I was from California), was amazing.

I can't imagine that many key U.S. government buildings would place as much trust in Americans, much less foreigners. No I.D. No metal detectors. No X-raying bags. In the U.S., guards get suspicious if someone is seen taking photos *outside* a government

commemorating all manner of people and events, including such insanities as the Boer War and World War I.

Even so, Canadians have been minor followers of British and American imperialist policies, rather than policy-makers. Canada doesn't install foreign despots or fund ungrateful "allies" that oppress



The Hall of Speakers on the second floor. Just me and my camera and portraits of past speakers.

building. Consider the security measures (and list of prohibited items) that visitors to California's state capitol museum in Sacramento must undergo: <http://capitolmuseum.ca.gov/detail.aspx?content2=2296&content3=1576>.

Why do Canadians fear terrorists less than do Americans?

I suspect it's because Canada has a reputation for minding its own business overseas.

Canadian foreign policy has not been perfect. At times it's slavishly rubber-stamped British or American wars. The hallways of Manitoba's capitol are covered with plaques

and kill innocent civilians. As a result, no one hates Canada for its freedom and prosperity. Its buildings are not targets.

Imperialism does not *justify* terrorism, but it does *motivate* terrorism. Creating enemies abroad spurs a police state at home. Imperialism diminishes freedom for both the conqueror and the conquered.

It's silly, but Canada still enjoys a vicarious thrill from its ties to the defunct British Empire. One plaque in the Manitoba capitol "commemorates the arrival on Canada's soil of those British subjects whose loyalty to their King, faith in God, and courage to endure hardships

continued on page 4...



Letters to the Editor

Membership Drop

Since LPC Chair Mark Hinkle stepped down from his position [in 2001], few have glimpsed the staggering membership numbers. When his term expired, there were over 7,500 dues-paying members in California. As of the 2009 Convention, that number is down to 1,200.

When I presented these numbers to those in charge, they told me that I had nothing to worry about. The party was doing great. The new Chair is really active and getting a lot done.

Membership doesn't lie.

The Chair should be consulting the wealthy to get them to donate large sums of money, as Mark Hinkle did. Because of his actions, one man donated \$30,000 to the party. There were many others similar to him.

The heads of the LPC are hardly reaching out to the youth. They are hardly attracting many new members.

Admittedly, we have had a 10% increase in voter registration. The increase is one of the main arguments they used to defend how "good" the party has been doing.

Now seriously, in eight years, if membership numbers were that high then, don't you think that 10% would have been considerably higher if we had not changed to our new tactics?

Several key policies should be reimplemented: hiring staff for [the] state party and as many county parties as the counties can raise money for; have businesses handle the convention (doing so, convention attendance reached 500 in California; it is now down to a bleak 80) so that they may profit and benefit us with additional members; having the Chair resume his efforts of extracting donations from wealthy supporters.

Everyone thinks they know the best way to run the party, but Mark Hinkle has a proven, effective way to run the party. Let's use logic and reason, as Libertarians do, and reestablish our former policies.

— **Logan Hinkle**
Morgan Hill, CA

Editor replies: The LPC's membership plummeted from 2001 to 2007. However, Beau Cain informs me that the LPC has had a *net gain* of approximately 200

members since the San Ramon convention in April 2007.

Today's LPC *is* reaching out to wealthy donors and youth (see this issue's front page). Even so, I wouldn't rely too heavily on big donors. Over-reliance on a wealthy few may be one reason for the LPC's membership drop.

The 2006 cruise convention was an especially egregious example, disenfranchising povertarians and those unable to obtain a passport (either legally, or out of principle). Why would people stay in a party in which they can't afford to participate as equals?

The LPC needs big donors, but it also needs voters and street activists, most of whom are not wealthy.

Mark Hinkle may have struck a good balance between attracting the wealthy, without dissuading grassroots youth and povertarians. His immediate successors apparently failed at finding that balance.

I'm sure the current LPC, which is slowly growing again, would welcome Mark Hinkle's advice and activism.

Medved Thrashes Third Parties

On Sunday, May 3, 2009, [on] KSFO 560 Radio, Michael Medved said that open primaries would put an end to those destructive third parties!

How can we fight the motor-mouth talking heads on radio and TV too?

— **Irvin E. Chambers**
Menlo Park, CA

Outright Against DPI

We at Outright Libertarians are disappointed that the Libertarian Party of California has endorsed the Domestic Partnership Initiative, a bizarre ballot measure that increases taxes, creates child custody issues, hurts military families, and so on. DPI isn't even a properly written amendment to the state's constitution—which is what is now required after Prop 8's passage—and so therefore has no real force of law. (For details, see: www.lao.ca.gov/bal-lot/2009/090031.aspx.)

Outright Libertarians documented all these problems in collaboration with our own Board (which includes a family law attorney), and the ACLU, the Tax Policy Institute, and the nonpartisan Legislative Analyst's Office. We then published and documented all our concerns in two national press releases, three media interviews, and a white paper distributed to attendees at the LPC convention.

LPC leaders did no real research about DPI until *after* their endorsement of it, and then only in reaction to our policy experts bringing up these obvious problems.

We received negative feedback from the LPC's "No on 8" partners, who didn't like their former ally describing them as "culture warriors" in public statements. We tried to mitigate that problem through a convention resolution overturning the endorsement, and were told by some convention delegates that we were "hurting party unity" and were "angry."

Hurting party unity? That goes both ways.

One wonders why a gay person—or indeed any minority—would be interested in participating in a political party that, over the last 24 months, has shown such disregard for us. When an organization doesn't even do basic homework prior to its endorsements, dismisses as irrelevant the opinion of minority caucuses, and chooses to call inconvenient facts "divisive," it has crossed the line into political never-never land.

And anger? You bet!

As principled Libertarians, many of us indeed feel a righteous indignation at seeing our party of individual liberties co-opted to promote statist, social engineering gobbledygook like the DPI in order to appease fans of Sean Hannity, Rush Limbaugh, Glenn Beck, and Alex Jones.

The LP is only as effective as its constituents. When the constituent is a strong, influential, and persuasive Libertarian voice in the community—like former LP presidential nominee Ed Clark (who publicly opposes DPI)—the LP is very effective. When the constituent is an unknown amateur whose greatest joy is playing parliamentary games, the LP becomes the weak and ineffective mess that it has become under its current leadership.

In contrast, Outright's leaders have been key participants in successful libertarian LGBT initiatives in New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Connecticut.

In California, I got the LPC included as a partner organization in the "No on 8" campaign, so this contradictory DPI endorsement directly impacts not only the LPC's

credibility, but my own credibility in my community.

The recent tone-deafness and petty internal politics of national, and some state, LP organizations are having a dramatic impact on the relevance of our party.

Sadly, Outright Libertarians has voted to remove LP membership as a requirement to participate in a leadership position in our organization—a requirement we've had since the organization's founding 11 years ago. This will allow us to continue to do what the LP has unambiguously decided to cease doing—promote libertarianism to the LGBT community while vigorously participating in the broader national debate.

It is our sincere hope that the LP will opt to rejoin us on the front lines of the fight for liberty in the near future. A good first step would be for the LPC ExCom to rescind its endorsement of the Domestic Partnership Initiative.

— **Rob Power**
San Francisco, CA

DPI Silent on Divorce

The most devastating thing about government's involvement in domestic affairs is not its involvement in marriage. It is its involvement in divorce. If the Domestic Partnership Initiative doesn't wrestle this aspect of the relationship from the government, [then DPI] does little to ameliorate the risk couples take in marrying one another.

The initiative does not change from the current condition that denies marrying couples any right of having a contract with each other about their terms of separation. The government comes and takes all of the assets earned by one spouse and gives it to the other, or to itself. It takes all of the children and gives it to the abusing spouse, or to itself, just to extort more money from the higher earning spouse.

I could go on. The devastation never stops. It usually ends in the lifelong dispossession and slavery of the good spouse for the rest of his life.

— **Aarde V. Atheian**
Los Angeles, CA

Glasnost Is Good

Il just got the May *California Freedom* and I remembered that I've been meaning to send you

an email about your "Peace and *Glasnost*" editorial in the April issue.

I thoroughly agree with you that you should provide us low-level members more info about what's going on inside the party. For the past 30+ years, it seems like I have read nothing but overly optimistic happy talk in the CA and national LP newspapers, and it's been a breath of fresh air to read your somewhat more here's-really-what's-going-on articles lately.

Of the instructions you mentioned, I disagree with all the instructions. In particular, if I could I would contradict all the old instructions by issuing these instructions to you:

1. You should discuss America's foreign interventions.
2. You should not just print material all libertarians agree on.
3. You should not just print "positive" stories.
4. You should cover the LNC activities, especially the "internal debates." You should foster debates about "internal" matters.
5. You should feel free to question the actions by party leaders.
6. You should print discussion or debate about contentious party issues, because people like me are not aware of any of the controversies. If we are lucky we may read about them decades later in someone's memoirs.

I wish you success in your quest for *glasnost*. I can tell being editor is a difficult and time-consuming job. So, on behalf of most of us out here, "Thanks".

— **Bert Donaldson**
San Diego, CA

Editor replies: Thanks, but I should clarify. I've not received official instructions on how to run *CF*, but rather, unofficial complaints from some unhappy members.

For more info on current controversies and internal debates within the LP, I continue to recommend: www.IndependentPoliticalReport.com.

YOUR Letters Welcome!

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

Please submit your letters to:

editor@ca.lp.org

Canadians

continued from page 2...



Photo: Thomas M. Sipos

The capitol basement. Which I had all to myself.

caused them to sacrifice their homes in the American colonies, and to pioneer in the Canadian wilderness. The mark of Honour, U.E., established by Order-In-Council No. 25 passed at the City of Quebec on November 9, 1789, and approved in London in 1790, was conferred upon the Loyalists and their descendants."

This means that descendants of those Tories who fled the American Revolution for Canada get to affix U.E. after their names. U.E. stands for United Empire. Thankfully, now an empire in name only.

More silliness: Canadians still recognize Elizabeth II as their queen.

Okay, so Canadians are wrong about the American Revolution. And there are other things they can learn from us. Canadians are weaker on free

speech ("hate speech" is a crime) and gun rights. Then there's their socialized medicine.

But there are things the U.S. can learn from Canada. War and empire do not make a nation safe. Peace and non-intervention bring safety and security.

Lee Wrights "Reappointed"

Due to membership uproar, including two online petitions, the LNC has voted to "reappoint" R. Lee Wrights to an At-Large seat on the LNC.

This does not end the controversy. Some LNC critics argue that Wrights cannot be "reappointed" because his removal was never valid, because it violated due process. Rather than a 2/3 removal vote by the LNC, as required by the bylaws, LP Secretary Bob Sullentrop had simply declared that Wrights was no longer an At-Large member due to his lapsed LP membership.

LNC critics worry that accepting Wrights's "reappointment" (rather than declaring the removal invalid) creates a dangerous precedent for the future, permitting the easy removal of minority faction LNC members without due process.

LNC Region 7 Rep. Rachel Hawkridge emails me that: "The vote to reappoint Lee Wrights was 12-0-4, with Aaron Starr, Dan Karlan, Rebecca Sink-Burris and Alicia Mattson not voting/abstaining.

The Libertarian Perspective's op-ed columns are sent via e-mail weekly to over 2,000 news media professionals in California.

If you know of any reporters, editors, publishers, or other parties who might be interested in receiving The Libertarian Perspective and Libertarian Party of California press releases, please have them subscribe to our media list by entering this URL in a web browser and following the instructions provided: TinyURL.com/df3uy.

Libertarian Party members are also welcome to join the list and receive our media e-mail missives!

Party of Economic Liberty**State Licensing Kills Jobs**

by Pamela B. Maltzman

The American Association for Medical Transcription/Association for Healthcare Documentation Integrity (AAMT/AHDI) has long lobbied for state mandated licensing and credentialing of medical transcriptionists (MTs).

As a working MT, I oppose state mandated credentialing and licensing, because it will harm self-employed professionals such as myself, the companies that employ us, and the public at large. State mandated licensing and credentialing for MTs will increase health care costs and reduce competition, with no countervailing benefits to the public.

We're already in a recession, possibly a depression. People are being laid off, losing their jobs, having difficulty paying their bills, even losing their homes. Meanwhile, MT wages have been plummeting for years now.

The owner of the small company for which I've worked for over 12 years has always paid better than the national average. However, since several years ago, our production has been counted by character rather than line-for-line, which is about a 30% pay cut. I don't blame the "boss." (Technically, I'm an independent contractor.) Various pressures forced him to that decision. No one has unlimited funds.

But I'm still reeling from that pay cut. None of my bills went down in the slightest. I had to borrow like crazy just to keep eating. The last several years have been financial hell.

In the April 2009 issue of *Advance for Health Information*

Professionals magazine, Lynn Jusinski writes that licensing fees in Pennsylvania would amount to \$2,105 per license every two years. Licensing fees in California would likely be even higher. And those license fees would be on top of what the AAMT/AHDI plan to charge for their credentials -- which they hope that states will also mandate.

The question is: *Cui bono?* Who benefits?

MTs will *not* benefit under state mandated licensing and credentialing. I'm already burdened with more bills than I can handle—on 30% less money than I was making a few years ago. How can I fork over hundreds of dollars to the AAMT/AHDI, and thousands to a new state licensing bureaucracy? Who said they deserve even one dollar of my hard-earned wages? For what?

The only people to benefit would be AAMT/AHDI CEO Peter Preziosi and his cronies, plus the various new state bureaucracies, all of whom will have control over my work, and the power to tell me whether or not I can work in this field. They'll all get nice salaries without themselves having to transcribe a single line of dictation.

I've done MT for over 20 years. I learned on the job. I had to take tests and compete to earn my first trainee MT job at a major Southern California teaching hospital. I continue to learn every night on the job, which is one of the things I have always liked about this job, despite the lousy dictators we must deal with.


Just because I don't have

credentials or a degree doesn't mean that I'm inferior to someone who forked over big bucks for a course. My significant other took a course from one of the major online schools, and now has about two to three years of job experience in this field. But he still asks me questions about what he's hearing, and not the other way around.

Mandatory licensing and credentialing will also burden the Medical Transcription Service Owners (MTSO), who must then do the unpaid work of monitoring who has "permission" to work for them and who does not.

Mandatory licensing and credentialing will throw people like me out of work, either by denying MTs the right to contract for work on their own, or by putting small MTSOs out of business.

In an economy which is tanking in many sectors, why make it more difficult for people to support themselves?



Pamela B. Maltzman is a former Secretary of the Los Angeles County LP. Her email: pbmaltzman@yahoo.com.

DVD Review**A Secret to Share With Friends**

by Laura G. Brown

(*A Secret*, Directed by Claude Miller; Cast: Patrick Bruel, Yves Jacques, Ludivine Sagnier, Yves Verhoeven, Nathalie Boutefeu. French with English subtitles. 2007)

Think you've seen enough compelling stories like *Sophie's Choice* and *Schindler's List* to cement your hatred of fascism? Already hold a firm commitment to your Second Amendment rights, and stand ready to defend yourself at the drop of a brown shirt? After seeing this lovely, understated drama by director

Claude Miller, you'll find your anti-statist views confirmed in a subtle, yet intense way.

A Secret reveals that a crushing stone tossed into the middle of human affairs has a ripple effect extending far beyond its initial damage. The film is based on the life story of novelist Philippe Grimbert, whose parents jumped to their

deaths from their Paris apartment more than 20 years ago. Although they left no note, they had been scarred in that they survived the gas chambers while their then-spouses had been killed.

According to an interview with *The Guardian's* Stuart Jeffries, Grimbert originally in-

continued on page 7...

Book Review

Saying No to War

by Laurence M. Vance

(We Who Dared to Say No to War: American Antiwar Writing from 1812 to Now, edited by Murray Polner and Thomas E. Woods Jr., 368 pp, Basic Books, 2008)

Apologists and defenders of Bush's global war on terror have always had one thing they could fall back on should none of their other lame arguments for war, militarism, the suppression of civil liberties, an imperial presidency, and an aggressive foreign policy be convincing: to dissent when America is at war is to be un-American or anti-American.


Not any more. This pathetic argument has been laid to rest by *We Who Dared to Say No to War*.

Murray Polner, who's written for *The Nation*, and Thomas E. Woods, who's written for *The American Conservative*, are

opposite politically, but united by one noble idea—mass murder is wrong. Even when undertaken by governments.

They accurately claim to have assembled "some of the most compelling, vigorously argued, and just plain interesting speeches, articles, poetry, and book excerpts" in the American antiwar tradition. This tradition includes such "anti-Americans" as Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, William Jennings Bryan, Helen Keller, Senator Robert Taft, Governor Robert La Follette, and Presidents Abraham Lincoln and Dwight Eisenhower.

Their anthology introduces each major war in U.S. his-



tory, followed by "some of the most memorable, if largely neglected, writings and speeches by those Americans who have opposed our government's addiction to war." Seventy selections, covering the War of 1812, Mexican War, Civil War, Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars, World War I, World War II, Cold War, Vietnam War, and Iraq War. Also a chapter in which "Americans from the past two centuries address various aspects of war."

All aspects are addressed: militarism, imperialism, empire,

conscription, and government propaganda. As the authors observe: "The history of American war is littered with propaganda, falsehoods, a compliant media, the manipulation of patriotic sentiment—everything we've seen recently, we've seen before."

During the War of 1812, Daniel Webster delivered a speech in Congress disparaging conscription as inconsistent with free government, civil liberty, and the Constitution:

"Where is it written in the Constitution, in what article or section is it contained, that you may take children from their parents, and parents from their children, and compel them to fight the battles of any war, in which the folly or the wickedness of Government may engage it?"

During the Mexican War, Congressman Abraham Lincoln denounced President Polk as a "bewildered, confounded, and miserably perplexed man." Polner and Woods write that "Congress voted 85 to 81 to censure President Polk, declaring that the war had been 'unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States.' "

The chapter on the Civil War includes a speech by Ohio Congressman Clement Vallandigham that was declared treasonous: "I assert here, today, as a Representative, that every principal act of the Administration since has been a glaring usurpation of power, and a palpable and dangerous violation of that very Constitution which this civil war is professedly waged to support." Vallandigham was tried before a military tribunal and deported from the Union.

Three-time Democratic Party

presidential candidate William Jennings Bryan initially supported the Spanish-American War, but objected to the occupation of the Philippines: "Those who would have this nation enter upon a career of empire must consider not only the effect of imperialism on the Filipinos but they must also calculate its effects upon our own nation. We cannot repudiate the principle of self-government in the Philippines without weakening that principle here."

Bryan later resigned as Secretary of State under Woodrow Wilson because he felt that Wilson was not committed to avoiding U.S. involvement in World War I.

Although blind and deaf, Helen Keller was more perceptive than most members of Congress on the U.S. entering World War I. In her speech before the Women's Peace Party in 1916, she said: "Congress is not preparing to defend the people of the United States. It is planning to protect the capital of American speculators and investors in Mexico, South America, China and the Philippine Islands. Incidentally this preparation will benefit the manufactures of munitions and war machines. The clever ones, up in the high places know how childish and silly the workers are. They know that if the government dresses them up in khaki and gives them a rifle and starts them off with a brass band and waving banners, they will go forth to fight valiantly for their own enemies. They are taught that brave men die for their country's honor. What a price to pay for an abstraction—the lives of millions of young men; other millions crippled and blinded for life; existence made hideous for still more

continued on page 6...

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

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.



Please Join our Coffee Club

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

Saying No To War*continued from previous page...*

millions of human beings; the achievement and inheritance of generations swept away in a moment—and nobody better off for all the misery!”

Concerning World War II, Polner and Woods describe the America First Committee (AFC), which “prevented the U.S. from becoming even more involved in the European war for some two years.” The AFC included among its estimated 800,000 members Gerald Ford, John F. Kennedy, Frank Lloyd Wright, E. E. Cummings, Walt Disney, and Charles Lindbergh. Included is the classic “Two Votes Against War: 1917 and 1941,” by Jeannette Rankin, the only member of Congress to vote against U.S. involvement in both world wars.

Of the Cold War, Polner and Woods relate how “Soviet capabilities were consistently exaggerated.” Included is “Those Who Protest: The Transformation of the Conservative Movement,” by Robert LeFevre, businessman and founder of the Freedom School in Colorado Springs, CO. LeFevre explains how conservatives, who originally favored peace, individualism, and smaller government, discarded these ideals in the name of fighting Communism.

Polner and Woods note the Cold War’s legacy: “The Soviet Union may be long gone, but the military-industrial complex that got such a boost from the Cold War, and the interventionist thinking that came to dominate policymaking circles, are as strong as ever.”

Concerning Vietnam, the weightiest selection is from General David Shoup, former commandant of the Marines: “You read, you’re televised to, you’re radioed to, you’re preached to, that it is necessary that we have our armed forces fight, get killed and maimed, and kill and maim other human beings including women and children because now is the time we must stop some kind of unwanted ideology from creeping up on this nation.... I don’t think the whole of Southeast Asia, as related to the present and future safety and freedom of the people of this country, is worth the life or limb of a single American. I believe that if we had and would keep our dirty, bloody, dollar-crooked fingers out of the business of these nations so full of depressed, exploited people, they will arrive at a solution of their own. That they design and want. That they fight and work for. And if unfor-

tunately their revolution must be of a violent type because the ‘haves’ refuse to share with the ‘have-nots’ by any peaceful method, at least what they get will be their own, and not the American style, which they don’t want and above all don’t want crammed down their throats by Americans.”

The Iraq War is harshly criticized. In “Why Did Bush Destroy Iraq?”, Paul Craig Roberts, assistant Secretary of the Treasury under Ronald Reagan, writes: “Every reason we have been given for the Iraqi invasion has proved to be false. Saddam Hussein had no weapons of mass destruction. Reports from UN weapons inspectors, top level U.S. intelligence officials, Secretary of the Treasury Paul O’Neill, and leaked top-secret documents from the British cabinet all make it unequivocally clear that the Bush regime first decided to invade Iraq and then looked around for a reason.”

We Who Dared to Say No to War contains many hard-hitting essays. The speech by John Quincy Adams shows just how far we have come in this country when he writes: that America “goes not abroad in search of monsters to destroy.” U.S. foreign policy is about as far removed from that of the Founding Fathers as it could possibly be.

The book’s appendix includes “Great Antiwar Films,” by Butler Shaffer.

Sadly, *We Who Dared to Say No to War* demonstrates that, after all the lies and propaganda of one war have been exposed, Americans are all too willing to rally around their government, their president, and their troops for the next war.

All patriotic Americans should say no to war and its evil stepchildren: militarism, imperialism, empire, nationalism, jingoism, gunboat diplomacy, torture, extraordinary rendition, domestic spying, conscription, nation building, regime change, the military-industrial complex, the warfare state, government propaganda, and an interventionist foreign policy.

This book reminds us that we who say no to such things are not alone.

Laurence M. Vance is the author of *Christianity and War and Other Essays Against the Warfare State*. His website: www.VancePublications.com. His email: lmvance@juno.com.

A lengthier version of this review originally appeared on LewRockwell.com.

Party of Economic Liberty

Gloomy '09 Economy, Thanks to Govt

by Jason Gonella

The economic news this year was already going to be bad. Those who did foresee hard times last year also foresaw that this year would have a commercial real estate bust. Strip mall owners must still pay the mortgage, even if stores aren’t renting space. This commercial real estate bust is on top of the continuing residential real estate bust.

But now it appears that matters are going to get much worse.

Some people appear to think that the economy is recovering. Stocks are up somewhat and thus everything should improve soon. This is according to Treasury Dept. and Federal Reserve officials—the very same officials who failed to see the recession coming in the first place.

If a bucket has a hole in its bottom, the hole will eventually drain whatever is in the bucket. But if water is added to the bucket at a faster rate than the hole can drain it, the water level in the bucket will, for a while, rise. Bush and Obama, through their stimulus pack-

ages, have pumped so much money into the economy that the bubble has partially re-inflated, despite deflating just as much as before.

What has happened is a debt increase of unprecedented scale. The end result is that when this trickles through the economy, prices will skyrocket. This is the leading indicator of severe inflation.

But while that would be bad news on its own, the federal government has decided that stricter regulations are needed for credit cards to prevent the raising of interest rates or the lowering of available credit.

Any loan is a risk, which is one reason that lenders charge interest. If it becomes impossible to recoup the risk of lending, such lending ceases. Payday loans are already under assault. New regulations will shutter these other means to short-term unsecured debt.

This is not to suggest that debt is a good thing, especially in the current economic environment. But responsible use of debt and short-term loans will suffer from the attacks on payday loans and credit cards.

Combine these with the proposed Employee Free Choice Act, and a new mercantilist “pro-America” policy coming from the White House, and it becomes apparent that the United States is in for some rough economic times in 2009. Even the administrators of the Social Security Trust Fund recently announced that they foresee troubles ahead.



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

LPC Gains Voters

The LPC has increased its registered voters, according to California Secretary of State Debra Bowen, as reported by Richard Winger’s *Ballot Access News*.

Bowen reported on May 15th that, since March 20th, the Democratic, American Independent, Libertarian, and Reform Parties, and Decline to State (i.e., independent) registrants enjoyed slight increases in their shares of registered voters. (The Reform Party is not ballot-qualified, yet California still tracks its registrations.)

The Republican, Green, and Peace & Freedom Parties suffered slight decreases in their percentage of registered voters.



Voters Agree With Us!

LPC: Voters Demand Real Budget Reform

The Libertarian Party of California applauds the defeat of ballot propositions 1A through 1E, and notes that to eliminate the perennial budget deficit, the state legislature must confront its addiction to spending.

"The LPC couldn't be more pleased that voters soundly rejected the proposed tax increase and phony budget solutions offered by Props. 1A through 1E," said LPC Chair Kevin Takenaga. "These propositions, which were crafted in a backroom deal with no public input, offered phony solutions to real problems."

"The legislature has no choice now but to confront its addiction to spending. And the LPC has offered, and will continue to offer and support, policy suggestions that could save billions of dollars dedicated to wasteful and inefficient programs."

Government demonstrates every day that increased spending doesn't guarantee quality service. Test scores for students in government-funded schools are lower, on average, than for students who attend private schools, which spend less per capita than its public counterparts. In *The Money Myth: School Resources, Outcomes, and Equity*, author and UC professor W. Norton Grubb cites studies that find only a weak relationship between public school funding and educational outcomes.

Adjusting state employees' pay and benefits to average that of workers in private industry could save the state up to \$40,000 per position, and would go far towards eliminating the current budget deficit.

The state budget could be further cut by reviewing each state department, division, bureau, board, and commission to determine whether the taxpayer-funded government service should be discontinued, merged with other departments, or charge user fees to cover its budget, or whether the service should be competitively bid out at less cost to taxpayers. Many such options were offered by the California Performance Review Commission.

The legislature and governor can also find savings by rethinking its current punitive taxes on wages, enterprise, the sale of goods, and the value of buildings, and replacing them with voluntary user fees, pollution charges, and taxes on the land value generated by governmental public goods.

Spending relief could also come as a result of decriminalizing recreational drugs. Billions of dollars could be saved by eliminating enforcement of drug laws, including the arrest, prosecution and incarceration of nonviolent drug offenders.

"Libertarians don't just complain, but offer real solutions," Takenaga said. "Our sound advice is a far cry from the shell games, phony spending caps, and budget gimmicks that the Democrats and Republicans have tried for years to offer as budget reform. If they have proven anything, it's that their ideas don't work. It's time for a fresh approach. Libertarians believe in freedom and limited government, but we want the government we have to work efficiently and effectively. Unfortunately, that is a novel concept for the career politicians who control Sacramento, but it's one we hope voters will embrace as a real solution for California."

A Secret

continued from page 4

tended to call his work *The Cemetery of Dogs*. He explains that while walking in his Seine-et-Marne neighborhood with his daughter, he came across a dog cemetery with loving inscriptions on the tombstones. He noticed a tombstone for a dog that had belonged to Pierre Laval, the prime minister of Vichy, France—a man who had cooperated with the Nazis in deporting Jews, especially large numbers of children.

That Laval's dog was honored in death, while his own mother and half brother had no such memorial, outraged Grimbert and resulted in a flurry of memoir writing that led to the book and movie.

A Secret centers on a young boy who feels inadequate next to his godlike parents. His dad is an Olympic-caliber athlete and his mom is a champion swimmer who could give Marilyn Monroe a run for her money. (Throughout the movie, she manages to don form-fitting, skin-baring outfits without making it seeming gratuitous.)

Francois is a pale, wispy imitation of these superior beings, and is keenly aware of it. At age 15, he begins to elicit a gigantic family secret from his aunt, who tells him what happened to his parents a decade earlier in Nazi-occupied France.



The seed of his aunt's revelations grows into a mighty oak of a story, including a half brother whom Francois is never told about, and his parents being drawn together at the same time their spouses were killed in the war. Francois learns he would never have been born if his brother had lived, and that this phantom child exceeded his father's expectations in every way—a painful contrast to his own experience.

The drama of heartrending events is downplayed at every turn. The director relies on the viewer's intelligence to ascertain the repressed feelings, motives, and guilt of the characters. At the film's pivotal scene, you'll find yourself asking, "How could a mother do that?" How could she put

her child in harm's way? *San Francisco Chronicle* critic Mick LaSalle suggests that she follows an agonizing path "from innocence to disillusion to an almost fathomless despair and nihilism."

Ludivine Sagnier, who plays the mother, Hannah, earned the equivalent of an Oscar nomination for her role. Hers is just one of many impressive acting performances. The movie is beautifully filmed, with gorgeous costumes and scenes of Paris and the lush countryside. The main beauty, however, lies in the film's ability to capture the simple longing for the presence and influence of loved ones who were cruelly murdered by a perverse regime.



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.

"When you make your peace with authority, you become authority."

~ Jim Morrison

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

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

Party of Foreign Non-Intervention

Bribing Egypt, Israel Is No Model for Peace

by Rep. Ron Paul

[Below is Ron Paul's opposition to H. Res. 282, "Recognizing the 30th anniversary of the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel." H Res 282 passed on March 31, 2009, 418 Ayes, 1 Nay, 12 Not Voting/Present.]

Mr. Speaker: I rise in reluctant opposition to this resolution. I do so not because I oppose our recognizing peace as preferable to, and more productive than, war. On the contrary, too seldom do we celebrate and encourage the end of violence and warfare on this Floor so I welcome any such endorsement of peace in international relations.

However, I cannot agree with the final "resolved" clause of this resolution, which states that:

"...the House of Representatives calls for recognition of the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel as a model mechanism upon which partner nations may build to overcome longstanding barriers to peace and effective mu-

tual cooperation."

What the resolution fails to mention, and the reason we should not endorse the treaty as a model, is that at the time the peace was being negotiated at Camp David the United States committed itself to an enormous financial aid package to both Egypt and Israel in exchange for their accession to the treaty.

Over the past thirty years, the United States taxpayer has transferred to—some might say "bribed"—Israel and Egypt well over 100 billion dollars as a payoff for their leaders' signature on the treaty.

Particularly in this time of economic hardship, where so many Americans are out of work and facing great financial challenges, I hardly believe we should be celebrating that

which increases the strain on taxpayers. I believe we should cease all foreign aid to all countries, as it is a counterproductive and unconstitutional transfer of wealth from US taxpayers to governments overseas.

I do believe we should, where possible and without meddling, encourage nations and regions at war or in conflict to work toward peace. But I also believe we should lead by example: that we should demonstrate by our actions the benefits of friendly relations and trade with all nations which seek the same.

I strongly oppose the idea that we should bribe the rest of the world to do what we demand. Therefore, while I celebrate the achievement of peace between Egypt and Israel, I do not believe this



Ron Paul speaking in Northern California, July 14, 2007

Photo: Lawrence K. Samuels

"model" to be productive or in the best interests of the United States. I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution.

Ron Paul is a GOP Congressman from Texas. He is a life member of the Libertarian Party and was the LP's presidential candidate in 1988.



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: Thomas M. Sipos

Manitoba's provincial capitol unafraid of terrorists.

• Page 2

INSIDE

Outright Against DPI **3**

State Licensing Kills Jobs **4**

Saying No to War **5**

Govt Tanks Economy **6**

LPC Gains Voters **6**