

The Libertarian

By Vin Suprynowicz

They have us surrounded. This is good. Now we can safely attack in any direction.

Listen to the under-45 members of the press corps — and the populace at large, for that matter — wax eloquent about freshmen Illinois Sen. Barack Obama, that fine orator and fledgling socialist Chicago race-hustler.

"He wants to UNITE us. He wants to give us HOPE FOR THE FUTURE. He wants to give us SOMETHING TO BELIEVE IN!"

Yeah. He wants to impose collectivism on a gigantic scale.

Didn't work out so well when Stalin, Mao, and Pol Pot tried it. Even our own small-time imitator, Frank Roosevelt, managed to stretch out the Great Depression for an extra decade based on some of the same claptrap. (Asked where the planes that bombed Tokyo came from, it's widely reported that Roosevelt smiled and said "Shangri-La." Few people today realize the apparent jest was caused by a time-delay in the electronic relay of the questions at that press conference. Roosevelt thought he was answering the PREVIOUS question: "Where did you learn your economics?")

But after all, who cares about boring old economics? Nobody under-

stands it and it's all cyclical, anyway. It's so thrilling to listen to Obama TALK. Why, I don't know when I've seen someone able to hold an audience spellbound like that since, since ... since ... some German guy back in the 1930s, can't bring his name to mind right now ...

I don't write today to ridicule Barack Obama, who is the effect and not the cause. I write to ridicule American-style democracy, which Hans-Herman Hoppe has characterized as "The God that Failed."

We've all heard about how democracy must fail once the populace realize they can vote themselves a stipend out of somebody else's pocket. That's currently in progress, and about as easy to reverse, now, as reclaiming a wounded rabbit from a pack of wolves busily tearing her apart.

What was not foreseen as clearly is how pathetic the end game would become — presidents and congresscritters being chosen with hardly a lingering pretense of examining their character, their insights, their proven history over a long public career of defending property rights and the Constitution, but rather the way the fans decide who's their favorite pop singer or magazine cover girl: "She's so rad," or whatever the phrase of the month may be.

If democracy has failed, why continue to go through the motions? You cannot sell ideas based on historical analysis of the failures of collectivism in this kind of a popular bazaar any

more than you can hope to compete by placing a copy of Hayek's "Road to Serfdom" or Bastiat's "The Law" or even "Atlas Shrugged" on a supermarket checkout rack next to three warring tabloids showing Jennifer, Britney and the other Jennifer falling out of their sun dresses while promising to tell you inside which one is really pregnant by the other's boyfriend.

I do not know how to get a majority of today's brain-dulled government-school graduates, taught to tune out and ridicule anyone who starts referring to the words of warning of "dead white slave owners," to coalesce and vote for a version of freedom that doesn't promise to give them lots more stuff for free.

If it could be done by an inoffensive, friendly, likeable, principled fellow, dressed up in suit and tie and willing to mention in brief sound bites that part of the problem might just be the Federal Reserve and its fiat currency, Ron Paul would be the current presidential nominee-in-waiting of the Republican Party — if not both parties.

You do not get from 2 percent to 51 percent in a nation of 250 million people glued to the TV going nuts over young men with pituitary problems tossing balls through hoops by painting a few more yard signs.

If Libertarians want to accomplish anything, I submit they must stop trying to be inoffensive and non-threatening, and do just the opposite.

America is not going to change

until the current system collapses into bankruptcy. The question is, in which direction will it then turn?

Numbers will not matter, at that point. The message might. A shocking, startling, well-honed message.

But you cannot have an impact on that decision and that direction unless you have their attention. You do not get their attention by trying to appear mealy-mouthed and "mainstream." If that worked, Montovani and the Hollyridge

Strings would have remained more popular than the Beatles and the Rolling Stones, who did not get where they got by being widely considered "inoffensive."

I do not say we need to sacrifice the truth to get anyone's attention. I say we need to speak the truth in a way DESIGNED to get their attention.

My newspaper recently editorialized that higher gasoline taxes were not the right way to raise the funding needed to repair our highways.

A reader wrote, in reply:

"A recent editorial ... stated that because 'family paychecks barely cover basics, the money [needed to repair our country's crumbling infrastructure should come from] somewhere else.' What could this 'somewhere else' be? ... Is the Review-Journal advocating higher Federal income taxes, or a new national sales tax, or new toll road like user fees to pay for this? ..."

Suprynowicz Continued on Page 9

What is the purpose of the Libertarian Party?

By Powell Gammill, Senior Editor, Freedom's Phoenix

The purpose of a political party is to get its leaders elected, to grab coercive control over as big a slice as possible of the taxpayer booty, and to gain power over the suppressing enforcement mechanism involved in the collection and maintenance of those funds. Additional power is gained through the distribution of that money through favoritism which provides mass cooperation and approval of the armed robbery tactics applied.

As a response to over 250 years of such corrupt practices by the Constitutionally created and ostensibly limited United States government, espe-

cially in the past century, the Libertarian Party (LP) was formed by visionaries in 1971. Sick of watching both parties fleece the populace unchallenged, and recognizing the futility of internally trying to fix what **is not broken**, they proposed instead using the tools of the state -- the election process -- against the state.

Not all approved of this endeavor. Murray Rothbard, in particular, objected strenuously that to become a political party was to invite the eventual corruption that comes with forming such an association. Having lost the argument, Rothbard embraced the Party, and to protect against future encroachment upon the principles of libertarianism, he and others eventually convinced the members to adopt rules and a platform to ensure statists would have an impossible time gaining control of the newly formed party and changing its purpose to that

of a statist chattel.

Any organization, once it reaches critical mass, attracts people to its membership who work to rise up the ranks to control the organization and change the goals of the organization from one of purpose to one about them -- the leadership becomes more important than the original goals of the organization. It is human nature that gatherings attract a minority of people who desire and are committed to rule, and a majority of people too lazy to oppose such apparent benevolence. After all, such kingdoms are built not only on the pledged best of intentions but with (short term) promises to address, lighten and remove perceived problems suffered by the members of that association. "Bread and circuses."

Sadly, this is very much like the

history of the failed U.S. Constitution, created with clear tripartite organization designed to be combative with one another, while explicitly laying out the limited duties and powers, and explicit prohibitions on the government. It failed. Like the Libertarian Party by-laws, the Constitution is ignored by the very association (government) it purported to create. Its lack of restraint has the current federal government bearing no resemblance to Constitutional government, meaning an impositor — with guns and the violent will to use them — stands in its place.

The Libertarian Party, the "Party of Principle", two years ago eliminated virtually all of the platform in one massive vote. Unfortunately for those orchestrated this -- and this includes over a 2/3rds majority of the then Libertarian National Committee (LNC),

Gammill Continued on page 10

Let Freedom Grow...

By Steve Kubby

As a candidate for the Libertarian Party's 2008 presidential nomination, I believe that America's voters deserve a clear and compelling alternative to the failed policies of Republican and Democratic politicians.

In this watershed election, I offer myself as that alternative, and ask of

Arizona's national convention delegates that they carefully weigh their choices. Among those choices, I believe that I offer the best combination of name recognition, media penetration, political track record and, most importantly, realistic yet uncompromisingly Libertarian stands on the issues.

Before packing your bags for Denver, please take the time to visit my campaign web site (kubby2008.com) and the sites of my opponents. Put all

of us to one simple test: Upon whom can you depend to most ably represent your party and your principles in November? For many voters, our party's presidential candidate will be the sole visible representative of libertarian ideas in the political arena for the next four years. We owe it to ourselves, and to those voters, to put our best foot forward.

As your presidential candidate, I will do my best to bring a bold libertarian message to America. The mes-

sage that we CAN achieve a full restoration of civil liberties; that we CAN end the war on Iraq, the war on drugs, the war on same-sex couples and the war on immigrants; that we CAN raise the iron curtain of repression and stagnation brought down upon our nation by decades of Democratic and Republican misrule. I humbly request your support in Denver, and after as the LP's 2008 presidential nominee.

Let Freedom Grow!