



# *The Liberty*

# REVIEW

*A Publication of the Libertarian Party of Northeast Ohio.*

## What are we to do? **GROW.**

The Libertarian paradox: We must unite to protect our individuality. To use the politically correct jargon; We are socially challenged by our excessive individuality. Libertarians don't want to bother anybody else and we don't want them bothering us. That's all fine and dandy until the flip side of the social equation is entered. Enter those meddling self-proclaimed do-gooders who want to make everything over into their own image of what is good and proper. They have a natural tendency to get together and regulate everyone else. If they stuck to their own voluntary collective, it wouldn't bother anybody. This would be a voluntary association, right in line with the Libertarian view. But NO, they have to get into every aspect of everyone's lives. They steal our rights by placing theirs at what they consider a higher moral level. ("All animals are created equal. But some animals are more equal than others." Animal Farm - George Orwell.) So how do we get our rights back? What price are we willing to pay? (Gosh, I hope a \$35 toss to national LP membership is not too much!) So what about getting co-workers, friends, family informed maybe to join? The Republicans and Democrats roughly have 400,000 regular voluntary dues-paying members and that is fine. The rest of us are involuntarily supporting the Republicans and Democrats because we are taxpayers. The Libertarian party has 23,000 members. Right now we are peanuts compared to the others, but we are bigger then ever before. The media has done more inquires to and interviews with the national HQ in the first quarter this year than in the last presidential bid year. The Cato institute is quite frequently referred to in the Wall Street Journal as a Libertarian think tank. The Libertarian Ideals of personal responsibil-

ity and smaller government are having an impact. But to be successful we need more than the 190 libertarians in offices that dot the nation. We need party growth. We need people, their energy and (yeah, you guessed it) their money. If we can double our size over the next two years, that will generate a larger base for more people to take office, more existing officeholders to stop shying away from freedom-promoting ideas. More media coverage,



**Friends of Liberty:** Rob Logan, Chairman Friends of Liberty, State Rep Cuyahoga County; Tom Martin, State Rep Committee LP Review Editor; Aaron O'Brien, Ralph Harris and Dave Macko, NE Ohio Regional LP Rep. At the Ohio State LP Convention.

more candidates, more Libertarian voices are saying enough is enough. Not everybody needs to go run for president, but we do need people to join and renew

*See **GROW** Continued on page 2*

# The Cato Institute & Social Security Reform.

The Cato Institute recently unveiled an innovative new interactive World Wide Web site devoted exclusively to Social Security reform. It features a unique combination of leading-edge technologies that goes well beyond the usual collection of written articles.

The Web site, located at <http://www.socialsecurity.org>, features an interactive benefits calculator that allows individuals to instantly generate data on their personal retirement benefit levels—in the Social Security system and in private alternative investment vehicles involving stocks and bonds. The personalized data, which remain in the user's computer, can be adjusted according to the user's anticipation of such factors as income, the rate of inflation and the rate of return in the stock and bond markets.

"The benefits calculator brings the public policy debate to the next level," said Michael Tanner, director of the Cato Project on Social Security Privatization. "Anyone with a computer and a modem can now find out in a very personal and individual way how the debate over the future of the Social Security system will affect his own retirement."

For example, the calculator demonstrates that a worker born in 1948 who earns an annual salary of \$30,000 will receive \$1,083 per month in Social Security benefits upon retirement at age 66. But had that worker been able to put his retirement contributions in a stock market fund, assuming historical rates of return, he would retire with \$6,812 per month.

Data like those demonstrate what's really at stake, according to Tanner. "Even if Social Security's impending bankruptcy can be avoided by raising taxes and reducing benefits," he says, "few people realize the degree to which the system begun under the New Deal has turned into a raw deal for most Americans—and that's especially true for today's young workers."

"Payroll taxes are already so high that even if today's young workers receive the promised benefits, they'll get less back than they paid in—a negative rate of return!"

Also available on the Web site is a wide variety of information from books, articles, congressional testimony and speeches on Social Security reform, as well as streaming audio and video material.

## The Social Security Privatization Site

<http://www.socialsecurity.org>



### LOCAL TOPICS FOR THE NEXT FEW YEARS:

**Separation of sports and state,** - why must the common Cuyahoga taxpayer be compelled to subsidize the millionaire life styles of baseball players and owners?

**E-check,** - the G-Check Government schools funding. A time bomb with a short fuse. 11 billion dollar additional package, difficult to swallow.

## GROW, *continued from page 1.*

national, state and local memberships. Participation can be as simple as submitting letters to the editor maybe once a quarter, going to a local town meeting and asking whether we really need this new bill or law or ordinance? Have we paid for the ones we're saddled with already? Are there private, voluntary alternatives? Former Congressman Bob Dornan has blamed the Libertarian party for the loss of seven Republican congressional seats. We apparently stole the fiscally conservative voters who have seen way past the Republican rhetoric. If divide and conquer works for them, why not for us? Hey, Bob, you guys already had a chance and you blew it because you're just like the Democrats! Greedy!

May I recommend: *Party growth - the pitch WIIFM.* Some of the daily grind.



## SNIPPITS

What is the difference between a free citizen and a subject? Citing the agreement between the Democrats and Republicans on a balanced budget. Clinton claims more programs, the republicans claim smaller government. For once I actually believe the democrats. The "smaller government plan" will cost an additional \$200 billion if the "aggressive" cutting plans are followed. (Every time I listen to this double-speak, I envy Star Trek it's Universal Translator.) What also is counted against the debt is the "Social Security Surplus." There is still more money coming in than what is going out from Social Security. That extra money is immediately spent on daily operations. An IOU is set aside for later repayment, to keep the SS trust fund "fully funded" (without accounting for the IOU being created). The reason for the "surplus" is the constant changing of the rules. Instead of paying 1 percent of our gross income, we pay 15 percent. Instead of working to age 65, we will have to work to age 67, then 69, and so forth. Instead of a \$3,000 dollar cap on gross income, the ceiling is above \$60,000 and rising. And when today's children get working they will be taxed at a rate of 60% of the results of their labors. If any private insurance company did what the Fed does, it would justifiably be sued for fraud and shut down. Where in the Constitution does it say the government has all of the rights and the people can only obey? After all of that baloney is sliced, there is the simple fact that the debt is not being touched. Ever. The current level of debt already has the US paying more interest on the debt than it is spending on the military, which is one of the few legitimate main functions of the federal government.



---

---

# We're in it to Win!

By Aaron J. OBrien

Dr. Nancy Lord, 1992 LP vice-presidential candidate, says we can no longer be content to debate amongst ourselves our abhorrence of the Federal Reserve system or the errors in the Labor Theory of Value. We are a political party. We need candidates. We need candidates to win to take back our freedom.

Many issues, complex, ephemeral, and abstract to those who rely on soundbites. To be sure, complex laws can and do affect our daily lives, yet they are unlikely to incite the average American to action. If we are to achieve long term success we need to begin by addressing the concrete problems that voters face in their everyday lives.

Prophesizing that we'll live in an Orwellian society at some vague time in the future is not enough. Even the impending doom of Social Insecurity has drawn little concern from the electorate. Our issues must be immediate; i.e., an upcoming referendum. They must be concrete and readily comprehensible. And, perhaps most importantly, the issues our candidates select must harness the broad, underlying, sometimes unconscious, public support for our ideas.

Dr. Lord used medical-marijuana as an example. The issue is concrete and easy to understand: marijuana would be available by prescription. The issue is immediate and calls for action: it is decided by the persons actions on the first Tuesday in November. The issue has broad underlying support: most Americans are troubled by the excesses of the Drug War; and this was an easy way to express those concerns. The California Libertarians who supported this important step toward re-legalization gained a lot of positive public relations.

Likewise, a group of dedicated Libertarians in Columbus have had tremendous success and quality media coverage due to their opposition to a proposed stadium tax. The tax, which so clearly illustrates welfare for millionaires, meets all three requirements of a prosperous issue. It has broad support from people of all walks of political life. Its impact and the action necessary are immediate. And, the issue is literally concrete.

Because these Libertarians selected the proper issue, our position is virtually impossible to dispute. Finally, the public and the media perceived us as the voice of reason. How wonderful it is for Libertarian sports fans to ask beleaguered taxpayers, "why should you have to pay for my stadium?"  
Granted, some issues are necessarily complex. Yet, we

must still concentrate on their immediacy and relevance. For example, when Bill Clinton began talking about national health care, no one seemed to care. Then, probably because no one understood it, the plan began gaining support. Indeed, it seemed as though he was elected on that issue. Then the Libertarians exposed socialized health cares immediate and concrete implications. In other words, we said if this proposal passes, you wont be able to choose your own doctor. The all too common and tragic anecdotes of children who died waiting for a government doctor were more than enough to crystallize "what's not in it for me." These efforts made real the complex issue and energized the people to defeat the measure.

We must continue to find local issues that are concrete, immediate and which expose the publics underlying support for our ideas. We can use these positive alliances to boost our image and catapult our membership. By no means does this equal bending principle. We are simply focusing our, and the voters, limited time and energy on the issues



Aaron O'Brien and Nancy Lord. Ohio State LP Convention.

where we have the most likelihood of success. Then, hopefully we can persuade them that liberty, on every issue, is the path to peace, abundance and freedom. ★ ★ ★

Aaron O'Brien has this year graduated from Marshall Law School of Cleveland State University, passed his BARR exam and is licensed in the state of Florida. He remains in active communication with the *Friends of Liberty*.  
**Keep up the LP activism in FLA Aaron!!**

## Letters to Ed:

By Bruce Lyle

A summary of basic points from *Vultures In Eagles Clothing* - a book by Lynn Merideth, published by *We the People*, which outlines the steps necessary to assert your rights as a Sovereign citizen and get the IRS (Ignorance Related Slavery) off your back:

- 1). The People are Sovereign. The People created the Constitution and the government.
- 2). The government (state and federal) is limited by the Constitution and can have no powers not specifically granted by it.
- 3). The United States of America is a corporate entity, distinct and separate from the 50 Sovereign united state Republics of America, and having no direct control of the 50 states other than that granted specifically within the body of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. (The word "united" was an adjective used to describe the unity of the original 13 states against the tyranny of England. The name of our country is "America." Each state is a separate and distinct Republic.)
- 4). A Right cannot be taxed. Only a privilege can be taxed.
- 5). The Right to work and earn a living (to contract; to conduct business) is a Sovereign Right.
- 6). Article 1, Section 9 of the Constitution declares that: "No Capitation, or other direct, tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to census or enumeration...." In other words: without an awful lot of work that the federal government doesn't want to have to do, no direct tax can be levied, and the Income Tax is a direct tax.
- 7). The IRS codes can only effect the corporate United States of America, which is an entity legally foreign to the 50 Sovereign states. The jurisdiction of the federal government extends only to its territories, such as Puerto Rico, Guam, etc., to the District of Columbia and to federal enclaves deeded to the federal government by the 50 states. Federal jurisdiction does not extend to the 50 Sovereign states, nor does it extend over the Sovereign Citizens of America. By definition, a natural born American citizen (of the 50 states) is an "alien non-resident" with respect to the [federal; corporate; district] United States of America.
- 8). Sovereign citizens of the 50 states have been paying a "voluntary" tax for over sixty years, without ever being told that they do not legally have to pay it. Under the rules

of Common Law, which is the basis for all law, if the assumption of responsibility to pay the tax is not refuted in writing via affidavit, it is assumed to be true. (Under Common Law, the last affidavit submitted is assumed to be true, unless legally refuted by another affidavit.) So, unless the Sovereign Citizen refutes the responsibility to pay, he or she is stuck with it. Literally. The Citizen must assert his/her rights as Sovereign, in order to refute the standing operating assumption of the IRS.

## Time To Grow Up!

By Zorik Gelman

Why don't most Americans want to grow up? Why don't they realize that their government treats them like children? Remember when mommy told you not to eat too much sugar? Your government also tells you what you may or may not consume. Don't do drugs or your grounded for five to ten years with no parole. Did mommy ever forbid you to play with BB-guns? It's all fun and games until some one loses an eye? Your government wants to forbid you to use guns, even though you probably think of your gun as more than a mere toy. Did daddy ever tell you not to read those filthy magazines or say dirty words? Your government also dictates what pictures you are allowed to see and what words you are allowed to say. At this moment, the FCC tells you what is OK for radio and television, but you can bet your social security checks that it wants to do the same for the internet. How much money did daddy give you as an allowance, a few dollars a week if you mowed the lawn? Your government lets you keep about 60% of what you earn. But if you are a good boy or girl, and you do just what daddy tells you to do (like help him get re-elected), you get to have part of your brothers and sisters money too. Hillary Clinton wrote that "It takes a village to raise a child." The village is a fitting analogy: The "village" is the state and we are the children. Bill and Hillary Clinton are Daddy and Mommy, and you better listen to Daddy or he'll send the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms after you. The parent/child analogy is not a perfect one. Most parents want their children to grow up, to be independent. Your government, however, wants you to be dependent on its handouts. It wants you to live as a child on an allowance, to ask for permission before you can do anything, like build a house or start your own business. But there is another reason why the parent/child analogy doesn't fit. A child has no choice who his parents are. He is born into a family, and must live with his parents until he is old enough to leave the house. You, however, can choose your government. You can choose a government that treats you like a child, or a government that lets you live your own life as long as you bear the consequences for your actions. You can choose a government that wastes your money trying to protect you

**TIME**, *continued*

from yourself, or a government that will defend you from real criminals, the people who initiate the force against others. So which government should you choose? If you want to be treated like a child, just keep voting for the Democrats and Republicans. They believe that naughty boys and girls like you need to be supervised. If you want to live as a free, responsible adult, then vote for the only political party committed to the principal of personal responsibility. The Libertarian party.

Campaign finance question From R. Kisel : In the Winter 1995 volume 3 issue 5 addition to the liberty Review that mention something that I am unsure about regarding campaign contribution limits. Tom Martin, on page 3 of this paper, stated that "... All candidates may receive contributions up to \$1,000 per donar; however, contributions to independents essentially stop there. The Republicratic parties can receive unlimited donations....political parties can dump obscene amounts of cash into their candidates coffers..."

Does this mean that: 1. Individual republicrat candidates can receive unlimited amounts and contributions to Independent candidates stop at 1,000? For instance could a Clintonite have donated 1,000,000 to Clinton's 1996 campaign? 2. An unlimited amount be given to a political party (not an actual candidate but the party backing the candidate)? I thought candidate contributions were limited to 1,000 and party contributions were unlimited. What is reality?

Good question(s) . Maybe a short story or two for the answer: Republicratus runs under the favorite incumbent party. Her(his) incredibly wealthy supporter gives the maximum \$1,000 to his primary campaign. After Republicratus wins that Her(his) supporter may donate another \$1,000 directly to that campaign. Seeing how that is not enough, the wealthy supporter has a small dinner at the White house (or other high place with low people) and dumps a great gob of money into the Republicratus's national party's coffers. More money can be dumped into the State party's coffers. The state party receives money from national. The state party donates directly \$25,000, the maximum the party may directly donate for a congressional or state senatorial race to Republicratus's race. Republicratus gets to use the money for How wonderfull I am campaign. Then the Party runs it's own ad's saying how wonderfull candidates Republicratus and others withen the party are. That money is a Party expense, not the candidates.

Joe Independent Congresswannabe gathers 40 times the number of signatures Republicratus needed. Joe has no primary so there is only one election elimination. His supporters may contribute \$1,000 a piece.



## JURY RIGHTS.

The daily erosion, what it means.  
Fraudulent alternatives - professional government jurist.

NEW YORK (AP) - Judges must root out jurors who use personal beliefs about race, ethnicity or anything else to disregard the law in deciding a case, a federal appeals court said Tuesday (5-20-97).

The 2nd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that judges have a duty to stop jurors from ignoring the law by issuing firm instructions or even dismissing jurors. "We categorically reject the idea that, in a society committed to the rule of law, jury nullification is desirable, or that courts may permit it to occur when it is within their power to prevent," Judge Cabranes wrote.

Removing the legalese from the phrasing, this says: "We, the government, can stack the jury as we see fit - to insure that the jury will find as we see fit. We will only permit judgments by people who respect the law of rulers." The Peoples' right to a trial by a jury of their peers has been replaced by whatever the government bureaucrats decide is in the government's compelling interest. The Rule of Law is the concept that every person has a right to defend his property (life is considered to be that individual's property, as well). A just government is merely an extension of every individual's rights. What we see being defended by the "judges" is just the opposite: the Law of Rulers. To protect future generations from exactly this, the founding fathers included trial by a jury of peers. This is intended to insure the common citizen protection via a check upon the expanses of government. We must be aware of our rights and assert them or we will lose them. Does anyone else find it coincidental that jury duty is continually promoted as inconvenient and difficult by the popular media? Is it possible that promoting this view has a more sinister and long-term purpose, such as reducing our faith in the jury system to the point where we are finally glad to be rid of it? Enter the Professional Juror, who is paid to parrot the judge. Polly want a subsidy?

E-checked A former E-Check technician has questions to be asked. (A) Why does the Ohio EPA continue to allow inaccurate testing in the state of Ohio? The proof is in the EPA official state audits, if they will allow public access. If they don't, what are they covering up? (B) Why does the Ohio EPA continue to fail cars on NOX readings when the current analyzers are not set up to test NOX emissions? These devices have been set to N/O

Greg Bell, CROE Communications director. croe@coax.net  
P.O. Box 402, Miamisburg, Ohio 45343 24 hr. voicemail and  
FAX: 937.429.4183 email: croe@coax.net \* <http://www.coax.net/croe> Become a member—follow “Take Action” & “Join Us!” links on our website

you can get this from <http://www.logan.com/liberty/>

E-check was a scam, is a scam, and will continue to be a scam. Early registration turned out to be of no benefit. The advance testing was good for a year. They tested again, the next year, just to get back into the normal two year testing cycle. Technicians were supposed to have 6 months training. Well, most of that became on the job. If the tests were run by the book, half of all cars tested would have failed. Eight to twelve percent failure is what was eventually reported. Greg offered to help audit the multitude of programming changes made to permit higher test-passing rates. What could not be audited was (is?) the multitude of changes made directly to the data by the technicians, without any programming changes. In anything except a government program, this would be called “fraud.” E-check has not contributed to any improvement in air quality where it has been implemented. We do not need E-check, even if it did work. Ohio Air quality has been getting steadily better over the last few decades - without any E-check. Frequently, Geauga county has higher pollution counts than Cleveland's Cuyahoga county. Must be all of those flatulent cattle. Ohio's air quality is in compliance. In 1990, it was just a bit above compliance level. We are still compliant. What the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) is mainly concerned about is not air quality - just the appearance of doing something. That way, they insure their jobs.

In September of 1993, a 10-year plan was enacted, complete with a poison pill. If the state bails out, then it (read “we”) must pay EnviroTest the remaining balance. This comes to \$100,000,000 per year until the contract would normally expire. The same soulless bureaucrat who signed off on Ohio's being in compliance to the Federal EPA, 6 months later signed the 10-year contract on an unproven system (previously physically ejected from the state of Pennsylvania), which was supposed to get us into compliance. Given the money involved, he was probably most eager to do so. (Don't anybody use the words “bribe” or “kickback;” they're illegal.) We could have used a fraction of the money on proven means, such as reclaimer nozzles for evaporation and spillage at the pumps.

It is also telling to note that the equipment currently being

used in Ohio is the same, faulty equipment ripped - unused - from Pennsylvania testing stations, when the program was rejected, there.

What has been done? CROE has sponsored simultaneous countywide protest in Columbus. They have been in Parades and used other media outlets. They now have a web site, have driven around Columbus in a BUS pasted with banners. They have done letter campaigns. The bureau-critters know who they are.

Here is what the Feds are willing to do to us: They threaten not to refund gas tax money. Currently Ohio drivers “donate” about a \$1 billion a year, and get back about \$640 million. Other states, like Massachusetts, get \$2.14 for every dollar they “donate.” Because Ohio was at a borderline state of attainment, when Mercedes Benz was looking for a new site, it factored compliance heavily, along with other considerations, and went to South Carolina instead. New Jersey enacted a state law allowing confiscation of property (cars) which is non-compliant. They then took an auto collector's Packards because they were not tested. (Excerpt from Article V. of the Bill of Rights: “... Nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.”) Those cars were stolen. This is a perfect example of the difference between law and justice.

What is being /can be done: Let supporters understand that money is being diverted from more effective solutions. If you back a program that the public backs, and it turns out to be a modern Dodo - you will lose backing, later, when it may really count. CROE is targeted as a statewide organization to help shut down the E-check. We need more people involved in more geographic areas. The gentleman with(out) the Packards should be wallpapering the New Jersey capitol building with affidavits contesting the illegal seizure of property, demanding proof of jurisdiction, and targeting the misuse of public offices.

? HB175 - would have given local officials a bit of more coverage an opportunity to say yes to the E-check rather than the means of passing a bill where no response meant a YES, as was originally set up. ?

How to challenge the validity of the E-check: Ohio Senate Bill 18 has 13 Constitutional violations. These seek to divide and conquer by selecting some counties and ignoring many others. This is unequal treatment of people within the state; a selective discrimination; a quarantine zone. E-check does not fulfill their end of the deal, which voids the contract. Pennsylvania paid a \$145 million bribe to the Federal EPA instead of running an E-check. The E-check that Ohio got was starting to be installed in Pennsylvania (the junk machines we are currently stuck with). Apparently, as far as the Environmental Protection Agency is concerned, getting money is the same thing as clean air. After all, they do sell “pollution credits” to those rich enough to pay. This just makes the word “Prostitution” that much more appropriate. Too bad it's our asses they're selling.

After Gov. V. vetoed the E-check bill, the legislator was weened & won't challenge the veto.

# Local Ordinances

Private ownership and the collective (Borg) - Who owns this thing anyway? Why Government doesn't work on a local level.

I only had to cross my street to experience practical verification of why government doesn't work. The problem in this case was local zoning ordinances.

A neighbor of mine has constructed a garage three feet from his home. He was denied a permit to attach the house to the garage, while the garage was being constructed. He wishes to improve his property and its safety by connecting the garage to the house. Because of the city's original intervention, there was created an unplanned and unexpected dangerous circumstance whereby the steps going to the basement created an exposed open pit, going straight down ten feet from ground level. The owner contends that it would be far safer if these steps were enclosed within the building. The local government has, so far, denied his right to peaceful enjoyment of his own property. The City says they have their rules and they simply can't allow exceptions (except the ones already excepted - more bureaucratic doublespeak). The city's lawyer said that the owners had the options of petitioning city council, going to court to sue the city, or hiring an attorney. The petition of city counsel route appears best. That is the source of the problem; that is where it must be cured. I like the First Amendment route of demanding redress until the mayor appears like NY City mayor Rudolph Giuliani, if necessary. There is no limit on demand for redress. (I annoyed one of the bureaucrats at the counsel meeting because I "falsely accused them (the board) of being the Bad Guys." They choose to take the safe route and ignore the fact that the zoning board - on their lawyer's recommendation - already voted down my neighbor's request for the building expansion. Thus, they have already acted as the Bad Guys.) The Owners stressed the safety issue and petitioned for a variance. They also pointed out how precedence has been set

because there are other similar properties that were approved. The owners also pressed the liability issue, in the event they were denied the opportunity to improve the safety. They believe that, if the city denies an improvement that increases safety, the city should be completely liable in the case of any injuries as a result of the denial. This seems perfectly reasonable.

I reread the definition of property, which describes one's exclusive right to possess, use, and dispose of a thing. I also reread my own definition: If one can not legally control a thing then they do not own it. My neighbors are not being allowed to do this work on their home, so do they own it? The point was also raised that bureaucratic fiat apparently valued its rules more than the rights of those whom those rules are supposed to protect.

One of the board members was offended. She pointed out that we have to have our rules otherwise "people will be living in tents." I pointed out that in those locations with the tightest control on property - i.e., rent control like New York City - also have the highest rents and the highest level of homelessness. 20/20 hindsight shows that I missed a far more important point: Those laws which outlaw tents also outlaw the Taj Mahal. We must all live in identical tacky-tacky houses to please bureaucrats. I closed by lauding the honesty of the zoning member who pointed out that they had no solution to the problem. I pointed out that the owners had a solution that would not cost the city a cent. It only required the city to respect the owners' right to their own property. I pointed out that government has the necessary function of protecting persons and property. And I asked again: What is property? Who are owners?

The city counselor promised to re-evaluate their "law". Cripes, folks, it's an ordinance! My, how officials like to inflate their importance. With any luck, a variance will be granted and we will go away. If something extraordinary occurs, the board could have a stroke of sanity, respect persons and their property, and remove the ordinances prohibiting peaceful use of property by its owners. Or they may dig in their heels to prove how damn important they are (legends in their own minds). I hope for sanity.

Good bloody luck.

---

---

ADVISORY FROM THE LIBERTARIAN PARTY  
News from the National LP headquarters for  
members & supporters of the Libertarian Party

---

---

Watergate Office Building 2600 Virginia Avenue,  
NW, Suite 100 Washington DC 20037 Phone: (202)  
333-0008 Ext. 226 E-mail:  
73163.3063@CompuServe.com For information  
about the party: (800) 682-1776 Ohio Libertarians  
win stadium tax battle

WASHINGTON, DC — Libertarians in Ohio  
helped save taxpayers \$192 million this month —  
thanks to their starring role in a battle against a new  
stadium tax.

On May 6th, voters in Franklin County rejected a  
proposed one-half percent sales tax increase, just  
two days after delegates at the LP of Ohio's  
convention unanimously passed a "Separation of  
Sport and State" resolution opposing the stadium  
tax.

The anti-tax vote was hailed by Libertarians as a  
victory against "corporate welfare" and as a symbol  
of the LP's growing organizational clout.

"Had it not been for the leadership of the Libertarian  
Party, big-government politicians would have met  
with little opposition," said LP member Dena  
Bruedigam, one of the leaders of the anti-tax  
citizens coalition. "The taxpayers of Franklin  
County are fortunate that a political party exists  
which truly represents their interests."

Supporters of the new tax — which would have  
boosted the county sales tax to 6.25% and raised  
\$192 million over three years — wanted the revenue  
to build a 20,000-seat arena and a 30,000-seat  
stadium in Columbus, Ohio. But they hadn't  
counted on opposition from Libertarians, who  
helped form a group called Voters Against Stadium  
Taxes (VAST). Working with Green Party mem-  
bers, Socialists, and a few renegade Republicans  
and Democrats, VAST posted yard signs, gave  
speeches, made phone calls, and distributed litera-  
ture against the stadium tax.

On May 4th, Libertarians passed a resolution by a  
vote of 72-0 at their annual convention calling for  
"freedom from sports taxes." The resolution said  
taxpayers are "beleaguered by corporate welfare for  
sports and entertainment," and urged voters to  
refuse to "further burden themselves, their neigh-  
bors, and their visitors through an additional sales  
tax."

Franklin County voters took that advice — despite

an extensive and expensive pro-tax lobbying campaign by  
local politicians, media, and sports teams — and voted  
56% to 44% against the tax increase.

After the upset vote, LP of Ohio Central Region  
Chair Scott Smith said, "We are very pleased that voters  
rejected the tax-and-spend-on-sports policies of our  
Republican and Democratic politicians. And we are proud  
that the Libertarian Party was at the forefront of this fight  
against corporate welfare." The Libertarian Party  
<http://www.lp.org/> 2600 Virginia Ave. NW, Suite 100  
voice: 202-333-0008 Washington DC 20037 fax: 202-333-  
0072

For subscription changes, please mail to <announce-  
request@lp.org> with the word "subscribe" or  
"unsubscribe" in the subject line — or use the WWW  
form.