



New Jersey Libertarian

Volume XXXIX, Issue 1

Winter 2014

Chair's Message

On March 29th the party is holding our [annual Convention](#). I strongly urge you to attend. In the morning we will be having our ultra-important business meeting, a noon luncheon, followed by an incredible line up of speakers. For the quality of the speakers and the quality of the luncheon this Convention is the best bargain you can find.

While I'm very excited about our speakers, our morning meeting is really the most important part of our convention. Each year the party resets itself, restructures the leadership, nominates candidates for office, and reorganizes the individual county organizations. Each of these tasks is very important for the future of the party.

We are looking for candidates at all levels. If you are at all interested in running for office contact our Election Coordinator, Patrick McKnight at elections@njlp.org.

We will also be electing new officers. If you are interested or have any questions please give me a call and I can describe the general duties of the positions available.

We will also be nominating delegates to the Libertarian National Convention to represent New Jersey. The convention will be held in Columbus, Ohio from June 26th to June 29th. If you are interested in hanging out with lovers of liberty and representing our State Party let me know and we will add you to our list of delegates.

While the past four years as Chair have been challenging, fun, and extremely satisfying, I do not plan on running for Chair this year. I'm not going anywhere though!

Jay Edgar
Chair, NJ Libertarian Party

NJLP Member Judy Schubert Passes

I'm very sad to report that on January 31 the world lost a very lovely and beautiful person. Judy rarely ever missed a NJ Libertarian Party event. Judy was a joy to talk to about almost any topic. Her spirit will continue to live on at all of our events.



Judy with Jay Edgar and Emerson Ellet at the 2012 National Libertarian Party Convention in Las Vegas

See March 29th Convention
Announcement on Page 9

<i>In This Issue</i>	
.....	
Alleged Mistreatment of Prisoner	2
Somerset County Defends Practice	2
Campaign Finance Limits	3
CBO Minimum Wage Report.....	4
10 Steps to Liberate America	5
2 nd Amendment Brief Filed	6
Letter to Editor on Gun Ownership	6
Making Third Parties Relevant.....	6
Only Way Forward is Together	8
Convention Announcement.....	9

Alleged Mistreatment of Prisoner Leads to Death and Secrecy

By Jay Edgar

When Edward Forchion, aka [NJ Weedman](#), left the Burlington County Jail on January 28th it marked the end of his sentence for [probation violations](#) related to an arrest for medical marijuana possession. He was carrying with him a very [disturbing letter from fellow inmate](#), Sean Turzanski. Sean's letter tells the story of an elderly homeless man, Mr. Robert Taylor. Mr. Taylor is known to have been in and out of jail and to have a drinking problem. He was known as Drunk Santa Claus.

According Mr. Turzanski, Mr. Taylor was thrown onto a concrete floor, stripped of his clothes wearing only a prison "turtle suit" without any other clothes, blanket or mat. For 5 days Mr. Taylor did not eat. Mr. Taylor was non-verbal and given no care. On December 29th Sean heard Mr. Taylor begging for help. Sean yelled to get the attention of the Correction Officers on duty but was told to "shut up". The next day the Officers checked on Mr. Taylor and found him dead lying on the concrete floor in the same position where he was thrown five days earlier.

In an effort to corroborate Mr. Turzanski's letter, the Open Government Advocacy Project requested reports on "any police incident or other report that was issued after [Taylor] was found dead in his cell." John Paff, Chair of the project, [received a reply](#) stating that no police record exists and that the request was not specific enough.

On Sunday my daughter and I visited Sean in the Burlington County Jail. After meeting with Sean, I completely believe his account of the treatment and subsequent death of Robert Taylor. Sean is being punished by the warden for writing his letter. He has been held in Administrative Segregation for about two weeks now. He was placed in Segregation after the Warden, Lawrence Artis, confronted him in the prison gymnasium. Artis called him a liar and told him that no one would believe him. Right after this confrontation Sean was moved into Segregation and remains there today.

Sean Turzanski is being punished for speaking out by the very same people that may have tortured and killed Robert Taylor.

In addition to the Mount Holy police department we have also sent requests for an investigation to the Burlington County Prosecutor. Sean desires justice for Mr. Taylor and is currently paying the price for speaking out. I urge readers to investigate this further on [our website](#) and decide for themselves what happened. ♦

Somerset County Defends Its Use of Executive Sessions

By John Paff, Chair NJLP Open Government Advocacy Project

In his February 7, 2014 letter, Somerset County Counsel William T. Cooper III [defended](#) the Somerset County Freeholder Board's decisions to conduct [seven matters in nonpublic](#) (i.e. closed or executive) session instead of publicly.

With all due respect to Mr. Cooper, I believe that his position is flawed.

As just one example, the minutes of the January 14, 2014 closed meeting state:

Mike Amorosa addressed concerns and complaints received about employees utilizing e-cigarettes indoors. The Board endorsed the inclusion of e-cigarettes to the policy.

Mr. Cooper defends the Board's private discussion of this matter by relying on [N.J.S.A. 10:4-12\(b\)\(8\)](#), which states:

Private session can be used to discuss "[a]ny matter involving the employment, appointment, termination of employment, terms and conditions of employment, evaluation of the performance of, promotion or disciplining of any *specific* prospective public officer or employee or current public officer or employee employed or appointed by the public body, unless all the individual employees or appointees whose rights could be adversely affected request in writing that such matter or matters be discussed at a public meeting." (Emphasis supplied.)

As the emphasized text shows, this exception to the general rule of discussing matters in public allows private discussion of specific, individual employees. It does not, however, allow policy matters related to employees in general to be discussed privately.

Support for my interpretation of the law (and against Mr. Cooper's) can be found in the 2009 Appellate Division case of [Burnett v. Gloucester County Board of Chosen Freeholders](#), 409 N.J. Super. 219 (App. Div. 2009).

In the Burnett case, the trial judge had found that the matters the Gloucester Freeholders discussed on December 20, 2006, February 7, 2007 and March 7, 2007 were exempt because they involved "personnel matters." 409 N.J. Super at 238. The December 20, 2006 discussion dealt with "presenting a State ethics training seminar for department heads" and awarding a bonus to a lawyer who represented Gloucester County in a public records lawsuit. The February 27, 2007 involved the "need to pay Harold Crass [] [\$14,000] for legal work done relative to the matter at the Pitman Golf Course." At its March 7, 2007, the Board discussed "the proposed replacement member of the Board of Trustees for Gloucester County Community

College, who would complete the term of a resigning member." Id at 229-30.

Citing an earlier New Jersey Supreme Court decision, the Appellate Division found that the Legislature allowed public bodies to discuss personnel matters in private because it "recogniz[ed] the potentially-inhibiting effect of public debate about the qualifications, performance, merit, and shortcomings of specific employees." Id at 239. In other words, the Legislature believed, and rightly so, that a discussion about, say, a particular employee's battle with alcoholism or constant tardiness, would be difficult, if not impossible, to conduct with the public--perhaps even the employee's family--watching and listening. Privacy in such discussions is needed, the Legislature found, to foster "free and uninhibited discussion about matters relating to the hiring, firing, performance, compensation, and discipline of public employees."

Against this standard, the Appellate Division judges wrote that they were "hard pressed" to agree with the trial judge on the applicability of the "personnel exception" to these three meetings. Wrote the judges:

Two of the three sessions involved awarding a bonus or other remuneration to outside counsel. The remaining item arguably involves discussion on a possible appointment, which may fall within the exception, however, without more information it is unclear. *Nevertheless, in respect of other sessions plaintiff focuses on, it appears the Board overstates the scope of the allowed exclusion and its position is transparently incorrect because the closed sessions adopted policies affecting county employees generally or the creation of new county positions, and did not relate to discussions regarding a specific employee. Neither of these areas are excepted.* (Emphasis supplied). Id at 239.

As shown, the "personnel exception" is intended to allow public officials to meet in private so that observation by the public does not dissuade from speaking frankly about a particular employee's shortcomings. The exception is not intended to cover policy decisions that may affect employees, such as whether or not they should be allowed to smoke electronic cigarettes in government buildings. ♦

Campaign Finance Limits Hurt The Little Guy

By Joe Siano

Recently, the issue of campaign spending limits arose on the NJLP Activists Discussion List. An advocacy group approached us regarding a point-of-view on this issue. This essay is adapted from a response that I gave to a group called Voters First during my [2010 Congressional campaign in NJ District 4](#).

I oppose putting restrictions on campaign spending.

In recent elections my opponent, Congressman Chris Smith, spent [over \\$1 million](#) defending his seat while the Democrats invest about \$400,000 in opposition. I, on the other hand, did not even raise enough money to meet the minimum FEC reporting threshold of \$5,000.

According to Cato Institute analysis, spending limitations and regulation ["threatens to close off electoral politics to outsiders, hinder grassroots political involvement."](#)

Although it may appear to be in the best interest of third parties and challenger candidates to support spending limits, I do not. Here's why:

First, any legislation that limits campaign or any advertising investment is a violation of the First Amendment right to free speech. Free people have the right to say not only what they please, they also have the right to speak to as many people as possible and to repeat their message as often as they wish.

The First Amendment also protects the right of citizens to peacefully gather for the purpose of political expression. This includes PACs and corporations which are nothing more than peaceful and voluntary gatherings of individuals.

Secondly, putting limits on paid speech is disingenuous and deceptive. Marketing and campaign professionals understand that there are three broad classes of marketing media:

1. Paid media – paid for TV & radio commercials, print ads, billboards, web banners, etc.
 - This is the kind of marketing communication that is generated by advertising agencies
 - Paid advertising is limited in its effectiveness because of audience skepticism about ads combined with commercial avoidance via remote controls, etc.
2. Unpaid / "Earned" media – favorable coverage of candidates or issues in news stories, feature articles, interviews, etc.
 - This type of exposure is typically generated through PR agencies, press agents and publicists
 - This type of communication is typically more effective as it holds the aura of "objectivity" and implied endorsement, especially when a story is delivered by a trusted media outlet or a favorite personality.
3. Owned media – as it sounds, owned media is public facing media which the candidate or his agents control such as websites, books, newsletters, etc. These platforms may serve considerable audiences though they involve no trackable exchange of payments as would paid advertising that is placed on a broadcast station or in a newspaper.

It is obvious why it is the Progressives that are continually pressing for restrictions on campaign spending. For years the Left has enjoyed a virtual monopoly of slanted exposure from the mainstream media. By restricting paid media, the Left hopes to hold its edge on the stage of public discourse. This is also why the Left threatens to regulate Talk Radio and the Internet which have become formidable outlets for dissenting voices.



One additional area that often favors left-leaning candidates is celebrity endorsements. If a commercial brand marketer were to hire a Matt Damon or an Oprah Winfrey, etc. as a pitchman, it would cost millions. However, these endorsements, including personal appearances come at no charge to the campaigns and are not accounted for in any campaign finance reporting. In addition, these endorsements generate millions of dollars in unpaid and unreported free media coverage (earned media).

In politics, owned media heavily favors incumbents. Tax dollars provide office holders with a high profile website. What candidate would not like to own a highly trafficked website such as WhiteHouse.gov that shouts your praises? Likewise each and every U.S. Senator and Congressman has his or her own taxpayer funded website to tout their virtues and achievements. So do many governors and big city mayors.

All U.S. Congressman also have [franking privileges](#). This means that our elected representatives can mail their propaganda directly to your home at no expense to their political war chests.

Also, have you noticed how governors and big-city mayors often wind up starring in their state's or city's tourism and commerce campaigns? They get millions of dollars of taxpayer funded TV exposure that portrays them as strong, visionary yet approachable leaders. Can you say "[stronger than the storm](#)"?

One final owned media scam is the "campaign book". Perhaps you noticed that many presidential candidates often write a book, such as *The Audacity of Hope*, prior to launching their run. What is to stop a well connected supporter from giving a copy to his family, his friend, to 10,000 of his best buds? Nothing.

Finally, and most important of all, limiting campaign expenditures addresses a symptom and not the

disease. Our problem is not that we have too much money in politics. Our problem is that there is far too much money in government.

With all the trillions of dollars that government doles out, with its ability to lavishly reward favored constituents and hamstringing those on the blacklist, is it no wonder that smart and ambitious people will invest millions to buy influence?

Therefore my solution is not to call for a cap on campaign spending but to call for a return to a limited federal government that operates within its Constitutional boundaries. ♦



In November the NJ Libertarian Party sponsored a concert featuring liberty musician Jordan Page

CBO's Minimum Wage Report

By Jeffrey Miron; published on the *Cato @ Liberty Blog*

In a new [report](#), the Congressional Budget Office estimates that raising the federal minimum wage from its current level of \$7.25 an hour would raise the incomes of low-wage workers who remain employed while lowering the incomes of low-wage workers who lose their jobs. CBO's "middle" estimate is that a \$10.10 minimum wage would reduce total employment by about 500,000.

These effects are exactly what textbook economics predicts; the question is then how policy should regard this combination of good news for some, bad news for others. On that score, the answer is obvious.

A policy that alleges to help low-wage workers, yet forces half a million to lose their jobs, is hard to reconcile with any sensible view of redistribution. People with the lowest incomes are more appropriate targets of redistribution than people with higher incomes, yet the minimum wage forces more people to have zero incomes. A minimum wage is therefore loony from the get-go, even if one believes in a government safety net.

Worse, the minimum wage is poorly targeted toward low-wage workers in poverty, even amongst those who retain their jobs. According to CBO:

The increased earnings for low-wage workers resulting from the [\$10.10] ... minimum wage would total \$31 billion ... However, those earnings would not go only to low-income families, because many low-wage workers are not

members of low-income families. Just 19 percent of the \$31 billion would accrue to families with earnings below the poverty threshold, whereas 29 percent would accrue to families earning more than three times the poverty threshold.

Thus, the minimum wage, in part, transfers income from people in poverty to people in middle- and upper-income households!

And the minimum wage's negative effects do not stop at its perverse impact on the distribution of income. The minimum wage forces employers to substitute higher-wage workers or capital for low-wage labor, raising costs and therefore prices. The minimum wage perpetuates the notion that evil employers, rather than low skill, explain low wages. And the minimum wage pretends to fix a problem without imposing any costs, except that the costs are merely hidden, not avoided.

The right minimum wage is not \$10.10 or \$7.25. It is zero. ♦



The New Jersey Libertarian Party visited Lakewood Tent City to drop off propane heaters, propane, fire extinguishers, and gift cards that were donated to the party as a result of a fundraiser started by Steve Uccio.

10 Steps to Liberate America in 2014

By Patrick McKnight – McKnight1776.com

1) Restore the legal supremacy of the Constitution. Repeal NDAA 'Indefinite Detention' and the PATRIOT ACT immediately. Repeal unconstitutional executive orders and signing statements. Terrorism wins when we forfeit our freedoms. In America, Citizens are innocent until proven guilty.

2) Bring the troops home from bases in over 130 foreign nations. Use our world-class military only to defend American Citizens and the Constitution. End the expensive military empire and instead use the money to help balance the budget at home. The United States government is over **\$17 trillion** in debt. **Insolvency is our greatest existential threat.**

3) Legalize marijuana. In a free society there is no such thing as a "victimless crime". Save taxpayers billions and discourage border violence by ending this unconstitutional prohibition.

4) Stimulate job growth now, cut taxes and end NAFTA. Politicians promised NAFTA would increase a trade surplus but instead it created a massive deficit and outsourced millions of jobs.

5) End the Federal Reserve monopoly. This unaudited bank has unchecked power to dictate US monetary policy, print money and set interest rates. The Federal Reserve Dollar is a paper bill of credit backed by nothing. Artificial interest rates encourage malinvestment and create destructive bubbles. **Allow gold and silver Constitutional Tender and finally return to sound money.**

6) End the Bailouts. Bailouts are legal plunder for the politically well-connected. Divorce investment-houses from commercial lending institutions by repealing Dodd-Frank and reinstating Glass-Steagall.

7) End the NSA, CIA, IRS, TSA, FEMA, DHS and Obamacare. End the Departments of HUD, Interior, Education, Energy and Commerce. **Balance the budget by immediately and drastically reducing unconstitutional federal expenditures. Stimulate economic growth by slashing taxes.**

8) Ban electronic voting machines. Paper ballots help election transparency and accountability.

9) Restore American sovereignty. Get the US out of the UN, NATO and other entangling alliances that make Americans less safe. Get the US out of the Bank of International Settlements.

10) Run for office as a Libertarian. Our families deserve better than the lesser of two evils. Our families deserve freedom. We are the fastest growing party in the United States. We are the party of the People and the future. Be a leader in your community and spread the message of liberty! ♦

Libertarians do nothing for America or themselves by joining and supporting our oppressors! WE gain nothing and America loses every time someone falls for this load of elephant droppings. Republicans cannot be trusted. We have learned even the Democrats have more integrity than Republicans. Not by much, mind you, but by a degree. Democrats tell us they are going to take our money and give it to others, then, they get elected and do it. Republicans lie through their teeth and tell us, "Vote for us, we are not like that!" Then, they get elected, take our money, and give it to their friends. Republicans and Democrats are two wings on the same bird of prey..

- R. Lee Wrights, Vice Chair of the Libertarian National Committee

Nappen Law Firm Files 2nd Amendment Brief with NJ Supreme Court

Eatontown, NJ- The New Jersey Supreme Court, for the first time in 45 years, will be considering Second Amendment rights. The Nappen Law Firm has filed its brief with the Supreme Court. A website version may be read at www.evannappen.com.

The brief strikes at the heart of New Jersey's gun control scheme. *NJS 2C:39-5b Unlawful Possession of Weapons-Handguns* reads as follows:

Any person who knowingly has in his possession any handgun, including any antique handgun, without first having obtained a permit to carry the same as provided in N.J.S.2C:58-4, is guilty of a crime of the second degree.(Emphasis added)

Nappen argues that currently, in New Jersey, individuals who possess a handgun, even in their home, without a permit to possess (*so called – "permit to carry"*) do so under a "*presumption of illegality.*" They must prove they fall under one of the "*strictly construed*" exemptions listed in N.J.S. 2C:39-6 to establish their innocence. (N.J.S. 2C:39-6e exempts possession in one's residence.)

Without a permit to possess, the only way to legally possess a handgun in one's home in New Jersey, is by exemption. Individuals, who rely on exemptions, are perpetually at risk of arrest, prosecution and having to prove facts at trial necessary to establish one's innocence.

To be granted a New Jersey permit to possess a handgun, one must demonstrate "*justifiable need.*" This is an extraordinarily difficult requirement. The only way a private citizen may meet the requirement is if the applicant can;

"specify in detail the urgent necessity for self-protection, as evidenced by specific threats or previous attacks which demonstrate a special danger to the applicant's life that cannot be avoided by means other than by issuance of a permit to carry a handgun." N.J.A.C. § 13:54-2.4.

The United States Constitution does not contain a Bill of **Needs**. It contains a Bill of **Rights**. No "*need,*" justifiable or otherwise, should ever be required for an individual to exercise the rights guaranteed by that document.

The average private citizen who wishes to possess a handgun in his or her home, whether for protection, target practice, hunting, collecting or any other legitimate purpose, can not meet such an absurdly burdensome need requirement. **It is a *defacto* ban.**

The justifiable need requirement has to be struck as unconstitutional, and average citizens must to be granted permits to possess. Otherwise, New Jersey's handgun possession law, N.J.S. 2C:39-5b, is itself unconstitutional because it converts a right into an exemption. Rights may have exemptions, but rights themselves must not merely be exemptions.

Evan Nappen (www.EvanNappen.com) is a criminal defense attorney who has focused on New Jersey firearms and weapons law for over 23 years. He is the author of the New Jersey Gun Law Guide. Visit his website at www.EvanNappen.com. ♦

West Milford Letter to Editor: Pro-liberty on gun ownership

By Mark Richards, Published in Suburban Trends

Dear Editor:

Thumbs up to letter writer Bruce Eden of Pompton Lakes with regard to his recent (Jan. 8, 2014, Suburban Trends) letter against gun control laws.

I hope Mr. Eden has thick skin as he will no doubt be attacked as an anti-Semite for calling attention to the fact that many Jews support gun control. In addition to groups like the ADL, I would also include many of the media bosses and leaders in the entertainment industry who also want to see Americans (of all religions and races) disarmed by "our" own government. The Southern Poverty Law Center run by Morris Dees and his sidekick Mark Potok is another group that smears gun owners and pro-freedom groups.

If you support the Bill of Rights, you are now classified as being part of the "hate" movement!

Mr. Eden, of course, did not say that all Jews favor gun control but mark my words, he will still be attacked for what he wrote.

Most major religions are on the pro-gun control bandwagon, especially the mainstream Protestant denominations. I was raised as an Episcopalian and that church has become one of the most pro-socialist, anti-liberty (except for gay marriage) churches in America.

With the exception of attending a memorial service at St. David's in Kinnelon for a dear departed family friend in October 2012, I haven't been inside an Episcopal church in years!

I'm proud to say that many of the Libertarians I know who happen to be Jewish don't go along with the anti-gun garbage ladled out by the media and the politicians. Sheldon Richman, of the Future of Freedom Foundation (www.fff.org); Ken Kaplan, the Libertarian candidate for governor of New Jersey in 2013; Alan Gottlieb of the Second Amendment Foundation; and Professor Murray Sabrin of Ramapo College; are all outstanding individuals who happen to be Jewish that stand up for the principles of individual liberty that our republic was founded on.

All pro-liberty people regardless of religion, race, gender, sexual orientation, or any other category one can think of, should stand with those of us in the Libertarian movement and oppose all attempts to disarm against and convert our once-great nation into a police state.

Mark Richards,
West Milford ♦

How Does a Third Party Become Relevant Nationally?

By Marc Carcanague

You mean, besides get a hold of Bill Gates' account?

I jest, but not really - it will take a lot of money to be able to compete with the Republicans and Democrats...and unfortunately, those parties have made it difficult to gain any

foothold from which it would become easier to raise such funds and challenge the status quo.

So what options do other political parties have?

Two words: 1. Commitment, 2. Patience.

It is possible, but it's going to take time - and it will take a lot of discipline among the leaders in the party to see its goal through AND to sell it to the general membership. In my estimation, I think it would take at least twenty years before any significant gains would be seen. Here's the plan:

1. *Load up candidates for local elections.* The average voter needs to get used to seeing the party listed on election ballots. More importantly, if the party can have multiple candidates for multiple offices, they will get their own column, which will increase the number of votes they get simply by being equal to the major parties on the ballot.

2. *Campaign differently between local and statewide/national elections.* I'll explain this more later on, but at the local level; the party should focus on offering lower property taxes and open government. To be more effective, these campaigns should be more intensive in towns where this has been a problem recently.

3. *All monies available to the party should be invested into one of these campaigns in the first election cycle, then increased as more money becomes available. At no point should money be invested at the statewide/national elections.*

A recent state assembly race (to gain an office in Trenton, not even a Congressional seat!) cost each of the major parties' candidates **one million dollars**. A third-party can not compete with this: the NJLP ran a hell of a race in the 14th District. One candidate raised \$6000...and won 2% of the vote. Gary Johnson ran a great race, received more votes than any Libertarian candidate in history...and still won less than 1% of the vote.

4. *This isn't to say the third party should not run candidates at this level. They should do the opposite to flood the ballot, but the party should spend NO money on the campaign.* I used this analogy at our meeting. The money we have available to our candidates for Governor/Senator/Congressman/Presidential level is minimal, and to think it has any effect on the outcome is the equivalent of pissing in the ocean and expecting to turn it yellow.

5. *The current battlefields for elections were created by the Democrats and Republicans. To fight them on their turf is to expect defeat. The Art of War indeed.* How can a party be expected to win against one of the Big Boys when playing by their rules? What's worse is that the media and average citizen buy into their creations without even realizing it.

The news channels (MSNBC, Fox, CNN), news programs (including *The Daily Show*), radio programming and voters all buy into this logical equation:

If not x, then y.

Ask any of the above, and they will almost always give some form of the following response:

I vote to keep the Democrats/Republicans out of office.

Our elections have become bi-polar. Our campaigns have become bi-polar. Our political conversation has become bi-polar.

Sadly, the minor parties are playing this game without even realizing it. The Libertarian Party in their promotional material often describes themselves as somewhere between Republican and Democrat. The Libertarian Party buys into this dichotomy. By doing so, it reinforces the impression among most voters that they have taken sides.

This is NOT the way to break the hegemony in our political system.

6. *Change the political conversation.* I stated earlier how our electoral system is based on:

If not x, then y.

What if we began to argue that $x = y$.

The key to changing the battlefield, the conversation, the CAMPAIGNS is by changing the logic behind them. What the Libertarian Party needs to do is show how **similar** the Democrats and Republicans are to each other, not emphasize their differences. Where can one do so?

- Foreign Policy - there is no discernible difference between either of the parties. I could go into detail, but for anyone interested, please take a look at foreign aid given by our government, and see how little it has varied from administration to administration, from Congress to Congress.
- Corruption - both parties are incredibly corrupt, and donors increase the amounts they give to campaigns because studies have shown that it is an incredibly valuable investment for industries. For instance, the private prison industry invested \$45 million in campaign donations, and earned \$5.1 **billion** in immigration detention contracts alone. It is no wonder that more and more money is getting pumped into the elections ... because candidates respond by giving out contracts to their supporters.
- NSA - don't get me started, but this was started by the Bush Administration, then continued by Obama.
- Patriot Act - Obama actively **campaigned** against this, then wound up not only signing its extension, but increasing its powers!

I could keep going, but the point to remember here is that these parties have more in common with each other than they want to admit...and actively create this bi-polar world most of the United States lives in.

7. *Stay away from issue specifics.* The party needs to stay on the attack against the Democrats and Republicans, and to do so, they must not give anything for the major parties to aim at. By taking a stand on specifics, the party will get grouped in with "the opposite". The Libertarians, for instance, work extremely hard on protecting 2nd Amendment rights ... but in doing so, they get lumped in with right-wing Republicans, and lose any possible support they could gain from the Democrats. Throw in gay marriage, or marijuana legalization, then they've infuriated the Bible thumping right among others. Minor parties can NOT win this battle.

8. *If there is an issue a third party begins to gain success with, it will quickly be adopted by one of the major parties.* A great example of this is LP support for marriage equality. A noble, worthy cause. But once it gained

mainstream acceptance, the Democrats seized it as their own. The LP graphic stating "Supporting Equality Since 1971" reads to me as "We were here first... WAHHH!!!! (throw a temper tantrum like a five-year old who just had his blocks stolen from him by the Class Bully).

Another example is Colorado's Amendment 64, which proposed the legalization of marijuana. Gary Johnson spoke regularly in Colorado and was the only Presidential (among those who received a sizable number of votes) to actively support it. It passed with over 54% of the vote.

Gary Johnson got a little over 32,000 votes...just over 1% of the vote. At our board meeting, I asked a general question: "Are we trying to win elections, or are we just trying to get some of our stances on issues accepted and passed?" The members in attendance seem to be split, which does not bode well for a party looking to break into the national scene.

Issues will not gain minor parties traction on the national level.

To summarize, a minor party must funnel its financial clout into small elections they have a chance of winning, and nationally maintain an anti-Establishment stance on the national level. The party must not focus on issues, but rather aim their attacks at both major parties, painting them in the same colors. As the minor party begins to win local community elections, they will begin to register greater numbers of voters, and earn some donors' support. In time, they will affect change nationally.

I hope the Libertarian Party is ready to achieve greatness. Will we have the patience and discipline to do it? ♦

The Only Way Forward Is Together

By Steven J. Uccio

I like the Libertarian Party. I think we have the best platform of any party in the United States of America. We're the party of self-ownership, freedom, and liberty. I don't think any other party stands for those things anymore. We're the third largest party in the country. With all that being said I think we can do a much better job in the state of New Jersey.

When I ran for state assembly I felt like I didn't get a lot of

support from the party. People tried to help where they could, the party gave what money it had to give, but overall I found it to be lacking in organization and structure. Patrick McKnight and myself are trying to help with the candidates this year, but we're still just two people. We can only do so much.

During last year's convention we all divided up into counties. Someone asked if I wanted an officer position. I didn't want any part of it. I thought it would be hours of work a week and I just wanted to be a candidate. I didn't know it, but I never heard anything about Mercer County officers for the rest of the year and we had not one single meeting.

We need to be better organized. We need to be organized at the county level with meetings every month. To give potential candidates and members a place to go. To give candidates the minimal support they need to be successful. It doesn't have to be a lot of people and it doesn't have to be big. It can be just discussing local news, screening a film, or a single speaker. The response for the few events I've planned have been very positive. If we are consistently visible and accessible to people throughout the state there is no reason we can't grow.

As an example, on February 26th I went to the Burlington County Freeholder meeting. I wanted to pressure the freeholders to investigate the death of Robert Taylor at the county jail. There's an article about it in this newsletter. I had to drive over 30 minutes to get there, I didn't know the building, I didn't know the area, I got there 10 minutes late, and the meeting was over before I could say anything. I messed up. The party missed an opportunity. There was a reporter there who may have gotten us into the newspaper. If there was a Burlington County group they probably could've done it easier than me and better than me.

We are the best party in the country. I truly believe that. This state and its people are begging for better candidates. We only had 5 candidates last year. I know we can do better than that. There's no reason we can't have a Libertarian on the ballot in every county. I'm ready to start holding Mercer County Libertarian meetings. I hope at the convention we could lay the foundation for a more active New Jersey Libertarian party. ♦

The New Jersey Libertarian

Winter 2014 Volume XXXIX, Issue 1
©2014 The New Jersey Libertarian Party
ISSN 1093-801X
Editor, Matthew M. Turner

NJL Advertising Rates

Full page	\$60
Half Page	\$30
Quarter page	\$20
Eighth page (business card)	\$10

The *New Jersey Libertarian* is the official monthly publication of the New Jersey Libertarian Party. Opinions, articles and advertisements published herein do not necessarily represent official NJLP positions unless so indicated. Material appearing in the *NJL* may be reproduced, as long as credit is given the author, the *New Jersey Libertarian*, and tear sheets/e-mail notice are furnished to the address below.

Commentary and advertising should be submitted to the editor. Contact us at:
New Jersey Libertarian: editor@njlp.org. PO Box 56 Tennent, NJ 07763

NJ Libertarian Party Convention Announcement

March 29, 2014 9:00 AM - 6:00 PM

Tavern on the Lake
101 N. Main Street
Hightstown, NJ 08520

The Party's Business Meeting will be held from 9:00 AM until Noon and will be open to all. Registration will be required for the afternoon events which will include lunch and guest speakers. Our convention package will also include coffee and refreshments that will be available all day. We have a top notch selection of speakers this year!

Registration for the Convention will be \$40 until March 24th. After March 24th (including at the convention), registration will be \$45. Note that this caliber of speakers does not come cheap, please consider an additional donation to help us offset our expenses.

Tentative Agenda:

- 8:30 – 9:00 Gather for Continental Breakfast
9:00 – Noon NJLP Business Meeting (all are welcome, only NJLP members may participate)
- Nomination of 2014 Candidates
 - Election of NJLP officers
 - Discussion of NJLP Business
- Noon – 1:00 Luncheon
1:00 – 5:30 Speakers including:

Dr. Walter Block
Dr. Mary Ruwart
Dr. Murray Sabrin
Dmitri Vassilaros
Daniel Zolnikov

Note that the morning business meeting is free. You do not need to register for the meeting. Full speaker biographies and online registration is at <http://njlp.org/convention>. Contact Email: convention@njlp.org



NJLP Convention Form

Check here to use address from mailing label on reverse

Name: _____

Address: _____

Town: _____ State: _____ ZIP: _____

Email Contact: _____ Phone Contact: _____

Full Convention Package (\$45; \$40 if paid prior to March 24th) _____

Additional Donation: _____

Reserve your place by sending payment to: NJLP Convention, P.O. Box 56, Tennent, NJ 07763



New Jersey Libertarian Party - - - - -

Are you a current member? **Please consider joining.**

I'd like to join the NJ Libertarian Party! I have checked the level at which I want to join and have enclosed the corresponding dues. I certify that I do not believe in or advocate the initiation of force to achieve social or political goals.

(Signature required for membership only) X _____

Check here to use address from mailing label

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City: _____ St: _____ Zip: _____

Email Address: _____

- \$500 Life Membership
- \$100 Patron Membership
- \$50 Sustaining Membership
- \$35 Supporting Membership
- \$15 Regular Membership

Newsletter subscription is included with membership. Check here to only receive the newsletter on line.

Make checks payable to NJLP and send to NJLP, PO Box 56, Tennent, NJ 07763

You can also renew on-line at <http://njlp.org/joinus>



New Jersey Libertarian Party

P.O. Box 56

Tennent, New Jersey 07763

www.njlp.org

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED