



New Jersey Libertarian

Volume XLI, Issue 3

Fall 2016

Press Release: NJLP Opposes Gas Tax Increase

by Patrick McKnight

Trenton, NJ, October 8th 2016

The New Jersey Libertarian Party opposes the proposal of a 23 cents per gallon increase in the gas tax. This tax hike could cost New Jersey motorists \$4 Billion over the next 10 years. New Jersey spends \$2 million per mile of road, the most in America and twice as much as the next highest state. The problem isn't revenue, it's spending. Let's abolish prevailing wage laws and stop using taxpayers as an ATM for special interest groups.

Garden State taxes are already far too high. New Jersey property taxes, income taxes, estate taxes and inheritance taxes are all among the highest in America. Due to excessive regulations we are consistently voted the worst place to start a business. We have more people leaving New Jersey than any other state. When adjusted for cost of living 30% of New Jersey now lives in poverty. Garden State politicians have crippled our taxpayers with over \$170 billion in debt. At \$55,550 per taxpayer that's also the highest in the nation.

This is unlimited government run amok. The only future for our state is to reject the corruption, hypocrisy and big government of both establishment parties. Let's empower people instead of the politicians.

The NJ Libertarian Party is the Garden State's third largest political party. We believe liberty is the foundation of justice and prosperity. The party has grown 78% thus far in 2016 and has a record number of candidates on the ballot.

For further information, contact [NJLP Chair Patrick McKnight](#). ♦

2016 NJLP candidates

- Gary Johnson** for U.S. President
- Bill Sahr** for U.S Congress (1st District)
- John Ordille** for U.S Congress (2nd District)
- Jeremy Marcus** for U.S Congress (4th District)
- Claudio Balusic** for U.S Congress (5th District)
- Judy Shamy** for U.S Congress (6th District)
- Dan O'Neil** for U.S Congress (7th District)
- Dan Delaney** for U.S Congress (8th District)
- Diego Rivera** for U.S Congress (9th District)
- Jeff Hetrick** for U.S Congress (11th District)
- Tom Fitzpatrick** for U.S. Congress (12th District)
- Demos Backos** for Bergen County Freeholder
- Peter Rohrman** for Bergen Country Freeholder
- Doug Burgoyne** for Allendale Town Council
- Michael Chazukow** for West Milford Town Council
- Edmund T. Maciejewski** for Berkeley Council
- Patrick McKnight** for Montgomery Council
- Joe Rafferty** for Washington Township Council
- Michael Roche** for Ocean Township Town Council

Be sure to vote on November 8th.

In This Issue

.....	
NJLP Opposes Gas Tax Increase.....	1
Bylaws Change Proposal	2
Kearny Meeting Minutes Problem.....	3
Trenton PD vs NJ Weedman.....	3
NJLP on Ballot Questions.....	4
Nature of Politics	4
Prosecutor Protecting Forfeiture?	5
Letters to Editor	6

*** General Meeting –November 12th – Details on Page 7 ***

By Laws Change Proposal

by Jim Tosone

Whereas the NJLP Bylaws were amended November 15, 2015 to put in place our current organization structure,

Whereas we deferred other smaller changes to a future date,

Whereas technology advances have made electronic delivery of documents more practical and desirable,

Whereas the current Bylaws use the terms Organization and Committee inconsistently,

Whereas the Newsletter Editor is now the responsibility of the VP Marketing,

Whereas the Membership List is now the responsibility of the VP Marketing,

I, Jim Tosone, Vice Chair, move that the following changes to the Bylaws be approved at the November 2016 General Meeting, to take effect at the adjournment of the General Meeting.

Editor Comment: The below has been modified to fit the newsletter format. Material proposed for deletion has been marked with a strikethrough, proposed additional text is underlined.

Paragraph 5, Membership, 2nd paragraph. Allow for a free electronic copy of our membership list. Change to:

Members shall be furnished, upon request of the VP Membership, a printed copy of the membership list at reasonable cost of reproduction or an electronic copy at no cost, provided that the private list may be used only for official NJLP business and may not be disclosed to any other organization or nonmember individual.

Paragraph 6.c.7, d and g State Board, add specifications on removal of Regional Representatives

d. A Regional Representative may be removed and replaced at any time by a two-thirds (2/3) vote, provided that only those individuals qualified to select the Regional Representative may participate in the decision to remove and replace the Regional Representative. ...

g. ... Failure to attend two (2) consecutive State Board meetings by a Representative or alternate during a term shall result in the representative's seat being declared vacant. ...

6.d. Bylaws Committee, specify which meetings for agenda preference at meetings.

... Agenda preference at General Meetings is to be given proposals that have been considered by the Bylaws Committee.

6.e. Platform Committee, specify which meetings for agenda preference at meetings. Fix incorrect reference to wrong committee.

... Agenda preference at General Meetings is to be given proposals that have been considered by the ~~Bylaws~~ Platform Committee.

7a. Officers, remove Newsletter Editor, this position is now under VP of Operations

a. The State Chair, who shall ... and appoint or remove the Party Counsel ~~and Newsletter Editor~~, both actions subject to the approval of the State Board.

7d. Officers, remove maintenance of membership list from Treasurer duties.

d. The Treasurer shall maintain and make available proper financial records and report them to all meetings; prepare and submit any government or other financial or tax reports as required; ~~maintain the NJLP membership list~~; and prepare and mail renewal notices.

9. Other Officials, add Regional e-lists to VP Membership responsibilities.

b. VP Membership: whose responsibilities shall include new member and prospect outreach, college outreach, member retention, Members e-list (and its moderator), Announce e-list (and its moderator), Activists e-list (and its moderator), and Regional e-lists.

11. Regional Organizations, a. Composition. Change Organization to Committee to be consistent, update who can be a member of a Regional Organization.

There shall be three (3) Regional ~~Committees~~: Organizations: Northern NJLP, Central NJLP, and Southern NJLP. Each NJLP member in good standing shall be a member of the Regional ~~Committee~~ Organization for the region of his or her residence, or workplace. An NJLP member can be a member of only one Regional Organization. Voting shall be restricted to NJLP members.

11c. Change title, and text to specify Regional Organizations.

c. Selection of Officers of Regional ~~Committees~~ Organizations

At a designated time during each State Convention, each ~~committee~~ Region shall caucus and elect a chair and a State Board representative, together with any other officers it may choose, from its membership, for terms to expire at the next State Convention. A person may be selected to hold more than one office, and need not be present at the State Convention in order to be elected, provided his or her consent is obtained. ♦

*Government is the great fiction,
through which everybody endeavors
to live at the expense of everybody
else. – Frédéric Bastiat 1848*

Kearny Admits to Five Year Delay in Transcribing Closed Session Minutes

by John Paff

In her October 20, 2016 response to a Government Records Council (GRC) Denial of Access Complaint, Patricia Carpenter, Clerk of the Town of Kearny (Hudson County), admitted that her office has not yet transcribed the minutes of Town Council nonpublic (closed or executive) meetings held as early as September 8, 2011.

In her [Statement of Information \(SOD\)](#) to the GRC, Carpenter wrote:

The Closed/Executive Session meeting minutes requested have not been released because they have not been transcribed. Therefore, they were not available for release when the request was received.

The Town of Kearny's municipal budget over the years in question suffered a reduction in staffing in all departments which ultimately had a negative impact on the Town Clerk's office and the many essential functions within the department.

Without the necessary staffing in the Clerk's Office due to budget constraints, the transcription of the Closed/Executive Session minutes have been delayed.

Currently, the fiscal condition of the Town of Kearny has improved and the necessary staffing should be in place to provide the requested documents by November 15, 2016.

The complaint to which Carpenter responded, [Libertarians for Transparent Government \(LFTG\) v. Town of Kearny, GRC Complaint No. 2016-261](#), referenced two Open Public Records Act (OPRA) requests that Carpenter's office acknowledged but then abandoned. In its May 10, 2016 request, LFTG requested five sets of closed minutes and resolutions, including those from September 8, 2011. Carpenter disclosed the resolutions on May 17, 2016 but said that "additional time [is] required" to produce the minutes. Carpenter had not responded further on that request when LFTG filed its Denial of Access Complaint on September 19, 2016.

The other request, filed on June 6, 2016, asked for the Kearny Town Council's March 25, 2008; April 9, 2013 and May 8, 2012 closed session resolutions and minutes and, if none existed, "the minutes of the three most recently held Town Council closed sessions for which minutes can be disclosed in whole or in part." Again, Carpenter told LFTG that she needed additional time and then took no further action to fulfill the request. Carpenter's October 20, 2016 response to the GRC did not explain why Carpenter's office failed to disclose any of the records sought in the June 6, 2016 request.

According to the Open Public Meetings Act, N.J.S.A. 10:4-14, government agencies, including municipal governing bodies, are required to make the non-exempt portions of their closed meeting minutes "promptly available" to the public.

LFTG is being represented in this matter by Ted M. Rosenberg of Moorestown. ♦

Trenton Police vs. NJ Weedman

by Severin Freeman, originally published on *The Freedom Paradox*

Trenton Police have always had one of the worst reputations when it comes to allegations of abuse. The Department is no stranger to [lawsuits and complaints](#). Recently though they have jumped to the center of a lot of people's attention by targeting a well-known, and even loved marijuana activist.

Edward Forchion is better known by the name "The New Jersey Weedman". He is (obviously) an outspoken marijuana activist. Mr. Forchion has been a Trenton NJ resident, Church owner, and small business owner for many years. Last year he opened "The Joint" across the street from city hall. The Joint is a business that sells chicken wings.

The Liberty Bell Temple is a registered church that operates next to The Joint. Mr. Forchion keeps the temple open at all hours of the night on most nights due to his late night services.

This is the basis of the beginning of a life changing ordeal that will possibly forever change the way the police in New Jersey are allowed to operate.

It all started when the city of Trenton Police started targeting his temple for selling chicken wings after 11pm. The city has an ordinance that says food establishments must close by certain times. However Forchion does close his business. [It's actually the temple that remains open.](#)

That did not stop the police from issuing tickets every day and even harassing people outside. It was the harassment that put the police in an awkward position. The police made arrests and filed police reports that claimed a fight had taken place outside the temple. They did not realize that there were a number of security cameras that disputed their claims.

Forchion quickly took his evidence to court by [filing a lawsuit against the city](#). Several weeks after that lawsuit was filed NJ.com reported that "NJ Weedman Has Been Raided By Police". The raid happened so close to the lawsuit it made many news sources question a possible link. [NJ.com's report of the raid is quoted:](#)

Last month, Forchion, one of New Jersey's best known marijuana legalization advocates, filed a lawsuit against Trenton police after several late-night visits officers made to his businesses.

It followed several complaints he made on social media and in news accounts that city police were harassing him and his customers.

Forchion had said until police started visiting him last month and in late February, he'd been operating the restaurant and temple without incident and growing a community "peaceful potheads."

To top off the suspicious timing of this raid, the police also took all the cameras and footage that were on the property, including the footage of the night in Forchion's Lawsuit.

Forchion quickly filed yet another suit for his losses and asked for criminal charges to come to the police department. Those requests were not only denied but the police sent Edward a

letter informing him his [beloved van had been crushed and destroyed](#).

A man can only take so much so Edward finally decided to not be so nice about his resistance. He took to the outside of his business and started calling out officers loudly. He was yelling all of the crimes they have been committing against the community and getting away with. He called out a Sargent that endangered a child and an officer that was caught with a young girl under suspicious circumstances. He even held up a sign that said "F*** The Police".

His supporters went nuts for him being so bold. They took to social media in mass numbers calling out the department and officers in particular. There were a number of memes created about the cops there and posted on social media. The page was so over run that the [department took its Facebook page down](#).

Shortly after the page went down a warrant for the arrest for Edward Forchion was served at The Joint. What was the charge this time? Cyber-bulling. I know you find this unbelievable [but this is totally true](#).

The Trenton police have proved to not follow the law. They are a rogue department in my honest opinion. [The ACLU agrees](#). After hearing about the cyber-bullying arrest they have now stepped up and told the Trenton police that what they are doing amounts to a crime.

The police seemed to have backed off at this point. They kept distance since from Ed, but that's only in person. They have kept sending fines in the mail every day claiming violations to the closing time code.

Aside from bail and legal fees, Edward now faces new struggles. People are afraid to eat at his place. In the past it was packed at any given time with people laughing and having a good time, people eating huge baskets of chicken wings, and people just having a plain good time. Today the mood has changed. It's a long time to wait for court and the crowds have been replaced with single people. The funds to keep running and keep fighting are not a bottomless pit. Far from it.

Edward has faith though and his spirit is strong. He [has beaten them before and he will do it again](#). Every time Edward appears in court he has a brand new custom made suit courtesy of donors. He has so much community love and support. It's a great thing to see. There will most certainly be a lot more developing with this story so I encourage everyone to follow [NJ Weedman](#).

IN THE MEANTIME. The Trenton Police have [brought back their Facebook page](#) and have added a legal sounding disclaimer to the top. The "social media experts" that designed the disclaimer were paid a sum of \$7,300 by the city (taxes) to monitor and solve the city's issue with people posting negative comments. The service provided was to compile a list of "agitators" and to create the disclaimer. This writer is proud to admit to [being on that list](#). ♦

Press Release: NJLP Endorses Ballot Questions 1&2

by *Jim Tosone*

Tennent, NJ, October 21, 2016 – Much to our surprise, the New Jersey Libertarian Party recommends a YES vote on the two state questions on the New Jersey ballot in November. Both are legislatively referred constitutional amendments.

On Question 1 we recommend a YES vote. A Yes vote supports allowing the state legislature to pass laws allowing for two additional northern counties to each have one new casino, thereby ending four decades of casinos only being permitted in Atlantic City.

Although there should ideally be no restrictions on where in New Jersey a business decides to open a casino, this amendment at least takes us a step in that direction. Our YES recommendation does come with a caveat. Should the question pass, taxpayers will need to be vigilant that the casino operators not get any government favors (tax breaks, subsidies, bond guarantees). The decision to locate a casino in a particular place should be made solely because it makes business sense.

On Question 2 we also recommend a YES vote. A YES vote here supports the proposal to dedicate all revenue from gas taxes to transportation projects.

A constitutional amendment is the only way to force the state government to dedicate "user fees" to the purpose for which the tax is being collected. Absent that, politicians can (and often do) tell you a tax will be used for a specific purpose. And then they spend the money on something totally unrelated.

Unlike the U.S. Constitution, where the amendments are primarily about securing, protecting, and expanding our basic rights, the New Jersey Constitution is riddled with this level of detail. Nonetheless, we'll take an increase in liberty whenever and wherever we find it.

So vote YES on ballot Questions 1 and 2.

The NJ Libertarian Party is NJ's third largest political party, founded in 1972. Our vision is for a world in which all individuals have the right to exercise sole control over their lives, and have the right to live in whatever manner they choose, so long as they do not forcibly interfere with the rights of others to live as they choose. Our goal is to build a political party that elects Libertarians to public office and moves public policy in a libertarian direction. ♦

The Nature of Politics

by *William H. Howcott, USAF Retired*

Generally, republicans believe that all citizens have the right to freely use their property in any manner they decide, except to deny others this same right. They would prefer to rely on the inherent goodness of humanity to freely support the needy, and to protect the property ownership rights of the citizenry. Democrats believe that it is the calling and responsibility of a representative government to acquire property and to use it as needed to maximize the happiness and productivity of the

citizenry. They rely on the property employment decisions of a representative government to be superior to those made by the individual citizen.

The two parties are generally portrayed as one being good, the other evil. Both parties in fact are good. They have the best interest of the citizenry in mind. The fundamental difference between the parties is in the degree of power their governments would exert over their citizen's property, and the willingness of the government to use this power to improve the general welfare of the citizenry. Herein lies the fundamental difference in the various political ideologies:

Governments, and their empowering political ideologies, are distinguished from each other by their relative regard for the property rights of their citizens.

And so, a measure of a political ideology is its willingness to take the property of the citizen for political uses. Imagine a one dimensional Political Ideology Scale. On the extreme left end of the scale is pure communism, an ideology in which there is no private ownership of property. All property is owned by government. On the extreme right end of the scale is pure libertarianism, the mirror image of communism. Under pure libertarianism, government owns no property. All property is privately owned by the citizenry.

On this scale, the Democratic Party would clearly fall to the left of the Republican Party, as its ideology requires the use of property possessed by the citizenry; while the ideology of the Republican Party discourages such use. All other political parties and ideologies may be positioned on the Political Ideology Scale based on their relative regard for the property ownership rights of the citizens. If someone were to devise an explicit measurement for a government's respect or regard for property rights, an enormous insight into the political picture would be provided. And so, the difference between political parties lays in the relative emphasis placed by their governments on the forceful acquisition of the citizen's property for social purposes. It is the government's level of thirst for the property of its citizens that determines the nature of a political party.

These are my views. What say you? ♦

Is NJ Prosecutor Combining Cases to Protect Asset Forfeiture?

by John Crowe, [NJ Watchdog News](#)

Jermaine Mitchell was given two bad options. Allow the government to keep the \$171 dollars seized from him during an arrest, or lose an additional \$4 dollars if his appeal to get the money back proved successful.

When Mitchell was arrested in April and charged with multiple counts of possession and distribution of narcotics, Jersey City Police seized the \$171 dollars he had on him. One month later he received a letter informing him that he would have to pay \$175 dollars to file an appeal if he wanted his money back.

Mitchell's money was seized under the state's [civil asset forfeiture](#) law, which allows police to seize assets suspected of being involved in criminal activity.

The ACLU says a New Jersey prosecutor combined several small seizure cases into one larger one to make challenging the individual seizures a money-losing proposition.

Mitchell is now one of 21 defendants included in a civil action filed by the Hudson County Prosecutor's Office. [According to the New Jersey ACLU](#), which is representing Mitchell in a [court filing](#) submitted Sept. 8, the Hudson County Prosecutor's office unlawfully combined the 21 unrelated civil forfeitures in a blatant attempt to deprive defendants of their right to an appeal by making the filing of such an appeal financially undesirable.

Under standard procedure, Mitchell would have paid a much smaller \$15 dollar filing fee to appeal for the return of the \$171 dollars seized from him during his arrest. Mitchell was deprived of this option because the Hudson County Prosecutor's decision to combine his case with the cases of 20 other defendants in [one civil action](#).

The defendants named in the action were charged with similar crimes in Jersey City, Bayonne and Union City between January and April of this year.

The sum of the assets seized from those defendants totaled just over \$10,000 dollars in cash and included one vehicle, which pushed the combined asset value past the \$15,000 dollar threshold required to qualify the case for Superior Court.

This move — from the Special Civil Part, a court that presides over smaller claims — to the Division of the Superior Court, increased the filing fee from the \$15 dollars that would have been required had Mitchell's case been filed alone, to the \$175 dollars Mitchell and his fellow defendants are each expected to pay.

The New Jersey ACLU is challenging the August decision by trial court Judge Mary K. Costello that the inclusion of the 21 individual seizures into one case was lawful because the cases "concerned a common question of law."

The ACLU argues that New Jersey law stipulates the cases must not only "concern a common question of law" but also a "common transaction or occurrence." While the defendants were charged with similar crimes, they do not know each other and were charged in different cities, on different days, over a period of a few months.

"They don't allege conspiracy against most of these defendants," [Rebecca Livengood, an attorney with the ACLU, told NJ.com](#). "It's certainly not that all the defendants are part of a common scheme."

A state appeals panel will rule on the matter.

According to the NJ ACLU, the practice of joining separate forfeiture cases in this manner is unique to Hudson County. But in Hudson County, the tactic appears to be commonplace.

Assets were seized from more than 500 defendants so far this year in the county, the state's fastest-growing. The individual cases were combined into fewer than 30 civil actions. Notably, in more than half the cases the defendants had less than \$175 dollars seized.

Livengood told Watchdog she believes the Hudson County Prosecutor's Office is looking to save money by "shifting the cost onto the people they're prosecuting" by filing multiple unrelated cases together as one action.

Civil forfeitures have come under public scrutiny in recent years as critics allege law enforcement agencies have expanded the scope of what qualifies for seizure beyond reasonable limits.

The [total annual forfeiture](#) across 14 states — the only ones that have reliable long-term data — more than doubled from 2002 to 2013, and federal asset forfeiture increased by 4,667 percent.

Law enforcement officials maintain the policy is a helpful tool that facilitates the disruption of criminal activity.

Hudson County Prosecutor Esther Suarez declined to comment when asked about the bundling of unrelated forfeiture cases. But Suarez earlier told NJ.com that her office was "acting properly," pointing out that the practice of combining the cases of multiple defendants has been upheld by a Superior Court Judge.

Suarez also defended the effectiveness of civil forfeiture in reducing crime.

"Proceeds from any criminal activity are often utilized by defendants to purchase goods which are used to facilitate future crimes," she said. "The HCPO will continue to take all lawful action to ensure that crime in our county does not pay and that any proceeds of a crime are removed from the hands of the criminals and used for a lawful public purpose."

The Institute for Justice, a nonprofit civil liberties advocacy organization, questions that narrative.

The IJ and allied groups have sought to draw attention to what they view as "[policing for profit](#)," in which civil forfeiture laws incentivize police to seize property to pad their own departmental budgets.

Opponents of civil forfeiture also criticize the policy's broad scope in allowing the seizure of property on mere suspicion, absent any conviction.

They view use of civil forfeiture against low-income defendants as especially problematic because such individuals often lack the legal resources to appeal the seizure.

Of the 11 low-cost legal organizations suggested to Mitchell by the Hudson County Prosecutor's Office, none had the resources to aid in a forfeiture case. One had been shuttered in 2012 for fraudulently claiming to offer legal services. ♦

Letter to the Editor: Get Government Out of Atlantic City

by John Ordille, LP Candidate for Congress, NJ District 2

Dear Editor,

We all realize what happened with the Taj and Local 54 was a bad deal for everybody all the way around... Bad for Atlantic City, Bad for the employees, Bad for the casino industry and Bad for the taxpayers.

But for the state of New Jersey to go out of their way and be an impediment to jobs and job growth in the City is sophistry at its finest.

To guarantee that the Taj Mahal will be shuttered for five years is not the type of involvement any government should be making into the private sector.

For all the cries that we need "jobs jobs jobs" and that "the middle class is hurting" then to propose this really shows me and all of us where the state assembly people and state senators stand.

As a libertarian, I see how excessive government involvement and overreach is exactly why Atlantic City became stagnant, and then fell apart.

To me Icahn should be able to reopen...and the picketers should also be able to return if they so choose...the state should not be the ones making the decision.

This is exactly the reason why libertarians need to be on the ballot in every assembly and Senate race in 2017. ♦

Letter to the Editor: Debates are Fraud

by Emerson Ellett

Dear Editor,

Monday's presidential debates were another "fraud on the American voter," and a fraud on the U.S. constitution too.

In 1988 the League of Women Voters withdrew its sponsorship of the presidential debates as "a fraud on the American voter," because of the many conditions demanded by the Republicans and Democrats. But that didn't stop them from fraudulent activity. They slyly colluded with Congress to create the presidential debate commission, which obligingly made up rules to keep everyone out but the Chosen Two.

The founders were well aware of the possibility of such scheming and therefore limited the powers of Congress to those enumerated in Art. 1, Section 8 of the constitution. Needless to say Congress exceeded its powers by creating the debate commission.

It's reported that about 29% of voters identify themselves as Democrats and 23% as Republicans, and that many of them, as well as many of the unaffiliated 48%, are dissatisfied with the Chosen Two's candidates.

The commission so far refuses to admit other candidates to the debates. Will it reject its bogus, anti-democratic mandate, or will the next debate be another fraud on the American voter?

Letter to the Editor: Live and Let Live

by Mark Richards

Published in Suburban Trends, June 26, 2016

Dear Editor:

Will people in the journalism field such as [Suburban Trend's] writer Holly Stewart ever take a consistent stand on behalf of individual liberty and the Bill of Rights? If her op-ed of June 15th is any clue, I guess the answer would be no. It almost seems that the politicians and the media mouthpieces

look forward to mass shootings to crank up the "gun control is needed more now than ever" machine.

The sad events in Orlando, Fla., are reported to create the idea that if you're supportive of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender (LGBT) community you must be anti-gun and if you're for the Second Amendment than you must be a "hate-filled homophobe." This is how the media frames the debate; alternative viewpoints generally get ignored.

For example did you know that there is a pro-gun group in the LGBT community known as The Pink Pistols (pinkpistols.org)?

Probably not since that story doesn't "fit" the images the media wishes to create. My group, The Libertarian Party, and other related Libertarian organizations are 100-percent pro-individual rights on sexual freedom and gun ownership. There are not mutually exclusive positions, but the media doesn't tell you this. To them all issues are in a false "left" versus "right" spectrum, instead of the more accurate "individual liberty" versus "authoritarian government power" position.

Back to your op-ed by Ms. Stewart, she states she wants another opportunity to explain why only the military and police should have assault weapons (which by the way she doesn't define; just because a gun "looks military" on the outside, doesn't make it fully automatic. A semi-automatic

like the AR-15 requires a pull of the trigger each time to get off a shot).

The worst mass shootings in history weren't done by "lone nuts" but by the military and police, massacres of Native Americans at Sand Creek, Colorado, and Wounded Knee, South Dakota, come to mind plus the killing of striking coal miners and their families at Ludlow, Colorado, in 1914.

The first gun laws in American history that Ms. Stewart thinks are so great were motivated by prejudice and bigotry. Southern states passed laws keeping guns out of the hands of recently freed slaves. In the West people feared Native Americans, Mexicans, and Asians on the West Coast having access to guns. Even here in the "Liberal Progressive" Northeast, gun laws were often aimed at Italian and Eastern European Jewish immigrants who might be involved with "organized crime" or "radical labor unions" – so no guns for them either!

I find it odd that those who sound off so much against "hate" want minorities to be disarmed and defenseless against the state. Ms. Stewart concludes by saying how important it is to be tolerant and not to embrace hate. Well to have tolerance you must have liberty and to have liberty you must have the means to defend oneself. It's that simple. It's time to "live and let live" as we Libertarians often say and that applies to all – LGBT people and gun owners!

NJLP Post Election General Business Meeting

Saturday, November 12, 2016 4:30 PM

Omega Diner

1337 US Highway 1, North Brunswick, NJ

All members are strongly urged to attend. We will be discussing and voting on changes to our bylaws structure, socializing, and planning strategy for the 2017 election cycle. Please plan on attending.

The New Jersey Libertarian

Fall 2016 Volume XLI, Issue 3
©2016 The New Jersey Libertarian Party
ISSN 1093-801X
Editor, **Vacant**

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. Commentary and advertising should be submitted to the editor. Contact us at: *New Jersey Libertarian*: editor@njlp.org. PO 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

<http://njlp.org>

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED