Republican Liberty Gree Enterprise, Individual Freedom & Limited Government

Summer 1992

Caucus Newsletter

Vol. III, No. III

Term Limits, Tax Relief and Shoe Leather Keys to Victory

by Mike Holmes

The GOP primary victories by libertarian Republicans Greg Kaza in Michigan and Duncan Scott in New Mexico for state legislative office shared at least three things in common: issues focused on support for term limits, opposition to new taxes and the importance of door-to-door canvassing in overcoming long odds. Both Kaza and Scott were first-time candidates with impressive libertarian credentials and both replaced long term incumbents in predominantly Republican districts.

Scott, 36, cut his political teeth in Montana, where while attending law school and chairing the state's Libertarian Party, he wrote a successful initiative deregulating the sale of beer and wine. He continued his libertarian activism after law school in Alaska, where he managed initiative efforts to deregulate surface transportation and to repeal legislative pay raises. He also managed former LP Alaska legislator Dick Randolph's 1986 gubernatorial nomination bid, raising more than half a million dollars in a six-way race.

He moved to Albuquerque, N.M., shortly thereafter with his wife where he practices commercial law. Scott worked for several years for New Mexico's Republican attorney general and was also the leader in a successful two-year municipal initiative battle to require a city vote before constructing a multi-million dollar performing arts center with taxpayer funds. Scott is also active with New Mexico Citizens for Term Limitations, which is supporting Proposition 1 on the state's ballot this fall.

He said he decided to run for State Senate District 19 at the last minute. "I studied the results of the 1990 GOP gubernatorial primary, where the incumbent state senator failed to carry his own district. I sensed an opportunity."

Though incumbent Les Houston was the State Senate minority leader, Scott won endorsements of 12 former GOP legislators along with the former lieutenant governor and attorney general.

His track record on initiatives and term limits yielded support from the conservative wing of the GOP, unhappy with the incumbent's weak record on taxes and spending. Pledging not to serve more than two four-year terms, Scott pounded away at the term limits issueuntil his opponent finally publicly changed his own position on the issue three weeks before the June 2 primary vote.

Armed with precinct voter lists, Scott walked door-to-door every night and weekend, introducing himself to every voter in precincts with over 50 percent GOP registration. "I raised over

(Continued on page 6)



Paul Coverdell

Paul Coverdell: Georgia on his Mind

by Jack Brantley Lightfoot

Paul Coverdell (R-GA) won the Aug. 11 Republican U.S. Senate runoff race, defeating challenger Bob Barr 51 to 49 percent.

A runoff was necessary because no candidate in the July 21 primary received over 50 percent of the vote as required by Georgia law. In the primary, Coverdell, a fiscally conservative, socially tolerant Republican, outpolled Barr, the tough-talking former U.S. attorney and CIA alumnus, 36 to 24 percent.

Coverdell, 53, was the only businessman in the race. He is the chairman of Coverdell and Co., a national financial services group based in Atlanta. He was elected to the Georgia Senate in 1970 and served until 1989. He served as the Georgia Senate minority leader and was the state Republican Party chairman from 1985 to 1987. He was named director of the Peace Corps in May 1989 and served until September 1991.

Coverdell will now face incumbent U.S. Sen. Wyche Fowler (D-GA) in the November general election. Interestingly, approximately 275,000 people voted in the Republican primary, a Georgia record. Only about 360,000 Democrats voted for the unopposed Fowler, while over 750,000 of them voted in the primary.

RLC: Do you see a more libertarian, or pro-liberty stance being adopted by the Republican Party?

COVERDELL: I think there is a more open expression of it now. But generally, I think that it is already pretty well-rooted in the party. It's funny, people always say they are for limited government, except when they want to use government as a tool to carry out their will. Americans unconciously do this. They see a problem and say "there ought to be a law against this." Years ago I gave a speech

(Continued on page 6)

			₩.	

RLC at Republican National Convention	3
Abolish Selective Service	4
GOP Primary Results	7



Ed. Note - Henceforth, 'Republican Liberty 'will publish Feedback, an opportunity for readers to comment on RLC activities and the ideas presented in this newsletter. The feature will run in every other issue. Letters should be short and concise and are subject to editing for space and grammar. Dues paying members always will be given priority in the selection of letters for publication.

School Vouchers

Editor:

My dissenting view on "School Vouchers: a Dissenting View" (Spring 1992):

Jack Simons offered his opinion on the use of school vouchers as "pie-in-the-sky stuff, defying both common sense and political history." His argument from ethics, whereas school stamps remain just another form of welfare, encouraging parents "to avoid the intimate responsibilities they chose for themselves when they became parents," is sound. But Mr. Simons, your appraisal on the pragmatic/economic front lacks real-world grounding.

You ask: have conventional food stamps driven down the price of food? The obvious answer is no . . . as a matter of fact, they probably contribute to the cost increasing. But that's because most food production, distribution and retailing is presently private (at least quasi-private). If the above were totally socialistic as our schools are, eventual disassociation with government would allow us to count on costs spiralling downward.

I am an advocate of the voucher system as means to an end. This mild idea is difficult enough to sell to the general public, no less the total separation of education and state. Do you expect today's parents, who have bore children with the understanding that their offspring's education would be paid for, are ready to vote themselves into a realm of shelling out over \$3,000 per child, per year? Turn off that computer and smell the coffee!

Chuck Geshlider Las Vegas, NV

Editor:

Jack Simons appears not to see school vouchers as a step in the program he seeks, "a program designed to get government out of the school finance business."

Most of the people who can afford to put their kids in private schools are already doing so. Vouchers, funded from school budgets, will increase the private school population and the capacity of private schools. Incremental increases in voucher amounts will gradually decrease the funding for government schools so they can be phased out. Then, school taxes could be eliminated and the vouchers stopped.

An incremental approach seems a more probable success than an abrupt termination of government school funding.

Grant O. Hansen Philadelphia, Pa.

Editor:

While I tend to agree that "what's really needed is ... a program designed to get the government out of the school finance business," I do not think supporters of liberty, including Mr. Simons, should oppose vouchers. One has to keep in mind the alternative. Compared to privatizing education, vouchers are a poor choice. But compared to the present system, I believe they will be an improvement.

To use an example employed by Mr. Simons, I agree that food stamps have not driven down the actual cost of producing food, compared to not having food stamps. One would suspect quite the opposite. However, having food stamps is probably more efficient than having the government run its own farms and distribute the products in grocery stores in which citizens could get food without paying for it (that is, by paying for it whether they got it or not), analogous to the current state of the educational system.

As is so often the case, the best course may be to choose the lesser of two evils. Perhaps if the populace likes the taste of a little efficiency and self-responsibility, they'll come back for another serving.

Will Murphy Miami, Fla.

Foreign Correspondence

Editor:

Libertarians in Britain engaged in party politics are active in the Conservative Party. In fact, libertarians have had an enormous impact within the youth wing of the Conservative Party. Indeed, the Federation of Conservative Students, the main conservative youth organization, was closed down by the party because it was controlled by libertarians. However, the puppet organization they then founded it its place was - surprise, surprise! - also taken over by libertarians.

Virtually all the major youth activists within the Conservative Party are now libertarians and most are affiliated with the Libertarian Alliance. My colleague Brian Mickelthwait and I address Conservative youth conferences throughout the country frequently.

Chris R. Tame, Libertarian Alliance London, England

Editor:

I am a strong advocate of libertarians working inside political parties rather than on the "fringe" to achieve change. The work your organization does is tremendous and I sincerely wish you every success.

Troy Lanigan Creston, B.C., Canada

Publisher: Roger L. MacBride Senior Editor: Mike Holmes Editor: Enc J. Ritberg Copy Editor: Philip Blume! Contributing Editors: Clifford Thies, Gene Berkman, Norman Singleton, Richard Duprey and Kevin Southwick. Contributing Writers: Brian Doherty: Mark Thornton: Joseph Gentili, Jack Simons, Tom McClintock, Mark Uncapher, Fred Stein, T. Franklin Harris Jr. and Jack Criss.

Republican Liberty is published five times a year (quarterly plus annual outreach issue) by the Republican Liberty Caucus, 1717 Apalachee Parkway, Suite 434, Tallahassee, Fla. 32301. (Send address changes to same address). The views expressed do not necessarily represent those of the Republican Party Permission is granted to reprint articles with proper accreditation. Unsolicited articles or news items are welcome. Questions, comments and criticisms are also welcome. Write us, or phone/fax us at (904) 878-4464. Layout and design by Philip Blumei. 1016 1/2 SW 4th Ave., Gainesville, Fla. 32601.

Inside the Big Tent

RLC Makes its Debut at the 1992 GOP National Convention

by Eric J. Rittberg Sunday, Aug. 16

We arrived at our hotel in Houston in the afternoon. RLCers from out of state attending the convention included myself, Troy Carroll, Joel Delafave and Tom Walls from Florida; Jay Taylor from Georgia; Scott Schneider and Troy Phares from Louisiana; Andrew Murphey from Tennesee; and Matt Taylor from Massachusetts. We were soon joined by a number of Texas RLCers, including Mike Holmes, Tom Glass, Lonnie Brantley, Kevin Southwick, Harry Robinson, Bill Eastland and Matt Hogan.

We linked up with the "Buchanan Brigades," the youth group supporting Pat Buchanan's presidential bid. The Buchanan campaign offered usaspecial deal for hotel arrangements and conven-

tion access. At a poolside party in the evening, RLCers had a chance to chat and

debate with the

Gov. William Weld spotted our 'libertarian Republican' stickers and said loudly, "music to my ears!" He was shown wearing an RLC sticker on the *Today* show the next morning.

Buchananites. Some were not at all receptive to the RLC. Still others did not need much convincing - three of them joined us on the spot.

Monday, Aug. 17

We woke early. Arriving at the Astroplex, we split up into two groups. Walls and Jay Taylor were stationed at the official protest site with stacks of RLC/libertarian literature to hand out to prochoicers, pro-lifers, POW/MIA activists, Greens, gay rights advocates and other single issue activists. The two worked the crowds for the next three days.

Inside the convention hall, we spent the afternoon schmoozing with media people. We distributed about 100 press kits and spoke with scores of reporters and commentators including Michael Kinsley, Robert Evans, Michael Novack, Nina Totenberg, Al Hunt, John Fund, E.J. Dionne, Jack Germond, Christopher Matthews, Joe Klein and Cal Thomas. The Wall Street Journal crew was clearly the most receptive. Hunt gave us a thumbs up, yelling "libertarians!" Only Cal Thomas rejected us, saying "The GOP's big tent isn't big enough to include you libertarians."

At 5 p.m. we made our way over to Pappacitas Mexican Restaurant where a reception for the moderate wing of the GOP was being sponsored by the Ripon Society.

Rep. Jim Leach of Iowa and Gov. John R. McKernon of Maine spoke, but the big draw was Massachusetts Gov. William Weld who talked of his privatization efforts and fiscal conservatism.

After the speech we introduced ourselves to Weld. The governor spotted our "libertarian Republican" stickers and said loudly, "music to my ears!" He then asked if he could wear a sticker, and placed one on his lapel. After we left, Weld was interviewed by NBC news.

The next morning on the *Today* show a five-minute piece on Weld opened with a clip of him at the reception, with our sticker clearly displayed.

In the evening, we were admitted onto the convention floor to hear Buchanan and Ronald Reagan and pass out brochures. Tuesday, Aug. 18

In the morning we attended a "Breakfast with Brent Bozell," sponsored by the Buchanan camp. We then returned to the convention site. We spoke to former Office of Management and Budget Director James Miller III who seemed genuinely pleased to hear of libertarian activities within the GOP. We also spoke briefly to Kate Michelson of the National Abortion Rights Action League about the pro-choice Republican vote. In the afternoon, we attended a "God and Country Rally" at a nearby Sheraton.

That night we headed over to Kay's Lounge for the RLC National Caucus. About 30 RLC members, two Libertarian Party members and quite a few guests were in attendance. RLC coordinators gave accounts of their activities. As chairman, I gave an

update on RLC activities nationwide. There was a discussion of organizational structure and ob-

jectives. The by-laws were accepted and passed by acclamation. Nomination for national committee spots were made. A vote was taken, and a seven-member NatCom was approved unanimously.

Afterward, paleo-libertarians Murray Rothbard, Lew Rockwell and Burt Blumert arrived. I asked Rothbard and Rockwell to say a few words. Rockwell said he no longer supported social tolerance as the nearby RLC banner proclaimed. He blasted William Weld as a liberal and Jack Kemp and Virginia Postrel as far-out neo-cons. He urged us to support George Bush and to back Buchanan in '96.

Rothbard, much more soft-spoken, largely echoed Rockwell's sentiments. He said he hoped to see Libertarian Andre Marrou get less than 100,000 votes this year. Reaction from caucus members was restrained but decidedly unsupportive. After a good-spirited question and answer session, the meeting was adjourned.

Wednesday, Aug. 19

We attended a term limits rally at the protest site at noon.

That evening we went to a reception for Buchanan held at an art gallery, where we had arranged to meet with former Texas congressman and one-time presidential candidate Ron Paul.

Later, at the convention site, eight of us waved our "Libertarian Republican: Less Government Now" signs during Marilyn Quayle and Barbara Bush's speeches. We also talked with Rep. Newt Gingrich (GA), Sen. John McCain (AZ), Sen. Al D'amato (NY), Ann Stone, James Pinkerton and John McLaughlin.

Thursday, Aug. 20

On the final day, we got aggressive with pamphleteering. Over 4,000 of the new RLC brochures were handed out at the entrance to the exhibition area. RLC signs were plastered throughout the area as well. The response was incredibly positive. A few people signed up on the spot. New Jersey State Sen. Randy Corman spotted us and stopped us for a chat. We wrapped it up around 5 p.m.

Before leaving we left thousands more pamphlets and newsletters on info tables around the convention sites. That night, four of the Texas RLCers again gained floor access. The rest of us departed on the long ride home.

Christian and Libertarian?

by Clifford F. Thies

Can a Christian be a libertarian? It depends on what the word means. If "libertarian" implies a value-free, anything-goes society: not. But, if it means limited government - i.e., a government that uses force to protect us from those who violate our rights and uses persuasion to encourage us to do what is right - then I believe a Christian not only can be a libertarian, but must be a libertarian.

In making this argument, I realize that both Christianity and libertarianism have image problems. First, from a libertarian perspective, Christianity suffers from the history of injustice perpetrated by Christians, from the Crusades to the Inquisition.

Second, from a Christian perspective, libertarianism suffers from the "anti-clerical" sentiments of the continental liberals of the 19th century, recurrent flirtations with utopianism and teachings against objective truth, especially concerning morality.

I will not defend Christianity by arguing that when athiests have gained powers of the state they have been even more thieving and murderous. For, while it is true that power corrupts, Christians are particularly condemned for their abuse of the powers of the state because of their knowledge of right and wrong.

Nor will I defend libertarianism by arguing that whatever values are most conducive to human happiness will win out in Darwinian social evolution. For, while this too is true, the waste of human potential due to our failure to communicate what we know about these values in tragic.

What I will do, however, is to argue that the split between Christianity and libertarianism is largely an unfortunate accident of history, and a terrible mistake.

Let me start with the Bible, and specifically with Romans 13. Paul writes that the state is ordained by God to be a terror to evil and to praise those who do good. I will admit that what "evil" means is not self-evident from this passage alone. But, in conjunction with other teachings about the state, I believe this "evil" refers to murder, theft, fraud and negligence. This interpretation is reinforced by the fact that the state is to praise those who do good. The combination of using force against "evil," and not using force but merely encouraging people to do good is what I will call Christian libertarianism.

Throughout the Bible there is a distinction between those things we should do as a matter of justice, and in so doing are answerable to the state; and, those things we should do as a matter of charity, and in so doing are not answerable to the state. For example, in one of his parables, Jesus spoke of an employer who paid all his workers a full day's wages even though some of them had worked only a part of the day. When asked by some of the workers who had labored for a full day about the fairness of what he had done, the employer first explained that he paid everyone what he agreed to pay. And of his higher rate of pay to some he said "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with what is mine?" This shows that the employer recognized his obligation to pay what he had agreed to pay as a matter of justice, and his ability to go beyond his legally enforceable obligations as a matter of charity.

Let me make this point clear: as Christians we have an obligation to be charitable - it is a duty, not a choice. We are to give,

or tithe, to support widows and orphans (i.e., those who cannot work), our religious leaders (who have special work) and the stranger among us. If we fail to give, we will be held accountable as the rich man was held accountable for not giving crumbs off his table to Lazarus.

Regarding personal morality, it's clear we, as Christians, are instructed to be moral. But where is it in the Bible that we are instructed to impose morality on others? We are told that homosexuality is an abomination, but where is it that we are to impose a prohibition on homosexual acts on those outside our congregation and off our property? We are told not to raise our daughters to be prostitutes, but when two prostitutes brought a custody dispute to Solomon he did not have them arrested for solicitation, but used his wisdom to grant custody to the true mother.

Regarding intoxicating drugs, it's clear we, as Christians, are generally instructed to remain sober. To be precise, use of mild intoxicants to celebrate the end of the work week and the holy days is proscribed, and use of strong intoxicants to deal with the grief associated with the loss of immediate family is allowed. Furthermore, all plants are described as kosher. So on what basis is the prohibition of alcohol and marijuana justified?

It is fair to say our country was founded on a libertarian understanding of the Bible. The founders incorporated the role of the state into a world view that also recognized the roles of the individual, the family and the community, as well as the roles of history and nature. George Washington married his brother's widow and freed his slaves because for him the great truths of life were more than political, they were personal.

When Christian libertarians vote to roll back the state, they do more than express a belief that God will somehow express his mercy on those who are less fortunate. They also reveal their willingness to become the instruments of his peace, to become involved, and not to leave the poor to the perverted charity of the state.

Secular libertarians may find Christian libertarians uneasy allies in the political struggle against the democratic socialists of our day. I admit that Christians have not always shown themselves to be trustworthy, but have from time to time rationalized their own exploitation of the powers of the state. This only goes to prove once again that nobody can be trusted with using the powers of the state to go beyond what is found in Romans 13; namely, be a terror to evil and to praise those who do good.

Ed. Note - Clifford F. Thies is the Durell Chair of Money, Banking and Finance at Shenandoah University in Virginia, and currently a visiting scholar at the Heritage Foundation.

Draft Registration: It's the Law - Still!

by Mark Thornton

Ronald Reagan was right when he said the military draft and draft registration were contrary to everything in America worth fighting for. When Congress recently failed to repeal draft registration and save Americans millions it demonstrated for the umpteenth time that we must throw out the government and take back America.

On July 29, the U.S. House of Representatives rejected HR 5679 which would have ended funding for the Selective Service System, by a vote of 96 to 310. Eighty-four Democrats and an independent voted in favor of the measure. Surprisingly, only 11

Republicans supported the measure. The 11 included Al McCandless (CA), Christopher Cox (CA), Dana Rhorabacher (CA), Nancy Johnson (CT), Matthew Rinaldo (NJ), Bill Green (NY), Willis Gradison (OH), TomDeLay (TX) and James Senstenbrenner (WI) along with the two most libertarian members of Congress Phil Crane (IL) and Dick Zimmer (NJ).

However, other supposed free marketeers including DickArmey (TX), Robert Walker (PA), Vin Weber (MN), Newt Gingrich (GA), Bob McEwen (OH) and Bill McCollum (FL) voted against.

In terms of efficiency, Selective Service is an economic joke. It makes the U.S. Postal Service look like Federal Express. Its supposed purpose is to provide a pool of draftees so we can quickly respond to an external threat. The evidence, however, indicates that Americans will volunteer much faster and to a greater extent than necessary to any bona fide external danger. The Selective Service method is dangerously slow and hopelessly outdated even if working according to the government's own blueprint.

Heroically (and in some cases, through pure apathy) young men have resisted draft registration in substantial numbers. Estimates are that more than 15 percent have failed to register, and nearly 25 percent fail to update their registration.

Using the Selective Service information to provide military manpower would be a waste of time in a real national emergency. The only newsworthy accomplishment of the system during its recent tenure has been to harass 19 philosophical dissenters to the draft. Crushing dissent in the name of defending freedom is epitome of Orwellian politics.

But what if draft registration actually had a purpose and what if the bureaucracy could carry out its job? The draft and draft registration is still unnecessary. A free society does not need conscripts for its defense. Volunteers respond faster than conscripts. And volunteers make much more reliable soldiers and sailors than conscripts.

Draftees and mercenaries are only "necessary" to fight unpopular wars of foreign aggression. Commanding officers consider draftees inferior soldiers. When proponents claim that the draft is cheaper than the volunteer military, they should be reminded you get what you pay for. History has shown time and time again that the most effective security is the soldier defending his own home against foreign invasion.

The notion that the draft is somehow fairer than a volunteer military or militia is equally absurd. Conscription is slavery, pure and simple. There is nothing fair about slavery. Big government, ancient or modern, democratic or dictatorial, has always cherished slavery, conscription and oppressive taxation. Just take a look at those who regularly conscript their citizens: the former Soviet Union, Red China, South Africa, North Korea, Cuba, Iraq and Iran. America was able to win its independence from the world's leading military power without the draft and we've never needed the draft to defend ourselves.

History has taught us that America does not need a Selective Service System, it only needs a "well regulated militia," "no entangling alliances," free trade and the unrestricted right to bear arms. The failure of the 102nd Congress to abolish Selective Service is an abomination that should count against the 310 members of Congress who voted to preserve the bureaucracy, Democrat and Republican.

Ed. Note - Mark Thornton is a professor of economics at the Auburn University . He is author of The Failure of Prohibition.'

ADA a Threat to American Businesss

by Jack Criss

Litigators all over the country are licking their lips. As of July 26, 1992, the job portions of the Americans with Disabilities Act apply fully to more than 2 million businesses, those with 25 or more employees. (Firms with 15 to 24 workers have until 1994 to comply with the guidelines). What appears to be a benevolent, good-intentioned law to help the disabled becomes, on closer scrutiny, a possible threat to businesses and those very people the ADA is meant to assist.

Supposedly, the ADA was designed to protect people with hearing, sight or mobility impairments against discrimination and to ensure access to employment. But according to an editorial in the Wall Street Journal, those groups of handicapped Americans represent only 3.3 million people, while ADA proponents say it will cover 43 million Americans. Why the disparity in number? Because Congress broadened the definition of "disabled."

The ADA can, and does, include all who suffer from emotional or mental illness, drug addiction, alcoholism and AIDS. So, in the example the *Journal* uses, emotionally "disabled" employees could claim they couldn't work overtime. You can bet the contingency bar is thrilled about the ADA going into effect and being so encompassing. Government officials predict as many as 15,000 complaints a year, some even relating to a potential employer asking about an applicant's disabilities.

In fact, employees can no longer require medical tests before offering a job, ask if an applicant has a physical defect that could hamper job performance, or ask about conditions and diseases the applicant has been treated for. I believe it is certainly within the business owners' rights to ask, and follow up on, such questions. However, the concept of "rights" has beome so distorted that it will now be considered a crime for an employer to attempt to obtain pertinent information about a person seeking a job.

What will be the results of the ADA? For one thing, a plethora of lawsuits will emerge since it will now be easier to sue. Toward that end, the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund has trained some 5,000 "Barrier Busters" to to look for access violators and then file lawsuits.

Also, disabled workers will become high employment risks because of the possible legal problems involved. Of course, the law states that worker accommodations are considered "reasonable" if they don't create an "undue hardship" for the employer, but no one seems to know what the definition of "undue hardship" is. Assuredly, a lawsuit would determine that in some arbitrary fashion.

Sadly, most companies will be inclined to agree on settlements rather than pay lawyers fees while waiting for years to reach a courtroom, thus guaranteeing increased prices. And, ironically, can you imagine what groups are excluded from the ADA regulations? You guessed it: the federal government and government-owned corporations. Here we see the chickens coming home to roost.

Will the ADA help disabled people find a better way of life? Possibly a few. But the government, in trying to help, has weighted down the small businesses of this country. And that hurts us all.

Ed. Note - Jack Criss is the managing editor for the 'Jackson Business Journal' in Jackson, Miss.

Coverdell...from 1

saying "there ought not to be a law." I believe in more community, institutional and personal solutions to problems instead of governmental solutions or legislation.

RLC: What is your stand regarding tax policy and the budget?

COVERDELL: The tax burden in this country is way too high! It's becoming onerous. Taxation is limiting the entrepreneurial spirit in America. Especially troubling is when the federal government mandates programs without allocating funds, then asks businesses or local governments to pay for them. Specifically, I support a balanced budget amendment, capping expenditures to promote economic growth, a line-item veto and any tool to promote fiscal health.

RLC: Do you favor privatization and deregulation of services and industries?

COVERDELL: I think privatization should be accelerated. Parts of the Defense Department are good examples. Airports are great candidates, as are prisons. Sanitation collection is a good example of a service that has largely gone in that direction already. I still believe that roads and transportation are the proper function of government. Conceptually, deregulation fits with a philosophy of less government and I support that.

RLC: Do you favor educational choice, specifically educational vouchers?

COVERDELL: I do favor educational vouchers and choice. But I don't think the federal government should mandate it. I think they should encourage educational choice, but the decisions should be left to the communities and the states on whether, or how, to implement them. I am dedicated to local control of schools.

RLC: What type of drug policy do you favor?

COVERDELL: I believe that we need to break up drug gangs and curtail the use of drugs due to the impact that drugs have had on our country. I would encourage "Weed and Seed," education, treatment and a look at options. But repeat offenders need to go to jail. I have heard complaints about some of the seizure laws, but it's not something I am completely informed on. I am against the decriminalization of any drugs!

RLC: Do you favor the all-volunteer armed forces? How do you stand on defense policy?

COVERDELL: Yes, I believe in an all-volunteer armed forces. I am somewhat hawkish on defense. We must always be able to respond quickly in a crisis. The world is still a dangerous place. We cannot allow the national Democratic liberals in Congress to weaken America by making massive cuts in our defense budget.

RLC: What is your stand on abortion?

COVERDELL: I believe that is a woman's choice. She's in the best position to make what is a personal, moral and/or religious choice. I do favor parental notification for minors, but not consent. I do not favor the current version of the Freedom of Choice act, because it strikes out parental notification. I do not have a problem with reasonable parameters being adopted by the states, as long as they don't negate choice.

RLC: How do you feel about gun control?

COVERDELL: I oppose gun control, including waiting periods. I would be for them if they worked, but they don't. Atlanta has a seven-day waiting period, yet it leads the state in violent crime, domestic disturbances, assaults, etc.

RLC: What is your position on health care?

COVERDELL: I believe that we should keep it in the private arena. I don't favor governmental approaches like "pay or play" and I strongly oppose socialized medicine. I believe that we can reform our private health care system and make it more affordable. I support the development of tax incentives for individual and businesses that allow every citizen to be covered by health insurance.

Ed. Note - Jack Brantley Lightfoot is an AT&T systems analyst residing in Ringgold, Ga.

Scott and Kaza...from 1

\$15,000 while my opponent outspent me nearly three times, but I personally talked to over 3,000 Republicans, leaving my brochure and home phone number if they wanted to call me with any questions." His opponent instead sent out eight mailings, stressing "experience."

Scott's hard work paid off, besting his opponent by narrow 80 vote margin out of about 3,500 votes cast.

Scott is still campaigning hard in the general election, facing a Democratic challenger with no previous experience in a district with a 54 percent Republican district. More doorbellings, mailings and candidate visits await Scott before Nov. 3

Similar activities await Greg Kaza this fall, still working hard after his Aug. 4 primary victory for state representative in Michigan's District 42, in the Rochester Hills-Troy area of suburban Detroit. Kaza, 31, a former journalist and economist who teaches at the Northwood Institute in Troy, campaigned for nearly a year, wearing out three pairs of shoes, by his estimate, visiting over 7,500 households and meeting over 10,000 voters.

Kaza is a longtime libertarian, who worked for the 1980 Ed Clark LP presidential campaign and was later a leader of the Students for a Libertarian Society and the Libertarian Student Network. A reporter for a Detroit paper and contributor to libertarian publications such as American Libertarian, Kaza also worked at the Mackinac Center, a Michigan think tank, where he authored Michigan: An Agenda for the '90s, a book which received national attention for innovative approaches to state and local problems.

Kaza faced three other opponents in his race, which after redistricting had no incumbent running. "After I announced, to the dismay of local GOP leaders, the incumbent announced he would not seek another term," Kaza told *Republican Liberty*. "My major issues were term limits, Proposition 13-style property tax relief, no new taxes and support for (Republican) Gov. Engler's proposed budget cuts," Kaza said. "My major opponent, a liberal Republican lawyer, supported none of these issues."

Kaza received help from the NRA, raised over \$16,000 and sought out pro-liberty groups for support. Despite last minute smear attempts, Kaza received 51 percent of the votes, versus 30 percent for his opponent.

In the general election, he faces a local councilman who received 1,900 primary votes with no opposition, who opposes property tax limits and term limits and supports tax increases.

But despite the tough campaign work it wasn't all sore feet and skinned knuckles. Kaza announced his engagement to his longtime girl friend the evening of his primary victory, demonstrating that even libertarian Republicans are serious about "family values" in this election year.

Kaza and Scott can use financial and volunteer support. You can contact: Friends of Greg Kaza, 284 Woodside Ct., Rochester Hills, MI 48307; and Duncan Scott, 10200 Menaul N.E., Albuquerque, NM 87112.

CANDIDATE NEWS

More Primary Results

In South Carolina, libertarian Republican Bill McCuen was unable to defeat Greenville attorney Bob Inglis in the GOP U.S. House primary for District 4. McCuen finished second in a three-way race with 16.5 percent to his opponent's 69.5 percent. Inglis had been campaigning for two years and was the preferred candidate of the party establishment.

In Florida, State Rep. Dick Graham was defeated in the GOP primary for Congress in District 7 (Daytona/Orlando). Graham of Daytona lost to Mica of Orlando, coming in second in a three-way race with 36 percent. Graham, an Objectivist, is one of the most fiscally conservative members of the legislature. Meanwhile in nearby DeLand, RLCer Steven McGehee lost a bid for County Supervisor of Elections.

Michigan Libertarian Republicans suffered two defeats for Congress in Stephen Dresch of Hancock (upper peninsula) and Margaret O'Connor of Ann Arbor who both lost primaries on Aug. 3. Dresch, a freshman state representative, ran a hardcore libertarian campaign. He stressed reform of Congress, deficit reduction through spending cuts, decriminalization of narcotics and opposition to socialized medicine. O'Connor, a five-term state representative, was beaten by wealthy businessman Richard Chrysler.

In Vermont, RLC coordinator Jack Simons lost his primary for State House from Sheffield. Simons finished third with 29 percent, losing by 101 votes. Meanwhile, Kansas RLC coordinator John D. Foster lost a brutal primary fight for State House in Wichita (District 95). A recent bloodbath in the Kansas GOP over abortion resulted in pro-choice Republicans and even moderately pro-life Republicans being ousted from the party heirarchy, and in primaries. Foster, who is pro-choice but opposed to government funding, was a victim of the onslaught, losing with 45 percent.

In Ohio attorney David Sams of West Jefferson won the Republican nomination for Madison County prosecutor. Sams, a member of the Ohio Libertarian Party, faces no opposition in November. He will become the first Libertarian-Republican elected in Ohio. In Arkansas, RLCer Frank Gilbert won an uncontested GOP primary for Grant County coroner. Gilbert faces no opposition in the fall. Upon election, Gilbert will become the first Republican elected to any office in Grant County since Reconstruction. Finally, RLCer Harry Robinson of Arlington, Texas, won the nomination and has been certified as a presidential elector.

Campaign Briefs

Now that California's budget crisis is over, Assemblyman Tom McClintock has returned to his district to campaign full time against incumbent Congressman Tony Beilenson. McClintock received a great deal of favorable press for his budget cutting efforts while in Sacramento. He was given four paragraphs in a front page L.A. Times story, and air time on the syndicated radio broadcast, California Election Report, which referred to McClintock's "libertarian message," and described him as a "maverick Republican who wants to privatize everything." A report in Roll Call magazine out of Washington listed McClintock's opponent as one of the "top 10 endangered house Democrats." Recent polls suggest the race is neck and neck. Additionally, the National Republican Congressional Committee has targeted the McClintock campaign and will provide support.



Another targeted race by the NRCC is that of Congressional candidate Dick Rutan running in District 42 (San Bernardino). Rutan, well-known for flying the Voyager plane around the globe on one tank of fuel is running as an entrepreneurial, staunchly free market Republican. Rutan is also a staunch supporter of gun owner's rights and takes a tolerant stance on social matters. He faces longtime liberal incumbent Democrat George Brown.

In other California races of note, State Sen. Ed Royce is looking good for election to Congress from Orange County. In Santa Barbara, oil millionaire Michael Huffington is favored to win his congressional race. Huffington is running against "the old guard which wants more taxes, more spending and more control over our lives." Gun Owner's of America chair Bill Richardson is challenging incumbent Congressman Vic Fazio (District 3).

Other States

A poll done in July showed Henry Butler with 37 percent to 33 percent for Virginia's District 11 against Leslie Byrne. According to a July poll, State Rep. Art Pope of Raleigh is running seven to eight points behind his opponent for lieutenant governor in North Carolina. Meanwhile, attorney and RLC member Richard Miller of Fayetteville is stressing opposition to "unnecessary tax increases, intrusive state tampering with private commercial activity and obnoxious government micromanagement of personal behavior" in the race for State House District 18.

RLC member Jim Broyles is the GOP nominee for Congress in District 11 (Waco, Texas). Broyles, a fire captain, is a strong advocate of term limits and is fiercely critical of Congressional perks. Hs supports abolishing the income tax for those who make less than \$20,000 annually and spending cuts. He is facing incumbent liberal Democrat Chet Edwards. Houston RLCer Lonnie Brantley is serving as Broyles's campaign coordinator.

RLC member and maverick state Sen. John McClaughry of Kirby is the GOP nominee for Governor of Vermont. McClaughry is running an underfinanced but aggressive grass roots effort to unseatincumbent Gov. Howard Dean, a Democrat. Insight magazine recently did a five-page spread on McClaughry posing the question: "Can a candidate from McClaughry's distinctly libertarian cloth become governor of the state that in 1990 sent the first socialist [Bernie Sanders] to Congress in decades?" Pete Blute, stressing privatization, is running for Congress in Worchester, Massachusetts. Larry Hogan is running in Maryland's District 5.

Republican Liberty
Federal Campaign Office
10878 Westhelmer, Suite 395
Houston, TX 77042
(713) 867-9060

REPUBLICAN LIBERTY CAUCUS Directory

Republican Liberty Caucus Administrative Office 1717 Apalachee Parkway, Sulte 434 Tallahassee, FL 32301 (904) 878-4464 volce/lax

Ohio

National Committee Eric Rittberg, Chair Clifford Thies, Vice-Chair Norm Singleton, Secretary Mike Holmes, Treasurer Roger MacBride, At-Large Wainwright Dawson, At-Large Richard Duprey, At-Large

Advisory Board
Sen. Randy Corman (NJ)
Rep. Mark Foley (FL)
Joseph Gentili
Rep. Dick Graham (FL)
Rep. Bob Hedlund (MA)
John Hospers
Bill Hunscher
Paul Jacob
Tibor Machan
Assemb. Tom McClintock (CA)
Matthew Monroe, MD
Rand Paul, MD

Mark Skousen Mark Uncapher

Alabama RLC

Franklin Harris, Chair
P.O. Box 11709

Montgomery, AL 36111

(205) 826-1381

Rep. Don Roulston (NH)

Sen. John Scott (NJ)

Arizona Rick Tompkins, Cdtr. 4730 W. Northern Ave. #1063 Glendale, AZ 85301 (602) 930-1268 Arkansas Michael Marks, Ctdr. 12423 Sherri Marie Dr. Alexander, AR 72002 (501) 455-0442 California RLC Tom McClintock, Chair Kent Snyder, Cdtr. 5255 Clayton Road, #193 Concord, CA 94521 (510) 689-8207 Colorado

Wainwright Dawson, Cdtr.
Box U
Aspen, CO 81612
Florida RLC
Alan Turin, Chair
12555 Biscayne Blvd. #783
Miami, FL 33181
(305) 891-8310
Georgia RLC
Earl Smith, Chair
Jay Taylor, Cdtr.
1201 Panola Road
Ellenwood, GA 30049
(404) 981-5001

Illinois Laura Kotelman, Reg. Cdtr. 35 Merlin Court Deerfield, IL 60015 (708) 945-3075 Indiana Scott Wick, Cdtr. 1048 Azalea Dr. Munster, IN 46321 (219) 924-0992 Kansas John Foster, Cdtr. 407 S. Osage #2 Wichita, KS 67213 (316) 264-2921 Troy Phares, Reg. Cdtr. Scott Schneider, Cdtr. 1234 Carrolton Ave. Metairie, LA 70005 (504) 833-0518 Maryland Carol Thies, Cdtr. 2432 Eutaw Place Baltimore, MD 21217 (301) 523-0928 Massachusetts Matthew Whiting, Reg. Cdtr. 4 Westford St.

Chelmsford, MA 01824

(508) 256-4174

Jack Criss, Cdtr. 868-B Sussex Place Ridgeland, MS 39157 Frank Williams, Cdtr. 1226 Danforth Columbia, MO 65201 (314) 449-3833 Nebraska Ronald Schwab, Chair Harry Thode, Reg. Cdtr. 3060 Vane Omaha, NE 68112 (402) 451-3709 New Jersey RLC Fred Stein, Chair 685 Jamesburg Road Dayton, NJ 08810 (908) 274-2525 New York Joseph Gentili, Cdtr. 1401 Ocean Ave. #7B Brooklyn, NY 11230 (212) 487-5326 (w) North Carolina Wayne Morris, Cdtr. P.O. Box 1558 Banner Elk, NC 28604 (704) 898-8638

Mississippi

Russ Rosen, Cdtr 2199 Bellfield Ave. Cleveland Hts., OH 44106 (216) 721-4110 Tennessee Andrew Murphey, Cdtr. 1470 Heathcliff Drive Memphis, TN 38134 (901) 388-0846 Texas Matt Hogan, Cdtr. 6646 Shady Brook #3219 Dallas, TX 75206 (214) 696-8869 Vermont John Simons, Cdtr. Box 22, Sheffield, VT 05866 (802) 626-9001 Virginia RLC Ron Courtney, Chair P.O. Box 13 Urbana, VA 23175 (804) 758-4663 West Virginia Brian Horton, Cdtr. 207 Rustic Hills Crab Orchard, WV 25827 (304) 253-8085

Subscription/Student \$10.00 Regular \$20.00 (Couple \$25.00) Sustaining \$100.00		00.00
Members/subscribers receive five issues of outreach issue). Members also receive reguling and above levels also receive all minute and RLC press releases. Please cut out or convame.	lar Activist and Election but s of National Committee M ppy this form and send to th	lletins. Members at Sustain- eetings, Internal bulletins
DI	E-Mai	l
Address		
City	State	Zip

Membership Form

NOTICE:

Campaign Volunteers Needed!

Libertarian Republicans are running for public office at all levels and in all regions of the country. They need your active support as well as your \$\$\$!

Volunteers are needed to walk precincts, man telephone banks, stuff envelopes, put up yard signs and to help set up events. Find out how you can help.

Call the RLC Administrative Office (weekdays 5 to 11 p.m. EST) for information, or contact your state or regional coordinator. Strike a blow for liberty!

Republican Liberty Caucus 1717 Apalachee Parkway, Suite 434 Tallahassee, FL 32301

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED