

Libertarian Party of Hawaii

Phone: 1 (808) 537-3078

News

April 2012

<u>Upcoming Events</u>	2
<u>March General Meeting Report</u>	4
<u>Americans Oppose Obamacare-Moore</u>	6
<u>Internal Checkpoints a Failure-Adams</u>	7
<u>Sex Trafficking Bills-Ryan</u>	8
<u>Libertarianism for Young Americans-Henshaw</u>	7
<u>Recommended Links</u>	9
<u>Membership Form</u>	10

[Libertarian Party of Hawaii Officers:](#)

Chair:	Jim Henshaw	jhenshaw@hawaii.rr.com
Vice Chair:	Tracy Ryan	tracyar@hawaiiantel.net
Secretary	Pat Brock	pbrock@hawaii.rr.com
Treasurer:	John Spangler	jspan@hotmail.com

Hawaii County Chair:	Cindy Verschuur	lahilahi@hawaiilink.net
Honolulu County Chair:	Tracy Ryan	tracyar@hawaiiantel.net
Kauai County Chair:	Jeff Mallan	lightwriter@hawaiiantel.net
Maui County Chair:	Pat Brock	pbrock@hawaii.rr.com

[Libertarian Party of Hawaii Executive Committee Members:](#)

Larry Bartley	barteng@hawaii.rr.com
Jeff Mallan	lightwriter@hawaiiantel.net
Henry Panalal	henryp@leisinc.com
Ken Schoolland	ken.schoolland@gmail.com
Cindy Verschuur	lahilahi@hawaiilink.net

Upcoming events:

The 2012 Libertarian Party National Convention

When: Wednesday, May 2rd, 8AM
through
Sunday, May 6th 7PM, 2012

Where: **Red Rock Hotel**
11011 W. Charleston Blvd.
Las Vegas, NV 89135



Who: [Michael Cloud](#) - author of [Secrets of Libertarian Persuasion](#)
[Sharon Harris](#) - President of [Advocates for Self-Government](#)
[David Bergland](#) - 1984 LP Presidential nominee
[Tonie Nathan](#) - 1972 LP Vice-Presidential nominee
[Dr. Nancy Lord](#) - 1992 LP Vice-Presidential nominee
[Ed Clark](#) - 1980 LP Presidential nominee
[Robert Poole](#) - Co-founder of [Reason](#) magazine
[Alicia Garcia Clark](#) - National LNC leader from 1981 to 1983
[Judge John Buttrick](#) - Superior Court Judge of Maricopa County, Arizona
[Norma Jean Almodovar](#) - Former LP candidate for Lieutenant Governor of CA
[Tibor Machan](#) - Professor of philosophy at [Auburn University](#)
[Judge Jim Gray](#) - Former Superior Court Judge of Orange County, California
[Carla Howell](#) - Executive Director of the Libertarian Party
[Lenore Hawkins](#) - Principal, Meritas Advisors
[Alexander McCobin](#) - Executive Director, Students for Liberty
[Todd Grayson](#) - City Councilman, Perrysburg, Ohio
[Manny Klausner](#) - Co-founder of the [Reason Foundation](#)
[Erik Viker](#) - Selinsgrove Borough City Council
[Andy McKean](#) - Founder of Liberty Day
[Austin Petersen](#) - Judge Napolitano's "Freedom Watch" Associate Producer

What: Vote on platform planks
Nominate our 2012 Libertarian Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates

Cost: From \$119 per night

Contact: **Libertarian Party** **Red Rock Hotel**
1 (202) 333-0008 1 (702) 797-7777

International Society for Individual Liberty

When: Friday-Sunday, July 20-23, 2012
Where: **DoubleTree by Hilton Huaqiao/Kunshan Hotel**
2 Zhao Feng Road, Huaqiao CBD
Kunshan, Shanghai, China 215332
Who: more than 17 international speakers
What: Austrian Economics Summit, Asia Regional Conference
Cost: from \$758
Contact: **Li Zhao Schoolland**
1 (808) 676-0825
li.schoolland@gmail.com
[Shanghai Austrian Economics Summit](#)



The Federalist Society

When: Friday, July 30, 2012
Where: **Japanese Cultural Center of Hawaii**
Manoa Grand Ballroom
2454 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96826
Who: **Ted Cruz**, former Texas Solicitor General
What: Celebration of Milton Friedman's 98th birthday
Cost: \$35 per person or \$250 per table sponsorship
Contact: **Linda O'Grady**
1 (808) 285-8591
linda@siriuseventplanning.com



Libertarian Party of Hawaii March General Membership Meeting

A Report by Tracy Ryan

The Libertarian Party of Hawaii held a general party meeting on March 16 in the Art Gallery room of the Unitarian Church at 2500 Pali Highway. The theme was 'who should the LP nominate for president at our upcoming national convention'. Several party members spoke on behalf of various candidates.

Ken Schoolland spoke first on behalf of candidate R. Lee Wrights. Ken has known Mr. Wrights, hosting him while he was in Honolulu last year to speak at our convention. Ken addressed Mr. Wright's deep and principled convictions on core libertarian issues from drug policy, to spending, to use of the military. Many of you will remember Mr. Wrights from the 2011 convention and will know what Ken was talking about. Ken's main point was that we would be best nominating core libertarians rather than more moderate candidates so that our message would have the greatest clarity. Ken also praised Ron Paul and recounted his experience during the 1988 election when Mr. Paul and Mr. Russell Means were the two leading candidates for the LP nomination.

Ken was followed by Vice Chair Tracy Ryan who noted that she had agreed to substitute for the person originally scheduled to speak on behalf of Gary Johnson. Ms. Ryan noted the argument over nominating more libertarian purist candidates versus those who might have more appeal to voters due to their moderation had been going on for a long time. She added that it makes a difference if a person is moderate based on moderate principals rather than simply moderate to pander to voters. Not everyone in the LP scores 100/100 on the Nolan quiz. She noted that in the last two presidential years the party had gone in opposite directions. In 2004 they nominated political unknown Michael Badnarik over two persons with money and national name recognition. Badnarik was simply a great spokesperson for libertarian ideals. In 2008 the party chose former Republican Congressman Bob Barr a true national figure whose libertarianism seemed newly minted. Neither made an enormous impression in terms of votes earned.

By special invitation Matt Bowler talked about his work for the Ron Paul campaign. Much of his discussion involved where things were headed with the Paul campaign and how the Paul people could ultimately be incorporated in a movement towards libertarianism.

Several of the lesser known libertarian candidates were praised by speakers for their dedication to principal and hard work in the party. Daniel DeGracia talked about candidate R. J. Harris, a man known to him personally. Danny pointed out Mr. Harris has actively and recently served in combat. This gives him a perspective and a stature that should mean something with voters. Mr. Harris is a confirmed libertarian who will end all foreign aid, audit the Federal Reserve system and oppose deficit spending and raising the debt limit.

Larry Fenton talked about James Ogle, a man not well known to the party, but someone Larry knew in California. Larry first met Mr. Ogle at a time when Ogle was literally a walking billboard for legalizing marijuana. Mr. Ogle's sense of whimsy and dedication to principal immediately appeals to people. One of his interesting ideas is to reconstruct the US government based on a parliamentary model, which he believes would better serve democracy and possibly include more input from small political parties.

Henry Panalal talked about Roger Gary. Reading extensively from Mr. Gary's website, Henry showed Gary to be a solid mainstream libertarian with many good ideas. Gary is a promoter of school vouchers to bring market place ideas into the educational system. He makes the arguments common to our party about the national debt, cutting spending, etc. Henry repeatedly made the point of how good Mr. Gary was in espousing libertarianism.

Party Chair Jim Henshaw talked about candidate Bill Still. Jim investigated Mr. Still's campaign on request and was speaking as an informant without advocacy. Jim took the time to call Mr. Still and speak to him for over twenty minutes about issues and how he would do on the Nolan chart. He was not a 100/100 guy and maybe more of a social conservative than some of the other candidates. Candidate Still is focused on simply reducing government wherever possible with an emphasis on monetary reform and national sovereignty.

Tracy Ryan spoke again, this time about candidate Jim Burns. Mr. Burns seems to be a voluminous writer with over 38,000 words on various topics on his website. Tracy knew this because Burns had kindly given a word count for all of his web topics and an approximate reading time for each. Burns scores points for his length of service in the party having joined in his native Nevada in 1973. During the 1970's he was frequently an LP candidate and very active in his state. Tracy noted he put a good deal of blame on the too close relationship between the banking industry and the government for much of the recent economic crises. She also noted that Mr. Burns included a quote from UH professor R.J. Rummel on his site – the keynote speaker for our LPH convention a few years ago.

Chair Henshaw stepped up and talked about the last candidate, Mr. Carl Person. He had called Mr. Person and spoken to him at length about the Nolan quiz and other topics. He noted that the first thing candidate Person said was that if elected he would create 20 million new jobs. Person had many answers to the nation's problems, but those seeking the how's and why's may want to follow up.

The meeting wound up with an open discussion that aimed to get feedback from the attendees on how the delegates should proceed in Las Vegas. The people who had come as advocates reinforced their reasons why the candidate they had spoken for should be the nominee. Others pointed out the need to see how the candidates would really proceed as president on issues such as the debt, reining in the military industrial complex, and with drug policy. Who would be the candidate that would make the most impact on the public if nominated was an issue raised as well.

A decision on when to plan our Hawaii Libertarian Party convention was not made. The options are to do it around the beginning of July as a follow up to our national convention and before the candidate filing deadline in Hawaii or to wait until early September after the GOP has its national convention to see if we can get Ron Paul people more involved in the LP.

Call for Volunteers

If you are an Oahu resident and member of the Libertarian Party I'd like to know if you'd be interested in volunteering at an upcoming outreach booth. The dates are Friday the April 27th through Sunday the 29th. This is good experience for party members who want to help us grow. The event is at Neal Blaisdell Center. Please contact me for specifics.

Tracy Ryan
1 (808) 534-1846
tracyar@hawaiiantel.net

Reason Foundation Poll Finds a Majority of Americans Oppose the Afford Health Care Act

By Dr. Adrian Moore

Dealing with health insurance is a real hassle. I am lucky my wife is the one in our house who gets on the phone to fight with them when something is billed incorrectly. We use an HSA, and I am glad to have some control over what health care insurance options I have. So I am not excited about the individual mandate in Obamacare that the Supreme Court is reviewing this week.

And I am obviously not alone. A new Reason-Rupe poll of 1,200 adults finds 62% of Americans believe it is unconstitutional for Congress to mandate the purchase of health insurance, while 30% think requiring health insurance is constitutional. We will soon find out if the Supreme Court Justices agree.

One of the arguments used in the case is that if Congress has the power to require individuals to buy health care insurance, it may also mandate that Americans buy broccoli. The poll finds 87% of Americans believe Congress does not have the power to require the purchase of broccoli, while 8% say Congress can force you to buy vegetables.

Some other nuggets from the poll (see all the poll results [here](#)):

- 54% think the health care law will result in the rationing of health care services.
- Half have an unfavorable view of the health care law, while 32% have a favorable view of it.
- 49% say the law should be repealed and 36% would let it stand.
- 23% trust the government to address their health care needs, while 50% trust health insurance companies and 84% trust their doctors.

Some reforms the poll finds that the American public would support:

- Over two-thirds, 69 percent, would like to be able to shop for health insurance in the same way they shop for auto insurance.
- 48 percent of Americans would prefer to receive the money their employers spend on health care as part of their paycheck and then shop for their own health care plans. 41% would like to continue to get insurance through their employer.
- If they were allowed to shop for health care plans across state lines, 43 percent of Americans say insurance premiums would go down and 23 percent believe they'd go up.

Interestingly, 67% of Americans say that public sector workers have better health care benefits than private sector workers, 22% say the benefits are about the same, and 4% say private sector workers get better benefits than government workers.

All of this suggests that Congress should go back to the drawing board on health care reform. They will have little choice if the Supreme Court rules against the individual mandate at the heart of Obamacare. Of course, the Supreme Court's decision does not rest on what the public wants, but on the Constitution. Reason is one party in a "friend of the Court" brief that is part of the case, which lays out the earlier court decisions relating to the power of Congress to mandate something like health insurance. You can see the Brief [here](#).

Dr. Adrian Moore (661)477-3107
Vice President, Reason Foundation
Follow me on Twitter @reasonpolicy

U.S. Internal Checkpoints a Failure

Summary by Patrick Adams

A recent government report concluded that internal border patrol checkpoints are ineffective. Checkpoints at the actual border always work better. Here is my summary of that report.

“The federal role is to detect and apprehend 30% of major illegal activity [at the border].”

--Richard Stana, General Accountability Office

A recent government report entitled **Border Patrol** (<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09824.pdf>) seems to suggest that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is not as intent on securing our borders because of other priorities. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) states that the goal of DHS is to apprehend just 30% of illegal aliens at the border. The report states, “...the DHS Annual Performance Report for fiscal years 2008-2010 sets a goal for detecting and apprehending about 30 percent of major illegal activity at ports of entry in 2009, indicating that 70 percent of criminals and contraband may pass through the ports and continue on interstates and major roads to the interior of the United States.” GAO spokesman Richard Stana states that this is necessary so as not to interfere with commerce and traffic. He states in a GAO presentation, ***“The federal role is to detect and apprehend 30% of major illegal activity [at the border].”***



This 30% DHS goal is announced in the context of an increasing number of Border Patrol agents: “As of June 2009, the Border Patrol had 19,354 agents nationwide, an increase of 57 percent since September 2006. Of these agents, about 88 percent (17,011) were located in the nine Border Patrol sectors along the southwest border. About 4 percent of the Border Patrol’s agents in these sectors were assigned to [internal non-border] traffic checkpoints, according to the Border Patrol.”

The GAO report discusses the plans of DHS to create a permanent, internal non-border checkpoint in the Tucson Arizona sector, but the Border Patrol’s own statistics show that internal non-border checkpoints are ineffective compared to actual border checkpoints. There were 704,000 interdictions at actual border crossings in 2008; however, there were only 17,000 interdictions at internal non-border checkpoints. This 17,000 figure represents 2.4% of interdictions, but it took 4% of agents to accomplish this goal.

The figures for the Tucson Arizona sector are more dismal than national figures. Actual border interdictions numbered 320,000, but internal non-border checkpoint interdictions numbered 1,800. This means the number of interdictions per agent at the actual border was 116, but the number of interdictions per agent at internal non-border checkpoints was only 8.

The problem is further compounded because Border Patrol statistics are glaringly inaccurate: “Our analysis showed that the actual checkpoint performance results were incorrectly reported for two of the three measures in fiscal year 2007 and for one measure in fiscal year 2008. As a result, the Border Patrol incorrectly reported that it met its checkpoint performance targets for these two measures.”

The DHS proposal for a permanent, internal non-border checkpoint would seem to defy common sense. Illegal aliens and smugglers simply circumvent permanent checkpoints by taking another route. No criminal is going to “check-in” at a post that is staffed 24 hours a day, 7 days per week. Citizens have expressed concern regarding this illegal alien circumvention because “...checkpoint operations cause illegal aliens and smugglers to attempt to circumvent the checkpoint—resulting in adverse impacts to nearby residents and communities, such as private property damage, theft, and littering. These concerns were cited most often by ranchers and residents in areas around checkpoints.”

Border Patrol agents at the actual border also have much more authority than Border Patrol agents at internal non-border checkpoints: “Border Patrol agents at [actual border] checkpoints have legal authority that agents do not have when patrolling areas away from the border.”

The permanent, internal non-border checkpoint proposed for the Tucson Arizona sector has an estimated price tag of 25-40 million dollars. This is hardly money well spent, considering Border Patrol’s own statistics suggesting internal checkpoints do not work.

This all leads back to the statement made by government spokesman Richard Stana, which is “**The federal role is to detect and apprehend 30% of major illegal activity [at the border].**” It seems that number could be greatly increased if Border Patrol agents were not wasted at internal checkpoints that don’t work.

The Border Patrol needs to get back to the no nonsense patrolling of our borders. The question is why this is not being done.

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09824.pdf>

Report number 09-824, August 2009

Update on Sex Trafficking Bills in the State Legislature

By Tracy Ryan

Three of the several bills entered into the 2012 session by anti-trafficking advocates remain alive. The three all have passed the Senate and await a hearing in the house Judiciary committee before Chair Gilbert Keith-Agaran. Although some interesting elements exist within these bills none of them deserve passage in their current form. The greatest concerns surround SB 2123 which now includes fines of up to \$1000 per day for various entities such as clinics, hospitals, farms, and on and on, who do not put up an anti-trafficking hotline poster. It also includes forfeiture of vehicles for johns and fines directed presumably to support the non-profit groups that are pushing the bill. This bill should be opposed.

SB2576 continues without suggested amendments that would allow transgendered persons to clear their convictions. As written it is discriminatory. Advocates for the bill have insisted it remain so asking that only persons who claim status as a trafficking victim be allowed to clear their convictions for prostitution. This will encourage false statements of victimization that anti-trafficking advocates seem happy to hear. *Aside from my testimony LBGT advocates have yet to oppose the discriminatory elements in this bill. A bill that automatically voided all such convictions after a certain time period would make much more sense.*

SB2579 is a long and complicated attempt to set up services for child trafficking victims. The problem is in the central role anti-trafficking advocates will be allowed to play in organizing and directing funding to programs. Those of us who have had the misfortune to work with these folks would not recommend this process in the least. More discussion on whether there is any trafficking problem in Hawaii that needs more attention should be had by experienced professional people from within the harm reduction and law enforcement communities before the legislature gifts anti-trafficking groups with new powers and funds. I am trying to set up a useful conversation between harm reductionists and law enforcement so that these issues will not continue to be so poorly addressed.

What is Libertarianism and Austrian Economics?

By Jim Henshaw

On March 22nd, the Young Americans for Liberty (www.yaliberty.org) held a meeting on the topic "What is Libertarianism and Austrian Economics?" at UH Manoa, presented by members of the LPH. Perhaps 40-50 people, primarily college age, attended.

Ken Schoolland started off by showing a clip called "The Philosophy of Liberty" explaining the concepts of self-ownership and non-aggression (www.isil.org/resources/philosophy-of-liberty-english.swf), and then a hilarious economics rap video comparing Keynesian versus Hayekian economics called "Fight of the Century: Keynes vs. Hayek Round Two" (www.youtube.com/watch?v=GTQnarzmTOc&feature=fvwrel).

Jim Henshaw gave a brief intro to what the LP and libertarianism is about, and why liberty-minded people will likely find the LP a better fit instead of the two major parties.

Tracy Ryan gave a much longer talk about how economics works, including some common fallacies about monopolies and how these actually work, or more commonly break apart due to market forces and competition.

A Q&A discussion ensued, with the audience peppering Ken, Tracy, and Jim with questions, some skeptical and some for clarification, about these topics.

Recommended Links:

[Advocates for Self-Government](#)

[Antiwar](#)

[Cato Institute](#)

[Federalist Society](#)

[Freeman Online](#)

[Friedrich Hayek](#)

[Grassroot Institute of Hawaii](#)

[Institute for Justice](#)

[John Locke](#)

[Jonathan Gullible - Ken Schoolland](#)

[Lew Rockwell](#)

[Libertarian Party of America](#)

[Libertarian Party of Hawaii - Discuss](#)

[Milton Friedman](#)

[Murray Rothbard](#)

[Smart Business Hawaii](#)

[Walter E. Williams](#)

[American Civil Liberties Union of Hawaii](#)

[Ayn Rand](#)

[David D. Friedman](#)

[Freedom Library](#)

[Foolish Things Salon](#)

[Future of Freedom Foundation](#)

[Independent Institute](#)

[International Society for Individual Liberty](#)

[John Stossel](#)

[Law Enforcement Against Prohibition](#)

[Libertarian Anarchism – Roderick T. Long](#)

[Libertarian Party of Hawaii](#)

[Libertarianism Liberty Unbound](#)

[Mises Institute](#)

[Reason](#)

[Tibor Machan Tom Mullen](#)

[Young Americans for Liberty](#)



We invite you to join

The Libertarian Party

Believing in and understanding of the pledge is central to Libertarianism.
You may join by signing below:

"I certify that I oppose the initiation of force to achieve political or social goals."

Signature Date

Salutation: Mr. MissMrs.Ms.Dr.

First Name: * _____

Last Name: * _____

Address: * _____

Apt./Suite No.: _____

City: * _____

State: * _____

Zip Code: * _____

Phone: _____

Email: * _____

**Membership in the national Libertarian Party:
\$25 per year**

Make check out to: **Libertarian National Committee**

Mail form & check to: 2600 Virginia Avenue, NW
Suite 200
Washington, DC 20037

Or click: www.lp.org/membership

Your dues includes: **The quarterly LPNews newspaper
The Monday email bulletin**

**Membership in the Libertarian Party of Hawaii:
\$20 per year**

Make check out to: **Libertarian Party of Hawaii**

Mail form & check to: 713 Ulumaika Street
Honolulu, HI 96816

Or click: www.LibertarianPartyofHawaii.org/membership

Your dues includes: **The monthly Libertarian Hawaii News**

Contributions welcome.

Federal law requires political committees to report the name, address, and occupation and employer for each individual whose contributions aggregate in excess of \$200 in a calendar year.
Political contributions are not tax-deductible.

Employer: _____

Occupation: _____

* By checking this box I acknowledge that contributions from corporations and foreign nationals are prohibited (Permanent legal residents of the U.S., i.e., "green card" holders, are not considered foreign nationals).
I also acknowledge that this contribution is made from a personal account for which I have the legal obligation to pay, and is not made by a corporate or business entity.