



Leadership Convention—November 8, 2008

November 8, 2008 is the date set for our annual meeting and Leadership Convention. This is when we will elect a Leader, Deputy Leader and Executive to run the Party for the next three years. All members who have signed the statement, "I support the principles of the Libertarian Party," may run for any of these positions, nominate another member, and vote for nominees. They may also vote on amendments to the Constitution and By-laws. Proposed amendments to the Statement of Principles and the Constitution were documented in the summer issue of *Bulletin*.

Our first speaker is Ms. Guadalupe Rongifo, Directress of "Discovering Minds" Montessori Preschool at 74 Bathurst Street in downtown Toronto. Her preschool was one of 15 daycares written up in the Toronto Star on September 1, 2007 for being "below standards." In the article, Alirio Rongifo claimed that "(Ministry inspectors) come here and because a child was running around, they say the child wasn't supervised. They pick on for-profit daycares. Ninety-nine per cent is not true."

Ms. Rongifo points out that Montessori schools, unlike most daycares, teach children to be responsible for their actions. This may account for the apparent lack of supervision observed by the inspectors. The Ministry of Children and Youth Services has applied seven terms and conditions on their licence, in effect assuming responsibility that would normally belong to the parents. Ms. Rongifo will describe her encounters with government bureaucracy.

Our second speaker is Glenn Fox, a Professor at the University of Guelph and Graduate Coordinator in the Department of Food, Agricultural and Resource Economics. For most of his students, Professor Fox's classes are their first exposure to libertarian ideas and concepts. He has been helping his students to understand the value of free markets and individual liberty for some time. Typically it takes two years before they "get it."

Professor Fox feels that political Libertarians tend to focus on the harm caused by government interference, a negative message. While the utilitarian message of the prosperity and abundance that would result from liberty is positive, Glenn believes we also need to emphasize the morality of voluntary action versus the immorality of coercion by the state. How can we persuade voters that society won't fall to pieces if we transfer responsibility for clean air, clean water, education and health care from

Libertarian Events

October 8, 7:00 PM - **Toronto Pub Night**, Fionn Mac-Cools, (at the back of the restaurant) 21 St. Clair Ave. W., 416-925-7827. For more information phone Jim McIntosh at 416-283-7589. (2nd Wednesday of each month)

October 21, 6:30 PM - **Barrie Pub Night**, Molly's Restaurant, 4171 Innisfil Beach Rd, Thornton, 705-458-2932. For more information call Paolo Fabrizio at 647-300-8555. (2nd Tuesday of each month)

November 1, 3:00 PM - **Ottawa Pub Afternoon** - South Side Bar and Grill, 1670 Heron Road, (Heron Gate Mall) Phone 613-526-2192. For more information contact Andrew Philips (613-733-8948). (1st Saturday of every 2nd month)

November 8 - 9:00 AM - 4:00 PM, **Ontario Libertarian Party Leadership Convention**, Wyndham Garden Hotel (formerly Ramada Don Valley), 185 Yorkland Blvd. in Toronto (Hwy 401 & 404). \$50 before October 31, 2008; \$60 after —Call the Party for details.

November 22, 9:00 AM—4:00 PM **Kitchener-Waterloo Liberty Seminar**, University of Waterloo. Watch for details at www.liberalstudies.ca.

government to the free market? Professor Fox will give us his insights on these ideas.

Registration Fee is \$50 if paid before October 31, 2008, or \$60 after that. This includes a buffet lunch. Since this is a business meeting, the entire fee is treated as a donation to the party and eligible for a political tax credit of up to 75%. Everyone is welcome to attend.

Libertarian Kittens: A McCain campaign event goes awry—By George Dance

One fine summer day in 2008, a John McCain campaign staffer is walking to work, when he sees a little girl standing in the front yard of her home, with a large box and a sign which crudely spells out "Free." Intrigued, he approaches the girl and asks her:

"Hello, little girl. What's in the box?"

"Kittens," she answers.

"Oh?" He peeks into the box. "What kind of kittens are they?"

"Republican kittens."

(Continued on page 2)

Musings On Libertarian Fallacies—By Sam Apfelbaum

The libertarian cause is a great one, and there is no doubt we would have a world transformed with freedom, harmony and abundance if libertarian ideas were prevalent. That extraordinary vision has inspired me to devote a great deal of time and energy to lead our party since 1996. In support of that cause, conclusions drawn from general observation and experience over time impel me to provide a brief discourse here about what I regard as libertarian fallacies. Adherence to any of these has resulted and will continue to result in libertarian supporters and activists traveling unavailing paths.

Fallacy 1: We need only elect our first member of parliament and more will follow.

This puts the cart before the horse. An avowed libertarian cannot be elected today because libertarian ideas are only fully understood and accepted by a tiny number of people. The vast preponderance of people are accepting of the primacy, necessity and prestige of the state. The only possible change within that context is in the matter of the personnel in charge of the state. It is incumbent upon us to do whatever we can to bring the institution of the state into disrepute and eliminate the deference which it receives. That is the fundamental task at hand. When we have been successful, the context will have changed and those holding clear libertarian views will be elected with ease, whether from within or without our own political organization.

Fallacy 2: We must compromise our libertarian ideas to win elections.

This thinking makes politics rather than underlying ideas a primary. The electors are not interested in compromised libertarians. The reality of democratic politics is that to win you have to at least pretend to reflect as closely as possible what most people happen to believe at the moment. Most of the small number of people who have spent any time at all considering the matter of the legitimacy of the state hold statist views and our state dominated culture compels the ones who have given it no thought whatsoever to follow along by default as supporters of the state. I have always believed our primary role as a political party should be educational and that we must clearly delineate our ideas. Doing this within the structure of a political party has been useful for four reasons. Firstly, our funding receives favourable income tax treatment through political tax credits. Secondly, we get easy media publicity and other attention during election campaigns, helping to get the word out. Thirdly, an election gives us a common project to work on together and enhances team spirit. Fourthly, operating as a political party gives us credibility and recruitment possibilities

we might not otherwise have in a society in which people are conditioned to look to politics to effect change.

Fallacy 3: Libertarianism is rational, so we are bound to win.

This defies experience by assuming some sort of prevalence of rational big picture thinking. Save for some brief enlightened moments, it seems that irrationality and illogic have dominated the course of history. The norm for human societies has always been a power elite, their courtiers and favourites, ruling over and living at the expense of a broad mass of people who either voluntarily or resignedly allow themselves to be ruled. True liberty is an historical aberration. This does not mean that we should not strive to create something greater and more noble than has previously existed. We can simply recognize that the odds are not favourable and not allow ourselves to be discouraged by unlikely expectations. Expect little and hope for the best.

Fallacy 4: Once people understand the ideas, they will welcome libertarianism.

This ignores the fact that the livelihoods, welfare and future of so many people are linked to the state in countless ways. We have state created jobs and perquisites for officials and bureaucrats, state funding for and contracts with favoured businesses, organizations and occupations, state subsidies, privileges, monopolies and dispensations, state financial support and welfare programs for individuals, in short an enormous establishment of individual interests with financial incentive to resist change. The less the dependency on the state, the more likely acceptance of libertarianism, but the state extends its grasp by the day and there is little that remains untouched.

Fallacy 5: Libertarians can predict economic outcomes.

Libertarians make the same mistake here made by state planners, which is to believe that their exceptional systemic knowledge and understanding provides the ability to predict economic outcomes. Libertarians may be more on track than state planners, but there are countless variables of which they have no knowledge. It is surprising to see so many prominent libertarians attempting prediction of economic outcomes in light of their assertion that state planning fails because the planners never have all the information available to individual decision makers planning for their own lives and welfare in a free market. Libertarian seers are subject to the same limitation. Libertarians lose credibility and set back the cause when their predictions are wrong. State planners merely move on to the next bungled project.

(Continued from page 1)

The staffer is so amused by that answer, that he pats the girl on the head and walks off without speaking. At work, he tells everyone he meets about the little girl and her "Republican kittens." Everyone agrees that it's a cute story, and goes off to relate it in turn. Finally it reaches the ears of Steve Schmidt, McCain's new campaign manager,

who rushes in to tell his candidate about a great idea for a photo-op ...

The next day, the little girl is back in the yard with her box and sign; but this time the rest of the street is lined with reporters and cameramen. Suddenly a three-car motorcade pulls up, and John McCain himself emerges from

(Continued on page 3)

Chairman's Report—By George Dance

I hope you are as pleased as I am by our Convention plans. I look forward to seeing you at Toronto's Wyndham Garden on November 8, as we celebrate our present, honour our past, and plan for our future.

We will honour our past by awarding the Marilee Haylock Award posthumously to Vincent Miller. The Haylock is awarded at each convention "for long-term commitment to the Ontario Libertarian Party and the cause of freedom."

Vince, who passed away in July, was a founding member of our party. During the 1970s he served in several executive positions, including a brief stint as Chairman. In 1980 he founded Libertarian International, a worldwide libertarian network, which he ran until his death.

Under Vince's leadership, LI grew to become the International Society for Individual Liberty (<http://isil.org>), which works for a free society in 90 countries. ISIL has become the home for key pieces of the liberty movement: the 1960s-era Society for Individual Liberty, online network free-market.net, and most recently Laissez Faire Books. It holds a successful annual World Conference, twice in Canada (in 1996 in Vancouver, and in 2000 in London).

We will plan for our future by deciding on the crucial changes to our constitution and statement of principles presented in our last issue. The most controversial, which I authored, is a proposal to drop the membership oath ("I support the principles of the Libertarian Party") as a requirement of membership.

My argument is that our membership criteria should be in line with our membership goals. We seek to become a larger, more effective party; we do that by attracting the 15-20% of Ontarians who are basically libertarian in their thinking. Growing the party means building a coalition of everyone traveling the road to liberty, irrespective of how far they want to proceed on it.

That's the "big tent" argument. Against it is the "purist" argument, that admitting less-than-100% libertarians as members could pave the way to a takeover by complete non-libertarians, and the end of the LP as a libertarian party. I have tried to respect that concern by not only retaining, but strengthening, the oath for Party Officers, Ethics Committee members, and candidates.

Whether we opt for a "big tent" or a "purist" approach will drastically determine our prospects for the future. I hope you can come out on November 8 and help us to reach the right decision.

the middle car. McCain swaggers over to the girl, and asks her in his heartiest voice.

"Hello, little girl. What's in the box?"

"Kittens."

"Oh?" McCain asks in mock surprise, "and what kind of kittens are they?"

"Libertarian kittens."

Federal Election—October 14, 2008

The Conservatives passed a law setting the date of the next election as October 19, 2009. Maybe Harper decided to break his own law because he thinks the economy may deteriorate before then.

The following are the potential Libertarian candidates in Ontario. If there is one in your riding, give him or her a call and offer to help.

Federal Riding	Candidate (? = unconfirmed)
Ajax--Pickering	Stephanie Wilson?
Barrie	Paolo Fabrizio (647) 300-8555
Brampton West	Peter Radzio (905) 216-4051
Carleton--Mississippi Mills	Rob Alexander (613) 265-4479
Don Valley West	Soumen Deb? (416) 835-9664
Eglinton--Lawrence	Tom Gelmon? (416) 283-7589
Etobicoke--Lakeshore	Andrew Hawkins
Guelph	Philip Bender (519) 833-1001
Hamilton Centre	Anthony Giles (905) 691-0818
Kitchener--Waterloo	Jason Cousineau (519) 894-4202
Markham--Unionville	Allen Small (905) 477-4357
Ottawa South	Jean-Serge Brisson (613) 443-1964
Ottawa--Vanier	Jeffrey Cribbett? (519) 835-9431
Pickering--Scarborough East	Josh Insang (905) 665-9899
Scarborough--Rouge River	Alan Mercer (416) 629-0764
St. Paul's	John Kittredge (416) 421-2903
Stormont--Dundas--South Glengarry	Ben Cummins? (613) 652-6260
Toronto--Danforth	Mark Scott (416) 469-0999
Trinity--Spadina	Chester Brown? (416) 214-1550
Whitby--Oshawa	Marty Gobin (905) 665-8499
Willowdale	Paul Barnes? (416) 305-6453

Why I'm Leaving the Libertarian Party—By Larry Stevens

I joined the Ontario Libertarian Party and the Libertarian Party of Canada a couple of years ago and have since donated to both parties and written several articles for this newsletter. I also ran as a candidate for the Ontario Libertarian Party in last fall's provincial election on a platform of no government rather than limited government. I've now decided to end my membership in both parties and would like to explain to those I know within the parties why I'm doing so.

The most basic principle of Libertarianism is the principle of non-aggression. This is principle 3 of the Libertarian Party's Statement of Principles, which says in part: "it is essential that no individual or group initiate the use of force". On the other hand, the basic characteristic of government is that it is the only group that can legitimately initiate force. This means that by definition the very existence of a government violates the most basic principle of Libertarianism. Yet, principles 4 and 5 of the Libertarian Party's SoP indicate that there is a role for government, namely the provision of protective services. I have never believed in these two principles, nor will I continue to support them.

Many people, including most Libertarian Party members, view, former US presidential candidate, Ron Paul as

a Libertarian. The least that can be said is that his principles appear to be very similar to the Libertarian Party's SoP. Here is a well-known, long-term congressman, who collected more campaign contributions in one day than anyone else in history. Yet, not only will he not be elected president, he didn't even come close to being nominated. Given that Ron Paul did so poorly, it follows that the Libertarian Party has absolutely no chance of effecting change through the electoral process. Thus, even if the Libertarian Party principles could be changed (an unlikely possibility at best) it follows that the very approach taken by the Libertarian Party is untenable.

Given these reasons, it is time for me to move on – to investigate other alternatives. What are these alternatives? I'm currently looking into a couple of possibilities, namely Free Domain Radio and Agorism. I am interested in hearing about other viable alternatives if anyone knows of any. I am also interested in keeping in touch with anyone who feels as I do and would like to accompany me on this journey – this quest for freedom if not for ourselves at least for our children or grandchildren. You can contact me at larry.stevens.libertarian@gmail.com.

Why Larry Should Stay in the Libertarian Party—By Jim McIntosh

I really appreciate hearing from Larry why he is leaving the Libertarian Party. Many times a member will simply stop supporting the Party without any explanation. His departure will be a big disappointment. Both Parties will miss his support. We hope he will continue to write articles for *Bulletin*.

The Party is probably taking a risk publishing Larry's resignation. It could cause others to remove their support as well, so I feel obliged to make an appeal to Larry to reconsider his decision.

Larry is an anarchist, someone who believes that all government and laws should be abolished. Most anarchists believe that if you give government an inch, it will take a mile and will inevitably evolve into the coercive state we have now. However, I would contend that if government no longer used the school system to indoctrinate citizens, most would know that government is the greatest threat to our freedom. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." (Wendell Phillips, 1811-1884)

John Hospers has a chapter in his book, *Libertarianism*, titled "Is Government Necessary?" He describes how a civil society might function without any government. Science fiction writer, L. Neil Smith describes an anarchist version of the USA in a parallel universe in his book, *The Probability Broach*. Both provide strong arguments for doing away with government altogether.

Larry and other anarchists disagree with our Statement of Principle that says the legitimate functions of government are the police and national defense to protect the citizens from those who would use force against us, and

the courts to resolve disputes between individuals. Larry believes this violates the fundamental principle of non-aggression stated in principle 3. But if the police are limited to protecting our life, liberty and property from those who would use force or fraud against us, and if the National Defense is limited to protecting us from foreign invaders, how is this a violation of the of the non-aggression principle? And if the courts are only used as a last resort when private arbitration has failed, it is likely that eventually they will not be required. I don't perceive any contradiction in the Statement of Principles.

The challenge is how to get to anarchism, or even a libertarian society? Think tanks like the Fraser Institute, the Canadian Constitution Foundation, Cato, Foundation for Economic Education and the Mackinac Center are all making valiant efforts to move us in the right direction. I support several of these.

The alternative to political evolution is revolution, possibly as described by Taylor Caldwell in *The Devils Advocate*. Since revolution is unlikely, it is folly to abandon the political process. To get to anarchism in a peaceful way, it seems logical that we will first evolve to a libertarian society. Libertarian candidates serve to build a critical mass of libertarians and educate voters. As more voters support the Libertarian Parties, coercive laws will be repealed. As voters see less government doesn't lead to chaos, they will support more freedom and choice. When we get to a libertarian society, then we can decide if the government really needs to provide courts, police and national defense.