
Libertarian Presidential Candidates

Posted by Ken Kaplan - 2008/01/04 02:26

I'm not happy with the field of announced candidates. I know some would like Dr. Paul to run as our candidate if he doesn't get the Republican nomination. If he doesn't run, however, we need a dynamic candidate, and perhaps a draft movement if that candidate does not step forward on his own. Any suggestions?

=====

Re:Libertarian Presidential Candidates

Posted by Libertarian Joseph - 2008/01/23 22:09

True. George Phillies is kind of dorky (no offense), I don't think he will be doing a whole lot if he wins the nomination lol. We need a strong Libertarian.

=====

Re:Libertarian Presidential Candidates

Posted by Kevin Ferrizzi - 2008/03/30 00:39

After watching the candidates debate at the annual convention, I have to say that Phillies did a lot better than I thought he would. I think the most charismatic of the candidates were Root, Imperato, and Smith. I think Root is our best chance at getting the message out in this election.

=====

Re:Libertarian Presidential Candidates

Posted by Ken Kaplan - 2008/03/30 13:41

Having attended the debate, I feel a lot better about our prospects. We do have dynamic candidates! I was most impressed with Smith and Root. Phillies, who I think is very well organized, and did a lot of behind the scenes work to bring some organization to a very disorganized Badnarik campaign in 2004, is getting better and better at public speaking. The mild mannered professor takes it up a notch in front of an audience. Still, I think our dream ticket would be Smith and Root, with either one at the top of the ticket. I had questions for both of them and have exchanged emails with both since the convention. They were both responsive. I have no idea if either would accept the second spot on the ticket. I am really conflicted as to which one I think would make the stronger candidate for President, but I could support either one enthusiastically.

=====

Re:Libertarian Presidential Candidates

Posted by big eddie - 2008/05/26 16:20

I watched the convention and i was not very impressed with what i saw.I saw a confused and chaotic mess.If they cannot run their own convention how could they ever run our country? I watched as a back room deal was made to nominate a ticket.No difference from the major parties. The lp was smashed against the rocks of republican light.Two ex gopers who were light weights at best.The lp has now become rl, republican light.There is no lp. I see no reason to support two gop lightweights. Many of the delegates felt the same way by not voting in the last ballot.May the lp rest in peace.

=====

Re:Libertarian Presidential Candidates

Posted by Kevin Ferrizzi - 2008/05/27 21:34

I think the convention was a resounding success. For once, the Libertarian Party looked like the real deal (sort of) What back room deal? The entire thing was played out on national tv by a camera crew that was sneaking up on people as they were talking in small groups! And as for GOP lite, in case you haven't noticed the majority of us are ex-Republicans who have since re educated ourselves to the true meaning of freedom and liberty. It's the naysayers and conspiracy theorists that are holding this party down, not neo-cons in hiding or whatever. I've never been a big fan of Mr. Barr, but I

am all for any candidate that can bring exposure and money to the Libertarian Party. We can no longer be happy with being a private intellectual debating society. At some point we have to face political reality and choose to take steps forward. I am happy we have finally turned that corner.

=====

Re:Libertarian Presidential Candidates

Posted by Ken Kaplan - 2008/05/27 22:25

Big Eddie, your take on the convention is all wet. There was no back room deal. Any analyst would have predicted the final result. Root was closer ideologically to Barr than to Ruwart, so that once Root was eliminated it was obvious that more of his supporters would gravitate to Barr than to Ruwart, regardless of Root's endorsement. And here is a little LP history for you. Back in 1984, Earl Ravenal, the "pragmatist" candidate, was beaten by David Bergland, the "pure" libertarian. The Ravenal supporters left the party. It took us until now to recover. I am a pure libertarian who does not intend to do similar damage to our cause. I may not be thrilled with Barr, but I am giving him the benefit of the doubt. He could lose my support, but I am hopeful that he will, instead, solidify my support by saying and doing the right things from here on.

I certainly do not regard this as the death of the LP. The so-called pragmatists won this round. The so-called purists may win the next. We must continue to work together.

=====

Re:Libertarian Presidential Candidates

Posted by Ken Kaplan - 2008/05/27 22:42

Kevin, the key to the growth of the LP is not attracting more disaffected Republicans, but exciting disaffected Democrats and Independents. Frankly, nominating re-educated Republicans, middle aged white men, who project conservatism even when they speak libertarianism, is not the best way to do that.

=====

Re:Libertarian Presidential Candidates

Posted by Kevin Ferrizzi - 2008/05/31 23:06

I agree with you on both counts, Ken. I am just tired of hearing people who see negativity in even the slightest hint of success in this party. You have been around alot longer than I, and I have a feeling that such discourse is not new. My main point is that all of a sudden when I talk to people about who they will get their vote for President, and mention Bob Barr, some people have actually heard of him. They don't know what he stands for, but then again most of them have no idea what the people they usually vote for stand for either. Any media is good media when nobody knows who you are, right?

=====

Re:Libertarian Presidential Candidates

Posted by big eddie - 2008/09/16 18:32

When barr was a republican he spoke and voted as a republican,now he is a candadate for the lp and he talks and acts like an lper should. If he wanted to be the green party candadate he would tell them what they wanted to hear.Name a party and he will tell them what they want to hear.He doesnot convince me concerning his sincerity.I donot need the lp national committee to tell me how to vote.I will make up my own mind.Iam leaning toward chuck baldwin, he is not perfect but at least he doesnot change his mind depending upon who he is talking to.

=====

Re:Libertarian Presidential Candidates

Posted by Jay Edgar - 2008/09/16 23:19

Baldwin and the constitution party do not respect individual rights. They want to control what people do in the privacy of their own bedrooms. They want to ban pornography and have a problem with gambling. I could never support any

candidate that wants to control the activities between consenting adults.

I agree with you about Barr, although he would never fit into the Green party. Despite Barr's flaws and past transgressions he is still the best candidate on the ballot.

Re:Libertarian Presidential Candidates

Posted by big eddie - 2008/09/21 23:53

I cannot see how barr is the best candadate at all. He isnot even close to being the best.I find it interesting you sight behaviors that tend to enslave people as freedoms.Freedoms can never enslave people the way these obsessions do.

Re:Libertarian Presidential Candidates

Posted by Kevin Ferrizzi - 2008/09/22 13:09

He is the best candidate because he has the most name recognition. He has actual legislative experience. He dresses well, speaks well, and is confident in his abilities. He may not be the perfect libertarian, but he is a damn fine candidate. He also has no illusions about his chances of being elected and has told me personally that his candidacy must serve to increase the visibilty and popularity of the Libertarian Party to effect future elections.

Re:Libertarian Presidential Candidates

Posted by big eddie - 2008/09/24 23:52

I see that Ron Paul doesnot agree with you about Barr.He has endorsed Chuck Baldwin for president.RP agrees with his strist policy on immigration.I guess RP is not really a libertarian.

Re:Libertarian Presidential Candidates

Posted by Jay Edgar - 2008/09/25 09:34

Barr and Paul positions on immigration are EXACTLY the same. See Barr on Immigration.

I can't understand Paul's support of Baldwin. From what I can tell of Baldwin he does not embrace (or at least ignores) some of the distasteful parts of the Constitution Party platform. It is very easy to find parts of the CP platform that most freedom loving people would object to. Its much harder to find statements from Baldwin that I would disagree with.

I agree with much of Paul on immigration. Ron Paul has no problem with immigrants, and neither do I. I want to see the problem of illegal immigration ended by setting realistic immigration numbers. We need to secure our borders and have a handle on who is coming across. Our current policy of closed borders with a welfare state that encourages illegal immigration works against that.

Early this year Ron Paul stated: There was an immigration bill that had a fence (requirement) in it, but it was to attack amnesty. I don't like amnesty. So I voted for that bill, but I didn't like the fence. I don't think the fence can solve a problem. I find it rather offensive.

...
Be charitable, but have no mandates by the federal government. Catholics want to help a lot of these people. I'm not for (punishing anyone who wants to help voluntarily). But we wouldn't have so many (illegals) if they didn't know they were going to get amnesty. If you promise them amnesty -- medical care, free education, automatic citizenship, food stamps, and Social Security -- you're going to get more (illegal immigration). I think we could be much more generous with our immigration. (But) we don't need to reward people who get in front of the line.