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# LDP Voter Demographics

The LDP apparently has little up to date information on the demographics of our voters. Over the last 18 months we have been promised, in group emails, results of studies and research into this:

* “Development of a concise and targeted policy grouping and narrative in preparation for the 2022 State election campaign”,
* “You may has seen in my previous National President’s emails we have commissioned three projects that will be completed and released by 31st December 2020. Two of these projects [target demographics and policies] go directly to the nub of your question.”
* “The main focus of operations before the Xmas break is the completion of the **marketing strategy** to be launched in January 2021”

In fairness to the National President, it is extremely expensive to research demographics / psychographics of our target voter (T.D.). Assuming he/she makes up 16% of the population, then for every 16 neo-libertarians polled and asked questions about their lifestyles, beliefs, and what angers them, 100 people have to be interviewed to find them. Considering professional market researchers consider no accurate understanding of the public mood can be ascertained with less than two thousand responses, the cost to the LDP to undertake 12,500 interviews (100/16\*2000) would be prohibitive.

However, as unscientific as it may be, there are two other ways to best ascertain our target demographic:

### Where our members enrolled

What we can go on are statistics released at the 2014 Party Conference in Sydney relating to the success rates of membership drives at the various events throughout the country representing different public interests, where representatives of the LDP attended and had a stand. Of all new memberships apparently half came from the application form on the website, while the remainder though events. These were:

 **2014 2013 Average**

**Motorcycle shows                               15.6% 20.2% 17.9%**

**Custom car shows                               14.4% 18.5% 16.45%**

**Guns and hunting shows                    11.3% 8.4% 9.85%**

**Marijuana legalisation events           6.0% 10.0% 8%**

**Gay and Lesbian events                      2.2% 1.74% 1.97%**

**Internet censorship events                0.5% 0.7% 0.6%**

**4WDs 5.7% 5.7%**

**Sexpo 8.6% 8.6%**

### Demographic, Not (LibNots)

##### Other than those who abhor us.

As every member of the LDP would vouch, there are more than one of our policies that find it easy to induce antagonism, if not an hysterical response, from occasional members of the community we may happen to converse with.

We must remember that libertarianism is more a philosophy that is:

* anti-identity politics
* anti-18C
* anti-government media
* pro capitalism
* pro ‘right to bear arms’
* associated more with philosophers of “that great Satan”, the United States, rather than the postmodern ones of France.

Bearing that in mind it would be reasonable to assume that our T.D. **excludes** those we may call the LibNots, being the following:

* Inner city residents
* White collar public servants
* Liberal Arts graduates
* Legal fraternity
* Advertising / media / public relations / theatrical or visual arts employees.

### Best Estimation

Thus the best estimate, on limited research facilities, would be that those more susceptible to our principles and policies are:

* **Predominately male**
* **Below average age**
* **STEM graduates**
* **Small business owners**
* **Blue collar independent contractors**
* **Includes, but not limited to:**
	+ **So called ‘revheads’**
	+ **Serious motorcyclists**
	+ **Hunters and shooters.**

### Libertarian policies probably appealing to all our Target Demographic (TD)

* Freedom of speech
* Abolition of identity politics such as:
	+ Affirmation action programs
	+ Grants and public bodies that orientate towards a person’s race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, etc
	+ Identity taken into account in criminal proceedings and sentencing.
* Abolition of (taxpayer) foreign aid
* Immigration
	+ Immigrants paying a tariff to enter the country
	+ Abolition of welfare for *new* immigrants.
* School vouchers
* Business owners’ right to choose whether to allow smoking
* Loosen liquor licensing.
* Voluntary Euthanasia
* Liberal approach to:
	+ speed limits
	+ seat belts
	+ motorcycle & bicycle helmets
	+ alternative of fines or points for breaching traffic laws.

### Libertarian policies that would be appreciated by some and probably tolerated by remaining segments of our TD

* Liberal approach to:
	+ guns
	+ national parks.
* Abolition of :
	+ alcohol excise
	+ tobacco excise
	+ minimum wage, such as casual / weekend minimum pay awards.
* Personal autonomy:
	+ Child surrogacy for payment
	+ Organ trade (selling a kidney).
* Remove regulation on licensing and certification for certain occupations.

### Non libertarian policies that would probably appeal to our TD

* The Rule of Law
	+ Onus always on the prosecutor / plaintiff to prove a wrong
	+ Abolition of confiscation of property *because* it was used in a crime
	+ Abolition of Govt power to grant immunity *before* a possible crime.
* Family Court
	+ Re-criminalisation of perjury
	+ Custody decisions taken out of hands of the judiciary
	+ Except inheritance, communal property is *only* that property acquired during the marriage.
* In criminal trials, costs awarded to the defendant if found not guilty.
* Option for vehicle insurance to follow the driver.

# LDP Strategy

## Attracting, rather than repelling, our TD

After espousing policies that reflect our fundamental Classic Liberal philosophy, to be part of the national political discussion we also have to maintain some policies on issues that do not derive from a fundamental philosophical base. It enhances our reputation to have a “no comment” on as few issues as possible.

### Exercising Discipline

However, in undertaking that, as much as there may be the temptation to self-indulge in advocating all our pet causes that we have supported since high school, or being seduced to embrace by some smooth talking pied piper on TV, discipline must be practiced so as not to choose policies which in probability would alienate our target demographic.

In short, advocating policies that would especially appeal to the LibNots could well be an own goal with respect to our own TD.

##### Issues such as:

* Re criminal law, policies that give preference to the accused over the victim
* Re identity politics
* Re the Economy, policies that ultimately cause more govt debt.
	+ - [*all of which should be removed*, *but not necessarily replaced with anything*]

### Right to Silence

This is a con, a misnomer. Under existing law no person accused of a crime can be put on the rack and forced to speak. ‘[Right to Silence’](http://www.lawreform.org.au/Procedural/criminal/silence/silence.html) is a euphemism to describe the opposition to possible new laws, such as introduced this century in the UK, where if a suspect keeps quiet when first questioned about a crime, but six months later at his trial suddenly introduces new exculpating evidence, such as an alibi, then the prosecution is allowed to inform the jury that this is the first time he has declared it.

### Mandatory Sentencing

Mandatory sentencing is and has been, a common practice in many Western countries including the UK, Australia and the United States. Mandatory sentencing is the people, through their democratic representatives, declaring what punishment a convicted felon should receive. The alternative is a judge, answerable to no one, declaring he thinks differently. Whereas the jury is still out on M.S.’s virtue, there is no absolute reason why it is fundamentally wrong.

### Double Jeopardy

<https://www.autrefoisacquit.info>

<https://www.doublejeopardyreform.org/>

In a nutshell, double jeopardy treats the criminal law like a game, where if an accused can duck and dive his way through a trial so as to be acquitted, then he can never be tried again for the same crime, no matter what new forensic evidence, miscarriages of justice offences, or judicial errors of judgement come to light.

Technically, the law was “reformed” in Australian states from 2006, but the restrictions on a repeat trial are so tight with the new legislation, that in the fifteen years since then, there has not been one single repeat prosecution of the over 6,000 acquittals in criminal trials at higher courts. see [Getting a retrial](https://www.doublejeopardyreform.org/problems__with_d_j_.html).

### Gay Marriage

The battle is won and the war is over. When asked, we declare we are proud to have supported it, but otherwise we remove it from the website and forget the issue.

### Stolen Generations

This is most surprising that the LDP should accept the concept of “Stolen Generations”, considering all the debate about its authenticity that has been carried on over the last decades. The concept first got media attention from the so called “Bringing Them Home” government inquiry of 1995 established by then Labor Attorney-General Michael Lavarch. Many criticisms were made of the inquiry including the fact that witnesses giving firsthand experience of what allegedly happened were **not allowed to be cross examined.** Critics ofthe report included two Ministers of Aboriginal Affairs, Peter Howson and John Herron, Australian anthropologist Dr Ron Brunton, and then Prime Minister John Howard, who refused to countenance an apology. The strongest argument against this alleged theft is that about a decade ago Andrew Bolt threw down the (never accepted) challenge for anyone to present the names of at least 10 Aborigines and prove that they were taken from their parents for no legitimate reason.

‘The Moral Reason Why We Should Reject the Term Stolen Generation’, Andrew Bolt, *Herald Sun,* 1/3/2001.

‘There’s no excuse for an apology’, Frank Devine, *The Australian*, 7/6/2001.

‘The truth about the “Stolen Generation”’, Peter Howson, *The Age*, 14/4/2000.

‘Rabbit-Proof Fence grossly inaccurate, says Keith Windschuttle’, Lanai Vasek, *The Australian*, 14/12/2009.

“Former governor-general Bill Hayden…said the stolen generations report was based on faulty memory syndrome, lacked investigative rigor and maligned decent Australians.” – ‘Hayden draws fire’, Kerry Taylor, *The Age*, 13/10/2000.

### Capital Punishment

Not only do 50% of voters support it, not only are practically all other parties opposed to it, but there is good reason to believe our TD is specifically within that 50% who support it. And for the record, even though the Libertarian Party (United States) opposes the death penalty, that does not speak for libertarians in general. “The issue of capital punishment divides libertarians just as it does other Americans”- www.libertarianism.org/topics/capital-punishment. For further details please see [Appendix](#_Appendix__)

### Causing Greater Public Debt

Decreasing or eliminating excise duty on alcohol, fuel and tobacco are good ideas, but they must be mentioned **together with** cost savings from other areas. For example, abolition of grants or foreign aid. To advocate them on their own simply looks like a cheap populist ploy to get people to vote for you without caring about where the money will now come from.

##

## Fortune Favours the Brave

### W.A. Election Result

The results of the recent 13th March state election were rather sobering for the Liberal Democrats. In neither house of parliament did a candidate win a seat, but bearing in mind our competitors for the non-socialist vote, the absolute debacle of the Liberal Party, it was disheartening to note the average Liberal Democrat vote was barely more than half a percent. If hypothetically, instead of the Labor Mark McGowan being the super popular leader it had been the Liberal Zak Kirkup, then one might have expected a lower LDP vote as we would expect many right and centre-right voters being drawn to the popular conservative, but what was especially galling about the result was that, as much as the bizarre Kirkup was about as popular as the Bubonic Plague, the many traditional right and centre-right voters he repelled still didn’t end up in the arms of the LDP. In the Legislative Council tally there were still **twelve political parties** who accrued more primary votes than us.

Bearing in mind: that the LDP team leader Aaron Stonehouse displayed a very impressive, eloquent presence in the WA Parliament, and has also cultivated a significant media footprint (go to his Facebook page and note 30 instances of him discussing an issue in media interviews just up to one year ago) ; that there have been no scandals or embarrassing situations associated with the LDP in the state; that there has been a very impressive turnout of enthusiastic supporters, all having paid for and wearing the party T-shirts and caps, and displaying a multitude of corflute signs; one is left with the only apparent cause for failure: policy.

No, not our fundamental libertarian philosophy we have on our website, but the policies we publicly advocate in our campaigning.

### Grasping for too much

#### Less than 20%

In the 2019 LDP Strategy Review, one smart question on the form for all members wishing an input was what should be our target percentage of the vote at upcoming elections. Whereas one might at first thought be tempted to give the answer of 51%, the obvious correct response was the minimum percentage needed in upper house elections, the only place we currently have a realistic chance of winning seats, which was around 15% (although NSW, 5% and SA, 8%), known as a quota.

#### All things to all men, not!

Thus we do not have to be stepping on egg shells in choosing the policies we campaign with. If polling suggests 70% of respondents disagree with what we advocate that is still **not** a problem. Anyone who doubts that should look at the history of the Greens since first elected to Parliament in 1996.

#### Following the Liberals over the cliff

“Trying to be different from state Labor governments is not something Liberal oppositions tend to do these days – and the results of this approach speak for themselves.” John Roskam 26/2/2021

The Liberals might possibly tolerate modest change, but are deeply worried about creating controversy, scaring the horses and getting bad press from the ABC, Channel 10 etc., possibly threatening that 51% polling they need to win power.  Over the last decade in state elections their policy has been to be seen as the sensible, middle ground, conservative alternative and to abide by the adage ‘Oppositions don’t win elections, governments lose them’. As bad as that is proving to be for them in Qld, Vic, and WA, to at least try that policy you first have to be a major party with a visible presence in public consciousness. It is extremely unproductive to be a micro party few people have heard of offering anodyne ‘motherhood’ policies that fewer people will remember. Such being:

The LDP will:

* WA website:
	+ Get Western Australians back to Work
	+ Respond to COVID-19 with Compassion and a Focus on Wellbeing.
	+ Help with Cost of Living.
	+ Create Safer Communities and a Stronger Society.
	+ Hold the Government to Account.
* Interview on Sky News
	+ "The solution to declining education standards is more money for teachers.”
* Election Posters & Facebook ads
	+ Build a highway to Freemantle
	+ Make power bills cheaper: our plan to help ease the cost of living
	+ More police on the beat
* Facebook comment
	+ A $300 ‘baby bundle’ for children born after 1/7/2021
		- -This being both a metaphorical and literal ‘motherhood’ policy.

### Faint Heart Never Won Fair Lady

“But Nick Greiner [Liberal NSW leader 1988] knew something that Zak Kirkup didn’t – to be a person of character, and to stick to your principles is an attractive trait in anyone, *whatever your political stripe*.” [emphasis added] Mark Imisides, Spectator, 1/3/2021

 Thus, unlike major parties, especially the Liberals, the LDP in campaigning can afford to be bold and speak truth to power. (After all, it is not as though we are advocating the right to bear grenade launchers or stinger missiles; travelling at 200 kph in built up areas; sex with children; selling heroin in schoolyard playgrounds, or the reintroduction of the crime of vagrancy-jailing people arrested in public areas *because* they are poor.)

Being realistic, we are only after a minority of voters, and thus we are not forced to stray far from our core philosophical base, or even other non-philosophical policies significant segments of the population desire, but where the Liberals fear to tread.

When we propose a novel and “risky” policy advocating individual rights not taught in sociology courses around the country, we have no reason to fear Age or SMH newspaper editorials and segments on the ABC’s 7.30 Report solely dedicated to it. If a clear majority of Australians disapprove it is not a problem while there is still a quota who look upon us favourably.

## Opportunities,

### Cheaper Advertising

With the major parties having to appeal to 51% of the voters, their target demographic is extremely broader than ours and thus advertising would be in the more expensive higher circulation / viewership press and TV.

Ours, on the other hand, would be in the cheaper, more esoteric market, specifically chosen to match our target demographic (T.D.)

#### Broadcast

* Sky News
	+ not only possessing the highest concentration of our T.D., but significantly lower viewership than free-to-air, and thus lower charges.

#### Print Magazines

* Australian Shooter
* Sporting Shooter
* Australian Hunter
* Jeep Action
* Road Rider
* Australian Muscle Car
* Musclemania
* Survivor Car Australia
* Inside Small Business
* MyBusiness
* What Tradies Want
* Inside Retail Magazine
* Coast to Coast Business & Property Advertiser
* Ragtrader
* Building Contractor Magazine
* Appliance Retailer

### Building Bridges with Organisations which are Critical of Existing Family Law and Possibly Sympathetic to our Policies

* Adoptee Rights Australia
* Adoption Change
* Australia’s Right to Know
* Australian Brotherhood of Fathers
* Australian Family Association
* Australian Men’s Rights
* Australians Against The Family Law Courts
* Child Support Australia
* Eeny Meeny Miney Mo Foundation (Eli a member)
* Family Provision Reform
* Fathers for Equality
* Fathers for Justice
* Justice for Children
* Lone Fathers Association Australia
* Men’s Resources Tasmania
* Men’s Rights Agency
* National Fatherhood Initiative
* Non-Custodial Parents Party
* Single Parenting is Killing our Kids
* Surrogacy Australia
* Surrogacy Reform

### Getting Media Oxygen

#### An interesting media guest

Commercial media talk shows invite guests to come on and be interviewed or otherwise become part of a panel. They do this most times because they assume the guest will be somewhat thought provoking and thus keep the listener / viewer interested.

A political party that chooses its policies from the polls, and always subscribes to middle-of-the-road talking points is, by definition, not going to be as interesting as one that is prepared to go out on a limb for the sake of important ideological issues.

#### Friendly Media

That we do not get full coverage across most of the media is not that much of a problem as majority support from the public is not what we are currently after, but merely seats in as many Australian parliaments as possible.

For instance, bearing in mind the left-wing demographic who currently watch Australian government radio and TV, it would be a waste of time to bother to appear there if invited.

Target rich shows would be conservative radio hosts such as Ray Hadley and particularly the hosts on the Sky News Channel, such as Andrew Bolt, Paul Murray, Peta Credlin, Chris Kenny and Allan Jones, especially now that it can be acquired free to air in rural areas.

That the listeners and viewers of these shows may be described as Coalition voters is even better as the highly pragmatic policies of the Coalition over the last few years has made many erstwhile voters disenchanted with it and looking for a more ideological alternative.

## Appendix -- Capital Punishment

#### What most Australians believe

<https://www.sbs.com.au/news/poll-shows-death-penalty-support>

<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-02-05/triple-j-partly-to-blame-for-bali-nine-execution-campaigner-says/6072966>

<http://www.roymorgan.com/findings/finding-3944-201302270426>

Traditionally the narrative is that when some truly appalling crime happens with single or multiple deaths, the heat of the moment causes the general public to clamour for the death penalty. However, after a period of time, when a fair number of stories have been done about the prisoner or prisoners sitting on death row, and we find out one becomes a born-again Christian while the other an adequate fine arts painter displaying his angst on canvass, the public generally soften a bit with regards to their attitude to capital punishment. However this is not necessarily the case.

In 2015 an ongoing news item in Australia was the scheduled execution of two Australians in Indonesia found guilty of drug smuggling. At the time, a poll undertaken by Roy Morgan Research indicated that “52 per cent of people agreed that Australians convicted of drug trafficking in another country and sentenced to death should be executed.” And the two unfortunate criminals, Andrew Chan and Myuran Sukumaran, had not even spilled anyone’s blood. If the majority of Australians believe smugglers, who aren’t necessarily even dealers, deserve death, what does it say for cold blooded murderers or terrorist bombers?

In 2005 a Roy Morgan Research poll on Australians also revealed:

* 52% thought the execution that year for Australian Van Nguyen for drug smuggling should have been carried out
* 77% thought Amrozi, if found guilty of the Bali bombing, should be executed
* 77% thought Saddam Hussein should be executed
* 61% thought Australians convicted of trafficking drugs in a country where the sentence is death should be executed.

It is hard to ascertain how many Australians, on responding to these polls, would adopt a pedantic pose, and view the question through the rule of law aspect, to wit: not whether the felons deserved death for what they did, but whether the courts of those democracies had the right to pass on them that sentence that existed under their jurisdiction. Nevertheless, it might be fair to say that approximately half of Australians still believe in the death penalty, even if for only the more serious cases such as high level drug trafficking, terrorist acts or aggravated or multiple murder.

#### And might they be in our Target Demographic?

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Concealed_carry_in_the_United_States>

<https://deathpenaltyinfo.org/state-and-federal-info/state-by-state>

An interesting aspect of the Roy Morgan research is that they attached some demographics to those Australians supporting the death penalty. By far the most interesting statistic was that it was 33% of Greens voters, 32% above expectations. But after that, 48% of Labor voters were in favour, as well as 69% of the Coalition. Also, men exceeded women by 6% and rural respondents were 9% higher than metropolitan, and finally New South Wales was the state with the lowest percentage at 48%, while Western Australia came in at number one, above territories and other states, with 67%.

In looking for more demographic data, an indication of the degree of gun ownership rights in the United States is whether a state tolerates carrying a concealed weapon, manifested by so called CCW permits. In 40 states the permits are either not needed to carry, or they are guaranteed to be issued, subject to specified health and criminal record checks. Considering 70% of those states also maintain the death penalty, 18% above the average, it might be reasonable to conclude that there is a correlation in voter attitudes between gun rights and capital punishment.

#### And is C.P. abolition a fundamental libertarian issue?

<http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/view.asp?article=17331>

It would be futile to debate the pros and cons of capital punishment here, but what is highly relevant is whether abolition is a libertarian issue, in which case it should obviously be supported.

The most common arguments against C.P. are: “pretty barbaric” (then PM Tony Abbot); it is the hallmark of an uncivilised society (erstwhile Senator Gary Humphries); there is a sanctity in human life which must be respected (The Australian); it is statuary murder (Alan Jones, Bob Carr, Greens MP Colleen Hartland); the state can’t guarantee innocents won’t be killed; it will become a slippery slope; it is not the role of government to decide life and death; everyone has an inalienable right to life.

Whatever the strengths of these arguments, the only ones needing to be addressed from the classic liberal perspective would appear to be the last two; should we give government the power to kill, and do we have an inalienable right to life?

##### Is it the role of government to decide life and death?

This type of argument historically has had a lot of legitimacy.

* Is it the role of government to come into our bedroom and regulate who we sleep with?
* Is it the role of government to come into our kitchen and regulate our diet?
* Is it the role of government to regulate what we read or watch on TV?
* Is it the role of government to regulate what our children learn in school?
* Is it the role of that angry mob to lynch that person who appears to have committed murder?

However, in every one of the above examples, the implication is that it is the wrong party taking upon itself the responsibility to perform the specified task, instead of the more authorised party: in the last case a court of law following due process, and the rest, the individuals themselves exercising their own sovereignty.

But when you imply that party X should not be allowed to perform a certain task, while declaring there are no other parties to consider, it just seems a cheap semantic trick to get around being up front and declaring that it is the task itself that is wrong rather than who does it.

##### An inalienable right to life

So does this concept come from anywhere or have people just made it up to defend their abolitionist stance?

In fact it comes from at least two sources: Article 3 of the 1948 United Nations’ *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, “Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.”, and the American *Declaration of Independence*, "[we]…are endowed with certain unalienable rights…[such as] …life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness…".

Both these documents declare the right to life, but what should not be overlooked is that they also declare the right to liberty. So, if allegedly our right to life can never be removed by the state, then does it not follow that our right to liberty is also inalienable? In which case how would the state punish criminals without incarcerating them: arrange a two-hour intervention with family and friends after every conviction of rape or murder? Fathers of Classic Liberalism from the Enlightenment, John Locke and John Stuart Mill, both supported the death penalty, and their attitude to civil rights was simply that citizens possess them, but only while their behaviour remains civil, and beyond that they forfeit them to the degree they violate the rights of others.

##### An odd quirk within our policies

It is interesting to note that current LDP policies, as of March 2021, advocate neither mercenary organ trading nor capital punishment. So in a hypothetical situation where a woman was dying from kidney failure, LDP policy would prevent her from buying a kidney when none was donated, thus causing her to eventually die. And continuing the hypothetical, if a month later her daughter was raped and murdered, the LDP would do all it could to save the life of the felon if the death penalty was the legal sentence for his crime.

#### So where from here?

As C.P. does not appear to violate our libertarian principles, the ideal situation would be to become the only party to gain the respect of approximately half of the voters, by biting the bullet and embracing it into our declared policies. A lot of members over the years have put both time and money into campaigning. The governing body of the LDP owes it to them to make our policies, while never violating libertarian philosophy, as target orientated as feasible. Self-indulgence in policy choice irrespective of how it would affect voter popularity would be a betrayal to those members.

However, the problem with that is that many members, especially LDP office holders, would still feel quite uncomfortable about endorsing C.P., something they have always opposed, which might then lead to some discord within the party.

#### Compromise Solution

Remove C.P. as a policy and replace it with a promised referendum on the death penalty, to be guaranteed into law if passed. (save the technicalities that it has allegedly been made constitutionally illegal, etc, for another day).

 “The LDP declares that is it neither for nor against Capital Punishment, but it is definitely for democracy, and therefore we believe the Australian people themselves, state by state, should decide the issue.”

Well, we do believe in citizens’ initiated referenda and we have ‘democrats’ in our name.

LDP website at ‘Democracy’-- “The Liberal Democrats believes [C.I.R.] would introduce a new discipline on politicians and bureaucrats and allow greater democratic participation by the general public. As such, this policy promotes both liberty and democracy.”

Philip Lillingston

Melbourne

philip@lawreform.org.au