

Let Freedom Ring!

Volume 5 Number 6

Back Issues at <http://www.cmlc.org/cmlc/pubs.htm>

June 2003

Let Freedom Ring! LNC Activities, PVLA/WCLA Elections, Arizona LP Funding, Reach Out and Say Hi!....1 Letter: Recruiting....2, LPVA Chair and Vice Chair Resign....4, LPPA Considers By-Laws Changes....5, 2004 Petitioning, The Right to Be Disarmed is The Right to Be Enslaved, State-Chairs Echo List....6, Open Letter to Massachusetts Libertarians, Where Your Money Went....7, LNC Budget....8
Libertarian Strategy Gazette. Why I Ran....1 State Chairs Meet....1, James Gray on Party Strategy, This Time It Matters....2, Initiative and Referendum States....3

Let Freedom Ring!/Libertarian Strategy Gazette are edited and published by George Phillies, 87-6 Park Avenue, Worcester MA 01605, who is solely responsible for the contents, for the Pioneer Valley Libertarian Association (www.pvla.net) and others. Subscriptions are available from the PVLA, c/o Carol McMahon, 221 Bumstead Road, Monson MA for \$15/year to Activists, \$20/year to others. Checks payable "PVLA", please.

New LNC National Director UMP Payments Lag Further; Does LNC Abandon 'Issues' for 'Constituencies'?; LPUS Dues Increase Moved; LPNM Condemns Dues Hike

The Libertarian National Committee has a new National Director, Joe Seehusen, who apparently was to have begun work on May 27. National Chair Geoff Neale, in a letter circulated to the State Chairs email list, spoke highly of Seehusen's background and experience. Full details were not available at press time.

In a separate email to the lpus-misc list, California LNC member Joe Dehn said of the Executive Director hire "Maybe you [a fellow LNC member] think there really is no problem [with finances] because the new Executive Director, being hired without budget authorization, will just run out and raise enough money to pay for himself _and_ all the UMP backlog?"

Neale's May 18 letter opened, however, with the announcement that while most UMP payments to be made in May would be going out May 19th, the National Party "informed the Texas, Califor-
[LNC Funding] (Continued on page 3)

Arizona LP Funding Issues

A statement from Jason Auvenshine, Chairman of the Arizona Libertarian Party, on "Declare Your Independence with Ernest Hancock" 7am - 9am on AM1310, 4/28/03

There have been many responses to the East Valley Tribune story that came out on Friday concerning three Libertarian candidates accused of misusing so-called "clean elections" money. People have lamented the fact that under Arizona law political parties cannot control their candidates. All of that is quite true, but there is a little more to this story than just that. The officers of political parties are also selected via a derivative of the exact same primary election system used to select candidates, and this gives rise to some of the same problems illustrated by the situation discussed in Friday's Tribune.

Specifically, during the 2002 campaign season
[Arizona LP Statement] (Continued on page 2)

Watras Elected PVLA Chair; Phillies Elected WCLA Chair

At the PVLA's annual meeting, long-time PVLA activist Richard Watras of Easthampton, Massachusetts was elected Chair of the Pioneer Valley Libertarian Association. Watras succeeds 3-term PVLA Chair George Phillies, who nominated Watras for the post, saying 'as an officer, your most important challenge is the quality of your successor'. Last year Watras was campaign chair of Max Pappas's State Representative campaign. In a three-way race, Pappas finished second with a third of the vote.

In other elections, Carol McMahon of Monson was re-elected as Association Treasurer. Monson, who received her Bachelor's Degree in Accounting in May, is now preparing for her C.P.A. Professor George Phillies of Worcester, Massachusetts was elected Secretary. He continues to edit *Let Freedom Ring!*, adopted by the PVLA as its Association Newsletter.

In a more sparsely attended meeting, George Phillies was elected as Chair of the Worcester County Libertarian Association. Brad Ritchie of Worcester was elected Treasurer. Ritchie is considering running for state legislature next year.

"Reach Out and Say Hi!"

Libertarians of Western Massachusetts Prepare New Outreach Program

Central and Western Massachusetts Libertarians are preparing a new outreach program, intend to involve people more extensively in Party activities. "The idea is to inspire people in touch with the Libertarian Party to become more active in the Party, in whatever way they are comfortable with," said WCLA Chair George Phillies.

As a first step in the project the WCLA (an official LPMA affiliate) and Richard Watras's Easthampton Town Committee have requested from the State Party lists of people to contact: Current registered voters, current and past dues paying LPMA/LPUS members, and people who have contacted the Libertarian Party and asked for information. Requests were sent to State Party David Roscoe, who advised that he lacked registered voter lists and would ask the LPMA Executive Director for permission to supply the other material.

Letters

I think Charles Separk is right when he says that it is time for action. I admit, I am not sure what would increase recruitment. I think Charles Separk is correct in that there are "poe-tically homeless" out there that are right for recruitment. One problem with the politically homeless is that they cannot get long with one another. Fundamentalist Christians for example might not want to work with homosexuals. The incumbents are experts at the divide and conquer method.

Maybe we need to adapt the motto of the marines where we need a "few good men (or women)".

One problem we have is that very often members tend to leave the party when there is a disagreement, or they burn out. This problem even extends to the candidates themselves.

Charles Separk says that we do a good job attracting gun owners, anti tax people, and people who are against drug laws. I disagree. Most of the gun owners voted Democrat, Republican, or did not vote. The voting record of drug and marijuana users is even worse. Most of the people who voted for the repeal of the state income tax did not vote Libertarian, the only party that would abolish the tax. Most of the people complaining about the prescription tax probably voted for the legislators who passed it.

We spend a lot of effort preaching to the choir. When I look at full page ads in LP News, I ask myself why? If I want literature in Spanish to pass out on lower Carew Street I must print it and distribute it myself. I estimate I got about 45 write in votes, not bad considering the resources I was able to put into it. But In some legislative districts the effort spend on full page ads to preach to the choir might have generated more votes, publicity, and possibly members. Most of the major candidates come from a relatively high income bracket, and appear unable to effectively communicate with people in the working bracket. Those candidates who do get little support.

I got what may be news to some people in Wayland. Most people are not going to vote for a cataclysmic event that wipes out their source of income. Even if the end sounds good, they want to hear a migration plan. The harsh voting returns show that the voters made little if any connection between the parties and their platforms. Most of the people I know are too nice to point out people's faults. We needs to say, "that is the subhuman liar who voted to tax prescriptions," etc. etc.

We need to get the voters to vote on issues rather than family connections. Really the process is driven by who gets what contracts for government. It may be even worse the next time. As the economy worsens the Democrats will breeze into office with more gun control laws etc. Unfortunately those Libertarians who have the loudest voices are also those that are the least capable of communicating with the main stream. One problem is that many times the founders of a movement are good to start it but poorly suited to spread it. Henry Ford did not invent the automobile, but he put America on wheels. There were many superior models out there, and had their inventors controlled the market we would still be using horses.

Robert Joseph Underwood 83 Cherrelyn St. Springfield, MA

(Continued from page 1) [Arizona LP Statement]

four clean elections candidates, including the three candidates mentioned in the Tribune article, sent the Arizona Libertarian Party a total of \$6,000. The party added another \$4,000 of other party funds and sent the total of \$10,000 for voter registration services to the same Nevada firm mentioned in the article.

Why would the Libertarian Party accept "clean elections" money from candidates, even to pay for voter registration services, when the party has so clearly opposed the very existence of the so-called "clean elections" program in the past? The simple answer is that this was done solely because the former party chairman decided to do it. There was not a meeting of the Libertarian Party members, or even the party's board, where it was decided. There has been no change in the party's opposition to the Clean Elections program. The former party chairman did not run for re-election this year and is not on the Libertarian Party's current board.

There are two very important lessons to be learned from all of this. First: Both the officers of political parties and their candidates are selected according to a system that is dictated by the State of Arizona -- a system that insures a certain level of political acumen, but little else. Second: Public money programs like "Clean Elections" always act as a corrupting influence on anything they touch. They are poison, and the only way not to get sick is to stay away from them altogether. That is my personal policy.

The story of these candidates gets noticed, as well it should, primarily because Libertarians have always opposed programs that use money stolen from taxpayers to fund some politician's pet initiative. The ridiculously misnamed "Clean Elections" program is just such a government boondoggle, resulting in the exact opposite of its stated goals. That doesn't change simply because certain individuals, chosen under a state-dictated system

Show Your Liberty Spirit!

Become

your name@4liberty.net

Now \$17/month for Libertarians

http://excell.net/excellnet_national-dialups.htm

Dialup in most states and Canada.

Libertarian Owned Libertarian Operated

Supporters of the Pioneer Valley

Libertarian Association

(Continued from page 2) [Arizona LP Statement]

with the label "Libertarian", chose to accept some of the clean election funds. As the current chairman of the Arizona Libertarian Party, I reiterate the party's longstanding position that the so-called Clean Elections program should not exist. I call for the immediate and total repeal of the Clean Elections program, and pledge to work towards it with anyone who shares this goal, from any party. The Arizona Libertarian Party can be reached at: 4802 E. Ray Rd. #23-255 Phoenix, AZ 85044 (602) 248-8425 —End of Statement—

According to other statements reaching *Let Freedom Ring!* from LPAZ officers, the State Party sent \$10,000 to NVO, while the three Libertarian candidates who took State Elections money sent \$19,600 to the same place. The state Party organization is presently attempting to determine why the money was sent, what services were rendered by the recipients, and what was done with the money. The search is apparently complicated by the paucity of records turned over to the new State Committee by the old State Committee.

(Continued from page 1) [LNC Finances]

nia and Georgia state chairs that, seeing as they are receiving the three largest checks, and we're short of funds, efficiency directs that I defer their payment this month for possibly several days". Readers will recall that the payments to states other than Texas, California, and Georgia are being made two months late, and that payments to the final three states are more than two months late. Last month, only California received its payment more than two months late.

Neale continued by stating "...We have a fundraiser in the mail that we hope will raise significant funds - and this should not happen again."

The fundraising letter has been mailed. It announces that the Libertarian Party will no longer be a party of issues. According to the letter, "Issues can be *divisive*." An issue-based strategy, quoting Party marketing director Mark Schreiber, "...just doesn't work as a national strategy." Schreiber instead proposes "...a constituency based strategy." The proposed constituency is 'the Small Business Owner'. The intent is to "...develop brochures and mailings to target (small businessmen)...talking points and other outreach material to help our local parties..." The fundraising letter, signed by National Chair Geoff Neale himself, closes "Now that you know what the strategy is, it's time to unite behind it. Please give generously!"

It would be interesting to hear how we are to attract a constituency without promising them something, nationally, when that something would appear to be an issue and we have eschewed the use of issues.

The fundraising letter marks a significant departure from past Libertarian Party approaches. The National Committee just spent a year on a strategic plan making the war on drugs our signature issue. That signature *issue* is replaced by the Small Business *constituency*. The campaigns of Harry Browne and Carla Howell made eliminating the income tax a center-

piece—Howell's referendum got 45% of the vote. Tax cutting is an *issue*, no longer something on which we will campaign as a National Party. The Right to Keep and Bear Arms is an *issue*. But issues are *divisive*, so we're dropping RKBA, too. Actually, if you believe the letter, we're going to drop issue-based strategies completely in favor of a constituency strategy.

However, a letter from the National Party to the State Chairs list shows rather different plans for money raised from this fundraiser. "We have a fundraiser in the mail that we hope will raise significant funds - and this [Ed: late UMP Payments] should not happen again." That fundraiser is the one described above. If money from the fundraiser were going to be spent on the topics the fundraiser indicated, it would not help with UMP payments. There seems to be a disconnect here.

In other news, at the March LNC meeting, Mark Rutherford moved to increase National Membership dues to \$50. He apparently did this at the instruction and behest of his state's Party central committee. An amendment increases life membership dues. The motion was tabled to the next LNC meeting. The position of the other states in his region is unclear. The LNC is now raising money to perform a membership survey and other bits of fact collection.

On May 28, 2003, the Central Committee of the Libertarian Party of New Mexico passed a resolution opposing the dues increase. The resolution as received here read:

"WHEREAS there is a motion to increase national LP dues to \$50 on the table of the Libertarian National Committee; and

WHEREAS the Libertarian Party of New Mexico is a partner with the LNC in the Unified Membership Program; and

WHEREAS New Mexico has one of the lowest levels of per-capita income in the nation; and

WHEREAS an increase in membership dues would create a burden on LPNM by inhibiting renewals and new memberships; and

WHEREAS the LNC and Libertarian Party National Headquarters do not currently enjoy the confidence of the membership with regard to the responsible handling of dues monies;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED by the Central Committee of the Libertarian Party of New Mexico that LPNM opposes any dues increase at this time; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that upon passage of this resolution, the Secretary is directed to send copies of this resolution to each member of the Libertarian National Committee and the Chairman is directed to post this resolution to the State Chairs' list.

PASSED May 28, 2003

If you have an opinion on this matter, you might usefully contact your LNC representatives, whose names and addresses appear on occasion in LP News but are at <http://www.lp.org>.

Virginia Party Chair and Vice Chair Resign

Let Freedom Ring! has received the letters of resignation of Virginia State Chair Marianne Volpe and State Vice Chair Shelley Tamres. These letters, which have been widely circulated, are reproduced below. We contacted several other prominent Virginia LP members for comment. They either were unavailable or indicated that they are not involved in the situation.

Marianne Volpe wrote:

Dear Friends and Fellow Libertarians,

I am resigning today as Chairman of the Libertarian Party of Virginia. I do this under protest, however, because I do not believe the meeting of May 10, 2003 of some members of the LPVA State Central Committee was properly called and the motion submitted was not properly noticed to the members of the State Central Committee.

My Vice Chair, Shelley Tamres, has also resigned. See appended message.

We were a great team, and we agreed that we would resign together rather than try to continue in circumstances that are intolerable.

We have worked to advance the Libertarian Party of Virginia in its mission: to recruit, support and elect Libertarians to office. We only wanted what is best for the Party, but we cannot do that without the support of everyone presently on the State Central Committee.

Marianne Volpe

The forwarded message from Shelley Tamres read: "For those of you who have been trying to follow recent events on the State Central Committee (SCC), I cannot in good conscience agree that a valid SCC meeting was held on May 10 or that a valid motion was submitted to remove the Chairman, Ms. Marianne Volpe, from office. Therefore, I do not agree that I am now Chairman.

For those of you who have not been trying to follow things, it's time for you to do so.

The LPVA state party has been run by two individuals for twenty years: Marc Montoni and Jim Lark. While their efforts to create something from nothing over the years are to be applauded, their reluctance to relinquish control must be condemned. The state party cannot grow if it continues to be dominated by two individuals.

Marianne has been relentlessly attacked from the moment she decided to run for Chairman in 2002. These attacks have been motivated by personal dislike and a desire to retain control of the organization, not by policy differences. Other leaders

within the organization have agreed with me that the motivations are personal, but unfortunately they have only been willing to say so privately, not publicly.

Marianne has made mistakes, but none of them warrant her removal from office. Many accusations have been levied against her, but for the most part the accusers are themselves guilty of what they are accusing. Marianne has been accused of misusing our bank card by allowing use of it by an appointed committee head to purchase a computer. At the time, there were no written rules in our Bylaws even mentioning the bank card, much less defining restrictions on its use. However, the prior administration ignored the Bylaw requiring a second signature on checks for over \$500 by routinely splitting large payments into two or more checks. But it is Marianne who is being attacked when she did not even violate a written rule.

The original motion to remove the Chairman mentions the "purchase of capital goods over \$500" without SCC approval. I cannot find any mention in either the Constitution or Bylaws (either the current version or the version last May) of any such requirement. And our Bylaws **do** allow the heads of cost centers to expend the funds in their centers. The infamous "Bylaw 13" in the old Bylaws calls for approval of capital goods via the "Standard Budget Process". However, this is the first year that any Chairman has attempted to initiate a budget process. There wasn't one in place last year at the time of the computer purchase. And as Marianne has already pointed out, the computer purchase was listed in her Chairman's Report to the SCC.

Marianne has been blamed for falling membership numbers. Yet if you look at the numbers, Virginia's membership totals have exactly paralleled the rise and fall of National's totals for at least the past three years. And that includes the year we paid Marc Montoni to be our Executive Director. In other words, even a paid employee failed to change the pattern of our membership totals from what was happening nationally. So why blame Marianne?

And just what did we get for the money paid to Marc Montoni as Executive Director, and later for part-time clerical help while he was Chairman? Marianne has accomplished the work through volunteers. Yet no one seems to be giving her credit for this.

Marianne has been accused of causing "an unprecedented level of factionalism". However, the factionalism on the SCC predates Marianne's involvement on it. And it is the two-thirds of the SCC that refuse to work with her that are responsible for the current unprecedented level of factionalism, not Marianne.

Marianne fired Dave Briggman from his position of Communications Director for cause in January. The SCC reinstated him, citing that the Chairman had no authority to remove a committee head. I dare anyone to find one word in our Con-

stitution or Bylaws stating who does or does not have the authority to remove committee heads. And in the past it was always the Chairman's prerogative. But even if the SCC had a case, all that should have been done was to pass a resolution condemning the Chairman's action. Not reinstate a person who failed to take any steps whatever to replace a substantial amount of mischarged money belonging to LPVA. Mr. Briggman has yet to offer any proof substantiating any of his several contradictory stories about the money, nor to provide anything that could be verified by our Bank. And now we find that the computer purchased last year by Mr. Briggman with LPVA money is registered to someone in another state. Mr. Briggman is attempting to replace the LPVA computer with a substitute. I would very much like to know why.

I am also still awaiting a coherent explanation from current Secretary Charlotte Patrick as to why she tried to get our Bank to provide inquiry access to our bank account to Marc Montoni, who is not currently on the SCC. Her presentation of a Power of Attorney to the Bank, signed only by herself, upset the Bank Manager sufficiently that he contacted the Chairman with the information.

But most of all I would like to know why two-thirds of the SCC are spending their time and energy trying to remove the Chairman rather than seeking answers to the questions I have raised above. The same two-thirds of the SCC that voted to remove the Chairman apparently do not concern themselves with protecting the property of the LPVA.

Even if Marianne Volpe resigned, I would not accept the chairmanship at this point. (NOTE: I asked Marianne to refrain from resigning until after I issued this statement as I wanted to protest the May 10 meeting and actions taken there.) The current SCC has spent the past year "interpreting" the Bylaws in such a way as to deny that the Chairman has any powers whatsoever. They have even disputed what registered Parliamentarians have ruled to be correct (i.e., that the May 10 meeting could not be called without the Chairman's approval and that "written" notice of a motion to remove an officer must be mailed, not e-mailed). This is just what I need...a hostile committee, a whole bunch of responsibilities, and no power. Thanks, but NO THANKS. Why should any volunteer be expected to serve under such conditions? I'm not that crazy.

I have been extremely disappointed in the response of some of the membership thus far to the factionalism on the SCC. Most seem to want it to "go away" without wanting to know what it's about or whether anyone is right or wrong. The fact that the majority of those sitting on the SCC are against Marianne does NOT make them right. It is they who are failing in their fiduciary responsibilities to the LPVA, not Marianne.

Since the current state of affairs is obviously very unhealthy for this organization, I sounded out several SCC members about calling a Special Convention for the purpose of electing **all fifteen** voting members of the SCC. I thought this was the

fairest way of moving forward: allowing all sides to present their case to the membership and letting the membership decide. There was insufficient support for me to go forward with this motion.

I no longer take this organization seriously as a political party. The behavior of the current SCC and of various members for whom avoiding confrontation with friends is more important than doing what is right has led me to the conclusion that this is really a private club. Since I will no longer waste my time and energy working for such an organization, I resign from both of my State Committee positions, that of Vice Chairman and Ballot Access Coordinator, effective immediately.

Since the SCC believes it has removed the Chairman, this means they will have to call a Special Convention. I predict they will only place the election of a Chairman and Vice Chairman on the agenda. But this will not resolve the underlying problems. The Libertarian Party of Prince William County has called for the election of all positions on the SCC. This is what should happen if you truly wish to move forward.

If there are enough of you out there who really believe this should be a political party and not a private club, here's your chance. Attend the Special Convention. Learn as much as you can about what is going on between now and the Convention. And if enough of you care, a two-thirds vote on the Convention floor will enable you to override what the SCC sets as the agenda, and you may call for the election of the entire SCC.

I am requesting that the SCC publish this statement in the upcoming issue of Virginia Liberty. I am available for questions at 703-450-0218.

Best wishes,
Shelley Tamres

Pennsylvania Party Considers By-Laws Changes

...from our Pennsylvania Correspondent

As membership in and support for the LP at the national level as declined over the past three years, individuals from the LPHQ staff to the LNC to local activists have attempted to diagnose the causes; many of them have suggested remedies - some designed to make party membership attractive to more people. One of the most persistent, of course, is the proposal to eliminate the membership pledge, which requires members to disavow the initiation of force or fraud. The debate on that has raged on and off for a number of years.

At the recently concluded Pennsylvania LP convention, several proposals were made to open the party's leadership positions to individuals registered to other political parties. The first of two changes to the LPP's constitution would have allowed delegates at the annual convention to certify as delegates individuals registered with political parties other than the LP.

The second change would have allowed the LPP's board of di-

Let Freedom Ring!

rectors (BoD) to decide if members of the BoD itself and members of the LPP's judicial committee could be voters registered with any political party. Rather than immediately "cease" to be a member of the BoD or judicial committee, the only consequence would be to "notify" the BoD, no time frame specified.

The language of the proposed change was not more specific than that. Was the proposed change to be ad hoc or a blanket invitation to Democrats, Republicans, Socialists and others?

One proposed change to the bylaws would have given the LPP chairperson "the power to appoint an Executive Director." Not only would the rest of the LPP's officers or BoD have any say in this selection, under the proposed changes to the LPP constitution, the ED might also be registered with a political party other than the LP.

Another bylaws change would have given the BoD "sole power to select" a contact person for an "unrecognized county," that is, a county without an LP organization with a voting rep on the BoD. Grassroots activism this was not.

One of the two proposed changes to convention rules would have made formal the long-standing practice of including NOTA - None of the Above - as an option on every ballot. But the second change, which was listed separately in the convention book, would have rendered NOTA totally impotent. Assume three hugely unpopular candidates for a party office, who receive 100, 90 and 80 votes respectively, for a total of 270 votes. NOTA receives 297 votes. As now practiced, all three of the candidates would be ineligible for that office when nominations were reopened. According to the second proposal, however, the NOTA votes would have to be divided by the number of candidates. Hence, though NOTA had received 297 votes, the least unpopular candidate, at 100 votes, would have beaten the apportioned NOTA vote, 100 to 99.

Another bylaws change would have allowed the BoD to select "proxy" candidates whose names would go on LPP nominating petitions, in the event the ballot access petitioning period started prior to the LPP's annual convention. This proposal was the result of a bruising fight within the LPP BoD in 2000, in which two individuals who were candidates for office wanted their names on the petitions prior to the nominating convention. (Past practice had been that the "proxy" candidates were those who had disavowed candidacy, thereby retaining the BoD's neutrality toward potential candidates prior to the convention.)

All of these proposals were set aside. In the course of approving the agenda, and with the LPP chairman overruled on appeal, all discussion and voting on all the proposed changes was prohibited. Why? The LPP requires that all proposed changes to its constitution, bylaws and rules be submitted to the party secretary no later than 30 days prior to the convention. The practice has been that all proposed changes are then sent to all members in the final party newsletter prior to the convention. In some instances, fairly lively debate online precedes the convention.

That, however, is not what happened this year. Only two

newsletters were delivered all year; only the final issue prior to the convention included a schedule of speakers and other events.. As a result, most delegates did not have a chance to see the proposed changes until after they arrived at the convention; some arrived after the business session started.

Petitioning for 2004

Richard Winger writes: Since the November 2002 election, it appears that only 38,000 signatures have been gathered, on various Libertarian Party ballot access petitions for 2004. It's been almost 7 months since the Nov. 2002 election.

Four years ago, in the period from November 1998 to late May 1999, we had collected 113,000. If we are to have the same ballot access in 2004 that we had in 2000 (which includes full party status in Alabama, New Hampshire, Ohio and Oklahoma) we have at least 400,000 raw signatures to go. If we don't pick up the pace (6,000 signatures per month), we're obviously going to have lots of states with no Libertarians on the ballot in 2004.

This is sickening, since it seems somewhat likely that we will be the most important third force in the 2004 presidential election. Today's Washington Post reports that many leaders of the Green Party don't want to run a presidential candidate in 2004. [GP: Let Freedom Ring! has independent reports that Ralph Nader and the Democratic Party are deep in negotiations.] The Reform Party is almost completely moribund. No important independent candidate seems likely to emerge. 2004 may resemble 1984. In 1984, David Bergland placed 3rd, behind Reagan and Mondale. Yet we missed being on the ballot in 1984 in eleven states, so the campaign didn't have much prestige with the press.

Ron Paul has introduced HR 1941, to outlaw restrictive ballot access laws for minor party and independent candidates for Congress. I hope Libertarians will ask their member of congress to co-sponsor this bill. Under certain conditions, I will personally pay \$50 to anyone who gets his or her member of congress to co-sponsor. I will explain the conditions in the June 1 Ballot Access News.

The Right to Be Disarmed Is the Right to Be Enslaved

The *New York Times* for May 20 reports: "Iraqi citizens will be required to turn over automatic weapons and heavy weapons under a proclamation that allied authorities plan to issue this week, allied officials said today. The aim of the proclamation is to help stabilize Iraq by confiscating the huge supply of AK-47's, machine guns, rocket-propelled grenades and other weapons that are used by criminal gangs, paramilitary groups and remnants of the Saddam Hussein government. Iraqis who refuse to comply with the edict will be subject to arrest..."

LPAZ Chair Creates State Chairs Echo List

Arizona State Chair Jason Auvenshine has created a new read-only list statechairs_echo@yahoo.com on which will appear the nonconfidential contents of the Libertarian Party State Chairs email list. LPAZ support for transparency has become controversial among some list users.

An Open Letter To Massachusetts Libertarians

What should the Libertarian Party of Massachusetts do to building a strong state party?

First, we need to focus on a basic principle: The primary mission of a political party is to recruit candidates, get them on the ballot, and elect them to office. We are not here to debate philosophy or have social hours except to the extent that those build a stronger Party. We are here to build a stronger Libertarian Party that elects our fellow libertarians to political office.

Second, the Massachusetts state party needs a strong mesh of local and county associations, not tied to the vicissitudes of state election law, running from Pittsfield to Chatham. Strong local organizations will solve many of our challenges on ballot access, candidate support, petitioning, emplacing public policy questions, and recruiting and electing candidates to lower and higher office. The best way to get someone to run for office and win is to have people in her own town who are prepared to support her ask her to run.

Local organizations are built by local contact and outreach. Local organizations are built when one or two activists ask libertarians in local area to get together and get active. When there are no local activists, libertarians in neighboring areas that already have active local groups need to adopt the area and provide the needed needed to get a local group off the ground.

Third, the State Libertarian Party must make efficient and effective use of its very limited resources. We have only so much money, we have only so many candidates and volunteers. That money must be spent in a useful and effective way on our campaigns. Our candidates must be supported in ways that will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of their campaigns, win or lose.

Fourth, the state party has a range of lists of local libertarians. Lists are not fine wines. They will not be improved by aging them in the dark in brick-lined grottos. The state party needs to move information to activists without waiting for activists to ask for help. Lists whose existence is not well-known should be advertised.

Finally, the Party must remember that it should represent the views of all Massachusetts libertarians, rich and poor, regardless of their color or creed. When we choose state committee members and national convention delegates, we should make informed decisions that do not discriminate against the strict of creed or the poor of wallet.

Let Freedom Ring!

Subscriptions \$15 per year to activists.

\$20 per year to others.

SEND YOUR MONEY TO CAROL McMAHON, 221 Bumstead Road, Monson MA 01057.

Where Your Money Went

For April 2003 the Libertarian National Committee had total receipts of \$13,556, total disbursements of \$124,450, and ended with \$6106 cash on hand and \$169,751 in debts and obligations. The debts are currently on a downward trajectory. Disbursements include over \$5000 for mailing services, \$500 for bank services, printing from several vendors, \$410 to David Bergland for travel expenses, almost \$6000 for staff health insurance, \$500 for clipping services, various office suppliers, \$750 for web site design, \$1630 for web services, close to \$1000 for telephone and the like, \$3328 for telemarketing, over \$4000 for accounting services and an accounting consultant, over \$1500 for a direct mail consultant, over \$10,000 for payroll services and taxes, \$7914 a month for rent, as well as payroll and professional services charges to a dozen persons and firms. Many of the persons on payroll are paid rather small amounts. Expenditures for ballot access campaigns are not apparent.

For its first quarter, the Badnarik Presidential campaign reports raising \$8860 and spending \$6262.41. Itemized expenditures include \$830 in travel expenses, \$478 to the campaign treasurer for 'services rendered', \$220 to the Libertarian Party of North Carolina and \$230 to the LPOH for convention registration, \$379 for buttons, \$380 to the LNC for campaign brochures, \$216 for wireless phone charges, and \$795 to another Texan for 'services rendered'.

The Libertarian Party of Cass County, Missouri has an electronic poll for our next Presidential candidate, with multiple voting filters. The poll shows Gary Nolan with a narrow lead over Mike Badnarik, and Ron Paul (who is shown no interest in a draft) in third place ahead of L. Neil Smith. Other candidates such as James Grey are well to the rear.

Next Page [LPUS Budget] Omitted from Electronic Edition. The Party expects to bring in \$1.438 million and \$1.375 million. Changes noted in footnotes include adding \$325,000 for UMP payments, deleting \$80,000 for membership database implementation, and deleting \$122,000 for new staff and \$22,500 for associated benefits.

In other news, the Gary Nolan campaign in early May circulated an email message asking its supporters for more money. Under the heading 'Urgent message for Gary Nolan supporters':

"...An active presidential campaign incurs substantial costs traveling around the country to state conventions, on the order of \$500 - \$1,000 per week, on top of basic expenses like printing, postage, and telephone bills...Right now, the campaign has about \$2,000 in travel expenses incurred from April 13 through May 4 that must be reimbursed. ... In addition, we need to get ahead of the fund raising curve...We need to raise at least \$2,000 to pay reimburse Gary's travel expenses, plus an additional \$2,000 to pay for upcoming expenses over the next few weeks... In addition, we need to begin contacting Libertarians by mail..."

Readers will note the modest and restrained expenditures relative to Libertarian Presidential campaigns of 1996 and 2000.

Let Freedom Ring!

This Page is the LPUS Annual BUdget and is only available in the paper edition.