

Let Freedom Ring!

Volume 5 Number 11

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

November 2003

Free State is New Hampshire!

Let Freedom Ring!/Libertarian Strategy Gazette are edited and published by George Phillips, 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.

Massachusetts Libertarians Make Progress

In good news for Massachusetts Libertarians, local groups in central and Western Massachusetts report near record attendance at meetings. The PVLA and WCLA October meetings with guest speaker Amanda Phillips both set records for attendance with people never before met at those meetings in attendance.

PVLA member Bob Underwood is forging ahead with his translation work. Underwood had previously translated the CMLC (cmlc.org) and PVLA (pvla.net, wmlp.org) web pages an alternative Spanish-language front page; the CMLC front page is now backed by Spanish Language content. Underwood is now translating *Stand Up for Liberty!*; the first chapters of *Lucha Por Tu Libertad* are in complete form.

Waltham Libertarians have succeeded in placing on the ballot a referendum for a property tax cut within their city.

Condorcet-method balloting of the 5000 members of the Free-State Project has led to an unambiguous win for the New Hampshire as the destination of Free State Supporters. Wyoming was the clear but distant second choice. With the choice of a Free State, the Project has already begun choosing new officers. Prominent Massachusetts Libertarian Activist Amanda Phillips is now the Free State Project Treasurer.

Supporters of the Free State Project have agreed to move to the same state, when it was selected, so soon as 20,000 supporters took the same pledge to move. The next major effort of the Free State Project will be to recruit an additional 15,000 supporters, to take the Free State Project to the 20,000 supporters needed to start moving.

Many supporters of the Free State movement are not waiting for the 20,000 goal to be reached and are preparing to move. Some have already arrived in New Hampshire. Sampling data suggests that current volunteers to move are far more educated and thus employable than the average American.

Neale Critiques LPUS Financial Policy

In a letter forwarded to this Newsletter by our friends, Libertarian Party National Chair Geoff Neale has critiqued the financial situation of the LNC and how it got there. Neale wrote:

"Let's be very blunt. We are not in good shape, financially. We are just in better shape.

We owe about \$30K to ballot access and branding combined. Our policy manual requires a 2% of revenue reserve - we have NONE!!! That's about another \$30K we need just to meet that pitifully insignificant reserve required by our policy manual.

Ever since day one, the LP has been running a Social Security type scam.

[LNC Meets] (Continued on page 3)

LPNH Holds State Convention

Close to 100 people attended the 2002 New Hampshire Party convention. The Governor of NH spoke and was well received. Ken Blevens will again run for US Senate, because he narrowly defeated Dan Belforti for the nomination. NOTA won for Governor. The State Party leadership, which is elected at the yearly convention, was re-elected. The party treasury moved over the past year from close to zero to an iirc \$7500 cash on hand position. LNC Regional Alternate Bonnie Scott presented information on the national party situation.

A poll of the audience showed that the bulk of the LPNH attendees either were elected public officials, or had run for office. I discussed election politics and campaign support materials with one LPNHer, who did eventually note that she was in her fourth term as a selectman (roughly speaking, [Don't Say Hi!]) (Continued on page 2)

A DIFFERENT SLANT ON SOME LIBERTARIAN ISSUES

It's frustrating to hear folk talk about our party. Often the general population sees us as a party of pot smoking, gun tooting, tax delinquents. In an unfortunate way, this cartoon type characterization of us, has become the cause for rejection of the only party in America truly believing in liberty for everyone. I want to share a couple of ideas on changing that image.

Before I move to my ideas, it is important for readers to know this about me. In terms of drugs, I do not use any except the one that might be most dangerous, namely tobacco. I really enjoy smoking my very legal Lucky Strike cigarettes. I do hate paying the taxes on the butts. At this point I get confused. I cannot understand why someone who wants to use another drug is a criminal. He or she cannot buy his or her choice of drug as easily as I am able to purchase my drug of choice.

Second, I do not own any guns. I doubt I will ever own any. On the other hand, my son-in-law has a collection of twenty odd guns. Some he uses for hunting, some for target shooting, others for self-protection and the rest I am not sure about. I support his right to own the guns, and I want him to have the right to carry them. Above all, I do not want to government to have any say concerning the type of guns anyone has or carries. In a word, I despise any tax that goes beyond the limits outlined in the founding documents of our country. In a word, I support the ideas expressed in the characterization so popular with the enemies of real freedom.

However I am pressed to offer these suggestions to alter the perception others have of us. I think we need to look for more issues facing all of the citizens of this country. Let me outline two. As a party we have spoken out concerning the Patriot Act. However, our voice has been only a whisper spoken in the enclaves of our private meetings and printed on the pages of our subscribed to newspapers. John Ashcroft has said, "Our ability to prevent another catastrophic attack on American soil would be more difficult, if not impossible, without the Patriot Act. It has been the key weapon used across America in successful counter-terrorist operations to protect innocent Americans from the deadly plans of terrorists."

I really believe that it is up to our party to expose this sort of faulty thinking for what it truly is. It is the propaganda supporting another way for the government to crawl into our mail boxes, inspect our computer transmissions, and eventually be able to open the doors to our homes on order to monitor how we speak, and act, and finally infer what we think.

Web Pages:

Worcester wcla.tripod.com
Western Massachusetts pvla.NET
America and the World www.cmlc.org (Now in Spanish)

The only freedom protected by the Patriot Act is the freedom for the government to be even more out of control.

This atrocity, I fully believe, needs to be identified for what it is by every Libertarian running for office. It needs to become the next banner raised for the true sons of liberty.

The second item applies mainly to the party in Massachusetts. I would like to hear debate about a most important issue. There is an arena in which only a handful of citizens have say. That is the appointing of judges on our courts. Once appointed, it is nearly impossible to remove them. The question we need to ponder and nail into our state platform is should judges be appointed as they are now, or should they be elected. Remember, you too might stand before a bar of justice to be heard by an appointed judge who thinks all Libertarians are criminals because they are gun tooting, pot smoking, tax delinquents.

...Charles A. Separk

PVLA Member

town council member).

About half the attendees were Free State Project supporters from as far away as Florida. About half were preparing to move soon; two real estate dealers were in attendance with home and other price data. Many of the other Free State attendees were FSP officers, there to interact with the LPNH officers. There was some interest in keeping clear that the FSP is not a branch of the LPNH, and vice versa, and that neither is an affiliate of the LPUS. On the other hand attendees noted to me that the decision of the Free State Project to go to NH was likely the most important recent event in the libertarian movement, and it seemed surprising that it received only page 3 coverage in the LP News.

Two of the declared Presidential candidates, Michael Badnarik and Gary Nolan, spoke. Badnarik spoke about educating the American people on the Constitution. Nolan spoke about who his experience as a radio talk show host would get us many publicity contacts. Unlike, for example, the 2000 Massachusetts convention, at which one candidate spoke but questions were not permitted, there was an extended period of challenging but fair questions for both candidates. Both candidates received polite enthusiasm from the audience.

I discussed with several LPNH members who are in the business in some ways real estate prices for larger purchases. The LPUS pays over \$8000 a month in rent. This is the equivalent--from discussion in the audience while questioning the LNC representative--of a certain rental rate in dollars per square foot per year, which is about six times the rate for space in New Hampshire. Using the conventional x100 conversion, this would be the rent on roughly \$800,000 of building. While one could in NH build something quite substantial in this price range, even close to the Manchester airport, for about the same price one could also buy an older mill building, say in the 125,000 square foot range, that would be substantially modernized except for partitioning and internet wiring.

Your humble correspondent announced his candidacy for National Chair. I was asked who else was running. My flier on issues, etc., went onto chairs. In 2002, I noted that many of these for all three candidates could be recovered after the meal was over. This time, almost all of them were taken away by attendees.George Phillis

(Continued from page 1) [National Convention Financials]

When a member sends in \$25, that's supposed to pay UMP and media and LP News and such for a year. That member is pre-paying for services to be rendered by the LP. Let's assume that we have NO life members, and we have only 20,000 members, and the membership dues is for services to be paid out equally over the next year. Assuming even distribution of payout, that means we should have on hand, for services already paid for, approximately \$250,000. Now, if we count in all of those advanced years of memberships, and the life memberships, we should probably have on hand (wet thumb in the air) \$600K to cover what our members have already paid for.

Every LNC since day one has been borrowing against these member prepayments to cover operating expenses.

...Geoff'

Given the opportunity to respond, your Editor wrote:

To his great credit, Geoff Neale has pointed out the financial issues associated with the National Party's operations over the past decades. When we add to that the \$400,000 or more we were in debt at the start of the year, that's a million dollars that has gone missing.

Some members of the National Committee were not here when that happened. Others pointed out the issues, unsuccessfully. And when these issues were raised in years past, there were people who would go on about the evils of micromanagement.

Now the record is rather clear. A key line of defense of the persons responsible for bringing us to this situation was in fact the opponents of what was denounced as micromanagement', micromanagement that should actually have been recognized as the legitimate questions of a governing board legitimately concerned about its financial situation.

Best,
George

To which LNC Member Sean Haugh wrote
Thanks George. When I was elected to the LNC, I felt that the one thing I had to deliver was transparency. Transparency begets accountability. Today, I am proud to say that transparency has been pretty much delivered. There's still some work to do, but we have a much clearer picture of what is going on with the national party than we ever did, and that is being communicated to the membership.

I certainly cannot take full credit, because after all I only have one voice and one vote. Of course, I do flatter myself by

Now Available in Paperback

George Phillip's books *Stand Up for Liberty!* on the Local Organization Strategy for the Libertarian Party, and *Funding Liberty* on the 1996-2000 Presidential campaign anomalies, are now available in paperback and ebook format.
For more information <http://www.3mpub.com/phillies>

thinking my reports have been of service in this regard. Yet it really has been a team effort, and some of the key players may surprise you. As you note, Geoff Neale has taken a more hard-nosed realistic approach to our finances, and he has done yeoman's work in shoveling out the metaphorical stable that is the DC office. Mark Nelson and Mark Rutherford have been adamant in their call for clear and concise financial reporting. Rutherford, along with Michael Dixon and BetteRose Ryan, established much clearer and far more professional standards for how we hire and judge our employees. The current executive committee have changed the budget format to one which more closely conforms to reality, sets the right priorities, and allows us a stronger foundation from which we can actually do politics. Others not named have supported these efforts, had their own roles to play, and done their due diligence as board members.

Beyond the LNC, we are also incredibly blessed to have Joe Seehusen and Rod Severson on board, who have both brought a sensible new attitude, and have been implementing these changes on an ongoing basis. The rest of the staff now at the DC office have also pitched in and done their share to keep the party afloat and support our new executive director. Joe shares Geoff's perspective on finances, and has brought us some sorely needed leadership that is as honest as it is dynamic.

What the LNC needs to provide is oversight, not micromanagement. We avoid micromanagement by putting good people in place and letting them do their jobs. To borrow the words of Ronald Reagan (sorry to swear in polite company), the job of the LNC is to trust, but verify. So I would say that if the LNC has erred in the past, it's not because they failed to micromanage everything, but because they failed to verify anything.

There are other areas of policy which we might debate, but on the financial stuff alone I think the LNC's record this term is sterling. And frankly, on the other policy stuff, the LNC should be irrelevant. LPNH gives us a great example. They are driving the Free State Project process far better than the LNC possibly could. They have busted tail to earn the vote of FSP members, and are now engaged in the hard work on the ground to make it a success. Only they are in a position to do that well. I live in NC, so I am in much less of a position to do that work. All I can do is pass along House For Sale and Help Wanted notices to our FSP members here, and otherwise blow kisses at NH from afar. The LNC can say whatever it wants, or stay silent, about any topic of action. But our opinion is meaningless. What has meaning are the great Libertarian activists who work to make freedom real in their own home towns. We only add value to that when we distribute tools, and otherwise stay the heck out of the way of those who Do Stuff.

I am damn proud of the work LPNH is doing now. You can quote me as a member of the LNC if you like, but really I'm still just a guy from (the other) Durham.
yours in liberty -- Sean

Let Freedom Ring!

What I Believe In

I promise you that I will never become a "conservative" or a "liberal." I've already been those things and learned the error of my ways. Libertarians do, however, tend to resemble fiscal conservatives and social liberals regarding economic views and human rights, respectively (sort of).

But the critical difference is that the libertarian view acknowledges the fundamental problem of giving infallible humans the absolute coercive power of government, and thusly argues for limited government based on consistent, logical principles that are rationally coherent in and of themselves-as well as proven by history. Liberals/democrats and conservatives/republicans (and for that matter, anyone whose views fall along the standard left-right political continuum) will alter their stance on issues based on political expediency, or personal benefit-often without realizing it. And I have no respect for this. The successful, actualized, and great human being finds a way to make sense of the world that is congruent with his (or her) best observations of what he sees. I will not settle for less. My political views also happen to resonate perfectly with everything else I believe in.

I believe in the right to own property and retain the fruit of my labors. I believe that the federal government role is simply to ensure the security of our borders and ensure our civil rights via a judicial/penal system. I think \$100 billion ought to be plenty to accomplish this, and \$2.25 trillion is an outrage. Anything attempted beyond defending the borders of the country and protecting the rights of freedom will just be wasted anyway because of inherent properties of human nature and government. Other than that, I believe in the free market. It's not perfect-nothing ever is-but it provides the best guarantee of the highest standard of living for the most people. I despise the fundamental, life-destroying values of fascism, communism, and socialism, and, as far as I'm concerned, a socialist is a communist or fascist who doesn't yet have your gun. Most liberals and social workers are very close to being on this level, without even realizing it.

Winston Churchill said, "If by 20 you're not a socialist, you have no heart. If by 30 you're not a capitalist, you have no brain."

In any event, I have decided that my purpose in life is to fight injustice wherever it is found to occur. Accordingly, I have created my own "Declaration of Human Rights" (previously featured in the September PVLA newsletter) that attempts to address some of the weaknesses in the wording of the U.S. Constitution, as well as corrects the grave errors contained within Eleanor Roosevelt's original document of the same name. In the October issue I expressed a view on homosexual marriage which similarly incorporated the same libertarian philosophy, and I will continue to submit articles to the PVLA newsletter-and other publications-about presenting issues of significance. Hopefully, those who take the time to read these ideas will come to understand that if libertarians can summon

the discipline and the strength to remain true to our commendable principles, and to continue to patiently illuminate others about our stances on issues, we will make a huge difference in the end.

T.E. Lawrence, in the *Seven Pillars of Wisdom* said, "All men dream: but not equally. Those who dream by night in the dusty recesses of their minds wake in the day to find that it was vanity; but the dreamers of the day are dangerous men, for they may act on their dreams with open eyes, to make it possible."

My dream is that someday I will not only live in the greatest country in the world, but will be privileged to enjoy an America where the people are truly free. I am VERY, VERY dangerous.

...Bill Bryant
PVLA Member

Debate Looms Over Platform and Party Objectives

We have a series of reports on an opening debate over the Libertarian Party Platform. For a fair account of the proposal of the Indiana State party, consider the following, forwarded to us from the libertarian party State Chairs list:

Dear Fellow State Chairs:

Last Saturday, a very frustrated Central Committee of the Libertarian Party of Indiana passed a resolution calling for the abolition of the current national LP platform.

We're in the middle of 71 campaigns for local office. This vote reflects the frustrations of our candidates having to suffer the slings and arrows dished out by our opponents based on our poorly phrased and often misinterpreted national platform. Our opponents use it a lot against us. This means that instead of being able to concentrate on advocating positive Libertarian solutions, we have to defend ourselves from the poorly worded and negative diatribes of our platform (or be accused of being unfocused on the most pressing issues of our day - I don't think Lagrange libration points or the U.N. Moon Treaty are on most voters minds, for example.)

As to being poorly written, a good example is the Sexual Rights provision and the Freedom of Speech provision on Obscenity. I've seen them effectively used to describe us as supporters of sex with children (I've heard the argument used by our opposition and the news media - and it passes the blush test - which is all you need at a forum to try to destroy us). When it is used by the media, we can rehabilitate ourselves with letters to the editors, but a more effective use of our time would have been advocating our position on fixing the sewers in a responsible way, not writing about how we are not child sex perverts, etc.

I personally applaud the efforts of George Squyres and others with the Platform Committee to address these concerns. They are working towards the solution to our platform woes, and should be supported in their efforts at the National Convention in Atlanta next May.

Very truly yours,
Mark W. Rutherford
Chairman
Libertarian Party of Indiana

A contributor to one of the uncensored Massachusetts libertarian newsgroups spoke favorably to this point, receiving a detailed response from very-long-time Massachusetts Libertarian Walter Ziobro:

Contributor, from Ziobro's quotation: "Indiana thinks that the problem is that our ideas are an impediment to electoral success. Actually, I think they're right. Our ideas are an impediment to electoral success. Most people don't want to legalize freedom."

to which **Ziobro** answered: This is one of the most thoroughly honest and straight-forward statements that I have ever heard any Libertarian make about our own electoral prospects. I think all Libertarian activists should give serious consideration to its implications. If electoral success is going to elude us for the foreseeable future, just what is a rational strategy?

Those who founded the party foresaw a long period of "public" education. Those who belong to it now seem anxious for some kind of electoral success. This anxiousness seems to run through all of the current factions of the party, and appears to me to be a major source of the internal bickering. Leaders of each faction proclaim that they have the strategy, gimmick, or plan that will score our electoral breakthrough, and the failure to defer to each of them is given in rebuttal as to why we have not succeeded. People got along better when we were realistically resigned to educational strategies.

-Walter Ziobro

and to which your Editor remarked:

Let me suggest that the educational strategy is entirely valid, at least potentially, even though it has not yet worked. [GP: Walter has since indicated to me that running candidates can be part of an educational strategy. Indeed, he is now running for office himself.]

However, putting that or any other strategy into place will be greatly assisted by an appropriate organizational arrangement, one that permits disagreeing groups to advance in a positive way rather than perpetually engaging in, in Walter's words, internal bickering.

Fortunately, the historical record shows rather clearly what a

suitable structure might be, namely the structure that Massachusetts Libertarians had the prior time that we had major party status, namely 1995-1996. Under this structure, there was a libertarian educational organization that did not spend money to support candidates, namely the Libertarian Association of Massachusetts. There was also in nascent form a Libertarian Party of Massachusetts, with a nominal state committee structure, and a State Political Action Committee.

In the period in question, interest in running candidates for office was more modest than now. When I finished my year on the LAMA Board, including a half-year as State Executive Director, I viewed one of my major achievements my success at communicating to at least some other party members the notion that the purpose of a political party is to run candidates for office, get them into office, and put the party platform into effect.

In 1999, for reasons that are well known, the two organizations were--quite unnecessarily--merged. The advocates of running certain people for certain offices gained control of the State Party, leaving the advocates of education without an effective forum for advancing their ideas.

Particularly now, when there is a significant likelihood that the LPMA will soon lose major party status, it is not irrational to propose reconsidering the past actions. A Libertarian Association of Massachusetts, composed of oath-affirming libertarians would be well-placed to advance educational issues. So long as it did not act as a political body, and could readily point at the still-extant LPMA as the "Party"--LAMA would be freed from all legal constraints on fundraising and spending on educational purposes. On the other hand, a Libertarian Party organization could focus entirely on encouraging political victory. So long as the two organizations had a binding agreement to hold in common data resources on members, volunteers, etc. rather than following current beggar thy neighbor policies, there would be a real opportunity to advance the educational path that Walter notes without sacrificing the alternative political paths that others support.

Where Your Money Went

As a step toward restoring appropriate fiscal controls to the National Party, the Party's new accountant is refiling the Party's FEC reports for the current year, based on reanalysis of the financial records and correct re-entry and assignment of expenditure records. The new records differ a great deal from the old ones, it would seem. For August and September, the National Party currently thinks it received and spent a little under \$400,000. We will have more details on this when matters have settled down a bit.

Multi-Candidate Status

The Liberty Congressional PAC, the country's only Federal PAC with Libertarian Party inclinations, has recently satisfied the legal conditions for multi-candidate status. Multicandidate status increases the ability of the PAC to support candidates for Federal office.

Other Party News

L. Neil Smith has announced that he "will no longer be available to anybody as a candidate for any political office." This announcement has terminated the current Draft 1 Neil Smith campaigning activity. Smith has endorsed Michael Badnarik as the best of the available caiddates for the Libertarian Presidential nomination.

Libertarians Michelle Otterson and James Maynard were among the candidates to win the open primary for nomination to the Keene City Council, and will be among the ten candidates vying for five seats. They report having an extensive street sign presence and a significant radio advertising campaign.

The Carla Howell Small Government News elist reports that Michael Cloud will be giving workshops in Massachusetts and Ohio on effective speaking. A list of Libertarian notables are quoted as endorsing Cloud's speaking ability, including 1996 Libertarian VP Nominee Jo Jorgensen, former National Chair and National Director Steve Dasbach, LNC Regional Representative Mark Cenci, Advocates for Self-Government President Sharon Harris, former Director of the Libertarian Victory Fund Chris Azzaro, and former Massachusetts Party Chair Carla Howell. Endorsers of the quality of the Seminar Series include former Harry Browne Campaign Chair and Party National Director Perry Willis and American Liberty Foundation President Jim Babka.

Commenting on the vote totals, California LNC Regional Alternate Scott Lieberman was quoted by the State Chairs Echo list as having written:

" Here are the unofficial election results for Calif. Governor for the top third party candidates, as reported by Richard Winger (except that I rounded off to the nearest 100)

Camejo	Green	233000
Burton	Soc Eqilty	6500
Hall	Green	2200
Roscoe	Lib	2100
Watts	Green	1900
Hamidi	Lib	1900
Hickey	Lib	1600

Some of the LP members who read this echo had a cow when I dared to say a kind word about Arnold Schwarzenegger, and I basically said that it was a waste of time for the Libertarian Party to contest this election.

As you can see, the major Green Party candidate got 100 times more votes than the major Libertarian Party candidate. As far as I can tell, there have been zero new LP members brought in by the three Libertarian candidates. If there have been any new LP members recruited by these candidates, the candidates certainly are not telling us about them.

Please tell me how contesting this election benefitted the Liber-

tarian Party, other than giving some of you nice, warm fuzzies by seeing one of the candidates on the Tonight Show, or perhaps seeing Roscoe do a 4 minute "quickie" on Fox News Channel?

Publicity is ****meaningless**** unless it is translated into votes or new members.

The National LP Mission Statement, listed on page 2 of LP News, was not written as a joke, or just another recommendation to be ignored. We really mean it when we say our raison d'etre is to build a political party that elects libertarians to public office."

Writing in response, LNC Al-Large Member Lee Wrights answered the paragraph

"Please tell me how contesting this election benefitted the Libertarian Party, other than giving some of you nice, warm fuzzies by seeing one of the candidates on the Tonight Show, or perhaps seeing Roscoe do a 4 minute "quickie" on Fox News Channel?"

saying

"Without those candidates people that wanted to vote for greater freedom and less intrusive government would not have had that option. It may not mean much to you, but for some of us voting is an important way of sending a message. We give freedom lovers a choice. Not a choice of "lesser of two evils" but a clear cut choice for liberty. That is important in and of itself.

Now, I understand the frustration of a poor showing and I sympathize with the depression it can foster. But I still say it is better than no showing at all. You should be proud you have Libertarians willing to stand for off ice, in oft times certain defeat, just so people like us have a true choice on the ballot."

Flickinger Leaves Party

In other Libertarian Party news, long-time elected Libertarian Party member Bonnie Flickinger has announced that she is leaving the Libertarian party. The Moreno Valley *Press-Enterprise* in an article by reporter Dan Lee reports that she will becoming an independent. Flickinger, who is approaching 12 years as a Libertarian in elected office, was displeased with the way the National Party has spent or mis-spent its money.

There are almost 90,000 registered Libertarians and approaching 4000 National party Members in California. Flickinger reportedly said that she has had ifficulties because of the National Party's platform, even though she is running in a nonpartisan election. Flickinger also criticized the Party Leadership for taking stands on issues that the public does not care about, and for not having any visibility in the California recall election. In the same election the Libertarian candidate got 0.03% of the vote, and the Green candidate was seen closing in on 2% of the vote.

News of Flickinger's departure was radidly circulated electronically to Libertarian newslists across America, but no statement from Flickinger appears to have been distributed.

--	--

