
Libertarian Strategy Gazette

Volume 2 Number 1

Now on the web at www.cmlc.org

January

Looking for a Few Good Men and Women

...John W. Kopcha

The Libertarian Party needs to have party members elected to local, state and federal offices to make an impact in the political landscape, but running for an office as a Libertarian can be frustrating. Here are a few ideas for you to consider when pondering a potential run.

The Ideal Candidate

There is no such thing as the ideal candidate, however, there are qualities that make one person stand out above others running for the same office.

1.) You have to have a commitment to community service. I know very few people who have successfully run for office who had not served their community in some capacity. This could be as a volunteer at a local senior center, working as a Little League coach or a Town Watch leader. Community service not only confirms your activism in a positive manner but it affords you name recognition before you even consider running for elected office. I can not adequately state in words the importance of activism in the community in non-political organizations for a candidate.

2.) You must be aggressive. An extroverted person who likes to meet and talk with people about their personal concerns and the concerns about the community will surely do better in seeking office than someone who is adverse to publicity. You must sell yourself to the voting public that you are the best candidate for the office and liberation ideas and actions are the best solutions. You should take every opportunity to meet and talk to people.

3) You must be prepared to win. This goes along with being aggressive. Sometimes people run for office because the political party to which they belong has a hard time fielding candidates, and you submit your name just to file a ballot slot. If you do not feel that you can win, you will not exude the confidence in yourself that the voting public looks for in a candidate. You will not have the desire to adequately campaign nor express your ideas. Part of the campaign involves developing the organization, not only to win the election, but also how you will do into your

(Continued on page 2)

The LNC's Strategic Plan

...Lois Kaneshiki

[Editor's Note: A heavily edited version of this article appeared in *Liberty* magazine. We have here the unedited and rather milder original.]

What Went Wrong

The LNC first discussed embarking on strategic planning at the December 2000 LNC meeting in Washington D.C. Secretary Steve Givot made the proposal, which I thought got a lukewarm reception at first. I strongly favored (and still do) strategic planning for the LP at all levels, but believe that the process is as important if not more so than the final product. My concerns about the outcome of this project began before during our initial discussion.

I asked for a presentation and discussion of what the process would entail exactly. The process would use a consensus-building methodology, but that is all we were basically told, as anything more would "bias the outcome", to put it into Givot's words.

Of course the process itself can bias the outcome, which in my opinion, it did. In this case that meant that we wound up with a "let's do more" version of what is already being done. Only this one cost us \$93,000 and six and a half weekends spent in hotel rooms to accomplish.

Many individuals, including National Political Director Ron Crickenberger, commented at the August LNC meeting that the "plan" has basically put us back at the beginning. This outcome was predicted by original SPT member Joe Cadrin, who was selected to be on the team as a "small 'l' libertarian" not affiliated with the party. Joe, who had had experience in formal strategic planning settings, predicted that the way the process was being run would put us back at the beginning, with a list of goals without a plan on how to get there. He was right. Joe quit the SPT after the first meeting.

I attended and participated in the first four SPT meetings. During the first meeting we spent quite a while in a large meeting room with the SPT team and a group of state chairs and executive directors who were participating in a state chairs weekend concurrently. This was a brainstorming session in which we were asked to come up with any ideas we could think

(Continued on page 2)

(Continued from page 1) [Looking For Good Men and Women]

elected position.

If you are concerned that your knowledge of the office you seek is limited, you can call or write to the Department of Community Affairs and Economic Enterprise (formerly the Department of Community Affairs) in Harrisburg, Pa. to get literature on the duties, powers and responsibilities of the office. This literature is very detailed. The Libertarian Party should also consider running classes to assist and groom political candidates.

4.) You must have the time to campaign. Lifestyle considerations are an important part of running for office. Time spent campaigning is time away from your family and sometimes time away from your job. Can you afford the time? The best time to start a campaign for an office is right after the general election for the position you are seeking. This gives you time to get name recognition, raise funds and get your ideas known.

5.) You should be politically active. Aside from being active in the community, you should be active politically before considering a run for office. This may be handing out campaign literature for candidates, making telephone calls to get out the vote, or working at the polls on election day. The more politically active you are beforehand the greater your knowledge will be on how the political system works. Also, if you enjoy these activities, running for office will be a pleasurable extension of these experiences.

6.) Run for an office that you feel comfortable that you can win. Nothing is more frustrating than to get involved in a campaign and find out that you are over your head with what is required and expected of you. It is better to run for a local office, maybe one that no one wants, than to run for a higher position that you feel you have little chance of winning or little chance of being effective in should you win. Any elected position will get you name recognition, give you credibility for a higher elected office in the future, and give the Libertarian Party credibility that it can win elections. Winning also breeds confidence to continue winning. If we become the Judges of Election, the municipal Auditors, the Borough Council Members and Township Commissioners, we will have a tremendous foundation to establish and implement libertarian philosophies and policies. Then we build on that foundation.

Where do we find good candidates?

Good candidates are all around us. It is important to remember that not everyone should be or can be a candidate. Here are just a few areas from where can-

didates may come.

1.) Civil libertarians. Lawyers who do work to maintain and preserve civil liberties. Possibly someone who works for the American Civil Liberties Union.

2.) Office holders who have a libertarian bent. Independents, Republicans and Democrats who have expressed libertarian philosophies may be persuaded to change parties and run for office as a Libertarian.

3.) Others registered to different political parties but card carrying, dues paying members of the Libertarian Party who have the aforementioned qualities. Independents, Republicans and Democrats who are card carrying Libertarians and are politically active make great candidates.

4.) Colleges and Universities. There is usually more political activity at universities than in the general public. Young Republican and Young Democrat Clubs on college campuses may be potential breeding grounds for Libertarian candidates. If we establish Young Libertarian Clubs on campuses, we are doing ourselves a tremendous favor.

If anyone would like to comment on this article or who may want to run for office in Pennsylvania, you may E-mail me at jwilkopc@aol.com

(Continued from page 1) [The LNC's Strategic Plan]

of on "what the LP could or should be doing." But the question is, ideas to accomplish what end? Have we agreed yet what we should be? How do you come up with tactics before you know what you are trying to accomplish?

Givot's argument was that you cannot use goals or strategies if there are not tactics available to support those strategies. So you come up with a list of tactics first. Well, it is true that in order to achieve your goals you must have ways to achieve them. But you can sit around literally forever coming up with ideas if you have not identified your goals first. Furthermore, if you do not begin with the end in mind, you are not focused on what are the best activities on which you can expend your resources to accomplish those particular goals.

Imagine if you were brainstorming on what to teach children in school. You could literally come up with tens of thousands of ideas. You could spend an indefinite amount of time listing, sorting, and clarifying ideas. But if you don't decide what you are educating them for first, what is the purpose of that education, you are wasting a lot of time.

We ended the day with about 600 ideas or so, in my opinion, a pitifully low amount of ideas considering the overwhelming, undefined objectives of building the LP.

Then we spent a seemingly endless amount of time sorting and categorizing, resorting and then recategorizing those ideas, debating whether or not they were strategies or tactics or goals, before any planning or discussion of fundamental issues had even begun. In my opinion, this was all an utter waste of time.

When we did start the process of looking at goals, we began to collect a list of so-called "third rail issues". These were supposed to represent highly controversial issues in the party, issues over which many members would have very strong (and opposing) views. Some of them were as follows:

- * Should "The Pledge" be required for membership in the LP?
- * Does the National Platform need to be changed?
- * So-called "paper" candidacies
- * So-called "spoiler" campaigns
- * The Unified Membership Program (UMP)
- * Should the national office provide financial or other support to get ballot access for state affiliates?
- * Should the LP be a "membership organization"?
- * Should our candidates accept matching funds from the government?

Again, these questions and issues cannot be intelligently discussed if you cannot first accept some basic assumptions and agree upon your mission. Are we a political party or aren't we? Are we to get Libertarians in office and prepare a cadre of political operatives nationwide that will be prepared to govern at some point when the voters are ready to accept us, or are we going to spin our wheels trying to convince them of our philosophy first, or are we doing it all at the same time? Again, what are we doing in the LP?

Why do we have controversies over whether or not to run "paper" or "spoiler" campaigns? It is because we have not decided if we want to recruit members, sell our philosophy, or get Libertarians in office. It is not at all obvious that we can do each of these things at the same time, or that we should continue to try.

Politics is superficial and shallow. It is anti-intellectual. About 15% of voters vote on the issues. The rest vote based on habit or whether or not they know the candidate personally. (Remember, I am not talking about the Liberty readership. I am talking about the public at large.)

Yet Libertarian candidates continue to market the party and the philosophy over themselves as individ-

uals. Candidates must sell themselves first. Politics is a popularity contest.

But if your first goal is to build membership, or to "convert the masses", the purpose of a campaign might be different. Then you might want to market the views of the national platform, not yourself. You are merely a messenger for the philosophy.

It is this phenomenon that encourages candidates in the LP to run for offices for which they have no chance of winning and in which they are not prepared to actually serve. It encourages Libertarians to avoid lower-level offices, because (theoretically) those will not get as much "media exposure" as higher offices. (Although historically our higher-level candidates have not done well at getting media, anyway.)

Now, if your goal is to actually get elected, you will be looking at running for office in a completely different light. You will ask yourself, "Which race can I win a majority of votes?", not "Which race will allow me to recruit more members?"

But getting back to paper and spoiler races-Why are we discussing this at the national level, at a national strategy session? These issues should be discussed, debated, and decided at the local level, where the decisions are going to be made anyway.

The subject of the National Platform (NP) is interesting and important. But again, the LNC should not be discussing whether or not it should be changed, but why do we have the NP we have to begin with? What is it about our party that has created such an "in your face", radical set of planks? (Because let's face it, that is the way it would be viewed if anyone besides Libertarians, and occasionally, opponents of Libertarian candidates looking for ammunition against their competitors, ever read it.)

Who shows up to LP national conventions where these planks are debated and voted on? Are they our local activists who are involved in their communities? Or are they more the LP "religious following" that cares more about seeing their presidential candidate express their views on CSPan once every 4 years? Are they people who are true political operatives, or are they "club members" who wish to protect and ensure the future "purity" of the LP? Again, what are we trying to do in the LP?

You will not change the NP until you change the kind of party member you attract to the national convention. And you will not change that until you begin to change the membership, religious culture of the LP. And you do not change culture until you

take a serious look at how you got where you are to begin with.

The SPT not only failed to address these critical issues, but Givot consciously determined not to take a critical look at what we have done in the past. Look forward, not back. Let's not rehash the past. Well, why should you if you don't really want anything to change?

How do we as a party get more Libertarians elected to office? What is it about our organization per se that has kept us politically irrelevant for three decades?

You have heard all the excuses. The "wasted vote" syndrome. The whining that the voters just don't understand our philosophy. We are too small. We don't have enough money.

But the fact is that we have gotten Libertarians elected to local offices all across the country. As a party, why have we not focused on how these individuals got elected? What set of circumstances allowed them to be successful? Why was this not looked at more closely in the strategic planning process?

The reason it was not looked at is because the fact is that most Libertarians do not care about getting Libertarians elected to low level offices. They are more concerned with converting the masses to accept our philosophy of governance.

This goes back to the issue that the LP has not focused on its mission. The LP has (arrogantly, in my opinion) equated itself with the broader libertarian movement, even though other organizations, such as Cato, have been far more successful than we of getting our ideas discussed in the mainstream.

There is room and necessity for all sorts of activity within the libertarian movement. But to mix education and issue-advocacy per se within a political party is political suicide, and keeps us from focusing on short and intermediate term electoral results.

Many libertarians are afraid if the LP did have more electoral success, it would corrupt the party and

make it more like the other parties. That is even more reason why we need organizations and groups outside the LP, continually putting pressure on them to stay loyal to libertarian values and not "compromise". But we cannot get our policies implemented, and we cannot build a political infrastructure of operatives who can run the system without getting serious about low-level electoral success first. All politics is driven locally.

Instead of looking at what the national office and LNC have done to create and encourage a culture where political operations are secondary to "educating the public", the SPT came up with a series of "recommendations" for state and local affiliates. What qualifies that particular group of individuals to come up with any recommendations for anyone? That is not the mandate of the LNC. The party by-laws state:

The National Committee shall have control and management of all the affairs, properties and funds of the Party consistent with these Bylaws. The Libertarian National Committee shall establish and oversee an organizational structure to implement the purposes of the Party as stated in Article 3. The National Committee shall adopt rules of procedure for the conduct of its meetings and the carrying out of its duties and responsibilities. The National Committee may delegate its authority in any manner it deems necessary.

Article 3 states:

The Party is organized to implement and give voice to the principles embodied in the Statement of Principles by:

- * functioning as a libertarian political entity separate and distinct from all other political parties or movements;
- * moving public policy in a libertarian direction by building a political party that elects Libertarians to public office;
- * chartering affiliate parties throughout the United States and promoting their growth and activities;
- * nominating candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States, and supporting Party and affiliate party candidates for political office; and,
- * entering into public information activities.

In my opinion, the party by laws are clear. The LP should be trying to identify individuals who are interested in politics and getting involved in their local government, individuals who agree with our fundamental concepts of limited government and individual liberty and responsibility. Local electoral success should be viewed as the only important measure of success. Local people will discover the best tactics

Let Freedom Ring! Libertarian Strategy Gazette

Subscriptions \$13 per year.

Send your money to Carol McMahan,
221 Bumstead Road, Monson MA 01057.

and strategies to pursue in their local political climate. Nothing in the Strategic Plan is going to help them do that.

What the SPT should have done is take a look at why we have had so little success as an institution, and what have we done to perpetuate that condition? In other words, why are so few Libertarians interested in politics? Perhaps it is the way in which they are "recruited".

Harry Browne's latest membership-recruiting cd asks people to join the LP "just to be around people who agree with you". Well, that is what we have done for the past twenty or so years, and it has not made us successful as a political party. But I guess it has done ok for Harry Browne in terms of making him a libertarian icon and supporting himself financially over the past 6 years. Don't encourage people who want electoral success if you want to keep Mr. Browne in business! Mr. Browne's recent statement that the number of votes "doesn't matter" indicates he would perpetuate the current culture of the LP with no emphasis on electoral success anytime soon. Mr. Browne, please go build your fan club someplace else! Leave the LP to people who want to succeed!

The party should be left to people who are interested in politics. All other libertarians who are not interested in participating in the electoral process would far better serve the libertarian movement to organize with outside organizations that will also engage activities with the purpose of advancing the movement. We do need other libertarian activities running concurrently with political ones, and they must also be successful if we are to move society in a libertarian direction.

If you don't care about politics, elections, and getting libertarians in office, please do not come to the national LP conventions. Please, leave the politics to those of us who do. If you don't want to get your hands dirty in politics, there is plenty of other work that needs to get done in the movement, of which you can play critical role. There is room enough for us all in the libertarian movement.

The strategic planning process clearly illustrated everything that is wrong with the Libertarian Party. Unfortunately, it did not attempt to examine the source, only the manifestations of those issues.

be yourname@4liberty.net

http://excell.net/excellnet_national-dialups.htm
Dialup in most states and Canada. \$19.50/month

Libertarian Owned

Libertarian Operated

Supporters of the

Pioneer Valley Libertarian Association

Mickey and Judy or Cleavon and Mel?

**An analysis of the 'Massachusetts model'
for Party activism**

...Steve Trinward

The Libertarian Party is squarely at a cross-roads. It is not the first time, and it probably won't be the last, but in some ways the choices have never been clearer.

On the one hand is the current paradigm: Relatively big-budget blockbuster campaigns; full-time paid staff for just about every function; snail-mail fundraising letters costing a sizable chunk out of what they bring in. There is minimal outreach to the voters at large, but maximized appeals to the already-converted defenders of Liberty whose pockets aren't already empty from previous campaigns, just to keep the wheels rolling along.

On the other, we have the so-far untested method (unless you count almost every campaign ever waged for local office, at least the ones that actually WON!) of the volunteer-driven, grassroots and precinct-bas-ed effort. In this picture, instead of asking for money first, one seeks supporters and activists, builds a movement of committed and connected campaigners, and THEN looks to see what kind of money is available to spread a message which has already taken hold at the local level.

In many ways, each of these strategies can be shown as an iconic image, each with its own catchphrase, from a popular Hollywood film classic. The currently popular method, exemplified by the Harry Browne for President and Carla Howell for Senate campaigns, might use a scene from the hilarious Mel Brooks comedy, "Blazing Saddles."

The cover-boy would be Cleavon Little, who played the new sheriff for the benighted Western town; the catchphrase would come from the scene where he, a black man, is introduced to the townspeople, and they begin shooting at him. Little's character quickly draws his own six-shooter, sticks it against his own throat, and snarls in a malevolent baritone, "Nobody move, or the nigger gets it!" He then proceeds to duckwalk himself off the podium and through a convenient nearby doorway, escaping both bullets and hangman.

For many who have watched the Libertarian Party's marquee campaigns unfold over the last decade, this is uncomfortably close to reality. For those of us who actually contributed during the first Browne go-round (and perhaps even into the preliminary stages

of the second one?), it is painfully familiar. And as we watch even the non-candidate initiative petition to repeal of the state's income tax as a voter referendum, the ominous parallels stand out in sharp relief:

Contrast this approach with the grassroots paradigm. This is perfectly portrayed in an entire series of films from much earlier times. In this case, Mickey Rooney is the icon, from his late-teen and early-20s years as a co-star with Judy Garland, in such films as "Babes in Arms," "Babes in Toyland"... each of which pivoted around the same essential cry of epiphany: Hey, my Dad's got a barn Let's put on a show!" This is the perfect meta-phor for grassroots politics, with everything handled responsibly and creatively, working as a team and using essentially nothing but volunteer help.

This fairly clear forking of the road ahead occurred to me again, with the recent spate of e-mails from the folks up in the Grand Duchy of Massachusetts, Michael Cloud and Carla Howell. They have a very worthwhile project to put an initiative question on the November 2002 ballot, to repeal the state's income tax. Judging from the communiqués I've seen, they are going about it with the wrong strategy.

If there was ever a situation where the Mickey Rooney methodology was appropriate, it is in a referendum issue: the object of the game is neither to raise consciousness nor to promote a particular candidacy, but to get citizens to vote for it. The only way to do this is to muster support from the folks who actually live in the state, and registered to vote there, and will then come out in droves to pass your initiative.

The first step in running a referendum campaign is to figure out if you actually have the support, real or potential, to pull it off. Normally, this would imply some pre-planning, with a voter survey or some other method of determining that the plan is not just a good idea, but one whose time has truly come.

The next step: find your audience, and then build it as large as you can. One way to build those numbers is to get people directly involved in the effort -- as petitioners, fundraisers, canvassers and so forth. Another is to start making friends with as many other groups with similar goals as you can find.

Then and only then hit the streets with petitions. Begin the arduous process of getting the question on the ballot. In Massachusetts this is a two-step process: first they needed about 100,000 raw signatures this fall; then, there are another 40,000 or so to be collected in the spring to place it on the ballot next November. This is to say nothing of the actual campaign.

But whatever the case, it takes lots of warm bodies, a goodly percentage of whom are willing to do the foot-soldierly duties -- petitioning, door-to-door canvassing, leafleting, showing up for public forums, etc. -- which are absolutely necessary to win a referendum fight. In the case of this battle, over an income tax, they can expect to be opposed by the teachers' union, the state employees, most of the social welfare industry, and even that chunk of the business community which has come to rely on the nanny-state for its nourishment. It will take a mass movement to pull this one off; take it from someone still engaged in a similar battle, here in Tennessee, where we are only trying to STOP an income tax from being adopted, not overturning the existing tyranny!

Now let's look at how they seem to be doing this in Massachusetts:

First off, when did we first hear about all of this? Late summer, with the July 31st kickoff announcement: "Today the Attorney General's Office got a surprise. Carla Howell filed a Ballot Initiative to END the Massachusetts Income Tax."

One must first ask if this was also a "surprise" to the general voting public of Massachusetts. If so, I hope they enjoyed it, but I have to ask: Shouldn't they now be flocking to join this effort to liberate them from the bondage of the income tax? If they are ready and willing to see this happen, they should be all over it like white on rice. Is there any indication that they had surveyed, or done other preliminary work, to figure out if the Bay State was ready for such a move? Not that I can see.

The real test, though, is in how much support they were able to drum up to help get the ball rolling. It is here that we have an indication that Mickey and Judy are NOT playing much of a role in this thing. Exhibits A through K: the series of e-mail alerts, received by many of us out here in Libertyland starting with the one on the last day of July. (This was followed by one of those patented "Just Imagine If" missives, four days later, in which we were asked to visualize a tax-free Cradle of Liberty, while being given absolutely NO statements of fact or campaign promises which had to be fulfilled.)

On September 5th, the campaign's petition was officially certified by the Secretary of State, and the clock started ticking; they had roughly 60 days to collect the signatures. As of the 10th, they announced they already had "over 169 volunteer petitioners". Do the math: They need 57,100 certified signatures, and want 100,000 raw ones. Divide that by 200, and you get 286 (or 500 raw) signatures needed by each

person. If that is all you get to work with, and you have (a) volunteers willing to do the work, (b) enough time to do it, and (c) voters willing to sign and support the effort it sure seems possible.

Okay, so some of that will be done by proxy; and some of those volunteers may contribute money to pay someone else to collect their signatures. Also, you need to use some of those volunteers just to check the sheets as they come in. Massachusetts has one of the more archaic systems for a state-wide petition that there is: each petition must contain only the signatures of voters from a given city or town, and then the petitions must be delivered to the City Hall or Town Clerk of that particular location, where they are certified or rejected. Only then can they be re-collected and turned in to the Secretary of State's Office in Boston, at the eastern end.

Given that the state Supreme Court has shown no mercy in ruling on how easily signatures can be disqualified, there is a crying need for screeners, who go over each petition as it is turned in. They aren't just checking for legibility, they are seeking stray marks, coffee-stains or any of the other things that will disqualify the entire petition it is written on.

Another alert, on October 11th, assured us the campaign was on track, on schedule and well-funded. In the previous three weeks, they had managed to collect over 35,000 signatures, and raised enough money to cover another 15,000. They reassured us all that the petitioning effort, to put the question on the November 2002 ballot, had suddenly gone from way behind schedule to well ahead of it all within about a week. Less than week later, there was another happy-note: they were averaging about 2,000 signatures a day, and on cruise control.

Apparently, the worst was over.

Instead, only a week or so later, there came another e-mail blast, ominously title: +++ AN URGENT REQUEST +++ wailing about how they suddenly had no money, and couldn't pay the bills... The abridged version: it was another one of those pleas for money, the kind we all get tired of from every other political effort, couched in some of the most pitiful and pitiable language.

The panic was short-lived, however: Only a week later, on November 1st, came the "all clear" signal: back on schedule, or even ahead of it, with 75,000 signatures and counting, enough in the bank to pay for another week of petitioning, and 13 days to go. (Also somewhat reminiscent, I might add, of the short lived 'crisis' during the late stages of the pre-nomination Harry Browne campaign, which went from flush, to nearly flushed, to "back on track" all in a matter of about ten days in late April, 2000.)

So all's well that ends well but still...

Let's not belabor the problem further; what it comes down to is this: Any organization that has (a) been around for 30 years (as the LPM(A) has); and (b) established the visibility they allegedly now have particularly from the LAST great Libertarian effort to "put the LP on the map" should be able to simply wave its hands and muster support for just about any issue the heart could desire. Any organization with that long a history - that public level of identification, that political cachet - which cannot do so is not worth a damn!

An issue which is so allegedly vital, and has so much presumptive support, as repealing a state income tax SHOULD be a slam-dunk, in terms of getting LOCAL, VOLUNTEER campaign-workers, without ever asking anyone else for ANYTHING!

If that organization must instead beg its "party faithful" -- all across the country -- for the relative nickels and dimes it takes to pay a few petitioners .. What earthly hope is there that the initiative can gain enough support to have a prayer of passing?

By now, this dynamic duo of Howell and Cloud should have amassed (a) a warchest of local contributions, (b) a ready-call list of major donors, (c) several pages of influential endorsers and (d) enough volunteers (many of whom perhaps only care about passing THIS ONE ISSUE) to canvass the entire state in a couple of weeks at most... WITHOUT asking self-identified Libertarians for ONE DIME!

The proper order of operations for this endeavor would be to develop the organization, seek out a broad range of donor and volunteer support, budget for the expenditures, and only THEN to tackle the petitioning and campaigning to start the process. Start with a bare-bones plan, then build in the extra stuff if donations turn out better than expected.

Instead, here was another full-page ad in the October LP News (along with one each for Cloud for Senate, Howell for Governor, and innumerable 1/4-page promos for one or the other of them — over a YEAR before the election!).

And from whom? NOT "The Coalition to Repeal the Massachusetts Income Tax" or "The Coalition for a Tax-Free Massachusetts" Instead, we are hearing from Carla Howell & Michael Cloud and the generic "Committee for Small Government" How can one take this kind of thing seriously anymore?

One would at least hope that they are only at the head of long line of activist supporters. A CO-A-LI-TION, composed of everyone in the state who has had

ENOUGH of the Bay Statist Quo. A broad spectrum of people, who, with whatever motivation, all decided to sit up on their hind legs and bark NO MORE TAXES!

The ONLY way the Libertarian Party is going to regain its bearings, if that is still possible, is by countering this weltanschauung of creating magical party growth by bleeding the existing stock dry.

The new model is basically untested—unless you want to count damned near every political campaign, electoral or initiative, ever run to victory.

The new model is precinct-level grassroots activism, recruiting from registered non-voters and others who have given up on the mainstream. Supplement the search for committed full-bore libertarians with issue-coalitions.

This is the paradigm which must begin NOW to take its place as the method of choice.

Change will come, but only if we are willing to do the real work it takes to make it happen. We need to make Mickey and Judy proud of us, not just sit back and wait for some glorious epiphany to take the place of the Works Progress Administration program we are now running.

Take the sheriff's gun away and give the "Babes" their chance to shine.

Stand Up for Liberty!

George Phillies exciting new book of Libertarian Party strategy is now available as an ebook in multiple formats from Third Millenium Publishing, <http://3mpub.com>.

Grassroots Libertarians

dedicated to fixing the Libertarian Party from the bottom up. Now on the web at www.grassroots-libertarians.org.

Our Message: "Just Be Active! Run for Office! Campaign! Help!"

Pioneer Valley Libertarian Association

Massachusetts' oldest local Libertarian group, with regular meetings since 1995. We meet the second Wednesday of every month at Bickford's Family Restaurant, Old Boston and Pasco Roads, Springfield.

Our Web Pages

<http://www.pvla.net> <http://www.cmlc.org>

Brought to you by www.excell.net.

Libertarian owned—Libertarian operated
Provider of internet services

