

---

# Libertarian Strategy Gazette

Volume 2 Number 2

Now on the web at [www.cmlc.org](http://www.cmlc.org)

February 2002

---

## Liberty For All - a Success Story

....R. Lee Wrights

Early in the winter of 2000 two libertarian writers, one a sales man/musician and the other a stay-at-home dad, decided to try their hand at web design. Although they were only novice webmasters they set out to create a forum, for themselves and their friends, that would allow them a voice that could not be stilled by editor or advertiser. What began as a simple website constructed to basically facilitate a small discussion group has grown into one of the Internet's premiere on-line magazines.

In its humble beginnings Libertyforall.net was no more than a few pages filled with commentary provided by whomever chose to contribute. The journeymen webmasters updated irregularly adding content as it was received. With columns named for their author's pseudonyms, Liberty For All quickly gained the reputation of a respected free speech publication. No one was turned away and no one was censored. Within six months of its first edition the new on-line publication featured eight regular writers from across the country; and, the editor was beginning to receive more copy than he could use in the form of one-time submissions.

Today Libertyforall.net is a thriving, not-for-profit enterprise that has weathered growth and success without compromising the principles from which it was conceived. In addition to thirteen regular columns that deliver thought-provoking commentary, the on-line magazine dedicated to the First Amendment also features timely news items, humor and satire, LP state convention information and updates, press releases, a discussion forum, an e-mail group, as well as, numerous other resources. Liberty For All remains as committed as ever to being on the front line of the fight for greater freedom.

From its meager conception to the international circulation that it now enjoys, Liberty For All has remained a beacon for an individual's right to freely speak his/her mind as the founders intended from the birth of a nation. Even the original columnists honored our founding fathers by using pen names such as Carolinus, Patrioticus and Pacificus in humble remembrance of a time when patriots had to mask their identities in order to avoid a tyrant's gallows. Libertyforall.net also stands as a testament to what a couple of "regular Joes" are capable of achieving with nothing more than an idea, a group of supportive friends, and a deep affection for those precious American siblings - Liberty and Freedom. At Liberty For All the invitation is open to all as our clarion call remains, "Let your voice be heard."

[Liberty for All] (Continued on page 2)

## A Strategic Vision for The Libertarian Party

Executive Summary by John Famularo

The events of September 11<sup>th</sup> have profoundly affected American life and public attitude. Now more than ever is it important to demonstrate through actions rather than rhetoric, our commitment to the American ideal of freedom, individual liberty, and responsibility.

How are we to succeed ? .

For the Libertarian Party to succeed, we must first define success. The mission of any political party is to elect people who will implement their political philosophy as public policy. The mission of the LP should be:

"To elect public officials in sufficient numbers to effectively minimize the size and scope of government while maintaining its effectiveness in its essential roles of protecting individual life, liberty and property and expanding individual personal and economic liberty."

There are many organizations in the general Libertarian Movement, each with its own mission and each working towards the ultimate general goal of achieving a "Libertarian Society". .

For 30 years, we have been trying to "sell the party" and "promote Libertarianism" by running candidates at the national and statewide level. We have run thousands of campaign at those levels without a single win or even a close loss. At the state legislative level we have had a handful of wins but no sitting legislator remains. Our lack of success has been blamed on a number of firmly held but false beliefs, some of which are:

- \* Ballot access is too difficult.
- \* We don't get fair Media coverage
- \* We don't have enough money.
- \* Winning will compromise principle
- \* We will need many more members.
- \* We need a large paid staff.
- \* Low level offices are unimportant.

None of the above are true. The reasons why are discussed in the full plan located at [WWW.LP2000.COM/2002](http://WWW.LP2000.COM/2002)

We do know that Libertarians can get elected to public office and have done so since 1978. Most have been local town, city and county offices. Most recently the LP of Pennsylvania has again proven this with only a minimum effort.

[A Strategic Vision] (Continued on page 2)

# Libertarian Strategy Gazette

[Liberty for All...] (Continued from Page One)

R. Lee Wrights is a writer and political activist living in North Carolina. He is the co-founder and Editor-in-chief of the free speech online magazine Liberty For All <http://www.libertyforall.net>; an Editor for Free-market.net <http://www.free-market.net>; and, a Contributing Editor for Rational Review <http://www.rationalreview.com>. Lee also serves as Vice Chairman of the Libertarian Party of North Carolina <http://www.lpnc.org>; and, as Secretary to his local county affiliate of LPNC <http://www.lpforsyth.org>.

[A Strategic Vision] (Continued from Page One)

Not only is the focus on local offices the only way that the LP will ever be in a position to elect people to higher office, it is the only way that *any* political party has and will ever win high office *and* be in a position to implement public policy reforms.

We will achieve our mission when we have sufficient numbers of people in positions of authority and respect in all three branches of government (Executive, Legislative and Judicial) to enact and/or repeal legislation while maintaining support from the Media, the business community, and the general public.

No candidate for public official can get elected, get re-elected, and advance to higher office without a support team. We call this a Political Action Team (PAT) as differentiated from a Political Action Committee (PAC). PACs are for raising resources (mostly money) for PATs. An effective political movement consists of a coalition of PATs, or in other terms the lowest level operational unit of a political party is a PAT. The mission of each PAT is the same as the mission of the organization, that is, getting elected to implement public policy reforms. The laws of nature and politics dictate that the faster and more radical the change the more power is required. Whether you are a council member of the smallest borough or a US Senator, you can not implement your entire program overnight. Neither can you do this if you are the Mayor of the smallest town or the President of the United States.

The candidate/office holder is the front man/woman of each PAT. The job of the PAT is to continually advance the candidate/office holder.

When considering various strategies, tactics, plans, projects, and subordinate goals, each must be evaluated as to its effect on the mission. Any activity may be employed to achieve that mission, but no subordinate activity can replace that mission. Intermediate goals may be identified in order to work towards the ultimate goal.

The smallest PAT may just consist of a few people sharing the support duties of Communications, Research, Volunteer recruitment and training, Accounting and advance work.

There are no activities or expertise that is required at the county, state or national level that does not have its counterpart within the basic precinct level PAT. Any experienced PAT member should be able to step into the same function at the County, State, or National level. Every team member should know the basics of every other team member's job.

We Libertarians are always telling the rest of the country that government should be decentralized and closer to the people and that too much is mandated and controlled from the county seat, the state house and capitol hill. Since the only organization totally controlled by "Libertarians" that carries that designation is the "Libertarian Party, why don't we demonstrate to the rest of the world how we can achieve national goals through local action and control?

We don't need to win the Presidency or a Governorship in order to demonstrate the efficacy of our proposals.

We currently have hundreds of Libertarians in Office throughout the nation. Each could become the nucleus of a PAT and if we were to design our strategies toward the initial goal of increasing the number of PATs tenfold at the precinct and local municipality level, we could use that base to achieve the next goal of developing credible competitive candidates for the Executive, Legislative and Judicial offices at the town, borough, township and city level. Picture a pyramid with a base consisting of precinct level PATs supporting a higher level of municipal PAT's, supporting a higher level of county PATs until we have a 51 state PATs supporting a national PAT. Only when we achieve this structure will we be able to field competitive national candidates, however, we don't have to wait until then to be effective, since the process of building the bottom up structure delivers incremental and substantive reforms.

The image of the LP should be that of a dedicated group of individuals working within the community and not as a group of outsiders. With the proper public image, we will not only be more successful but we will attract more potential candidates from the general community.

Does all this mean that those whose talents and interests are focused on protests, education, declarations of freedom from societal norms, or a myriad of other strategies and tactics have no place within the LP? No, every strategy and tactic that does not violate Libertarian principles may be employed effectively within the LP, but they must be done in concert with and under the managements of those responsible for the achievement of the LP's mission.

Everything that is done in the name of the party reflects on all our Libertarian public figures. Since they have their names and political careers at stake, and since they retain our collective expertise concerning what reforms the public will accept and how fast we can present, implement and maintain those reforms, they should have a significant say

## Libertarian Strategy Gazette

in what, when, where and how we employ specific strategies and tactics. This deference to experience and personal commitment cannot be effectively enforced by written bylaws and rules of procedure. They must be understood and instinctive throughout the organization or we will be ineffective in achieving our mission.

With the accumulation of credibility in the community, some Libertarians will advance to higher levels of office and attain wider and more attentive audiences and others will provide the base of support to assure fair elections at the precinct level. We need to demonstrate the Libertarian principles espoused by America's founders.

We have to go further than merely proposing a devolution of power from the center to the periphery, we must by example in our communities and especially in those institution that we currently totally control such as the Libertarian Party. Should we not at least reflect upon the possibility of reorganizing the LP around the bottom up principle? Is the top down organizational model adopted 30 years ago inviolate?

We will be discussing these and other issues at WWW.LP2000.Org.  
...John Famularo

### Remarks

I like the idea of "reorganizing the LP around the bottom up principle" and I like the summary. In particular, we really need to take advantage of the I like the idea of "reorganizing the LP around the bottom up principle" and I like the summary. In particular, we really need to take advantage of the renewed interest in America's heritage since September 11th. The lead in to the summary is a very good start.

It also is important to focus on creating small libertarian models at the local level, that is what the Progressives did here in Vermont. Bernie Sanders, the founder of Vermont's Progressive Coalition, started out as a member of the Liberty

**Join [www.excell.net](http://www.excell.net) and  
Be *yourname*@4liberty.net**

**Excell.net**

**Providers of Internet Services**

**[http://excell.net/excellnet\\_national-dialups.htm](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**

Union Party. This was a small socialist party that focused on national and international issues. They did not run many candidates for local office. Bernie broke away from the LU Party and formed the Progressive Coalition. The Progressives moved to Burlington and focused on local issues and eventually took over the city government of Burlington. This gave them a platform to push their ideas in the political debate. Since that time, Vermont has moved in a statist direction faster than any other state in the country, and is seen by socialists all around the country as a laboratory for socialists ideas. Needless to say, the LU Party, though older, is not even on the political map.

We need to follow the same model. If we do not, the Green Party will certainly surpass us as the third largest Party. (In Vermont the Progressive Party is the third largest party by far, with the LP not even on the map) Although Ralph Nader jumped the gun in suggesting that the Greens are the third largest party, they have been around for a far less time than we have and are catching up. The only success that we can claim is local success. That success has happened *despite* the strategic approach of the LP. LP history has shown that we usually lose momentum gained by winning local races. I believe that is so because it is not a focus.

...Robert Maynard, LPVT

### A Campaigning Aside

Editor:

I translated Paul Norton's Leaflets for his State Representative campaign into Spanish. If you look at the precinct statistics, he got slightly more votes in the Puerto Rican area of lower Carew St. In Springfield. We also went campaigning in those areas.

My own literature has also been in English and Spanish, as is the PVLA web site.

To my knowledge we are the only Libertarian group in the area attempting to recruit Spanish speakers.

Robert Joseph Underwood

Springfield, MA

(If a reader can find us a Vietnamese or a Hmong translator for our web pages, it would be most appreciated.)

### 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](http://www.excell.net).*

## Prospective Delegate Counts

The following table gives for each state the number of LP National members as of 12/31/2001, the votes received in the state by Harry Browne in 2000, and the tentative count of delegates for that state at the 2002 National Convention.

State	Number of members	Browne vote	Total delegates
AK	137	2,636	8
AL	315	5,893	19
AR	133	2,781	8
AZ	503	0	19
CA	4,990	45,520	228
CO	767	12,799	42
CT	330	3,484	16
DC	78	669	4
DE	73	774	4
FL	1,445	16,415	71
DE	73	774	4
FL	1,445	16,415	71
GA	1,574	36,332	95
HI	107	1,477	6
IA	267	3,209	14
ID	119	3,488	9
IL	964	11,623	48
IN	557	15,530	38
KS	255	4,525	15
KY	178	2,902	11
LA	172	2,951	11
MA	895	16,366	50
MD	483	5,310	24
ME	157	3,074	10
MI	1,178	16,711	61
MN	376	5,282	20
MO	438	7,436	24
MS	96	2,009	7
MT	112	1,718	7
MS	96	2,009	7
MT	112	1,718	7
NC	610	13,891	37
ND	40	660	3
NE	107	2,245	7
NH	288	2,757	14
NJ	667	6,312	32
NM	247	2,058	12
NV	352	3,311	17
NY	966	7,649	43
OH	964	13,473	49
OK	190	6,602	14
OR	456	7,447	25
PA	1,171	11,248	55
RI	59	742	4
SC	313	4,898	18
SD	46	1,662	4
TN	424	4,284	21
TX	1,445	23,183	78
UT	204	3,616	12
VA	889	15,198	49
VT	104	784	5
WA	976	13,135	50
WI	354	6,640	20
WV	92	1,912	6
WY	68	1,443	5
Total	27,731	386,064	1449

## Register As What?

### A Strategic Challenge for Serious Massachusetts Libertarians

First, if you are going to run in a Massachusetts partisan race for public office under a particular party label, major party or party designation, *and* you are going to get on the ballot by collecting petition signatures [an alternative exists] there is no choice. You must be registered to vote as a member of that party. Of nearly four million Massachusetts voters, this paragraph matters for well under a thousand people.

For everyone else, the fundamental issue is Major Party Status. Registering to vote as a Libertarian will, under some conditions, help, get the LP Major Party Status. Anywhere else in the United States, this would not be a major issue, because in states with sane election laws Major Party Status is an advantage.

Alas, I am writing from Massachusetts. In Massachusetts, Major Party status has a variety of consequences, most of them bad. Major Party status makes it much *harder* to get partisan candidates on the ballot. Major Party Status lets your other-party opponents knock you out of the race in the September Primary.

Much *harder* to get on the ballot? Isn't that backwards? In '98 I ran for Congress when the LP lacked Major Party status. 3000 raw signatures got me on the ballot with a large safety margin. In 2001, Jim Fredrickson ran for Congress while we had Major Party Status. He collected nearly 6500 signatures, but missed getting on the ballot by a significant margin. The Appendix explains why.

On the positive side, Major Parties do not have to petition to run someone for President in November. However, the petitioning effort required to get a Presidential candidate on the ballot in an election year is far smaller than the effort required to capture Major Party Status two years early.

On the null side, you don't need Major Party Status to run as Libertarian. I ran in '98, when we weren't a Major Party, and my ballot line was "Libertarian".

The net result is that Major Party Status hurts the party, by making it much harder to run most candidates for partisan office. A strategically thoughtful Party could have noted the issue, and carefully avoided Major Party Status until we were

## Let Freedom Ring! Libertarian Strategy Gazette

Subscriptions \$13 per year.

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

# Libertarian Strategy Gazette

actually a major party that could win partisan elections (The Massachusetts LP has yet to win one), but that's not where we happen to be. Instead, a faction within our State Party has earnestly sought Major Party Status and has succeeded in their efforts, thus denying Jim Fredrickson his Congressional run and making life much harder for almost everyone else seeking to run in possibly winnable (that means non-statewide) partisan offices.

There are two ways to get major party status: A statewide candidate gets more than 3% of the vote. More than 1% of the registered voters are Libertarian.

Within the context of fraternal intraparty relations, you do not try to sabotage the efforts of other Libertarians, so Massachusetts Libertarians are obliged to live with those Libertarians who insist on running for statewide office. You can put your money and activist time into more positive efforts, and urge folks in other states to invest in their own fine candidates, but the party in which candidates sabotage each others' efforts is the Democratic-Republican. If you don't believe me, ask Scott Harshbarger and Jack E Robinson about Mayor Menino and Governor Cellucci.

There remains the question: Should Libertarians who want the Massachusetts Party to advance register as Libertarians? In my opinion, except for prospective candidates the answer is clearly negative. Each Libertarian registration moves the state party that much closer to Major Party status via the 1% Party Registration rule. In normal states, this would be a good thing. In some states, 'major party' means the state convention can put people on the ballot, no petitioning then being required. In Massachusetts, major party status is a bad thing for the party, because it keeps candidates off the ballot. Registering 'Libertarian' hurts Libertarian candidates for partisan office across the Commonwealth.

I am not a hypocrite. I take my own advice. And I urge Massachusetts Libertarians for the good of the Party to support partisan candidates for district office, Congress and down, and to register "Unenrolled".

Now there are Libertarians in the Commonwealth who take the opposite tack, by proposing it is a moral duty to register "L". I have heard the analogy drawn with the High School boy who tells his girl friend that the relationship is not real unless she wears his ring, or, correspondingly, registers to vote as a Libertarian.

This is indeed the thinking of High School boys. High school boys, however, tend to think more with other parts of their anatomy, and tend to be more interested in locating something other than their ring in juxtaposition to something other than her finger. Under modern conditions for persons of most inclinations 'wear my ring' is a dominance turn-off. Just as with major party status the high school boy's pursuit of symbolic victory is an obstacle to the common primary intent.

The Appendix gives details of Massachusetts' deranged ballot access laws, short may they reign:

## Appendix

How do you get on the ballot in Massachusetts, for partisan office? I'll limit the discussion here to statewide offices, the State Legislature, and the Governor's Council. The legal numbers treat all parties the same, but the practical numbers distinguish between parties. I'll look at both.

First I have to explain terms describing parties and terms describing voters. I'll then discuss legal petitioning requirements, practical petitioning requirements, and primaries. The Primary Election is the tool that lets you get on the ballot while letting someone else do the petitioning.

## I. Terms Describing Types of Parties and Voters.

**Types of Parties:** Massachusetts distinguishes between Major Parties, Party Designations, and independent candidates. A group becomes a Party Designation by petitioning. A group becomes a Major Party by getting votes or registered voters.

There are two ways for a group to gain Major Party Status:

(1) A candidate for statewide office, whose ballot listing identifies him as a member of that party, gets 3% or more of the vote in an election for statewide office. This Status lasts until the next statewide election. (The statewide offices are Governor and Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Treasurer, Auditor, Secretary of the Commonwealth, U.S. Senator (in years when there is a Senate Election) and President (in years when there is a Presidential election).)

(2) A scheduled count of registered voters reveals that more than 1% of the registered voters in the state have enrolled as members of that party. This status lasts until the next count, which must then show that the party has enough registered voters.

In recent years, Massachusetts has usually had 3 major parties, Democratic, Republican, and one other. We currently have four, Green and Libertarian both being major parties. The Democratic and Republican Parties qualify as Major Parties under both of the above rules. They both have more than 1% of the registered voters, and at least one of their statewide candidates got more than 3% of the vote in the last general election.

The one other party has always qualified because one of its statewide candidates got 3% of the vote. The Libertarian Party has done this three times, Reform did it twice, while the Green and Independent Voters/Mass Hi-Tech Party did it once.

No party other than Democrat or Republican has recently come close to 1% of the registered voters. (At last report, 1% of the registered voters in around 37,000 people.) The Libertarians at recent count had 18000 registered voters.

A group gains Party Designation status by filing a peti-

tion signed (at last report) by 50 registered voters, asking that the designation be listed. At the moment, there are about a dozen party designations. If your group had a Party designation, and gains and then loses Major Party Status in two elections, the Party Designation petition is still on file; you recover Party Designation status when you lose Major Party status. It is my understanding that the Secretary of the Commonwealth interprets the law to permit a Major Party to disorganize itself, and voluntarily return to Party Designation status, but to my knowledge there is no case in which this was done.

**Types of Voters:** Massachusetts uses a specific language to describe voters. A registered voter is anyone who has filled out the motor voter form and is in fact entitled to vote. If you check one of the boxes on the Motor Voter form, e.g., "Reform", or if you fill in the Party Designation line with the name of a Party Designation, you have "enrolled" in that Major Party or Party Designation. For example, if you checked the "Republican" box, you are an enrolled Republican. If you do not check a box, you are "Unenrolled", a status the rest of the country calls "Independent". However, in Massachusetts, an "independent voter" is a member of the Independent Voters Party, which had Major Party Status a few years back.

For better or worse, there is another way to change your party enrollment. If you are an Unenrolled Voter, you may vote in the Presidential Primary of any of the Major Parties (in 1996, and almost certainly in 2000, all three major parties will have one). When you vote, you are enrolled in that party. You may change back to Unenrolled on the spot, by filing out a Motor Voter form, but many people forget to change back. To add complexity, until recently when an Unenrolled voter voted in the September (state office) Primary of a Major Party, he was also re-enrolled into the Party in whose primary he voted. The result of this second way to change party registration is that a substantial fraction of the state's voters don't realize which party they belong to.

## II. Ballot Access by Petition: Practical Issues

In Massachusetts, the only ways to get on the ballot are via petition (the official phrase is "nominating paper") signed by registered voters, or (for Major Party candidates only) via a sticker ("write-in") campaign in the September primary. For Major Party candidates, the petition puts the candidate on the September Primary Ballot. For all other candidates, the petition puts the candidate on the November General Election ballot.

To seek via petition the nomination of a Major Party or Party Designation, you must be enrolled in that Party. Until recently, a voter could only sign one petition per office. This rule has been dropped. Until recently, the number of signatures required to get on the ballot was reduced for "small" Major Parties ("third" Major Parties, Republicans in some parts of the state). This rule has been dropped.

The required number of petition signatures for various offices are:

### TABLE 1 - Legally Required Count of Signatures

U.S. Senator, Governor, Lt. Governor, Attorney General - 10,000\*

Treasurer, Auditor, Secretary of the Commonwealth - 5000\*

U.S. Congress - 2,000

Governor's Council - 1,000

State Senator - 300

State Representative - 150

\*Major Parties must circulate a separate petition for each candidate. Party designations may circulate one petition listing a slate of candidates for statewide office; 10,000 signatures is enough to put the whole slate on the November ballot.

Each signature is checked by town or city officials, and must be valid. To be valid, a signature must (1) be by a registered voter (2) who lives in the district, and (3) who is a member of the right party. Unenrolled voters can sign any petition. Voters enrolled in a Major Party may not sign the petition of a candidate of another Major Party. Thus, in the last election, only Democrats and Unenrolleds could sign a Democratic candidate's petition, and only Libertarians and Unenrolleds could sign a Libertarian petition.

The rules for the U.S. President are more complex: A Party Designation or Unenrolled candidate for U.S. President needs 10,000 signatures to get on the November ballot. The State Committee of a Major Party informs the Secretary of the Commonwealth of the name of their candidate, which automatically goes on the November ballot. Major Party candidates get into the Presidential Primary, when last I checked, because either (1) the State Committee of that Party put them on the ballot, (2) the Secretary of the Commonwealth determines that there is substantial interest in their campaign, or (3) a petition with 10,000 signatures is filed.

## III. Petitioning: Practical Requirements

Your humble correspondent has actually tried to get on the ballot twice, in 1996 as a Major Party Libertarian candidate for U.S. Senate and in 1998 as a Party Designation Libertarian candidate for U.S. Congress. I only know of two other residents of the Commonwealth who has petitioned under both sets of rules, so I speak from one in a million unique personal experience.

First, the numbers above represent minimum numbers of valid signatures. If you have just barely enough signatures, one of your opponents may try to knock you off the ballot. Recall the CLTG tax cut initiative last year. A traditional safety estimate is that you want an extra 20% above the minimum; e.g., if you are running for U.S. Senate, you really want 12,000 good signatures, not 10,000. If you are running for State Rep, you want 180 or 200 valid signatures, not 150.

Now we come to practice. The numbers I just quoted are \*valid\* signatures. An Unenrolled voter can sign any petition. Any Registered Voter can sign the petition of an independent or Party Designation candidate. However, if you have enrolled in a Major Party, you may not sign the petition of a candidate from another Major Party. Thus, in the 1998 election, only Republicans, Unenrolled Voters, and Party Designation voters could sign the petition of a Republican. However, any registered voter could sign a petition to put a Libertarian on the ballot, because in 1998 "Libertarian Party" was a Party Designation. The Libertarian Party has now gained Major Party Status for the 2002 election; consequences are noted below.

If you collect signatures door to door, you know whose signature you have collected, and can check if it is valid. If you stand in a Mall or in front of the supermarket, and collect signatures from people who think they are eligible to sign, there are complications:

First, off the top, 10% (small towns) to 30% (large cities) of the signers turn out not to be registered voters.

Second, especially for the State House, some towns are split between several districts. Most people do not know which District they live in. If your town is divided into four districts, one per seat in the state legislature, close to 3/4 of your signatures will come from people who live in the right town but the wrong District.

Third, many signatures will be from people who are enrolled in the wrong party. They have forgotten which party they are in (for example, they forgot that they voted in a 1960 primary election), don't understand our state's rules on the topic,... You can question people more extensively about whether they are eligible to sign, but this doesn't in practice appear to affect the validity rates.

So, how many real signatures do you need to get on the ballot? I have run under a Party Designation and as a candidate of a Major Party. I have carefully tracked my signature validity rates. In 1998, I had the good fortune to have some petitions evaluated by cities and towns both under the Major Party and the Party Designation rules, so I have exactly comparable numbers. As a party designation candidate, 80% or so of my signatures were valid. As a Libertarian Major Party candidate in 1996, my validity rates ranged from 1/3 down to 12% (in Boston). Jim Fredrickson ran for Congress in 2001; his validity rate in Boston was around 20%; of six and a half thousand raw signatures he collected, around 1600 were in total valid. The signatures evaluated both ways were 80% valid under Party Designation rules, but only 30% valid under the Major Party rules. Carla Howell 2000 got above 40% valid by selective petitioning in towns with many independents. That requires a town of this sort in your district.

The following table shows how many signatures you need. Numbers are for wholesale (Mall, supermarket, post office) col-

lecting, not retail (door to door) collecting. If you have a town split between districts, you'll need even more signatures. For each office, I give five numbers, starting with the legal minimum of valid signatures. The next two columns are estimates for the Democratic and Republican Primary nominations. The fourth column is for a candidate of a third Major Party, e.g. Reform in 1998, Libertarian in 1996. The fifth column is for persons running under a Party Designation or as an independent candidate. The Reform Party numbers are quoted as matching the Libertarian for each status. Actually there are eight or so times as many enrolled Libertarians as there are enrolled Reform Party voters, so it is slightly harder to get on the ballot under the Reform label. The practical difference between Libertarian and Reform is very small. (Here K means thousand)

TABLE 2 - Practical Count of Needed Signatures for Nomination

	Valid	D	R	L/Ref	Independent
Statewide-Senator, Gov..	10K	17K	3K	40K	15K
Statewide-Auditor...	5000	8500	15K	20K	7,500
Congress	2000	3500	6,000	8K**	3,000*
Governor's Council	1000	1700	3,000	4,000	1,500
State Senate	300	550	900	1,200	450
State Representative	150	275	450	600	200

\*Been there, did this, and it worked.

\*\*Fredrickson failed at 6.5K, but another 1.5K would have done it

Note that life is much harder in practice if you are part of a small Major Party than if you are an independent. My D/R numbers are probably not as accurate as the other two columns, where I have practical experience. Required numbers will be higher in areas with poor party membership.,

#### IV. Primaries and Sticker Campaigns.

If you are running as an independent or under a Party Designation, your nominating papers get you onto the November Ballot. File enough valid signatures and you are home free.

If you are running as a candidate of a Major Party, life is more complicated. Major party petitions get you into your party's Primary. You have to win the Primary to get onto the November ballot.

Sticker Campaigns, which are well understood by Massachusetts voters, make life more complicated. I say "sticker" because many candidates supply their voters with a stick-on label. Labels tend to jam machines. In many small towns, Town Clerks will be very helpful about interpreting the voter's handwriting on a real "write-in" vote, in order to avoid having labels.

Suppose you would like to run for some office as the candidate of a Major Party, but missed the petition deadlines, which are a half year before the election. You can still run a sticker campaign in the party's primary. How many votes do you need? It depends:

1) If no one in the party is running for that office, so the bal-

lot is blank, you need to get as many Write-In (sticker) votes as you would have needed signatures on your petition. In 1996, someone ran for State Rep as a Libertarian by running a sticker campaign in the Libertarian Primary and getting (see Table 1) more than the required number of votes (which was then 75).

2) If someone has already done petitioning, and is on the ballot, all you have to do is beat them by getting more write-in votes than they get regular votes. If the person on the ballot gets 5 votes, and you get 6 write-in votes, you are the party nominee, even though you would have needed 10,000 valid signatures on your petitions to appear on the ballot.

Now we come to catch-22. To have your name on the primary ballot of a major party, you must be a member of that Party. Only a Republican can have his name appear on a Republican ballot, and so forth.

**However**, anyone eligible to run for office can run a sticker campaign in the Primary of *any* party. If you get enough votes, or more votes than the person who got on the ballot the hard way, *you win the primary!* What does this mean?

For example, go back to 1996, when the Libertarian Party had Major Party status, and I was their nominee for U.S. Senate. Suppose I had collected enough signatures to get into the Primary. I would reasonably have received about 1600 votes. However, suppose some friends of Bill Weld decided I was going to split the Republican vote. They could have run a sticker campaign to persuade their unenrolled friends to Vote Weld! in the Libertarian Primary. If Weld got 1601 votes, he would have won

the Libertarian Senate Primary and had two legal choices:

1) Accept the Libertarian nomination, and run in November General as Republican, Libertarian

2) Decline the Libertarian nomination, in which case **no one** would have appeared on the U.S. Senate ballot in November as a Libertarian. This was actually done to an Independent Voters Party State Rep candidate, back when they had Major Party status. That is, you can run a sticker campaign in a primary for the sole purpose of knocking an opposing party out of the race.

You can make your own estimate of how many votes a Libertarian nominee will be getting in 2002 in the September Primary, and what her chances are of protecting her nomination from a Democrat or Republican interloper. I'd estimate the Libertarians will have 2000 votes in a statewide primary...and 20-50 votes in a primary for State Senate or State Rep. A Democrat or Republican will need something like the same number of sticker votes to win the Libertarian primary, to knock the actual Libertarian candidate out of the race by September. There is a historical precedent for this bit of political chicanery.

For a candidate for Governor, life is more complex, because the Governor and Lieutenant Governor run in November as a team, but are elected in separate primaries. A sticker campaign in the Libertarian Lieutenant Governor primary by some anonymous Republican, followed by a declination of candidacy, would appear to leave the Libertarian Gubernatorial candidate high and dry, victorious in the September Primary but excluded from the November ballot. ...George Phillies

