

# Let Freedom Ring!

Volume 4 Number 1

Now on the Web at <http://www.cmlc.org>

January 2002

Contents — Let Freedom Ring! Where Your Money Went...Howell 2002...1, Mathias Chair Speaks...1, The Campaign for an Accountable LNC...1, LNC Fundraising Scheme...Correction...1,

Libertarian Strategy Gazette: Looking for a Few Good Men and Women...1, The LNC's Strategic Plan...1, Mickey and Judy or Cleaon and Mel...5

Let Freedom Ring/Libertarian Strategy Gazette Subscriptions are \$13 per year (\$10 per year in Massachusetts). Send to Carol McMahon (Treasurer, PVLA), 221 Burnstead Road, Monson, MA 01057 Your Money Helps Us Spread the Word Further. Checks Payable "PVLA", please. Your donations are gratefully accepted.

REPRINT PERMISSION: Libertarian organizations across the United States and elsewhere in the world are hereby authorized to reproduce in their own state, county, and local newsletters articles and complete sections from the *Libertarian Strategy Gazette*.

## Where Your Money Went Howell 2002

The *Carla Howell for Governor* Campaign has started filing with the Massachusetts Office of Campaign and Political Finance. We learn:

For August 2001, her campaign raised \$1243. For September 2001, her campaign raised almost \$6200, and spent (numbers rounded) \$765 for ads in Liberty magazine, \$110 to Corrigan consulting, and \$300 for printing, mail services, and bank fees.

For October, the Howell campaign brought in \$37,000, and spent nearly \$24,000 of it, including \$3500 to Kay Pirrello and \$1500 to Celeste Parent for Contracted Services, \$1000 to Michael Cloud for consulting, \$515 to Corrigan Consulting, \$783 to Web Commanders for website hosting, \$10,068 for postage, \$2065 to the Libertarian National Committee, \$270 to Fleet Bank, \$2800 to Walter Karl  
(Howell Continued on page 2)

## The Campaign for an Accountable LNC

In a longer press release, LNC member Joe Dehn advises us that LPUS Treasurer Deryl Martin sent a sharply worded e-mail message to the LNC denouncing as unethical Dehn's effort to strengthen the party's financial reserve requirement.

The charge arose in connection with Martin's proposal at the October LNC meeting. Dehn argued that Martin's plan put off the requirement for building a reserve too long and proposed putting the reserve in place six months earlier. The proposal was defeated on a 4 to 8 vote.

"I've been struggling to understand exactly what is 'unethical' about debating a proposal and offering an amendment", said Dehn. "I thought there were good aspects to his proposal, and I said so. I thought there was a problem with it, and I tried to make it better. What's wrong with that? I thought that's why we go to these meetings."

Martin claimed that Dehn had broadsided him with the amendment, instead of suggesting specific alternative language prior to the meeting. He termed  
(Continued on page 4)

## Mathias Chair Speaks

[In a prior issue, we reported Craig Mathias received 10% of the vote. At the start of 2002, Mathias resigned from the LP State Committee, and changed his voter registration to Unenrolled. His former Campaign Chair writes:]

Though Craig finished with 10% in a three-way race, a total significantly better than what Libertarians are accustomed to seeing, we were completely taken aback because we had believed that Craig should finish in second place or better.

We did a considerable amount of precinct analysis to determine where our base of support was located. We made a good faith effort to knock on every door in the district. By Election Day, there were five times more Mathias signs on lawns than signs for the Democrat or Republican. Craig worked the phones and called as many 'frequent voters' as pos-

(Mathias Continued on page 2)

## LNC Fundraising Scheme

Recently, LNC Treasurer Deryl Martin questioned a report in Let Freedom Ring! that the LNC had cashed its final \$25,00 Certificate of Deposit. Martin reports that the LNC held and holds a CD for in excess of \$25,000 that has been not cashed.

Our earlier article relied on public messages from the LNC proving our article's accuracy and confirming statements from LNC members. The public messaged appeared on The Libertarian Party Announcements list on 11/14 and 11/19. The 11/14 announcement included "...On November 15th, we need to send \$35,315 in Unified Membership Program (UMP) payments to...state parties...But we

(Continued on page 4)

## Correction

In a previous issue, we reported that the Libertarian Party of Massachusetts had given the legal maximum of \$500 to the Craig Mathias campaign. We were wrong. The legal maximum contribution for a state party committee is \$3000. Contrary to our prior statement, the \$500 that the LPMA gave the Mathias campaign is only a small fraction of what it was legally permitted to give Mathias.

**Support Liberty! Subscribe to Let Freedom Ring!**

(Continued from page 1) [Where Your Money Went...Howell]  
 (the LNC's list broker), and over \$500 for telephone ex-  
 penses.

In November, 2001 the Howell Campaign raised \$6000 and spent \$24,500, including \$1500 to Celeste Parent for contracted services, \$970 to Corrigan Consulting, \$78 to Denis Corrigan for travel, \$2000 to Dave Rizzo for consulting, \$5000 to Carla Howell to repay a loan, \$6250 to Time Printing, \$3350 to Mail for Less for mailing, \$160 to Fleet Bank for bank charges, and \$5000 for other postage.

As a contrast, for November 2001 the Green Party Governor candidate, Jill Ellen Stein, reported spending \$4700, including 'Contract labor-field' to four persons (\$1000, \$601, \$500, and \$300), \$732 for computer equipment, and \$580 for buttons and bumper stickers.

Prior columns have covered spending by the Libertarian Party of Massachusetts. We have received complaints that LPMA spending is none of our readers' business, because few PVLA members are LPMA donors. Most PVLA members are dues paying members of the National Party, and through the Unified Membership Plan are giving LPMA at least \$12 a year whether they want to or not. If LPMA dislikes our observations, they should consider not taking PVLA member money.

(Continued from page 1) [Mathias Campaign Chair]  
 sible.

Upon two months reflection I still have not identified any mistake made by our campaign. There were things we could have done better, certainly, but there was not a single case where Craig blundered in the press, failed to appeal to a Libertarian constituency, or simply didn't work hard enough.

But there is one factor that we never would have predicted, one that proves that the Libertarian Party of Massachusetts is not nearly ready to win partisan elections. I refer to the failure, nay the *refusal*, of Carla Howell and Michael Cloud to support the Mathias campaign. Against their active resistance, we spent much effort rallying our Libertarian base and had much less time to appeal to other voters.

Howell and Cloud ran the flagship campaign, Howell for Senate, in 2000, with the full support of the Libertarians of Massachusetts. They may believe that this support came from Howell's brilliance as a spokesperson. The truth is simple: we all wanted Howell to succeed because she was the Libertarian candidate. Carla Howell was willing to quit work for a year and campaign as her full-time job. For that she certainly earned our respect.

In 2000 she did nothing to return the favor to the 19 other Libertarian candidates, including yours truly, who by running for office gave her candidacy additional credibility. She spent more time campaigning with Harry Browne than she did with the other 19 candidates combined. When she received information on local volunteers looking to help *Libertarians* (not just Carla Howell), she refused to share that information with others.

On behalf of the Mathias campaign, I asked the Howell campaign for their yardsign locations in Ashland and Framingham. I offered them in return all of our information. Not only did they refuse every single attempt at cooperation, but each of them attacked Craig Mathias's libertarian credentials.

Howell and Cloud believe that they have no legal obligation to share their proprietary information. They forget that most of this so-called *proprietary* information came from local activists. They will only hurt themselves in the long run because those activists will in turn refuse to support the flagship campaigns. One activist had a hard drive crash after sending volunteer information to the Howell campaign. When he asked for his data back he was completely stonewalled!

The Mathias campaign was not seeking a free ride on the labor of Carla Howell and Michael Cloud. It is now very obvious to me that Howell and Cloud are seeking a free ride on the labor of the rest of the LPMA activists.

In the past I have generally avoided distinguishing certain individuals for praise to a campaign for two reasons: first, they know who they are and I've thanked them and second, I risk offending those who were not named. I will now take that risk and thank :

First, George Phillies not only donated much of his own money but also helped us raise a small fortune. .

Second, Kamal Jain not only pushed through the campaign's very late request for LPMA funding but also drove many miles far too often to make sure that we had a street presence.

Finally, and most, Dennis Corrigan for a million things. Even though as Treasurer Dennis was a paid employee of the campaign, his work as Treasurer went far beyond the paltry sum paid to him. Beyond that, he drove 100 miles round trip on numerous occasions to help the campaign, including spending all day with us on Election Day.

But Dennis's value to the Mathias campaign, and to the LPMA as a whole, goes far beyond this. Behind closed doors Craig and Dennis and I did not agree on every issue. Often enough Craig and I voted on a particular issue one way and Dennis voted the other way. In every case where Dennis and I disagreed, I gained an insight that I did not previously have. If I still believed in pursuing the opposite course, it was because I believed that there was no right-wrong answer to a question and that we had to try something new. Most of all, Dennis is brutally honest on every issue. When there is a problem, he does not hide behind false optimism or false pessimism; he simply weighs all the factors and maintains a wide visibility of all the possible outcomes without losing sight of the ultimate goal.

It is very easy to underestimate the value that Dennis Corrigan brings to the LPMA because he is more low-key and behind the spotlight that shines on others. But it is the loss of those who make this critical mistake, and it was certainly to my benefit to have the opportunity to work with Dennis.

I realize that there is a considerable amount of negativity in this message. I hope everyone understands that if the LPMA expects to grow, it is critical that LPMA understand the mistakes it is making and correct those mistakes before it is too late. The LPMA, like the national party, is quickly approaching a moment of truth; it can continue to fund high-level campaigns at the expense of the local activists and campaigns, or it can strike a healthy balance between the two. My intent is merely to provide information so that all can make an informed decision.

## LNC Staff, etc.

...Peter Orvetti <orvetti@bermanco.com>

For several months at the end of 1999 and the start of 00, I was briefly in the employ of LNC, Inc., as a staff writer for LP News and several other promotional publications. I left the job in mid-spring. Because of the brevity of my tenure and the fact that my employment coincided with a controversial period in the LP, I have since been asked many questions.

There have been suggestions that I was witness to some sort of conspiracy, or that I left because of a disagreement with policy. I am sorry to inform the conspiracy theorists that the story is much less interesting.

In 1999 I was employed as an editor with National Journal. Following the Columbine incident in April, I became deeply concerned by the growing encroachments on students' civil liberties. I felt a need to involve myself in freedom issues, and was shortly thereafter offered an editorial job at the Cato Institute.

I was entirely unqualified for the post, and to this day I am not sure why I was selected. Though I was happy to have the job, I have always felt it was rather unfortunate the position was given to someone as inexperienced as I was.

The job became extremely difficult for me, and I was performing poorly, so I decided to leave. Unfortunately, I gave notice without securing a new position. I was then told of a writing position with LNC, Inc., and accepted that role.

I was very much looking forward to a role in the LP. I had never been active in the party, but had followed the LP since -- before I was old enough to vote -- and had discussed becoming a candidate with some LP members a year and a half before my employment.

I liked the job and I respected, and still do respect, everyone who works in the office. But my performance did not meet the standards that LNC, Inc., had set for the position. Frankly, I still disagree with the organization's assessment -- I have since published articles in The Washington Times, The Baltimore Sun, on the Scripps Howard News Wire, and other publications under my own name; I have "ghost-written" pieces that were published in USA Today and The New York Times. LP donors should be pleased that LNC, Inc., has an even higher standard than these publications.

In any event, it became clear to me that my work was inadequate, and that made doing the job ever harder. I sought out other employment, and when I found it, I departed.

I have two regrets. First, I departed in a rather cowardly way, leaving a letter of resignation and clearing out. I owed it to the LP to provide a smoother transition, and I am sorry for this. Second, I made a few "sour grapes" comments in a cou-

ple of e-mail messages to LP and Cato acquaintances.

These were due mainly to my embarrassment and anger at feeling rejected from a job I really liked, but also because of some of my criticisms of the LP. Alone, these were no big deal -- but they apparently got some people thinking I was a critic of the party.

This simply was not the case. Though I have criticized some aspects of the party, and as a pragmatist I have some doubts about the possibility of real electoral success, I believe that LNC, Inc., is functioning extremely well. I think too many LP activists are far too hard on the LNC, Inc., staff. My own bad experiences at LNC, Inc., have done nothing to deflate my high regard for each of them.

Steve Dasbach is an intelligent and fair man who has represented the party well. He has always treated me respectfully. Although I do not actually know Steve that well, I have always been struck by his ability to moderate the dissension between various factions of the party without giving short shrift to any of them

Bill Winter is probably the single hardest-working individual I have ever met, and one of the smartest. He has singlehandedly created a voluminous flow of the most professional-looking publications of any alternative party. I do not know what Bill is paid by the LNC, but I do know a bit about the field and I'm sure he could easily make twice as much -- probably more -- in the business sector. Giving that up counts as a major contribution to the party.

Ron Crickenberger's importance is hard to overstate. In addition to overcoming the hoops and pitfalls of the ballot access process again and again, he also spearheaded that most impressive 00 U.S. House candidate push. And he was even listed in Campaigns and Elections as one of the most important new faces in politics. To those outside the Beltway, that's like being listed on the Fortune 500 -- and it's a feather in the cap of the LP.

George Getz, besides being a heck of a nice guy, has a natural talent for thinking up that one-liner that makes a radio interview work. And while it may not mean much to Libertarians, the fact that he has Capitol Hill experience has increased the credibility and stature of the LP's communications.

The fact that my departure came around the time of the Hornberger mailings added to the confusion. Some asked me if there was any LNC/Browne collusion, and assumed that my departure implied allegiance with one faction or against another.

In fact, as I have said repeatedly, there was absolutely no collusion between LNC staff and the Browne campaign leading up to the 00 convention. In fact, on one occasion a junior staffer was chided in my presence for pro-Browne comments; and when Don Gorman entered the race, several staffers

openly expressed pleasure, feeling a good nomination contest would be good for the party.

As for me, I have never met Jacob Hornberger or Harry Browne. I e-mailed Hornberger in early 1999, before starting employment at LNC, Inc., to ask him about the presidential campaign he seemed to be planning at the time. I interviewed Browne by telephone late in 00 for my website, Orvetti.com, but never spoke with him while working at LNC, Inc.

My own personal sympathies were with Browne's campaign, and I found Hornberger's essays rather reckless. I am much more favorably inclined toward George Phillies's efforts.

George and I disagree about some of his conclusions, but I am most impressed by the intricacy of his work. Unlike Hornberger, Phillies bases his comments on research, not invective.

While I liked Browne's message, and found Browne himself quite likeable when I interviewed him for Orvetti.com, his campaign's defensiveness puzzled me. My Orvetti.com interview with Browne dealt largely with why the media was ignoring him -- since Browne actually led Pat Buchanan in some polls at the time. It was a very favorable piece. I also let Browne respond to Hornberger's charges, which he did effectively and convincingly. But for some reason, the campaign later sent out a mass e-mailing in Browne's name saying the piece "contains some misunderstandings about what I said to him" -- even though what I published was a transcript of our conversation.

What's the point of rehashing all of this? In part, I want to clear the air and clear my own name. I'm not an employee of LNC, Inc., and probably won't be ever again, which makes me free to be active in the LP. But I do not want anyone thinking I have some secret knowledge or that there were scandals galore afoot.

**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****

don't have quite enough money in our bank account. We need your help...we have just a DAY to raise the remaining \$7,755. The 11/19 announcement included "... 294 people ... contributed \$16,827 to our e-mail appeal on Wednesday. (This) support allowed us to mail the monthly... (UMP) payment checks..."

The reasonable English construction of these two announcements is: 1) The LNC needed to pay \$35,315 to states for UMP. 2) The LNC had \$27,560 in the bank, and needed to raise another \$7,755 to make the payments. 3) The \$16,827 to the LNC 'allowed us to mail the ...(UMP) payment checks..."

If these statements had been true, the LPUS could not have had \$25,000 in another reserve fund in some place. In fact: (1) "in the bank" refers literally to a bank account, not to total resources. (2) The implication that payments could not be made without raising \$7,755 was misleading. (3) The assertion "Your support allowed us to mail the monthly... (UMP) payment checks." was untrue. The LNC had another \$25,000 in reserves that *could* have covered UMP payments.

(Continued from page 1) [Campaign for an Accountable LNC]

Dehn's actions "unprofessional, obstructionist, and downright unethical" and said they led to "needless and excessive" discussion which cut into the time available for "very important SPT work".

Dehn says that he offered the amendment after it became clear how long a delay Martin proposed. "The proposal distributed prior to the meeting was not clear on this point. I was not completely happy with it for other reasons, and I have discussed some of my concerns with the Treasurer both publicly and privately over the last several months. But it never occurred to me in reading his proposal that he could have meant to put it off that long. When I realized how bad it was, I decided I had to propose an amendment."

The LNC has been struggling to build a reserve. In 1999 and 2000, a fixed percentage of revenue was to be set aside. For 2001, a plan called for a reserve of \$150,000 in certificates of deposit. The planned purchases were not completed. In September, Martin directed that \$50,000 be taken from the reserve without the required Executive Committee approval. The National Office reported there was only \$25,464.79 in the reserve as of the end of September.

"Martin ridiculed the existing policy, which was put in place at the request of former Treasurer Mark Tuniewicz, as 'not a policy'. But it was a policy. It is in the Policy Manual. He either didn't understand what the policy required, or chose to ignore it.", Dehn said.

Martin asked that his proposal not be included in the formal Policy Manual. Dehn said the LNC has passed "a 'feel-good' motion that doesn't actually have any effect until after a new LNC takes office after the 2002 convention."