
Libertarian Strategy Gazette

Volume 3 Number 5

May 2003

A New Party?

by Sean Haugh

As it appeared in Liberty For All! www.libertyforall.net

Given the current condition of the national Libertarian Party, if we wanted to change anything about it, now would be the perfect time.

At the very least, we need to create a backup structure to the current hierarchy. While I am brimming with confidence that the national LP is going to come out of the current crisis stronger than ever, I'm not foolhardy. We have to acknowledge that the national party as we know it could implode, and if it does it will be sooner rather than later.

This natural hierarchical structure was very useful for us once, and still has great value. But the paradigm has shifted since we came up with the model of a strong, professionalized national office. Back in the mid 1990s, almost all the states were weak. We believed a strong national office was necessary to help raise them up and run the show.

And for a time, it served us well. There are certain areas that are best left to a national Libertarian Party organization - national media outreach, policy for federal and international issues, economies of scale in printing and distribution, and so on. There are some sound business reasons why we need an active and vibrant national party organization.

But unlike a business, it's a given that the national Libertarian Party will continue in some form no matter what. The state and local parties are too strong. We have an identity, a common principle, and in most states, ballot access.

If the implosion comes, and we don't have a backup system in place, we'll be in a mess. All we'll be at that point is 51 separate state parties, who already enjoy significant ideological and strategic differences. If set adrift on our own, I despair of the possibilities of getting all of us back together again. Some kind of structure is necessary so that our 51 separate directions can also be the same direction.

Plus, there are the physical assets of the national party to consider - files, databases, logos, etc. As we are now seeing with the collapse of the Henry Hazlett Foundation and FreeMarket.net, the attempts to pick up the pieces and continue their valuable work are hamstrung by, in large part, a lack of a coherent vision of how this work can continue. Their assets will be scattered to the four winds, or at least to those who are willing to buy the parts that interest them, and that's a sad thing.

[A New Party?] (Continued on page 2)

State Chairs Meet

Part Three

Bob Sullentrup, State Chair of Missouri, has again prepared an extended set of notes on the States Chairs meeting. These notes were reviewed and enhanced by Bonnie Scott, Jeff Allen, Joe Dehn, Sean Haugh, Dianne Pilcher, and Mark Schreiber.

This article began in the March 2003 **Let Freedom Ring!** and is available in complete form—subject to complications owing to format translation to .pdf—in the *Electronic Supplement* to the March 2003 issue of **Libertarian Strategy Gazette**.

Sullentrup writes:

Austin Hough (IL) also recommended National concentrate on national races, though this was met with some disagreement.

Other items included

Focusing on federal races for president, senate, and the house

Providing a clearinghouse for best practices

Providing information such as with the BCRA

Be a clearinghouse for ideas and perform as a template for state organizations.

Membership

Goal ten of the LP's strategic plan is to increase its support base including members, contributors, and volunteers.

Mark Nelson asked the group to focus the discussion on these three items. Others, however, wished to broaden the issue to include voters and perhaps voter registration activities.

Aaron Starr (CA) tried to resolve the issue by asking, "Who is our customer"? Aaron's answer was to say "He who is willing to pay the freight". This spurred some to suggest "investor" would be a better term.

Mark tried to bring the group back by drawing a distinction between an electoral process versus an organizational process, which was the topic at hand.

Steve Givot introduced a technique called "intentional dialog" which the LNC SPT (Strategic Planning Team) had used to understand opposing positions, identify points of common agreement and identify areas for research. The process involves "mirroring" in which one party plays back what the other person said until the first person agrees that what the second person played back matches what the first

[State Chairs Meet] (Continued on page 6)

(Continued from page 1) [A New Party]

Fortunately, there's a State Chairs Conference right around the corner (relative to writing date), February 22-23 in Houston. Perfect timing. I propose that at this meeting, we form an Association of Libertarian State Parties (ALSP, or whatever you want to call it, I'd just prefer an acronym that is less pronounceable in English, please).

All LP state chairs and executive directors would be members. The core administrative expenses are minimal, and can be covered either by individual donations, and/or moderate voluntary dues. This organization would take control of its own meetings and activities from the LNC. It could enter into regional or national Libertarian projects on its own. And, it will be an organization that can provide a seamless transition from the national LP in the worst case scenario.

This independent organization could become quite influential no matter what the national LP does. It does not have to be in any competition with the LNC. It could simply be the sprouting of another big branch on the Libertarian tree. Given the talent and experience assembled, this group could probably accomplish whatever it wants.

The simple fact of the matter is, the states have it going on. Compared to the national party, many of the state LPs are doing very well organizationally and financially. At the very least, the states have plenty to teach the national party about how to do stuff.

This information is much more valuable than simply sharing "best practices." These success stories are examples of grassroots leadership, the stuff this party is truly made of. An ALSP could do a better job of spreading this success around than the current system.

If the LNC survives, the ALSP could do a lot of what are now considered special projects of the national party, leaving the LNC to concentrate on the core responsibilities. We see a similar structure in our competitors. The Demopublicans have strong national party organizations that keep the doors open and the machines humming. But their true strength is in their subsidiary special interest organizations, from the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee to the Log Cabin Republicans. At the very least, this new ALSP could just be a great sign of our growth, a product of us becoming big enough that we need a new division of labor.

I am deliberately avoiding over-conceptualizing this notion. What an ALSP could do is not up to me, it's up to the states. I expect that some folks at the Houston conference will have brilliant ideas of what form this new organization could take that I would have never imagined. So I'm only fleshing out this proposal enough that if it's a good one, those who will be putting it into practice have the flexibility to make the most of it.

I'm not even sure we need officers, or any other trappings of hierarchy. The system already works pretty well now without them. The last two State Chairs Conferences were extremely productive with nothing more than a moderator holding the agenda together. An agenda, by the way, that is only created by the participants at the beginning of the weekend. If you want a living example of how anarchy (or, as I prefer to label it, spontaneous order - it's less scary that way) can work, an LP State Chairs Conference is as good as they come. We'll do fine without creating new offices. We already have so much leadership rooted in knowledge and experience that we don't need to invest any in the arbitrary authority of titles.

We've come a long way in the last six or seven years. As we enter 2003, many of the states have grown up and are ready to lead. Every LNC region contains a couple of these leadership states, and almost every state party is doing something others would benefit from learning.

Maybe now is the time to change the paradigm entirely and move from the standard hierarchical structure to a self-governing association. I've always been fonder of the Articles of Confederation than the federal Constitution, personally. Even if the current paradigm survives, there's still room for a new one.

I love ideas that are equally good in either the best or worst case scenarios. The Association of Libertarian State Parties is an idea whose time has come.

The states have proven that they know what they are doing. The time has come for them to feel their strength and assert their influence.

A New Party? (part two)
by Sean Haugh

In the above I laid out the bare bones of an idea of creating an Association of Libertarian State Parties (ALSP). In the best case scenario, this new organization could Do Stuff on a national or regional scale that is different from what the national office in DC can do. In the worst case, if the Libertarian National Committee (LNC) goes boom, at least we'll have an alternate structure to hold our national party together.

But what good is another new Libertarian organization, really? We already have quite enough bureaucracy. There are already a sufficient number of titles to go around. And there's certainly plenty left to do under the current national party structure. Personally, I think about the last thing we need to work on right now is creating something that's merely a shadow LNC.

In order to be anything other than a complete waste of our time, this new organization must further our mission and grow our party. It must represent a natural division of labor.

So let's ask the question, would an ALSP help grow the party nationally in a way that the LNC can't? Well, what do we want the party to do nationally, anyway? I'd say the core functions are: accounting and administration, media communications, the convention, candidate support, fundraising, and LP News.

Note that, in this glorious Information Age, most all of these tasks can be done from home, or at least a smaller office. Some of them can be designed to be self-funded. Fundraising and LP News should pay for themselves, and candidate support can bring something in.

If ballot access remains an ongoing concern of the national party, you can add that to the list. It could also be easily argued that other affiliate services are a necessary function, so let's give it the benefit of the doubt and talk some about that as well.

MG, my glorious LNC mentor and tag team partner, once said that the national party is basically in the publishing and seminar business. This deserves to be repeated. If you look at my list above, it's all pretty much all publishing and seminars, or the administrative and fundraising activities to make them happen.

That being the case, these seminars and publications can easily be decentralized, developed by individual initiatives rather than central planning. This is already happening. In the area of candidate support, there's Don Gorman and his Campaign School for Winners, and we've developed several one or two day seminars for our own use here in NC, just to name a very few examples.

But let's not get ahead of ourselves. I'm not here to be

preaching radical decentralism. The administration of the party, not to mention the federal laws which govern its conduct, requires some significant activity at the center.

One thing an ALSP can do is to foster those kinds of grassroots publications and seminars, and maybe even create a few of their own. Not only candidate training seminars, but affiliate services of all kinds could be effectively performed by the ALSP in the spirit of self-help. This is one way the states can show they are ready to lead themselves.

There are always lots of great ideas floating around that the LNC doesn't quite have the resources yet to make happen. Others may be more of regional rather than national interest. The vast majority of these ideas are for outreach projects. ALSP could be a network that puts the resources together to make more of these projects happen.

I would recommend that an ALSP not give any money to candidates, particularly federal candidates. That would allow it to go places where the LNC could not. In the eyes of the FEC, ALSP would be closer to a PAC than a party committee. (Add some tomato sauce and we'll have alphabet soup.)

There's also the wildcard of BCRA. Under the federal campaign finance laws effective the day after the November election, there's a whole heck of a lot the LNC used to do that all of a sudden they can't do any more. It's a royal pain in the neck, I tell you. It will probably be summer or even later before we know how much of BCRA will survive in court.

If, however, any significant parts of it do remain the law of the land (God forbid), there may be other current operations of the LNC that would find a better home elsewhere. Selling party literature could be one such area. Due to both BCRA and laws passed before it, the convention is already moving in the direction of an event run by independent host committees than the national party itself. ALSP could possibly serve as the permanent independent host committee.

Then there's LP News, which has always been the odd duck. It used to be handled by an independent contractor, and now it essentially is again, with Bill Winter publishing from his lush mountain bunker back home in New Hampshire. Since it is intimately connected with membership dues, I think LP News always stays with the LNC. But it does point up the fact that the national office knows it too benefits from some decentralization from time to time.

Media communications also naturally has a home in the DC office. It's good to have one consistent Voice of the Party, especially when we're lucky to have someone as great at it as George Getz. Still, an ALSP could easily help promote a much broader range of party representatives. After all, George can't do every radio and TV interview that this party is going to earn. This is an area where more is always merrier. (It's also the area most often mentioned in the feedback

**Be yourname@4liberty.net
NOW ONLY \$17/MONTH
TO LIBERTARIANS**

www.excell.net

Providers of Internet Services

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

Dialup in most states and Canada.

\$17.00 per month

Libertarian Owned

Libertarian Operated

Supporters of the

Pioneer Valley Libertarian Association

National Dialup Service

excell.net/excellnet_national-dialups.htm

Available in most states and some in Canada. \$19.50 per month.

to the first installment of this article.)

Ideally, the ALSP would eventually be able to carry more of the load in outreach and training, allowing the LNC to be more directly concerned with administration and fundraising. Now what's left for the LNC might sound boring to you, but it's the heart of the Party Machine and thus will always be fascinating. Well, at least to some of us (and, gentle reader, you should probably always be watching those some of us like hawks).

There will be areas of overlap, but that's to be expected. If we're smart, we can turn that into synergy, not redundancy. The simple fact is that the state parties have grown up and are ready to show some national leadership. We can show it through the structure of the LNC, or we can show it in a new way, one that supports and builds upon the LNC's work.

That's why I propose the formation of an Association of Libertarian State Chairs. We've got the leadership, the experience, and the creativity in hand to help this party grow even more. Let's put it to good use.

Sean Haugh is the Executive Director of the Libertarian

The Liberty Town Project

Reprinted from Liberty for All libertyforall.net
 Today I shall describe my Liberty Town Project, which is a bit different from the Free State Project.

In the Free State Project Libertarians move to a specific state to enhance the local activist density. I here broach the notion of the Liberty Town. In a sense, the Liberty Town is the Free State Project on a smaller scale. However, the Liberty Town project requires no commitment from any Libertarian to pick up stakes and move ...wherever. Instead, the Liberty Town project proposes to advance Liberty by taking advantage of ongoing natural processes.

The core issue is that Americans move from place to place, on the average, every five years or so. There's a lot of width to that average. Many residents of Worcester have lived in the same house for 30 or 40 years. Others move twice a year. The Liberty Town project seeks to take advantage of this mobility by focusing it. If you are going to move to Worcester and live in a suburb, you might move to Paxton or Sterling or Shrewsbury--small towns that most readers do

Let Freedom Ring! Libertarian Strategy Gazette

Subscriptions \$15 per year.

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

not know. Now, suppose matters were arranged so that Libertarians knew that when you moved to the Worcester area there was a designated Liberty town, a place that Libertarians might consider first. Some people would like the place; others would not. However, the natural process of in and out migration can be used to relocate Libertarians so we would modestly tend to live in the same places, one or two places per metropolitan area, increasing the likelihood that a single town would gain a Libertarian majority and provide a de-monstration project for our Party's ideas. There is no proposal that you choose to move solely to advance to advance Liberty. We won't turn you away, but you are not being asked to move. However, if you are going to move anyhow, you might at least consider a relatively congenial place to go.

What sort of features should each Liberty Town have?

A wide range of home prices. Some people are well to do; others are not. The rich bedroom community, however small, cannot be a home for many Libertarians. Open land for construction, and relatively friendly zoning so entrepreneurs can live close to home, are plusses. Tolerance for mobile homes is a plus.

Access to interstate highways and the Internet are very positive. The better the road transport, the further people can commute and still live in the Liberty Town. Given the predilection of many readers for the net, a town with terrible Internet access is likely not desirable.

Low public debt. If you influence public policy, you can reduce government activity and spending. However, you are stuck with whatever debt you inherit, at least until you pay it off. Low taxes are nice, but not nearly as important, because if our policies are right high **taxes** can be fixed.

High **debt** is less tractable.

Moderate school quality. Excellent schools lead to high home prices, not an attraction for people who may be making a sacrifice to move. They are not a lure for many Libertarians, many of whom believe in home or private schooling. However, not all people either believe in or can afford home or private schooling for their children, so a place with really bad schools is not acceptable.

Quality of state law is not an issue. We are proposing to do this in every major metropolitan area, so in each state you have the state laws that you have. However, many items involve local options, and areas with a record of liberal zoning, licensing,... policies are favorable. Some attention must be given to the local population in terms of social tolerance issues. I am reminded of a friend, I shall not say where in the Midwest, who reported that about once a year the local preachers of a particular Christian faith got together and agreed that the time had come to preach another crusade against the Mormons. The friend was himself a

Saint, and was not amused.

The town directly in the path of urban growth is undesirable, because many other people will be showing up at the same time. For example, on the rail line from Worcester to Boston four new commuter rail stations have recently opened. Their locations are to be avoided like the plague because hundreds of Bostonians are about to descent on these places for their own reasons.

I am prepared to bet a modest sum that I have missed some obvious considerations.

Create Local Libertarian Organizations An Arizona Plan

Libertarians,

In previous emails I have stated my opinion that the Libertarian Party should do just a few things, but it should do them well. One of the things that the Libertarian Party can do better than any other freedom organization is act as a point of contact for people that are dissatisfied with the politics of the Republicans and Democrats. I believe that it is principles that really matter. However, most people have only a vague dislike for politics as usual, and they often look for an alternative to it in the form of another political party. These people will figure out the principles of Liberty more quickly if they make contact with an organization that can help them along in the process.

I also believe that the best place to provide a point of contact and education is at the local level. Arizona currently has a problem doing this because 9 out of Arizona's 15 counties have no active Libertarian organization. In those counties, there is no one locally that people seeking an alternative to politics as usual can contact. There is no one representing the Libertarian party to the local media. And there is no one holding meetings where people interested in liberty can come and find out about freedom activities. One of the most important things we can do is create active Libertarian organizations in those 9 counties.

How do we create activist organizations in the counties that don't currently have them? George Squyres in Coconino County and David Owens in Mohave County have hit upon the right way to do this. They singlehandedly organized their own counties from the ground up, and then they successfully started organizations in Yavapai and Gila Counties the same way. George and Dave got the mailing list of registered Libertarians in the county, sent letters and made phone calls to set up the first county meeting, and have provided assistance and advice to the new organizations since then. Individual volunteer activism focused on one county at a time is the proven way to get this done. We need activists to take on the remain-

ing 9 counties and do for them what George and Dave have done for Yavapai and Gila counties.

To facilitate this effort, the ALP board is creating "adopt-a-county", to solicit individual volunteer activists across the state who will help specific counties create active Libertarian organizations. The state party will pursue getting the voter registration data from the counties, and will provide that data to the volunteers for use in creating the new county organizations. The state party will also put volunteers willing to work on different aspects of county organization in contact with one another, and will seek to provide other assistance if is requested. George Squyres has volunteered to help the volunteers do what he has done, by answering questions and providing details on what has been successful for him and Dave.

I am personally "adopting" Cochise County, and I will be focusing my own personal efforts on establishing a Libertarian organization in Cochise County. I am asking all Arizona Libertarians who agree with the goal of having active Libertarian organizations in all Arizona counties to do what I am doing by picking a county and "adopting" it. Please step forward now and sign up to make local organization happen in Arizona. Perhaps you know someone in one of these counties, or you have visited one of the counties in the past or would like to visit it in the future. These are all excellent reasons to adopt a particular county. If you just want to help whatever county most needs it, we can let you know which county is most in need of the help you are willing to offer. The key is for individuals to focus their efforts on one county at a time and see the effort through to completion.

We need leaders for each of the efforts to create new county

Subscribe to Let Freedom Ring! Only \$15 a year to Carol McMahon, 221 Bumstead Road, Monson MA 01057 Checks Payable "PVLA", please.

organizations. We also need people willing to assist with mailings, make telephone calls, and attend the first county meeting to provide logistical and moral support. Mailings and telephone calls do cost a little bit of money. Not a lot of money, because we're not talking about a lot of registered Libertarians in most of these counties. Nevertheless, if you are willing to do the work but can't afford to spend any money on the project, we will try to hook you up directly with someone willing to help out on the financial end. I believe everyone can help out in some way, and it is now time to roll up our sleeves and get to work.

TO BE CLEAR: I am not asking you to send money to a centralized financial program at the state party level. I am asking all of you who believe that liberty is best advocated from a bottom-up, local activist organization to step forward right now and get personally involved by helping to establish a local Libertarian organization in a county where there isn't one currently. You will have help from other ac-

tivists and access to information from people who have done it before. Please reply to this email now and indicate your willingness to help create a Libertarian organization in one of the following counties.

Place an X next to the county that you are willing to help:

- () List of Counties Deleted
 - () I will help whichever county needs it the most
- Place an X next to all of the tasks you are willing to do for that county:

- () Lead the organization effort
- () Assist in mailing a letter to registered Libertarians
- () Assist in calling registered Libertarians
- () Attend the first county meeting
- () Contribute money for mailings and long distance telephone calls directly to those doing the work of organizing the county

Please send your response to lpaz-info@cox.net. As usual, your comments or questions are also welcome.
--Jason Auvenshine

State Chair, Arizona Libertarian Party, Inc.

Campaign Matching Funds

"Is there something inherently unLibertarian about taking campaign matching funds?"

Leslie Fish writes:

Babe, if your ethics aren't utilitarian, you're in danger of drifting off to cloud-cuckoo land. To put it another way, if your ethics aren't grounded in the realities of survival, you're gonna die.

The only problem I've ever seen with Utilitarianism is that it lacks the dimension of time; experience has shown that the greatest good for the greatest number" must also include "for the greatest foreseeable extent of time", or else you wind up falling for get-rich-quick scams. The "match-ing funds" game turned out to be just that -- a get-rich-quick scam -- and a little study, caution and forethought would have exposed it. Yes, society *is* a jungle (and politics is a thicker jungle than the rest), complete with predators, parasites and plagues, and you just have to be jungle-wise to get through it alive.

Ethics are supposed to be survival-guides for a group, a community, a society. We've taken up Libertarian (or, in my case, Anarchist) ethics because we've seen that government is a mammoth parasite which damages and even threatens the survival of our community. If we see a chance to damage the parasite right back, we should take it. So, in answer to your question, if I saw an opportunity to get \$\$ (its lifeblood) out of the gov, then yes, I'd take it. No, I wouldn't stop with taking back just what blood the beast has bled out of me; I'd bleed it as dry as I could, in hopes of bleeding the monster to death. I suppose our ethics differ on this point because you-all are merely trying to tame the beast, while I'm trying to kill it.

(Continued from page 1) [State Chairs Meeting]

person said.

"Most of the time we are thinking about our response," said Steve, "rather than listening. Our minds are single threaded processors".

Mike Dixon and Phil Miller performed a quick vignette as an illustration of the process.

The keys to the process are the phrases "What I heard you say was ..." by the receiver followed by "Was I correct"?

If "no", then the process iterates. If "yes", then the receiver asks, "Is there more"?

Author's note: *The Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle applies here. Just as it asserts it is impossible to simultaneously determine the location of an atom and its velocity as*

Subscribe to Let Freedom Ring! Only \$15 a year to Carol McMahan, 221 Bumstead Road, Monson MA 01057

a result of the interference from the detection, so too was it impossible to record the exact words of the participants in the exchanges that follow.

The written text of the senders is abundantly apparent when presented in readable and reviewable form. When spoken in the air and then with the words suddenly vacant, the dynamic changes distinctly. Accordingly, 1) do not assume the exact text of the senders is transcribed here with perfect fidelity and 2) remember the receivers were unable to avail themselves of the immediate playback and correction mechanism that prepared text as presented here provides.

Mark Rutherford (IN) and Aaron Starr (CA) paired off on the question: "Should the LP continue to follow a membership model with dues - is it an asset or an impediment"?

(IN) Mark Rutherford (sender)
(CA) Aaron Starr (listener)

Mark: *The membership model is an impediment and serves to exclude LP-leaning activists*

Aaron: *What I'm hearing you say is ...did I get it?*

Mark: *Yes.*

Aaron: *Is there more?*

Mark: *There is no difference in terms of activism and dedication between LP activists who sign the pledge versus those who do not.*

Aaron: *(mirrored)*

Mark: *There is no difference between LP activists who give \$25, versus those who give but don't join the party.*

Aaron: *(repeated twice)*

Mark: *(rephrased) Considering non-members who are active, versus joiners who are active, there is no difference between them in terms of their activism.*

Steve Givot, the facilitator, jumped in: “Among givers, there is no difference in activity between members and non-members”

Aaron: *More?*

Mark: *None.*

Steve summarized Mark’s points:

A membership requirement excludes activists
 There is no difference between those members who give and are activists versus those who are not members and are activists
 Being a member doesn’t seem to affect levels of activism.

At this point, Aaron and Mark reversed roles of sender and receiver.

Aaron: *People who give money are more likely to become active than those who do not.*

Mark: *(mirrored), Did I get it?*

Aaron: *No. (repeated)*

Mark: *Now did I get it?*

Aaron: *Yes.*

Mark: *More?*

Aaron: *Those who give money tend to be more active.*

Mark: *(mirrored and got it), more?*

Aaron: *Yes. Those who get a membership benefit are more likely to give.*

Mark: *(mirrored) Did I get it?*

Aaron: *Not quite. Our offering membership status for money is more likely to get us more money rather than not.*

Mark: *(mirrored) Did I get it?*

Aaron: *No. For a new person who’s never given, offering membership as a benefit increases the likelihood they will give money.*

Mark: *(mirrored, and got it)*

Aaron: *Offering membership increases likelihood they will give us an initial gift.*

Mark: *(mirrored, and got it) More?*

Aaron: *Offering the benefit of a membership increases the likelihood that someone will give and will increase the likelihood of someone becoming active.*

Mark: *(mirrored, and got it) More?*

Aaron: *Conversely, not giving somebody the benefit of a membership reduces the likelihood of someone giving for the first time, and thus less likely to give at all.*

At this point, Steve Givot noted this process helps:

1. Understand each other
2. Identify areas of agreement
3. Identify areas of disagreement for which additional research or information could help test and resolve.

Steve clarified a point of agreement:

“Contributor” is the focus, not “membership”

Next Steve called for individuals to relate anecdotal and personal experience on whether membership actually “primes the pump” or “creates a threshold barrier”.

Aaron Starr (CA) used this time to clarify that his use of membership was as tool rather than a requirement. If you ask them to be a supporter, you can offer them a “free upgrade” in the future at no incremental cost.

Moreover, CA tends to get its activists through personal contact, not through membership campaigns in the mail. Also, Aaron noted that activism didn’t decrease when membership decreased.

Someone else asked, “Are we a political party or a membership organization”?

Summary Agreement:

1. We should focus on our support base
2. Membership is an option, but not the only tool in the box -- flexibility is key
3. By almost every other metric than membership, we are doing phenomenally well
4. Many states got more members when they ran more candidates (IN, AL, ID, MN). Some, however, did not (CA, TX)

Branding the Libertarian Party, Mark Schreiber

Strategy One calls for defining, developing and promoting the LP.

Mark Nelson framed this discussion by asking the attendees to assess whether “establishing an LP brand would be beneficial to the party”.

Mark Schreiber of the national staff noted, “We have the best political product and the worst marketing. Our brand is defined by the best AND the worst things associated with it, and every little detail in between”.

Mark has 25 years of marketing experience in many industries and has run for Lt. Governor. *Mark thinks we could dominate a state by 2008.*

In order to do that, the LP needs to create a brand. We would “encapsulate what we are in a positive way, so people hear what we have to say”.

In order to create a brand, you must:

1. Know who you are
2. Know why you exist (why are we here? - we do have a mission statement)

3. Know who you serve
All are equally important.

Who we are:

Libertarians are principled individuals, who are self-reliant, and who have reluctantly entered into the political arena in order to restore liberty and our American values.

Why we exist:

To move public policy in a libertarian direction, by building a political party that elects Libertarians to public office.

Who we serve:

A core constituency for the LP has not been identified.

Mark noted that protests, such as our tax day activities, don't work. "You have to get on the inside, prove you're credible and push their hot buttons".

A "constituency" Mark defined as a clearly defined group of people

- Who can self-identify and
- Who are easily classified as a member of a group with homogeneous characteristics,
- Who have a vested interest, and
- Who lend credibility to the successful accomplishment of organizational goals.

TO BE
CONTINUED

Funding Liberty

a new book by George Phillies

Party of Principle or Party of Principal? You be the judge!

Hear the actual conduct of the Libertarian party's 1996 and 2000 Presidential campaigns!
Be appalled by where your money went!
See how we might do better next time!

Now available as paperback and electronic downloads from Third Millennium Publishing,
<http://3mpub.com/phillies>.

Pioneer Valley Libertarian Association

Massachusetts' oldest local Libertarian group, with regular meetings since 1995. We meet the second Wednesday of every month, 7:00 PM, 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

