

# Let Freedom Ring!

Volume 7 Number 5

May 2005

Available electronically at [www.libertyforamerica.com/cmlc/headerpublications.htm](http://www.libertyforamerica.com/cmlc/headerpublications.htm)

**Let Freedom Ring: Why Have Rules If We Don't Follow Them, Liberty for Massachusetts Political Activities Roll Out, Announcing: The Libertarian Reform Caucus; LPMA State Convention.....1**  
**Where Your Massachusetts Money Went, Where Did Your National Money Go?.....2**

**Libertarian Strategy Gazette** The Basis of Victory, Building a Party from the Ground Up.....1; Doing Politics.....2; Organizational Planning for Libertarians.....3

**Let Freedom Ring!/Libertarian Strategy Gazette** are edited and published by George Phillis, 87-6 Park Avenue, Worcester MA 01605, who is solely responsible for the contents, for the Pioneer Valley Libertarian Association ([www.pvla.net](http://www.pvla.net)) and Liberty for Massachusetts ([www.libertyformassachusetts.com](http://www.libertyformassachusetts.com)) Subscriptions are available from the PVLA, c/o Carol McMahon, 221 Bumstead Road, Monson MA for \$15/year to Activists, \$20/year to others. Checks payable "PVLA".

## Why Have Rules If We Don't Follow Them?

**An Analysis of the Libertarian Party Bylaws and LNC Policy Manual by Sean Haugh**

At the next meeting of the Libertarian National Committee (LNC), among the items on the agenda are a revision of the LNC Policy Manual and the appointment of members for the next Bylaws Committee. This particular Bylaws Committee will have a lot of work to do. Already we have heard about major proposals regarding regional representation, membership dues and even the definition of membership itself. More will arise between now and our next convention in Portland.

The plan for the Policy Manual is to divide it into thirds: rules governing LNC members, rules for staff, and special rules for meetings. This should help make it easier at least to figure out

[LNC Rules] (Continued on page 5)

## Liberty for Massachusetts Political Activities Roll Out

**Newsletter, Mailbox, Web Page, Social Events, Candidate Recruitment, Outreach, Fundraising**

Liberty for Massachusetts has published the first issue of its monthly newsletter "Liberty for Massachusetts", available for free on the new LfM web site <http://www.libertyformassachusetts.com>. LfM Issue 1 went out to more than 500 libertarians around Massachusetts. Memberships in LfM are \$20 a year (\$10 if you agree to receive publications electronically), with check payable to and mailed to them at 30 East Chestnut Street, Sharon MA 02067.

The next LfM Social Event is Saturday June 4 at 3PM at George Phillis' home, 87-6 Park Avenue Worcester MA 01605. RSVP [phillies@4liberty.net](mailto:phillies@4liberty.net) The Liberty for Massachusetts State Organizing Committee met April 30 at the home of Steve Drobnis in Stoughton, MA. Income for April was

[Liberty for Massachusetts] (Continued on page 2)

## Announcing: The Libertarian Reform Caucus

by Carl S. Milsted, Jr.

For my past few columns I have been criticizing the Libertarian Party platform. In summary, I have stated that the platform is too radical for prime time. Whenever a likeable, moderate Libertarian candidate gets traction, the opposition party publishes a few zingers from the LP platform. Defeat of our candidate is then assured.

As I stated in "It's the Message," no matter how much we improve the Libertarian Party as an organization, real victory will elude us until we put forth a salable message. You can raise millions of dollars and have activists walking every precinct and still lose—and lose badly—if the voters dislike your message.

Well, the time has come to do something about this. America desperately needs a real libertarian party; that is, a libertarian party with the right balance of idealism and practicality. We need freedom lovers to run for office and win. It is time to turn back the tide of tyranny in our great country. Waiting for our nation to collapse under

[Libertarian Reform Caucus] (Continued on page 3)

## LPMA State Convention

The Libertarian Party of Massachusetts held its State Convention in Natick, MA on April 16, with morning and afternoon sessions separated by a catered lunch. 44 voting members—a small shadow of attendance in prior years—and a half-dozen others were present. No press coverage was apparent. The business session, scheduled for 35 minutes to approve a new State Constitution and Bylaws, went on for two and a half hours. Successful amendments dealt with recognizing as Party members people who belong to the State Party but are not dues-paying members of the National Party.

The most substantive debate was over an amendment by Rob Power, long-time California activist and party leader now moved to Massachusetts, to replace the proposed nine at-large representatives with nine representatives elected by geographical region, just as representatives are elected regionally now. There was a superb debate. It was recalled that the State Party had once elected this way, and the consequence had been that state support and organizational effort for remote places like Essex County—the north shore—had withered. Your humble correspondent offered an unsuccessful motion putting the new election bylaws into effect immediately rather

[LPMA State Convention] (Continued on page 2)

Liberty for Massachusetts now live at <http://www.libertyformassachusetts.com>

## Let Freedom Ring!

(Continued from page 1) **[Libertarian for Massachusetts]**

\$378.65, not counting the web site and mailbox donations. Chair Drobnis said that what LfM most needs are many vigorous candidates running for the city and town office this year. 'The best recruiting tool we have is activities in which people can get involved.'

SoC member Bob Underwood is running for Springfield City Council. The Cambridge LfM Chapter is organizing a slate to run for Cambridge City Council, perhaps to involve current candidate Andre Green and former candidate Jim Condit and others.

Outright Libertarians will have a booth associated with the Boston Gay Pride Parade, perhaps with the PVLTA Tent. LfM, the Free State Project, and the Pink Pistols may share the tent. The Gay Pride event is June 11; volunteer support is needed. Other Outreach events are planned for the Fetish Flea and the Boston Freedom Rally.

Liberty for Massachusetts will soon announce a spaghetti dinner fundraiser to be held in the Canton Stoughton area on July 16, at a site not yet fixed. Expect a good time, music, and dancing. Tickets are \$15 (\$25 for a couple), with a check by July 9 payable to LfM and sent to 30 East Chestnut Street, Sharon MA 02067. LfM plans an extensive outreach effort to supporters and volunteers of former Libertarian Presidential campaigns.

(Continued from page 1) **[LPMA State Convention]**

than waiting a year. If the change had been adopted, a new state committee would have been elected at the state convention.

### Where Your Massachusetts Money Went

State Treasurer Carol McMahan presented to the State Convention an excellent and detailed financial report. Consider first the Federal account of the State Committee:

In summary, in 2003 the State Committee took in \$41,662; in 2004 they took in \$14,892, a decrease of 64%. On the good news side, the 2004 State Convention broke even, as did the 2005 State Convention, even though there was no fundraising event. In contrast, prior state conventions for several years before then had lost money.

In more detail, membership dues fell from \$12,865 in 2003 to \$9761 in 2004. Donations fell from \$7,272 in 2003 to \$676 in 2004. This 91% decrease is less serious than it looks, because the bulk of the 2003 donations occurred at the convention and were used to cancel conventional losses. Pledge revenue fell from \$7,210 to \$2,475, a decrease of 66%, while registrations at conventions and other events fell from \$14,315 to \$1,980, a decrease of 86%. The shrinkage of the state budget will soon reach its absolute and, in that the UMP welfare program run by national brings in close to \$8,000.00 a year and so long as the national party is in working order that component of income is unlikely to decrease.

On the expenditure side, newsletter and convention printing expenses fell from \$7,457 to \$2,016, part of which was canceled by a \$1,000 increase in the line item for mailing the newsletter.

Mail did not become vastly more expensive; but costs moved from line to line. Other major decreases in expenditures included a fall from \$7,306 to \$568 for legal and accounting fees, and a fall from \$8,980 to \$1,756 for meetings. The 2004 political expense was \$4,750 transferred by the State Committee to the former U.S. Senate campaign of Michael Cloud.

The state account of the state committee showed more modest changes. Income fell from \$1,117.00 to \$555.00. Credit card fees remained at \$420.00 and small change. In 2003 no money was spent from the state campaign account for events. In 2004, \$498.00 was given to candidates for state legislature and other elective office.

No money was spent from either account in support of the Libertarian Presidential Campaign of 2004. The outreach expenditure was for a table at the Boston Freedom Rally, which was rained out by a hurricane, but that table can be used in 2005. Thousands of dollars were raised for voter registration efforts, but no voter registration efforts took place, and the money was instead turned over to Michael Cloud's former U.S. Senate campaign, which had ended up substantially in debt.

As of this writing the Libertarian party of Massachusetts has \$2,949.85 in its Federal account and \$97.13 in its state account.

### Where Did Your National Money Go?

The Libertarian National Committee's disclosures to the Federal Election Commission are odd. Let me emphasize that Treasurer Mark Nelson does not do the books himself, and the difficulty is elsewhere. For example, according to the FEC reports in February the LNC managed to get by while spending absolutely no money. Income, however, was doing very well, according to the FEC reports, with more than \$616000 in income for the first three months of the year, \$528167 cash on hand, and debts of \$241456.

For better or worse, **Let Freedom Ring!** has many friends, so we have also seen the substantially accurate LNC financials for the same period, financials that look very different. In particular, for the January-March period of the FEC reports Total income was budgeted for 155,000, but came in at \$96000, \$72 000, and \$184 000 for the three months. Expenses for the three months were \$136000, \$108000 and \$127000, for net shortfalls of \$114000 in income and \$92000 in expenditures. The spending cut was in Outreach. Cash on hand was \$38.7K in various accounts. Shortfalls? Donations, pledges, and memberships have targets of \$48.4K, \$36.8K, and \$34.5K per month, Renewals came in at \$23K, \$31K, and \$38K, respectively, meaning that renewals for Q1 were at 12,000 people/year annualized rate. Pledge income came in at \$20.6K, \$28K, and \$25.6K, respectively. Donations came in at \$14.2K, \$3.3K (under 10% of budget), and \$97.1K. March includes the Annual Report, a major fundraising drive.

### Now Available in Paperback

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

(Continued from page 1) [Libertarian Reform Caucus]  
the weight of big government is not acceptable.

To this end, I, and others of like mind, have launched the Libertarian Reform Caucus ([www.ReformTheLP.org](http://www.ReformTheLP.org)). This caucus is open to all who agree with the following Statement of Purpose:

#### Statement of Purpose

We, the members of the Libertarian Reform Caucus believe that America needs a real libertarian party, a party that promotes liberty while being conscious of political reality, a party designed to win elections and begin rolling back excess government now. In particular, the party needs:

A platform that proposes a realistic vision for the next few years, as opposed to an idealistic vision of a libertarian future. The public expects a party platform to show what a party's candidates intend to do during the next term of office. If the party wants a long-term vision statement, it should be in a separate document labeled as such.

- A platform that unites libertarians rather than dividing them. Where libertarians disagree, the platform should be silent. The party should be a tool for all libertarians.
- A platform based on the realization that there are other important values in addition to the non-initiation of force. Freedom is extremely valuable, but it is not the only value.

Allow me to expand on these words a bit. The prolog talks about a real political party. A real political party is one that seriously intends to win elections and is willing to do what it takes to do so. Educating the public is a secondary function for a real political party. A real political party listens to the public. It takes polls. It tailors its message to what the public is ready to accept. It is willing to drop or defer ideas that the public currently finds unacceptable, in order to implement those ideas for which the public is ready. I know this may sound horribly unprincipled to some, but this is political reality. Politics is a game of majorities, not saints. A party that puts forth ideas that don't have at least passive acceptance by at least half the population in some political districts is doom-ed to fail. Question: which is more principled, putting forth a plan that is "perfect" yet doomed to fail, or *accomplishing* something good? (See my previous essay, "Is Gradualism a Contradiction?" for a more complete argument.) But I did say *real libertarian* party. While there are few districts with a majority willing to support the current LP platform in one gigantic swallow, there are many districts which could support officeholders who are far more libertarian than those the voters in said districts currently send to the houses of government. These districts just need a party to put such candidates on the ballot and support them.

As I have stated in one of my earliest columns, we do not need libertarian takeover of any legislature in order to turn the tide. We only need to outnumber the authoritarians. While an extremist libertarian party can barely win *any* partisan elections, it is not necessary to water down the platform down to the 50% libertarian percentile. It is only necessary to mellow out to the point where we can get majority acceptance in 10-20% of the nation's political districts. This leaves plenty of room

for to push the envelope, to take "edgy," unconventional positions.

So how should the platform be improved? How can we increase acceptance and support the most with the least amount of compromise? The three bullet points in the Statement of Purpose give ways to do this.

First, note that the current platform is a statement of what current party members consider to be the ideal government, or lack thereof. It is not a statement of where they think the country can be in a few years. Walk around the convention floor and point to some of the more radical planks and most delegates will admit that those planks would take years, or even generations to implement. A classic example would be immigration: most delegates I have talked to recognize that the welfare state needs to be fixed before we should open the borders wide.

But this is not how the public defines the phrase "political platform." The public assumes that a political platform is a statement of what the party's current slate of candidates intends to accomplish. In other words, the platform is understood to mean a plan for the next term of office: 2-6 years, depending on office. Since most attention is on presidential races, the common understanding is 4 years.

In other words, a U.S. political party's platform had best reflect a four-year time horizon. By mixing long-term visions into the platform, we send a message that is more radical than intended! We Big-L Libertarians are radical enough! We do not need to exaggerate to the public how radical we are! The current platform is tantamount to an unnecessary self-sabotage! As a party, we need to think about *how* we are going to untangle the mess the Demopublicans have created-with a minimal amount of negative disruption. We should then put forth to the public the *first* steps in this plan.

There is another problem: not all libertarians agree on what the ideal should be. There are several points of very serious disagreement, even between people who absolutely agree on the non-initiation of force principle. Abortion is a classic example. Is an embryo human? If so, abortion is murder. If not, abortion is like a haircut or a tattoo. These questions are scientific, not philosophical. They are inputs into which we apply our non-aggression axiom. Principled libertarians can disagree vehemently on this one.

The second bullet point answers problems such as this. Where principled libertarians strongly disagree, the platform should be quiet, or even silent. The libertarian movement is small enough as it is; we do not need a party that represents only part of the movement! Just because the party as a whole should be quiet/silent on certain issues, does not mean individual Libertarians should be. For example, people like Ron Paul could be stridently pro-life while others could be pro-choice. The party platform should represent the intersection of the various flavors of libertarian thought, the points where most libertarians agree.

Perhaps the second biggest area of disagreement within the broader libertarian movement is that of defense and foreign policy. As a practical matter, is it prudent to allow madmen to

## Let Freedom Ring!

own nukes? Should we wait until nuked by a madman before acting? Is it riskier to wait and allow problems to fester, or is it riskier to create enemies while acting preemptively? These are tough scientific questions on which people can disagree strongly despite holding the same moral philosophy.

Speaking of moral philosophy, is it more immoral to levy taxes to support warfare against a genocidal government or to sit by while millions of innocents are slaughtered? Principled libertarians can disagree! Part of the disagreement stems from difficult scientific questions over the costs and benefits of foreign intervention. Internal genocide is pretty horrible, but foreign invasion isn't pretty, either. Isolationists can point to many unproductive examples of U.S. intervention. Interventionists can point to a few important successes. *Both* can be libertarians. (In a future essay I will try to point out some possible areas of common ground between these two camps.) The fact that the LP has come down so strongly on one side of this debate has isolated it from some of this country's most prominent libertarian figures. At the last convention there were calls to prevent Neal Boortz from speaking because of his stance on foreign policy. Mr. Boortz has done more to promote the party than just about anyone, and many party members wanted to kick him out! Another example: one time when Walter Williams was hosting Rush Limbaugh's show, a caller asked Williams if he was a Libertarian. Williams' answer was that he considered the LP's defense policy to be dangerous to the safety of this country. (I personally agree with him; the world has grown considerably smaller since 1790.)

And finally, the third bullet point: non-initiation of force is a very important moral value, but it is not the *only* moral value. There are other factors worthy of consideration, such as the plight of the poor, protecting endangered species, etc. Utilitarians in the audience may argue that these values will be taken care of in a truly libertarian society, and they may be right. But between where we are and where we want to be are many intermediate states. Many of the existing government programs exist to ameliorate harms caused by other government programs. The order in which we dismantle unnecessary government programs is important.

Do we get rid of anti-trust law before we fix the securities laws that stifle competition? Do we cut welfare benefits before we simplify the tax code and deregulate the labor market in order to create more/better jobs? Do we cut taxes before we pay down the national debt and take care of those already dependent on Social Security?

These are issues worthy of consideration and debate. Where there is consensus, these considerations should show up in the platform. Where there is division, the platform should be silent and individual candidates should take their own positions.

### The Plan of Action

So what is this caucus and how does it actually plan to fix the LP platform? Well, for starters the caucus is a web site. But it is not a mere weblog stating the opinions of a few reformers. No, the plan is to solicit platform ideas from a wide array of viewpoints that still fall within the broad boundaries of the Party.

These ideas are *not* the official view of the caucus. Instead, the view of the caucus is reflected in the votes on these proposals by those who have joined the caucus. In order to build the optimum consensus, we are doing preference voting for platform proposals: members are encouraged to vote for all of the options that they would support. The caucus will then promote those proposals that have a strong consensus within the caucus. (Hey, this might be a better way for the Libertarian Party to generate its platform instead of the gamesmanship of parliamentary politics!) While fixing the platform is our primary focus, there are other areas of improvement for the Libertarian Party, such as organizational matters, membership criteria, optimum strategy, etc. The ReformTheLP.org web site also has space for essays on these matters. Once again, these essays are not the official view of the caucus. The caucus states its opinions by the membership rating each essay on a 1-5 scale.

### Who We Are

We are libertarians who want to build liberty in this country *now*. We are libertarians who are unwilling to wait until society collapses in order to pick up the pieces. Other than that, we have a broad range of opinion. The caucus includes: Moderate libertarians, obviously. Radical libertarians who realize that to cut government a lot, you must first cut it a little. Anarcho-capitalists who realize that to eliminate government you must first cut it.

In other words, you do not have to be a moderate libertarian to join the caucus, and you shouldn't have to be a radical libertarian to join the Libertarian Party. The caucus and the party should be about *increasing* liberty *now*. After liberty gets increased, some moderate libertarians may decide that they have enough liberty and leave the party. Meanwhile, other moderates may decide they really like liberty and want even more. Philosophical debate over the ultimate optimum size of government is a good excuse to drink beer but should not be the overriding factor in running a political party. Notice also that I spelled "libertarian" with a small "l." This is intentional. There are many small-l libertarians who would support the party *if* the party was serious about winning elections. We are out to recruit them. There other small-l libertarians who avoid the party because the party takes strong positions in areas where the broader libertarian movement is divided. We are out to recruit them as well.

To some degree we are modeled on the Free State Project: start with a broad concept (take over a small state/fix the party), build a consensus on the specifics (choose a state/choose a better platform), and then encourage greater commitment *if* success looks possible (20,000 members/enough members to affect the convention). In our case we have no formal threshold for commitment to join/rejoin the Libertarian Party, but we do ask members to state their intentions in this regard for statistical purposes.

If all goes well, [www.ReformTheLP.org](http://www.ReformTheLP.org) may turn out to be the biggest Libertarian Party recruitment drive since Project Archimedes. The question remains as to whether existing members will be happy with the results.

...Carl Milsted

(Continued from page 1) [LNC Rules]  
what it all means.

The nature of rules is that they are often created and rarely repealed. Most rules are passed from the perspective of a particular moment, and may not hold up well in the face of new circumstances. The result is that, without constant reexamination and revision, any organization can easily regulate itself into knots.

The Libertarian Party, being a Libertarian organization, should take a Libertarian view of rules. They should be few and far between, allowing enough room for the peaceful voluntary action of everyone. Every once in awhile, we need to wield the same Libertarian ax we want to take to government regulation and apply it for our own benefit. It certainly would give the public an example of what we mean to do, not to mention how we hold ourselves to the same standards by which we measure others.

With these two events up for action at the May meeting, now is the perfect time for such a review. Below you will find every provision I could find in the LP Bylaws or LNC Policy Manual which are followed haphazardly or not at all. I attempted to be narrow in my scope, looking only for clearly factual deficiencies.

Members need to ask about the Bylaws, and LNC members about the Policy Manual, if we aren't following our own rules, what good are they? Maybe they are lousy rules that just don't work. Maybe they are good rules that need stronger enforcement. Or maybe they are just some nice sounding puffery.

This is not a comprehensive analysis. It does not include items which I could not verify one way or the other if they are done. It does not include proposals to create new rules or bylaws, nor any other attempt at reform beyond fixing what is obviously broken. And being fallible, I may have missed something. Even with such a narrow scope, as you can see, sadly there is plenty of material to work with.

Nor should this report be taken as any sort of job performance review of anyone, except for the LNC as whole where noted. It presents a skewed perspective, as it only concentrates on the negative, while deliberately ignoring all the provisions which are carried out in an exemplary fashion by those responsible. And as noted in some cases, we have been well served at times when some of these rules have been deliberately ignored.

Each section is in three parts: the rule(s) in question, my commentary, and finally my recommendation. Being a Libertarian, I hope you will forgive me if my prejudice is in favor of repeal.

**Bylaws, Article 5: The National Campaign Platform** The National Campaign Platform of the Libertarian Party shall serve as the campaign document of the Party during presidential election campaigns. This platform shall consist of proposals consistent with the Statement of Principles and the Party

Platform. The National Campaign Platform shall focus on issues important to the electorate. Each candidate seeking the presidential nomination of the Party shall provide the delegates with a copy of a proposed National Campaign Platform at least 48 hours prior to the delegates selecting the nominee. Immediately following the nomination of the presidential candidate, the delegates shall, by majority vote, ratify each plank of the National Campaign Platform, without amendment. If the convention fails to ratify any plank of the National Campaign Platform, that plank will not be used. The National Campaign Platform of the candidate nominated by the convention shall be in effect until the next presidential nominating convention.

**Bylaws, Article 6: Libertarian Party Program**

1. The National Committee shall adopt and report the LP Program to the membership.
2. The Program recommendation by the National Committee shall be comprised of:
  1. a maximum of 10 issues;
  2. issues which are currently receiving widespread, national public attention;
  3. issues which are readily identifiable by most individuals as matters which affect them personally and directly; and
  4. interim or transitional proposals which move toward a libertarian society, which are clearly identified as interim or transitional proposals.
3. The National Committee shall appoint 3 or more individuals to submit draft program planks to the National Committee.
4. Motions to approve planks require a 2/3 vote of the entire National Committee.
5. No proposal shall conflict with the LP Platform.

*Commentary:* The last version of the Program was issued in 1994. Not only has it lost much relevance, the platform and outlook of the party have shifted away from gradualism, causing this document to drift out of touch with today's need. Michael Gilson De Lemos (MG) has been working on a new Program for many months, but no final work product has yet resulted. In 2004, Michael Badnarik did not submit a separate Campaign Platform, instead choosing to use the LP Platform itself. Without either a separate Program or Campaign Platform, there no longer exists any official document detailing immediate 'transitional' proposals. The Platform reformatting project attempts to take this into account, by dividing Platform language into Issue, Principle, Solution and Transition. We seem to be getting along just fine without these documents. Those who want transitional language now have an avenue, by amending the Platform itself. There is no reason why the Platform can't speak to both direction and destination. Just about every imaginable libertarian policy document already exists somewhere, and if none are totally on a particular candidate's message, he is always free to create his own.

This last point might be in conflict with the provision that the Convention explicitly approve each plank of the Campaign Platform. Some would call that micromanagement. In any case, it does create a potential for conflict that might otherwise be avoided. After all, if a Presidential candidate espoused one or more particularly unlibertarian views, odds are he would not be in a position to offer a Campaign Platform to the convention for approval in the first place.

## Let Freedom Ring!

**I Recommend: Repeal both articles at the next convention.**

**Bylaws, Article 8.4:** No affiliate party shall endorse any candidate who is a member of another party for public office in any partisan election.

*Commentary:* Assuming this bylaw has any meaning at all, it is routinely violated. First, how does one define ‘member of another party’? Other parties don’t necessarily charge dues as we do. In some states, such my home state of North Carolina, we count voter registration as a signifier of party membership. State law allows us to run candidates registered as Democrats or Republicans in certain years, and we have done so. Finally, a strict reading of this bylaw would ban fusion and crossover nominations, which have resulted in us electing Libertarians in the past. For example, fusion in New Hampshire allowed us to elect Libertarians to their state house.

If taken literally, as bylaws should be taken, this stricture makes it very difficult for us to recruit strong candidates from other parties, and impossible for us to openly support true libertarians in other parties. Furthermore, each affiliate and even local affiliates within many states want to try some very different strategies to engage and exploit libertarian tendencies in other parties. While I personally have gained enough experience in this matter that I want to follow this bylaw to the letter, I still believe it is better that Libertarians find their own way. Each state is different, so different approaches may work for different situations. This bylaw does have a very noble purpose. We do need strictures of some kind to keep us from selling out our principles for a pretty face, such as when many prominent Florida Libertarians supported Rep. Tom Feeney for his nice fiscal talk while he was busy trying to develop vote-rigging software to steal the election for the Republicans and helping to sell our military secrets to the Chinese. [bradblog.com/ClintCurtisSummary.htm] But this wording utterly fails to do anything to advance this goal.

**I Recommend:** Unless someone can come up with language that truly helps us preserve our endorsements for real Libertarians without overly restrictive unintended consequences, the convention should repeal this bylaw.

**Policy Manual, Article I (General Policy), Section 2 Meetings), paragraph A (Agenda and Reports)** The agenda for each LNC meeting shall be the responsibility of the Chair. Any report that is to be presented at an LNC meeting should be submitted at least 18 days prior to the meeting, preferably in computer readable form. The agenda and all reports shall be distributed to the LNC at least 14 days prior to the meeting.

*Commentary:* What a joke! I can’t remember the last time the LNC fully conformed to this rule. It is rare that anyone at all meets these deadlines, and getting rarer all the time. Many critical and detailed reports are distributed by hand at the table. Certain LNC members, particularly the regional representatives from California, deliberately circumvent staff when distributing reports and proposals via email, which leads to spotty receipt of these reports by other LNC members and a lack of printed copies in the books made by staff for use at each meeting. These bad habits lead directly to stupid ill-informed decisions by the LNC. Of course you can’t make the LNC members actually read

anything, which in itself is a huge problem, but certainly they cannot properly consider their decisions without the opportunity to study reports and proposals in advance.

*The fact that they cannot be bothered to follow even this most basic rule is further evidence that the LNC has lost any moral authority to run this party.*

**I Recommend:** The LNC should start following its own rules if it wants to have any chance of regaining the confidence of the membership.

**Policy Manual, Article I, Section 2, paragraph C (Recording of Meetings)** The Director shall be responsible for recording all LNC meetings on audio or video medium, providing a copy to the Secretary, retaining the recordings for one year at LPHQ, and making copies available to any other member upon request at cost.

*Commentary:* Not one of the meetings has been recorded this term, and even before it was done by board members with records kept in now obscure places. The LNC has deliberately and explicitly let the Director know that he is not expected to follow this rule.

**I Recommend:** Place the responsibility on the Secretary, and establish a different web-based archive for these recordings that is easily accessible to the membership, such as a Libertarian Wiki page. Acquire the old recordings from Joe Dehn and place them in the same public archive.

**Policy Manual, Article II (Membership), Section 1 Membership Statement)** .... Any new wording for the membership statement shall be subject to the same review process as all other Party Literature. A list of wordings which have been approved for use in Party literature shall be maintained at the National office.

*Commentary:* There currently is no review process since the abolition of the Advertising and Publications Review Committee (APRC). The current LNC has completely abdicated any responsibility for this review.

**I Recommend:** Restore the APRC.

**TO BE CONTINUED**

# Stand Up for Liberty!

## Funding Liberty

George Phillies’ books on our Party’s  
strategy and history

**New! Now in trade paperback format!**

Also available in e-book  
<http://3mpub.com/phillies>