

Let Freedom Ring

CMLC Liberator

Now \$10
per year.

It's Not Easy Being Green

There is less hysteria about environmental issues these days. Perhaps some people have ventured out of the urban jungle to see that the world is basically intact. Perhaps some people have taken a sniff of the air and realized that it, too is essentially clean. Maybe people have put their faith in our government to save Mother Earth.

I have always worried that Al Gore would let his environmental enthusiasm damage our future. He sees mankind as some kind of plague on the planet. The life of a slimy slug is considered more valuable than the health, safety and well-being of our own species. I am hoping that his past rhetoric is as much a sham as Clinton's rhetoric about gays and minorities. Maybe he won't continue with his plans to herd us all into tiny corners so we won't upset the delicate balance of na-

(Continued on page 2)

Tale of a Teen-Age Communist

...by Peter Orvetti

I was a teenage communist.

Well, that is a slight exaggeration. But by the time I enrolled at an oh-so-liberal college in all-too-lefty Amherst, Massachusetts, I was prepared to join the revolution and make the world safe for redistributionism.

Instead, I received an unexpected four-year lesson in the insidious nature of leftism that led to my discovery of libertarianism by graduation.

That wasn't the lesson my professors intended me to learn. As early as matriculation -- before classes even began -- dean after dean told the assembled first-year class how to vote in the coming 1992 presidential election. That first semester, one professor told the class she

(Continued on page 3)

Our Web Pages

<http://www.wmlp.org>

<http://www.cmlc.org>

Brought to you by www.excell.net.

Libertarian owned-Libertarian operated

Provider of internet services

Libertarian Presidential Primary

No Preference Wins

First and Second Congressional Districts

No Candidate Above 30%

No Preference.....	71
Harry Browne.....	68
Kip Lee.....	19
Larry Hines.....	12
L Neil Smith.....	9
Edison McDaniels, Sr.....	6
David Hollist.....	3
Others.....	38
Blanks.....	13
Total.....	239

Results of the 2000 Libertarian Presidential Preference Primary are in. For the Massachusetts First and Second Congressional Districts, covering Western Massachusetts, the results are clear: "No preference" took a narrow but clear lead over Libertarian candidates. Libertarian front-runner candidates Don Gorman and Barry Hess entered the race late, and for a variety of reasons were not on the ballot.

LAMA Ends Ties to PVLA

The Libertarian Association of Massachusetts, working hard on its leadership's plans to merge into the Libertarian Party of Massachusetts, has found it necessary to impose new requirements on groups that wish to be affiliated with it. In particular, LAMA has decided to require that organizations wishing to be affiliated with it as local groups must impose, in the local group bylaws, a requirement that all officers of the local group must be registered to vote in Massachusetts in the Libertarian Party or Party Designation.

At its March Election meeting, Chair Phillies offered a motion to amend the PVLA Constitution to bring it into accord with this requirement. Phillies emphasized that he was doing this as a courtesy to LAMA. There was extended discussion. It was noted that under this rule our Connecticut residents — which we have had on and off — could no longer be officers. It was asked what benefits we get out of affiliation. After discussion, a vote showed no support for the motion. The Chair presented a draft of a polite motion emphasizing our intent to work on supporting Liberty in Massachusetts, and expressing our best wishes to LAMA with its future plans.

an affinity group work. That's two sets of talents your founders need. Finding people with these two sets of talents is not easy. The talents needed to make a affinity group get off the ground are not the same as the skills developed in most crafts, hobbies, or professions.

Furthermore, you need a reasonable number of founders, not one or two. There are some near-unique people who can launch new groups all by themselves. In most cases, you need a half-dozen or so activists to give good odds on success. If the group is based on a single activist, loss of that activist closes down the group. A single person may be honest and have the best of intentions. A single person sooner or later has health problems, family difficulties, a job that needs attention...and will have to give up on the affinity group, at least for a bit. If the affinity group is left hanging, it will often fail. On the other hand, if enough people are around to carry the load, the loss of one activist is a loss, not a total disaster.

Third,

Stand By for Next Month

Be A Secret Agent For Liberty

Why don't *you*, yes, *YOU*, do something for the Libertarian Movement? Why not take 30 seconds to *Stand Up for Liberty!* right here in the Commonwealth.

Be a Secret Agent for Liberty! gives you a way to do that! Our new recruitment—advertising program doesn't ask you to get conspicuous. It doesn't ask you to get in a political argument. All we are asking you to do is to take the enclosed trifold and put it up on a bulletin board someplace.

The enclosed trifold has our address and contact data. Put it out where people will see it: a library bulletin board, the coffee room at work,... Anyone who is ready to take another step for Liberty will find our address and contact information herein. Through the PVLA/CMLC secret agent program, you can do your bit for Liberty without risking personal confrontation.

Who Are We?

The Pioneer Valley Libertarian Association is Massachusetts' oldest local Libertarian organization, with regular meetings since 1995. The PVLA and its sister Central Massachusetts Liberty Coalition work to advance freedom across Massachusetts' 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Congressional Districts, stretching from Williamstown to Dartmouth. Read about the PVLA and CMLC at <http://www.wmlp.org> and <http://www.cmlc.org>.



First Class Mail

(Continued from page 1) [It's Not Easy Being Green!]

ture. (Should he be elected, of course) I am cautiously optimistic about our environmental future. I had buffalo fajitas for dinner (On the Border \$10.99) the other day. That species, through private investment and for-profit protection and breeding, has seen its prospects for extinction eliminated. Similarly, alligators are not only plentiful, but have also been consumed by yours truly. The government's role in this success is minimal. Thankfully, both species are off the List.

If the giant pandas were sold to a commercial outfit, science would find a way to breed them and we'd see pan-da-fur clothing in no time. I have a feeling that the governments will bungle that one. The black rhino could be saved the same way. There's a good market for some of their parts. There's no reason to see them die off.

I will probably inflame passions by saying this but: I think we've done all we can do for the last 300 northern right whales. We should let nature take its course and hope for the best. You can't make the Atlantic into a controlled aquarium. There will be no serious ecological impact if these few animals fail to maintain the population. We will all miss them as much as we miss the dodo and the masto-don.

Advances in cloning and genomic research are making the future of all species a little brighter. Private research by a few NASDAQ-listed companies is beating the U. S. Government handily at this game at a fraction of the cost. Few people care what advances will have taken place in the next millennium. We'll all be dead. But logic dictates that scientists will be able to create a species to specifications the same way we are now able to create a piece of machinery.

I see landfills as the most valuable real estate on the planet. At least, they will be a few generations. The technology exists to create a solids separator that will wander through the mountains of garbage sorting glass, metal, plastic, and other materials and turning the rest into fertilizer. It's simply not cost-effective to build it yet. It's somewhat like those big shale-oil production plants that were started and never finished.

So, cheer up. The earth is remarkably resilient. Making plants grow is easier than trying to prevent them from growing. Weeds and maple seedlings come to mind. Animal survival and regeneration is inevitable. We should concentrate on our own survival. As long as we don't destroy ourselves and each other, everything will turn out fine.

...Pit Warren

(Continued from page 1) [I Was a Teen-Age Communist!]

considered herself an "activist" and not an educator; though I supported her cause, it irked me that she took pay from an ostensibly objective institute of education to support partisan action. And, on the day before Election Day, one professor took half an hour of class time performing a strange, quasi-mystic ritual, complete with burning candles, to secure the gods' support for the Clinton-Gore ticket.

Through all this, I kept my mouth shut and went about my daily affairs. Though hardly poor, I was unable to afford the school's \$25,000 annual tuition and so I worked a job on campus to pay my way. It was because I knew how hard it was to earn that much cash that I indulged in liberal politics.

But I discovered that others, with more money and much farther to the left than I'd ever dream go, had no such work ethic. One student "revolutionary" decided to subvert the dominant paradigm through a campaign of guerrilla graffiti. Straight out of the 'hood of Greenwich, Connecticut, this Caucasian Communist could be seen strutting around campus in African colors, clutching a black permanent marker and scrawling collectivist slogans on dormitory doors, library walls, and everywhere the ink would take.

Her revolutionary act set janitors to work scrubbing away, and gave less-advantaged work-study students more to do for their meager wage. When she was finally punished, how did she defend herself? "I pay full tuition," she said.

This Neiman-Marcus Marxist proved her true colors at that point, not Red but old-money green. Despite her rantings about the revolution, in her heart she felt that because she'd been born rich she had a right to trash the campus, and that the poorer students should be glad to have the financial aid scraps that were provided by her tuition.

This was not an isolated case. Each day I'd walk past students in Castro fatigues toting fancy new laptop computers, Mercedes cars in the student parking lot bearing "Eat the Rich" bumper stickers, and organizers of left-wing cells wearing \$300 sneakers. There was a schizophrenia to it; this would-be Red Army saw no contradiction. Even the campus distributor of the New York Times, who made a healthy profit, had a poster of Mao on his door.

I started to question the prevailing tide, but was met with blank stares. I noted that a popular professor made admittedly well-reasoned arguments for socialism in class each day, but then retired to a comfortable sub-

urban home in a town with a sizable homeless population.

Why, I wondered aloud, wasn't he down at the shelter dishing out food or offering his couch to a street person with no place to sleep? If he believed in redistribution, why wasn't he redistributing his own salary, which was far above the national average? "But this isn't a socialist country," came the reply. The implication: There's no need for leftists to engage in voluntary charity; the government will coerce it when we win.

In another class, I said it bothered me that Newt Gingrich, then Speaker, would not be permitted to present his views on campus. "I wouldn't mind," more than one student replied. I noted that it is important to respect divergent views. "I don't think about 'respect,'" I was told.

That was certainly true. One night, a mob of activists flanked the campus and chanted violent anti-rape slogans on every sidewalk, words that called every man a suspect, guilty until proven innocent. I was used to this sort of thing by that point, and I only took offense at the aesthetic crudity of the action.

But others were not so milquetoast as I, and responded the next night with a wave of "anti-anti" chalkings, condemning the Inquisition mood the activists had set. Controversy erupted, and, as colleges are wont to do, a campus-wide discussion forum was called.

At this meeting, I pointed out that, regardless of one's feelings about the second wave, the students had the right to express their views. The school clearly had a policy that allowed political chalkings. I said they'd broken no rule, to which one of the anti-rape activists shot back, "Don't be so sure." They had the "anti-antis" called up on hate crimes charges before the school tribunal, and they were penalized.

I found it harder and harder to have a serious political dialogue. I was once called a racist because I accidentally mispronounced a Hispanic name; I was called "evil" for arguing in support of free trade.

Interestingly, the campus itself provided a microcosm that proved communism a failure, despite the views of its inhabitants. Most students lived in on-campus houses of five or six students. They shared

cooking, cleaning, and financial arrangements.

While some were autonomous, most were collectivist. And importantly, they were voluntary -- everyone chose to live under a collective system. Still, they failed miserably.

I lived with four other people. We agreed to share the cost of food and to take turns cooking and cleaning. But each week, the funds came up short as one person or another failed to ante up. At least twice a week there was no food. Only two people ever cleaned up. And by the end of the year, a self-described "radical socialist" resident had seceded, refusing to contribute any more money because she had not received a share of the purchased goods commensurate to her financial contribution. So much for "to each according to their need."

By the end of college, I realized that the goals I had striven for -- more goods for all, a society of free expression and free will -- could only be achieved under free markets and never under collectivism. Quite simply, socialism is about acquiring the ability to get more stuff, just like capitalism. But socialism is about getting more stuff through government coercion -- picking your pocket through taxation.

Leftism's methods made little sense for the children of hippies and pacifists. In their socialist "utopia," if you don't pay up, big goons with guns will come to your house and drag you away. This is pacifism? And how could these flower children who lionized Kent State want to seize guns from law-abiding owners, letting only the military and the cops have them?

No wonder they felt the need to create a campus where dissent was not tolerated. Their ideology was built on sand. Only fear could keep it standing -- while just a hint of freedom would knock it all down. While it wasn't what I'd expected, I finished my four-year immersion course in political ideology with honors. And I left my campus comrades to happily fly their red flag from atop their ivory tower, where they play at "liberating" the world. -

Peter Orvetti is the Deputy Director of Communications for the national Libertarian Party, has written for National Journal, and authors the daily Orvetti Political Report. This article originally appeared on Liberzine.com, a Web magazine for up-and-coming libertarians."

Stand Up for Liberty!

We continue to reprint chapters from George Phillie's book on Libertarian Political Strategy.

REMOTE ARCHIVES AND PARALLEL ANALYSIS

In recent years, acting on a variety of pretexts, government agents have seized and allegedly by accident destroyed computers, hard drives, and files of publishers and writers. The Secret Service raided the corporate headquarters of Steve Jackson Games to suppress publication of the roleplaying game GURPS Cyberpunk by seizing all copies of the manuscript. California Libertarians Steve Kubby and Peter McWilliams lost computers, files, and book manuscripts to local and state authorities. Even if your work is unlikely to suffer government harassment, it remains a sound principle of computer management that you always maintain a backup of your files at a remote site.

After the Kubby and McWilliams incidents, a web site was announced for encrypted storage of book manuscripts, especially for writers likely to be subject to censorship or state terrorism. The objective is to guarantee that writers who lose their computers cannot lose their manuscripts. Only the author can decrypt the files.

Similar principles apply to the electronic files of the local, state, and Federal Libertarian parties. The historical record in the United States is clear. In the early

Who Are We?

The Pioneer Valley Libertarian Association is Massachusetts' oldest local Libertarian organization, with regular meetings since 1995. The PVLA and its sister Central Massachusetts Liberty Coalition work to advance freedom across Massachusetts' 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Congressional Districts, stretching from Williamstown to Dartmouth. Read about the PVLA and CMLC at <http://www.wmlp.org> and <http://www.cmlc.org>.

The Pioneer Valley Libertarian Association meets monthly at Bickfords Family Restaurant, Old Boston Road, Springfield. Bickfords serves dinner, breakfast, and a full range of desserts. Meetings start at 7PM, with a working meeting at 8PM.

The Worcester County Libertarian Association meets the third Sunday at Tweed's Restaurant, Grove Street, Worcester, at 6PM. [This is not the Tweed's Restaurant on Route 9, Shrewsbury.] Bring a friend. WCLA organizers include Kevin Haskell, City Council candidate Jerry Horton, and George Phillie.

The PVLA and CMLC web sites are hosted by Excell.net (<http://www.excell.net>) a locally-owned, locally operated internet service provider offering solutions to people and businesses in the Pioneer Valley. Why not patronize a fellow Libertarian? See www.excell.net for excellent internet service.

1960s the offices of the democratic socialist parties of the United States were subject to illegal black-bag burglaries by federal agencies. The burglaries by plan destroyed the mailing and donor records of the parties, crippling their operations. **4**

One might hope that the Federal government has changed since the early 1960s. However, fire, accident, and other catastrophes are just as effective at destroying records as a wrecking crew of Federal bureaucrats. To protect the Libertarian Party and all of its branches from catastrophic loss, dispersed backup of membership and other records is mandatory insurance.

Parallel analysis focuses on what you do with the facts the you have collected. Information sealed in vaults is often not very helpful. By making the same systematic information available to large numbers of Libertarians, one can generate multiple perspectives on what has happened, why it happened, and how we should respond. By making the same information available to local organizations across states and regions, we enable local and regional groups to work better and make themselves stronger.

NEW TECHNICAL MEANS

You can always listen to Libertarian Radio on the net. It's not broadcast radio, not yet, but it is a Libertarian voice reaching out across the world.

A variety of techniques, still severely limited by bandwidth issues, now in principle permit face to face contact over the Internet. Instead of flying Libertarian campaign advisers to state conventions, we can bring the campaign advisers to the homes of real campaigners. Via the Internet and video tape, we can give Libertarian activists a chance to hear and replay messages on Libertarian strategy and tactics. Video tape can be substantially more efficient as a teaching tool than a lecture, because listeners can replay it. There's a price. The technical proficiency needed to teach via video tape is considerably higher than the proficiency needed to teach through a lecture.

Many Libertarian campaigns could benefit from a candidate support package, with information on ballot access, sample press release and lawn signs, and so forth. New file formats, such as .pdf, permit transmission of graphical formats with a quality limited only by the printer at the receiving end. Acoustic formats allow activists to hear as well as read scripts for get-out-the-vote and other phone banking drives. By using new technical means, state and national party groups can provide support to local candidates at almost no cost.

These new technical means are not yet universally

available. Just as the Libertarians were the first major political party in the United States to have their own web site, so also we can gain an advantage over our opponents by being first with other technologies.

FOR THE FURTHER FUTURE INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH

It is the fixed habit of enemies of Liberty within the United States to invoke an argument that "every other industrialized nation" does one thing or another. Often the claim is not even true. In many cases "every industrialized nation" is actually a selected list of countries in northwest Europe, places like Switzerland or Norway being omitted. Most of these places lie under the heavy heel of European tax collectors. The IRS may take a third of our income, but European tax collectors take half or two-thirds or more of their national incomes.

When it comes to freedom, European countries are even less fortunate than America. Britain has peacetime press censorship, the D Notice -- including until a few years ago a D notice forbidding the English Press from reporting that Britain had peacetime press censorship. It had detention without anything that an American would recognize as a trial, notably in Northern Ireland. To deal with street demonstrators, it is widely reported that the English government put snipers on the walls of one Northern Irish city, then shot in the back women attempting to flee from a dispersed civil rights demonstration.

Large parts of English cities are subject to continuous television surveillance, exactly as foreseen by Orwell's 1984. At this writing the English government is working hard to abolish trial by jury for almost all crimes, in essence because juries could not be relied upon to give the results demanded by the establishment. Be glad that we live in America!

If we talk about foreign governments that threaten American freedoms, it is easy to begin with the Beijing genocide regime and its campaign against the independent nation of Tibet. That's an obvious threat, though in the short term it is exceedingly difficult even for a science fiction novel to imagine a Chinese Army marching south across Canada. The less obvious but equally real foreign threat to American freedom comes from across the Atlantic, from the infiltration into America of European statist ideas of high taxes, all-powerful government, and contempt for freedoms that every American takes for granted.

Fortunately, American Libertarians can ride to the aid of Europe's overtaxed, underfree masses. The World Wide Web is indeed world wide. No matter what

the inclinations of the European socialists, the message of Liberty will percolate across the Atlantic, so Europeans as well as Americans will hear the Libertarian message of small government, low taxes, and a written Bill of Rights. In the short run, the need to reform the American Libertarian Party must take precedence, but in the long term we should recognize that a world

cannot permanently endure part free and most in statist chains. The World Wide Web and its descendants will finally allow us to take the American Libertarian message to the four corners of the Earth.

Chapter 10 Affinity Groups

This Chapter considers affinity groups: assemblies of people interested in a single issue. Affinity groups include the Chamber of Commerce, the schoolteacher's union, and Washington think tanks. Most special groups bond tightly to one political party or the other. They may say that they're non-partisan, but somehow they almost always support the Democrats (or Republicans). Affinity groups provide real support for their party. They mobilize people who might not be especially partisan, but who do care deeply about their one issue; they turn that enthusiasm about an issue into enthusiastic support for a political party.

Each group has libertarian members. For each group and its questions there is a Libertarian answer. How do we capture their energy and enthusiasm, and channel it to Libertarian ends? This chapter discusses what affinity groups are, how they provide political support, and suggests a five-step program for creating Libertarian-leaning affinity groups to neutralize the affinity supporting the other major parties.

How do affinity groups differ from local Libertarian groups? Consider first the local groups. City and county Libertarian clubs unite Libertarians who live in the same area. Neighbors can meet each other regularly. They learn each others' strengths and weaknesses. They have straightforward opportunities to form the bonds that let them work together. Local groups support Libertarian candidates by working with residents of their home town. The Boston Libertarian Club encourages Bostonians to support Libertarian candidates in Boston. A successful Libertarian movement will be based on local Libertarian groups supporting local political campaigns.

A successful Libertarian movement also needs groups united by common interests rather than by common geography. Interest groups work for Libertarian

candidates by uniting people with a common cause and opening them to Libertarian ideas and people. The Liberty Belles encourages feminist gun owners to support Libertarian candidates who support the right to keep and bear arms.

The other major political parties already have interest groups attached to them. Such groups are formally independent of their parties. Why are they kept independent? A group that is visibly run by a political party is less convincing to the public than a group that is nominally independent. A special interest groups appears to be independent, but in fact dutifully supports its political party.

Where are these groups? The initials NRA and NARAL do not stand for "National Republican Association" and "National Anti-Republican Action League". Indeed, there are Democrats supported by NRA members and Republicans supported by NARAL members. However, as Libertarians around the country have noted, the NRA will endorse anti-2nd-Amendment Republican over a pro-Bill-of-Rights Libertarian. In 1998 in my own Congressional district, NARAL supported my Democratic pro-life (he favored a ban on many late-term abortions) opponent, rather than endorsing the Libertarian pro-choice candidate. You can take whichever side you want on the abortion issue. My point here is that the pro-choice group supported a candidate who was not pro-choice but who was a Democrat. In the same year, the Massachusetts Gun Owners Action League endorsed Republican gun-grabber Governor Cellucci over his Libertarian pro-RKBA opponent Dean Cook.

In 1994, Worcester Congressman Joe Early was under siege by Republican challenger Peter Blute. Early had significant support from the Massachusetts biomedical community. Democrats are not particularly known as friends of working physicians, but Early sat on committees that could help steer hundreds of millions of dollars of Federal funds into Greater Boston biomedical research. Early therefore got his money. Biomedicine — or some part of it — is a affinity group, attaching itself to a particular candidate because it wanted to feed at the Federal patronage trough rather than earning Federal contracts through demonstration of merit. [I remind Libertarian readers that I am discussing why the biomedical community acted as it did, not what policies a hypothetical Libertarian government would apply to research.]

Each interest group has a nominal issues-based agenda: abortion, educational television, research

grants. However, when the issue and the preferred political party go their separate ways, each group follows its party, not its agenda on its issues.

Party attachments are highly beneficial to the associated political party. Their candidates get support from their affinity groups, whether they have earned it or not. Democrat A may oppose everything that group B stands for, but group B will still say "elect A and get us a Democratic Congress". Even if the interest group doesn't endorse individual candidates by name, it can tell its members how each candidate stands on issues. It can present to the press and the general public its evaluation of possible positions, and who supports those positions. Shading a presentation can be better than a simple endorsement. The members and general public learn which way their group's leadership is inclined, and think they have heard an impartial evaluation of the situation.

Interest groups choose the candidates that they support. Their choice reflects a political control mechanism. It's not a formal mechanism. It's not a secret society behind the scenery pulling strings. It's just that the activists in each group have a particular position on political parties as well as on issues. When they are confronted with an inconsistency between their issue and their party, they often forget they're pro-choice or pro-RKBA, and remember they're pro-Democrat or pro-Republican.

Sometimes affinity groups have very firm ties to the Democrats or the Republicans. Under a recent Presidential administration, one could apparently track money going into a group that allegedly spoke for the elderly, seemingly to replace similar amounts of money coming out of that group and going into a labor union, targeted to influence that union's elections. You could ask if the original group was acting in the interest of its members or at the behest of its political masters. Similarly, PBS television stations are nominally non-partisan. Nonetheless, it was recently reported in the Boston Globe that a New England PBS station repeatedly provided its donor lists to the Democrats. Other PBS stations across the country did the same. No other political party is known to have obtained similar access to those lists. Several groups with Republican-sounding names were quoted as being "Republican" groups, but none of these groups is registered with the FEC or is known to Republican activists.

Affinity groups of a different sort are the Washington and local "think tanks". Think tanks analyze issues, typically public policy issues. Think tanks de-

velop and organize reasons for supporting a particular point of view. Think tanks examine consequences of adopting different policies. They provide support for candidates. They help candidates work out what the liberal or conservative or libertarian stand on an issue is. They give candidates TV-sound-bite arguments to defend their points of view.

You might think that think tanks would be non-partisan. In fact, your position on each issue determines which questions you ask, not to mention how you interpret the answers. A Roosevelt Liberal think tank might ask "how can we spend more money more effectively?" Looking at the same issue, a Conservative think tank might ask "How can we get the same results more efficiently and cheaply?". A Libertarian think tank would ask "Why is this government program poking into none of Uncle Sam's business, and why is it a total waste of money, too?" Indeed, many famous think tanks (e.g., Brookings, Heritage, Cato) are said to have liberal, conservative, or libertarian leanings. Those leanings do not mean that think tanks are tools of a political party. Those leanings mean that the think tank chooses its questions, not just its answers, from a particular political perspective.

Many affinity groups are firmly in the grip of one of the duopoly parties. Libertarians with those affinities are left in a quandary. The group that naturally represents you instead serves a hostile political party. How can you advance liberty within your profession or union or hobby, when your interest group is owned by the Democrats or the Republicans? How can Libertarians around the country gain the political advantage that comes from having sympathetic affinity groups? How can Libertarians benefit from the intellectual support that a Libertarian think tank would give?

A simple answer is the best when it is right. The Libertarian Party needs its own pro-Liberty affinity groups. A Libertarian group represents some affinity, scuba divers or cab drivers or land developers, but at the same time takes a Libertarian stance on issues and candidates.

I am not saying that no such groups exist. One can readily name Libertarian-friendly affinity groups: Association of Libertarian Feminists, National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws, Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership, or the Institute for Justice. All take staunchly Libertarian positions, but none is controlled by the Libertarian Party.

Some special groups are geographically concentrated, but others are not. Every state has lawyers; two

dozen states have a seacoast. A Libertarian Litigation League draws members from across the country. The Libertarian Oceancoast Resort Operators Association largely functions within a few miles of the water. It is almost never the case that an affinity group is geographically local, the way a town committee is local. Launching and maintaining an affinity group by meeting in the local pub is in general not practical. How, then, do we get a set of Libertarian Affinity groups?

Of course, we could convince a special-interest group that already exists that they should become Libertarian. It's been done. If you belong to a group that takes political positions, you should Stand Up for Liberty! by trying to coax that group in the directions of small government, low taxes, and the whole Bill of Rights. This is a challenging process. For starters, the duopoly parties will stay hard at work, tugging the other way.

How do we persuade people having affinities to Stand Up for Liberty! and support the Libertarian cause? I present a five-step plan. Carrying out the steps is greatly aided by outside support. The supporter could be the national party. It could be a major state party. It could be a PAC or some other manifestation of the marketplace of ideas. You should care about what the outside group does to support Libertarian affinity groups, not which outside group is doing the supporting, at least within reasonable limits.

So, what do outside supporters do? How can the National Party or a Libertarian PAC forward freedom by helping Libertarians to organize themselves?

First, identify causes with a Libertarian theme. Identify causes where a Libertarian point of view would stand in stark relief to the statist viewpoint of current interest groups. In some cases, the theme is easy to spot because its Libertarian activists come to you asking for endorsement and support. In other cases, you need to look at public issues through a Libertarian filter. When are your Libertarian sensibilities especially offended by what you read in the newspaper? What groups are peculiarly hurt by some statist policy?

Second, find the activists who will make your Libertarian affinity group fly. This is the difficult step. You may, for example, identify all the mistletoe canners in your state. To get a mistletoe cannery affinity group running, you need to find people who are attached to the affinity *and* are Libertarians *and* who also have the skills and dedication needed to make