

Let Freedom Ring

CMLC Liberator

Now \$10
per year.

Extravaganja is Big Success!

Pit Warren writes: Carol, Al, and I teamed up with Mike, Ben and a few other Amherst Libertarians to man the table. Other PVLA members present, Bob Underwood and Steve Levine. Other Libertarians present: speakers Carla Howell and David Atkinson, campaign supporters Michael Cloud and Kay Perillo, petitioners Steve Epstein and a paid petitioner and LP member.

No numbers yet on signatures, voter reg forms, or party contacts but I have a good feeling about it. We stopped the OPH outreach and went to full-time petitioning after Carla spoke in the afternoon.

(Continued on page 2)

The Pioneer Valley's Fourth Branch of Government

For people that live outside the Pioneer Valley, a little background information is needed to understand this article. The fourth branch of government in Western Mass is a large left-wing publication called the Union News. Wielding considerable local influence, it is able to influence all types of legislation, decrees, ordinances and proposals.

For the past year or so, a continuing segment has been the "quality of life" articles and associated photos. The newspaper encourages people to complain about their neighbors and even includes a form that can be filled in and clipped out. The most common complaints are high grass, peeling paint, old cars and junk. The lucky winners have photos of their property taken and

(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

Western Libertarians Keep Perfect Record!

PVLA members and friends in Western Massachusetts continued their perfect record in obtaining ballot access for their candidacies. Last year, Paul Norton declared for State Rep, and Sally Howes declared for Libertarian Party State Committee. Both got enough signatures, and got into the race. This Spring, Libertarians and liberty-lovers Al Wilcox and Terry Franklin announced for State Rep. Al is running as a Libertarian; Terry is running as an independent. Both are on the ballot. Amherst, Massachusetts Libertarian Mike Froimowitz is running for State Senate. He also collected enough signatures, and will be in the running this Fall.

For a Libertarian, petitioning qualifies you to run in your party's state primary this September. For an independent candidate, petitioning puts you straight onto the November ballot.

I expect to have news from the rest of the state by next issue. Sadly, our sometime visitor Doug Krick, who had a very well organized campaign, did not get enough signatures, and will not be a candidate in the Fall elections.

PVLA members have generally followed a simple, logical efficient path to getting on the ballot, namely generating a list — in street-number and name order — of voters eligible to sign, going door to door to meet voters who can sign a Libertarian nominating paper and ask them for their John Hancock.

Congratulations to Sally, Al, Terry, and Mike, each of whom managed to accumulate enough valid signatures (50 for Sally, 150 for Al and Terry, 300 for Mike) to get their names on the ballot in front of the voters.

And Especial Congratulations to the hardworking volunteers who went door to door, collected signatures,...

Without your hard work, it wouldn't have happened. Without your work, Massachusetts would sink one step closer to being a one-party pseudodemocratic state.

14 on information management discusses analysis and how to learn from experience. From the standpoint of a working marketplace of ideas, one observation stands out. I am not in any sense faulting the Sabrin or Coon campaigns for their efforts. The campaigns were entirely honest about what they were trying to do. However, after the election was over, it appeared to me that some Sabrin and Coon donors wished that they had asked a few more questions before supporting either campaign.

These problems are not the fault of honestly-run campaigns that openly present their plans and objectives. The problems are *also* not the fault of the Libertarians donors, few of whom are political professionals who spend their time thinking about these questions. The fault lies with an under-developed marketplace of ideas in which investors have highly imperfect information.

TO BE CONTINUED

The complete text of *Stand Up For Liberty!* has now been professionally e-Published by Third Millenium, <http://3mpub.com>, together with George Phillies' somewhat Libertarian science fiction novel, *This Shining Sea!*

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!]

published in an effort to shame and embarrass them into cleaning up their yard. These are usually submitted by snobbish suburbanites. When entire neighborhoods of slums are in an unkempt condition, nobody knows which lot to complain about.

The newspaper, by its action, is basically filing a complaint and notifying authorities that action needs to be taken. It has written editorials encouraging action on a variety of issues. The issue of truants in the bus terminal was front-page above the fold material. Not coincidentally, the terminal is owned by the richest man in the valley who is a chum of the publisher.

The Union News has taken the lead on gun control and smoking bans, demanding all sorts of anti-freedom legislation. They were big movers behind the ballpark and Hall of Fame proposals of eminent domain. One multi-part segment on seat belts got the attention of a local legislator. After the articles were published, the leader of the 7-strong pseudo-Republican senators collapsed into a liberal knee-jerking spasm. Brian Lees is now promoting increasing police authority to stop cars and ticket the occupants if he sees someone without a seat belt. There's no doubt in my mind that this will eventually become law at the request of the newspaper.

Lost on the seatbelt advocates is a lack of meaningful statistics. The state government is that collection of people who think the lottery is a good bet. Fewer than two fatalities occur for every hundred million miles traveled (U.S. DOT stats) at the current rate of seatbelt usage. This means that, if you hop in your car for a local jaunt, sober, in good weather, you have a 0.000% chance of being killed or severely injured in an accident. Sure, if you keep carrying the decimal out, you will eventually see an integer, but who decides if it is significant? Like the lottery jackpot (also a 0.000% chance), betting on astronomical odds should be voluntary – the decision of a free individual. The newspaper editorial included several paragraphs of statistics on accidents and seatbelts and fatalities. They conveniently ignored the most relevant one.

A week can't go by that our local paper doesn't demand some restriction on our freedom. They do it with the haughty arrogance and authority of a god. However, I have to give credit where credit is due. They have diverse opinions from syndicated columnists, including libertarians Thomas Sowell, Stephen Chapman and Dave Barry. Most importantly, they publish alternative viewpoints in the "letters to the editor" section. It is our duty to write them (e-mail is most convenient) and provide a rebuttal to their tirades against liberty.

.....Pit Warren

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

I did analyze the results of the morning quiz session when I pulled the stickers off the chart.

Libertarian	51
Liberal	23
Centrist	5
Conservative	1
Authoritarian	0

In addition, 5 were on the line between libertarian and liberal, 4 were borderline liberal/centrist and 3 were in the liberal/libertarian/centrist junction.

Local Campaigns Work!

I read on the eMail lists an interesting note from Michael Hihn. He describes ways of developing the Libertarian Movement effectively, efficiently, and swiftly:

Our statewide (Washington State) candidates got the typical 2-5% of the vote, statewide. But in Washington County, where we elected three candidates, those same statewide candidates got 12-18% of the vote.

There's another factor there:

As I recall, they had only 23 members in the county, but (also from memory) 17 of them were on the ballot!!

Yet more ...

One year prior, the county membership was ... three.

So -- what a concept -- they went out and recruited **candidates** instead of members.

Compare that — which worked — with Archimedes (crash and burn), where we'd need to recruit maybe 100 highly-costly members to get one candidate.

Now consider all the arbitrary barriers we create -- needlessly -- between ourselves and ... governing.

.....Mike Hihn

One step at a time, we of the PVL/A are moving to do the same. We had no Libertarian candidates until a few years ago, and look where we are today!

Stand Up for Liberty!

We continue to reprint chapters from George Phillies' book on Libertarian Political Strategy. I continue with the five-step plan for launching affinity groups.

Third, having found enough activists, launch an interest group linked to their cause, e.g., The Friends of the Third Amendment or the Liberty Belles. The interest group should not be explicitly Libertarian, any more than the NRA is explicitly Republican or NARAL is explicitly Democratic. An explicit tie to a single party drives people away. You want only an implicit tie from the group to Libertarian ideas.

What is an implicit tie? An implicit tie requires that the group's founders support libertarian principles, but do not spend their time beating Libertarian Party drums. The people who start the group happen to be libertarians, and the standards for endorsing candidates often cause Libertarians to be endorsed, but the group is not formally a Libertarian Party subsidiary. There's nothing that requires that founders are all pure-hearted Libertarians. However, the organization's principles need to be such that the group cleaves to Libertarian candidates and positions.

Fourth, the support group does fundraising and membership recruitment for the interest group. Alternatively, the support group helps the new interest group to do its own fundraising and membership recruitment. For example, many people are perfectly able to do a recruiting mailing, except they have never heard of professional mailing house, and have no idea how to prepare printer's masters for a mailer to copy and distribute.

Depending on how many activists have appeared, the support that is needed to launch a affinity group may be substantial or quite modest. The objective is to create an organization associated with a particular special interest that also supports Libertarian ideas and candidates. The same group generates Libertarian-leaning press releases, studies, and publications, to move public debate in a Libertarian direction. Such organizations have long benefited the Democratic and Republican parties. If you want corresponding organizations that will Stand Up for Liberty! and help the Libertarian Party, you need to invest in them before you can show a profit.

Fifth, the interest group should occasionally support members of the other major parties. On almost any issue, at least some members of the Duopoly come

down on the correct side. Supporting them reminds people that we can agree -- on specific issues -- with the Democratic or Republican Parties. Supporting them leaves dogmatic Democrats and Republicans with the impression that they belong to a group that supports a cause, not a group that only supports a political party that is not their own. Occasionally, such support elects a candidate who will take libertarian stands without being a Libertarian.

At the early stages, interest group creation is an important task for national and state organizations. Initially, the Friends of the Third Amendment may be two dozen people scattered from coast to coast. These two dozen Libertarians are the seed who will -- with proper support -- grow a strong nation-wide organization. Eventually, as the organization expands, Local Organization leads to State interest groups that expand on the work of the national.

Moving an interest group from twelve people in their living rooms to a functional national association requires publications, advertising, electronic outreach, etc. Yes, in principle the twelve people can elevate themselves to national prominence, but initial growth phases are challenging and slow. A support group such as the national party or a PAC can give the interest group a leg up into national prominence. By providing thoughtful assistance, the national Party or some other widely-based group can be the incubator for a special-interest groups. The incubator is the mechanism that lets a few highly-motivated people move from first contact to national significance far faster than would otherwise be possible.

Persuading the real welfare kings -- people who really do drive a Mercedes or a Cadillac while working under Federal contract -- to support Libertarian policies will not be easy. The Libertarian Party needs a set of Libertarian affinity groups, covering as many areas as there are affinities. We need those groups so that biomedical researchers and gun owners and computer programmers and single welfare mothers and smokers can join a group that stands up for their affinity, and that Stands Up for Liberty!, too. We need these groups to bring all manner of people who care very much about their one question to support the Libertarian platform and Libertarian candidates.

In summary, I've discussed affinity groups, and the opportunities and advantages that affinity groups offer the duopoly parties. I then outline a five-step plan, explaining how to use our resources to develop our own affinity groups. The five steps require finding the

affinity, finding a core of founding leaders, launching the new group, doing fundraising and recruitment, and enjoying the group's support of our candidates and issues.

The party and its surrogates should not own affinity groups. The party and its surrogates should not run special interest groups. However, the party should nurture affinity groups, because in doing so it will give itself valuable pillars of strength, far more quickly than would otherwise be possible.

Introduction to Chapters Eleven through Thirteen

Implementing the Marketplace of Ideas

Why do we want a marketplace of ideas? How would it be different from the policies and procedures that we already have in place?

The why is easy. Our resources are going to get us the Alphabet, the Numbers, and the V's of Victory. How do we best develop those resources? Where do we apply those resources? The Marketplace of Ideas uses market techniques to answer some of these questions. The free market is the most efficient way to direct investment in industry and commerce. The free Marketplace of Ideas is the most efficient way to direct and apply libertarian resources to libertarian political action.

The next three chapters treat three topics:

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 Phillies.

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.

First, where did I find the notion of a "Marketplace of Ideas"? We all know what a market is, and have some notion of what an idea is, but how can you have a market for ideas? After all, ideas operate contrary to the law of supply and demand. If you explain your idea to someone else, you give your idea away.

After giving your idea away, not only do you still have your idea, but by sharing it you can make it more valuable than it was before.

Second, how operationally do we create a Marketplace of ideas? What sort of structures do we need to establish a market? The marketplace of ideas is like a financial market, except the return on investment is not financial. How will these structures function?

Third, how do we get market information to investors? How do investors learn how their money was spent? How do investors check how effective past investments have been? These are questions asked by conventional investors. Some of the same answers apply, notably answers about reporting standards and transparency.

Chapter 11 Wherefrom Comes the Marketplace of Ideas?

Let's consider where you could have learned about a marketplace of ideas. In 1983 Libertarian activist Jorge Amador published a short pamphlet "Heirarchy or Market?" Amador had been active in East-coast Libertarian politics. He'd watched carefully how the Libertarian Party conducted its internal politics. He concluded that the Libertarian Party did not follow Libertarian principles in its internal structure, and suffered as a result. Amador proposed: If we transform our Party that is Libertarian in name into a Party that is libertarian in operation, we will become much more effective. Our chances for victory will greatly increase.

Amador's pamphlet is quite long. Major excerpts are found on the web at <http://www.lp2000.com>. Amador's ideas on the marketplace of ideas are a bit different than mine. To summarize his most important ideas, as they relate to Stand Up for Liberty!:

Amador first asks why Libertarian ideas have not already -- in 1983 -- won in the political sphere. He proposes that lack of promotion is an obstacle. Libertarians have limited resources for promoting libertarianism to the general public. Worse, instead of teaching the

public about our ideas, we expend our resources on internal disputes. We have candidates for party office who promise to end our internal feuds, so we will focus on real politics and not internal factionalism. Amador, writing in 1983, notes that those promises had never worked. They haven't worked well since 1983, either.

Amador proposed that our real difficulty is how we are organized. Our party's structure causes our internal feuds. No change in factional beliefs can reduce our internal politicking, because at the roots our disputes are not about what Libertarians would do if elected. Our disputes are about what the Party structure should be doing in the here and now.

According to Amador, in order to focus our attention on bringing the Libertarian future to the real world, we must first change how the Libertarian Party is organized. Amador was not completely optimistic that the Libertarian Party can be reformed: If fans of parliamentary bickering and in-group politics are strong enough, he concluded, it will be more efficient to create a new Party, or a new non-Party structure, than to fight over the current Party.

Amador's alternative to the current Libertarian Party is a market model for political action. He proposes that our current party structure is impossibly cumbersome. He claims that his market model will be less wasteful. His market model is not exactly the same as model I am proposing. I believe that voluntary structures are very important; I believe that people have many motivations and ways of evaluating success other than money. In my opinion Amador over-emphasizes the importance of money. In the following I emphasize places where his ideas match mine as seen in Stand Up for Liberty!

Amador notes how much money is spent on internal politics in the Libertarian Party. He reports that the 1981 campaign for Libertarian National Chair cost more than \$30,000 1981 dollars. (In contrast, in 1998 none of our Congressional candidates spent as many as 20,000 inflated 1998 dollars.) Beyond money, internal factions disputes are divisive. Recall how often Libertarian conventions have included the irreversible walk-out of supporters of a defeated cause. Finally, internal politics consume time. When activists campaign against each other, they are not campaigning against Democrats or Republicans.

Even if we had no factions, our internal operating structure costs us time and money. For each National Committee meeting, several dozen Libertarians must travel to a common site, eat, and be housed. No matter who pays travel expenses, that money and activist time

is no longer available to Stand Up for Liberty! and confront the Democratic-Republicans.

Isn't the Libertarian Party a voluntary organization? Don't its members have the right to run their affairs as they choose? Amador emphasizes that "voluntary" is not a synonym for "good". People can voluntarily agree to throw away their time and money. In any event, internal politics is indeed voluntary, which means that you are not required to volunteer. Instead of putting your efforts into internal politics, you could instead willingly invest your time and money productively in organizing against the Democratic-Republican duopoly.

Amador stresses that centralized decision-making is inefficient. When a central body dispenses resources, people who want those resources will lobby, form coalitions, and strive to block other proposals, because the other proposals would take money from their pet ideas. Centralized control of resources guarantees competition for centralized resources, automatically creating internal politics. Internal politics is a fundamental reason for the failure of socialist central planning of the steel industry; internal politics will equally ensure the failure of socialist central planning of the Libertarian market of ideas.

Internal politics can be undesirable. It can waste time and money. It can drive away newcomers and activists. It can repel or amuse the general public. Shallow-minded Libertarians try to hide internal politics by demanding a false unanimity from governing boards speaking to their Libertarian constituents. Deep-thinking Libertarians harness internal competition efficiently, by replacing internal politicking with the efficiency of a market, namely the marketplace of ideas.

Amador further stresses that centralized decision making is incompatible with Libertarian philosophy. A centralized-governance structure makes the Libertarian Party behave like the government: A central body collects money nationwide and moves it to Washington D.C. In Washington, the money is given to the best string-pullers. Some people are better at Standing Up for Liberty! in the real world than at lobbying in Washington. These people end up second-best when they ask Washington for money. The money goes to the best lobbyists, not to the best people. Giving money to the best lobby is the basis of real socialism. Cash allocation based on lobbying and earmarking is seen in many Federal programs; it will equally be found for cash allocations by Libertarian

groups.

Furthermore, much of the LP's funds are raised with no specification by the donor as to how the money will be spent. Undirected fundraising minimizes feedback from the donating public to the National Committee. The National Committee has to guess how Libertarian Party members and donors, the people who own the Party, want their money invested.

Lump sum dues pay for everything at the same time, notes Amador. Dues thus give Libertarian Party officers only a minimal indication of which policies the members support, and which policies the members marginally tolerate. Dues-based support also means that Libertarian Party officers are spending other people's money, not their own, which sometimes promotes a certain casual attitude to potential risks. Dues are not our only source of income, of course.

We know why socialist planning competes poorly with a free market. Central planners have no feedback mechanism from consumers. Capitalist businessmen get feedback. The market economy is not only morally superior to socialist planning. The free market works better in the real world. Why, asks Amador, do many Libertarians think that socialist central planning will work for their Party, when they think the same planning model rapidly wrecks modern economies? There's an education gap here. Amador suggests that internal education on the superiority of capitalism over socialism remains necessary within the Libertarian Party, because many Libertarians still accept communist ideas about the organizational efficiency and central management.

What are we to do to change our party's structure? Following in part Amador's ideas, I propose that we supplement our central structure with a structure based on market relationships, in which you, the donor and volunteer, invest more directly in your choice of activities. I want you know more clearly where your money is going, how investment possibilities are evaluated, and what your time and labor is accomplishing.

I do not propose that we abolish the national Party. I do propose that the national Party should compete with alternatives. This competition is the free market of ideas, brought to the Libertarian Party. If the centralized national Party structure is the most effective, it will triumph in the marketplace of ideas, but it will be better than it is now, because it had to compete.

Some people will say that I am proposing wasteful, inefficient competition. These people may say they are Libertarians, but people who say competition is inefficient are socialists masquerading in Lady Liberty's

gowns.

Some people will say that competing Libertarian groups might disagree in public about free immigration, free trade, or the non-coercion oath. These people forget: We already have these disagreements. To these people I answer: Remember the Freedom Train. We know which way we want to go. Let's not argue about whether our final destination is Chicago, Denver, or San Diego when the train is still stalled in northern Maine.

Chapter Twelve

Marketplace of Ideas: Practical Methods

It's all well and good to say that a marketplace of ideas is fundamentally superior to socialist central planning of the intellectual marketplace. How **in practice** do you set up a marketplace of ideas? Ideas, after all, are the one commodity that ignores the law of supply and demand: If someone takes one of my ideas, I still have the idea, and the taker can make my idea more valuable, not less valuable.

In a certain sense, the market will provide. If there is sufficient demand for a product, namely a marketplace of ideas, that product will reach the market more or less as soon as it is physically and financially possible to do so. However, before a product reaches the market, it has to be invented. Volunteer fire departments and private lending libraries were wonderful innovations, but they had to be invented -- American libertarian Benjamin Franklin played a major role -- before they could be marketed.

This section described projects that an entrepreneurial Libertarian or Libertarian group could envision bringing to market. We and our fellow Libertarians will create projects and groups such as the ones that I have described. We'll let them compete for resources. By doing this, we shall create the marketplace of ideas.

I am giving examples of possible projects, so you get an impression what a project is. I am not giving a complete list. Central planning loses to the market when Washington bureaucrats are planners. Central planning still loses when I am the planner. Our thousands of Libertarians are far more clever than I am. When we create the marketplace of ideas we'll give every idea its chance to compete.

This section focuses on practical schemes that actually implement a marketplace of ideas. The next session focuses on the other half of an efficient market:

schemes that permit informed investment rather than blind investment.

Every Libertarian does not have the time or resources to track every political campaign in the United States. Similarly, every Libertarian cannot evaluate every project that might advance the cause of Liberty. The number of Libertarian campaigns is large. Every election cycle, the number gets larger.

How can an individual Libertarian choose which campaigns to support? How can an individual Libertarian choose which political projects to assist?

How have Libertarians chosen campaigns in the past? Many of the same answers apply to political projects.

The two simple campaign choices are (i) Keep your money at home! Invest in local candidates! and (ii) Help float the biggest ships in the ocean, the national Libertarian Party in Washington and the quadrennial Presidential campaign. Libertarians have had these choices since the Party's founding. One choice keeps money where the giver can see it. The other choice sends the money all the way to the top. Both choices are in principle effective ways to Stand Up for Liberty! The exact effectiveness of each choice depends on how well the money is spent.

Are these the only choices? The other major parties believe that some campaigns are more important than others. They focus their investments. The campaign for Governor of California or Senator from North Dakota gets money from across the country because that campaign has national consequences.

In recent election cycles, one or two Libertarian campaigns have done successful fundraising beyond their district. A recent example is the 1998 campaign of Murray Sabrin, who was our candidate for Governor of New Jersey. Sabrin raised money from Libertarians across the country. His campaign had a unique sales pitch: if the Sabrin Campaign raised enough money in small contributions, Sabrin would get to debate his opponents. Making that pitch, Sabrin's campaign raised hundreds of thousands of dollars from Libertarian donors. In 1996 many Libertarians also invested in the Michigan State Representative campaign of Jon Coon. The Coon campaign was massively funded. Coon spent \$110,000 while the Democratic incumbent spent \$55,000. A token Republican challenger spent nothing on his campaign. Indeed, the Republican campaign was launched at the last moment to siphon votes away from Coon, using a candidate who had run in the past and was very well known. Despite

a 2:1 advantage in spending, Coon received 16% of the vote. The Democratic incumbent got 68%; the token Republican roughly tied Jon's vote total, finished at 16%.

There has since been extensive discussion of the Coon campaign. Should the result have been expected in advance? Might a different spending plan have worked better? Is it simply hard to beat incumbents? Defenders and critics of the campaign and advocates of each answer to these questions go on at great length, demonstrating the value of strategic analysis.

Given a small number of choices, individual Libertarians are able to identify the campaigns they want to support. Sometimes they have been happy with the results. Sometimes they have been less happy with the results.

However, in each election cycle there are many Libertarian candidates, few of whom have any money. In the 1998 election cycle, only two dozen or so of the potential 435 Libertarian candidates for United States Congress raised enough money that the Federal Elections Commission required them to file financial reports. Our half-dozen best-funded Congressional candidates raised around \$10,000 each. The total raised by all of our 1998 Congressional candidates was under a third of the money raised by the Sabrin campaign.

Was the Sabrin campaign the right focus for our efforts? Would we have done better if we had funded two dozen Congressional races? Should we have instead supported races lower down the ballot? Ballot access is relatively easy in New Jersey. Instead of funding a Governor's campaign in one state and a State Representative campaign in another state, would we have been better off to make sure that a full slate of State Representative and State Senate candidates were running under Sabrin's wings?

The answers to these questions are not immediately obvious. There are ways to look for answers: Polling. Post-election campaign analysis. Political strategy. It is by no means certain that quantitative analysis will tell us what we want to know. Political forecasting and strategy is as much an art as it is a science. Besides, few Libertarians win their elections. It is not always obvious why some campaigns succeed while others fail. Polling is not cheap. There is a cost to radio ads, hiring consultants, and doing fundraising mailings; there are also costs in doing analysis. I support doing analysis, so we learn from the past rather than hoping we can ignore a quarter-century of Libertarian defeat. I also support analyzing the cost of analysis. Chapter