

Let Freedom Ring

CMLC Liberator

Now \$10
per year.

Republicans

Recent messages indicate that some people still have hope for the Republican Party in this state. There is none.

Argeo P. Cellucci signed the most hideous piece of anti-gun legislation in the history of this state. He has helped raise money to finance the Democrats. He lied like a Clinton to get elected. He has bloated the budget beyond imaginable proportions. He based his entire argument for tax cuts on the surplus, all but guaranteeing they will be reinstated once he and his fellow democrats piss away the slush fund.

Malone turned the treasury and the lottery offices over to thieves, misfits and incompetent hacks who

(Continued on page 3)

News

Reports in the newspapers indicate that we have approximately four State Senate candidates and 19 State House candidates. The Republicans are rumored to have 6 Congressional candidates, 15 State Senate candidates, and around 50 State Representative candidates. All these totals are down from two years ago, and none of the Congressional candidates are raising serious money.

Harry Browne of Tennessee and Art Olivier of California are our party's candidate for President and Vice President of the United States, as chosen by our National Convention in Anaheim California. Browne got

(Continued on page 5)

Debate Access Now!

Last night I stumbled across something that disturbs me greatly. It may disturb you also, possibly even to the extent that you feel compelled to forward my letter on to others.

The Commission on Presidential Debates is the organization that sponsors and produces the televised debates between U.S. presidential candidates. In addition to putting on the debates, the CPD also determines which candidates are allowed to participate.

On January 6 the CPD announced new criteria for determining which presidential candidates are eligible to participate. The commission, which is founded by and composed entirely of Democrats and Republicans, decreed that third-party candidates must show up at 15% or higher in public opinion polls in order to be included.

(Continued on page 4)

A Challenge to Match

Washington Libertarians Nominate Record Number of Minor Party Candidates!

This week, LPWS executive director Carol Miller will deliver nominating petitions for nearly 70 candidates to the Secretary of State, more than any other *minor party* has put on the ballot in this century.

"This milestone is much more significant to Washingtonians than Ralph Nader's latest publicity stunt," said LPWS communications director Brien Bartels, referring to the Green Party's recently anointed presidential candidate.

Research confirms that the 1990s have been relatively thin for minor parties in Washington, with only 21 candidates running in 1998. Excluding presidential candidates, which normally include a number of protest candidates, minor parties ran only 22 candidates in 1996. Ballot access historian Richard Winger says only the Socialist Party, which ran for a variety of offices in the 1920s and 1930s, might have run more candidates in a single election as a third party. Libertarian Winger

(Continued on page 6)

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

laws, or give a credible three-minute speech.

Technical support will reduce obstacles between Libertarians and the electorate. Technical support will bring "I'm running for office" within reach for large numbers of Libertarians who by themselves would not get on the ballot. Ballot access and effective campaigning may seem simple if you've run for office. For someone who has never Stood Up for Liberty! and been a Libertarian candidate, ballot access can appear unattainable. Technical support will put thousands of competent Libertarians, people who can do the job but who have no idea how to get elected, on the ballot and into office.

There is an unsatisfied market for candidate and candidate staff training. The staff is as important as the candidate. You cannot win without a credible woman or man in front. A candidate running a one-man show is equally unlikely to succeed. The National Party has sponsored single-site lecture events.

.....*To Be Continued*

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>.

Be a Secret Agent for Liberty

We regularly insert a trifold Libertarian brochure into Stand Up for Liberty! Take it! Go to your church or temple or synagogue or school or store or workplace. Put it up in an appropriate place! Spread the word about Liberty from Sea to Shining Sea.



First Class Mail

Signature Challenge

I am disappointed that the Howell campaign has decided to review the signatures of Republican Jack E. Robinson. I have a problem with this on two levels.

The bitter and brutal court fight between CLT&G and the TEAM/MTA forces is still fresh in my mind. I have developed a disliking for groups who seek to limit the voter's choices for their own political gain. We weep and moan about the unfair ballot access laws and now we are going to use those for our advantage. This opens us to charges of hypocrisy.

The difference in the signature count is eerily comparable to the first tax rollback petition. Who was the bad guy in that fight? Are we now saying that the teacher's union was right to challenge? Robinson and his campaign gathered well over 10,000 signatures. I don't think we should be anal and quibble over a couple hundred.

The second level on which I am protesting is much more practical. There is no need. The Democratic state committee is doing the review already. It's too late to take the moral high ground but you can certainly save on resources. Volunteers and contributions are scarce (relative to Ted K.). If the Howell campaign was fighting for the Libertarian slot, I would have no problem expending legal fees from the campaign account to secure the ballot access. Reviewing the opponent's signatures is totally different. If the Democrats can't scratch enough sigs to torpedo the Robinson campaign, what chance do you have?

I would love to see Carla beat Ted Kennedy. However, I am realistic. Knocking Robinson off the ballot won't be enough to do it. Financially, you are going to come up about 2 or 3 million bucks short. Harry Browne will be in the White House before Teddy loses his seat to a Libertarian. Also, I am fairly confident that major party status can be retained in a 3-way senate race; but if not, so be it.

The bumper sticker on my truck says, "small government is beautiful." It seems the Howell campaign is enjoying big government a little too much. If you lie down with dogs, you are going to wake up with fleas. I suggest staying away from the lawyers, consultants, judges and committees who think that political races should be kept to two opponents. This philosophy could come back to bite us in the ass.

...Pit Warren

2
For those of you wondering about the background to the National Chair and Presidential races, here is an explanation from Maryland State Chair Steve Boone.

"Upper Air Disturbances" in the National LP

should Maryland [or any other state] worry? I don't need to call a friend, use a 50/50, or poll the audience for the answer to this question. Final answer: No.

What's going on at the national level, despite the hype, is *not* going to mean The End of Civilization As We Know It, or even the end of the Libertarian Party itself.

Many of you have read the e-mails posted with charges and counter-charges by national Libertarian leaders, particularly Jacob Hornberger of the Future of Freedom Foundation v. David Bergland, National Chair; Harry Browne, presidential candidate and 1996 nominee; and various other past and present functionaries of the National LP office.

Jacob posted three separate articles, which have been forwarded other lists by various people. Those articles are: "The LP Needs a Divorce" (a three-parter), "Truth Rattles the Wrongdoers: A Response to Harry Browne and David Bergland" (a two-parter), "A Response to Harry Browne and David Bergland" (a two-parter), and "Harry Browne and the Great FEC Caper" (a three-parter). You've probably already seen the replies to the first barrage.

These articles are very hard-hitting, and deliver a concise telling of allegations that have floated around for a number of years. Some have far stronger legs than others, but there seems to be a pattern.

I personally debated David Bergland, Bill Winter, and Ron Crickenberger at the same time on the issue of *not* having the National office and the presidential campaign run out of the same office, and with some of the same key people. I didn't convince them--they didn't convince me.

In the past two or three [Maryland] state [LP] administrations, including mine, there have been some arms-length relations between National and the state party. That is not to say, under any circumstances, that we can't or don't or won't work with each other. We absolutely do what we can, but the state party's work is, by its very nature, more concerned with what's going on in Maryland than on a national level, and

that's the primary reason I believe the National flap will not affect us.

The major difference between Maryland and National's viewpoints stem from the proper functions of the Party. The National strategy is more=more=more. That is, more members = more money = more visibility = more members, etc., ad nauseum. It hasn't worked yet. Somewhere in that equation, there becomes a "mass epiphany," and millions of voters clamor for the relief of the Libertarian Party, thus sweeping all our slates into office. Right. And, where are the "worker bees" that need to translate ideas into action?

I, and many others of the "loyal opposition" prefer the local organizing method: you start at the bottom and work up. After all, all politics is local. Both Pennsylvania and Indiana have sterling records to support that.

You run local candidates. The local candidates speak to the voter at the local level. The local voter may be so impressed that he decides to change party affiliation to further support the candidate. As you run campaigns, you get volunteers to help. They get involved, and in a majority of cases, they stay involved -- and may even run for you next time.

Does it really happen? Yes. In Lorenzo [Gazanaga]'s race for Baltimore City Council last year, the number of registered Libertarians in Baltimore City more than doubled from before the campaign to the end of the year. Another 50 or so got on board. And, one of the volunteers is planning on running for the legislature in 2002. What's going to happen statewide when we run someone for the gubernatorial race, or even in the Third [Congressional District] when we run someone for Congress this year?

Some of that [local emphasis] has expressed itself on a state level by our repeated refusal to join LUMP, the Libertarian Unified Membership Program, which has all dues go directly to National, and they dole out a certain amount of such dues per month to come to the state. We believe that the state party needs to develop the infrastructure ourselves, and not rely on a national group to handle it for us.

That has also manifested itself in the fact that Maryland unanimously voted for the opposition candidate, Gene Cisewski, in the last National Chair's race, and supplied numerous delegates to other states to vote for him as well. (All legal under the National Convention rules, by the way...)

Bottom line: the "star wars" going on at the top won't affect us in Maryland one whit. We will still do

the same things we have been planning, no matter who is National Chair, no matter who gets elected Maryland one whit. We will still do the same things we have been planning, no matter who is National Chair, no matter who gets elected as President of the United States. In fact, depending on the outcome of either election, we might get encouraged to double, or redouble our efforts!

I strongly encourage you to keep focused on the local level. We have a state party to build. If you can volunteer in any way, please feel free to step forward. Phoning, staffing outreach booths, volunteering for voter registration, even offering yourself as a candidate in 2002 can be a tremendous help to build our group.

I make no secret that I will not vote for anyone for any office who is currently on the LNC, and I will lobby my state's delegation to Anaheim to do the same. Maybe we can send the message that business as usual is not acceptable, and that's been the bottom line of this whole row.

...Steve Boone

(Continued from page 1) [Republicans, continued]

couldn't use a calculator if their life depended on it. The taxpayers got a hard and dry reaming for electing that loser.

Sen. Minority Leader Brian Lees helped kick off Democrat State Representative Keogh's re-election campaign; and Keogh has a Republican opponent. Very loyal - to the Democrats. Lees also proposed draconian new seatbelt laws, supported huge pork projects and, in general, acts like a Democrat.

Senator Knapic proposed regulating little league baseball, requiring all the kiddies to wear a mouthpiece to protect their little teeth from danger. That failed in committee, as I recall. Pretty bad when the People's Republic of Massachusetts is too conservative to pass Republican legislation.

I challenge any one of you to find a money-grubbing Democrat that is sleazier and more arrogant than Lt. Governor Jane M. Swift. She flip-flopped on the gun issue so fast during the last election that she was promoting gun control at the same time that her website said she opposed it. I'm sure you're familiar with the tax dodge, helicopter rides, baby-sitting and sweetheart teaching post.

The Republican mayor in my town just submitted a budget that grew from \$100 million to \$104 million. (that's 4% for you public school grads) It's pretty modest by government standards but probably 60 or 70 percent

higher than the inflation rate. He's another Republican who's making sure that government outpaces the private sector.

We don't know if Jack Robinson is a Republican or not because the media has never asked him what his views are on any issue. It doesn't really matter because his own party treats him like an outcast from a leper colony. And he's their only hope because he's the best the Republicans have to offer. What a joke.

Anyone remember Peter Blute? What about Kerasiotes? Does anyone think that the Democrats can waste public funds faster than these guys?

And what about that early retirement bill for teachers? That passed both houses unanimously on a voice vote. What a piece of crap that bill was. After the veto, Cellucci says that a roll call will tell the voters who caved in to the teacher's union. Hey Einstein! We know who voted for the bill. The sound of crickets chirping after "all opposed" is a pretty clear indicator of how many Republicans are in the legislature. Zero.

You couldn't find a God-fearing, pro-business, flag-waving, Constitution-loving Republican in the state government if you had a pack of bloodhounds and a posse with the population of China. They simply don't exist. What we call Republicans are merely lapdogs for the Democrats who present the illusion of an opposing viewpoint. The only way to get elected here with an "R" after your name is by embracing the philosophy of the present the illusion of an opposing viewpoint. The only way to get elected here with an "R" after your name is by embracing the philosophy of the Democratic Party.

Small-government Republicans. Indeed.

...Pit Warren

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.

(Continued from page 1) [Debate Access Now!, continued]

This is an unreasonably high threshold that effectively locks every third-party candidate out of the debates, which are a crucial source of information for tens of millions of American voters.

Consider that Reform Party candidate Jesse Ventura was polling at 10% in Minnesota in September 1998, before being invited to the debates. Ventura went on to win in November with 37% of the vote. As the election of Ventura demonstrated, debates can change the outcome of an election. That's why the Debates Commission should offer voters a broad spectrum of legitimate candidates instead of acting as a filter, to "mainstream" our choices to an "electable" choice of candidates.

Inviting every candidate on enough state ballots to have a mathematical chance of winning would probably result in just six candidates on stage -- hardly enough to "confuse" voters.

I ask all members of the Constitution, Democratic, Green, Libertarian, Natural Law, Reform, and Republican Parties, and independent voters- to support the opening of the presidential debates, to allow all parties that are mathematically eligible to win the Electoral College in to the Debates.

An open debate will allow us to have an open forum to the American people, to help all voters form a complete idea of the political spectrum of choices in The United States of America, and make a more informed choice in the all important Presidential Debates of 2000 and the elections of our nation's future.

If you agree that third parties should have a chance to be heard in the debates, here are some things you can do to make it happen:

1. Sign the Open Debates America petition at <http://www.i-charity.net/bin/ptn/39>
2. Forward this email on to any friend, listserv, publication or organization that may have an interest in the issue.
3. Send feedback to the Commission on Presidential Debates using the link at the bottom of this page: <http://www.debates.org/pages/general.html>
4. *WRITE TO THE SPONSORS* of the Commission on Presidential Debates. Demand that they cease funding the CDP until all mathematically viable third-party candidates are included in the debates. Point them to some of the news stories listed at the bottom of this message. If you find the company unresponsive to your concerns, consider organizing a boycott.

There is a list of CPD sponsors at: <http://www.debates.org/pages/natspons.html>

5. Write a letter to the editor of your local newspaper to inform others in your community about this. Make sure to include a URL and/or the Open Debates America contact information. Just for kicks, toss around some of the names of CPD's corporate sponsors.

6. Four colleges and universities have been chosen by the CPD to host the debates. Email them at the following addresses to demand (yes, you have a right to demand :) that third-party candidates be included:

- University of Massachusetts, Boston: lewis_a@umbsky.cc.umb.edu
- Centre College, Danville, KY (VP debate): trllngrp@centre.edu
- Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem NC: debate2000@wfu.edu
- Washington University, St. Louis, MO: volk-mann@wustl.edu

7. Join one of the lawsuits against the Federal Election Commission, whose regulations are *supposed* to be governing the conduct of the CPD. One suit is being brought by a coalition of the Committee for a Unified Independent Party, Ballot Access News, and registered voters of various affiliations. I believe the other is being brought by Pat Buchanan and the Reform Party. If anyone can point me to more info on these I would appreciate it.

Links:

Open Debates of America <http://www.i-charity.net/bin/ptn/39> 1403 Haar Lane, Elk Grove, IL 60007

Commission on Presidential Debates <http://www.debates.org/>

America's Open Debates Foundation (out-of-date but has a few useful resources, not affiliated with Open Debates of America) <http://www.opendebates.org/>

News clippings Ballot Access News: Pressure on the CPD is growing <http://www.ballot-access.org/2000/0501.html#13>

The Nader Page: The CDP: Not the Unpartisan Organization It Appears <http://www.nader.org/interest/11100.html>

CNN: Buchanan accuses debate panel of conspiring against him: <http://www.cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/03/20/buchanan.debate/index.html>

CNN: Perot sues to stop presidential debates <http://www.cnn.com/US/9609/23/perot/>
...Tim O'Brien

(Continued from page 1) [News, continued]

56% of the delegate vote on the first ballot, beating Don Gorman, Jacob Hornberger, and Barry Hess. Olivier won on the second ballot, beating Steve Kubby after Ken Krawchuk withdrew. The climactic moment of the VP nomination was the floor effort to nominate Don Gorman, requiring a 2/3 vote of the delegates to suspend the rules. Former LP Presidential candidate Ed Clark — widely identified as co-author of the Draft Gorman movement — was ready to give the nominating speech when Gorman entered the Hall and strode to the stage. Gorman said “We are the Party of Principle. I am not here to steal the nomination from the people who have worked hard to earn it. I decline being put in nomination.” Gorman was later told by a CSPAN cameraman “that was the most honorable thing I have ever seen a politician do”.

The Presidential campaign ends in November. The National Committee goes on for two years. For National Chair, Jim Lark of VA beat George Phillies and Gary Copeland of CA. John Brickner of Wales, PVLA co-founder and Elected Libertarian, gave one of Phillies' seconding speeches. A draft-me campaign of David Nolan, complete with buttons, fliers, and petitioners, whose planks went approximately ‘Most things are fine. We need a full-time fully-salaried National chair. Support my planks and make me Chair.’ was cancelled before the nominations for lack of support.

Dan Fylstra was elected Vice Chair over Charles Wilhoit and Gary Copeland. Steve Givot beat Steve Boone for Secretary. Mark Tuniewicz of Massachusetts beat Terry Savage for Treasurer. At-Large Representatives include Lois Kaneshiki of and Lorenzo Gastenaga; the additional Executive Committee member is Regional Representative Michael Gilson de Limos of Florida. For the most part, Platform changes were accomplished by deletion.

The Convention was a happy time for most delegates. Debates were civil. Contrary to custom, nothing that was happening led to a walkout of one side or the other, a dramatic change from conventions of 15 and 20 years ago.

Harry Browne gave a solid acceptance speech, outlining the issues on which he will run. Not yet heavily noted was his discussion of the drug war in terms of the son of a noted drug-warrior Senator, who returned from foreign parts with 12 ounces of hashish, and was caught. Son received a \$500 administrative fine. Senator and son were named on-air.

(Continued from page 1) [A Challenge to Match, continued]

publishes the newsletter ^Ballot Access News;^ his email address is ban@igc.org.

The LPWS candidates include a full slate of statewide offices, a complete slate of congressional candidates, a senatorial candidate, three candidates for county commissioner, and over 50 candidates for the state legislature. The party hopes one of its statewide candidates will obtain more than five percent of the vote in the general election, allowing the party to obtain the legal status of a major party. Many other states report similar success in recruiting libertarians to run for office this year.

Although recruiting has temporarily outpaced efforts to record contact information, many of the candidates are already listed at the party's web site, at www.lpws.org/candidates.htm. Candidates will be available for media contacts in the counties of King, Pierce, Snohomish, Skamania, Spokane, Grant and Benton.

The petition signatures are a legal requirement for ballot access, and were largely gathered from voters of all persuasions at public locations around the state on June 24.

The Libertarian Party of Washington State stands for individual liberty and personal responsibility, freedom of choice in health care and education, and the right to keep and bear arms. More information is available at <http://www.lpws.org>.

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.

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*.

Serious conflict of interest questions arise if the state organization both acts as a support group and also supports individual projects from its general funds. In this case, the same group is collecting restricted funds for the use of specific projects, and is also collecting general funds that can be used to support any project. Are these activities legitimately separated?

This conflict of interest question has arisen before. Some charitable appeals allow individual donors to specify how their donations should be allocated, but also accept and distribute unrestricted funds. A subtle conflict of interest issue then arises. If restricted funds

are ignored while the appeal's governing body allocates unrestricted funds, so unrestricted funds are given to projects as though there were no restricted funds, then no difficulties arise.

However, general funds could also be distributed to projects while taking into account how much restricted funding was received by those projects. A project that was especially effective at raising restricted funds might find that its allocation of unrestricted funds had therefore been selectively reduced. This process for allocating unrestricted funds reduces the collection of restricted funds to a sham. The restricted funds are indeed being collected, but unless most money is restricted the donors have no say in how money is spent. The allocation of restricted funds by thoughtful donors is simply cancelled by the general fund allocations, so the body that allocates the unrestricted funds effectively controls every penny of funding.

Sham collection of restricted funds to support specific projects, with the intent of using general funds to nullify the choices of restricted fund donors, cannot be kept secret. When such a policy becomes known, the fundraising ability of the support group collapses. The restricted fund donors start giving directly to their choice of projects. The former general fund donors question the honesty and integrity of the support group and stop giving. In order to avoid this difficulty, which has disrupted fundraising by some major charities, the body operating a Unified Collection Plan must abstain from raising money other than for its internal operating expenses. In particular, the body must not raise money that it directly allocates to its recipient organizations.

Method: Advisory Services

If all else fails, you can invest in an advisory service. An advisory service does not give any money to candidates. It does not even urge people to vote for candidates. Instead, an advisory service sells cheap subscriptions to its campaign analysis newsletter. A campaign analysis newsletter is a lot like a stock-picker newsletter. Instead of identifying the next Microsoft or the most secure corporate bonds, a campaign analysis newsletter tries to identify potentially winning candidates and projects most likely to build a Libertarian future.

A good advisory service finds the Libertarian Jesse Ventura. A poor advisory service misdirects the investments of its readers. By creating competition between different advisors, rather than funding a central bureaucracy, we sort out who is best able by art or science to identify winning ideas. We also reduce the

likelihood that funds get spent on advisory services rather than actions. A mutual fund with a very high expense ratio often has trouble competing with funds with low expense ratios. Equally, an advisory service with high expenses for advising -- unless it does something very clever with its money -- will often have trouble competing with advisory services with lower expenses.

The advisory service has some strong points, and some weak points. Because an advisory service does not advocate electing anyone to office, and does not give money to campaigns, it is largely exempt from campaign financing laws. It can report on any campaign or group, anywhere in the world, under the protection of the First Amendment.

The strength of an advisory campaign is also its weakness. The advisory service does not send money to campaigns. It does not make gifts in kind to political campaigns. Money flows from donor to campaign only when the donor actively writes the check or provides the volunteer effort for the specific campaign she supports. If the donor is busy that month, the volunteer time does not happen. If the donor is momentarily short

of cash, checks do not get written. Advisory services work for people who are prepared to set aside money until it is time to give, and have donation targets for the year. Advisory services do not work for the person who reaches April 16, notes what the folks in Washington did to his bank account, and wants to do something about it Right Now! by writing one check.

Method: Political Action Committees

Political Action Committees are the political equivalent of a mutual fund. You give your money to the committee, and the committee figures out where to invest its support. How do you decide which committee to support? You study their objectives and past records, just as you study the objectives and past records of mutual funds. By investing in a PAC, you have entrusted your political investment decision to someone else. However, that someone has more time to think than you do, more information than you do, and more experience supporting political activities than you do. There is a possibility that the PAC will invest your money better than you would have.

Political Action Committees must obey many legal restrictions, different for each state and campaign. In general, political action committees cannot legally give a single campaign huge amounts of money. However, at this time most Libertarian campaigns can't readily

use vast infusions of cash. What most Libertarian candidates really need is practical technical support.

Technical support? At the simplest but most important level, one group in each state needs to prepare a "candidate support kit" telling erstwhile local candidates what to do to run for office. The kit should give timelines, instructions on petitioning or whatever for ballot access, and boilerplate letters that a candidate can modify to reflect local issues. The same or a different group in each state can maintain a list of local volunteers and potential volunteers, people that it can steer toward candidates when they become available.

On a more technical level, a political action committee can give prospective candidates bumper sticker and lawn sign designs, record radio ads, supply scripts for political fundraising, and perhaps offer startup funding or a first fundraiser mailing to local Libertarians.

In the future, electronic media will be a key tool. The Internet and the World Wide Web are moving from politically marginal to politically central. Many computer users have Libertarian inclinations. Web sites and mailing lists are tools that help these people learn that they, too, are truly Libertarians at heart. Chapter 14 discusses information management at much greater length.

A Political Action Committee that sent each candidate a package containing a skeletal web site would give candidates a big boost. A skeletal site includes standardized graphics, text, marked blanks to be filled in by the candidate, and links to important Libertarian web sites across America. The same package can be maintained in downloadable form on the Committee web site, but remember: most people only know how to use a few capabilities of their computer. Total reliance on downloads from your site does not replace putting a diskette or CD-ROM on the candidate's lap.

Technical support groups can mobilize incredible resources for individual candidates. You may not know enough html to design your own web site, but plenty of people in the party do. You may not know which neighboring towns have Libertarian candidates, and which neighboring towns have Libertarian volunteers hungering for a candidate to support, but a technical support group can tell you. At our present state of political maturity, technical support for enthusiastic, politically unskilled candidates and their staffs is more effective than money for lawn signs, bumper stickers, and radio ads. With a little help, local people can do their own fund-raising. Local people cannot as readily decide how to design posters, comply with campaign