

Let Freedom Ring CMLC Liberator

Now \$10
per year.

Wilcox Soars! 36% in Wales!

Washington State Does Well! PVLA Scores Breakthrough!

Ruth Bennett, Libertarian for Lt. Governor, received 7.55% of the vote or 122,700 votes so far. In addition to Ruth, Steve Layman, Libertarian for Commissioner of Public Lands, and Chris Caputo, Libertarian for State Auditor, received over 5% of the vote. All three of these Libertarians outpolled Ralph Nader in the state.

Libertarian candidates in the state of Washington have polled over 750,000 votes in the counting so far. We could hit 1,000,000 by the time all of the

(Continued on page 7)

PVLA Member AL Wilcox scored a breakthrough in his State Representative campaign, getting 36% of the vote in Wales and 35% of the vote in Monson, for an overall 19% mark. These are all records for libertarians in our part of the state. Terry Franklin of Amherst, who spoke to the PVLA last spring, got 15% of the vote for State Rep from Amherst, while occasional meeting attendee (and U Mass Amherst student) Mike Froimowitz got 11% in his State Senate race, including 23% in Huntington.

(Continued on page 2)

Browne Sinks

Harry Browne's 2000 Presidential campaign did much worse than his 1996 campaign. The Libertarian Presidential candidate received under 400,000 votes, well under the 1996 result. The following tables list performances in 1972, 1976, 1980,...

Was "Close Election" an issue? Let's look at states where one of the duopoly candidates staged a crushing landslide over the other. (Tables follow)

With a few shining exceptions where we did better, in most we did worse in 2000 than in 1996 in state after state after state. Furthermore, in most states where we did better, we did very slightly better [Georgia and North Carolina are exceptions.] On the other hand, in very large states California, Illinois, New Jersey, and New York we lost more than 40% of our vote. In Massachusetts, despite an extremely well-funded Senate campaign we lost 20% of

(Continued on page 2)

Stand Up for Liberty!

We continue to reprint chapters from George Phillies' book "Stand Up for Liberty". To read the complete book, see <http://3mpub.com> or <http://www.cmlc.org>

Contrariwise, we do not support advocates of the Membership Recruitment Strategy...

*We do not support advocates of Membership Recruitment when they run for Party office. We do not vote for them, and we do not support their campaigns. We support candidates for party office who Stand Up for Liberty! by standing up for Local Organization. We respect the freedom of advocates of Membership Recruitment to disagree with us about tactics. We also remember that the money they spend on their approach is money lost to Local Organizing. By voting against advocates of Membership Recruitment when they run for party office, we vote to keep Party-raised funds available for the path to Libertarian Victory that we support.

*We do not support the Membership Recruitment strategy with our organizations. We keep our local

(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

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, find a thumbtack, and at a convenient moment put the trifold up on a bulletin board someplace.

The enclosed trifold has 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>.

Let Freedom Ring CMLC Liberator

Published by the Pioneer Valley Libertarian Association, Carol McMahon (Treasurer) and George Phillies (Editor and Chair) Subscriptions are \$10 per year, payable to Pioneer Valley Libertarian Association, 87-6 Park Avenue, Worcester MA 01605. Contributions of articles are always welcome.



Let Freedom Ring
c/o George Phillies
87-6 Park Avenue
Worcester MA 01605

First Class Mail

(Continued from page 1) [Wilcox Soars!]

The Wilcox results by town were:

Al Wilcox	Opponent	Wilcox	%
EAST LONGMEADOW	2732	460	
HAMPDEN	1915	460	17%
LONGMEADOW	6829	895	
MONSON	2116	1147	35
SPRINGFIELD	568	180	24
WALES	396	222	36
TOTALS ::	14556	3364	19

Terry Franklin	Opponent	Franklin	%
AMHERST	8422	1592	16%
PELHAM	700	94	
SHUTESBURY	891	115	
TOTALS ::	10013	1801	15%

Mike Froimowitz	Opponent	Froimowitz	%
AMHERST	8805	1285	
ASHFIELD	791	105	
BERNARDSTON	867	115	
BUCKLAND	761	99	
CHESTERFIELD	462	84	
COLRAIN	654	98	
CONWAY	878	100	
DEERFIELD	2300	282	
GILL	617	92	
GOSHEN	397	63	
GREENFIELD	6146	755	
HADLEY	2159	295	
HATFIELD	1600	163	
HUNTINGTON	658	195	23%
LEVERETT	962	77	
LEYDEN	306	46	
MONTAGUE	3098	344	
NORTHAMPTON	11825	1205	
PELHAM	725	69	
SHELBURNE	869	114	
SHUTESBURY	921	80	
SOUTH HADLEY	6115	955	
SUNDERLAND	1327	199	
WENDELL	366	59	
WESTHAMPTON	664	110	
WHATELY	707	87	

(Continued from page 1) [Browne Sinks]

our Presidential vote.

In states without a landslide, we also lost a third or more of our vote, relative to 1996, in Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, and Pennsylvania (where our vote fell 60%).

The following three tables show landslide states where we did better, landslide states where we did worse, and all states. Each state is a horizontal line. Years are Vertical columns, la-

beled at the top.

TABLE ONE. The Eight Landslide states where we did better in 2000 than in 1996:

YEAR	1984	1988	1992	1996	2000	
DC Gore 85/09		279	554	467	588	641
GA Bush 55/43	159	8,435	7,110	17,870	36,222	
ID Bush 68/28	2,823	5,313	1,167	3,325	3,533	
NC Bush 56/	3,794	1,263	5,171	8,740	12,118	
OK Bush 60/38	9,066	6,261	4,486	5,505	6,602	
SC Bush 57/41	4,359	4,935	2,719	4,271	5,132	
SD Bush 60/38		1,060	814	1,472	1,664	
TX Bush 39/38	37,643	30,355	19,699	20,256	23,159	

TABLE TWO: The 21 Landslide states where we did worse in 2000 than in 1996:

YEAR	1984	1988	1992	1996	2000
AK Bush 59/28	6,378	5,484	1,378	2,276	2,041
CA Gore 54/41	49,951	70,105	48,139	73,600	40,266
CT Gore 55/39	204	14,071	5,391	5,788	3,324
DE Gore 55/42	268	1,162	935	2,052	774
HI Gore 56/37	2,167	1,999	1,119	2,493	1,476
IL Gore 54/43	10,086	14,944	9,218	22,548	11,552
IN Bush 57/41	6,741	---	7,936	15,632	15,454
KS Bush 58/37	3,329	12,553	4,314	4,557	4,423
KY Bush 56/41	3	2,118	4,513	4,009	2903
MD Gore 57/40	5,721	6,748	4,715	8,765	4,992
MA Gore 60/3		24,251	9,024	20,426	16,353
MS Bush 57/41	3,336	3,329	2,154	2,809	2,121
MT Bush 58/33	5,185	5,047	986	2,526	1,723
NB Bush 63/33	2,075	2,534	1,340	2,792	2,137
NJ Gore 56/40	6,416	8,421	6,822	14,763	7,138
NY Gore 60/35	11,949	12,109	13,451	12,220	7,453
ND Bush 61/33	703	1,315	416	847	671
RI Gore 61/32	277	825	571	1,109	704
UT Bush 67/26	2,447	7,473	1,900	4,129	3,603
VT Gore 51/41	1,002	1,000	501	1,183	728
WY Bush 69/28	2,357	2,026	844	1,739	1,456

TABLE THREE: For every state: (States in CAPS are _not_ listed above.) (Sorry about the type size, but there are a lot of columns.)

YEAR	1972	1976	1980	1984	1988	1992	1996	2000
ALABAMA	---	1,481	13,318	9,504	8,460	5,737	5,290	6,233
Alaska	68	6,785	18,479	6,378	5,484	1,378	2,276	2,041
ARIZONA	---	7,647	18,784	10,585	13,351	6,759	14,358	5,195
ARKANSAS	---	---	8,970	2,221	3,297	1,261	3,076	2,797
California	980	56,388	148,434	49,951	70,105	48,139	73,600	40,266
COLORADO	1,111	5,339	25,744	11,257	15,483	8,669	12,392	12,834
Connecticut	10	209	8,570	204	14,071	5,391	5,788	3,324
Delaware	---	34	1,974	268	1,162	935	2,052	774
D.C.	---	274	1,114	279	554	467	588	641
FLORIDA	4	103	30,524	754	19,796	15,079	23,965	14,521
Georgia	14	175	15,527	159	8,435	7,110	17,870	36,222
Hawaii	---	3,923	3,269	2,167	1,999	1,119	2,493	1,476
Idaho	---	3,558	8,425	2,823	5,313	1,167	3,325	3,533
Illinois	---	8,057	38,939	10,086	14,944	9,218	22,548	11,552
Indiana	---	---	19,627	6,741	---	7,936	15,632	15,454
IOWA	---	1,452	13,123	1,844	2,494	1,076	2,315	3,169
Kansas	---	3,242	14,470	3,329	12,553	4,314	4,557	4,423
Kentucky	---	814	5,531	3	2,118	4,513	4,009	936
LOUISIANA	---	3,325	8,240	1,876	4,115	3,155	7,499	3,018
MAINE	1	12	5,119	3	2,700	1,681	2,996	2,957
Maryland	---	255	14,192	5,721	6,748	4,715	8,765	4,992
Massachusetts	43	135	22,038	---	24,251	9,024	20,426	16,353
MICHIGAN	---	5,407	41,597	10,055	18,336	10,175	27,670	17,396
MINNESOTA	---	3,529	31,592	2,996	5,109	3,374	8,271	5,397
Mississippi	---	2,787	5,465	2,336	3,329	2,154	2,809	2,121
MISSOURI	9	179	14,422	---	523	7,497	10,522	7,432
Montana	---	40	9,825	5,185	5,047	986	2,526	1,723
Nebraska	---	1,476	9,073	2,075	2,534	1,340	2,792	2,137
NEVADA	---	1,519	4,358	2,292	3,520	1,835	4,460	3,309
NEW HAMPSHIRE	---	---	936	2,064	735	4,502	3,548	4,237
New Jersey	---	9,449	20,652	6,416	8,421	6,822	14,763	7,138
NEW MEXICO	---	1,110	4,365	4,459	3,268	1,615	2,996	2,168
New York	6	12,197	52,648	11,949	12,109	13,451	12,220	7,453
North Carolina	---	2,219	9,677	3,794	1,263	5,171	8,740	12,118
North Dakota	---	256	3,743	703	1,315	416	847	671
OHIO	---	8,961	49,033	5,886	11,989	7,252	12,851	13,639
Oklahoma	---	---	13,828	9,066	6,261	4,486	5,505	6,602
OREGON	61	464	25,838	376	14,811	4,277	8,903	7,266
PENNSYLVANIA	8	73	33,263	6,982	12,051	21,477	28,000	11,593
Rhode Island	2	715	2,458	277	825	571	1,109	704
South Carolina	---	53	5,139	4,359	4,935	2,719	4,271	5,132
South Dakota	---	1,619	3,824	---	1,060	814	1,472	1,664
TENNESSEE	1	1,375	7,116	3,072	2,041	1,847	5,020	4,222
Texas	52	575	37,643	---	30,355	19,699	20,256	23,159
Utah	---	2,438	7,226	2,447	7,473	1,900	4,129	3,603
Vermont	---	4	1,900	1,002	1,000	501	1,183	728
VIRGINIA	---	4,648	12,821	---	8,336	5,730	9,174	15,039
WASHINGTON	1,537	5,042	29,213	8,844	17,240	7,533	12,522	10,485
WEST VIRGINIA	---	17	4,356	6	28	1,873	3,062	1,866
WISCONSIN	---	3,814	29,135	4,883	5,157	2,877	7,929	6,584

organizations separate from national groups. However, we are happy to trade lists of supporters -- except supporters who want their names kept secret -- with people who trade with us. That trade benefits both groups.

However, our members remain our members; their members remain their members. Individual Libertarians should be free to choose which groups they support, and which groups they do not support. By giving individual libertarians this freedom, we use the free marketplace of ideas to determine which ideas work. The opposite of the Marketplace of Ideas is coercion: In a coerced group, if you want to belong to the East Mugwump Libertarian Caucus, you must also belong to the State of Mugwump Libertarian Coalition, whether you want to associate with the Coalition people or not. We reject coerced membership because it is inconsistent with Libertarian recognition of the superiority of membership competition.

*Finally, we do not support the Membership Recruitment strategy with our donations. As Libertarians, we applaud Libertarian supporters of Membership Recruitment when they try to raise money to support their strategy. That's a marketplace approach. However, we do not support their strategy, so we do not give them our money. We give our money instead to candidates and groups that support Local Organization and try to put it into effect.

Whether we win or lose, within the Libertarian Party:

*We do not carry disputes on party matters over to campaigns for public office. The Republican golden rule "thou shalt not speak ill of a fellow Republican" works for Libertarians, too. We may not support every Libertarian candidate actively, but we do not throw needless obstacles into the path of other Libertarians and their strategies.

*We do not sue our fellow Libertarians over party issues. (Suing people who steal campaign donations is a different issue. As Libertarians we con-

demn fraud and theft.) Libertarianism is a movement based on individual liberty, not on government regulation. If a single state or county has several competing groups, we encourage them to work together on practical issues and get on with the business of Standing Up for Liberty! We discourage them from spending time engaging in intraparty feuds.

We shun those who sue over purely internal party issues. Shunned Libertarians and shunned Libertarian groups are not supported in word, thought, or deed by other Libertarians. Other Libertarians do not recognize their presence or existence.

In some states, we are the majority within the Libertarian Party. In those states, we use state and local organizations to put our ideas into effect. How? We build up local Libertarian clubs. We field candidates for many offices, especially town and county offices. We put into place pro-local activities. We carry out, as best as we can within the limits of available resources, the Local Organization strategy sketched here, including all the improvements you will make in my plans. By doing so, we build Local Organization, and we field-test and improve its implementation plan. Continuous improvement works in high-tech design. It will work for the Libertarian Party, too.

In some states, our position is the minority within the Libertarian Party. In those states, we urge libertarians supporting Local Organization to Stand Up for Liberty! Form Local Organizations! Run candidates for Local office! Strive to put the Local Organization strategy into effect!

We discourage pointless internal politicking. If the majority in your state organization wants to focus on mass membership in a National Party, candidates for President and statewide office, and self-perpetuating mass mail fund-raising campaigns, up to a point it is better to let them. Save your energy for advancing the Local Organization strategy. The free marketplace of ideas will settle the disagreement.

However, having accepted that advocates of Membership Recruitment are free to carry out their plans, don't let them stop you from Standing Up for Liberty! To paraphrase the ancient Greeks: let the supporters of Membership Recruitment say what they think is right. Just be sure that you personally do what is right.

Engage in Significant Internal Political Action

Having said that I discourage pointless internal politicking, I now advocate significant internal politicking. It should be an objective of the Local Organization movement to take control of the Libertarian Party's National Committee, and to ensure that our Party's Presidential Nominee supports Local Organization.

Why should we want to control the National Committee? After all, Local Organization is not based on democratic centralism. Taking control of the National Committee to take control of the 50 state parties is a mistake. If controlling the state parties is your goal in life, I urge you to consider a more promising career. Butterfly herding comes immediately to mind. Under the Local Organization Strategy the National Headquarters is not going to run the Party. The Party's owners, its activists and specialists and members, are going to run the Party.

Taking control of the National Committee is not necessary for the victory of the Local Organization strategy. After all, we're Libertarians. We're here to encourage the growth of private, consensual groups to replaced statist government operations. The entire Moral Armament approach holds that we will build the strong private civic space that will let

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 Phillis.

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.

us Ignore the State! As Libertarians, we believe that we should replace central control of civic life with unregulated private entities.

If we believe that local and individual organization are better for civic life, how can we believe that the Local Organization strategy requires control of the National Committee? That can't be right! The Libertarian National Committee lacks the coercive power of a government. If the Local Organization strategy is correct, the marketplace of ideas will insure that the local organization strategy wins within the Libertarian Party.

If we don't need control of the National Committee, why should we, the supporters of Local Organization, seek to control it?

The National Committee is moving the Libertarian Party in the wrong direction. One readily sees a trend to bureaucratic centralism in the operation of the national Libertarian Party. National fundraising in the millions of dollars yields a pittance to support real political campaigns likely to elect someone to office. There is no longer even a pretense that money raised by the national party is primarily used to promote Libertarian candidates. Instead, the leadership of the national Libertarian Party has turned the National Party into a membership fundraising club, in which donations are recycled to generate more members, more donations, and more paid staff needed for more membership recruitment and donor appeals.

What is the evidence that we are becoming a membership club? Look at your letters from the National Party. What are the primary criteria for success that the National Party uses to evaluate its own acts? Why, the criteria are the number of new members and the amount of money raised. The criteria for success are the number of people who can be persuaded to mail their dues and sign their card, and the amounts that they donate. These criteria for success are taking us astray. If you judge your performance using wrong criteria, you will move in the wrong direction, and that is exactly what the National Libertarian Party is now doing. Also, new members are largely being recruited from other Libertarian groups. Recruiting members of another Libertarian group into the national party makes the Libertarian movement not one iota larger.

Of course, the national party does trumpet Libertarians who run for office and sometimes are elected. However, those candidates are from local and state organizations, and run with essentially no support from the national party. The national party rightly reports to all Libertarians the successes of Libertarians in other states, but those successes reflect the

hard work of local activist groups, not a success of the National Party organization.

The national party does run a Presidential candidate. Our candidate is on the ballot in every state, a major achievement that few parties outside the duopoly regularly achieve. However, "finished fourth in ninety-two" and "finished fifth in ninety-six" suggests that the President campaign focus is not advancing the Libertarian Party. Indeed, we are moving backwards. Short of a fusion candidacy with another party, we are unlikely to do much better in the next Presidential election than we did in the last Presidential election.

The current behavior of the National Libertarian Party reflects the ineffective Membership Recruitment strategy, which puts an excessive emphasis on membership recruitment and fundraising drives by the national party. We should replace Membership Recruitment with Local Organization. We should direct the focus and spending of the national Libertarian Party into activities that build local organizations, develop the voter base, and run candidates in winnable elections. We'll build a far more effective Libertarian Party, and incidentally create a Libertarian Party that people will want to join without being pressured.

For the last quarter-century, we've focused the party's efforts on running someone for President, and on running people for statewide office. Statewide races -- in some states! -- can improve ballot access, so in those states some statewide races were not complete wastes of money. The millions we spent on Presidential campaigns have gotten us almost nothing. If some of that money had been redirected to lower-level races that we can win, and invested in building Libertarian special-interest groups, the Libertarian Party would be well ahead of where it is now. By taking control of the National Committee, supporters of the Local Organization strategy can redirect the party's attention away from massively expensive, ineffective Presidential campaigns and Membership Recruitment gimmicks.

The core issue is that under Membership Recruitment the National Committee puts a massive drain on Libertarian Party resources. The National Committee raises vast sums in Libertarian funds and invests that money in Operation Everywhere, Project Archimedes, and similar schemes. That money drains the limited resources of the Libertarian Party, a drain that the supporters of Local Organization will end by putting control of those resources in our hands. For example, we apparently spend \$10,000 on single-effort consultancies.

\$10,000 is more money than any of our congressional candidates except two raised in 1998. Indeed, in a recent year the National Committee raised 2.6 million dollars and spent under 3% of its income on supporting local candidates.

By taking control of the Libertarian National Committee, we can divert those millions of dollars into effective spending. Effective spending is spending that gives results, results that you can show prospective donors to persuade them to give you more money.

Furthermore, the national Party controls the most effective tools for putting Local Organization concepts in front of our members. The Local Organization strategy asks state and local groups to change and do things they have not done in the past. The National Party is well placed to ask for these changes. Control of the National Party gives supporters of local organization an excellent platform to propagandize for our strategy.

The reasons that drive us to control the National Committee also drive us to nominate advocates of local organization for President and Vice President. Every four years, the Presidential race gives us an umbrella campaign, a way to put the Libertarian Party in front of every voter. Into which shape do we mold that campaign?

Historically, our Presidential campaigns have consumed vast party resources. Our Presidential ticket's results have not varied substantially since 1980. If a Libertarian Presidential candidate were an advocate of local organization, her campaign would rebound to our benefit. By running a limited campaign, our Presidential nominee would free enormous sums of money to support Libertarians running for Congress, State legislature, and lower office. A Presidential nominee who campaigns locally will garner enormous publicity in local publications, putting our local candidates and their groups before the voters. By speaking up within the Party for Local Organization as the path to Libertarian Victory, the Presidential campaign also lures Libertarians across America to into working for their local Party.

I therefore urge supporters of National Organization to organize an gain control of the National Party.

An important caveat:

We believe in the intellectual marketplace. We should respect our fellow Libertarians who believe that Membership Recruitment and a single big national group will give us a Libertarian electoral majority. We believe that Membership Recruitment is the wrong strategy, and Local Organization is the

right strategy. We try to put our plans into effect but do not sabotage plans based on other strategies. We may not give them our money, but we do not keep them from spending their money. In our conduct, we should always remember: Perhaps our strategy is wrong and their strategy is right.

Where is the Libertarian Party Now?

Recruiting members for the sake of having members is a winning strategy for a membership club. It's not a winning strategy for a political party. Recruiting members because they will someday be donors is a winning strategy for a charity. It's not a winning strategy for a political party. Recruiting members because they will someday become activists can be a strategy for Libertarian victory. It's not a winning strategy unless you also have a membership activation strategy. The successful membership activation strategy is Local Organization. It is through Local Organization that we will gain the Alphabet, the Numbers, and the Vs of Victory.

A successful national leadership of the Libertarian Party will understand that we are not a membership club, and should not act like one. A successful national leadership of the Libertarian Party will understand that we are not a charity, and should not act like one. A successful national leadership for the Libertarian Party will know that success comes from activating the members, turning them into activists and specialists. A successful national leadership of the Libertarian Party will recognize that Libertarian Victory comes from implementing the Local Organization strategy, and will do its part toward implementing that strategy.

We have the people. We have the mission. The Local Organization strategy will persuade our people to Stand Up for Liberty! and do the work that gets us to Libertarian victory.

What Should You Personally Do?

There's no such thing as a free lunch in economics. There's no free lunch at the ballot box, either. If you sit back and wait for someone to give you free money, you're going to have a bit of a wait. If you sit back and wait until someone gives you Libertarian candidates and Libertarian political victories, without your helping to earn them, you're going to have a very long wait indeed.

If you want to move toward a Libertarian future, you yourself need to challenge the Democratic-Republican duopoly. You need to challenge it in your ward and precinct, your town and county and state, even in the Halls of the Federal Congress. The Libertarian future belongs to us, but only if we each take the initiative.

How you make the challenge is up to you. Not everyone will Stand Up for Liberty! in the same way. Some will run for office. Others will donate their time or money. Others will speak up for the cause of freedom, write letters to the editor, or sound off on the Internet. The path you choose to Stand Up for Liberty! depends on your personality, your resources, and your time. One outcome is certain: If we all sit and do nothing, the defeat of Liberty is assured. Only if you, personally, and every other Libertarian chooses to Stand Up for Liberty! can we reach the Libertarian future of freedom, peace, and prosperity.

It's time to Stand Up for Liberty! It's time to send forward the banner of freedom from sea to shining sea. It's time to Stand Up For Victory! for the one American political Party that stands one hundred percent for freedom one hundred percent of the time.

The path to Libertarian Victory, the path to the Libertarian future, is the Libertarian strategy of Local Organization and Local Victory. Let us advance down that path to the Libertarian future of peace, prosperity, and freedom.

(Continued from page 1) [Washington Does Well]

absentee votes are counted.

Jeff Jared, Libertarian for US Senate, received far more votes than the margin of difference between Slade Gorton and Maria Cantwell. Jared's campaign focussed on issues which drew equally from Democrats and Republicans, so Jared's voters were voters for freedom. Not spoilers.

Tom Chambers, Supreme Court candidate supported by the LPWS, appears to have won a seat on the court with Richard Sanders.

Three of our state legislative candidates; Mark Leirh, John Gearhart, and Randy Brooks, received over 20% of the vote.

Disappointments

Michael Hamilton, Libertarian for Pierce County Council, campaigned very hard in a two-way race against a Democratic opponent. So far, (and there are lots of absentees in Pierce County) he is receiving 29+% of the vote. This bests the previous partisan best % by an LPWS candidate of 28.5%, but Michael and his supporters were hoping for much better.

Jim Richardson, Libertarian for Skamania County Commissioner, also campaigned very hard in a three-way race. At last count, Jim is receiving 31% of the vote and coming in third! The leader has 35% of the vote. What a wild race! There are still absentee ballots yet to come in, but it looks like we will lose a squeaker.

US Senate Race - Jeff Jared 3%

Gubernatorial - Steve LePage 2%

US House Washington State

District 1 - Bruce Newman 3%

District 2 - Stuart Andrews 3%

District 3 - Erne Lewis 3%

District 4 - Fred Krauss 2%

District 5 - Greg Holmes 4%

District 6 - Dr. John Bennett 4%

District 7 - Joel Grus 7%

District 8 - Bernard Mcilroy 2%

District 9 - Jonathan Wright 3%

This material from Richard Neel,
Spokane, Washington

The Washington LP:

- Cost the GOP control of the state Senate.

- Cost U.S. Sen. Slade Gorton his seat.

- Prevent either party from winning a clear majority in the state House.