

Liberty for America

Journal of the Libertarian Political Movement

Volume 3 Number 11

April 2011

Table of Contents

Future of the Libertarian Political Movement
Oregon Rises from Dead
More State-By-State Good News
News of Other Parties
LNC Acts!
Hinkle Blocks Olsen Motion from LNC Agenda
LNC Rejects Hinkle Budget
Ploeger Demands That Hinkle Resign
Oregon State Party
Public Statement by Former State Chair Wes Wagner
Hinkle Asks Funding for Right-Wing Outreach
Mary Ruwart Discusses Budget
Lark Provides Thoughtful Critique
Staff Responds to Lark
Knedler Proposes Dues Increase
LPO Chair Blasts LNC Regional Reports
LNC Debates Wall of Shame Ad

Future of the Libertarian Political Movement June 19, Manchester, NH National Event Amasses Quality Speakers

The Serious Presidential Candidates Will Debate

Expected-to-be-declared and FEC-filing candidates Lee Wrights and Roger Gary are expected to appear. Former Presidential candidate George Phillies will moderate.

Nationally Known Libertarians Will Talk

Lead speakers already committed to appear include Judge John Buttrick, Ernie Hancock, Angela Keaton, Joe Kennedy, Alex Peterson, Mary Ruwart, and Bonnie Scott.

Look also for local speakers including Dave Blau (Chair, LPMAss), Bob Clark (candidate, U.S. Congress), Alwin Hopfmann, Carol McMahon, George Phillies, Dan Reale (chair, LPCT), and John Walsh.

Sponsoring the event is the Libertarian Association of Massachusetts. The event is walking distance from the Manchester Airport, at the Highlander Inn. If you are flying to PorcFest, just arrive a day early. Admission including all meals is \$100. See the announcement on the LPMAss.org front page for more information.

Oregon Rises from Dead State Party Is Reborn with New Bylaws

The LPO State Committee after “contentious debate” has voted to restructure the LP of Oregon with new Bylaws. The new Bylaws bring Party organization into agreement with state law. Only Oregon voters registered Libertarian are allowed to participate in the business of the party. A more extended report appears later in this issue.

More State-By-State Good News

Iowa LP has State Convention — The Iowa LP annual convention will be May 7 in Johnston, which is very near Des Moines. Details available soon at LPIA.com.

The LP of Nebraska’s Facebook page has reportedly surpassed the Nebraska Democratic Party’s Facebook page in ‘likes.’ thanks to a couple hundred dollars of branding.

Massachusetts — New web pages at LPMAss.org are up. Their state party newsletter is mailed every month.

Rhode Island — 2011 State Convention is Saturday, May 14 · 2:00pm - 4:00pm at the Warwick Public Library, 600 Sandy Lane, Warwick, RI.

Connecticut — Libertarian Party of Connecticut (LPCT) annual convention will be held May 7th, in New London, at VFW Post 189 (110 Garfield Avenue, New London, CT). lpct.org/Events.html.

New York—LPNY Chair Mark Axinn has announced that he is running for re-election as LPNY Chair.

Louisiana—the State web pages show that the Louisiana candidate for U.S. Senate in 2010 received 1.1% of the vote.

Maine—the State web page has been updated during this year and gives a calendar with regular monthly meetings, but no indication of place or minutes. The state party last fall launched a large petition campaign (30,000 signatures) to gain a different legal status; last news on this was late last year.

Maryland—The State convention was in March. Their ballot access petition drive is continuing. From their web pages, the LPMD State newsletter comes out regularly three times a year.

Michigan—Their 2011 State Convention is April 30. The LPMI State Newsletter appears monthly electronically and lists a dozen or more events each month.

Minnesota—The 2011 State Convention is April 30 in Rochester, MI.

News of Other Parties

Some second party behavior is so outrageous it is worth noting.

Republicans Reject Reality. The Republicans in the US House voted that Global Warming does not exist.

All we can say is “guys, it’s not flat, either.”

On a different antilibertarian note:

Ron Paul Campaigns to Defend DOMA — As reported on IPR, Feb 24, 2011 — “The Defense of Marriage Act was enacted in 1996 to stop Big Government in Washington from re-defining marriage and forcing its definition on the States. Like the majority of Iowans, I believe that marriage is between one man and one woman and must be protected.

“I supported the Defense of Marriage Act, which used Congress’ constitutional authority to define what other states have to recognize under the Full Faith and Credit Clause, to ensure that no state would be forced to recognize a same sex marriage license issued in another state. I have also cosponsored the Marriage Protection Act, which would remove challenges to the Defense of Marriage Act from the jurisdiction of the federal courts.

“The people of Iowa overwhelmingly supported, both houses of the Legislature passed, and the Governor signed into law the Iowa Defense Of Marriage Act in 1998. Iowans then valiantly recalled three activist Judges who spurned the will of the people by over-turning the state’s law.

We now turn to our Libertarian National Committee. National Party Membership continues to fall, and is down to 13675 for the end of March. It was last that low in 2007. For February 2011, income reported by the LNC to the FEC came to \$109713.

LNC Acts!

The LNC Budget as supplied to us calls for \$573,000 in membership dues, \$209,000 in donations, \$408,000 in recurring gifts, and \$200,000 to be raised by "Board Solicitation". \$24,000 will be received for the distribution of publications. Fundraising costs are estimated at \$150,000, while membership fundraising is estimated at \$234,500.

Expenditures are \$369,500 for Administrative Costs, \$522,000 for compensation, \$52,000 for brand development, \$9,000 for affiliate support, \$9300 for campus outreach, \$1,000 to support candidates, campaigns, and initiatives, \$12,000 for litigation, \$44,000 for 'member communications, and \$9,000 for outreach, PR, and Marketing.

Our sources have supplied us with what we believe to be communications between various LNC members. In the following, our comments and notes are in blue, and the communications between various activists are in black.

Hinkle Blocks Olsen Motion from LNC Agenda

On 3/25/2011 12:39 PM, LNC Region 4 Representative Norm Olsen reportedly sent to the LNC a Motion:

I provide notice of my intent to move the following motion at the upcoming National Committee meeting on April 16th and 17th of 2011:

The Committee hereby instructs staff to prepare for its evaluation at the August 2011 meeting not less than three alternatives to the current leasing arrangement with the Watergate complex. Alternatives presented should include sufficient detail to enable the committee to properly evaluate the political and economic effects of an actual relocation such as an estimate of relocation expenses for each alternative. At least one of the provided alternatives shall be a location within a major metropolitan area other than Washington DC; such metropolitan area being chosen as representative of economic efficiencies available in metropolitan areas other than Washington DC.

Rationale:

A leasing arrangement is necessarily a long term agreement which deserves careful deliberation. It would be irresponsible to make such decisions without detailed information and/or without sufficient time for careful deliberations. I would find it rather embarrassing to renew an expensive long term leasing arrangement simply because we didn’t have enough time to find an alternative.

On April 5 Olsen reportedly followed up with a message to the Chair:

I see no reference to my proposed notion concerning alternatives to our current leasing arrangement in the proposed agenda. I know this is not something that you support, but I believe others have expressed support for having ample information available on the office space alternatives.

The final outcome was that LNC Chair Hiinkle refused to place Olsen’s motion on the LNC Agenda. His refusal reportedly read in part:

Norm,

The LNC Policy manual gives me the authority to propose an agenda for each LNC meeting. As such, I’m exercising my authority to remove your request from the proposed agenda.

Liberty for America is published by George Phillis, 48 Hancock Hill Drive, Worcester MA 01609 (508 754 1859). To Subscribe, go to LibertyForAmerica.com and click on the 'subscribe' button. Back issues of Liberty for America magazine are available on the web at <http://LibertyForAmerica.com/LFAMagazine.htm>.

The LP HQ staff is already working on alternatives to the current lease. And, as you know, several LNC members will be meeting April 15th with a Realtor to explore several of those options, including buying a building/office condor, etc. We've been working on alternatives since prior to the LNC meeting in New Orleans.

So your motion is unnecessary.

Furthermore, moving away from the DC area would result in substantial moving costs and the potential lost of critical LP staff. I find that idea unacceptable. And I have detected no support for the idea of moving the LP HQ out of the DC Metro area.

You may, as always, propose it as an amendment at the time the agenda is adopted on April 16th.

[Hinkle is said to have first objected:](#)

The LNC has already authorized the creation of a building fund to look into buying a building.

And we already have close to \$50K pledged to that project, mostly just from the LNC members and staff.

This appears to be a direct move to under cut that decision. Which, as I recall, passed pretty handily.

Sample—This is your only issue of Liberty for America

For more issues, [subscribe!](#)

Subscriptions are free at no charge.

To subscribe, go to LibertyForAmerica.com
And click on the Subscribe button

Join **Liberty for America** — \$15.

Donate electronically at LibertyForAmerica.com
Checks, payable Liberty for America, to George Phil-
lies, 48 Hancock Hill Drive Worcester 01609.
Membership lets you call yourself a member.

Liberty for America will be performing political acts, and other activities that the Federal government calls "Federal Election Activity" and hence FEC-reportable. We must therefore funnel dues to our PAC, "Liberty for America". Dues will not be used to support candidates.

Required Federal Notices:

Your Donations are not tax deductible. Federal law requires us to request the occupation and employer of donors of \$200 or more in a year. Paid for by Liberty for America. Your donations may be used in relation to a Federal Election.

So, what's the point?

[To which Olsen reportedly responded:](#)

Undercutting the effort to purchase a building was not the intent of my motion. If that happens to be the end result, I'm more than happy to plead guilty as charged on all counts. I consider this idea to be unwise and ill-advised.

The current lease expires in ten months. Such a lease usually requires some sort of notice prior to expiration as to what the tenant is going to do: renew or move out. So, we have six, maybe seven, months to make a decision about office space in 2012. If we wait until December to see if, just maybe, the purchase of a building becomes a reality, we will be creating for ourselves a very uncomfortable position. Waiting to do our homework can easily lead to forcing us to accept what landlords will be offering even though it's an incredibly good market for leasers.

Also, it is my intent to make sure that even LNC member understands that the economic justification of purchasing a building is based on the premise that it is good policy to spend \$10,000 month for office space for 6 employees (that's \$1,666.66 a month per employee). That number is insane. Even a number in the \$250 per employee per month per employee would be extravagant for metropolitan areas outside of Washington DC.

The purpose of the motion is to make sure the committee gets its homework done in the proper time frame. I just want everyone to be aware of the realities of the real estate situation before we paint ourselves into an unwelcome real estate corner.

[To which Hinkle is said to have given a long answer, including as a response to](#)

"Undercutting the effort to purchase a building was not the intent of my motion. If that happens to be the end result, I'm more than happy to plead guilty as charged on all counts. I consider this idea to be unwise and ill-advised."

[The assertion](#)

However, most of the LNC agreed that, if, we can raise the money, it would be a good idea. So, how about supporting the decision of the rest of the team?

[To which Olsen later responded](#)

Can't agree, Mark . . .

We need to be spending our time pursuing the goals which were adopted in New Orleans. Of specific interest to me is the one about 48 active affiliates. Per Bob Johnston's analysis, only 31 affiliates meet the very liberal criteria established to qualify an affiliate as active. Of the 31 supposedly active affiliates, I willing to bet that 20 or so operate on a budget of less than \$1,000 per month.

This is where we need to be investing our time, energy, talent, and especially, our donor's money. Let's hold off on the real estate speculation business until we demonstrate a minimum of prowess in the political party business.

LNC Rejects Hinkle Budget He may try again in D.C.

Mark Hinkle as LNC Chair apparently sent to the LNC a motion requesting a mail ballot on his proposed budget. Voting against were LNC members Alicia Mattson, Andy Wolf, Wayne Root, Mark Rutherford, Kevin Knedler, Dan Wiener, Mary Ruwart, and alternates Randy Eshelman and Brad Ploeger. The Eshelman and Ploeger votes appear to be valid; the motion was therefore defeated.

No (zero) votes in favor appeared on the LNC-Discuss list.

It would appear that the DC Budget Motion will be a motion to reconsider, so there are implications for the required vote.

[Writing in opposition, Andy Wolf is said to have written:](#)

This is a massive abuse of LP donor funds. What we're being asked is to pass a \$1.5 million dollar budget without any discussion. That's \$1,500,000.00 that our donors have trusted us with. And we are requested to spend those monies without any discussion or any debate or any explanation.

We complain and argue year after year that our legislators recklessly spend taxpayer money. Yet we're being forced to vote in the same irresponsible manner, without considering how our members' hard earned money will be spent.

I have several concerns. For example, what is the plan to get board solicitations from \$10,000 to \$100,000 raised? Or why are we projected to spend \$112,500 more on direct mail new donor prospecting, while at the same time expecting just \$37,500 in return? Or how does the house direct mail fundraising revenue decrease by \$7,000 but the expense jump by \$25,000?

Also, Wes pointed out at the last meeting that many of the line items were classified in a certain manner for accounting or GAAP reasons, but they weren't the true nature of how the funds were being spent. I would like a bit more explanation in that regard before passing a budget.

Making a budget is difficult, and I appreciate that. There may be simple explanations, but it's my responsibility to consider them.

Passing this budget without discussion would be reckless. I'm not willing to do that. The members whom I represent deserve better.

Andy Wolf

[Liberty for America](#)

Welcome to Liberty for America!

A magazine. A web site. An organization. [Liberty for America](#) has had several inquiries on launching [Liberty for America](#) Chapters across America. A draft set of state/regional By-Laws appears on the [LibertyforAmerica.Com](#) web site.

Ploeger Demands That Hinkle Resign

[Our sources report that LNC Alternate Brad Ploeger sent the following message to the LNC:](#)

Chairman Hinkle,

I am deeply offended and appalled! May I remind the Chair that email is neither an effective discussion mechanism nor can this body hold phone conferences under the Bylaws. At no point did the motion, as presented, state that the budget proposal was simply limited to be a stop-gap measure until the April meeting.

While the Executive Committee of the LNC could have voted on a budget (pursuant to an overly expansive precedent established by the appointment of Mr. Redpath as Treasurer). However, the Chair has decided to call a vote to approve a 2011 budget without discussion. Despite my earlier statement that I would decline comment and after a personal attack by the Chair, I feel that I must defend myself and make my point.

The decision to call a vote without discussion on the 2011 budget appears to be nothing more than an attempt to grab control of This Body by the Chair. Personally, I request the resignation of the Chair for this maneuver. Each of us has a fiduciary duty to the membership of this Party. This does not serve them well.

In Liberty,
Brad Ploeger

Oregon State Party Public Statement by Former State Chair Wes Wagner

Last night after contentious debate, the LPO State Committee being the last body capable of acting on behalf of the Libertarian Party of Oregon, voted to restructure the governing documents of the party. The final vote was all yeas and no nays.

It is important to note that the current bylaws the party were operating under were illegal under Oregon Law. Oregon Law defines a member of our organization under Chapter 248 as: 248.002 Definitions. As used in this chapter:

Page 4

(4) "Member" means an individual who is registered as being affiliated with the political party. [1979 c.190 §67]

Further:

248.005 Parties to insure widest and fairest representation of members. Each political party by rule shall insure the widest and fairest representation of party members in the party organization and activities. Rules shall be adopted by procedures that assure the fair and open participation of all interested party members. [1975 c.779 §1; 1979 c.190 §68]

Thus the allowance of Republican, Democrat or out of state members is and has been a violation of Oregon law, and we have been in violation for many decades and all party business for several decades stands suspect since it adversely affects the rights of our defined membership. Further the charging of dues and the barriers to participation also stand suspect.

Given that the party bylaws, by M Carling's assessment were "by far the worst bylaws he has ever seen", and that he further noted that "the county party structure has been a failure in every state it was attempted" (including our own), we went further that simply correcting the current bylaws, and decided to re-structure the organization.

We do not believe we have the ultimate authority to impose this new governing body on the members of the State of Oregon, and thus will be referring the matter to them for ratification congruent with our mail ballot for nominating candidates in 2012. Should the libertarian people of Oregon reject this proposal, there would still be adequate time to call a convention for doing nominations under the old party rules.

We believe that this proposal shall bring to a close the structural issues that have plagued the Oregon party; however, we are conscious of the fact that some people who were unwilling to give up power and authority voluntarily shall not agree with what we have done. We know who they are and they have repeatedly exposed themselves of having interests that are not aligned with serving the membership of our organization as either good stewards or proper statesmen.

The leadership of this organization stands firm that our obligation is to protect the interests of all persons who declare themselves libertarians in the State of Oregon, and subsequently, that this party must be capable of functioning once again with those members being the ultimate authority. The people who have attempted to tie this organizations hands with the various, and arguably unlawful, rules were given every opportunity to negotiate and at each instance chose instead to use their abilities to shut the party down, prevent it from operating and prevent conversation from occurring.

Because they were unwilling to negotiate in good faith, and have a history of breaking the common law requirement of fair dealing, they ultimately were not included in this process. They will claim victim status, but I can reassure you that their exclusions was ultimately self-imposed. They were the ones who

brought in national LNC members to shut down the November convention where they would have otherwise had a large enough minority (> 1/3rd) to negotiate for themselves a large number of concessions. Their antics tired even some of their more ardent supporters, and have since lost that capability as demonstrated at our subsequent March convention.

Their last remaining state committee representative excused himself last evening before the final vote because he had physically assaulted our treasurer in front of about 7 witnesses and a video camera during a recess and did not want to be present for a conversation with the police.

I provide you this letter and ask that you share it with anyone that you deem has the capacity to understand reason, so that they will know that we are on the road to recovery and that any interference from the LNC/National LP is unnecessary and will not be entertained. [The above was from a statement by LP Oregon Chair Wes Wagner.](#)

Hinkle Asks Funding for Right-Wing Outreach

[Our sources on the LNC report a request from the chair:](#)

Dear LNC,

I've done a couple of Blog radio appearances over the last couple of months with an individual that works with Special Guests ([specialguests.com](#)).

They, for a fee, book people on radio and TV shows. Yesterday I spoke with the CEO of Special Guests, Jerry McGlothlin to see if they and the LNC could work together. As they indicated, they primarily work with conservatives and conservative causes. I would presume most of the bookings they might generate would be on fiscal and foreign policy issues where we're in sync.

I'm attaching a copy of a media alert they did based on the recent press release concerning Libya. Please take a look and let me know what you think. Also, since we've yet to pass a budget, do you think it's worth paying for media bookings? And, adding it to the budget for 2011.

The pricing model is a pay for performance model and the scale ranges from a low end of about \$100 to almost \$5K (Oprah's show). And we can set dollar limits and engage them on a week by week basis, i.e. no long term contract. Just a 1 week cancellation notice.

Mary Ruwart Discusses Budget

[Our sources again supply us, this time with a missive from Mary Ruwart:](#)

While much of this budget is excellent, I have some questions and comments. First of all, all of the past data that I have from our records in the last two years indicate that we've had to pay over \$100 per new donor using direct mail unless we mailed to people who inquired or took our quiz (these later two groups returned more than costs immediately). During the last LNC, I sent out an analysis showing that even under the best assumptions for attrition rates, that investment was never recovered over the next 10 years. We MUST find a better way to do prospecting. We'd be better off spending money of that magnitude on making our web site more interactive to get more people to mail to. Unless HQ can show me some compelling data which I haven't yet seen (and I hope they can), spending \$136,500 on direct mail is not something I can support.

This brings me to the expectation that the LNC should raise \$100,000. Our bylaws do not require us to do this; I believe it is quite counterproductive. This body is supposed to be governing, not fundraising. A primary function of HQ is fundraising; they are, under Mr. Benedict's able supervision, doing that better than we have EVER done it before in a non-presidential election year.

I am currently working with HQ to design and fundraise for the proposed Stossel TV ads; I suspect that none of that counts towards this \$100,000 we are supposed to raise. Should I suddenly drop the Stossel project, for which I expect to help HQ raise \$5-\$10K, and hopefully gain many new members at a lower cost? There are only so many hours in the day; if I am expected to raise \$5000 (or put it up myself) towards the \$100K I doubt that I'll have time to do a project that is more likely to pay off.

We need to experiment with new and less expensive ways to bring in donors. We already know that making our web site more interactive (e.g., a quiz) gives us a high return when we solicit the people it attracts. Committing almost 10% of our budget on something that doesn't have a good track record is too much. Maybe Wes and Robert have some new numbers for me to crunch, but otherwise I just don't see it.

We each should be doing what we do best on this Board. If someone wants to go out and solicit funds from major donors for the general fund, that's what they should do. If someone is passionate about it, they should volunteer to do it, just as I have volunteered to work on the Stossel ads. I know there are individuals on this LNC who believe that the LNC should raise money. I say "Go do it!" but don't force the rest of us to follow your dream for the LNC. We each have our own and the passion that we have for that dream is what inspires us to put in our time, money, and effort.

OK, I've beaten that horse to death, so to speak. I see \$12K on the revenue side of Tele Fundraising and \$11K on the cost side. If this is right, we are spending 90% of what people give us to raise money that way. Surely, this is a mistake? We have allotted \$52K for branding. How did that number come up? What will it be spent on specifically?

Thank you, Mr. Benedict and Mr. Kraus for putting this together! I look forward to your responses.

Lark Provides Thoughtful Critique

From our usual sources, comments reportedly from Professor Lark concerning the draft budget:

1) I am concerned that \$200,000 is budgeted for LNC/Chair/ED solicitation. In particular, I am concerned about the rather substantial increase in Board Solicitation (line 4020-10 on p. 2). I suspect that it will be difficult for the LNC and Mr. Benedict to raise \$200,000 via solicitation, especially given that there may be a vigorous effort to raise money for the purchase of an LPHQ building.

Before approving a 2011 budget that includes this amount, I would like Mr. Benedict and the members of the LNC (especially Mr. Hinkle) to provide information as to how much they believe they can raise this year. It would be particularly nice to see pledges for specific amounts to be raised.

2) Given that we anticipate substantial costs for ballot access during the next 18-20 months, I believe the LNC should explicitly budget for some of these costs where possible. In particular, we may wish to establish a reserve of \$100,000 - \$150,000 for ballot access expenses to be incurred in 2012.

3) The New Donor Prospect expense (line 7010-30 on p. 3) is listed as \$136,500. I would like to see some information from Mr. Benedict concerning his ideas about this item.

4) No convention expenses are listed for 2011 (see lines 7200-10 and 7200-20 on p. 3). I would appreciate comments from the Convention Oversight Committee as to whether we are likely to incur any substantial expenses in 2011 for the 2012 convention. (I suspect the answer is "no," but I would like confirmation.)

5) The Recurring Contributions - Pledge revenue (line 4080 on p. 2) of \$408,000 is evidently predicated upon the current growth trend for such revenue. While I don't regard this proposed revenue unreasonable, we may wish to consider lowering that number somewhat.

6) Regarding the suggested move from four issues of LP News to five, will the fifth issue be a special issue devoted to a specific topic? I inquire because it may be helpful to devote the fifth issue in 2011 to the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the founding of the LP.

Staff Responds to Lark

Staff responses to Lark's comments are said to have been:

1) \$200k major donor fundraising goal with \$100k from the board. Although this is an ambitious goal – so is the EC's goal of staff meeting \$1.4M in revenue in a non election off year during poor economic times (8.6% increase in non convention

revenue). Thus, perhaps it is only fair for the board to do their part in meeting this goal. Also, as a reminder, the board (with very few participants) raised primarily thru the "give and get" program \$86.7 in 2007 and \$72.5 in 2008. So they do have the capability of bringing in some major funds - especially if the other 22 members (not including the chair) each do their part to "give or get" \$4500 each.

2) Ballot Access was explained in note "J": (j) Initial B/A set at zero, expenditures to be approved by LNC-EC under current method

3) New Donor Prospecting was explained under note "B" using many of the suggestions provided by the EC in its goals: (b) Assumes membership renewal and acquisition remain stable at 2010 levels (15,000 members) and ads 1500 additional new members via prospecting for \$75 expense each (revenue of \$25 each) towards reaching LNC-EC Goal of 20k members by 05/12

4) Convention Expenses for 2012 being incurred in 2011. Can you please advise Dr. Lark that GAAP (dictated by our bylaws) requires us to book those expenses in May 2012 - thus, even if they are incurred in 2011, they will not be on the P&L until May 2012 (but will be on the balance sheet under pre-paid convention expenses in 2011). Please note that this is how the expenses and revenue were handled for the past 2 conventions as well.

5) Pledge Revenue is covered under note "D" - staff should mention we are already averaging \$33k per month this year (Jan/Feb) so this is not at all an overly ambitious goal: (d) Continued growth of the pledge program ave \$34k per month

6) LP News - I leave that to our editor in chief but like the idea of a "Commemorative 40th Anniversary Collectors Edition"

[A different staff member is said to have written:](#)

1. Board/Chair/ED solicitations are a bit complicated. For example, the \$20,000 contribution I raised for door hangers July 2010 in Las Vegas did not apply to the Board/Chair/ED solicitation category. Funds raised for other categories don't fall into the Board/Chair/ED category. I got a monthly pledge of \$2,533 per month pledger starting January 2011, but that doesn't go in the Board/Chair/ED category. From the detailed financial reports you recently received, you can see that in 2010, LNC Board Members, (not including the Chair and ED funds raised), raised \$9,900. So, going from \$9,900 to \$100,000 might be a stretch. I think that may be something the board ought to discuss. I'm hopeful Mark Hinkle and I can raise \$100,000 for the general fund, but I'm not confident the other LNC members and alternates can raise another \$100,000.

And just to re-emphasize, if you raise \$10,000 for a wall of shame ad or some other ad, that doesn't apply to the Board/Chair/ED solicited funds category the way I understand our accounting.

2. I think the LNC could budget for ballot access. You don't have to specify how much goes to whom and you can still require an LNC Executive Committee vote to release the funds. Nevertheless, we didn't put ballot access in the budget as explained by Robert below--because that's what the LNC has been requiring for a few years running.

3. Direct mail prospecting to a few lists, like Reason Magazine, as explained by Robert below will get new members. Maybe we'll run some ads on the Stossel show also. I can't tell you how much membership those ads will raise so I can't put together a detailed plan. Maybe they'll work, maybe they won't.

4. See Robert's comments.

5. Our monthly pledge is strong already. But \$408,000 is an aggressive number, not a conservative number.

6. I think an LP issue dedicated to the 40th anniversary would be a great thing. We originally budgeted for 4 issues of LP News then amended the budget for a 5th issues of LP News in 2010, but we only got around to running 4 issues in 2010.

Knedler Proposes Dues Increase

He leaves the final amount to discussion, but by report urges that it should be in the range of \$2,500 to \$15,000. He notes the current amount was set many years ago.

LPO Chair Blasts LNC Regional Reports

[In a widely circulated letter, new LP Oregon Chair Wes Wagner condemned representations being made to the LNC about Oregon events :](#)

For nearly 6 months Dan Karlan has been generating reports to the LNC about the activities in Oregon without actually consulting the State Chairperson or Vice Chairperson and presenting them to the LNC as if they were true and unbiased representation of activities in Oregon. I have been advised that another such "report" has just gone out.

In reality he has been communicating with a small group of individuals who do not currently hold any office in the LPO for his "facts". He was instrumental in the urging of LNC member's involvement in the Oregon convention in November, and has been essentially helping cause further division in the Oregon party and interfering in our affairs as well as spreading disinformation.

He has not been communicating regularly with party leadership nor vetting his information and his bias has been clear to us for some time.

Please treat any report he provides on "our behalf" as extremely suspect given that he generates them based off the information of outsiders with a particular agenda and purpose. He is not

working with our organization at all nor communicating with us.

LNC Debates Wall of Shame Ad

[Alicia Mattson reportedly, in a missive headed "Ignoring the board" wrote the LNC:](#) The Executive Director asked for input from the board about running the Republican Wall of Shame ad, and the overwhelming response from board members was that if it was done at all, it should be balanced by adding Democrats as well.

I don't understand why the Executive Director seems to be forging ahead with the plan in spite of the feedback from the board. And when a board member asked about it, I don't believe the ED's response even addressed the legitimate questions being raised. We've gotten a lot of non-answers lately.

Why did the Executive Director even ask us for our input if he's just going to ignore us and do what he wants to do anyway?

Why does one donor with \$10,000 in hand get to buy more influence with the ED than the LNC has?

The poll conducted with the power of our mailing list indicates that very few of our members care enough about this to bother to vote. And of the ones that did, there is not a flood of support indicated.

So if the members mostly don't care, the ones that care don't want to do it, and the board doesn't want to do it, why are we spending \$15,000 to do it?

[Wayne Root is said to have critiqued the ad, writing in part:](#) We ALL agree both parties stink...and both parties bear blame for this disaster.

That's why I'm in the LP.

But you have 2 irresponsible parties...one party (GOP) that spends too much...but fights for lower taxes (not low enough)...and fights to end government programs (but not hard enough)...and fights govt employee unions...and fights against national healthcare...and fights for tort reform.

The other party (Dems) spend way way way too much (to the point of insanity, or the purposeful destruction of capitalism), and argue it's not enough (more stimulus, more welfare, more food stamps, FAR more education monies needed)...fights for far higher taxes...fights to add government programs...supports govt employee unions...wants even illegal immigrants to get free healthcare for life...is disappointed with Obamacare because they wanted single payer govt takeover of healthcare... and fights on behalf of anything but tort reform.

Which one do you attack? Excuse me for being just a bit confused. Excuse Tea Party activists for thinking we're either idiots

or insane. Excuse Washington Posts' liberal readers for cheering us on as we attack the party that is trying to reform the system and reign in government...and give a pass to the party of communists, marxists, unions, and community organizers.

I repeat...this makes no sense.

Either promote the LP by simply pointing out how we'd do it better... or point out the failures of the GOP...while also pointing out the even more destructive desires of the Democrats.

But the current strategy makes no sense.

You are rewarding the worst offenders by giving them a pass.

[To which the Executive Director's response was, we're told:](#) Wayne,

My opinion is that your strategy does not make sense. I think your strategy convinces people that Republicans are better than Democrats and that people should vote for the lesser of two evils, which means Republicans according to you.

Wes Benedict, Executive Director

[To which Root reportedly responded:](#)

I understand what you think of my strategy.

I think you are dangerously out of control, rude to your Board members, ignore our advice and requests, and out on an island right now.

I currently serve on numerous Boards and Commissions, and for a decade was CEO of a public company, and therefore served as Chairman of the Board. I understand how a Board must be treated and their concerns listened to carefully. I was not an employee. I was Chairman and CEO, yet I was polite and careful to always treat my Board with respect and take all their concerns into consideration. I knew I served at their request. I knew in the end they were the boss- even of the CEO.

You are not in my opinion behaving properly.

The revolution in Egypt just proved one thing...management had better listen to the people, or their tenure at the top could end quite swiftly. We MUST listen to our members. Todd Grayson in Ohio...and the more pragmatic wing of this party, and quite a few Board members are obviously offended by your tactics.

Treat us with respect. Take our views seriously. Stop arguing so defensively. Let's discuss, not denigrate.

[Wes Benedict's response was apparently](#) "Wayne, you are frequently rude to me. Yes, the board can replace me. All it takes is a majority vote."

[And LNC Treasurer William Redpath seems to have contributed](#) I voted "I'm a Libertarian, don't run the ad and send the money back" on the poll today.

I do not like the Republican (or Democratic) Party at all. One reason that I ran for Congress in 2010 was that I strongly dislike my Republican congressman. I substantively criticized him frequently during the campaign, several times to his face in debates.

I became an LP member in 1984 because my profound disappointment with Ronald Reagan (an opinion of mine that has not changed).

But, what I don't think LP candidates or the LP ought to do with major party politicians is to get sassy with them.

In my opinion, unfortunately, the "Wall of Shame" ad crosses that line.

There is too much that major parties and their politicians can constitutionally do to harm third parties, including the LP.

We need politically fight them in many ways, and I am certainly not suggesting backing down in any substantive way.

But, I just don't care for the presentation of "The Wall of Shame." That is my problem with it.

And, it appears to be very divisive within the LNC, and that is another reason not to run it.

[To which Wes Benedict apparently responded:](#)
Bill,

Thanks for sharing your opinion.

It would indeed help me if you would speak up about whether or not Wayne Allyn Root's postings also "cross the line" in your opinion.

It's OK either way (not that it needs to be OK with me). But seriously, all this talk about the controversial wall of shame . . .

Again, I'm for continuing to post Wayne's stuff even if Reagan "tears down this wall."

[And the rebuttal from Wayne was said to be](#)
Wes,

I see you're a fan of Saul Alinsky's "Rules for Radicals" just like Obama. Change the topic, confuse the audience, point the argument at someone else. Wayne root's commentaries are not in the debate. Your wall of shame is. Your disrespect to board is the topic.

[And along the way Sam Goldstein was quoted to us as saying:](#)
Correct me if I'm wrong, but I thought the cost of running the ad was \$30,000, not \$15,000. If I'm correct then where is the other \$15,000 coming from? If I'm wrong then I'm still of the opinion that we could have found a much better use for the money.

[To which National Chair Hinkle reportedly answered:](#)

We're only going to spend money raised, and nothing from the general fund of the LP, on this AD.

I too could find much better use for the \$15,000 that's been donated so far.

But the initial \$10,000 came with strings and I plan to honor those strings so more \$\$\$ will be donated by that donor in the future. Not to mention the donors of the other \$5,000 raised.

Now that we know the donor can write a \$10,000 check for what he/or she wants (aren't I cagey about who it is???), the next time we'll approach them to write another \$10,000 check for something we find of greater value.

If we send that \$10,000 check back, saying no thanks we don't want your money with strings attached. What do you think their response would be to Wes or I, the next time we're looking for a \$10,000 donation? Or more?

Would they even talk our phone call the next time?

Chances are no.

As someone who's been responsible for raising hundreds of thousands of dollars for the LP over my career, trust me when I tell you that anyone who can write a \$10,000 check is good for more. Probably a lot more.

But, not if we piss them off.

And that's exactly what would happen if we send their check back.

As a service organization, we have to be mindful of our customers wishes.

Our customers voted with their wallet and we'd best listen to them if we wish to continue to garner their support.

So, can we turn our attention back to the real enemies of the U.S. now occupying Washington DC and running our nation into the ground?

[The National Chair is said to have answered Mattson, writing in part:](#) I'll give you the same answer I gave to Sam. The ED reports to me. I've decided to back running the AD. And I approved it at CPAC as well. We're spending the money, because some people have contributed \$15,000 to run the AD. They think it's a good idea and they put their money where their mouth is. Giving some overriding reason, that's a pretty good reason in my book to run the AD.

The LP is a service organization and some of our members have spoken, with their hard earned bucks, and we'd be smart to listen to them. The AD may be a dumb or smart marketing move, but sending \$10,000 back to a major donor trumps dumbness in spades.

Liberty for America
Liberty for America is
not currently a political party.

But you can join — \$15 per year.

<http://LibertyForAmerica.com>

Liberty for America has a Federal PAC —we actually support
real Libertarians when they run for Federal office.

In this issue:

Now with News Color Coding: Good News Other News News from the World

Future of the Libertarian Political Movement

More State-By-State Good News

LNC Acts!

LNC Rejects Hinkle Budget

Oregon State Party Public Statement by Former State Chair Wes Wagner

Oregon Rises from Dead

News of Other Parties

Hinkle Blocks Olsen Motion from LNC Agenda

Ploeger Demands That Hinkle Resign

Hinkle Asks Funding for Right-Wing Outreach

Lark Provides Thoughtful Critique

Mary Ruwart Discusses Budget

Staff Responds to Lark

Knedler Proposes Dues Increase

LPO Chair Blasts LNC Regional Reports

LNC Debates Wall of Shame Ad

Address Corrections Requested
First Class Mail

Liberty for America
c/o George Phillips
48 Hancock Hill Drive
Worcester MA 01609