

Minutes of the Meeting of the Libertarian National Committee 12-13 December 1992 Las Vegas, Nevada

Members Present:

Chair	Mary T. Gingell
Vice-Chair	Steve Dasbach
Secretary	Joseph W. Dehn III
Treasurer	Bill Redpath
At Large	Tamara Clark
	Don Ernsberger
	Steven I. Givot
	Geoff Neale
	Ken Prazak
Region 1	Dave Schumacher
Region 2	Steven J. Alexander
	Thea McLean
Region 3	William W. Hall
Region 4	Ron Crickenberger
Region 5	Dan Karlan
Region 7	Maggie Kohls
Region 8	Gary E. Johnson

Absent:

Region 6	Clay S. Conrad
----------	----------------

Also Present:

National Director Nick Dunbar

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The regular meeting of the Libertarian National Committee was called to order by Chair Mary Gingell at 9:20am on Saturday, 12 December 1992 at the Alexis Park Hotel in Las Vegas, Nevada.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Clark announced that there would be a Nevada LP banquet on Saturday night.

3. CREDENTIALS:

There were no changes in LNC membership since the last meeting.

4. REPORT ON MAIL BALLOT:

Dehn reported that there was one mail ballot since the last meeting, on the question of increasing the TV ad budget; it passed unanimously.

5. SETTING OF THE AGENDA:

Gingell proposed that the "Atlanta Strategic Plan Proposal" [Attachment A] be considered for 20 minutes as item 6A, that the time for the Administration Area Report (item 7) be cut to 5 minutes while increasing the Chair's Report (item 8) to 20 minutes, that policy manual changes be considered for 5 minutes as item 25A, and that "advice and consent" on the appointment of a new National Director be considered for 15 minutes as item 26A. Givot proposed that 15 minutes be allowed for the policy manual item. There were no objections.

Givot moved to remove the Republican Liberty Caucus presentation (item 27). Arguments in favor included: the RLC has behaved in a manner destructive to the LP, and since they have defined themselves as Republicans it would be a waste of time to have a discussion with them. Arguments against included: this would be an opportunity to hear what they are doing and ask questions about their approach, we may face decisions about whether to run candidates against theirs and should hear what they have to say about that, we should be willing to listen to people who make a reasonable request for our time. The motion failed on a voice vote.

Karlan moved to have the RLC presentation immediately after lunch on Saturday, in recognition of the presenters' preference for Saturday and because what they say could affect our budget decisions. Arguments against included: they were informed that we would hear them on Sunday, extending to outsiders the courtesy of listening to them does not imply that we must rearrange our schedule around them, this should not be placed before the budget discussion -- our priority business for this meeting -- because we may have a shortage of time before some people have to leave, and the likelihood that their presentation would have any real effect on the budget discussion is very small. A poll of members indicated that we would be losing six people by 3pm Sunday. Redpath moved to amend the motion to set the time for the presentation as 5:30pm Saturday; there was no objection to the amendment. The vote on the main motion failed, 8 in favor, 8 opposed.

6. CHECK OF PAPERWORK:

Gingell reviewed the paperwork that had been distributed up to that point.

The meeting was recessed at 9:53am and resumed at 10:12am.

6A. ATLANTA STRATEGIC PLAN PROPOSAL:

Dasbach moved to adopt the mission statement from the proposal:

The mission of the LP is to move public policy in a libertarian direction by electing candidates of the LP to public office.

to replace LNCPM I.1, arguing that this mission is what makes us distinct from other libertarian organizations and so it should be our focus.

There was a discussion of the implications of adopting this mission statement. Several members expressed concern that this would limit the ability of the LP to engage in activities such as lobbying and educational projects. Various participants in the Atlanta meeting indicated that lobbying that relates to the process of electing people, such as lobbying for ballot access changes, would still be considered in line with the mission, that lobbying in general and projects such as the 1990 census project and initiatives would not be in line with the mission, that activities not in line with the mission would not necessarily be precluded but that our limited resources must be focused on those activities that do support the mission, and that the adoption of this mission would not affect the ability of affiliate parties to make their own choices about their priorities.

Various members spoke in support of the current "purpose" statement, arguing for the benefits of the other activities included in that statement. Points included: activities like lobbying and initiatives can help move policy in a libertarian direction, and other activities are important in places where election laws keep us from running candidates.

Alexander said that the statement was crudely written, and objected to the wording of several of the phrases. There was a discussion of the implications of the phrase "electing candidates of the LP": in contrast to "members of the LP" this avoids questions about the meanings of "member" and makes clear that the mission does not include supporting election of people through other parties.

Dasbach moved to change "LP" to "Libertarian Party"; there was no objection.

Dasbach pointed out that adopting this statement would be an act of the LNC that could be changed if we later wanted to, in the same way as we adopt a budget but can amend it. Ernsberger asked that the record show that the Atlanta participants had said that with adoption of this mission statement activities other than electing people to office could still be done.

Dunbar pointed out that the current "purpose" statement already includes electing candidates, and suggested that the intent of the Atlanta plan could be served simply by stating that this particular purpose has the highest priority.

Redpath moved to insert "and by engaging in other political action" into Dasbach's proposed statement. After a brief discussion, the motion failed on a show of hands.

The main motion to adopt the mission statement passed on a voice vote.

Dasbach moved to adopt the goals listed in the Atlanta memo as goals of the LNC, noting that this would not imply that they are our only goals.

Discussion immediately began on the subject of the membership "oath".

Dehn moved to divide the question according to the numbered headings in the memo, arguing that since these

were not intended to be our complete set of goals, there was no need to consider them as a package. Johnson and Alexander argued against, saying that they wanted a chance to address the problems of the package as a whole. The motion to divide failed on a voice vote.

Johnson argued against adopting a package of this sort, but said that this did not mean that there weren't good ideas in it, such as having a "shadow cabinet".

Karlan commented on the membership certification, saying that its purpose is unclear.

Alexander objected to the use of the word "quadrant" in Image Goal #1, saying that this implied that we should make the party attractive to anyone above "50/50". He said that the proposal would effectively make the Program be our platform, but that having the convention adopt the Program did not work when it was tried. He objected to the idea of eliminating the current type of platform, saying that this would make the LP less attractive to some people and that the platform was valuable as a reference for party officers and candidates. He said that making people with different positions welcome in the party was fine, but that if we say that all positions are as good as the "100/100" position we will have lost the meaning of the party.

There was discussion of extending time, limiting the time for each person to speak, and whether a motion to table was in order. After a simple extension of time was approved, Gingell said she would take a motion to table after Alexander was finished with his remarks.

Alexander said the "shadow cabinet" was not likely to get much attention. He objected to the elimination of the "oath" and the weakening of the whole concept of membership. He said the campaign goals were unrealistic, and that setting goals that are too high would be setting us up for failure. He objected that the LNC was being asked to adopt a plan that didn't even exist a week before, that was "sloppy" and "sophomoric", and that was missing any strategies for achieving the proposed goals.

Gingell reported that an observer had requested permission to videotape the proceedings.

Prazak argued against the "oath" and said that it was the Platform that was "sophomoric" and that it contained "ridiculous" things; he suggested renaming it something like an "idealistic vision".

Ernsberger moved to table discussion of the Atlanta plan goals; the motion passed on a show of hands.

7. ADMINISTRATION AREA REPORT:

Gingell referred to her previously distributed Chair's report and reviewed her personal situation that was making her less available for LP work. She said that a major part of the job of Administration Area Manager is to communicate with the office, but she has had to rely on Dehn to handle these calls. She announced that she was appointing Dehn as Administration Area Manager; at the same time Dehn would be resigning from his current post of Education Area Manager.

In reply to a question from Gingell, John Robertson explained that he was the person who wanted to videotape the meeting and that he was doing it as a "public service" and to add to Liberty Audio's collection. In reply to other questions, he clarified that he had not been requested by Liberty Audio to do this. In reply to questions from Johnson, Gingell said that LNC meetings are open to members and that she would not ask others, such as reporters, to leave unless the LNC passed a motion to that effect.

Clark moved to allow the videotaping. After a bit more discussion, the motion passed on a voice vote.

8. CHAIR'S REPORT:

Gingell invited questions on her previously distributed Chair's report; there were none.

Gingell described the approach she was taking to hiring a new National Director, including announcing the position on Libernet and to state chairs and including funds in the proposed budget to "upgrade" the position. She reported on expressions of interest from various people, and said that the proposal from Stuart Reges and Rick Sincere seemed the best fit for our needs; she said she expected, assuming certain points were clarified, to hire them and would be asking the LNC to "advise and consent" on this.

Gingell explained that Nick Dunbar understood that we were changing the nature of the job to one which he would not necessarily fit, that he might be interested if we created a separate "business manager" position, that he was willing to continue working until we have somebody new, and that he had not resigned. Dunbar confirmed these points and cautioned that hiring a high-powered Director who would take on new jobs would necessitate an increase in support staff.

In response to questions from Ernsberger, Gingell said that the hiring of Reges and Sincere was more of a "training" proposal than an attempt to create two distinct positions, that it was an outgrowth of an offer she had previously made to hire Reges alone, and that the resulting staff size would be about what we were working with prior to the Marrou/Lord campaign. In response to questions from Johnson, Gingell reviewed the people who had applied for the job and commented on some of their qualifications. Givot commented on the importance of having somebody who can run the office, and said that we should be ready to pay enough to get a good person for this job.

Ernsberger said it was time to consider having two separate management positions in the office, that there really are two different jobs to be done and we can't expect one person to do both. There was discussion of the need to decide on this before considering the details of the budget, whether this decision should be made before or after the adoption of the "goals", and the need for job descriptions.

Ernsberger moved to adopt a two-individual approach to management of our office, with responsibilities divided between a "national office manager" and a "national communications and media director". He said the LP was in an unusually good position coming out of this election, that we should take advantage of this opportunity to grow, and that we are very much in need of someone to give us a "presence" in DC.

Dasbach objected that this should be part of the budget discussion. Neale objected to the idea that the LNC would be unnecessarily "institutionalizing" the division of labor in the office, suggesting that it should be up to the Director to allocate tasks.

Givot moved to postpone consideration of Ernsberger's proposal until after the "goals" were set. There followed a discussion of whether we already had "goals" before the Atlanta document was developed. The motion to postpone the topic passed on a voice vote.

The meeting was recessed at 12:10pm and called back to order at 1:34pm.

9. VICE-CHAIR'S REPORT:

Dasbach said that he had nothing to report in his capacity as Vice-Chair.

10. SECRETARY'S REPORT:

Dehn reported that he sent a memo about delegate allocation [Attachment B] to state chairs. In response to a question from Dasbach, he said he did not expect his switch to the Administration Area Manager position to have any effect on getting out the minutes, that this position was in line with much of what he was working on anyway, and that he hoped that this would allow someone to take over the Education Area who could concentrate on that.

11. TREASURER'S REPORT:

Redpath reported that income statements that he considers close to correct have been produced [Attachment G]; he said that the accounting work is now going more smoothly and it should be possible to have statements on a monthly basis in 1993. He explained the lack of attention to accounting during 1992 as the result of his concentration on ballot access. He said that one person should not be doing both the Treasurer's job and the ballot access job, and that more attention needs to be paid to FEC reporting. There was a brief discussion of the general problem of people "wearing too many hats".

Ernsberger and Dehn pointed out that there are items in the income statement that appear to be incorrect. In response to a question from Givot, Redpath said that there are more detailed accounts than the ones that appear in the income statement, but that he wasn't sure it was worth printing them all out. He also noted that there are still some expenses that have not been allocated across budget activities.

12. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT:

Gingell offered to answer questions about the activities of the Executive Committee; there were none. Alexander and Johnson asked that Dehn resume posting minutes of the Executive Committee meetings.

13. LEGAL COUNSEL'S REPORT:

Hall reviewed some of the projects he worked on since the last meeting, including: the Tamara Clark election fraud situation, suing a school district about not including Libertarian candidates in their "mock election", the case of an activist who was assaulted by police while photographing an LP demonstration in Missouri, and an attempt to recover funds from a petitioning contractor who did not complete the job. He said that his personal goals for 1993 are to pay more attention to ballot access and to analysing our relationship with the FEC and that he hoped to find other lawyers who can work on other issues.

14. CONVENTION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE REPORT:

Neale provided a written report [Attachment H]. He reported that 1993 contractor Bob Waldrop has been keeping in touch with the Convention Oversight Committee and has provided notice of the selection of Russell Means as keynote speaker.

There was a discussion of the keynote selection, including questions of what sort of speech is appropriate at our conventions and whether Means is likely to provide such a speech. Particular concern was expressed about the fact that even though the convention contract gives the LNC until 90 days before the convention to reject the selection, Waldrop has already announced the selection publicly. Various members suggested that this is a matter for the Convention Oversight Committee to follow up on with Waldrop, in particular to investigate what arrangements Waldrop has made regarding the type of speech Means is to give. Gingell said that if it turns out that there is a problem, the Convention Oversight Committee should so inform Waldrop rather than wait until the next LNC meeting.

Neale reported that he did some work on preparing a "mission statement" for our conventions but that he didn't have it with him; it is a one page document that outlines the purposes of the convention, the first one being to conduct the business meeting of the party.

Neale reported that the bid submission criteria document for the 1996 convention is not yet ready for publication. In response to a question from Dasbach, Neale said that bids would be solicited by announcing the availability of the criteria document, but that first the LNC needs to make a decision about the date.

There was discussion of the suitability of dates around the period previously decided upon (1 June through the 4 July weekend). Givot moved to authorize the Convention Oversight Committee to select dates for the 1996 convention between 10 June and 7 July inclusive, to publish the selection, and to solicit bids based on those dates. The motion passed on a voice vote.

There was brief discussion of other convention-related topics, such as: the schedule of business sessions at the 1993 convention, the need for committee rooms, and whether we should have a backup plan in case we find that a 1996 date will not work out.

14A. ATLANTA STRATEGIC GOALS PLAN (cont.)

Givot moved to take discussion of the Atlanta "goals" off the table; the item was taken from the table.

14B. DEVELOPMENT AREA REPORT:

Sharon Ayres asked that her report be deferred until Sunday, or that it be taken up at this time; there was no objection to taking it up at this time. She provided a written report [Attachment C]. She noted that membership has continued to increase. Karlan provided a written report on prospecting plans [Attachment I].

There was brief discussion of the need for better followup of pledgers. There was a discussion of the various 800-number answering systems that we have been using.

14C. ATLANTA STRATEGIC GOALS PLAN (cont.)

Givot moved to divide the proposal into three parts: all sections other than Organization Goal #2 and Image Goal #1 ("the rest" of the goals), Organization Goal #2, and Image Goal #1. Ernsberger moved to substitute that the proposal be divided into "budget-related" items and "non-budget-related" ("oath", platform) items. The motion to substitute failed on a show of hands. The motion to divide into three parts passed on a voice

vote.

Givot began the discussion of "the rest" by saying that we need higher goals if we are to grow, and that we need to grow geometrically to keep people from getting discouraged.

Dasbach moved to change the word "adopt" to "endorse" and to change the word "quadrant" to "region" (everywhere it appears). After some discussion of the meaning of these words, Dasbach moved to drop the "quadrant"/"region" part of his motion; there was no objection. The motion to change "adopt" to "endorse" passed on a voice vote.

Neale said we needn't worry too much about the exact language because if we find we don't like what we have passed we can always change it later. Schumacher suggested waiting until the next meeting to consider these things. Kohls questioned the psychological processes that went on in Atlanta that seem to have resulted in such enthusiasm for this set of goals.

Alexander moved to change (in Image Goal #2) "point" to "person", saying that points on the Nolan chart do represent different views, some of which we must consider inferior to others. Crickenberger said that Alexander's wording better represents what the Atlanta group meant. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Johnson moved to delete (in Campaign and Candidates Goal #3) the point about enabling presidential candidates to qualify for federal matching funds, saying that we should not be taking a stand in favor of this controversial position. Dasbach said this goal had already been largely achieved by our decision to hold the next nominating convention in the election year (1996). Redpath, Neale, and Givot argued that it was acceptable for our candidates to use matching funds. The motion to delete this point failed on a voice vote.

The motion to endorse "the rest" of the goals passed on a voice vote. Dehn and Gingell asked that their "no" votes be recorded, giving as their reason that there had not been sufficient time for any discussion of most of the individual points.

Givot began the discussion of Organization Goal #2 by saying that requiring the "oath" for membership is stupid. Ernsberger moved to table this question; the motion failed on a voice vote.

Clark moved to amend the point about eliminating the "oath" by adding the words "except for candidates and National Committee membership".

Neale spoke out against any kind of oath and said that it would be more useful to have a way to kick people out of the party if they demonstrate that they are not libertarians. There was a brief discussion of the theory that the "oath" was originally intended to let people know that we are not a violent group set on overthrowing the US government by force. Alexander said that while that may have been a valid concern at the time, the "oath" also serves the purpose of defining who is a libertarian, saying that it was good that people who honestly disagree with the idea expressed in the "oath" stay out of the LP. He noted that in the California LP, where people have the option of joining as "associate members" without signing anything, about 6% do that. He noted that with the "oath" we have managed to collect a list of 12,000 people who say they oppose the initiation of force.

Givot moved to divide the question between candidates and LNC membership; the motion failed on a voice vote. He then argued against keeping the "oath" for candidates, pointing out that in many places state law determines how candidates are selected.

The motion to except candidates and LNC membership from the elimination of the "oath" failed on a voice vote.

Johnson argued that the goal in question was unlike the ones we adopted earlier because it concerns something which has been debated at conventions and on which we know what the delegates want; the others were just intended to carry out the job that has been delegated to us.

Redpath argued that people don't understand the "oath", and said he himself isn't sure he agrees with it if taken literally.

Givot moved to change "adopt" to "endorse" in the current motion and in the remaining part of the original motion; this passed on a voice vote.

The motion to endorse Organization Goal #2 passed 9 to 7. Voting in favor were Crickenberger, Dasbach, Givot, Hall, Karlan, Kohls, Neale, Prazak, and Redpath. Voting against were Alexander, Clark, Dehn, Ernsberger, Gingell, Johnson, and McLean, with Gingell noting that she voted "no" primarily because there had not been time to discuss the other points in the goal.

Givot started the discussion of Image Goal #1 by criticizing the Platform, explaining that it wasn't that he objected to the things that are in the Platform, but rather to the fact that they are in the Platform. He said that our Platform should be more like those of the major parties.

Kohls moved to amend the goal by deleting the second point (the Platform point). Neale moved to substitute that the question be divided between that point and the other three points in the proposed goal, saying that it was important to have a chance to find out how people feel about the Platform. Others spoke in favor of having a chance to consider the specific language within the second point. The motion to substitute dividing of the question for deletion of the point passed on a voice vote. The motion to divide the question then passed on a voice vote.

The endorsement of the other three points (1st, 3rd, 4th) passed on a voice vote.

Clark began the discussion of the Platform by relating that as a candidate she had had difficulty dealing with questions about the Platform. Alexander said the Platform has a value in answering questions about the Libertarian position. Neale said that the rule that we start from scratch at each convention wouldn't mean that the convention couldn't re-adopt old planks, and that the 10 plank limit was arbitrary and could be changed. Karlan said our members should be able to think for themselves and not rely on a platform to answer questions.

Redpath moved to delete the subpoint "2-4 year perspective", saying that it was somewhat redundant. Johnson argued that long-term points should stay in the platform. Prazak said the current platform should be renamed as something else and that it should never be used externally. Dasbach argued that the "2-4 year perspective" and "transitional proposals" points were addressing two different issues. The motion to delete the "2-4 year perspective" point failed on a voice vote.

Johnson argued that our Platform should be something that we can measure our candidates against. Givot said the Platform has not prevented past candidates from saying things contrary to the Platform. Kohls pointed out that it was not necessary to throw out the whole Platform just because there are some things that people don't like. Ernsberger pointed out that the Democrats and Republicans have a different situation when adopting

their platforms since they don't have the same need to be consistent.

The motion to endorse the second point of Image Goal #1 passed 11 to 6. Voting in favor were Clark, Crickenberger, Dasbach, Ernsberger, Givot, Hall, Karlan, Neale, Prazak, Redpath, and Schumacher. Voting against were Alexander, Dehn, Gingell, Johnson, Kohls, and McLean.

Prazak moved to extend time to allow for discussion of endorsing removal of "challenge the cult of the omnipotent state" from the Statement of Principles; the motion failed on a show of hands.

Ernsberger moved to take up the two-manager office question following the budget committee report; the motion passed on a voice vote.

15. BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT:

Gingell noted that three documents had been made available: the 1992 budget as it had been amended over the year [Attachment D], a proposed 1993 budget [Attachment E], and a table summarizing and comparing the revenue categories from the two budgets [Attachment J].

She explained that the proposed budget was based on input from the area managers which initially implied a deficit of \$80,000; cuts had been made to bring the proposal into balance but these changes did not necessarily represent any kind of consensus or majority opinion.

She noted that it was the sense of the Executive Committee that our budget should just limit the total spending on each line, with the breakdown by expense category just in the budget to show how the total was derived. She said that the proposed budget made certain assumptions about staff salaries that were based on discussions with Stuart Reges; the "intern" would be a college student working at near the minimum wage. She noted that the proposed budget included a cash flow analysis that showed a low point of negative \$9,441 but that this should not be a problem if we start out the year with some cash.

After a brief discussion, Gingell noted that it was necessary to clear the room because the hotel needed it for another event.

The meeting was recessed at 5:27pm and reconvened at 5:33pm.

Givot said that although a good job had been done in allocating office staff time to the various activities in the proposed budget, actually accounting for this allocation would require a large amount of overhead and be a waste of time. He said that all the staff expense should be moved into the Administration Area and accounted for there, just as we do for rent.

Gingell pointed out that the budget did not require that we actually track people's time and we could allocate expenses simply according to the proportions that appear in the budget. Dehn added that it would be possible to adjust those proportions during the year if we had evidence that they did not correspond to reality, and that we also had the option of measuring some kinds of staff activity and proportionately allocating the remainder.

Redpath commented that although the accounting process had not gone well in 1992, there are software packages that would let us track staff time and many organizations use them.

In reply to a question from Karlan, Neale said that there was money in our budget for convention

"decorations" because we control what goes on the stage, but noted that we will be getting \$15 per delegate from the contractor to pay for things like that.

In response to a question from Dasbach about the practicality of tracking staff time, Dunbar said that it wasn't that hard to do and was actually done for a while; Gingell said that she had reviewed the data for the 1st quarter (1992) but that it hadn't actually be used for accounting; she also said that she had not discussed this question with Reges.

In response to a question from Dasbach about allowing flexibility in expenditures within each area, not so strictly limited by line, Gingell said that was possible but that wording still needed to be worked out. Dehn noted that the current rules permit the Executive Committee to make certain kinds of adjustments and that the EC had always been willing to do it; those cases where the change was too big to be accomodated in that way were big enough that they should be considered by the full LNC.

Givot suggested looking at the proposed budget in light of the proposed set of goals, and said that there were items probably totalling \$50,000 or more in that should be added.

The meeting was recessed at 6:07pm, and reconvened at 8:34am Sunday 13 December.

Gingell proposed taking up policy manual changes at this time, followed by the two-manager idea, then the budget; there was no objection.

Dasbach assumed the chair.

15A. POLICY MANUAL CHANGES:

Gingell moved: to rename the Education Area to be the Marketing/Education Area; in VII.6 to change item "c" to read "development and sale of literature and other outreach materials", to add a new item "d" to read "development and placement of advertising", and to renumber the following items; in VII.4 to add a new item "j" to read "information exchange with affiliates"; in VII.7 to change item "d" to read "coordinating with affiliates 1. telephone tree 2. newsletter".

There was a discussion of the proposed name "Marketing/Education" and alternative suggestions. Prazak moved to change it to "Communications". Givot moved to substitute a change to "Marketing". After some discussion, the motion to substitute passed on a voice vote, and the motion to change the name to "Marketing" then passed by a vote of 8 to 7. The main motion to update part VII of the Policy Manual passed on a voice vote.

Gingell moved: in VI.2.B.2 change "line" to "area"; in VI.2.B.4 change "item" to "line"; in VI.2.C.1 to change "item" to "line" and change "budgeted amount" to "total budgeted expense amount". She explained that these changes would put the budgetary limitations on the activity line level rather than the individual expense category and give area managers more flexibility. The motion passed on a voice vote.

[Gingell resumed the chair.]

Givot moved:

That the LNC directs its staff and contractors that the LP shall accept no advertising from

Michael Emerling or any organization with which he is formally or informally associated, and that the staff and contractors shall make a reasonable effort to ascertain such association in accepting advertising.

That that LNC directs its staff that no LP mailing list rentals shall be made to Michael Emerling or any organization with which he is formally or informally associated, and that the staff shall make a reasonable effort to ascertain such association prior to any mailing list rental.

He said Emerling's recent actions, including distributing copies of letters written during the campaign by Perry Willis and by Givot, showed him to be an "enemy" and someone who is willing to violate confidences; we should not help such a person nor should we trust him with our mailing list.

Redpath pointed out that Emerling is associated with Project 51-'96 and that he wants to keep good relations with that organization and encourage them to help with the ballot access job. Dasbach said 51-'96 will be less efficient than the LP in raising and spending money for ballot access, and noted that we are still having to clean up problems created by 51-'92. He noted that he had argued against banning Emerling from LP News at the April meeting, but that he would not so argue now.

In reply to a question from Karlan about possible effects on affiliate parties, Givot said that his intent was that this apply to organizations in which Emerling has a leadership position, not simple membership.

Neale moved to change "a reasonable effort" to "every reasonable effort"; there was no objection.

Kohls moved to delete "or any organization with which he is formally or informally associated". Dasbach moved to substitute to change the text to "or any organization in which he holds a leadership role".

Givot said affiliate parties should be exempted and that his intent was not to say that organizations would be forever tainted -- they could become qualified again by getting rid of him.

Schumacher said he shared Givot's sense of outrage but that this approach is fraught with problems. Redpath suggested allowing the Executive Committee to make exceptions. After a bit more discussion of the implications for campaigns in which Emerling might be involved and of the question of whether we should ever refuse ads, the motion to substitute a change of text for deletion of the phrase about organizations and that substitute amendment passed on voice votes.

Redpath moved to insert "without the approval of the Executive Committee"; the motion passed on a voice vote.

Prazak said he was concerned about how such an action would look in the future in a "marketing sense", comparing it to something that a Communist council would do. Crickenberger said it reminded him of something that Emerling might do, and that it could interfere with our members' access to some valuable materials. Dehn said the whole thing looks like a personal feud, that it was something that came out of the Marrou/Lord campaign, that we should be trying to forget that campaign rather than extending its legacy.

Clark said we should be able to take this sort of action when somebody does something wrong. Neale said this was an example of how useless the "oath" is.

The main motion failed on a voice vote.

15B. DUAL-MANAGEMENT APPROACH:

Dunbar gave an overview of his experience in running the office over the past four years. He likened running the office to building a fort, in preparation for the expected "attack" of a campaign during which all systems will be tested severely; he said that despite the preparations, the office systems suffered a great deal during this past campaign, and that we were now in a lull during which we should be rebuilding. He said that over the four year period the party's annual gross revenue had about tripled and paid membership had nearly doubled but that the budget for office staff had stayed about the same. He recommended budgeting for a four-person staff and investing in new, more supportable software. He said he had not resigned, but that if we wanted to put someone else in charge he was ready to go, but if he is needed to help in the transition he would be willing to do that, too.

Givot noted that his campaign support proposal could mean another three staff members in the office during campaigns.

Ernsberger said it was time to build up our infrastructure permanently, not just during campaigns. He said we had outgrown our office structure and needed to be willing to spend more money on this. He said we had come out of this campaign with the resources to be able to expand our infrastructure, and that to get all the work done would require two management-level people because one person could not have the flexibility needed to work on expanding our media presence and also be in charge of running the office operation. He said the Reges/Sincere proposal offered an opportunity to get started on this. He moved that we endorse as a goal "to strive for a dual-management approach to the operation of the national office".

There was discussion of who would be in charge in a two-person management team, with general agreement that one would have to report to the other but that which one need not be specified in the goal and would be worked out at the time.

Givot moved to substitute that the goal be "to employ a Director of Marketing and a Director of Operations, one of whom is also designated the National Director". The motion failed on a voice vote.

The motion to endorse a dual-management approach passed on a voice vote.

15C. ADOPTION OF 1993 BUDGET:

Gingell proposed that we first hear all the proposals for amendments to the proposed budget. She proposed changing the Liberty Today development contractor expense from \$2000 to \$1000.

Givot proposed budgeting \$40,000 for the "Equalizer Project": \$10,000 in the Marketing Area for tv/radio ads and \$30,000 in the Organizing Area for campaign support. He proposed adding a line for "1994 winnable state and local races", representing \$250,000 to be raised in 1993 at a cost of \$100,000 with \$150,000 saved for spending in 1994. He said that there would be increased communications expense involved in preparing shadow cabinet news releases; Gingell suggested increasing that item by \$250. Givot said money would be needed for producing an organizing manual; Dehn suggested using the figures (total \$275) that had been specified in the 1992 budget for this purpose.

Ernsberger proposed adding \$10,000 in revenue from convention fundraising, increasing direct mail revenue

by \$18,000, adding \$24,000 for office staff, and \$8,000 more for computer hardware and software.

Givot proposed increasing the convention fee revenue by \$1500. Neale proposed increasing the convention facilities and decorations line by \$1400 and leaving the expense category undesignated.

Dunbar proposed adding a \$13,000 line to cover expected bonus payments for 1992 employees.

Givot proposed eliminating the \$6000 contractor expense for talk show placement, adding a \$1500 volunteer pizza expense item like the one that had been added to the 1992 budget, and reducing 800-number activity to 25,000 calls.

Crickenberger proposed cutting the Directory expense by \$1500, eliminating the \$100 Program revision expense, eliminating the \$2450 expense for producing topic brochures, eliminating the \$1800 expense for producing other brochures, eliminating the \$3000 clipping service expense, eliminating the \$500 for Internal Education, adding \$500 to the candidate recruiting line to pay for mailings, and increasing the funding for 1993 "winnable races" by \$25,000

Redpath proposed raising the ballot access total to \$100,000.

It was estimated that the net effect of all the proposed changes would be an excess of spending over revenue of \$67,206.

Discussion of the proposed changes began with consideration of how realistic the revenue projections were. Ayres noted that the proposed increase of \$18,000 in direct mail revenue was about the equivalent of one more letter; she said the original proposal was already reasonably optimistic, and that in looking at the 1992 letters as an predictor of future performance we should remember that an election year provides more "sexy" topics for letters.

Crickenberger noted that the proposed fundraising, including \$250,000 for future campaigns, would be less than the total raised in 1992 by the national LP and Marrou/Lord.

Ernsberger noted that if we are taking the new "goals" seriously we should be adjusting the budget numbers accordingly.

Givot termed Ayres original projections "conservative", suggested that we could find sexy topics for 1993, such as TV ad development and winable races, and noted that expenses in these areas would not actually occur until the second half of the year after we have had a chance to see some actual revenue results.

Crickenberger noted that there might be opportunities for helping with elections earlier in the year.

Givot questioned why \$8,000 more was being requested for computer facilities when there were no specific purchases being proposed; Dunbar said more research was needed on software packages; Gingell noted that Stuart Reges seemed to be of the opinion that we had enough hardware.

There was a discussion of the proposed addition of \$24,000 for office staff, including how this additional spending would be allocated among the budgets of the various activity areas, whether it was reasonable to budget for an additional person before actually deciding what additional tasks the office would be taking on, whether this change should be coupled with elimination of the separate item for talk show promotion, and whether that job would be better done by a separate person even if we had a media person in the office.

Givot moved approval of all of the previously mentioned changes to the proposed Administration Area budget, including the \$24,000 office staff increase, together with removal of the \$6,000 talk show contractor item (from the Marketing Area).

Dasbach moved to amend this package by keeping the talk show item but reducing the additional office staff amount to \$8,000, saying that this would keep the two-person option open and we could decide later to transfer the talk show budget amount if we decided to bring that function in house. After some additional discussion of whether this function should be brought into the office, Dasbach's amendment failed by a vote of 6 in favor and 7 opposed.

Givot clarified that it was the intent of his motion just that the net increase in staff be \$18,000, not to specify which budget lines the amounts would appear on; Dehn said if the motion passed it would be recorded as \$18,000 for additional office staff with the talk show amount unchanged; there was no objection.

Givot moved to amend the package of proposed changes to set the total computer hardware and software expense budget at \$6,000.

The meeting was recessed at 12:10pm and reconvened at 12:34pm.

The motion to set the computer budget at \$6,000 passed on a voice vote. The motion to make all the changes to the proposed Administration Area budget passed on a voice vote.

Dasbach moved to suspend the rules to take up the Field Organizing report; there was no objection.

Dasbach assumed the chair.

15D. FIELD ORGANIZING REPORT:

Joseph Knight provided a written report [Attachment K] and commented on various topics, including the help he was now getting from Marti Stoner, the "internship" program, some reactions of students to the political quiz, the "spring break project" concept, and the need to switch the emphasis of our college program over the next few years from establishing new clubs to the maintenance of existing ones. He asked that a statement about campus organizing be added to our list of goals, saying that this function is vital to the party's mission.

Crickenberger moved to add a subgoal under Organizing Goal #4, to read:

Develop a world-class campus organizing program, with

- Contacts on 500 campuses and between 100 and 200 organized and functioning campus clubs going into the '96 elections
- Such a visible presence on campus that any student attending an American college or university will have heard of the LP and have some idea of what a libertarian is

The motion passed on a voice vote.

In response to a question from Johnson about state parties being able to follow up on the leads generated on campus, Knight said that he makes three copies of the list, leaving one with the campus person, sending one to the national office, and sending one to the state chair.

15E. ADOPTION OF 1993 BUDGET (continued):

Givot moved to amend the proposed Development Area budget by increasing direct mail revenue by \$18,000 and reducing 800-number expenses by \$15,000, saying that the estimate of the number of calls was too high.

Redpath assumed the chair.

Dasbach noted that if we change our estimate of the number of calls, we should also adjust the expenses and revenues associated with inquiry and followup mailings. Givot moved to amend his proposal by also reducing these items by 15/40.

Gingell resumed the chair.

The motion to reduce the inquiry items passed on a voice vote. The motion to amend the proposed Development Area budget passed on a voice vote.

Redpath moved all of the previously mentioned changes to the Marketing Area (except the talk show item previously dealt with).

Johnson moved to amend this package to keep the \$3,000 clipping service item, objecting to the fact that the budget was taken up out of order before he had a chance to give his report, and saying that the clipping service was market research and an important way of measuring our results. There was a discussion of the value of this service, with various members saying that it was imperative that we know what kind of coverage we are getting, that it gives us an opportunity to respond to coverage, that having people volunteer to send in clippings had been tried and had not worked, that this service fits in with the plan to have an expanded public-relations effort, and that it is useful to have the clippings for archival purposes. Givot argued that this was not a good way to spend our limited resources, and said that during the Marrou/Lord campaign people commonly faxed clippings to him voluntarily. The motion to keep the clipping service passed on a voice vote.

15F. RLC PRESENTATION:

Redpath moved to suspend the rules to hear the RLC presentation at this time; the motion passed with 12 in favor and 4 opposed. Redpath introduced Mike Holmes. Holmes introduced Roger MacBride.

MacBride described his history in the libertarian movement, saying that he always was and still is a libertarian. He complimented the LP on its success in getting libertarian ideas out to the public, but said that it looks to him unlikely that we will succeed in electing anyone to a major office. He said both the LP and the RLC are equally committed to libertarian principles, and that there are opportunities for us to work together. He said that the RLC never criticized the LP, but Marrou had criticized RLC. He cited the support by Georgia Libertarians for Republican Paul Coverdell, after the LP candidate forced a runoff, as an example of good cooperation, and noted that there were cases where a good Republican might be able to be elected if LP members added their support rather than running their own candidate. He made note of several Republicans, some of whom were previously active in the LP, who were endorsed by RLC and who now hold public office.

Holmes proposed that Clifford Thies serve as RLC's liason to the LNC. He called for the avoidance of "libertarian fratricide", saying that Libertarians should support RLC candidates in their Republican primary races, and provide cross-endorsements in the general election. He also suggested the possibility of

cooperating to put on conferences. He suggested that former Libertarians now in state legislatures could help us with legislation, that Libertarians could work with RLC members on joint projects on such issues as National Service, and that we should take note of the increasing number of Republicans who call themselves "libertarian". He claimed that most prominent Libertarians have come from the Republican Party and said that we should maintain communication with Republicans to keep this path open.

Givot asked about Alan Lindsay's relationship with RLC. Holmes responded that he had been their Director, but no longer holds that position and does not speak for them. Givot commented on actions taken by Lindsay attempting to discredit our presidential candidate, noting that our candidate was running against a clearly non-libertarian Republican, and said that RLC should rid itself of such people before coming to us with suggestions.

Redpath thanked RLC for their efforts to bring libertarianism to the Republican Party, but commented that the RLC-endorsed congressional candidate in his district didn't seem very libertarian and that our field organizer had been having problems organizing clubs on campuses where there was an RLC organizer. Holmes responded that RLC does not control its candidates' campaigns and that it has no policy of interfering with LP campus groups.

Dasbach said that there have been cases of RLC members specifically going to recruit students away from LP campus groups, that Alan Lindsay went to considerable time and expense to sabotage Marrou media appearances, and that before we could consider cross-endorsements there would need to be a way to be certain of a candidate's libertarianness.

Kohls said she would be willing to be a liason to RLC.

In response to questions from Ernsberger about the possibility of RLC support for LP candidates and of Republican support for ballot access reforms, Holmes said that RLC could consider endorsing Libertarians on a case by case basis and that although Republicans in general did not have much concern about ballot access it might be possible to work on that.

In response to a question from Clark about whether RLC members considered themselves Libertarians or Republicans, Holmes said that some of their members are also LP members.

Schumacher noted cases in Colorado of former LP activists being elected as Republicans, and said he favored continued contact between the parties.

In response to a statement by Prazak that Eric Rittberg and Alan Lindsay should publicly apologize for trashing Marrou, Holmes said that the LP and Marrou had said nasty things about Republicans but that he apologized for whatever bad things RLC people had said about us.

In response to a question from Dehn about the liason role, Holmes said the idea was to have someone who can be called when we want to communicate, to avoid confusion about who is the right person to talk to.

In response to a question from Neale about RLC's definition of "libertarian", Holmes said that their definition might not be exactly the same as ours but noted that about 1/3 of their members seem to be formerly from the LP and that people who run as Libertarians aren't always completely libertarian as we would define it.

Givot said he wanted it to be clear that Alan Lindsay had been the Director of RLC and that RLC had

permitted his activities to continue.

15G. ADOPTION OF 1993 BUDGET (continued):

Givot moved to add to the proposed tv/radio item a limitation that no expenses be allowed until after the national convention; the motion passed on a voice vote.

The package of amendments to the proposed Marketing Area budget passed on a voice vote.

Givot moved to adopt all the proposed changes to the proposed Organizing Area budget.

He then moved to add to the campaign support item a limitation that no expenses be allowed prior to the national convention; this passed on a voice vote.

Dasbach moved to reduce the campus organizing expense to \$53,500 and the campus packs expense to \$4,500, explaining that there probably would not be an intern working in the spring and that more emphasis would be put on maintaining existing campus groups. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Givot estimated that the net effect of all the changes made so far would be about \$64,280 worse than the original proposed budget, with \$40,000 in expenses deferred until after the convention, and suggested that we find another \$24,000 to cut or defer.

Givot moved to add to the proposed \$40,000 in funding for winable races a limitation that \$20,000 of it may not be spent until after April. Crickenberger objected that campaigns are the activity most relevant to our newly adopted mission statement, and noted that it was possible that the whole amount could be needed for a spring campaign.

Dasbach moved to substitute that the \$18,000 in additional office staff not be spent until after April. The motion to substitute passed on a voice vote; the motion to defer the office staff passed on a voice vote.

In response to questions from Givot, Alexander said that there would likely be \$5,000 to \$6,000 in receivables due from MLC and that he hoped MLC could pay this by January. Givot commented that this should take care of the remaining imbalance.

Crickenberger pointed out that the candidate seminar funds would not be spent until after April.

15H. BALLOT ACCESS REPORT:

Redpath moved to suspend the rules to give his report; there was no objection. He submitted a written report [Attachment L] and commented on the situation in various states where we could do petitioning this year. Clark noted that petitioning might not be needed in Nevada because of work being done to change the law.

15I. ADOPTION OF 1993 BUDGET (continued):

The motion to make the changes in the proposed Organizing Area budget passed on a voice vote.

Dehn moved to delegate to the Executive Committee the authority to reallocate staff expenses among the budget lines. Givot moved to substitute:

To direct the Executive Committee to adopt a policy of showing all internal staff salary, benefits, bonuses, and related expenses as a new category 'Staff' under the Administration Area and cease to allocate internal staff expense among various budget line items.

arguing that since the allocated staff expenses were not discretionary, they should not appear in each manager's budget. In response to a question from Schumacher about whether this would be less convenient for Gingell and Dehn, Dehn said that if the LNC ordered this he would implement it, noting that he had the option of resigning; he also said that he thought the time spent on detailed adjustments to the budget had been a waste since under the new budget policies the Executive Committee could approve any necessary changes; the LNC was really only setting the total limit for each activity area.

The motion to substitute and the motion to direct the EC to cease allocating staff expense passed on voice votes.

Givot said that, given that we are doing accounting with accrued expenses, staff bonuses should be counted as an expense in the year on which they are based, not in the year they are paid.

The motion to adopt the whole budget, as amended, passed on a voice vote. Ernsberger asked that his "no" vote be recorded, having explained that he objected to the deferral of additional budget authority for media work.

16. DEVELOPMENT AREA REPORT (see item 14B)

17. EDUCATION AREA REPORT:

Dehn provided a written report [Attachment M] and offered to answer questions.

Gingell announced that she was appointing Jo Jorgensen to be Marketing Area Manager. After a brief discussion of her qualifications, Karlan moved to accept her appointment; the motion passed on a voice vote.

18. MEDIA RELATIONS REPORT:

There was a discussion of implementation of the Shadow Cabinet idea. Ernsberger suggested that the LNC should advise on who should be appointed, that it would be bad if this project took away people who could work on other activities, and that we should appoint people who will impress outsiders. Gingell said people should give their suggestions to Jorgensen. Schumacher said that there needs to be an advise and consent process.

Johnson reported on the news release program and coverage of the LP as shown by newspaper clippings. He said that pure issue-oriented releases seemed to get relatively little response, that the clippings showed that in many places the only time we got actual news coverage was when Marrou or Lord visited, that there were lots of clippings of letters and commentary columns, and that there were too many cases of "no photo available" or "not available for comment" in reporting about our local candidates. He recommended more

work on getting people to distribute releases locally by fax and better coordination with future presidential campaigns.

Ernsberger moved:

The Libertarian National Committee directs the Marketing Area Manager to prepare a written proposal on a Shadow Cabinet to the LNC for its Spring 1993 meeting, so it may be distributed with the agenda mailing.

The proposal shall cover, for example, a description of the Shadow Cabinet, the number of members, their duties, the term of office, the selection and removal process.

It is the view of this body that members of the Shadow Cabinet be recognized spokespersons in the field, not merely interested Libertarian Party activists.

Dasbach argued against the motion, saying that we should let the Marketing Area Manager do her job. Clark suggested that the Marketing Area Manager set it up but send us a report on what she is doing to give us an opportunity to object. In response to a question from Neale about what authority the Marketing Area Manager would have to set up a Shadow Cabinet if the LNC sets no policy, Gingell said that any action would be taken only in consultation with the Chair and the Executive Committee. The motion failed on a voice vote.

19. ORGANIZING AREA REPORT (no separate report)

20. BALLOT ACCESS REPORT (see item 15H)

21. FIELD ORGANIZING REPORT (see item 15D)

22. CAMPAIGN '92 REPORT:

Crickenherger reviewed the state and local election activities of 1992, noting that we provided funds to eight candidates two of whom won. The largest amount was provided to Tamara Clark in her state senate race. He reviewed other notable races. He suggested that we do more to encourage our best prospects by providing money earlier in the process.

Johnson reported on a special election for US Senate coming up in Texas for which Ron Paul has been mentioned as a possible candidate.

Crickenberger said that in 1992 we didn't have anyone who ran a "real race"; that even Clark did not have a campaign manager and did not do the kind of polling that major party candidates do.

Clark commented on the lack of support from the national LP that she felt as a candidate.

Ernsberger provided a written report on Congressional races and on election results reporting through the 900-number [Attachment F]. He reviewed his activities in connection with these projects and his work

relating to media coverage of our campaigns.

22A. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES:

Neale moved to suspend the rules to consider the minutes and the National Director appointment at this time; there was no objection.

Karlan moved to approve the minutes of the August 1992 meeting; the motion passed on a voice vote.

22B. NATIONAL DIRECTOR APPOINTMENT:

Gingell said she had resumes of Reges and Sincere available and had clarified the outstanding questions about Sincere's intentions. In response to a question from Alexander, she said that the planned total to be paid in 1993 was \$36,250 to Sincere and \$13,750 to Reges. In response to a question about Sincere's abilities, various people noted his work on a supper club, his work on media for the Marrou/Lord campaign, his experience with public appearances, and the fact that Reges and Sincere had different talents and would be working as a team. In response to other questions, Gingell made clear that initially Reges would be in charge, that they were not "co-directors", and that although they would be exploring the media person concept this appointment did not constitute an actual startup of the "two-person management approach".

Neale moved to approve the appointment of Reges and Sincere; the motion passed on a voice vote.

22C. PUBLICATION OF GOALS:

Neale moved to suspend the rules to consider the question of publishing the newly endorsed goals; there was no objection. Neale moved that the goals be published in LP News as soon as possible, including divisions where recorded, along with a short history of how this came about. He explained that he wanted there to be no secrecy about this and for everybody to know how LNC members stood on the issues. Gingell said that it would be possible to make the January issue if we were just going to publish the goals and votes; Neale moved to amend his proposal to eliminate the requirement of a history; there was no objection. After some further discussion, Alexander moved to require that the reasons for the votes be included, where they had been recorded. The motion to require inclusion of reasons passed on a voice vote. The main motion passed on a voice vote.

23. MARROU/LORD CAMPAIGN REPORT:

Dasbach said there was no report on the campaign at this time but that he would be writing something up.

24. REGIONAL REPORTS:

Schumacher (Region 1) provided a written report [Attachment N] and made some brief comments.

McLean (Region 2) provided a written report [Attachment O] and offered to answer questions.

Hall (Region 3) provided a written report [Attachment P] but was no longer present.

Crickenberger (Region 4) provided a written report [Attachment Q] and made some comments about the Georgia US Senate race.

Karlan (Region 5) provided a written report [Attachment R] and made some brief comments. Enisberger described the situation in his Congressional district where he decided not to run against a Republican who said he would be voting libertarian 70% of the time; there was a brief discussion of the circumstances under which such action might make sense.

Dasbach provided copies of a Region 6 report [Attachment S] sent by Conrad.

Johnson (Region 8) provided a written report [Attachment T] and commented briefly.

25. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES (see item 22A)

25A. POLICY MANUAL CHANGES (see item 15A)

26. ADOPTION OF 1993 BUDGET (see items 15C, 15E, 15G, and 15I)

26A. NATIONAL DIRECTOR APPOINTMENT (see item 22B)

27. RLC PRESENTATION (see item 15F)

28. CONCLUDING BUSINESS:

McLean moved to thank Clark for arranging the meeting; there was no objection.

Dunbar praised the work of staff members Steve Feldman and Marc Montoni and suggested that they be given honorary life memberships. Karlan moved to make Feldman and Montoni life members. Dasbach moved to add Dunbar to the list. The motion to include Dunbar passed on a voice vote. The main motion passed on a voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:17pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph W. Dehn III
Secretary

Attachments:

Attachments distributed prior to the meeting

- A. Atlanta Strategic Plan Proposal
- B. Delegate Allocation Memo to State Chairs
- C. Development Area Report
- D. Amended 1992 Budget
- E. Proposed 1993 Budget
- F. Campaign 1992 / 900 Line Reports

Attachments distributed at the meeting

- G. Income Statements for 1992
- H. Convention Oversight Committee Report
- I. Prospecting Plans
- J. Budget Gross Revenue Comparisons
- K. Field Organizing Report
- L. Ballot Access Report
- M. Education Area Report
- N. Region 1 Report
- O. Region 2 Report
- P. Region 3 Report
- Q. Region 4 Report
- R. Region 5 Report
- S. Region 6 Report
- T. Region 8 Report



[LP HOME](#) | [LP ARCHIVES](#)