

2024 BYLAWS AND RULES COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES NOVEMBER 16, 2023

Meeting called to order at 9:02 PM ET

MEMBERS	ALTERNATES	GUESTS
SYLVIA ARROWWOOD		DUSTIN COFFELL
PAUL BRACCO		WINRICH CRUZ
NICKOLAS CIESIELSKI		ELI D
CARYN ANN HARLOS		STEPHEN ECKER
ROB LATHAM		WILL HOBSON
FRANK MARTIN		MARRION KAUFMAN
CHUCK MOULTON		LARRY SILVER
TOM ROWLETTE		
DEAN RODGERS (A6)		
DAVE ROBERSON (A2)		

Absent: Rufo, Seebeck

LATHAM TRAVELING AND MAY BE IN AND OUT OF COMMUNICATION.

PUBLIC COMMENT: JACOBS: Often agree with decisions made by JC. Important to have a safeguard. Strongly urge committee to consider continuing the JC. **ELI D:** Would like volunteer hours to be credit toward National membership fee and see safeguards implemented as to logos and trademarks. Like to have these two items put into LP bylaws. Pay members for getting others to join Party and not have to pay professional fund raisers. **HARLOS:** Trademark is to help protect citizens from fraud. Some affiliates allow service to the party to be applied against dues.

HARLOS: Approached LNC as to limiting debate for our committee. That was passed. Does not mean we have to use it but we can. Have consent by appointing body to do so if needed. Committee can do that at any time. We do have the consent of appointing body. Will discuss timing after we adjourn for those who remain. We did that last time and don't want to waste time here.

MINUTES APPROVAL-November 2, 2023 Approved Without Correction.

**PROPOAL BB– Amend bylaws Article 7.12 TIME LIMIT TO APPEAL LNC DECISIONS-
HARLOS**

HARLOS: This is to insert a sentence right before the last one: [Such an appeal must be filed within 60 days of the decision.](#) Will speak to my proposal. These open-ended

things do not give any sense of stability. If there is a violation of the bylaws, this needs to be addressed. Cannot have LNC taking actions that go on for nine months. If someone believes the bylaws have been violated, this needs to be taken care of for the good of the Party and we need resolution so people aren't screaming about something. We need to know one way or another with the JC. There is another situation which might be cured by a later proposal on issue of constructive disaffiliation. There is a question which will not presume to say what the JC would decide – but there is an interpretive issue here and we should always clear up ambiguities in the bylaws once we see them. Feel we need some type of time limit in here.

DEBATE AS TO PROPOSAL BB.

BRACCO: Move to strike **sixty** and replace it with **ninety**. Want to allow people who might not have the reach or the notoriety in the party ample time to gather signatures if they need to do so. It can take time to get the facts together and don't want the clock to run out on someone.

HARLOS: Any further debate as to amendment? (No Response). Is there any objection to the amendment? **AMENDMENT ADPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.** Back on Main Motion. Any further debate as to the Motion? (No Response). Is there any objection to the main motion as amended?

ROWLETTE: Objection.

ARROWWOOD	YES
BRACCO	YES
CIESIELSKI	YES
HARLOS	ABSTAIN
LATHAM	YES
MARTIN	YES
MOULTON	YES
ROWLETTE	NO
RODGERS (A6)	YES
ROBERSON (A2)	YES

ADOPTED VOTE 8-1-1

MOULTON: Could ROWLETTE explain his vote? Might have changed my vote.

HARLOS: Allow it as a point of information if ROWLETTE cares to speak.

ROWLETTE: No. My option on this is not strong enough to be debate. Just let it go.

HARLOS: Next Proposal is CC

PROPOSAL CC-POLLING PROCEDURE-RULE 3-LATHAM

LATHAM: There was discussion on this on the list. One thought was to put it in the post-convention report. Makes sense to me. Would be in support of that.

RUFFO ENTERS. RODGERS (A6) RETURN TO ALTERNATE AT APPROXIMATELY 9:40 PM.

HARLOS: Does committee wish to spend a limited time on this? Will speak on my issue and then see if anyone else has anything to add. Don't like change in first sentence. Think bylaws should be stylistically consistent and don't like "Affiliate Chair shall serve as chair". Language throughout the bylaws is "X shall be X". Don't mind taking out the "shall" and "his or her" and have it be "delegation". It's very awkward and we don't use that a lot but the "shall do this or that", that is used stylistically throughout our bylaws. If we strike out **State** in all of those places and put in [Delegation](#) or [Affiliate](#), I'm perfectly fine with it. That would probably pass very fast. But please let's not get into a gender debate on the floor; but with removing all of the statist language, it's a wonderful proposal. Probably should stay away from the grammatical items.

HARLOS: Seem to have lost LATHAM.

LATHAM: My connection dropped. Back again. Sounds garbled but probably bad connection. The "shall" thing. That's above and beyond. Fine if you don't need that. The "his or her", that's something we don't need.

DEBATE AS TO PROPOSAL CC.

BRACCCO: Move to unstrike the "shall" and get rid of the second "s" in **Serve**s to make it "shall serve" again.

HARLOS: You are moving to strike from, the proposed amendment to put back in "shall" and take out the second "s" so it would say "The Affiliate Chair shall serve as chair of that affiliate's delegation"? Basically to return those two to the original state. It's already been spoken adequately to.

Any objection to that change? (No Response). ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION. Back on the proposal as amended. Seems there was unanimity so will ask: With that change is there any objection to this proposal, realizing it might not make it to the report due to time constraints but at least so it is preserved and will go into a post-report. Is that correct? Is there any objection to passing this proposal by the committee? (No

Response) **ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.** Next is ROWLETTE'S Proposal EE, Affiliate Party Disputes. Floor is ROWLETTE'S.

PROPOSAL EE – AFFILIATE PARTY DISPUTES – ROWLETTE.

ROWLETTE: Was hoping someone else would put this forward before I got to it. This is not my favorite proposal. However, believe this is an important proposal. In the year 2016 I began putting together a list of every political party that has ever existed in the US and noticed how many political parties there were, mostly of socialist and communist vent and researched the history and saw there were tiny little splinters. Being tiny and always fighting with each other, they were never very successful and those that were able to become somewhat successful were not able to hold onto that success for very long. When putting that list together, thought there must be something about Libertarians that we only had one entry on the list. Maybe we had more common sense or better character or practicality which had allowed us to stick together as one political party for at that point 45 years. But the same diseases and infighting which split the communists and socialists into a thousand pieces and made them irrelevant when they could have had near major success a long time ago, affects us today too.

This is a proposal to stop our splintering. This is a proposal to help set broken bones straight. The central issue at most of the splits is: Who is the legitimate leadership of an affiliate? Maybe a different question although similar is, legitimate or not, which group of people will the National Party recognize as its affiliate? Having a uniform way of answering at least one of those questions will make it clear to everyone in the state where leadership is in question, how that leadership dispute will be resolved. The opinions I have on how that dispute ought to go are not strongly held. The details and mechanics of how the resolution happens, aren't that important to me. What the roll of the JC ought to be and how much weight the LNC should give to various factors of legitimacy, all of those are things that can be adjusted to our heart's content. Another thing we can talk about is whether the Region Rep of the affiliate should be required to recuse themselves from voting on any dispute. Only have two strong opinions about this. The first is that we should pass some bylaw out of this committee and even though it is not my favorite topic, I'm convinced that if we do this and nothing else, our bylaw committee will have been a success and if we were to get everything else passed but not this, we will have done less than 50 percent of what we ought to have done.

My second strong opinion is that this item should be presented to the delegates at convention. That will cause debate at convention and I strongly suspect that there will be motions to extend time for debate on this issue. Would like that debate to be unfettered as can be from time pressures and to take place when the delegates are still sharp and not yet fatigued from considering other bylaws. Amend this however you wish but put something forward and put it in front.

DEBATE AS TO PROPOSAL EE – AFFILIATE PARTY DISPUTES – ROWLETTE

HARLOS: Is there any objection to postponing this until the next meeting for wordsmithing on the email list with it being on next agenda? We can decide at the end of the meeting whether we want to go with this one or not. But it will be at the top of the agenda. I will work on language over the weekend. Is that acceptable to the committee? (No Response). Is there any objection to the motion to postpone? (No Response). **ADOPTED. PROPOSAL EE POSTPONED TO NEXT MEETING, 11-30-23.**

Will work on this over weekend. All are welcome to join in. But we do need something. Next Proposal GG is also from ROWLETTE. It is to amend Article 10.1 to Shorten Time Convention Window.

PROPOSAL GG – Article 10.1 – SHORTEN TIME CONVENTION WINDOW – ROWLETTE.

ROWLETTE: Have had slight change of heart about this. Would like to change word ~~June~~ to July. Essentially every presidential candidate that I have heard talk about this says that we choose our presidential candidates far too late in the process and basically that August screws them over. If choosing one date that every convention will happen on this date of this year and granted we don't want to do that. Want to give them more flexibility. If there was one ideal day to have the convention or the weekend, it would be the weekend before the Fourth of July. Have looked at the primary window for various dates and that would be the sweetest spot. Given every presidential candidate that I've ever heard talk about this has said we do this too late. We have to knock August out and having it go as early as July of the previous year seems nuts to me. Believe we should change this up so that we have a convention every even-numbered year between March and July.

DEBATE AS TO PROPOSAL GG–Article 10.1–SHORTEN TIME CONVENTION WINDOW- ROWLETTE

MOULTON: Amendment. Move that we change ~~July~~ to August and change ~~March~~ to February.

HARLOS: Anyone else like to speak to the amendment? (No Response). Any objection to the amendments? This would not pass the proposal. It is just the amendments. Speak now if have objection to the amendment. (No Response). **AMENDMENTS ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.** Proposal now is to strike out ~~July of an odd numbered year through August~~ and instead insert February through August. If this would pass, it would say “Regular conventions shall be held sometime during the period of February through August of an even numbered year.” We will take a roll call.

ARROWWOOD	NO	
BRACCO	NO	
CIESKIELSKI	NO	
HARLOS	ABSTAIN	
RODGERS (A6)	YES	
MARTIN	NO	
MOULTON	ABSTAIN	
ROWLETTE	YES	
RUFO	NO	
ROBERSON (A2)	YES	<u>FAILED VOTE 3-5-2</u>

LOST COMMUNICATION WITH LATHAM AT APPROXIMATELY 10:10 PM

HARLOS: Next also from ROWLETTE which deals with minority reports.

PROPOSAL HH -Article 11 OTHER COMMITTEES-Minority Reports-ROWLETTE.

ROWLETTE: Not terribly important but has come up at least twice. Either Bylaws or Platform has put forth more than one minority report. When that happens, all hell breaks loose. Procedure for that is to determine which of the two minority reports becomes the big minority report. Then the big minority report has to go against the majority (committee) report and you vote on that to see which one will become the main motion. Once you are done with that you have to decide whether to pass the main motion. Have you ever heard “Point of Information” 28 times in 30 minutes? This must never happen again. It’s awful when it happens. My solution is pretty easy. It gets down to where a committee can only put out one minority report. This can grind everyone to a halt. Every one of those 1,000 people are confused -- except for maybe five – about where they are. It’s happened twice. Third time is not a charm. Let’s have only one minority report from our committees ever presented to the delegates again.

DEBATE AS TO PROPOSAL HH.

MOULTON: Move to amend by eliminating the revision from ~~Four~~ to Five and revert from ~~3~~ to 2.

HARLOS: Striking the strike. ROWLETTE, this does not prohibit making more than one minority report. If that's your intent, wanted to let you know that this proposal does not do that. It might in affect do that but I does not say there is only one minority report. Want committee to be clear this does not prevent more than one minority report. We are on the amendment. Is there any debate? (No Response). We can get to the last sentence when we get through this amendment. Will speak against the amendment.

DEBATE AS TO AMENDMENT TO HH.

HARLOS: Would anyone else like to speak to this amendment? (No Response). Know there are disputes. What we are voting on is striking the strike from original language. "Four" would remain and "Two" would remain. A Yes Vote would strike the strike and leave original threshold. A No Vote would keep ROWLETTE'S amendment of keeping it "Five" and "Three".

ARROWWOOD	ABSTAIN
BRACCO	ABSTAIN
CIESIELSKI	YES
HARLOS	NO
RODGERS (A6)	YES
MARTIN	NO
MOULTON	YES
ROWLETTE	NO
RUFO	ABSTAIN
ROBERSON (A2)	NO

FAILED VOTE 3-4-3

HARLOS: ROWLETTE'S amendment remains intact. You can vote for the committee report and still sign on to the minority report. If this passes, you have three minority reports because there are ten members of the committee, three, three and three can sign off on three different minority reports. Platform you could have four minority reports because there are 20 members.

BRACCO: Move to strike ~~5~~ and insert 6. Platform is 20 voting members. Bylaws is 10 voting members. Whatever the ratio is believe that ratio should be consistent between the two committees in terms of percentage. Three of 10 and Six of 20.

HARLOS: Debating amendment at this point.

DEBATE AS TO AMENDNET TO HH.

HARLOS: Any further debate as to BRACCO’S amendment? (No Response). Is there any objection as to this proposed amendment?

ROWLETTE: Yes.

ARROWWOOD	YES
BRACCO	YES
CIESIELSKI	NO
HARLOS	ABSTAIN
DEAN RODGERS (A6)	YES
MARTIN	YES
MOULTON	YES
ROWLETTE	NO
RUFO	ABSTAIN
ROBERSON (A2)	YES

ADOPTED VOTE 6-2-2

HARLOS: Not raised but want to bring to committee’s attention. Platform, because it’s appointed by a different body, there are states in which they do not appoint somebody or their appointees never show up. That is going to happen. In theory there are 20 members but it can be 18 or 19 members. Wyoming was AWOL. Did not send delegates at last convention and they are not responding to any emails. Don’t know who chair of Wyoming is. Just be aware the six is actually much greater than it is if there is a full 20. Letting committee know. What if you have five states whose members do not show up? It’s not like LNC where if Bylaws only has seven people consistently show up, the LNC could appoint more people. LNC can do nothing about a state which decides they don’t want to send anybody or whatever it might be. Just wanted to get that out there. Could be a bigger problem with Platform than Bylaws.

DEBATE AS TO PROPOSAL HH CONTINUED.

HARLOS: Coming up on time. Five more minutes. Would anyone else like to speak to this proposal? (No Response). Is there any objection to this proposal?

MOULTON: Yes.

HARLOS: We are voting on language as seen on screen which is striking of **Four** and inserting **Six**; the striking of **Two** and inserting **Three**; and adding the final sentence **No person may join in more than one minority report for a particular proposal.**

ARROWWOOD	YES
BRACCO	YES
CIESIELSKI	YES
HARLOS	ABSTAIN
RODGERS (A6)	YES
MARTIN	YES
MOULTON	NO
ROWLETTE	YES
RUFO	ABSTAIN
ROBERSON (A2)	YES

ADOPTED VOTE 7-1-2

HARLOS: Let's look at the next one. Is this duplicative with QQ? ROWLETTE, do you want to explain your proposal and if anyone wants to extend time –

PROPOSAL JJ RULE 8 Election of Officers and National Committee - ROWLETTE

ROWLETTE: The way thought things worked is maybe different from how they work. Thought people were being nominated and they didn't want to be nominated. Thought that would solve that issue. If not an issue, I'm fine with withdrawing this.

HARLOS: You didn't move it yet. You can't withdraw it. If someone else wants to move it, they can. (No Response). **PROPOSAL JJ NOT PRESENTED.**

JACOBS: Would like to speak to something happened in the meeting if that were permissible? It is providing information.

HARLOS: Prefer we wait until after adjournment. We are pretty concerned about committing committee time to committee members.

ROWLETTE, know we talked about DD. Was that yours, the interrupting mic one?

ROWLETTE: This is heart's love. Keeping it but don't think we should hit it tonight. Would prefer to wait until next meeting.

PROPOSAL DD TO BE HELD OVER TO NEXT MEETING.

HARLOS: Next meeting is November 30. Adjourned at 11:01 PM ET.

DRAFT ONLY 11-21 AT 2:18 PM4:43 PM****