

THIS CONVENTION IS OUR BEST CHANCE TO GET THIS DONE

Supporters of this effort have been successful in getting this proposal passed to be decided by this convention:

CURRENT WORDING	PROPOSED AMENDMENT	IF ADOPTED WILL READ
<p>ARTICLE 17: AMENDMENT</p> <p>1. These Bylaws may be amended by a 2/3 vote of the delegates at any Regular Convention.</p> <p>2. Article 3, Section 1 shall not be amended by a vote of less than 7/8 of all registered delegates at a Regular Convention.</p>	<p>ARTICLE 17: AMENDMENT</p> <p>1. These Bylaws may be amended by a 2/3 vote of the delegates at any Regular Convention.</p> <p>2. Article 3, Section 1, <u>or this Section</u>, shall not be amended by a vote of less than 7/8 of all registered delegates at a Regular Convention.</p>	<p>ARTICLE 17: AMENDMENT</p> <p>1. These Bylaws may be amended by a 2/3 vote of the delegates at any Regular Convention.</p> <p>2. Article 3, Section 1, or this Section, shall not be amended by a vote of less than 7/8 of all registered delegates at a Regular Convention.</p>

However it is Proposal Q which makes it highly unlikely there will be time to hear this item. How can make sure this is heard?

The Bylaws report is split between two sessions on Sunday. Right after lunch, someone may move to suspend the rules in order to request that this item be moved up on the schedule and heard immediately. If this happens, we urge you to support this.

If this Proposal is heard, you can expect that someone will attempt to lower the threshold so here are some key things to understand:

- The current threshold is not merely a 7/8 vote, it is a 7/8 of **all registered delegates**. So if another high number like 5/6 is bandied about you will note that it will not include that key phrase of “registered delegates” and thus is a much **larger change** than it at first appears.
- If a lower threshold is proposed it will be immediately appealed as Out of Order to the Chair. Why? Because it is obvious and inarguable that the intent of Article 17.2 of the Bylaws was to also require a 7/8 vote of registered delegates for its amendment. This is where disputes over Robert’s Rules of Order (RONR) will come into play. The opposition will cite RONR as stating that intent should not be considered when interpreting an ambiguous Bylaw (which to us seems absolutely ridiculous as nothing else in life operates that way); however, there are three key weaknesses to that argument in addition to the blatant disregard of what was intended and under which understanding thousands of us joined this Party and gave millions of dollars. The first is that RONR also says that an assembly has the right to interpret its own Bylaws, and it cannot tell you what you use in your own judgment and common sense. Secondly, it is apparent that RONR is implicitly referring to what is called “parol evidence”, i.e., evidence from outside the document

itself. But that is not necessary, if one reads the answer is right there. In Bylaw 3.1

The Statement of Principles affirms that philosophy upon which the Libertarian Party is founded, by which it shall be sustained, and through which liberty shall prevail. The enduring importance of the Statement of Principles requires that it may be amended only by a vote of 7/8 of all registered delegates at a Regular Convention.

That Bylaw would make no sense if there were another way, other than the 7/8, to amend the Statement of Principles. And when there are competing interpretations, the one that does not render another related section absurd is the correct one.

- Be prepared to be at a microphone to argue the case for protecting our principles with conviction and passion.

You may be wondering, isn't this just a panic about something that is not ever going to happen? Well, in fact, it has been attempted. In 2008, the Bylaws Committee attempted to exploit this back door in order to change the Statement of Principles, including a key part of the Dallas Accord language.

END THE GAMES. PRESERVE THE DALLAS ACCORD. CLOSE THE BACK DOOR!