



Caryn Ann Harlos <carynannharlos@gmail.com>

FW: [judicial] Amicus on Ruling of the Chair

1 message

Mary J Ruwart <mary@ruwart.com>

Fri, Apr 29, 2022 at 11:42 AM

To: Cristina Crawford <crawford.cris@gmail.com>, Whitney Bilyeu <chair@lp.org>, chair@lpmass.org, membership@lpmass.org, operations@lpmass.org, technology@lpmass.org, Tara DeSisto <tara.desisto@gmail.com>, secretary@lpmass.org, Caryn Ann Harlos <carynannharlos@gmail.com>, Andrew Cordio <cordioace@gmail.com>
Cc: judicial@lp.org

From: judicial@lp.org <judicial@lp.org> **On Behalf Of** Ken Moellman**Sent:** Friday, April 29, 2022 10:00 AM**To:** jc@lp.org**Subject:** [judicial] Amicus on Ruling of the Chair

I write as an individual party member, and not as a representative of the LNC.

The core of the current controversy is which body in MA the LNC recognizes as the leadership of its one affiliate, which inherently requires that the LNC determine which group is legitimate under their bylaws. This was the same question on the DE decision, and the LNC again should answer the same question.

I believe the LNC has both the ability and the responsibility to decide who is the rightful leadership of an affiliate. The JC has ruled similarly very recently. Expanding upon that ruling, it is a disservice to our members, and harmful to our potential new members, to have an unanswered question as to who our affiliate actually is.

It would appear that there are members of the LNC who would prefer that the LNC not answer the question, because the answer would likely end up in the JC with similar results as those in the recent similar DE matter. In essence, it appears to be an attempt through parliamentary procedure to thwart a preconceived likely outcome.

I believe that this party is made up of its members, and not the whims of the elected leaders. That fewer than 20 people have banned almost 50 people from participation, because those 50 people exercised a right enshrined in their party's governing documents, and that more due process is built into their governing documents for leadership than for members, can be classified in no other way other than "just awful".

We had a similar issue, a few years ago, in LPKY. Leaders used an accidental loophole in the governing documents to create 30 pages of new rules outside convention, part of which included significant restrictions on the rights of the members in convention. It took a few conventions to overcome the intentional filibustering, and only because we had codified strong protections for membership were actual attempted membership purges thwarted; but the members eventually were able to overcome and eliminate those board-created rules.

But the extension of the timeline in the LPKY matter did significant internal damage to the body, with many great activists who cared about our principles choosing to walk away from an extended, internal battle which did nothing to make our

state more free. From experience I can say that the longer the battle is permitted to continue, the more harm that is done.

Therefore, I urge the JC to expeditiously rule that the motion was in order, just as the previous motion on DE was in order, so that the LNC can dispense with that business as quickly as possible.

Thank you,

Ken Moellman

LP Lifetime Member

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "judicial" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to judicial+unsubscribe@lp.org.

To view this discussion on the web visit <https://groups.google.com/a/lp.org/d/msgid/judicial/CA%2B7F3RG8uoCpNHGrpE8a8wFs2BY%2BtriGo5dLdU232ShhAm3Q%3DQ%40mail.gmail.com>.