

**2024 LIBERTARIAN PARTY BLAWS AND RULES COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES OF MEETING JUNE 15, 2023**

Meeting called to order at 8:48 PM ET

<b>MEMBERS</b>	<b>ALTERNATES</b>	<b>GUESTS</b>
SYLVIA ARROWOOD	DEAN ROGERS (A7)	DUSTIN COFFELL
PAUL BRACCO		J. J. JACOBS
NICKOLAS CIESIELSKI		NATHAN MADDEN
CARYN ANN HARLOS		LARRY SILVER
ROB LATHAM		MARRION SKINNER
FRANK MARTIN		ERIC THRAEN
ROGER ROOTS (A5)		JESSICA TEWKSBURY
TOM ROWLETTE		
MIKE RUFO		
MICHAEL SEEBECK		

ABSENT KEN MOELLMAN

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** (No Response)

**LATHAM:** In vehicle. Connection may be in and out.

**HARLOS:** LATHAM asked to postpone consideration where committee stopped mid-meeting, electronic voting. Is that still intention until computer access?

**LATHAM:** Mostly concerned with electronic voting. We can see how it flows. Not have access to computer for approximately 90 minutes.

**HARLOS:** ROOTS to fill in for MOELLMAN. Will start off with major rewrite where we left off at [RULE 3: ELECTION BALLOTING PROCEDURE](#). Contemplating a vote on –

**SEEBECK:** Have a question. Item [5..](#) has double period.

**HARLOS:** Tweaks could be made once we get to LATHAM’S proposal to add electronic voting. That might require some changes. Motion on floor is to approve this language. Are there further amendments? RULE 3 is stricken in entirety and made a new RULE 3 that combines all balloting procedures into one rule with acknowledgment that our nomination procedure is the same way and there would be a future section from me dealing with nominating to simplify the rules. All procedure dealing with balloting and nominations would be contained in one rule each. That is not done yet. This is consolidation of scattering throughout.

**SEEBECK:** Go up to [3](#) in blue, [3.3](#).

**BRACCO:** Page 17 in Word.

**SEEBECK:** Besides double period on No. 5 have a Question. Is it intent there that a candidate and NOTA, does it fall to the candidate instead of NOTA?

**HARLOS:** Yes. That is way it exists right now.

**SEEBECK:** Or is that a spoiled ballot because it's not filled out properly?

**HARLOS:** No. Our National rules have always said this. Different from Colorado. Not a substantive change. Just combining all the various rules.

**BRACCO:** In current Bylaws would be RULE 8.2. a.

**HARLOS:** Goal was to put it all in one section; try to clean it up and eliminate redundancy. More substantive issues will come with LATHAM'S proposal.

**SEEBECK:** Motion on the floor is for what?

**HARLOS:** To strike RULE 3 and make a new RULE 3 with all that comes from current balloting language and then all the other scattered places where you see red strike-outs here. These were all moved up so that no concepts were lost. These all moved into new RULE 3. Then RULE 8 is ELECTION OF OFFICERS because we moved all balloting language to RULE 3. It just deals with nominations. All at bottom gets struck because it all got moved up to RULE 3, dealing with the JC and verification of vote totals.

**ROWLETTE:** Scroll up to 3.3. Thought we got rid of that at last meeting because of confusion over what a nomination is. My memory is we simply got rid of 3.3 in its entirety because it was not necessary.

**HARLOS:** Let's check. That sounds familiar. Determined it was redundant; Is that your recollection?

**ROWLETTE:** Yes.

**HARLOS:** Does anyone have a different recollection? That now rings a bell with me and must not have properly noted it.

**LATHAM:** Did we approve the minutes from the last meeting? Wonder if exercise of doing that might jog our memory as to what was done. Seem to remember a satirical comment.

**HARLOS:** Kind of brushed over approving the minutes. Will save that for end if we have time. Do Secretary's notes indicate we struck No. 3 which was "For each election for office or nomination, a majority vote shall be required."? That is my recollection.

**MOULTON ENTERED APPROXIMATELY 9:05. ROOTS RETURNED TO ALTERNATE (A5).**

**HARLOS:** It is my recollection that we did that. Will ask committee if there is objection to striking through 3.3; we will double delete it. My recollection is that No. 3 was deleted because of what is now in 4 and 5. It talks about candidates in both kind of races, single-winner and multi-winner, having to get a majority. To say again in No. 3 is redundant. Is there any objection to striking No. 3 and renumbering accordingly? (No Response)

**ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.**

**BRACCO:** Believe we made some changes to the last sentence of No. 5. “or been elected in previous rounds” was struck

**HARLOS:** Know I put this on screen. This is a Google doc and Google must not have saved some changes. That is what appears to me. Did all of this live and made no downloads to this. Believe BRACCO is correct. We may need to stop sharing the screen and go to the minutes. BRACCO has minutes.

**BRACCO:** Last sentence of No. 5. The “~~after every~~” is out. Would read: “the procedure shall be repeated until the total number of candidates to fill the open seats have received a majority vote” and then “~~or been elected in previous rounds.~~” was struck.

**HARLOS:** Yes.

**BRACCO:** Vote was 4 -2 and 4 abstentions. 5. Was deleted; so it’s gone.

**HARLOS:** My recollection. Take a look at minutes and see if there is anything that was not captured on the Google sheet. Every once in while Google flips out and might leave something out. Take a quick look and make sure we caught everything.

**BRACCO:** Might be some changes at beginning of 3. and 4. In beginning of 3. and 4. ~~It~~ is now For. There was an amendment without objection.

**LATHAM:** Remember amendment on replacing ~~vote tellers~~ to just tellers.

**HARLOS:** Decided not to go through and create this here. Problem with Google Sheet. Will move to postpone this and will review the video and make sure this Google doc has captured everything. Will not waste committee’s time looking for Google errors; that is my job. If no objection, will postpone rest of this until next meeting where we can see as amended. If someone would rather not, we can spend time going through the minutes and still not be sure we caught everything. That’s the committee’s choice but motion right now is to postpone until next meeting and instruct chair to review the video to insure the Google doc accurately reflects the decisions of the committee. Any objection to that? (No Response) **ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.** Now not completely trust Google.

Moving on to No. 3. A proposal from LATHAM to make the preamble explicitly part of the platform, Proposal Q. LATHAM cannot see the proposal. Should I speak to it?

**LATHAM:** No. Great if you would speak to it.

**HARLOS:** In past have been on Platform Committees – and MOULTON may add to this – there has been a question as to whether the preamble is part of the platform because of way bylaws are worded. If not, can it be amended? Deletion is by majority vote. Is it amended by a 2/3 vote or majority the way as rest of platform does? This came up at least in two conventions, perhaps more. Needs to be clarified if preamble is part of the platform and therefore a 2/3 vote would be required to amend the platform. What instigated this was at 2016 convention or maybe the 2018 convention where a platform committee member wanted to delete the entire preamble -- which in my opinion is a work of poetry -- and replace it with the effect of “We Libertarians want the government out of your bedroom and your wallet” or something like that and in my opinion it was a crude bumper sticker as opposed to as now stated which think is a really good Libertarian philosophy. Whether or not the preamble should be deleted, amended, changed will be up to the delegates. Some might prefer the shorter but think it should not be by majority vote. Believe most consider the preamble part of our platform and should require a 2/3 vote if amended.

Article 3. 2. presently says: “The Party platform shall include, but not be limited to, the Statement of Principles and the implementation of those principles in the form of planks.” My statement was the preamble is part of the platform but people argued about that and there is alleged ambiguity and it needs clarity. Proposed amendment would add the Preamble after “Statement of Principles”. This also would make a preamble mandatory. That is a consequence of this FYI and would also change Section 3. “The current platform shall serve as the basis of all future platforms. The existing platform ~~and Preamble~~ may be amended only at regular conventions. A platform plank may be deleted by majority vote. New planks or amendments to existing planks or amendments to existing planks or the Preamble require a 2/3 vote.” That is the motion on the floor.

**ROWLETTE:** Move to amend last sentence. Would like to insert some commas. A comma after “new planks”. Take out ~~or~~ and then a comma after “existing planks”. Then add amendments to after the next “for”. It would read “for amendments” to the next “preamble”.

**HARLOS:** Grammar not correct.

**LATHAM:** Think what ROWLETTE is proposing is correct. Need to add a little more to it.

**HARLOS:** It would read: “New planks, amendments to existing planks or the preamble,

require a 2/3 vote.

**SEEBECK:** One way to do it.

**HARLOS:** “amendments to existing planks or the Preamble” is a set. Not dividing them. Don’t want comma in middle. New planks is one set. Amendments to existing planks to the Preamble is another set and then “require a 2/3 vote”.

**ROWLETTE:** Think we want to keep first “or” then and just insert the commas.

**LATHAM:** Think ROWLETTE is correct but needs more to it.

**HARLOS:** Okay. Just to let you know grammatical changes are within the realm of the Party Secretary. Maybe rewriting the sentence is in order?

**SEEBECK:** The idea of putting amendments to existing planks, or amendments to the existing Preamble is grammatically accurate because of three different possibilities here, new planks, amendments to the existing –

**HARLOS:** Have a way to fix this.

**SEEBECK:** If you say that amendments to the Preamble, adding new planks or amending existing planks, then it becomes crystal clear and there will be no problems.

**HARLOS:** Simpler way. Say “new planks, amendments” –

**SEEBECK:** Look at No. 2.

**HARLOS:** It already says in platform without conflict – Okay. See what you say.

**SEEBECK:** Everything except the SOP.

**BRACCO:** Put something in the chat.

**HARLOS:** We are getting over 12 people out of their night. We need to look ahead on the agenda because items like this can easily be handled in email. Would want our meeting times to require all of us in one place at one time. Think sentence needs to be completely rewritten. Is that a motion you are making, BRACCO? -- Did SEEBECK have a motion on deck first?

**SEEBECK:** Had my hand raised to ask a question. Asking about 2. so put me back in line.

**HARLOS:** BRACCO, you wanted after “new planks”, no comma – Going to reset the chess board. ROWLETTE did have a motion but we were kind of tweaking this motion. Give ROWLETTE priority first. ROWLETTE, did you have an amendment that you would like first crack at?

**ROWLETTE:** Noticed a problem but did not have a solution. Believe other people's solution might be better than mine. Pass to the next person with a good solution.

**HARLOS:** That is BRACCO. Would BRACCO'S suggestion be adding the word –

**BRACCO:** Am still not sure that want to propose this. It was just a suggestion. Not making a motion at this time. Might make a motion on something else.

**HARLOS:** Have a fix if you are not moving a motion. "New planks and amendments to existing planks, or to the existing Preamble require a 2/3 vote." Put that in clean language –

**SEEBECK:** Take out second comma after "planks".

**HARLOS:** No. Intend to keep it there.

**SEEBECK:** Then creating a separation where you don't want it. You need to have "amendments" tied to the Preamble part and that comma separates it.

**HARLOS:** Okay. Buy that. SEEBECK wanted to delete the comma which there was no objection to. Does anyone have an objection to that proposal? We should tighten this up and not do informal workshopping. If we are doing informal workshopping, will move to discussion list. " New planks and amendments to existing planks or to the Preamble, require a 2/3 vote."

**BRACCO:** Seems to me there is no opposition to this in principle, that this is just a grammatical workshopping issue. With that in mind, would like to table this entire proposal until our next meeting. Your suggestion that we work this on the list is a great idea.

**HARLOS:** Will highlight where we were at and when we come back, this is where we will be. This is the pending amendment. Let's discuss this on the list. Will come at next meeting after first item that was postponed to next meeting.

**SEEBECK:** Objection. We have language right here, right now. That's just fine. Don't need to postpone any further. As highlighted it can be stated without any problem.

**HARLOS:** There is objection. Is there any further debate on motion to postpone?

**BRACCO:** Know it takes everybody but will withdraw my motion.

**HARLOS:** Any objection to the motion of BRACCO to withdraw his motion to postpone?  
(No Response) **Motion to Withdraw Motion to Postpone by BRACCO ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.**

**BRACCO:** My motion to withdraw motion to postpone is adopted.

**HARLOS:** Substituting what was originally proposed by LATHAM and cosponsored by me. Is there anything further?

**ROWLETTE:** Prefer what SEEBECK posted in chat to what is on screen currently. I move we adopt that instead of what is highlighted on the screen. That is an amendment to an amendment.

**HARLOS:** “New planks, amendments to existing planks, or amendments to the Preamble shall require a 23 vote.”

**ROWLETTE:** Will move that as an amendment to this amendment.

**HARLOS:** Because there are changes separated by words we are going to make a substitute to the substitute. Since there is no further amendment, we will go right to a vote on the substitute which is a substitute for the substitute. If this passes, we are done. If not, we will be back to the original substitute. Motion on the floor is to substitute the language which I will highlight here in green. It is to substitute the language in green for the language in blue. “New planks or amendments to existing planks or the Preamble require a 2/3 vote.”

**SEEBECK:** You said that backwards.

**HARLOS:** Correct. Motion before us is to substitute the language in blue for the language in yellow. Making the language in blue the primary amendment which would require another vote to put it into the proposal. First ask: is there any objection to substitute the language in blue for the language in yellow? (No Response) **ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.** That now becomes the primary amendment.

**LATHAM:** Point of personal privilege. Would like to let an alternate vote on this. Would love to see those. Both sound good to me but prefer to see both so would defer vote on this to an alternate. Would really rather pass or abstain but rather not do that and will defer vote to an alternate.

**HARLOS:** ROOTS (A5) would be next ranking alternate; LATHAM is deferring to ROOTS.

**LATHAM DEFERS VOTE TO ROOTS (A5) AT APPROXIMATELY 9:35 PM.**

**HARLOS:** Any objection to substitute the language in blue for language in green? (No Response) **ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.** New language is now on the screen.

**ROOTS (A5):** Will now be voting?

**HARLOS:** Yes. LATHAM is deferring on this to someone who can actually see the screen

as he is on the road.

**SEEBECK:** Should Preamble be ahead of Statement of Principles in No. 2 because it's ahead in the Platform?

**HARLOS:** No. Don't think so.

**SEEBECK:** No. Had no motion on that.

**BRACCO:** Looking between 3. and 2. In 3. we say "the Preamble". In 2. "a Preamble". Think we should change "a" to "the" in No. 2. We say "the" in Statement of Principles. Would like to make that motion. Would like to strike the blue "a" in 2 and insert "the".

**HARLOS:** The more we go through this, personally starting to not like this proposal. Arguing against proposal was co-instigator for.

**SEEBECK:** Think this is a distinction without a difference because there's really no difference between the two, "a" and "the". Let's face it. Ever seen a document with more than one preamble? Makes it consistent but not a huge problem.

**HARLOS:** "The Statement of Principles" is something separate whereas "a Preamble" is more fluid. In 2. It is just saying what the platform shall include. It shall include a Preamble and the implementation of these principles in planks. 3. Assume that platform includes what 2. requires it to include so "the Preamble" is speaking of one that exists whereas 2. is speaking of hypothetical requirement for "a Preamble". When you say "the Preamble" there, it sounds like a stand-alone document that already exists that has to be inserted into the platform in the same way as the Statement of Principles. It removes distinction of "the Statement of Principles" by making that "a" other than "the". Would absolutely oppose this amendment. Any further debate?

**BRACCO:** Not sure understood what you said there.

**HARLOS:** 2. is instructions on what the platform shall include. It shall include the Statement of Principles which is something that already exists as a stand-alone document with its own amendment threshold, its own primacy of place elsewhere in our bylaws. It is intended to be something that is difficult to change. It is relatively stable and probably never will be changed again. It's the Statement of Principles. We do not have a document that is consistent through time called "the Preamble". 2. is saying what is required to be in "the platform". It is required to have a preamble. There is not a "the Preamble" that has to be put in. It just has to have "a preamble" just like it has to have planks. Those planks can change. It just has to have planks. This speaks of a requirement. 3. talks about when you have these requirements fulfilled. Then at the time of the



amendment there is an existing preamble which would be the preamble that you are amending at the time. That's a distinction I see between these two.

**BRACCO:** Then there is the issue of the capitalization of the "P" in the Preamble which would also correspond to this issue depending on which way it goes.

**HARLOS:** Would not mind uncapping that.

**SEEBECK:** But it's a section title.

**BRACCO:** Okay.

**HARLOS:** Any further debate on this amendment? (No Response). There is an objection. Amendment on the floor is on No. 2. to delete the article "a" and replace it with "the" so it would say "the Preamble" rather than "a Preamble"

ARROWWOOD	NO
BRACCO	ABSTAIN
CIESIELSKI	NO
HARLOS	ABSTAIN
ROOTS (A5)	NO
MARTIN	YES
MOULTON (A1)	NO
ROWLETTE	NO
RUFO	NO
SEEBECK	NO

**DEFEATED VOTE 1-7-2**

**HARLOS:** Are there any further amendments to this proposal?

**ROWLETTE:** Could we read No. 2. out loud? "The Party platform shall include, but not be limited to, the Statement of Principles, the Preamble, and the implementation of those principles in the form of planks." That last little bit "and the implementation of those principles", that should apply to the last item on the list and not the second-to-the-last item. Would like to move "the Preamble" to the first spot. Do you want me to give the details of how that is done? Am moving to scoot over "a Preamble" to be first item on the list.

**HARLOS:** Motion on the floor is to strike "the Preamble" after "the Statement of Principles" and move it to before "the Statement of Principles" so that it would read "The Party platform shall include, but not be limited to, a Preamble, the Statement of Principles, and the implementation of those principles in the form of planks." Do you wish to speak further to that?

**ROWLETTE:** No.

**HARLOS:** Any further debate or amendment to the amendment to the amendment? (No Response). Is there any objection to this amendment? (No Response). **ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.** Are there any further amendments or debate? We are back to the top level. You can debate the proposal or amend it. (No Response). Is everyone clear where we are in the process?

**ROOTS:** If we already moved that wording up to where it is now, think it is an improper sentence to say the Party platform shall include, at the very bottom part, the implementation of those principles. That is not a good sentence. It doesn't make any sense. Would move for an amendment that would say "The Party platform shall include" blah, blah, blah "and any planks which would implement those principles." Hope you understand what I am saying. A platform does not consist of implementation. It's a bad sentence. That last phraseology at the very end should be flipped around so it should say "The platform shall include" blah, blah, "and any planks to implement those principles."

**HARLOS:** What I am considering here is whether for this proposal, it goes beyond the scope for this proposal and that it be suggested that if you can convince a primary to move this as a separate proposal. The goal for this proposal was adding words to protect the Preamble and not rewording that had nothing to do with the Preamble.

**ROOTS:** Okay.

**HARLOS:** The committee can overrule me but we are free to offer as many amendments as we want. No one's right will be violated if I say it is not proper at this time. That is what I am going to rule. That would need to be a separate proposal. It would be like if someone said, let's change No. 1. but this is beyond the scope of this particular proposal. We will continue as there is no appeal to the ruling.

**ROWLETTE:** Not even sure this is a good idea but move to amend to uncap "Preamble" where it exists in this proposal and make it lower case "preamble" in 2. and 3.

**HARLOS:** ROWLETTE'S motion is to uncapitalize "Preamble".

**MARTIN:** Have typed alternative language for No. 2. in chat. Move that language be substituted for No. 2.

**HARLOS:** Since you are a primary and rather than deferring this, we will do it now. It is kind of out of the scope but it seems there is appetite for it. Will let you make this motion but it is out of order right now because the amendment on floor now is about capping or not the word "preamble". We can only amend the amendment right now

and then will call upon MARTIN to make this substitute.

**SEEBECK:** "Preamble" is a specific title of the document; therefore, no particular reason to be capitalizing it.

**HARLOS:** Technically correct. Statement of Principles and Preamble, think it is correct both ways. Statement of Principles is very important and suggest we keep that capitalized and not capitalizing is not wrong.

**RUFO:** If we take away "the" and take away "a", "the" would make it a name, a proper noun. When you say "a" it is not a specific preamble; you are talking about it in general. Think lower case is the proper way to do it.

**HARLOS:** It is "the" in No. 3. Are you making an amendment to only cap it when it is "the", uncap in No. 2. and leave it capped in No. 3.?

**ROOTS:** Missed that. No. I think where it says "the" it should be capped and where it says "a" it should not. When you say "the" it makes it a specific preamble. When you say "a" it could be any preamble. Want to propose an amendment to the amendment where we lower case "a preamble" and upper case "the Preamble". Lower case No. 2. and leave No. 3. capitalized.

**HARLOS:** Now on the amendment to the amendment. It is to strike the lower casing of "preamble" in No. 3. and retaining strike of the capitalization in No. 2 so it would go to lower casing. Now debating the amendment to the amendment only. ROOTS, do you wish to speak to that? The amendment and the amendment to the amendment will be heard together as they are closely linked.

**ROOTS:** Argument can be made that it should be lower case in 2. and upper case in 3. as it is at the moment. Argument would be that No. 2. is sort of the layout. No. 3. it sort of assumes a preamble exists. No. 3. it seems the flow would support capitalized "P" in 3.

**HARLOS:** Speaking in favor of the amendment to the amendment which is leave it upper case in 3. while making it lower cap in 2.?

**ROOTS:** Yes.

**HARLOS:** Any further amendment or debate to the amendment to the amendment? (No Response). Believe there is objection from SEEBECK.

**SEEBECK:** Do not have objection.

**HARLOS:** Is there any objection to the amendment to the amendment which would retain the upper case in No. 3.? (No Response). Then all we would be addressing is lower

casing it in No. 2. If there is objection and it does not pass, will be back to the original amendment which is to lower case in both. Must be clear. Is there an objection to striking the proposal to lower case it in 3.?

**ROWLETTE:** Object to amendment to the amendment.

**HARLOS:** Will proceed to a vote.

ARROWWOOD	NO
BRACCO	YES
CIESIELSKI	NO
HARLOS	ABSTAIN
ROOTS (A5)	YES
MARTIN	NO
MOULTON (A1)	NO
ROWLETTE	NO
RUFO	YES
SEEBECK	YES

**FAILED VOTE 4-5-1**

**HARLOS:** Amendment to the amendment failed. We are back to the amendment in both areas. Is there any further amendment to the amendment? (No Response). Is there any further debate or amendment to the amendment? (No Response). There was objection from SEEBECK. Does his objection remain?

**SEEBECK:** Yes.

**HARLOS:** What we are voting on and the motion before this body is to strike the upper cap on Preamble in subparagraphs 2. and 3. and to make it lower case.

ARROWWOOD	NO
BRACCO	YES
CIESIELSKI	YES
HARLOS	ABSTAIN
ROOTS (A5)	YES
MARTIN	YES
MOUTON (A1)	YES
ROWLETTE	YES
RUFO	NO
SEEBECK	NO

**ADOPTED VOTE 6-3-1**

**HARLOS:** That passes. Now at MARTIN'S amendment.

**MARTIN:** Put it in chat.

**HARLOS:** MARTIN is moving to strike all of 2. And put in: (Substitute): “The Party platform shall consist of a preamble, the Statement of Principles, and planks to implement those principles.”

**MARTIN:** Yes. Trying to reduce word count here and create something short and straight forward. It takes out “includes but not be limited to” and specifies what the platform will include. Don’t know if that will be an issue or not. The “include but not be limited to” leaves what the party platform is, is ambiguous whereas my proposal makes it specific. That’s all I have.

**HARLOS:** In favor of this. Piggy-back on what you just said. Question is whether the preamble is part of the platform or not is because of the “shall not be limited to”. To me it prevents another cool thing from being added to it and then another debate about what the amendment threshold is for this other cool thing is and it would force people to amend the bylaws to actually include it in the platform and it’s simpler and shorter. Why say two words when you can say twenty? I tend to word stack but the simpler one is more elegant.

**ROWELTTE:** Like this amendment. But would like it somewhere else. Will vote for it if it is its own thing but won’t vote for it as part of this proposed amendment. Reason is that – well a couple reasons. Instead of saying “shall not be limited to” that’s an improvement but it’s a separate improvement from making sure that the preamble can’t be changed with a majority. Like it but it deserves to be its own thing and probably on the convention floor. The two should be right next to each other on the convention floor. Will also say that of a thousand Libertarians, one of them is going to move to divide the question if we don’t divide it for them here. Am going to vote no on this but am enthusiastic about it as its own separate proposal.

**HARLOS:** Will interject but not going to debate. That is originally why I ruled this out of order; but because of multiple people who wanted it, decided to go forward with it but you articulated why I had originally ruled it out of order.

**BRACCO:** Have a concern that might be unfounded. Is it correct that this particular 3.2. is authorization for the Statement of Principles and without its authorization here, the Statement of Principles could not exist?

**HARLOS:** No. There have been those who don’t like the Statement of Principles or they don’t like it being so front and center. Think it sounds 1970’s, Ayn Rand, Libertarian on a soapbox. They want to have a Statement of Principles but it does not have to be included on the platform page. It could be buried somewhere in the dark recesses of the

website. This was worded this way so that the Statement of Principles is always front and center with the platform and cannot be buried. No. 1. makes the Statement of Principles mandatory and it does exist and can only be amended by a 7/8 vote. No. 2. cannot do anything about the existence or non-existence of it. What it does do is prevent the burying of it.

**BRACCO:** If this were to pass, then someone could not come in later, strike the Statement of Principles and therefore backdoor the Statement of Principles but they could with the taking out of “not limited to” force the removal of the Statement of Principles from the platform? Would that force it to be buried?

**HARLOS:** No. But don't think what you are saying is anywhere in the realm of either of these amendments. Both say that the platform has to include it.

**BRACCO:** Understand presently. Wondering about in the future?

**HARLOS:** In future could do that and it could be buried. It has been tried many times.

**BRACCO:** Guess in the future it could be 2/3 no matter what? It's just different wording?

**HARLOS:** Recently been tried and argument was by making it its stand-alone page and not with the platform, that's actually elevating it. Didn't buy that then and will not buy it in the future.

**BRACCO:** Was a technical question and you answered it.

**MOULTON:** Want to confirm what you said. Don't think it prevents it from being buried. Staff have tried to bury the whole platform before.

**HARLOS:** Yes. It can be buried with the platform, sure.

**MOULTON:** Have talked to former Executive Directors who have said they made the platform hard to amend and they could elevate their issue statements which they thought were less kooky.

**HARLOS:** That happened when the website was redesigned. I was ARPC at the time. Will leave it at that.

**SEEBECK:** Understand the idea behind the amendment here. I want to speak to something separate from the amendment. Put me back in line until after this.

**HARLOS:** Lower your hand. Will call upon you once this is finished. Is there anything further? Would anyone else like to speak to this amendment or to amend the amendment? (No Response) Is there any objection to this amendment?

**LATHAM:** Yes.

**HARLOS:** LATHAM has objected. Will restate the question so everyone is clear.

MARTIN'S amendment to LATHAM's proposal is to strike all of the language in No. 2. and substitute in: "The Party platform shall consist of a preamble, the Statement of Principles, and planks to implement those principles." A yes will substitute that and that will then be part of our proposal. A no vote would leave the proposal in tact where it is and just adding the words "a preamble" to the existing language in No. 2.

ARROWWOOD	YES
BRACCO	ABSTAIN
CIESIELSKI	ABSTAIN
HARLOS	ABSTAIN
ROOTS (A5)	YES
MARTIN	YES
MOULTON (A1)	YES
ROWLETTE	NO
RUFO	NO
SEEBECK	YES

**ADOPTED VOTE 5-2-3**

**HARLOS:** Any further amendment or debate on the proposal? (No Response) Is there objection to this proposal?

**SEEBECK:** Want to speak to this. The wording as it is right now, I'm having a major problem – and I'm not sure what the right answer is – with "implement". "Implement" sounds to me like we are defining a program and not a platform and they are different documents. When you look at the preamble of the platform itself it specifically says "we set forth our basic principles and enumerate basic policy stands derived from these principles." Don't think that policy stands and implementation of a belief are exactly the same thing. A policy stand elaborates on what the principles mean in certain areas. How you get there is implementation. I'm not sure what the right answer is here but don't think "implement" is the right word.

**HARLOS:** Now moving way beyond the purpose of this proposal which is to protect the preamble.

**SEEBECK:** It may be a separate proposal.

**HAROS:** Yes.

**SEEBECK:** Do it later.

**BRACCO:** Not suggesting an amendment but “refine” instead of “implement”?

**HARLOS:** That sounds like the Statement of Principles is unrefined.

**BRACCO:** “further refined”?

**HARLOS:** Worst.

**BRACCO:** Never mind.

**LATHAM:** Present now. Don’t want to dive into middle of conversation. May contribute in chat while you go forward. (Approximately 10:20 PM)

**HARLOS:** Still at proposal. Is there anyone else with further amendment or debate? (No Response). Is there any objection to adopting this as the proposal of the committee? (No Response). **ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.** Next is Proposal R. See how far we get with LATHAM’S Proposal R, RULE 8. ELECTION OF OFFICERS AND NATIONAL COMMITTEE. This is to add RCV. LATHAM, this kind of impacts a proposal we are in the middle of.

**LATHAM:** Let’s table this or postpone or whatever the terminology is.

**HARLOS:** Until we perfect your other pending proposal, my pending proposal, and then we can look if it passes and propose further amendment. Would suggest that committee agree that when we pass P that it will not consider reconsideration for LATHAM to consider amendments to Ranked Choice Voting when we get back to R because there are two other things stacked behind it. If there is no objection to proceeding in that unconventional way, we are going to move onto No. 5. which is Proposal S, Refine Dues Definition. Going to read the problem. “Staff has told the LNC that there is a difficulty with the CRM in the way we calculate dues and the way that our Bylaws describe them” which can include more than just designated dues payments but other “donations.” This proposal presumes the dues increase in Proposal B if it passes, and if not, the amount here will be \$25.00 instead of \$50.00. Solution: increase sustaining membership dues from \$25.00 to \$50.00 annually. Benefits: This would better align membership dues in real terms to the last time they were updated. As the problem will tell you some of the problems that staff is encountering. SEEBECK is familiar with these problems as we have had some of the same in Colorado as well.

Let me read 4. “Sustaining members” are members of the Party who: ~~a. During the prior 12 months have donated, or have had donated on their behalf, an amount of at least \$25.~~ Have paid, or have paid on their behalf, dues of \$50 in a single payment within the past 365 days.” Again that \$50 could be \$25 if the proposal to raise dues does not



pass or has not been heard yet, or whatever. Ignore that amount. It is going to be whatever the amount is. Part of the problem with CRM is these little micro-payments is creating a rolling dues expiration date. Say one pays \$5.00 in January, \$5.00 in February and go all the way through April. After the \$5.00 payment in April, you then become a sustaining member because within a 12-month period you have donated \$25.00. However, if that is the last payment you make and do not continue to pay \$5.00 a month, your sustaining membership will not expire the following April. It will expire the following January because \$5.00 will have dropped off your \$25.00 total within the previous 12 months. We don't define the "previous 12 months" as a calendar year. It's the previous 12 months. With the thousands of members, it is a nightmare. Dues should be something separate. No one should have to determine if you made a donation to get a tee shirt from the store whether that makes you a member. These are issues staff has struggled with forever. Maybe someone donates \$50.00 for a convention theme. Does that make them a member? There is not a checkbox on the pledge because it has nothing to do with membership. It just indicates this person has paid \$50.00. Staff now has to chase them to see if they want to sign the pledge. This is a nightmare. There is question if even the numbers reported out on the CRM are accurate. Staff has gone through and done an extensive audit. We shall see how these numbers change. Not saying anyone did not do their job but it is what it is. I am looking forward to solve this problem. When someone pays dues, it should be because they intended to pay dues. They knew they were paying dues. They had opportunity to sign the pledge. One and done. Move on. Ran this proposal by staff and they wanted to make me a saint if this passes. It is costing more to maintain the dues than comes in.

**BRACCO:** Believe the proviso is carried over from the earlier amendment.

**HARLOS:** This proviso goes with this. Let me speak to the proviso. When at convention there are people who have certain lapsed states that might be based upon this rolling contribution. This is not intended to reset anyone's current lapsed state. This will go into effect as people's memberships lapse. Then they will have to make a single payment. This is not to do a big reset at convention. Everyone's lapse date stays the same until it reaches that date. But if they continue to make micro-payments after convention, it won't be rolled forward. This proposal will not change any current member's lapse date. After a year, it will be caught up and done.

**ROWLETTE:** Understand the meaning of "sine die" but in general like English better than Latin. Is there an equivalent in English that would work just as well?

**HARLOS:** Don't think so. It's a term of art. This is just a proviso. We can adjourn to another day and then the meeting is not adjourned even though the people would all go

home. The group is still a body. A meeting or convention does have the authority to adjourn to another day (Fix the Time to which to Adjourn-Privileged Motion). We could even have a procedure which would allow us to do something remotely. "Sine die" is a technical term for a specific type of adjournment.

Is there further debate on the amendment? (No Response). MOELLMAN, were your ears burning? Are you awake?

**MOELLMAN:** Not very much. Not feeling very well today.

**HARLOS:** We have a Proposal S which might be of interest to you. It's on the screen. It's to stop the rolling expiration date and to make it clear it is a dues payment, not a donation. Did run this by staff and staff started singing "Hallelujah" by Leonard Cohen.

**MOELLMAN:** This looks good. Will just observe and let whoever has my spot to keep it – unless there is an empty spot right now.

**HARLOS:** MOULTON has been filling your spot

**MOELLMAN:** Let MOULTON continue. That is fine. Will observe.

**BRACCO:** Want to clarify. This is not a reconsideration of any prior amendment?

**HARLOS:** No. The way we are submitting these, it will make it a real job for me but that's okay. It is going to take a lot of technical report writing. It is not a reconsideration of anything. If the convention adopts \$50.00 or \$35.00 or whatever it might be, that will be the figure that will be here. Is there any further debate or amendment? (No Response). There is five minutes left in the meeting. Is there any objection to this proposal with the proviso? (No Response).

**LATHAM:** No but would like to reclaim my spot.

**LATHAM RETURNS TO VOTING STATUS. ROOTS RETURNED TO ALTERNATE AT APPROXIMATELY 10:40 PM**

**HARLOS:** Again is there any objection to this proposal with proviso? (No Response).

**ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.** Do not think we can get to any other proposals. Is there anything that anyone else would like to consider at this meeting? (No Response). Would anyone else like to extend time to consider another proposal? (No Response). Otherwise we will be adjourning in two or three minutes.

**ARROWWOD:** Approval of the minutes from June 1.

**HARLOS:** With change on list which was corrected, are there any other corrections to

the minutes? (No Response). Any objection to approving those minutes? (No Response).

**MINUTES APPROVED WITHOUT OBJECTION.**

**BRACCO:** Believe we are at time.

**HARLOS:** Since there is no extension of time, will state the next meeting date is June 29. We will start with No. 2. Not sure we will get to RCV matter. LATHAM needs to see what we passed for 2. 4. will probably get postponed to the next meeting. We can tinker with the language in 2. without reconsideration. We passed No. 5. We will do No. 2. and then go to 6.

ADJOURNED AT 10:46 PM ET.

**DRAFT 6-21 11:55 PM ET 6-21 12:25 PM6-21 at 11:59**