



Caryn Ann Harlos <carynannharlos@gmail.com>

FW: [judicial] Caryn Ann Harlos Appeal

2 messages

Mary J Ruwart <mary@ruwart.com>

Fri, Oct 22, 2021 at 12:22 PM

To: Whitney Bilyeu <whitney.bilyeu@lp.org>, Caryn Ann Harlos <carynannharlos@gmail.com>

Cc: D Frank Robinson <dfrankrobinson@gmail.com>, Tom Arnold <libertyclaus1@gmail.com>, Jim Turney <Jim@jimturney.com>, Alicia Mattson <agmattson@gmail.com>, Chuck Moulton <chuck@moulton.org>, Vermin Supreme <judgeverminsupreme@gmail.com>

From: 'Sean Campbell' via judicial <judicial@lp.org>

Sent: Friday, October 22, 2021 12:14 PM

To: jc@lp.org

Subject: [judicial] Caryn Ann Harlos Appeal

I hope this finds you well.

As a person who's been associated with the LP since the mid-90's, I listened with great interest last weekend to Caryn Ann Harlos appeal of suspension. Before I express a couple concerns of the LNC's case against Ms. Harlos, I do want to commend the Judiciary Committee for their cool-headed handling of the particulars. Given that, I have some concerns about the LNC's position towards Ms. Harlos:

1) Ms. Harlos spoke of many charges without documentation. In subsequent rebuttal, it didn't seem any further documentation was offered, simply loose references to interpretations of what had been heard or already discussed. In manufacturing quality assurance we have a saying, "If it isn't documented it didn't happen". That credo may be a bit dismissive in this case, but it's no less meaningful.

2) Very frankly speaking, the crux of the complaints seemed to be due to hurt feelings. As Ms. Harlos pointed out, no examples cited indicated an attack on "protected status", rather, they were a challenge of how well roles & responsibilities were being carried out.

Members of the LNC are public figures; criticism of their public performance should absolutely be fair game, *especially* if the criticism comes from their cohorts.

3) The LNC invoking the NAP regarding Ms. Harlos comments was particularly chilling. We are not the DNC - a party that that seems to enjoy sowing division by expressing fake outrage at the latest offensive word of the day. Nor are we the GOP - a party that questions your patriotism if you don't agree with their statements. The Libertarian Party is "The Party of Principle" and free speech should be one of our paramount planks. To twist the NAP in such a way as to suppress free speech would simply make us "The Party of Status Quo".

As a long-time party member who's had some concerns about the direction of the party I respectfully request the Judicial Committee to grant Ms. Harlos' appeal and let a woman who has represented the best of the LP to continue to set an example for those who would simply make us the GOP version 2.0

Thank you for your consideration.

Sean Campbell

Staunton Virginia

--

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/1662491C-F600-4240-80FA-A0A73CAC6B17%40yahoo.com>.

Caryn Ann Harlos <carynannharlos@gmail.com>

Fri, Oct 22, 2021 at 12:25 PM

To: DL <444c43@gmail.com>, "Jonathan M. Jacobs" <jjparlia@yahoo.com>, Mike Seebeck <mike.seebeck@gmail.com>

[Quoted text hidden]

--

In Liberty,

Caryn Ann Harlos

LNC Secretary in Exile, 561.523.2250