

Members of the Judicial Committee,

Again let me thank you for your time during Sunday's hearing. I want to briefly clarify my words as I believe several LNC members mischaracterized them. Let me provide a backdrop before clarifying.

My time with the Libertarian Party started in late 2017 when I joined my local affiliate. Shortly after we disaffiliated when our chair abruptly stepped down and with no replacement. After several months, at my insistence, several members and I planned a path back to affiliation. I have since fulfilled the role of Secretary, Treasurer and now Chair. And I went on to participate in my state affiliate, including becoming a delegate to national.

The relevance is that throughout I've sought to raise the standard of conduct, holding peers and leaders accountable. This includes executive committee members at all levels, including past state and local chairs, several LNC members, and even Ms. Harlos. It includes libertarians with very large social media presence, with one such person privately telling me my words had positively influenced them. It includes the Mises Caucus, having criticized prominent and regular members, and even the group as a whole. My reputation for demanding better is well-known with those I've engaged with.

How is it I now defend Ms. Harlos? It might at first seem contradictory.

First and foremost, I believe I cannot ask of another what I do not deliver myself. No man is perfect and despite my best efforts I occasionally falter. I acknowledge mistakes and persist. A major criticism of mine is with those demanding better of others while not delivering it themselves—including current LNC members.

Second, those who've engaged with me will surely say my strongest belief in communication and engagement is earnestly hearing those with whom you disagree. It's the message I deliver the most often and the one peers disagree with the most. And it isn't limited to any particular group, often the first thing I look at when addressing conflict.

Speaking of conflict, I'll directly address the mischaracterization of my words.

Chair Bilyeu twice disagreed that in-fighting could be seen in a positive light. It is not my belief that conflict for the sake of conflict is good. The question is what conflict (in-fighting) represents. As I quoted Mr. Bishop-Henchman, it can reflect a body with members who passionately care and where the voice of each is valued. That does not preclude rising to unproductive levels.

I believe the LNC failed each of my three reasons for defending Ms. Harlos. They failed to deliver what they demanded of Ms. Harlos; they failed to demonstrate when and how they earnestly heard Ms. Harlos' concerns; they failed to demonstrate how conflict with Ms. Harlos exceeded reasonable or expected levels (and in the case of timestamps, failed to distinguish which words of hers should be seen as conflict and rebuked).

These failures led to accepting Ms. Harlos' request to speak on her behalf, detailing concerns about future detriment to the body. These failures, I believe, reflect the current mischaracterization of my words, and the need for members of the LNC to reflect on their own leadership before suspending another.