

On Mon, May 2, 2022 at 1:22 PM Uggadugga <uggadugganh@gmail.com> wrote:

Don,

The motion to "reinstate" those who were purged by your prior board did not even pass at the convention held on the 23rd. Or, am I mistaken? Furthermore even if it did, those members would not have been able to vote on the leadership of the current "Purge Party". Therefore rendering them powerless in regards to the new leadership. Your analogy about computers does not hold any water, and your current "party" is built on bad decisions and broken bylaws. Having a new captain of the same broken ship changes nothing as far as NH is concerned, a sentiment shared by other states as well. Since the petition was done in accordance to the bylaws, there is no question who the current leadership is, and that is the Andrew Cordio board.

Sincerely,

Nolan Pelletier, Chair LPNH

---

On Mon, May 2, 2022, 3:25 PM Don Graham <dongr2009@gmail.com> wrote:

Thank you for including me in this email chain regarding the judicial committee meeting from last week.

One of the comments that has been made is in regards to the legitimacy of the new MA state committee based on the legitimacy of the previous state committee.

That should not be the crux of determining legitimacy. The matter at hand is what members may do under the LAMA bylaws when they disagree with their state committee, or what former members may do.

Depending on your perspective, the members in question are either members, or they are not.

If they are not members as determined by the previous MA state committee on Jan 10th, then they had no further recourse under the bylaws as they would be former members of the organization with no afforded rights. In order to vote in the MA state convention, you are required to be dues paying members under the bylaws.

If they are members, then their recourse under the bylaws would have been to submit a petition with the required number of signatures. Had they done so, it may have been responded to as their previous one.

If I may suggest a computer programming example to illustrate, the bylaws are like a programmer writing a loop that will never once entered. The only way to get out of the loop is to reboot the computer. The April 23rd convention was the reboot and it was put there by the previous state committee when they scheduled the annual convention.

Prior to my election I had reached out to some of the people on this chain and attempted to serve as a mediator in negotiations. I advised the Cordio members at the time that the next best option besides a negotiated compromise would be the April 23rd convention for the reasons explained above. They chose to pursue a separate convention which is not supported under our bylaws.

My commitment as the new LAMA chair is to resolve this between the two parties before the Reno convention.

---

On Mon, May 2, 2022 at 1:31 PM Caryn Ann Harlos <carynannharlos@gmail.com> wrote:

I am writing in my capacity as a signatory member.

Mr. Graham is completely incorrect, in my opinion, from a parliamentary perspective and a plain reading of the Constitution (not bylaws).

They were members when they filed the petition for a special convention. The special convention MUST have been called which the state committee refused to do but instead expelled them ostensibly for the petition but Ms. Crawford admitted it was a dragnet to get rid of people merely who belonged to a caucus she didn't like and that anyone who could prove they were not a member of the caucus would be let back in one by one (see link to LNC meeting filed earlier). Thus there was no legitimate expulsion (and it also was not procedurally sufficient under both the bylaws and constitution).

Thus they are members and remain members. This brings up the additional wrinkle of the alleged convention in which Mr. Graham was allegedly elected Chair as invalid by reason of it being a continuing breach of the governing documents by excluding from voting rolls legitimate members.

No matter which avenue one goes down, the current alleged LAMA board is illegitimate, either because a new board was elected at the special convention and then again at the annual convention called by them or due to the exclusion of valid voting members at the "other LAMA convention" who were attempted to be expelled in an action that national Vice-Chair Ken Moellman rightly called "simply awful."

I will leave it to the wrongfully "expelled" members to speak on this, but Mr. Graham has appeared to tell them there will be no resolution before Reno in screenshots I have seen. Perhaps they were misunderstood as text on social media seems inherently ripe to be misunderstood. However, it is up to them to decide what would resolution would be satisfactory. As a signatory member, but not a member of the aggrieved MA members who have ultimate say, the only JUST resolution is to recognize the member convention where everyone remains a member, the governing documents remain the same and move on from there with the alleged delegates selected at the invalid convention in which Mr. Graham was elected being voluntarily accepted as new alternates at the end of the whatever alternates were "elected" at the illegitimate LAMA convention. That is more than fair, and I believe the delegates in Reno will agree. Whether Mr.

Graham and his fellows wish to see this, in a time of great division in our Party, a unifying issue has emerged: agreement that what was done on 1/10 was simply awful.

I wish Mr. Graham (who had no part in the expulsions) and everyone else the best of luck in resolving but remind them that any such resolution has to be in accordance with your governing documents (and not as illegitimately amended in the alleged recent convention for the reasons stated above).

I don't find these discussions to be a waste of time even though they are not directly relevant to this appeal which is limited to the sustainment of the ruling of the chair for these reasons:

1. It is clear by the Delaware ruling that the sustainment was improper thus the LNC is going to have to hear the Bowen resolution
2. No matter which way that resolution is decided there will likely be another appeal
3. The JC will then have a head start on that appeal (though I think it needs to hear from the LAMA Board in control at the time of the alleged removals and not an innocent party like Mr. Graham)
4. I do believe the JC can issue non-binding guidance to the LNC on how it would rule on a potential future appeal (barring any additional radically different facts brought to its attention)

I thank Mr. Graham for his efforts and the JC for its hard work.

As a signatory member, I, however, want to hear from the board in control at the time of the acts in question. I wish Mr. Graham was on the board at that time. I suspect none of this would have happened.

In Liberty,

*Caryn Ann Harlos*

---

On Mon, May 2, 2022 at 1:38 PM Caryn Ann Harlos <carynannharlos@gmail.com> wrote:

I see I bungled something.

To me, speaking as a signatory member, the only rightful resolution is this:

1. The special member convention was valid and thus their annual convention is the valid one and the valid board. Whatever delegates were elected at the invalid "LAMA" convention be agreed to be added in a gentleman's agreement to the end of whatever ranked alternates were already elected at the valid convention. It appears that this can be done under the current governing documents. This would avoid a floor fight and provide a clear and JUST path forward.

Allowing the purger faction to dictate the terms simply isn't justice in my opinion. However it is the opinion of the aggrieved MA members that ultimately matters.

In Liberty,

*Caryn Ann Harlos*

---

On Mon, May 2, 2022 at 1:47 PM Caryn Ann Harlos <carynannharlos@gmail.com> wrote:

To add to Mr. Pelletier, Colorado joined in on a Florida resolution condemning the actions of the purge. Between those two states, they comprise nearly 9% of the national membership.

I urge Mr. Graham to consider what I laid out. This has nothing to do with caucuses. Mr. Moellman is part of no caucus, and I believe his voice represents the opinion of the everyday Libertarian who doesn't care about caucuses one bit. If this is left to Reno, I believe the everyday Libertarian will be disgusted by what happened and you risk having no one seated from the illegitimate LAMA convention or MA having no voice at all. I may be wrong. It won't be the first time, it won't even be the first time today.

In Liberty,

*Caryn Ann Harlos*

---

On Mon, May 2, 2022 at 2:30 PM Don Graham <dongr2009@gmail.com> wrote:

The Cordio committee seems to have derived its authority from the fact that 2 board members who were expelled could call for a convention, or rule on a petition, under our bylaws.

Our bylaws also state a required number for a quorum to meet as a state committee. The two former state committee members would not have met that quorum.

The other argument is that because the previous state committee did not act within its own bylaws, that the members had a right to take matters in their own hands. The only recourse in the bylaws is petition and to vote in a convention called by the state committee.

Thus the actions of the Cordio committee were improper and the convention on April 23rd was the one that is the LAMA convention.