

Amicus Curiae Brief

In the Case Of appeal of the suspension of Caryn Ann Harlos as LNC Secretary

I believe the interpretation of the Non-Aggression Principle (hereinafter NAP) by the LNC to include speech as force is improper and cannot be sustained under scrutiny. The NAP is part of the Statement of Principles of the Party and “may be amended only by the vote of 7/8 of all registered delegates at a regular convention”. This is a high bar to achieve, and for good reason, our principles should be ideals that are solid, not frequently changed, and provide our “North Star” to guide our deliberations.

The Statement of Principles presented on the LP Website as part of the platform specifically states that as part of the right to life (from which the NAP can be reasonably considered derived) “. . . we support the prohibition of the initiation of physical force against others;” It is in that light of “physical force” that almost all libertarians in my age group (50’s/60’s) reasonably understand it. I believe that the general understanding and most reasonable interpretation of the NAP would assume physical force and fraud were the potential offenses included in the prohibition. I suspect that most reasonable libertarians of my age group would be shocked to see the NAP applied to speech in the manner the LNC is attempting.

If we were to consider slander or harassment as “harmful speech” worthy of being considered as a violation of the NAP, one would think that such harms would need to be specifically detailed as to who was harmed and in what manner. With no apparent evidence of any individual having been slandered (a high bar to prove for a public figure, which all the LNC members are) being presented we would have to consider this bar not met.

In conclusion, the idea that Ms. Harlos violated the NAP by slandering or harassing individuals: 1) Has not been proven in any manner sufficient to be considered “cause” and 2) Is not a reasonable interpretational change to the Platform and Statement of Principles that the LNC is empowered to make outside of convention. Given these facts, I believe that the charge of a NAP violation against Ms. Harlos must be discarded in this case.

Respectfully Submitted

Michael F Meehan

Michael F. Meehan, CMRP, CRL, CMM

Maumee, Ohio