

## Filing cover & attestation

Petition #1 — (a) Suspension of an affiliate party

FILED BY

**Caryn Harlos is a lifetime member of the Party.**

ATTESTATION

This amicus brief was filed by Caryn Harlos on their own behalf, who is a lifetime member of the Party, and who adopts, incorporates, endorses, and accepts ownership of the material contained within as their own, has signed this document accordingly, and attests that it is accurate and not filed to harass, delay, or for any improper purpose.

**LIBERTARIAN PARTY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE ("LPNH" or "Appellant")  
V.  
LIBERTARIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE ("LNC" or "Appellee")**

**In re: Disaffiliation for Cause**

**AMICUS OF CARYN ANN HARLOS DATED JULY 18, 2026  
IN SUPPORT OF LNC**

**BEFORE THE NATIONAL LIBERTARIAN PARTY  
JUDICIAL COMMITTEE ("JC")**

**PREFACE**

I have become aware of some new assertions made that are likely to make it into the record to which I would like to comment as below. As unpopular as such a statement may be, I once again urge once all members to stop using AI to come up with JC arguments. The second argument addressed below was so obviously contrived by AI so as to be painful.

**THE 2026 NATIONAL CONVENTION HEARD A MOTION TO  
DISAFFILIATE THE LPNH AND VOTED IT DOWN**

**That Literally Never Happened.** Such a motion was never made. Even if one was, it is questionable as to whether it would have been in order since the Bylaws grant disaffiliation power to the LNC and not the convention, see RONR (12<sup>th</sup> ed.) 49:7. Further, in a contrafactual reality in which this happened, the failure to pass a motion does not mean that the opposite position has been adopted, RONR (12<sup>th</sup> ed.) 10:12. In such a circumstance, persons may have held this is a matter for the LNC since the Bylaws would offer no JC appeal for such a decision made by the convention and may have disagreed on the vote threshold required (majority? 3/4 of all delegates?).

But to repeat: this recitation of history of false. While perhaps we might be seeing the Mandela Effect in action, on this timeline, that vote never occurred.

**INSTUTIONAL DECISIONS DIE WHEN BOARD MEMBERS CHANGE**

I would like to quote the exact statement I am responding to as even if it does not make it into the record as this statement, and others like it are floating around.

*It is a well-established organizational principle within the Party that the actions and policies of a previous Libertarian National Committee are not binding upon a newly elected LNC. This principle of institutional turnover and fresh electoral mandates must be applied equitably across all levels of Party governance. In the exact same manner that a new LNC operates free from the immediate constraints of its predecessors, the actions taken by a previous state executive board cannot be justly held against a current, duly elected state board. As demonstrated by the complete turnover in New Hampshire's leadership and the formal repudiation of the prior board's unconstitutional endorsement, the current LPNH Executive Committee is a distinct governing body. For the LNC to claim a fresh administrative mandate for itself while simultaneously revoking the charter of a state affiliate for the repudiated actions of a defunct predecessor is deeply inequitable and violates the basic standards of fair organizational governance.*

My first thought upon reading was.... well those are words. False words. False words hallucinated by AI. Because that is fundamentally incorrect on every possible level in a way only AI can achieve. Actions taken by a board remain in force for the organization until they are properly rescinded or amended or have expired.<sup>1</sup> There is no parliamentary rule that grants an automatic fresh start or nullifies prior decisions merely because of turnover in board membership. A moment's thought experiment bears this out. Who affiliated the LPNH? A past LNC. By this argument, this LNC was not even required to disaffiliate. It could have just declared it is not bound by the affiliation decision of a long-past LNC. But of course, that's not true. The Party (and Party affiliates) operate under Bylaws passed, sometimes decades ago. The LNC has a persistent policy manual that is followed. As to the attempted repudiation after the fact of disaffiliation, that has been addressed in other amicus.

**A tip for members. Nearly everything AI says on parliamentary procedure is wrong.**

Caryn Ann Harlos  
Life Member

---

<sup>1</sup> I refer the JC to my July 4, 2024 amicus, page 4 including footnote 4, and Exhibit 2, for the repudiation by putative convention delegates of the former LPCO board over a year ago.