

Filing cover & attestation

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

FILED BY

Justin O'Donnell is a lifetime member of the Party.

ATTESTATION

This amicus brief was filed by Justin O'Donnell 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.

BEFORE THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE LIBERTARIAN PARTY

IN RE: Revocation of Affiliate Status of the Libertarian Party of New Hampshire

BRIEF AMICUS CURIAE OF LIFETIME MEMBER JUSTIN O'DONNELL IN OPPOSITION TO THE PETITION FOR REVIEW AND REVERSAL, AND IN SUBMISSION OF PROCEDURALLY DEFICIENT CONTEXT ON BEHALF OF THE OPPOSITION

I. INTEREST OF THE AMICUS CURIAE

Amicus Justin O'Donnell is a lifetime member of both the national Libertarian Party and the Libertarian Party of New Hampshire. Out of a sense of pure, exhausted benevolence for the procedurally illiterate, Amicus submits this brief to assist the Judicial Committee in reviewing materials that the opposition desperately wished to place before this body but lacked the basic administrative competence to submit correctly.

Recently, Austin Martin and a collection of six state chairs attempted to file a combined amicus brief. However, because they fundamentally failed to comprehend that *affiliates are not members of the national party*, their filings were rightfully flagged under Judicial Committee Rule 2.5 and ultimately rejected as "Dilatory Spam" by the Judicial Committee Chair. Rather than watching these chairs continue to flood the committee's email servers with non-compliant attachments, Amicus has stepped forward as a legitimate, dues-paying individual Lifetime Member to enter their exact arguments and attached appendices into the official record. This ensures that the Judicial Committee may fully observe the depth of the opposition's strategic bankruptcy and their comical lack of original thought, not to mention their inexplicably heavy use of the em dash in their "writing."

II. ARGUMENT

A. The Incomprehensible Inability of the Opposition to Follow Simple Instructions

The attempt of Mr. Martin to file a brief on behalf of 6 state chairs is a masterclass in reading comprehension failure. Despite operating under a national framework that explicitly separates corporate affiliate charters from individual memberships, these chairs could not figure out how to simply sign their names as individual party members to comply with the rules.

If the leadership of six entire state affiliates cannot navigate a single-page procedural rule enforced by the Judicial Committee Chair, it is a self-evident truth that they possess zero standing to lecture the Libertarian National Committee on how to interpret complex national

bylaws. To ensure this Committee can review their defective attempt in its entirety, the rejected text is provided verbatim below:

[VERBATIM REJECTED FILING]

BEFORE THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE LIBERTARIAN PARTY

In re Revocation of Affiliate Status of the Libertarian Party of New Hampshire

BRIEF OF SIX STATE LIBERTARIAN PARTY AFFILIATES AS AMICI CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER

INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE

Amici are six state-level affiliate parties of the Libertarian Party, each chartered under Article 5 of the Libertarian Party Bylaws. Amici have invested years of effort fielding candidates, recruiting members, administering elections, and advancing liberty under the auspices and brand of the Libertarian Party.

Amici write neither to adjudicate the internal affairs of LPNH nor to endorse any position it has taken. Amici write because the precedent set by the Libertarian National Committee on May 25, 2026, raises a concern of grave institutional importance to every affiliate of this Party.

In 2021, the LNC established a formal model—embodied in the Jarvis Resolution and the Dixon Committee report—governing how the LNC would intervene in the affairs of state affiliates. That model promised notice, investigation, enumerated findings, and reasoned process before any intervention was undertaken. Amici have continued to invest in the Libertarian Party for years in reliance on that commitment. The LNC's summary disaffiliation of LPNH executed without a single element of the established model signals to every affiliate that the LNC may revoke its affiliates' status at will, without notice, without investigation, and without cause. We urge this Committee to reject that signal, restore the model, and make clear that the Libertarian Party honors its obligations to its affiliates.

ARGUMENT

I. The 2021 Jarvis Resolution and Dixon Committee Established a Normative Model of Notice and Reasoned Process for LNC Intervention in Affiliate Affairs.

In June 2021, following an internal dispute within LPNH during which then-LNC Chair Joe Bishop-Henchman interceded on behalf of one faction, the LNC adopted a resolution forming an ad hoc committee to investigate those events. The committee (the "Dixon Committee") was chaired by Pat Dixon, a current member of this Judicial Committee.

The Jarvis Resolution was not merely a response to one dispute. It was a deliberate act of institutional architecture. The resolution expressly charged the Dixon Committee to "set forth a model of investigating internal matters" and, more specifically, to "set forth a model of investigating internal issues not covered by the Judicial Committee, Bylaws, and Policy Manual."

Dixon Committee Report (Aug. 30, 2021) at 8-9. The LNC directed the committee to "report back to the LNC for a debriefing of the findings, recommendations, and final thoughts upon the investigation being determined complete by the committee." Id. at 9.

The Dixon Committee fulfilled this charge through rigorous, systematic investigation. It "interview[ed] pertinent members" of both organizations. Id. at 8. It "review[ed] any pertinent party run or personal electronic communications of the parties involved." Id. It undertook "an examination of the facts, evidence and reasoned analysis." Id. at 10. Committee Chair Dixon personally prepared "an evidence folder," "wrote a project charter and project plan," and "created a timeline of events, list of questions to ask, and contact list." Id. at 22. The committee reviewed numerous specific documents and social media posts. Id. at 25-31.

The Dixon Committee then issued a formal written report with specific findings and recommendations. Among its conclusions: there had been "intentional interference in a state party by individual LNC actors," including the then-LNC Chair, "using their LNC titles to influence an outcome of a convention in a state where they do not reside." This was not a vague declaration of displeasure. It was a documented, reasoned institutional judgment, reached after investigation, with specific evidence.

The Jarvis Resolution and Dixon Committee report together created a governing model for LNC intervention in affiliate affairs: a formally charged committee; interviews of pertinent parties; review of evidence; reasoned analysis; enumerated findings; specific recommendations. Affiliates across the country observed this process and were entitled to understand it as the framework within which the LNC would operate whenever it intervened in their affairs.

II. Amici Have Relied on the Dixon Model in Investing in the Libertarian Party.

Amici are not merely observers of the Libertarian Party. We are its constituent parts. We recruit candidates, grow memberships, manage state ballot-access filings, host conventions, and perform the daily work of building a national political movement under the LP name and brand. This work is expensive, time-consuming, and often personally costly to the volunteers who make it possible.

When amici chose to build within the Libertarian Party rather than independently—adopt and use the LP name, to satisfy affiliation requirements, to operate under LP bylaws—we did so understanding that the relationship between affiliates and the national party would be governed by fair and established norms. The Jarvis Resolution and Dixon Committee model were central to that understanding. When the LNC committed by formal resolution to a "model" of "investigating internal issues" through structured notice, evidence-gathering, reasoned analysis, and enumerated findings, affiliates were entitled to rely on that commitment.

That reliance was not passive. Amici have continued to operate under LP affiliation, to expend resources under the LP brand, and to trust that if the LNC ever believed we had violated the party's bylaws, it would follow its own model: notify us, investigate, give us an opportunity to

respond, and issue findings before taking any action. We did not anticipate that the LNC might one day disaffiliate one of our number in under thirty minutes, without a list of charges, without prior notice to the affiliate, and without the faintest gesture toward investigation.

III. The LNC's Unilateral Departure from Its Established Model Triggers Settled Principles of Voluntary Association Law.

A. The Jarvis Resolution Constitutes a Binding Commitment to Affiliates.

The bylaws of a voluntary association form a contract with its members. *Polin v. Kaplan*, 257 N.Y. 277, 281 (1931) (Cardozo, J.) ("The constitution and by-laws of an unincorporated association express the terms of a contract which define the privileges secured and the duties assumed by those who have become members."); *Taboada v. Sociedad Espanola*, 191 Cal. 187, 191-92, 215 P. 673 (1923) (right to hearing under association bylaws is "not a mere pretense but a real substantial, enforceable right").

Formal LNC resolutions are part of the Party's governing fabric. State affiliates are parties to this relationship. When the LNC commits by formal motion to a "model" governing its intervention in affiliate affairs, that commitment becomes part of the associational contract, binding on the LNC in its dealings with every affiliate.

The Dixon model is not merely aspirational. It was codified in a formal report, explicitly endorsed by the LNC as a normative standard, and published to all affiliates. Where an association commits to specific procedures, those promises are binding, and members may not be expelled without them. See *Hackethal v. California Med. Ass'n*, 138 Cal. App. 3d 435, 187 Cal. Rptr. 811 (1982) (court ordered association to grant the fair hearing it had promised in its bylaws). The LNC cannot now repudiate this commitment unilaterally.

B. Affiliates Are Entitled to the Protections of Promissory Estoppel.

Even setting aside direct contract analysis, the doctrine of promissory estoppel provides an independent basis for relief. To invoke promissory estoppel, a claimant must show: (1) a clear and definite promise; (2) that the promisor should have expected to induce reliance; (3) that the promisee reasonably and detrimentally relied; and (4) that injustice can only be avoided by enforcement. Restatement (Second) of Contracts § 90; see also *Hoffman v. Red Owl Stores, Inc.*, 26 Wis. 2d 683, 133 N.W.2d 267 (1965).

Each element is met here. The Jarvis Resolution is a clear and definite promise of process. The LNC should have foreseen that affiliates would rely on this model in continuing their relationship with the national party. Affiliates have invested years of organizational effort on the reasonable understanding that this model would govern any LNC intervention in their affairs. It would be manifestly unjust to allow the LNC to collect the benefits of decades of state affiliate labor, and then discard the procedural protections it expressly promised at the very moment those protections are most needed.

C. Courts Require Fair Procedure in Voluntary Association Discipline.

The broader backdrop is clear: courts do not allow voluntary associations to discipline members arbitrarily or to violate their own governing commitments without consequence. See *Pinsker v. Pacific Coast Soc'y of Orthodontists*, 12 Cal. 3d 541, 550, 526 P.2d 253 (1974) ("[W]henever a private association is legally required to refrain from arbitrary action, the association's action must be both substantively rational and procedurally fair."); Hackethal, 187 Cal. Rptr. at 811 (court ordered association to grant fair hearing it had promised). While this Committee is not a civil court, these principles reflect the normative framework within which all voluntary associations including political parties are expected to operate. The LP's own bylaws reflect this understanding: Article 5 §6 requires disaffiliation "for cause," invoking the same standards of specificity and fairness that courts have long required.

IV. The Record Confirms the LNC's Departure Was Deliberate and Demonstrates Exactly Why the Dixon Model Exists.

This is not a case where the LNC inadvertently failed to follow its own procedures. The record makes the deliberate nature of the departure unmistakable.

On May 25, 2026, LNC member Alfa Shaw moved to add to the agenda the formation of an investigatory committee on the potential disaffiliation of LPNH—that is, to follow the Dixon model. The motion was rejected on voice vote. Shaw then moved to amend the disaffiliation motion to require investigation first: "If we're going to do something as large as disaffiliating one state, I would like to produce a report [enumerating specific violations]." That too was defeated.

Austin Martin, Chair of the Hawaii Libertarian Party, urged the LNC from the floor: "due process consists of two elements: notice and an opportunity to respond. What you're about to do will have a massive impact on state bodies, plural, and on the composition of this body, and it would properly be considered a disciplinary action for which we have given no notice and opportunity to respond." He warned that the action "would be easily shown" to be "a snap decision made after the heat of the convention." His warnings were ignored.

A member voting in favor of disaffiliation acknowledged on the record: "I may not have a list of particulars this happened in such and such a time... but we all know what's been going on up there." A final speaker in favor pointed to a social media post and said simply: "I'm actually not going to say anything else."

This is precisely the conduct the Jarvis Resolution was designed to prevent. The LNC committed in 2021 to a model that would require investigation before action, enumerated findings rather than "big picture" impressions, and specific evidence rather than general notoriety. On May 25, 2026, the LNC was offered that very model by two of its own members and chose to reject it deliberately, on the record.

V. This Committee Should Reverse the Disaffiliation to Protect Party Unity, Fundamental

Fairness, and the Party's Legal Obligations.

The stakes of this proceeding extend far beyond LPNH. The question before this Committee is whether the LNC's commitment to a model of fair affiliate intervention means anything at all. If the LNC can disaffiliate a state party in thirty minutes without notice, without charges, without investigation, in direct repudiation of its own established procedures—then no affiliate in the country can trust that its affiliation is secure.

Amici ask this Committee to consider what that world looks like. State affiliates cannot recruit candidates, grow memberships, and build organizations under the LP brand if the brand's protections can be revoked at will, based on general impressions and without a list of particulars. The national party's value to its affiliates depends in part on the stability and fairness of its internal governance. A national party that can disaffiliate state organizations arbitrarily, at a moment of political frustration, has no meaningful model only a perpetual threat.

This Committee has both the authority and the obligation to prevent that outcome. Article 5 §6 requires disaffiliation "for cause." Article 8 §2(a) establishes this Committee as the appellate body over affiliate suspensions precisely because the Bylaws contemplate that the LNC might sometimes exceed its authority. This is such a case.

Amici respectfully urge this Committee to:

- Reverse the LNC's purported disaffiliation of LPNH and order reinstatement; or
- In the alternative, order the formation of an investigatory committee modeled on the Dixon Committee—the very procedure the LNC itself established in 2021 and whose revival was blocked on May 25, 2026.

Either remedy restores the model on which affiliates have relied. Either remedy protects party unity. Either remedy honors the Party's obligations to the affiliates who have built it. And either remedy sends the essential message to every state party: the Libertarian Party means what it says.

CONCLUSION

The Jarvis Resolution and Dixon Committee did not merely resolve a 2021 dispute. They established a promise made to every affiliate of the Libertarian Party—that LNC intervention in affiliate affairs would be conducted with notice, investigation, reasoned analysis, and enumerated findings. Amici have relied on that promise in choosing to invest in this Party, build under this brand, and operate under these bylaws.

The LNC's May 25, 2026 disaffiliation of LPNH is a deliberate repudiation of that promise, executed without charges, without investigation, and against the explicit counsel of multiple LNC members urging basic fairness. For the reasons set forth above, amici respectfully urge this Committee to reverse the disaffiliation of LPNH—or in the alternative to order a Dixon-style investigatory committee—and to affirm that the Libertarian Party will honor its commitments to its affiliates.

Respectfully submitted,

George Stamper, *Chair of LPNV on behalf of the Libertarian Party of Nevada*

Josiah Baker, *Chair of LPTN on behalf of the Libertarian Party of Tennessee*

Dane Courtois, *Chair of LPME on behalf of the Libertarian Party of Maine*

Sonja Feintech, *Chair of LPO on behalf of the Libertarian Party of Oregon*

Austin Martin, *Chair of LPHI on behalf of the Libertarian Party of Hawaii*

Patrick McNally, *Chair of LPNE on behalf of the Libertarian Party of Nebraska*

B. The Hilarious Absence of Original Thought Among Intervening Affiliates

If the Judicial Committee shifts its gaze to Appendices A through D of this brief, a stunning comedic performance unfolds. The Libertarian Parties of Delaware, Hawaii, Maine, and Oregon all proudly passed local executive resolutions regarding "State Affiliate Speech Autonomy"

Appendix A: Delaware Resolution

Appendix B: Hawaii Resolution

Appendix C: Maine Resolution

Appendix D: Oregon Resolution

A text-by-text review reveals that these "independent, sovereign state boards" possess a collective hive-mind. The resolutions are so explicitly identical that Delaware literally forgot to strip out the phrase "*Adapted as appropriate for adoption by any state-level affiliate*" from the top of its finalized document.

Every single one of these groups regurgitates the exact same copy-pasted "WHEREAS" clauses in the exact same order, mourning a lack of national authority to "police" social media, crying about the 2021 New Hampshire matter, and demanding identical multi-step investigation metrics.

This complete deficit of original thought demonstrates that the regional leadership teams supporting LPNH are not engaging in serious, localized deliberative governance. They are simply printing out a pre-formulated template distributed by a central pro-Kauffman faction. It is highly ironic that a group of caucuses screaming about "national centralization" cannot even draft a localized resolution without using a centralized corporate boilerplate.

III. CONCLUSION & RELIEF SOUGHT

The Judicial Committee should note the sheer administrative chaos and lack of diligence defining the appellant's network of support. The LNC acted lawfully, properly, and on an undisputed factual record. The rejected amicus and copy-pasted resolutions entered here

prove that the opposition's defense is built entirely on generic templates and procedural delays.

Amicus respectfully requests that the Judicial Committee **DENY** the LPNH petition in its entirety and **AFFIRM** the disaffiliation.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 15, 2026

Justin O'Donnell

Lifetime Member, Libertarian Party and LPNH

Manchester, New Hampshire

APPENDIX A: DELAWARE RESOLUTION (ADOPTED JUNE 25, 2026)

Adopting body: Libertarian Party of Delaware State Board

MODEL RESOLUTION FOR STATE AFFILIATE SPEECH AUTONOMY

Affirming Affiliate Autonomy and Procedural Due Process Within the Libertarian Party

Adapted as appropriate for adoption by any state-level affiliate Executive Committee. Bracketed items indicate fill-in fields.

WHEREAS, Libertarian Party of Delaware is a chartered state-level affiliate of the Libertarian Party;

WHEREAS, Article 5, Section 5 of the Libertarian Party Bylaws provides that "the autonomy of the affiliate and sub-affiliate parties shall not be abridged by the National Committee or any other committee of the Party, except as provided by these bylaws";

WHEREAS, the strength and integrity of the Libertarian Party have historically depended on the deliberative independence of its state affiliates, who reflect the political character and judgment of their respective state memberships;

WHEREAS, recent action by the Libertarian National Committee raises questions of broad institutional concern about the scope of national authority over state affiliate communications and the procedural standards governing affiliate discipline;

WHEREAS, the Bylaws of the Libertarian Party contain no express grant of authority to the National Committee to police the social-media or other speech of state affiliates beyond the specific affiliate-conduct prohibitions stated in Article 5, Section 4;

WHEREAS, the National Committee's own most recently applied procedural standards for affiliate discipline - as demonstrated in the 2021 New Hampshire matter and the 2022 New Mexico matter - included advance notice to the affiliate, articulation of specific alleged conduct, opportunity to be heard, and in the 2021 matter the convening of an investigatory committee to develop the record before any sanction;

WHEREAS, departure from those standards in any future affiliate-discipline matter would expose every state affiliate to discipline without procedural safeguards;

WHEREAS, the State Board of The Libertarian Party of Delaware takes no position in this Resolution on the merits of any specific affiliate's conduct or any pending appellate proceeding, but addresses only the institutional principles governing

affiliate autonomy and procedural fairness;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. The Libertarian Party of Delaware affirms the autonomy of state affiliates as guaranteed by Article 5, Section 5 of the Bylaws, and the right of state affiliates to determine their own messaging and communications consistent with the Bylaws and the Statement of Principles.
2. The Libertarian Party of Delaware expresses concern about any assertion of National Committee authority to police state affiliate communications absent express bylaws authorization, and calls for the National Committee to articulate, with clarity and in writing, the textual bylaws basis for any such assertion of authority.
3. The Libertarian Party of Delaware urges that any disciplinary action by the National Committee against any affiliate be conducted with: (a) advance written notice to the affiliate; (b) particularized articulation of the specific conduct alleged and the specific bylaws provision alleged to have been violated; (c) a meaningful opportunity for the affiliate to respond before any vote; and (d) the convening of an investigatory committee to develop the factual record where the alleged conduct is material or contested - consistent with the National Committee's own most recent applied precedent.
4. The Libertarian Party of Delaware calls upon the National Committee to adopt and publish, through the appropriate bylaws or policy-manual process, written standards governing affiliate-discipline procedure, so that affiliates and their members may understand in advance the procedures by which their status may be reviewed.
5. The Libertarian Party of Delaware directs its Chair to transmit a copy of this Resolution to the Chair and Secretary of the Libertarian National Committee, to the Chair of the Judicial Committee, and to the chairs of the other state-level affiliates.

Vote: Adopted by the State Board of the Libertarian Party of Delaware on

6/25/26 by a recorded vote of 5 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.

Prakash Seshadri, MD, *Chair Libertarian Party of Delaware*

APPENDIX B: HAWAII RESOLUTION (ADOPTED JUNE 24, 2026)

Adopting body: Executive Committee of The Libertarian Party of Hawaii

RESOLUTION FOR STATE AFFILIATE SPEECH AUTONOMY

Affirming Affiliate Autonomy and Procedural Due Process Within the Libertarian Party

Adopting body: Executive Committee of The Libertarian Party of Hawaii

Adopted: June 24, 2026

WHEREAS, The Libertarian Party of Hawaii is a chartered state-level affiliate of the Libertarian Party;

WHEREAS, Article 5, Section 5 of the Libertarian Party Bylaws provides that "the autonomy of the affiliate and sub-affiliate parties shall not be abridged by the National Committee or any other committee of the Party, except as provided by these bylaws";

WHEREAS, the strength and integrity of the Libertarian Party have historically depended on the deliberative independence of its state affiliates, who reflect the political character and judgment of their respective state memberships;

WHEREAS, recent action by the Libertarian National Committee raises questions of broad institutional concern about the scope of national authority over state affiliate communications and the procedural standards governing affiliate discipline;

WHEREAS, the Bylaws of the Libertarian Party contain no express grant of authority to the National Committee to police the social-media or other speech of state affiliates beyond the specific affiliate-conduct prohibitions stated in Article 5, Section 4;

WHEREAS, the National Committee's own most recently applied procedural standards for affiliate discipline — as demonstrated in the 2021 New Hampshire matter and the 2022 New Mexico matter — included advance notice to the affiliate, articulation of specific alleged conduct, opportunity to be heard, and in the 2021 matter the convening of an investigatory committee to develop the record before any sanction;

WHEREAS, departure from those standards in any future affiliate-discipline matter would expose every state affiliate to discipline without procedural safeguards;

WHEREAS, the Executive Committee of The Libertarian Party of Hawaii takes no position in this Resolution on the merits of any specific affiliate's conduct or any pending appellate proceeding, but addresses only the institutional principles governing affiliate autonomy and procedural fairness;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. **The Libertarian Party of Hawaii affirms** the autonomy of state affiliates as guaranteed by Article 5, Section 5 of the Bylaws, and the right of state affiliates to determine their own messaging and communications consistent with the Bylaws and the Statement of Principles.
2. **The Libertarian Party of Hawaii expresses concern** about any assertion of National Committee authority to police state affiliate communications absent express bylaws authorization, and calls for the National Committee to articulate, with clarity and in writing, the textual bylaws basis for any such assertion of authority.
3. **The Libertarian Party of Hawaii urges** that any disciplinary action by the National Committee against any affiliate be conducted with: (a) advance written notice to the affiliate; (b) particularized articulation of the specific conduct alleged and the specific bylaws provision alleged to have been violated; (c) a meaningful opportunity for the affiliate to respond before any vote; and (d) the convening of an investigatory committee to develop the factual record where the alleged conduct is material or contested — consistent with the National Committee's own most recent applied precedent.
4. **The Libertarian Party of Hawaii calls upon the National Committee** to adopt and publish, through the appropriate bylaws or policy-manual process, written standards governing affiliate-discipline procedure, so that affiliates and their members may understand in advance the procedures by which their status may be reviewed.
5. **The Libertarian Party of Hawaii directs its Chair** to transmit a copy of this Resolution to the Chair and Secretary of the Libertarian National Committee, to

the Chair of the Judicial Committee, and to the chairs of the other state-level affiliates.

Vote

Adopted by the Executive Committee of The Libertarian Party of Hawaii by unanimous vote.

Austin Martin, Chair The Libertarian Party of Hawaii

Abbra Green, Secretary The Libertarian Party of Hawaii

APPENDIX C: MAINE RESOLUTION (ADOPTED JUNE 10, 2026)

Adopting body: Executive Committee of The Libertarian Party of Maine

RESOLUTION FOR STATE AFFILIATE AUTONOMY

Affirming Affiliate Autonomy and Procedural Due Process Within the Libertarian Party

Adopting body: Executive Committee of The Libertarian Party of Maine

Adopted: 6/10/2026

WHEREAS, the Libertarian Party of Maine is a chartered, state-level affiliate of the Libertarian Party; and

WHEREAS, Article 5, Section 5 of the Libertarian Party Bylaws explicitly provides that "the autonomy of the affiliate and sub-affiliate parties shall not be abridged by the National Committee or any other committee of the Party, except as provided by these bylaws"; and

WHEREAS, the strength and integrity of the Libertarian Party have historically depended on the deliberative independence of its state affiliates to reflect the political character and judgment of their respective state memberships; and

WHEREAS, recent actions by the Libertarian National Committee regarding the disaffiliation of the Libertarian Party of New Hampshire raise broad institutional concerns about the scope of national authority over state affiliate communications and the procedural standards governing affiliate discipline; and
WHEREAS, the Bylaws of the Libertarian Party contain no express grant of authority to the National Committee to police the social media or other communications of state affiliates beyond the specific affiliate-conduct prohibitions enumerated in Article 5, Section 4; and

WHEREAS, the National Committee's own past procedural standards for affiliate discipline—as demonstrated in the 2021 New Hampshire matter and the 2022 New Mexico matter—included advance notice to the affiliate, particularized articulation of alleged conduct, a meaningful opportunity to be heard, and the convening of an investigatory committee to develop an objective record prior to issuing sanctions; and

WHEREAS, the current Executive Committee of the Libertarian Party of New Hampshire is distinct from the past leadership body that issued the controversial 2024 presidential endorsements, rendering the recent disaffiliation a form of collective punishment applied to an altered governing body; and

WHEREAS, Article 5, Section 6 of the Libertarian Party Bylaws mandates that the Judicial Committee must rule within 30 days of an appeal or the National Committee's revocation is automatically affirmed, effectively creating a mechanism where judicial inaction deprives a state affiliate of a definitive ruling on the merits, rendering the process structurally insufficient to safeguard affiliates against the party's most severe disciplinary penalty; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Committee of the Libertarian Party of Maine takes no position in this Resolution on the underlying merits of any specific affiliate's messaging, but addresses exclusively the vital institutional principles of affiliate autonomy and procedural fairness;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. The Libertarian Party of Maine affirms the autonomy of state affiliates as guaranteed by Article 5, Section 5 of the Bylaws, including the right of state affiliates to determine their own messaging and communications consistent with the national Bylaws and the Statement of Principles.
2. The Libertarian Party of Maine expresses grave concern regarding any assertion of National Committee authority to police state affiliate communications absent explicit bylaws authorization, and calls upon the National Committee to articulate, clearly and in writing, the exact textual basis for any such assertion of authority.
3. The Libertarian Party of Maine urges that any future disciplinary action by the National Committee against any affiliate strictly adhere to fundamental due process, ensuring:
 - a. Advance written notice to the affected affiliate;

b. A particularized articulation of the specific conduct alleged and the exact bylaws provisions violated;

c. A meaningful, timely opportunity for the affiliate to respond before a vote is called;

d. The convening of an independent investigatory committee to develop the factual record when the alleged conduct is material or contested; and

e. Absolute clarity regarding undefined terms within party policy, such as what constitutes an "official endorsement" rising to the level of cause for disaffiliation.

4. The Libertarian Party of Maine calls upon the National Committee to adopt and publish formal, written standards within the Policy Manual governing affiliate-discipline procedures, ensuring affiliates can clearly anticipate the metrics and mechanisms by which their charter status may be evaluated or revoked.

5. The Libertarian Party of Maine directs its Chair to transmit a copy of this Resolution to the Libertarian National Committee, and to the Chair of the Judicial Committee.

Vote

Adopted by the Executive Committee of The Libertarian Party of Maine on [6/10/2026] by a recorded vote of [7 *in favor*, 0 *opposed*, 1 *abstain*].

Dane Courtois, Chair of The Libertarian Party of Maine

Ben Tucker, Secretary of The Libertarian Party of Maine

APPENDIX D: OREGON RESOLUTION (ADOPTED JUNE 6, 2026)

Adopting body: Executive Committee of Libertarian Party of Oregon

LPO RESOLUTION FOR STATE AFFILIATE SPEECH AUTONOMY

Affirming Affiliate Autonomy and Procedural Due Process Within the Libertarian Party

Adopting body: Executive Committee of Libertarian Party of Oregon

Adopted: 6/6/2026

WHEREAS, Libertarian Party of Oregon is a chartered state-level affiliate of the Libertarian Party;

WHEREAS, Article 5, Section 5 of the Libertarian Party Bylaws provides that "the autonomy of the affiliate and sub-affiliate parties shall not be abridged by the National Committee or any other committee of the Party, except as provided by these bylaws";

WHEREAS, the strength and integrity of the Libertarian Party have historically depended on the deliberative independence of its state affiliates, who reflect the political character and judgment of their respective state memberships;

WHEREAS, recent action by the Libertarian National Committee raises questions of broad institutional concern about the scope of national authority over state affiliate communications and the procedural standards governing affiliate discipline;

WHEREAS, the Bylaws of the Libertarian Party contain no express grant of authority to the National Committee to police the social-media or other speech of state affiliates beyond the specific affiliate-conduct prohibitions stated in Article 5, Section 4;

WHEREAS, the National Committee's own most recently applied procedural standards for affiliate discipline — as demonstrated in the 2021 New Hampshire matter and the 2022 New Mexico matter — included advance notice to the affiliate, articulation of

specific alleged conduct, opportunity to be heard, and in the 2021 matter the convening of an investigatory committee to develop the record before any sanction;

WHEREAS, departure from those standards in any future affiliate-discipline matter would expose every state affiliate to discipline without procedural safeguards;

WHEREAS, the Executive Committee of the Libertarian Party of Oregon takes no position in this Resolution on the merits of any specific affiliate's conduct or any pending appellate proceeding, but addresses only the institutional principles governing affiliate autonomy and procedural fairness;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. **Libertarian Party of Oregon affirms** the autonomy of state affiliates as guaranteed by Article 5, Section 5 of the Bylaws, and the right of state affiliates to determine their own messaging and communications consistent with the Bylaws and the Statement of Principles.
2. **Libertarian Party of Oregon expresses concern** about any assertion of National Committee authority to police state affiliate communications absent express bylaws authorization, and calls for the National Committee to articulate, with clarity and in writing, the textual bylaws basis for any such assertion of authority.
3. **Libertarian Party of Oregon urges** that any disciplinary action by the National Committee against any affiliate be conducted with: (a) advance written notice to the affiliate; (b) particularized articulation of the specific conduct alleged and the specific bylaws provision alleged to have been violated; (c) a meaningful opportunity for the affiliate to respond before any vote; and (d) the convening of an investigatory committee to develop the factual record where the alleged conduct is material or contested — consistent with the National Committee's own most recent applied precedent.
4. **Libertarian Party of Oregon calls upon the National Committee** to adopt and publish, through the appropriate bylaws or policy-manual process, written standards governing affiliate-discipline procedure, so that affiliates and their members may understand in advance the procedures by which their status may be reviewed.
5. **Libertarian Party of Oregon directs its Chair** to transmit a copy of this Resolution to the Chair and Secretary of the Libertarian National Committee.

Vote

Adopted by the Executive Committee of **Libertarian Party of Oregon** on June 6th 2026 by a recorded vote and ***Passed without objection***

Sonja Feintech, Chair **Libertarian Party of Oregon**

Joe Christman , Secretary **Libertarian Party of Oregon**