

Libertarian National Judicial Committee

Petitioner: Jonathan M. Jacobs

vs.

Respondent: Libertarian National Committee

August 14, 2025

Members of the Judicial Committee:

I had intended upon several additional amici but at seeing the continued twisting of my words by Jacobs and re-reading the prior filings, I believe what I would want to cover has been handled well by others, and I wish to spare myself and the JC from a digital avalanche.

I would like to point out to members several things in Jacobs' last response to show why I am simply not subjecting myself further, particularly when both Mr. McGee and Mr. Ponty did such excellent jobs.

In JC filings there is always a bit of repartee, sometimes pointed, but there are lines, and Jacobs crossed them here:

Ms. Harlos does not speak for the LNC, for which the LNC might be breathing a collective sigh of relief.

First, of all I never claimed to speak for anyone but myself and of things I have personal knowledge, but there is a veiled insinuation of incompetence in there that is beyond inappropriate. I don't agree with Mr. Jacobs on multiple things, and it is certainly clear to everyone that neither of us have any personal fondness for the other. But I would never impugn his undeniable professional competence by saying something such as "*Mr. Jacobs is not the LNC's parliamentarian, for which the LNC might be breathing a collective sigh of relief.*" It should be galling to the delegates that have supported me for over a decade and elected me **five times** to the LNC with this insinuation. He can have at his games. I will not play, and I think he should be ashamed that he chose to stoop that low. I will not. To quote the great Lee Wrights (which Mr. Jacobs only knows about to "use" as he has no root in this Party except to engage in parliamentary wrangling): I am not at war.

Second, I trust the JC can see that showing where RONR uses a word (in this case "fitness") does not carry with it any insinuation that these resolutions were that thing, ergo,

discipline. It wasn't, and everyone knows that. McArdle was not an officer at the time, and if the LNC wished to engage in discipline, her resignation did not have to stop them as Jacobs is aware as RONR explicitly states that a resignation does not automatically halt discipline (63:6) as it could be refused to be accepted. This may conflict with DC law on resignations but that is a question for attorneys; the fact is that the LNC itself decided not to continue with an action that was clearly discipline and instead chose a different path. This is just a grasping at straws, and in this circumstance, it is almost as if Mr. Jacobs has taken on the role of defense counsel (not literally, no accusation of UPL here, and as he is not in the role of parliamentarian but of member/petitioner, most certainly no accusation of any professional standards breach) looking for any theory to keep McArdle from quite mild consequences from actions that she clearly did in breach of her duties, up to and including misappropriation of Party funds. RONR anticipates such non-disciplinary consequences in its recognition of non-disciplinary censures.

Lastly, his mischaracterization of the point of definitions was to show that the word "deem" is not **automatically** a legal term as he asserted Wikipedia stated—I never denied it *could* be thus there was no point to show the other Wiktionary definitions as that was a point already conceded.

I do not choose to engage with such a person any further in this matter. I wish the JC all wisdom in coming to their findings. I am off to enjoy life and my new dog. I do not envy you this job with this petitioner.

Caryn Ann Harlos, a Lifetime Member of the Libertarian Party with deep and extensive roots and personal investment in the good of this Party
(https://lpedia.org/wiki/Caryn_Ann_Harlos)