

JACOBS V. LIBERTARIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

In re: Resolutions Adopted at June 9, 2025 Special Meeting

INTRODUCTORY LETTER AND OBJECTION OF CARYN ANN HARLOS

Date: August 12, 2025

Hello members of the Judicial Committee, I wish to provide responses, accordances, as well providing supplementary information regarding the items already filed. However, I realize that putting all that information in one document can be unwieldy while conversely filing multiple documents can seem excessive or annoying. In balancing these factors, I decided that ease of reference outweighed the rest.

In this introductory letter, I wished to lay out an objection and a note on prejudice in cases of doubt to keep them separate from the more substantive items.

OBJECTION: Please consider this my formal objection to Mr. Jacobs bringing this appeal as a sustaining member without ever disclosing that he is the retained parliamentarian for the Mises Caucus of which Angela McArdle is the Chair, and thus technically his boss, whether or not he was specifically retained for this appeal as part of his duties. I am not claiming any rules were broken. None were. It is also not a negative claim about his fitness in this matter. But this is information that needs to be part of the record, and I doubt I am alone in believing this should have been disclosed at the outset, particularly considering the heart of the investigation that is the foundation for this matter is multiple concealments by Ms. McArdle.

NOTES REGARDING BALANCE IN CASES OF DOUBT: I do personally find it ironic that Ms. McArdle, who has been openly mocking rules, bylaws, and parliamentary procedure is attempting to overturn a case via proxy, with clear and convincing evidence of her misappropriation of Party assets, by using advanced RONR arguments. If you read her X timeline regularly, caring about the minutiae of RONR or the Bylaws is described frequently with derogatory epithets. Life is full of ironies. It is certainly her right to appeal through Mr. Jacobs. However, as the argument here might devolve into some subtleties (though I believe Mr. McGee's excellent defense brief shows that the Judicial Committee does not even need to consider them), in cases of doubt, the Judicial Committee should weigh on the side of the LNC who conducted the investigation thoroughly and to the good of the Party to avoid future abuses of power by those in positions of high trust. I would urge the Judicial Committee to read the Special Investigatory Committee report, particularly the sections on Swing Vote Strategist and Freedom Calls

https://mywikis-wiki-media.s3.us-central-1.wasabisys.com/lpedia/Special_Investigatory_Commit

[tee_Report.pdf](#)). There is no question here that unconscionable breaches of fiduciary duty occurred. Of course if you think there was a **clear** breach of the rules in passing the resolutions, you must find in favour of the rules, but in cases of doubt, I do believe that the prejudice of the Judicial Committee should be towards justice against clear, ironically, gross malfeasance.

The fact is that the report has already been adopted. Any attempt to nullify resolutions does not take away the fact that the LNC has in fact made the report its judgment on the matter. It is like trying to build a bridge over a 100-foot canyon using only a yard of wood. History is not going to look kindly at this saga, but hopefully the Party learns from it.

Absent additional filings, my submissions will be as follows over the coming week:

- Amicus Regarding Nature of Resolutions (Original or Incidental Main Motions) and Notice
- Amicus Regarding Wording of Ruling of the Chair
- Amicus Regarding the Meaning of Deems in Context of Contested Resolution

I am not writing this at the employ of anyone or in any capacity other than that of a sustaining member. You can expect these over the next few days, and I hope they are helpful.

Caryn Ann Harlos, Lifetime Member