



## DELEGATE NEWS

### RESPONSE TO RESPONSE AND RESPONSE TO RNC RULING

Dear Michigan Delegates,

A response was sent to the delegates by an individual who questioned the Press Release that I sent out titled DELEGATE NEWS – SUPPORT FOR PRESS RELEASE STATEMENT. If you have not had opportunity to read my SUPPORT FOR PRESS RELEASE STATEMENT, I have included it in its entirety at the bottom of this news.

I would also like to address the ruling of the RNC regarding MIGOP Chairwoman Karamo. It would be safe and politically strategic for me to remain neutral, but I don't believe in neutrality because I am not a politician. I hold truth above a desired office. Again, this statement has nothing to do with personality, performance, preference or politics, but everything to do with process.

#### **MIGOP BYLAWS ARTICLE XIV**

Both the author who questioned my Press Release, and the recent decision by the Republican National Committee fail to address Article XIV of the MIGOP Bylaws with respect to the meeting of January 6, 2024. Article XIV of the MIGOP Bylaws states "Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, shall govern the conduct of all meetings of the Committee and its standing committees, except as provided in these Bylaws or by law." The exclusion of Article XIV has led to a false conclusion.

This was apparent when the individual who questioned proceeded to the topic of motions without first addressing the requirements of Robert's Rules of Order regarding what actions can and cannot take place at a Special Meeting based on the Call to the Meeting. He failed to address all of the relevant points from Robert's Rules of Order regarding a Special Meeting and the Call for a Special Meeting and instead offers two quotes from Robert's Rules of Order on the subject of motions. I can appreciate the tutorial on motions and procedure

of debate; however, this fails to address the protocol of a Special Meeting, and what actions can be taken based on the call for that Special Meeting. Neither motions nor amendments can go beyond the scope of the Call for a Special Meeting. Roberts Rules makes rules for special meetings because of the nature of a Special Meeting.

Robert's Rules of Order allow for discussion on the floor without motions.

### **ATTEMPT TO PERSONALLY DISCREDIT ME AS A PARLIAMENTARIAN**

The attempt to personally discredit me as the parliamentarian at the Kent County Meeting has no basis. Kent County did not have Bylaws to guide their Special Meeting, and therefore the Executive Committee voted previously to adhere to Robert's Rules of Order until Kent County could create their own Bylaws. Robert's Rules of Order have certain requirements for a Special Meeting. Those requirements were not met for *that* meeting. The motion in question arrived *after* the Call for the Special Meeting had been sent out by the Secretary, and therefore could not be addressed at *that* meeting. Further, Robert's Rules of Order and those that adhere to them are not taking sides, but rather siding in favor of the *rules*. To accuse a parliamentarian based on his adherence to Robert's Rules of Order is baseless.

### **THE AUTHOR IN QUESTION FAILED TO SHARE FACTS IN THEIR ENTIRETY**

Additionally, it is valuable to know that the individual who questioned failed to share facts in their entirety. It should be noted that the parliamentarian spoke with the mover of the motion that is referenced in the above dialogue following that Kent County Meeting and outlined for him the proper way to proceed in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order should he want to bring up the motion the correct way at another meeting. At the subsequent Kent County Meeting, the same gentleman thanked the parliamentarian because the same rule had this time benefited him. The parliamentarian sided with Robert's Rules of Order. Truth is truth. Truth does not change. Truth does not take sides. So, when the individual who questioned states,

*"Two different meetings, same favoritism. His latest statement of RONR interpretation, for a third time, shows favoritism to again, the same side. These are not minor mistakes, nor are they arcane rules, but basic rules ensuring fairness to all."*

He has failed to share the facts in their entirety. Those who resort to attacking the character of another have run out of arguments. Let's leave that game to the Democrats.

### **AGREEMENT**

The individual who questioned closes with a statement we can all agree on:

*"We are either a party that follows it's own bylaws, or we lose all moral authority with regards to our party, as well as election integrity to the outside world that is watching".*

For clarification, I would add to the statement above that adherence to the MIGOP Bylaws *includes* the adherence to Robert's Rules per MIGOP Bylaws, Article XIV.

### **IN CLOSING – AN ENCOURAGING OUTLOOK FOR THE MIGOP**

We can look at the MIGOP in terms of where we are and become discouraged, or we can look at where we want to go and become motivated. I hope that we can all recognize that dialogue and disagreement are

important tools for both, as is truth. Without truth, we cannot be honest about where we are, and without truth we cannot be honest about where we want to go. I would encourage every God-fearing, country loving patriot to take a pause and ask how we can dialogue and disagree better. Our country was founded with rag tag, every day, fractured, grassroots patriots. Dialogue and disagreement were essential in the birth of our great country. Our Founders found a way to arrive at unity to fight the common enemy. I hope we will use these tools to better equip us, and not to assassinate each other. There is a wicked and evil world out there that would love for us to devour ourselves *because it fears our unity most*.

I would appreciate your partnership on March 2nd. Let's get this job done!

Best Regards,

*Ralph*

Ralph Rebandt

RalphforRNC.com



## DELEGATE NEWS

### SUPPORT FOR PRESS RELEASE STATEMENT

Dear Michigan Delegates,

I have received emails requesting that I comment on the research that formed my conclusions in the "PRESS RELEASE: Statement on the state of the MIGOP." My conclusions are not based on *personality* or *performance*, but on the *process*. If you have not read the PRESS RELEASE sent to the delegates, I recommend that you do that. Here I will expand on the statement from that PRESS RELEASE that reads:

"In examining the communications and documents in light of the MIGOP Bylaws and Robert's Rules of Order, I believe that the actions at the January 6, 2024, meeting were not binding, and that Kristina Karamo is the legitimate chair of the MIGOP."

#### **MIGOP ARTICLE XIV & ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER**

Article XIV of the MIGOP Bylaws state that "Roberts Rules of Order, newly revised, shall govern the conduct of all meetings of the Committee and its Standing Committees, except as provided in these Bylaws or by law".

#### **TWO SEPARATE ISSUES – THE "CALL" AND THE "ACTIONS"**

There are two separate issues regarding the legitimacy of the January 6, 2024, meeting. This has caused a great deal of confusion and has led those who are unfamiliar with the process to make accusations that should not have been made. The two issues involve the "call" (for a special meeting), and the "actions" (actions taken at the special meeting).

#### **THE CALL TO HAVE THE MEETING OF JANUARY 6, 2024, WAS LEGITIMATE**

I stated clearly, and I stand behind the statement that the call to have a meeting on January 6, 2024, was legitimate. The 37 voting members (who have paid their dues and are in good standing – MIGOP Bylaws Article III.E) of the State Committee had the right to ask the Chair to call a special meeting according to MIGOP Bylaws Article VI.B (hereafter called Bylaws). The Chair chose not to call a special meeting to address their concerns, but rather offered an alternative special meeting addressing other topics. According to MIGOP Bylaws, because the Chair bypassed the intent of the written meeting request, at that point any state committee member had the right to call a special meeting within 5 days (Bylaws - Article VI.B), so the call to have a meeting on January 6, 2024 was legitimate.

### **THE “ACTIONS” TAKEN AT THE MEETING OF JANUARY 6, 2024, WERE IMPROPER AND NOT BINDING**

I have also stated clearly, and I stand behind the statement that some of the “actions” at that meeting on January 6, 2024 were improper and therefore not binding.

### **THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING AND A SPECIAL MEETING**

There is a difference between a Regularly Scheduled meeting and a Special meeting. Regular meetings are scheduled, often months in advance. Special Meetings require a “call” and reasonable “notice” so that members can decide if they are going to attend that special meeting. For a special meeting to take place, the “call” for the meeting must be sent to every member of the organization. Included with the call must be specific business to be transacted. No business can be transacted at a special meeting other than that which is specified in the call (Robert’s Rules, 9:15)

### **EXAMPLE OF A “CALL” FOR A SPECIAL MEETING**

For example, a call for a special meeting might look something like this, “The chair is calling a special meeting on September 20, 2024, to raise the annual dues from \$100 to \$110. The meeting will be held at Freedom Hall, Smalltown, Michigan at 6:30 p.m.” This call for a special meeting would be sent to all members of the organization.

Now suppose at the Smalltown meeting that someone thinks, wow, we could do a lot more as an organization if the dues were \$200. If that person offers an amendment to raise the dues to \$200, that amendment must be ruled out of order because it goes “beyond the scope for the special meeting,” and as Robert’s Rules states, “no business can be transacted at a special meeting other than that which is specified in the call.”

### **WHY AMMENDMENTS CAN NOT GO “BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THE SPECIFIED CALL”**

According to Robert’s Rules of Order (12<sup>th</sup> Edition, 1:4), each member has four basic rights:

1. the right to choose to attend (or not attend) meetings;
2. the right to make motions;
3. the right to speak in debate;
4. the right to vote

When the “call” for a special meeting goes out, people have a choice based on the “call” as to what will be discussed and whether or not they would like to attend. In our story about the town of Smalltown, some members might choose not to attend that special meeting because raising the dues by ten dollars is not a big deal to them, so they don’t care if it passes or not. However, if there is an amendment to the motion proposed at that meeting to raise the dues to \$200, that motion would be out of order because it “goes beyond the

scope of the specified call" for the Special Meeting. When the call is issued, it must describe the business that will be transacted at that special meeting.

Therefore, the call for the Special Meeting on January 6, 2024, needed to include business that would be transacted, and include any actions according to the Bylaws that could be rightfully taken at that meeting.

### **THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A CALL FOR A SPECIAL MEETING AND AN AGENDA**

There is a difference between a call for a special meeting and an agenda. According to Robert's Rules, a list of items to be discussed does not constitute a "call" for a special meeting. Special meetings may be called to "discuss" topics. But all actionable items must be specifically included in a "call" for a special meeting, if such action may properly take place.

An agenda does not describe the business to be transacted at a meeting. They are just words on a piece of paper. An agenda does not qualify as a "call" for a special meeting. A "call" according to Robert's Rules for a special meeting has specific business to be transacted with "notice" to alert membership of an action to take place so that the members may choose to attend to not attend.

Robert's Rules (9:13) states, "a special meeting . . . is convened to consider one or more items of business specified in the call of the meeting. Notice of time, place, and purpose of the meeting, clearly and specifically describing the subject matter of the motions or items of business to be brought up, must be sent to all members a reasonable number of days in advance."

Robert's Rules further states (9:15), "The only business that can be transacted at a special meeting is that which has been specified in the call of the meeting."

Regarding the meeting of January 6, 2024, the request for submitted topics in the list from the 37 signers did not represent a call for a meeting, but rather a request to the chair to call a special meeting to address them. A "call" for a special meeting with notice is an action that is requesting specific business to be addressed at a special meeting of an assembly. This addresses the confusion as to why some signers who desired to have a meeting to discuss certain topics requested to withdraw their names because the meeting turned into something they were not prepared to support, namely the removal of officers. They signed the request for a special meeting only because they wanted to have issues discussed. The meeting on January 6, 2024 went beyond discussion, so therefore "beyond the scope of the call of the meeting." Further, at the January 6, 2024 meeting, motions were presented, but were not presented when the "call" for that meeting was sent out.

### **HAVING AN AGENDA ITEM TO DISCUSS POSSIBLE REMOVAL OF AN OFFICER IS DIFFERENT THAN CALLING A SPECIAL MEETING TO REMOVE AN OFFICER**

Having an Agenda item as "possible removal" of officers, is different than calling a special meeting to remove officers. According to the Bylaws (IV.G.2.), a petition bearing the signatures of at least fifty percent of the entire committee (54 signatures of voting members who have paid their dues and are in good standing) needed to be sent to the MIGOP secretary. This petition requests that "such a vote be taken". Then, according to Robert's Rules, a meeting needs to be called, with a specific call listing the business to be transacted, namely a vote to remove the officers. Regarding the meeting of January 6, 2024, 37 signatures were secured to call the meeting, (presuming those signatures were valid), however, 54 signatures are required to petition for a meeting to vote on the removal of an officer. These 54 signatures were not secured *prior to the call*, and therefore removal of officers could not be included as an actionable item at that meeting.

## **THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HAVING ENOUGH SIGNATURES TO REQUEST THE CHAIR TO CALL A SPECIAL MEETING AND HAVING ENOUGH SIGNATURES TO PETITION TO REMOVE AN OFFICER**

There is a difference between having enough signatures (37) people to request the chair to call a special meeting (MIGOP Bylaws, VI.B) and having enough signatures (54) to petition to remove an officer (MIGOP Bylaws, IV.G.2). There was no petition to remove officers before the January 6, 2024 meeting. That petition came after the meeting began. Therefore, the call for the meeting could not include the removal of officers, and therefore, any action to remove officers was improper and invalid.

## **IN ORDER TO REMOVE AN OFFICER, 54 SIGNATURES MUST BE PRESENTED TO THE SECRETARY OF THE MIGOP**

Additionally, according to the Bylaws, in order to remove officers, 54 signatures must be presented to the Chair or Secretary of the MIGOP. If these signatures were obtained prior to or at the January 6, 2024, meeting, no petition was properly filed. Therefore, the action to remove the officers was improper and invalid. Stated in the language of Robert's Rules,

"The only business that can be transacted at a special meeting is that which has been specified in the call of the meeting." Announcing an action to remove officers was not in the call for the special meeting, it was only an item on the agenda, and was stated "possible" removal of officers," not "removal of officers."

## **THE ACTIONS TAKEN AT THE JANUARY 6, 2024, MEETING WERE IMPROPER AND NOT BINDING**

In order for the January 6, 2024, meeting to have binding effect, a call for that special meeting must have stated the transaction of business to remove officers, announcing that 54 signatures were secured for the removal of officers, and that those signatures had been sent to the secretary. The point of the Bylaws is that removal of officers is not intended to be accomplished in 45 minutes. A petition with 54 signatures must be sent to the secretary. The secretary is required to vet those signatures. *Then, and only then* a special meeting may be called for the purpose of removing officers, not for the possible removal of officers.

## **WHY IS THE PROCESS IMPORTANT?**

Why is that important? Because members decide if they want to attend a special meeting or not based on the "call," not the agenda. Robert's Rules protects members against a bait and switch system. Remember the illustration of raising the dues from \$100 to \$110? Anything beyond the scope" (say \$200 as was the example), would be ruled out of order for that special meeting. Therefore, anything beyond discussing the "possible removal of officers" was out of order at the January 6, 2024, meeting because it was beyond the scope of the call of the meeting.

## **UNCHECKED BOXES - BYLAWS EXIST FOR THE STABILITY OF THE ORGANIZATION**

The MIGOP Bylaws require that names of the proxies be sent to the MIGOP Secretary. Those who called the January 6, 2024, meeting announced "possible removal of officers" specifically the chair, the counsel, and the communications director, not the MIGOP Secretary. The January 6, 2024, meeting violated the Bylaws requirement in this area as well. The names of the proxies were not sent to the MIGOP Secretary. The MIGOP Secretary was bypassed, and the names of the proxies were sent to another email address. The MIGOP Bylaws require proxies to be sent to the MIGOP secretary. In addition, the January 6, 2024, minutes, assumed quorum, record of those who voted, and actions taken were not submitted to the MIGOP Secretary for distribution to the State Committee. When the State Committee met on January 13, 2024, no documents from the January 6,

2024, meeting had been presented to the secretary. At the January 13, 2024, meeting, an overwhelming majority of the voting members of the State Committee ruled that the January 6, 2024, meeting was out of order.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at [RalphforRNC@gmail.com](mailto:RalphforRNC@gmail.com)

I would appreciate your vote on March 2<sup>nd</sup>, but even more than that, I would appreciate your partnership. Let's get this job done!

Best Regards,

*Ralph*

Ralph Rebandt

RalphforRNC.com