

I am DANIEL J. HARTMAN, JD, and I am writing you in my official capacity as duly elected Precinct DELEGATE from Little Traverse Township, Emmet County, Michigan.

Dear fellow Republicans of Michigan.

I had the responsibility of serving as the General Counsel of the Michigan Republican Party when I was elected unanimously by the Michigan State Committee in May 2023. This was not a position I sought as I was merely in attendance at the committee as a duly elected member of the state committee from the 1st District when asked to serve (a seat I had to resign from when I became an officer of the state committee). I continued to serve as General Counsel until February 27, 2024, when a Circuit Court Judge entered an order stating that Kristina Karamo was removed on January 6, 2024.

In the same meeting that Karamo was removed (according to Judge Rossi) a vote on my removal was taken by the minority faction against Karamo. As such I have suspended my 'official' actions pending resolution of the lawsuit on behalf of the order.

That Injunctive order is under an interlocutory appeal (which is a process that requires a litigant to ask for permission to appeal) it will not be decided until sometime later this spring. An appeal to the Michigan Court of Appeals is generally limited to *final* orders of a court. This case is a long way from final as there is a jury trial scheduled for June of 2024 to decide who is the rightful chair. I am confident that a jury will decide in favor of Karamo--should she ever get a jury trial.

It is foreseeable that somehow a case with higher priority will force adjournments of this civil lawsuit until the Kent County lawsuit 'dies on the vine' in February of 2024 waiting for a trial. It likely will become *Moot* by the passage of time--but only after time and money is spent on discovery depositions and much ink is spilled on the inside of this controversy. I am therefore not confident that the case will ever see a jury.

Now let's turn to the appeal of the order.

The Court of Appeals denied a motion to enter a stay (an order preventing the judge's order from taking effect) but GRANTED the permission to appeal and GRANTED the motion for immediate consideration. The appeal is not 'lost' as represented by some because the STAY was denied; rather it will continue to resolution. I am certain that whoever loses will then seek permission from the Michigan Supreme Court (which may or may not review the interim order as well). The Appeal process is not quick so this is a long way from over.

The appeal is on the *preliminary injunction* which is an order containing a special *remedy* that courts may use in extraordinary circumstances to freeze the *status quo* while cases go through court for a final trial. There are established rules for the issuance of an injunction that were violated by the judge in the case.

First, understanding the definition of the *status quo* requires a simple analysis to go back in time to BEFORE the controversy began. That would mean as argued on behalf of Karamo to the moment before the request for a meeting on December 2, 2023,. At worst it would be on January 5, 2024, the day before the vote for removal was held. It is established law that an injunction can not be used to CHANGE the status quo. Yet, the Judge has flipped the organization on its ear with his order disregarding a rule of law that is so clear that it is breathtaking.

In addition to the very *purpose* of an injunction being violated by Judge Rossi, there is another concept called *EQUITY* that has been violated. Equity is a legal concept of *fairness* and it states when the court is granting equitable relief that the person asking the court must have 'clean hands' and not act to cause controversy. In the present case, the proofs show that there was a conspiracy of people acting to topple the chair of Karamo who opposed her not only politically, but publicly, and I will explore those motives below in what has transpired to cause Karamo to be a must remove for certain people. What is important is that the *hands* of these actors, especially Warren Carpenter and the attorneys employed by the RNC and NRCC (according to him), assisting in the heist scripted out the plan to remove Karamo had created the controversy that they asked for an injunction to settle. The unclean hands doctrine, like the status quo concept, is a complete bar to an injunction being issued. Then there is another concept in equity that bars an injunction called *bad faith*. The Rossi court had the affidavit of Grant Gossa who reported that his signature on the petition was sought from Plaintiff Warren Carpenter by threats and bribes. The judge also had the emails of four actual signers who stated that their signatures were misappropriated in addition to those who were not in good standing.

There are four factors a court must look at to decide whether to grant a preliminary injunction. This is the subject of the appeal.

The injunction is an extraordinary remedy when issuance will not *harm the public interest*. In this case, the injunction resulted in 24 county delegations duly elected in county conventions on February 15 before the Judge's order and submitted to the uncontested Secretary of the State Committee following the Convention Rules were ARBITRARILY AND CAPRICIOUSLY denied by Peter Hoekstra and Stu Foster. This act was foreseeable and a direct consequence of this harm is attributed to the decision to issue an injunction. Why was it foreseeable to the court? The attorney for Pete's proxies in court told the Judge on February 9, 2024, that this was Pete's intention to hold a second convention AND the attack on the legitimate chair was made with a shadow group that regardless of the injunction the team intended to create a second convention. The shadow group was legitimized by the Judge's order essentially and the real secretary Angela Gillisee who is not in dispute was nullified allowing the Hoekstra faction to ignore the delegate submission.

Subsequently, despite, the rules for removal of officers Pete Hoekstra has removed the authority of the duly elected treasurer as well by having the bank remove her from the accounts. It has not even been a week and he is already using the power he has claimed arising from the injunction to circumvent two officers and the will of the state committee which is the body with the authority, not the person who acts as the chair of a committee. A chair only has the authority to act as delegated by the committee in the bylaws and to run the meetings. A chair even in a meeting can be overturned after consulting the parliamentarian by a simple vote to appeal the decision of the chair to the body of the assembly.

The harm from issuing the injunction to the public is real and was foreseeable and not just now looking back after less than a week that it's been in effect.

The second factor a court must find before issuing an injunction is a balance test related to harm to each *party* and this means the court must decide by weighing the harm to the plaintiffs from non-action against the harm caused by issuing the injunction, that court is compelled to issue the injunction. The balance test is not just roughly equal but the protected party must be a clear winner in comparing the harm to the party requesting from not acting as greater than the harm caused to the restrained party by acting. To be clearer, the first factor is about collateral damage to the *public* (and this bombshell

decision definitely has had some) while the second factor compares the harm to the *litigants* of the consequences of the decision.

This is where I must explain the pretrial motion (not on appeal yet) as to *standing*. A court must only consider a case when there is a *real interest* of the party. A very simple question is who is the lawsuit concerning and this one is about whether Kristina Karamo or Pete Hoekstra is the chair of the party. That is what the Judge in his ruling decided in favor of Hoekstra in his injunction. So was Pete a party to the lawsuit? The lawsuit is Pego and others against Karamo. The judge in his opinion did not even discuss the interests that Warren Carpenter and Malinda Pego have in the outcome of his decision because they have only an indirect interest and lack standing. It must be nice to win a case without even having to show up. The law does not usually allow proxies in the courtroom—usually. The lack of standing should have resulted in a dismissal of the case on February 20, 2024.

So now how do we weigh the potential harm to Kristina Karamo against the harm to Warren Carpenter who is not even a member of the state committee, or Malinda Pego whose interest in the litigation was moot by her own admission when Pete was elected? Somehow the judge had to determine Warren and the state committee members' interests (as Pete's proxies) were harmed more than the harm to Kristina by the injunction in order to justify the issuance of a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs are merely members of the public considered if at all as part of the public or the committee—representing a minority view of who should be chair. This balancing test must have had a thumb on the scales of justice for Pete to win in *absentia*.

The third factor required before a court can issue an injunction is that there has to be a *likelihood of success on the merits*. I will not rehash the tactics used to justify the actions of a rogue meeting on January 6, 2024, or the method in which the signatures were present; the signature insufficiency, or the fact that the proxy rule and quorum rules were misapplied. I am not skipping this because the merits do not weigh in favor of Karamo, but to say this debate on this factor which is long and tedious does not matter UNLESS the other three factors are present. Therefore, I will spare you another dive into the weeds. Just know that there is a claim that the majority of the state committee is against the removal of Kristina Karamo was admitted by the other side but justified by 'sharp elbow tactics' according to the judge when it is against the WILL OF THE PEOPLE.

We have looked at two of the three factors, the status quo and that the court acts in equity.

Bylaws are rules of procedure that a parliamentarian body has the authority to interpret. The bylaws do NOT create substantive rights rather the bylaws define a process for a deliberative body to govern itself. Michigan has been down this road twice before in cases (in which the federal court has overturned the state courts (Ferency) and the legislature's interference (Heitmanus) in a political party's freedom of association. This court interference in the rights of the party is a violation of a constitutional right guaranteed by the First Amendment that was just trampled—by invitation of the anti-Karamo crowd. Now let us watch as Pandora's box is opened and litigation will explode as Lawyers will begin going to the court for every procedural violation that occurs in any political party committee hearing. I can assure you it's a target-rich environment and my voicemail and inbox is already full of potential cases. I have yet to decide if I will stoop to regulating of every committee meeting with court actions—but there are already several that are so blatant that are stunning beginning with the stripping of the powers of two duly elected officers in his first week. This brings me to the next point

A court can only act when the court has *subject matter jurisdiction*. Kristina Karamo filed a motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and on February 20, 2024, Judge Rossi ignored the clear federal precedent that should have resulted in a dismissal of the case. The law states that courts are not supposed to get into the intra-party disputes of political parties. It's a non-intervention doctrine that keeps the judges from entering orders like this injunction or allowing courts to regulate the bylaws of political parties instead of the body of delegates.

While I am addressing the second reason of subject matter jurisdiction (standing was the first) requiring the judge to have dismissed the case on February 20, 2024, I will inform all that I will be seeking to add an appeal from that order denying the motion to dismiss. This must be done by a separate application for leave to join the appeal of the injunctive order as it is a separate order.

The third part of that motion to dismiss which should have been granted deals with a series of procedural rules that limit the way a court can hear a case. These pesky little things are known as Michigan Combined Laws and the Michigan Court Rules which together are supposed to govern the authority of a Circuit Court. A court can take action in cases brought under the rules and different *types* of cases have different rules. There are rules for special proceedings and us lawyers call the type of lawsuit a cause of action.

What does the legislature and Michigan Supreme Court call the *cause of action* to determine leadership in an organization? The answer is *quo warranto*. This is a legal action that originated from common law that the legislature of Michigan has placed some limits on when it can be brought and the court rules have added to this special cause of action. Many have heard of a statute of limitations which is a rule that says a type of action cannot be brought after a certain amount of time has passed that removes the right to bring it. This is how the legislature limits the access to courts by the rule of law.

The law related to Quo Warranto can be found at MCL 600.4501 et seq and the rules at MCR 3.306.

AS an aside Imagine the shock of Kristina Karamo when the court wants to interpret the bylaws of a political party as though it is a legislative governing the state committee as though they have the effect of law and yet these rules that actually govern the conduct of a court are flagrantly ignored?

A *quo warranto* action is the ONLY action that can be used by courts to resolve the office holder of an association. A *quo warranto* action has another description that is the very word that Pete labeled Kristin with—Usurpation of Office. A *quo warranto* action has CONDITIONS that must happen before the court takes jurisdiction (the right to act). The law and rules prevent private attorneys from bringing a *quo warranto* action and place the power in the hands of the attorney general to act first, and only if the attorney general declines then for a private lawyer to ask permission (like when we appealed by leave) of the court BEFORE the filing of a lawsuit. The lawsuit also provides for a remedy at law and shockingly there is no right to injunctive relief in *quo warranto*. The rules govern thee but not me...

These three reasons that the court should have dismissed the case on February 20, 2024 were not appealed YET because the hearing on the injunction started the next day. Returning to that issue that is on appeal...

The fourth factor of the injunction that the court must find (together with EACH of the first three) is called *irreparable injury* which has NO remedy at law. I digressed into a discussion of *quo warranto* aka usurpation of office so that it would be clear there is a legal remedy in the statute so equitable relief

including injunction is NOT permitted. Even when we ignore that there is a legal remedy, there must be an injury that is *irreparable*. The plaintiffs claimed that the irreparable injury would be the conduct of a second convention of delegates that was not called until February 20, 2024...They created the controversy they asked the court to solve much like an arsonist calling the fire department.

The crazy fact is the convention of delegates has almost nothing to do with the chair of the state committee and the leadership of the STATE committee. This is simply because of two reasons. First, the convention is actually 13 *district conventions* and NOT a state convention.

This means the districts meet in congressional districts and not as a state body. Second, at each of the 13 separate district conventions, the delegates elect a person in EACH of the 13 districts to act as the permanent convention chair to conduct the meeting with authority for that day only. There will be 13 separate convention chairs operating at 10 am and not one of them will be affected by who the chair of the state committee is—unless the state committee chair cancels the venue in Detroit.

There is no right to conduct business outside of the *call to convention* which puts the delegates who decide who goes to the district convention on *notice* when selecting delegates at the county conventions.

What does the state chair do? The chair is supposed to conduct as chair the state *committee* meeting after March 1 but before the district conventions to pass a binding resolution of intent as required by the RNC and to conduct a meeting AFTER the district conventions to have the state committee vote to confirm the votes in each district convention for reporting to the RNC. So where is the irreparable harm if two people are claiming to be state chair?

On a normal day NONE. I say a normal day because it is inconceivable that a chairman can disregard or act contrary to the state committee which has since November identified the 13 District conventions and 2 state committee meetings as taking place in Detroit at the Huntington Place. Yet, Pete Hoekstra caused the cancellation of the venue of the districts who were to gather there as arranged by the state committee by the threat of lawfare using his POWER from the injunction and sending the party delegates into chaos and blaming Karamo.

The convention center was paid for by regulated federal funds properly before the court's order with a deposit in December as approved by the Budget Committee long before January 6, 2024.

The appeal on the injunctive order was drafted very quickly and filed in under a day. In that process, within the claim for appeal and motion for a stay a statement was made that the harm fromf the judge's rule was that effect of the court injunction was that the preliminary injunction had given Pete the illusion of authority and he would move the conventions to Grand Rapids—a fact that he declared after February 20, 2023. When the Court of Appeals declined to enter a stay, it was not an endorsement of the injunction giving him the power but rather a prediction that has come true..

On Wednesday, February 28, 2024, at just after 4:30 PM after a long day of drafting the Court of Appeals case was filed by the legal team of Don Campbell on behalf of Karamo simultaneously I filed an action in Cheboygan Circuit Court asking the Court to enter an injunction on the issue of the *venue* as many delegates were thrown into confusion by the last minute message moving the 13 district conventions first announced on February 20, 2024. The Cheboygan Circuit judge applied the facts and decided not to enter an injunction. A part of his reasoning was that Karamo was seeking relief in the Court of Appeals

and that the filing there seeking a *stay* included a concession the party would be harmed as the injunction had given Pete the audacity to assert authority to move the venue. While I disagree with that interpretation of the statement as phrased, I respect the decision of the judge in Cheboygan to take it as he did and choose to not intervene in the dispute and select a *venue* in the dispute between the state committee and the newly 'appointed' chair Pete Hoekstra considering the Court of Appeals acted in the simultaneous action to grant leave and deny the stay between the time we filed and the Cheboygan Circuit court ruled.

After the Cheboygan Circuit Court declined to enter an injunction, the party delegates were left with four choices. First, they could go to Detroit. Second, they could go to Grand Rapids. Third they could stay home and fourth the districts could hold their conventions in their own locations.

Let me explain option number four as chosen by the 1st and 4th Districts. The chair of the District, not Pete Hoekstra has the authority to decide if a chair can override the state committee. The logic is the same. If Pete can by his authority decide then how does he control the location of a district which by the bylaws is NOT under the authority of the state committee (while he is). The District Chairs then may select their own venue AND at the DELEGATES at the District the convention can decide the credentials disputes.

When the two districts(1 & 4) learned that Stu 'I'm Back' Foster had returned from the failed Weiser administration to reject the credentials of some of their counties AND that the door into convention center in Detroit was shut and the door into the convention in Grand Rapids would be closed to their delegates, the District Chairs have acted. This was leadership in the face of Karamo being sidelined by the injunction and Pete Hoekstra's failed leadership in his first actions.

Now we consider the other choices. The venue in Detroit was canceled by Hoekstra. This was in direct violation of his duty to execute the decisions of the state committee and is just cause for his immediate removal. Pete Hoekstra as the appointed *governor* sent by the RNC to *rule* the party just ignored the representative voices of the state committee that selected the Huntington Place Detroit venue in November 2023. Faced with the prospect of a long drive and no venue designed to funnel only certain delegates to Grand Rapids many are staying home from disgust.

Pause and ask yourself why change the venue? What was the purpose? This was a contingency plan in case the Grand Rapids judge was not cooperative and failed to issue the injunction on time. And once the money was spent...(I cannot wait to see how that is explained without a violation of campaign finance laws as it is a campaign event for the presidential election and must go through the federal account). For a selfish power move by Pete asserting his newly attained POWER to RULE, the delegates elected from 83 counties have been displaced with buses canceled, hotel reservations moved, and why...to divide the party further and to exclude the supporters of Karamo.

I want to inform the reader of this document to understand why the convention of delegates was happening in the first place. The Democrats who are supposed to be our adversaries took over both houses and maintained the governor's office during the last four years of Weiser. This ineffective leadership of that administration including Stu 'I'm Back' Foster resulted in the delegates' demand for changes which led to the election of Kristina Karamo. A consequence of the same gang that supports Pete's ineptitude is that the Democrat-controlled Congress moved the Michigan Primary before March

1, 2024 and this triggered a Republican National Committee Rule that would have resulted in losing 39 delegates of Michigan's 55 delegates to the national convention.

This happened as Karamo took office in 2023 and I had a first-hand seat to her leadership as she identified a problem (the penalty from the legislature moving the date) and a solution which was to request a waiver of the penalty by moving the 39 delegates that we would otherwise lose to after the March 1 date in the RNC rule. Her plan was that by allowing the primary to elect the 16 delegates seated that were not subject to the penalty, she could rescue the rest of the delegate seats at the National Convention. I will not bore you with the process, but the Karamo administration (especially Jim Copas) and the Michigan Rules committee worked to formulate a "Delegate Rescue Plan" that required state committee approval and the RNC Executive Committee approval in a very tight window of time. The plan meant hours of the Rule Committee meeting to formulate a novel plan (Special Thanks to Cheryl Constantino) The concept was to allow the delegates which are bonus delegates awarded to the state for each congressional district to be ACTUALLY awarded by the Congressional Districts in conventions. This is a first-in-the-nation bifurcated primary and caucus process for delegate selection to the National Convention. To my knowledge, it is the first time the delegate selection was EVER given to the districts in Michigan--a win for the grassroots of the party.

As a proud election integrity advocate, I do not trust the primary. Yes I am an election denier. I became involved in the Republican Party as a direct realization that the stolen 2020 election was not the first time. I realized that the election system is based on the concept that each political party participates and watches the process. The breakdown in 2020 was a *failure* of the Republican Party to execute its mission to staff and observe the election processes. If the election was stolen then the party failed to stop it and they (oops I mean we the people of the party) failed.

So, I got involved. I joined many others in the Michigan Party at county, district and state levels of our party who are focused on the *right to vote* and believe that a vote must be counted as cast and not diluted. My trust in the primary election run by the Secretary of State was forever shaken when my friend and candidate Ralph Rembrandt was cheated out of votes in 2022. Not only did votes get removed from his totals but there was an 'unseen hand' steering the results in the State to an outcome that was predetermined. What evidence do I have for that statement? The results of the election in the 2022 primary were published *before the primary began* on three local news stations of Fox and CBS. This happened apparently when the election reporting system showed a result before a vote was cast. It is NOT possible without fraud that they could predict the outcome so closely. I will not digress, but I am now an advocate of the caucus for candidate selection. I like the fact, that *people* must show up in person and vote in person with credentials. I like the fact that the candidates are beholden to the delegates not to special interests—at least through the primary.

I will conclude this narrative with five more things each of the readers must know. First, is a situation that I learned when the Karamo administration went to meet with Weiser in February 2023 a fact that will disgust each of you reading this letter. I was part of a team that included IT, HR, accounting, legal, administrative) assembled by Kristina to ensure a smooth transition.

It was not the fact that the party had been dismantled that will disgust you as I have spoken on that many times. I participated in two official state committee phone call meetings in which the state committee voted in 2022 and again in February of 2023 under Weiser. I was a guest of Kristina Karamo

at both times which occurred by telephone in a virtual meeting—not Zoom. I was present when votes were taken by pushing buttons on the phone keypad 1 for yes, 2 for no, and 3 to abstain.

During the 45 minutes allotted by Paul Cordes for the transition. I asked how to use the phone voting system and Paul Cordes laughed in my face and said there is no system and never was, the committee pushed buttons and the Weiser team just made up the results of the votes taken. He thought it was funny that the state committee members were gullible and trusting that their vote mattered.

This is the same system that had apparently been used to conduct the business of the party on many occasions. I wonder how much Stu “I’m Back” Foster knew of this shameful scam.

That was not the only thing that would shock me during my tenure, Kristina was provided zero records of the former administration and while it took more than a week to get the bank to cooperate with the transition, we eventually learned that despite assurances made to the state committee in December 2022 that the party was debt free, that Paul Cordes had signed a \$3 Million dollar debt with CO-America of which \$900,000 was outstanding. While it is true the accounts had about \$300k in them meaning that day one the party was underwater by more than \$600,000.

I know everyone remembers that but what was shocking to me was that the note signed by Paul was authorized by a fake resolution of the state committee. The document was signed by the officers but had no signature of the Secretary and was not the result of a state committee meeting as it declared on its face. This debt was also supported by a negative pledge of the MIGOP building.

Per Paul Cordes, the computer server with all financial and fundraising records was the private property of a former chair who said Karamo could not have access because the party did not own its data it was in a trust and Karamo was not permitted access.

This would be shocking until I began to defend a collection case and also learned that the Michigan Republican party was the GRANTOR of the property on Seymour Street to make the building trust which means it transferred the building for the stated reason in the documents that the party could not own the property—a misstatement of the law.

The next shock to the system was that the name Michigan Republican Party and the Michigan Republican State Central Committee did not ‘belong’ to the party but instead belonged to the building trust. Who were the trustees? I would imagine the state committee but it was a group of former officers including the chairmen and general counsel who were the trustees.

What do you think was the first thing Pete Hoekstra mentioned after the injunction as reported by a news?—that he was going to shut down the lawsuit on the building against its rightful owners. I will only say that enough of what has been discovered that forced the former chairs to remove Karamo. I am sure this was a primary factor in the urgency to remove our grassroots chair—but not the only.

The third revelation is the myth of fundraising. Almost all of the money raised into the Republican Party comes from 20 organizations and no amount of fundraising will bring that to a grassroots party. This issue of fundraising was used to discredit Karamo. There has not been any fundraising done from chairs as far back as the records we were later able to obtain show. I say obtain is because we reconstructed records from campaign finance filings and some other sources like bank records.

Let me give the uninformed average delegate a quick primer on campaign finance laws. The intent was to limit the influence of money on public officials. It was known that when you *buy* a politician you could use the government to pass laws or make policy that enriches some people at the expense of others. Even back in the day our founders in Washington would leave work and go to a restaurant to eat and encounter men attempting to influence the statesmen by being present where the founders ate as they would hang out in the lobby of the hotel restaurant. . Hence, the name lobbyist. This is overt influence.

Campaign finance laws were designed to limit donations from private individuals to an amount that would not be able to corrupt the politician who was generally perceived to represent the constituents who elect them from their district. Corporations were not allowed to contribute.

If you believe that this works you are more naïve than the state committee members who pushed one thinking the votes were tallied. But in theory, money collected was regulated in an account so the *sources* and *uses* of the money was tracked. A federal account was regulated by the Federal Election Commission and a state account by the Secretary of State.

Now come the loopholes. A group can gather money into a Political Action Committee (PAC) and collect money for an issue (not a candidate) as long as they do not directly support the candidate they can indirectly support issues that a candidate differs from the opponent with the same result. The concept is the group wants to oppose gun control and they can spend and support money to ‘educate’ the electorate on the gun control debate and make contributions to candidates (limited) that support their cause but message the issue so that the voters choose between their candidate and the other.

Now to conceal the source of money you make the donation to the PAC and they contribute to your candidate and you have averted the laws. The PAC can spend money in the district opposing the opponent on the ‘issues’. The money is concealed and it becomes dark money. Now comes the administrative account. Money can be put into a political party for administrative expenses and these expenses can originate from corporations and the influence is tremendous. Let’s pretend you’re an energy company seeking contracts with the state you make your deposit into the party administrative account and surprise you get the contracts. The party has ways to reward its friends.

Another loophole that has destroyed our representative government is the *joint fundraising agreements*. This is the accumulation or *bundling* of many politicians to receive simultaneously a series of maximum contributions.

Let me explain. In our hypothetical, say a particular US Representative from the 7th District signs a JFA and now a person wielding the influence-- may be a speaker of the US house—Kevin McCarthy is the person in control of the JFA.

The fund gets a series of people with an agenda and for our example we will use Pro-Ukraine War that are defense contractors who will get rich with the war. These companies will pay big bonuses and so the executives then are willing to make maximum contributions to the JFA. They each write one check that would be 100 times the maximum contribution if made to a candidate. The one oversized check is then given to Kevin and he rounds up 50 congressional friends who each take a piece. That would be bad enough but now Kevin bundles the people who take the money AND the people who make the maximum contributions.

Now 100 people with the same agenda each write one check and Kevin collects them and writes one check to 100 congressional friends. The list of 100 people who made the maximum contribution for 100 candidates each wrote one check is given to all 100 who disclose the source as though they raised the money knocking on doors in their campaign fiancé reporting.

The money goes into the JFA which deducts its lavish expenses for wielding influence and each politician now receives 100 times the maximum contribution in one check and a list of 100 names to show the regulators.

If the amount was \$3000 per candidate allowed by law then each of the 100 people put in \$300,000 and each candidate received \$300,000 with 100 names for reporting. Kevin now has a voting block of 100 representatives who will vote as he directs. He then does this bundle with ten issues and his guys all have \$3M. When it comes time to vote on Ukraine, does the politician listen to your calls to his office?

Now we conservatives have 10 issues that matter so the bought and paid-for politician will vote consistently on one or two issues to keep their credibility and betray their base on all the others so we think well our representative is good on that issue so he is good. We will say he is better than the Democrats even when then they betray us on many other issues. But because of the one issue, they claim to represent the views of their conservative base.

The best part is that the politicians have term limits so after a politician has betrayed your 30% of the time and brags about his 70% voting record and you are disgusted by enough betrayals then they cycle through to the next person. The voters are like Lions fans thinking this is the year that we have a good politician that will do us good. Only to have our heart broken again and again. Once in a while, you get a rock star like Neil Friske who doesn't take the money and represents the people but then he is punished and he gets no committee assignments because he didn't take the dough.

How is the money granted to the candidates used? Is it in the general election? No, it is used to blow out a grassroots candidate in the primary. What is the solution? The candidate MUST go to the county and be vetted at a caucus and face tough questions without big campaign dollars. Only then do they advance to the district or state caucus and face others vetted at the county. In this basic system, the buy-off does not help the candidates because they will have to face the county party. As they advance from a county office they have additional vetting by the district or state caucuses.

The general election will have only candidates that had to face their electorate. It is simple.

I watched voices break in outrage when they held up the proposed Michigan Republican Constitution drafted by James "Madison" Copas. The constitution incorporated the ideas of many but included this caucus concept of Dan Bonamie (Crawford County Chair) and Ken Beyer (4th District Chair) and others to the caucus process for the restoration of accountability of elected officials to the electorate. This idea was another BIG motive to remove Karamo.

A fourth observation is that the party is engineered for division. The administration is fractured. After Karamo took office it was like building a bridge during a storm under gunfire from the enemy. The haters were organized with resources and as soon as Karamo refused to play their game and she stuck to her resolve to represent you she needed to be removed or destroyed. The party at its various levels is currently designed to have the authority at the top dictate as Pete does instead of the delegates giving authority and closely watching the authority they delegate to the county, district, state, and national

party. We are Republicans. The authority to our officers is power actually belonging to the grassroots is delegated for a specific purpose and is limited. I have now seen the appointment of an ambassador to govern us unruly pesky delegates and declaring business as usual is back open. Where does he get his authority? Is it from the majority of delegates? How about the majority of the state committee? Now his power is gained by invoking the anointing of the RNC and Trump to justify the elimination of representative authority. A parliament is just a body of members that makes decisions. The chair is the leader of the body and their authority comes from the body to the chair who is just the representative of the body, not its boss.

Explain to me why the party has to receive big money from the big donors to help select complicit politicians instead of being a tightly run organization that has a \$40,000 convention instead of \$200,000. The myth of the fundraising was ironic that Kritina did not take the money with strings, so she was disqualified.

The fundraising since 2017 has been 97% given to the party by its overlords for redistribution as directed. It is no wonder why we elect a Republican in name only who votes like a Democrat. Look at the donors, it's the same names on both sides of the aisle. Call it the swamp, the deep state, the uni-party, or the cabal—whatever you want to name it is NOT a representative government.

I began an adventure to understand why the votes in the 2020 election did not match the yard signs. I have learned that the machines (and other parts of the voting systems as defined by HAVA which include the ballots) have been designed so that fraud will avoid detection.

The idea is that you will shrug and say you were outvoted. The centralization away from precincts is a key part of this. This is to prevent you from knowing how your neighbors vote by their yard signs, and conversations at the church parking lot, or the bleachers of our kid's ball fields. We all know how our precincts voted on issues.

Mix a precinct into a state or national system (or into an Absentee Voter Counting Boards) and now we do not know and we merely say those guys over there are voting crazy and shake our heads and say, "well it's what they voted for"—meanwhile they are doing the same thing about you. It's no different than pushing one on the phone thinking your vote counted while they laugh at us.

I thank the people who have taken the time to look at the system like Pat Colbeck, Phil O'Halloran, and Tim Vetter and many others. It's not surprising when affidavits are signed by people attesting that they voted and turned in their ballot but the record shows the vote was not counted. I have looked at the voting rolls and seen the people who voted from the property I own and known to have been vacant by a in-person ballot attributed to a person who moved out of state years before. I have a good idea why the system is not working, and it is because they want it to be broken. Like the open borders, they want early voting with ballots mailed and not accountable to a real person. They know that the real casualty of the pandemic was our elections, not the people we lost to the illness or vaccine.

The last observation I have is that there has been a loss of trust. I have seen them divide us and we turn on each other until the good people leave. I want to describe my friend Jim Copas. Jim is best described as a man who has no filter and always tells you like he sees it. He usually sees it right. He lacks guile and while not gullible he does not see deception at first glance so he will trust you only until you prove he cannot trust you. It's not that he sees you are corrupt rather he knows he cannot trust you after you

have made critical mistakes repeatedly or you have failed to keep your well-intentioned promises maybe merely because of any reason such as distractions.

Jim is laser-focused and sharp. Jim was recently tasked with writing a constitution (like James Madison). It's a daunting task that requires a brilliant legal mind, a bulletproof sense of duty to God and country, and armor-like skin that does not offend easily. It requires a person to filter out great ideas from bad ideas. A document like a constitution is not written overnight and it's not the product of one mind. After the draft was made Jim attributed the document to a committee of people who contributed to the document with ideas but was the primary author. This was done to share credit and not imply each of them endorsed the final draft before public release. To Jim he decided as the author, it was ready to send to the people for comment.

I was astonished at the criticism he received from good patriots. Some people had said why did Jim wait so long to share the working draft and other said it's not ready and should remain a secret. Some said it's not strong enough for the delegates and others complained that it does not grant enough authority to the officers and committees. In short, hardly one person said thank you Jim for the months Jim worked on this document. I want to say thank you now.

Here is my assessment. Read the document. It is not perfect but it's the BEST solution I have seen for solving party unity and restoring the balance of power. I love how it sets forth rights and responsibilities while leaving the procedures to the bylaws. As power moves away to the various committees from the delegates there is a means that the delegated authority of the state is still accountable but the state has some power to reign in the rogue counties to a uniform structure to keep unity. I like the committees have zones of authority that do not overlap for example the counties focus on election operations and candidate vetting, and the districts focus on election and candidate training but provide a second vetting for district and state candidates. The state has a role to unify the party behind a platform and to keep the chaos down by settling disputes fairly and finally. A platform that unifies us is critical to allow us to sort out who is really a Republican and to make sure that our candidates, delegates, and political offices meet the standard of what is Republican as outlined in a platform.

Candidates who want to run for higher office must go through three levels of party-delegated authority in committees before they earn the "R" next to their name and they must run the gauntlet of the people each election to retain the right. Betray the base and you will be a one-term wonder--Then and only then do the candidates get to go to the general election. This process scares the establishment as it's a fundamental shift in power to the people.

I love the leadership book *Extreme Ownership* by Jacko Willink & Lief Babain, (2 navy seals). The book describes a 'blue on blue' situation where the same team accidentally shoots, injures or kills another on the team during the 'fog' of war. This is done when communication breaks down. I want to caution the patriots that I have seen the enemies of God and Country sow so much confusion that it's hard to discern friend from foe so that we will sometimes eat our own.

I say this because well-intentioned speculation about another person's motives can harm as much as gossip and be heard as gospel as it rushes from lips to ears. I saw this happen with some people who misinterpreted the reasons that Jim released the Constitution to the public before the convention and on schedule as he promised. Instead of reading the Constitution for what a great start that it is, people questioned his motives. I am here to speak for a friend who is discouraged that while you may not like

the directness of Jim (a fact he does not consider when speaking and acting) but I have come to trust his motives are pure and true. When friendly fire struck Jim, he did not fire back or switch sides and in fact he continues to this day to fight for what is right. Jim is just an example that we must not let ourselves get divided.

Finally, I want to address those who like me profess to follow Jesus as our Savior and not Trump or anyone else of this earth. I will try to obey the commandments of Christ today better than yesterday and when I fall short, I pray that one of you will gently redirect me and that I can repent and do better in my quest to follow the teaching and example of Christ tomorrow. I am a fallible human being as we all are but as long as I stay oriented by my faith I know that I can make a positive difference. God Bless each of you as you decide what battles are worth fighting for in the weeks, months, and years to come. May God have mercy on our land and may his people seek his face while he is near.

Daniel J. Hartman 3/2/24