Proposed General Community Discussion Rules; for Conferences of the Supreme Court of Law for the USA.

This Version of these Conference Rules has been composed by Charles Stewart, as modified from the great start on this important document which Lewis Hammond has recently proposed.

I, Charles Stewart, here-by build on this text-based discussion, by pointing-out, that, similar to the multitudes of confusing statutory codes, <u>excessively formalized 'Rules</u>' routinely & seriously Inhibit Spontaneous & Open Flow of Discussion. I have come to believe, that, all problems like this, are best resolved, by first examining the Traditions of the more ancient & righteous communities of Biblical Torah-Law, & Anglo/American Common-Law; & there-under focusing on specific issues like this one.

In the more ancient Common-Law Community Governing Model, this difficulty of responsibly "Balancing Interests of Openness & Spontaneity, Vs Formalized Rules to Prevent Chaos & Confusion & Time-Wasting; was addressed by Relying on a 'Responsible Leader' or 'Moderator' of the Discussions. Protections for the community from potential Abuses of this Power, were secured through placing this man under Direct Accountability to the the Constituent/Electors there-in Assembled; & where-under he would promptly face a "Vote of Confidence", & possible "Immediate Recall & Replacement", from any one of the Assembled Constituent/Electors, if he might suddenly become inspired to abuse his Position of Leadership & Trust.

In essence, I believe, this man was only one among a large number of a fully grass-roots accountable & organic-body-politic hierarchically-arranged "Common-Law Monarchs". I further believe, that, the more divinely blessed versions of 'Israelite Torah-Law' followed this same basic procedure, & there-by they secured quick & efficient resolution of disputes, all through similar grass-roots based & fully: "Accountable but Trusted Monarchy" process.

Here-under; I respectfully suggest, that, <u>excessively formalized 'Rules</u>', <u>should be 'Avoided</u>'; & that, instead, we just <u>Rely On 'Responsible Leadership'</u>, to <u>Responsibly Interrupt</u>, <u>Moderate</u>, <u>&</u> <u>Limit any Transgressions</u>, in our collective efforts at maintaining mutually Respectful & Efficient Verbal Communications.

But; here-under <u>recognizing that At Least 'Some Rules' should be clearly Written Down &</u> <u>Distributed</u> to all concerned members; I here-under believe our community conferencing 'optimal procedure', requires as follows:

Try to stay Reasonably Focused on a Single Topic/Subject.

<u>Usually there has been a Single Topic/Subject agreed on</u>; and, (unless there is some sort of an 'emergency concern', as recognizable by the leadership of the group), then, <u>that single Topic/Subject should Remain the Focus of the Discussion</u>, at least <u>until it has become formally concluded</u>.

Of course; there may be rare instances where two or more Topics jointly become worthy of being discussed, at the same time, in order that an effective over-all strategy to be developed; & <u>there</u> <u>may be other reasons for merging more than one subject together</u>. But these instances should be rare, & they should be raised by "Point of Order" to the moderator, & formally approved by him, before they begin being discussed in detail.

Definitely; <u>Never Drop a presently discussed Topic/Subject Completely, & just start talking</u> <u>about a New Topic/Subject</u>; unless you have formal approval from the moderator for something like an 'emergency exemption' from these rules.

<u>If any-one is Straying 'Off-Topic', any other participant</u> in the discussion <u>may immediately &</u> <u>vocally point out</u> that problematic behavior, <u>through saying "Point of Order</u>". At that point the moderator has a Duty to stop the discussion & to resolve the merits of all actual "Point of Order" issues

that might be raised. Occasionally these "Point of Order" motions will be 'meritless'; but the time taken to discover such meritlessness is trivial in comparison to the time wasted by allowing dysfunctional speakers to hi-jack the discussion off in-to off-topic subjects.

The word "Motion" is acceptable to use in raising these & similar issues

Rules Governing how to Gain the Floor to Speak:

<u>When there is break in conversation</u>, & with respect, <u>the floor may be gained by stating "May I"</u> <u>of "If I May</u>". Other phrases should be avoided; in order that the process can remain simple for everyone to comprehend.

Also; <u>When you have Concluded making your statement</u>, question, proposition, or argument; <u>please clearly declare "I Yield</u>". This courtesy will allow every-one to know that you are yielding the floor; & they can there-under make quick & efficient use of our available but limited & precious Time.

Generally speaking, & <u>once a caller has been 'Recognized</u>', & given the floor by the moderator; <u>This Speaker Has 'The Floor</u>', & (generally) May Not be Interrupted by any-one other than the moderator, & then only for reasonable & fully justified "Cause Shown".

"Respect"; & Maintaining "Qualified Elector Status".

<u>People who Un-Justifiably Speak Abusively</u> & Dis-Respectfully of Other good-standing Members of this Community, <u>should have their presumed "Qualified Elector Status" Challenged</u>; & there-under, <u>they may become formally adjudicated to Not be a "Qualified Elector</u>", & there-under declared to be <u>Not Qualified to further Participate in these Organic Body-Politic & Group Community</u> <u>Discussions</u>.

I would like to point out here that there are passages in the Bible, where Jesus is described as dis-respectfully chastizing the Scribes & Pharisees, by referring to them as 'Serpents & Off-Spring of Vipers'. And in the Biblical Old Testament the Israelite people were directed to form Armies, & to execute death-penalty against people whom are commonly assumed to have been un-repentantly 'Evil'. And, in our modern times, our American People are now in 'Spiritual War'; & that we all are facing extremely serious dangers, largely from Purposefully Subversive Activists who posture as honorably concerned Patriots; all similar to the old FBI 'Counter-Inteligence Program, known as 'Cointelpro', as web-linked here:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/COINTELPRO https://vault.fbi.gov/cointel-pro

It is the opinion of my-self, Charles Stewart, that, <u>these sorts of 'Purposefully Subversive</u> <u>Activists</u>', when they are discovered; they <u>Should Properly & Boldly Be Accused of engaging in 'Evil</u> <u>& Subversive Practices</u>'; &, in efforts to Clarify the Extremely Intense Seriousness of This Issue, then before the assembled community, <u>they may & likely should be talked to in seriously 'Dis-Respectful</u> <u>Words & Tones</u>'; <u>& this immediately being followed by</u>, Collecting the Votes of all Assembled Constituents, (never to exceed twelve, & unanimously deciding); <u>& there-under Expelling Out</u> from the Organic Body-Politic Community <u>One or the Other of these Two Conflicted Persons</u>.

But; & generally speaking; <u>unless an individual has clearly evidenced such grossly abusive</u> <u>practices</u> as these; <u>then he or she should consistently be communicated with in</u> words & tones which consistently reflect <u>only Respect & Courtesy</u>.

Factual Accuracy is Prioritized.

At any point in our community discussions, <u>when any good standing individual has Easily</u> <u>Verifiable 'Evidence</u>', that <u>a specific Declaration of Truthful-Facts</u>, is "In Error"; then, <u>he may & should verbally raise & declare a "Point of Error</u>".

If a listener only Suspects that a specific Declaration of Factual-Ttruth, is actually "In Error';

then that listener should just make a note of the specifics of such an error, & keep quiet, until, at a more graceful & less confrontational opportunity in the discussion, he or she might present his or her Dissenting-Views of the actual Evidence related to the alleged 'Factual-Truth'.

Even when participants are quite certain that another participant is absolutely subversive & evil; & with-out compromizing the righteous-essence of the message, & <u>at least up until the actual 'narrow</u> <u>time-window' where-in manifests the 'moment of final-confrontation</u>'; that other likely subversive & evil participant <u>should be Communicated With through Words & Tones which Reflect Only Dignity,</u> <u>Firness, & Respect</u>.