Agenda

Agenda of the Special Meeting
of the Imperial General Estates
of the Adrian Empire

10:00 a.m. February 27-28, 1999

To be held in the Tai Room of the Roadhouse
2100 N. Boulder Hwy, Henderson, NV
702-564-1150
(near the corner of Sunset Rd.)

Directions:
From McCarran Airport, take Russell Rd. east to Boulder Hwy.
and south (right) on Boulder Hwy. to the Roadhouse located
on the east side of the road.

From I-15 North, take the 215 East toward the airport. Exit on
Sunset Rd. east towards Boulder Hwy turning north (left) onto
Boulder Hwy to the Roadhouse located on the east side of the road.

Salutations:
Unto Their Imperial Majesties, Imperial Highnesses, Royal Majesties, Highnesses, Graces, Excellencies, Chivalry and Sires of the Estates, your Chancery sends warmest wishes that this much awaited agenda reaches you, that you are well, and that we shall assemble soon to attend to the business of the Empire with goodwill and a dedication to driving a stake through the heart of the accumulated Old Business since 1997.

Please inform the members of the populace and those estate holders for whom no address reached the Chancery, that these documents and missing supplements may be found at www.adrianempire.org to be perused or downloaded. Every effort will be made to provide electronic versions to those desiring them.

Each regional Chancellor or other appropriate officer must notify the Chancery with an accurate list of estate holders from your region entitled to vote at this meeting. The voting right was frozen 60 days prior to the February 27 meeting date – December 29, 1998. Accurate information will be accepted until the meeting is called to order, but would be greatly appreciated earlier. Written proxies will be honored as per the By-Laws. Verbal proxies will be accepted, provided that the bearers shall attest in writing that they have the right to carry said verbal proxies (we are still trying to figure out a more elegant way to state that!). Remind us to bring up that discretion thing.

Generally accepted principles of Parliamentary procedure shall be followed during the meeting (but this also is a pesky issue of the discretion of the Chancery). A simple set of rules or order shall be posted. Members may wish to consider something more official during the Spring Meeting.

Enclosed please find the agenda.

Appendix A: The Minutes of the November 1998 meeting.
Exhibits in support of the minutes.
Appendix B: Stewards Financial Report. (from the exhibits)
Appendix C: College of Heraldry of the Adrian Empire, 1998.
Appendix D: Manual for the College of Arms of the Empire of Adria, 1999.
Appendix E: The Physicker Manual of the Adrian Empire, Inc. 1998, and proposed amendment.
Appendix F: Imperial Writs
Appendix G: Arts and Sciences Manual of the Adrian Empire, Inc. 1997/1999.
Appendix H: ECS to Adria Conversion
Appendix I: Proposed By-Law Changes (Sir Thomas)
Appendix J: Archery
Appendix K: Proposed By-Law Changes (Baron Jonathan, Baroness Meghan)
Appendix L: Proposed By-Law Changes (Sir Duriel)

Respectfully submitted by the Chancery

AGENDA OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE IMPERIAL ESTATES GENERAL OF THE ADRIAN EMPIRE FEBRUARY 27-28, 1999

(References to “I” are Sir Nikolai’s comments; the agenda was based on his draft)

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL (VERIFY PROXIES, ESTABLISH QUORUM)

SUMMON BYLAW CONVENTION

I. MINUTES OF 11/7-8/98

Attached for approval as Appendix A

II. MINISTER'S REPORTS

A. STEWARD'S REPORT

Attached as Appendix B is a current financial report from Dame Kitara as well as list of invoices and expenditures for approval by the Imperial Estates General. Expenditures from the Marcus law firm are to be donated and require no disbursement of funds. They are presented for tax purposes only (so Sir Nikolai can write them off).

(1) 501(c)(3)

The Empire already has the status. It is Sir Nikolai's hope to be able to report that nine of its chartered subdivisions have the status as well. That application process is complete. Other chartered subdivisions can add at any time. Have your local Stewards contact Guillory-Chavez consulting at (760) 352-3034.

(2) BUDGET

As indicated in the minutes, one item was forgotten. In 1997, a $400 annual expense was authorized to assist the Imperial Crown with travel in the Empire.

(3) ASSIGNMENT BY ESTATES

At the last meeting, the Estates directed Dame Kitara to make a report on the following:

(a) Expenditures for the Chocolate War;
(b) Check copies of all missing checks;
(c) Research "unknown" and "split" expenses; and,
(d) Western Imperial War costs.

(4) REIGN OF MATHGHAMHAIN II AND ISABEAU II

All items were approved at the last meeting, although there was direction that the Steward's office to work with Dame Isabeau to revise the report into typewritten/tabular form. It is hoped that the Estates will relieve us of this duty. In the mean time, one item remains to be approved:

+ Check #544 - War expenses.

This item may be found as Exhibit C to the Minutes

of 11/98 (Appendix A). Dame Isabeau was to research this item and present further explanation.

(5) OFFICER/DIRECTOR LIABILITY INSURANCE

Sir William Baine will be presenting a report on his progress in finding officer/director error and omission insurance (for about $1600/year).

(6) NEW STEWARD'S MANUAL

We already have three manuals:

1992 Steward's Manual (which is still good law, except the fee schedule is wrong). This manual is subject to change by the Imperial Crown to comply with IRS standards, but otherwise is an Imperial Estates Writ.

Sir Duriel's Steward's Manual (1998): A how-to manual for Stewards. A list of policies and tips. It is not law, but it is helpful.

Steward's Manual by Guillory-Chavez Consulting (1998): This is a manual of procedures propounded by our accountant to keep us in compliance with 501(c)(3) standards. It has never been formally adopted as law, but it is a series of necessary procedures for Stewards to follow.

Dame Kitara is working on a current manual of procedures within the Adrian Empire. All told, we should have four manuals to assist us before the reign is over.

B. SOVEREIGN OF ARMS AND HERALD REPORT

Dame Dorothea's and Dame Rose's College of Arms Manual was made a set of Imperial Proposed Guidelines not rising to the level of law in November of 1997 (when it was called the "French" College of Arms. It was resubmitted to the Senate in 7/98 and has since been revised. It is submitted for approval as Appendix C.

Lord Nigel's Heraldry Manual is now an Imperial Writ. It is submitted for approval as Appendix D.

C. OTHER MINISTERS: ROLLS AND PHYSICKS

Currently, this is the state of the law with regard to these manuals.

(1) Rolls: The 1993 manual is nothing more than a list of proposed "procedures" It was approved as a continuing Writ at the November 1997 meeting, but it expired at the Senate meeting in July 1998 (where it was not even mentioned). The manual is only useful because there is no other manual in existence, but it cannot be truly characterized as law. That's all right. There is nothing wrong with manuals of ministerial "procedure" which are not necessarily Imperial Law.

(2) Physickers: The latest manual is 1992 (although Dame Tachelle announced that the "new" physicker's manual was ready at the 11/97 meeting). Same analysis as rolls. I understand that Her Imperial Majesty has submitted a new manual as a Writ. This would be up for approval as Appendix E with proposed Amendment

attached.

D. OTHER MINISTERS: CHANCERY

(1) OPINIONS OF LAW

(a) As published in the Herald, Their Imperial Majesties have come to the conclusion that the rules regarding Pax Regium apply to Duchies as well as Kingdoms. This could change if certain clarifications are made regarding the difference between Ducal and Royal Crowns. Such clarifications are set forth below. In the past, the rules regarding Pax Regium have never been applied to Duchies.

(b) An emergency court was held after the last Imperial Estates Meeting. The ruling was that at a war, no tourney win would be granted to a participant (for the purpose of advancement in rank) if there were fewer than four participants in the particular list. This ruling overturned a prior non-binding interpretation of the Imperial Throne made at the Umbrian Crown War. The interpretation of the Imperial Throne was non-binding as there had been no written request for interpretation pursuant to Article VI.F.5.a.ii. The finding of the emergency court is also non-binding according to the Codex adjudicata, and only applies to the day on which the decision was made. A full court will be convened on thirty days notice at a time and place to be chosen by the Imperial Crown.

(2) Both Sir William Baine and Sir Frederick indicated that they considered that the portion of Article V to which amendment had been proposed (and failed) [regarding requirements that Crowns hold more than one war per year, and that nobles autocrat one event per year] to be dead law. Nevertheless, since amendment to these sections failed to pass the Estates, there seems to be some interest in preservation of the original language, or at least, disinterest in the amendments as proposed. Steps to clean this up should probably be taken, but it would probably be an abuse of Chancery authority to simply unilaterally edit these sections. It should be referred the chancery, with a proposal to be made at the next Senate meeting

(3) Dead law; Discretion; Voting Minors; Procedure; BOD Authority; Authorship; and Dividing the Authorized Crown Event.

E. OTHER MINISTERS

F. STATE OF THE EMPIRE

G. REPORT FROM THE PATRIARCH

(1) PROPOSALS (see Exhibit D to the minutes of 11/98, which is Appendix A).

III. WRITS AND CHARTERS FOR APPROVAL:

A. Annelynnerose: elevated to duchy. It keeps its original borders, and is granted all the rights and privileges available pursuant to the bylaws.

B. Isenwold: elevated to duchy. It keeps its original borders, and is granted all the rights and privileges available pursuant to the bylaws.

C. Umbria: elevated to Kingdom. It's borders are now the state borders of Arizona. It is granted all the rights and privileges available pursuant to the bylaws. It also retains all its rights and privileges as set forth in its original charter as follows:

> The Imperial Crown shall not alter, rescind, or change this Charter unless:
>
> 1) There is just and stated cause as defined in our Imperial By-Laws and two thirds of the Imperial Estates approve;
> 2) A Kingdom fails to maintain the standards for status as a Kingdom as delineated in our CURRENT (1992) Imperial By-Laws in which case the Imperial Crown shall be authorized to reduce said Kingdom to the status of Duchy;
> 3) Two thirds of the Estates General of a Kingdom request the Imperial Crown to alter the Charter of the Kingdom.

D. York: elevated to Kingdom, without change to its borders. It is granted all the rights and privileges available pursuant to the bylaws. It is also granted the following rights and privileges as has been traditional as follows:

> The Imperial Crown shall not alter, rescind, or change this Charter unless:
>
> 1) There is just and stated cause as defined in our Imperial By-Laws and two thirds of the Imperial Estates approve;
> 2) A Kingdom fails to maintain the standards for status as a Kingdom as delineated in our CURRENT (1997) Imperial By-Laws in which case the Imperial Crown shall be authorized to reduce said Kingdom to the status of Duchy;
> 3) Two thirds of the Estates General of a Kingdom request the Imperial Crown to alter the Charter of the Kingdom.

E. Any new Shires.

B. Appendix F.

IV. ISSUES FOR CLARIFICATION:

The following, is Sir Nikolai’s commentary preceding his clarifications.

Below, Good Imperial Chancellor, you will find several proposals. Nearly without exception, NONE are intended to change current law. All are of the nature of clarifying current law. In organizing the proposals below, those labeled "Clarification only" should simply pass into the bylaws on presentation, unless there is an objection. Those labeled "Proposed Amendment" are actual changes, but represent what I believe to be in accord with current trends in Adrian Law, and are designed to clean up some inconsistencies. These were all submitted to Sir Frederick, but unfortunately, only about half made it to the agenda, and none in a form which could be easily addressed. I believe that these are presented in a format that requires no editing, and would allow for relatively easy review. Any changes or clarifications would appear in the next edition of the bylaws or appropriate

manual.

A. WHAT IS A CROWN? [Clarification only]

At the last Senate Meeting, I tried to clarify the confusion regarding Ducal Crowns, as distinguished from Kingdom Crowns by substituting the generic "Ruling Noble." As was pointed out, this was the wrong thing to do. The word "Crown" is clearly defined as including Ducal Crowns in the glossary at the back of the bylaws. As Viceroys now rule chartered subdivisions in their own right, perhaps it would be simpler to say that a "Crown" is the ruler of a chartered subdivision or the Empire, while a "Ruling Noble" is the ruler of a Subdivision. This will make cleanup much easier, as was pointed out by Sir Frederick, and authorized by the Senate at the last meeting.

The "typo corrections" were all accepted without opposition by the Senate as reported on pages 26-30 of the Senate Agenda, except that wherever I tried to change "Crown" to "Ruling Noble", we agreed that the word "Crown" should remain. This affects the corrections to the items listed below. The page numbers refer to the Senate Agenda:

p.26 ARTICLE VI(E) [sentence following subsection 3]

p.26-27 ARTICLE VI(E) [last par.]

p.27 ARTICLE VI(F)(4)(a)

Also, on page 30, I suggested that "Crown", "Ruling Noble", "Peer" and "Landed Peer" be defined in the glossary rather than in Article VIII(A) as set forth on page 36. I stick with this idea, but the definition as set forth in the agenda would have to be slightly modified in order to conform to this point. The proposed definitions would be amended as follows:

Ruling Noble: Ruler of a Subdivision (unchartered)
Peer: Any member with a title ((Article IX(D))
Landed Peer: A Peer whose title comes by virtue of being a Crown or Ruling Noble

In addition, as used in the bylaws, the following definition should be added:

Royal Crown: Ruler of a Kingdom

The insertion of this definition will solve a lot of problems. Only a "Royal Crown" has a pax regium (Article XV). Only a "Royal Crown" need be of knightly rank ((Article VIII(B)(1)(a)). Also, only a "Royal Crown" has the powers set forth in Article VI(F)(5)(b). The powers of other Crowns are actually set forth in Article VIII(D). In addition, further powers of the Royal Crown are also set forth in Article VIII(D). This can be clarified by simply adding the following:

ARTICLE VI(F)(5)(b)(x):

other and further rights and obligations as may be set forth in Article VIII(D)(3)(b).

ARTICLE VI(F)(5)(c): Other Crowns

i. The rights and obligations of a Crown (other than a Royal Crown or an Imperial Crown) are

the same as those of a Royal Crown, except that they are subject to applicable limitations set forth in Article VIII(D).

Speaking of obligations, there needs to be one more clarification in:

ARTICLE VI(F)(5)(b)(vii):

The {Royal} Crown shall hold a minimum of one (1) court a month.

Interesting to note is that pursuant to Article VI(D), since Viceroys are "Crowns" but are not "Royal Estates", they may summon meetings of the Estates General, but may not vote at those meetings (unless they hold a vote by some other right, which is quite normal actually).

ALSO:

In Article V(D), the words "Ruling Royal Peer" should simply be changed to "Crown". "Ruling Imperial Peer" should be changed to Imperial Crown.

AND:

In Article XV(B) (Interim Civil War), "Imperial Throne" should be replaced with "Imperial Crown" for consistency.

ARTICLE IV(C):

Substitute "Crown" for "Royal Crown".

ARTICLE VI(G):

"Substitute "Crown" for "Ruling Noble" in the first two sentences of this section.

B. ROYAL ESTATES: [Clarification Only]

In reviewing the sections discussed immediately above, I noticed the following typos:

ARTICLE VI(F)(4):

The Royal Estates General has the right to:

It SHOULD read:

The Estates General of a given chartered subdivision has the right to [as not all Estates General are "Royal"]

ARTICLE VI(F)(4):

etc., etc., etc. In the following subsections, the following changes should be made:

a. "Royal Crown" to "Crown".

b. "Royal Crown to "Crown".

c.i. "Royal Estates" to "Estates General".

c.ii."Royal Crown to "Crown".

d. "Royal Codicils" to "Local Codicils".

ARTICLE VI(F)(5)(ii):

> "...Royal Crown and Chancellor and Imperial Chancellor..." to "...Crown and Chancellor of the chartered subdivision from which the request (appeal) has come, as well as the Imperial Chancellor..."

Chancellor's Commentary: the more draconian alternative to what follows in C. and D. is to simply dissolve the Imperial Senate, reintegrate the Imperial General Estates, meet once, twice or more each year as you select with full law making authority and the power to expedite the business of the Empire. Such a motion can be entertained as amendment by substitution to C. and D.

C. POWERS OF THE IMPERIAL SENATE: [Proposed Amendments]

It was first proposed in 1994 that the Imperial Estates General be split into two houses. At that time, there was a great deal of concern that the Senate could pass laws which would limit the rights of the Grand Assembly, effectively disenfranchising it. To avoid this problem, the Grand Assembly was given the right to veto most acts of the Senate (Article VI(F)(3)). Also, the Senate was forbidden from acting to change Article VI (Article VI(F)(2)(b)). Article VI was important as it detailed the rights of all Estates and Crowns, as well as the very functioning of the Governing Body. As indicated above, since November of 1997, many of the rights and responsibilities of the Estates and Crowns are now detailed in Article VIII (specifically, Article VIII(D)). It is now nearly impossible to phrase sections in Article VI without reference to Article VIII (as seen above and as mentioned in the proposal on page 30 of the Senate Agenda). That being the case, it seems appropriate to expand the prohibition on Senatorial action to Article VIII (at least) to prevent messing with Article VI through the back door. Other sections which might be considered for prohibition could be Articles III (membership), XIV (term of office), XV (pax regium and interim civil war), and XVI (crown war-- which includes an automatic meeting of the Imperial Grand Assembly). All of these sections are subject to manipulation such that modifications to these Articles could, in effect, modify Article VI through the back door. They probably merit jealous safeguarding to preserve the rights of the populace.

PROPOSAL:

> I would therefore propose that Article VI(F)(2)(b) be expanded to include Article VIII (at least), as well as Articles III, XIV, XV, and XVI. These would be like the members' "Bill of Rights."

Of less concern would be Articles IV (dues), and IX (awards, orders, ranks, and titles) as they do not directly impact our system of government. Changes in Article IX could not affect CURRENT holders of awards, orders, ranks, and titles pursuant to Article VI(J).

D. POWERS OF THE GRAND ASSEMBLY: [Clarification only]

This section remains in the same rambling order as drafted by Terrance four years ago. I wouldn't change the law, but its presentation sure could be clearer. Here is the way I would put it:

ARTICLE VI(F)(3): The Imperial Grand Assembly has the right to:

a. by a simple majority vote (more than half), veto any amendment, alteration, or amplification of the Imperial bylaws or Imperial Estates Writs (including manuals) [this is almost identical to the original text].

b. by a simple majority vote (more than half), veto any expenditures approved by the Imperial Senate which are subject to veto. All expenditures approved by the Imperial Senate are subject to veto unless proposed by the Imperial Crown and submitted to the Imperial Senate and Imperial Grand Assembly at least 60 days prior to any Senate meeting. [this is a re-written version of subsection "d"-- no change in the law].

c. No Imperial Senate action subject to veto shall become effective before it has been presented to the Imperial Grand Assembly, either at a fully noticed meeting (Article VI(G)), or by mail, AND the Imperial Grand Assembly determines that the Imperial Senate action should not be vetoed.

   i. If the Imperial Chancellor determines that the presentation shall be done at the next fully noticed meeting of the Imperial Grand Assembly, actions may be vetoed by a simple majority of members present once a quorum is established (Article VI(B)).

   ii. If the Imperial Chancellor determines that the presentation shall be done by mail, all Imperial Senate actions which are subject to veto shall be mailed, first class, to each member of the Imperial Grand Assembly, return receipt requested, at the address the Imperial Steward has on record. Accompanying the copy of each Senate action shall be a form as follows:

      [ ] Yes
      [ ] No
      [ ] We need a meeting to discuss

      which each member of the Imperial Grand Assembly may mail back to the Imperial Chancellor (whose address will be included) to notify the Imperial Chancellor of that member's decision regarding the Imperial Senate action.

      TIMING: The Imperial Grand Assembly has 30 days to veto each Senate action or call for a meeting. The 30 days shall be measured from the date the Imperial Chancellor mails the last copy of Imperial Senate actions to a member of the Imperial Grand Assembly. All responses must be postmarked or received to the Chancellor by the end of thirtieth day (unless there is no mail delivery that day, in which case the deadline would be the next day on which mail is delivered).

      TALLYING: All responses (or failures to respond) will be tallied by the Imperial Chancellor. Any responses not received by the

deadline will be tallied as a vote in favor of the Imperial Senate action (opposing a veto). A "Yes" vote will also be tallied as a vote in favor of the Imperial Senate action (opposing a veto). A "No" vote will be tallied as being in favor of a veto. A "We need a meeting to discuss" vote will be tallied as a vote to table the matter until the next fully noticed meeting of the Imperial Grand Assembly. If the number of "No" votes pertaining to a given Imperial Senate action corresponds to a majority (more than half) of all members of the Imperial Grand Assembly entitled to vote, that action is vetoed. If the number of "No" votes alone does not correspond to a majority, but the number of "No" votes PLUS the number of "We need a meeting to discuss" votes corresponds to a majority of all the members the Imperial Grand Assembly entitled to vote, that action is tabled until the next fully noticed meeting of the Imperial Grand Assembly. If the number of "Yes" votes PLUS the number of missing or late responses correspond to a majority of all members of the Imperial Grand Assembly entitled to vote, the action passes. "Silence implies consent." [This section is unchanged, but the language is (hopefully) clearer.]

d. by a 2/3 majority void a challenge for the Imperial Crown. [This is nearly identical to the old language of subsection "b." (I added "Imperial").

e. Any two members may put a proposal on the agenda before the Imperial Senate. [original language]

I put the sections in different order to avoid the necessity of constantly re-listing those items which were subject to veto. Also, under the old language, it was unclear that budget items could be subject to veto by mail. This should make it clearer.

E. TERM OF OFFICE: [Clarification only]

(1) QUORUM

It used to be that it took two thirds of 90% of the Estates General of a chartered subdivision two remove a Crown (Article VI(F)(4)(c)(ii). As can be seen, the reference to "90%" no longer exists in that section as the Imperial Estates found the reference to 90% to be "dead law" and a violation of local sovereignty. It was to be left to the local regions to determine their own quorum requirements. (A long time ago, the quorum requirements for the Imperial Estates was 90%, but it was changed in 1994. We forgot to take care of the quorum requirements of the local Estates until 1997.) Unfortunately, in cleaning up the bylaws, the reference to "90%" remains in Article XIV (Term of Office). Also, Article XIV still refers to a "Landed Royal Estate holder," which would not include Viceroys (as Viceroys are not Royal Estates). This MUST be fixed. The old language is as follows:

"Any Landed Royal Estates holder may be removed from office by a 2/3rd's majority vote of 90% of the Estates General... The Imperial

Crown may be removed from office by a 2/3rd's majority vote of the Imperial Senate and Imperial Grand Assembly jointly, with only a regular quorum. A Crown my not follow themselves as Crown."

It SHOULD read:

"The Imperial Crown may be removed from office pursuant to Article VI(F)(1)(a). Any other Crown may be removed from office pursuant to Article VI(F)(4)(c)(ii). A Crown may not follow itself as Crown."

(2) ROYAL REIGN

By the way, there is a section in Article XIV which is really weird. It reads:

ARTICLE XIV(B):

The King/Queen shall rule for not more than one (1) year from the date of coronation or within thirty (30) days of becoming the Heir Apparent, whichever comes first.

What the section is TRYING to say is:

ARTICLE XIV(B):

The King/Queen shall rule for not more than one (1) year. The year shall be measured from the date of coronation or from the latest date coronation should have occurred pursuant to Article XIV(E), whichever is earlier.

The Senate recently reviewed and passed a change to Article XIV(E), thus making the above change even more necessary.

(3) VICEROY'S REIGN

Finally, the term of office of a Viceroy needs to be clarified. It is clearly set forth in Articles VI(F)(4)(c)(ii) and VIII(D)(1)(b)(iv), and should be summarized with the other Crowns and Ruling Nobles as follows:

ARTICLE XIV(D) ALL OTHER CROWNS AND RULING NOBLES.

All other Crowns and Ruling Nobles shall rule until they resign or are removed by their populace. They may be removed by their populace through war (except Viceroys) or by 2/3 majority vote of the composite Estates of the respective chartered subdivisions or subdivisions which they rule. In the case of Sires, the vote shall be of the individual members. Viceroys may also be removed by act of the Crown at whose pleasure they serve. [The prohibition against removing Viceroys by war is in Article XV(B) (Interim Civil War).]

F. VICEROYS: [Clarification only]

Speaking of Viceroys, I note that Viceroys are fully defined in Article IX(D)(11). The powers of Imperial Viceroys are fully defined in Article VIII(D)(1). As Viceroys are no longer ministers...

ARTICLE VII(F)(10): [DELETE IT! IT'S MISLEADING!]

Chancellor's Commentary: In G. we revisit the issue of authenticity and consistency of titles and retiring titles. Currently (more or less since the beginning) that was out of the window when English Counts (Earls) and Italian Countesses (Contessas) began populating the "French Court" and founders holding "Viscount" titles out rank Counts. Adria must live with it or fix it. In the meantime, have fun with Sir Nikolai's alternatives or offer a few of your own.

G. DUCAL RETIREMENT TITLES: [Proposals (& 1 clarification)]

The original proposal is on page 52 of the Senate Agenda. That portion which applied to Article VI was tabled until November as the Senate is forbidden to touch Article VI. The only thing which passed had to do with the name of retired Duc/Duchess (although, even though it passed the Senate, it was never properly ratified by the Imperial Grand Assembly, and is thus up for review again at this Meeting. That being the case, it will be appropriate to revisit the whole proposal). The name "Freeholder" failed as it had historical significance within the game other than that which had been intended. The proposal which did pass renamed Duchies of 50 members or above as Archduchies. All other Duchies were Grand Duchies. A retired Duc or Duchess was a Duc or Duchess...

Awkward. Also, we end up with the ironic situation that a retired Archduc/Archduchess ends up with a title which historically outranked the retirement titles for King/Queen (Earl/Comtessa). As this needs to be revisited anyway, let us fix this awkwardness as follows:

Let Duchies of 50 members or above remain Archduchies. Let all other Duchies simply be called Duchies (as folks continue to confuse Grand Duchies with Archduchies-- they both sound big). Let the retirement title for Archduchies be one of the following:

(1) SEIGNEUR/SEIGNEURA: A title once reserved for Sires but no longer in use. It is elegant because a Seigneur, like a Sire, would wear a black chain and have a vote on the Estates General.

(2) PETTIDUC/PETTIDUCHESS: A title which has quasi-historical basis (like "Comtessa"), but which would actually be uniquely Adrian. The name itself implies a rank less than Duc.

(3) HOUSEHOLDER: Implies an analogy to Sires in that the retired Crown has a Household unto his/herself.

(4) BANNERETTE: Implies an analogy to Knights Bannerette which also wear a black chain, also have a vote on the Estates General, and are also non-landed.

(5) FREEMAN/FREEWYF: Sir Karl of Tierra del Fuego suggested "Freiherr", which is the German translation. "Freewyf" is pronounced "free-wife."

(6) FIEFLORD/FEIFLADY: Generic. It literally means "Estate holder."

(7) POTENTATE: A 15th century word for ruler or sovereign. More broadly, it means one who has great power or sway.

(8) MAYOR: A title from the Romance languages meaning literally "elder" or "greater". Mode of address for a Mayor (and perhaps for the other suggested titles) would by "Your Honor".

(9) ALDER: A gender-neutral adaptation of "alderman", which is a medieval term for a civic leader. Alderman literally means "elder man".

(10) ELDER: Truly generic. To some, it may have some religious overtones.

(11) POOBAH: Sorry. Couldn't resist.

Thus, Article IX(D) would be amended to add a new subsection 13 (with the current number 13 becoming number 14, etc.) as follows:

13. [insert name here]: The retired ruler of a chartered subdivision which qualifies as an Archduchy (having over 49 members) at the end of a successful reign of at least six months. The [name] wears a black chain of state. Part of the Estates Minor.

(1) CLARIFICATION

The changing of the bigger Duchies to "Archduchies" and their rulers to Archducs/Archduchesses (as opposed to Duc/Duchess Elector) will cause minor changes in Articles VIII(D)(2) and IX(D)(4).

Regarding the possibility of voting rights for retired Archducs/duchesses, see below (IX.C. of the agenda).

H. CROWN WAR: [Proposals and Clarifications]

Although it was new business, Sir Jehan's proposal regarding multi-site wars was passed, with some modifications. It may be found on pages 42-45, but was amended as indicated in the Senate Minutes. Of course, it was never properly ratified by the Imperial Grand Assembly, and thus, an opportunity may be taken to revisit the issue as a whole.

We have now actually play-tested a multi-site war. I believe the play-test was an unmitigated success. Based on that experience, I propose the following minor changes:

(1) WARSITES [Proposed amendment]

p.42 ARTICLE XVI(D)1(a)(ii):

[The following section (slightly reworded) was deleted: "The site(s) of the Imperial Crown War shall be in chartered subdivision(s) other than that in which the Imperial Crown resides. If there are co-rulers who live in different chartered subdivisions, the war shall be in chartered subdivision(s) in which neither ruler resides."]

That section was passed in 1996 as Article XVI(A)(1) to avoid Imperial Crowns from giving a home-field advantage to local favorites, OR TO THEMSELVES IF CHALLENGED TO CIVIL WAR. At the Senate meeting, it was suggested that the section was no longer necessary. I had no strong opinion at the time and did not argue. We were pressed for time, and the matter was new business in any event. Of course, proxies had no opportunity to discuss the proposed change. On reflection, I would like to revisit the issue. The arguments in favor of canceling the section are listed below followed by my response:

1. "We no longer have corruption at the Imperial level."

I hope we never have it again. In fact, I would like a safeguard to PREVENT it from happening again. This is such a safeguard. It HAS happened before. Do we wait for it to happen again and revive this section after it's too late? What if it's too late?

2. "It was hard to find war sites anywhere but Esperance."

With all due respect to my cousins, Their Imperial Majesties, Whom I have served loyally throughout their reign, I don't buy this one. There are so many chartered subdivisions now that a park should be available if the search begins early enough.

3. "With multiple warsites, this section might be difficult."

I don't buy this either. The West has three Kingdoms, three Duchies, and many Shires. The East has a Kingdom and two Duchies, as well as several Shires. We won't have a Middle War until there are several chartered subdivisions there too. There are only (at most) two people on the Imperial Throne. We SHOULD be able to find warsites!

4. "We are looking at purchasing a permanent Imperial Warsite in the West, and that site may be in a chartered subdivision in which an Imperial Crown could reside someday."

When the proposal to purchase a permanent Imperial Warsite comes before the Imperial Estates, we can deal with this "problem" then. In the mean time, it is nothing more than a dream. I am interested in that dream, but right now, I am more interested in what we know to be reality. Before this restriction on warsites existed, there was abuse. There might be again. The future is the past forgotten. In a year when hardly anyone wanted the Imperial Throne, it may be hard to remember a time when there were people who would do anything to get it. It could happen again. I'd rather not tempt our good populace.

Remember, the Imperial Government has unfettered authority to designate the Imperial War site(s). The above restriction is the ONLY restriction on that unfettered authority.

(2) CLARIFICATION:

By the way. The language we are discussing still remains in Article XV(B) (Interim Civil War) [although "Imperial Throne" should be replaced with "Imperial Crown" for consistency.

(3) QUALIFICATION OF CONTENDERS [Proposed amendment]

p.43 ARTICLE XVI(D)(2)(a):

> "Records of these two Imperial Ministers shall be considered final for this determination."

This section should be stricken. Nothing is "final", and the Imperial records have never been in perfect order. The paragraph is fine without this draconian sentence. Contenders should be allowed the right to prove their qualifications. Furthermore, Ministers should NEVER have "final" power when it comes to determining who the successor to their boss will be. Politically, it is unwise.

(4) ACCEPTABILITY OF CONTENDERS

p.43 ARTICLE XVI(D)(2)(b):

> [This section should be slightly modified as follows:] The {Imperial} Grand Assembly is automatically summoned {at any Imperial War where there are contenders for the Imperial Throne} to decide the acceptability of the declared {contenders}. If {a} consort is to be a co-ruler, then {the consort's} fitness shall {also be} examined. If a {contender} is judged as unfit by the {Imperial} Grand Assembly, {that contender} shall be notified in writing of the reason. The meeting of the Imperial Grand Assembly may occur at a single war site or at multiple war sites, so long as a quorum is established overall. The meeting shall be held following the statements of the contenders (see below) but prior to the membership choosing sides.

(5) NON-COMBATANT CONTENDERS [Proposed Amendment]

p.43 ARTICLE XVI(D)(3):

> [As indicated above, this section was deleted and replaced with the original language of XVI(A)(3). I think the decision was made in haste. I like Sir Jehan's original language.]
>
> Non-combatant contenders:
>
> > Non-combatant contenders for the Imperial Throne shall be present {at a war site} to encourage, advise and admonish their army, but for safety reasons shall not join their army on the field of battle.

(6) NON-COMBATANT CONTENDERS II [Proposed Amendment]

Similarly, ARTICLE XVI(A)(3) should be amended as above, except replace "Imperial Throne" with "Crown" and delete "at a war site."

(7) POLITICAL CORRECTNESS [Clarification only]

p.43 ARTICLE XVI(D)(4):

[I like Sir Jehan's language perfectly except for all the references to "the Chancellor or HIS representative." It should read the Imperial Chancellor or representative.]

(8) BATTLE SCENARIOS [Clarification only]

p.44 ARTICLE XVI(D)(6):

[The following section should be slightly modified: "The number and types of battles shall be {} determined by {} Imperial Estates {Writ}, but in any case{,} there shall be an equitable mixture of {light weapons}, renaissance and armored battles. In the absence of an Imperial Estates Writ, the armed-combat battles shall be as set forth in Article XVI(B) above."]

(9) BATTLE SCENARIOS II [Clarification only]

Just as a note of clarification, Article XVI(B) was changed last November, although it is not reflected in the current edition of the 1997 bylaws. It should read ...and (1) armored champions battle and a number of arts points as set forth in the current Manual of Arts and Sciences...

(10) BATTLE SCENARIOS III [Proposed amendment]

Of course, this now begs the question-- now that our MANUALS and WRITS might affect the outcomes of Imperial Wars, do we extend the prohibition against Senatorial action to include those Manuals and Writs? I think so. The language would be "any Imperial Estates Writs, including Manuals, which are specifically contemplated in Article XVI."

(11) TABULATING RESULTS [Proposal + 1 Clarification]

p.44 ARTICLE XVI(D)(7):

[I like this section too. References to "Chancellor" should be changed to "Imperial Chancellor." I am concerned about the sentence which says the following: "Failure to communicate results by 7:00 a.m. Pacific Time on Labor Day will NEGATE that war sites PARTICIPATION." First, let us start with "negate." Do we really want two days of hard struggle "negated" because of the negligence of one representative (who ostensibly is chosen by the Imperial Chancellor)-- or worse, because phone lines were down due to a hurricane! Do we really want to negate the "participation" of the members (or was the intent to merely negate the war points-- it is unclear). Just so you know, the Imperial Chancellor was not even involved in setting up the communications between the sites this year. I reported the results to the only cell phone number I knew-- Sir Stefan's. Did I "fail to communicate results." Was the Eastern War "negated?" Hardly. This sentence is draconian beyond reality. It should be reworded as follows: "Results at each war site shall be communicated to the Imperial

Chancellor or designated representative for tabulation no later than 7:00 a.m. Pacific Time on Labor Day (or Memorial Day if an Imperial Civil War)." Also, the sentence on tabulation should be slightly modified: "Upon receiving all of the points, the Imperial Chancellor shall tabulate the results and announce the winner of the Imperial Crown War. {Victory shall go to the contender(s) whose army won the most points.} Finally, our experience with this year's Imperial War shows that a tie is nearly impossible. So many fractional points are floating around that a tie-breaker is truly unnecessary. The complex tie-breaker section, which was never on the agenda anyway, should simply be repealed.]

I. CIVIL WAR

Interestingly enough, Sir Jehan's proposal does not even contemplate Imperial Civil War. This problem is easily remedied. Analogous sections should be placed in Article XV:

(1) PAX REGIUM [Proposed amendment]

ARTICLE XV(A): PAX REGIUM

[Add the following sentence on the end:] In any event, the Imperial Minister of War shall advise the Imperial Chancellor, the Imperial Crown, and the Imperial Chronicler of the site or sites of the Memorial Day Imperial War no later than March 1 preceding the War. The Imperial Chronicler shall cause this information to be published well in advance of the war.

(2) INTERIM CIVIL WAR [Clarification only]

ARTICLE XV(B): INTERIM CIVIL WAR.

[This section needs to be modified to accommodate Interim Civil Wars for Ruling Nobles as contemplated in Article XIV(D):] An Interim Civil War may be called by any member who meets the qualifications for Crown or Ruling Noble of the chartered subdivision or subdivision for which that member wishes to challenge. In the event... two day duration. In a Kingdom Civil War, if the Royal Crown is successful, a new Pax Regium shall be instituted for the duration of the time allotted to the Royal Crown to rule. [The fourth sentence must be modified for reasons explained below:] No Interim Civil War may be called against a Lord/Lady Protector or Viceroy. [This modification is necessary because the prohibition regarding Civil War against "Estate holders" makes no sense as all Ruling Nobles and Crowns are "Estate holders". Perhaps the reference was to non-landed Estate holders. We'll probably never know.] Only the membership of the Estate in Civil War (Empire, chartered subdivision, or subdivision as the case may be) may choose for whom they will fight; the distribution of all visiting members and participants shall be in proportion to the size of the army as set by

the choice of the membership of the Estate. [The last two sentences need only be changed slightly to accommodate multiple war sites:] In the case of an Imperial Civil War, the war must take place in chartered subdivision(s) other than that in which the Imperial Throne resides. If there are co-rulers who live in different chartered subdivisions, the war shall be in chartered subdivision(s) where neither ruler lives.

(3) NOTICE [Clarification only]

ARTICLE XV(B)(1): NOTICE.

[Add the following sentence at the beginning:] In the case of an Imperial Civil War, the site(s) and date of the War are pre-selected pursuant to Article XV(A). In all other cases, the following procedure is used. Upon qualification, the contender will give the Crown thirty (30) days notice...

(4) VOID CHALLENGE [Clarification only]

ARTICLE XV(B)(2): VOID CHALLENGE.

[This section is fine, except it needs a comma between "challenge" and "a". At the end, I would add, "Conduct of the Imperial Grand Assembly will be as set forth in "Crown War" below, specifically Article XIV(D)(2)(b)."

(5) MULTIPLE CHALLENGERS [Clarification only]

ARTICLE XV(B)(3): MULTIPLE CHALLENGERS.

[This section wouldn't change much.] In the event there is more than one qualified challenger, the Minister of War shall plan the event as a two (2) day war, and on the first day of the war, the armies of the challengers shall vie to determine a single pretender to face the Crown or Ruling Noble of the Estate in Civil War. This section does not apply to Imperial Civil War, which shall be governed in all respects (other than those specifically set out in this Article) pursuant to Article XVI(D) Imperial Crown War.

(6) FEALTY [Clarification only]

ARTICLE XV(B)(4): FEALTY.

[This would remain identical to current law, with a minor clarification in the section on subdivisions, which previously made no sense:] {Usually,} in {a} Civil War {or Crown War}, only personal fealty will be binding. Those in fealty by dint of Estate shall be free to choose whichever side they wish in a {} Civil War {or Crown War}. This applies only to Crown wars, Crown Civil Wars, and Subdivision Civil Wars in subdivisions which have no more than one subordinate subdivision (e.g. Households, or Baronies which only have one Household or no Households at all). In a Subdivision Civil War where the subdivision is comprised of two or more smaller subdivisions,

all members of the subordinate subdivisions shall fight on the same side as directed by their respective Ruling Nobles. Combatants who are not bound to a principal in the war... [The balance of this section continues, either as is written in the 1997 bylaws or as proposed by Sir Thomas if approved. (1998 Senate agenda in Appendix D.) Now Appendix I.]

J. QUORUM AND MEMBERSHIP OF THE IMPERIAL AND LOCAL ESTATES GENERAL [Proposed amendments and Clarifications]

As we all now know (since a court case in 1996), a meeting occurs once a quorum is established. This is now codified in Article VI(E). The issue of "quorum" recently came up in Umbria, and the time seems ripe to clarify the issue. We start with Article VI(E). I wouldn't change the language (other than what was clarified at the last Senate meeting, and some stuff at the end, which I will explain), but it needs to be subdivided into subsections for easy reference:

(1) ARTICLE VI(E) [Clarification only]

ARTICLE VI(E): OFFICIAL MEETINGS, IMPERIAL ESTATES CALENDAR

1. A meeting of a given body of Estates is officially convened when a quorum is established. {Once a quorum is established, a meeting may continue until adjourned, even if the membership drops below quorum. In tallying a vote, a measure passes if it garners a sufficient proportion of the voting body (excluding abstentions, which are deemed voluntary exclusions from the voting body).} [The sentence in brackets was misplaced in Article VI(B) at the last Senate Meeting (p.26 of the agenda). I fix it here now.]

2. The Imperial Estates General shall meet on the first weekend of November of every year, at which time they shall conduct appropriate business including but not limited to evaluation of the success or failure of the current Imperial Crown's reign as well as any prior reigns not yet evaluated, irrespective of the length of such reigns. The Imperial Estates General shall have the right to table consideration of any Imperial reign.

3. The Imperial Senate shall be required to hold a regularly scheduled meeting in the third weekend of July for the purpose of attending to the mundane business of the corporation. The meeting would be at a fixed date (or weekend) and would not change from year to year. It shall be the responsibility of the Imperial Crown to coordinate the meeting which shall be held at a time and place designated by the Imperial Crown. The principal agenda items of this meeting shall be:

   a. To review Imperial level expenses for the past year;

   b. To finalize enough data to prepare the corporation's tax returns (if necessary);

c. To see to any other mundane business.

Each chartered subdivision's Crown shall present a copy of his or her chartered subdivision's financial records at this meeting. Attendance at this meeting shall be mandatory for at least one ruling Crown {or representative} from each chartered subdivision.

Chancellor's Commentary: In order that the two meetings be 6 months apart, a motion to amend the proposal as follows would be in order, delete third, insert first. Delete July, insert May, or if reintegrated combine 2. and 3. delete "Senate" references and limits and call for meetings the first weekend in May and November.

4. Members entitled to a seat by virtue of rank or office whose dues are not current, are under judicial ban, or have not attended at least (2) official events in any subdivision within the previous six (6) months will be denied a seat. The membership entitled to vote at a meeting of a given body is fixed as of the SUMMONING of the meeting and may not be subsequently altered by any means, including expiration of dues, non-participation, formation of new Estates, or change in Estate held by a given member, until the meeting is concluded. {The only exception would be resignation of a given member, or judicial ban.} A meeting is deemed summoned at the point of minimum notice. The point of minimum notice is defined as thirty days for the Estates General of chartered subdivisions or sixty days for any body of Imperial Estates, unless waiver of such notice is granted by the summoned body, in which case the point of minimum notice shall be the date of actual notice. The Crown, if available, will convene the summoned Estates at the appointed time and place, and the meeting will be presided over by the Chancellor, if available.

The exception written into subsection 4 was intended by the Imperial Estates General when the measure was past last November, as is clearly reflected in the minutes. Subsection 4 was recently misinterpreted to mean that the membership of "Estates" was fixed as of the summoning of the meeting, rather than the membership of individual members. For example, in Umbria, a Crown war is to happen the week prior to the meeting of the Imperial Estates General. Under this section, the OLD Crowns are entitled to vote, and the new Crowns have to wait until the next meeting. The purpose of this section was three-fold:

1. There HAS to be a point when the membership is fixed so that agendas can be mailed out to the right people.

2. This bit of legislation was specifically designed to prevent the reshuffling of the representatives of Estates at the last minute to try to get a political advantage--something which was regularly done before 1996, and which was recently attempted in Umbria.

3. It allows the outgoing Imperial Crowns to retain their vote throughout the meeting of the Imperial Estates General, even though their successors are usually crowned on Saturday night.

Of course, nothing prevents outgoing Crowns from giving proxies to incoming Crowns, which is what Sangreal did at the last Senate meeting.

Nevertheless, there was an attempt to misinterpret this section to mean that UMBRIA'S vote was fixed (as opposed to that of Umbria's Duc/Duchess). This is absurd. The language of Articles VI(B), (E), and (I) are clear, and speak of "members" not "Estates".

(2) ARTICLE VI(B) [Clarification only]

In a recent series of actions in Umbria, Article VI(B) was interpreted differently from the intent of the author (me), and the Imperial Estates General. In that section is the following passage:

"Any person who is a member of either body [the Imperial Senate or Grand Assembly], and who was a member at the last properly noticed meeting at which the body met, and who failed to appear at that meeting (either in person or by proxy) shall not count toward calculation of the quorum."

The purpose of this section was to keep people from deliberately trying to prevent meetings from occurring by simply not showing up and by trying to get their friends not to show up (thus preventing a quorum). This was attempted many times in Adrian history, most recently in 1996. The law now is that if you failed to show last time, and you fail to show again this time, your Estate is not considered when we count the total of all "members entitled to vote." In other words, if there are 24 Estates entitled to vote, and you are absent (again), then for purposes of determining quorum, we only count 23 Estates. Thus, a quorum would by 12 (rather than 13). Recently, Umbria interpreted this passage to mean that if you were absent last time, YOUR ESTATE DOES NOT COUNT THIS TIME FOR PURPOSES OF ESTABLISHING A QUORUM! In other words, even though you are present, you don't count because you weren't there last time. Wow! Let's fix the wording to preserve the law! The section should now read:

ARTICLE VI(B):

> The quorum requirements for the Imperial Senate and the Imperial Grand Assembly shall be more than half of the {"active"} members entitled to vote within each body. {The quorum requirements for the Imperial Senate and the Imperial Grand Assembly jointly (Imperial Estates General) shall be more than half of the "active" members entitled to vote within the joint body. Anyone who was a member of a given body at the last properly noticed meeting of that body, and who failed to appear at that meeting (either in person or by proxy, whether or not a quorum had been established) shall not be considered "active"

at the following meeting, unless that member is actually present for the counting of the quorum. A member who was formally not "active" but who is present for the counting of the quorum will be fully entitled to vote so long as that member meets the requirements of Article VI.E.4. Members of a given body must still be notified of meetings pursuant to Article VI(G), even if not "active", so long as they meet the requirements of Article VI.E.4.

(3) LOCAL QUORUM [Proposed amendment]

The interesting thing about Article VI(B) is that it does NOT apply to Estates General of local chartered subdivisions. It ONLY applies to Imperial Estates. Nevertheless, Umbria applied this section to its own Estates. That may be ok. In the absence of locally-adopted quorum requirements, the Imperial rules could be the default rules. The following sentence could be added to Article VI.E.1:

"Each chartered subdivision shall determine its own quorum requirements. Until such determination is made, the quorum requirements in each chartered subdivision shall be equivalent to those set forth in Article VI.B.1."

(4) ARTICLE VI(I) [Clarification only]

Recently, in Umbria, it was thought that a member had a vote on the Estates General by virtue of two titles. He was a second-level knight as well as the ruling noble of a subdivision. Pursuant to Article VI(I), he was only entitled to one vote only. The question was whether he could "proxy" his other vote to someone else. Article VI(I) DOES say "proxies excepted", but that is not what is meant. "Proxies excepted" means that you can hold multiple votes if you carry proxies. To clarify, the words "proxies excepted" should simply be replaced with "except that the member may carry the proxies of other members entitled to a vote."

Interestingly enough, another misinterpretation of Articles VI(B), (E), and (I) is that for the purpose of establishing quorum, to determine the total number of members entitled to vote, one counts EVERY Estate, even if some people hold multiple Estates. By the plain language of the bylaws, it is PEOPLE who are counted, NEVER Estates. Having an Estate (or several) can give an INDIVIDUAL the right to vote.

(5) ARTICLE VI(G) [Clarification only]

There was a question about ARTICLE VI(G). The question was: If it takes 2/3 of the members to pass a measure at an emergency Estates meeting, does it take 2/3 to "ratify" that measure at the next fully noticed Estates meeting-- or does it just take a majority, kind of like approving minutes. The intent is that it would take 2/3. Sir William Baine pointed out that to make this absolutely clear, the word "ratify" should be replaced with "reconsider." That makes sense.

(6) WEAPONS [Proposed amendment]

In Adria, the tradition is that no weapons are borne at an Estates meeting. A sergeant-at-arms is appointed (who is the only one allowed arms), who disarms any members who bring weapons and keeps those weapons until the meeting is concluded. It has been suggested that it is time to put this tradition to writing. Fine.

ARTICLE VI(E)

1. A meeting of a given body of Estates is officially convened when a quorum is established.

   a. Once a quorum is established, a meeting may continue until adjourned, even if the membership drops below quorum. In tallying a vote, a measure passes if it garners a sufficient proportion of the voting body (excluding abstentions, which are deemed voluntary exclusions from the voting body).

   b. A sergeant-at-arms shall be appointed by the presiding member. The sergeant-at-arms shall ensure that all members are disarmed. Any weapons removed by the sergeant-at-arms shall be kept until the meeting is concluded. With the exception of the sergeant-at-arms, no one may bear weapons at any meeting of Estates.

K. SILLY TYPO [Clarification only]

In Article VIII(F)(4), there is a reference to "Article VII.D or E..." It should be to "Article VIII.D or E..."

L. DOMAINS [Proposed Estates Writ]

Perhaps it is finally time to put to writing what has been the tradition regarding Domains since 1993:

"A Domain recognized by the Imperium may give and take enforceable oaths, and have it's own distinctive heraldry. To be recognized as an Imperial Domain, an association must

1. Include members from more than one chartered subdivision;

2. Have maintained a reasonable membership level for at least one year;

3. Have registered heraldry;

4. Have submitted rules on how a member joins, and how a member quits."

Members of an Imperial Domain may have armigerius and sumptuary rights as granted by the Imperial Crown, or by the College of Heraldry (subject to approval of the Imperial Crown)."

M. Like proposals H. and I., this clarifies a Crown and Civil War

issue. Her Imperial Majesty Katyana proposes the deletion of awarding tournament wins for arts war points.

V. SENATE ACTIONS (AND INACTIONS) FOR REVIEW (7/98)

Several items passed the Senate and await ratification.

A. BUDGETARY ACTIONS

All budgetary actions of the Senate were reviewed at the meeting of the Imperial Estates General of 11/98. No action necessary.

B. ARTS AND SCIENCES

(1) 1997 Manual of Arts and Sciences

As reflected in the 11/98 minutes (amending the 11/97 minutes), the 1997 Manual of Arts and Sciences was approved "sight unseen" subject to review by the Senate in 7/98. That review never occurred. Attached as Appendix G. is that manual for approval by the Imperial Estates General.

(2) In Appendix B to the Senate Agenda for 7/98, Dame Willow made several proposals. Those which passed the Senate are as follows:

(a) CHANGES TO THE MANUAL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

(i) WARS (V.E.3): "All entries with a final entry score less than 15 will be removed from the list."

changed from

WARS (V.E.3): "All entries with a final entry score less than 10 will be removed from the list."

(ii) Add V.E.5.: "For the purpose of determining the winning army in any list, a masterwork shall be awarded an additional 5 points."

(b) The Proposed Artisans and Judging Guidelines Handbook was approved as Imperial Proposed Guidelines not rising to the level of law (as was the Judging Guidelines Handbook submitted by Dame Delia at the meeting of the Imperial Estates General in 11/96)

C. WRITS (having passed the Senate in 7/98)

(1) LEX KATHERINAE JOHANNIS PRIMA

This was a Writ setting forth how Internet and e-mail could be used as official means of communication. Although it passed the Senate, its terms specifically indicate that the Writ was only to apply during the reign of Jehan II and Katherine II. That reign having been concluded, it will be up to the current Imperial Crown to develop its own policies regarding e-mail and the Internet. This Writ is expired by its own terms, and no

action need be taken.

(2) Adria/ECS Conversion System:

(a) The system in its Writ form is attached as Appendix H. for approval.

(b) After approving the system, the Senate resolve to amend the commentary therein such that all references to "Terrance" would be changed to "a former member."

D. PROPOSAL REGARDING LORDS/LADY PROTECTOR (passed by the Senate in 7/98, and reflecting case law as articulated in March of 1996)

(1) [Article IX(D)(5) should be amended as follows]:

LORD/LADY PROTECTOR. The regent of the Empire or chartered subdivision if an appropriate Crown is incapacitated or otherwise unavailable. The Lord/Lady Protector wears a gold and black chain of state. Part of the Great Estates, although a Lord/Lady Protector has the same rights to vote at a meeting of Estates as would the appropriate Crown in whose place the Lord/Lady Protector reigns.

(2) [Article XIV(C) should be amended as follows]:

LORD/LADY PROTECTOR. The Lord/Lady Protector shall serve as regent of the Empire or chartered subdivision for not more than one (1) year. Lord/Lady Protectors may be appointed any time all appropriate Crowns are incapacitated or unavailable. If the appropriate Estates are not in session, and the incapacity is due to Judicial Ban or act of a Court of Justice, said Court shall have the power to appoint a Lord/Lady Protector. Otherwise, said appointment may be by act of the Chancellor of the region. If no Chancellor is available, the appointment may be done by the Senior Peer of the region. The Lord/Lady Protector shall reign until removed by the appropriate body of Estates, or until replaced due to the availability of an appropriate Crown. The first act of the Lord/Lady Protector is to call a meeting of the Estates at whose pleasure the Lord/Lady Protector reigns. Said meeting shall be held at the soonest practicable and legal time, at the place most convenient to the Estates.

E. PROPOSAL REGARDING RETIREMENT TITLE FOR ARCHDUCHIES (ARTICLE IX.D.)

This passed the Senate, and may be retroactive in effect at the discretion of local Estates General. Assuming it was reviewed in section IV.G. of the agenda (above), no further action need be taken. Regarding the possibility of voting rights for retired Archducs/duchesses, see below (IX.C. of the agenda).

F. AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE XIV.E. (by Sir Dilvish, passed Senate 7/98)

E. CORONATIONS

1. The Estates General of the Empire, Sovereign Kingdoms, and (with advice and consent of the Imperial Crown) other chartered subdivisions

shall have the right to establish by law their own timetables for coronation if the Heir(s) Apparent following a Crown War. These timetables shall be made known throughout the chartered subdivision and the Empire.

2. In the event that the Heir(s) Apparent fail to follow the timetable established by the Estates General, any qualified individual(s) may challenge the Heir(s) Apparent for the throne on the first day following the established date. The right to challenge shall continue in effect until the coronation takes place.

3. In the event that the Estates General do not establish and publish their own timetable for coronation following a Crown War, said coronation shall take place within thirty days from the date of determination of the Heir(s) apparent. If the coronation has not taken place by within thirty days of the said date, beginning on the thirty-first day, any qualified individual(s) may challenge for the throne. The right to challenge shall continue in effect until the coronation takes place. With regard to Imperial Coronations, the establishment and publication of a timetable for coronation shall be set forth in this section in the paragraph(s) that follow.

4. With regard to Imperial Heirs Apparent determined at regular Imperial War on Labor Day Weekend... [as per original text].

5. With regard to Imperial Heirs Apparent determined at an Interim Civil War on Memorial Day Weekend, coronation shall occur at a War site on that same weekend.

G. BYLAW AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY SIR THOMAS FITZSHOKES

These may be found in Appendix I. The following proposals passed the Senate:

Chancellor's Commentary: Because the author wished the proposal be considered by the Imperial Estates General in 1997 and the Senate consideration was not ratified in 1998 the proposal was resubmitted for consideration. Here we consider ratifying VII F. 2-9 before consideration of the rest of the proposal C.

Article VII.F.

2. Passed as presented.

3. Passed as presented.

4. Passed as presented.

5. Passed as presented, but with the word "electronically" stricken throughout.

8. Passed as presented.

9. Passed as presented.

10. Failed.

All other proposals of Sir Thomas either failed or were

withdrawn, except for those portions dealing with Article VI, which are dealt with below (section VI.C. of the agenda)

H. ARCHERY KNIGHTHOOD PROPOSAL [Duchy of Dragon's Mist]

Chancellor's Commentary: In H.,the proposal is an alternative combat Knighthood. Besides the consternation this causes combatants – it simply isn't combat. While it could be considered an art, until we adopt combat arts or some similar performance or sport division, a separate knighthood is not only more in keeping with original intent, it is more practical and easier on record keeping. Such an amendment would be in order striking references to combat knighthood. Proposals for Archery Manuals/Rules appear in old business, one is an amendment by substitution, Appendix J.

This passed the Senate in 7/98 and is presented with the original commentary by Sir Nikolai.

Ultimately, I (and most elder Adrians, I suspect) would like to see the return of the green fleur-de-lis, the symbol of the archery knighthood, a knighthood distinct from all others in that it is not exactly an art, but it isn't direct combat either. For now, however, I propose that archery simply be an approved method to gain a combatant knighthood. This is because the interest in archery knighthood is primarily in Dragon's Mist, where many members are unable to engage in traditional combat due to physical disability, but nevertheless, enjoy archery competition. It is not likely that every chartered subdivision is yet ready to offer monthly archery tournaments-- as they would have to do if archery became its own discipline.

Nevertheless, as interest grows, archery knighthood may become a discipline in its own right. I do foresee a problem in that those who got their combatant knighthoods through (at least in part) participation in archery, might not be allowed to use those participations toward the new archery knighthood. Transition is never perfect, but change is inevitable.

Anyway, without further ado, here is the proposal:

[Let an Article be added to the Combat Manual as follows]:

Article VII. Archery

A. Target archery tournaments are competitions of skill in which participants compete by attempting to accurately shoot an arrow at an unliving target. Lists for target archery may be held, so long as appropriate safety is observed and a Marshall is present. Participation in such lists may be counted toward advancement in rank in the Combatant Roll, but may not be used in lieu of participation in armored combat (required for second and third level). Said lists may be divided into Sergeants' lists and Knights' lists in accord with Article II(B) subsections 1.b. and 2.b. Said lists will comply with the rules of Article I subsections A (except the proscription against participation by a pregnant woman), B, C, and E(1-5 and 9 only). Rules regarding scoring of the archery tournament may be determined by

the autocrat of the tournament so long as the rules are fair and allow all participants an equitable chance to win based on their skill. The minimum age for participation in target archery shall be 13 years of age.

B. There are no armor or weapon requirements for target archery, but puruant to Article III(A)(5), the Marshall shall make certain that all participants are using safe weapons and are participating safely.

C. Other than the sections specifically set forth in this Article, no other sections of the Manual of Combat shall apply to target archery.

I. AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE XVI.B.

The following change passed the Senate in 7/98.

Change "If the contender is a Knight Combatant, he must represent him/herself in the armored champions battle."

to "Knights Combatant are encouraged to represent themselves in the armored champions battle, but it is not required."

VI. OLD BUSINESS FROM SENATE MEETING OF 7/98

A. AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE VI.C. (by Sir Dilvish)

"All changes to the Imperial Bylaws shall be published as soon as possible through official channels before becoming law."

Sir Dilvish: "The Chancellor is now empowered to create language for the Bylaws to serve the will of the Estates or to correct mistakes or typos. Should the Estates, as it did last November, direct the Chancellor to write or correct numerous sections of the Bylaws, thirty days can be too tight a deadline. This can be especially onerous if proposed Bylaws changes are submitted as general statements, not specifice add/change/delete Bylaws wording."

B. PROPOSAL REGARDING NON-LANDED TITLES AND VOTES (by Sir Stefan-- presented with original commentary, but with references to "Crowns" in the proposal substituted for references to "Ruling Nobles")

The following is proposed by Sir Stefan and drafted by Sir Nikolai as a solution to the issue which has been raised every year regarding the increasing number of votes on the Estates which belong to non-landed Estate Holders (Princes/Princesses, Viscount/Viscountesses, Earls/Comtessas, and knights of second level or above).

There are two problems which arise from our current system.

1) Over time, Estate Holders who represent no one but themselves are expected to outnumber landed Estate Holders (Emperor/Empress, King/Queen, Duc/Duchess, Viceroy, Marquis/Marquessa, Count/Countess, Baron/Baroness, Sire). "Landed" means "representing a subdivision or chartered

subdivision." This could impact our current representative-democratic system, taking power from current active members and placing it in the hands of older retired members.

2) In general, the Estates are becoming quite numerous. It is getting cumbersome to deal with them all.

On the other hand, the current system has some advantages. It mixes representative government with the wisdom of elder players who ruled in the past. Presumable, these elder players have a useful long-term perspectives on the roots and mission of the Game. They may vote independently, as they are accountable to no one but their own consciences (unless, of course, they commit some outrageous act which causes them to lose their Estates through act of Court or Government).

We want the wisdom and freedom of the non-landed Estates, but we don't want the past to control the present-- or the future. Members must not see the Estates as being controlled by folks who are accountable to no one.

The following proposal guarantees that the Estates will be representative, and yet have that much-needed perspective that only non-landed Estates can give.

The concept is that not all non-landed Estates would have a vote anymore. To be allowed to vote, they would have to be ELECTED by the bodies which created them. All non-landed Estates would be eligible to run for a limited number of voting positions. Those not elected would still have the right to speak and participate, if they so chose.

As this proposal deals with Article VI, it cannot be formally addressed until all the Imperial Estates meet in November. Nevertheless, it is presented for discussion now so that it may be placed under Old Business at the November Meeting. Also, it is presented now so that it may be preliminarily discussed. The Senate may pass it as a non-binding resolution-- that is to say, a statement of intent to review and adopt the proposal (or one like it) in November.

TEXT OF PROPOSAL

[Article VI(A) should be deleted and replaced with the following language]:

A. COMPOSITION OF THE GOVERNING BODY

1. The Governing Body of the Adrian Empire is divided into the Imperial Senate and the Imperial Grand Assembly.

   a. The Imperial Senate is composed of the Imperial Estate (Empire), the Landed Royal Estates (Kingdoms and Duchies), Shires, and non-landed Royal and Founding Estates (Princes, Princesses, and Founding Viscounts).

      i. The voting members of the Imperial Senate shall be the Emperor or Empress (Imperial Estate), one King or Queen from each Kingdom, one Duc or Duchess Elector from each qualifying Duchy under Article

VIII(D), and a fixed number of Senate Electors as set forth in Article VI(F)(1)(c).

ii. The non-voting members of the Imperial Senate shall be one Duc or Duchess from each qualifying Duchy under Article VIII(D), one Viceroy from each Shire, and all non-landed Royal and Founding Peers who are not Senate Electors.

b. The Imperial Grand Assembly is composed of the Landed Great Estates (Marches), the non-landed Great Estates (Viscounts who do not serve as voting members of the Senate, Third Level Knights, Earls and Comtessas), and two senior members of the Estates Minor from each chartered subdivision. "Seniority" of members of the Estates Minor shall be determined by the Crown of the chartered subdivision from which those Estates come, in accord with the local law of that chartered subdivision.

i. The voting members of the Imperial Grand Assembly shall be the Marquises and Marquessas, Estates Minor, and a fixed number of Grand Electors as set forth in Article VI(F)(4)(a).

ii. The non-voting members of the Imperial Grand Assembly shall be all non-landed Great Peers who are not Grand Electors.

2. A Peer which has the option, must choose whether to sit on the Imperial Senate or the Imperial Grand Assembly, and may only sit on one of those bodies in a given Imperial Year (Labor Day to Labor Day). If the Peer is an Elector, the Peer must sit on the body for which that Peer is an Elector. If the Peer does not notify the Imperial Chancellor to the contrary, the Peer shall be deemed to sit in a body determined as follows (in order of priority):

a. The body on which the Peer is an Elector, if any.

b. The Senate, unless the Peer had been eligible for the Senate in the previous year and had decided to sit on the Grand Assembly anyway.

c. The Grand Assembly.

3. Meetings of the Imperial Senate and the Imperial Grand Assembly may be called at the pleasure of the Imperial Crown.

[The rest of Article VI(A) is deleted as being superfluous in light of the recent changes elsewhere in the Bylaws.]

[Article VI(D) should be deleted and replaced with the following language]:

D. GOVERNING BODY OF CHARTERED SUBDIVISIONS

1. The Governing Body of a chartered subdivision is the Estates General. This body shall be composed of the Royal Estate (or Imperial Viceroy, in the case of a Shire), Great Estates, and Estates Minor.

    a. The voting members of the Estates General shall be the Landed Royal Peer or Imperial Viceroy, the Landed Great Peers, the Landed Minor Peers, and a fixed number of General Electors as set forth in Article VI(F)(4)(a).

    b. The non-voting members of the Estates General shall be those non-landed Great Peers and Minor Peers who are not General Electors.

2. Meetings of the Estates General may be called at the pleasure of the Crown of the chartered subdivision, but not less than twice per calendar year. If, within six (6) months of the last meeting, there has not been a full meeting of the Estates General at which all appropriate Crown/Viceregal acts (including writs, warrants, charters, and expenditures) have been reviewed, the Chancellor (or other appropriate person(s) pursuant to local law) shall immediately cause to be published the date, time and place of a meeting that shall occur not later than thirty (30) days after publication at a place accessible to all members entitled to a seat. Meetings of the Estates General of a chartered subdivision may enact local codicils which shall have force of law only within their own borders, so long as they do not conflict with the Imperial bylaws. All such local codicils and writs shall be submitted in writing to the Imperial Chancellor for conflict review within thirty (30) days of enactment.

[Article VI(F)(1)(c) should now read]:

c. by a simple majority vote (more than half) determine a successful completion of reign regardless of the length of said reign (for the award of the titles Prince and Princess); appoint a new member to the Order of the Protectors of the Dream; enact, modify, or cancel Estates Writs so long as such action does not conflict with Imperial bylaws; elect or remove a Lord or Lady Protector; and elect Senate Electors to vote at the next meeting of the Imperial Senate.

    i. Senate Electors must be non-landed Royal Peers (Princes or Princesses) or non-landed Founding Peers (Viscounts or Viscountesses).

    ii. The number of Senate Electors to be elected shall be half of the sum (rounded down) of all Kingdoms and Duchies with populations of 50 or more.

[Article VI(F)(4)(a) should now read]:

a. by a simple majority vote (more than half), approve writs and charteres issued by the Crown, approve expenditure of treasury funds, determine a successful completion of reign regardless of the length of said reign (Kingdoms only: for awards of the titles of Earl and Comtessa); enact, modify, or cancel Estates Writs so long as such action does not conflict with Imperial bylaws or local codicils; elect or remove a Lord or Lady Protector; elect Grand Electors to vote at the next meeting of the Imperial Grand Assembly; and elect General Electors to vote at the next meeting of the Estates General.

   i. Grand Electors must be non-landed Great Peers.

   ii. The number of Grand Electors to be elected shall be two or the number of non-landed Great Peers in the chartered subdivision, whichever is lower.

   iii. General Electors must be non-landed Great or Minor Peers.

   iv. The number of General Electors to be elected shall be determined by the chartered subdivision.

[Article VI(G) should have the following sentence added]:

Voting members of a body of Estates shall receive an agenda, unless such is waived. Non-voting members of a body of Estates may also receive an agenda if they direct a written request to the appropriate Chancellor, or the Crown of their chartered subdivision.

END OF PROPOSAL

Not only does the proposal deal with overpopulation of the non-landed, it cleans up some areas of the bylaws. No substantive changes were made other than those limiting the number of non-landed votes. Certain powers (such as Estates Writs, which were hinted at in Articles VI(A) and (D) but not defined) are now specifically enumerated rather than just implied.

The beauty of this proposal is that the composition of the government remains the same, and everyone still has the opportunity to vote, although for the non-landed, there may be competition for a limited number of votes. A compromise.

An interesting question: What if an Elector loses the right to vote due to judicial ban, membership lapse, inactivity, resignation, or other reason, and there is no opportunity to elect a replacement before the next meeting of the Estates? Does that mean that there will simply be one less vote? Yes. On the other hand, it might be less likely that said Elector would get reelected.

BECAUSE THE PROPOSAL HAS IMMEDIATE EFFECTS ON THE COMPOSITION OF THE IMPERIAL ESTATES FOR 1999, AND AN ELECTION IS REQUIRED, I WOULD REQUEST THAT THE IMPERIAL ESTATES WAIVE THE PUBLICATION REQUIREMENT (ARTICLE VI(C)) FOR THOSE SECTIONS WHICH APPLY TO ELECTION OF THE SENATE ELECTORS SUCH THAT SAID SENATE ELECTORS COULD BE ELECTED

AT THAT SAME MEETING.

C. PROPOSALS OF SIR THOMAS FITZSHOKES

These may be found in Appendix I.

D. New Business from the Senate July, 1998 not addressed

(1) Bylaws Proposal Appendix K.

(2) Bylaws Proposal Appendix L. and amendment to #4 to Death From Behind.

(3) Sovereign of Arms Manual Proposals

(a) Appendix C 1998 Proposal

(b) Appendix D 1999 Proposal

I have not seen the latest version of Lord Nigel's manual and proposed bylaw changes. The counter-proposal below was developed last year in response to the version in Appendix G. For some reason, it never made the agenda. I submit it now in the hope that it is still somewhat relevant.

The proposed Bylaw changes to Article VII should pass as is except for these modifications:

The "Adria King of Arms" should be the "Adria Sovereign of Arms" (and thus, the sentence referring to an Adria Queen of Arms should be deleted). Also, substitute "Fleur-de-Lis Sovereign of Heralds" for "Fleur-de-Lis King of Heralds.

The changes to Article IX are fine except that the Empire-recognized orders of the Table Round and of Saint Joan are omitted. As these are not truly Imperial Orders (the Imperial Government having no say in their membership), that is probably ok, so long as the recognition of these independent orders is included elsewhere. I propose that it be included with the Estates Writs along with the Empire-recognized Domains and chartered subdivisions.

With regard to the Heraldry Manual itself, I have the following changes to propose:

This manual should not supersede the Heraldry Handbook. The Heraldry Handbook should remain a set of Empire-approved ideas not rising to the level of law.

All references to "King" should be replaced with "Sovereign."

On page 13, the consequences of failure to report should be brought into compliance with Article VII(H).

Throughout the manual, all references to revocationor expiration of warrants of appointment of local heralds and pursuivants of a given subdivision by anyone but the local Ruling Noble or designee should be expunged. It is an established rule now that Imperial Ministers can't fire the ministers of chartered subdivisions, or the ministers of subdivisions therein. The exclusive

remedy is Article VII(H). Section E on page 13, "Chain of Command" should reflect that the buck stops with a Ruling Noble of a given subdivision, and if there is any violation of law, the responsibility is with that Ruling Noble.

I have no particular objection to the Royal Order of the Crowns Companion (ROCC) being renamed and re-abbreviated. We'll see how members of the order react.

As to the rest, lets pass it, but let us set it for review in November. I know that it is highly controversial. Let us see how it works.

VII. ON THE TABLE INDEFINITELY

Sir James' successful reign is still on the table. It will remain there until the body resolves to raise it from the table.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS FROM THE 11/98 MEETING

A. MOTION: TO AWARD THE ARTS WAR POINTS TO THE HIGHEST SCORE ON AN ARTS. THE WAR POINT WILL GO TO THE ARMY THE PARTICIPANT REPRESENTS. (Dame Delia)

Note: This is how it was before our current Manual of Arts and Sciences was passed in 1997 (at which time the system was changed such that all arts scores over a certain minimum level were counted and added together for a total score). At the Senate Meeting of 7/98, Dame Willow made this same proposal that we return to the old system, and the motion failed.

B. MOTION: TO LIMIT THE NUMBER OF ARTS ENTRIES AT A WAR TO ONE PER PARTICIPANT. [WITHDRAW IF THE ABOVE MOTION PASSES.] (Dame Delia)

C. MOTION: TO AWARD THE ARTS WAR POINTS BY TAKING THE CUMULATION OF THE FIVE HIGHTEST SCORES FOR EACH ARMY PER LIST. [WITHDRAW IF EITHER OF THE ABOVE MOTIONS PASSES.] (Dame Delia).

D. MOTION: TO AMEND ARTICLE VI.F.3.C.

"...silence implies ABSTENTION. Majority..."

E. MOTION: TO REMOVE THE VOTING RIGHTS FROM THE RETIREMENT TITLE OF DUC.

Note: There is currently no voting right for the retirement title of Duc. Perhaps this motion anticipates that such a voting right will pass pursuant to one of the agenda items above.

E. ARCHERY (see Appendix J.)

(1) PROPOSED MANUAL OF ARCHERY

(2) PROPOSAL TO AMEND

(3) PROPOSED ARCHERY RULES

G. LADY ALLORA'S PROPOSAL

The following is a commentary from Dame Allora regarding a proposal. It appears in its original raw form. It was

submitted to Sir Frederick for the last meeting, but did not make the agenda for some reason.

Most companies, as well as non profit agencies in the world have "shareholder meetings" . These Share holder meetings have a few things in common that we do not. The first is a sense of order, this is something we deal with as it is a passionate game that we love.
The second would be committee decisions acquired after 5-20 minutes of discussion. We do this at time and are getting better at it.
The third and the reason for this letter is that we have an agenda that people submit suggestions, bylaw changes, new manuals and a variety of other things too. The problem lies in the fact that we have no order to this submission process. In most corporations for an "idea" to be placed on the agenda one shareholder must author the idea and two others must support it. his is much like a nomination and a second, but here they need a third.
The reason I see this as a needed measure is that I have seen some ridiculous things be proposed to the estates… some of them might have been good if presented properly. Some of them did not make it on to the agenda. What I propose will allow for better thought out proposals and better written ones as well. Therefore:

"In concerning the Imperial agenda all submissions to said agenda must be authored by at least and not limited to one member (this is not limited to Imperial Estates Members) and signed in support by at least and not limited to two additional members. If said submission fails to have the required three names, then said submission will not be placed on the agenda until it has the required names and falls with in the given and or allotted time open for Imperial Estates agenda submission."

Note: The above proposal, if passed, would probably fit best in a "Chancellor's Manual", drafts of which are already in the possession of your Imperial Chancellor.

IX. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. PROPOSALS FROM THE AD HOC JUDICIAL REFORM COMMITTEE (by Sir Jehan)

Attached as Exhibit E to the 11/98 minutes (Appendix A).

B. DUCAL COMMITTEE PROSAL REGARDING VOTING RIGHTS FOR RETIRED DUCS/DUCHESSES

This was originally presented to the Senate in 7/98, but as it proposed to amend Article VI, no action could be taken until a bylaw convention. The text of the proposal is as follows:

Article VI(F)(4)(a) should read as follows:

"a. by a simple majority vote (more than half), determine a successful completion of reign regardless of the length of said reign (Kingdoms: for awards of the titles of Earls and Comtessas; Archduchies: for awards of titles of [insert names here]; enact, modify, or cancel Estates Writs so long as such action does not conflict with Imperial bylaws or local codicils; elect or remove a Lord or Lady Protector; elect Grand Electors to vote at the

next meeting of the Estates General..."

C. COMMITTEE ON KNIGHTHOOD (chaired by Sir Winfred)

(1) At the Senate meeting of 7/98, it was proposed that the committee study the possibility of developing a proposal whereby certain ministry projects might be worth more ministry participations than others based on level of difficulty and service. A "sliding scale". We should have a report.

(2) Also to be studied was the idea of gaining ministry points (either participations, or demo initiations) for autocrating events or for other ministry projects. It was suggested that in light of the current estates writ regarding classes, perhaps all we need do is substitute "initiate, organize, and autocrat [insert number here] demonstrations or events" for the current language.

X. PROTECTORS OF THE DREAM

The following people are nominated to the order by Sir Nikolai: Sir William Baine, Dame Katayana Belski, Sir Stefan Belski, and Dame Jericho Gutte d'Or.
Note: Sir William Baine requests that his nomination be tabled until he steps down as chancellor.

XI. SETTING THE NEXT MEETING

XII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

XIII. ADJOURNMENT