



[Lynn Wiemeler](#) shared a [link](#).

[October 22 at 5:45 PM](#)



About this website

[dailyherald.com](#)

[LWV asks Smolenski to pull down video](#)

Letter to the editor: The League of Women Voters of Park Ridge says the...

[10 Comments](#)

[Like](#) Show more reactions

[Share](#)

Comments



[Gareth Kennedy](#) For an organization that doesn't take sides it looks like they just did.

[Like](#)

· [6d](#)



[Sarah Surisook](#) They aren't taking sides; the video was not to be used for promotion. That was the agreement. **[What "agreement" – the "verbal" or the "written" one?]**

[3](#)

[Like](#) [6d](#)



[Gareth Kennedy](#) I read verbal agreement which is a she said, she said. Sounds like they either have poor risk management practices as they should have gotten it in writing or they are taking a side and being political.

[Like](#) [6d](#)




[Ginger Lee](#) No. They are asking the agreement to be upheld. **[What "agreement"?]**

[1](#)

[Like](#) [6d](#)


 [Gareth Kennedy](#) What agreement? A verbal agreement?

[Like](#) [6d](#)

 [Ginger Lee](#) The League's principles and policies are well known. **[What "principles and policies"? Where are they? If those were the basis of the deal with the campaigns, why didn't the LWVPR president assert those rather than the terms of some "verbal" or written "agreement"?)** She agreed to terms and was given a platform to speak on those terms. She violated them. End of story.


[2](#)

[Like](#) [6d](#)


 [Sarah Surisook](#) [Gareth Kennedy](#) why would The League of Women Voters need more than a candidates word that their event not be made a partisan ad? Seems like the word of a candidate should be binding. **[Who besides the LWVPR president is in a position to say which candidate, if either of them, gave their "word" about anything?]**

[7](#)

[Like](#) [6d](#)


 [Gareth Kennedy](#) [Sarah Surisook](#) For all we know the candidate could very well believe she is keeping her word. A verbal agreement is a very poor way of getting an outcome you desire as it is open to be honestly interpreted very differently by two parties. I would think the LWV should either not allow it or have it in writing next time rather than politicize it this late in a campaign and be seen taking sides.

[Like](#) [6d](#)

 [Sarah Surisook](#) they asked for the video to be removed before publicly announcing they were not backing the candidate with the usage of their materials. Seems like they did their best and are trying to not be political for either side. Seems like Marilyn is trying to appear indirectly endorsed by LWV. **[How so? By running a few second clip of a video whose source isn't even identified?]**


[2](#)

[Like](#) [6d](#)

 [Ginger Lee](#) It is in writing on their website and any candidate should be well aware of FCC guidelines on these debate events. **[What "FCC guidelines," how are they applicable in this instance, and if they were why isn't the LWVPR asserting them?]** If she isn't; she isn't fit for office. Ignorance isn't a defense


[5](#)

[Like](#) [6d](#)


 [Chuck Stiffer](#) [Gareth Kennedy](#) so it looks like you are saying you can't just trust her word then why would you vote for a liar? **[Whose "word" was the given to the LWVPR, how, and who witnessed it?]**

[3](#)


[Like](#) [6d](#) · [Edited](#)

 [Gareth Kennedy](#) [Chuck Stiffer](#) I am saying two parties can agree something verbally and interpret it very differently. I am not calling anyone a liar.

[Like](#) [6d](#)

 [Ginger Lee](#) That's not real tough to interpret **[Do you mean the “verbal” agreement of the written one “which the LWV Park Ridge has been using for years” – according to the LWVPR’s president?]**


3
[Like](#) [6d](#)

 [Ginger Lee](#) Even if we were to give her a very generous benefit of doubt that she didn't understand the policies on taping, **[What are those “policies,” where are they published, how do you know Ms. Smolenski or her campaign were aware of them, and why hasn't the LWVPR president invoked them?]** it's all there for her to read. The honorable thing to do would be to apologize for the violation **[What “violation”?]** and pull it . It's still up on her page last I checked.


1
[Like](#) [6d](#) · [Edited](#)

 [Chuck Stiffer](#) [Gareth Kennedy](#) are you saying she can't read now?

1
[Like](#) [6d](#)

 [Mary Upson](#) Both campaigns signed an agreement, one in which LWV Park Ridge has been using for years. **[Where is the signed copy? Heck, where's even an unsigned copy?]** This had never been an issue before. Smolenski's spokesperson **[Name?]** stated **[When, where and to whom?]** that the video would used for internal purposes only and agreed to share the video with LWVPR. Phone and emails **[When? How about producing copies of those “emails”?]** by our VP **[Name?]** to the campaign **[To whom, specifically?]** were ignored for three weeks following, the campaign has never returned her calls or emails.


7
[Like](#) [6d](#)

 [Ginger Lee](#) Unbelievable. So much for your line of defense, Gareth. It was even in writing. ☹️. **[What writing...the as-yet un-produced “emails”?]** That's awful.


1
[Like](#) [6d](#)

 [Ginger Lee](#) [Mary Upson](#) you should repost that info in the main thread so it doesn't get lost


2
[Like](#) [6d](#)

 [Chuck Stiffer](#) [Gareth Kennedy](#) there is ample evidence that shows there was more than a verbal agreement do you disagree with that? **[Is that “ample evidence” the as-yet un-produced “signed... agreement” of the form the “LWV Park Ridge has been using for years”? Or the as-yet un-produced “emails” from the unidentified LWVPR “VP” to an unidentified person at the Smolenski “campaign”? Or the LWV “principles” and “policies” that even the LWVPR president hasn't asserted as governing the debate or even disclosed to the candidates or their campaigns?]**

[Like](#) [5d](#)

 [Ginger Lee](#) Unethical. If this is the level of integrity exhibited in the campaign stage, I don't trust this person to adhere to ethical principles in office. Fail. **[What “level of integrity”? At this point there's not a shred of evidence that the LWVPR's president has just made all of this stuff up.]**

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/757160731018252/Like> 6d


 [Gareth Kennedy](#) I totally agree the LWV shouldn't have done this at this stage of the campaign.

[Like](#) 6d

 [Ginger Lee](#) please.


1

[Like](#) 6d


 [Ginger Lee](#) Marilyn shouldn't have put out the ad at this stage of the campaign. It's a response to the unethical action she took. **[What "unethical action"?)**

2

[Like](#) 6d

 [Gareth Kennedy](#) [Ginger Lee](#) This is clearly your speculation given it was a verbal agreement too which you were not a party. **[At this point the LWVPR president hasn't identified any individual who entered into any "verbal agreement" for either campaign or either candidate; and the president also has said it was a "signed...agreement," as in a written one that she just doesn't seem ready, willing or able to produce.]**

[Like](#) 6d

 [Ginger Lee](#) Nope. Actually FCC guidelines for debates that the league closely follows **[The LWVPR president hasn't said that, so who has given you the authority to speak on behalf of the LWVPR?]**

4

[Like](#) 6d


 [Ginger Lee](#)

League wants to ensure that information is not manipulated to create false or misleading impressions; no candidate should be allowed to use or edit the footage for campaign purposes.

2. State and Local Level Races - the same advice applies at the local and **[So is this "advice"- not a "rule" or "contract provision" – directed to the LWVPR's own videos, or to all videos. And if this is binding on the campaigns, why hasn't the LWVPR president asserted it?]**

1

[Like](#) 6d

 [Gareth Kennedy](#) Then why did the article say there was a verbal agreement? Did they not follow their National organization's policies? The article also fails to address if the other campaign was asked for the video given they also filmed it. It seems to me the letter is making an organization that is meant to be non-partisan, partisan very late in an election cycle which is very poor form.

[Like](#) 6d · [Edited](#)



[Ginger Lee](#) interesting interpretation. Facts seem pretty clear. Footage is not to be used in campaign ads. **[What/whose “footage” – the LWVPR’s or the campaigns’?] It was. Mental gymnastics don’t change the facts.**

[Like](#) [6d](#)



[Steve Paschos](#) Or as I like to say..shady **[As what they call a “Hard D” and, presumably, a Moylan supporter, of course you would.]**

[2](#)

[Like](#) [6d](#)



[Ginger Lee](#)

VZW Wi-Fi

6:26 PM

lww.org

59%

What can we do to ensure that parts of our candidate debate are not captured on cell phones and broadcast in some way?

1. Federal Level Races - Announce at the beginning of the debate that cell phones should be turned off as a matter of courtesy and that unauthorized videos are not allowed because the FCC requires that a debate must not be edited and must be broadcast in its entirety, either live or reasonably soon after it takes place. Realistically, there is no way to guarantee that someone won't capture some video or audio without our knowledge so a disclaimer should also be put in the guidelines for the debate. The

[This isn't a “Federal Level Race.” Additionally, it doesn't cite to any FCC regulation to confirm the truth of the statements about what “the FCC requires.” And since it talks about “unauthorized videos,” what exactly are those? Because if a debate video “must not be edited and must be broadcast in its entirety,” then every Chicago television station repeatedly violated that FCC requirement by playing nothing but excerpts of the Rauner/Pritzker et al. debates.]

[Like](#) [6d](#)



[Ginger Lee](#)

10:38 AM
@gingerlee

guidelines for the debate. The League wants to ensure that information is not manipulated to create false or misleading impressions; no candidate should be allowed to use or edit the footage for campaign purposes.

2. State and Local Level Races - the same advice applies at the local and state level, but you should also check state and local laws.

Are we obligated to give a tape or DVD of a candidate debate to anyone?

1. Federal Level Races - All candidates must be advised of League's release policy in the letter of invitation. Any use of the tapes requires the approval of the LWV with the caveat that it is for non-commercial use only.

[Same comments as above.]

3

Like 6d



[Jim Argionis](#)

It is also concerning that the LWV asked several times for a copy of the video but didn't receive it. **[Says who – the LWVPR president who can't even agree with herself on whether the "agreement" was verbal or written? And who can't/won't produce the alleged "signed...agreement"? And who can't/won't identify any of the parties to any "verbal" anything? And who can't/won't name the LWVPR's "VP" or anybody from the Smolenski campaign with whom the LWVPR claims to have dealt?]** Here is what the article says on that issue:

“

Additionally, Marilyn Smolenski's campaign (managed by the Illinois Opportunity Project) offered to share its video with us to post for community members who could not attend.

Unfortunately, the League never received the video despite numerous attempts to contact the campaign.

3

Like 6d



[Steve Paschos](#)

Honestly I'd like to consider myself a more articulate person with a decent vocabulary...but only one word comes to mind;shady. **[Try "stupid" and your vocabulary is instantly doubled.]**

2

Like 6d



[Mary Upson](#) Both campaigns signed an agreement, one in which LWV Park Ridge has been using for years. **[Where's the signed copy, or even an unsigned copy?]** This had never been an issue before. Smolenski's spokesperson **[Who/name?]** stated **[When, where and to whom?]** that the video would used for internal purposes only and agreed to share the video with LWVPR. Phone and emails **[When? How about producing copies of the "emails"?)** by our VP **[Who is that?]** to the campaign **[To whom at the "campaign"?)** were ignored for three weeks following, the campaign has never returned her calls or emails. This Letter to Editor was written before the commercial was posted to Marilyn Smolenski's facebook page. I was finally able to get in touch with the contact person **[And who might that be?]**, I asked that it be removed. It's still there. It is now being aired on TV. Our organization has been in existence for nearly 100 years. The Park Ridge League has been hosting forums for decades. Whether Liberty Principles PAC acted on their own **[In doing what, exactly? Did Liberty Principles PAC make the video? If so, how is the Smolenski Campaign responsible for that when, by law, it is not supposed to coordinate activity with PACs of any kind?]** or if the campaign was involved, this breach of trust **[By whom: Ms. Smolenski personally, or some named individual formally a part of her campaign, or someone with IOP, or someone with Liberty Principles PAC, or yet another un-named political operative?]** hurts.

[10](#)

[Like](#)

[6d](#)



[Steve Paschos](#) I'm sorry to say but is this not the new norm? Will there be a course correction in the country when we restore dignity to the highest office in the land? I hope so but I have my doubts and unfortunately I'm afraid it's spreading reactionary to the other side (which I consider myself part of but also criticize). We can call it trickle down ethics or just what it is ... horrible role modeling and setting the poorest standard. **[What about the "horrible role modeling" of a Maine Twp. trustee who apparently made up a sexual harassment charge, or the LWVPR president who can't seem to tell the truth about something as simple as whether the alleged "agreement" concerning debate videotaping was "verbal" or written and "signed"? Not so much?]**

[2](#)

[Like](#)

[6d](#)



[Mary Wynn Ryan](#) Hopefully, this breach of trust **[Thanks, MWR, we knew you wouldn't let a fabricated dispute go un-exploited!]** will hurt the results of those who pulled this stunt. Lots of old-fashioned, decent precedents have been violated in in the past few years in the name of some perverse version of liberty, and hopefully the voters will make it clear they're not buyin' it.

[Like](#)

[5d](#)

[Edited](#)



[Mary Upson](#) The commercial has now been removed from the campaign facebook page.

[7](#)

[Like](#)

[6d](#)



[Alice Dobrinsky](#) After all the posting here. IMAGINE THAT. Testing the boundaries, testing the boundaries....

[2](#)

[Like](#)

[6d](#)

[Edited](#)



[Mary Upson](#) Hopefully it will no longer air on TV or on other Facebook pages in its current form.

[2](#)

[Like](#) [6d](#)



[Alice Dobrinsky](#) Thanks Char!

[1](#)

[Like](#) [6d](#)



[Jack Stephen Barnette](#) I'm a big fan of the PR LWVs. The LWVs has been serving this community for decades. Keep up the great work.

[7](#)

[Like](#) [6d](#)



[Mary Upson](#) Thank you!

[Like](#) [6d](#)



[Mary Upson](#) The ad has been made inactive on a Profit supported facebook page as of last night. Progress.

[4](#)

[Like](#) [5d](#)



[Ginger Lee](#) Progress!!

[1](#)

[Like](#) [5d](#)



[Alice Dobrinsky](#) Thanks Char!

[2](#)

[Like](#) [5d](#)



[Ginger Lee](#) Did they **[Who is “they”?]** reach out to LWV at all to apologize **[For what: Not complying with the non-existent terms of a non-existent “verbal” agreement or the terms of a “signed...agreement” that nobody has seen?]** or offer explanation? **[Of what: The LWVPR’s non-compliance with an imaginary agreement?]**

[1](#)

[Like](#) [5d](#)



[Mary Upson](#) Not as of yet

[Like](#) [5d](#)



[Mary Upson](#) Ugh, the ad is active again on Facebook 😞

[2](#)

[Like](#) [1d](#)



[Jim Argionis](#) Early voting has started. Be heard. Vote.

[1](#)

[Like](#) [1d](#)

As of 10:10 a.m. on 10.29.2018