

10:00 - 10:15am registration and hellos

10:15 - 10:30am welcome and agenda

10:19 Lou N. welcomes us; we go around the room introducing ourselves (29 people – more coming in)

10:30 - 11:00am officers' reports

Lou N apologizes for having erased Lynn M's report (in process of virus elimination)

Linda M says 388 people on official list

minutes-taking?: JALP has PC; Adrianna willing to take notes, but doesn't have tools

JALP's written report (as Media Co-ordinator)

treasurer's report?

Patti resigned, Marc's in for now; if anyone wants to take over, please speak up & we'll consider it later

Adrianna reports about \$1,300 should be in the account; Craig says still about \$1,000 debt on the books

Adrianna notes possible SCC subcommittee to explore how to make a non-Ann Arbor treasurer possible

Ted H volunteers – he lives in Battle Creek (1 hour away “at the speed limit”)

Matt A suggests five minutes of discussion of Ted's volunteering and the issues involved

he was treasurer for successful judicial challenger's campaign

did/does his own taxes

trustee of his deceased wife's trust for children

minimum of quarterly reports? (Adrianna, asked, says it depends on whether election or non-election year)

he wouldn't take a chance of filing late (with a [. . . .])

he likes numbers – they're neat (and tell you a lot of things)

James W has 3 questions:

* we assume you can learn campaign laws – how good are you with computers? (need to learn MERTS)

Ted H says OK

* what is your position on helping locals (by sending money to them)?

Ted says he's working with [. . . .]

he would not be opposed to giving state money to locals – doesn't think he could do it on his own, but [. . . .]

Paul F – more complex concerns due to differing locations; could Ted H & Adrianna talk about it at lunch?

Adrianna – let me review the issues SCC has been talking about:

we have to file with FEC as well as state, must report to both . . .

Federal reports are extremely detail-oriented, basically have to report anything

(and they have fined us before for being late)

bank & office (& mailing address) in Ann Arbor – right now, Elliott collects mail & brings it to Patti/Marc

Marc & Lynn M are generally the ones who have to *spend* money . . . they, too, are in Ann Arbor

we've talked about a second depository, but Marc thinks that would be very complicated

(current bank is in Ann Arbor, not a [. . . .])

[Lou N calls for 10 more minutes]

Ted H says he's retired, could be in Ann Arbor 3-4 days a week if necessary

agrees with Marc that 2 banks would be a mistake – “records *of* records”

Elliott: it's SCC that would give \$\$ to locals

Paul E – seems to him we could split off record-keeping, have two signers

if we want to get this party outside Ann Arbor, we need to put names from outside “on the letterhead”

Ted H agrees

John Porter – why discussing? can SMM appoint, or only SCC?

[Lou N cites multiple-offices clause]

Alan K – even if John P correct, we can discuss & clarify issues

but in terms of substance . . . agrees with Ted H's view of unfair treatment to be expected in judicial challenge

that spoke volumes to me

Pete S – completely sympathizes with multiple-officer concern

not against Ted H, just wants to be sure he knows what he's up against (with FEC, etc.)

important is learning software we have (QuickBooks) . . . and filing electronically with FEC (it's a quagmire)

Linda M – aren't there also 501(c)(3) filings?; Pete S says no – HVG tried, but it's still up in the air

Adrianna – she never really heard Ted H talk about computers

Ted: I'm a little weak on them – we have 3 in the house . . . son a wizard, daughter approaching it, I give me a C

when wife died, I had to learn it – since then, I've learned more

it's true we can file paper with state, but they prefer electronic (& have passed rule requiring it for \$20k+)

Federally, we've been electronic too

[Lou N closes stack]

James W – we've established by-laws that say we can vote on this; he's willing; let's finish it

Matt A – not on a list?
vote?

Adrianna expresses blocking concern – wants Ted to talk with Marc first about technical & legal requirements after some more discussion . . . consensus on tabling until after lunch

Locals Liaison/Pete S (has handout)

most of the work has been done by others

hard to come up with hard-and-fast numbers, but only ten groups represented now on SCC (+ five who could)

can mail a kit; can also send contact info to anyone who wants them – about 250 new contacts this year

Alan K – doesn't think he's an SCC member, local never approved it (& he wants more gender balance anyway)

had been suggested to replace Marilyn

Elections Co-ordinator/JALP

Pete S notes we have overlap

JALP invites people to take on one or the other of his "titles" (no formal election of Media Committee chair)

Lou N raises other sheet with reports from officers/committee chairs

Fundraising – David S absent

Alan K wants us to discuss more

Pete S says yes, \$100k is doable (he'd thought 31k signatures wasn't, and we got 55k)

his understanding was that the \$100k was to support candidates (we haven't before – ever . . . & we need to)

more discussion of what it would take to get \$100k . . .

mention of JALP's "Million Masthead Movement"

Art M/Platform Committee

added a plank on vitrification — unique? (no other state party has it?)

also notes suggestion to use this list for creating position papers

if you want to draft a paper, this is the list for it . . . get to him and he'll sign you up

Sylvia I/Presidential Exploratory Committee

not able to attend national meeting in DC – tried to get PEC members who were there to share notes, none has her understanding is that candidates include:

David Cobb of TX

Paul Glover of NY (Ithaca)

favorite sons/daughters: Carol Miller of NM, Lorna Salzman[?] of NY

Ralph Nader wasn't there but sent a video

Cynthia McKinney also wasn't there (hasn't decided)

some members think PEC should be disbanded (as having done its work)

one idea was to arrange for a contact in each state

other ideas – make PEC part of Co-ordinated Campaign Committee

third point – re: safe states & swing states (state party might) campaign more in safe states, less in swing states

swing states: CT IA MI MN NH NM NY OR TN

safe states: _____

she gathers PEC's position is that this safe-states question would no longer be in the hands of the national party or the candidates, but rather that the voters there would decide

her feeling is that she wants to see Michigan have a vigorous campaign

need to stand up against strong labor/Dem intimidation

lots of discussion of the (very) idea(!) . . . reviewing what was said at the national meeting, etc.

gp.org has a downloadable PDF flyer

publicize our stand against safe strategy?

Lou N/Meeting Manager

we have hosts for next three meetings:

Van Buren County Greens in November (probably Lawrence)

Flint Greens in February

Traverse Bay Watershed Greens in May [with nominating committee?]

Linda M: one-day or two-day meetings? (probably one day for November, two days for 2004)

Linda M/AWOG Editor

only 24 pages (she was tied up with other stuff) . . . & didn't print as many (short on funds)

[Adrianna notes Patti S also resigned as national rep – need to fill *that* position as well]

Elliott Smith/Clearinghouse Co-ordinator

takes phone calls, distributes mail, etc

not too many calls (about 10 a month before, now . . . *very* low) – need a membership drive to generate more activity

Pete S says the same happened in 2001; also notes he gets membership/etc contacts via e-mail

11:00 - 11:30am GPUS National Meeting report

[Lou N refers to page 9 of *AWOG*]

[Ted H asks us all to look at his layout for a big sign (on the floor)]

11:30 - 11:45am break [11:44]

====
after break [11:56], back to GPUS national meeting

Adrianna elected to national Co-ordinated Campaign Committee there

she's the only one here who was there (Carolyn Dulai out getting lunch), so she was asked to report

refers to *AWOG* article . . . and her own highlights

GPUS voted to fund the Black Caucus to go on a tour (of historically-black universities, etc.)

“Home by the Holidays” resolution (& Web site coming soon)

also a resolution to support impeaching Bush

voted for some new Steering Committee co-chairs (Ben Manski, Anita Rios, Jo Chamberlain . . .

Tom Sevigny not on anymore – lost a write-in campaign for Secretary to Greg Garrett)

lots of press there to hear Presidential candidates

she thought Carol Miller was great – saying Dems haven't done anything, *they* shouldn't run

(Dem friends she's talked to thought it sounded awful. . . .)

only person known to be an appointee in both the Reagan and Clinton Energy Departments

David Cobb spoke first; she spoke last, and after she did he looked thoughtful; may be backing down on safe strategy

held at Mayflower Hotel (site of some inaugural balls – but didn't seem so fancy to Adrianna)

had fun – Ben Manski had a room for his campaign for Steering Committee)

held a lottery for the suites (and those who won had to share them)

she got elected to Co-ordinated Campaign Committee (one of 10)

interesting to see how people from across US (with different views) could work together. . . .

next year in Milwaukee (and it's the national convention)

Lou N: how many people were there? (probably about 150)

Craig H: what is the Co-ordinated Campaign Committee? (not just Presidential, right?)

not really Presidential – though CCC & PEC are trying to work together

CCC tries to focus on smaller races, target GPUS resources to those races

two programs – targeted resources (media coverage, volunteers, calls for candidates, etc.)

& matching funds for support staff for campaigns (rough guideline of \$500; overall budget \$10,000)

Craig H's 2nd Q: about Carol Miller, is she only a favorite-daughter candidate?

press asked her, she said she was definitely going to run in NM, she'd see what happened as to the rest . . .

rouses Green enthusiasm, but might put off some on the edges

Linda M: would it be worthwhile for non-national rep to go?

Adrianna wasn't, and it was good for her – last year, too (lots of good workshops, etc.)

George [Martin?] of WI says they're going to block off streets and have a jazz party at the convention next year

[Carolyn D asked on the side how many people of color were there – didn't count, but many;

Roy Williams of TX was also elected to CCC – which, in fact, has only 2 white guys on it]

11:45am - 12:00noon IPPN Summit/McKinney visit report [12:12]

biennial summit, hosted by HVG & U of M Student Greens . . . highlights included McKinney speech

Paul F agreed to facilitate discussion of this

Green presence strong – partly because we hosted, but also an indication of where this movement is going

good that we're leading the movement, and that it's broader than us

wanted to report on (semi-)private meeting of Greens & McKinney

she didn't commit (as *AWOG* article said) – Ben M was frustrated; to Paul F, she still seemed to be learning about us

she respects the Greens, doesn't believe we'd sell her out (has been by Georgia Democrats)

a new idea to her that she could run for Congress and for President – she's playing with it

also considering the spoiler issue – if she runs, she wants to run full out (5% is definitely a goal)

one of the people who wandered in was JoAnne Watson

definitely in the Democratic organization, but she came to our meeting to hear Cynthia McKinney

raises the question of what we want our candidate(s) to be

Nader put us on the map as something more than tree-huggers; with McKinney, we could take another step forward

(and she was even stronger on anti-war issues)

Alan K: two separate items

missed mention of fact that IPPN event was called to defend affirmative action –

he was deeply involved on that (with BAMN etc.), but wasn't contacted about that (nor Ellis Boal *et alia*) though he's very happy the event took place, he thinks the party missed out

saw a post from Marc – wanted to respond

JoAnne Watson is *not* a Democrat – and Alan K worked on her campaign, & contributed past Exec Dir of NAACP/Detroit, involved with ACLU of Detroit too
radio voice [. . .]

ran great grassroots campaign against extremely powerful politician who had 10x her money she's potentially a member of the Green Party; wrong to identify her as D, especially in a non-partisan race
Detroit Jewish News ran article on Jewish responses to Affirmative Action – talked to Alan K

they took his suggestions to contact two people, and she was one . . . her respect for us is genuine

Adrianna responds – we voted at Detroit meeting to host IPPN; Juscha convinced everyone

it *wasn't* supposed to be about Affirmative Action – the decision just came down at that time

[Alan K said the flyer (which focused on Affirmative Action) was the first thing he saw]

Jim M was at IPPN; really, really got energized

people from SNCC said they thought US was in its worst shape ever (even worse than days of lynching etc.)

because things are really horrible and a lot of people are just tuning out, not even fighting back

another thing that caught her attention was all the different kinds of people there – and caucuses on such issues compared notes on how we all handled different issues

now he's getting e-mails on where other people interested in similar issues are

(in fact, he got elected to IPPN's National Steering Committee)

Ben B on McKinney – everything said was positive . . . he wanted to quickly inject a note of caution

actually, she voted for the blank-check resolution for response to 9-11

JALP notes McKinney was also elected to IPPN Steering Committee

12 noon - 12:30pm proposals [deferred until after lunch]

12:30 - 1:30pm lunch [break at 12:35]

1:30 - 2:30pm proposals [back at 1:33]

Carolyn D clearing away lunchstuff, so first proposal is Paul Felton's

Paul F – resolution opposing Bush's [union-busting] Postal Commission

among 200 pages of recommendations:

3-person panel appointed by President to study, approve cap on new-worker wages
(they can't strike, do have arbitration)

also recommended closing rural post offices, outsourcing any part of work other than actual home delivery effectively downsizing an institution that provides living wages to 700,000 people
national union's president has said large mailing advertisers (junk-mailers) behind it

1st-class mail going down, 3rd-class up; best way to raise more \$\$ is raise 3rd-class rates, but they hate that idea
[read the "resolved" of his resolution]

draft of flyer for demonstration W 9/17

3-4pm informational picket around Post Office [4th St]

4-4:30 march to Hart Plaza

4:30 rally at Hart Plaza

Bob G: is the 200-page report anywhere people can see it?

www.apwu.org may have a link

are local units aware of it?

several different unions – APWU local has been publicizing it (includes window clerks)

carriers are a different union; Paul F doesn't know

Bush as advocate of small government? this is big govt coming in to help big business smash a union

(can't provoke a strike and replace workers, because they can't strike)

Harley M: should we change wording to oppose privatization explicitly?

commission *said* they were against privatization, but all its recommendations point that way (just not called so)

Doug C: add that we'll transmit the resolution to the Congressional delegation –

. . . and the Michigan offices of all postal unions. . . . [Paul F willing to accept this]

Elliott: maybe say "outsourcing" instead of "privatization"? [Paul F says OK, let's add after "depress wages"]

Jim M used to be a rural carrier – as he understands it, bulk mail subsidizes 1st-class mail . . . and that's *good*

why do they want to mess with something that's working well?

ALL TWINKLE

/===== text [as amended & passed] =====\

Resolution in Opposition to President Bush's Postal Commission

Submitted by Paul Felton

Whereas, The recommendations of President Bush's Postal Commission are intended to break the unions, depress wages, outsource, and curtail service to many communities, and

Whereas, The Postal Service presently provides universal service at the same time as it provides living wage jobs to 700,000 people, and

Whereas, President Bush's plans for the Postal Service are consistent with his overall policy of putting corporate interests first and people's needs last. Therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Green Party of Michigan goes on record opposing the recommendations of the Postal Commission and will work to prevent these recommendations from being enacted into law, and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to the office of every member of the Michigan Congressional delegation, and to the Michigan offices of all postal unions.

\=====

Carolyn Dulai on her proposal – questioning the behavior during the election of CCC members

in the official packet was some info from the CCC . . . including members' participation times on conference calls
Joe Buchanan[?] of RI (who'd been in on only one call) was the only other one besides Carolyn at diversity workshop
he's most interested in bringing hip-hop community into the Green Party (involved in creating the Black Caucus)
she later found out people had recruited someone to be the 11th candidate for 10 seats
one factor(/one piece of info) was used to label him (& smear him, she says)
would this look racist from outside?

(the replacement candidate was also African American – but would he be seen as an Uncle Tom?)

Ted H: have you discussed this with him? (no, but she knows he's angry) his perspective should be the top concern

Adrianna: Juscha told her one requirement (known at the start) is participating in one call a week (not just e-mails)

CCC bought him a phone card, but he still only participated in one call

it's a 10-person committee; members commit to 15 hours a week & 1 call a week & attend national meeting

Juscha approached Joe & asked him not to run again if he wasn't pull[ing his weight?]

they put the info in because they thought it was relevant – she doesn't think it was racist

Juscha got the most votes for CCC – the replacement (Roy Williams of TX) got the second-most votes

Craig H: one added point – Joe can still reach out to the hip-hop community

Pete S: thanks to Carolyn for bringing it up – anytime something doesn't look right, we need to question it
seems like it's one of those "could-go-either-way" issues

agrees with Craig title not needed to work to bring hip-hop into Greens, but also don't want to slap people down
as an anecdote, first _____ Co-ordinator was Scott Trudeau

didn't do much – when Pete asked to replace him for that, he said he'd work to do more. . . .

that was probably a better way to handle such a situation than this is

how many invited, and how? (Adrianna [. . .] responded to general call)

Carolyn D doesn't say GPUS was racist, but rather that it might look that way – wants it carefully investigated

Pete also wants to get away from the subtle racism that steers people of color to Diversity Committees & suchlike

Karen S: the issue *is* important to her; the fact that Joe is black makes it such a big deal because we have so few

Paul E: seems to him that the problem is with was behind-the-scenes moves (not racism but cronyism)

the guy never had a chance to say he wasn't participating *here* because he was so busy *there*

Alan K: one of the traditional problems . . .

language that got Granholm elected was when she said she'd bring people to the table

she was canny enough to know that being at the table matters

the same phenomenon can seem like cronyism to some and not having a seat at the table to others

the way to resolution is to build the party by conduct inside community & outside (W Bloomfield & Detroit)

prevent what's happened in Benton Harbor both in Benton Harbor and in Marshall

Paul F: only two in this room were at that meeting . . .

what bothers him about Carolyn's telling is that we dismissed a willing worker

could we expand the committee to eleven?

Adrianna clarifies – there's a move afoot to make this committee like other committees (reps from each state)

originally the preference was for a small group (easier to get consensus, etc.) – but . . .

could either have state elections people get more involved or have three from each state, etc.

Ted H: were candidates given a chance to speak before the election?

(yes – but it was so subtle, Carolyn didn't even think about it)

Carolyn D has no firm proposal – Black Caucus wants to look into it, but she felt it was bigger than that

Lou N suggests taking language at the bottom . . .

three blocking concerns:

Ted H wants to know person involved in cause wants it followed up

Matt A hesitates to start an investigation (using up limited energy)

Candice C sees language as nebulous, committee could let it slide . . . likes what Adrianna was talking about

_____ agrees we all can get overcommitted, but it may be fair to consider that in (re-)election “campaign”

Carolyn D willing to accept Matt’s replacement ideas as friendly amendment

wordsmithing:

GPMI acknowledges concern about the election of the CCC . . .

encourage GPUS to adopt rules to avoid problems, expand memberships, or both

ask Co-ordinating Committee to look into the circumstances?

Lou N suggests that SCC work on language consistent with the spirit of this discussion to forward to the SCC . . .

Paul E suggests that Carolyn, as national rep, can raise this to Co-ordinating Committee

she’d prefer more direction, but . . .

Paul F would prefer the SCC do it – different nuances possible; he wants healing, not accusatory, tone ultimately, no blocking concerns to **“punting” it to SCC**

Peter P. Ponzetti – increase student/low-income/senior dues from \$5 to \$10

[reviews printed proposal; somebody has since posted that Ds’ dues are \$15? (\$25 says someone, but for county & state)]

Craig H: if Pete P feels this way, why hasn’t he paid more? (just came to this)

Alan K: how many members are this way? (Pete S says 70-100 were in \$5 category)

Candice C: is he aware that most people who belong to Lapeer County Dems aren’t state Ds? (& rate for them is \$2)

Pete S: reason for doing away with dues waiver? (Pete P copied rate chart, not brochure; he supports waiver)

also notes if you attended

Karen S: fundraising problem shouldn’t be addressed by raising dues of our poorest folks

Ben B: regarding comparisons with other parties, Socialists don’t charge for state membership meetings. . . .

and purchasing power has gone down for minimum wage

Doug C: fully support raising dues for other categories, but would drop comparisons

James W: live in college town, so wouldn’t necessarily count students among the poorest . . . but, considering

how economy’s “rebounding” . . . how many locals are collecting dues? (chorus of “huh?”s. . .)

if this means more money for the locals, more money to get our business done, yeah, okay. . . .

David ____: Ypsi group has discussed this; good to include free/waiver category more consistently on all our flyers

any organization that bases its finances strictly on dues is pretty well dead from the get-go

need to raise more money elsewhere (work through that calling list, etc.)

Craig H: had a lot to do with original dues structure – didn’t have *AWOG* then, had considered separate subscription tripling dues might cut out 2/3 of members (no guarantee of raising more total money)

he usually says \$20 and then notes other categories if people want to take advantage of them

idea of dues waiver was to get people to sign up – number of people is more important than number of dollars

didn’t have a membership card back then, either

Paul F: he’s leaning toward yes but also bumping regular membership to \$25

doesn’t entirely buy the idea of raising money by SMM registration fees

Alev Akbulut [Kalamazoo]: feels we have to be a bit more aggressive

as a student (and on-and-off unemployed for last 2 years) . . . some things we just have to pay for

comparison suggests “you get what you pay for” attitude

Pete S: thinks this is going to be a relatively moot point . . . “micro-managing” the issue

\$50 sustaining membership doesn’t mean anything; \$1,000 lifetime membership more trouble than it’s worth

if we open up dues, we’ll probably be going that way; he’d rather see people sign up on PayPal for \$5 a month

[stack closed]

Pete P feels the only suggestion he’d incorporate was James’s to add a \$5 low-income category

(keep that at \$5, put seniors and students up to \$10)

Ben B has blocking concern – all the stuff he said earlier

goes to a vote: 23-12 (2 abstentions) . . . not 2/3, so rejected

confusion, so re-vote; 2nd count: 19-14 (6 abstentions) . . . still not 2/3, so rejected

Ted H proposes +\$5 across the board with friendly amendments:

waiver

\$ 5 low-income/hardship

\$ 10 student/senior

\$ 25 regular

\$ 60 sustaining

\$1,000 lifetime

_____ other

blocking concern: Bob G still opposes raising rates for students or seniors

vote: 27 yes, 7 no (2 abstentions) . . . **passes**

[break (taken early, at 2:55 or so) to read Roger McC's proposal to repeal CIPA before caucus – back at 3:12]

Alan K asks if “instructs” is the right word . . . but Roger McC's not here, so he stands aside
no blocking concerns – resolution **passed by consensus**

/===== text [as passed] =====\

Resolution to Repeal CIPA Submitted by Roger McClary

Whereas, The 106th Congress passed and the President signed the Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA), Title XVII of Appendix C of Public Law 106-554, which came into force on April 20, 2001, and

Whereas, CIPA requires public [and] elementary and secondary school libraries that receive Federal funds under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the Museum and Library Services Act, or E-rate discounts under the Communications Act of 1934 to install filtering [software] that [can] block “visual depictions” that are obscene, child pornography, or harmful to minors, and

Whereas, Most Internet filtering software that is available [is] text-based, [and] there is as yet no image-based software available, thus virtually ensuring a monopoly to a company that does develop such, and

Whereas, The American Library Association (ALA) challenged the [C]onstitutionality of CIPA before a three-judge panel in Federal District Court in Pennsylvania which ruled that CIPA was unconstitutional, and

Whereas, The Government then appealed to the United States Supreme Court [(under the provisions for expedited appellate review in CIPA),] which held by a plurality opinion that CIPA was constitutional; [now, therefore, let it be]

RESOLVED THAT THE GREEN PARTY OF MICHIGAN (GPMI) hereby instructs the Michigan Congressional delegation to introduce legislation that will repeal subtitles A, B, and D of CIPA, and the references to “visual depictions” in the definitions, and [let it be further]

RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to the office of every member of the Michigan Congressional delegation.

\=====/

3:15 - 3:30pm break [taken early; see above]

consensus – let's do the officers first, then we'll see what time is left for other things. . . .

Ted H: somebody suggested to him (he can't remember who) –

if he has any problems, everyone will be the first to know – and he wants to be outside the room when we “vote”

Linda M presumes Marc would like to work with a new person for a while. . . ?

Adrianna tried to call, but Marc's cell phone off; Marc did that with Patti . . .

she feels Ted H's willing and will either be able to do it or be able to say he can't handle it as long as everyone's comfortable with him being on SCC (as an officer). . . .

no blocking concerns – **ALL TWINKLE**

another open position – but it's national rep (but they do have a vote on SCC, notes [Craig H?])

Linda M nominates Karen S

Pete S wants her to raise her issues of racism & invisible privilege

Alan K thought her campaign for St Bd of Ed was deep . . .

there are Green ways to look at issues and races other than legislative (&, e.g., Drain Commissioner)

but finding a way to run a Green campaign for St Bd of Ed was impressive

also positive that we elect someone to leadership from Oakland Co

Jim M glad to have someone who's run for office . . .

ALL TWINKLE

November 15 suggested as preferred date for Van Buren County meeting . . . pending availability.

Feb 2004 in Flint: 2/7 is Dem caucus, 2/14 Valentine's Day . . . aim for 2/21?

May 2004 in new university maritime center in downtown Traverse City: Mother's Day is 9th, so aim for 15th-16th.

2:30 - 3:15pm Women's Caucus and Allies workshop [delayed until after break; 3:40 or so?]

Adrianna & Pete S running it:

split room (make that the great outside) into women on one side, men on the other – about our interactions

hoping this discussion can help lead to a bigger session in the future

[back in at 4:12 for about 10 minutes of discussion]

Adrianna – women had very general discussion, asking that we all try to be comrades for each other, be supportive recognize we have different views of issues and that they all can be valid; ask men to take their concerns seriously for example: platform item perceived as having more impact on men than women was cut from the platform(!)

[re: hormone interruptors . . . which, as she points out, could equally well impact men]

when women come to the group, we should encourage them (twice as many men here as women)

platform has an abortion plank – but generic; women haven't been asked their feelings (impacts them more directly)
some women have said their approach to issues from feelings are ignored by men (men don't want to talk about that)
Bob G doesn't know if he has any business talking about women's issues
Alev totally disagrees – hopes men will/do talk about them. . . .
but man's perspective is perceived by society as everyone's perspective, women's only as their own
cf. "chick flicks"
not sure what "feminism" means to her
Pete S notes feminism plank was originally titled "post-patriarchal values" . . . less wieldy, but more accurate

Pete S reviews men's discussion:

men decided we needed to ask why were we talking over here while women were over there?
what patriarchalism is, what privilege is – one person said it wasn't useful to talk about privilege
factors of oppression – everyone's oppressed; white male privilege is still a myth, and it's still a privilege
things are different between men & women (engineers & ecologists?); we wouldn't really want them to be the same
discussed: what are we going to do about it? (that's a male approach)
. . . and in the male group, the same males talking in this room were talking again
Lou N mentioned IPPN's double stacking system (female & male); Socialists stop talking if nobody on one line)
Ted H has already made up his mind to support abortion rights:
his not asking Adrianna about the issue is his problem; her not asking him is hers
Adrianna: I think it's about the fact that our party's plank didn't take women's feelings into account
[Alev, Doug C pass their turns]
Karen S: T-shirt "feminism is the radical notion that women are people"
Susy Z: platform is also about prioritization of issues
Paul F: Adrianna's women:feelings::men:[facts?] struck him as interesting . . . but not *always* true
JALP: Arnold Schwarzenegger notwithstanding, he'll never have an abortion –
but hopes his partner would be comfortable enough to discuss with him,
and to trust that he'd be comfortable with her making the decision
we have much in common here; he hopes we can all come together and discuss all such issues
Adrianna: oppression is a continuum . . . ending oppression helps everyone, not just those oppressed
need to reach more/farther/harder to get the views of groups that are oppressed
Candice: suggests to less-verbal men, as she did to women in their group, that they consider writing for AWOG etc.
____ [John P?]: doesn't feel there are men's or women's issues
David ____: dealt with these issues elsewhere in Maine in 2000 – had separate lists for 6 months or so
this kind of discussion is good for this group

3:30 - 4:15pm CCC campaign manual panel discussion Art M & JALP

Art M has people who've actually filled out & turned in a campaign-finance report stand up (missed out in manual)
questions about Kalamazoo local spending – on administrative vs. candidates or ballot questions
requirements: legal (what is necessary to run a legal campaign?) and situational (what are our goals of the moment?)
both kinds require attention and people
fundraising a big topic – Alan K, James W, etc. . . .
Susy Z notes Marijo Grogan & Lynn Meadows ran a successful fundraising event
[art auction with chocolate-chip cookies, adds Pete S]
Bob ____ (Mt. P) [. . . .]
JALP's focus on info-gathering (extrapolated from printed Elections Co-ordinator report) . . .
Ds & Rs have a big head start – not because they're better, but because they've been at it longer; we need to catch up
we need more: candidates; people to be campaign managers and fill other key campaign slots; INFORMATION – on:
county & local clerks; county & local events (if only for next year); county & local offices/races;
county, local, & state groups (get on their agendas/calendars/candidate lists/etc.)
Bob G got info for Van Buren County
David Palmer on his experiences in Maine . . .
Jim M has been accomplishing more stuff lately (behind the scenes, but. . . .)
if you want to magnify your power and effectiveness as an activist, run for office!
Alan K notes we haven't properly publicized Jim M's successes (& at least he's been on "In the Green"; David P hasn't)
we need to celebrate the cultural properties of the party when we win
we need to tell people: "this is the difference we're trying to be"

4:15 - 4:45pm strategy & planning [skipped]

4:45 - 5:00pm closing

[announcement: Hillsdale Coalition for Peace & Justice's "Freedom Forum" concert (with speakers) going on until 8pm
[closed around 5:10 or 5:15 (no circle; Library getting ready to push us out)]