

**SMM – UAW Local 771 Union Hall Troy
February 24 & 25, 2007**

Saturday, Feb 24

9:15 to 9:45 Setup, registration; coffee, bagels & donuts from Detroit Greens
Priscilla Dziubek volunteers to facilitate the meeting.

9:45 to 10:00 Volunteers for evening's fundraising: Silent auction setup (Lynn Meadows) – silent auction going on until 5pm – and the fundraiser starts at 6 (Richard Kuzmar gives details).

10:00 to 10:45 National issues - presentation by national reps, (Linda Manning Myatt, Lou Novak, Fred Vitale) – questions, discussion (except Green Card Program in the afternoon).

Lou N reported on some items considered at National: The budget didn't pass, and is being re-done. The Delegate Apportionment Committee had come up with a proposal, but it didn't pass; some want to amend it, some want to start from scratch.

The Annual National Meeting will be in Reading, PA 7/12-15 (registration \$75 if we do it now, It will go up after 3/31).

Linda M reports she was one of those who voted against the Delegate Apportionment Committee's new apportionment proposal which lost by 2 votes. The chief problem with the proposal was that it allowed proxy voting for on-line proposals – which amounted to weighted voting because it provided that votes could be cast for unoccupied seats.

Fred V commented on how the DAC debate led people to think about GPUS as a federation, and that some important healing of the fault lines from 2004 took place. The tone of the discussion, while sometimes a bit raucous, was nothing like what had gone on before. The budget discussion was something of the same.

Richard K asked where GPUS finances stood, then – Fred V notes that a proposal to continue funding operational expenses was passed.

Harley M asks if anyone is eligible to go. Linda M says anyone can go, but only reps can vote at plenary sessions.

Art Myatt notes that Linda M's on the committee planning the meeting. She reports that some of the things happening there will be a campaign school, a workshop on ending racism, and probably a presentation by Catherine Austin Fitts who's knowledgeable about finance from a grassroots/local community perspective.

The meeting will be at the Abraham Lincoln Wyndham Hotel (rooms expensive, \$103 reg/\$120 suite ... but you can share them).

Pete Schermerhorn has questions on delegate apportionment; sorry it didn't pass. Is it true that 8 people were elected to the committee, but ultimately 5 did the work? Linda M says yes, and the committee as such is unlikely to do anything more. (Any allocation proposals may give us more seats, though.) Fred V says Phil Huckleberry from IL is working on a proposal, and has asked for feedback from the NC as to changes they would like to see in a new proposal.

Ken Mathenia asks if anyone's started recruiting presidential candidates. Linda M notes some people had expressed interest in the nomination; Nan Garrett had declared, but had to drop out or lose her job. Kat Swift of Texas and Kent Mesplay from California have expressed interest. People are talking about it, and the PCSC continues to exist as a standing committee.

Harley Mikkelson notes there was a questionnaire sent out to the state parties – only 7-8 people participate in the conference calls; Phil Huckleberry is doing a lot of work on this.

Chuck Jordan asks if there's been any change in the nominating rules. Linda M notes there will be a convention, and anyone can nominate anyone.

Lou N notes that convention rules are decided before the convention. The DAC's NC apportionment plan was seen as one step, to be followed by similar rules for the 2008 convention.

Fred V says everybody's together on the need to run a good, strong campaign everywhere. Chuck J notes

that we're always going to face the "lesser of two evils" situation.

Margaret G was concerned about internal disagreements.

Aaron S asks who set up the criteria for Cobb's campaign to visit only "safe states." Linda M points out that Cobb did come to "swing states" including MI for one fairly significant visit.

Linda M asks for volunteers to be quoted in GPUS news releases (easier if we say we have particular interest/expertise in issue/area).

Art M, thinking over what's happening at the national meeting, is concerned that one thing missing is discussion of nat'l energy policy. He's not sure he'd lead it, but he'd be willing to contribute to it or take part on a panel. Lou N will take that proposal to the NC.

All 3 "reporters" willing to run for National Rep again in May.

Doug Baker asks if workshops are free once you register for the meeting. Well, included in the price, responds Linda M.

11:00 to 11:45 State officers' reports, including the necessity to elect a new meeting manager pushed up ahead of the break

Art M (Platform Committee chair)

Richa did a lot of work reviewing the national platform & suggested changes; Art M would like them to be sent to the NC.

Lou N points out that GPUS rules require state-party endorsement

John Anthony La Pietra asks if it can be done through authorizing the SCC or Platform Committee to review Bob Wicke doesn't want to vote on anything he hasn't seen.

Art M says the committee itself has been very inactive; he wants the SCC to take on the job.

Doug B asks if there's a motion on the floor. Art M says it's to send this to SCC for timely action (within a month).

Proposal passed by consensus. Chuck J asks if the edits can be sent to the SCC; Lou N says he'll do that.

Randym (Treasurer)

The report is in packets. He has changed name of political account so checks to "GP of MI" can go in there. We need to track the name, address, and occupation of anyone attending a fundraiser

Art M asks how long he's willing to remain as Treasurer; until the May meeting, Randym responds yes.

Richard K asks if his arm is twistable; not really – but we had 29 candidates last year who all had to deal with campaign-finance reporting.

Pete S (Membership Secretary)

He's resigning – hasn't been able to do any work which means our numbers are up because he hasn't done any purging. Currently we have 253 members (including some 6 months overdue). About 25-30 are members through GPUS Green Card program (though some already were). He hasn't got much of an explanation for not wanting to do the job anymore, but there is somebody willing to take over – Doug B – and he's looked at the contact database and not run away screaming, so . . .

Another note: we no longer have a full-time Webmaster (Mary A's out; Lou N's the back-up, but Pete S hasn't ask)

JALP (Elections Coordinator & Media Committee)

We haven't heard of anybody running in spring elections, or anything to publicize. He did go to State of the State – well, to MECAWI rally; handed out his own response, since there was no word on "In the Green" taping.

Pete S raises David Skrbina situation (facing \$1,000+ in fines for failing to meet filing deadlines). Much discussion; Richard K proposes GPMI help pay fines (if/as legal, adds JALP); Linda M blocks on personal responsibility. More discussion of need to support our candidates, don't let unfair enforcement discourage them. Various amendments are proposed on how much to pay (what percentage, \$ cap, should it be a fundraiser?) and when. A motion is made to table any specific action pending finding out what if any fine will ultimately be

assessed. (SCC implicitly asked to watch?) Richard K has blocking concern, so we vote 23-5 (1 abstention) . . . **tabling motion passes.**

10:45 to 11:00 break * [11:21]

Fred V moves to pass a statement that GPMI supports its candidates in general and David S in particular.

Proposal passed by consensus.

Bill O (Locals Liaison)

He thanks us for the opportunity to serve as LL, but tends to believe in term limits/rotating authority, so he'll resign in May. He also thanks the party for letting him run for office.

He started an Outreach Local eight months ago at Doctor Bob's (Bob = Robert Wicke). The fundraiser is outreach – some of the people we'll see there haven't ever heard anything about the Green Party. Ditto for the talent though Muruga is a good friend of Bill's. If you can't attend, please consider contributing. We need to put more energy into outreach and fundraising.

Pete S notes that there's a prospect of someone organizing a local in Houghton; asks about anything more.

Bill O says Bill & Linda Hardy (to be here tonight; old radical friends of Bill O's) will be opening a local in Livonia. Doug B has founded a new local in Hillsdale; another group in Novi will come in 3-4 months .

11:45 to 12:00: Meeting manager election, other elections if needed

Two officers to be elected; Meeting Manager & Membership Secretary; Priscilla D invites current holders to describe the jobs.

Art M says what a meeting manager does – much of it finding the venue and bringing the stuff to it. After that, it depends on the person's style; the meeting manager can be the one running the meeting, but need not be. As for the next meeting, Ellis B has suggested Boyne City again. He expects more local people to attend this time; a peace rally conflicted last time. Art hasn't minded doing the work, but his day job now requires him to be in Greenville living out of a suitcase much of the time.

Pete S adds that Meeting Manager also has to provide notice of SMMs. It was done through *Green Light* this time, rather than postcards.

Pete S says Membership Secretary can be easy or hard, depending on how much work you put in, e.g., when/how often you try to contact people to get them to renew. It also involves sending membership cards (if/when any), thank-yous for renewals, and orientation packets for new members.

also works with Fred V re Green Light (and Mtg Mgr if there's a separate mailing notice)

Pete S has also kept a list of former members in case they want to come back; occasionally contacts some of them

David Palmer re-upped (he's back in Ypsilanti)

he's also been doing some of what he believes are Clearinghouse Coordinator's duties – contact point for general contact list (people who wanted GPMI info, GPMI speakers, etc.)

Doug B has told Pete S he's willing to maintain that list – & give it to any member who asks (but not to any non-member)

Lou N asks if Aimee S (current CC) isn't doing that job

Pete S says there may be some misunderstanding

Chuck J asks if we could talk about Webmaster; Chuck L suggests making the Webmaster an official officer

JALP suggests including Webmaster as part of the Media Committee

Lou N suggests deferring that until after existing officer slots

Priscilla opens nominations for Meeting Manager

Bill O suggests Priscilla D, then Richard K (both decline)

Fred V not looking to do it, but he'd be happy to fill in; Lou N nominates him

Richard K suggests electing by acclamation before he changes his mind

Chuck J notes Fred V already is Nat'l Rep & does Green Light

Richard K, Karen S volunteer to help for the term

Proposal passed by consensus.

Nominations for Membership Secretary

Pete S nominates Doug Baker.

Proposal passed by consensus.

Discussion of Webmaster

Art M suggests proposal for by-laws change to make it a formal position; Chuck L agrees

Lou N proposes to put it under Media Committee as a subcommittee.

Proposal passed by consensus.

Lou N, Chuck L, Doug B will share the work for the time being. Fred V suggests a new, updated Web site to do more with that medium – encourages the subcommittee to work on this. Chuck L notes MoveOn as a possible model . . . less of a democratic structure, but more fundraising & other activity; the process is relatively easy – it's the content that's hard. Linda M says GPUS has graphics, buttons, etc that can be used. (JALP asks whether the subcommittee members want to be on the Media list; Chuck L does, Doug B doesn't.)

12:00 to 12:30 Report on recent & upcoming Washington demonstrations

Art M says he put it on the agenda for discussion of whether these demos were worth participating in, or are they too focused on electing Democrats.

Doug B says there was a good Green contingent, and people noticed them; there were no Green speakers on the main podium, though.

Karen S thinks it was important to have Greens there.

Aaron S understands there has been some criticism of UFPJ for not inviting Greens to speak.

Linda M agrees with that, despite some efforts for representation having been made.

Fred V says there was discussion on the national media list as to how much GPUS had endorsed the activity, but even after that, UFPJ was unwilling to include Greens (or Nader) as speakers – and they had Kucinich speak. If we wanted to take a position as a party, we'd need to find out first how much GPUS pushed with national UFPJ.

Sylvia I remembers a rally in downtown Detroit where Margaret G was denied a chance to speak. but there were Democratic candidates who were allowed to speak. On the other hand, she's not sure Greens want to ***not*** march.

Bill O says the same thing happened at a UFPJ meeting he attended; someone slammed Greens and Bill O wasn't allowed to respond.

Richard K says the issue is too important for Greens not to participate. If there are 200 Greens, we should be able to grab the microphone (or bring a bullhorn). He'd go back to the Democrats if they'd do anything, but they won't.

Reggie M, a Democratic Socialist will never go back to the Democrats.

Art M discusses lunch – many places available.

Karen S says Democrats don't want Greens on the podium because we're a threat to them – we should be visible every chance we get. Is David Sole's group (MECAWI) going? (Yes, but they weren't responsible, answers (___))

Chuck J says we need to remind fellow peace supporters it was the Democrats who voted for the war; he suggests impeaching Congress.

Lynn M agrees we need to be at demos – but we need to be more visible. Where's our banner? Why not have hats/etc.? Also, we've been putting lots of energy into fighting the war – but we have a bigger issue: global

warming/climate change.

Doug C may be hazy on the details, but he remembers 15 million people in the street 2/15/03 opposing the *coming* war. Today, Democratic Presidential contenders claim they were hoodwinked. We should say, okay, you were hoodwinked – you didn't notice the 15 million. We shouldn't elect someone that *stupid* to be President. We should promote a pledge that, if there are still troops (and contractors, etc.) in Iraq in fall 2008; and Shrub & Cheney aren't impeached, then we'll never vote for another Democrat again. We also need to avoid being sucked into any anti-Bush campaign that's going to turn into a pro-YD Democrat campaign. We should advocate impeaching Cheney *and* Bush.

Candice C thanks people who went to meetings, spoke up, and identified themselves as Green – even if you don't get to speak, some folks will realize it's unfair.

Lou N notes there is another Washington event March 17. MECAWI will be involved in a march on the Pentagon (more info at mecawi.org or troopsoutnow.org) – MECAWI helped organize the "Stop the War" slate.

Robert W. notes that Democrats are talking about rewriting the original Authorization to Use Military Force. It's important to distinguish Greens from Democrats talking about redeployment, etc. As far as he's concerned, the minimum position to take is US out of the Middle East. It's also clear/easy to understand.

Fred V doesn't think anyone's entertaining a choice to participate or not. When we endorse an activity, we should also push to have a speaker. Do we want to keep on endorsing activities that don't include us? If not, individuals can still speak. Of course, we need to have someone ready to speak – a candidate, or someone known in that peace community.

Matt A wonders why we don't have 5-10 banners.

Reggie M suggests a banner slogan: "Terrorism is the war of the poor, and war is the terrorism of the rich."

(Peter Ustinov in *You Can't Beat That* – or was it just "and you can't beat that"?)

Richard K has several motions:

- 1) authorize up to \$150 total to help low-income people attend the 3/17 DC rally
- 2) buy at least two more GPMI banners
- 3) print up (& post) petition along lines of Doug C's pledge (if not out of Iraq by Nov 2008, vote only for Greens)

We could take it to GPUS, too.

Dianne F never listens to speakers; she's more interested in the creativity of the people than in who's on the podium. She's proud that Green candidates stood up (& were recognized) as anti-war candidates, not just anti-Iraq war.

On proposal 1:

Linda M would prefer giving the money directly to GPMI members rather than to MECAWI

John Torkelsen asks if GPMI is running down the wrong road with all this anti-war activity? When asked why he asks that, he said, "because it doesn't solve the problem."

With the friendly amendment (directly to GPMI members) . . .

Proposal passed by consensus.

On proposal 2:

JALP asks if we know how much banners cost, etc.

Candice C says they had one made for \$45.

Dianne F suggests \$200; Pete S suggests up to \$500 for as many banners as that can get (accepted).

Ken M suggests there might be a bulk discount – if so, maybe each local could get one.

Chuck J says this looks like we need to do some research.

Doug C suggests passing a sense of the body resolution to get more details later.

Karen S wants to act soon.

With authorization of up to \$500 . . .

Proposal passed by consensus.

On proposal 3:

JALP asks if, in light of 3rd-party coalition efforts, we want to include anti-war 3rd-partiers instead.

Linda M says there already has been a pledge on line not to vote for anyone who's supported the war (including militarily).

Harley M says we'll never grow if we alienate progressive Democrats

Randym reminds what happened the last time we supported collecting signatures: trying to get anti-war referenda like WI.

Fred V suggests tabling this – it's more complicated, no solid language, etc.

Richard K says his language was specific –“If the troops are not out of Iraq by Nov 2008 Presidential election, vote only for Greens.”

Pete S responds on 3rd-party coalitions . . . other 3rd parties could have their own petitions, or we could say “insert party name here.”

Sylvia I agrees with tabling . . . and is worried about printing expense with petitions. If it's a downloadable PDF from the Web site, fine.

Richard K says when we table things, it takes too long to get activity on them; we need something to do now. Anybody who does sign is someone else we can contact for other support.

JALP says the previous “WI-like” petitions to put anti-war vote on the ballot faced legal restrictions; a different kind of petition,

Reggie M says her hero, Zoltan Ferency, always said, “The money is there – it's always there . . . the question is where is it going?”

Art M doesn't know what kind of motion he wants to make — but he wants to break for lunch . . .

moved by acclamation (or at least acclaimed and moved); the current stack of 4 will continue after . . .

12:30 to 1:30 *** lunch break *** [1:00]

During the break, Richard K withdrew proposal 3.

John Torkelsen says he's a GPMI member, repeats that he's against GPMI spending money for banners against the war in Iraq.

Lynn M corrects him – the banners would just say “Green Party of Michigan.”

1:30 to 2:30 **Pete Schermerhorn: Green Card Program and GPMI fundraising and sharing with GPUS**

Pete S tries to offer the long version of the issue quickly: we decided previously that we'd recognize GPUS Green Card participants as GPMI members, though we only get half the money (\$18 of \$36), as long as they sign onto the 4P/10KV. But things have changed . . . the new GPUS treasurer says the half-and-half split between GPUS & states should be net and 20% should be taken off the top as administrative cost/overhead. For this program, it would leave us 40% (\$14.40). Various states besides us have tried to use the Green Card for state membership. Some states are adamant that they can't accept this new lower split – e.g., IL (1,000+ members, but 50% on full waiver and 40% \$10 or less). In the back of *Green Pages*, the form still lets “sustainers” volunteer to have 50% of their money go to their state parties.

So Pete S & others at the national level are proposing to push the sustainer program with the 50-50 split but with a \$10/month minimum. (Smaller amounts leave little after the cost of processing.)

The Green Card can still be useful – but not necessarily the same way. The push from GPUS may now be to get state parties to accept a GPUS donation button or other link, so the money goes through their PayPal account – and GPUS cuts a check back to the state party.

The GPUS budget was flawed – but it was a budget; better to have one in place. One issue is that parties are owed some revenue-sharing (our overdue share is \$1,060). Pete S proposes that we do what TX and some others are doing: forgive some or all of that “credit.”

Questions and comments:

Sylvia I says the Green Card was a good idea in theory – and, until there's a new treasurer and a new budget in place It's not just state parties that aren't getting their money; Women's Caucus too . . . and it's not fair to donors who wanted their \$ targeted/dedicated.

Randym notes that we send GPUS \$100 per quarter already, separate from forgiving them; what are other parties doing? Decentralization is one of the 10KV, too.

Matt A knows there's been problems passing the budget. If we're talking one Green, one vote, then every member should get a Green Card. He'd back TX's idea (with a 60-40 split – 60 for the state). He wouldn't object to a GPUS link – but with some reservations.

Ken M concerned that, if we forgive the debt, will we still get the info about Green Card contributors? That can affect membership and reporting.

Fred V followed some of this discussion on the national lists – brings it back to the “federation” idea. He's not for forgiving all the debt – that would be rewarding bad procedure, sending the wrong message. The budget failed for a reason (and not by just a little). He has no problem with our continuing to send GPUS \$1,000 – but, what exactly do we want/expect from the national office? Once we decide that, we'll be clearer about the money. And what are we expecting from ourselves? GPUS staffmembers are taking pay cuts (5-10%) . . . it's not at all clear that we'll raise enough \$\$ to meet the requirements.

Linda M says we can put buttons on our site for donations in both directions (both to GPMI and to GPUS). That way it's clear where/to whom the \$\$ is going.

Doug B uncertain about distinction between Green Card and regular sustainers:

The difference is that, with the Green Card program, you get the card – and *Green Pages*.

Pete S notes they'd still have to send us the money; then, after it clears [into] our account, we could send it back. Is there a place on line for donating to Women's Caucus separately? AFAHK, earmarking is illegal in MI campaign-finance law.

GPUS didn't ask us to “forgive,” it was Pete's idea. We recently changed from accrual to cash accounting – which is helping get our fiscal house in order. We still get info on any kind of hit on the GPUS site related to MI. It was coming quarterly, now monthly (and they're talking about changing to bi-weekly).

John T asks how GPUS went into debt – and forgiving their debt.

They did hire a fundraiser – but she wasn't keeping pace with her own salary. On the other hand, she only got 6 months to do that, and such things usually take longer.

Lynn M is surprised to hear that sustainers don't get same benefits as Green Cards.

Richard K says the donation form on line for GPUS has space for indicating caucuses as the desired benefactors of the donation.

Linda M contributed via credit card and designated Women's Caucus.

Doug C says earmarking ban is limited (in MI) to something on the ballot.

That's not what Marilyn Freeman told PeteS 8-9 years ago . . . but maybe things have changed since then.

Pete S says Fred makes a good point – what do we want out of GPUS? He's not delighted with things going on at the national level. That said, he is pleased with Green Pages and the Green Senatorial Campaign Committee.

JALP thinks the ban on earmarking in MI has to do with from one campaign committee to another; he can check with B. Wittman.

John T says if/when we're mainstream, we'll get all the money

Lou N contributes to local, state, and nat'l party . . .

Matt A points out national is what we make it; if we want a stronger national party, we can volunteer to do something.

Priscilla D tries to boil down the discussion to a proposal:

GPMI will “forgive”/return half the revenue-sharing money GPUS owes us. (Jody told PeteS the total was \$1,060 for the past three quarters . . . so half would be \$530).

Richard K suggests forgiving all.

Pete S suggests a straw poll . . . votes cast: 16 for half, 9 for all, 2 for none

Lou N suggests another option: 60-40 split (40% to national) . . . that gets 22 votes.

Pete S is willing to accept that as a friendly amdt; John T suggests a letter with it saying we won't do it in the future.

Proposal passed by consensus.

Pete S notes we may not get any \$ back in future from the Green Card program (not enough per person; overhead would eat it up).

2:00 pm FAME – Finding Alternatives to Military Enlistment (moved up from tomorrow) John T, Dianne F

John T says group has pacifists & non-pacifists; what it agrees on is “bringing truth to military enlistment.” He reads an “anonymized” letter to show “where our passion comes from” – the story of what happened after a staff sergeant’s lies. He says they have a good Website: www.FAMEdetroit.org (flyer also gives e-mail FameDetroit@gmail.com). They used to rely on social-studies classes to get in to schools. They had a real breakthrough a few months ago when the Detroit School Board finally gave them equal access to schools with recruiters, but they need more support. They will be training speakers this Tuesday. They’ve also been on local cable-access TV, at Wayne St U, etc.

Dianne F gives a flavor of the 40-min presentation FAME gives in schools (mostly to individual classes, could be a general assembly). Generally they ask the audience to raise hands if they know anyone who’s in the military. When people do, they ask where those people are, and always a high proportion are active in the war one way or another. Then they ask people to come up front and help them – and what they’re helping with is a sheet-by-sheet “banner” of all the US people who’ve died in Iraq (just Iraq, and only up to last summer). For every one of those, at least 6 times as many have been severely injured – and that’s not counting Iraqis. Then they show a bit of video (e.g., the recruiters-at-the-mall section of *Fahrenheit 911*). Next, they pass out an enlistment contract and invite people to find things that look odd to them. Next is a little “Test Your G.I.Q.” flyer. One question involves Emilio Santiago who’s obligated to the military until 12/25/2031!

(Candice C says maybe he’s got special skills like she does, and they want her available until age 72).

There will be a training 7-9:30pm Tuesday at the “troubleplex” in Detroit, and at Osborne HS in Oak Park Thursday 3/1. (FAME is interested in the whole SE MI area.)

The materials are also translated into Spanish (and may soon be in Arabic as well). Phone numbers – (313) 884-3271 or (313) 587-5484.

Another possible target is in rural areas where a lot of recruiting now is going on. Lansing has a group; Ann Arbor/Ypsi has MI PeaceWorks & HS students in Ypsi.

Aaron S is involved with the Lansing effort. He says legislation was passed to guarantee equal access for counter-recruiters under NCLB – a case from the US 9th Cir. Court of Appeals. One way to help FAME (and kids) is to talk to a teacher we know who wants to present counter-recruitment information.

The Archdiocese of Detroit says all Catholic HS are open.

2:30 to 3:15 Ken Mathenia – Report on IRV work, discussion

Ken M started this effort after we spoiled two State Senate races, and kept the Democrats from taking that chamber over, too. He drafted a letter to Granholm, all State Senators & Reps, etc. – seeking endorsements for IRV. He mailed out the letters on 1/24. The only response so far was from a Granholm staffer that the concern would be brought to her attention. If anyone wants to sign on, he’s still collecting names at IRVProject.org

Chuck L from Huron Valley Greens brings a request for help to get IRV on the ballot in Ann Arbor. They need 4,500 signatures (which HVG calculates would take about 3/4 of a person-year). He, Craig Harvey, and Peggy _ of the Ann Arbor FairVote Coalition are working with County Clerk Larry Kestenbaum to draft a proposal. They brought the idea to AA City Council, too, but they seem to like the system they have. A new petition-drive signature-gathering period will be starting up after the proposal is drafted. The only way to get on the Council is to win the Democratic primary in August (when students are away).

He proposes that GPMI support the Ann Arbor FairVote Coalition financially (\$100, say) and help provide support for the petition-drive effort.

Lynn M understood that non-AA residents couldn’t gather signatures; is that true? (We’ll have to check; it would be on the charter, I think)

Ken M wonders when the proposal will be done (a month or two).

Karen S asks what election they’re aiming for? (Nov 2008) In Ferndale, she helped – not gathering signatures, but going door to door

Pete S says people in the 1970s AA blamed the method for the closeness of the result (12 votes) and the difficulty of implementing it.

Dianne F thinks we could help with campaigning – or even “support staff” for the petitioners.

Linda M is concerned that we can't promise volunteers, so the proposal is changed to just offer support with petition drive.

Proposal passed by consensus.

3:15 to 3:30 *** break *** and time for last bids in the silent auction

3:30 to 5:00 **Fred Vitale's proposals**

- 1) What should GPMI do next? Two parts to this item – first, a discussion of the documents in *Green Light* and any other documents that can reach the membership two weeks before the meeting and second, a time for resolutions on what we should do to bring the discussion to some conclusions.
- 2) I also propose that *Green Light* have this dual purpose for the subsequent SMMs. The paper could be another 4 pages for some articles more outwardly directed. We can save postage for the SMM notification and we can engage our members more by providing them with some idea of what we are going to talk about.
- 3) Michigan should adopt the national outreach brochure as a basic outreach piece and add a one page supplement to it.

Fred V reviews the proposals and asks whether we want to try to cover all three at this point in the day. He thinks #1 & #3 are simpler.

Sylvia I says if *Green Light* is going to be the meeting announcement, it needs to invite advance registration.

Candice C says she & Des didn't get their *GLs*.

Pete S wonders if tab closers were used; some can get spoiled in the mail if not. (Fred V not sure.)

Dianne F asks about the other war (global warming); Fred V says Detroit Greens will do a forum/panel on that in April near Earth Day.

Lynn M says HVGs will show *Too Hot to Handle* (everyone's seen *An Inconvenient Truth*). They're also contacting a new group in that area called Climate Crisis.

Ken M suggests making SMMs media events by inviting in speakers, even Green candidates from elsewhere.

Priscilla D adds the idea of contacting local media (near the SMM site) to cover the meetings.

Chuck J cautions that we don't want the media listening to us ... (deliberating, says Doug C).

Lynn M thinks we need to do some training on facilitating. (Doug C adds that we need more training on lots of things.)

Fred V was wondering if we could just draw names for random assignments.

Bob _ wants more continuity on our activities and policies ... he can think of several ideas talked about at Nov SMM but no action since

Fred V asks what happens to JALP's minutes; he & Pete S say they go to SCC and MIGreens Business lists

Matt A says we act as though we have no institutional memory ... maybe we need an old business section as well as new biz.

Proposal: include in GL something of the upcoming agenda, and maybe at least the action items from the previous SMM.

Chuck J suggests maybe spending the last 30 minutes of each SMM reviewing what business is going to SCC (or elsewhere).

Fred V organizes passing around of GPUS outreach flyer ... good on the key issues, good production values we can get them for \$15/100 and put an insert from/for MI stuff.

JALP asks how many addresses in contact database? (Pete S says 5,000. If we were to mail them each one, that would be \$750 not including postage or our insert.)

Fred V is seeing this more as used for tabling.

Doug B asks how we're going to develop the insert; he's willing to help Fred V.

Fred V says it'll go through the SCC ... but the idea is to move fairly quickly (be done/ready before the next SMM; maybe by Nader event 4/19-21). He's thinking of an insertable page (tabloid size, possibly newspaper).

Dianne F suggests some MI-related content (e.g., “Global Warming and Michigan”, MI’s lousy economy, water, etc).

Matt A suggests JALP’s response to State of the State could be taken to lay some of that out. Of course, locals could include their own local materials.

Linda M suggests state order the flyers and provide them (free) to locals.

Proposal: GPMI spend \$300 to buy 2,000 outreach brochures.

Candice C wants to make sure our insert says we’re a party on the ballot. Some folks still confuse us with Greenpeace, etc.

JALP presumes we’re going to include membership form space, too. (Fred V: naturally.)

Randym asks where to send the flyers; Lynn M volunteers to take care of distribution.

Proposal passed by consensus.

So what do we want to do? (cf. the several articles in *GL* on 2006 results, etc.)

Pete S suggests we need a “campaign school” (Doug C says put that under the “training” heading.)

Richard K asks if we could invite candidates from elsewhere who won to help with campaign school (& be speakers for fundraiser).

Doug B says a 7th District Congressional caucus is in the works.

Doug C says Elaine Brown (former Black Panther, Brunswick, GA mayor candidate; may run for Pres) will be in Toledo; he’ll send a notice.

Fred V asks if there’s general agreement that we need more local candidates

Ken M does agree, but adds we need candidates at all levels, though maybe we need to put more focus on winnable races.

Doug C thinks what we want to do ultimately is create the power to steer policy. He does support local candidacies – but having a majority on New Paltz City Council won’t change policy. Maybe the biggest problem we face is that we don’t have a farm team of staff assistants, pages, etc.

Art M says one way to work on that through *GL* is a series on what are good Green issues for County Board, school board, legislature, etc. The GPMI platform is top-level-heavy ... when he ran for county office, he had to wing his own platform.

Linda M thinks one problem with state and national party is that there’s no coordination; every candidate for her-/himself. We need to know better how locals can help.

Richard K notes there are some local races this year: Ann Arbor; also Warren which has non-partisan races up. He has a friend who might well like a Green endorsement there

Dianne F remembers a woman last year who was interested in running for State Board of Ed. Dianne remembers thinking that we should help find a group of teachers who could help her. It’d be good to develop expertise. One reason people might vote for us even though we’re “odd” is because they see us as trustworthy, having knowledge, etc. That’s a reason to have local candidates: to develop that trust.

Lynn M asks why aren’t there any GPMI bumper stickers here?

Fred V recaps: campaign school, series of articles – something not on here is recruiting candidates.

Richard K says we need to move up our convention – May or even Feb/Mar, and find candidates early (particularly US Senate candidate).

Aaron S agrees that we need a jumpstart on candidates; he’s planning on running in 2008. (Several people tell him: start now.)

Chuck J says what we really need is more voters – which primarily means getting people who consider themselves to be independent to go to the polls.

George C disagrees with earlier nomination; look at the Presidential candidates we have already ... if you want to run, start now.

Robert says we need to know when our convention will be anyway – how do we establish that? He’d prefer it by April.

JALP remarks that 2004 pattern was state convention in May, partly to elect delegates to GPUS convention in June. But counties could caucus before or after ... anyone who wants to run can start now.

Fred V asks if anything stops us from asking (on our internal lists, at least) if anyone wants to run?

JALP says no, but notes that there is no such thing as an exploratory committee in MI.

George C adds that anyone who opens a Federal Office exploratory committee has to start reporting to the FEC. (Aaron S says that is true only if the committee reaches the \$5k threshold.)

Doug C says he plans on not running in 2007, 8, or 9

Linda M says she'd much rather recruit Greens to run than recruit people to run as Greens.

Art M says we won't get endorsements even if we nominate in May – organizations like the Sierra Club and the UAW endorse Democrats for/by the the primaries, and go on to endorse the same Democrats in the fall elections. They endorse Democrats, period.

Candice C counters that there's a trick for that ... somebody invented his own organization to endorse him for school board. Anyone who knows anything in that area knows that's what happened.

Lynn M would hate to see us stuck with a self-fulfilling prophecy; if we don't ask, we won't get. But we can go after some local endorsing groups.

Harley M thinks one reason we don't get endorsements is that we don't try to get them until the last minute. He tried to talk to UAW in 2004 to ask why they endorsed a Republican instead of a Green. He was told that the Greens didn't ask. Even if we don't get endorsements, we can get some individual supporters, and he is planning to be a candidate for something in 2008.

Richard K says David Sole got *MI Citizen* endorsement, Lauren Spencer got MSU State News, and *Between the Lines* (GLBT newspaper) gave some Green endorsements, too. As for the Sierra Club, he sees some members here – probably a majority of some chapters.

Art M says he went to SE MI PAC one year before he ran for Congress; he was refused endorsement 12 times.

(Some discussion of arrangements for the fundraiser.)

Fred V asks if we want to wrap this up formally or let it sit for now?

Matt A wonders if we should look into having 100 candidates in partisan local races, and who would we like to have as a US Senate candidate?

Harley M tries to recruit Matt, and he declines; Lynn M suggests Harley, and he might do it.

Dianne F thinks maybe we should set up a campaign school; if Doug C isn't running, maybe he can work on it. (He will but not run it.)

Richard K suggests SCC develop a wish list of candidates with notoriety ... and aim for a campaign school in June or so.

Fred wonders if we want to hold it before or after GPUS national meeting in July; Linda M says GPUS has developed materials to help candidates.

JALP asks if we're talking about something independent of an SMM; Doug C says it could be Saturday night of an SMM (Lynn M: or Friday night.)

Richard K says a campaign school should be an all-day event; Doug C says it should be held at least every year.

Twinkle

Fred V goes back to his *GL* article and how Black Democrats took over the Democratic Party in Detroit. The results of a State Rep recount indicated how strong straight-party ticket vote was. They didn't even look at ballots marked straight-party. What can we do about that?

Linda M points out that you can mix as well as split your ticket. (Fred V, Gary D didn't know that.)

George C says the question he's heard people ask most when he is campaigning at the polling place is "what is the Green Party?" That's why the flyer is so important.

Doug B wonders if people actually read the material we give them.

George C says sometimes, at least – someone came out after voting and told him so.

Candice C says only the big two parties appoint people to the County Board of Canvassers. In her experience,

County Bd of Canvassers just rubber-stamps; it's people from State Bureau of Elections who did the recounting. We need to become election judges (or election workers, adds Lynn M).

5:00 to 6:00 Finish up silent auction, rearrange furniture in prep for fundraiser

8:00 to after midnight: Fundraiser – Bill O and Richard K

Sunday, Feb 25

10:00 Doors open [10:25]

Lou N leads discussion of re-arranging schedule:

Report on fundraising event (Richard K)

Postcard outreach and possible expansion (Doug Baker)

Discussion of State of the State and response (John La Pietra)

The movement (Art M)

The Waking Up store in Universal Mall

The Third Party Coalition, proposed by Socialist Party of Michigan

Priscilla Dzubek – New Nestle petition, other water work

Doug B notes he brought petition from Elena Herrada on Efren Parada

Report on fundraising event (Richard K)

It was a good party. There was some good spreading of the Green words ... and the band loved it. Financially, it was not a great success – only 50-60 people attended. It would have been \$100 net, split between GPMI & band; Richard donated his up-front money. We need more advance planning for publicity, liquor license – both to draw bigger crowd. He's always willing to show up for house parties – and we need a bigger fundraising base to get more money (& support) from others.

Reactions:

Priscilla D thought it was a great event ... and a big effort for us, too.

Ken M was glad there weren't 200 people in the hall – that would have been crowded. It would have been nice to have buttons and bumper stickers available, and maybe somebody speaking for GPMI (briefly) before the band started to play.

Reggie M thinks it's important to wear buttons all the time, in public, to show we're Green and maybe get people to open up.

Lou N agrees it was a good event and a great time, takes some responsibility for lack of literature/etc. He thanks Richard K and Bill O for doing this – notes that Mike Witty suggested we should do something like it at every SMM.

Doug B asks if we need him to make some more buttons; discussion of need (and uses – tabling, etc.). "Labor donated" should go on all of them (has been on the GPMI buttons themselves). Someone notes/suggests that Doug B (or other button-maker) can join IWW and then legitimately say union-made.

Bill O notes that the people who are starting up a local in Livonia were here last night, too.

Postcard outreach and possible expansion (Doug Baker)

A message about his postcard has been on Business list; what he wants most today is feedback on a 3-up slip. He got the idea while attending a Howard Zinn event.

A few editing comments offered – one on cutting "corporations or their PACs" down to "corporate PACs." This raises questions about union PACs.

Lou N notes that there has been discussion on national list about small-biz service.

JALP checks campaign-finance manual, suggests maybe cutting Senator's name off the 3-up slip.

Discussion of State of the State and response (John La Pietra)

There is approval in general: some comments on content/details (e.g. “rebuild” the economy, businesses paying income tax); format; audience.

A discussion ensues of primary issues covered: Single Business Tax, energy policy (& carbon tax), etc. (water, IRV also mentioned in flyer).

There is general agreement that it’s probably too late to use the piece as a response to the 2-weeks-old-and-counting State of the State speech, but we do want to do such things – maybe focus on individual issues for some pieces, too.

Lou N proposes accepting it as GPMI’s statement; JALP is somewhat concerned.

Lou N notes that it’s about to be published in *Critical Moment*, thinks it might carry more weight if it were describable as GPMI’s.

After discussion; Lou N withdraws his motion, but the matter is referred to the Platform Committee to develop ongoing party statement.

The Waking Up store in Universal Mall (Mike Kitchen)

The store sells sweatshop-free clothing, union-made products, organic goods (some hemp goods too) ... *very* environmentally conscious overall. The Web site is hosted on a server that’s solar-powered. They found recycled-plastic mannequins from a source in Australia – but the mannequins are made in Sturgis!

The store is open Sundays noon-5pm (10am-9pm F-Sa).

Doug B asks about possibility of advertising store on GPMI Web site; Lou N notes most talk of advertising has focused on *Green Light*.

Mike K says there’s a community bulletin board; Richard K says he put lit there – on the bottom of the rack – & Mike moved it up to the top of the rack.

Break [11:52]

The movement (Art M)

Lou N asks Art M to give a brief synopsis of his article.

Art M begins: we’re really a party & not a movement; he’s old enough to remember when there was a movement (several, in fact). A movement is a substantial group of people insisting on changes in society/govt/etc. – and insisting on having it right now! Plus a movement has ways of forcing action (for or against) – or at least consideration of its objectives ... e.g., sit-ins. Today, we have remnants of civil-rights, labor, and peace movements, but when the speakers at a big rally in DC are Jane Fonda and John Conyers, that’s the remainders of a former movement. He predicts there’s going to be a new one – or more than one – given the crises of today. When it comes, it’ll be important that we have ballot access, etc – we’ll be accusing Democrats of spoiling us (or winning despite Democrats). But it won’t happen until Democrats split up as a party, or both Democratic & Republican parties splinter. So it’s important that we keep ballot access for when whichever crises trigger a movement to emerge. Our membership may be overwhelmed when it happens, and it will happen – but we need to be patient. If the movement arises at a time of elections and we’re the ones standing up in favor of the movement, we may win elections.

Reggie M wants to change the world, but for now she’s focusing on MI ... she thought of 12 movements. She’s a Democratic Socialist – hasn’t voted for a Democrat since Zoltan Ferency ran for governor & said he wouldn’t support LBJ. That’s the backdrop for her statement that she’s here to praise Al Gore (hopes to see him win an Oscar tonight), but she told someone at [an organic-food store] she wouldn’t vote for him. She’d rather leave him alone – he’s doing more good where he is now. She has two ideas ... the only part of the ballot that’s democratic is the proposals; she wants the people of MI to vote yes on money for a mass transit fund ... she’s been in Transportation Riders United since its beginning – 5 yrs or so. Back in the 1970s, what energized the people was the draft; today it’s global warming. She feels democracy (wouldn’t it be nice if we had it?) would benefit from a revival of Z Ferency’s petition for a constitutional amendment for proportional representation (PR). It would enable minor-party candidates, independents, etc to win with 5% of the vote. The petition includes

a unicameral legislature, with multiple seats from each district (matching Congressional districts). Students (members of the Human Rights Party) in her day elected 2 of their number to the AA City Council, and helped put in IRV. She quotes Eleanor Roosevelt as saying everyone should do something every day that frightens them. Someone should put other issues on the ballot, too (e.g., universal health care). She thinks that, if we put transit on the ballot, Al Gore would come and help us. As for the PR proposal, that might draw the Center for Voting and Democracy. She also wonders if an attorney could challenge the petition-drive signature requirements.

Richard K notes that the Road Builders Association wants to boost tax by another 17 cents per gallon to fund road improvements. Also, Federal law says up to 15% of the funds raised by gas taxes may be used for mass transit, but MI only uses about 6%.

Doug C asks if the RBA's proposal addresses different fuel taxes. There's an attorney at Wayne State who's interested in mass transit who was written up in the *Metro Times*.

Art M says one problem with ballot proposals is getting the language drafted properly; he reviews states where IRV is moving.

JALP reports on last cycle's signature requirements, mentions that IRV is allowed for cities.

Bill O could almost wish Democrats had won the state senate so we could tell them to put up or shut up.

Ken M notes that an initiative drive would require both drafting the petition and building a coalition to get the signatures. Another possibility: medical marijuana.

Priscilla D notes that several of these issues are discussed at Social Forums (local/etc. leading to US Social Forum in July). They are a good way to work with other like-minded people.

Richard K thinks petition drives are a good concrete thing for members to do between meetings/elections. They are also good to build coalitions, bring the issues to the people. There should be a renewable energy portfolio for MI ... been done in other states (including Colorado and Texas under Shrub!).

Harley M agrees with the idea of building coalitions with like-minded groups and working on initiatives. But we're already in the 2008 election cycle – petition drives would take money & time away from running candidates.

Reggie M says they should join us!

Matt A is very active with MI NORML, would like us to endorse the Flint vote. The state petition drive will be paying circulators \$1 per signature. He also likes the renewable-fuel portfolio and IRV ideas.

Richard K agrees with Harley that we need to work on issues to get people into the party (working with us). If we come up with a good issue, the people will join in. A renewable-fuels portfolio could avoid 2 Nuclear plants and/or 10-15 coal-fired plants. That would do more good for the environment than our electing 1-2 state legislators. He has Colorado's bill at home as one model.

Jan M asks how we're going to reach the younger people; Bill O notes that his son was (surprisingly) at the party last night.

(assorted discussion of issues)

Doug C makes a concrete proposal to designate Reggie M as a contact for GPMI to Al Gore's office to get him to come front some issue petitions. She declines.

Lou N makes Matt A's request for endorsement of Flint medical-marijuana vote a formal proposal.

Doug C doesn't want to block, but wants us to think a moment – would it help the initiative, or help us? We are the mainstream, but all people know about us is that we're dope-smoking treehuggers (& the French government blew up our ship).

Ken M notes that most people in the area and nationwide support medical marijuana – so it is a mainstream issue. He argues we can get some support from it – not a big boost, but ... building relationships.

Harley M suggests we can't be less brave than the Libertarians on this.

Proposal passed by consensus.

Lou N tries to round off the discussion by focusing on which of the ideas (Reggie M's & others) we want to start working on first.

Richard K agrees with Reggie M that we're doing the reverse of what normally happens (issue groups going to parties for support). We need to act ...

Lou N repeats the reminder of earlier decision that we should join rather than assume the lead.

Matt A reviews the ideas: PR, IRV are more structural. Mass transit is certainly an important issue – could we combine it with renewable energy? Maybe we should plan for Universal Health Care and renewable energy, one in 1 year and one in 3 years.

Ken M says there is a 3rd-party coalition building ... maybe PR and IRV could feed into that.

Linda M asks what parties are involved in the 3rd-party coalition so far.

Ken M says Socialists invited Greens, Libertarians, Constitution Party, US Taxpayers Party, World Workers Party, etc.

Lou N says we know that we & Libs have signed on

JALP points out that IRV petition drives can be done locally (e.g., AA, Ferndale) ... can PR? We need to check.

Art M is struck by the failure to invite the Labor Party. (Ken M says he's a member of that, too.)

One last comment from Reggie M: the crimes of people in government (Democrats & Republicans) have been so egregious that they demand a dramatic response.

Lou N suggests bringing this issue to SCC (and locals).

Break [1:19]

The Third Party Coalition, proposed by Socialist Party of Michigan (Ken M)

Ken M says nothing's happening yet except recruiting of parties; he brought Matt Erard's original e-mail, hands out copies. (Matt E was invited, but he isn't here.)

The general idea is to work together on ballot access, IRV, inclusion for 3rd party candidates in debates & coverage in the media, etc. The e-mail has some specific ideas (though the coalition hasn't yet formed enough to meet).

Ken M thinks Democrats would rather take away our ballot access than make forward-looking proposals like these. Some of the parties are R-wing, true, but we should work together on these kinds of issues.

JALP asks if Ken M (or the body) wants the meeting to adopt GPMI priorities for coalition action (from the e-mail or others).

Doug B asks if any framework in place to avoid procedural problems with any governing body.

Ken M says not yet ... the first meeting will presumably be in Lansing.

Reggie M says every great movement starts with fire ... maybe we should burn our voter-registration cards and announce that we are doing it. Otherwise, the media will pay no attention.

Art M's understanding of coalitions is that they don't need elections, etc. – they're formed to work on a common project. If you don't have agreement for that, you don't actually have a coalition.

Lou N notes that the e-mail mentions a national Coalition for Free and Open Elections – is GPUS in that? He volunteers to Doug B to be Detroit rep for this coalition.

Richard K suggests top priority should be to ease getting & staying on ballot and raising campaign finance reporting threshold for minor parties.

Doug B asks if any of those would take a Constitutional amendment. Lou N talks somewhat about answers.

Reggie M says it's a shame not to work with PR after Zoltan Ferency worked so hard.

Ken M suggests that she bring the petition to the coalition.

Doug B is concerned by the length of the petition – wouldn't want to read all that; is it required?

Reggie M says there's basic language to summarize the change.

Lou N sympathizes, but says Doug B has a point; compares last year's Proposal 2 (and its misleading title).

Priscilla D first, notes that Detroit Greens were a sponsor of MLK march – MLK Spirit Award to Bishop Gumbleton, etc.; good word-spreading).

She hands out an outline of the Water Affordability Program; it's been implemented in Detroit – sort of. It's a voluntary (opt-out) program to contribute to paying for people who can't afford water bills, avoid shut-offs (like THAW for heating). But the problem is that the program has been passed through the counsel and the Water

Board has accepted it, but nobody's being enrolled yet. They'd like people to check what's happening in their own cities ... as a way to raise consciousness of water as a human right. Also, she attended a training on the Great Lakes by the Sierra Club in late December. The issues included Annex 2001; the major loophole of which is it permits the diversion of bottled water in containers 5.7 gallons or less. The Sierra Clubs of the same general area have developed a Great Lakes Coalition to close that loophole; also to fight exotic species (e.g., Asian carp; funding for a permanent barrier on the Chicago River is being held up in DC).

They are also working with other water-protection groups (e.g., Clean Water Action working to close that loophole in implementing legislation).

Priscilla D's not sure how that proposed legislation would affect Ice Mountain (only one pumping from an aquifer). One hope is to avoid grandfathering

Reggie M has a wastebasket full of Fund-raising letters; she's for a ballot question saying no turn-offs. As a single mother years ago she got gas cut off; it was traumatizing. It's not that she didn't *know* her house used gas, but she refused to accept/take in what all that meant. She again Quotes Zoltan Ferency on "the money is there; it's [a question of] where is it going?"

Art M got a letter from MCWC about a new petition re: Nestle; didn't bring it because he presumed she'd have it here; he'll forward it to her.

Doug B asks if mention of 3rd-party administrator for the Water Affordability Program means there would be additional administrative costs. (Not a full start-up, but there would be some costs which would have to be covered either by program funds or \$\$ set aside by utilities.)

Priscilla D notes that Roger Colton, who's to "develop the program design", has done the same in other places across the country.

4:00 or before Wrap up (no later than 4:00 PM)

Lou N appeals to Art M for a wrap-up; he forwards to JALP to review.

Twinkle

There is no final figure on \$\$ raised from silent auction.

Reggie M reads a Longfellow poem as (or in lieu of) a closing prayer.

*** END ***