

GPMI State Membership Meeting
June 25, 2005 – Dearborn

9:20 - 9:30am welcome & introductions
[Lou N starts us off at 9:48]

introduces Sylvia Inwood for welcoming remarks

starts off from author Arundhati Roy and her 2003 book *War Talk*

when asked if she's moving out of city, Roy asks back: where would she go?

some people voted Dem, said they'd leave America if Bush was re-elected

Sylvia had a community party/concert to help pay her property taxes . . .

Detroit has 900,000 people supporting a 2,000,000-person infrastructure

kids helping her with her garden etc. are helping her make Detroit a better place to live

community is about making it better, getting our structure together

comparison with problems inside GPMI – we need less “navel-gazing”, more effort to go out and make social change

ends with quote from Che Guevara: “The true revolutionary is guided by great feelings of love.”

self-introductions all around; some highlights:

David S manages the national database for contributions

he's created a Wiki for updating the GPMI platform, and is organizing a SW Wayne County local

Scott H is organizing a NW Wayne local

9:30 - 11:00am officers' reports & discussions; SCC reports [10:0x]
[Y or N = are they going to be running for their post again?]

Sylvia (Chair) [Y]

her opening comments were her report

Ted H (Treasurer) – not anymore, he says [N]

Lou N (Meeting Manager) [N]

Randym (Clearinghouse Co-ordinator) [N; he's running for treasurer, suggests Rebekah Chor of Huron Valley Greens]

about 80 calls since last meeting, half seeking taxi (or hang-ups); maybe 7 legitimate messages since February

message for Oakland County local: “they need your updated information”

Karen S (National Representative) [Y]

strong and cohesive party requires us to be kind to each other – this isn't happening nationally

each state is responsible for [cleaning up] its own house

has particular suggestions and requests:

she's national rep and [runs] speakers' bureau – but wants a better description of her job[s]

got no response to forwarding of Delta College request, then got complaints for not informing folks(!)

someone from every local should be checking the lists every day

David S agrees our weakness is depending on e-mail; we need more direct-contact info (phones, etc.) too

Ted H says that's the Local Liaison's job

her e-mail & phone number are listed for the speakers' bureau

as delegate to nat'l committee, she thought she had 2 jobs: vote on GPUS proposals, inform GPMI of key items

complaint for too much e-mail, though she trims hundreds down to a few

David S suggests a bit more context info on the issues she does forward: why it's important, what we can do

Doug C says the only thing she's doing wrong is taking criticism too seriously, not deleting it fast enough

yes, but we want to keep things cohesive . . . she has a problem with too much criticism

Steve Heinzman agrees she's doing a good job; if a piece of criticism is unreasonable, ignore it

okay, she'll keep on doing what she's doing – but put in her own subject line (etc.)

national meeting coming up in Tulsa

some discussion of not having national delegates vote in Tulsa, and/or not having proxies – but it's not clear

but the main problem with GPUS is the same problem here . . . not enough people getting involved

people have limited funds & time, and other responsibilities

we need to make it easier for everyone in the state to participate in these meetings

how expensive would teleconferencing, etc. be? dunno, but she wants to find out . . .

Doug C notes digest option is daily; if people aren't getting mail within a week, it's because they're neglecting it

she feels we must confront this within the Party – people must pay attention

hands around some info on Medea Benjamin – passed around to let everyone know what's going on

she's urging Code Pink to support Progressive Democrats of America
she & others (David Cobb, Dean Myerson, *et alia*) are part of the Green Institute (non-profit/think-tank)
Lou N suggests tabling to later in meeting (possibly during discussion of Tulsa)

Fred Vitale (National Representative) [Y]

notes national reps discussed, but all they could agree on is that each would report

[Matt A not here yet; he may be]

[David S notes Carolyn D is backing away from her nat'l rep seat due to employer's order for 12 credits of statistics]

he has prepared a list of all proposals passed at the national level since 2003 (passed around)

can give an idea of the discussion going on

he'd ask our opinions – but most items are internal procedure changes, etc.

not sure they're all clear even to those on the national list who are discussing them

not a criticism of the national organization, but need to talk about US and rest of world, not just internal [issues]

but there have been some interesting developments:

Elaine Brown (former Black Panther) running for mayor in Brunswick, GA; she's good at reaching minorities

VT Greens involved in anti-war referendum in March (per their tradition of town-hall democracy)

[we need to discuss] relationships between national committee & steering committee, relations to state parties
not always sure what he can do

David S notes sounds the same as when he was a national rep – but cautions not all internal stuff is trivial

Fred V agrees, it's just that issues aren't always clear (and 30-40 posts a day, almost a full-time job)

one bit of optimism is that opposition to the war has reached a majority . . .

and Greens are the only national/nationwide anti-war-from-the-start party

reviews VT effort, also notes WI's proposed referendum drive[s]

working on a county-by-county basis, but "one focus" statewide

another issue for us is the auto industry's crisis (here in Michigan): closings, economic impact, etc.

what would we do?; entire communities devastated

UAW warns of big push downward in standard of living if concessions are made

GPMI is [potentially] in a unique position because of our community focus

Doug C asks how the 2008 national convention rules are going?

Fred V says nowhere near rules yet; he's in PNP group which will report so far at Tulsa

a question which may be resolved at Tulsa is how to apportion delegates:

two choices Fred V mentions are "one Green, one vote" and apportioning by populations of states

without sugarcoating, Fred V adds, no one is trying to say "let's go backward" (to how it was done in 2004)

Doug C would very much like to see this settled by December 2006

Fred V notes there was a lot of discussion at first, then it kind of dropped off

Doug C (Vice-Chair/SCC Whip) [Y]

slow quarter for this vice-chair

we had one speaking opportunity ("Currently Speaking" on Delta U Public TV stations) which was then withdrawn

asst producer/(staffer who called) was eager for broad range of views, but host Alan Rapp only wanted Rs & Ds

Doug C did call in and got 2 minutes to note that Dems had all voted for Bush agenda

Karen S thinks we could have gotten more action going if we'd organized earlier (maybe local folks' protest?)

he submitted a piece for the Delta U student newspaper, but it was already closed for the summer

he'll be going to Tulsa . . . if anyone wants him to do something there, please let him know

he's also available for other speaker opportunities, hoping for places like civics classes

[anyone who wants to be a speaker/presenter, please dive in]

Linda M: if he's going, should he go as an alternate in case other national reps aren't going?

Bill O: SE Oakland organizing meeting; we are not organized, we should get together

who can speak [officially] as a Green Party rep, and who can't?

most of us are activists, many of us enjoy speaking up for our views

in his opinion, telling folks they can't is undemocratic & wrong

we sure don't want to confront each other . . . there should be things discussed here:

Stephanie Loveless

who are the dissidents/radicals at these meetings that want to tear the party apart?

don't rely on Stalinist tactics; accusations should be made clearly & openly

lots of other progressive groups agree with us on issues, but won't work with us:

we're uninteresting, effete, no sense of humor.

pick our ten best points & go with them

what should we do about "healing" the Party?

Karen S: is Doug C the moderator of the SCC list?

he has that power, but he hasn't used it to block messages or writers

she thinks some folks don't think as clearly, or express themselves as politely, on e-mail as in person
he says he'd make a direct comment [about unkind comments on the list]

Peter S: anything to say about the SCC process and what it's done this year?

Doug C replies it'd be a lot easier to keep up with that if he didn't have a day job now
he's not spending enough time to [properly] organize [the lists]
he had to hoped to do it, he was unemployed when he got the job as vice-chair

Peter S has printed by-laws; they say chair's responsible for responding to requests for interviews, appearances,
and requests for statements from the media (IV-8-B; passed at December 2004 SMM)
or either of the vice-chairs may respond

Sylvia I noted she wasn't able to respond to the Bay City invitation (the speaking engagement)
she didn't want anyone to speak for her, so she spoke to 2 Greens: Doug C & Art M

Bill O: that's the criticism . . . it's always the same people speaking; that's why people come and go
he's a salesman and marketer . . . if he were elected, he would want to speak
we're shrinking (i.e. losing membership)

[Lou N reminds the meeting to direct any questions to Doug C, since he's reporting now]

Art M: do you think the logging set-up on Yahoo would be a good way to discuss proposals like this?
or is it too amorphous

Doug C thinks online process can be improved, but still limited in terms of contact
in-person SCC meetings (when we had them) were poorly attended, etc., didn't work so well

Karen S suggests conference calls, Fred V suggests the voting pages(/poll function) on Yahoo

Doug agrees we can set polls up; Fred says okay, as long as we know; Lou notes a web-based item due later

Dianne F: it'd be helpful to put up a sheet or board to keep track of topics, make sure we're not losing them

Lou N asks for help to document them later; JALP is too busy taking notes (to track the discussion)

SMM agenda items should be submitted to the meeting manager in advance

Bill O says he called Lou, tried to propose such before the 18th

Lou counters that Bill O had no specific proposal; maybe agenda [can be added to at the end]

Alan K asks Doug C & Sylvia I what are the critical political discussions we should be addressing?

what discussions do they (as vice-chair/SCC whip & chair) see that have been or are going on?
he would prefer that these meetings be about politics than procedures

Sylvia says, as chair, she's dealt mostly with putting out fires, moderating squabbles, smoothing things over
there's a war on, cities are dying, schools are closing, all sorts of things are going wrong
we are losing sight of the bigger picture

Detroit Greens are working on an anti-war referendum, she'd like [th. . .]

Ted H: is the Camejo-Cobb split (for lack of a better name) still the big division/issue on the national party?

Karen S: it is and it isn't . . . the real issue is the direction of the national party

one side (mostly but not all Nader people) says we need to be totally independent of Democrats

another side (happens to be mostly Cobb supporters) says we can influence Dems thru Progressive Dems

JALP (elections co-ordinator . . . & Media Committee) [Y]

reports for both are on the back page of the article on Rev. Pinkney and BANCO and Benton Harbor
[answering an earlier question, doing an Iraq petition statewide does not preclude local petitions]

David S: it's good our news releases are getting on IndyMedia/Michigan; are they picked up by other media?

JALP would welcome help [from Greens across state] to watch for news being picked up by other local media

Ted H: comments re: BH recall revocation . . . Rev. P talked to him as a lawyer

in civil suit on the recall, no mention made of Rev. P's papers, signed by each canvasser, saying no \$ for votes
case was a loss without those –

and, though Rev. P not a party to that case, he was accused of fraud all through it

so, now that Rev. P is charged with fraud, he'll always be remembered as "a fraud", thinks Ted H

his worry: could the wrong impression of Rev. P spread to GPMI?

a judge has ruled, and there's virtually no chance of the Appeals Court overturning that ruling

JALP refers to article/handout – and notes the motion claiming prosecutor had no right to bring the suit

Alan K: Ted H right in matter of court process, but he thinks Ted's wrong politically (though it's a legitimate issue)

he agrees that questioning the authority to bring the case from the beginning would be a better chance

the judge now assigned to the case is a former head of the state Bar Association, and highly revered

we should trust Rev. P; he's in a dangerous position, but we shouldn't be scared of it

feels state party has statewide responsibilities that require people who will do statewide work

people on Media Committee should watch for our news, contact their local media people & help get our news in

David S asks the room how many here are in locals – and how many of them actually meet regularly

that's something the state party should do: help locals & local people get more active

Dianne F suggests dividing proposals time into structure & politics

is the hesitancy of locals due to state-level squabbling?

Chuck J notes squabbling exists in locals, too

Alan K (International Committee) [Y]

has 45-48 members now, not all active; authorized to have 3 per state (including DC), so could be about 160 people wide-ranging responsibilities, including bringing international issues to the national committee also for relations with foreign parties (sending & bringing delegates)

recently a Mongolian Green Party was founded . . .

new, so didn't know what the party's protocol was – so came to DC office and announced themselves that's how the International Committee found out about them(!)

OTOH, internally there are difficult discussions . . .

a new delegate came on the committee (Tony Gronowicz) – Nader supporter from Wisconsin

the first discussion he ran into was whom to send to meeting about CAFTA in Miami

the main name discussed was Jim Polk (highly esteemed, has been to several such meetings?)

discussion wound up with a proposing that Pat LaMarche (who's also on the International Committee) also go

Tony G attacked Pat, didn't accept everyone's explanations of the misquote on Kerry, etc., etc.

also in the discussions on the committee was Tony Affigne [Tony A]

he said Tony G's attack "violated internal democracy"

Alan K talked to them both

the point was that the International Committee had a wide range of ideologies

usually they manage to express differences of opinion in a civilized manner (tradition of civil disagreement)

it had been a couple of years since the IC's previous "internal dust-up"

then Tony G said he'd take the internal party discussion as material for his next book. . . .

he was suspended for that (though some people may not have realized that was why); now back on, behaving

Alan K wasn't sure if this was a Nader/Cobb leftover or purely a Tony G issue

Dianne F found this report over the top – "more information than we need", not at all helpful for a 1-day meeting

suggested Alan K could provide a written report; come up with structural suggestions or talk politics

Alan K says he couldn't report on IC without mentioning this . . . and it was really the very condensed version

George Christian agrees with Dianne F:

90% of this meeting [should be about] win[ning] elections or [how to] get better at it; don't waste precious time

JALP: what happened to invitations we were thinking of issuing for GPUS or GPMI?

well, for one, Alan K answers, Wangari Maathai came to US as part of the Friends of the Green Belt Movement

they invited her and sponsored her trip; he wonders why we had so little involvement

Sylvia: Green Party's not just about elections, it's a movement too

yes, says George C, but we spend too much time on protocol and Robert's Rules . . .

Bill O: apologizes for interrupting

the point is that this party is a shrinking violet – anyone who can't see it is blind; anyone who can't hear it is deaf

I've been going to all these progressive tribes; they agree with our issues . . . but we must relate to people's

issues

if you want a viable party, we think we have a way to make that happen – but we should vote on it

are we here to serve humanity or our own egos & needs?

11:00 - 11:15am officer nominations

[postponed until after lunch]

11:15 - 12:00noon speaker [11:35]

Maureen Taylor, head/Michigan Welfare Rights Organization (and candidate for Detroit City Council)

<* awaiting supplemental notes *>

** lunch ** [12:30?]

officer nominations [2:00]

Lou N offers to consolidate nominations and elections

opposition – some folks want to hear policy discussion first

discussion

the offices of Chair, Secretary and Recordkeeper are required by the state

people could nominate themselves or be nominated by others (either way, a second is required)

chair

Sylvia Inwood

vice-chair/SCC whip

Doug Campbell, David Spitzley

vice-chair/committee manager

[Roger McClary hasn't been heard from much; nobody volunteers]

David Spitzley suggests putting it off – apparently not vital, not being done

[Lou N suggests have loser of whip vote take on VC/cmte. mgr. instead; ** consensus ** (including 2 candidates)]

recordkeeper

[Priscilla D has been since Adrianna's resignation; no volunteers]

treasurer

Randym Jones

elections co-ordinator

John Anthony La Pietra

meeting manager

[Lou N doesn't want to stay; George C(orsetti?) also declines nomination]

Ted H nominates **Jim Wilber**, assures Lou N he's willing; Lou N said he was willing to help Jim

membership secretary

[Jason Seagraves not here, no expressed interest in continuing]

Peter Schermerhorn

locals liaison

[David Palmer leaving MI]

Bill Opalicky

clearinghouse co-ordinator

[Randym switching to treasurer, presumably]

Rebekah Chor (also of HVG)

Peter S says she's not a GPMI member; Randym says she'd be willing to join

they agree she's been coming to HVG meetings

so we'll approve her on a provisional basis (provided, that is, that she joins GPMI)

national representatives [4; Carolyn Dulai stepping down to study statistics, other 3 still OK:

Fred Vitale, Matt Abel, Karen Shelley]

Linda Manning Myatt

International Committee reps

Alan Kaufman does still want to be on . . . *Steve Herrick* is still on, too, he thinks

he adds that we need to continue to populate that and other national committees?

Fred V suggests at least renewing nominations of folks like **Aimee Smith** (on the Peace and Justice Committee)

David S suggests consensus re-approval of existing committee persons (twinkle/** consensus **)

back to recordkeeper

Linda Manning Myatt will volunteer to take it on for now at least

1:00 - 2:30pm proposals & resolutions [x:xx]

proposals

David S to stack; Fred V to facilitate & keep time; start with 5 minutes each (hope to be done in an hour)

“Troops Home Now” Signs in No-Locals Areas (Paul Emery)

Proposal to facilitate putting up “Bring our troops home now”

signs in areas of the state where there is no local organization.

1. Allow members in areas not covered by a GPMI local to make proposals to the state to raise money in the name of the state party earmarked to put a copy of the 32' x 8' sign. The proposal will specify the location and the cost and a time limit within which the project will be completed.
2. After approval, authorize the state treasurer to receive such earmarked funds and to pay costs for the project as bills are presented.
3. If the proposal cannot be completed within the specified time the party may[,] at its own discretion, spend any earmarked funds for other expenses.
4. The sign will be the property of the state party and indicate it was paid for by the state party.

Randym asks cost of sign in Detroit; George Corsetti says sign cost \$850, billboard rent \$100/3 months(?)

Alan K: how control costs/etc. in such no-locals areas? covered in paragraph 1

Ted H: no time limit; if not enough \$\$ by a proposal's time limit, need to write back to say may wind up with GPMI

A personal correspondence contribute \$50; general fund. (sic)

Treasurer would act as shepherd [of the money, but it would be **outside** of state money].

Nothing would prohibit party from contributing – would take SCC vote.

** consensus **

outreach to young working-class people (Fred Vitale)

Outreach to working class young people

Background:

Nearly 60% of Americans say that the US should withdraw some o[r] all of its troops from Iraq, according to the latest Gallup poll (June 6-8). For the first time, a majority would be “upset” if Bush sends more troops. An ABC News-Washington Post poll said that 2/3 said that the US military was bogged down in Iraq and nearly 3/4 said the casualty level was unacceptable.

At the same time in Michigan, the crisis of the auto sector has accelerated. The problems at Delphi, Visteon, Ford and GM are everyday headlines. GM and Ford will soon close factories; Visteon is likely to do the same. Other local suppliers will follow suit. And the unemployment rate in Michigan remains among the nation's highest.

Young, working class people are among those most affected by the war. The growing opposition also affects their thinking. Young people are among those most affected by the high unemployment rate. Good jobs are getting scarcer and employment prospects are dwindling for new workers.

Bush and the Democrats have no plans to leave Iraq any time soon. As for jobs, Bush has no jobs plans. The Democrats are split with many supporting the trade pacts (NAFTA, CAFTA) that have contributed to job losses; others oppose the trade pacts, but offer very little as a positive alternative to job loss.

The Green Party has proposals and/or answers to these very serious problems and we should make a special effort to reach young people with them at this critical time.

Proposal:

The SMM asks that a group of volunteers meet, in person and electronically, to:

1. Develop a flyer directed at young people that addresses and links these two key issues.
2. The literature be no longer than 1 page and include a membership form and a spot for a local address or contact;
3. That the target completion date be September 1;
4. That a day (or week) in September be picked for handing out the flyer at a local community college;
5. That every local or group of Green Party of Michigan members is asked to participate in this day or week of flyering;
6. That we assess the results immediately afterwards via e-mail and discuss possible ways to continue the outreach;
7. That the GPMI set aside \$100 for producing the flyer, as well as posting it in a format capable of downloading.

The flyer will be posted to all the usual lists for discussion for comments.

Randym clarifies target: . . .

Dianne F agrees – maybe set aside full month of September internally: a campaign we can all work on, carry out and evaluate place the flyers at community colleges and other places

Bill O: excellent proposal; should add to it: been to MECAWI meetings lately, we should promote anti-draft stand this proposal addresses the military draft, parents' [issues with the military draft]

Randym suggests adding in student-info privacy from recruiters too

Ypsilanti Greens [are putting together program to help students opt out of military recruitment database] cf. LeaveMyChildAlone.org

Alan K suggests finishing sooner so we can try for county fairs; maybe staffing booths at them, state fair, etc.

Linda M agrees, but it's expensive (including insurance) and takes a long lead time

Matt A agrees re: “horrendous” cost, especially at state fair, and also notes possible problems with staffing

Paul Felton: SMM: volunteer corps. [We should] leave here today with one [set up].

Paul F: don't overlook gathering volunteers; Margaret G volunteers, Fred V starts collecting names
Fred V appreciates support – might be able to piggyback on booths already organized (e.g., Jobs with Justice, union)
** consensus **

AWOG (Fred Vitale)

Proposal for AWOG

Background:

1. AWOG is the regular public face of the Green Party of Michigan. It serves the purpose of informing the general public of the positions, policies, and proposals of the Michigan Green Party, of activities of the Michigan Green Party and Green Party members, [and] on important issues inside the Green Party. It also serves as a directory of the Green Party local offices, names of officials, and organizations that we have some kind of working relationship with.
2. AWOG is one component of this work. There are also press releases, e-mails, local flyers, posters, campaign literature, [and] recruitment literature.
3. AWOG costs a lot of money to print. AWOG took up a lot of hours of work by the previous editors, Linda and Art Myatt. It should be useful to Green Party members as a tool for recruitment, for election campaigns, and for coalition-building.

Proposal:

1. Maintain AWOG two times a year in non[-major-]election years as a fully printed publication. In [a major] election year, publish AWOG at least four times a year, perhaps six times a year in a smaller format, if the resources and interest are there. (*comments from Pete S suggested 4 times in non-Presidential [major] election years and 6 times in Presidential years – noting that the “Presidential year” tends to start 18 months before the election; Fred V seemed “up for it”.*)
2. Establish an editorial board composed of 5 people from around the state to work together through e-mail on the publication. I propose myself as editor, but I would like 4 others to work with me on the publication – suggested composition: 1 from the UP, 1 from Kalamazoo, 1 from Ann Arbor, 1 from Campus Greens. I am open to any other way to get representation and input from across the state. (*Pete S suggested rotating membership on this board, possibly including locals now being formed, maybe even a Green House rep.*)
3. Establish AWOG as an electronic bulletin six times a year on the Web [in] a .PDF format with separate downloadable articles that locals or individuals can print and use as they see fit. The editorial board will work on a format that is suitable for easy downloading and modification.
4. Publish the first electronic AWOG [to be] available no later than September 1 and each two months thereafter.

(further discussion also on more frequent updates [Wiki-style, perhaps?], more news from the locals, etc.)

do this or jump to referendum first?

David S wonders if it's a little vague, but would be okay with forwarding it to the editor

** consensus ** on that

Petition for Referendum on Troop Withdrawal from Iraq (Randym Jones)

[formal proposal developed during discussion]

Fred V gives background . . .

JALP talking about state level; Detroit Greens already planning on the local level

state[wide] opinion about war: do people agree [with us on withdrawal]?

lots of interest on the SCC list

a petition could be either formal or informal

Dianne F strongly supports doing this on a local level

we should encourage other Green Parties in MI (i.e. other locals) to do it

Dearborn apparently the first community to hold a local referendum calling for an end of the Vietnam war (1967)

after Dearborn, [they] did it twice in San Francisco: first time 37% (in favor of getting out), second time 54%

at state level, much more difficult

put on ballot in whatever form over next year

JALP reviews legal situation, possible benefits of formal petition

to do it formally gives us an advantage – it's harder for people to ignore us

[to do it in] cities, look at [their] charters

Bureau of Elections says MI Constitution say an initiative or referendum **has to** involve legally binding action so earlier draft language changed to say governor, all legislators shall **act** on this tactical problem: [a statewide initiative would] not [appear on the] ballot until November 2006

long time to wait – but we'd be bringing out our voters when we have candidates on the ballot then, too a local initiative would generally need about 5-10% of voters [to get on a local ballot]

Randym and he have discussed this (on e-mail); he's eager to support either formal or informal petition drives one other tactic: we could post our petitions on the Web site, and people could download and print them out like the current petition petition for regulation rather than prosecution of pot

Linda M: could we try on different levels at different times or otherwise get people used to the idea? (JALP: yes)

Bill O: has gotten some things done locally; could also get resolutions from some city councils/commissions he got his City Council to pass a resolution against the PATRIOT Act in 2-4 weeks

Fred V: this has got a lot of good potential for us; he knows we're going to do it in Detroit

but we'll have to get a good lawyer; help from "**our**" lawyers [= members who are attorneys]

statewide would be more difficult; we'd need more information and legal help

advisory referendums happen all the time – used by cities [to get a] sense of the people

this issue has the potential to get us working with other groups:

especially if with 250,000 signatures [necessary to get on state ballot]

growing national effort. Come out of [this] meeting -- go forward.

Paul F: first, this is very exciting, and has tremendous possibilities for building our party

it's important, if we do this, that we win – so it's important to do it so we can . . . which argues against statewide threshold (i.e. number of signatures necessary), language limit us

selected areas can do it,

do it locally, pick the areas to organize – but if we aren't organized (don't have members) in areas, we may lose we'll explore further on the state level -- form another list? we don't have to work out all the details today

cf. Nader/Cobb[?] Dem/non-Dem (sic)

[we'll need to] work with people who **voted** Democratic . . . appeal to Dem voters, but bring them to us

Doug C: recommends we **not** do a formal proposal; agrees it's important that we win

if we go statewide, we may lose – remember, 4 million in Michigan voted for Bush or Kerry

if we have this much effort available to do something statewide, put it into Congressional races:

run 15 Green candidates for Congress, elec one or more of them – that's [how we could affect this issue?]

Randym: he & JALP have been talking on this; he's the advocate of bomb-throwing

he recommends doing it on a local level, as an informal petition

we talk to people on-on-one, maybe recruit for Greens too

George C(?): need to recruit, get votes from Republicans too

Paul F re-states the proposal formally; after wordsmithing:

The SMM supports anti-war referenda in local areas

and encourages all locals & individuals to investigate local rules on how to hold them in their own areas.

The SMM also establishes a committee of volunteers to co-ordinate efforts.

[In areas where we can't do a formal local initiative/referendum, work on statewide informal petitions.]

** consensus **

17 minutes left out of the hour; on to other proposals

address Stephanie Loveless application to the women's caucus (Carolyn Dulai)

The Green Party of Michigan wishes the USGP Accreditation Committee to know our concern regarding the long delay in processing Stephanie Loveless's membership application to the Women's Caucus. At this time the Green Party of Michigan is not prepared to write a complaint, but is closely monitoring the processing of this application.

The pertinent points in this matter:

- Stacie Loveless is transgendered.
- There has been a long delay in the processing of her application to the Women's Caucus of the United States Green Party.
- The Green Party of Michigan does not tolerate discrimination.
- A member of any Green Party has the reasonable expectation and right to have their application processed in a timely manner.

This proposal is sent to the USGP Accreditation Committee to make this committee's members aware of this situation. The Green Party of Michigan supports the membership of Stacie Loveless in the Women's Caucus of the United States Green Party.

- Sylvia I: called Morgan D'Arc before SMM; she said Stephanie will be receiving a response next week so this proposal (to demand response from Women's Caucus about why no reply yet on her application) may be moot
Karen S asks if she said what the response would be; Sylvia didn't ask – caucus matters are private
David S notes (in the interest of accuracy): initial papers in October, formal dotted-i/crossed-t application in since April
Stephanie had said she waived privacy on the application, so we should be able to find out
Lavender Caucus also inquiring?
but if a letter is forthcoming, maybe we should wait until we see what it says
Karen S feels Morgan has been extremely rude to Michigan, [She] accused many of being disruptors
Karen's "outraged" . . . this has been going on since October 2004; when she joined, it took her 2 days
this deserves a formal complaint
George C(?): agrees with Karen S, it's taken a horribly long time – we should formally inquire, bring it out into the open
this subterfuge should not be repeated
seems like a frivolous matter; [they should] handle it more intelligently
Sylvia I: it's not Morgan deciding as an individual what's going to happen; she's a member of the caucus
Women's Caucus, like GPMI, had no membership secretary for months
she & Morgan were both called Stalinists [by Lorna Salzman, says Linda M]
it disturbs her when people speak who are not members of the caucus
Matt A: I'm not a woman, but I am a national rep
because of this problem, Stephanie came to the national reps to find out what's going on
he doesn't care what the Women's Caucus decides – what's bad is the lack of response
when national reps ask, no decency of response – just give us an answer; it's been a long time, just make a decision
the process is messed up
we can't get behind Morgan to find other members; she is [the] gatekeeper
Bill O: saying something pragmatic – he was reading poetry at Stephanie & Sue's wedding last week
it's not a good recruiting tool to treat someone in the way Stephanie was treated
he's remarked on what he felt were "Stalinist *tactics*", but didn't call any person Stalinist
if he did offend anyone, he apologizes; let's remain united to get rid of corporate SOBs
Paul F notes Accreditation Committee (national) hit up for vote [sic]
Sylvia I has a blocking concern – state parties don't generally interfere in business of "cauci"
she feels submitting this would be an embarrassment to GPMI; she wouldn't feel comfortable standing behind it
Dianne F: not clear to her whether Women's Caucus has discussed the transgender issue (or has been too dysfunctional)
Linda M: block – proposal is out of date to the extent that it sought to stop accreditation of the Women's Caucus
Karen S: now that Linda mentions it, she's right
Karen's purpose was to get fair treatment – haven't, for Stephanie or her; received no response whatsoever
should propose to national committee that committees & caucuses must treat applicants fairly & with due process
“. . . [This should] never happen again. Everyone should be respected.”
Paul F?/[Fred V?] suggests that, given wording problems, we send it back to SCC to follow up informed by the response
Karen S objects – it's not just about Stephanie, it's also about the fact that there was no response
JALP notes technicality – this proposal was Carolyn D's, and we can't amend it since she isn't here to say yea or nay
Matt A suggests SCC will have authority to follow through, take prompt action on that basis
he feels national reps should handle this, since the Women's Caucus is a national caucus
** consensus **

remaining items

Report Any Unfinished SCC Business to the Next SMM for Members Consideration/Action (JALP)

I'd like to propose that we have a permanent section on each SMM agenda where all pending items are reported to the members there, so all of them at least have the chance to be acted upon by/at the SMM.

Matt A notes that we do this informally anyway
** consensus **

what next?

Dianne F: wants to talk about endorsing Maureen Taylor next (quick yes-or-no vote)
then discuss for 15 minutes supporting Rev. Pinkney

she also wanted to talk about the right-wing Michigan Civil Rights Initiative – needs a GPMI response and has a piece of literature relevant to the Tulsa meeting; her proposal:

“The purpose of the Green Party
is to build an alternative party that represents the vast majority of working and community people,
not to support the Democratic Party.”

Fred V suggests we need to move forward – an hour and a half behind now

discussion: when is this agenda over? / we need to have elections / we need a short time on the national meeting

proposal: spend 15 minutes on Tulsa, 15 on elections, 15 on resolutions

drop preparing for 2006 elections – but [Bill O] suggests the whole next meeting should be on the 2006 elections

** consensus **

Endorse Maureen [D.] Taylor for Detroit City Council (Chuck Loucks)

The Huron Valley Greens have requested that the GPMI endorse Maureen Taylor’s run for the City Council of Detroit. Please see Maureen’s campaign web site at: <http://www.taylorforcouncil.org/index.html>

This is a formal motion that I would like discussion on. I expect that our Party Chair will moderate this discussion. If you are a SCC Rep, please weigh-in on this.

Doug C has a blocking concern; wants to limit endorsements to members who aren’t members of other parties

Sylvia: this is a non-partisan race; she sounds very open to joining the party, & maybe bringing others with her

Lou N: this body has endorsed and nominated non-members

David S: no actual rules, so maybe we should have a “first hits free” rule:

we will endorse someone once, but then they must join the Party to be endorsed (in the future)

Bill O: supports Maureen Taylor, but would suggest adopting Doug’s idea for partisan races

Doug C: withdraws the concern, likes David S’s idea

** consensus **

Support Rev. Pinkney and BANCO Against Trumped-Up Charges of Election Fraud (JALP)

[no formal text proposed]

. . . The synopsis of the treatment of all this is that I’m asking SCC to consider what support to give to Reverend Pinkney and BANCO. For purposes of expedited (not to say immediate) discussion and decision, I hereby make a rather open-ended proposal to offer Rev. P and Banco the general support of GPMI on this matter – in the hopes that our discussion will lead to details coming out in the form of a friendly amendment or three. . . .

I think I would not be exaggerating to say that Rev. P would be delighted with any and all kinds of support we can offer – explicitly including but not limited to the financial – or to say that he expects soon to have to fight off criminal charges based on the claims made during the civil case. He mentioned a figure of \$3,500 he thinks will be needed for legal costs. . . .

Fred V suggests demanding that charges should be dropped, don’t accept their legitimacy; Alan K seconds

Doug C adds recognizing the recall election as valid, and that the commissioner involved will be recalled

contested votes weren’t enough to affect the outcome of the election anyway

** consensus **

JALP asks about a monetary contribution

(somebody jokingly suggests: why not contribute some lawyers?)

** consensus ** on \$100 (once we have the change-over of treasurers straightened out

oppose the Michigan Civil Rights Initiative (Dianne F)

Dianne F says maybe MCRI can/should be on the agenda for the next SMM, since their petition might be thrown out

Alan K says direct SCC to investigate the issue (and its instigator, Ward Connerly)

and prepare to take action in opposition on behalf of GPMI

** consensus **

\$100/month to GPUS for the next 12 months (Art Myatt)

Almost buried in the general discussion of AWOOG and a possible state party office, there is one specific proposal which can be discussed on this list while the general plan is discussed on the business list.

I would like to send \$100 a month from GPMI to the national Green Party, starting now. I've gotten a couple of requests in the mail for my individual donation to the GPUS. While there is nothing wrong with people individually deciding to give money to the national party, it is, I think, wrong for the national party to be financially dependent on these individual donations. The national party should be dependent on the state parties.

Perhaps we can set a good example. If we can afford \$100 a month, the Green Party of California should be able to send a lot more. If their argument about how many members they have compared to us holds water, it should be a WHOLE lot more (like \$16,000 a month), but I somehow doubt that's going to happen.

At any rate, while we are certainly in need of a working state party office, we do have a working national party office which is precariously financed. It will be a very good thing if, when the next Presidential election rolls around, we still have it. I believe we can afford \$100 a month to that end, and I'm willing to listen if someone wants to make the case it should be more.

I think this is the kind of proposal that should be revisited from time to time, so I'll make it for 12 months only. At the SMM next February, it will be expiring, and we can decide if we want to renew it, or change the amount.

Randym suggests polling membership before giving away 25% of our balance (~\$5,000) to GPUS over 12 months
Karen S: we need to look at our budget first; growing GPMI by running in local elections should be our first priority
Alan K: if we do it (and he thinks we should), we should make a political statement in doing it
GPUS needs funds to sustain itself, and help us sustain GPMI; this would be a recognition of their lack of money
our communication to National: we're challenging other state parties to kick in, too
Art: happy if this proposal passed with money used every third month to buy *Green Pages* for our members
our by-laws provide for polling locals (though it's never happened), not members (maybe it should be in there)
Sylvia: likes idea of polling the membership; would prefer \$50 a month, but also likes idea of buying *Green Pages*
Art says \$125 per quarter (for about 500 pages), but that would be in the third month of the quarter
Fred V: also concerned about the amount/scale of donation; has a blocking concern with giving 25% of our money
\$50 would be more plausible . . . also likes Alan K's idea
George Christian: understands total annual budget is about \$17K; the proposed amount would be 8% of that
this needs to be thought through
Randym: with the proposed changes, we are now down to donating 18% of our bank account instead of 24%
David S asks if Art M would accept \$50 per month plus \$125 for *Green Pages*; he would "if it passes"
Fred V re-states the proposal with that amendment, and including a challenge to other state parties
** consensus **

sign onto July 4 Signature Ad for New National Priorities (Richard Wunsch; forwarded to SCC by Ted Hentchel)

[primary sponsor: Michigan PeaceWorks]

Fred V proposes that SCC investigate expeditiously, with a view toward participating
Randym notes Aimee Smith's concerns that Michigan PeaceWorks is not sufficiently positive on Palestine
** consensus **

Support Referendum on Racially-Diverse Juries (JALP)

[basic intro: article from Marquette *Mining Journal* 3/8/05:]

http://www.miningjournal.net/columns/story/038202005_col01-cl0308.asp

Racially diverse juries proposed

LANSING, Mich. (AP) - Parties in a criminal or civil trial could be guaranteed that members of their racial group make up half the jury under a measure an organization wants to put before state lawmakers or voters.

Ypsilanti-based People of Diversity United for Equality received the go-ahead Monday to start collecting signatures for proposed legislation that supporters say would protect people from racially biased jury trials. The Board of State Canvassers approved the form of the petitions to be circulated.

The measure, called the "Casey 50/50 Jury Act," would let plaintiffs or defendants ask that half of those in the jury box have an identical or similar racial appearance to their own. If enough minority jurors weren't

available in some parts of Michigan, jurors could be exchanged from other parts of the state.

The state would provide transportation, lodging and food for jurors who were required to travel outside their home jurisdiction. . . .

JALP says he'll withdraw the proposal and defer consideration to SCC/the next SMM . . . but everybody read it!

3:00 - 3:15pm break [scratch]

3:15 - 4:00pm officer elections [4:06]

allocated: 15 minutes to Tulsa, 15 minutes to officer elections – but in reverse order

**** consensus **** on all but the one contested race

vote between David S & Doug C for Vice Chair/SCC Whip (“loser” gets Vice Chair/Committee Manager)

speeches:

David S

he's done this before (referring to queue process)
it's worked on By-Laws and Platform Committees
it will allow the SCC to get things done . . . & he would like to see real-world stuff done by SCC
the queue process would keep track of stuff – SCC needs that desperately
also, I would remind people about the limits of social discourse (to wit, being polite to each other)

Doug C

[he] would do much the same thing; reject non-topical comments
[he would] spend more time, do better job than has been [done until now]

Art M: if you get stuck with the other job, how will you do that?

David S

review list of committees; get in contact with chairs; check every month and see how progressing
report back to SMM

Doug C

would do the same; also would identify people actually posting, strip deadwood
(that is, people who are on committees who are not posting or participating)

George Christian(?): what if there's another round of “scurrilous” e-mails about someone?

David S

a little guilty of doing that himself
ad hominem attacks contribute nothing; as for e-mails addressing fitness for duties, that would be allowable
if someone flies off the handle, they should get back on the handle

George Christian(?): and if that's not done?

David S: talk to the local about replacing their SCC rep if it's a recurring problem

if it gets that extreme, talk to SCC

only if it happens under his watch, not retroactively

Doug C

reluctant to invoke moderator privilege to review content of messages
if there's a recurring problem, he would do it
if it were a matter of a personal attack, he'd send back the legal definition of slander to the offending party
retroactive? no

Karen S: Doug, you were moderator when [the case of Ted H] happened . . .

Lou N clarifies – wasn't on the SCC list, but on the MIGreens-Business list

Doug C did have SCC authority, but chose not to use it

there were a number of comments saying “don't want Ted to be spokesperson (for the Green Party)”
under the same circumstances, he would not censor such messages

they fall under evaluation [of] job fitness; if it happened again, he would let them circulate

vote: David S 11
Doug C 10 so:

vice chair/SCC whip

David Spitzley

vice chair/committee manager

Doug Campbell

4:00 - 4:30pm preparing for 2006 elections [scratch]

discussion of national meeting in Tulsa in July [4:23]

Paul F moderates

Matt A's likely to go; Doug C (as alternate)

Linda M

Fred V – on the agenda in Tulsa:

VT Greens' motion against the war

one Green, one vote

report of Presidential Nominating Process group

discussion of strategies

proposal: no vote at Tulsa.

Karen S: why go if no vote? – not even proxy (i.e., proxies not allowed)

and our two proposals from Michigan

encouraging efforts in all states and localities toward anti-war referendum or other broadly-accessible methods

Fred V reads it out loud

he put it on the national e-mail list

got support on the line from the national secretary

[?! JALP notes]

OR

National Secretary Greg Jarrett said our state can't do that

[?! Randym notes]

the sentiment of this body seems to be to send an anti-war message to the people of the state any way possible

Dianne suggests adding what we decided here today

** consensus **

official language as forwarded to GPUS:

The Green Party of Michigan, at its State Membership Meeting of June 25, passed the following resolution for consideration at the National Convention in Tulsa.

A Proposal on anti-war activity for the National Green Party Convention in Tulsa

Sponsor: Green Party of Michigan

Contact: Fred Vitale, 313-831-0383; fx2386@peoplepc.com

1. The Green Party National Convention in Tulsa go on record as supporting the anti-war referendum efforts in Wisconsin and Vermont and encourage state Green Parties and local Green party committees to initiate anti-war referendums in their areas.
2. The anti-war referendum efforts and other Green anti-war activities be featured prominently in The Green Pages, on the Green Party website.
3. The Green Party Convention encourages all committees of the Green Party to find ways to join in these referendum efforts.
4. A specific campaign to raise money to fund these efforts nationwide be undertaken from August through the election day in 2006.
5. In some states the Green Parties cannot legally initiate referendums. In others, the requirements may be too onerous, too ridiculous, etc. In such cases, the Tulsa National convention strongly urges such state parties and local committees to find ways to bring the anti-war message to the citizens of their states in the broadest,

most accessible way possible. For example, if the state runs candidates, that the Green Party candidates make opposition to the war and for the immediate phased withdrawal of US troops out of Iraq key components of their campaigns.

Motivation

The opposition to the war has reached nearly 60%. Yet, the two political parties remain committed to the war. The Green Party, having more experience than most progressive organizations in dealing with ballot issues, signatures, etc., is best suited to initiate such an effort. The effort will only succeed if it is embraced by other progressives. Greens can initiate and help bring together other progressive organizations.

Many of the people that the Green Party wishes to recruit from are deeply and profoundly affected by the war – young people, working class people, people of color.

Referendums played a key role in helping build the momentum in the United States against the Vietnam War.

TIMELINE:

This proposal is time sensitive so we propose it for the 2005 national Green Party meeting, to be held July 21-24[,] 2005.

RESOURCES:

None.

one quick question from Matt A:

GPUS by-laws say there should be a convention; questions about online voting, proxies, etc. vs. in person only what do we think?

Karen S supports allowing voting over the Internet

suggests everyone should be able to participate; now, rich white people are going, others aren't

Doug C notes Alaska, Hawai'i members say they need money to travel

should people from far away be helped to attend? – he thinks the rest of the country would send money "if you're really committed, you'll get there" . . . (and there's no substitute for face-to-face discussion)

Lou N seconds support for face-to-face meetings

notes how effective face-to-face was here (handled some issues much faster than over 3 months in the SCC) but also agrees with Karen S that meetings keep all but retired white men of independent means from leading so would allow proxy or Internet voting if necessary

David S says the value of meetings is talking to each other

at least 1 rep is coming from each state; we need to offer funding for at least one person per state

Alan K understands it's national committee chairs' responsibility to attend (including him, now)

it's wrong, undermines fair participation (and ability to do the work) if only the rich can attend destructive of the base of the party, corrosive to the capacity of the organization to exist

Dryden (despite the cold) was a good meeting, even though Alan K objected to electing Marc R to two posts that's also an example of how we're burning people out

Matt A can afford the money, the question is if he can afford the time . . .

but it's sad if the national party can't send four people per state to a national party convention once a year we need to build the Green Party; it goes back to funding

(as an aside, Matt added that he'd heard Joe Ditzhazy has passed away)

Ted H: one Green, one vote seems to divide us between states with (CA) and without (MI) registration by party

he suggests largest statewide vote for a Green candidate, divided by the total vote in the state

(for example, if that's 4%, and there are 400 delegates, 4% of 400 is 16 delegates)

Dianne F revives her proposal:

"The purpose of the Green Party is to build an alternative party that represents the vast majority of working and community people, not to support the Democratic Party."

Karen S: it's not just about Medea Benjamin, it's more about Green Party leaders supporting progressive Democrats the Green Institute board includes David Cobb, Medea Benjamin, Dean Myerson, and [Ben] Manski

that institute got \$250,000 after the election – from Democrats

are all Greens immune to the money tactics that the business community used to take over our government? corporations took over the government with money; is the Green Party totally pure/immune?

she thinks that this is a really important issue

Doug C suggests the decision to take the proposal to Tulsa (or not) should be based on what the proposal says

Sylvia I, Chuck J generally agree

Sylvia says the proposal should go to Tulsa – “we need to stem the tide of that trend”

Linda M can't disagree with the wording . . .

** consensus **

Lou N: we're out of time

Matt A reminds members to please take AWOGS; JALP renews call for members to take videotapes, too

adjourn about 4:50pm