

State Committee Meeting of June 29, 2008 at Bristol Community College, Fall River, MA

Scheduled meeting time: 9:30 am to 5:00 pm

Co-facilitators: Elie Yarden, Nancy Lee Wood

Meeting called to order at 9:50 am by Nancy Lee Wood
(Meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm)

Elie Yarden addressed the agenda which had been handed out. (The agenda is reproduced in full a few lines below).

Elie brings the meeting's attention to item a) credentials and appointment of new members (30 min)

Gary asks to put this item later in the agenda

Elie replies that credentialing current delegates will begin soon. He said we will put the appointment of new members after item e) explanation of proposals. Elie said State Committee (SC) delegates and potential new SC members will arrive throughout the day, a pattern we have typically seen in past SC meetings.

Elie asks who the meeting functionaries will be. Stepping forwards were:

Stacker: Nat Fortune, Time Keeper: John Andrews, Note takers: Larry Ely, Eli Beckerman
Vibes watcher: Lawrence Fine

Full reproduction of the day's agenda, as handed out:

29 June 2008 State Committee Meeting Agenda

This is a draft agenda, subject to modification by the co-facilitators for the meeting (Nancy Lee Wood and Elie Yarden). Review of agenda at the beginning of its meeting.

***MORNING ACTIVITIES: 9:30 AM - 12:00 PM ***

- (a) credentials and appointment of new members (30 minutes)
- (b) review of agenda and explanatory materials regarding ballots, process, etc (30 minutes)
- (c) short address by candidates for state and local office, if present, and opportunity for state com members to sign up as campaign volunteers (15 minutes)
- (d) legislative action updates and opportunities (foreclosures/other) (30 minutes)
- (e) explanation of proposals (30 minutes)
- (f) ranking of proposals (15 minutes)

LUNCH (12:00 PM - 1:00 PM)

AFTERNOON ACTIVITIES: 1:00 PM - 5:00 PM

(g) ballot measures workshop (60 minutes)

(h) deliberation on proposals (180 minutes)

PROPOSED URGENT ITEMS:

(1) one on change in database access rules (combination of two proposals submitted by Jamie, Wanda, and Dan and one by Wanda)

(2) one on the allocation of Green-Party delegates proposed by CDLC (submitted by Merelice and Nat)

(3) one on the release of Green-Party Presidential campaign delegates (submitted by Jim Hammerman and Mike Heichman)

(4) one on the allocation of Green-Rainbow party resources to the Green-Party Presidential campaign (submitted by John Andrews/Jill Stein/Merelice/Nat)

STANDARD ITEMS FOR REGULAR OR EXPEDITED PROCESS

(5) one on ad-com size change (submitted by Merelice and Jill)

(6) one on actions to be taken during August - November relative to the Presidential campaign, if it gains co-sponsors submitted by Mike Heichman)

(7) four other proposals on various committee activities and responsibilities --- working committees, role of Secretary, diversity of leadership, and the strategic planning working group, if they gain co-sponsors (submitted by Mike Heichman)

(8) three other proposals with the text "place holder," if they gain co-sponsors (submitted by Grace Ross)

continuation of the minutes...

Elie says that Nat will talk on the agenda, explaining it: agenda item b).

First we identify who is currently seated – doing a go-round.

Present as seated clockwise: Nat Fortune, Dave Schwab (unseated), Mike Heichman, Gary Hicks, Jamie O’Keefe, Nancy Lee Wood, Elie Yarden, Larry Ely, John Andrews, Ralph Walton, Lawrence Fine, Eli Beckerman, Dave Dionne, Joe Carvalho, Lyn Meza (unseated), Sandra Harris (unseated), Phil Kindler

(unseated), Karen Francis (unseated), Dan Melnechuk, Gil Obler (unseated, NY state, providing child care), Jim Hammerman

Dan Melnechuk as parliamentarian reviewed the quorum issue. He said we have 27 seated delegates, so **quorum is 14**, which is one more than the integer division of 27 divided by 2. We **had 15 delegates, so we had quorum.**

Dan Melnechuk discussed the balloting process of the proposals.

Nat reported on the creation of the draft agenda. Co-chairs Nat and Merelice did the draft agenda, explaining there was no time for the Administration Committee to help with the agenda since Merelice was on vacation, and we could not set up a conference call in so short a time.

Nat explained that the agenda is in a standard format, except that urgent items were so named at his and Merelice's discretion, since they were very familiar with the time urgent issues in the delegation selection process we have been engaged in. (We were supposed to have done delegate selection by May 15, so we are running very late.) Nat asks SC to support their choice of urgent items. Nat said also that we need to rely on Dan for how to rank urgent matters amongst the other proposals.

Dan read from Standing Rules p. 2 #8 giving criteria on such things as legal matters and other things as SC sees fit. Dan said we can handle Urgent Items #2 (allocation of Green Party delegates proposed by CDLC) and #3 (release of Green Party Presidential campaign delegates) as urgent matters, but not #1 (combination of two proposals – one on change in database access rules by Jamie, Wanda, and Dan – and one proposal on registering GRP Logo by Wanda) and #4 (allocation of GRP party resources to the Green Party Presidential campaign). He said that #1 would need a change to be done at our GRP Convention. He said he considers #2 and #3 as straight forward, and that #1 and #4 could be considered to be urgent if the SC meeting sees that as fit, as OK.

Dan said he considered #6 (actions to be taken during August – November relative to the Presidential campaign – retitled on ballot sheet as “G – Supporting the Green Party's Ticket and Building our GRP”) to be urgent, and that we include it with #1 - #4 as in the draft agenda. As an alteration to the draft agenda, he said that #1, #4, and #6 should be included as urgent, or else none of them singly.

c. 10:10 to 10:30 am - a discussion ensued on how to determine which of #1, #2, #3, #4, and #6 are urgent

Nat - said that the only reason that he had not included #6 as an urgent matter is because it had lacked a co-sponsor

Mike – announced that all of his proposals now had co-sponsors - Jamie for #6 and Gary for the others. He said that since his #6 now has a co-sponsor, it also should be treated as an urgent matter.

Dan suggested having #4 and #6 handled together, with #1 as separate. So #1 could be considered urgent, but not #4 and #6, or vice versa, as opposed to all three or none of them, as he had first suggested.

Ralph said that to be an urgent item, there needs to be an externality. Also we must spend unlimited time discussing the proposal if it is urgent, otherwise we make it a highly ranked proposal with time limitations.

Dan replied that we still use the system of extension of time by straw poll even when a matter has been identified as urgent.

Lyn (unseated) asks if she has speaking rights.

Elie said he thinks everybody has speaking rights, but that we need to consult with Dan for clarification.

Dan said it depends if we have time or not, and that we usually try to be inclusive.

Lyn said she thinks Dan's recommendations of lumping #1, #4, and #6 together are sound.

Jim questioned whether the registering of the GRP Logo (lumped in with the change in database access proposal) is urgent.

Nat said that this was an error of omission on his part, and that he would put the GRP Logo portion of #1 as not urgent, so it would be part of the regular ballot ranking phase of the SC meeting.

Dan said that AdCom can handle the GRP Logo matter, saying it is not urgent and that it has no legal deadline.

Elie concurs that this is a simple house keeping matter for AdCom.

John agrees with Ralph, who mentioned that something urgent involved an externality. John said an urgent matter is one that has legal consequences.

Jamie asked a point of order – wondering when we will take up the scheduling of our state convention.

Elie said we also have to decide where it will be.

Jamie said we must take up this matter of our state convention today, but not in the urgent section of business.

Elie asked Jamie where he'd like to put that decision on our state convention.

Jamie said that after lunch was OK for him.

10:30 am Grace Ross and David Maciewski (unseated), arrived.

Nat announced that #6 has been added to urgent.

10:35 am

We next moved to item c) on the agenda: short address by candidates for state and local office, if present, and opportunity for SC members to sign up as campaign volunteers (15 minutes)

No one in this category was present. It was announced that Steve Baer (a SC delegate) was to come today.

Dan asked the co-facilitators if Steve can be recognized when he arrives later today.

Elie and Nancy agree to including Steve in the agenda later in the meeting.

10:38 am

We next moved to item d) on the agenda - legislative action updates opportunities (foreclosures/other) (30 minutes)

1. John Andrews spoke on the Global Warming Solutions Act before the legislature, and it has now been hung up. Our Fossil Fuels subcommittee of Platform did support the bill, but recognized that it did not go far enough in its target goals – asking for 80% reduction in greenhouse gases by 2050 instead of by 2020, which is what the Fossil Fuels subcommittee is promulgating. The bill is now in limbo. There are local ballot initiatives ongoing now until the July 9 deadline (200 valid sigs for a rep district).

2. Grace Ross spoke at some length about her work to fight foreclosures in Worcester with her work in the Massachusetts Alliance Against Predatory Lending (MAAPL.INFO). She has been working with the Beacon Hill legislators that she has good working relationships with, and has filed three pieces of legislation involving 60 co-sponsors. 80,000 people are affected in the Worcester area. She asked for help of GRP members in writing letters to the editors. She has been working with Chuck Turner (GRP and city councilor in Boston) on this urgent issue.

3. Dave Dionne has been working to improve the energy bill on Beacon Hill by working with Clean Water Action, which has lots of environmental lobbying history and expertise. The bill reduced its goals from 20% reduction of greenhouse gases by 2020 to only 10% reduction of greenhouse gases by 2020.

4. Nancy Lee Wood reported on her work on Peak Oil with Senators Marc Pacheco and Dick Lawrence. This appears to be a landmark turnaround because the theory of Peak Oil has to date been controversial amongst the lobbyists and corporations and politicians in general.

All four of these GRP activists asked for GRP membership support.

Jamie, Membership Secretary, pointed out that we have a membership database which we can use to access members in particular areas, which will be good help to getting a good GRP turnout for these four actions.

10:55 am

e) explanation of proposals (30 minutes)

Elie said that when we come to e) explanation of proposals, we will allot 3 minutes per proposal presenter to summarize his/her proposal as we have some 10 proposals in the allotted 30 minutes.

DO: Dan asked that we post to the announcements list Grace's request for support in helping with the four actions in d) just above. No objection raised.

Gary, returning to Elie's 3 minute proposal summary per proposer, said we should just make it 30 seconds to one minute.

10:55 am Lisa Richards (unseated), Amanda Sanderson (Lisa's daughter, also unseated), and Steve Baer (delegate) arrived.

David Maciewski (unseated) of Worcester, announced that he wants to be appointed as a delegate.

Dave Dionne announced that this Wednesday, July 2, is a big rally at the State House on Global Warming

DO: Dan asked if this Global Warming rally can be put on the announcements list. No concerns.

Steve Baer announced a protest this fall against the Exotic Animals Act. He can be called at 508-842-1450 for more information. This is an act to prevent cruelty to circus animals.

.....this finished d)

11:02 am

Steve Baer described the status of his candidacy for state senate. Time allotted 5 minutes.

- Steve said his job rules/restrictions at Mass. Transportation do not allow him to run for office! He is fighting this with the help of the ACLU. He has been speaking with the OCPF (Mass. Office of Campaign

Political Finance).

- His issues are around local food and local energy (solar, wind, biofuels, etc.) and health care
- He is a strong advocate of furthering knowledge of our 10 KV, and he thinks this will help increase the membership in the Worcester/Nashua River Greens
- Dave England and Jill Stein, co-chairs of CDLC, have been of some help to him.
- He needs a treasurer. His current treasurer is disqualified because he is also a state worker.

Elie said he needs a committee.

- his union is the Massachusetts Organization of State Engineers and Scientists (MOSES)

Ralph said he wants his issue to get some play, for he would be in the same bind working for the MBTA.

Grace said she thinks it is illegal. She said that using engineering contracts connected with one's work as an aid to seeking office is illegal, but this does not look to her to be an applicable situation in Steve's case.

- Steve wants the GPR to help publicize his difficult situation to enlist more help.

11:15 am a two minute break was called by the co-facilitators

11:20 am resumption with e) explanation of proposals

Proposals are put on the white board by Nat, just as on the ballot sheets prepared and distributed by Dan. 15 proposals with labels A, B,...N, O.

- A. Clarifying Obligations of GPUS Delegates – Jim and Mike**
- B. Getting SPWG Moving Again – Mike**
- C. Diversity of the Leadership of Our Party – Mike**
- D. A More Efficient StateCom/Role of the Secretary – Mike**
- E. Getting Our Working Committees to Meet – Mike**
- F. Revision of Rules Releasing Our Databases to Candidates – Wanda, Jamie, Dan**
- G. Supporting the Green Party's Ticket and Building Our GRP – Mike**
- H. Amend Database Use Policies – Wanda**
- I. Confirming Delegate Allocation – Merelice, Nat**
- J. Register GRP Logo – Wanda, J. Cooney**
- K. Green Party Presidential Campaign – Merelice, Nat**
- L. Adcom Size Change – Jill, Merelice**
- M. Listerve Procedure for Respectful Communications – Grace**
- N. Clarifying Commitment to Diversity & Gender Parity – Grace**
- O. Rebuilding Commitment to Our Basic Principles – Grace**

Mike announced that he was withdrawing Proposal D.

These 14 above proposals (with D withdrawn) were briefly commented on by Nat, standing at the white board.

Elie handed out a single page document entitled “Three green values for today”, describing ecological politics, which he pointed out covered topics covered in M, N, O, which were placeholders on the web page. [As Secretary, I took the prerogative of including Elie’s document in an Addendum]

Grace’s proposals M, N, and O were disputed as properly being placed before SC. These proposals had no text on the web page, no co-sponsors on the web page, where it simply said “place holder”, and in addition to this, no copies of the proposals were presented before the SC meeting.

Discussion of which proposals to be admitted for balloting.

Jim said that there are several ways people take in information. Oral is OK, but the text would have to be finalized. One could take consideration of this in how one ranked the proposals.

Grace defended her three place holder proposals, saying they were posted by the deadline. She said that it has happened before that texts were not presented at the SC.

Gary said – as a point of procedure – that he seconds all of Grace’s statements.

John said that we are establishing a precedent if we proceed with admitting Grace’s proposals – they are being created on the fly as a surprise motion – this is not above board using this action and using the language on the web page “place holder”.

Dan said that we are just ranking the orders, not voting on them, and so Grace’s place holder proposals should be acceptable.

It is not in my minutes that any decision was taken by SC at this time to accept or not to accept Grace’s three proposals.

Discussion of seating six potential new SC members

Some shift happened. Maybe some new unseated people arrived, because now Nancy shifted talk to the potential 6 new members.

Dan gave the qualifications for GRP membership: a person who is registered as ‘J’ or as ‘U’, a person who has paid dues to the Party, a person who cannot vote but wants to be a member, a person less than 18 years

old, or a felon who has lost voting privileges.

Potential new SC members visiting with us are 9 in number:

[Lisa Richards (Concord, Middlesex), Amanda Sanderson (Concord, Middlesex), Dave Schwab (Williamstown, Berkshires), Karen Francis (?), Phil Kindler (Salem, Essex), Sandra Harris (Chelsea, Suffolk), Lyn Meza (Chelsea, Suffolk), David Maciewski (Worcester, Worcester), and Terezinha Cardoso (Ashland, Middlesex)]

Amanda Sanderson is Lisa Richards' daughter.

It was announced by someone, but I do not remember who, that Jamie and Dan had credentialed all of these nine before the SC

Dan asked who wants to be seated at this SC. Karen Francis and Phil Kindler say they do not - that they want to wait until another SC meeting.

Mike mentioned a report that Jamie mentioned at the 4-12-08 Holyoke SC, which he had published about credentialing criteria or membership criteria. Mike reported that the bylaws had required that a report be submitted which included info about the MA census and the diversity of the population and how that would impact our diversity goals in seating GRP members on StateCom. He said this should be discussed because it related to the composition of the StateCom, and right now we were discussing the credentialing of delegates.

Nominators of these 7. I did not note a specific statement concerning who the nominators were.

John said that SC is non-partisan and he felt that admitting this new group of 7 into SC represented a partisan effort.

Elie said that people should have read the good faith nature of the SC and the GRP. He took it on faith that they had.

Dan asked that either we now accept all 7 into SC by consensus, or else give our concerns.

The potential new SC members now spoke for themselves in the following order:

Terezinha Cardoso said she backed immigrant issues, and had known Grace and Lisa Richards for 4 years.

Lyn Meza said she worked with Chelsea United Against the War at Home and Abroad, she was a former activist with the Labor Party.

Sandra Harris said she is with Chelsea United Against the War, too. She is working on minority issues, Hispanic issues, native peoples issues.

Dave Schwab said he founded (or heads?) the Williams College Campus Greens, and lives in Cambridge currently, and is a GRP

Lisa Richards said she was a past member of the Rainbow Coalition Party where she was quite active. She said she had been a member of StateCom and AdCom, and had been a major leader of our Abolish Poverty Campaigns.

David Maciewski said he has worked with the homeless in Worcester, low income, peace to justice, against ROTC in schools, worked on single payer health care unit, worked on Grace's City Council campaign, on organic agriculture issues

Amanda Sanderson was too young or too shy or both to speak. Her mother spoke for her.

Consensus was asked for (**I did not note by whom**) – that we now appoint them as delegates to SC. Gary and Jim seconded this.

Concerns given:

Elie – he will stand aside, but he has a concern that everyone must help with the work and not be symbolic delegates.

Larry said he felt just the same way as Elie. He did not say one way or the other about standing aside.

Nancy said that she would like the people to first be observers so that they see what is at issue, since right now they have no knowledge of the history and current nature of our issues yet they would be voting on important matters before us that required such knowledge.

Steve – is concerned that one first have been a member of a local. He place a big emphasis on that.

Elie amplified that the day to day work is done by locals, so they should first find one.

Steve said he wants people in GRP who are focused on GRP structure, not on outside issues.

John said we should not be making SC a competition for factions in the Party, we should be non-partisan, saying Dan prevented us from casting an educated report, even SC members do not understand the suppression of questions.

Eli said he felt similar to Elie – the responsibilities of being in SC are not being spelled out to these new people.

Sandra said it was OK to come because new people were told they could express themselves through their areas of interests.

Mike said that our leadership needs diversity.

Elie said these new people have been recruited for a faction. But he presumes they are coming in good faith.

Steve, John, and Nancy will not stand aside with their concerns.

Jamie said that new members into SC brought in during the county conventions had no checks on them such as we are doing now for these people.

David Schwab asked whether the new people had been asked how they felt about these questions.

Elie said that we do not have time to go over all this now. He said this kind of examination is not easily resolvable, and suggested that one solution would be to admit them to SC but to recuse them from voting on proposals today.

Gil Obler – who announced that he wrote our bylaws – said that Dan and Merelice were the only elected members at SC, citing that 8.51, 8.52, and 8.53 addressed all the issues

Lisa Richards said she is an independent thinker, citing her living in Concord, land of independence, and that she has raised six kids. She denied that she was one who took orders on how to vote from others.

Jim said nobody raised any issue when he joined SC in 4-12-08.

Grace asked Steve to clarify his concern about having had a local membership first.

Grace, Elie, and Gary try to have Steve clarify and explain further his idea that a prospective SC delegate should first have been active in a local before coming to SC.

Dan interjects as procedures person, saying we have already gone beyond the 10 minutes for addressing concerns in the consensus process that has been underway.

Elie said that he does not want these concerns to impede the SC meeting. He said there is a risk in any action. He enunciated that ecological politics says that we accept a risk, and then assume responsibility for the outcome.

John does not stand aside.

Elie calls for a vote. Vote is whether to appoint the 7 persons as new representatives to state com.

Dave Schwab asks if this is a parliamentary procedure and not a motion.

Dan said, no, this is not a motion.

Elie calls for a vote by raising of hands. The vote must be 2/3. One may abstain from voting. Nat counts the hands.

**Yes accept all 7 people into SC so they can vote today: 9
No, do not accept all 7 people into SC so they can vote today: 6
Abstain: 2**

1:00 pm Vote did not pass. New people may not vote today.

BREAK FOR LUNCH

Joe Carvalho left during lunch break

Luc Schuster arrived at 1:00 pm
Jill Stein arrived at 1:00 pm
Ken Selcer arrived at 1:00 pm

2:30 PM RESUMPTION AFTER LUNCH

Elie wants agenda altered for maximum business focus:
1) to cancel g) ballot measures workshop (60 minutes)
2) adjust the agenda

Grace, Jim, Jamie, Gary, Mike, and the six new people who had come to be appointed to SC, stood as a group, not taking seats. Jim announced as an apparent spokesman for the group that was standing that the vote taken just before lunch was very upsetting. He moves to reconsider the vote.

Elie said that reconsidering the vote is out of order, since it is not in accord with procedures because it does not address the contents.

John said if they had something new to talk about, that was OK, but otherwise it is not OK. He said for months we have been treated poorly and responsibility has not been respected. He said maybe the discussions should not be at this meeting. He said there has been much misleading.

Gil Obler announced that he was former chair of accreditation at the National Party, and said that it is important that discussion happens to talk about the real issues, about the soul of the Party.

Lyn Meza said that SC contradicts its key values of diversity by not appointing the new people to SC.

Dan spoke on the diversity of the 7 people.

Jill said that the controversy has been very destructive for 9 months. She said that reconsideration of the DSP for the millionth time has gone on, and that repeatedly new people have been brought in who do not know the history, the issues, so have no rational basis for voting.

Luc, former co-chair of GRP, wants us to get to proposals because time is a waisting.

Nat said he would abstain from voting yes or no because the consequences either way would be destructive.

Nat offers the compromise that we seat all 7 at the end of this meeting.

Mike said this is the most diverse group to be inducted by far. He said the people are not 100% rigid ideologically. He said that as to leadership of committees – never in our history have we had a less diverse leadership than today. He said he is ashamed at us for this vote, and for the way the current and contemporary virtual meeting has been going on.

Lawrence said we went through a process and the people standing are unwilling to accept the decision.

Elie said if there is trust everything will work. The way to build trust, he said, is to not reconsider the vote of this morning, which was 9-6-2. Elie reiterates the primacy of working in good faith. If these new people feel used, even if accepted into SC now, they would eventually leave.

Sandra Harris denied that she is being manipulated. She mentioned she is a good capable worker, and is annoyed that she is often not respected in meetings because of her accented English when she speaks.

Dave Schwab said that this invoking of new members has the feel to him of something more symbolic than pragmatic.

3:05 pm We went to a vote

Yes to reconsider the vote: 7

No to reconsider the vote: 10

abstain: 2

The vote was that we would not reconsider the vote of 1:00 pm.

Nat asked the co-facilitators if his proposal to admit the seven at the end of the SC meeting can be voted on

next.

Co-facilitators said we would take that up at the end of the meeting after the urgent business and the proposals were voted on.

3:10 pm Grace, Jim, Jamie, Gary, Dan and Mike walked out of the meeting. Six of the seven new people walked out with them. Dave Schwab remained as an observer. Gil Obler remained as an observer. It was not recorded if Karen Francis and Phil Kindler were present at the vote to reconsider the 1:00 pm vote, but they were not present during the remainder of the meeting.

Dan raised with Nat two concerns about the two most urgent proposals:

#2 the allocation of Green Party delegates proposed by CDLC (Nat and Merelice)

#3 the release of Green Party Presidential campaign delegates (Jim and Mike)

On #2 Dan said he had concerns, but he would be willing to stand aside provided that our Party agreed to go to a lawyer within the next six months. Nat agreed to hire a lawyer within the next six months.

On #3 Dan said he wants this accepted because Nader is against our DSP. (Nat became a co-sponsor of this proposal later in the meeting when it was on the table for discussion.)

CONTINUATION OF WORK ON PROPOSALS – RANKING THEM

3:35 TO 3:45 pm - RANKING OF PROPOSALS (computations by Nat and Dave)

The original list of proposals enumerated at 11:20 am had be 15: (A, B, C, D, E, F,G, H, I, J, K, L,M, N, O). Mike withdrew his Proposal D during the discussion that ensued. Grace's three (M, N, O) had been disallowed on various counts. Now we saw that without Wanda, Jamie, or Dan present, one or more of whom were sponsors of Proposals H and J, we eliminated those two from consideration. This left for discussion these nine proposals: : (A, B, C, E, F,G, I, K, L).

We ranked the nine proposals (A, B, C, E, F,G, I, K, L) with scoring 10 down to 2.

Nat and Dave compute the rankings of proposals.

3:50 pm Item g) in agenda: ballot measures workshop

An abbreviated workshop by John Andrews for about 15 minutes, not the originally scheduled 60 minutes, due to time constraints.

John recaps that in a previous SC we agreed to set up an Advisory Ballot Working Group (ABWG) under

the Platform Committee, which John has been facilitating and in which Mike has been the note taker. Idea was to get local ballot initiatives in four areas of pressing public policy questions from the Green's point of view: Health Care (single payer), Predatory Lending, Ranked Choice Voting (IRV), and Secure Green Future (working on global warming and depletion of world oil – “peak oil”). The Health Care and the Secure Green Future issues were the ones that elicited the most support.

John gave a power point presentation on the Secure Green Future ballot initiative which asks for 80% drop in greenhouse gases by 2020 instead of 80% by 2050. (The corporate and state goals are 10% or 20% by 2020, as a basis of comparison.) It also asks for a local approach to small business for solar, wind, bio fuels, etc., emphasis on conservation by citizens in home insulation and in transportation, and eliminating tax subsidies to energy-intensive energy projects (corporate), such as coal gasification.

The emphasis on local action with widespread knowledge and contributions on the part of the public is the Green's core stock-in-trade, and the philosophy behind this ballot initiative.

He mentioned Lester Brown's book Plan B 3.0, which he felt to be an excellent source book for the problems and the solutions of global warming.

John mentioned that Rajendra Pachauri, Chair of the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) of the United Nations, said that we have to make major reductions by 2012, which is a critical window. We will have a sea rise of 22 feet when Greenland is ice-free and a sea rise of 150 feet when the Antarctic is ice-free. At the rate we are going we will have an ice-free Arctic in 15 years. Due to moving ice sheets that are a mile to two miles thick, when they fall into the sea, we will have an overnight rise in ocean height of 3 to 20 feet without warning of the public by officials.

Eli gave a short report on the progress on getting 200 signatures in the various rep districts. He mentioned the best: a woman in Melrose who got 350 signatures.

The deadline is July 9, and many districts are going to make the required 200 sigs.

RANKED PROPOSAL RESULTS:

- I - Confirming Delegate Allocation – Merelice and Nat
- K – Green Party Presidential Campaign – Merelice and Nat, John, and Jill
- A – Clarifying Obligations of GPUS Delegates – Jim and Mike (Nat was an added co-sponsor)
- F – Revision of Rules Releasing Our Databases to Candidates (Wanda, Jamie, Dan)
- G – Supporting the Green Party's Ticket and Building Our GRP – Mike
- L – AdCom Size Change – Jill, Merelice
- E – Getting Our Working Committees to Meet - Mike
- B – Getting SPWG Moving Again - Mike
- C – Diversity of the Leadership of Our Party – Mike

Discussion of Proposals in order above:

I – Confirming Delegate Allocation

concerns expressed

Elie – 1. it may be unnecessary to include any pejorative comments on AdCom for lack of achieving anything. Would strike para 3 and para 4. Nat said this was a friendly amendment. 2. keep diversity criteria or is it implied?

Nat answered that it is already implied.

John – at what point do we have seats assigned to the spots?

Nat – said something about proposal #3 of the virtual meeting ongoing now included here - if we do not adjourn the virtual meeting, we will get mischief.

Elie – this is not an issue at this time – we have 9 empty slots – filling them will complete the slate – they are in the Nader list currently – allows for diversity requirements remaining – a matter for action, not discussion.

Nat – we do not have all the names.

Jill – does today's meeting preempt the virtual meeting? Jamie had said anything in a virtual SC meeting can be redone in our in-person SC meeting. Virtual meeting proposal #3 says that we are to keep it open until criteria is filled – the filling of the slots.

Elie – you cannot stop sabotage. There are seven slots for Nader available. 32 delegates in Chicago only means sending 17 or 18 delegates, and they can cast all 32 votes. Those who do not go can assign their proxies. The number of delegates for Nader is 15, the number of delegates for McKinney is 9.

Jill – many are not interested in the details of this. there is a lack of trust to delegate...I am happy with the CDLC allocation as worked on by Elie and Dave England. We will have loopholes and gaps. Let's approve what CDLC did, and move on. The virtual SC meeting is a separate subject.

Elie – we must participate in the virtual meeting

Nat reported that the deadline for submitting delegate names had been 11:59 pm of June 29, but that he had moved the deadline to 11:59 pm of July 4.

Eli – the April 12 SC in Holyoke had no proposal to alter the nature of the virtual meeting. I say we pass Proposal I, and appoint members now, get closure on this.

Jill – we need to keep the enrolling of delegates open to the last minute to allow others to come in. She suggested that we change the co-facilitator in the virtual SC meeting to someone other than Jamie.

4:55 pm Merelice arrived. Now we have quorum of 14. She left her sick bed to see to it that the urgent matters could be attended to, since Grace, Jim, Jamie, Mike, Gary, and Dan had left at 3:10 pm leaving us without quorum.

Members now present to vote and decide matters:

Nancy, Elie, Larry, Jill, John, Ralph, Lawrence, Eli, Dave Dionne, Luc, Nat, Steve, Ken, and Merelice

(Dave Schwab remained as an observer, as did Gil Obler, but they were not seated persons at this meeting.)

Nat asked the GRP delegates present if they would consent to extending the meeting from 5:00 pm to 6:00 pm so we could handle the urgent matters. There was consensus that we do this.

CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION ON PROPOSAL I (Confirming Delegate Allocation)

Elie brought Merelice up to speed on where we stood in the SC meeting.

Merelice said that eliminating para 3 and para 4 she would also consider a friendly amendment.

Eli said 1. from now on the virtual SC meeting can only add people to it 2. the virtual SC meeting went against the decision at the April 12 SC in-person meeting at Holyoke on the format in the virtual SC meeting, so we should change the facilitator.

John – has abrogated since he is chair of the virtual meeting. He proposes a new co-facilitator.

Jill – let's reappoint a new cochair of the virtual meeting

Elie – let's just all be sure to be in on the virtual meeting

Merelice adds clarifying sentence to the first para of Proposal I: “Accordingly, the list of delegates as contained in Proposal 3 and introduced to the virtual State Committee meeting is hereby “approved” and/or

“selected” as appropriate for their category. “

This is accepted by all as consensus.

We skipped further discussion of the thorny problem all have experienced in how the virtual meeting had been arranged, its format, and its scope, moving to decide on Proposal I.

DO: Elie is to get the signatures of the co-chairs of the GRP.

Proposal I passed by consensus.

Proposal K (Green Party Presidential Campaign – Merelice, Nat; co-sponsors John, Jill)

The proposal was summarized (I think by John): this proposal asks that we not participate in the GPUS campaign here in our state. No GRP resources are to be expended in campaigns here. We will make our Party’s contact list available – so long as there is no interference. The Sec. of State has been taking away SC’s own powers.

Eli offered a friendly amendment: change in Part B “no Party resources” to “no state Party resources”.

Ken said he thought that was a friendly amendment.

John said that Part A already handles this.

Merelice said that we should give them the voter list.

John said we give them the membership list, provided they have no legal claims against us. The membership list has no contribution data in it.

Nat proposed this addition to Part A at the end: “we will supply our ballot line to whomever is selected at the nominating convention”.

This was agreed to as a friendly amendment.

Proposal K passed by consensus.

Discussion of Proposal A (Clarifying Obligations of GPUS Delegates – Jim and Mike)

Nat said he would be a co-sponsor of Proposal A.

This proposal has to do with when a delegate is considered to be released.

Nat said that this handles uncommitted delegates. It represents the spirit of the voters. The Nader delegates will not be reassigned to McKinney.

Nat communicated an agreement he made with Dan upon Dan's departure (to take his ride home), wherein Dan said he supported Proposal A and he had concerns with Proposal I, so he would stand aside on Proposal A if the Party would agree to go to a lawyer within the next six months. I think Dan intended to have a legal opinion on both A and I. Dan did not specifically request that his request to have the Party go to a lawyer be included in the language of either Proposal A or Proposal I.

Eli proposed that the following sentence be added to the end of section 1) of A: "This hereby amends the delegate selection plan."

This was considered a friendly amendment, and was agreed to by consensus.

Proposal A passed by consensus.

Discussion of Proposal F (Revision of Rules Releasing Our Databases to Candidates – Wanda, Jamie, Dan)

This did not pass because there was no proposer present and no revised text.

Discussion of Proposal G (Supporting the Green Party's Ticket and Building Our GRP- Mike)

Nat co-sponsored this at the meeting.

Vote: unanimously opposed. Proposal G did not pass.

Elections to AdCom added to agenda

Jill presented her nomination form to be admitted to join AdCom as a diversity rep (self-identification is "female") and it was signed by seven nominators: Larry Ely (Amherst), Nancy Lee Wood (Taunton), Lawrence Fine (Brookline), Eli Beckerman (Cambridge), Luc Schuster (Cambridge), MK Merelice (Brookline), and John Andrews (Lexington).

Jill handed the signed nomination form to Larry (Secretary) for his filing.

AdCom size currently allows 7 regular members, and 6 diversity members. Jill mentioned that Wanda

(Fundraiser) had quit, but might come back.

Vote: 11 yes, 0 no, 3 abstain. Jill is admitted to AdCom.

Discussion on Proposal L (Adcom Size Change – Merelice, Jill)

The proposal changes the size from 7 elected and 6 diversity reps to 4 elected and 2 diversity reps.

The argument is that a large AdCom takes people away from other activities. It subsumes working committee work that should be done by working committees.

Luc said that this was long overdue.

Ken asked whether it frees up people to do working committee work. He does not get that this would necessarily occur.

Eli in AdCom and in ComCom said he could never find the time to build up ComCom. He was adamant that the current structure and size of AdCom was responsible for working committee weaknesses that come about by not being fully enrolled, thereby not being able to performed their assigned responsibilities as stated in the bylaws.

An amended version appeared June 19 on the web page that called for the size change to be immediate as an experiment, to be adopted as final at the Convention, when evidence for its asserted effectiveness would have had time to prove itself.

Nat proposed that we just adopt the original proposal without the size change taking effect immediately as an experiment. Accepted as a friendly amendment.

5:43 pm

The original Proposal L per Nat's suggested passed by consensus.

Return to discussion about change of facilitation in the Virtual SC meeting to appoint delegates to the National Convention.

Merelice said the current virtual meeting was not in a format that was appropriate for the matter before it.

It was proposed that Eli be male co-facilitator to join Wanda as female co-facilitator.

Elie had the concern that Eli had made a pejorative statement about Jamie's functioning in the current virtual

committee meeting. Elie stood aside on this.

Concern continued to be expressed about the willingness of the current facilitator of the virtual meeting to carry out the express wishes of the State Committee. There was the feeling that the April 12 StateCom consensus to address one item was misunderstood, and that the appropriate online format was not applied. It was proposed that Wanda become female co-facilitator and that Eli replace the current male facilitator to assure that StateCom's original intentions and the actions of this meeting would be carried out appropriately.

We approved by consensus that Eli join Wanda as male co-facilitator of the ongoing virtual SC meeting.

We set by consensus the date of the two-day Convention to be November 22-23, which is a week before Thanksgiving

Return to earlier proposal that we admit new SC members after the important business was done, for which they had no background, so should not vote.

We admitted by consensus 6 new delegates to StateCom, to be admitted on July 15:

Lyn Meza
Sandra Harris
Lisa Richards
Amanda Sanderson
Terezinha Cardoso
David Maciewski

(David Schwab will not be a resident of Massachusetts much longer, so declined to be seated.)

6:00 pm Meeting adjourned [With the prerogative of the Secretary, I append a short document by Elie Yarden “Three green values for today” – a reflection on what constitutes his notion of ‘ecological politics’ – which Elie distributed at the meeting. Larry Ely]

ADDENDUM

Three green values for today, by Elie Yarden, state committee meeting, June 29, 2008

ECOLOGICAL WISDOM

Human societies must operate with the understanding that we are part of nature, not separate from nature.

We must maintain an ecological balance and live within the ecological and resource limits of our communities and our planet.

We support a sustainable society which utilizes resources in such a way that future generations will benefit and not suffer from the practices of our generation.

To this end we must practice agriculture which replenishes the soil; move to an energy efficient economy; and live in ways that respect the integrity of natural systems.

FEMINISM AND GENDER EQUITY

We have inherited a social system based on male domination of politics and economics.

We call for the replacement of the cultural ethics of domination and control with more cooperative ways of interacting that respect differences of opinion and gender.

Human values such as equity between the sexes, interpersonal responsibility, and honesty must be developed with moral conscience.

We should remember that the process that determines our decisions and actions is just as important as achieving the outcome we want.

RESPECT FOR DIVERSITY

We believe it is important to value cultural, ethnic, racial, sexual, religious and spiritual diversity, and to promote the development of respectful relationships across these lines.

We believe that the many diverse elements of society should be reflected in our organizations and decision-making bodies, and we support the leadership of people who have been traditionally closed out of leadership roles.

We acknowledge and encourage respect for other life forms than our own and the preservation of biodiversity.

