

Submitted by RGV October 7 2017

We have decided to tell the DRC that we agree to enter dispute resolution with no pre-conditions from either side about what is on the table for discussion.

For the moment, we have decided to hold off on sending a critique of the seriously flawed preliminary report and findings. If we do eventually submit our objections to the preliminary report, it won't look exactly like what follows but it will contain many of the same points.

The national party forced us to "voluntarily" request dispute resolution, yet the DRC declines to mediate the actual dispute. The DRC has invented other issues (the Jill Stein campaign) or has redefined the problem (a personality clash). — Discussing allegations of wrongdoing by a sitting national co-chair is a minefield, no doubt about it. But it is a farce for the DRC to claim to be working to resolve issues that are not disputed. Why not just declare that the DRC cannot conduct a proceeding of this type given the parties involved? Why not declare that the DRC is not the appropriate place to handle allegations of wrongdoing?

The conversation with Judy occurred on Tuesday September 19, not on Thursday September 21 as stated in the report. I will forward the full e-mail exchange, but note the date of the message below:

Date: Tue, 19 Sep 2017 16:16:22 +0000  
From: Jesse Townley  
Subject: Re: GPUS dispute resolution  
To: Judy Harrington, Jesse Townley

Hi-  
This afternoon sounds more realistic

I'll be calling from [...](#)

Yours, Jesse

When Judy asked, Jesse said he had read nearly all of the original complaint and a few of the additional submissions made over the summer. Apparently he failed to notice that these consist primarily of reports of violations by one side in the current dispute. Yes, there is a disagreement about whether the state party should work to further all ten of the key values or focus only on social justice. But the fight is being conducted unfairly, by illegitimate means. We are complaining about the means. That is a legitimate ground for complaint, and not something that should be waved away as merely a surface manifestation of a different underlying conflict. Surely the national party expects a state unit to follow the state unit's own rules for conducting party business, regardless of what that party business might be.

During the conversation Jesse volunteered the opinion that he was concerned about members at the grassroots level being denied the opportunity to participate. Clearly he had heard about the bannings. There is no evidence of this concern in the report. We are aware of four statewide bannings, three of which were conducted in violation of the state by-laws. These are not related to the Jill Stein campaign or to personality clashes. These are violations of state by-laws.

Jesse also expressed concern about one person occupying so many offices at the same time, saying he did not understand how such a thing could happen. By the time he wrote the report, he had concluded that Andrea took over those positions to "make sure tasks are done" despite evidence (in the complaint that he claims to have read) that volunteers stepped forward almost immediately and were ignored. Andrea has done the task of treasurer so well that neither she nor the newly elected treasurer, Josh James, is able to release a report on the condition of the state party's finances. Andrea has done and continues to do the task of facilitator so well that no proposal makes it to the Forum to be voted on unless she wants it to be voted on. She did the job of national delegate so well that nobody on the state council was aware that she had taken it over completely from the elected national delegate, Larry Dunn, immediately after he was elected, and that she was casting votes in the name of the Colorado party without notifying the state council of national proposals and without soliciting input from the state council on national proposals. These are not "irregularities" as Jesse claims. These are violations of state by-laws. Andrea was not making sure tasks got done. She was making sure that only her opinion was expressed and only what she wanted done got done.

In the report Jesse dismisses election rigging as just "hardball politics". Spare me. The national Green Party has complained loudly and bitterly about the unethical, unfair, and downright dishonest tactics of the Democrats and Republicans in preventing the Greens from getting their message out to voters. Gosh, guys, that's just hardball politics. Let's all get some practice in deleting our opponent's supporters from the voting rolls and casting votes from the graveyard for our own candidates so we'll merit the slogan of the "clean Green Party". We'll show the voters that a third party can be just as crooked as the Big Two.

The DRC's acceptance of Andrea's claim that party officials were properly elected and state council decisions were properly made ignores the documented facts that massive violations occurred. Two state party positions were invented and secretly added to the ballot and only a Merida ally and Andrea Merida herself were allowed to run for them. The credentialing of voting participants was not open to inspection, and a few cases have leaked out of decisions that are inconsistent with Andrea Merida's own rules about the deadline for affiliation. The state council decision to ban Harry Hempy was done in blatant violation of the state by-laws. Other state council decisions were manipulated behind the scenes by Andrea. The question of whether the state governing body is functioning properly is one of the basic issues in dispute, with plenty of evidence to suggest that all is not well, yet Jesse thinks it is "reasonable" to remove this from the table.

The idea that RGV must withdraw its complaint before the complaint will be mediated is illogical.

Andrea's claim that RGV has made libelous statements is simply wrong. It's not libel if it's true.

Harry's points are minor and probably were submitted as irony, to show how ridiculous the process can become if everybody submits as pre-conditions what they should be trying to win during mediation. The rest of us did not agree that these should be submitted, and some of us did not even know Harry was planning to do this. Sigh. I do agree with Jesse that these should be addressed during mediation, not announced as pre-conditions. Harry probably would agree, too, if he were not incensed at Andrea's efforts to neuter the whole process.