

OFFICIAL GPCO Forum

Council => Proposal Agreement Seeking => Topic started by: Andrea Mérida Cuéllar on July 27, 2017, 11:53:48 AM

Title: **Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Andrea Mérida Cuéllar on July 27, 2017, 11:53:48 AM**

This is Proposal 009-17: REVOCATION OF RIGHTS OF PARTICIPATION FROM HARRY HEMPY

Please read the proposal and keep comments on the topic of the proposal only. This proposal is moderated, and the GPCO Code of Conduct will apply (located here: <http://coloradogreenparty.org/forum/index.php?topic=28.0>).

Per Section 3.3 of the GPCO Bylaws, “3.3 The right of participation of an individual in the Green Party of Colorado can be revoked by a Green local using its own criteria or by a 75% vote of the members at a Green Party of Colorado state meeting. Revocation of the rights of participation must be based on failure of the individual to adhere to the purpose and methods of the Green Party of Colorado. Any individual must be informed of the potential revocation of their rights of participation at least three weeks prior to the vote and have a chance to speak in his or her defense at the meeting when the vote is held.”

There are currently 11 active voting chapters in the Green Party of Colorado. Adoption of this proposal requires an AGREE of at least 75% of all votes cast and also requires a minimum quorum of at least one response from eight chapters.

Active Chapters
Adams County
Arapahoe County
Denver
Douglas County
Greater Boulder
Pikes Peak
Poudre Valley
Mesa
San Miguel
Longmont
Ouray

SPECIAL NOTE: To comport with the three-week notice period specified in the bylaws, this proposal will be held in “Proposal Drafting” until July 26, 2017, and afterward will be moved to “Agreement Seeking” for a one-week vote, ending August 3, 2017 at 12 midnight.

1. Basic Info

Date proposed: July 12, 2017 (Agreement seeking will begin two weeks after posting in “Proposal Drafting” on the Official GPCO Forum)

Name of the sponsor(s): Denver Green Party, Adams County Green Party, Arapahoe Green Party

2. Title: REVOKE RIGHT OF HARRY HEMPY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE GREEN PARTY OF COLORADO

3. Text of the actual Proposal: The state council of the Green Party of Colorado hereby suspends the rules regarding revocation of rights of participation at a state meeting (GPCO Bylaws, Section 3.3) and moves to enact this proposal within the state council. As of the date of consensus or successful vote of this proposal, the right of Harry Hempy to participate in the events, activities, internet- and social media-based portals and operations, online or otherwise, of the Green Party of Colorado are hereby revoked. Should any local choose to appoint Harry Hempy to the state council, his participation on any GPCO forum or voting portal will be blocked, and that local should appoint another delegate or forfeit one delegate vote on the state council. Harry Hempy is henceforth declared not in good standing with the Green Party of Colorado, and an active local chapter in good standing may submit a proposal for his reinstatement after a period of three years from the date of this proposal's ratification.

4. Justification/Goals: The GPCO bylaws call out grounds for such a proposal in section 3.3 of the bylaws, "(r)evocation of the rights of participation must be based on failure of the individual to adhere to the purpose and methods of the Green Party of Colorado."

Harry Hempy returned to the Green Party on October 2, 2016, after resigning from his position as Greater Boulder Green Party's co-chair, in order to caucus for Bernie Sanders and to primary Jared Polis in the Democratic Party. His return has been marked with debate after debate, often on trivial matters, causing unnecessary strife on the state council forums. He has been reminded of the council forum's code of conduct regarding profanity and combative tone on several occasions. Some council members point to the strife in the council forums as the reason why they no longer engage with enthusiasm.

Harry Hempy has misrepresented information or his own role on various occasions, demonstrating a failure to "adhere to the methods of the Green Party of Colorado," as follows:

On June 14, 2017, Harry Hempy submitted a grievance in collaboration with Judy Harrington to the GPUS Steering Committee, which listed the names of Arn Menconi and Scott Olson as co-signers. An email Harry sent to Arn Menconi and Scott Olson on June 15, 2017, asking them to support the grievance, shows that their names were listed without their approval because they received the email on the day AFTER Hempy and Harrington submitted the grievance. Scott Olson has been a registered Democrat since July 2015. The grievance asks GPUS to de-affiliate the GPCO.

In an attempt to circumvent the democratic election of delegates already scheduled for the August state meeting, on June 18, 2017, Harry Hempy emailed Green Party of the Pikes Peak Region Treasurer Bob Kinsey and Chair Karyna Lemus to recommend that they submit a proposal to Council nominating a temporary alternate delegate to the GPUS Annual Meeting since National Convention delegate Bob Kinsey is unable to attend due to an injury. There is no need to nominate another delegate because of the following:

- Delegates are not required to be physically present at the National Convention and can vote online if needed
- Colorado already has an appointed alternate delegate, Andrea Merida, so there is no need to appoint anyone else until the upcoming State Convention when new GPUS delegates will be elected. Link to Colorado Green Party forum discussion where Andrea was originally elected delegate: <http://coloradogreenparty.org/forum/index.php?topic=217.0>

Harry Hempy has already stated that his purpose for trying to send other Colorado Greens is to ensure that Andrea Merida doesn't "attempt to avoid personal accountability to actions," a clear attempt to cause disruption at the national meeting (see attached email).

On February 9, 2017, Harry Hempy submitted a proposal for holding the state meeting in Grand Junction, misrepresenting that Andy Hamilton (Mesa co-chair) suggested holding the meeting there.

Also on February 9, 2017, Harry Hempy submitted a proposal that included Bob Kinsey (Pikes Peak) as a co-sponsor, though Bob asserted he had not co-sponsored the proposal.

On June 11, 2017, Harry Hempy misrepresented his role in the GPCO by attempting to speak on behalf of the Denver Green Party and the Adams County Green Party regarding the membership status of persons living within their party boundaries, and subvert the role of the co-chairs to speak on behalf of GPCO, to the Annual Meeting Committee of the GPUS (see "escape accountability" document).

Section 2.3 of the bylaws, under "Purpose," states, "The Green Party of Colorado (GPCO) is the affiliate of the Green Party of the United States for the State of Colorado." Harry Hempy has listed himself as a co-author of the grievance against GPCO's accreditation with GPUS and is acting as one of the organizers of this initiative. This action is a direct threat to the very existence of the GPCO and is therefore grossly counter to the purpose of the GPCO.

It should be noted that Hempy has ignored the democratic remedies delineated in the bylaws, which allow for submission of proposals to the state council to overturn decisions made by the co-chairs via a 60% affirmative vote. The stated purpose of the grievance was to ask GPUS to overrule the GPCO bylaws and remove the democratically elected leadership of the GPCO. The bylaws are clear that the state council may remove an officer via a proposal that is submitted to the council, and an affirmative vote of 75% must be reached. As the leader of the grievance proponents, Hempy has never pursued that avenue and instead attempted to retaliate for their own lack of effectiveness in changing the tenor of the state party by pursuing de-accreditation of the GPCO with the GPUS.

5. Pros and Cons: It is to the benefit of every state council member to collaborate in an environment with robust discussion and courteous disagreement; however, the proposal sponsors recognize that this outcome may cause the Greater Boulder Green Party to change its leadership, if not its council delegates. Recruiting new Green participation for such ends must also be regarded as a pro, however, and the sponsors stand at the ready to assist.

6. Alternatives to the proposal:

7. References: Section 3.3 of the GPCO bylaws, attached screen shots, <http://restoregreenvalues.org/>, <https://www.facebook.com/boulderdsa/posts/1033106493431316>, <https://web.archive.org/web/20161005115845/http://harryhempy.com/>
Modify message

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Sean Friend** on **July 27, 2017, 11:55:29 AM**

Agree

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Jason Justice** on **July 27, 2017, 12:03:49 PM**

Agree.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Véronique Bellamy** on **July 27, 2017, 12:30:01 PM**

Agree

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Larry Dunn** on **July 27, 2017, 01:05:07 PM**

Agree.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Evan Vann** on **July 27, 2017, 01:49:24 PM**

Agree.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **damiangonacgp** on **July 27, 2017, 01:52:25 PM**

Agree

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **Brianna Friend** on **July 27, 2017, 02:03:46 PM**

Agree

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **Bryan Williams** on **July 27, 2017, 02:36:13 PM**

Agree

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **Mark Gormley** on **July 27, 2017, 03:27:06 PM**

Agree

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **Andrew Hamilton** on **July 27, 2017, 03:49:12 PM**

Agree.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **Carolyn Bninski** on **July 27, 2017, 05:39:44 PM**

NO.

It seems clear to me that this proposal is a blatant retaliation against Harry for his efforts (along with several other people) to address the numerous actions of Andrea Merida. The full document, which lays out Harry's and others' grievances against Andrea Merida and which was sent to GPUS can be read at www.restoregreenvalues.com. Given the actions of Andrea Merida as State Co-Chair, Harry and others felt it would be best to go to GPUS and ask them to intervene.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **Jason Justice** on **July 27, 2017, 06:04:23 PM**

Well, maybe you can answer these questions ma'am, since all of your colleagues tend to run for cover.

Why does your group, Restore Green Values, feel it's appropriate to run background checks on Andrea, me, and members of our family?

Why was it appropriate for you to send Charmaine Barros to the National Convention as a delegate from Colorado when no quorum was achieved in her selection. You talk about democracy, but your "vote" was undemocratic and not even held on the official forum.

And why would you choose her, when she made physical threats to our duly elected state co-chair on Facebook. You saw them, your group is well aware of them. Non-violence is a key value. We most importantly make a clear distinction between self-defense and aggression. So isn't Ms Barros saying "I'm going to get her in the street. She may have Army training but I was trained in the streets" a clear violation of non-violence? So were you looking to facilitate a violent confrontation between two women of color?

This is very troubling on many levels. It appears you are putting your personal stereotypes into play on a racial and class level. White people trying to instigate a "gang fight" between two women of color to further a political agenda is highly problematic.

What was the motive of going through all of this trouble? What were you trying to achieve? Is incitement of violence a key value, or is it ok when the person being targeted is Latina?

I only ask you because you are complicit. Just want to know if you can answer these questions.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **josh james** on **July 27, 2017, 08:28:29 PM**

Agree

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **Jason Justice** on **July 27, 2017, 10:19:27 PM**

I'm waiting for an answer Ms Bninski.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **Harry Hempy** on **July 27, 2017, 11:01:02 PM**

I received the following questions while this proposal was being drafted:

Quote

Why does your group, Restore Green Values, feel it's appropriate to run background checks on Andrea, me, and members of our family? (Jason Justice)

Are you claiming here that you were not involved in submitting the grievance to the national Steering Committee and Accreditation Committee? (Sean Friend)

Or gathering evidence? Or preparing justifications? (Andrea Merida)

Would you like to include proof of your assertion in that language, to assist your case? [The assertion is, "Andrea wrote the letter [to deny Charmaine Barros a diversity waiver for the 2017 GPUS Annual Meeting]and sent it to Dave and Sean and to sign and send".] (Andrea Merida)

Why was it appropriate for you to send Charmaine Barros to the National Convention as a delegate from Colorado? And why would you choose her, when she made physical threats to our duly elected state co-chair on Facebook. You saw them, your group is well aware of them. (Jason Justice)

Here are my answers:

Quote

Why does your group, Restore Green Values, feel it's appropriate to run background checks on Andrea, me, and members of our family? (Jason Justice)

This is like the question, "Why do you let your partner beat you?" The problem with the question is that it assumes facts not in evidence.

I know nothing about background checks done by the Caucus to Restore Green Values on you or anybody.

-more tomorrow -

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Karyna Lemus** on **July 28, 2017, 08:21:25 AM**

Agree

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Jason Justice** on **July 28, 2017, 10:53:51 AM**

Mr Hempy, how dare you use the violent imagery of spousal abuse when so much violent rhetoric and literal physical threats, from Bill Bartlet physically threatening his colleague Andrea Merida (I was there, I had to keep him from throwing a punch at her) to you trying to facilitate a physical altercation by sending Charmaine Barros to "stalk" Andrea after Ms Barros made physical threats to Andrea and slanderous accusations. There has been so much white-rage fueled violence directed at the first Latina co chair of a political party in Colorado history that you should be ashamed of yourself. Your slander, your online bullying, your sexism, and your cowardice are obvious. And as a part of the Restore White Values group (it's not a caucus, no matter how much you stamp your feet and yell that it is) you are complicit in what they do.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Andrea Mérida Cuéllar** on **July 28, 2017, 11:16:06 AM**

Ok, folks; this is at quorum. As a reminder, this proposal closes next week Wednesday Aug 3 at

midnight.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Desmond Wallington on July 28, 2017, 11:29:04 AM**

Agree

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Samuel Cable on July 28, 2017, 01:38:19 PM**

Yes

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Bob Kinsey on July 28, 2017, 03:33:08 PM**

No.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Susan Hall on July 28, 2017, 11:06:41 PM**

Where is my reply?

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Andrea Mérida Cuéllar on July 28, 2017, 11:14:25 PM**

Not sure. The system shows your last three posts here:

<http://coloradogreenparty.org/forum/index.php?topic=355.msg2112#msg2112>

<http://coloradogreenparty.org/forum/index.php?topic=354.msg2083#msg2083>

<http://coloradogreenparty.org/forum/index.php?topic=347.msg2037#msg2037>

Is it possible you didn't click "post?"

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Harry Hempy on July 29, 2017, 06:00:57 AM**

Quote

Are you claiming here that you were not involved in submitting the grievance to the national Steering Committee and Accreditation Committee? (Sean Friend) Or gathering evidence? Or preparing justifications? (Andrea Merida)

Not at all.

I am a founding member of the Caucus to Restore Green Values in Colorado. I leaked evidence from the private sections of the GPCO Forum for the grievance. I prepared sections of the grievance dealing with ColoradoCare and exclusion of men from Green discussions of feminism.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **ETroe on July 29, 2017, 08:19:18 AM**

Agree.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Julie Bañuelos on July 29, 2017, 11:14:23 AM**

I agree.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Harry Hempy on July 30, 2017, 07:55:32 AM**

Quote

why would you choose [Charmaine Barros], when she made physical threats to our duly elected state co-chair on Facebook. You saw them, your group is well aware of them. Non-violence is a key value. (Jason Justice)

Jason, I have never seen a single Facebook post by Charmaine Barros.

But I have seen Facebook posts advocating violence by GPCO co-chairs Andrea Merida and Dave Bell. See pages 178 and 179 of the evidence file

http://restoregreenvalues.org/Case_to_Remove_Andrea_05bb-full-doc.pdf

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Roberta Ayala** on **July 30, 2017, 08:40:00 AM**

agree

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Susan Hall** on **July 30, 2017, 03:03:27 PM**

Keeping the Green Party Grass Roots and allowing Chapters to Select and Keep the CoChair's they elect & want, As Opposed to Andrea Merida Cuellar and her ally's banning our elected CoChair.

Against Proposal to Expel Harry Hempy, Greater Boulder Green Party's Elected CoChair

Keeping up with Emails and People is offense #1 & 2:

It is interesting that unintentionally I sent Andrea an email today. Harry did the same thing with a letter he was not really ready to send out, hoping to have Arn & Scott's name on it. Now Scott is a Democrat, but Harry was not aware of that. How many people have all of us not seen for a while and then find out they stopped being a Green. The Green Party had at least one person, Lauren, acting as campaign manager for our Green Party of Colorado (GPOC) US Senate Candidate Arn Menconi who may have come from the Bernie campaign. She liked the 10 Key values and would have stayed as a Green, but said she did not feel welcome even the first time she met the GPOC cochair and though I worked with her I don't know today if she is a Green Party member. I marched along side Lauren's African American friend in the Broomfield parade. She was handing out flyers for Colorado Healthcare and I was handing out flyers for the Green Party. She appreciated some of the ideals of the Green Party, But of course was aware that the GPOC would not support Colorado Healthcare, which was an important issue to her. I don't know if these two women either went ahead and joined the Greens or had joined the Greens and then left or were and are members still. So there are lots of people we worked close with and then we have our own busy lives and do not keep up with everyone. We can block those that have come from other parties, but I'm not sure that is right. Also if you were to check with either the Green Party candidate for US Senate, Arn Menconi as to if he would be in agreement with this letter, I am pretty sure he would say emphatically NO. I will see if I can get a written statement from Arn. Though many in this Green Party don't care anything about what any of the millions of people from other parties such as the Democrats and Socialists say, I will still add I think Scott Olson would be shocked to find out the Green Party does such things as is being done to Harry. I can also try to get a written statement from him too.

The first time we met Andrea, which was at a Colorado State Green meeting, she had said she came to the Greens because she was unhappy with the Democrats. If she had not been elected that day I don't know that we would have kept up with whether or not she was staying a Green.

Leaving to join the Bernie movement and returning is offense #3

Yes, Harry did leave and join the young people who were following Bernie. He taught them a lot of things about how the legal system works with voting and campaigning. The Greater Boulder Green Party chapter was glad Harry to have him return with his efforts, talents and friends. There is certainly no evidence shown here that he did any harm at all, leaving and returning. Wherever the young people go that received new information from Harry, it will be a good thing. As a teacher in the Denver Public schools I can say many young people do not even know the difference between a political party and the three branches of government. If he mentioned the Green Party and it's former or present candidates it would not be surprising if they previously knew little about them. I do not believe there is anything in the Bylaws about leaving for a short

time & returning.

Also I think we, the Green Party, should NOT be punishing those who leave and then return to the Green Party. Certainly there were a lot of people who have a right to think differently at different times. It is one thing to try to convince people to do and believe exactly like us and another thing to ban Green members when they are working for the Green Party.

Concern for Trivial Matters is Offense #4

I also do not think instigating trivial debates is a good reason to ban a person from the Green Party. That will definitely not look good as a bylaw on our FB pages. People might want to see if their list of trivial matches the bylaw..or the rest of the groups. There has been no official determination of what is trivial.

It is disconcerting to both the Green Party members and those in the general public who are trying to stay informed to have so many problems and for the first time an effort to ban people in local chapters, like Judy Harrington, in the State Forum as Harry Hempy, and even to block whole chapters from being reinstated such as the Jefferson Country Green party chapter. It looks like is certainly a problem, especially just before the GPOC State elections. It seems to be a problem to have so many members unhappy & I think Victor says he was banned from the local Denver group. Under "About Us" on the GPOC website it states Denver Greens have few conflicts but there are at least 3 of their members who are seeking another chapter to be part of so they do not have to leave or be banned from the Green Party. The GPOC is now considering banning a CoChair from a chapter, then a WHOLE CHAPTER is being banned too. These are not trivial issues, but even if they were it is obvious that there are more members concerned with the Denver Green Party where Andrea is CoChair than there are concerned Green Party members in the GBGP where Harry is CoChair.

Delegate to GPUS is Offense # 5

Perhaps Harry should not have tried to get someone else to be a delegate for the GPUS. However this is neither a expulsion offense nor was it even harmful to the party. Harry was trying to help the Green Party because he like myself and maybe others in this country concerned with political parties might think it is really not advantageous to have Andrea be the National CoChair for the National GPUS, the CoChair for the state of Colorado and for a time the only CoChair, the CoChair for the Denver chapter, the Facilitator for the State & local websites, and for awhile the State treasurer, and the Alternate for GPUS.

Subversion of Green Party values in the 10 Key Values and the use of an Offense word is Offense #6

One of the Green Party values is Grassroots Democracy. The GBGP really likes their CoChair, which is why they elected him. It is a bit of a shock that it is now NOT up to the local chapter to have their Appreciated and Elected CoChair targeted by the State CoChair and her followers who vote Exactly like her on every single thing. Not only are they targeting him for his offenses online, but also they are voting out the GBGP CoChair from representing them with the GPOC or state and national communications. This week one of those officers of a fairly new chapter who the GBGP with Harry as CoChair welcomed and had their member, me –Susan Hall, go to pass out flyers with Véronique when she was running for an RTD position. This member, Véronique went to another Green Party member's Face Book page and stated Andrea SENT her to that person. Véronique is a person who is an official on this council and voted for Harry to be removed for offenses that included using a foul word. This member, Veronique ended her message with worse obscene words than Harry has used. If a local chapter can elect a local CoChair and then have the State CoChair with her followers decide to ban him from participating in voting and communicating, then the process is obstructed and it is definitely not a Grassroots system then nor does it practice social justice if it bans some for doing offenses and not others. I

will post those words with the statements from the people I mention in these endorsements before the final date of the proposal. Certainly there are times people stop being perfect in representing the 10 Key Values otherwise we would be perfect people, which I do not believe in.

Surely we should not ban everyone for using profanity either, which is one of the offenses listed in the proposal against Harry. I listed above how one of the council members, Véronique used much worse obscene language than Harry and was sent by another council member, Andrea, the very person who sponsored this proposal against Harry. Another account of a GPOC council member using inappropriate words is when the CoChair Andrea put forth after the state elected other GPOC CoChair, Bill, felt pressured into leaving CALLED ME. The other CoChair Andrea chose to work with is Dave Bell and he used an obscene word when he Called Me On the Phone. I have worked with the other CoChair, Dave Bell, and really have always like him. I did not write a proposal to ban him from having a voice on the GPOC, but rather forgave him and went my way. I don't use profanity because I am a teacher and could get fired or at least in big trouble. The CoChair Dave Bell & I had talked many times before because we had agreed on many things before and enjoyed each other's company. I had never heard him speak to me with the word before, but I forgave him and let him know I didn't like it.

Another reason I think Harry should not be kept from being a part of the GPOC communication due to using a or a couple of profane words is because the person responsible for the GPOC website has attached Andre's writing to the following: <http://coloradogreenparty.org/AboutUs/PartyStructure/Financials..>
<http://www.thestranger.com/slog/2016/07/19/24362128/dan-savage-on-jill-stein-just-no>.
Even though this article has to be clicked on to be read, it is provided as a resource and is totally offensive to have connected to the GPOC.

Ignored Democratic Process by revealing GPOC imperfections and grievances is Offense #7

As far as Harry attempting to submit grievances to the steering committee, I do not think we are bound by some cultish pledge to keep Green Party concerns secret. I have had hopes that the Green Party was about being transparent. I have seen organizations that have gotten to the point that they are agreeing with one or two people on almost everything until after a long period of time they stop and say wait I'm not sure that is right & yet I went along with it anyway. Infact, I think if people are not caring for each other; if there are absolute sides to most everything, than there may be a problem with group think, somewhat like gangs or cults instead of critical analyzing, freedom of thought and again grassroots democracy.

Harry contributed and volunteered so much of his time when he ran for governor. Tom and I enjoyed having our grandchildren do cartwheels in a parade while we all passed out Green Party flyers. We supported him as he debated with Governor Hickenlooper and my former kindergarten classmate, another governor candidate. Many of those that have run for office in Colorado know of the sacrifice it takes to run for office and most of those in Colorado who have run for office support Harry over Andrea and her friends. Many or most of the people that have voted against Harry being connected to the GPOC council I have never met and it makes me wonder if they have met or really even know Harry well enough to judge and vote on his character and deeds. I do not think they were even around for the last state Cochair election and the things in this proposal are not familiar to them and yet they surely must be just following what Andrea is saying, similar to Véronque stating Andrea sent her to another Green Party member to say something.

I will present the copy of this conversation later to document that Veronique was sent and more than once purposefully used profanity on the other Green Party members FaceBook page.

Many Green Party members who have run for office appreciate Harry's efforts, sacrifice and commitment to see the campaign through. Most of those in Colorado who have run for office would NOT vote to have Harry expelled from any of the activities of the Green Party. One example of a Green member who ran for office is Ron Forthofer, whose writings and videos demonstrate that he is still committed to working for important causes through vigils, writings, speakings, and debates. Common Cause has him listed, "Ron Forthofer is a retired professor of biostatistics from the University of Texas School of Public Health in Houston and was a Green Party candidate for Congress and also for governor of Colorado.

He is on YouTube as taking part in a debate, <https://youtu.be/ue2XQlj1RwE>. Gary Swing is another candidate who ran for US House of Rep. Denver Dist. Susan Hall, myself, ran for US House of Rep. Dist. 2. Bob Kinsey and Arn Menconi ran for US Senate. None of these past Green Party candidates would vote Harry out. It is interesting that I did not see Andrea come to support any of the events for Harry or Arn and she even had a conflicting event with one of the major debates Arn had planned for at the CU University. The fact that this proposal is put forth and pertains to things that most of the new council members aren't even familiar with and yet vote on is extremely undemocratic too.

My vote is for the more powerful higher authority of the STATE Green Party of Colorado not take away the rights and voice of the lesser powerful grassroots Greater Boulder Green Party chapter's CoChair, Harry Hempy. The GBGP voted for Harry Hempy to be one of the CoChair with all the responsibilities that come with that office. My GBGP chapter and myself say no to disenfranchising Harry and Yes for him to continue to have a voice in the State Green Party's forum, State meeting and anywhere else any other State CoChair has rights and voices.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Andrea Mérida Cuéllar** on **July 30, 2017, 03:08:34 PM**

Susan, this tactic that you use, to turn actions addressing others into indictments on myself, is old and tired.

I think you need to read the language of the proposal clearly. No one is saying Boulder cannot choose its own co-chair. The proposal simply says that if this passes, Harry will not be permitted to work within the structure of the state party.

It specifically says that if this passes, if you all appoint him a delegate to the state council, he will not be recognized, and Boulder either forfeits a vote or must appoint someone else.

If you feel I need to be recalled, you are invited to submit a proposal to that effect.

Aside from that, your comment is an ad-hominem attack, and under the rules of this forum, it can be deleted. Please take some time to edit your commentary, and please also take time to read the proposal thoroughly.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **eepps** on **July 31, 2017, 12:13:47 AM**

Agree.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Zach Heath** on **July 31, 2017, 05:24:27 PM**

Poudre Valley Greens have voted to AGREE on this proposal.

Unfortunately, Harry has chosen to exclude many of us from any dialogue about GPCO state leadership and circumvent democratic process and open debate. Harry could have contacted us (those in local chapters) individually and brought his concerns to light, but did not. I wish him the best, but I don't think we can move forward as a party while Harry is able to take those actions. Hopefully we can improve our processes for conflict resolution in the future and focus on building strong, grassroots political party.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **John Anderson** on **July 31, 2017, 05:41:39 PM**

Agree.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **keterry** on **July 31, 2017, 06:19:11 PM**

Agree.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **Shannon Williams** on **July 31, 2017, 10:15:28 PM**

Agree

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **Chris Allen** on **July 31, 2017, 10:35:11 PM**

Agree

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **Harry Hempy** on **August 01, 2017, 10:11:20 AM**

Jason Justice's final question:

Quote

Why was it appropriate for you to send Charmaine Barros to the National Convention as a delegate from Colorado? What was the motive of going through all of this trouble? What were you trying to achieve? (Jason Justice)

My whole life I have stood up to bullies and championed the rights of people, especially oppressed people, to speak and be heard. So I spent much effort to allow Charmaine Barros' account of Andrea Merida's abusive behavior toward indigenous people at Standing Rock last fall to be heard by the GPUS National Committee.

As a result, Charmaine's account is now on record on the GPUS National Committee VOTE listserv for all to see.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **Andrea Mérida Cuéllar** on **August 01, 2017, 10:14:48 AM**

The truth, however, is here: <http://andreamerida.com/standing-rock>.

How did you get the "statement" on the NC listserv?

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **Linda Templin** on **August 01, 2017, 01:18:30 PM**

Agree.

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **Shane McDonnell** on **August 01, 2017, 04:56:57 PM**

Agree

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **davebell** on **August 01, 2017, 07:05:38 PM**

Susan,

I'd like to ask a few questions and also try to clarify what I see as a few misconceptions in your statement.

This proposal has nothing to do with Harry communicating with the national party. It is the intent and stated purpose of the communication that is being called into question here. The RGV complaint was filed with three possible outcomes.

1. Asking the GPUS to anti-democratically remove duly elected leadership and banning Andrea, Jason, and myself from the Green Party for life.
2. Having the GPUS Steering Committee overturn a bylaws amendment that was overwhelmingly adopted by the council and change the date of the state meeting against the wishes of the GPCO council.
3. Or failing the previous requests, dissolving the affiliation of the GPCO.

All of these demands were leveled at the GPUS by your co-chair without even giving the current

active members of the GPCO a chance to discuss the severity of such an action.

That is the reason for this proposal.

You mention that you did not suggest banning me for my language on a phone call with you. Did you not know that your co-chair was in fact attempting something far worse than that at the national level? Did Harry misrepresent or understate his intentions to you, or do you agree that Andrea, Jason, and I should be removed from the party for life?

This proposal also has nothing to do with Harry sending the email in error. Harry (and all of the people involved in filing this complaint) sent it to the GPUS with signatures of people that had not even been contacted at the time the message was sent. Those signatures should not have been added to the document until the signatories had confirmed that they wished to sign. I, personally, do not believe that this was an error as Harry has exhibited this behavior in the past when listing proposal sponsors that could not be verified as registered greens and promptly removing their names when asked for proof of registration. Was this an accident or oversight as well? If this same situation had been a business deal with a financial aspect involved, it would be lawsuit territory, whether the message was sent in error or not. If he had filed a legal document under these circumstances, he would be prosecuted and likely convicted of fraud.

He has admitted on this thread that he copied internal, private council discussions for public dissemination, without the expressed permission of any of the members of this state council, which constitutes a gross ethical breach. Couple that with the fact that the original complaint was filed and circulated widely, and publicly, with un-redacted names and email addresses of council members, and this whole thing is an unconscionable act of either negligence or malice. With that act alone, he is in violation of the rules of this forum. How should we deal with such an egregious violation of our rules?

From the current code of conduct:

"Be respectful of privacy. Do not copy information from this forum and post it outside of this forum. Do not post things to this forum that violate other's privacy. For example, don't post a private email to this forum without the consent of all parties. Do not assume that this forum is secure. Avoid posting extra-sensitive information to this forum."

<http://coloradogreenparty.org/forum/index.php?topic=28.0>

Additionally, No one is proposing that Harry, or anyone else, be removed from GPCO for leaving the party to support Bernie Sanders. The statement about his return is intended to illustrate that since his return to the party he has been severely disruptive, specifically by submitting proposals with fraudulent signatories and repeatedly using the forum as a vehicle to air his personal issues with Andrea. Harry's persistent and pushy behavior, (presumably with full support of GBGP) caused our forum moderator to resign, and has had a tremendous negative impact on the level of engagement in the GPCO forum. I have personally had several members state to me that they dread logging into the forum because of the toxicity.

Do you agree that Harry misrepresented his role by trying to force an election for national delegates while those seats were actively held by members in good standing who were democratically elected to fill those positions? What do you suppose was the reason for sending Shark to the national meeting? I believe it was to cause disruption, and his letter to the GPUS Annual National Meeting proves that. He has stated in his own words that his intention was to hold Andrea accountable for offenses he alone deemed valid. Do you believe he has the authority to act without the democratic voice of this state council? Do you believe that fundraising with the sole purpose to harass members and/or officers of this party is a peaceful action?

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**
Post by: **Rachel Towbin** on **August 02, 2017, 09:27:40 PM**

Agree

Title: **Re: Proposal 016-17: Revocation of Rights of Participation from Harry Hempy**

Post by: **Harry Hempy** on **August 02, 2017, 10:33:35 PM**

My position is ABSTAIN.

This proposal is not legitimate under state bylaws. The bylaws reserve the task of revoking an individual's right of participation to the general membership at a state meeting. Council is exceeding its authority by attempting to suspend the bylaws, a power not provided to Council by the bylaws, and circumvent Harry's due process right to speak at the state meeting.

I assert my right under the bylaws, and my intention, to speak in my defense at the Annual Meeting on August 12, 2017.

THE FOLLOWING POSTS WERE MADE AFTER MIDNIGHT AUGUST 3, WHEN HARRY WAS LOCKED OUT OF THE GPCO FORUM AND COULD NOT RESPOND.

Post by: **davebell** on **August 03, 2017, 12:16 AM**

I'd like to point out that your assertion that council has no authority to take this action is once again counter to the actions of you and your chapter. In proposal 007-16: Call for election of both state Co Chair positions, filed 13 days after your return, the Greater Boulder Green Party ran a proposal to suspend the bylaws and vacate an elected co-chairs seat. Are you now arguing that that proposal was a violation of the rules. Why then did you try to use that proposal as evidence in your anti-democratic attempt to usurp the purpose and methods of the GPCO. Also there is a reference to you yourself saying "We may want to suspend the rules to allow nominations from the floor at the meeting." in Topic 2014 Annual Meeting. Granted, it is hard to glean context because it is not a proposal and you did not clearly state that the council should suspend the rules.

Let me get this straight. You believe that the GPUS should have the authority to remove democratically elected officers and ban them for life, with no due process, but you do not believe that the GPCO council should have the ability to handle disruption amongst it's membership? Duly noted.

Proposal 007-16: Call for election of both state Co Chair positions.

<http://coloradogreenparty.org/forum/index.php?topic=296.msg1381#msg1381>

Topic 2014 Annual Meeting

<http://coloradogreenparty.org/forum/index.php?topic=204.msg618>

Post by: **Andrea Mérida Cuéllar** on **August 3, 2017, 12:18 PM**

Ok, the vote is now closed.

30 votes, minutes one abstention not included in tally.

29 votes to count

Agree: 26

No/Disagree: 3

Abstain/Stand aside: 1

Proposal carries at 89.7%

Note: as a courtesy, I am counting Susan Hall's vote as a NO, even though she did not actually count the vote. In fairness, I think her intention is clear enough. That post is here:

<http://coloradogreenparty.org/forum/index.php?topic=360.msg2224#msg2224>

Thank you everyone for your participation. May we have a clean start in 2020.