

State Meeting

Roanoke, Virginia
November 8, 2003

I. Setting of Agenda

II. Old business

- A. Status of fundraiser with Jim Hightower-unknown, check with Jim Polk
 - B. Fees from locals for newspaper - has word gotten out about this, is money coming in?
 - C. Approval of minutes from Virginia Beach and Pocahontas deferred as they are not yet available for review.
- III. Treasurer's report – Newspaper costs have been roughly \$1,000 dollars. Current funds in treasury are about \$1,900. We have sufficient funds to publish and distribute the next paper.

IV Local Reports

- A. Blue Ridge Greens – Getting some renewed interest by partnering with like-minded organizations to sponsor public events, educational forums, etc. No potential candidates on the horizon.
- B. Arlington – Living Wage ordinance was approved into law by Arlington City Board (10.98 an hour). Local Chamber of Commerce was against ordinance, claiming it will discourage employers from hiring. Working with ACLU and Amnesty International to draft resolution limiting the enforcement of the Patriot Act.
- C. Central Virginia – Meetings to resume regarding (non)enforcement of the Patriot Act. Working on ordinance addressing the resolution already proclaimed by city government.

V. Organization and Outreach

- A. Remarks by Susan Dridi, food for thought stemming from her recent attendance at a seminar presentation by a renowned marketing expert
 - 1. You will never make your point to the public with logic alone
 - 2. Perception is everything – which begs the questions –
 - a. Why aren't more people voting Green?
 - b. Why aren't more people active in locals?
- B. Discussion –
 - 1. How do we blend substance and creativity?
 - 2. How do we become more sophisticated in the art and science of mass communication without a loss of integrity?
 - 3. Long term vs. short term goals of party-building.
 - 4. How do we overcome blocks in people's willingness to vote Green (i.e. the "spoiler" issue)?
 - 5. Running Independent vs. Green candidates and public perception. Are the victories of Green's who ran as Independents really "Green victories"?
 - 6. We can't always rely on substance, we need icons, logos, visual images. We need to humanize the voice/fact of the Green Party.
 - 7. In summary – YOU HAVE TO GET PEOPLE'S ATTENTION BEFORE THEY CAN HEAR YOUR MESSAGE!!!!

C. Outreach remarks by Brian Czech

- 1. Public seems to perceive Green's as exclusively focused on the environment
- 2. Professional environmentalists (i.e. employees of natural resource agencies) view Greens as folks with ultraliberal social agendas and as not having a well-established environmental agenda.
Clarifying question from Kirit – What are you defining as "the Green Party"?
Response from Brian – In general, state and national
- 3. Environmental network/ad hoc committee has formed
- 4. How do we "bundle" our message with existing environmental organizations and appeal to this prim pool of members (professional environmentalists)?
- 5. Awareness of public perception of our alignment with different groups – Are we losing voters because of these perceived alignments (for instance, with communists or socialists)?
- 6. Brian proposed that the Green Party should make the environment the number one Key Value. (Perhaps literally).

D. Discussion of Election Results

- Analysis of results by Tom Yager (as phoned in and presented by C. Bowles)
- HOD- 61 seats were uncontested, 10 candidates ran as Independent or Green
 - 9 seats were decided by less than a 10% margin
 - Senate – 19 seats uncontested, only 2 Independents ran, 2 seats were decided by less than a 10% margin
 - US Congress – 4 seats were uncontested, only 2 Independent/Green candidates, none were decided by less than 10%
 - 1. Greens are choosing to run as Independents-how many and WHY?
 - 2. Discussion of Eric Sheffield's campaign

E. Steady-State Plank Proposal- presented by Brian Czech

- ~MOTION - that GPVA advance (submit) plank to the National Platform Committee, where it will be open to comments and review on a national level and will be considered a draft. Not asking for endorsement of the plank.
- *Friendly Amendment (Kirit)- Arlington local would approve of submission but want a disclaimer about the lack of consensus at the local level and other concerns with the proposal
- #Reply from Brian Czech- There is a section in the submission template where comments can go. I have no problem with adding these concerns along with the submission. Language changes and other modifications can still be submitted.

? Question from Charlie Jordan – How does this relate to sustainability?

#Reply from Brian – Steady-State Economics and sustainability are intrinsically linked.

.?Question – Do any locals have objections to submitting the platform versus concerns about its wording?

#Reply – No. Discussion about how to word the submission resulted in the following :

The GPVA submits the following plank to the GPUS Platform Committee, noting that it is not necessarily endorsed by all GPVA members.

+ PASSED BY CONSENSUS

How to submit? Brian is only known GPVA member of the platform committee.

Concern voiced by Cindy B. about appropriateness of platform committee member Brian and Kirit will submit together.

F. Platform Plank(s) submitted by Charlie Jordan

“A good platform is a vital resource for a candidate” (Charlie J.) During the 2000 draft for the national platform Charlie submitted several items.

1. The current rules state that state approval is needed for submissions. Charlie is therefore requesting approval of the GPVA for his submission packet. (Submitted a very varied and lengthy list of platform proposals.

?Question – Are these revisions of old proposals already submitted or new proposals?

#Reply – Most are new proposals

< Blocking Concern – We need time to review these proposals.

Suggestion by Kirit – post or link proposals from the business list. Solicit comments.

#Response – Charlie will submit to the National Platform Committee on his own if he does not get GPVA submission.

~MOTION- That this be submitted to the GPUS and GPUSA

Discussion – Feeling was that platform committee and specific individuals get involved in rewriting this. It needs to be boiled down to its essential elements and organized into meaningful issues more suitable to submission as platform planks. We need time for review and feedback. We are no longer affiliated with the GPUSA.

No consensus was reached and forwarding submission to the GPUS.

= DISPOSITION OF MOTION – that Daya will post a request to the business list for all parties interested in submitting items to the national platform submit their items to the state platform committee.

G. Selection of Delegates to National Convention

1. We need to start a discussion about how to appoint delegates and meet national delegate criteria.

2. Suggestion from Kirit that each local would elect one delegate, plus the two elected delegates and two alternate elected delegates would make 14, the number allowed to us.

3. What will be the selection process? Each local could choose one delegate and one alternate. Alternative – individuals could submit their own names and then the volunteer pool could be screened for diversity and other national criteria.

4. DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF DELEGATE NAMES TO NATIONAL COMMITTEE IS MAY 10, 2004.

5. How do we bind delegates to who they will vote for? Or should we?

6. Also need to address how vice presidential candidate will be chosen.

7. GPUS delegates will find out the procedure for selection (this was still being worked out at the national level at the time of this meeting).

~MOTION - Co-chairs will send to the appropriate list serve a straw-poll vote soliciting delegates to the national convention. If number is over 10-14, will work on developing a systematic way of selecting delegates. If number is less than that our allotted number of delegates, will probably vote at next meeting to approve these volunteer delegates.

Blocking Concern (Charlie J.) Wants locals to nominate delegates, in addition to a general call at the state level.

Blocking Concern (Kirit) General call may not meet the diversity requirements. Suggest that co-chairs call for a discussion of this.

Clarifying Question (Charlie) – What is the definition of “diversity” (that the National Nominating Committee is using)?

#Reply (Kirit) Diversity in congressional districts, gender and minority representation.

Clarifying Question (Susan D.)- What is required in terms of cost, time, etc.? People need this information before they can decide to volunteer or accept a nomination.

+MOTION PASSED BY CONSENSUS

H. Discussion of strategies for finding and assisting Green candidates. We need an ambitious plan for having more Green candidates.

MEETING AJOURNED AT 4:50 PM.

MINUTES RECORDED AND SUBMITTED BY Cindy Bowles

List of attendees:

Local

Cynthia A. Bowles BRG

Kirit Mookerjee Arlington

Susan Dridi Arlington

Charlie Jordan BRG
Daya Bill Central VA
Brian Czech Arlington
Manual Dotson Guest of BRG
Matthew Fields New River Valley

<Latest Update: June 22 , 2010