

Indiana Green Party

Indiana Green Party

Second Annual Congress

July 27, 2002

Glendale Branch Library [\[map\]](#)
North Keystone Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46220

AGENDA

10:00 Registration (Snacks provided by Marion County and Monroe County Greens)

10:30-10:35 Welcome, Tracy Carson and Peter Drake

10:35-10:40 Explanation of voting process, Tracy Carson

10:40-12:00 Proposals discussed, voted on (See list of proposals enclosed.)

12:00-1:00 Lunch ON YOUR OWN-*There are a plenty of food courts in the mall*

1:00-2:00 Platform committee report (Other committee reports as time permits)

2:00-2:30 Official IGP Representative Nominations:

- Indiana Coalition for Fair Election Laws Representative
- Common Bonds Representative

Coordinating Council Nominations:

- Technology Coordinator (only if this proposal is approved by the membership)
- Secretary
- Treasurer
- Male Co-Coordinator
- Female Co-Coordinator

2:30-3:30 Elections, speeches

3:30-3:45 Break

3:45-4:30 Progressive Videos

4:30-5:30 Reports from locals

5:30-7:00 (Snacks and cheesy board games provided by St. Joseph and Campus Greens)

PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL 1: CHANGES TO THE BYLAWS

A. Section 1, 2nd sentence: Change "our states" to "our state"

B. Section 2.1 - Membership definition. Should US citizenship or US permanent resident status be a requirement for someone to become an active member?

C. Section 2.3.7 - Membership review process. "...the membership assembly...shall have the right to vote and sanction..." Does this require calling a special congress? Calling a special congress might delay the decision too long, e.g. if someone is stealing funds, they might go on stealing while we announce the special congress 45 days in advance.

D. Section 3.1.8 - "Meeting minutes, financial records, membership lists...shall be open to inspection by any member in good standing." This should say "by any ACTIVE member in good standing," since we don't want supporters whose names we just got by having them sign up at a rally, but who never attended a meeting, to be able to see our records, do we?

E. Section 3.2.2.1 "Candidates shall be active members in good standing of the IGP for at least one year, effective 1/1/02." Should we change the language to make this rule more flexible? For example, if we go strictly by the Bylaws, we couldn't have even tried to run any candidate this year.

F. Section 4.3.6.1 - Discussion at the Congress. "The Coordinators shall determine the length and frequency of such speech with the goal of encouraging participation, but none too much." What does this mean, "none too much"? I assume it means we don't want any one person to dominate the debate, at the cost of excluding other points of view, or at the cost of making other business impossible to conduct. We should state this more clearly.

G. Section 4.7.2 - Referenda. "A vote must take place within 28 days of the date when the coordinators receive and confirm the signatures of the written request for a referendum." Which signatures, and how would they be confirmed? Are these the signatures of the delegates from 33 1/3% of the IGP locals? We should clarify this.

H. Glossary - 10 Key Values: "the ten principles by which Greens value their activities and the activities of others." A suggested change to improve clarity is "the founding principles of the Green movement, which form the basis for all Green activity."

PROPOSAL 2: TECHNOLOGY COORDINATOR

Add the following sections to the Bylaws to establish a Technology Coordinator

4.4.4. Technology Coordinator

4.4.4.1 The technology coordinator shall maintain and manage electronic mailing lists and web pages for the Indiana Green Party and perform any necessary interactions with technology coordinators from other levels of the Green Party.

4.5.5.1 State elected officers (Coordinators, Secretary, Treasurer, and Technology Coordinator).

4.5.6.1 <same change>

PROPOSAL 3: GRANDFATHERING OF HUNTINGTON COUNTY

When the bylaws were originally passed, the Huntington County local was given special dispensation to serve as an active local without the regular minimum five members. As repeated attempts to contact this local have elicited no

response, it is proposed that this "grandfather clause" be removed from section 4.1.1.

PROPOSAL 4: CLARIFICATION OF OFFICER TERMS

It is proposed that we add the following sentence at the beginning of section 4.5.4:

Terms for officers last from the annual Congress at which they are elected to the next annual Congress.

PROPOSAL 5: HOSTING AN ANNUAL FORUM

IGP should host an annual forum with a topic relevant to a current political issue in the state and specifically tied to one of our 4 pillar values. The forum would consist of a panel of 4 experts who would each present their knowledge on an aspect of the issue at hand, to be followed by a question and answer session with the public. The forum would be free and held in an easily accessible place, perhaps a different city each year. It is recommend that the first forum be held in Indianapolis, another idea to be discussed is to decide on the topic of the first forum and form a forum working group.

PROPOSAL 6: VIDEO, TELEPHONE, OR E-MAIL PARTICIPATION

We ask that IGP revise its bylaws to allow decisions to be made via e-mail and/or telephone because current requirements for face-to-face meetings unnecessarily limit participation by distant members. We believe that IGP's use of these technologies will increase participation. (We also believe that the change would reduce pollution produced by our drives to and from Indy!)

This proposal is preliminary. IGP might prefer to limit the use of technology, e.g., to monthly meetings and not the annual Congress, or to include provisions for holding face-to-face meetings when requested by some member(s). We have little pride of authorship in the exact form of this proposal, but we do strongly feel the need for a less burdensome way of participating in IGP.

PROPOSAL 7: AFFILIATION WITH THE GREEN PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

GP-US is the recognized Green Party in the U.S. by the Federal Elections Commission. Indiana is the only state in the region not affiliated with GP-US. Consequently, Indiana has no voice in regional Green affairs, nor input into the national party platform nor sanctioned events. It is proposed that IGP officially affiliated with GP-US.

PROPOSAL 8: FORMATION OF CAUCUSES

The Indiana Green Party should form caucuses to better outreach to those who currently are not present at large amounts of meeting. The duties of each caucus would be guided by the 10 key principles. Furthermore, a committee comprised of an odd number of people should be formed to look into specific caucuses that should be created.

PROPOSAL 9: ESTABLISH 1-800-VOTE-GREEN

The Indiana Green Party should establish a free "800 number" for people to call. There is not a way for people to contact the party for media releases, campaign information, etc. If the group decides not to establish an "800 number," we still need some number (a voice mail) where IGP can be reached.

PROPOSAL 10: THE LOCATION OF IGP

The Indiana Green Party should be located in the state's capital of Indianapolis, IN. All bank accounts, voice mails or other IGP material should be located in Indianapolis, IN also. This does not effect where members of the coordinating committee can come from. For example, in some political parties, treasurers live far away, but there is someone in the city of Indianapolis to sign checks should we need them.

NOMINATIONS FOR IGP OFFICES

Note: Other members may be nominated (by themselves or others) at the IGP Congress itself.

Maureen Barlock, nominee for IGP treasurer

“I have an accounting background, working for AHM Graves Realtors and AHM Graves Construction Company as a bookkeeper and accounting clerk for 10 years. I have done all phases of accounting as Accts. Rec., Accts. Payable, General Ledger, Payroll, Income Statements, Balance Sheets, etc. I held that position until I received a degree in computer tech from Purdue at which time I quit Graves and acquired a programming job. I have 27 years experience in computers. I worked at the State of Indiana for 10 years in the Info Tech Division of the Family and Social Services Administration as a programmer and systems analyst.

“I also attended Indiana Business College and received certificates in accounting courses as well as accounting courses at IUPUI. In addition to this experience and education, I was Treasurer for 2 years for the Women In Construction organization in Indianapolis, which was an organization with approx. 100 persons.

“I have been an Indiana resident my entire life, originally from Northwest Indiana and living in Indianapolis for 35 years. I am degreed, with 2 B.S.'s, one in Computer Tech and one in Organizational Leadership and Supervision. I have done my own income taxes all my life and never have been audited. I have the time to devote to the duties of treasurer as I am now semi-retired.

“In conclusion, I would keep members abreast of the financial condition of the Green Party and keep the books and be sure to file in necessary forms required by the government.”

DELEGATE FORM

All locals have one or more delegates who carry a block of votes for that local. The delegate(s) must be a member and be present at the Indiana Green Party Congress. They must also complete the form below and bring it with them the day of the Congress. Please print:

Name of Delegate: _____

Address: _____

Date of Membership: _____ Local: _____

The above individual is the/a delegate for the local Green Party named above and is carrying _____ votes for our group. As the delegate and as the local GP coordinator, we verify that this delegate has been selected democratically by the IGP members of our local to carry the above votes at the Indiana Green Party Congress 2002.

_____	_____	_____	_____
Signature of Delegate	Date	Signature of local Green Party coordinator*	Date

*May be in the form of an email message if obtaining signature is not feasible. Please print and bring e-mail message.

MINUTES - JULY 2002

Indiana Green Party Congress

Indiana Green Party Congress
Glendale Public Library Branch
Indianapolis, IN
10:00 am to 6:15 pm
Saturday, July 27, 2002

Present at the start of Congress: Pam Raider, Philip Davis, Neal Smith (Skywolf), Harold Donle, Tracy Carson, Bethany Hayes, Heather Drake, Peter Drake, Isabel Piedmont, Tom Brown

Votes represented at the start of Congress (Total = 21)

- Marion County: Bethany served as delegate, carrying 8 votes
- Monroe County: Isabel served as delegate, carrying 5 votes
- St. Joseph County: Tom served a delegate, carrying 6 votes
- Unaffiliated: Pam and Philip carried their own votes (2)

MINUTES

I. Registration of delegates.

II. Introductions

III. Voting Procedures (Tracy)

Tracy explained the procedures for consideration of the proposals before the Congress. On each proposal, pro and con will have time to speak. The person who brought forward the proposal, if present, would first have a chance to clarify the intent of and reasoning behind the proposal. Then anyone against the proposal will also have time to speak. A general discussion will ensue, and then time will be given for delegates to confer with those they are representing.

IV. Question of a Quorum for conducting business

Number of votes represented through delegates today: 21

Number needed for quorum: 24 (at least 60% of the 39 IGP members)

Harold moved to suspend the bylaws so that we can conduct business. Bethany seconded this motion. Those present voted 9 Yes, 1 No.

Further discussion on this question ensued. Tom thought it would be better to change the bylaws to reduce the number needed for a quorum.. But Peter pointed out that we can't change the bylaws now, without having a quorum and without having announced the proposal 45 days in advance. He spoke in favor of suspending the bylaws for today and then changing the quorum clause in the bylaws later.

Harold withdrew his motion, suggesting instead to conduct business on an unofficial basis, and then send minutes to members, and if no objection, the business will become "official." Skywolf replied that he thought it would be better to suspend the bylaws on the quorum question in order to conduct official business today. Bethany, on the other hand, agreed with Harold's suggestion.

Harold made a new motion: Since we don't have a quorum, we should conduct business on an unofficial basis, and then

send the minutes to IGP members. If there are less than (50% +1) of members who object, the unofficial business will become "official." Deadline for objections is 30 days after the Congress. Objections shall be registered on each individual item for which votes were conducted at the Congress. Peter seconded the motion.

Skywolf added, and Harold accepted, a friendly amendment – that the deadline is inviolable.

Vote on amendment: 10 votes Yes

Vote on the motion as amended: 10 vote Yes

V. Discussion and Vote on Proposals

Proposal 1: Changes to the Bylaws (All proposed by Isabel.)

Proposal 1-A. Section 1

In section 1, 2nd sentence: Change "our states" to "our state."

Isabel explained that this was just a matter of making the second sentence of our bylaws more logical. Currently it reads: "The Indiana Green Party shall strive to understand and live the values of the Green movement in our electoral work, and shall promote the understanding and practice of these values in our neighborhoods, our cities and counties, our states and country, and internationally." Since these are the bylaws for the Indiana state party, our state is just one = Indiana.

There was little discussion on this point, and the proposal, which was in the form of a motion, was approved unanimously with 22 Yes votes. (By this time Michael Berndt of Monroe County had joined the group, also choosing Isabel to be his delegate. Thus the total number of votes increased from 21 to 22.)

Proposal 1-B. Section 2.1

Membership definition. Should US citizenship or US permanent resident status be a requirement for someone to become an active member?

This proposal was not in the form of a motion, but rather was a point that Isabel thought should be discussed. Bethany said she was uncomfortable about limiting IGP membership to US citizens. Peter pointed out that we can't legally accept dues from non-citizens. Harold reminded the group that the Green Party is one of only two international political parties, a fact to be proud of. Therefore, he argued, we should not restrict membership to citizens. Tom said he was wary of making distinctions between members, creating classes of members. Personally he would not like to limit membership in IGP.

Heather clarified that only time it's tricky to have non-citizen members is when money is involved. She doesn't see a need to restrict membership now, but rather just take non-citizen memberships on case by case basis, i.e.: asking them not to pay dues. Isabel pointed out that we don't know if any current members are non-citizens. For all we know, we may have already received dues from someone who's not a US citizen.

Peter suggested that we could let non-citizens become active members, but just waive their dues. He made a motion: Direct the treasurer to not accept dues from anyone who is not a US citizen. Isabel seconded the motion. Harold pointed out that this motion was just telling the treasurer to obey the law. Peter withdrew his motion.

Proposal 1-C. Section 2.3.7

Membership review process. "...the membership assembly...shall have the right to vote and sanction..." Does this require calling a special congress? Calling a special congress might delay the decision too long, e.g. if someone is stealing funds, they might go on stealing while we announce the special congress 45 days in advance.

This proposal refers to the section in the bylaws on a membership review process when charges are made that an IGP member is in violation of membership standards, as defined in section 2.2. Section 2.3.7 currently reads: "The burden of proof shall be on those making the charges. After hearing the report of the special committee and statements by those making the charges and by those charged, the membership assembly of the appropriate level of the confederation shall have the right to vote and sanction, including exclusion, by a 66 2/3% vote."

After some discussion, Peter made a motion to add "This vote will not require calling a special congress" at the end of the subsection. This would allow a vote of the membership to take place via mail, email, or phone instead of in person.

Harold pointed out that, in the example of stealing funds, the accused person would be subject to US and state law. So the police and legal system would handle the charges. Peter responded that there are other examples which do not involve the legal system. For example, if an IGP candidate advocates blowing up SUVs, we would want to address this problem rapidly. At this point Tom seconded Peter's motion.

Harold insisted that a face to face assembly to decide expulsion or any other type of penalty is essential. Bethany said that she thought that such serious charges will be brought only very rarely, so it would be OK to call a special congress, since it wouldn't happen very often. Tracy said that the current lack of participation at congresses does not auger well for representation at a special congress. Harold said that, from his point of view, if you can't gather a quorum for a special congress for membership review, then maybe the charges aren't very important.

Peter withdrew his motion. Harold moved to table the issue until the next annual congress. Peter seconded Harold's motion, which was then approved by consensus.

Jenett Tillotson from Howard County showed up at this point. Formerly a supporter, Jenett signed up to be an active member. As part of the unaffiliated caucus, she decided to serve as her own delegate.

Proposal 1-D. Section 3.1.8

"Meeting minutes, financial records, membership lists...shall be open to inspection by any member in good standing." This should say "by any ACTIVE member in good standing," since we don't want supporters whose names we just got by having them sign up at a rally, but who never attended a meeting, to be able to see our records, do we?

Isabel said she wasn't sure about this issue, but made the proposal to generate discussion. Heather pointed out that the minutes are already posted on the website and financial records are open due to state laws. That leaves membership lists, which she feels are OK to make public. Peter said that what the proposal seems to address is the possibility of saboteurs infiltrating the party. He pointed out that a saboteur would have such an easy time becoming an active member anyway, that he/she could have access to our information even if we added the word "active." Isabel withdrew her proposal.

Proposal 1-E. Section 3.2.2.1

"Candidates shall be active members in good standing of the IGP for at least one year, effective 1/1/02." Should we change the language to make this rule more flexible? For example, if we go strictly by the Bylaws, we couldn't have even tried to run any candidate this year.

Isabel explained that she brought this up since, according to our current rules, George Fish couldn't have been a candidate for secretary of state this year, even if he had received the necessary number of yes votes from the membership. Heather and Tom both said that they thought the requirement to be a member for at least one year should stay in the bylaws.

At this point in the meeting, Chris Stafford of Monroe County showed up and gave his vote to Isabel as the Monroe County delegate. At this point, a quorum was reached. Harold made a motion that, now that we have achieved quorum, all business conducted to this point will be official IGP business. Isabel summarized for Michael, Jenett, and Chris the

decisions made so far. There were no objections to the motion, so it passed by consensus.

Proposal 1-E (continued)

Harold made a motion to delete the words "effective 1/1/02" and substitute "unless a candidate can get the signatures of at least 50% of the statewide (active) membership."

Heather argued against this motion. She felt it is a good idea to require a candidate to be a member for a year. By guaranteeing that someone is a member for a year, Heather said, you also ensure that the candidate knows what he/she is getting into. Peter said that IGP should have a mechanism to allow a progressive Democrat to switch to the Green Party and run on the Green ticket with less than a year of IGP membership. Bethany agreed with Peter. She agreed that the wording of this section should be changed to allow members who haven't been IGP members for year or more to run for office.

In support of his motion, Harold said he thought that members will think seriously about it before they sign on to support an individual as an IGP candidate. They won't just sign blindly. Tracy disagreed, saying that members would probably just sign without thinking about whether the person is qualified. She supported keeping the language in this section as it is.

Michael offered a friendly amendment revising Harold's motion to require 2/3 of IGP members to sign to support a candidate. A vote was taken on this amendment, as follows:

- Yes - 7
- No - 16
- Abstain - 1

The amendment was defeated.

A vote was taken on the original motion:

- Yes - 10
- No - 13
- Abstain - 1

The motion was defeated.

Adjournment for lunch at 12:10 pm. Reconvened 1:15 pm.

Present when Congress reconvened: Pam Raider, Philip Davis, Neal Smith (Skywolf), Harold Donle, Tracy Carson, Bethany Hayes, Heather Drake, Peter Drake, Isabel Piedmont, Tom Brown, Michael Berndt, Jenett Tillotson, Chris Stafford, Maureen Barlock.

Proposal 1-F. Section 4.3.6.1

Discussion at the Congress. "The Coordinators shall determine the length and frequency of such speech with the goal of encouraging participation, but none too much." What does this mean, "none too much"? I assume it means we don't want any one person to dominate the debate, at the cost of excluding other points of view, or at the cost of making other business impossible to conduct. We should state this more clearly.

Harold made a motion to delete "but none too much" and substitute the words "by everyone present." Michael seconded the motion. Maureen asked whether a time limit should be set for each individual to comment on a question. Peter: said he likes the motion and suggested we not try to micromanage the way meetings are run by setting time limits.

Vote on Harold's motion

- Yes - 22
- No - 0
- Abstain - 2

The motion passed.

Proposal 1-G. Section 4.7.2 - Referenda.

"A vote must take place within 28 days of the date when the coordinators receive and confirm the signatures of the written request for a referendum." Which signatures, and how would they be confirmed? Are these the signatures of the delegates from 33 1/3% of the IGP locals? We should clarify this.

This proposal dealt with the section of the bylaws concerning a call for a referendum on an issue that the Coordinating Committee made a decision on.

Section 4.7.1 states: "If 33 1/3% or more of affiliated Green locals oppose a decision by the Coordinating Committee, signify so in writing, and wish the membership to vote on the decision, the Coordinating Committee shall conduct a referendum."

Section 4.7.2 states: "A ballot question must be drawn up and mailed (postal mail) to the IGP Coordinators. The ballot question must be concisely presented and contain statements representing all points presented. A vote must take place within 28 days of the date when the Coordinators receive and confirm the signatures of the written request for a referendum. 50% + 1 of responding members must vote for the ballot for it to pass."

Peter made a motion to change the wording of section 7.4.1: change "33 1/3 % of affiliated Green locals" to "33 1/3% of active members."

Harold said that revisions to section 4.7.1 should not be considered since the proposal talked about a different section, 4.7.2. Isabel clarified that the proposal was not in the form of a motion and that she had made the proposal so that the group would discuss the whole process of calling for a referendum, not just the words in 4.7.2. Peter said that his motion was relevant to the proposal, and several others present agreed.

Tom expressed concern that, if Peter's motion passes, one local could push something through with no support from other locals. Peter said that, strictly speaking, what constitutes an affiliated local is at least 5 IGP members. So an "affiliated Green local" is actually just a group of IGP members who live in the same area. He also said that, since the purpose is calling for a referendum and not actually making a decision, the member vote should be OK, even if it is dominated by members from a certain county.

Harold pointed out a problem in 4.7.2. This section says that "50% + 1 of responding members must vote for the ballot for it to pass." This should read "ballot question" not "ballot." Also, the current wording means that if only 3 members vote, 2 of the 3 can make a decision which will effect all 40 or more IGP members. That's not democratic.

Peter withdrew his motion and made a new motion with three parts: 1) In 4.7.1, replaced "affiliated Green locals" with "active members." 2) In 4.7.2, replace "responding members" with "active members." 3) In 4.7.2, replace "ballot" with "ballot question" in the last sentence. Isabel seconded the motion.

Chris pointed out that we may have very few people respond in a referendum, and that it therefore may be problematic to require 50% + 1 votes in favor of the ballot question. Heather reminded us of the context: The issue is how to vote to reverse actions of the Coordinators. Peter added that, by making this process difficult, we show our trust in the Coordinators.

Harold offered a friendly amendment to Peter's motion: To lower the 33 1/3% minimum number of members required to call for a referendum to 15%. This would encourage participatory democracy. Peter accepted this as a friendly

amendment.

Peter and Isabel clarified that the Coordinating Committee does not make policy decisions but rather conducts the organizational business of the party between Congresses. Therefore a call for a referendum on a CC decision would probably be rare.

Vote on the amended motion:

- Yes - 22
- No - 0
- Abstain - 2

The motion passed.

Proposal 1-H. Glossary - 10 Key Values

"the ten principles by which Greens value their activities and the activities of others." A suggested change to improve clarity is "the founding principles of the Green movement, which form the basis for all Green activity."

Isabel said this proposal was offered as a motion to change the bylaws.

Harold said that, since this change of wording is just in the glossary of the bylaws, the wording should just be changed by the CC - there is no need to vote on this proposal. Peter disagreed, saying that we should vote on it since it does affect how people read our bylaws.

Michael questioned calling the 10 Key Values the "founding principles" of the Green movement, since the Greens were actually founded based on just the 4 Pillars (first 4 of the 10 values). Peter offered a friendly amendment to Isabel's motion: replace "founding values" with "central values." Isabel accepted this as a friendly amendment.

Harold objected to the motion saying he thought we shouldn't get rid of the words about valuing members and their activities.

Vote on the amended motion:

- Yes - 15
- No - 1
- Abstain - 8

The motion passed.

Proposal 2: Technology Coordinator (Peter)

Proposal - Add the following sections to the Bylaws to establish a Technology Coordinator

4.4.4. Technology Coordinator

4.4.4.1 The technology coordinator shall maintain and manage electronic mailing lists and web pages for the Indiana Green Party and perform any necessary interactions with technology coordinators from other levels of the Green Party.

4.5.5.1 State elected officers (Coordinators, Secretary, Treasurer, and Technology Coordinator).

4.5.6.1

Peter argued that a Technology Coordinator who would be in charge of the website and the email lists is essential to the party. Adding this new position would also make 5 instead of 4 members of the CC, thus avoiding ties.

Tom expressed his concern that the new position would be difficult to fill. Peter responded that yes, it could well be difficult to fill. If we can't fill it, we won't fill it. He underlined another benefit of adding this officer: that more views will be heard this way on the CC. Heather agreed that we probably won't be able to fill all 5 officer positions, but we need this tech coordinator position.

Jenett, who has been voluntarily managing the website with Tom's help, said she wouldn't mind being in charge of the web site and email lists, but she wouldn't be able to come to many monthly IGP meetings. She said that she would perhaps prefer not to fill an official role within IGP, but would rather prefer to keep doing it "unofficially."

Harold asked why does the technology coordinator need to be an official position. Peter responded that electing the person is the best way to democratically choose who will be in charge of the website and email lists. Michael pointed out that this person will be a contact person for the party, and thus will represent the party in some ways. She/he should therefore be elected. Jenett agreed with Michael's point about being a contact person. That's why during these past months, she herself did not want any decision making power and did not want to act as representative of the party.

Chris said he agreed that the first contact many people would have would be through the Technology Coordinator by asking to get on email lists or by browsing the website. That first contact with new members is important. Isabel said she felt that a Tech Coordinator is needed. Currently some of this work is taken up by the secretary and co-coordinator, who already have enough work on their hands. Peter pointed out that the Tech Coordinator would have the additional responsibility to monitor the Ingreens and Ingreens-discuss lists and remind users of the rules of using the email lists.

Isabel seconded Peter's motion, and a vote was taken.

- Yes - 8
- No - 13
- Abstain - 3

The motion did not pass.

Break

Proposal 3: Grandfathering of Huntington County Local (Peter)

Proposal - When the bylaws were originally passed, the Huntington County local was given special dispensation to serve as an active local without the regular minimum five members. As repeated attempts to contact this local have elicited no response, it is proposed that this "grandfather clause" be removed from section 4.1.1.

Tom, who was originally in touch with the Huntington County Greens, has also not heard anything from this local in many months. He said the local consisted of just one family. The family is still there, but they are not responding to email or phone messages. We have no postal address for them. Peter, Heather, and Tom have tried to contact them. Heather said she supports motion made in the proposal.

Vote:

- Yes - 17
- No - 6
- Ab - 1

The motion passed.

Proposal 4: Clarification of Officer Terms (Peter)

Proposal - It is proposed that we add the following sentence at the beginning of section 4.5.4:

"Terms for officers last from the annual Congress at which they are elected to the next annual Congress."

Peter's proposal was in the form of a motion, which Isabel seconded. Peter explained that he made the proposal because nowhere in the bylaws does it state what the terms for IGP officers are.

Vote:

- Yes - 23
- No - 0
- Abstain - 1

The motion passed.

Proposal 5: Hosting an Annual Forum (Isabel)

Proposal - IGP should host an annual forum with a topic relevant to a current political issue in the state and specifically tied to one of our 4 pillar values. The forum would consist of a panel of 4 experts who would each present their knowledge on an aspect of the issue at hand, to be followed by a question and answer session with the public. The forum would be free and held in an easily accessible place, perhaps a different city each year. It is recommend that the first forum be held in Indianapolis, another idea to be discussed is to decide on the topic of the first forum and form a forum working group.

Before discussion began, Isabel sought to withdraw this proposal because she felt that IGP did not have enough truly active members to undertake the organization of annual forums at this point.

Harold suggested that IGP urge the locals to host such forums, say on a quarterly basis. These events would be good to recruit people. Heather suggested to just leave it up to the CC to organize forms if they want. Peter proposed to move on to the next proposal, but others wanted to continue the discussion.

Bethany suggested keeping the proposal, but changing "should host an annual forum" to "may host an annual forum." She felt that it is the job of Congress to guide the actions of the CC. Chris agreed with Bethany that the wording should be changed to "may." He suggested the motion should perhaps empower the CC to form an ad hoc committee for forums. Michael agreed that such a working group or committee could oversee the organization of the proposed forums.

Isabel offered a revised motion - To empower the CC to form a working group to organize an annual forum. The suggested structure of the forum would remain the same as in the original proposal. Chris offered a friendly amendment to remove the word "annual" so that the forum could be held whenever.

Harold asked whether the CC already has the power to organize such a forum, as part of educating the public. Why do we need to give special permission? Heather agreed that we don't need to give formal permission for the CC to have a forum working group. She referred to section 4.5.3.5 of the bylaws. Harold appreciated this bylaws reference, and also said folks should look at 4.5.1, in which the purpose of the CC is given.

Bethany seconded Isabel's motion. Isabel clarified that the motion is like a recommendation to the CC.

Harold moved to table the motion until the next Congress. Peter seconded Harold's motion.

Isabel withdrew her motion, because she felt it was not worth the time to argue about this issue.

Bethany, however, wanted to keep the motion.

At this point, Harold left the meeting and asked to be removed from all IGP member lists. Therefore, we no longer had a quorum.

Peter made a motion to revert to the policy of the beginning of the meeting, when we decided that all business will be conducted unofficially, and then the minutes will be circulated to the IGP members, who will have 30 days to register an objection before the Congress business becomes official. This motion was approved by consensus.

Proposal 6: Video, Telephone, or E-Mail Participation at Meetings (Dave Vollrath)

Proposal - We ask that IGP revise its bylaws to allow decisions to be made via e-mail and/or telephone because current requirements for face-to-face meetings unnecessarily limit participation by distant members. We believe that IGP's use of these technologies will increase participation. (We also believe that the change would reduce pollution produced by our drives to and from Indy!)

This proposal is preliminary. IGP might prefer to limit the use of technology, e.g., to monthly meetings and not the annual Congress, or to include provisions for holding face-to-face meetings when requested by some member(s). We have little pride of authorship in the exact form of this proposal, but we do strongly feel the need for a less burdensome way of participating in IGP.

Tom spoke for Dave Vollrath, who made this proposal but was not present at the Congress. He explained that Dave is a member of the IU academic Senate, and that the Senate is exploring the use of closed circuit video and other technological means to avoid the hassle of physical meetings. Tom added his own endorsement, one reason being that he would like to be able to have someone else be the delegate from St. Joe county, but no one else wants to do it because of the long drive from South Bend to Indy. Dave would be willing to do it if some of the trips to Indy could be eliminated.

Peter gave an example of a committee which communicated only via email. On the platform committee, the work was done entirely electronically, but Peter basically wrote the committee's proposal himself. Only two other people were really involved, pointing out issues regarding the platform. Peter said it wasn't really a successful collaborative effort. He added that some people are better off meeting physically, i.e.: they don't have Internet access.

Tracy spoke in favor of the proposal because she has trouble driving to places. She said that chat rooms should be investigated, and maybe a 1-800 number. Chris also spoke in favor of the proposal, citing the amount of time it takes to drive. He suggested that a conference call between 2 or 3 meeting places around the state would be a possibility.

Jenett said that the IU campuses and & Purdue have teleconferencing facilities that are available. Maybe IGP would need to connect with a student organization to use the room. She would be willing to check on the options. Bethany said it would be a good idea for Jenett to look into it.

Jenett made a motion that she will investigate the possibilities for video conferences and report to the CC at their next monthly meeting. Tom said this might be a good way to get the campus groups involved, and Isabel seconded Jenett's motion. Phil pointed out that communication by snail mail should also not be overlooked.

Jenett's motion passed by consensus.

Proposal 7: Affiliation with the Green Party of the US (Various Members)

Proposal - GP-US is the recognized Green Party in the U.S. by the Federal Elections Commission. Indiana is the only state in the region not affiliated with GP-US. Consequently, Indiana has no voice in regional Green affairs, nor input into the national party platform nor sanctioned events. It is proposed that IGP officially affiliated with GP-US.

Tracy explained that several different people submitted this proposal under separate cover.

Peter gave some background info on the two major national Green groups in the US: the Greens/GPUSA and the Green Party of the US. He also reminded us that IGP held a special congress in March to vote on this issue, at which time the proposal did not receive enough yes votes to pass.

Tracy made the proposal into a motion, which Chris seconded.

Tom said he would like more information on the differences between GP-US and GPUSA, and more information on how GP-US is run. For example, is it true that we currently have no voice in GP-US business? If we affiliate, but are unable to send a delegate to national meetings, do we not get to vote?

Heather explained that a lot of GP-US work is done electronically. National meetings are, however, held in person. She isn't sure what happens if we can't send a person physically to those meetings.

Michael asked whether there are states with a Green presence that are not affiliated with GP-US? If yes, then why aren't these affiliated? Peter replied that less than 6 states with a Green presence are not affiliated with GP-US.

Michael said that a big problem that many people have with GP-US is that individual members are not represented, only state parties. So GP-US is not as grassroots as GPUSA. Peter pointed out that representative democracy is still democracy. As for individual membership vs. membership in a local or state party, this has caused confusion and problems here in Indiana, where someone may be a member of a local but not of the state party. He suggested that IGP should, in the future, consider making everyone who is a member of a local automatically a state member.

Skywolf spoke strongly in favor of affiliation. He said it would help us in organizing and communicating with other Green groups. Indiana needs to have a voice in national Green policy-making.

The question was called, and the motion passed by consensus. The Congress thereby charged the CC with affiliating the IGP with the Green Party of the US.

Proposal 8: Formation of Caucuses (Tracy)

Proposal - The Indiana Green Party should form caucuses to better outreach to those who currently are not present at large amounts of meeting. The duties of each caucus would be guided by the 10 key principles. Furthermore, a committee comprised of an odd number of people should be formed to look into specific caucuses that should be created.

Tracy said she proposed the formation of caucuses primarily to reach out to people of color.

There was some discussion of what the word caucus actually means. Tracy interpreted it to mean a group of people who come together for a specific purpose. Tom and Isabel thought that a caucus was a special interest group within a political party. Tom suggested changing the word "caucus" to "working group."

Skywolf said that, based on his involvement with the American Indiana movement, he knows that when you try to reach out to other races, they are very suspicious at first. Tracy agreed and said that, for example, we would have to have black Greens to recruit more black Greens.

Heather suggested a directive to the CC to make recruitment of people of color a priority in the coming year. Michael suggested a more specific charge to the CC, spelling out how caucuses would be formed. For example, based on the efforts of an outreach working group, a caucus would be formed when we get X number of people of color.

Tracy made a motion that the IGP CC should undertake the process of forming caucuses if enough interest exists. This was a "first draft" of the wording, which Tracy said was open to revision.

Heather and Isabel asked whether the main goal of the proposal wasn't to increase minority recruitment. Tom pointed out that most recruitment is done at the local level.

Tracy revised her motion - The IGP CC should foster the recruitment and retention of minorities in the party. Heather offered a friendly amendment: the IGP CC should encourage locals to foster the recruitment and retention of minorities in the party.

Chris pointed out that this motion is already covered in the bylaws, in section 3.1.1, which calls for affirmative action. Heather said the motion is still important, as it is turning the political practice into a directive for action. Peter offered another friendly amendment - change "minorities" to "historically underrepresented groups." Heather seconds the amendment.

The following objections were raised regarding the twice amended motion. Jenett said that she's against singling out people based on race, gender, or ethnicity, so she's opposed to this motion. Michael said he didn't think the motion went far enough, and that we should make a more clear directive, with specific actions that the CC shall take.

A vote was taken on the motion: The IGP CC should encourage locals to foster the recruitment and retention of historically underrepresented groups in the party.

- Yes - 17
- No - 2
- Abstain - 4

The motion passed.

Julie Roberts, Green Party candidate for Monroe County Council, showed up and became a member of IGP. She delegated her vote to Isabel. At this point, we had a quorum again. Heather made a motion to make official all the business done while we didn't have a quorum. Isabel offered to read the decisions made up to this point to Julie, but Julie declined. Heather's motion was passed by consensus.

Proposal 9: Establish 1-800-VOTE-GREEN (Tracy)

Proposal - The Indiana Green Party should establish a free "800 number" for people to call. There is not a way for people to contact the party for media releases, campaign information, etc. If the group decides not to establish an "800 number," we still need some number (a voice mail) where IGP can be reached.

Heather proposed to let the CC deal with this question. The group agreed by consensus to send this issue to the CC.

Proposal 10: The Location of IGP (Tracy)

Proposal - The Indiana Green Party should be located in the state's capital of Indianapolis, IN. All bank accounts, voice mails or other IGP material should be located in Indianapolis, IN also. This does not effect where members of the coordinating committee can come from. For example, in some political parties, treasurers live far away, but there is someone in the city of Indianapolis to sign checks should we need them.

Tracy said she proposed this because she felt that, as a state party, we should be headquartered in the state capital.

Peter chimed in on several aspects of this question. In a way, the Idea of where the party is located is moot, since we have no office. A bank account doesn't live in a particularly city, but at a particular bank, and banks have branches. Voice mail, on the other hand, would need some sort of location (area code). A PO box must be located where 1 or preferably 2 members of the CC are located.

Heather said we should leave this question up to the CC, letting the people who have to deal with the PO box, bank account, etc. decide.

Tom pointed out that Bank One does have branches in most Indiana cities. 800-numbers could be routed to any number, and voice mail messages could be accessed from anywhere. The PO box is the only thing which is really location-bound.

Chris underlined the need for consistency. If we keep changing the PO box location, it's a hassle. The PO box should not move around every year. Tracy said that for political reasons, the PO box should be in Indy. Philip asked Tracy whether she felt that she could open and check regularly a PO box in Indianapolis. Tracy said that yes, she would be willing to do that.

Peter asked the group to consider the suggestion that this should be left up to the CC.

Julie said that, from a reprinting standpoint, it's best to be consistent with PO box. Although she also recognized that there may be a delay if the person who checks the PO box is not the treasurer or other CC member. Heather said that, due to treasurer reporting requirements, we need a quick turnaround time for financial documents/payments to get to the treasurer. These deadlines come at several times during the year.

Peter made a motion to leave this issue up to the CC. This motion was approved by consensus.

Peter proposed a revision of the agenda to have candidate and coordinator speeches now. There were no objections.

VI. Candidate Speeches

Julie Roberts gave a speech reviewing her local race for Monroe County Council, including lessons learned and the amount of work involved.

Peter Drake, who is not a candidate for office, asked whether he could give a short speech he had prepared. There were no objections. His speech looked back at the last year on the international, national, and state levels and served as a rallying call for Greens to continue to fight for the Ten Key Values.

VII. Report of the Platform Committee

Peter handed out copies of the report. Peter called for volunteers to continue the work of this committee. Tom, Tracy, Bethany and Skywolf volunteered. Tracy volunteered to take ownership of the Yahoo group for discussion of the platform from Peter, who, along with Heather, will be leaving the state in a few weeks.

VIII. Nominations for IGP Representatives to Other Groups

1. ICFEL

Indiana Coalition for Fair Election Laws, meets the 3rd Sat. of each month

Skywolf volunteered, but said he won't be able to make all meetings. There were no objections.

2. Common Bonds

coalition of progressive, leftist organizations, predominantly in the Indy area. Supports living wage campaign, take back the Earth day, NORML.

Skywolf volunteered to continue as the rep. He is also the rep from NORML.. There were no objections.

IX. Nominations for IGP Officers

- 1. Secretary: No nominees
- 2. Treasurer: Maureen nominated herself
- 3. Co-Coordiators: Peter nominated Chris

In view of the fact that we did not have enough nominees to fill all positions, Heather suggested that we need to rethink

what officers we really need, and what we can do when there are not enough nominees. Someone suggested a Round Robin, meaning we would go around the room and hear from everyone present what they think about the situation.

Peter: The main goal of the state party at this point should be to encourage and organize the locals. The IGP can be a rather thin entity, just a contact point for Greens statewide. We can just go with the two officers for now, and then hold a special congress if someone else expresses interest in serving as an officer.

Tracy: Holding a special congress is a big hassle. She personally wants to focus on the local level now and therefore does not want to continue as co-coordinator.

Maureen: She suggested putting on the web site that the two offices are open, and hope that someone expresses interest in filling them soon.

Pam: She said feels she's too new to be an officer, and she wants to focus on the local level. Maybe after November she would have more time and experience to consider being an officer.

Bethany: Feels she can make the best contribution to IGP by being on the platform committee. She is also busy with local work as co-coordinator of the Marion County Greens.

Skywolf: We should hold a special congress after the election to try to fill the other positions. He asked whether Tracy would hold on to the co-coordinator position until early December? Or someone could be acting co-coordinator for a while.

Chris: We should have discussed this earlier during this Congress, since a 2-person CC won't be able to do much of the work that the Congress has directed it to do. He will not be able to take on secretary role in addition to co-coordinator.

Tom: Also said needs to help his local.

At this point Tracy responded to Skywolf, saying that she might be able to stay on until Oct. 31, but we would have to actively recruit a new female co-coordinator to replace her soon.

Isabel: Said she needs to focus on the local level, on Julie's race, and on her own possible race for City Council next year.

Julie: Said the grassroots need to be nurtured, we don't want to squish all the energy out of local activists, because they should use their energy to preserve and build the locals.

Heather: This may be time to have a semi-dormant year for IGP, just having a contact person for new members, keep up the website, and collect dues. Its main function would be to facilitate communications between locals. That's how the state party can help the locals without spending much time and resources. We don't need the CC to have monthly meetings. We must nurture the locals.

The Round Robin ended, and Tracy pointed out that eventually, we will want to run a statewide candidate, so we will need to assemble as a statewide group for fundraising and coordinating a campaign. Heather said that strong locals will make it easier to run statewide candidates.

Maureen said that she thinks she and Chris can do an adequate job to network with the locals. Bethany said she is pleased that we have two volunteers to be officers - we could have none!

At this point, Pam said would be willing to be female co-coordinator. The group was very happy with this announcement.

Maureen was optimistic about the IGP's future, saying that there are a lot of dissatisfied voters out there that we could tap. On the practical side, Heather said the CC could meet when they need to, else just stay in contact via email or phone. She pointed out that visiting locals is often more valuable than just holding an isolated meeting.

THE VOTE:

Peter reminded everyone that there is a "none of the above" option for each office. Paper ballots were cast for the offices of male co-coordinator, female co-coordinator, and treasurer.

The results of the vote were as follows:

1) treasurer

- Maureen-23
- None of the above-0
- Abstain-1

2) male co-coordinator

- Chris-23
- None of the above-0
- Abstain-1

3) female co-coordinator

- Pam-23
- None of the above-0
- Abstain-1

All 3 nominees were elected.

Maureen gave a brief speech rallying the troops. Skywolf and Chris thanked the past coordinators. Chris especially thanked the Drakes. Tracy made a brief speech saying it's been quite an experience to be co-coordinator for 2001-02!

X. Reports from Locals

A. Monroe County - Heather

1. Work on the next edition of the quarterly newsletter continues.
2. The local is still hosting quarterly forums, although the grassroots democracy forum was pushed back 3 months.
3. Work on the campaigns of Jeff Melton and Julie Roberts.
4. The shadow govt. program is not as active as it used to be. People don't have time to attend local govt meetings.
5. A possible planning retreat is being considered for Sept.

B. Marion County - Bethany

1. The local has chosen three issues to focus on:
 - a. healthcare
 - b. public transportation
 - c. civic participation taught in schools
2. They are looking at candidates for city or county council in coming year.
3. A fundraiser is planned for Sept.

4. There are approx. 10 active members

C. Brown County - Pam

1. The local just started in March, when they had 2 meetings.

2. There are 18 members, 2 supporters.

3. They are running a candidate for county commissioner, Timothy Baer. The process of endorsing the candidate almost tore the local apart. He's somewhat controversial, and some thought it was just too early to run someone.

4. They will have a booth at the county fair.

5. They have also started a shadow government program.

6. The local has already faced criticism from Democrats and Republicans, which shows their perceived strength.

7. They are planning a social event to get to know each other.

D. St. Joseph County - Tom

1. Their focus is on democracy and the environment.

2. Tom has committed to getting the website updated.

3. Issue of combined sewer/water overflow (CSO) is a hot topic locally. The local is trying to get a party member who's an expert to get more involved to try to do something about this problem.

4. They have plans to work with IKE, Improving Kids' Environment.

5. Education issues

- a. Layoffs of elementary school music teachers.
- b. One of the high schools was recently closed, which is actually one of the newest school buildings. This has raised public uproar, esp. because of anti-segregation busing that is now taking place.

A coalition has formed between folks upset about these 2 education-related issues, and Tom is keeping the GP involved.

6. Notre Dame greens - only a couple of students, who are attending the St. Joe Valley local meetings.

7. They are working to encourage increased parental involvement in middle schools.

8. They have between 3-10 active members, and almost 300 "lurkers" on their email list.

The Congress adjourned at 6:15 pm.

Secretary's note: Chris and I thought that he was a member of IGP before the Congress. Nobody realized until the next day that he was actually not a member. He signed the form to become a member on July 28, 2002. I apologize profusely for this oversight.

Minutes submitted by Isabel Piedmont, outgoing IGP Secretary, on July 28, 2002.
