

**Unsolicited Email Blasts Sent to Green Party of the United States
Delegates, Rank-and-File Greens,
and/or GPUS Diversity Committee Members**

The following unsolicited spam email messages were sent from the Dialogue Not Expulsion group and the Emergency Committee to Save the Green Party for the purposes of influencing National Committee delegates and other Greens regarding proposal 1062—the vote to disaffiliate the Georgia Green Party from GPUS for GAGP’s violations of GPUS accreditation requirements—and to solicit donations for the Gender Critical Greens federal PAC, which organizes against GPUS.

**Dialogue Not Expulsion Email Blast to GPUS Diversity Committee
Members, with Diversity Committee Statement on DNE Appended**

Dialogue Not Expulsion Caucus ≥ Friday, October 9,
2020 12:25 AM

Dear member of the Diversity Committee,

On October 7th, the Dialogue Not Expulsion Caucus ratified by consensus the attached statement. The DNE Caucus grew from a [statement](#) which has collected the signatures of 265 Greens and Green Party supporters, from 38 U.S. states and seven other nations. Many signers of this statement have joined our caucus to work on an ongoing basis to encourage our party's commitment to "decentralization, grassroots democracy, and a united Green Party . . . (believing that t)he political principles that unite us remain far more important than the questions where we clash, significant as those questions might be."

The October 7th statement was crafted to respond to one adopted at the August 2020 meeting of the Diversity Committee, and published to the NC-Affairs list by Anita Rios, co-chair of the Diversity Committee, on September 25th.

The Diversity Committee statement itself responded "to the Georgia Green Party's affirmation of the Declaration on Women's Sex-Based Rights".

You can read the statement by the Dialogue Not Expulsion Caucus at:
http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/documents/DNE_Responds_to_Diversity_Cmte_Statement

For your convenience a pdf version of our statement is available at the above link as well as attached to this email.

In solidarity and on behalf of the Dialogue Not Expulsion Caucus,
Kerri Bruss - WI
Paula Bradshaw -IL

Ann Menasche -CA

Tekla Lewin - OH
Thistle Pettersen -WI

Hugh Esco - GA

Members of the Administrative Committee for the DNE Caucus

Diversity Committee statement on DNE:

The statement below was approved by the Diversity Committee at our August 2020 meeting. We regret that we did not release it sooner. None the less, we want to be absolutely clear that we stand firmly with our transgender sisters and brothers just as we support the efforts of all women and men, and gender non binary people, as we all seek equity, security, fulfillment, and joy .

Please share widely.

In service,

Anita Rios, Diversity Committee co-chair

The Diversity Committee of the Green Party of the United States offers the following statement in response to the Georgia Green Party's affirmation of the "Declaration on

Women's Sex- Based Rights:

1) We find this declaration adds to the oppression of transgendered individuals and, as such, is inconsistent with Green values.

2) All women deserve dignity and respect and the right to govern their own bodies and lives with equity and justice in our nation and the world.

The Green Party of the United States has affirmed in our platform that trans women are women, trans men are men, and all children deserve the opportunity to live and grow in the world into their own self-determined place and presence regardless of gender identity or sexual orientation. Discrimination and oppression based upon a person's gender are inappropriate in all circumstances and every person should be conscious of the oppression and lived experiences of all women, whether identified female at birth or later in life.

The Diversity Committee affirms the rights of all individuals to self-identify and live out their identities without restrictions: neither social, legislative, nor cultural. We also call for an examination of social norms that demean women and femininity, or that marginalize those who do not fit or choose to accept socially constructed gender norms or expectations.

We oppose state parties or caucuses taking stances that violate Green Party standards. These principles should provide the guidance for how we continue to engage each other on these and other issues that may come in the future. We have the opportunity to lead in a world where clear leadership is needed through education and positive discussion that will lead to affirmations that the entire party can stand behind.

Reference:

[1] Declaration on Women's Sex-Based Rights www.womensdeclaration.com

Emergency Committee to Save the Green Party Unsolicited Email Blast #1

David M. Keil
<dmkeil@savethegreenparty.org>
Wed, Jul 21, 2:28 PM

In the context of the ongoing vote on #1062, I thought it important that members of the National Committee understand the censorious actions being taken in our names by the Forum Managers. It is my assessment that their intent is to silence dissent on questions being discussed before this deliberative body which no longer seems a very welcoming place for deliberation. List moderation is intended to be used to enforce civil decorum among our colleagues on this body. We may have differences of opinion about whether the posts which led to my being placed on moderation rose to the level of violations of list decorum. But I thought it important that you be provided. I have made since then are themselves violations of list decorum rules and were suitably rejected; or properly belong in our discussions on the list related to party business and

were improperly censored by the List Managers.

The List Moderation team works for the national committee. It is left to each one of us to hold them accountable for their actions.

For today, I will share only these two sample posts I made which have not been seen on the listserve, one from yesterday.

DAVID KEIL

Emergency Committee to Save the Green Party Unsolicited Email Blast #2

Rich Whitney

[<rich.whitney@savethegreenparty.org>](mailto:rich.whitney@savethegreenparty.org)

Wed, Jul 21, 3:15 PM

After over a quarter century in the Green Party, and after serving as candidates who won over half a million votes for the Green Party in Illinois, my wife Paula and I recently resigned from the party. We did so in response to the national party leadership's undemocratic conduct in seeking to expel the Georgia Green Party, including suppression of speech critical of the proposal. We have documented this in our detailed resignation letter, a copy of which is attached and may be found at the foregoing link.

I suspect that many Greens have been led to believe that, since the proposal came from the Lavender Caucus, in the name of defending trans rights, they should take it at face value that disaffiliation of the GAGP is probably necessary, lest the party be branded as transphobic or insufficiently resolute on the question of trans rights. Indeed, that was my initial reaction - but it isn't correct. Neither the GAGP nor any of those opposing disaffiliation, to my knowledge,

opposes the rights of any adult to express themselves as they wish, identify with the sex or gender of their choice, change their names or preferred pronouns, modify their body as they choose -- and to do so without being subject to oppression or discrimination in employment, housing, etc.

That is not the issue. The issues are many. They include the definition of who is or is not "trans" in the first place, whether mere "self-identity" as female is sufficient to allow biological males into women's spaces, and what are the consequences of doing so for women and society at large.

Just days ago, it was reported that the Central California Women's Facility, a women's prison, has just begun providing condoms and new pregnancy resources in their medical facility, as males who self-identify as women, including violent sex offenders, are now being transferred to the prison, even if they are not undergoing medical

transition and still have functioning penises -a tacit admission by officials that women inmates will now have to just accept rape and the threat of rape as a condition of incarceration. Some women have already been assaulted. Now if you think that this is an acceptable level of collateral damage for supporting trans rights, then there is probably nothing else I can tell you that would cause you to change your mind. However, if you are troubled by this, then you would have to admit that the question cannot be settled by a simple rigid declaration that "trans women are women, end of discussion," which seems to be the position to which many Greens are clinging.

The issues include whether society should permit the use of puberty blockers, hormones and major, permanent body-altering surgeries on minors who self-identify as trans, in the light of a growing body of evidence showing that it is not medically advisable. Yet Big Pharma and the medical-industrial complex have strong financial incentives to ignore or cherry-pick the data and promote such policies anyway, and now Washington and Oregon allow children to obtain such treatments without parental consent. In its proposal, the Lavender Caucus takes the position that the matter is settled and that trans rights necessarily include the "rights" of minors to make such decisions, thus aligning itself with Big Pharma and profiteering doctors rather than following the science.

The issues include whether the Green Party should be seen as aligning itself with the "cancel culture" tactics employed by some trans-activists, who believe that threats and acts of violence, suppression of speech, retaliatory loss of employment and other severe acts are all acceptable measures to use against those who disagree with them.

The issues include whether disaffiliation of a state party for "violating" the national platform or taking a position on a policy issue is even authorized by the national party's rules and procedures.

In sum, the issues are complex and require serious research, study, careful consideration and deliberation - not knee-jerk reactions, posturing, sloganeering -- or expulsion of an entire state party for taking a position on policy matters that, flawed or not, reflects its own careful consideration.

Finally, the issues include the larger issue of whether the Green Party of the U.S. will even allow a fair and unhindered internal debate on the policy issues described here. Our experience told us that it would not, which drove our decision to resign. Thus, the upcoming vote is no longer just a vote on whether to disaccredit the GAGP. In light of the compelling arguments against expulsion advanced by Ann Menasche, Jeff Sutter and others (including by video depositions), I think it has become a referendum on whether the party will be true to its principles, including

grassroots democracy and feminism, or whether it has elevated ruling-class dogma over principles, science and logic and its own internal rules.

Of course, Paula and I have already concluded that the latter has occurred, but I would love to be proven wrong. A vote to reject the expulsion of the GAGP would cause us to reassess.

Please consider the matter carefully

before voting. Respectfully,
Rich Whitney

You may unsubscribe from this list.
Or opt out of all emails sent by the Gender Critical Greens PAC.

The work of the Emergency Committee
to Save the Green Party is supported by the GCG-PAC.

We urge you support our work with a financial contribution to:

Gender Critical
Greens PAC
Thistle Pettersen,
Treasurer
P.O. Box 465
Madison, WI
53701-0465
United States
FEC # C00771618

Emergency Committee to Save the Green Party Unsolicited Email Blast #3

David M. Keil

dmkeil@savethegreenparty.org Jul

22, 2021, 2:07 PM

This is my second installment in this series.

In the context of the ongoing vote on #1062, I thought it again important that members of the National Committee understand the censorious actions being taken in our names by the ForumManagers. It is my assessment that their intent is to silence dissent on questions being discussed before this deliberative body which no longer seems a very welcoming place for deliberation.

List moderation is intended to be used to enforce civil decorum among our colleagues on this body. Whether the posts which led to my being placed on moderation rose to the level of violations of list decorum, moderation status is no excuse for censorship. I thought it important that you be provided I have made since then are themselves violations of list decorum rules and were suitably rejected; or instead properly belong in our discussions on the list related to party business and were improperly censored by the List Managers.

The List Moderation team works for the national committee. It is left to each one of us to hold them accountable for their actions.

For today, I will share only these two sample posts I made which have not been seen on the list serve, the first one from Sunday. Makes me wonder why this might be branded as a violation of decorum, while the dehumanizing language of calling fellow Greens 'trash' would not be.

From: DAVID KEIL <dmkeil@gmail.com>

Date: Sun, Jul 18, 2021 at 7:07 PM

Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] WIGP endorses Yes on 1062

To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work
<natcomvotes@green.gpus.org>

A delegate's call to "vote to take out the trash next week" will be part of the record for all time. As will the call for a purge of the state parties: "finally, the Green Party is no longer a safe space for anti-trans bigotry."

The harm done by calling activists "trash" will not be to those activists, but to the reputation of this party as a source for inspiration in grassroots democracy.

David
Keil
Delegate,
GRP(MA)

and another from

last Friday:

From:

DAVID KEIL

Date: Fri, Jul

16, 3:56 PM To:

National

Subject: Re: [usgp-dx] The "Emergency Committee to 'save' the Green Party"

This is in reply to Del. Kidney. The mission statement of the Emergency Committee to Save the Green Party is as follows:

"We stand for building a transparent party which respects grassroots democracy and due process. Accordingly, we will challenge autocratic decision making and kangaroo-court proceedings and a cancel culture that is destructive to democracy, open dialogue, diversity of thought, class solidarity and the Left. We will work to prevent purges of state parties and individual members for ideological offenses. We will help to build the Green Party through fellowship, respect for truth, hard work, and our adherence to the ten key values on which it was founded."
(https://savethegreenparty.org/about/mission_of_the_emergency_committee_to_save)

The Emergency Committee has more women members than men and advocates for the rights of women as well as gender-nonconforming and trans-identified people. It currently has no budget and operates with volunteer labor.

Jeff Sutter and Hugh Esco should be invited to reply to Del. Kidney's comments. Among those women who have contributed to the Emergency Committee's work

are Ann Menasche, counsel for the Green Party of Georgia, Kerri Bruss of WI, and Paula Bradshaw of IL, whose voices should be heard.

David
Keil
Delegate,
GRP(MA)

Again I pose this question to you, do either of these somehow violate our expectations for decorum on our list serve? Please write and let me know what you think.

You may find from this list.
Or of all emails sent by the Gender Critical Greens PAC.

The work of the Emergency Committee
to Save the Green Party is supported by the GCG-PAC.

We urge you support our work with a financial contribution to:

[PAC](#) Thistle
Petterson,
Treasurer
P.O. Box 465
Madison, WI
53701-0465
United States

[C00771618](#)

Emergency Committee to Save the Green Party Unsolicited Email Blast #4

Tykisha Murphy

<tykisha.murphy@savethegreenparty.org> Jul 22,
2021, 8:51 PM

I am writing today to address my personal experience with the behavior and culture the Green Party has signed on to in the last several months. I have been working with and participating in Green Party activities for about a year now, and I am increasingly becoming disgusted with platforms and conversations regarding the Green Party of Georgia. The rumor is has been the basis of all information exchanged in the Texas party regarding the Georgia Green Party. Well I needed to know what the reality is, the factual parts. Once I took responsibility for doing my own research, all the information I have been easily able to access tells me the U.S. Green Party as a **whole** is in trouble.

The Green Party in my view is increasingly becoming a driving force, as a threat to the practice of democracy within its ranks, in the oppression of women, in an accelerating backlash to our rights as women. To even bully anyone that stands up to protect women, the female half of the human inhabitants of our planet, is insane and misogynistic. We already have the Democratic and Republican parties; we certainly do not need to build a new party for that.

Advocating for women's rights **oppresses no-one**, it doesn't rob rights from anyone, and it is not the advocacy of sameness either. Males and females are distinctly different. We live on the same planet together, but definitely not equally. I have to wonder what the end game is here and who is really benefiting? And only a year after being inspired by Green rhetoric, I find myself

really questioning this exhibition revealing to me in its observed behavior, the actual values of the Green Party.

I have personally had to stand up against the abuse I have witnessed. I have seen female party members voicing their concerns on issues only to face vicious attacks from those who claim they are **green** and fighting against **oppression**. I have witnessed rumors passed off as if facts, name calling passing for debate, and insidious practices within caucuses stemming from this issue of protecting **women's rights**. But **men** in the Green Party ain't got no problems. They benefit either way. This is seriously affecting the party's membership, current and prospective. I have personal knowledge of this. Although active with the Texas Green Party for only a year, I already have been engaging potential candidates including sitting office holders looking to me for guidance on changing their affiliations to the Green Party from the parties they currently participate in. They are waiting on the word from me. But what I have experienced around the issues being raised by the Lavender Caucus complaint

against the Georgia party has me questioning my own participation; has left me shy about closing the deal on these candidate recruitment conversations which have been underway for months.

Among what I found inspiring about the rhetoric and values of this party was its commitment to feminism. This is how Merriam-Webster defines the term:

feminism: belief in and advocacy of the political, economic, and social equality of the sexes expressed especially through organized activity on behalf of women's rights and interests

The Georgia Green Party platform amendment (attached), at the heart of this controversy failed to address the question of impoverished women's bodies being solicited for reproduction by wealthy people. The Declaration on Women's Sex-Based Rights (also attached), however, does. Now a member of our party, who is unlikely to ever be able to afford the quarter million dollars necessary to access commercial surrogacy for herself, has taken up the cause, advocating that women's bodies in the Global South or from the poor side of town in our own country ought to be commodified as birth vessels for the benefit of those who can afford it. She is using her problematic position on surrogacy to advocate that the Georgia Green Party be expelled from our national party.

As a former labor and delivery nurse, I know what women risk when they bring forth new life in this world. I participated in the care of a 16 year old, who intended all along to give her child up for adoption. It was a harrowing experience for all those involved. While her medical team survived the experience, this young mother did not. None of us will soon forget what happened. Her medical and psychological care became secondary to producing a healthy child for adoption, despite my every effort to make her the center of her own medical treatment.

I want and need a political home for myself, my community, for these prospective Green Party candidates I have been communicating with and for the next pregnant 16 year old who was underserved in my community. But this party seems to have forgotten the values which brought me into its ranks. And this has left me concerned if I am ready to ask my candidates to take this step and join me in a Green Party which seems to have lost its way so soon after I found my way into this conversation.

Please read this as my appeal that you support the Georgia Green Party; and for every woman in the party who remain feminists, who understand that feminism is for women, and understands

that feminists need a vehicle for our political independence. This is my appeal that each and every member of the National Committee cast a NO vote on #1062.

s/ Tykisha Murphy
member, Texas
Green Party former
labor and delivery
nurse and health care

technician

You may from this list.

Or of all emails sent by the Gender Critical Greens PAC.

The work of the Emergency Committee to Save the Green Party is supported by the GCG-PAC.

We urge you support our work with a financial contribution to:

[PAC](#) Thistle
Pettersen,
Treasurer
P.O. Box 465
Madison, WI
53701-0465
United States
[C00771618](#)

Emergency Committee to Save the Green Party Unsolicited Email Blast #5

Teri Ulm

[<teri.ulm@savethegreenparty.org>](mailto:teri.ulm@savethegreenparty.org)

>Jul 23, 2021, 2:43 PM

My name is Teri Ulm. I'm the outgoing Interim Chair of the Indiana Green Party (INGP) for 2020-2021, former Chair of the Circle City Greens 2018, and current member of the [Indiana Green Party](#), the and the National Women's Caucus.

I write to share my report of the autocratic actions of the Indiana Green Party. Our allies in the Emergency Committee to Save the Green Party say our situation is not unique; that apparently similar shenanigans have been reported in as many as nine state parties, where dissent on these issues has surfaced. This list includes multiple states with large enough delegate counts to meaningfully reflect the diversity of views on the underlying issues at the heart of this controversy. I assure you that two YES votes from Indiana on GNC #1062 misrepresent the opinions of Indiana Green party's membership which were evenly divided when we actually discussed the matter and took a vote on the question several months ago.

Dissent has been silenced in both our state and national parties which each tell us that they oppose silencing dissent. The Minority Report linked below recounts some piece of the history we are busy writing of the destruction of our party. My own report, attached, provides another chapter to this volume. But for the rest of the story it is important that we listen to the many other voices being silenced within our ranks.

As Greens we all care about the environment, democracy, diversity, feminism, social justice, and so much more. However, the mutually recognized need to lift up oppressed voices has backfired in the case presented in #1062. It has backfired because the oppressed don't know where their dogmatic ideology ends and the thoughts and convictions for the rest of us begin. We all want a party which hears the oppressed, lifts us up, and ensures we each have a place in society. But compelled thought and speech is itself oppressive and anathema to Green values.

It seems redundant to have to reiterate, as Jeff Sutter did in the [Minority Report](#), that "Greens are all united by our support for trans folk to be able to do and be the way they want & not to be mistreated for their gender non-conformity or self-presentation. Indeed, all people should be free to dress and express themselves as they wish without discrimination, stigma, or violence.

Members of the Georgia party believe this just as other Greens do. The disagreement that led to the LC's complaint therefore has nothing to do with actual bigotry or prejudice on the part of Georgia."

Autocratic Behavior of incoming leadership in the Indiana Green Party

On June 26, 2021, I chaired the Indiana Green Party's Annual Congress and officiated the election. ([INGP Congress 2021](#)). While seasoned Greens in the state of Indiana were focused on filing a ballot access lawsuit with Oliver Hall from the Center for Competitive Democracy, identifying and vetting candidates, Greens new to our party were actively campaigning to unseat any Green that failed to support without question their own narrow ideology already demonstrated to be highly controversial within the Indiana party. The election went as the new Greens had planned, with a healthy dose of ad hominem attacks by the new candidates and their allies leveled against the incumbent. It was nothing unusual. Just the by now expected tactic of tagging, without evidence, Jeff Sutter as a transphobe; much like we have seen deployed against the Georgia Green Party in the run-up to #1062. Such extremists have been doing exactly this for years now, to their feminist targets and to the pro-feminist men who stand up against such abuse.

These people did not know Jeff, nor his history of activism for human rights and against homophobic discrimination and violence. Jeff's crimes? (1) standing up for the rights of women in the world (Jeff was a member of RAVEN, Rape and Violence End Now, an early pro-feminist batterers intervention program, and to this day is employed by an organization challenging male violence against women); and (2) exposing violations of basic due process in the Accreditation Committee (the Minority Report), were all the evidence the ideologues needed.

They claimed their seats and started ruling with an authoritarian style, purging and silencing dissenting opinions within our ranks from their legitimately held leadership roles in our state party. Most significant to the current vote on #1062, the newly elected INGP leaders put a muzzle on Jeff Sutter, author of the Minority Report on #1062, because they all share that controversial and narrow gender ideology, supported by cancel culture tactics. This is in direct violation of the key values: Respect for Diversity and Democracy.

I outline the entire chain of events in my report on the autocratic behavior of the incoming leadership. You are urged to read the full details in my report, attached, *by browsing to [the html](#) or by downloading it as [a pdf](#).*

Conclusion & Plea

The Green Party's values are being cast aside. Voices we support are demanding we adopt their ideology without debate. Where is the line? The rejection of political pluralism, or recognition and affirmation of diversity within a political body, is authoritarianism. A vote yes or no on GNC #1062 will determine if the Green Party respects the diversity of thought within its ranks. A vote yes or no will determine if the Green Party is an authoritarian party, or is willing to respect its own values for democracy, feminism and respecting diversity.

Silencing of dissent is happening all around us. Why is it so many people (unless it is their voice) seem to be fine with this? Voices in the Green Party which once sought to build consensus among its diverse membership are being silenced by sectarianism. To say that there is no debate as the national Lavender Caucus and (Dis)accreditation Committee have is not grounded in reality. No one is debating the existence of anyone. But a political party must be able to debate the implications for the rights of women of the policy demands being made by gender ideologists. It would be irresponsible of us not to do so. These very same issues are being debated around the world. Surely, there must be room for such debate here in the democracy-valuing Green Party. Let's #OpenTheDebates and #FreeAssangeNOW.

For all of the reasons set out above, and many more, your vote on whether or not to disaccredit the Georgia Green Party will resonate. As a woman, an Army veteran, a mother of a disabled child, a step-mother of a trans-child, a veteran member of the Green Party, I humbly request that each of you take time and really consider all the evidence submitted before you. I also request that you think about the consequences of your vote. A vote to purge the Georgia Green Party is a vote against our own self-professed values, starting with decentralization, feminism, and democracy.

Please Vote No on

proposal #1062. In

solidarity with the Ten Key

Values,

Teri Ulm
Outgoing Interim Chair
and member of the Indiana
Green Party
Former Chair, Circle City
Greens Member, National
Women's Caucus

You may from this list.
Or of all emails sent by the Gender Critical Greens PAC.

The work of the Emergency Committee
to Save the Green Party is supported by the GCG-PAC.

We urge you support our work with a financial contribution to:

[PAC](#) Thistle
Pettersen,
Treasurer
P.O. Box 465
Madison, WI
53701-0465
United States
[C00771618](#)

-

Emergency Committee to Save the Green Party Unsolicited

Email Blast #6Emergency Cmte to Save the Green Party

[<media@savethegreenparty.org>](mailto:media@savethegreenparty.org) Mon, Jul 26, 2:01 PM

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Monday, July 26th, 2021

For further information, Contact:

Ann Menasche

counsel assisting in defense of Georgia

Green Party Hugh Esco 912-571-1833 (cell, sms)

Secretary, Georgia Green Party

Georgia Expelled for Standing Up for Women's Rights

by self-proclaimed feminist political party

In voting which concluded this morning at 3am Eastern, the Green National Committee revoked the accreditation of the Georgia Green Party as a member state party of the Green Party of the United States. The final vote tally was 119 Yes, 17 No and 6 Abstain.

The vote was the result of a complaint filed by the National Lavender Caucus against

the Georgia party accusing the Georgia party of “transphobia” for a platform amendment adopted at the state party's 2020 Bonaire Convention, held on February 22d of last year. The amendment endorsed the Declaration on Women's Sex Based Rights, an international campaign that has obtained 19,078 signatures from 138 countries and 358 organizations. The Declaration supports privacy rights of women and girls to female only spaces such as changing rooms, communal showers, shelters, and jails, as well as female only programs such as sports programs, special scholarships and set-asides that aim to secure equal opportunity for the female sex. The Declaration also advocates for the protection of gender non-conforming children from experimental treatments that will likely render them sterile and cause other permanent harms.

A Minority Report from Accreditation Committee member Jeff Sutter paints his committee's upholding the Lavender Caucus complaint and referring it to the National Committee as having glossed over, "a reality that's psychologically, medically, and politically more complex" than proponents for expulsion have painted it. He found, "the positions taken by Georgia were not transphobic" and that Georgia had a "long history of empowering individuals and groups from oppressed communities."

Indeed, the Georgia Party's platform amendment endorsing the Declaration reflected an attempt to balance the conflicting rights claims of both sides:

"We believe that it is possible for responsible policy makers to weigh the conflicts between existing law and the demands of those campaigning for the legal protections of trans-identified individuals, and to find nuanced approaches which will protect the latter without gutting from the former the gains that women have made for the protection of these sex-based rights of women under the law."

Sutter also found that there were multiple authoritarian abuses of democratically agreed to rules of the national party; perhaps most significantly, a refusal, over objection to enforce the recusal rule, respect for which would have left the original motions on accepting the complaint failing for lack of a quorum. Also at play was an ongoing campaign of abuse, bullying and harassment of those holding dissenting views.

In her brief in "Defense of the Georgia Green Party to the Complaint of the Lavender Caucus", Ann Menasche, counsel assisting the Georgia Green Party in their defense, characterizes "(t)he Lavender Caucus's Complaint (as) full of misstatements of facts and half-truths, and smears based on nothing more than 'guilt by association' . . . This shameful persecution echoes the notorious methods utilized by the McCarthy witch-hunt of the mid-20th century".

"Last week's vote, built on a record of repeated due process violations, has made it clear that the members of the national committee are neither prepared to govern nor to serve as 'responsible policy makers' in a democracy," said Hugh Esco, Secretary of the Georgia Green Party and a lead sponsor of the platform amendment at the heart of the controversy. The Georgia Green Party has been supported in its defense

efforts by a broad coalition of hundreds of Greens across the nation (and around the world), many operating as a Dialogue Not Expulsion Caucus, which has given rise, as well, to a new Green Alliance for Sex-Based Rights expected to soon announce the launch of its website.

"The vote of the National Committee does not represent the views of rank-and-file members of our party," Sutter said. "This vote is the result of authoritarian actions across our party to silence dissent, to threaten and remove anyone in our party who fails to agree to a narrow and dogmatic view of transgender rights." Sutter served as a Delegate of the Indiana Green Party to the National Committee until the publication of his Minority Report at which point the incoming leadership of the Indiana party autocratically removed him, without notice, due process or consultation with the Indiana state committee, from the National Committee nearly a month before the end of his term.

Advocates for Georgia have characterized the vote as a blow to the national Party's long-held commitment to feminism. "The position of the Georgia party is far more consistent with the letter and spirit of our national party platform than is that of the Lavender Caucus which relied on a narrow misinterpretation of a single sentence in our platform," said Ms. Menasche. "We have apparently failed to conduct the political education necessary to integrate new Greens into our party's historic commitment to the liberation of women. It's heart-breaking to watch as our party is captured, as have been so many organizations on the left, by this misogynist ideology."

"We remain confident that Green voters are still prepared to rally around the independent and majoritarian politics we offer which places sanity, material reality and the long term interests of our families, our communities, our global neighbors and our planet at the heart of its work," said Esco who has spent three decades so far building the Green Party. "The Evergreening of our national party, culminating in last week's vote ended an abusive relationship, but not the

intention of the Georgia Green Party to offer the people of Georgia candidates worthy of their vote and trust."

– 30 –

For background, please pursue the following links, . . .

GaGP Platform Am HR3: Endorse the Declaration on Women's Sex Based

Rights <https://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/sites/default/files/documents/hr3>

[_endorse_dwsbr.pdf](#) Declaration on Women's Sex Based Rights

<https://www.womensdeclaration.com/documents/7/Declaration-with-logo.pdf>

GNC #1062: Disaccreditation of the Georgia Green

Party Proposal: [https://secure.gpus.org/cgi-](https://secure.gpus.org/cgi-bin/vote/propdetail?pid=1062)

[bin/vote/propdetail?pid=1062](https://secure.gpus.org/cgi-bin/vote/propdetail?pid=1062) Vote:

<https://secure.gpus.org/cgi-bin/vote/propresult?pid=1062>

Defense of the Georgia Green Party

to the Complaint of the Lavender Caucus

<https://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/sites/default/files/pleadings/nlc-vs-ggp/2021-05/Defense.GeorgiaGreenParty.20210510-v0.5.1.pdf>

Report of the Minority of the Accreditation

Committee With respect to the Committee's

referral of the Complaint of the National

Lavender Green Caucus

Seeking the Revocation of Accreditation for the Georgia Green Party

https://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/sites/default/files/pleadings/nlc-vs-ggp/2021-07/Report_of_the_Minority_of_the_Accreditation_Committee_final.pdf

Press Releases covering developments related to

Complaint of the National Lavender Caucus vs the

Georgia Green Party

<https://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/nlc-vs-gagp/prs-rls>

Green National Committee Debate Silenced

<https://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/internal-democracy-threatened/gnc-debate-silenced>

Women Silenced in Self-Proclaimed Feminist Political Party

<https://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/internal-democracy-threatened/women-silenced>

Kangaroo Court Proceedings

<https://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/internal-democracy-threatened/kangaroo-court>

Georgia Green Party

<https://georgiagreenparty.org/>

You may find this list.

Or of all emails sent by the Gender Critical Greens PAC.

The work of the Emergency Committee to Save the Green Party is supported by the GCG-PAC.

We urge you support our work with a financial contribution to:

PAC

Thistle Pettersen, Treasurer

P.O. Box 465

Madison, WI

53701-0465

United States

[C00771618](#)

Emergency Committee to Save the Green Party Unsolicited Email Blast #7

Ann Menasche

<aemenache@savethegreenparty.org>

Sunday, July 18, 2021, 8:00:21 PM

Dear _____:

Voting begins tonight on GNC #1062, "Dis-accreditation of the Georgia Green Party."

Expelling a state Party is a very serious step, especially coming at a time when the Greens had a hard election year and lost ground, and need a strong and united Green Party more than ever. Moreover, the expulsion of Georgia (and the purge of Greens from State Parties happening simultaneously) based on a political disagreement sets an extremely dangerous precedent for how we handle disagreement. Do we handle such disagreements administratively by silencing those who disagree, demonizing them, and carrying out a purge, or do we respectfully discuss, learn from each other, and even live with our differences?

And if we think it will stop with Georgia and those who agree with Georgia (or disagree but nonetheless defend their right to remain in the Green Party as do many in the DnE), *think again*. You could be next. Already, in California, a group of Greens are trying to disenfranchise my county and several others on spurious grounds

fundamentally based on political disagreement, and plan to take their grievances to the Accreditation Committee. *The poison spreads.*

The tragedy of all this is that so much more unites us than divides us. We have wars to end and a planet to save against the corporate duopoly that is threatening all of humanity. Why are we "eating our own?" And whose interests do we serve by continuing down that path?

I assume that the only way that supporters of the purge are justifying to themselves this act of utter self-destruction is that they believe their targets are *haters*, *bigots* and *fascists*, that we are *transmisic* -- a brand new word that has been thrown at us and only recently added to the UrbanDictionary, as meaning "irrational hatred of transgender people." But the targets of these ad hominem attacks are fellow Greens, many who have spent a life time building the party. The targets include the Georgia Green Party and many feminists (including myself) who were the original drafters of the much maligned documents that Georgia endorsed. These authors are mostly lesbians, by the way, (the "L" being the first letter in LGBTQIA+). Reflecting on our own lived experience, as a challenge to the oppression we experience as females and as lesbians, we crafted the Declaration on Women's Sex Based Rights and the Feminist Amendments to the Equality Act. Neither we, nor our work, nor the brave organizations which have weathered this vitriolic campaign can be so easily dismissed by any organizations which publicly professes feminism as a key value.

As directed against me --- a feminist, a gender non-conforming lesbian with deep roots in the movement to which we provided the first letter, a life long socialist, a Civil Rights lawyer and activist fighting injustice in the courts and in the streets to this day, as well as a person with a long history as a Green who has run for public office and devoted decades to building the Green Party, *such an accusation that I am transmisic is absurd.*

I decided to use my legal and political skills to assist in the defense of Georgia because this characterization of them is *absurd* as well. As I wrote in our "Defense of the Georgia Green Party', attached here for your perusal, "the Georgia Party has not only shown its commitment to the Pillars as well as the Ten Key Values, but has demonstrated in practice its exemplary commitment to justice and equality for females as a sex, to the rights of gays, lesbians and bisexuals, and to the rights of transgender and all gender non-conforming people."

Please ask yourselves honestly, do you take action against a group simply because most everyone around you is demonizing them, calling them names, accusing them of horrible things? What would you have done during the McCarthy witch-hunt? The Stalin show trials? The Dreyfus affair? Would you go along to get along? Do you just assume people accused of wrongdoing must be guilty without thinking things through for yourself? Or would you do your own research, thoroughly and with an open mind, and if need be, courageously stand up against the majority, regardless of the consequences?

All I ask is that you allow Georgia a fair chance to defend itself before you vote - a right that was denied Georgia in the Accreditation Committee - by familiarizing yourself

with the materials Georgia produced in its own defense.

Those documents are

linked below. Yours for a

Green future,

Ann Menasche

- [letter](#)
- [counsel](#)
- [Lavender Caucus](#)
- [-- Depositions](#)
 - [Domingo](#), Womens Human Rights Campaign
 - [Mason](#), pediatrician, Society for Evidence-Based Gender Medicine
 - [Kerner](#), collective member, Vancouver Rape Relief
 - [Kimberly](#), RN, Gender Dysphoria Alliance Canada
 - [Newgent](#), Trans Rational Educational Voices
 - [Watson](#), a detransitioning woman
- [Caucus](#)
- [Brief](#)
 - Appendix A. [Sex Rights](#)
 - Appendix B. [Rights](#)
 - Appendix C. [GaGP Platform Am HR4: Endorse the FIST Amendments to the Equality Act](#)
 - Appendix D. [Act](#)
 - Appendix E. [Georgia Party Responds to Invitation from Lavender Caucus, April 2020](#)
 - Appendix F. [Georgia Party Responds to Lavender Caucus Complaint Seeking to Georgia Party](#)
 - Appendix G. [Complaint Georgia Party](#)
 - Appendix H. [Ann Menasche Responds to Lavender Caucus Complaint Seeking Georgia Party](#)
 - Appendix I. [Complaint](#)
 - Appendix J. [Declaration](#)
 - Appendix K. [Rich Whitney, Chairman, Illinois Green Party Supports Open Discussion](#)
 - Appendix L. [Guilt by Association as a Tool of Reaction: MEs Hit Piece against Feminists](#)
 - Appendix M. [homophobic](#)

You may [_](#) from this list.

Or [_](#) of all emails sent by the Gender Critical Greens PAC.

The work of the Emergency Committee to Save the Green Party is supported by the GCG-PAC.

We urge you support our work with a financial contribution to:

[PAC](#)

Thistle Pettersen, Treasurer

P.O. Box 465

Madison, WI

53701-0465

United States

[C00771618](#)

-

Emergency Committee to Save the Green Party Unsolicited Email Blast #8

Aimee Smith

aimee.l.smith@savethegreenparty.org>Fri,

Jul 23, 2021 at 8:02 PM

Below is my reply and challenge to Allan Hunter for his determination that he has the right to claim another person's motives and then worse, take it out on an entire state party in an act of collective punishment. I hope you will consider my arguments.

I have faced similar judgemental entitlement from someone in my local county council, although to her credit, she stops short of agreeing that her rock solid faith in her ability to read minds and determine other people's motives should result in disaffiliating the GA GP. She never seemed concerned about the mistreatment I have received from many people in the Green Party for having traditional Catholic views, such as at the hands of Dario Hunter who I invited to give a presentation to our local and her own husband. Sadly, I don't think she has a problem with it. I resigned actually because of this kind of failure of any effort to be genuinely inclusive.

My local is located in a state with a sizable Latino community, the majority of which is Catholic. Catholics think about sexuality and gender differently than typical animal rights, eco-socialist, anarchist or climate activists, but are they not capable of sharing a democracy and treating others - even those who have different views - with respect? Isn't this what respect for diversity requires of us? If they share our Green values, should they not be recruited into our party that we think is fit for being trusted to govern over all of society justly?

I expect I will face the methods of the politics of destruction for outing myself as having traditional Catholic beliefs. I have always had them, I just focused on the issues that I did agree with and defended people's rights to have views I do not share, such as by wearing a headscarf for more than 7 years in the wake of 9/11 to counter

anti-Muslim intolerance and violence and by supporting gay marriage (which I didn't realize at the time was a dishonest claim for inclusion that would be turned in to a tool to slander and attack those who look at sexuality differently such as my church as haters and bigots.) Thus I no longer agree with gay marriage, but I still absolutely agree with the right of people to live their own lives and make up their own minds as to which way of living is better and to find ways to protect people's right to this, such as through civil unions.

When I joined the Green party in 2000 during the Nader campaign and in the rush of the anti- Globalization and organic food movements, we focused on what we had in common, we did not interrogate each other to find differences or test and judge each other. We did not need to agree on everything to support each other, trust each other and love each other. What happened to this party? What happened to our political culture? May God help us all.

Just because I care about you doesn't mean you get to tell me how I have to think. Just because you care about me, doesn't mean I get to tell you how to think. Trust can only be built with mutual respect and consent, never coercion or emotional blackmail. We have a duty to appeal to each other to consider our views and to make our case - but no, none of us is all seeing and perfect and gets to coerce another into our view. The dominant culture has tricked us into thinking that attacking people for wrong think is noble and healthy and effective. It is toxic, immoral, narcissistic and guaranteed to fail.

Sincerely,

Aimee Smith

a "deplorable" Catholic who loves every last one of you, even Margaret Elisabeth, who never treated me with respect ever.

PS BTW, since I love every one of you, resist the pressure to be part of the gene therapy experiment called "COVID vaccine". Instead, learn how to protect yourself by building your immune system and informing yourself about alternative therapies if you should be struck with an infection that could be COVID or better yet, means that people have found that are silenced by google/youtube and corruptly ignored by the FDA since no big money will come out of it, to prevent contracting it altogether.

<https://podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/bret-weinstein-darkhorse-podcast/id1471581521>

Do not be quick to trust the authorities that lie us into war and nuclear power and glyphosate covered GMO food and mass surveillance.

an earlier letter I wrote to Allan Hunter --

If I misgender someone, which means fail to use their imposed speech but instead choose my own categories of understanding, then I am "hating" them?*

You have the right to compel me what I am allowed to say to be free from the "hate" accusation?

You have the right to censor and disaffiliate people who in your mind "hate" because they refuse to use your imposed speech?

I thought you were not a gender ideology tyrant, but now I see you are.

I am for appreciating and loving every human person. But I have my own right to conceptualize gender as I see fit. There is no one way or "correct" way to think about such things. Claiming there is is nothing short of intolerance and bigotry. And just because oligarchs promoted CRT and corporate media might back you up on that feeling, that is a far cry from making it true, fair or Green.

VERY disappointed. I thought you were for respecting people with different views. I will continue to be for that no matter how intolerant individuals of any identity group are. I do not believe in collective blame. You know I promoted a more respectful way of being toward all in DnE [Dialogue Not Expulsion Caucus]. I thought you felt the same, but I guess you only believe in tolerance when you are not in power and when you have the numbers, you go full authoritarian. Unprincipled, self-serving and sad.

If I were Hugh, I would not go out of my way to use gender terms you or someone not even on the call does not like, but I also will not accept being required to accept their gender terms. I will try and work to find a way that allows everyone to be respected in their beliefs by referring to people by their names. Nevertheless, the purpose of people like Hugh doing this is NOT to hate or attack, but to RESIST people thinking they have the right to coerce you to use their language and ideas instead of one's own. He is resisting tyranny. Or at the very least, you cannot be certain he is driven by hate and not a protective-to-feminism desire to resist coercion. Knowing him much better than you, I am quite sure he is trying to be loving to women he feels are being oppressed and not by hatred to anyone. But if both of us are honest, we must admit that no one can truly know another man's heart. Is it important to you to be honest? If so, please retract your

authoritarian declaration that Hugh is driven by hate. You know no such thing. Save your reputation. Retract your slander.

Si

nc

er

ely

,
Ai
me
e
S
mit
h

* Catholics do not understand there to be a "gay" identity but instead view it as a person experiencing same sex attraction. Such people are called to channel their sexuality into either abstinence or the procreative purpose as are all Catholics. Are Catholics "bigots" if we refuse to call someone "gay" or refuse to accept gay marriage? If yes, are you not a bigot for thinking you get to tell Catholics how they must think? In other words, what if your world view and ideology is one of many world views/ideologies and not the one true correct one? How do you intend to share a society and a party with people who do not share your "correct" ideology/world view? How are you not an arrogant and intolerant ideologue?

I was responding to this thread of comments --

[usgp-nc] Proposal 1062

C Sandy Przybylak via

Natlcomvotes 1:29 PM (1

hour ago)

to National,

Gloria Mattera posted the entire proposal on our NYS work list for discussion. I solicited views from our State committee members and will consider them all before voting. Here is the best response so far from Allan Hunter, a long time State committee member and member of the Lavender Caucus, shared with their permission.

"Well, Sandy, since you're actually soliciting views...

I am not a gender critical feminist myself -- I claim a gender identity, and unlike most gender critical feminists I don't see gender as being nothing but restrictions and limitations and patriarchal ideology. But I am quite fine with gender critical feminists being participants in the Green Party and I don't think that being a gendercritical feminist means one is a bigoted transphobe.

On the other hand it is certainly possible for a person, or a political group, to cling to gender-critical feminist rhetoric to whitewash their transphobic bigoted attitudes.

In my opinion the GA Greens are doing the latter.

At no time did I take the Lavender Caucus's word for it that the GA Greens were reprehensible, although I did join the Lavenders once I realized I fit the description & mission statement. I did my own research. I participated in "dialog, not expulsion". Then, later, realizing that the DnE folks did not officially represent the GA Greens or the GA Greens' position, I reached out to them directly to ask if they wanted to have my ear, as I was willing to listen. The person who responded was Hugh Esco who

indicated he was replying on behalf of the GA Greens, and into my ear he dumped a load of dismissive and belittling attitudes, in addition to which, despite knowing that I was a Lavender Caucus member, he spoke disparagingly of certain Lavender members by name and misgendered them throughout.

I am satisfied that the GA Greens in the form they chose to represent themselves to me was 100 % transphobic and bigoted, hostile, and caustic. Keep in mind that they have complained that no one will let them present their side of the story and that everyone has made up their mind beforehand that they are bad and evil and politically untenable and must be punished etc etc.

If I had a vote in this matter myself, would vote to disaccredit them. It doesn't mean the end of all dialog, but it draws a clear line. If you're going to offend a substantial percent of the Greens as a whole AND then insult and belittle and dismiss anyone who is actually taking time to hear you out, the party doesn't need you and doesn't need the fallout of being associated with someone like you. So yeah at an absolute minimum they need to be given the message that they need to take this seriously and if they think they have any semblance of a valid and tenable political position, then YES they have to seek our understanding. They DO NOT get to just say "well we don't care what you think and we're entitled to our own opinions and we didn't ask you"."

C. Sandy Przybylak

GPUS NY Delegate, BAC Member

to which Gloria responded --

Gloria Mattera via
Natlcomvotes2:38 PM
(19 minutes ago)

to

Gloria,
National
Sandy,

Thank you for getting Allan's permission to post this. Their personal experience speaks volumes. I also appreciate Allan's proactively approaching GPGA to experience firsthand how Hugh Esco views transgender rights which we as a party must call out.

Glori
a
Matt
era
New
York

Followed by a comment by Michael Trudeau --

Michael Trudeau via
Natlcomvotes2:43 PM
(14 minutes ago)

to National

I do hope the entire New York delegation votes Yes on 1062. I see Abstains from two well-known NY Greens (James Lane and Dani Liebling), which is discouraging.

Michae

I Trudeau

Delegate

NCGP

and then one by Travis

Christal -- Travis

Christal via

Natlcomvotes2:54 PM

(3 minutes ago)

to Travis, National

I am glad to see that Allan Hunter had the labels “bigot” and “transphobic” locked and loaded and ready to fire at fellow Greens with whom he disagrees.

It’s important that we are clear, and do not welcome, encourage, coddle, or tolerate hate and discrimination.

Thank you for

sharing, Sandy.

Travis Christal

TX delegate

And then by Tommie James --

Tommie James via

Natlcomvotes2:56 PM

(0 minutes ago)

to Tommie, National

Sandy thank you for sharing Allan Hunters excellent statement on this

matter. Well said Allan! Tommie James

(she, her, they) North Carolina, delegate

You may [_](#) from this list.

Or [_](#) of all emails sent by the Gender Critical Greens PAC.

The work of the Emergency Committee
to Save the Green Party is supported by the GCG-PAC.

We urge you support our work with a financial contribution to:

[PAC](#)

Thistle Pettersen, Treasurer

P.O. Box 465

Madison, WI

53701-0465

United States

[C00771618](#)

-

Emergency Committee to Save the Green Party Unsolicited Email Blast #9

From Jeff Sutter

[<jsutter@savethegreenparty.org>](mailto:jsutter@savethegreenparty.org)

Thursday, July 15, 2021 19:45

This email seeks to lay out some of the highlights from the Minority Report I filed as a member of the Accreditation Committee, in opposition to the Committee's majority position reflected in #1062. While I urge you to review the entire report, attached and linked below, I hope that these excerpts from that longer document lay out enough of the key arguments on why #1062 should be rejected by the Green National Committee.

1. The positions taken by the Georgia Party are not transphobic

Nowhere in the Complaint has the Lavender Caucus cited any evidence of the alleged transphobia of the Georgia Party, except for the assertions, unsupported by any actual evidence, that the Declaration for the Rights of Women as a Sex is a statement in opposition to the rights of trans-identified people.

Nor does the Accreditation Committee anywhere provide any evidence that Georgia "exhibit[s] bigoted, anti-transgender positions that violate the Key Value of Social Justice and Equal Opportunity." It is reasonable to expect that when one group asserts rights which conflict with those recognized and existing for another group,

that the resolution of that conflict would be the result of discussion, debate and compromise. The other marginalized group in this case is the female sex, 51% of the population.

To argue 'there is no debate' as the AC and LC have, is simply a denial of reality - there is a debate, among trans people (as evidenced by the video depositions of the Georgia party's expert witnesses), among feminists (as cited in multiple documents included in Georgia's defense pleadings), and in the wider society (see especially recent developments in Europe). The Lavender Caucus claims that the definition of "transphobic" is under its control and that anyone who merely asserts that sex exists and that the rights of females as a sex are worthy of protection must be deemed "transphobic." However, the evidence and testimony provided by the Georgia Green Party demonstrate that the Party's position is not transphobic.

To the contrary, Greens are all united by our support for trans folk to be able to do and be the way they want & not to be mistreated for their gender non-conformity or self-presentation.

Indeed, all people should be free to dress and express themselves as they wish without discrimination, stigma, or violence. Members of the Georgia party believe this just as other Greens do. The disagreement that led to the LC's complaint therefore has nothing to do with actual bigotry or prejudice on the part of Georgia.

2. The Georgia Green Party is not in violation of the GPUS accreditation requirements

(1) The Georgia Party has a long history of "good faith efforts to empower individuals and groups from oppressed communities"

This claim was made in spite of a long history in the Georgia party of participation in the state party leadership of lesbians, gay men (including at least one past state party co-chair) and even to this day, trans-identified persons (including one member of the party's current state leadership). This statement is made by ignoring the Georgia Party's early advocacy for and activism on behalf of the Lesbian and Gay community. The adoption of a chapter on Family, as a part of the state party's platform by its 2001 Athens Convention placed the Georgia party on record in support of same-sex marriage in Georgia, four years before Green Party Mayor Jason West sparked a stand-off in New Paltz, NY with the state Health Department and the Attorney General's Office; and fourteen years before the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Obergefell v Hodges (576 US 644). In 2004, Reverend Zack Lyde, a past state party co-chair and four time candidate for public office with the nomination or endorsement of the Georgia party signed on as one of the leading plaintiffs in litigation challenging Georgia's Marriage Amendment, actively opposed by the Georgia Party leadership in the 2004 General Election. Reverend Lyde, at the time, pastored the St. John's Missionary Baptist Church.

(2) The LGBTQ+ Community is not as unified as the Lavender Caucus would have us believe

Further, it remains in contention that a cohesive LGBTQ+ community even exists. The interests of the various groups subsumed in the expression, LGBTQ+ community,

are hardly aligned, except on the narrowest of areas. Little evidence exists of the reciprocal solidarity required to build such a community, and even a minimal investigation reveals the existence of deep divisions.

Lesbians have for years been pointing to the encroachment on lesbian interests and women's spaces by many advocates for and a growing proportion of members in the trans-identified community. Among the more shocking of these encroachments, is the rape-culture concept of the so-called cotton-ceiling, popularized in online discussions among trans-identified males.

More recently, gay men have raised concerns which parallel those long expressed by lesbians. In the past year these abuses have become so egregious as to motivate splits by founding members in Stonewall UK to form the LGB Alliance, inspiring similar moves in multiple countries far beyond Great Britain, including in the US. The US now has two LGB organizations [LGB](#) and LGB Fightback.

Also evidence of the splits is, in the past year, the organization of new publications intended to serve explicitly the LGB community, particularly but also others. In addition, the authors of the Declaration on Women's Sex-Based Rights are lesbians, and many of the leaders of the Women's Human Rights Campaign and Feminists in Struggle, Get the L Out and others are likewise lesbians. For these groups and many other individuals, Georgia's adopted positions would be far more attractive than the positions of the Lavender Caucus.

3. The NLC Complaint seeks to expand the Accreditation requirements as they exist in the rules of the party without action by the Green National Committee to amend those rules

At the very outset of its proceedings in this case, the Accreditation Committee violated its own mandate by accepting for consideration a complaint based very heavily on the false notion of "violation of platform". The GPUS Platform is not a set of rules and the Accreditation rules do not include a rule requiring parties to align with Platform planks.

The Accreditation Committee majority by their referral of the Complaint are advocating expansion of the requirements for state party accreditation. Georgia's support for women's sex-based rights should not be turned into an

opportunity for a faction to impose new obligations on autonomous state parties, outside of the national parties process for the democratic revision of its rules.

4. What the AC-LC fail to recognize, but the Georgia party does:

(a) the harm caused by gender identity ideology to women, lesbians and gay men through its denial of the existence of biological sex;

(b) the disservice of the medical experimentation being performed on gender non-conforming or dysphoric children and youth that will likely result in sterility, and other permanent harms to their health, turning them into

lifelong medical patients and consumers of Big Pharma; constituting

- (i) a violation of the ethical standards generally expected of medical practitioners;
- (ii) a violation of professional standards requiring fully informed consent;
- (iii) medical malpractice, and
- (iv) as clinicians the world over have described it, conversion therapy targeting gay and lesbian youth.

These harms are of great concern to many lesbians, gays and bisexuals, as well as to persons who identify as transgender. See, e.g. [Trans-Rational Educational Voices](#), a group of transgender individuals that are leading a campaign against child medical transition; and, the [Gender Dysphoria Alliance, Canada](#). Leaders of each organization offered video depositions (linked below) in defense of the Georgia Party. See also the [Society for Evidence Based Gender Medicine](#).

5. The unfair and undemocratic proceedings in the Accreditation Committee.

The leadership of the Accreditation Committee issued a series of one-sided rulings intended to achieve a predetermined outcome. Under the rules of our national party, the Accreditation Committee is expected to conduct a fair and impartial hearing on adversarial conflicts brought to the committee in the form of a complaint. These hearings are expected to allow for a complainant to present their case and for the respondent to mount their defense. A fair reading of these rules anticipated that the members of the Accreditation Committee are expected to sit as a jury -- as a trier of the facts and the rules. These baseline expectations were undermined repeatedly in the multiple ways discussed further in the full report.

While GPUS rules require a hearing for disaffiliation, what transpired within the Accreditation Committee failed to provide a fair hearing, and might more accurately be described as a "showtrial" or "political trial." AC co-chairs enabled a biased atmosphere within the committee. What transpired within AC under the guise of an honest process included:

- (1) A false and unprovable allegation levied against GAGP delegate John Fortuin for the purpose of creating a distraction, timed to undermine a motion to allow the GAGP to present evidence during an extension of the scheduled period for testimony. Several members of the AC recklessly or deliberately faked an accusation that Fortuin had misrepresented his relationship to the Dialogue not Expulsion website.
- (2) Inadequate time to question the LC representatives under the 5 minutes per member rule, which was heavily stacked, and limited the time available to question the hostile and evasive LC representative.
- (3) Exclusion without explanation of the secretary (and a founding member) of the

Georgia Party during the testimony of Margaret Elizabeth of the Lavender caucus, again in violation of the AC's transparency rule, that "All business of the AC will be conducted in a transparent manner and documented as specified within these Policies and Procedures." (See the first paragraph of the [and Procedures](#)).

(4) Denial of the right to counsel. Not only were the officers of the Georgia Green Party denied notice of the process, but their Appearance of Counsel naming Ann Menasche counsel for the defense and requesting service explicitly on both the state party officers and Ms. Menasche was similarly ignored, along with the Georgia party's witness list and request for a hearing at which they might be examined.

6. The AC failed to assess the validity of Georgia's defense

The Committee failed at every opportunity to address and honestly assess the content of the defense materials presented by the Georgia party at every stage of the process, including in its final report to the Green National Committee. In committee, there was NO discussion of the content of the documents sent by Georgia, referenced below. Neither are the issues raised in those pleadings discussed in the Committee's Majority Report.

This is one of the most outrageous facts of the entire process; but since the committee's members had largely pre-judged the results, there is little surprise that the Georgia party's arguments, participation, and evidence

were treated as beside the point.

7. The Georgia party was denied an opportunity to present its defense or point of view.

Whatever the result of the finger-pointing about this, the fact is that the AC did not hear any affirmative presentation from GAGP or allow a hearing requested by the Georgia party to receive the testimony of its defense

witnesses. The Georgia Green Party defense team was left to host video depositions, inviting the Lavender Caucus to send counsel to cross-examine Georgia's witnesses. To the best of our knowledge, not a single member of

the jurors on the AC, nor a single member of the LC, attempted to or did attend these open video depositions. Hearing decisions have been overturned for minor judicial procedural violations not approaching the magnitude of

this breach of procedure. [_](#) have been published for viewing by anyone with an interest in doing so.

Please read the minority report, yourself, by downloading the [_](#) or browsing to the [html version](#).

/signed/

Jeff Sutter

South Bend

Indiana Green Party, recent National
Committee delegate Accreditation Committee
member

You may from this list.
Or of all emails sent by the Gender Critical Greens PAC.

The work of the Emergency Committee
to Save the Green Party is supported by the GCG-PAC.

We urge you support our work with a financial contribution to:

[PAC](#)
Thistle Pettersen, Treasurer
P.O. Box 465
Madison, WI
53701-0465
United States

-

Email from Hugh Esco to the National Committee Discussion List Equating Transgender Women with Using Rohypnol and as Rapists

My apologies for not weighing in on International Women's Day. It was busy for many of us. Let me begin today's contribution to this conversation by stating that I join with feminists around the world who are reminding us that:

#TheWordWomanIsTaken

One tactic which has so often been used to shut down conversations around the concerns being raised by women and parents responding to gender ideology has been to accuse those raising such concerns of 'literal violence'.

When #metoo was trending, it captured public attention as an assertion by women of their boundaries, so often violated in a toxically patriarchal culture where men act on a sense of entitlement to sexual access to the bodies of women and girls, to women's emotional labor, to their time and energy and resources.

We understand from the study of biology, that humans (in fact all mammals if I understand this subject correctly) are a sexually dimorphic species. Human reproduction depends of the cooperation of two parents representing each side of the sex-binary. If anyone reading this can identify a third human gamete and describe its role in human reproduction, there is a \$1 million reward waiting for you.

Actually, the paragraph above is not quite accurate.

No, sex is actually a binary, determined at conception, and the whole idea that one can 'self-determine' one's sex, as asserted by the SOGI plank of our national party platform simply makes us look as silly as the Democrats do around these issues. But the liberals in our ranks, it seems, would rather that we follow the Democrats than the science in our formulation of public policy.

But that idea of cooperation, . . .

About a decade ago a Member of the Missouri Congressional Delegation told a St Louis TV station, arguing against a rape exception to a proposed prohibition on abortion, that "If it's legitimate rape, the female body has ways to try to shut the whole thing down." But that is not quite right either, is it? Setting aside for the moment any discussion of how a rape might be legitimate or not, we each know in fact that many women have conceived in rape and brought to term the children which resulted. So human reproduction does not necessarily require cooperation among the parents.

We know that rape is so ubiquitous in our culture, that is highly unlikely that at least one of us reading this was not conceived in rape, rather in love.

Now rape, yeah. That is literal violence.

War? That too is literal violence.

Economic relationships which require that most of us live in poverty, that counts as violence.

The denial of health care can certainly be violence.

But asking questions? Disagreeing with or refusing to bend the knee to the bullies among the trans-demand-activists? The proper use of the English language, to accurately sex people in our use of pronouns? Not so much.

The Duluth Model has taught us that that men's violence against women exists on a continuum, that there exists a cycle of abuse. They have developed a tool called the Power and Control Wheel, which visualizes physical and sexual violence as supported by the abuse of male privilege, isolation, by minimizing, blaming and the classic DARVO tactics (to Deny, Attack, Reverse Victim and Offender), use of intimidation, emotional abuse, coercion and threats, economic abuse, the manipulation of children. The Duluth Model has us understand that tactics short of physical and sexual violence are often used on their own to exert power in a relationship to permit men to control the women in our lives, short of the criminally proscribed acts. But that these behaviors can also serve as tactics of escalation which leads to the physical and literal violence.

This week, I learned that the acronym, faafo, is apparently a threat intended to intimidate; that it exists on that continuum.

In her book, "Pornography: Men Possessing Women", Andrea Dworkin wrote:

"Men have the power of naming, a great and sublime power. This power of naming enables men to define experience, to articulate boundaries and values, to designate to each thing it's realm and qualities, to determine what can and cannot be expressed to control perception itself. [...] The world is his because he has named everything in it, including her. She uses this language against herself because it cannot be used any other way."

Of late, more and more, we have seen language and the 'power to name' abused to break down women's boundaries. I am told it was Voltaire that wrote: "Anyone who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities."

Today's article is pretty short. For any not aware, rohypnol is commonly known as the 'date-rape' drug. It is why women teach each other to never leave their drinks unattended among strangers. Women teach one another a lot of tactics to minimize their risks of sexual assault. A popular meme reminds us that while men fear that women will laugh at us, leaving us feeling humiliated; women, we are told fear that as men, we will physically and sexually assault them, leaving them injured, traumatized or just dead.

That is just one of many sex-based distinctions which lead men and women to view the world differently.

Today's article is yet another example of the silencing of women. It was purged from @medium, owned by twitter (a subject just this

afternoon of still another hearing in the UK Parliament for its abuse of the free speech rights of British subjects). The silencing of women is justified by men's power to name, to control the narrative and the boundaries of acceptable discourse.

Accusations of 'literal violence' besides abusing the English language, amounts to a coercive tactic. It is emotional abuse. It seeks to shift blame onto women (and others who ask questions) for the violence of homophobic men. And when we allow others to name questions, concerns and disagreement as 'literal violence', we give up our power to the bullies who are happy to take it from us.

Today's article speaks to the power to name and the impact that it can have. It examines the pronoun ritual which has become so commonplace in 'woke' circles; the pressure to conform, to be silent when we are not prepared to embrace the group-think. This article is built on the premise that much like rohypnol, that the compelled speech of preferred pronouns is intended to break down people's, but particularly women's boundaries.

Please take a few minutes to do the exercise laid out at the beginning of this piece. I hope you find this essay as thought provoking as I did.

Pronouns are Rohypnol
<https://fairplayforwomen.com/pronouns/>

-- Hugh Esco, Secretary
Georgia Green Party

--
[Hugh Esco <hesco@yourmessagedelivered.com>](mailto:hesco@yourmessagedelivered.com)
