

<https://greenlibertycaucus.org/november-16-round-table-event/>

Transcript to Roundtable discussion on bridging Pacific Green Party divide.
November 16, 2024

00:00:04.080 --> 00:00:25.349

Chuck Fall: and I am going to mute. If you're not talking, I'm going to go ahead and mute people. My name is Chuck fall, and I'm and this is a meet up of a roundtable discussion for Green Party Pacific Green party members to discuss the the kind of what I call in the green party, and it stems from. There's long history to this. But it had a a major blowout with what some of us are calling an electoral theft of the February convention. This involved 39 votes being essentially discarded.

Linn Benton County [members were] dismissed from the final count. We can talk about that or not. But the issue is, there has been a break. I'm active in the green Liberty caucus, and my caucus was decertified, the Lane chapter was decertified. These all came out of that February convention, and that is part of the what. Again, I'm calling the rupture and the question for us today is is repairing that and getting back onto some kind of program where the green party, I suppose, would function as a kind of united front of diverse elements that we all essentially bring together in a, in a community of tolerance and solidarity for change and improvement and activism.: and so on.

So that's my introductory remark. If people I'm inclined to just, we're going to pass the Talking stick. I think we should probably kind of in our own mind. Think 3, 4 min to make a statement. and and at some point after 5 min and it would be nice to have it. I'll kind of keep informal time, and others can as well we will give you an alert and say it's you know. Can you wrap it up.

Does that sound fair and reasonable to people? Or should we be completely open here? Let okay thumbs up from Michael Sonnleitner? Michael, are you willing to to give us a reflection and and and remarks about our Round Table conversation?

If you want to pass to others, you may, or you can just share, and we'll go to you.

00:02:28.970 --> 00:02:35.619

Michael Sonnleitner:

I'm happy to break the ice, and that will allow other people to appear to be more wise than I am. probably because they are fair enough.

Oh, I was at the the February Conference. I have no problem criticizing the throwing out of the votes. What I have a problem with. And I think this is a cultural issue, not a policy issue is the disposition of too many greens on different sides of different issues, engaging in personal attacks. My own style of green orientation is inspired by, among others, Mohandas, Gandhi.

3:29.969

Chuck Fall: Gandhi had a principle.

25

00:03:30.050 --> 00:03:35.359

Michael Sonnleitner: Which I find extremely important in my political and personal life. For example, while I was serving on the board of Directors at Portland Community College as a trustee for 8 years: I was a lone voice, often marginalized by others on the board bottom line is, I had to be very careful, and I was never to personally attack them. I opposed their actions, I opposed their positions. but I did not ever call them by name anything obstructionist, racist homophobe. None of that, because when we engage engage and personal attacks. we alienate those who we may also be able to learn from, they turn off. Most of us turn off if we're personally attacked.

So I think we need to engage in a cultural revolution amongst ourselves, to be very careful to propose positive ways forward without condemning any person or faction to me. That is the only way to healing. and if we listen to one another, and I mean, we all need to listen to those we disagree with. we can find common ground. I have complete faith that we can find common ground and move forward. but a culture of attack, retaliation attack, retaliation is simply going to get us red cheeks and no particular movement forward. I want a cultural revolution within ourselves, and that includes the people within this meeting. It's not a matter of policy.

43

00:05:41.980 --> 00:05:42.360

Chuck Fall: Okay.

44

00:05:42.360 --> 00:05:43.949

Michael Sonnleitner: Better of attitude.

45

00:05:46.270 --> 00:05:52.109

Chuck Fall: I think that's a great intro. I think that's a great start of things for us to consider and and put out there for as imperative for moving forward, and I and I appreciate what Michael has just shared. We have a hand up from Sabrina. Michael, is there anything else you want to, just to just to wrap the bow on that? Or should we go to others.

MS: No, we can discuss. We can discuss the color of the bow later. Good.

Thank you.

53

00:06:18.020 --> 00:06:24.432

Chuck Fall: Hey? So I'm gonna take the spotlight off of Michael and Sabrina. Please share your hand is up. You have to unmute.

55

00:06:34.080 --> 00:06:35.386

Sabrina Siegel: Thank you.

I was just wondering, you know, to ask a question of Michael. How? What is more

of a personal attack than throwing out the votes of people. And how does he negotiate that? You know in his mind, according to his principles.

60

00:07:00.150 --> 00:07:01.170

Chuck Fall: Go ahead and answer that.

61

00:07:01.170 --> 00:07:05.310

Michael Sonnleitner: Yeah. Well, briefly, when I am personally attacked.

whether it was during the 8 years on the board where, among other things, I was personally censured at 1 point by the other board members. My response is to not retaliate.

To be the change I want to see in the world. I need to be. Try to be the person I would like other people to be so. If I am wronged, it's proper for me to call out the wrong, but it's for me counterproductive to attack the person who may be engaged in what I perceive to be wrong.

Make a distinction between the person and their actions, respect the person, oppose the actions it comes out in. Our language comes out in our body language. We need to heal ourselves, and he'll.

74

00:08:08.920 --> 00:08:12.490

Greg McKenzie (Corvallis, OR): The relationships at the same time.

75

00:08:12.610 --> 00:08:13.140

Michael Sonnleitner: Thank you.

76

00:08:14.320 --> 00:08:14.900

Chuck Fall: Okay. good. Thank you, Michael, and thank you, Sabrina, for the question. Mark has his hand up. Please, mark.

78

00:08:23.987 --> 00:08:26.980

Mark Rolofson: Yes, I see the February convention vote and the Re. The rereading of it, the the throwing out of 39 votes, and to to achieve a certain result, one of which was throwing Marv Sands out of the party and and decertifying 2 chapters as a personal attack on those individuals by Seth Woolley. So I think the idea that there was no that. Yeah, I'm in favor of not, you know. trying to personalize everything.

But you know the bottom line is is, those people were attacked, me being one of them being in the green Liberty caucus so, and my vote was likely thrown out. So I see that as a a personal attack, but to achieve a certain result by the leadership that was in power, Seth, Natalie, etc. and so I I don't think I can totally square with that. I I agree I don't. As far as you know, we don't need to like in a meeting, you know.

Say, well, you did that, you know. Make it everything personal. Yeah, we should. We should be arguing policy, and we should be. We should be more inclusive. So if people don't agree in the party, we can still have them in the party, and let them be heard, you know, on a variety of issues. whether it's you know you name it. you know, antiwar issues or covid vaccines, etc. You know, people should be able to express their points of view, and people should be able to disagree, and we shouldn't be attacking each other and decertifying chapters because of their stance on certain issues and and demonizing Marv as an anti Semite, when, in fact, if you read what the charges against him and he was anti Zionist, which I am adamantly anti-zionist at this point, and think that Israel should not exist to seeing its behavior. So anyway, that's that's where I square with this whole thing.

96

00:10:19.720 --> 00:10:22.369

Chuck Fall: Thank you, Mark. I'm gonna go ahead and yeah, take. Thank you for taking your hand down. Brian. You have your hand up. Thank you, Brian. We're going to put the spotlight on you. Go, Brian. You have to unmute.

99

00:10:33.490 --> 00:10:36.606

Brian Setzler: Yeah. So thanks for putting this together. Thanks for being here.

I don't know how product we shouldn't be. You know, the the shenanigans that have gone on at the conventions and stuff are just ridiculous, and I don't know how helpful it is to rehash what happened back in February. I think more important is about what are we gonna do going forward?

And I agree with what Michael said, I mean. And I'm sorry when you've been disenfranchised, and it's a a shitty process where a few people have control. And there's nothing about essentially are. We're broken. in my opinion. And I want. I've been studying this. Just so for people who don't know me. I helped start the Green party 30 years ago, 35 years ago, before my daughter was even born and was very active. And at 1 point I just thought, you know, we're gonna turn the whole world green. We had so much going on so much positive vibes.

Things were happening, and as soon as we actually became a political party and be and got recognized as an official party and had ballot access. The mental models of what a political party is and does, kicked in hard. And at the same time the Socialist lost their ballot access joined us. and they wanted to change our structure, which was this decentralized chapters where the action was happening to a much more hierarchical, structured of, like the the political system precincts, city, county, state, National.

And that was, you know, we we had this fight 25 years ago. Trey Smith was from the Socialists, and I was from the Greens, and it was just a battle, and at that time I didn't really fully understood it. But I understood there was something, you know, we didn't want to go down that path. And then, when I I went and got an Mba in sustainable business about 10 or 15 years ago, and by profession I'm a Cpa. And in my Mba program I learned a lot about systems, thinking system structures, teams, organizations, and I always kept reflecting on What, what did I learn? What, how can I bring this information and wisdom and knowledge back and help the greens be better?

And what I what I finally concluded about this about 5, 6, 7 years ago now. But Blair was at. We were at a convention down in Lake Oswego and Blair said. You know all we need to do to grow the party is XYZ. You can. You can guess what your Xyz is. but the reason things you know what

he's what he was trying to get going was a snowball like. If we just go knock on more doors, invite more people to join, get more candidates, run more offices, win more elections. We'll get this snowball going, positive feedback loop, and we'll grow. And what I learned in my systems. Thinking thing is when things don't grow, when you're trying to make them grow. There's often what's called a hidden negative feedback. If you're not aware of.

And so I took about 5, 10 min, penciled it out. and it became obvious to me that it was our structure, because we were getting lots of great people joining the party. If I look over the last 30 years, there's probably a hundred outstanding individuals, activists, leaders that have come in and left so frustrated and pissed off that it's not the people. It's the system. And I've been working for literally 5, 6, 7 years to bring this awareness. and I keep bumping up against again these mental models. And then and then, as I brought it to our conventions, I was bumping up against Really, Natalie and Seth, you know, just would would sabotage it for really no reason, and the reason was like fear. Fear of you know I don't know what it is, but I just want to say some things which is one.

Our structure drives what we do, and I've watched it. I got on the I got on the CC. Back in like 2019. I've really never been on it, because I didn't think that was where we needed to be to do things, but I got on there to try to bring leadership and change and ideas. and then Covid hit. It was just, you know it was chaotic, and it was also so easy for things to break down. But the structure causes, you know, like what Michael was talking about, name calling in systems, thinking there's a thing called escalation. And that's when you feel like you're going to get destroyed you up you up something, and then they up it, and then they up it, and that's what all conflicts are like. Each person feeling like my whole life is at stake here, and if I don't win this, I'll be destroyed. And so they up the game, and then the other side counters, and it's and each side looks at the other as if it's their fault. And yet we all play a role, and the only way out of escalation is to either find something where you both unify around and and change the paradigm, or one person just you or one side unilaterally withdraws and stops escalating.

So what I proposed going forward, and I brought to the Convention a couple of times I've brought to the National Party. I'd like to write a book about it, but I don't really ever seem to get started on that process is a model that I've intellectually examined, and I just think would be amazing for us is this decentralized model of where you get together in your groups like we're all in groups and connected. And we connect as cells to make a network of action. And we do things instead of you know, if somebody decided they wanted to put out a green newsletter right now, the way they would probably go about it is, go ask the CC. And try to get resources from the CC.

And then the CC. Would have their hands all over it. And you can write about this, but you can't write about that or blah blah blah. And it's just like that's not the way the world works. And the model I'm talking about is I forget the technical name right now. It's early, but it's a you know. It's it's how our economy works. It's how almost anything works that grows and thrives. People have the freedom to vote with their with their dollars, to vote with their attention, to vote with their feet. and they go where the action is. And so I really think that's what we need to do. And in doing that I really think that as in an informal way, we will come up with the right solution for this state structure. Like we, we need a very light state structure. The main thing was just, I think, when we founded it, and for 20 years was like. just make sure we don't lose ballot access, you know. It was required by law. So we have to have that body. But it's it's meant to have a light touch. It's not meant to oversee everything.

They've always called it from the very beginning. When we started, this was about cord coordinating committee like, if I want to do something when this network's going. I know how to get a hold of Dan. I know how to get a hold of Chuck. I know how to get a hold of Michael. I know how to get a hold of you guys. I don't need anybody to coordinate us. We know how to pick up a

phone email connect. And so I really think it's the solution. Because when we're in this structure and kind of you know, when we're in this kind of new paradigm. we're all free to do essentially what we want to do. If you don't want to connect to a group. Let's just say, you know, the fear we always had this fear from the beginning that, like what happens if a racist groups gets in the party right like the Kkk. Joins the Ppp. Because we have valid access. Well, 1st of all.

172

00:19:06.050 --> 00:19:07.580

Chuck Fall: Brian, I'm gonna ask you to.

173

00:19:07.580 --> 00:19:15.469

Brian Setzler: I'm glad to stop talking and pass on. But I just think the solution. I wanted to sum up one thing, the solution, the problem with our party is the structure. And if we don't change the structural dynamics. this will just give me 30 seconds to sum this up, the problem that we're experiencing. I've been monitoring the Greens for 30 years, both locally and across the country, and every single place, across every single jurisdiction across all that time comes back to these same conflicts, and they all result from our structure, and I'll stop there. Thank you.

00:19:44.840 --> 00:19:55.480

Chuck Fall: I'm gonna let. There's no other hand up. I'm gonna just jump in myself and make an observation that Michael, son Leitner, you observed that the problem is not structural. The problem is that individuals are reacting to other individuals is what you've essentially suggested.

You can correct me on that. And if you see this, if you're in, if you see what the structural problem is, I don't think our bylaws in the Pacific Green party are problematic in any which way I actually like our our direct democracy at convention for doing our business. I like the idea of being inclusive. I like the idea of following Oregon law that actually says, parties have a legal duty to be inclusive. That's in the law, and I can cite it. I've written about it, and inside it.

I made the argument so. and I but I think one of the things I'd like us to kind of pay attention to is where what are next steps. How do we unify after this rupture? And so you might. Anybody here could disagree with my reaction to having my vote thrown out or no, my vote wasn't, in fact, thrown out.

My vote was counted in the convention on account that I was on the sec at the time, but the chapter I'm leading was decertified against. And so that's a painful break for me to deal with. I would look for counsel from people in this group. How can I move forward and kind of lick my wounds and return to the fold? If that's the right thing to do? Some people might disagree with that, and how do we set that up?

There is a January convention on the schedule and as part of this, you know, to go back to Michael Sunlightner's point about, you know. Don't name call, just speak to the issues, and so on and so forth.

you know, we had a convention on May 5, th and we've and we sanctioned Natalie and Seth for advancing. So there's so this is that tit for tat that back and forth that Michael is saying we should not do again. I'm looking for guidance and counseling here on how to move forward, how to heal a rupture that's deep in this party, and how to create tolerance and inclusivity. I think that's a critical thing. Here are we being tolerant, or are we being intolerant?

Okay, Dan has his hand up, and then, Marv.

189

00:22:21.531 --> 00:22:30.370

Dan Pulju: As since the subject of structure came up, I just wanted to hopefully, briefly mention that we are in a situation now where, regardless of the of the Convention dispute and the dispute over, who's on the sec. The State did not allow the party the chance to resolve that dispute on itself. The State broke, I think. for I think it's the 1st time the State ever did it.

They broke the statutory prohibition against the Secretary of State, enforcing a party rule. and in so doing they very badly misread our bylaws, and effectively appointed the party Secretary as dictator; at least as far as communicating with them is concerned. Because they decided the Secretary is the only one authorized to communicate or to be the corresponding officer with the State which effectively gives the secretary control of our ballot access, and that's 1 that's the one. the ballot access being the important thing. That is what a political party is all about.

That's 1 structural issue that actually does really matter, and the State has inverted it. i tried pro se to litigate this, but I was not successful. To make a long story short, I would not have been able to get. for various reasons, a trial before January, at which time 4 new SCC.

Members will be elected, and who knows what else might happen? So. simply reversing the order they made back in May would not have had a whole lot of effect. because that would just affect 3 seats. And now there's gonna be 4 new seats. So that probably what's going to happen in January is, whoever controls that convention unless okay, the the question is going to be, how is that convention run? At least as far as who is on the SCC. If it remains under the control of people that want to be in a tight control of everything, then it might simply things might continue as they are, and the State just to get back to that, though the State has set this precedent where the State now doesn't mind interfering, and that's a whole new dynamic to politics.

I've tried to convince people like Dan Meek and other political parties that that's actually a bad thing and something they should have paid attention to, because we're not really sovereign anymore. But that that's been my focus has been on dealing with that now, because that that more than the party itself. Even if I go to another party they might do the same thing.

So I guess I'm rambling now. So I'm gonna stop.

217

00:25:08.080 --> 00:25:13.230

Chuck Fall: Okay, thank you, Dan. I'm gonna take the spotlight. Let's go to Marv. And then Sabrina.

218

00:25:14.320 --> 00:25:16.920

Marvin Sandnes: Well, I've been saying this for a long time. This party needs and needs an issue or 2 that we can agree on that that goes beyond these personality. So we need an issue or 2. And we need candidates. We need people to file and run. If we had candidates, this party would grow exponentially, it would grow suddenly. We need candidates. But we need issue. We need an issue in this organizational stuff. We can just leave it. leave it alone focus on an issue that we can all unite around. I mean, my God, we've got. We've got issues, stared us in the face right now. So that's my point. Thanks.

227

00:26:05.260 --> 00:26:10.359

Chuck Fall: Okay, thank you. Marv of Sabrina. And then Mike Bilestein. take your hand take your hand down, please, Mark, if you are, maybe I can do it for you. I think I did it for you. Hey? Go ahead, Sabrina.

230

00:26:22.500 --> 00:26:23.894

Sabrina Siegel: Oh, thank you. Let's see sorry. Just the phone just rang and I got a little distracted. I I just wanted to say let us not be confused and let us not miss the fact that this is about much more than interpersonal dynamics. with these people that, you know have been in power in the party. that more than this interpersonal phenomenon. njwhat I see or we see is a systematic repression of ideas, you know, that they oppose or are uncomfortable with, and they've been systematically disenfranchising whole chapters and throwing out votes. And so it goes way beyond interpersonal interaction. And they do these things when it's inconvenient for them. And their positions. And they, they're abusing their power and and the system here. In a very undemocratic way. And and that's what we have to review and think about that issue more than you know, are not getting along as people, or you know such interpersonal things. This is like an abuse of the whole system. It's it's a corruption. And.

244

00:28:11.860 --> 00:28:13.270

Chuck Fall: Thank you. Sabrina.

245

00:28:13.900 --> 00:28:16.720

Michael Sonnleitner: Put me on the stack somewhere. I can't get my hands.

246

00:28:17.400 --> 00:28:21.019

Chuck Fall: It hurdles you're on stuck. Is that? Is that Charles or Michael.

247

00:28:21.710 --> 00:28:22.400

Mike Beilstein, Corvallis, OR: Michael.

248

00:28:22.400 --> 00:28:26.649

Chuck Fall: So you're on stack after Mike Welstein, Mike, I'm gonna put the spotlight on you.

249

00:28:27.220 --> 00:28:39.840

Mike Beilstein, Corvallis, OR: Yeah. Thanks. I. Yeah, I I don't know if I agree with Brian that that we can find any structure which is not going, you know, which is in which the sorts of divisions that we're seeing will not happen. Mike Beilstein, Corvallis, OR: So I you know it's it's if you know, if if there was some workable structure, then, you know, I'd I'd agree we should go to workable structure. But I think the structure we have is is fine, I think 1 1 major problem which was abused in the in the February Convention as this concept of of supporting member. And I think that you

know, and I. So I think any any future convention, if we're going to accept the results of it, we have to eliminate this concept of supporting member and say, anybody who's a registered green, you know, has equal equal rights to vote vote in that convention. And I think we need to. We need to have a State leadership that is at least accepted, or, you know, by by a majority of of party members. Unfortunately, we don't have. We don't have the ability to communicate with a majority of party members.

You know what we you know, we have email lists of which we can reach some party members. We have mailing addresses which, if we want to make a great effort that costs, you know, on the order of 3 to \$4,000, we can send a postcard to every every registered green. But we're not really. We're not hearing the voices. We're not getting the input of of, you know more than you know. Probably 95% of greens aren't aware of this. The leadership problems in the party. They aren't aware of of any schism.

It's just those people who are paying attention working in the party. But all those you know we have. We have, like 8,000 registered greens, most of whom are just registered green, and they have, you know, other, you know. They'll vote green but they have no connection with the party, really. And we, you know, and so I don't. I don't have a solution to this, but I do think that you know, one important thing to do is, you know, one of the when we have a State convention the next next one in January, and I think Justin Phillip is is intending to organize it because we don't really have a functional State coordinating committee.

Now. then, when we have a State convention that one of the 1st things to do would be to eliminate this aspect of the bylaws that defines supporting members. And so I'm I'm very much in favor of that. And then I'm and I think we also have to get the idea that we accept the results of elections rather than throwing out voters from elections when we don't like like the results. And that's, you know, and I think Seth Woolley has really damaged the party. Other people on the coordinating committee that just accepted him doing that, you know, they contributed to the damage that was done to the party.

But but I also think that you know as as well you know Seth Woolley has has worked for the party. He's done things that have benefited the party the same as you know, as I could say that you know Dan pull you has. He's worked for the party, and and and I, you know, and you know, so I'm not. I'm not willing to throw any of these people out and you know, especially especially right now, Justin Phillip and and Ken Black, I think, have been essential to keep the party going. although you know, I'm sure there's people who would say they're keeping keeping it going in the wrong direction.

But I think we we need to have some sort of State convention that actually is representative. and can elect a a coordinating committee which people will accept as as believable and and and then not once once elected, not try to throw them, not not not not being attacking them.

So that's I've kind of rambled, but that's you know. I I agree with Michael Sonneleitner, nurse. You know, assessment that we can't. We can't have this internal attacks going on. You know we've had a in Lynn Benton Chapter. We've existed for over 25 years now, and we, you know, we've had a a few kind of crazy people who cause difficulty. But they, you know we they left. And you know, and we've we've managed to keep keep an organization together. You know, in which we've had people elected to office. We've had. We've Maintain Chapter. We've had meetings we run campaigns. And so I I think it's, you know, it's possible I wouldn't. I wouldn't go about throwing anybody out of the party, even, I think the most abrasive unfriendly person in the party is Marvin Marvin Sandnes, and yet I don't think it was made sense to, you know, to try to exclude him from the party. You know he has some minority views which you know, like like supporting

Robert Kennedy campaign for President, which I think are crazy. But I think it's not so crazy that we have to exclude Marvin from from the party, anyway. I don't know if I've said anything useful, but I'm I'm willing to quit and let somebody else say something.

283

00:33:48.770 --> 00:33:52.704

Chuck Fall: Well, thank you, Mike. and I appreciate your your commitment to inclusivity, and I think I am hopeful that our conversation this morning, evening, afternoon, wherever we're almost morning. That we can actually come to some concrete points of of, you know, solidarity commitment and even if I can take away from Mike Bilestein's remark that you would counsel people to participate in the January Convention. Is that a fair position? You would take? Mike Beilstein.

288

00:34:28.010 --> 00:34:41.159

Mike Beilstein, Corvallis, OR: Yeah, I I agree. I don't think it's going to. I don't think you can accomplish anything by just saying that that. That convention is illegitimate because it's being organized by people who carried out a coup. I think we you have to participate in that convention at that convention. I hope we can elect leadership, which which will be respected by all the party.

290

00:34:51.080 --> 00:34:55.180

Chuck Fall: Thank you, Mike. Dan, pull you please mute unmute.

291

00:34:57.080 --> 00:35:05.879

Dan Pulju: The January Convention will either be a Pacific Green Party convention, where the party rules are determined by the supporting members present, as is our precedent and our tradition. or it won't, it'll be another webinar. We've already had several of these in a row where they're just controlled by people who appoint themselves guardians of the process. and this strikes me as as an implicit, implicitly the same model.

And, Mike, you used the same words that Luke Balant did when he intervened the word leadership. I do not believe that party officers should be appointing themselves to leadership. If the convention is to be genuine. then it has to be controlled by the members, those in attendance. Right? Well, I yes, we are the leaders, Brian, but I don't think we need leaders. We we need officers who who act as servants of the party to to pull the levers and push the buttons to to do the mechanics and the logistics. That's what they're there for. They're not there to run the conventions.

The conventions themselves are in an organic on an organic living collection, a collective making a decision. That's the question. Is that gonna happen in January or not? And I don't intend to dignify. I don't see any reason to dignify it. If it becomes plain that it won't. Now, there's time between now and then to try to make sure that we actually do have a real convention this time. And so just to me that that's that's what I'm thinking about.

309

00:36:44.480 --> 00:36:55.869

Chuck Fall: Thank you, Dan. Charles, your hand is oh, Michael Sunlighter. Yes, you go next. And

then, Charles, thank you for the the reminder. I'm going to put the spotlight on you. Go, Michael, what are your thoughts.

310

00:36:56.680 --> 00:37:00.700

Michael Sonnleitner: Sorry I don't have the hand raising function on my phone easily accessible. First, st I would minimize any disagreement that I may have with Brian seltzer. I think we need to respect his not only his participation and institutional memory, but his insights. Structures do make a difference. People in structures make a difference. Relationships among people make a huge difference in terms of how they operate in structures. But structures make a difference. And I think the cultural revolution I'm speaking about needs to include a State Central Committee. If we have it that operates with a light touch.

I'm using your words, Brian. I think that's extremely important, and to agree with others that have been speaking. The con. The convention in January, if it turns into another webinar. and I think I found that very disturbing, because not only was it controlled by those who created the convention, but it also effectively silenced many of the participants. I complained about this at the time. Among other things, we couldn't see each other and we need to be open to seeing one another as well as listening to one another; and if it is simply another controlled environment. I will probably bow out of the convention very quickly because the structure of it will not allow for us to learn from one another. That's my bottom line.

I think, between now and then. Since I have a fairly good relationship with Natalie. I will speak with her personally and encourage her to have a relatively open convention, whether it's in person and or online, but one where we can see one another, listen to one another as we are in this gathering here. and hopefully emphasize at that time the non-productive sort of traditions that we have manifest of engaging in personal attacks. When we are personally attacked, we don't have to personally attack back. That simply reinforces the cycles of dysfunction.

So I hope we can exercise that discipline. I hope I can, if I'm personally attacked, respond by saying what we need is to freely express ourselves, find common ground, find issues that we can operate on and work within a structure that includes a culture of respect for all members. Thank you.

344

00:40:06.720 --> 00:40:09.300

Chuck Fall: Thank you, Michael and I and I. And I'll just say that you represented a tactical play. were we? We? And I'm speaking to the the people that got hurt. I I'm gonna say, hurt by the by the theft. That we would return to the fold, as it were, to the January Convention, but with the understanding, if that if it conducts as a webinar and doesn't abide by our bylaws, rules for open you know, transparent at convention. Democracy. Well, then, on moss, we would all just leave. Then we could come back to the next one and just keep the struggle going. Okay, that's a thought. Charles. And then, Brian. I'm gonna put the spotlight on you.

351

00:40:55.550 --> 00:40:58.610

Charles: Okay, I managed to unmute myself. Yeah, there are several things I was prepared myself to say for the meeting one, and unfortunately, it's just a little involved in personalities. But I'll try to minimize that in respect of Mr. Sonnleitner. Is one of them, Michael. Oh, we got a report from Mike Beilstein. Well, his discussion with the treasurer and secretary.

358

00:41:40.810 --> 00:41:46.079

Michael Sonnleitner: And one thing here is, if they're quite satisfied.

359

00:41:46.240 --> 00:41:49.480

Charles: It's just doesn't situational authority. In other words, I think it's good riddance that some people have. I'll have to throw it off and that well, for one thing, that reduces the amount of pressure that we can apply, even if we don't show up for the convention. They think that's fine. Who's them in control?

The big problem I have with a convention that they're organized. Yes, it's that who counts the roles. There's a famous saying ascribed, I think, to various dictators that it doesn't matter who votes. It matters who counts the votes and we discovered that for ourselves, personalities again. I guess So without some sort of commitment. that the way it should not be manipulated. I don't think I would even nor were to stay at a convention. and I don't see any sign that the peasant officers are likely to come through about your network. They can be asked, probably not by something.

382

00:43:48.890 --> 00:43:52.169

Brian Setzler: Yeah, I think everything that's been said here is important. One thing I would recommend, I think maybe for us is the you know. What is the process we use at these conventions?

Because. we've known for a long time. We kind of need to improve the process. And when I was on the the State Coordinating Committee. You know. We tried to do it. I I don't remember really what we we accomplished. But again, I think it needs to be like a task force, and with some proposals that come forward where we're committed to the the values of participation, voting transparency in process. And all of that.

The reason I really wanted to get on here a second was talking about the structure, and how important this stuff is. If everybody remembers. I don't know how many people participated in occupy Wall Street. but I live downtown and occupy. Wall Street was just 4 or 5 blocks away, and I was involved with it for a long time. And the way they wanted to make decisions was they had each night, like, you know, people would just stand up and talk. and it worked fine when there were 2030, 40, 50 people there.

But it was a system that collapsed when all of a sudden there were 2,000 people there. We didn't have enough time to hear everybody speak. You couldn't hear everybody, and I see the same kind of problems a little bit with our conventions when you say like. what I hear Dan saying is like, well, the people at the convention should make the rules. That's fine when we have 40 or 50 people there, I think that that's legitimate.

But all of a sudden, when you've got, if we were to actually grow. I think that breaks down when you get 500 people there. How does how do you manage that kind of the kind of chaos. And so again, that's where the structure. our our structure. When I've looked at our structure. the negative feedback loop that we have is as we grow.

The frustration with the party goes up and people leave. And so for that reason we don't grow. and we've got to find a way out of that dynamic. And my solution, I think, gets us out of that. But I'll leave it there. I think we should create a task force where you know people who want to think about how to run a good convention regardless of size. Come up with some some ways to do it.

406

00:46:31.720 --> 00:46:34.240

Chuck Fall: Okay, thank you, Brian. Mark Rolofson.
and then we can go back to Charles.

408

00:46:37.830 --> 00:46:42.038

Mark Rolofson: Yes, there's a lot to unpack here. But I I wanted to try to elaborate on a few things. there have been some attacks on us or Dan and our group. Specific green party websites. 4 1st off, there's there was somebody that was faking emails claiming to be us, you know, and and sending them to the press and the Secretary of State, and just outrageous, you know, saying outrageous things.

And then our website was bombarded by some bot. We got hundreds of of registrations for this conference room. You know, emails, you get like 3 or 4 from the same email. And it would go to another email and all the information. The name, the address is all just a bunch of letters. And then it was all from the town was Zimbabwe for the service state, you know. It's like. or the the country, I guess. But anyway, it's so. That was kind of bizarre. So there's a real effort. I think it's more than just personal attacks. There's somebody that's really [acting with malice].

418

00:47:45.720 --> 00:47:46.970

Michael Sonnleitner: What's shipping.

419

00:47:47.660 --> 00:47:52.070

Mark Rolofson: In terms of. They're willing to go be very underhanded in how they do it, too. And then I should just say to elaborate on.

Marv was saying, as far as an issue to get behind. Well, we did have an issue to get behind, or we do have an issue still to get behind. At the February Convention Dan introduced a resolution to add genocide into the Israel's committing genocide into the party platform, and we did that. We all agreed on that. I think the issue of Gaza and the destruction of Gaza is a major issue, that of. you know, Jill Stein, it took on, you know. I joined the party years ago because of because of people like Jill Stein and Ralph Nader who really highlighted what's going on there. And so I think we do have an issue.

But the problem is, when there's other issues that are pertinent. It seems like all of a sudden. No, that's not. That's not okay. You know it's not. It's a and I should remind Mike Bilestein that RFK. Got one and a half percent of the votes in Oregon he got the highest of any independent or 3rd party candidate, and that should tell you something. And before Joel Stein entered the race back in 2023. I was willing to support Rfk. On many issues until he opened his mouth about Israel and condemn the Palestinians. And but because I I agree with him on vaccines, and I agree with him on what he said about the war in Ukraine.

So I think and if the green party is going to grow. They're going to have to look at the fact that he got more votes than us and and go like, how? Why? Is that. Because if we want to remain this marginalized party, you know, we can continue to just say, well, you know, we're gonna we're going to condemn what Butch Ware said about. you know, biological males competing against females in sports and etc.

And we can be this politically correct version of the Democrats, or we can branch out and realize that there's a lot of views that need to be heard, and a much bigger tent can be formed by. you know, bringing in people with a lot of dissenting views in society versus trying to like, say, well, you're not politically correct enough to be in the green party. so I'll leave it at that.

439

00:50:07.330 --> 00:50:22.450

Chuck Fall: Thank you, Mark. Let's go to Charles, and I'm going to jump in. I'm going to put my hand. I'm going to ask Dan actually to respond to Charles's concerns. That people in leadership in green party are happy with status quo. And give us some tactical strategic perspective on how to deal with that. But, Charles, your hand is up. You have you recollected your additional thought, I believe.

Charles: Yes, and it's purely tactical. It's not clear to me how we can move forward, but I think one thing we should be prepared for is to hold a convention in January of our own, because there's a provision because of there is no SCC to organize a convention in January. And there's a history of failing to accomplish things from the groups that are presently running or attempting to run the party. I assume they're pretty overwhelmed. So I think we should be. I think it's quite possible that they will simply fail. There won't be a convention, and the my laws call for us to call for somebody to hold an emergency convention to reconstitute the party. So that's something. I think it may well not happen. There's something I think we should be prepared for. Thank you.

453

00:51:46.190 --> 00:52:00.550

Chuck Fall: Thank you, Charles. Dan, would you chime in now? I've asked you to respond to Charles's concern. I wasn't aware that we don't have a standing SCC. And he just posed that the convention may not even happen, in which case an emergency call would be appropriate. But, Dan, what do you? What do we do?

455

00:52:05.270 --> 00:52:07.360

Dan Pulju: I don't know either, but.

456

00:52:07.640 --> 00:52:08.490

Charles: Shoot.

457

00:52:08.760 --> 00:52:13.709

Dan Pulju: In my opinion, the most important thing is to find out. Yes, whether this January convention, if it is to be held at all, will be held under our party rules of the convention attendees controlling the process and I think it behooves us to try to find out. Obviously, if I go up

and ask ask them personally myself. I'm not going to find out much, but it it just the membership basically can suss that information out from from? From what's any news that they that they put out, or conversations they have.

464

00:52:48.160 --> 00:52:49.880

Chuck Fall: Would. Okay.

465

00:52:49.880 --> 00:52:54.090

Dan Pulju: But it. The one other thought that I had.

And this is very important to me. The.

467

00:53:01.570 --> 00:53:02.530

Chuck Fall: If.

468

00:53:03.120 --> 00:53:13.720

Dan Pulju: If Justin and Ken, who voted to throw out my chapter's votes in February of last year. and then working with Seth, told the State that they were in charge and that these are the correct results. They lied to the state I want. I'm wondering if there's a chance that they might tell the truth, now that the people they told the State where the party's officers have fallen apart, apparently, and it's gone dysfunctional there is.

Maybe it's worth considering whether there's a chance that they might contact the State and say, Well, oh, sorry we were mistaken. These people are are SCC members. Then we could run the convention. It's not likely. But if we, the the position that they took that the the tampered result last February was the the real Scc, and that it's discredited by the fact that it collapsed so quickly. And again, we're we're strategically, if we want to actually have an effect and be recognized by the State of Oregon. We have to go through Justin because he is the party secretary, and in the State of Oregon's opinion the party secretary is the corresponding officer, so they are going to believe anything he tells them.

479

00:54:41.310 --> 00:54:43.510

Chuck Fall: So what did we do with that, Dan?

480

00:54:43.510 --> 00:54:48.770

Dan Pulju: I don't know, and that's why I'm I'm hoping that other people might come up with ideas.

481

00:54:48.770 --> 00:54:56.879

steven curry county: So, Dan, that means to me that we need to start interacting with Justin, because everything becomes a matter of public discourse. So that sounds like an excellent idea if we create an an avenue and a methodology strategizing that.

483

00:55:03.030 --> 00:55:04.130

Dan Pulju: It might work.

484

00:55:05.120 --> 00:55:11.829

Chuck Fall: Okay, my hand is up. I'm gonna make a suggestion that from this meeting we identify. And it may be this could be Mike Beilstein. who will communicate with Justin because it sounds like Justin is an officer, or he's not an officer. He's a secretary without a steering committee in effect? Is that correct.

487

00:55:27.480 --> 00:55:34.190

Dan Pulju: The the State considers that an officer okay, they don't know or care that that it's appointed by the Sec.

488

00:55:34.780 --> 00:55:41.570

Chuck Fall: Okay. So Justin Phillip is, in fact, the last officer standing in the Pacific green party of Oregon is that a fair characterization.

489

00:55:41.570 --> 00:55:47.879

Dan Pulju: Him and Ken and and whoever's officially on the Scc. That are not currently doing anything, I think that's.

490

00:55:47.880 --> 00:55:50.040

Chuck Fall: Who's officially on the sec. Still.

491

00:55:50.484 --> 00:55:59.375

Dan Pulju: Amy. I haven't checked recently, but last I looked it was Amy Sachs, Mary Jedry, Felipe, Laura, and their new guy, Greg Bouger.

493

00:56:02.570 --> 00:56:09.489

Chuck Fall: So then this group could issue an advisory statement to Justin, copy those people and and make a demand that the convention in January. Not be webinar, that it follow our open, transparent program. That voting not be opaque, hidden behind open vote counted over 7 days and issued findings. I mean we could do that. That's a that's a possibility for us. We can do it in a way that doesn't point isn't naming names and being nasty and snarly, and we can be polite and kind and gracious, and all those virtuous things. What do people think about that, Mike Beilstein, please. I'm going to put the spotlight on you. Yeah, because you're the one who has relations with these guys.

497

00:56:53.130 --> 00:56:59.329

Mike Beilstein, Corvallis, OR: Yeah, I'm sorry there's some other conversation going on in my home, so I'll I'll try to speak up. But so.

498

00:56:59.330 --> 00:56:59.830

Chuck Fall: Okay.

499

00:56:59.830 --> 00:57:03.069

Mike Beilstein, Corvallis, OR: Overcome it.

But that I think this opposition to the Webinar format. I can understand that. I you know, and I don't like it. You know, I I at the conventions that we're done with that I would have liked to be able to see people the other but the other aspect about that is is shutting down the chat, which I think was a a very smart move. You know, so I I guess I you know, because even in this meeting to follow what's going on, you have to listen to people and read the chat at the same time. And so I see the chat as it's functioning in this meeting right now is just side talk. You know. It's it's talk that's going on outside the main meeting, and and it's distracting people. So so I think the idea of shutting down chat for a meeting is, you know, which we've done, which was done, and I can see the problem with that, because it limits discourse, but at the same time having the chat going on at the same time as the main meeting is a is a problem.

The other thing is, I. I do like the idea of people being able to vote absentee. If you cannot attend the meeting, I think you ought to have the ability to to review the meeting and and vote later.

So I I do think it's, you know, to have anybody who's registered allowed to vote is, you know, is is good. I don't think people have to show up at the meeting to to have a vote. I think I think that's just limits participation.

So I think these are things that people are claim. You know, the the you know, shutting down chat and allowing, allowing P. Allowing absentee votes votes to occur after the the session has ended. I think those are things which people are saying are undemocratic, but I see them as as essential for ha! Having a functional meeting. I I do agree that getting rid of the Webinar format where people can't see other people. They can't. They can't even know who who is attending or the number attending.

I think that's you know, I'd I'd say that's a demand that we ought. We ought to forward to Justin, or whoever organizes the January Convention.

514

00:59:15.880 --> 00:59:20.822

Chuck Fall: Okay, I I'll just make an observation. I'll take the spotlight off of you, Mike. That our rules. We have rules, Mike, and this issue about putting the vote out to whomever is actually against our bylaws, and Natalie has had 5 years of opportunity to change the rule. The rules. They never approached a rule change through the normal course of doing a bylaws [change]. They've insinuated this, anybody can vote, but they've agreed that every anybody who votes must register, which is an interesting concession to make. So you still have to register. You don't have to attend a meeting.

You don't have to listen to any argument. You can just basically vote as you're told through a text

message. And that's where I think, staying true to our bylaws. Is something that is worth doing, and if the business of the party is important, then, you know, register, come into the meeting. Come in and say, Hi, maybe you don't stay for the whole thing. We weren't strict about that.

525

01:00:34.610 --> 01:00:36.040

Chuck Fall: let's go to Dan.

526

01:00:38.820 --> 01:00:45.710

Dan Pulju: Yeah. Whether or not to do things like absentee voting is a It is, as Chuck says, under our bylaws and traditions, a convention decision, a party decision that's made by the majority of those present, and a lot of the past history of of conflict is rooted in fighting over that people that didn't want that to be the case.

These the the chat that that annoys people so much that developed in the dynamic of conventions have started to be controlled, top down, people controlling the mute button and controlling who could talk, and when and and and So the the fighting and the dynamic of that fighting people would take it to the chat. And of course, that that's annoying. But the the basic problem there is that the conflict is is happening, and and there's the fighting. Look on this call. We've got plenty of chat, but I don't think any of it is negative. Nobody's fighting each other. No one's using it as a as a side channel to snipe at each other while someone else has the microphone. So the that's a symptom. The the cause is is that we is that our processes are just not working. That's all.

540

01:02:06.490 --> 01:02:10.690

Chuck Fall: Okay, thank you, Dan. Charles, your hands up, unmute.

541

01:02:16.720 --> 01:02:20.020

Charles: It has occurred to me that one of the problems is zoom. It's very convenient for holding conventions or meetings of any sort, including this one without people having to travel. But the problem is that it's highly centralized. There's a host who controls the terms of the meeting can shut people off or just end a meeting. There are a variety of things the host can do and that seems to be, as far as I can tell that's built into the system.

So Brian mentioned the possibility of a task force for another purpose. Maybe we should have people looking for other remote meeting systems that are less centralized. That was that was fine. Okay, there's there is other meeting technology that's correct.

552

01:03:21.396 --> 01:03:26.360

Chuck Fall: So, Greg McKenzie, are you trying to share something? You're muted? What are people thinking now? We've been going for an hour, plus, and we're and I think there's some agreement that we ought to engage and with the next convention, and that would mean communicate an intention to participate, and an intention or request a demand that the the rules be followed.

Now what? Those, what rules we would follow obviously are up for some debate right now. People don't agree with some of the rules. I mean, and the elephant in the room right here is that that.

One of my demands going into a January convention would be the original demand of the February Convention that green Liberty caucus be represented on the Green party website. This is the thing that absolutely blew Natalie and Seth into a state of hysterics. They could not tolerate that, and they went to great lengths to preclude it.

So now what [can be done]? Maybe Michael Sonnleitner can help us here. How am I as an aggrieved party, as an activist who advances policies that I insist are completely in line with our green values. But others don't like. Nevertheless, where am I supposed to go. What am I supposed to do? Am I supposed to just keep my mouth shut and say, Okay, I'll suck it up here. And just, you know smother my passions, and [deny] where I think we can grow our party? What do we do? How do I navigate this? And then, Sabrina? If Michael, if you're willing, Michael, I'm gonna put the spotlight.

570

01:05:17.550 --> 01:05:21.389

Michael Sonnleitner: Chuck. I personally believe that to do nothing is the worst. To be silent is the worst. That is the most violent option. That is one that harms not only our self-respect, but the respect that others may have for us. so I can't tell you how to express yourself, but I do think you must. in a tactical kind of positive sense. I think it sounds wise that Justin be approached by those have some relationship with him to express the concerns. We have shared here particularly that this not be a Webinar format, and that people be seen and heard respectfully at the convention. Frankly, if those requests are not met.

I will not stay at the Convention very long. I mean withdrawal is an option. For my part, I'll speak with Nathalie and one or 2 others with him I have some reasonable relationship and express that concern. It's not an ultimatum to say that if these basic conditions for an open convention are not met. I will choose not to participate. and I know that I'm not alone.

We can resist. We don't have to resist. With personal attacks we can resist in other ways. Again, I think it's important for us to be who he would want others to be and not model behavior that they may be expressing. We need to be better than that. And I I'm I think, in the in the long term, perhaps in the shorter term that will have a positive impact. I encourage participation in January.

I encourage communication between now and January with those who may be having a hand in organizing this thing. it's not clear who's doing it. And as we become more clear, perhaps another gathering like this one may be appropriate between now and January. Thank you.

604

01:08:04.230 --> 01:08:07.770

Chuck Fall: Thank you, Michael, Sabrina, your hands up. Please go.

605

01:08:07.770 --> 01:08:23.470

Sabrina Siegel:

Yes, I was going to say. It's an excellent point that you may check that your chapter.

Our chapter of Green Liberty, has not been included on the party website, and neither has the Longstanding Lane chapter been included on the website. And this is very undemocratic and repressive of those in control of the party. So this is again way beyond personal attacks. It's a systematic effort on the part of those in control, you know, to repress ideas, you know, and expression of part of chapters. Even so, you know, it's a it's a very Anyway, it's it's so glaring and wrong. And yeah, we can. Somehow we have to figure out. you know. I guess the structure. If we can't have people that are not going to abuse the system, you know, in positions of power in the party. We have to have some kind of structure where you know that cannot be abused. Somehow I don't know.

616

01:09:38.930 --> 01:09:43.450

Chuck Fall: Okay, thank you, Sabrina, Suzia. And then Charles.

617

01:09:45.130 --> 01:09:46.999

Souixzan: Oh, that happened fast. What I want to say is. and I'm not sure where this fits. But you know this happened not just in Oregon. This happened all over the country to the Green party, so half of the green party is disenfranchised. and I'd like to know how we could put the whole party back together frankly. And I think that our problem is reflected in their problem, and and vice versa. So I think there's there's some wisdom in what other groups have done. and we might even be leading the way. As far as I can tell.

625

01:10:25.540 --> 01:10:28.189

Chuck Fall: Okay, thank you, Suzia. Charles. Oh, you're muted.

627

01:10:39.650 --> 01:10:45.849

Charles: Had another minor point, and I've already forgotten that I was listening to Suzia. I'll check back later. Okay.

630

01:10:51.080 --> 01:10:53.540

Chuck Fall: You have to write. You need a piece of pad of paper to

631

01:10:53.730 --> 01:10:55.520

Charles: Yeah, I would hope. I'm not at a desk.

633

01:10:58.290 --> 01:11:04.220

Chuck Fall: Okay. So Mike Beilstein has left the meeting. I don't know.

635

01:11:06.910 --> 01:11:07.760

Charles: Why

636

01:11:08.810 --> 01:11:20.650

Chuck Fall: I know that my insistence in advancing the Green Liberty caucus is a major point of irritation and contention. and my concern is that the party develops the cultural shift that I think Michael Sonleitner is looking for, which is a cultural shift into tolerance and not intolerance against people who are advancing. Argument, that we disagree with.

640

01:11:43.780 --> 01:11:49.260

Charles: Now, and I don't, and all I can. I think the I think a model.

641

01:11:49.710 --> 01:11:53.200

Chuck Fall: Is that the green party should become a kind of united front. And apparently there's a distinction between being a united front from being the popular front. and in the United Front people wear their politics frankly and out front. If you're a Catholic, you would be a Catholic Radical. If you're an atheist, you would be an atheist. If you're a Marxist, you carry your Marx, you carry your ideology out front, but you but the people unite against a common enemy, and in our case it's going to be.

645

01:12:25.050 --> 01:12:25.590

Charles: What?

646

01:12:25.590 --> 01:12:32.129

Chuck Fall: The plutocracy. You know the military, industrial, complex, the class that has ruined the planet. So that goes back to Mark Marv Marvin Sands's point.

648

01:12:38.925 --> 01:12:39.220

Charles: Okay.

649

01:12:39.220 --> 01:12:45.990

Chuck Fall: I'm looking for is the possibility that Natalie and Seth will suspend they are what I think is a form of hysteria, irrational opposition and to such an extent that they actually broke the rules in order to get their way.

So, Michael, in your conversation with Natalie, understand? We understand that she's alienated from Seth, the person that was her ally in this in this thing. So I you know there's a lot to navigate here. It could be that a January actual January convention could lead us into a united front with the understanding that there are these oddballs, you know, Chuck Fall and his Green Liberty Group, you know. Okay, but you know we don't kick people out, for you know, blah blah, I mean, it's I don't agree with it, but we tolerate, and that would be the cultural shift that I would hope we could accomplish. Dan. Pull you. And then Mark Wallafson. I'll put the spotlight on you, Dan.

655

01:13:42.860 --> 01:13:48.730

Dan Pulju: Okay, just speaking in general terms of real politic.: Our party had a major purge, and now an organization.

657

01:13:53.259 --> 01:13:56.859

Charles: Flaps. The officer cast.

658

01:13:56.860 --> 01:14:00.279

Dan Pulju: Addition to an intervention by the State. So there's kind of a power vacuum here, and that can be an advantage, although, of course, the nominally the power is still all in Justin and Ken's hands, because the State recognizes them. Is in this kind of situation. I've learned I'm a strategy gamer. And I've learned the hard way to to not focus not not not get target fixated on, not focus over much on risk. And what can go wrong, because then you can miss opportunities.

We do have an opportunity here to rally the membership to simply take action in enough numbers that that it will simply be irresistible, that yes, we. We want to put an end to all this. Let's have an honest convention. Boom, it happens and that May. That may require a lot of just back Channel conversation with the people involved, and and say, Well, yes, we're not. Gonna we're not going to kick anybody out. I'm fine. With that.

We're not going to reactivate the recriminations. turn the convention, I hope not to turn the convention into another ideological death spiral with a struggle over what the party is for. But just to repair it structurally, that that's an opportunity. It might happen it might not.

I can't say I'm optimistic so I just wanted to ask Michael if he thinks if he thinks that there's that there might be enough momentum to. He mentioned meeting again, basically before January, should we tentatively plan on just regrouping and talking again in about a month, say December, and just just to figure out where we're at, that's all.

673

01:15:54.120 --> 01:16:06.930

Chuck Fall: Thank you, Dan. Let's go to Mark Rolofson, and I think another reconvening of this conversation is a good idea. We can. We can make a date for that tonight. This morning. Mark, go for putting the spotlight on you.

674

01:16:06.930 --> 01:16:17.600

Mark Rolofson: I would just like to invite Greg Mckenzie and Page Raymond and and Steven kiss to, to to speak. We haven't heard from them. If they, if they want to speak, they should raise their hand, speak because we haven't heard from them what their what their thoughts are. But I think I think we're a party in crisis. And it's unfortunate because I think this could. We could end up, just, you know. becoming smaller and smaller and and more irrelevant rather than growing our numbers, which I think we should be doing. And people should be. you know.

I guess I was watching a lot of media attention about Jill Stein and social media attention, and the Democrats were so worried that she was going to be the spoiler, and she was getting a lot of headlines, and there was obviously, you know, different groups that were supporting her. You

know Muslims voters in Michigan and students. And but we. But somehow it didn't really resonate. as far as you know, a big election result.

And I think we have to ask ourselves what you know. What is the way forward? And and you know, is there is there hope for this party to to grow? And unfortunately, Oregon, the Oregon voters didn't pass rank choice voting which is unfortunate, because that would really move the needle forward for for 3rd parties. But you know, we kind of have to to make this work if we want the party to survive. So that's that's what I have to say.

685

01:17:36.820 --> 01:17:47.130

Chuck Fall: Thank you, Mark. Let's go to Steven, and then Greg Mckenzie will come, will come to you. Greg. You're at the Lynn Benton group. Be good to hear from Steven. Go for it. Unmute. You're still muted.

687

01:17:52.650 --> 01:17:53.690

Steven curry county: Hello, everybody. Oh, okay. So you know, number. I've really just been enjoying the conversation, and I I enjoy the chats. I enjoy the chats of adding information into the conversation. And I like how Dan addressed that saying that we were. Basically. you know, it's up to us to filter out the noise, and when we're not fighting with each other, the chat is maybe a positive distraction rather than a negative one, and I would say that from the beginning of this process for me for the last 4 years. and interacting with a lot of patriotic and civic minded individuals. you know, speak directly to to mark that comment about the the problem with this tiered voting process is, it's very manipulatable.

And we've seen that ourselves. With the what happened in our party when when Natalie backed off without party approval and and swung the vote towards with with that deal she made with Kotec. So I'm and I understand why it's done politically. And I see that the green party is being used mostly to basically filter. You know, people over to to the Democratic side, and Natalie has said that during the meeting is that funds are being raised, and and so we we don't come up with our own candidates, and then we we we go with another party.

We may as well be Democrats at that point. And so you know, the tiered voting system is manipulatable because you simply just remove a candidate. and when you got the numbers down. if you have a system that automatically tears it all the way up. You know you pull some choice people out that they were and involved in an election, and and next thing you know, you've you've swung the vote one way or the other and I'm more, as Chuck constantly reminds us, I'm into transparency.

I'm into some sort of integrity. If we don't have integrity as a people running our own systems in our government, then we don't have integrity as a culture and as a country right and as a society. And we're seeing that happen all around us with a lack of integrity from the top down to the bottom. And we have to start here. We have to start with ourselves. And I, I think the idea of breaking into groups as task force. and, you know, working together.

And then you take, and then you take the leader of those task force and you work them together. and you you create a a sliding understanding between the upper leadership and the lower leadership, providing more of a real democratic and representative constituency. We're we're as as an awareness of people who speak and share thoughts. And then we we come up with the best solutions, which I think is the whole idea. So thank you for inviting me to come on and speak,

Mark, and those are my thoughts. Thank you.

721

01:20:57.140 --> 01:21:02.619

Chuck Fall: Thank you, Stephen. Greg McKenzie from Lynn Benton, what are your thoughts? Please share.

722

01:21:02.620 --> 01:21:06.483

Greg McKenzie (Corvallis, OR): Well, I found this very interesting, and I'm I've been involved for a couple years in the green party, and I think that this last election leaves a lot of people looking for alternatives and looking for some other way the Democrats have did a pretty poor job, and I'd like to see the greens grow, and they they need to grow by getting more younger people involved. Primarily, I'd be very interested in working on that, and from the from this meeting, maybe some more women involved. And That's all I have to say. I'm not sure how to deal with the particular organizational details. So I'm gonna pass on and and go see the folks at the rally. And but I'll come back sometime and see how you're all doing.

737

01:22:16.370 --> 01:22:20.379

Chuck Fall: So are you, are you? You're leaving the meeting now, Greg, is that what you're communicating.

738

01:22:20.720 --> 01:22:23.289

Greg McKenzie (Corvallis, OR): Unless somebody wants something more from me.

739

01:22:23.450 --> 01:22:24.630

Dan Pulju: No, that's fine. I got it. Question for you, Greg.

741

01:22:26.380 --> 01:22:26.930

Greg McKenzie (Corvallis, OR): Yep.

742

01:22:26.930 --> 01:22:30.350

Dan Pulju: I forgot you had been to to Russia. When was that.

743

01:22:31.160 --> 01:22:32.610

Greg McKenzie (Corvallis, OR): You forgot I was what.

744

01:22:32.610 --> 01:22:35.179

Dan Pulju: That you had been to Russia before. When was that.

745

01:22:36.860 --> 01:22:41.689

Greg McKenzie (Corvallis, OR): When it was years ago, like 20 years ago.

746

01:22:41.890 --> 01:22:42.680

Dan Pulju: Oh, yeah.

747

01:22:43.550 --> 01:22:44.160

Greg McKenzie (Corvallis, OR): Yeah.

748

01:22:44.160 --> 01:22:45.140

Dan Pulju: Like, back, then.

749

01:22:45.820 --> 01:22:47.999

Greg McKenzie (Corvallis, OR): Well, we should talk about this offline, I think.

750

01:22:48.000 --> 01:22:48.730

Dan Pulju: All right.

751

01:22:48.740 --> 01:22:58.119

Greg McKenzie (Corvallis, OR): Basically, I did a tour where I took a dance group of contra dancers to go dance with Russians without speaking the language. You can hold Russians in your arms and dance with them. And it was a citizen diplomacy, effort. And I did 3 of those tours.

753

01:23:07.820 --> 01:23:08.260

Dan Pulju: Wow!

754

01:23:08.260 --> 01:23:12.299

Greg McKenzie (Corvallis, OR): And that's I think it's 1 of the more significant things I've done in my life. So. anyway, thank you.

756

01:23:15.000 --> 01:23:25.609

Chuck Fall: Thank you, Greg, and and please remain dialed in and participate. I think there is going to be another meeting of discussion about January. So I'm going to suggest that we wrap up our Round table, and I have a quick, some quick question. When is the January Convention? Does anybody have a hard date for that.

758

01:23:37.500 --> 01:23:42.829

Dan Pulju: 25th is what they say, but that doesn't make it a hard date. They could change it.

759

01:23:42.830 --> 01:23:46.189

Chuck Fall: Okay, they've identified the [25.th](#) We have this rule about getting agenda items into the con into the in 30 days before. december 21st is a Saturday. We could agree to have another roundtable conversation. And and we would have any agenda items, I can tell you. My agenda item is going to be a repeat of something I've been asking for for 4 or 5 years, and that is that green Liberty be represented. And Lane Chapter be represented on the website. I'm I mean, that's gonna be an ask.

And I'm it's it feels like old material or or an agenda item to to recognize the raw results of the February convention and a dismissal of the election committee. So these are some, I guess, questions we need to answer as our group going forward.

How do we approach January? Do we go with an agenda, or do we just ask for a good honest convention. I can't go in there without asking for some justice personally. So. But should we make a commitment that we're gonna have another meeting on December 21? st Does that sound like a good idea, or should we do it sooner.

767

01:25:05.420 --> 01:25:11.419

Michael Sonnleitner: The 14th of December is the Saturday before the 21, st we could do it on the 14, th and give ourselves more time.

768

01:25:12.189 --> 01:25:22.019

Chuck Fall: And that might be the better date. Any thoughts on our next rendezvous by Zoom to keep our roundtable going about repairing the party.

769

01:25:26.830 --> 01:25:27.530

Chuck Fall: Charles here.

770

01:25:27.530 --> 01:25:29.700

771

01:25:29.700 --> 01:25:37.480

Chuck Fall: Okay, let's let's I agree with I. That's my gut telling me. Let's let's push it up. Let's let's have another roundtable event. 11 o'clock.

772

01:25:37.550 --> 01:25:45.270

Charles: To talk about repairing our party. Charles, your thoughts. Your hand is up. 2 things. Yeah. I would agree with the [14.th](#) Let's give ourselves a little leeway.Traveling on the due date. And I remembered what I was thinking about before, because it's directly relevant to your ask. We were careless and allowed control of the Oh.electronic communications as a party to be extremely centralized. I think Natalie was in charge of everything, the website, the oh, and the emails everything. That's not a good situation for her. I think she was overloaded. And it's certainly not a good situation for the party. So it's something.

Basically, I'm not quite sure what to do about it. I can't do any of that stuff. So that it should be a party goal to have those have control of those dispersed. More than one person has the keys to the to the website, and somebody else altogether is in charge of the email and whatever else our party communications, those should be scattered around. Otherwise you have. Centralization is a formula for for the kind of problems we've been having.

787

01:27:17.740 --> 01:27:20.580

Chuck Fall: Absolutely. This is. I'll just tell you for the record I've I've asked oh, I don't even want to rehash the record. But yes, we do need to expand the ranks of people who have keys to the kingdom, as it were, and just for the record. If I'm understanding things correctly. Natalie has been in effect, kicked out of the Nation Builder website. I don't know if that's true or not. But that was represented in in an email I saw, Dan, your hand is up, please.

791

01:27:50.790 --> 01:27:56.249

Dan Pulju: First, are there any blocks to the 14th at 11, as the next round table. at least amongst those still here? 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 no blocks. Second, regarding the centralization of the websites. Yes, Charles, as a is absolutely right about that.

That's that's been that has contributed to the dynamic of top-down control. And that, proceeded Natalie. Actually, when I 1st joined the party, I found out that Tricia Driscoll was in control. What control of all the the pacificgreens.org and the Google Drive and everything, and had help. She put me in charge of a few things, but then I found out the within a few months that that was not really accepted by everybody in particular. Joe Rowe was quite angry about that, and stormed out of a convention when I said things that that made that that implied that I had more authority than I did. It's not good to have these things in one hand. Currently it. Brian has left the call. But if you look at the campaign finance of of the of the Pacific Green party of Oregon, Pac.

They've been spending about \$80 a month on password management, and I don't know who is. I I don't know who it. It's a password management company called Bitwarden, and normally they charge like 4 to \$6 a month. So there's some some really elaborate thing going on there that has the. It's obscure to me who actually is even con in control of that, because the because it's it may be behind a password management system. In any case, Charles is absolutely right. This, this shouldn't be centralized. And once it becomes centralized, then it yeah, that's when problems happen. Of course we have.

Chuck and I and and Mark are running an all oregongreenparty.com website. And we're trying not to do it that way. So anyone on this call that wants access to the blog. The website itself is just a thing like a placeholder. This, this is a green party website, and we make the blog available to anyone that's interested in editing and and posting the content. which I think is as open as as centralized as something should be, it should be accessible to all interested party members. Of course it hadn't really taken off like that because because of how things played out during this year, but anyhow, it still exists. We still have about \$400 in our miscellaneous pack to to do this and that. It's not really too important at the moment. But that's okay.

823

01:31:22.224 --> 01:31:25.009

Chuck Fall: Any end or any final thought. Okay, I'm gonna. Showing up, everyone.

826

01:31:29.540 --> 01:31:52.660

Chuck Fall: Yes. So let's I'm we're just going to end the recording in a moment here, and then this can be shared out. We made a decision for a December 14th continuation to plan, and there will be conversations between now and then that people can bring back to this roundtable conversation around healing the rupture in the green party again. I'm chuck fall, Dan, has been a key leader in helping us hold ourselves.

Where's the oh, the recording is ending right here. So we're ending our recording.

Stop it.

00:54:06.470 --> 00: