

TULSA 2005

GREEN PARTY NATIONAL MEETING

JULY 21-24, University of Tulsa

Committee and Workshop Reports

2005 GREEN PARTY NATIONAL MEETING

CONTENTS

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Dispute Resolution

Personnel

Finance

Platform

Diversity Committee/White Privilege

Diversity Committee Report

Outreach

Strategic Plan Working Group Workshops

Presidential Nomination Working Group

WORKSHOPS

Nuclear Waste Transportation and Storage

Media in Community Organizing

DISPUTE RESOLUTION COMMITTEE

DRC, 8/2/05, Maya O'Connor

On Friday afternoon I gave a brief committee report to the NC that just reminded NC members about our mediation services. I also reminded the NC that they are voluntary and confidential. Also, during the Saturday plenary session when a question was raised about which delegate could represent Utah, our committee was mentioned by several NC members as a possible means of resolving the conflict between Utah members. So I think the National meeting was a place where we were able to promote our services and hopefully they will be utilized soon.

Maya O'Connor,
Co-chair, DRC

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

Personnel, 8/2/05, Maya O'Connor

On Friday afternoon I gave a brief report to the NC that reminded NC members we still need help to work on the manual, our policies and procedures, and we need to elect officers for the committee. So far Jane Hunter from NJ has agreed to look over the manual and I hope she will be joining the committee as well. Budd Dickinson has also seen the manual and wants to work on it. We are trying to schedule a conference call to start this work.

Maya O'Connor,
For the Personnel Committee (in formation)

FINANCE COMMITTEE

Finance 8/6/05

Financial/Internal Input Session

Tulsa Meeting - 7/24/05

We had a productive breakout session to get comments and input on financial and internal issues. Attending the session were 3 members of the FinCom committee and those interested in making input to us: Jeff Turner, Doug Malkan, LaVerne Butler, Earl Gerhard TX, Aram Falsafi WA, Paul Juntunen NV, Kimberly Wilder NY, Jane Hunter NJ, Kim O'Connor FL.

We had too many issues to cover all of them in the time allowed so we decided that whatever we didn't get to would be addressed by email. This is the follow-up and also the notes from the session. This is being sent to the participants and to the finance committee for follow-up there. Anything not fully addressed plz send questions to Doug.

1. **CROSS ENTITY CASH FLOW:** There was a concern about keeping \$ squeaky clean and separate from other entities, like the Green institute. USGP is a 527 org which can engage in political activities unlike a non-profit org. We have policies about who we accept money from, like no corporations or PACS, and the max of \$25k per year from any one individual. USGP has not received any money from the Green Institute and likely will not, however we have received money from the Cobb campaign and also one fairly large donor at the \$25k level and several large donors at the \$5k level. FinCom has not seen any problems or conflicts of interest thus far from our sources of money.

2. **BUDGETING DISCONNECT:** people felt that there needs to be an improvement in the process. Currently calls for the budget input are sent to various committees and to the national list. People felt that there should be direct communication with the co-chairs of the states and caucuses, like an email list or even a phone list. We don't currently have such a list and one problem is that such a list goes out of date quickly. We decided to work toward having such a list by hopefully using an intern in the office to compile a list of all state officers by checking their webpages. After that we would require the states to update their list at intervals perhaps annually or maybe more often. They would send their updates to the office email, unless there was an input form that they could access to do it themselves. Doug agreed to head up the project and see what could be done.

3. **GREEN PARTY CARD:** Concerns were raised that there might be a misunderstanding when someone gets a green party card that they might think that they were registered to vote and affiliated with the green party. This could cause confusion in the elections and maybe lower registration accidentally. Strong suggestion was made to print a disclaimer on the card itself. Also we should address the need to register green (if the state allows it) in the mailpiece when the card is sent out.

4. **SUSTAINABLE SYSTEM:** comments were made that our level of expenses needs to be sustainable.

5. TRANSPARENCY: The group was satisfied with the transparency of our finances. The issue is the budget process. The idea of a direct contact list stated above is an attempt to make the budget process more direct and therefore more transparent. Any other ideas would be welcome.

6. FINANCIAL TOOLS AND KNOWLEDGE SUPPORT FOR STATES: More financial tools are needed at the state level. We could make blank databases available to states. Possibly help them import their data into it. Most states do not have the ability to take online donations on their websites. We should have technical help available for them for this.

7. CAMPAIGN SUPPORT: campaigns could use the same additional tools as the states.

8. MERCHANDISING: not sure what the concerns were here because we didn't have time to address this but the variety of merchandise has dramatically grown and is looking great. input for merchandise can be sent to the merch committee.

Respectfully Submitted,
Doug Malkan

PLATFORM COMMITTEE

Platcom - 8/6/05 - Holly Hart

I. PLATFORM SUMMARIES NOW AVAILABLE!!

Platform Summary Booklets were printed and available to have on hand in Tulsa. Each delegate received a copy in their delegate packet, and copies were available at the merchandise table. Several comments were overheard, mostly good (ranging from, "this is really nice," "nice graphics," to "a piece of shit.") Summary was the work mostly of Budd Dickinson, CA; cover design by Joannes Pool, IA, inside graphics by Jim Stauffer, CA.

The summary is a condensed version of the full 2004 Green platform, designed to fit into a normal business-size envelope. It includes a little information about the Green Party and a space for your local contact information - great for tabling, wedding gifts, etc.

Copies are \$1/apiece and can be ordered through the Green Party office. Bulk orders receive a discount.

II. The GPUS Platform Committee met over lunch on Friday, July 22, 2005

The committee has re-activated after a hiatus. Several committee business items were discussed. Members also discussed whether to "sunset" for another year (and reactivate in 2006 at the start of the next platform update/revision cycle), or to take on various projects that had been suggested. Members would like to keep things low-key, but have overwhelmingly opted for the projects.

Topics of discussion included:

- Platcom officer elections;
- officer terms (staggered or not);
- projects and assignments

PROJECTS/ASSIGNMENTS

It seems clear that members are interested in only a partial shut-down during this interim period. Members have expressed interest in:

- 1) A short 4- or 5-fold brochure that would be a very brief, bullet-point style summary of the platform; this would be formatted in a downloadbale .pdf file for the GPUS website. Great for tabling, leafletting, spamming your friends, and Greens have been asking for something like this.
- 2) 3- 4-fold brochures on various Platform subjects: easy to do, these would also formatted in .pdf for the GPUS website. This would involve selecting 3-5 topics (for example, Peace/Foreign Policy; Labor; Energy) and mostly formatting a brochure from platform material.

3) Papers. Basically educational, background papers going into more detail on various platform subjects. Topics might include particular aspects in Agriculture, Energy, Health, Foreign Policy, Labor, Technology...) Papers would be linked to the Platform webpage.

Holly Hart
Co-chair, GPUS Platform Committee

DIVERISTY COMMITTEE / "WHITE PRIVILEGE"

Friday July 22, 2005 1:30 PM -- 4:45 PM Plenary ACAC Great Hall

Summary of Anelle Williams' remarks on ""White Privilege""

American and Western culture, in general, are predicated upon dominance and subordination -- dominance by one group over another..."White Privilege" is the advantage that white folks expect, hold, receive and/or benefit from the quality of being "White" as opposed to not being "White" or some other quality....Notions, feelings and ideas of entitlements, ego attachments, feeling better than..feelings that one deserves X because they are "white" or judging someone to be less than because of X quality are reflective of "White Privilege" ideology and impair opportunities to build alliances.

What can you do? Release the need to feel special or superior. Release the need to have more. Release the need to be right. Release the need for self importance. Release the feelings being easily offended or indignant, to be waited on first, to get better service and have everything better than anyone else and maybe at their expense.

"White Privilege" is keeping silent when you receive a benefit at someone else's expense..when a salesperson turns to you for service when a person of color was there before you. "White Privilege" is getting a promotion at work over a person of color who all know should have received it. "White Privilege" is exercised when a Black or other person of color can not get into a doctoral, medical or other college or graduate school but you can because of your "color".

Embracing "White Privilege" is propping up an evil unjust system of have and have nots, racism and white supremacy and their relatives of sexism, classism and exploitation.

Things have to change if we all are going to work together. The challenges are too big for us to be divided. I've got to change..you have got to change.

Anelle Williams, Houston -- Harris Co. TX

DIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT

Diversity Committee, Carlyn Dulai 8/9/10

Scholarship Subcommittee Report

The USGP awards scholarships to traditionally disenfranchised Greens. These scholarships are administered by the Diversity Committee. Fourteen scholarships were requested before the meeting and two people who received scholarships were unable to come due to the lateness of the site selection. Another person received one after arriving in Tulsa. The following numbers cannot be added for a total of 13 because there is overlap.

5 disabled
8 females
4 lavenders
5 blacks

4 delegates to the National Committee
4 members of national committees

Twelve registrations and 32 nights in the dorm plus 2 nights in a motel were submitted with 3 nights not used.

Summary and Recommendations

1. The USGP, simply must do more to enable more people to attend and participate in our national meetings. These scholarship have increased Green grassroots participation but we must explore options other than travel for some meetings such as teleconferencing.
2. Locations of meetings must be decided at extreme minimal 6 months in advance. Hopefully we will be able to increase this to one year advance notice.

Co-chair Michelle Tingling-Clemons (Black Caucus delegate) Secretary Carolyn Dulai (MI) who could not go to Tulsa.

Thursday, July 21st, 2005 3:30 PM Diversity Committee Meeting. Meeting not held. No officers attended and only 3 people had come for meeting.

Friday July 22, 2005 , morning session - ACAC

Program on "White Privilege"

Asa Gordon to facilitated a discussion on White Privilege.

Because the "Founding Fathers" are often men, lack of new leadership can be part of the problem of privilege.

Many groups are oppressed. He made a suggestion that people read the book "Bury My Heart At Wounded Knee."

There was a lot of positive dialogue.

Friday July 22, 2005 1:30 PM 4:45 PM Plenary ACAC Great Hall A Summary of Anelle Williams' remarks on ""White Privilege"

"White Privilege" is the advantage that white folks expect, hold, receive and/or benefit from the quality of being "White" as opposed to not being "White".

Embracing "White Privilege" is propping up an evil unjust system of have and have nots, racism and white supremacy and their relatives of sexism, classism and exploitation.

Kimberly Wilder
(NY)
Tulsa attendee

OUTREACH WORKSHOP

TULSA BRAINSTORM - MEMBERSHIP AND OUTREACH

The most popular ideas have an asterisk.

OBSTACLES TO MEMBERSHIP - POLITICS IS "DIRTY," VOTER APATHY

*Focus on "non partisan" issues where the effect on local citizens is broad and apparent - such as trying to stop a landfill or toxic dumping.

*Organize in three branches as Maine does: Political/electoral, educational, activist/direct action.

*No one can avoid politics - we all pay taxes, government fees, etc. Everything is political.

We agree it's dirty - we're trying to clean it up.

NEW MEMBERS-REACHING OUT TO DISAFFECTED DEMS, OTHERS

*Be Visible - Wear Green buttons, t-shirts, bags, stickers, yard signs, esp. when doing other activism or participating in coalitions – carry banners in marches.

*Voter Registration - at concerts, fairs, etc.

*Co-Sponsor Events.

Bring Speakers.

Tabling.

DIVERSITY

*Focus on LOCAL issues of economic justice, development, govt. spending.

*Form neighborhood committees.

*To appeal to women, control violence on listservs, listen more, have gender equity in speaking

*Outreach to ex felons. We could be the first to tell them about their voting rights.

Be proactive on coalition work.

Distribute Jody Haug paper, Turning Green To Black.

Youth: anti recruitment.

Get on lots of mailing lists to publicize our activities.

Welcome Wagon (Jacqui Deveneux). Prospective or new members get a specific call of welcome.

BETTER MEETINGS and MEETING WITH MORE ACTION, LESS TALK

*Have "Work" meetings such as cleaning up a local park.

*Have Parties

Have an action item assigned by end of every meeting.

Organize through meetup.com - meet at bars.

Vary locations.

Have child care.

Have "friendraisers" - parties where everyone brings a friend not previously involved.

Better facilitation.

Recognize and welcome new folks, but don't overwhelm them.

Have separate meetings just for discussion of issues.

STRATEGIC PLAN WORKING GROUP

Workshop

7.24.05

Electoral

Measures against ballot access - We need an inventory of states that are actively campaigning against us.

- 1) Races were contesting
 - a) We can win
 - b) Advance message/ballot access
- 2) Caliber of Candidates
- 3) Alliance building - candidates

Working on ballot access @ state and national level

National to provide expertise on electoral law and lawsuits - legal aid

Common understanding of what we want to do

Concern about orphan candidates

Credible candidates - not just issue

Listening skills for candidates

Build local candidates as well as ticket leaders

Pushing ranked voting by our candidates

Being smart about who were running against

City charters and charter changes are important to Election Reform

Candidate support Network

Redistricting by multi-partisan group

Utilizing bioregional planning process to break left/right

Supporter paradigm, opens process

Populate our committees!

Advance electoral planning - years in advance

Election reform issue as a way to gain Greens

Appointed offices, local boards, etc.

Be seen being Green

"Lightning Committee" - looks for open seats on boards etc.

Issue questionnaires for endorsed candidates

Work on issues with other political party's operatives

Low income housing issue in underserved communities

National needs to challenge exclusion from media - enforcement of equal access law

Election reform effort from National - being knowledgeable about what we can do about it.

Regional Strategy - one size does not fit all.

Gerrymandering - multiple proportional districts vs. single member districts.

Always working on Election Reform

How to lobby

Building relationships with future greens

Critical to have some guidelines on how to maintain Green identity in spite of so many different election laws.

On the major races, especially young states, you need to be prepared to have candidates who understand the Green message - Full Slate

Presidential - respectful message for the Green Party

Focus on places where we have some organization with the potential to grow

Slate card as way of defending from bogus candidates

Push IRV after being accused of 'spoiling'

Voting Rights: Resident Alien and Convicts

Withdrawing from races and ABB phenomenon is becoming local and we need to address this.

Lightening strikes mobilized @ national level

Draft template for states that we want for state legislatures

Public Financing

PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION WORKING GROUP

9/29/05

At the Tulsa Annual Meeting, the Presidential Nominating Working Group reported that we would be supplying individual final reports. What follows is my report, based on my own experiences, and what I believe to be true. It is not presented in a scientific manner, because we did not vote on many issues, and therefore, individuals may disagree with my findings. I apologize in advance for the length of this report, but the Working Group had many lengthy discussions over many months. I've tried to focus on several main topics, and hope my fellow working group members will help fill in the gaps. I will answer clarifying questions, but am not prepared to engage in lengthy debate over what I've written.

My report covers the following areas:

Working Group Format
Areas of discussion/Agreement
Suggestions for Future Work/Recommendations

WORKING GROUP FORMAT

The group consisted of volunteers, who elected our own facilitators. While there were 24 initial members, it quickly dwindled to about 15 more or less active members. In Tulsa, it was reported that the lack of oversight and direction by the NC was problematic. I disagree.

Any direction by the NC would necessarily entail restricting the topics for discussion by the group. That is precisely why we were given no direction- everything was on the table.

I think we tried to discuss too many topics simultaneously, without ever resolving issues, or, since consensus was difficult, having a vote to determine relative support for individual ideas. Our attempt was to achieve consensus minus two, which seemed to work reasonably well, with individual opposition noted on each topic.

There was some discussion of having subgroups work on some issues. I was opposed to this, since it limited my ability to represent my state.

AREAS OF DISCUSSION

Wow. Looking back on the e-mails, we discussed SO MUCH. There were heated exchanges, but LOTS of useful interchanges, and much that would be useful if it could be properly condensed and reported.

Some areas where there was significant agreement:

Proportional Representation. From the interim report:

For the purposes of ending this particular tangent, we noted in the interim report that general agreement, though not technically consensus, had been reached on the following statement:

"We agree to use a representative method (i.e. delegates, at the Convention) to decide the nominee for President, if...

- * Each state agrees to conduct some variety of "good faith" effort to inform its Greens of their choices, and to poll and tally those choices; and
- * Each state agrees to use some variety of proportional representation based on the above poll to allocate its delegates; and
- * Each state agrees to bind its delegates in such a way that the preference of the state is properly expressed through at least one round of voting at the Convention."

Any further Working Group needs to start from this point.

Convention Timing. It was generally agreed that the nominating convention needed to be as early as possible. The problem lies in certain states that have late primaries. There was discussion, and some agreement, that it would be advantageous if the Greens could come up with a separate, earlier polling method in these states that would allow an earlier convention, while still respecting the polling of all states.

Presidential Candidate. We personally agreed that the GPUS should run an all out campaign for President. But, as my state had a significant No Candidate contingent, I felt we needed to retain the right of members to vote this option. Phil suggested a separate vote by the NC prior to the convention reconfirming our desire to run. This would be fine with me.

Candidate Ballots. There was general agreement that an official Ballot Template would be good for identifying Presidential candidates, and aiding smaller states by providing an easy to reproduce ballot. While not unanimous, I saw strong support for having candidates collect Green signatures to get on an official GPUS representative ballot (either a few from several states, or more from one state. The idea is to show some support for a candidate, without making it extremely restrictive).

None Of The Above and No Candidate were discussed extensively. General agreement that NOTA and NC could be used on a state ballot where a write-in candidate would go.

Convention Ballots. Agreement that ballots should be blank, write-in type only, which maximizes state flexibility.

Vice President Nominations. Agreed that the Pres should choose own running

mate. I wanted to see a short list of choices from each candidate so delegates can research prior to the convention. All Prez candidates would, of course, be known as VP candidates, if a fusion slate is arranged at the convention. While it was agreed advance notification is preferable, some wanted to ensure that the Prez candidate could choose someone else at the convention. I don't like unknowns at the convention, but wouldn't block this.

Floor Rules. Split on whether convention delegates can make changes. More support if proposal for changes are made prior to convention. Agreement that the NC makes initial floor rules.

Nominating Delegation Size. Without a doubt the most contentious topic. Unanimous agreement that the current system needs change. It seemed we were working towards consensus on using various methods of determining voting strength to assign delegate allotment, with the states choosing the most advantageous method from the choices presented. Votes cast for Greens, number of Green candidates, and percentage of national Green voting were all possibilities. One working group member advocated population as a major factor, but I believe most of us objected, since we are representing Greens, and not all of a state's population. A minimum of two delegates seemed accepted.

Convention Size. Most of the group was flexible. Some desired a larger convention for the drama and publicity of a gala event. The size of the convention will primarily be dictated by the two delegate minimum, since whichever proportionality system is used, it must reflect the appropriate proportion between the smallest and largest states.

ISSUES WE DIDN'T DISCUSS.

Nominating Delegate Meeting. Prior to the balloting, the delegates need to have a formal meeting. Floor rules, possible changes, agenda, and expectations must be addressed. This will facilitate an orderly, timely convention.

Mediation/Objections. There were reports from Milwaukee of formal objections raised by delegates, who were unable to speak with Matt Gonzalez, the convention Moderator. We need an impartial panel (NOT the SC, IMO) to whom objections can be raised and addressed in a timely manner. The DRC might be useful in mediating disputes during the convention, or even serve on the Objection panel.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

The PNWG bit off a lot, and had trouble chewing it. Yet without continuing, and Completing the work we began, I don't see how we can have a successful 2008 Nominating Convention.

I know there is at least one proposal coming before the NC dealing with these issues. This is good, since we have no time to waste in preparing for the future.

I think the size of the Working Group was not a factor in the difficulties we encountered. By allowing each state to have a representative, there were no claims that any faction was not represented. Most states did not have a rep, and that is their choice.

As I stated earlier, I feel that any future group should follow a simple, focused format:

1. Pick ONE SINGLE topic.
2. Discuss it, and attempt consensus.
3. If unable, vote on it.
4. Send the results of the discussion, and the vote, to the NC.
5. The NC then determines what to do with the info.

I thank my fellow Working Group members. It was a difficult task. We all learned a lot about our own beliefs, and those of our fellow delegates. I wish future groups the best of luck.

Gary Hecker
Florida Member of the Presidential Nominating Working Group.

Convention Size.

NUCLEAR WASTE TRANSPORTATION AND STORAGE

Workshop - GP of Utah

8/7/05 - Deanna Taylor

The Green Party of Utah presented a workshop on Nuclear Issues entitled:

"The Facts of Nuclear Testing and Waste Transportation - It Affects Us All!"

Thursday, July 21, 3:30 p.m. CDT

A power point presentation was featured which included a history of nuclear testing and more recent waste issues. There were displays on nuclear testing and on transportation routes across the country of nuclear waste. The latter display was moved to a table in the main hall during the plenaries for the rest of the meeting. People were genuinely interested and signed up to receive copies of the handouts. A "Things You Can Do" list was also available for Greens to take back to their states.

Attendance was low. About 6 people attended who remained for the entire workshop session. A few people came at the beginning and stayed until the concurrent workshop on Greg Gerritt's book "Green Party Tempest" began, at which time they left to attend that. States in attendance represented were Michigan, Maine, Iowa, Delaware, Washington, Oklahoma and Mississippi. Attendees remained beyond the workshop session for an additional half hour of discussion. All attendees were impressed with the presentation. It was suggested by some that the presentation be given again on another day. That did not materialize.

Suggestions for improvement:

- Hold workshops in the same building as the plenaries (or have all the workshops in the same building during the workshop sessions)
- Ask presenters to hold two sessions of their workshop so that folks have a chance to attend (sometimes difficult to choose between workshops)

Tom King, Delegate

Deanna Taylor, Alternate Delegate and Co-Coordinator

Green Party of Utah

MEDIA IN COMMUNITY ORGANIZING; focus on for-profit prisons

Franks Smith, Green Party of Kansas
8/7/05

(Workshop held Friday, July 22, Noon)

Since most delegates in attendance are community activists, and because I was a late registrant, I offered to do a workshop just a couple of weeks prior the National Meeting. I suggested it be on the use of the media in community organizing with particular examples centering on the prospective siting of for-profit prisons.

I had asked for a DVD playing T.V. set to show a couple of short films, and perhaps to let attendees or others interested to watch longer ones either before or after the session. My proposal was accepted just prior to the Meeting.

The workshop appeared in the schedule, however, as one on criminal justice reform and as a second one on community organizing.

Because of construction and unanticipated water damage problems at Tulsa University, the workshop venue was not specified or selected until extremely late. The site was chosen apparently at the last minute, though no room number was given on the schedule nor did dorm staff know where it was to be held. There was also a pretty good walk between it and the sites of some of early morning workshops, and we ran into the lunch break two blocks further on. Finally, a couple of the competing workshops held in the same time slot promised to be very interesting. I wound up holding mine in the lounge at John Maybe Hall, with no DVD playing T.V. set, but we still had a good workshop.

At first only a few people showed up. As we went on, though, we were soon joined by about 8-10 more people and most stayed until well after the scheduled noon finish.

I did a few minutes on my background and volunteer work that I've done, mostly in the last nine years, how aggressive use of the media has played a central part of the organizing, and how issue-oriented action often extends to electoral campaigns. I encouraged participants to join in and contribute their own experience and to ask questions. The discourse was rather lively.

I passed out a lot of materials to the whole group, and some scarcer materials to those attendees from states that are experiencing industry-establishment efforts to site new prisons, such as New Mexico, and in one case, Michigan, to keep a private prison open despite the lack of programmatic need to do so. Items I distributed included a "cheat sheet" that I use for talks that covers numerous high points that focus effective resistance to siting and counter industry propaganda and includes some internet URLs as resources. I'm attaching a copy of that to this e-mail. I also passed out copies of a short video made

by the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees about the problems of the for-profits. AFSCME, a public employee international union, has been in the forefront of fighting these prisons.

Other items I distributed included a comic book: "Prison Town: Paying the Price" produced by the Real Cost of Prisons Project in Northampton, Mass., which is an activity of the Sentencing Project, a D.C. think tank. I've found these to be very effective in getting the message across to wide ranging audiences from state legislators to homeowners concerned about the effect of sitings on their neighborhoods. Because of the specific concerns of attendees from a few states, I gave them the Grassroots Leadership monographs, "Corrections Corporation of America: A Critical Look At Its First 20 Years." This is very useful broad history of the rapacious corporation that owns or manages over half the for profit prison "beds" in this country and whose tentacles stretch overseas. I also passed out a couple of copies of "Jail Breaks," a monograph that comprehensively details the subsidies that desperate and foolish states and municipalities have extended to the for-profit incarceration industry. This latter was produced by Good Jobs First, a project of the Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy from Washington D.C. All three of these publications owe their existence to support from the Open Society Institute.

I also introduced them to the Private Corrections Institute, a wholly volunteer, very low budget but extremely effective all-activist think tank that has successfully fought the privates nationally.

I got very good feedback from most of the attendees after the session. One woman startled me by coming up and handing me a \$20 bill, which I've passed on to PCI, which has very marginal funding. Interestingly, the only reservation expressed by any of the attendees was by one delegate afterward in response to my generally listing a long string of unbroken successes fighting private prisons and against specific environmental threats. I've helped stop about 13 private prisons in a row where I've been significantly involved (AK & CA), have a few more proposals (KS & CO) on years-long holds, helped stop a public KY prison from going private, and slightly helped close another (SD) that was briefly opened by a for-profit. I've also kept a local non-union KS public jail from expanding with an intent to profit from potential federal or other county contracts. In some of these battles, in over half of which I have been central to the resistance, I and we have been outspent perhaps 500-1,000 to 1. The delegate said that I might be raising the expectations of attending organizers too high.

I'd like to recognize the efforts and support of the Kansas Council that enabled me to attend the Meeting and present the workshop.

I hope that this description will be sufficient for the s/c's purposes.

Frank Smith/Kansas
