California Greens host ‘Presidential Primary Debate that Matters’

By Cres Vellucci

SAN FRANCISCO – The Green Party presidential race – already the most competitive ever – is intricate-ly connected to the going-on of California Greens, who hold the nation’s first, and maybe only, high-visibility Presidential Debate on January 13 in San Francisco.

The Green Party’s nominee for President will be chosen at its Presidential Nominating Convention in Chicago July 10-13.

But there was surprising news just a month after the debate when San Francisco favorite-son Matt Gonzalez, former president of the Board of Supervi-sors and nearly elected mayor San Francisco, an-nounced he was leaving the Green Party so he could run as the vice-presidential candidate – but not for the Green Party.

Gonzalez said he would be running at VP with Ralph Nader as the presidential candidate. But that he still supported the Green Party and was only leaving – temporarily – because ballot access laws prevented the independent ticket from appearing on the ballot in some states if a candidate was a member of a political party.

Gonzalez reportedly informed media outlets he would remain active with future Green campaigns and is committed to alternatives to the two-party system. Nader, the Green Party presidential candidate in 2000 and presidential candidate in 1992, 1996 and 2004, tabbed Gonzalez, a civil rights attorney, for vice president on his independent ticket. Nader said he won’t seek the Green Party nomination.

Ironically, it was Nader who dominated the Feb. 3 Green Party Presidential Primary results, polling 61 percent. Former six-time Democratic Party congress-person Cynthia McKinney (www.runcynthiarun.org), now a Green, garnered about 26 percent.

Other vote totals included Kat Swift (a Texas organizer, 3 percent; Kent Mesplay (www.mesplay.org), a California environmental engi-neer, 2 percent; Jesse Johnson (www.jesse08.org), a West Virginia actor and producer, 1.8 percent. Former Black Panther Party leader Elaine Brown had 4.6 percent, although she quit the race in January. University communications and hip-hop professor Jared Ball has also withdrawn. He had 1.6 percent.

Those speaking at a Green Party Presidential Debate – Jan. 13 before a near-capacity crowd of about 850 at the Herbst Theater in San Francisco – repeatedly asked progressives to work together to end the Iraq War now, enact universal single payer health care and fix global warming. Independent Congress-sional candidate Cindy Sheehan was the moderator.

Comments included:

- **Cynthia McKinney**: “We need to ask some very tough questions: Who’s country is this and what is it that we stand for,” noting that the war needed to end now.

- **Dr. Jared Ball**: “We have to develop a party that will not only put us out there in 2008, but every election cycle after that.”

- **Dr. Kent Mesplay**: “I do want to make the (major parties) sweat but I also want to change our life for the better.”

- **Jesse Johnson**: “This is an opportunity for voters to elect someone who actually does feel the pain of the common individual.”

- **Kat Swift**: “We’re looking for non-tradition-al voters such as the punk anarchist move-ment, youth and vegans.” Swift will turn 35 just before the Fall election.

Greens call on Schwarzenegger to cut budget in prisons, negotiate energy contracts

By Green Focus Staff writer

SACRAMENTO – The Green Party of California said Gov. Arnold Schwarzeneg-ger has taken a wrong turn et again in his budget proposals that were the focus of his State-of-the-State message, and noted the state could save “billions of dollars” by taking a hard look at energy crisis contracts, MediCal and prisons.

Instead, Greens charged, the Governor continues to think first about his big spe-cial interest campaign donors, and not the people of California.

“The Governor is wasting billions by not ripping up contracts signed during the energy crisis and by paying full price for prescription drugs for MediCal patients.

But he and the legislature won't dare do either of these things, because it would mean getting tough with big donors in the energy and pharmaceutical industries,” said Erika McDonald, San Francisco Green Party spokesperson.

Former Green Party Lt. Governor can-didate Donna Warren said the Governor is missing an obvious way to safely save billions by overhauling the troubled state prison system.

“Even the building of 53,000 more prison beds at a cost of $7.5 billion for non-violent offenders, and this is on top of a $10 billion prison budget. The $14 bil-lion deficit could be wiped out by not sending non-violent offenders to prison for life under California's abhorrent 3 Strikes Law,” said Warren, now campaign coordinator of Three Strikes Reform Act of 2008 Families to Amend California's Three Strikes (FACTS).

And, Green Party union activist Hank Chapot chastised the Governor for being the source of the budget crisis, noting that “His fiscal problems are partly his own fault. While he’s promoting coerced health insurance for low-wage workers, he won’t discuss raising taxes for the wealthy.”
Greens in 6 federal/state, 6 local races in June 3 Election; Only 1 Green Party primary seat contested

By Cres Vellucci

(Editor’s Note: The following story reflects information made available by the Secretary of State, county registrars of voters and the GPUS andGPCA, and candidate websites. There may be more Greens running for local office in November and that information will be available in our July 1 issue. If you should have any updates to this information, please contact Cres Vellucci at greenparty-press@comcast.net).

SACRAMENTO – Except for one possible race in a North Coast congressional district, Greens will run opposed in the June 3 Party Primary election, with 13 candidates overall running for an even dozen elected offices. Currently, there are at least 55 members of the Green Party holding elected positions in California, including 16 mayors, supervisors or city council members. In June, six Greens are vying for the party nomination in five congressional districts (4 unopposed, and Carol Wolman and Pam Elizondo competing in the 1st District along the North Coast). Elizondo was the party’s nominee previously.

Others Greens running for Congress, but unopposed in the June Primary include Barry Hermanson (CD 12, San Francisco/San Mateo), Carol Brouillet (CD 14, Santa Clara/Palo Alto), Peter Myers (CD 15, Santa Clara County) and Tom Lash (CD 46, Orange County).

John Paul (Jack) Lindblad is the sole Green running for the State Legislature (Assembly, District 39 in Los Angeles). He is unopposed.

Six Greens are on the ballot for county or municipal offices, and running to win. Those include Paul Pitino, the former Arcata City Council member now trying to win a spot on the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors, District 3. Ross Mirkarimi is running for re-election in District 5 on the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. He hopes to be joined by Mark Sanchez, President of the San Francisco Board of Education, who is bidding to win the District 9 seat on the SF Board of Supervisors. Joe Racano is in a race for the Morro Bay City Council, Bruce Wolfe is on the ballot for the San Francisco City College Board of Trustees and Ginny-Marie Case is trying to be re-elected to the Los Angeles Neighborhood Council.

Please contact the candidate(s) of your choice to volunteer, contribute or help in some other way.

Green Party Members Running For Office in the June 3, election.
When my family first moved to Phoenix, I was Vice President. Our host was Richard Scott, Tucson for college. I've been all over Arizona; I've seen birds and just ordinary folks. But a surprising thing made it a nice fit for the Greens in a way. It was the route. The low carbon footprint of the parade was a hand-drawn, marched or walked down the parade route. Every entrant has to be horse-drawn, gathering signatures from attendees at the parade. We started our work early on Saturday morning (who would have guessed Phoenix had this much culture?) as well as a few other, smaller excursions brought our total for the weekend to nearly 1500. Impressive! For the remainder of signatures, Arizona will have to rely, at least in part, on paid signature gatherers. But on that front, the Arizona Greens are also in good shape. Thanks in large part to a tireless effort by Greg Jan, a Green in Northern California, the Arizona Green Party now has about $9000 contributed from Greens across the country to hire signature gatherers and close the gap.

We ended our visit to Arizona with a press conference at the central public library in Mesa, another Phoenix suburb. There we heard from three Greens seeking the party’s presidential nomination: Kat Swift, Kent Mesplay, and Jess Johnson, as well as SKCM Curry running for Vice President. They spoke at length on what motivated them to run, as well as how they would use the power of the presidency to begin bringing humanity back from the brink of disaster. You can see more of what these candidates have to say by visiting the website of documentarians who are following their campaigns: www.polidoc.com.

As we drove back through the Arizona desert, the sky painted in brilliant sunset hues of orange, pink, purple and blue, we were proud to have been a part of democracy. However the 2008 election may turn out, we California Greens enjoyed the privilege of hopping across the state line to reach out to Arizonans, one voter at a time, one signature at a time. It doesn’t get any more grassroots than that.

California Greens lead the way with Arizona Ballot Access Drive

By Derek Iversen
LA Greens

In late February, I took a Friday off from work and piled into a car with three other Californians for a road trip to Phoenix, Arizona. I traveled with Jim Weill, Craig Thorsen and John Ulloth, all Greens from the greater L.A. area, to support the Green Party’s ballot drive.

As things stand right now, a resident of the state of Arizona cannot register to vote as a member of the Green Party. And when voters go to the polls to elect a President this November, time is of the essence. Is this an issue worth fighting over? Is it worth making time to round up hundreds of signatures. It was time to move on.

We split up from there, some going to an art festival in Fountain Hills to the east while I went with another team downtown to gather signatures at a Scottish festival and a farmer’s market. It had been a competition, I’d have to confess that Jim Weill beat me badly, and Craig Thorsen did a bang-up job as well. But it was really a team effort, more collaboration than competition.

By the end of Saturday, we’d rounded up about 1000 signatures. We didn’t have as much time to round up signatures on Sunday, but a fruitful visit to a Japanese festival on Sunday morning (who would have guessed Phoenix had this much culture?) as well as a few other, smaller excursions brought our total for the weekend to nearly 1500. Impressive! For the remainder of signatures, Arizona will have to rely, at least in part, on paid signature gatherers. But on that front, the Arizona Greens are also in good shape. Thanks in large part to a tireless effort by Greg Jan, a Green in Northern California, the Arizona Green Party now has about $9000 contributed from Greens across the country to hire signature gatherers and close the gap.

We ended our visit to Arizona with a press conference at the central public library in Mesa, another Phoenix suburb. There we heard from three Greens seeking the party’s presidential nomination: Kat Swift, Kent Mesplay, and Jess Johnson, as well as SKCM Curry running for Vice President. They spoke at length on what motivated them to run, as well as how they would use the power of the presidency to begin bringing humanity back from the brink of disaster. You can see more of what these candidates have to say by visiting the website of documentarians who are following their campaigns: www.polidoc.com.

As we drove back through the Arizona desert, the sky painted in brilliant sunset hues of orange, pink, purple and blue, we were proud to have been a part of democracy. However the 2008 election may turn out, we California Greens enjoyed the privilege of hopping across the state line to reach out to Arizonans, one voter at a time, one signature at a time. It doesn’t get any more grassroots than that.

Think Global - Act Local

Green Presidential Candidates: (from left to right) Kent Mesplay of San Diego, Ca., Kat Swift of Texas and Jesse Johnson of West Virginia, all came out during February to support the Green Party ballot access drive in Arizona.
Progressive Issues Drive Green Party Presidential Contest

Opinion

By Green Focus Staff writer

The name of the Green Party nominee for President of the United States in 2008 has been put to the test in many of the spring state primaries around the country yet questions remain as to exactly who that person will be.

Ralph Nader won the Green Party primary in California, with 61% of the vote, although he later announced his candidacy on February 24 on Meet the Press as an independent. Cynthia McKinney took 26% of the vote in that election followed by Elaine Brown with 4.6%, Kat Swift with 3.1%, Kent Mespley with 2.0%, Jesse Johnson with 1.8%, and Jared Ball with 1.6%.

McKinney has done much better in many of the other state primaries, notably in Illinois, with 57% of the Green vote, ahead of Howie Hawkins as a surro- gating candidate. McKinney won Illinois with 55%

In Arkansas however; Uncommitted won first place, followed by McKinney with 20.4% of the vote.

Ralph Nader: Four time Presidential hopeful Nader is running as an independent with Matt Gonzalez, former Green Vice Presidential candidate.

It should be noted that the other Green Party candidates for President, including Kent Mesplay, Kat Swift, Jesse Johnson and others have been very active at the grass roots level, attending events all over the country to promote the Green message of hope for a sustainable and just future. This, in spite of the fact that apparently, the nomination may be beyond their grasp.

The question remains. Who will be the Green Party nominee, and what role will the party play in the election?

In a Pacifica radio interview of February 29, along with his vice-presidential running mate Matt Gonzalez, Nader faced the question of whether his candidacy would be ever or was a ‘spoiler’ for the democrats by suggesting that his candidacy represented the voice of those people who were disenfranchised from the corporatized political process because they didn’t bring huge checkbooks with them to the process as do the players in either the Republican or Democratic parties. Matt Gonzalez clarified their position by saying that while the common wisdom of 2000 and 2004 was that the two parties were not fundamentally different, those distinctions could be made. This however did not excuse the democrats for supporting war in Iraq, nta, and failing to fully work for the poor working classes, many of whom desperately need universal health care, basic education and jobs which could be created through investment in infrastructure. This, he felt, as does Nader, is a real reason to hold the Democrats feet to the fire in each and every election to ensure that they get the message.

Cynthia McKinney is a strong voice for progressive issues too, as is indicated by her 12 page manifesto which served as the founding document of her Recon- struction Party. With a 10 point agenda emphasizing the rights of the poor and people of color, decrying the corporate controlled political machine, the corpo- rate controlled media and the spirit of greed and consumption which drives commercialism, racism and environmental decline, McKinney has proven beyond doubt that she does indeed support the Green agenda.

In the February 29 interview, Matt Gonzalez was asked to explain why anyone would want to support a Green candidacy or progressive candidacy at all, particularly in light of the possibilities that some feel would be open if Obama for example won the presidency.

Basic Matt reaffirmed his position that money and corporate control had so completely skewed the political landscape against the disenfranchised poor that a strong voice decrying this fact is necessary, now, more than ever to bring the pain and injustice to the attention of those who suffer less educationally, materially and spiritually.

In other words, he suggested, as does Nader and McKinney, that in light of the current circumstances we find ourselves in as a people and a planet that we have no choice but to speak out, speak up and try to make a difference.

It is clear that both Ralph Nader and Cynthia McKinney are poised to do that with a certain degree of effectiveness in the months to come. Likewise, the other Green candidates for President have and will undoubtedly continue to carry the torch for green issues through the November elections and beyond.

This it would seem is the best of what the Green Party intends. The Green Party invites those new to the party to read the platform on the Internet at: http://www.cagreens.org/platform/ and see if you agree. And please note: there is plenty of time left to register Green if you haven't done so already. You are invited to join with Greens and progressives every- where in your vision of a better world, and participate in whatever way possible in the struggle for the hope of a new day.

Greens and the LGBT Community

By Shane Que Hee, LA LGBT Greens

While the GPCA platform has very Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender (LGBT)-positive platforms on sexual orientation and AIDS, and ob- jects to police entrapment in the California Secrecy platform, the LGBT community knows almost noth- ing about the Green Party, at least in Southern Califor- nia. The Green Party is the only one to support same-sex marriage and the duopoly both do not. Yet, who knows about this in the LGBT community?

I have heard stories about rapturous welcomes for Greens in the annual Gay Pride parade in San Francis- co. In Los Angeles, the LA LGBT Greens and Out Against War: LGBT & Friends Coalition for Peace & Justice (the non-partisan LGBT antiwar group in Los Angeles) have marched together in the Christopher Street West LGBT parade since 2003 to great acclaim by onlookers. Yet, the LGBT Community response is always in terms of the duopoly— that is, Republi- cans support the Log Cabin Club or clubs like the Eleanor Roosevelt Club in San Francisco, the Dems support the Stonewall Democrats, and the apathetic majority could care less.

The Green Party is hardly ever mentioned in the LGBT media while the Dems and Republicans get the lion’s share of attention. Many editors and news editors regard Greens as the “spoiler” enemy.

What can be done about this situation? The Green Party Media Committee should put all LG- BT publications on their Press Release lists, and also forward these releases through LGBTs with media contacts. Greens, LGBT and otherwise, need to get immersed in local LGBT politics to become better known and to fight on things that LGBTs want.

Los Angeles’ IN Magazine p.14 contained a brief account of the 1st national debate among de- clared Green Party Presidential hopefuls (Cynthia McKinney, Jared Ball, Kent Mespley, Johnstone, Kat Swift and draft candidate Ralph Nader) that occurred on Jan 13 in San Francisco in the Herbster Theater. That article still a pot shot at Nader as a spoiler. San Francisco’s Bay Area Reporter, San Diego’s Gay & Lesbian Times, and Frontiers (San Francisco) did not mention the debate at all. Even straight media coverage of that debate was spotty. The San Fran- cisco Chronicle but not the San Francisco Examinn- er carried a debate story on Jan 14 and the Chronicle also conducted a poll on the relevancy of the Green Party. The LA Times ignored the debate as did the Los Angeles alternative weeklies, LA Weekly and LA City Beat.

LGBTs have been quite influential in the duopoly 2000 Presidential campaigns. The Califor- nia Log Cabin Republicans all supported McCain against Romney. The state Dem LGBT hierarchy were all for Hillary Clinton over Obama and Ed- wards. However, Obama’s chief fundraisers since 2000 have been LGBT leaders Jeremy Bernard and Rufus Gifford. David Mixner who helped Bill Clint- on win election was a member of Clinton’s “kitchen cabinet” in 1991, initially supported Edwards but now supports Obama—he having been put off by the Clintons’ Defense of Marriage Act sponsorship. It was a sign of the struggle that the Dem STA- wall Democrats agreed not to endorse anyone in spite of the pressure to endorse Hillary Clinton from such people as State Senator Sheila Kuehl and former rep Jackie Goldberg. Democratic Clubs elsewhere in San Francisco (Alice B Toklas and Harvest Milk), Sac- ramento Stonewall, and the Silicon Valley LGBT Dem- ocratic Club could not agree to endorse one candidate either.

LGBT aspects of Super Tuesday were covered in Advocate Mar 11 p22. Some items included a Black Presidential forum in Los Angeles and counting the times “gay” was used (once by Obama) during the S Carolina Democratic presidential debate. Gay fund- raising for Obama was also discussed in Advocate Mar 25 p12, and the November elections from the Advocate’s perspective (predominantly Dem) was presented in Advocate Mar 25 p4. There was no mention of the Green Party or Nader. Other predomi- nantly pro-Dem coverage also occurred in IN Maga- zine Feb 18 p20, Mar 3 p22.

So people! Reach out to your communities and please spread the Green message! 
LOS ANGELES - Returning from a Hollywood peace march and rally one afternoon recently, I passed an historic marker by an old cafe on Santa Monica Blvd., the erstwhile Route 66. "It's a Burger's" it read. My Green stream of consciousness re-interpreted the sign to read "IRV's Burgers" and to reflect on just how far the advocates of Instant Runoff Voting (IRV) have come in the last decade or so of promoting this history making movement.

Since both our Green Party platform supports this fairer voting method and Green Party members have participated in its advancement, this is very good news, indeed!

As Gautam Dutta, Esq., Deputy Director of the New America Foundation, reported from the March 4 hearing at L.A.'s City Hall, "IRV gained an advantage of support over the last 10 years!" "Elected officials, community leaders, and civic activists packed the hall for the L.A. City Council's Rules and Government Committee's hearing on IRV," Dutta said. "City Clerk Frank Martinez was assigned to prepare the report on IRV that we subsequently heard on March 4 of this year. Ms. Serpe also spoke about IRV before the Latino Congress in 2007. (Post IRV election analysis in San Francisco shows that voter participation in the six most socio-economically diverse neighborhoods increased over 300% with the adoption of IRV.)"

Others, like Denise Munro Robb, Genevieve Marcus, Bob Smith and Patrick Meighan, representing the Los Angeles Greens local, working with LA VoteFire, founded by David Holtzman, have lobbied City Council members, encouraging adoption of IRV. The Los Angeles Greens have been participating with the LA VoteFire coalition since its inception. Green Party member Amy Connolly founded Santa Monica Ranked Voting whose members successfully convinced the city council there in Sept. of 2005 to pass a resolution stating an on-going interest in Ranked voting.

We have come a long way from the afternoon in 1996 when Steven Hill, who is now the Director of the Political Reform Program at the New America Foundation, made a presentation on IRV at Santa Monica College. The audience that day was comprised of three individuals: Green Party of California co-founder, former Santa Monica mayor and long-time ardent proponent of IRV, Mike Feinstein, myself, and one lone college student! Now, of course, Steven Hill is the definitive and much sought after expert on the topic! He is the author of "Ten Steps to Repair American Democracy" (PoliPoint Press, May 2006). His previous books include "Fixing Elections: The Failure of America's Winner Take All Politics." Recommended reading for those wanting to bring IRV to their* cities!*

"IRV - A Way Out of the Spoiler Dilemma"

By Linda Piera-Avilla

LA Greens

With Ralph Nader announcing his candidacy for president, Democrats are fuming and no doubt promoting give me the same legal tricks they used in 2000 to keep Nader off the ballot in many states. Meanwhile, Republicans are cackling with glee.

But Republicans shouldn't cackle too loudly. They also have been hurt by the spoiler dilemma. In fact, the GOP lost control of the U.S. Senate due to Libertarian Party candidates in the states of Minnesota, Washington, Mississippi, and South Dakota, spoiling Republicans. Many observers believe that Bill Clinton beat George H.W. Bush in 1992 only because Ross Perot drained away enough votes from Bush.

The problem is that the winners of our highest offices are not required to win a majority of the vote, either nationwide or in each state. Without a majority requirement, we can't be certain in a multi-candidate field that the winner will be the one preferred by the most voters.

How ridiculous: we can map the human genome, and send an astronaut to the moon, but we can't figure out a way to hold elections that guarantee the winner has a majority of the vote. Naturally people are having flashbacks to the 2000 election, when George Bush beat Al Gore in Florida by only 538 votes, even though Bush lacked a majority of Florida's popular vote and Ralph Nader won 97,000 votes. A lot is at stake to make sure that the winner this November can legitimately claim the presidency and try and heal a polarized nation. Yet despite the spoiler problem playing out in the 2000 presidential election and in various Senate races, neither Democratic nor Republican Party leaders have done anything to fix this defect of our electoral system.

Fortunately, it's not too late to address this problem. Since the U.S. Constitution delegates to states the method of choosing its Electoral College electors, each state legislature could pass into law -- right now -- a majority requirement for their state to ensure that whichever candidate wins, she or he will command support from a majority of that state's voters.

We don't even need to do it in every state, since the race will boil down to a half dozen battleground states, including the primaries Ohio and Florida. Rather than asking Nader or any candidate to forego his democratic right to run for political office, the Democratic and Republican leaders could legislate this right now. What are they waiting for? Time is growing short, but it's in the public interest to protect majority rule.

One approach would be to adopt a two-round runoff system similar to that used in most presidential elections around the world and many Southern primaries and local elections in the U.S. A first round with all candidates would take place in mid-October. The top two finishers would face off in November, with the winner certain to have a majority.

But two elections would be expensive and time-consuming, both for taxpayers and candidates. So a better way would be for each state to adopt instant runoff voting (IRV), which accomplishes the goal of electing a winner with majority support, but gets it over in a single election. IRV allows voters to pick not only their first choice but also to rank a second and third choice at the same time, 1, 2, 3. If your first choice can't win, your vote goes to your second choice. The runoff rankings are used to determine a majority winner in one election. Nader or Perot-type voters are liberated to vote for their favorite candidate without helping to elect their least favorite candidate.

IRV is used in Ireland and Australia for national elections, in San Francisco, Cary, North Carolina and elsewhere for local elections, and in South Carolina, Arkansas and Louisiana for overseas voters. Interestingly, IRV is supported by John McCain, Barack Obama and Ralph Nader.

Many people are criticizing Ralph Nader for risking a repeat of 2000, but only Democrats and Republicans have the power to change the rules of the game. We've seen this movie before and don't like how it might turn out. It's time for the Democrats and Republicans to produce a new ending by fashioning a fair, majoritarian system for electing our nation's highest offices.

Steven Hill is director of the Political Reform Program at the New America Foundation and author of "10 Steps to Repair American Democracy" (www.10steps.net).
I received an email from a very old, very conservative WWII generation man today that was one of these SPAM emails declaring that “if we just all buy gasoline at the pump on Thursdays,” or on a day depending on whether our license plate ends in an even or odd number... (you get the idea, right?)

But the nice thing about the email for me was it started out with the suggestion that it might be time to start rationing gasoline.

Well Duh!

I figured long ago that the Ronnie Raygun's crowd would have thought that they could wave the flag, sing some patriotic songs and get us all to ration our gas and even take public transportation. But they haven't done that. And apparently, they are embarrassed to suggest that there is any problem at all.

When you are promising 3 cars in every garage, Ipods for all - and Tyson chicken is so cheap, why would they want to suggest that there are problems in paradise, eh?

On July 15, 1979, then president Jimmy Carter delivered what is one of the most memorable speeches of his presidency – and the least appreciated at the time.

Appearing before the teleprompter in a sweatshirt, he told the country that at that time they were facing a moral and spiritual crisis in addition to the problems of the economy, energy shortages and all the rest. He suggested in these words: "It's clear that the true problems of our Nation are much deeper -- deeper than gasoline lines or energy shortages, deeper even than inflation or recession. And I realize more than ever that as president I need your help...

He went on to say that people had given him much advice. "We can't go on consuming 40 percent more energy than we produce. When we import oil we are also importing inflation plus unemployment."

Well, we've got to use what we have. The Middle East has only five percent of the world's energy, but the United States has 24 percent.

That warm night in July, Carter called on the American people to join him in ‘the moral equivalent of war’ in an effort to end dependence on Mideast oil. His words, in retrospect were barely headed or we would not be in the deep crisis we are in today, nor mired in a middle eastern war in two countries.

"So, the solution of our energy crisis can also help us to conquer the crisis of the spirit in our country. It can rekindle our sense of unity, our confidence in the future, and give our nation and all of us individually a new sense of purpose."

Jimmy Carter, July 15, 1979
LA Green Screen Writer Finds Agreement Satisfactory—Sort Of

By Patrick Meighan, LA Green and Screen Writer

It’s February of 2008, you’re a Writers Guild member in Members 5 of the writers’ strike, and the producers have offered your union a contract that you don’t like. Actually, no one in the WGA really likes it, but 93% of the union is gonna vote “yes” anyway. It’s a bad contract, sure, but it could be worse, and they want the strike to be over. But you, brave reader, want to fight for a better bit. You’re part of the wee 7% that’s decided to vote “no.”

With me so far?

Okay, so you’re in an online debate about this vote with a wealthy and successful writer who works as a sitcom showrunner (that’s how a leading writer-literally, the person who “runs” his “show”). In the world of tv writers, this guy’s in the rare elite. Play your cards right and he may end up hiring you some day! But guess what? He won’t. Because you’ve let him know that you’re part of the crazy 7% that’s gonna vote “no”—that wants to keep striking!—rather than joining the 93% majority that wants to accept this bad-but-could-be-worse contract.

Still with me?

Okay, so Mr. Powerful Showrunner is shocked at your vote, and asks what your problem is. Did you eat paint chips when you were younger? Weren’t you breast fed? Do you have meds that need rebalancing? You don’t take the bait, of course. You simply explain to Mr. Powerful Showrunner that, in your opinion, this contract doesn’t reflect the bargaining leverage the WGA holds, that’s it worth the sacrifice you all have made, and that, ultimately, it’s just not a contract that you can, in good conscience, support. Mr. Powerful Showrunner reads your words and writes back to you, apropos of nothing: “Well, okay, but please tell me you’re not gonna vote for Nader.”

Certainly, every democratic institution (be it a labor union or a state government) runs on compromise. But for any organization to want to accept this to be something other than a one-sided capitulation—there has to be a committed faction that’s willing to keep fighting the tough fight in pursuit of something better. How is the Writers Guild ever going to win a fair percentage of DVD revenue if there’s not a crazy 7% that keep on demanding it? How will California ever win single payer health care, marriage equality and environmental justice if there’s not a Green Party that keeps on demanding it?

They need us, in all our paint-chip-eating, breast-milk-need-ing, med-unbalancing glory! I’m a “Family Guy” writer, and our television shows are known for being very...well...racy. Wanda knows a secret? We write our actual “Family Guy” scripts to be far racier than what ultimately gets on the air. Wanda know a bigger secret? We do that on purpose. That’s cause we know that the Fox censors are going to cut all our edgiest bits before they get on the air. So we write extra bits that are extra profane, just so we can bargain them away and hang onto the slightly-less-profane bits that we really want.

In the political realm, perhaps we California Greens serve a similar purpose. Maybe we’re the racy, edgy element that gets negotiated away, but whose very existence helps ensure that the final compromise made by others doesn’t suck royal.

Is that enough for us, as a party? Probably not. Wouldn’t we rather be the powerful folks on the inside, brokering the compromise? Sure. The catering’s better there, in one (you gotta try the brie!). And some day that will be us. But until the time comes, I, personally, pledge to be the raciest, edgiest, most profane bit that I can be, in hopes that the compromise that others craft around me (in my union, my party, or my state) will be as non-sucky as possible.

Political Campaigns: The Top 25 Priorities

In Memoriam, 1941-2008

By Kent Smith (Originally Published in 1994)

Ken’s obituary appears on page 8

For candidates, especially first-timers, it’s very important to use your energy efficiently. Therefore, I offer these 25 top priorities. These are the things you must do, and do well.

1. Check and Solidify Your Motives: to carry these 25 top priorities. These are the things you must do, and do well.
2. File Your Candidate’s Papers Correctly: study the forms well ahead of time to know exactly what’s required and when for unforfaging deadlines. Start gathering any needed signatures immediately.
3. Set Campaign Objectives and Strategy: without a campaign strategy, you’re going to get them.
4. Develop Your Core Green Team: personally ask and/or the frontrunners. Determine the best issues and positions and biography sheets in writing.
5. Get Your Campaign Manager: search strenuously for the best manager you can find, from the outside or within your district. Develop teams which can maintain your privacy and sanity.
7. Establish Media Relationships: meet reporters and/or the frontrunners. Determine the best issues and positions and biography sheets in writing.
8. Develop Your HQ Office: people need to get ahold of you (and campaign information and materials) quickly and comfortably.
9. Design and Distribute Materials: people want to be able to find and get your materials.
10. Establish Credibility: get out of marginalized positions and biography sheets in writing.
11. Make Up Your Master Schedule: determine time and money. Learn how to contact voters personally and/or the frontrunners. Determine the best issues and positions and biography sheets in writing.
12. Meet with Friendly Groups: this is your chance to test your ideas on friendlies and also get contributions of time and money. Learn how to contact voters personally and/or the frontrunners. Determine the best issues and positions and biography sheets in writing.
13. Establish Eligibility: get out of marginalized third-party status by demonstrating strong ideas, organization, appeal, and/or money.
14. Develop District-wide Organizations: recruit campaign contacts in the other key regions and communities throughout the district. Develop teams which can work successfully on their own. Overcome the temptation to focus on your safe home base.
15. Establish Media Relationships: meet reporters and editors personally and establish good reliable working relationships early. Once the race heats up, it’s too late to develop friendships.
16. Develop Your Media Strategy: set media objectives, develop media lists, draft press releases, collect clippings, and review the results. Get a skilled Media Coordinator on the job.
17. Develop Your Volunteer Organization: recruit volunteers, screen them, train them, and assign them to tasks as needed. Find a cheerful, energetic Volunteer Coordinator really helps.
18. Secure Key Endorsements: identify the organizations whose support will help you and vigorously pursue their endorsements. Endorsements translate into press, money, and votes.
19. Make Up Your Master Schedule: determine time and money. Find a protected get-away place where you can maintain your privacy and sanity.
20. Reorganize: restructure your objectives and campaign organizations as needed, especially for the Final Push. Surprises come...and quick adjustments of strategy & staffing will be needed.
21. Attack the Opposition: despite your hesitancy, you must give voters reasons to abandon the incumbent and/or the frontrunners.
22. Take Vacations: burnout is a serious danger—allow yourself to escape for weekends (or whole weeks) to stay healthy.
23. Go All-out: be prepared for maximum intensity the last month of your campaign: this is when it counts for the candidate, the press, and the voters.
24. Get Out-The-Vote: set up a program to identify your supporters and motivate them to get their votes cast in time. Track down last vote...You can collapse after your victory.

These top 25 priorities are the things that must be done effectively for a successful election campaign. Time is precious. If you can concentrate on the absolute-ly essential tasks, you can conduct your campaign with confidence and even enjoyment.

Good luck. May the Green Force be with you!
Greens mourn passing of Kent Smith, one of the co-founders of the Green Party of California

IN MEMORIAM
Kent Smith
June 16, 1941-Feb. 18, 2008

NEVADA CITY, Ca. – Kent Smith, one of the founders of the Green Party of California, died here Feb. 18 – and as is fitting his legacy, a major peace protest was held at about the same time as a celebration of his life on Sunday, March 16, according to family and friends.

Mr. Smith, who was 66 when he passed away at his home, is recognized as one of the founders of the Green Party of California. He attended the first state meeting of Greens in Fresno in 1989 with about two dozen others, and was one of the organizers of a meeting in Sacramento in 1990 where Greens decided to found the official Green Party of California.

In 1992, after more than 100,000 people were registered to the fledgling party, Mr. Smith was the one who accepted the state-declared petition of the Secretary of State for a new state being. He ran for state and U.S. Senate in the early 1990’s, garnering more than 30,000. Mr. Smith also played a key role in the first Planetary Meeting of Greens in Rio de Janeiro in May 1992, and helped create the Federation of Green Parties of the Americas.

According to GPCA unofficial historian Michael Feinstein, when California Greens first met for the first time statewide, it was in Eugene, Oregon at the annual meeting of the then-national Greens organization, the Greens Committees of Correspondence. At that meeting, a case was made for representing a “cult” from Argentina set up a mirror, fake Green Parties in Europe and including a group representing a “cult” from Argentina set up a mirror, fake Green Parties in Europe and including a group representing a “cult” from Argentina set up a mirror, fake Green Parties in Europe and including a group representing a “cult” from Argentina set up a mirror, fake Green Parties in Europe and including a group representing a “cult” from Argentina set up a mirror, fake Green Parties in Europe and including a group representing a “cult” from Argentina set up a mirror, fake Green Parties in Europe and including a group representing a “cult” from Argentina set up a mirror, fake Green Parties in Europe and including a group representing a “cult” from Argentina set up a mirror, fake Green Parties in Europe and including a group representing a “cult” from Argentina set up a mirror, fake Green Parties in Europe and including a group representing a “cult” from Argentina.

As it turned out, said Feinstein, that there were more than 30,000 votes against the shoe-in, corporate-funded Republican incumbent. We were so proud!

“During the initial GPCA ballot drive efforts, Kent and I tabled together in Nevada County, registering over 1,000 Greens between us. The earlier Green Alliance was very strong here, with sometimes more than 100 people at gatherings. It slowly transitioned to Green Party when ballot status was achieved, becoming smaller, but with more focused ballot and issue campaigns,” said Beth Moore, a longtime Green Party activist and friend of Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith continued to work with the new local Green Party, rooted around Kent during his 1992 state senate campaign, with our ‘$100 pennies-a-plate’ fundraiser dinner, concerts, and hilarious candidate practice drill sessions with Kent on a mike and us peppering him with reporter-style questioning to get him ready!

With 3,000 Greens in the district, Kent gathered over 30,000 votes against the shoe-in, corporate-funded Republican incumbent. We were so proud!

“Kent was challenged about his one time assertion that Greens should run to win. Why then did he run for State Senate in ’92, which he could not win, when he could win a local race? He received 32,000 votes and 10 percent in his race, and argued that his campaign had actually built the party because it got many people involved and improved the chances that some of them might run in future local races.”

Kent Smith/GPCA Strategy Committee documents, 1990-1991

Kent Smith: He could command the room with his powerful, statesman’s voice, confident style and well-worded reasoning. Kent had a big, warm laugh, twinkling blue eyes and a genuine smile. He enjoyed joking, dancing, and was witty in political debate. Kent and I were sometimes allies, sometimes adversaries, but I was so grateful for his efforts building the GP. He impacted me, and he mattered to us in his way. I think that’s what counts, in the long run.”

She said that, at the historic moment when then-Secretary of State March Fong Eu declared the Green Party for the first time on common issues, but also on whether they should start a formal Green Party in California. The group decided that it was interested in possibly pursuing ballot status for the Green Party in California and appointed Kent and Roger Picklum of Oakland to work with the California Secretary of State’s office on the matter.

“Kent came forward by his commitment and made himself a logical choice for the task – again repeating the pattern of creating and seizing opportunity – the pattern of a real leader,” said Feinstein, noting that Mr. Smith played an important role at the first planetary meeting of Greens in Rio de Janeiro in May, 1992 immediately preceding setting up the first global Greens Bulletin, and a key player in organizing global cooperation between Green parties in Canada, Mexico and the US, helping to create CANAMEX, the organization between Greens in the three countries, which lead today to the FPVA, the Federation of the Green Parties of the Americas.

“Kent was challenged about his one time assertion that Greens should run to win. Why then did he run for State Senate in ’92, which he could not win, when he could win a local race? He received 32,000 votes and 10 percent in his race, and argued that his campaign had actually built the party because it got many people involved and improved the chances that some of them might run in future local races,” report-
ed Feinstein.

“Kent was my mentor, and mentored many others, in the early days. I am saddened by his death but the good things he did for us will always be remembered,” said Hank Chabot, a Bay Area Green.

“I remember Kent well. After knowing Kent I was MUCH more committed to making something of the Green Party. He was one of the very few guys that really had much impact on my life,” said Tan Harker, another Green activist.

Mr. Smith enjoyed tennis, soccer, trips to the family cabin, international travel, reading, writing (he authored/co-authored two books), meditating, art, walking the streets of Nevada City, attending cultural events and spending time with his family.

Mr. Smith is survived by his life partner, Lynn Ely; daughters and sons-in-law Micaela Rubalcava and Jeff Cunan, of Quincy, and Gabrielle Smith-Dhluha and Radovàn Dhluh-Smith, of the Czech Republic; grandchildren Luis, Che and Miles Rubalcava-Cunan, Jacob Dhluh-Smith, Teo Dhluh-Smith and Olivia Dhluh-Smith, of 3 Generations; nieces and nephews. He was preceded in death by his parents, Ralph J. Smith and Louise Dally Smith.

Memorial contributions may be made to Hospice of the Foothills. A celebration of life was held Sunday, March 16 at 2 p.m. at the Nevada City Memorial Building, 415 N. Pine St. Nevada City.

See the following webpages for a wealth of information on Kent:
http://www.cagreens.org/history/people/kent_smith
Kent Smith/GPCA Strategy Committee documents, 1990-1991

August 1990
http://www.cagreens.org/cc/internal/strategy/workpl ans/1990-1991/kent_smith_g pca_strategy(1)_08_90.pdf

December 1991
http://www.cagreens.org/cc/internal/strategy/workpl ans/1990-1991/kent_smith_g pca_strategy(2)_08_90.pdf

May 1992

March 16 at 2 p.m. at the Nevada City Memorial Building, 415 N. Pine St. Nevada City.
On Living a Green Lifestyle - La Vida Verde

By Wes Rolley, CoChair, EcoAction Committee, GPUS. Morgan Hill, CA

Everyone has their own ideas about what it means to live green. Most of us are in the Green Party because we are willing to vote Green, but just how far are we willing to go in order to live green? Does it mean that we drive a hybrid to work? Might it mean that we ride a bicycle to work one day a week? Many people believe that seeing living Green means you have to give up something. Just what part of our lifestyles are we willing to give up? Why was it ever so important that we have to now give it up?

There are others who seem to want to disconnect the lifestyle question from Green politics. One Green Party leader from the Mid-Atlantic states wrote ‘We cannot only be an eco/environmental organization, centered around EcoVillage enclaves around the world, with our own little organic vegetable gardens protected from the outside world, and only accessible to the very few. That makes it sound as if living a sustainable lifestyle is very elitist, something that only the privileged are capable of.

The question of sustainability should not depend on whether or not you live in an EcoVillage. It is truly a question of what you value and being willing to work toward those ends.

My wife and I have made a gradual transformation. When we purchased our current home in the mid 1970’s, living green was not anything we thought about. We purchased the home because it offered her space for her studio, it has a wonderful view of the lake and the mountains and Mor- gan Hill then had good schools.

Now, we are thankful that we bought a half-acre of land then, because that land grows some of the best, freshest fruit that I have eaten. Every day of the year, I am able to eat organic fruit that we grow ourselves. Right now, it is citrus, orange, grapefruit, pomelo. Next up come cherries, plums, apricots. By next fall, we will have persimmons, and pineapple guava or kiwi to carry us until the citrus ripes again. We now have an orchard that keeps us, and many of our neighbors, in fresh fruit all year.

What did we give up for this? Nothing that I value as much as knowing the origin of the food we put into our bodies and the fact that it is free from pesticides. Yes, I still have a 10 year old pickup and a 15 year old minivan. We use them when necessary: to drive the nearly five miles to the highway or a grocery in eight to the public library. I just don’t do those things as often as I used to. I’ll pay a library fine for a late book rather than spend the gas to drive down town.

Others manage to take it all the way. Sandra Everett is the CoChair of the GPCA national delegation. She and her husband Brian also founded the San Mateo EcoVillage. Like my wife and I, they grow some of their own food. But Brian and Sandra have gone several steps beyond what we have done. The most important difference is the fact that they are building a community. No urban lifestyle is ultimately sustainable without community, the active sharing and involvement with others.

The San Mateo EcoVillage consists of two four-apartment buildings. Each apartment has a small front yard and a shared outdoor space. The Permaculture Institute defines permaculture as “an ecological design system for sustainability in all aspects of human endeavor. It teaches us how to reconnect the human being to the web of life.”

According to Brian, it is about community, communication and choice. Just how far will you go toward a sustainable planet?

For more information on the San Mateo EcoVillage, check Sandra and Brian’s web site: http://www.greensolutions.org/smec.htm

San Diego Green Receives “Shameless Agitator Award”

By Don Boring

SAN DIEGO – John Falchi, a longtime supporter of the Green Party, recently received “The Shameless Agitator Award.” This is a very meaningful award given for the twelfth time by the Social Justice Ministry of the First Unitarian Universalist Church of San Diego, to honor service to this Church and to the larger community. On Thursday, February 14, 2008, a reception was held for John by the Social Justice Ministry at the church on 4190 Front St. across from the UCSD Hospital.

The award was presented by Mr. Mel Duncan, the CoFounder and Executive Director of Nonviolent Peace Force. John Falchi considered this a special honor since he knows to Mel Duncan as a mentor who leads an international peace force of human beings who ‘love over the globe and put themselves in harm’s way’ as nonviolent peace advocates in places as contentious as Iraq or Palestine.

John is a change of life person. He turned fifty, left the fast-paced world of capital campaigning across the country, and settled into a more monkish existence as a world server in San Diego, California. The work in which John has been engaged expresses the “Philosophy of Creative Altruism,” in which one gives oneself away, pro bono, to those in need in the community. During his development management career he had served as Chief Development Officer for a number of major institutions and as Fund Raising Consultant to many non-profit organizations in campaigns from $100,000 for the Salvation Army to $1.1 Billion for Stanford University.

“I have been honored in doing altruistic work over the years by people like Carl Rogers, Robert Muller, Joanna Macy, and Robert Theobald—who were great supporters of green values in their lives,” says John. “I had the opportunity to meet a and work with these people and to experience each of them in a way that they had a profound influence on his life.”

John attributes his ability to work for social causes over the years to what he calls “positive well-being for all living things.” His mission has been to help leaders meet their organization’s goals and objectives by training them in fund raising, membership building, organizational planning, and PR work. He practices the concept of teaching people how to fish, rather than providing them with food.

To fully accomplish these aims, according to John, will take a paradigm shift in the consciousness of our people. Nevertheless, he believes that, by posting great goals and working towards them, we may just see that paradigm shift in our lifetimes.

John has served as Chair of the Board of the Unity and Diversity World Council which has done a lot to bridge the differences between Religious groups. He has carried out the role of Community Coordinator for SANDIONS, the San Diego Chapter of the Institute of Noetic Sciences, which attempts to bring spirituality and science together. He, also, is the founder of, and the facilitator for, Plan of Action in a Changing Era, a meta-networking group which brings people together in otherwise conflict filled situations.

John has served in the campaigns for the President of Adial Stevenson, George McGovern, and Dennis Kucinich. Since the inception of the Green Party, however, he has voted for Ralph Nader twice, and worked hard for Green candidates like Medea Benjam for the U.S. Senate, and Peter Comejo for CA Governor. Most recently, he has been called upon for political advice by more than a few congressional candidates. He, also, is working with Common Cause, Progressive San Diego and the League of Women Voters on a forum at UCSD for San Diego’s Mayoral Candidates, particularly involving students. At the same time, he is playing an instrumental role in two multi-million dollar capital campaigns for good causes.

John treasures his membership in the Green Party because he agrees so firmly with the principles that it represents. He continues his work despite health problems at age 72.

John can be reached by email at: pacerjp14@sbcglobal.net

By Sam Fassbinder

In this pathbreaking 2002 book, Joan Martinez-Alier, professor of economics at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, divides environmentalism into three main movements. They are:

1) “The ‘cult of wilderness,’” preservationism which “arises from the love of beautiful landscapes and from deeply held values, not from material interests.” (1.a) In this category Martinez-Alier includes the “deep ecology” movement and the organization “Friends of the Earth.”

2) The “gospel of eco-efficiency,” connected both to the “sustainable development” and “ecological modernization” movements and to the notion of the “wise use” of resources. Martinez-Alier tells us that “ecological modernization walks on two legs: one economic, eco-taxes and markets in emission permits; two, technological support for materials and energy-saving changes” (6). This, then, is a reformist movement attaching itself to industrialism, “and for it, ecology becomes a managerial science mopping up the ecological degradation after industrialization.” (6)

Now, seeing the environmental movement in the First World in terms of these two movements is reasonable. There is, however, a third current of environmentalism, however, that has come to challenge the first two currents:

3) the “environmentalism of the poor,” which has as its main interest “not a sacred reverence for Nature but a material interest in the environment as a source and a requirement for livelihood; not so much a concern with the rights of other species and of future generations of humans as a concern for today’s poor humans.” This is the “environmental justice” movement, and it is centered around what Martinez-Alier calls “ecological distribution conflicts.” (12) Its protagonists are locals whose livelihoods are threatened by environmental impacts. It “receives academic support from agroecology, ethnology, political ecology and, to some extent, from urban ecology and ecological economics.” (12)

The third type of environmentalism was not recognized as such until the 1980s and 1990s, as “actors in such conflicts” over environmental justice “have often not used an environmental idiom” (14). Martinez-Alier suggests that the three strands of environmentalism complement each other; but his rhetorical tack is to persuade us that the first two types are rather limited in what they can do, and that we ought to seriously investigate the third type.

“The Environmentalism of the Poor” wants us to face up to some rather essential facts about environmentalism. First, the eco-efficiency movement is “demeaning,” and so environmental harm is not going to go away. Second, environmental concerns use different languages of valuation than economic concerns, with one language often not translatable into another, and that the environment, like the economy, is about “distributional issues” (23). These facts set the stage for an endorsement of the “environmentalism of the poor.”

Chapters 2 and 3 of this book are about ecological economics, which for Martinez-Alier is about how economic growth is bad for ecosystem integrity over the long run. He lists a number of indices of “unsustainability,” and briefly touches upon neoMalthusianism and the doctrine of “carrying capacity,” that the Earth only has resources to support so many human beings. This is done as a sort of demonstration of the insufficiency of the gospel of eco-efficiency.

Thereafter Martinez-Alier discusses conflicts in political ecology. These conflicts are, for the most part, conflicts between particular money-making entities and groups hoping to preserve their traditional ways of making a living. One whole chapter, chapter 5, is devoted to the conflicts in tropical regions throughout the world, between shrimp farmers and those who live sustainably in the mangrove forests which are sometimes destroyed for shrimp farms. Chapter 6 is devoted to various other conflicts over natural resources – the book offers a survey of situations in which technological developers, looking for gold or oil, farming land, rivers to dam, or timber to harvest, confront peasants.

Chapter 7 is then about cities which, we are boldly told, are unsustainable (153). Here Martinez-Alier wants to measure the environmental damage caused by the growth of cities.

Chapters 8 and 9 are about the “environmental justice” movement and its congruence with the “environmentalism of the poor.” With Chapter 10 we are confronted with the notion of “ecological debt.” The idea of ecological debt is encapsulated in this explanation:

First, as we shall see immediately, the imports of raw materials and other products from relatively poor countries are sold at prices which do not include compensation for local or global externalities. Second, rich countries make a disproportionate use of environmental space or services without payment, and even without recognition of other people’s entitlements to such services (particularly, the disproportionate free use of carbon dioxide sinks and reservoirs). (213)

In its last chapter, the book concludes with the thought that the “environmentalism of the poor,” popular environmentalism, livelihood ecology, liberation ecology and the movement for environmental justice (local and global), growing out of the complaints against the appropriation of communal environmental resources and against the disproportionate burdens of pollution, may help to move society and economy in the direction of ecological sustainability. (270)

Our environmentalism, right here, right now, really does need some of the elements of the “environmentalism of the poor” in its repertoire. We need to put ecosystem resilience as a first priority, rather than viewing the Earth as merely the source of our favorite consumer appliances.
We are not Embarrassed To Admit It!

We could use your help in producing this newspaper.

If you own a digital camera, enjoy going to Green Party events and have college level skills in writing, we may want to make you a roving correspondent for this paper.

ALSO WANTED:

- Graphic Artists
- Cartoonists

Contact either of the following people in email below, to find out how you can help.

Send email to donb@cagreens.org or civillib@comcast.net

Don’t be shy! Get in touch today...

The Ten Key Values of the Green Party in English and Spanish

**Grassroots Democracy** - Develop participatory ways to control the decisions which affect our lives.

**Social Justice** - Create a system which promotes equality and dignity for all.

**Nonviolence** - Develop alternatives to current patterns of violence at all levels.

**Ecological Wisdom** - Operate our human society knowing we are a part of nature, and learn to live within the ecological and resource limits of the planet.

**Decentralization** - Move power and responsibility away from larger and more distant institutions toward individuals and communities, with the goal of a decentralized, democratic society.

**Community-Based Economics** - Redesign work to encourage employee ownership and workplace democracy, and establish basic security for all and a fair distribution of wealth and income.

**Feminism** - Replace the ethic of domination and control with cooperative ways of relating to each other.

**Respect for Diversity** - Honor cultural, ethnic, racial, sexual, religious and spiritual diversity, reclaiming our country’s shared ideals, the dignity of the individual, democratic participation and liberty and justice for all.

**Personal and Global Responsibility** - Learn from and be of genuine assistance to grassroots groups in all parts of the world.

**Sustainability** - Act not for the short range narrow interest of one country or group of people, but for the collective future of the entire planet.

**Economía Basada en la Comunidad** - Rediseño de las estructuras de trabajo para fomentar la propiedad para los empleados y la democracia en el trabajo, al mismo tiempo que se establece una seguridad básica para todos y una distribución justa de la riqueza y los ingresos.

**Feminismo** - Sustituir la ética de dominación y control por la de relaciones de cooperación.

**Respeto por la Diversidad** - Respeto a la diversidad cultural, étnica, racial, sexual, religiosa y espiritual, volviendo a los ideales compartidos de nuestro país: la dignidad de cada persona, la participación democrática, y libertad y justicia para todos.

**Responsabilidad Personal y Global** - Debemos aprender de los grupos de base del resto del mundo y ser de verdadera ayuda para ellos.

**Sostenibilidad** - Pensar en términos del futuro colectivo del planeta entero, no en los estrechos intereses de corto plazo de un país o grupo de personas.

---

**Dream of a Sustainable Planet Earth**

**We Are All Looking For A Bright Future**

But We Need Your Help to Make It Happen

The Green Party of the State of California is working hard to promote candidates and provide financial support to campaigns on the local and regional level that we feel we have a chance of winning, or in which we feel we can make a spectacular showing in the media.

Further, we are improving our ability to speak truth to power, provide training programs for candidates and managers across the state and gaining media access through a viable network of spokespersons and a press agent for the party. To do this, and to fulfill our dreams of a permanent office in our state capital, we are looking for people who can step up and become Monthly Sustainers to the Green Party of CA.

And as your added benefit, you will receive a free subscription to the GREEN FOCUS newspaper. We invite you to fill out the form below and help grow the party in a meaningful way. Today!

---

**Sustainers Receive Green Focus - Free**

**We Appreciate Your Support**

Mail To: Green Party of California
P.O Box 2828
Sacramento, CA 95812

☐ Yes! I will proudly donate monthly to the Green Party of California
☐ $5 ☐ $10 ☐ $25 ☐ $50 ☐ Other $

☐ Annual Newspaper Subscription
Send $25 to address above

Contributions of $100 or more must by law be returned if we do not have this information on file.
Contributions are not tax deductible. Other restrictions on sources of contributions may apply.

Name:
Address:
City:
State: Zip:
Home Phone: Wk:

Email:
Occupation:
Employer:
Credit Card #: Expires: mm/dd/yy
Signature:
Here are just some of the articles in this issue:

**Green Presidential Debate**
The Green Party presidential race – already the most competitive ever – is intricately connected to the goings-on of California Greens, who held the nation's first, and maybe only, high-visibility Presidential Debate in San Francisco January 13.

**Progressive Issues Drive Green Party Presidential Contest**
As things stand right now, a resident of the state of Arizona cannot register to vote as a member of the Green Party. And when voters go to the polls to elect a President this November, one name they won't see on their ballot is the Green Party's candidate. If our effort to get signatures proves to be effective, that's about to change.

**Kent Smith Obituary**
Mr. Smith, who was 66 when he passed away at his home in Sacramento, is recognized as one of the founders of the Green Party of California.

**And More:**