

Report of the Minority of the Accreditation Committee With respect to the Committee's referral of the Complaint of the National Lavender Green Caucus Seeking the Revocation of Accreditation for the Georgia Green Party

The Accreditation Committee has adopted a majority report¹ in the form of a proposal, being referred to the Green National Committee seeking a vote to revoke the accreditation of the Georgia Green Party for endorsing the Declaration on Women's Sex-Based Rights.

The Georgia delegation, being prevented by the recusal rule from participating in most respects with the Accreditation Committee process for considering the complaint filed by the National Lavender Caucus (referred to throughout this report as the Complaint); I offer this minority report as one member's perspective.

I offer this report to examine whether our committee performed due diligence in fulfilling its responsibilities to the Green Party of the United States, in the handling of the Complaint. To reach a determination on that question, I believe it is necessary that our committee:

- 1) determine the legitimacy of Georgia's position, that is (whether one agrees with it or not), is it allowed, permissible, for a Green party to take this position?;
- 2) have an open dialogue on the issue;
- 3) resolve the complaint according to the evidence (which in my view would be to decide against disaccreditation of the Green Party of Georgia).

With respect to the first goal, it has become clear to me that the positions the Georgia party has taken are legitimate from a Green point of view. Before I started reading further about this issue, I would have signed right on to the grievance, with "of course that's right!" But no more. A closer look reveals a reality that's psychologically, medically, and politically more complex.

With respect to the second and third goals, I believe that the committee has failed. A biased and stacked Accreditation Committee has made fair consideration of the issues impossible, in my view. Further the process to date on the Complaint has been so thoroughly tainted as to render illegitimate any determination to revoke the Georgia party's accreditation on the basis of the report it produced.

The Georgia party, recognizing that a fair hearing has not been possible in the current environment within the party, has presented its defense directly to the members of the National Committee, to the media, and to the public. I have reviewed the testimony and documents

¹ Majority Report of the Accreditation Committee to refer a proposal seeking Revocation of Accreditation of the Georgia Green Party: https://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/nlc-vs-ggp/pleadings/Majority_Report_of_the_Accreditation_Committee_to_refer_Complaint_of_NLC

provided to us by the Georgia party and its counsel. I urge each member of the NC considering their vote on the question of the NLC Complaint referred to the GNC by the AC to do the same. In the pages below, I lay out many of the reasons I believe this important.

**Problems with the Accreditation Committee's proposal
and why it should be rejected by the Green National Committee**

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

Nowhere in the Complaint has the Lavender Caucus cited any evidence of the alleged transphobia of the Georgia Party, except for the assertions, unsupported by any actual evidence, that the Declaration for the Rights of Women as a Sex is a statement in opposition to the rights of trans-identified people. Nor does the Accreditation Committee anywhere provide any evidence that Georgia "exhibit[s] bigoted, anti-transgender positions that violate the Key Value of Social Justice and Equal Opportunity." It is completely reasonable to believe that when one group asserts rights which conflict with those recognized and existing for another group, that the resolution of that conflict would be the result of discussion, debate and compromise. The other marginalized group in this case is the female sex, 51% of the population. To argue 'there is no debate' as the AC and LC have, is simply a denial of reality – there is a debate, among trans people (as evidenced by the video depositions of the Georgia party's expert witnesses), among feminists (as cited in multiple documents included in Georgia's defense pleadings), and in the wider society (see especially recent developments in Europe). The Lavender Caucus claims that the definition of "transphobic" is under its control and that anyone who merely asserts that sex exists and that the rights of females as a sex are worthy of protection must be deemed "transphobic." However, the evidence and testimony provided by the Georgia Green Party (see attachments below), demonstrate that the Party's position is not at all transphobic. Further, the logic of this assertion flies in the face of the oft-repeated claim that 'rights are not like pie'; for if that were true, a defense of women's rights would pose no threat to the rights of trans-identified people.

To the contrary, Greens are all united by our support for trans folk to be able to do and be the way they want & not to be mistreated for their gender non-conformity or self-presentation. Indeed, all people should be free to dress and express themselves as they wish without discrimination, stigma, or violence. Members of the Georgia party believe this just as other Greens do. The disagreement that led to the LC's complaint therefore has nothing to do with actual bigotry or prejudice on the part of Georgia.

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

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

The majority report of the Committee falsely asserts that "There is no evidence that GAGP is empowering members of the LGBTQ+ community".

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

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

Further, it remains in contention that a cohesive LGBTQ+ community even exists. The interests of the various groups subsumed in the expression, *LGBTQ+ community*, are hardly aligned, except on the narrowest of areas. Little evidence exists of the reciprocal solidarity required to build such a community, and even a minimal investigation reveals the existence of deep divisions.

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

More recently, gay men have raised concerns which parallel those long expressed by lesbians. In the past year these abuses have become so egregious as to motivate splits by founding members in Stonewall UK to form the LGB Alliance, inspiring similar moves in multiple countries far beyond Great Britain, including in the US. The US now has two LGB organizations, LGB Alliance and LGB Fightback. Only this week, organizers responsible for the organization of Pride events in Philadelphia PA took down their website and have apparently disbanded a thirty year old organization after public statements revealed organizational disagreements over an assertion that transwomen are women.

Also evidence of the splits (among what the Accreditation Committee's final report would have us believe is some sort of unified community) is, in the past year, the organization of new publications intended to serve explicitly the LGB community, particularly [Lesbian and Gay News \(https://lesbianandgaynews.com/\)](https://lesbianandgaynews.com/) but also others. In addition, the authors of the Declaration on Women's Sex-Based Rights are lesbians, and many of the leaders of the Women's Human Rights Campaign and Feminists in Struggle, Get the L Out and others are likewise lesbians. For

these groups and many other individuals, Georgia's adopted positions would be far more attractive than the positions of the Lavender Caucus.

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

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

The Accreditation Committee majority by their referral of the Complaint are advocating expansion of the requirements for state party accreditation. Georgia's support for women's sex-based rights should not be turned into an opportunity for a faction to impose new obligations on autonomous state parties, outside of the national parties process for the democratic revision of its rules.

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

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

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

(i) a violation of the ethical standards generally expected of medical practitioners;

(ii) a violation of professional standards requiring fully informed consent;

(iii) medical malpractice, and

(iv) as clinicians the world over have described it, conversion therapy targeting gay and lesbian youth.

These harms are of great concern to many lesbians, gays and bisexuals, as well as to persons who identify as transgender. See, e.g., <https://www.trevoices.com/>, Trans-Rational Educational Voices, a group of transgender individuals that are leading a campaign against child medical transition; and <https://www.gdalliancecanada.com/>, the Gender Dysphoria Alliance, Canada. Leaders of each organization offered video depositions (linked below) in defense of the Georgia Party.

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

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

- (a) The Lavender Caucus (and their allies) packed the committee with allies to the LC's position.
- (b) The AC is full of members who should have been recused, as members of the LC or representatives of states or caucuses which had joined the complaint, and were bound to support it. The [existing Recusal rule](#) (see Section 3. Decisions), reads in relevant part: "Each member of the committee is entitled to cast a vote unless there is a conflict of interest (i.e. member of a state party or caucus which is a party to the issue being voted on, or any other direct conflict of interest). Such members shall be required to be recused from the vote". This rule was ignored for the sake of ensuring the predetermined outcome. The Georgia party is in possession of a list of the names of two NLC delegates and five additional members of the Lavender Caucus who participated, in violation of the recusal rule in the February 20th vote; as well as two NLC delegates and five additional members of the Lavender Caucus who similarly participated in the original February 4th vote. A fair application of the recusal rule would have resulted in a ruling that both the February 4th and the February 20th ***votes to 'accept the complaint' had been defeated due to a failure to achieve quorum.***
- (c) The committee usurped powers delegated to the National Committee by the [bylaws](#) (see Section 3-7) and the [rules and procedures](#) (see the section labeled: **V. Procedures for the Revocation of Accreditation**) of the Party. The Accreditation Committee violated these provisions of the governing documents of our national party by writing its committee's rules to govern its investigation and hearing on the Complaint and ***failing to submit those rules for ratification by the Green National Committee.***

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

- A. A false and unprovable allegation levied against GAGP delegate John Fortuin for the purpose of creating a distraction, timed to undermine a motion to allow the GAGP to present evidence during an extension of the scheduled period for testimony. Several members of the AC recklessly or deliberately faked an accusation that Fortuin had misrepresented his relationship to the Dialogue not Expulsion website.

- B. Inadequate time to question the LC representatives under the 5 minutes per member rule, which was heavily stacked, and limited the time available to question the hostile and evasive LC representative.
- C. Exclusion without explanation of the secretary (and a founding member) of the Georgia Party during the testimony of Margaret Elizabeth of the Lavender caucus, again in violation of the AC's transparency rule, that "All business of the AC will be conducted in a transparent manner and documented as specified within these Policies and Procedures." (See the first paragraph of the [Committee's Rules and Procedures](#)).
- D. Denial of the right to counsel. Not only were the officers of the Georgia Green Party denied notice of the process, but their Appearance of Counsel naming Ann Menasche counsel for the defense and requesting service explicitly on both the state party officers and Ms. Menasche was similarly ignored, along with the Georgia party's witness list and request for a hearing at which they might be examined.

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

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

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

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

Whatever the result of the finger-pointing about this, the fact is that the AC did not hear any affirmative presentation from GAGP or allow a hearing requested by the Georgia party to receive the testimony of its defense witnesses. The Georgia Green Party defense team was left to host video depositions, inviting the Lavender Caucus to send counsel to cross-examine Georgia's witnesses. To the best of our knowledge, not a single member of the jurors on the AC, nor a single member of the LC, attempted to or did attend these open video depositions. Hearing decisions have been overturned for minor judicial procedural violations not approaching the magnitude of this breach of procedure. [Video of these depositions have been published](#) for viewing by anyone with an interest in doing so.

8. Other deficiencies in the AC process.

- (a) Failure to provide appropriate notice

The co-chairs of the AC failed to provide notice to the officers of Georgia party and its designated defense team of the processes and deadlines under which they were expected to operate. The Georgia party Secretary [addressed a letter on May 6th to the](#)

[co-chairs of the Accreditation Committee](#) and copied to the Secretary of the national party, in which he wrote:

“The officers of the Georgia Green Party are dismayed that we must chase rumors of proceedings, presumably under way within the Accreditation Committee, without our having ever been afforded notice by your committee of your rules, time frame or hearing schedule.”

With no response yet from the leadership of the Accreditation Committee leadership, the Georgia party [on May 11th sent an email](#) with the subject line:

Subject: Andy, Lyn: filings in Defense of the Georgia Green Party, request for hearing

The next day, on May 12th, (not May 10th, as asserted by the timeline in the Proposal by the Committee majority), [Chairman Ellis, of Maryland, on behalf of the Committee responds:](#)

“Your request for a hearing came on May 11th, one day before the process ended and 9 days after the deadline we had communicated.”

Indeed the timeline outlined in the proposal includes an item described as:

April 19 GAGP and NLGC invited to provide additional Testimony in writing or via zoom. Deadline is May 2nd for zoom and May 9th for Written Testimony.

But following the link on that bulleted point finds an email

Subject: Written or Oral Testimony to the Accreditation Committee

addressed by Co-Chair Ellis to Co-Chairs Ellis and Maravell, and blind copied to Margaret Elizabeth and to two of the three Georgia members appointed to the Accreditation Committee. The two Georgia appointees included one who has not answered a quorum call on the committee list since his appointment and who has only posted twice in that time to the committee list, but not since February, leading the co-chairs to exclude him in their calculation of quorum.

The original notice to the Georgia party dated December 23th, 2020 was appropriately addressed to the email published for the state party where it was timely and unambiguously received by each and every officer named by the state committee for the Georgia party. It is unclear why subsequent communication was not also appropriately addressed.

- (b) A member of the Accreditation Committee (with a role of acting as impartial juror) wrote part of the complaint (and failed to recuse himself having done so).

- (c) Hearsay testimony of Abby Thacker is referenced and cited in their report by the majority, despite no reference to such testimony being made either in the LC Complaint or during the hearing period, and no opportunity afforded committee members to question the author of that letter, nor for the Georgia Party to cross-examine the assertions made or provide contrary evidence. Had such testimony been presented during the hearing period, the Georgia defense would surely have sought to investigate and address any legitimate issues cited.
- (d) The Accreditation Committee, including its leadership, permitted extensive name-calling and slurs against any member questioning the Lavender Caucus accusations, such as asking about gender identity, gender ideology, sex, evidence of transphobia, or the like. Members called such questions or discussion “semantics antics” and “rhetoric” and claimed that the need for “impartiality” was absurd and that the Georgia Party had no right to due process. Providing no evidence, quotations, references, or links, accusations of “bigotry,” “transphobia,” “terf,” and other insults were regularly posted by AC members against other members of the Committee. These claims by the AC regarding “transphobia” and contained in the complaint are baseless.
- (e) The proceedings throughout tolerated personal attacks on the Georgia delegates, including a bogus witch hunt against John Fortuin for supporting “Dialogue not Expulsion”; name-calling; claims of right-wing collaboration without a scintilla of evidence, etc.

9. The AC added new allegations regarding “internal democracy” not contained in the Lavender Caucus complaint.

In what can only be described as a fishing expedition, the Accreditation Committee acted beyond the scope of its jurisdiction to examine the validity of the LC complaint, and added new charges to the indictment after the time had lapsed for the Georgia party to mount a defense to these new charges. The AC is in no position to assess the validity of those claims generated through speculation by the committee.

The addition of these charges demonstrates the kangaroo court nature of the process and the flimsiness of the resulting factional proposal for disaccreditation.

10. No open discussion of the Lavender Caucus’s gender claims has been allowed.

The Lavender Caucus Complaint is part of a broader and more general attempt to purge the Party of supporters of or sympathizers with gender-critical viewpoints, or even anyone opposing expulsion on that basis. At its repeated, insistent request, listserv moderators have silenced NC members challenging or questioning the Complaint.

At the April 11th 2021 meeting of the Steering Committee, Margaret Elisabeth further skewed what would be considered acceptable debate by purging Sid Smith from the forum manager candidates’ list by violating the Steering Committee’s rules of order (listen for yourself starting at the 1h40m mark, at <https://secure.gpus.org/secure/SC-Recordings/2021-04-11.mp3>).

Accreditation Committee Co-Chair Linnea 'Lyn Joy' Maravell bragged about her abuse of power in the removal of T. Oliver, a dissenting voice in matters related to the Complaint, as an Oregon appointee to the Accreditation Committee. Additionally, Maravell's recent abuses of power in the Maine GP deserves examination, but that is beyond the scope of this report.

10. A responsible Lavender Caucus would have engaged in honest state-level politics.

Rather than abuse the administrative processes of the party over policy differences more appropriately resolved within the party's established platform revision process, a responsible party caucus committed to the values of the party would have organized among its natural constituency within the jurisdiction of the Georgia party to change that party's position. Instead the Lavender Caucus has engaged in dishonest and top-down bureaucratic maneuvering to shut down debate on legitimate questions of public policy which deserve a fair hearing before the Party. The entire proceeding against the Georgia state party is a massive attack on the values of decentralization and grassroots democracy, as well as feminism. Every state party henceforth must fear the wrath of members of the Accreditation Committee every time they consider a state-platform amendment, or even an action not related to platform.

The Green Party must be able to listen meaningfully to public opinion and discuss policy within the broad polity, or we will have little chance to appeal to voters or to contribute to legislation. The Accreditation Committee's approach is to enforce narrow positions grounded in gender identity ideology insisted on by caucus activists as if they are Green Party requirements, and thus guarantee the party's irrelevance. This disempowers the GPUS, and empowers the billionaire class' favorite puppets, the political duopoly.

Appendix A: *Written Pleadings*

It bears repeating, that the concerted effort by the Committee majority to ignore the defenses raised does not mean that no defense was mounted by the respondents to the Complaint. The Accreditation Committee has failed in its duty to appropriately weigh the evidence, or even to conduct an investigation and hearing which would allow the evidence to be weighed. It is now left to each and every member of the Green National Committee to review and consider for themselves the considerable evidence presented by and on behalf of the Georgia party which puts to rest every accusation leveled in the Complaint and undermines every *conclusion* of the majority report now before the GNC.

Below I have quoted **brief** excerpts from each document cited. But they each deserve the full attention of each and every Delegate or Alternate who will cast a vote on the NLC Complaint referred by the majority of the AC for GNC action.

Final defense pleadings filed May 11th, 2021:

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

Should this persecution succeed on those grounds, it would create a dangerous precedent for the Green Party of the United States that will likely in the future result in the targeting and expulsion of others holding minority political views on a variety of positions which would otherwise be the subject of legitimate debate within the party. The political stance of the Georgia Green Party as reflected in its adoption of HR33 and HR44 is completely consistent with the Four Pillars and the Ten Key Values. Georgia supports social justice for all oppressed and marginalized groups including a demonstrated commitment to feminism and to our lesbian and gay sisters and brothers that far exceeds that of the Lavender Caucus. Georgia has never denied the humanity and intrinsic worth of transgender individuals. To the contrary, Georgia has always supported and continues to support the rights of transgender people and all gender non-conforming people to dress, groom, and express themselves as they like regardless of sex or sex stereotyping, and to follow their interests and inclinations freely and without discrimination, stigma or violence.

. . .

What the Georgia Party and the international movement of feminists and lesbian, gay and bisexual activists with whom we are aligned disagree with is what we refer to as sex denialism , i.e., the denial that biological sex exists and/or has any social significance, and the belief that gender identity should in all instances override sex. We believe that sex denialism is both sexist and homophobic in that it does serious harm to the half of humanity born female and still oppressed based on their sex, and also undermines the rights of lesbians, gay males and bisexuals as same sex attracted people. Tragically, this deeply mistaken strategy pits transgender people against their natural allies and may ultimately harm trans people themselves.

. . .

In the Party's plank related to Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity, in sub-section 3 our party takes the position that "We are opposed to non-consenting intersex genital surgery." It seems odd that the Green Party has a plank in our platform that opposes without equivocation, surgery on intersex children too young for informed consent, while the National Lavender Caucus tells us (with no clear support in the Platform) that children should be put on puberty blockers long before the age of consent, before they can drink, obtain a tattoo or even a learners permit to operate a vehicle on the public roads. And of course, puberty blockers do not just block normal growth and maturation of secondary sex characteristics, they also block bone development and leave researchers concerned about the impact on the developing brain.

Yet, the Lavender Caucus is willing to impose its view on this issue without discussion, label critics of child transition "transphobic," and seek the expulsion of a State Party on this basis. This is policy-making by bullying, and anathema to our party's commitment to participatory democracy.

Appendices to Georgia brief:

http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/sites/default/files/pleadings/nlc-vs-ggp/2021-05/Appendices_to_Defense_Brief--NLV-vs-GaGP--20201223.pdf

pg 2 Appendix A. GaGP Platform Am HR3: Endorse the Declaration on Women's Sex Based Rights

http://georgiagreenparty.org/georgia-green-party-2020-nominating-convention-february-22nd-bonaire-georgia/hr3_endorse_dwsbr/ pdf

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

pg 3 Appendix B. Declaration on Women's Sex Based Rights

https://www.womensdeclaration.com/documents/78/DECLARATION_-_FINAL_VERSION_AMENDED.pdf

This Declaration reaffirms the sex-based rights of women which are set out in the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 18 December 1979 (CEDAW), further developed in the CEDAW Committee General Recommendations, and adopted, inter alia, in the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women 1993 (UNDEVW).

pg 23 Appendix C. GaGP Platform Am HR4: Endorse the FIST Amendments to the Equality Act

https://georgiagreenparty.org/georgia-green-party-2020-nominating-convention-february-22nd-bonaire-georgia/hr4_endorse_fist_am_to_equality_act/pdf

Elevating gender-identity on a par with sex as a protected class pits the established sex-rights of women against the demands for inclusion and protection by trans-identified persons. However, a prohibition of discrimination based on 'sex stereotypes' provides many important protections for transgendered individuals without placing at risk the sex-based rights of women.

pg 24 Appendix D. Feminist Amendments to the Equality Act

<https://feministstruggle.org/feminist-amendments/faea/>

by inserting “sex (~~including~~, sexual orientation, and ~~gender identity~~),”sex stereotyping,” before “or national origin”;

pg 51 Appendix E. Georgia Party Responds to Invitation from Lavender Caucus, April 7th, 2020

http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/sites/default/files/2020-05/Reply_to_Dario_Hunter_invitation-final_signed.pdf

We do understand that framing this conflict as interpersonal is counter-productive to the work we have to do as a political party. The resolution of this conflict must engage a party-wide conversation on the underlying issues. No invitation-only reconciliation retreat will do the trick.

. . .

We sincerely doubt that amending the platform of the Green Party of the United States to “(affirm) the right of all persons to self-determination with regard to gender identity”, was understood by most people who voted to support that proposal as supporting compelled speech, or intended to endorse the creation of thought crimes with which to prosecute Greens and others who cling to material reality and biological science. Many of us believe it is completely possible to respect a person’s right to self-determination without sacrificing our own commitment to intellectual honesty.

pg 57 Appendix F. Georgia Party Responds to Lavender Caucus Complaint Seeking to Purge Georgia Party

[GaGP-Response to complaint by National Lavender Committee to Accreditation Committee.pdf](#)

The NLC complaint fails to make the case that any of their asserted violations of the accreditation criteria are true. They fail to cite any action, quote any statements or positions taken by the Georgia Green Party which would support such an assertion. They make accusations, but fail to present credible evidence.

pg 67 Appendix G. Dialogue Not Expulsion Caucus Responds to NLGC Complaint Against Georgia Party

https://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/sites/default/files/documents/DNE_responds_to_NLGC_complaint_against_the_GaGP.pdf

The Declaration on Women's Sex-Based Rights is not a transphobic document

There is a vigorous debate developing within the medical community over appropriate intervention for gender dysphoric and gender confused children

There exists no actionable offense for violation of the platform

The Georgia party endorses the ten key values, differs from the Lavender Caucus, only in their application to narrow areas of public policy

No unanimity exists among Greens on the Lavender Caucus' narrow interpretation of the national party Platform,

and certainly none for its abuses of the democratic principles expected to govern the internal deliberations of the party

pg 71 Appendix H. Ann Menasche Responds to Lavender Caucus Complaint Seeking to Purge Georgia Party

https://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/sites/default/files/documents/Ann_Menasche--OpenLetter.GPAccredComm.final_12.28.20.pdf

(The Lavender Caucus Complaint) completely misunderstands or else has consciously misrepresented what Bostock and the Feminist Amendments stand for. Whether (the Complaint's author) acted purposefully or was merely misinformed, the Bostock decision as it actually reads and the Feminist Amendments as actually drafted provide no basis for criticizing, not to speak of suspending, the Georgia State Party.

pg 77 Appendix I. Green Feminists Response TO Lavender Caucus Complaint

<http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/sites/default/files/documents/Green-Feminists-Response-to-LC-Complaint-final.pdf>

(Taking action to revoke the accreditation of the Georgia Green Party over the NLC's Complaint would) be in direct conflict with the Ten Key Values, one of which is "feminism," another of which is "grassroots democracy," another of which is "diversity," and another of which is "decentralization." If this regressive step is taken, it would send a message that the Green Party no longer cares about the rights of women and girls, progress on which has always been on the basis of sex, not 'gender identity,' and that the Green Party has abandoned four of its Ten Key Values. This action would have a chilling effect on feminists and feminist allies throughout the

Party, undermining bedrock principles on which this party is built and the grassroots democracy we so strongly advocate and should be modeling.

pg 87 Appendix J. Steve Bloom, Green Party of New York State, Personal Declaration

http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/sites/default/files/documents/Personal_Declaration_of_Steve_Bloom_2021-April.pdf

On one issue and one issue only I place 100 percent of the blame on the NLC forces: They are the ones who reject a coexistence in the broad-tent of the Green Party including those with whom they disagree on questions of sex and gender. The NLC calls for the expulsion of Georgia. There is no reciprocal call by the Georgia Party or by the consciously GCRF members of the US Green Party for the expulsion of the NLC. That's why I have so far been able to work with GCRF elements in Dialogue not Expulsion, because the goal of that formation is to avoid a split in the party over this question.

pg 90 Appendix K. Rich Whitney, Chairman, Illinois Green Party Supports Open Political Discussion

http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/sites/default/files/documents/Response_to_Lavender_Greens_v._GA_GP.amended.2.pdf

If the national party sets a precedent of suspending or removing state parties based on disagreements or conflicts with the national platform, we could turn our national party into a circular firing squad. Policy disagreements, or disagreements with the national platform, are not a proper basis for attacking the affiliation of a member state party.

pg 96 Appendix L. Guilt by Association as a Tool of Reaction: MEs Hit Piece against radical Feminists

https://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/sites/default/files/documents/Guilt_by_Association--Green_Party_Georgia_defense--2021.03.31.pdf

The smears against those who question a particular version of transgender politics have no basis in fact. There is no “symbiotic relationship” between gender critical feminists and the Christian Right. GC feminists and their allies have politics generally ranging from mainstream Democrat, to progressive Democrat, to independent to socialist to Green. Overwhelmingly, GC feminists unequivocally support lesbian and gay rights, birth control, the Equal Rights Amendment, abortion rights and the right of everyone to dress, express themselves, and pursue their interests as they chose, which many people refer to as “gender.” These are hardly Christian fundamentalist Right wing positions.

pg 101 Appendix M. Sex Denialism is not just Sexist but homophobic

https://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/sites/default/files/caucus_member_opinions/2021-04/Menasche--Sex_Denialism_is_homophobic--20210426.pdf

Sex denialism - the idea that sex doesn't exist and/or has no social significance – fundamentally means that female sex-based oppression can no longer be named, recognized, measured, organized around or struggled against. . . . Just like race blindness is harmful to Black people . . . , sex denialism is extremely harmful and discriminatory to those of us born female.

Appendix B: Video testimony

Testimony of Hilla Kerner -- Vancouver Rape Relief

http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/nlc-vs-ggp/testimony/Hilla_Kerner--Vancouver_Rape_Relief

(Women-only spaces) has two elements: it's a separatist strategy, a strategy of the oppressed to organize. The consciousness-raising practice that the women's movement have been using since the second wave has been taken from the black liberation movement and the concept of "telling it like it is".

And we see it now in the Palestinian Liberation Movement. So having the space when the oppressed can meet without the gaze, the rules, the controls, the intervention of the oppressor is very, very important to women who are doing organizing around liberation.

When it comes to male violence against women, women have been victims from a person who belongs to that oppressive class of men, of someone who is male. So being in a female-only space is an immediate safety strategy, for both her physical boundaries and her emotional well-being.

what we hear from other women who call our crisis line from shelters, from swimming pools, these are mainly the places that women reported to us, that they felt threatened, they felt violated.

It was not a subjective feeling.

Those men were invasive, we know that men are exposing their genitals in swimming pools. So women called us after they were forced to share a room in a women's homeless shelter. Sometimes they had lots of empathy for that person. But it's not a woman from their experience. They had to move out. They were not comfortable. They could not have recuperated and be comforted and supported and feel safe having someone who was not born female in their space.

people who claim to be trans activists, and I use the term claim because I do not think they are doing trans people or the trans community any justice, and any service, using it to mobilize against women's groups and women's organizations. So the social implications, the cultural permission to attack feminists. That is the real price of the (C-16) bill.

Some of the most common tactics that the abuser has on women, individual women victims is: isolation, taking any element of autonomy.

So we definitely see that attempt, of undermining our economic independence. I think that the backlash against us is a very effective warning to other women's groups not to take this position, not to connect with us. The boycotting is a very good example for limiting our association. Yes, silencing and isolating are very very similar tactics. It's also very very common in incest, if the silencing is not working and the isolation is not working, then there is

the element of discrediting. I think that is definitely being done to us, undermining our authority and our expertise and a lot of time, the attacker lies about what the victim did.

And that is true for us.

There is constant misrepresentation of our position, not just about that, but about women in prostitution . . . so the discrediting the victim is very consistent with lying about who we are. There are all kinds of "false testimonies" about women who we did not serve, . . . they are actively lying about our front line work. . . .

The attacker can do what he does to women and to girls because society either acting as a passive bystander or supporting the attacker. . . . so the silence is allowing them to be more effective. But they really they are bullies, they are very effective bullies, and the crazy irony that they are looked at for protecting the oppressed is just mind boggling.

We think that reality will prevail. It will take time and it will take a lot of courage because the silencing is very very effective.

Testimony of Dr. Julia Mason -- Society for Evidence-based Gender Medicine

http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/nlc-vs-ggp/testimony/Dr_Julia_Mason--Society_for_Evidence-based_Gender_Medicine

(Gender dysphoria) was incredibly rare until recently, vanishingly rare, really, like 0.2% of the population up until the last ten years. . . . (puberty blockers were) developed for prostate cancer, and then utilized for chemical castration of male sex-offenders. And it has been used for women with endometriosis, sometimes successfully, but there are large groups of women who had unacceptable side-effects from that medication. (Dr. Mason discusses) the normal adolescent identity formation . . . its completely normal for young people to be considering different identities. I was concerned that everyone going to the gender clinic was getting a diagnosis of transgender, because I understood it from experience to be a really rare thing. So how is it that something that's been so rare for so long is suddenly like every single kid?

. . . when every expert . . . told me that 99% plus of young people who are put onto the puberty blockers go on to the cross-sex hormones and the (inaudible) surgeries and the rest of it. . . . (based on 25 years in pediatric medicine) what I hear is, this is not a harmless pause. This is a medication which stops brain development and concretizes the gender dysphoria, concretizes the cross-gender identification. . . . there is no diagnostic criteria which leads to that level of precision. That was the first clue to me that there was something wonky about pediatric gender medicine.

This is what happens over and over (in the gender affirmation medical literature), this conflation of homosexuality and gender identity. And they are in no way the same thing. . . . so I look at the AAP paper and see they are really sloppily conflating homosexuality with gender identity . . . there were all these appeals to authority, and yet the references they were citing were not backing them up.

. . . we're all really busy and we just assume that if the American Academy of Pediatrics puts out a policy statement, that they really looked at the science, but they didn't. Then you just kind of go down the rabbit hole, because the level of institutional capture is stunning. And I guess the Georgia Green Party is discovering this as well.

Testimony of Aaron Kimberly -- Gender Dysphoria Alliance Canada

http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/nlc-vs-ggp/testimony/Aaron_Kimberly--Gender_Dysphoria_Alliance_Canada

80% of the improvement in my mental health has been the rejection of queer theory and gender ideology as a part of my identity and a part of understanding what gender dysphoria is. . . .

Queer theorists have taken over the system of care. . . . I have concerns about the ideological capture. . . .

I need to educate my clients based on evidence-based, and I need to treat a condition based on evidenced based, not on political beliefs or someone's identity. . . .

100% of the people that I know who went to (my own) surgeon had complications. . . .

Its alarming, the complication rate from these surgeries.

we had no delusions we were changing sex.

Testimony of Amparo Domingo (Spain) -- Women's Human Rights Campaign

http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/nlc-vs-ggp/testimony/Amparo_Domingo--WHRC

Over 189 states have signed CEDAW. In CEDAW, the rights of women are stated in terms that are sex-based. So women are defined by sex, and generally it is not mentioned. What is mentioned is sex-stereotypes. Culturally it is understood that in many countries that there are sex-stereotypes that make men and women to fulfill different roles in society. But that is a cultural thing. Because of those different sex stereotypes, men and women have difference in status in the society. By highlighting that those were stereotypes, that men and women should have same level of human rights in politics and participation in sports, the idea that men and women are equal before the law and the courts.

So by taking this idea from CEDAW, we remind the states, the government, that rights for women should be sex-based. Because many of the issues that are related to women are related to our female bodies for instance, reproductive rights should be granted for women because we are female.

So that is the background of the Declaration. It's at our website, WomensDeclaration.com. So I invite everyone to read it. And it has nine articles that define different aspects in which the sex-based rights of women should be protected.

One of the articles in CEDAW is about the rights of women to participate in sports (the same) as men. So, we also have in our Declaration, an article for re-affirming the rights of women to participate in sports. When we arrive at the present time in which many countries are introducing changes in their legislation, in order to be kind people by the gender identity, then males who claim to have a female identity want to compete in the female category of sports. And that prevents women from participating, themselves. So, from our point of view, allowing that is a new form of discrimination against women.

Another example, for instance, is prisons. Usually there are only male and female activities in prison and in many countries; I think in the U.S. its happening, and in Canada it's happening, if a male claims to have a female identity, they are placed at female facilities. But they do not take into account what kind of crimes those males committed in order to be sent to jail. So, because of this placement of male and female all together, female security, women are put in danger because they are locked with men in a close . . . Like I said, women's, the physical integrity, the security of women that are put in prison with males that have committed maybe sexual or violent crimes against women; that is a concern for us. So if policies and all legislation were to speak to the condition of women by sex, these conditions which endanger women wouldn't happen.

For instance, statistics also get affected.

Because we believe that sex is a material reality, gender identity in that sense is a sort of a belief. It is a belief system. Sex is a material reality that science can tell. Human remains, archaeologists are finding, or even egyptologists are analyzing human remains from a long time ago and they can tell the sex of people. So men claim to have a female identity, but that's a belief they have. It's a belief system. And we do not agree with that belief system. But this is not transphobia, because transphobia is not defined, usually. Homophobia is easier to understand. For instance, a homophobic behavior would be someone mistreating a homosexual person because they think badly of them or they think they have . . . or for religious reasons. They would condemn that man, so maybe they would be violent to them. But when you say that a man is a man and you base your opinion on the sex that that person is, that is not hateful, that does not affect the dignity of that person. That is just a statement based on science and on reality. So we do not agree with the accusation of transphobia in that sense.

Things happen to women because we are women. . . . Elective abortion does happen for women that are pregnant with female babies; or child marriage that is carried out on girls. So things happen to women in every country of the word because of our sex. . . . some people they might believe they have a gender identity . . . they can call themselves as they wish. They can live their lives as they wish. But we are opposing the changes in law that would redefine the term, woman, based on that gender identity. We defend the legal category of women as sex-based. Only females should have that right to call themselves women and girls before the law. In every country, for instance in Arabia, women cannot drive. That's because of female sex. In many other countries, women are prevented from doing many things because they are female. And 100 years ago in the U.S., women could not vote because they were women. So all the discrimination that has been historically against women has been to female bodies, to

women, because of their sex. So we are defending that we keep on defining the female in law, the women, sex based.

Sinead Watson -- detransitioner from Scotland

http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/nlc-vs-ggp/testimony/Sinead_Watson--detransitioner

Gender dysphoria is a very serious medical condition that, you know, shouldn't be conflated with the awkwardness of adolescence. But that is what's happening.

Testimony of Scott Newgent -- Trans Rational Educational Voices

[http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/nlc-vs-ggp/testimony/Scott_Newgent--
Trans_Rational_Educational_Voices](http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/nlc-vs-ggp/testimony/Scott_Newgent--Trans_Rational_Educational_Voices)

The only thing we know about trans-health is that all the studies that said it helps mental health have been retracted or pulled, and are wrong. That is the only thing we know about trans-health. . . . 95% of (those who have medically transitioned) regret some form of transition.