

Letter of Resignation

We hereby resign from the Illinois Green Party. We do not make this decision lightly -- not after devoting over a quarter century to building this party since establishing the Shawnee Green Party in 1996. This decision is motivated more by the actions and direction taken by the Green Party of the United States rather than the ILGP *per se* – although those actions and direction are obviously supported and enabled by several ILGP officers and Coordinating Committee members.

Specifically, recent actions and statements of the GPUS Accreditation Committee, Steering Committee, National Committee Forum Managers, National Committee and the Lavender Caucus -- all taken in support of the Lavender Caucus's proposal to suspend the affiliation of the Georgia Green Party – betray the democratic principles and precepts upon which the party was founded and evince a clear intention by the party majority to suppress dissent, elevate policy positions to the status of inviolable "principles," and rule by decree rather than by democratic process. It has become increasingly apparent that the GPUS is determined to become a rigid dogmatic sect rather than a political party in which policy questions and interpretations of the Ten Key Values can be freely discussed and debated, and in which minority viewpoints are tolerated.

I. Suppression of Paula's speech on the National Committee

The final straw, the recent policing and suppression of Paula Bradshaw's expressions of views on the National Committee list exemplify this:

1) Her first warning, for "demeaning or degrading comments," was imposed after she merely made the sarcastic comment, "His mother must be SO proud!" to New York delegate Mike Gamms (Gammariello). This occurred in **response to** Gamms' equally sarcastic and gratuitous veiled threats against Paula, in a post in which he referred to members of the "Dialogue Not Expulsion" caucus (a group encompassing a number of Greens who oppose the effort to disaffiliate the GAGP) as a "hate group." It also occurred in the context of prior exchanges on the GPUS official Facebook page last year, in which [Gamms repeatedly posted violent and/or obscene memes¹](#), including numerous memes calling for **death** to so-called "TERFS," many of them aimed specifically at Paula, and an actual **doxing** of Paula, in a post in which he claimed to be booking a flight to Carbondale, apparently to carry out his threats of violence. He later [doubled down²](#) in a post to another Green, stating: "every antifa group in this country the east bay to nyc has a file on every one of your transphobic hate mob," and asserting that his doxing of Paula was "me playing nice," with worse actions to come.

In any event, it is a stretch to call Paula's relatively mild sarcasm as "demeaning or degrading."

The warning was unjustified.

2) Her second warning was purportedly for "referring to trans women as men who 'put on lipstick,'" which purportedly violated a rule against "Insults, name-calling, sexist/sexual, racist, homophobic, or otherwise demeaning or degrading comments."

The post in question was in response to a post by Tony Ndege in which he asserted that "so many cis-gendered well educated white people" were claiming to be "the *real* victims in this party." That in turn was a response to a post by delegate Phoebe Sorgen, in which she criticized Gamms for posting the death threat memes. Paula wrote, in response:

“If we are going to play Oppression Olympics, I would remind everyone that women have historically been oppressed throughout history and over the globe.

“The violence against women is ongoing. Every town is a sundown town to women. We don't walk the streets alone, or go into stairwells or parks at night. 4 women a day are killed in the USA. 87,000 women are killed globally annually.

“Most of the violence against women is committed by men, but there are always women who contribute, from women holding down girls in Somalia for circumcision to Aunt Lydias in the US standing up for male privilege.

“But now we are supposed to believe that the historic oppressive sex can put on lipstick and suddenly transform into the Most Oppressed People Ever? I don't think so.

“Trying to smear feminists by calling us Republicans is rich. Greens should not ally themselves with Democrats, who are actually our biggest enemy. I am unmoved by people telling me I am not Democrat enough.

“ And there has NOT been a party wide debate about these issues. That is what we need, but it has not happened. And when feminists bring us issues, we are attacked, harassed, banned and slandered. You know, in the name of ‘inclusivity.’

“And speaking of hypocrisy, it is astounding hypocritical to wave off violent threats because ‘you are still alive,’ and simultaneously whine about ‘the literal violence of using the wrong pronoun’ which we are told makes people disappear. Why does no one point out ‘And yet you are still here’ the way I have been dismissed with ‘You are still alive, so shut up?’

“The Democrats are turning off voters by pushing this Big Pharma-backed agenda. The Labour Party in the UK lost thousands of women in one day when they made adherence to the dogma part of their platform.

“But women are fighting back in the UK as well as in the Green Party, especially lesbian women, who are especially targeted by the Establishment-backed privileges granted to transwomen.

[1]<https://lesbianandgaynews.com/2021/04/lesbian-labour-lesbians-within-the-labour-movement-are-fighting-back-against-attacks/>

http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/caucus_member_opinions/menasche/Sex_Denialism_is_Inherently_Not_Just_Sexist_But_Homophobic”

Plainly, Paula was **not** claiming that all transwomen were “men who put on lipstick.” What she was referring to was the well-documented phenomenon that the definition of “transwoman” is no longer limited to persons whose dysphoria is so acute as to cause them to transform their bodies by hormonal and surgical means to conform to the sex with which they identify. It has now come to encompass anyone who “self-identifies” as the sex opposite to their natal or birth sex. In fact as [this article](#)³ points out, many of today’s trans-activists believe that being “trans” is a state of mind, and **one does not even have to have gender dysphoria or undergo [any hormonal or other transitioning at all](#)**⁴ in order to be considered a “transwoman.” (We would recommend reading the entire larger essay on “The New Backlash” to fully grasp the dimensions of the problem.) Indeed, many trans-activists assert that the male penis can be redefined as a female sex organ (a “lady dick”) and if lesbians or other women fail to recognize this, they are to be [criticized](#)⁵ as “transphobes” or bigots. As transsexual feminist Miranda Yardley (one of [many transpersons](#)⁶ who distinguish between genuine transsexuals, serious about transitioning, and “transgender” activists who merely “self-identify” as transgender) [wrote](#):

“As comically ridiculous as it may seem of Zinnia Jones to be talking about his ‘[girl dick](#)’ or Riley Dennis suggesting it is ‘[cissexist](#)’ to be attracted to people with only one type of genital or that [your dating preferences are an act of hate](#), or Roz Kaveney claiming that ‘[trans women’s penises are not male penises](#)’, don’t be fooled by the deep-rooted homophobia which lies at the heart of what these men are trying to do, which is to make it unacceptable for women to be able to set their own intimate and sexual boundaries. There is of course nothing new with heterosexual males trying to do this, the difference is this is being done under the flag of social progressivism and civil rights.”⁷

This is a huge part of the problem that many Greens apparently fail to understand or don’t wish to understand.

So we see, for example:

- Renowned antiwar activist [Cindy Sheehan being vilified](#)⁸ for joining women veterans who critiqued a Veterans for Peace statement on “transmisogyny,” issued by its all-male executive board, while not addressing longstanding misogyny in their organization. She was later criticized for supporting a group of midwives who objected to a licensing board replacing the word “breastfeeding” to “chestfeeding,” because it offended women transitioning to male who had mastectomies yet had become pregnant, and changing references to pregnant “women” with “pregnant partner” or “birthing individual.” Cindy was subsequently deplatformed from a planned antiwar talk in Carbondale that we had organized because she made some Facebook posts supportive of Paula and expressed her opinion that persons with functioning penises should not be permitted in women’s spaces.
- Similar attacks on womanhood in our language have occurred. Some trans-activists have critiqued people for [using the word “vagina,”](#)⁹ while Healthline notoriously recommended using the word “[front hole](#).”¹⁰ A doula was forced to resign from her position as head of her professional association for making the biologically factual statement that “[only women have](#)

[babies](#).¹¹ As professor of gender studies at the University of Rhode Island Donna Hughes has written:

“The dystopian trans-sex/’gender identity’ world claims that female mammalian characteristics should be redefined and disappeared from the female body to satisfy the feelings of biological males who identify as women. Basic biological words like breast and vagina are [replaced](#) by misogynistic, trans-sex/trans-gender language so that a female has a “front hole” instead of a vagina; females “chest feed” instead of breastfeed. All references to women disappear into terms such: “people who menstruate,” “people with uteruses,” “a pregnant person,” or “a birthing parent.” No such changes in terms are proposed for men’s bodies and anatomy. These redefinitions are hatred targeted at women’s bodies and their rights.”¹²

Hughes, of course, was attacked and threatened with removal for expressing her opinion.

Feminist trailblazer Andrea Dworkin [once wrote](#) that men’s power of naming is a “great and sublime power”: “The power of naming enables men to define experience, to articulate boundaries and values, to designate to each thing its realm and qualities, to determine what can and cannot be expressed, to control perception itself.”¹³ This is what we are witnessing as predominantly (biologically) male trans-activists seek to write biological women out of existence as a distinct class.

- California has passed [a law allowing transgender-identified biologically male state prison inmates to transfer into women’s prisons](#) based on “individual preference” —**no hormones, surgery or time spent living as the opposite sex required**.¹⁴ The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation reports that 264 male prisoners have declared a nonmale identity and formally requested transfer to women’s facilities. **Washington state, which has a similar policy, has already allowed [a rapist and serial killer of women to transfer into the women’s prison](#)**.¹⁵ Meanwhile, in the United Kingdom, which has similar policies, sexual assaults on women by natal male transwomen have [already occurred](#).¹⁶ In fact, [a report](#) by the Ministry of Justice reports that inmates who identify as transgender are responsible for a rate of sexual attacks that is exponentially higher than their proportion of the population of women’s jails and prisons.¹⁷
- In Vancouver, Tyler Porter, a man who “identifies” as transgender, has [publicly boasted](#) on social media of harassing women at a women’s center.¹⁸ When these posts and behaviors were brought to the attention of the shelter, their Twitter response was to call women’s concerns “harmful mistruths,” because Tyler is transgender, despite the numerous disturbing social media posts presented to them in which he is abusive and predatory, admits to stabbing someone and being a “violent offender,” discusses masturbating in the shower, and shares a recipe for making the deadly poison Ricin while mentioning the Vancouver water supply. The complaints were dismissed in a formal statement as “transphobic.”
- Meanwhile, another Vancouver rape crisis shelter, the oldest one in the country, was viciously [attacked and defunded](#) due to its policy of not allowing transgender-identified biological males to receive some of its services.¹⁹
- The type of violent threats made by Mike Gamms against Paula and other women is not unusual but is part of a much larger misogynistic violent mob mentality perpetrated by trans-identified biological males against women, as is well documented at [this site](#).²⁰

- There are numerous examples of other real-world harms facilitated by “trans-identified” males [attacking gays and lesbians as “transphobic”](#)²¹ for being gay or lesbian, supporting the medicalization of youth struggling to define their sexuality, committing actual acts of violence against women, deplatforming or doxing women, getting women fired from their jobs or forcing them to resign, and otherwise censoring or silencing women’s speech, as is well documented and catalogued [here](#),²² [here](#),²³ [here](#),²⁴ and [here](#).²⁵

The evidence cited here supports the conclusion that many – certainly not all, but many – trans-identified biological or natal males, and especially those who identify as trans “activists” are espousing, practicing and reveling in the same type of violence against women as their straight brethren have been practicing for years. Misogyny in drag is still misogyny.

Returning to the central point: Paula was not referring to all transwomen as men who “put on lipstick.” But there **are** men who do little more than put on lipstick or similar “feminine” accoutrements who identify as, or claim to be, transwomen. This is a real social phenomenon, and it has had serious consequences for natal or biological women. We believe, and the [Dialogue Not Expulsion caucus](#)²⁶ believes, that this can and should be the subject of partywide discussion. And yet the Forum Managers, and apparently the majority of the National Committee, apparently believe that the appropriate response is to silence women who raise such concerns.

The warning was unjustified.

3) Paula’s third warning was imposed for stating: “The problem is that the LC [Lavender Caucus] is decreeing that everyone’s lived experience must be subsumed in order to validate certain people’s internal feelings.” The Forum Managers decreed that this violated the prohibitions against “homophobic, or otherwise demeaning or degrading comments,” and/or making “false and defamatory accusations on the listserv against another list member” or caucus “that can be clearly and objectively disproved.” The Forum Managers did not bother to explain which of these prohibitions was actually violated or how it was violated.

This was the pertinent paragraph from her comment:

“Live and let live. All people have their lived experience and I have mine. The problem is that the LC is decreeing that everyone’s lived experience must be subsumed in order to validate certain people’s internal feelings. You have no problem with that. I do. Why should you be able to force that decree onto me? Live and let live means that I don’t care if someone has a certain identity, but I should not be forced to bow to them.”

Obviously, there is nothing homophobic about this comment unless one takes the position that any criticism of the Lavender Caucus is “homophobic,” in the same manner that many equate any criticism of Israel with being “anti-Semitic.” The comment does nothing more than express an opinion characterizing the LC’s proposal – an opinion that the Forum Managers failed to “clearly and objectively disprove.”

To the contrary, “lived experience” **always** plays a role in informing and shaping policy proposals. The Georgia Green Party’s platform amendments have been shaped, in part, by the lived experience of the

growing numbers of [detransitioners](#)²⁷ – persons who underwent hormonal and/or surgical treatment for their gender dysphoria, then changed their minds and returned to their natal identity. It has been informed, in part, by empirical evidence of an [unprecedented surge in young women](#)²⁸, especially, self-reporting gender dysphoria. This has raised concerns by many in the LGBT community that many such women are responding to [social pressures to regard themselves as male](#)²⁹, and are being poorly diagnosed and treated for gender dysphoria -- rather than accept their same-sex attraction. And of course the GAGP's platform positions were shaped by the lived experiences of [gender-critical feminists](#),³⁰ including those who authored the amendments in question.

The lived experiences of transgendered persons and others in the Lavender Caucus undoubtedly helped inform its viewpoints and positions as well. This includes the lived experience of having “internal feelings” that that their natal sex is inconsistent with how they want to live, present themselves and identify themselves. That, after all, is at the core of what it means to be transgendered.

However, it is only the Lavender Caucus that is proposing to suspend or terminate the affiliation of a state party, “until they rescind their endorsement of the Women’s Declaration of Sex Based Rights and strike” various portions of its platform. The Georgia GP is not seeking to disaffiliate the Lavender Caucus or force it to adopt certain positions; it is not asking for LC members to suppress or deny their lived experience. It is only the LC that is demanding ideological conformity or expulsion. Therefore, the statement that it is “decreeing that everyone's lived experience must be subsumed in order to validate certain people's internal feelings,” is at most, overly reductive, but it is not demonstrably false, not homophobic, and not defamatory, demeaning or degrading.

The warning was unjustified.

4) The Forum Managers’ fourth warning to Paula, which resulted in her being placed on “probation” (meaning that she cannot post anything without prior approval from the Forum Managers for three months), faulted her for her “assertion that the transgender rights movement is an agenda by ‘The Establishment. . . to convince the population that there was no such thing as biological sex.’” The Forum Managers again decreed that this also violated the prohibitions against “homophobic, or otherwise demeaning or degrading comments,” and/or making “false and defamatory accusations on the listserve against another list member” or caucus “that can be clearly and objectively disproved.” Once again, they did not bother to explain which of these prohibitions was actually violated or how it was violated.

Here is the comment at issue, in full:

“We are told by one candidate [running for Forum Manager] that she considers “transphobia”, *i.e.*, recognition of biological reality, to be condemned as equivalent to racism, and Greens who speak out for the rights of women, *i.e.* feminists, are to be censored and banned.

“This is a spurious analogy. When the key value of feminism was adopted by the Green Party, everyone understood what a woman was. There was no controversy about that. We all came out of a woman’s body and most were suckled by a woman. Incorporating feminism into our key values meant that Greens respected women and advocated for women’s rights. In 2015 the Establishment rolled out an ambitious agenda. Although they had been teaching college educated Millennials “gender studies” for some time, it was not until 2015 that they rolled it out

to the general population. They attacked the very foundation of life on Earth, as well as the human species, and launched a campaign to convince the population that there was no such thing as biological sex. Ambitious indeed, and I stand awed at their power of persuasion.

“Consider this. What if the media had played it in another way? What if in 2015 Caitlin Jenner was mocked, scorned (not counting the last few days), and cancelled for the sin of cultural appropriation and Rachel Dolezal was feted, called stunning and brave, and given a standing ovation at the Oscars and a soft focus cover story on Vanity Fair? What if in the last 6 years we had gotten a steady diet of “race is not based on biology, it is an idea in a person’s head” and told that anyone who identified as Black was to be acknowledged as Black? The Establishment controls the media and could just as easily pushed that counter narrative.

“I have no doubt that the same Greens who accepted the official narrative of trans ideology would have just as easily accepted any other official narrative. As Marx pointed out ““The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, *i.e.* the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force.” The same people objected calling for the censorship of feminists now would be insisting on shutting down Black voices who [were opposed] to the appropriation of their identities, if the Establishment were pushing that agenda. They would call it “transracialphobia” and they would wax indignant whenever realists spoke up.

“Obviously acknowledging biological reality is NOT equivalent to hurling racial slurs. Therefore, transphobia is not in any way analogous to racism. Comparing the two is an absurdity, and those who believe absurdities are more easily convinced to commit atrocities. Running on a platform of harassment and censorship of Greens who prefer to remain reality based is an atrocity in a party that supposedly has Democracy as one of its pillars, and feminism as a key value.”

While it may be a bit of an overstatement to assert that the U.S. ruling class has been literally campaigning to persuade the population that “there was no such thing as biological sex,” there is abundant evidence that a) the prevalent ruling-class view is supportive of the same transgender agenda as that supported by the Lavender Caucus, and b) that many proponents of that agenda redefine or downplay the significance of biological sex. Thus, at most, Paula was “guilty” of hyperbole or exaggeration, not homophobia, degrading or demeaning comments, false statements, etc.

With the exception of Fox News, which opposes aspects of the trans-activist agenda for reasons different than those advanced by gender-critical feminists, corporate media news coverage and expression of opinion on controversial issues like the participation of transwomen in women’s sports is overwhelmingly on the side of allowing such participation. If one searches the NPR database, for example, for stories with the word “transgender” over the last year, one finds stories in which supporters of legislation barring such participation are quoted and reported upon, but the commentary is tilted strongly in opposition to such legislation. The same holds true of stories on legislation to restrict the use of so-called gender-affirming medical intervention on minors.

It is also obvious that, in the political sphere, the prevalent Democratic Party/neo-liberal wing of the ruling class supports a trans-activist agenda that includes allowing self-identified transwomen into women's spaces and women's sports, and use of puberty blockers and surgical interventions on minors.

Greens should surely understand the importance of "following the money" in order to discover whether a policy direction enjoys ruling-class support. The corporate interests supporting the transgender agenda, notably including the transgender billionaire sibling of Governor Pritzker, are real and substantial, as is well documented in the [Green Feminists Response to Lavender Caucus Complaint](#) (see part 5)³¹, and even more thoroughly documented in [this article](#),³² and [this one](#),³³ among others.

As for the downplaying or [denial of biological sex](#),³⁴ the entire precept that being "male" or "female" is a state of mind, or can be "established" by simply self-identifying as such, obviously requires a [denial of the significance of biological sex](#) (*i.e.*, natal sex or chromosomal sex),³⁵ as [many transgender activists themselves assert](#).³⁶ (For more on the harms caused by sex denialism, read [this essay](#).)³⁷

Accordingly, the substance of her comment has a basis in fact, and, once again, the warning and imposition of probationary status was unwarranted.

II. Other examples of suppression of speech on the National Committee and elsewhere

What Paula has experienced is by no means unusual. Massachusetts delegate David Keil has also been placed on a "moderated" status, requiring pre-clearance from the Forum Managers for his posts, and has been unable to post anything pertaining to the Lavender Caucus proposal to the other delegates for weeks. One of his "infractions," documented [here](#),³⁸ was his recommendation that delegates **view the contents of a website**, Women's Liberation Radio News.³⁹ To the Forum Managers, this was yet another violation of the same prohibitions against "homophobic, or otherwise demeaning or degrading comments," etc., that was used to censor Paula. Thus, the Forum Managers have taken the position that NC delegates must be "protected" from the speech of third parties, and that it was somehow harmful to suggest that they **view a website and make up their own minds** about the merits of the contents.

The GPUS Media Committee has repeatedly censored and banned gender-critical Greens from posting comments on the GPUS Facebook page while being much more permissive of critical comments and violent imagery from members and supporters of the Lavender Caucus. It has barred statements from the Dialogue Not Expulsion caucus. Some state parties have barred gender-critical feminists from expressing their views at meetings and/or are seeking to expel members for expressing views that question or critique aspects of the trans-activist agenda. The GPUS Women's Caucus has barred gender-critical feminists from its list-serve and gender-critical feminists have been removed from at least one workshop at a GPUS national meeting. Some of these incidents have been documented [here](#).⁴⁰

Although we do not have first-hand documentation, we have it on good authority that the GPUS Accreditation Committee, to which the Lavender Caucus complaint was originally referred, violated its own procedural rules (which had never been ratified by the National Committee as required by the national by-laws) in its handling of the complaint. It allowed interested parties to cast votes to accept the proposal, refused to schedule a hearing to hear witnesses from the Georgia Green Party, failed to communicate with the GAGP since last year, and barred observers and the Secretary of the GAGP from attending the only hearing it conducted, with Lavender Caucus co-chair Margaret Elizabeth. We also

understand that discussion within the Accreditation Committee has been characterized by abuse, threats, and agitation for the sanctioning and removal of opponents of the LC proposal.

III. The Steering Committee Attack on the Dialogue Not Expulsion Group

The Steering Committee of the GPUS, which is primarily to serve as an [administrative body](#) for the national party,⁴¹ nonetheless took the unprecedented step of publicly [attacking](#)⁴² the “Dialogue Not Expulsion” (DNE) caucus, an informal caucus of a [number](#) of individual Greens and Green supporters who oppose the Lavender Caucus’s proposal to suspend or disaffiliate the GAGP.⁴³ As the DNE pointed out in its [response](#): “There isn’t a single citation of a single policy of our caucus, a single word we have written, or a single action we have taken that can substantiate even one of the accusations made” by the Steering Committee.⁴⁴

The DNE’s response speaks for itself, but two points bear emphasizing. First, as the response points out:

“We will assert, further, that it is completely improper for the national Steering Committee of the Green Party to take sides in a dispute that is, shortly, going to come before the full National Committee for discussion and decision. The SC is a subcommittee of the NC and, by rights, should play a neutral role, strictly as the facilitator of a fair and honest assessment by the NC of the relevant questions. This has now been made impossible, however, by the choice to denounce one side -- even before the report of the Accreditation Committee is brought to the NC. We find it of some considerable interest that this is the first and only time to our knowledge the national Steering Committee has issued a formal public declaration. The killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis did not stimulate such an action. The most recent Israeli attack on Palestinian civilians did not stimulate such an action, nor did any of a number of noteworthy events in between. On its face this would seem most extraordinary.”⁴⁵

Second, the Steering Committee, in its statement, saw fit to recite one of the slogans of the modern transgender movement: “Trans men are men. Trans women are women.” To this it added: “Nonbinary people are valid” – a strange addition, considering that no one involved in this controversy, to the best of our knowledge, has ever suggested that nonbinary people or anyone else are “invalid.”

The slogan, “trans men are men; trans women are women” may be a feel-good affirmation to some but it fails the test of elementary logic. The slogan tacitly admits that “trans men” are different from other men and “trans women” are different from other “women”; otherwise, it would not be necessary to proclaim that one category fits within the other. Obviously, trans men do not have XY chromosomes, testicles, or the ability to produce their own sperm. Obviously, trans women do not have XX chromosomes, ovaries, the ability to produce their own eggs, menstruate or give birth. What the sloganeers actually mean to say is something like: “Society should regard trans men in **every** way like biological males and it should regard trans women in **every** way like biological women.”

We disagree. This does not mean that we think discrimination or violence against transpersons is okay, or that it is okay to violate their human rights. It is not. Transpeople can, should and must enjoy the same human rights as everyone else, be accepted as equals in civil society, treated with compassion and safeguarded from harm. (A point by the way, with which the Georgia Green Party [agrees](#), in its cogent response to the LC’s proposal.)⁴⁶ Recognizing biological differences does not mean that we “hate” transpersons or “fear” them – it is not “transphobia.”

However, natal or biological women also have human rights, and we believe that those include the right to safe spaces where persons with penises are not allowed. As the sources cited in this letter demonstrate, some natal males, including some who have no intention of transitioning, have misused their “self-identification” as transwomen to invade those spaces and cause harm. This means that some lines must be drawn. Where the lines should be drawn, and how to enforce them is a matter of **public policy**, that should be resolved by discussion and deliberation, guided by fact and science, not the issuance of edicts in the form of sloganeering.

We also believe that even transitioning transwomen who have lowered their testosterone levels to those in the natal female range still retain innate biological advantages over natal women in terms of size, strength and athleticism, and therefore, should not be permitted to participate in women’s sports. Growing up male gives transgender athletes a lifelong edge that simply cannot be fully negated by a period of testosterone suppression. We admit that some reasoned arguments to the contrary have been made. Where the lines should be drawn, and how to enforce them, therefore, is a matter of **public policy**, that should be resolved by discussion and deliberation, guided by fact and science, not the issuance of edicts in the form of sloganeering.

Of course, the debate about the advisability of treating gender-dysphoric youth with puberty blockers, hormones, double mastectomies and other surgical interventions is not addressed at all by slogans like “trans men are men; trans women are women.” One can agree with the slogan but still have concerns about such practices as applied to children and adolescents whose views and feelings about sexual orientation and identity are still emerging and subject to a variety of unsettling peer, parental, social, cultural and environmental influences. The pros and cons of such practices are the subject of [vigorous debate, discussion, ongoing data collection and interpretation and reinterpretation of the data⁴⁷](#) – **as it should be**. Where the lines should be drawn, and how to enforce them is a matter of **public policy**, that should be resolved by discussion and deliberation, guided by fact and science, not the issuance of edicts in the form of sloganeering. Yet for the Lavender Caucus, and apparently most of the GPUS National Committee, the matter is settled, the practices currently supported by the medical establishment and Big Pharma are correct, and there is nothing to debate.

This gets to the core of the problem with the Green Party of the United States. **It is not allowing a real policy discussion on this issue to take place.** Opponents of the Lavender Caucus proposal have been silenced and barred from presenting evidence in support of their point of view, on the grounds that it is demeaning, hateful, bigoted, etc. – then subjected to hateful comments themselves. Substantive discussion of the underlying issues has been squelched. It has been replaced by conclusory statements, edicts and labeling of other viewpoints as “transphobic,” with little or no real analysis coming from supporters of the proposal.

The majority of the party, at least as represented on the National Committee, Steering Committee and Accreditation Committee, has betrayed its commitment to Grassroots Democracy, not to mention Feminism and Non-Violence. It has declared that gender-critical feminists, not just those who support the GAGP, but others (including Rich, who believes that there are more than two positions on these issues) are not welcome in the Green Party. You don’t have internal democracy when open discussion and deliberation on matters of policy are not to be permitted. You don’t have internal democracy when the organization ignores its own rules (or makes them up as it goes along), in order to reach a preconceived result. You don’t have internal democracy when you turn the Party platform into a rigid

dogma, treat persons disagreeing with it as heretics, create a new “violation of platform” offense out of thin air and then use it as grounds to expel an entire state party.

This is not what democracy looks like. This is what dogmatism and sectarianism look like. The Green Party of the United States has succumbed to mobocracy, and it has elevated, not “trans rights,” but a patriarchal, ruling-class supported **version** of “trans rights,” to the level of organizational principle, as if it were now replacing Grassroots Democracy as one of the Ten Key Values.

Let the record reflect that, at a time when humankind and all life on Earth face the existential threats of the climate crisis, mass extinctions already underway, and nuclear war; when people are killed, wounded, displaced and starved by U.S. imperialism on a daily basis; when poverty and privation remain endemic even in the U.S., the Green Party of the United States decided it was a top priority to rid itself of members who question the edict that persons born with XY chromosomes should be permitted to invade women’s spaces whenever they “self-identify” as women.

For the above reasons, we have come to the conclusion that the Green Party of the United States can no longer serve as a vehicle for social progress. There are still some good people in the ILGP and GPUS, but the national organization has been captured by a mob of dogmatic, self-righteous authoritarians and we can no longer support it. Therefore (with Rich’s apologies to Sheldon Schaefer for abandoning him as co-chair), we resign from the Illinois Green Party.

Sincerely,

Rich Whitney

Paula Bradshaw

Shawnee Green Party chapter

¹ We are providing endnotes as well as links, in case any links become defunct.

http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/internal-democracy-threatened/women-silenced/Mike_Gammariello_Melt_Down.

² http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/internal-democracy-threatened/women-silenced/Gammariello_files/continuing_threats_of_physical_violence.

³ *The New Backlash*, anonymous author, <https://thenewbacklash.blogspot.com/p/4-transgender-identity-politics.html>.

⁴ *Your Male Privilege Is Showing*; <https://secretlyradical.blogspot.com/>.

⁵ Dave Urbanski, *Transgender 'feminist' lays down the law: 'Some women have penises'*; *The Blaze*, March 23, 2017. <https://www.theblaze.com/news/2017/03/23/transgender-feminist-lays-down-the-law-some-women-have-penises>.

⁶ *The New Backlash*, op. cit.

⁷ Miranda Yardley, *Girl Dick, the Cotton Ceiling and the Cultural War on Lesbians and Women*, <https://mirandayardley.com/en/girl-dick-the-cotton-ceiling-and-the-cultural-war-on-lesbians-girls-and-women/>

⁸ Mickey Z., *Who’s Trying to Silence Cindy Sheehan?*, World News Trust, October 2, 2015; <https://worldnewstrust.com/who-s-trying-to-silence-cindy-sheehan-mickey-z>.

⁹ Michelle Goldberg, *Feminism’s Toxic Twitter Wars*, *The Nation*, Jan. 29, 2014; <https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/feminisms-toxic-twitter-wars/>.

¹⁰ Elise Solé, *People are angry over this safe sex guide, which calls the vagina a 'front hole'*, *Yahoo Life*, August 21, 2018. <https://www.yahoo.com/lifestyle/people-angry-safe-sex-guide-calls-vagina-front-hole-012527170.html>.

-
- ¹¹ Stephen Adams, *Birth coach is 'hounded out' of industry charity Doula UK after transgender activists branded her Facebook message claiming only women can have babies 'offensive'*, Daily Mail, November 2, 2019; <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-7643251/Charity-hounds-birth-coach-post-saying-women-children.html>.
- ¹² Donna M Hughes, *Fantasy Worlds on the Political Right and Left: QAnon and Trans-Sex Beliefs*, 4W, 28 Feb 2021; <https://4w.pub/fantasy-worlds-on-the-political-right-and-left-qanon-and-trans-sex-beliefs-2/>.
- ¹³ *Transgenderism and the Power of Naming*, Women Are Human, January 13, 2021; <https://www.womenarehuman.com/transgenderism-and-the-power-of-naming/>.
- ¹⁴ Abigail Shrier, *Male Inmates in Women's Prisons*, Wall Street Journal, May 31, 2021; https://www.wsj.com/articles/male-inmates-in-womens-prisons-11622474215?mod=hp_opin_pos_1.
- ¹⁵ Dori Monson, *DOC employee reports men are claiming to be women to transfer prisons*, KIRO radio website, March 10, 2021; <https://mynorthwest.com/2666243/doc-washington-correctional-center-women-men-transfer/>
- ¹⁶ Fair Play for Women, Prison page, <https://fairplayforwomen.com/campaigns/prisons/>.
- ¹⁷ Diana Shaw, *'Transgender' Inmates are Raping Female Prisoners at a Shocking Rate, Ministry of Justice Reveals*, Women Are Human, May 18, 2020; <https://www.womenarehuman.com/transgender-inmates-are-raping-female-prisons-at-a-shocking-rate-ministry-of-justice-reveals/>.
- ¹⁸ *Transgender-Identifying Male Boasts of Harassing Women in Crisis Shelter*, Women Are Human, September 26, 2019; <https://www.womenarehuman.com/male-transgender-boasts-of-harassing-women-in-crisis-shelter/>
- ¹⁹ Jessica Kerr, *Vancouver Rape Relief targeted with vandalism, threats over transgender controversy; Dead rat nailed to door more than once in recent months*, Vancouver Is Awesome, Aug 28, 2019; <https://www.vancouverisawesome.com/courier-archive/news/vancouver-rape-relief-targeted-with-vandalism-threats-over-transgender-controversy-3106045>.
- ²⁰ TERF Is a Slur website; <https://terfisa slur.com/>.
- ²¹ *The New Backlash*, op cit., part 10.
- ²² Ibid.
- ²³ Helen Joyce, *The New Patriarchy: How Trans Radicalism Hurts Women, Children—and Trans People Themselves*, Quillette, December 4, 2018; <https://quillette.com/2018/12/04/the-new-patriarchy-how-trans-radicalism-hurts-women-children-and-trans-people-themselves/>.
- ²⁴ Fair Play for Women, op. cit.
- ²⁵ Women Are Human, op. cit.
- ²⁶ <http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/>.
- ²⁷ See, e.g., Pique Resilience Project; <https://www.piqueresproject.com/>.
- ²⁸ Gender Health Query, Topic 11, *Why Are So Many Females Coming Out as Trans/Non-Binary?*; <https://www.genderhq.org/increase-trans-females-nonbinary-dysphoria>.
- ²⁹ Lisa Marchiano (2017) *Outbreak: On Transgender Teens and Psychic Epidemics*, Psychological Perspectives, 60:3, 345-366, DOI: 10.1080/00332925.2017.1350804; <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00332925.2017.1350804>
- ³⁰ See, e.g., The Gender Critic; <https://thegendercritic.com/>.
- ³¹ *Green Feminists Response to Lavender Caucus Complaint*; <http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/documents/Green-Feminists-Response-to-LC-Complaint>
- ³² Jennifer Bilek, *Who Are the Rich, White Men Institutionalizing Transgender Ideology?*, The Federalist, Feb. 20, 2018; <https://thefederalist.com/2018/02/20/rich-white-men-institutionalizing-transgender-ideology/>.
- ³³ Sue Donym, *Inauthentic Selves: The modern LGBTQ+ Movement Is Run By Philanthropic Astro turf And Based On Junk Science; How the LGBT community got suckered by Big Business and Big Philanthropy*. Jan. 31, 2021; <https://suedonym.substack.com/p/inauthentic-selves-the-modern-lgbtq>.
- ³⁴ Joyce, *The New Patriarchy*, op. cit.
- ³⁵ Colin M. Wright and Emma N. Hilton, *The Dangerous Denial of Sex; Transgender ideology harms women, gays—and especially feminine boys and masculine girls*; The Wall Street Journal, Feb. 13, 2020; <https://archive.is/puTGy#selection-1959.5-2011.24>.
- ³⁶ *The New Backlash*, op. cit., part 5.
- ³⁷ Ann Menasche (California Green Party), *Sex Denialism is Inherently Not Just Sexist But Homophobic*; http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/caucus_member_opinions/menasche/Sex_Denialism_is_Inherently_Not_Ju st_Sexist_But_Homophobic

³⁸ *'Feminist' Party Sanctions National Committee Member for Reference to Feminist Site*;

http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/internal-democracy-threatened/gnc-debate-silenced/Feminist_Party_Sanctions_National_Committee_Member_for_Reference_to_Feminist_Site.

³⁹ <https://womensliberationradionews.com/>.

⁴⁰ *Women Silenced in Green Discussions about Gender*; <http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/internal-democracy-threatened/women-silenced>.

⁴¹ GPUS Bylaws, Article IV; <https://gpus.org/bylaws/#04-01>.

⁴² *Steering Committee of the Green Party of the United States Statement on the "Dialogue not Expulsion" group*, https://www.gp.org/steering_committee_of_the_green_party_of_the_united_states_statement_on_the_dialogue_not_expulsion_group.

⁴³ Dialogue Not Expulsion Statement Signers;

http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/engage/signers_of_the_Dialogue_not_Expulsion_statement.

⁴⁴ Dialogue not Expulsion Reply to the Green Party National Steering Committee, June 4, 2021;

http://www.dialoguenotexpulsion.org/Documents/Dialogue_not_Expulsion_Reply_to_the_Green_Party_National_Steering_Committee.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ DEFENSE OF THE GEORGIA GREEN PARTY TO THE COMPLAINT OF THE LAVENDER CAUCUS;

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

⁴⁷ See generally Gender Health Query, *op. cit.*, "Topics" page; <https://www.genderhq.org/topics-transgender-youth>.