

# Resolution A

## NATIONAL YOUTH AND STUDENT PEACE COALITION

### CALL TO ACTION

It's time for all those who believe in and still cherish democracy, freedom and equality to demand accountability from government officials and

Stop the War, at Home and Abroad!

March on Washington, D.C. April 20th, 2002

The "War on Terrorism" Breeds More Terror. . . and It's Unamerican Too!

The White House promises a war without end\*. Under the pretext of strengthening security, our democratic rights are being further eroded, hundreds of people have been "disappeared" into jails and prisons, and corporate interests are shamelessly trying to use this crisis to their advantage. It is clear: unless we, the people of this country, rise up and come together now, the future for us and for people around the world is very bleak. But united, as we have done in the past, WE CAN MAKE CHANGE! There is an alternative!

Join us on April 20th to demand:

- A U.S. foreign policy based upon social and economic justice, not military and corporate oppression.
- An end to racial profiling and military recruitment targeting youth of color and working class youth.
- Government funding for programs to benefit the economic victims of the 9-11 attacks and the recession.
- An end to the degrading and secret imprisonment of immigrants.
- Increased funding for non-military-based financial aid for education
- Full disclosure of military contracts with universities.

Preparatory events will be held in various cities prior to April 20th. Trainings and other activities will take place that weekend, including the Colombia Mobilization rally on April 21 and lobbying on April 22 and 23.

HOSTING GROUPS: National Youth and Student Peace Coalition, National Coalition for Peace and Justice, 9-11 Emergency National Network, NYC Labor Against War COALITION ORGANIZATIONS (partial list): 180/Movement for Democracy and Education, Black Radical Congress-Youth Division, Campaign for Access and Reproductive Equity 2000, Campus Greens, JustAct: Youth Action For Global Justice, Muslim Students Association, National Youth Advocacy Coalition, Not w/Our Money Campaign of the Prison Moratorium Project, Student Environmental Action Coalition, Student Peace Action Network, Students Transforming and Resisting Corporations, Students United for a Responsible Global Environment, United Students Against Sweatshops, United States Student Association, Young Communist League, Young Democratic Socialists, Young People's Socialist League, American Friends Service Committee, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Black Radical Congress, Global Exchange, Pax Christi, Peace Action, Shundahai Network, School of the Americas Watch, Veterans for Peace, War Resisters League, Women's Action for New Directions, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Independent Progressive Politics Network, Green Party of the United States (USGP), Citizen Soldier, Washington Peace Center, Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space, ProLibertad, Solidarity, Center for Peace and Human Security, Freedom Road Socialist Organization, WESPAC, Kwame Ture Work-Study Institute and Library

Contact [aprilmobilization@riseup.net](mailto:aprilmobilization@riseup.net) for more info.

\*According to the October 7th, 2001 Washington Post, Vice President Dick Cheney is quoted as saying that the government's war "may never end. At least, not in our lifetimes."

# Resolution B

THE GREEN PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

MEDIA RELEASE For immediate release: Friday, February 8, 2002 Contacts: Nancy Allen, Media Coordinator, 207-326-4576, nallen@acadia.net Scott McLarty, Media Coordinator, 202-518-5624, scottmclarty@yahoo.com

**GREEN PARTY JOINS THE 9-11 EMERGENCY NATIONAL NETWORK** New coalition seeks to unite Americans concerned about Bush's threat to extend the war, violations of rights, and the corporate buy-out of politics in the wake of Enron WASHINGTON, D.C. -- The Green Party of the United States has voted to join the 9-11 Emergency National Network (ENN), a broad-based national peace coalition. Green participation in ENN will add the political force of the U.S.'s most prominent third party to the growing peace movement, and will encourage Green participation in the March on Washington scheduled for April 20.

"When Greens take to the streets of the nation's capital on April 20, we'll join thousands of Americans for whom 'bipartisanship' has become a dirty word," said Ben Manski, a Green Party Co-Chair. "Talk shows and diner counters are buzzing with anger over the bipartisan Enron scandal, with both Democrats and Republicans in Congress and both the Clinton and Bush Administrations bought off by Enron's tainted money. And millions of Americans are outraged by the uncritical bipartisan support for Bush's threats to extend military attacks to other nations."

Shortly after the September 11 attacks, the Independent Progressive Politics Network held a meeting to establish the Emergency National Network. The goal of ENN is to forge a visible and effective national activist movement in opposition to the Bush Administration's plans for an open-ended war on terrorism, attacks on civil liberties and democratic rights at home, and further shifting of resources away from services urgently needed by low-income and working people over to Pentagon contractors and other corporate interests.

Since its first meeting in New York City, the group has established a diverse 'continuations committee' to guide the work of the network. The committee has since reached out to other coalitions and newly-formed groups to organize the April 20 demonstration in Washington, D.C., called for town meetings with members of Congress, established a website to coordinate national peace efforts, and agreed on a set of unity principles. The decision to join ENN was made by a vote of the Coordinating Committee of the Green Party of the United States, representing parties in 33 states and the District of Columbia.

The following organizations have now joined the 9-11 Emergency National Network : Black Radical Congress, Center for Constitutional Rights, Center for Peace and Human Security, Citizen Soldier, Committees of Correspondence for Democracy and Socialism, Communist Party USA, Connie Hogarth Center for Social Action, Dynamics of Leadership, Freedom Road Socialist Organization, Global Network Against Nuclear Power and Weapons in Space, Green Party of the United States, IFCO/Pastors for Peace, Independent Progressive Politics Network, Kensington Welfare Rights Union, NYC Labor Against War, Pro Libertad, Solidarity, Veterans for Peace, Vietnam Veterans Against the War, War Resisters League, Washington Peace Center, and Westchester People's Action Coalition.

**MORE INFORMATION** The Green Party of the United States <http://gpus.org>  
<http://www.greenpartyus.org> Independent Progressive Politics Network <http://www.ippn.org>

# Resolution C

Green Party of the United States, Coordinating Committee Call for Global Green Solidarity in Opposition to the War

The Green Party of the United States stands ready to strengthen global Green solidarity on a basis of our common commitment to the Four Pillars of Non-Violence, Grassroots Democracy, Ecology, and Social Justice.

In recognition of the multiple violations of international law in the ongoing illegal war in Afghanistan and of the ever-louder drumbeat for the expansion of war to the peoples of other nations, the Green Party of the United States Coordinating Committee states the following:

We affirm our determined opposition to the continuing military strikes against the people of Afghanistan, who have already suffered the deaths of thousands of innocent civilians, ostensibly in pursuit of a few or one. These actions have been conducted based on hidden evidence, perpetrating gross violations of civil and human rights in nations around the globe, in the very name of protecting those rights.

We echo the call of the Green Party of Japan for Greens around the world to unite in efforts to end the war and to oppose any expansion to the other nations. The "war against terrorism" has already spread to many western nations as government officials attack our civil liberties and undermine democracy. Greens here are outraged by the growth of police, military, and corporate power in the United States and request the solidarity of international Greens in supporting North American movements for democracy and peace in this current crisis.

We have admired the historic commitment of German civil society to a demilitarized foreign policy, and we greatly respect the contributions of our partners in the BÜNDNIS 90/DIE GRÜNEN (German Green Party) to the cause of peace. We are thus concerned by recent German coalition-government actions in support of the U.S.-led war, and by the involvement of our partner Greens in the prosecution of the war. The opposition of BÜNDNIS 90/DIE GRÜNEN to the expansion of the war to other nations is noted and appreciated, yet the position of the German Green Party of "Critical Solidarity" with the military strikes in Afghanistan led by the Bush Administration contradicts the position of the Green Party of the United States Coordinating Committee. We ask the BÜNDNIS 90/DIE GRÜNEN for dialogue and cooperation in developing an anti-war solidarity with U.S. Greens and Greens across the globe.

As a partner of the European Federation of Green Parties (EFGP) we support the efforts of most European Greens in opposing American and European military actions in Afghanistan. We have confidence that all member parties of the EFGP can fully unite in opposing individual military deployments in their respective countries.

For our part, the Coordinating Committee of the Green Party of the United States has made our opposition to the current U.S. military strikes clear in the recent statement "Seeking Justice for Acts of Terrorism" ([http://www.greenpartyus.org/press/pr\\_12\\_21\\_01.html](http://www.greenpartyus.org/press/pr_12_21_01.html)). We are ready to engage in global collective actions with Greens and others in the pursuit of a peaceful resolution to the current crisis.

# Platform Proposal A

Green Party of Michigan AIDS Platform  
Jodie Barger

Given the importance of national healthcare to the Green Party, it seems the party is in a unique situation among political parties in the fight against AIDS. The proposed policies are the result of interviews with service providers, as well as research conducted among Centers for Disease Control (CDC), the Michigan State Health Department, and the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA). In the proposed policies support is interpreted as endorsing already existing programs throughout the state, whereas advocacy is interpreted as endorsement and the legwork of putting these policies into action.

1. The Green Party of Michigan will advocate for education among the populations most affected by HIV/AIDS: gay men of colour, injection drug users (IDUs), women, adolescents, and racial/ethnic minorities.
2. The Green Party supports using state tax money for needle exchange programs. Green Party candidates elected to state level offices will advocate lifting the ban on state tax use for needle exchange programs. Needle exchange programs provide clean needles for dirty needles, as well as counseling for IDUs and introduction to rehabilitation programs. They are recognized as being essential to controlling the spread of AIDS among IDUs.
3. The Green Party supports education and support for partners of People with AIDS (PWAs). The Green Party will advocate for the rights of Partners at the local and state levels.
4. No PWAs should be denied services because of their immigration status. The Green Party supports programs that provide services to undocumented residents, as well as those beginning the process of becoming an American citizen. The Green Party will advocate for creating health centers specifically for those PWAs who are not yet legal citizens.
5. The Green Party supports increased funding to the Ryan White CARE Act. Green Party of Michigan candidates elected to national offices may refer back to this platform when such funding is up for renewal. The Ryan White CARE Act is the closest policy to national healthcare in the U.S. It provides services to PWAs, regardless of income or insurance. The Ryan White CARE Act is up for renewal every five years, the next renewal being in 2005.

Many service providers believe that these measures are essential to stop the spread of AIDS. It is also apparent to those providers interviewed that these measures cannot move forward by the other political parties. As a growing left-wing party, the Green Party may provide the means to help PWAs and their partners.

# Bylaws Proposal A

Section 1: Decisions of the Green Party of Michigan shall be made at a state membership meeting or by a poll of the locals

## 1a) State Membership Meetings:

A quorum of voting members is required. A quorum is defined as the square root of the number of GPMI members. An issue is approved when a quorum of voting members is present and a consensus is reached. If a consensus cannot be reached, a vote may be taken. An issue is approved when the number of "yea" votes is at least 2/3 of the total number of "yea" and "nay" votes and the total number of "yea" and "nay" votes is equal to or greater than the quorum. An issue is rejected when the number of "nay" votes is at least 2/3 of the total number of "yea" and "nay" votes and the total number of "yea" and "nay" votes is equal to or greater than the quorum. An issue remains undecided when the number of "yea" and "nay" votes are each fewer than 2/3 of the total number of "yea" and "nay" votes or when the total number of "yea" and "nay" votes are fewer than the quorum.

1b) Locals Polling: An issue is approved when 2/3 of the valid locals in the state vote to approve it. An issue is rejected when 2/3 of the valid locals in the state vote to reject it. An issue remains undecided until 2/3 of the valid locals in the state vote to approve or reject it.

-----  
OK, here's what I've changed:

\* Divided the meeting and locals polling languages.

\* Added language to define what failing to reach a quorum does.

\* Changed the lack of consensus clause from "a vote shall be taken" to "a vote may be taken" so that a meeting facilitator is not obliged to press for a vote.

\* I dropped the idea of a minimum size for the quorum. It'll only become relevant if GPMI shrinks from its current size, and if that happens, GPMI itself will cease to be relevant. (such as it is anyway)

" - If the 'yes' and 'no' votes add up to quorum, but a significant number of possible voters abstain (instead of not vote), then the decision should not be taken without further discussion." My definition of a "significant" number of abstentions is a when they're significant enough to break the quorum. That's the reason for a quorum and an adequate way to handle abstentions. If the number of abstentions do not break the quorum, then either a) the number of abstentions isn't "significant," or 2) we've chosen the wrong number for the size of the quorum.

-----  
This is substantially different from the current locals polling mechanism. I know it is tricky language, but the standard is a \*consensus\* of a \*quorum\* of 2/3 of the active locals in the state -- no voting at all. That is, if 2/3 of the active locals chime in with 'yes', but one says 'no', it's blocked.

# Bylaws Proposal B

## Article II, Section 1

### C) Voting Rights for GPMI Issues and Nominations; Status as Delegates to National or International Meetings:

A member who has attended a previous GPMI general membership meeting within the past thirteen months is eligible to vote on GPMI issues.

A delegate representing the GPMI at national or international conventions must be a GPMI member in good standing with voting rights.

To be eligible to vote to nominate GPMI candidates for elected office, a member must be eligible to vote on GPMI issues and must be a Michigan qualified elector in the appropriate district.

A member who has not attended a GPMI general membership meeting in the past thirteen months may request special voting privileges based on significant participation in the Green Party by communicating a request to the Meeting Manager. The Meeting Manager shall evaluate the request and grant or deny special voting privileges for issues, candidate nominations, or both, with the number of members receiving special voting rights being limited to 1/4 of the applicable quorum.

-----  
(Craig's notes)

It should also be noted that as written this does not allow the SQM to approve anyone for voting rights who has not been approved by the Meeting Mgr (and it could be argued that it also doesn't allow the SQM to deny voting rights to someone duly approved by the Meeting Manager).

NOTE: If we keep the language about needing to be electors in the appropriate district, we will need to be very careful about how we deal with bylaws wording regarding non-statewide nominations -- since this precludes the ability of the whole SQM to nominate anyone. If a person is seeking the nomination for a county/local office, and they are the only convention attendee from that county, s/he would be the only person eligible to vote on their nomination. And I don't think we want that to be the case.

# Bylaws Proposal C

(from Pete Schermerhorn)

Add to Article II, Section 1D:

(Existing language) D) The Green Party of Michigan shall hold quarterly general membership meetings which may also coincide with conventions.

Add: As described in Article IV, Section 12, a separate meeting for removal of officers may be called; such meetings cannot conduct any other business other than the consideration of officer removal.

# Bylaws Proposal D

(from Pete Schermerhorn)

Add Article I, Section 3:

Wherever in these bylaws a measure of  $\frac{2}{3}$  is cited, it is to be calculated as 67%, or if  $\frac{3}{4}$  as 75%, rounding to the nearest whole integer, or down if equidistant to two integers.

# Bylaws Proposal E

Removal of Members: Article II - Section 1 - Paragraph E

A member may be suspended or expelled for actions perceived to be contrary to the best interests of the Party.

Any ten GPMI members, representing at least two different locals, may allege that a GPMI member has acted in contempt of the best interests of the Green Party of Michigan. A Motion to Suspend may be brought against such a member. The motion shall include a statement of alleged actions and the duration of suspension requested, which shall be a minimum of 80 days and a maximum of 360 days. The motion shall be presented at a Statewide Membership Meeting, provided that a copy of the motion has been delivered to the member facing suspension at least 10 days prior. A Motion to Suspend may proceed in the member's absence.

After the end of a suspension period, said member may petition for readmission at a Statewide Membership Meeting. A standard consensus of the membership or  $\frac{2}{3}$  affirmative vote is required for the member's readmission. Failing an affirmative decision to readmit, the suspension remains effective until the next Statewide Membership Meeting. A suspended member may not petition for readmission at three consecutive Statewide Membership Meetings.

A Motion to Expel may be brought against a member who has been suspended twice. The same procedure shall be followed for expulsion as for suspension. An expulsion is permanent.

Within 10 days of a suspension or expulsion, the Treasurer shall refund the member's annual dues.

# Bylaws Proposal F

Membership Secretary

Redo Article IV, Section 6 to reflect language below, replacing Locals Liaison description. If Locals Liaison is not abolished, then insert this as Section 8, and renumber Article IV, Section 8 - 11 to 9 - 12

Amend Section 7 (Clearinghouse Coordinator) as below

Add Section 2G as below

+++++

Proposed Membership Secretary as Officer of the state party:

- A) Closely tracks memberships in a database, including inactive members; redesigns database as needed to easily/accurately track membership status, as well as coordinate with the Treasurer and Record Keeper regarding tracking money received from members
- B) Explains member rights and responsibilities to each member upon initial membership
- C) Sends out membership renewal notices
- D) Reports membership figures to the SCC, appropriate committees and membership
- E) Maintains and updates the GPMI trifold brochure used for recruiting purposes
- F) Encourages unaffiliated members to form or join locals
- G) Sends out acknowledgment letters for receipt of memberships; tracks membership statements and resolicits from members if expired under Article II, Section 1A.

# Bylaws Proposal G

Section 7: Clearinghouse Coordinator:

Has primary responsibility, although may delegate authority for:

- A) Properly gathering, opening, and sorting mail sent to state headquarters; notifying proper persons of mail they have received, including routing to proper local if of interest to that local's area
- B) Gathering and responding to phone messages, routing to appropriate persons as necessary; updating phone machine outgoing message as needed
- C) Responding to requests for information from all sources, by routing to appropriate spokespeople
- D) Acting as spokesperson for the party
- E) Producing a regular electronic and/or paper gazette, specifically for the purposes of keeping members up to date on current issues

+++++

Section 2G, Treasurer:

- G) Sends out acknowledgments for donations received by the party (outside of memberships); duty may be delegated.

# Bylaws Proposal H

## Proportional Diversity

(proposal as of 2/6/02. Other subsections of Section 1 get renamed to B through E)

Article II - - Membership (Adopted Aug 13, 1999; Amended April 30, 2000, )

Section 1: The Green Party of Michigan shall be composed of individual Green members and members organized into locals.

A) Membership is open to anyone regardless of age, race, gender, creed, national origin, sexual orientation, appearance, or physical ability. The purpose of this provision is to encourage diversity in all aspects of cultural, social, biological, economic, or political conditions in the membership of the Green Party of Michigan, and respect for that diversity in every member. (changes proposed February 9 - 10, 2002)

(We are also looking at language concerning the diversity in the SCC and other GPMI committees, such as the following.)

## Article IV - Officers

### Section 13: Concentration of Positions

C) The composition of the GPMI elected officials (and committee chairs?) will reflect, to the degree possible, the diversity of the membership.

# Bylaws Proposal J

## Article II, Section 1B Membership Dues:

As of March 1st, 2002, Membership Dues will be set as follows:

- Low Income/Activist/Student: \$5 per year
- Supporter: \$10 per year
- Regular Member: \$25 per year
- Sustaining Member: \$60 per year
- Benefactor: \$100 per year
- (name?) \$250 per year
- (name?) \$500 per year
- (name?) \$1,000 per year
- Sustainer: at least \$5 per month.

Dues may be paid as a single donation or in monthly installments, and will be waived in the case of hardship or inability to pay if requested in writing by the proposed member.

The Membership Committee is authorized to formulate and institute membership benefits and to add such to the GPMI Rulebook. Said benefits are subject to the review of the entire membership at each State Membership Meeting.

The Membership Committee will revisit the dues structure and make recommendations regarding adjustment of dues levels at the Winter State Membership Meeting bi-annually.

All members of the Green Party of Michigan are encouraged and welcome to participate fully in our organization by volunteering to the extent that their time permits.

# Bylaws Proposal K

## Article V - Committees (Adopted April 30 2000)

### Section 1: Committee Membership

All committee members other than the State Central Committee are self-selected. The state steering committee, comprised of the elected officers \*and national representatives\* of GPMI, is elected as specified in Article IV, section 9. \*Remove rest of language of section\*

### Section 2: State Central Committees (Subsection G Adopted May 20 2001)

A) The State Central Committee shall be comprised of delegates from each recognized local in GPMI, \*as well as the elected officers and national representatives of the state party\*. Method of election of said delegates is at the discretion of the particular local, \*although locals are strongly urged to balance their delegation by gender, ethnicity, orientation, and/or ability\*.

The SCC will be the authority of the party between state membership meetings, responsible for statewide cooperative actions, changes in policy, issuing press releases and position papers, endorsements of other organizations and their actions, and so forth. \*change "and so forth" to "and other similar practices."\*

c. The SCC will strive for consensus, but revert to a 2/3 majority (66%) margin to pass a proposal. \*change to 67% to be in alignment with Article VII Section 1\*

B) The state steering committee (treasurer, recordkeeper, committee manager, meeting manager, clearinghouse coordinator) will be responsible for day-to-day operations of the party and can be granted the authority by the SCC to make time-sensitive decisions as necessary. \*I am ambivalent about whether or not to make the proposed Membership Secretary position an elected or appointed one. If elected, it needs to be added to this section. If appointed, then obviously not -- and should not therefore be considered a member of the SCC, either. However, the duties of the MS are in line with and/or exceed those of the CC, so probably should be included on the steering committee\*

C) The officers of GPMI and National Representatives shall be elected from among the delegates to the SCC. \*I'm having trouble with the idea of removing the right to vote for officers from the membership directly, unless the thinking is to completely do away with business at SMM's altogether. Even so, I think the Grassroots Democracy principle lends itself to direct voting by the membership to the greatest extent possible, i.e., at SMM's in the Spring. Also, I strongly believe that the steering committee should not be comprised of local delegates, as that would compromise effectiveness of those doing 'double duty' and potentially make junior partners out of any delegate from a local who is not on the steering committee whose partner is. And the sooner we come up with a proportional representation system for delegates, the better. Some locals only have 3 members, and they're going to have two of them sitting on the SCC?!?\*

# Bylaws Proposal L

Local/County/District Caucuses

----- (from Paul Emery)  
It has always seemed to me that:

1. We SHOULD try to give the nominating power for offices up to US Congress to our Locals because, it will make it worth the trouble for people to form a Local. 2. Also, that this would be specified in our bylaws by specifying how a Local goes about calling a caucus to nominate. 3. These bylaws should only make four requirements of a local that wants to do nominating. a. They be a recognized local as per the bylaws. b. They inform all state members in the county or congressional district for which they are caucusing in a \*timely\* maner so anybody that is interested has a chance to participate. c. If there are other recogized Locals in the same county or congressional district for which a Local wants to caucus, it must get agreement from the other Locals to hold a joint caucus. d. They satisfy the requirements of the state statutes. 4. If no Local has caucused for a particular county or congressional district, then we allow delegates at a State Wide meeting to call a caucus and nominate for the county or district they reside in.

I can draft a bylaw to accomplish the above. I believe that it would reasult in nominations that would satisfy the Sec. of State Election bureau. In fact I believe I already drafted one but it got swamped by additonal concerns back when we spent 3 or 4 months one-upping each other on the bylaws list serve.

Again, I can draft language to accomplish the above. Would that be a good idea. Or are there other concerns that people do not see addressed in the above.

Paul E. -----

(Pete's comments on the above ideas)

Paul, this all looks good, as long as you include that there must be a member from a particular congressional district present at a state convention, if the nominating is to be done then, in order to nominate someone in that district -- the law is very specific about that.

If locals must ask for approval to hold a caucus, then the resolution to any disputes over competing locals could be handled at that time. If locals don't end up needing to ask either a SMM or the SCC for approval to hold a caucus, then some mechanism for resolving the dispute needs to be described -- at least broadly.

The real hangup is 3.b. -- informing every qualified GPMI elector in the particular district our county in a timely manner. This could be left very broad -- that it must be done -- or it could be narrow -- specifying who must do it and how, and how timely. As I don't see that we have an answer to the narrow version, I would suggest leaving it broad, at least for now, until more structures are in place at the state level to give the support needed to a local (i.e., who is a voting member in good standing in their area).

And here's another weird question -- do members have to have established voting rights per the bylaws in order to vote at a state nominating convention? I'm not sure what the law says on that -- if anything. It just assumes one class of membership, not "members" and "voting members". Yeesh.

# Bylaws Proposal M

I'm going to suggest that we go below "every member in attendance" and get a 2/3 majority to agree that an emergency exists.

While I'm looking at this stuff, I noticed the following language (proposed at a prior SQM) that I find almost hilarious (viewing it from my practical side, rather than my process side). It essentially says that in a crisis situation it only takes one member's vote to force the party to destroy itself. This is rather scary, given that we acknowledge a need to protect ourselves from "hostile takeovers."

from previously proposed bylaws amendment amendment:

## Article VIII - - Amendments to Bylaws

### Section 2: Presenting Proposals

C) Bylaws amendments may be proposed and considered at any GPMI statewide meeting if every member in attendance is in agreement that an emergency situation requiring an immediate change to the bylaws exists. For these purposes, an emergency situation is one where, if no immediate action is taken, the GPMI's ability to sustain itself or comply with legal or contractual requirements is presently or will be harmed. Amendments proposed under this provision will be adopted by consensus only.

-----

Craig's proposed re-write (2/6/2002):

(simply remove the last sentence from the above version)

C) Bylaws amendments may be proposed and considered at any GPMI statewide meeting if every member in attendance is in agreement that an emergency situation requiring an immediate change to the bylaws exists. For these purposes, an emergency situation is one where, if no immediate action is taken, the GPMI's ability to sustain itself or comply with legal or contractual requirements is presently or will be harmed.

===== Pete Schermerhorn Huron Valley Green, Michigan