



Christine Morshedi <cmorshedi@gmail.com>

Proposal made to GPTX for your comments

Tue, Dec 1, 2009 at 10:37 AM

Christine Morshedi <cmorshedi@gmail.com>

To: Phil Huckelberry <phil.huckelberry@gmail.com>, Hugh Esco <hesco@greens.org>, "Hart, Holly J" <holly-hart@uiowa.edu>, ellquist.co.atty@juno.com, Green Discussion List <770discussion@txgreens.org>

All,

The attached proposal was made to the GPTX by a new face, Garret Mize. He seems to be serious and attended our recent state meeting, but we don't know who is behind his plans. Please send us some ideas of how to form a counterproposal that would work with the GP values and actual timelines. We, of course, can't make a written commitment to run a candidate. That decision is made at our annual state meeting in June, well after the dates for filing and for gaining ballot access. We also don't want to take money blindly. However, there must be a way we can take advantage of this offer. What do you think?

Christine Morshedi
Co-chair, GPTX

 **Green Proposal.rtf**
10K

145

Who am I?

A political science major at the University of Texas Austin. I am an intern at the Texas Freedom Network and am the president of the Texas Freedom Network Student Chapter. I am also the vice president of the University Vegetarians and am myself a vegan. I have always been a very liberal Democrat, but lately I have been frustrated with how slowly Democrats are moving lately, and I think this is an opportunity to influence the Democrats for the better. I have always been familiar with and supportive of the Greens and have recently come upon the opportunity to help.

How did I come up with this idea?

I have a couple of personal contacts who made me aware of the fact that there is a group of people who are interested in seeing the GP succeed in this upcoming election by having ballot access. I saw this as an opportunity for me to help out the GP in a way that is meaningful. As a student, I have time on my hands and the ability to spearhead this. I have come up with the idea of raising the funds myself from likely donors.

What is the plan?

The GP needs 45,000 signatures to get on the ballot. If the GP runs a gubernatorial candidate they will have access to run any other state-wide candidate as well. The GP may or may not get 5% of the vote from governor, but they will certainly get 5% from another position in which the Democrats do not decide to run a candidate (like Agricultural Commissioner, etc.). If the Democrats do not run a candidate, the Greens are likely to get at least 20% of that vote. If the Greens get 5% of the vote they will have long-term ballot access. The GP will be able to run next time without having to get any signatures – automatic permanent ballot access (until they get lower than 5% in any given election).

How do I fit in?

I will raise the funds necessary to get the 45,000 signatures necessary to get the GP ballot access for the Governor's race. I already have commitments for approximately \$60,000 and anywhere from \$150,000 to \$250,000 is necessary to get this many signatures in such a short amount of time. With the GP's promise that they will run a candidate, I can continue collecting money from interested parties. I will form a PAC because it is the only legal way to get all of these funds together and get them to the GP candidate. The PAC would eventually hire people to collect signatures and the GP candidate would accept those signatures as an "in kind" donation and take them to the Secretary of State's office for filing.

146

Why a PAC?

I am aware that the GP does not accept corporate money nor money from PACs, but as we know PACs are how all political campaigns are financed. It is the only way for me to raise this money over a given period of time. Also, some supporters are not interested in coming out publicly until they know this plan is "for-sure." A PAC allows me to collect the money and return it to them later if the GP decides not to do this either now or down-the-road. The GP has had PACs before and this is a legitimate way of conducting business. Also, the donors are only interested in handing over the money and signatures until after the GP has promised to nominate a candidate and actually nominates the candidate. It is a security mechanism for making sure that they can get their money back if the GP ends up not going through with this.

Does this limit the GP in any way?

Absolutely not. The GP is 100% in charge of who they nominate. In fact, donors will want to make sure that the candidate, obviously, is 100% selected and nominated by the Party according to its rules. The candidate and the GP will, of course, be able to say anything and everything related to the GP message and platform. Since many of the donors will be wind-power people, they will be happy to see the GP candidate talk about clean and renewable energy like wind, but this is something the GP would be doing anyway, so nothing changes.

Who are the donors?

Our donors are people from the renewable energy industry and people who are interested in energy efficiency. Also many of the donors will be people who simply do not want to see the Democratic Party win and would like to see a counterbalance to the Libertarians in the election.

The people I know are regulated and the natural gas power plants are trying to cut out wind power even more and the donors don't want their names involved with political controversy. PACS have to file in January and July. They don't want their names associated with it until after January and maybe July.

Why do the donors care?

The Texas Renewable Portfolio Standard is set at a megawatts # cap. Texas is the only state that does a number cap. It needs to be a percentage of the total energy. Currently it is 3 % solely based from total megawatts. The most moderate state, or the minimum average is 5%. The most aggressive is 30% and the federal goal is 20%. Specifically the

donors want the TRPS to be set at a percentage standard.

It's time to use 100% of the wind energy generated — currently only 40% of renewable energy created is actually used in Texas homes or in any other way. It's time to mandate that 100% gets used. Currently it's being curtailed. Specifically our donors want to stop this curtailing. Home efficiency and energy efficiency could also be helpful to be talked about by the Green candidate — all new buildings need to be mandated to be efficient. Our donors want these things talked about in addition to anything else on the Green platform.

Also, some donors will be people who are interested in seeing the GP serve as a counterweight to the Libertarians.

What about the Democrats & why now?

The Democrats are going to lose state-wide. By acting now it will do the least amount of damage to the Democrats. It has to be now because it will hurt the Democrats less, get the message out the most, and help the Greens the most. It is a win-all situation this year and a particularly special time because the people of Texas are ready for a real voice that stands for Progressive, Texan values. It is expected that Democrats will gain state-wide viability in 15-20 years from now, and when that happens the Greens need to be in a position to wield influence over them to push the progressive agenda forward.

How does this benefit the Green party?

We'll pay the filing fees for any GP candidate as well as the signatures required to get a gubernatorial candidate on the ballot. This is worth over a hundred thousand dollars in itself. Once a Green runs for governor, the GP will get unprecedented media access and coverage in Texas. The candidate will get interviewed by every state and local paper as well as be on television. They will most likely get invited to debates. Anytime there is any statewide story, the GP will get publicity — more exposure, more people involved, more donations. If the GP accepts this offer and gets 5% of the vote (permanent ballot access) any Democrat that wants to run will have ask the Texas GP, "what do you need not to run." This is how the GP can achieve long-term power

As we all know, third parties operate best when they influence the two major parties in the direction they want. This is a plan to achieve long-term influence over the Democrats and push the progressive Green Agenda into state politics. This is our chance to finally get the ballot-access we deserve — after all, the GP believes that the highest form of activism is participation, and this is our chance to participate and get real, tangible power.

The media is looking for a story. They have told the Kinky Friedman Story. They have been harping on the Perry v. Hutchinson story for months. If the GP gets involved, this is the exact kind of story that will invigorate the media and get the GP as a focus of the race.

By doing this, people will begin to take the Green Party seriously.

OK, What's next?

The GP needs to agree to nominate someone for Governor and write this commitment on paper. I can use this to obtain more funds. Then the GP needs to go about selecting a candidate.

That's the offer.

What is the timeline?

We can probably go another month. I need to know ASAP because I need to raise this money, but by January for sure.

[the above letter was submitted by Garret Mize gmize@mail.utexas.edu and proofread Sunday afternoon preceding this forwarding (insignificant punctuation and word-substitution changes not altering any meanings) by GP-TX member Alán Alán Apurim apurim@gmail.com November 22, 2009]

149