

Green Party Coalition Engagement Protocol to Preserve Integrity and Advance Strategic Goals

AUTHOR: Wissam Charafeddine

Steering Committee CoChair of Green Party

August 15, 2025

4
4
4
4
4
4
5
5
5
6
6
6
7
7
8
8
8
9
9
9
10
11
11
11
11
12
12
12
14
14
14
15
15
15
16
16
2

Title:

SPONSORED BY

CONTACT

SUBJECT / TITLE

TYPE OF PROPOSAL / EXPECTED APPROVAL THRESHOLD

REQUESTED PROPOSAL DECISION-MAKING TIMELINE

Subject and Purpose:

Background and Justification:

Proposal:

Section 1: Principles of Coalition Work

Section 2: Criteria for Participation

Section 3: Formal Agreement Requirements

Section 4: Red Lines for Coalition Work

Section 5: Engagement Process

Implementation Timeline:

Resources and Budget Impact:

References:

EXHIBIT A

Coalition or Core Principles?

The Green Party's Dilemma in the Sawant Endorsement Debate

Analysis

EXHIBIT B

Coalition vs. Core Principles: A Debate on Political Strategy

The Coalition-Building View

The Principles-First View

Underlying Philosophical Divide

My Analysis: The "Anchor Bridge" Approach

EXHIBIT C

Machiavelli - Pragmatism and the "Ends Justify the Means" .1

Max Weber - Ethics of Conviction vs. Ethics of Responsibility .2

Edmund Burke - Gradualism and Tradition .3

Lenin - Revolutionary Alliances and the "United Front" .4

Rosa Luxemburg - The Dangers of Compromise .5

Antonio Gramsci - Hegemony and the "War of Position" .6

Hannah Arendt - Integrity of Political Action .7

17	Giovanni Sartori - Party Identity vs. Electoral Strategy .8
17	Analytical Synthesis
18	EXHIBIT D
18	Coalition-Building vs. Principles in Political Thought: A Philosophical Journey
21	EXHIBIT E
21	Formal Coalition Agreements .1
21	Publicly Announced and Framed Alliances .2
22	Clear Red Lines .3
22	Shared Leadership but Protected Identity .4
22	Alignment with Core Strategic Goals .5
22	Sunset Clauses and Review Mechanisms .6
23	Education & Communication with Members .7
24	EXHIBIT F
24	MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
24	I. Purpose
24	II. Scope and Objectives
25	III. Roles and Responsibilities
25	IV. Guiding Principles
26	V. Decision-Making
26	VI. Branding and Visibility
26	VII. Funding
26	VIII. Duration and Review
27	IX. Exit Clause
27	X. Signatures
28	EXHIBIT G
28	GPUS Coalition Engagement Checklist
28	I. Alignment with GPUS Values & Platform
28	II. Clarity of Purpose
28	III. Structure & Decision-Making
29	IV. Visibility & Branding
29	V. Roles & Responsibilities
29	VI. Funding & Resources
29	VII. Risk Assessment
29	VIII. Final Approval

:Title

Coalition Engagement Protocol to Preserve Integrity and Advance Strategic Goals

SPONSORED BY

- **Wissam Charafeddine**, Member of the Steering Committee
 - (Platform Committee (To Be Proposed
 - (International Committee (To Be Proposed
 - (GPAX Committee (To Be Proposed
 - (Outreach Committee (To Be Proposed
-

CONTACT

Primary Presenter: Wissam Charafeddine, Member of the Steering Committee
[✉ wissam.charafeddine@gmail.com](mailto:wissam.charafeddine@gmail.com)

SUBJECT / TITLE

PROPOSAL TO NC: Green Party Coalition Engagement Protocol

TYPE OF PROPOSAL / EXPECTED APPROVAL THRESHOLD

Structural and procedural policy proposal; **simple majority approval**

REQUESTED PROPOSAL DECISION-MAKING TIMELINE

week discussion period, followed by 1-week voting period-2

:Subject and Purpose

This proposal establishes a formal **Coalition Engagement Protocol** for the Green Party of the United States (GPUS), its caucuses, and affiliated state parties to guide participation in coalitions with other organizations or movements. The purpose is to enable effective collaboration on shared objectives while safeguarding the Green Party's **core values, political independence, and platform integrity**.

:Background and Justification

The Green Party has historically engaged in coalitions with grassroots movements, advocacy groups, and other political organizations to advance shared goals such as environmental justice, social equity, and democratic reform. While coalition work can increase visibility and impact, it can also risk **diluting the Party's identity** or **compromising its principles** if not managed carefully.

:In recent years, concerns have arisen within GPUS regarding

- The risk of aligning with groups whose broader agendas conflict with the Green Party's platform
- .The perception of GPUS as a "ballot line" rather than an independent political force
- The absence of a clear process for evaluating, approving, and monitoring coalition participation

This proposal seeks to resolve these concerns by introducing a **clear, transparent, and values-based framework** for coalition engagement that preserves the Party's independence while enabling .effective cooperation on specific, mutually aligned campaigns

:Proposal

Section 1: Principles of Coalition Work

Mission Alignment: GPUS will join coalitions with advocacy organizations - not individual .1
candidates - whose primary goals **directly align** with core eco-socialist anti-capitalist
platform planks such as grassroots democracy, social justice, ecological wisdom, and
.nonviolence

Independence of Identity: Coalition participation will not imply ideological merger or .2
subordination. GPUS's name, logo, and platform positions must remain visible in coalition
.materials and communications

Transparency: All coalition agreements must be documented in writing and made .3
.accessible to GPUS members

Section 2: Criteria for Participation

:A coalition must meet **all** of the following criteria

- .The coalition's primary goal aligns with at least one **core strategic priority** of GPUS ●
- The coalition's tactics and messaging do not contradict the Party's **non-negotiable values** ●
(e.g., opposition to corporate money, support for BDS, commitment to grassroots
(democracy
- .The coalition allows **equal participation** by all members ●

- The coalition is **time-bound** or **goal-bound**, with a clear plan for review and exit

Section 3: Formal Agreement Requirements

Before joining a coalition, GPUS will secure a **Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)** or similar document that includes

- (Scope of Cooperation (specific issue or campaign objective
- Roles and Responsibilities
- Branding & Visibility commitments
- Recognition of GPUS's non-negotiable values
- Decision-Making Process
- Exit Clause for withdrawal if principles are violated

Section 4: Red Lines for Coalition Work

:GPUS will not join coalitions that

- Endorse or promote candidates or organizations opposed to core Green Party 10 Key Principles
- Accept corporate funding or engage in pay-to-play politics
- Suppress or exclude voices from marginalized communities protected by GPUS's platform
- Demand public silence from GPUS on its core platform positions

Section 5: Engagement Process

Proposal Submission: Any state party, GPUS caucus, or GPUS committee may propose coalition participation by submitting a written proposal to the National Committee .1
.Committee

Review & Approval: The Steering Committee will review against criteria in Sections 2 & 4. .2
Approval of the coalition agreement requires a **simple majority** vote of the National
.Committee

Member Notification: Approved coalitions will be announced to GPUS membership, .3
.detailing the coalition's purpose and GPUS's role

Evaluation: Coalition participation will be reviewed at least every six months to ensure .4
.continued alignment and benefit

:Implementation Timeline

- .Upon NC Approval: Protocol becomes active •
- .Within 90 Days: All existing coalition engagements will be reviewed for compliance •
- .Ongoing: Steering Committee will oversee coalition approval, monitoring, and reporting •

:Resources and Budget Impact

No significant budgetary impact is anticipated. Staff and volunteer time may be required for
.drafting MOUs, monitoring participation, and conducting six-month reviews

:References

- GPUS Platform •
- GPUS Bylaws and Rules & Procedures •
- Previous GPUS coalition work history and case studies •

EXHIBIT A

?Coalition or Core Principles

The Green Party's Dilemma in the Sawant Endorsement Debate

Within the Green Party, the discussion over whether to support Kshama Sawant's campaign has ignited a deeper philosophical question: **should the Greens prioritize coalition-building at the risk of diluting their principles, or hold steadfast to their platform even if it means standing alone**

On one side of the debate lies the view that **coalitions are the lifeblood of political power** in a fragmented left. As one voice put it, *"Sawant may not be the perfect candidate, however she is a Leftist force that is pushing the boundaries, and we should be supporting her. When we join in support of her campaign then we have a seat at the table to share our views. If we don't have a seat at the table, then we'll have no input at all"*

Supporters of this perspective argue that waiting for the "perfect" alignment with the Green platform before endorsing anyone outside the party is a recipe for political irrelevance. They point to past successes of progressive movements that rallied diverse groups under a common cause – citing, for example, the 2016 Bernie Sanders campaign as an imperfect but unifying moment. For them, **strategic alliances are not a betrayal but a necessity** in challenging the entrenched .two-party duopoly

In stark contrast is the **principles-first position**, which warns that coalition-building without ideological guardrails can erode the very identity that differentiates the Greens. As one participant in the debate framed it, *"We're asked to abandon our core principles like decentralization, grassroots democracy, and justice-based policy in the name of unity, but that kind of unity is shallow. Ballot lines are not bargaining chips to trade away for visibility. They're sacred tools, earned by decades of organizing"*

This faction stresses that **compromise can become surrender** if the party begins to endorse candidates who fail to support foundational planks, such as BDS, reparations, and decentralized governance. In their eyes, if the Greens become indistinguishable from other left-leaning formations, the movement loses its reason for existence. *"If people want a party that functions like a campaign machine, they'll choose the bigger one,"* the argument goes

Between these poles lies a nuanced middle ground. Some argue that endorsements should not demand total platform alignment but should meet two tests: (a) does the campaign advance independent politics, and (b) does it work against corporate profit and toward human liberation? The thinking here is pragmatic: perfect alignment may be rare, but supporting movements that .share core structural goals can still move the needle toward systemic change

Analysis

At the heart of this debate is an enduring tension in political theory: **the dialectic between .ideological purity and strategic pragmatism**

Political parties that rigidly uphold their ideals without forming alliances often preserve their identity but struggle to gain influence. Historical examples include smaller revolutionary parties that remained pure in principle yet failed to shape policy on a national scale. Conversely, parties that overcompromise in pursuit of alliances often gain short-term visibility but risk dissolving into .the larger movements they joined

For the Greens, the choice is particularly stark. Their ballot access is a rare and valuable asset in a system designed to marginalize third parties. This gives them leverage, but also a responsibility: .every endorsement signals to the public what the Green brand stands for

The coalition argument correctly observes that social movements need unity to achieve breakthroughs in the face of the duopoly's structural dominance. Without forging alliances, the .Greens risk isolation, speaking only to the already-converted

The principles-first argument rightly warns that alliances with movements or candidates unwilling to stand on bedrock Green issues – especially those tied to justice for marginalized communities – can hollow out the party's meaning. The risk here is not just ideological drift but a loss of trust .from the party's most committed base

Ultimately, the resolution may not be to choose one side absolutely but to establish **clear, non-negotiable thresholds** for coalition endorsements. A candidate might not need to align on every policy plank, but they should not be fundamentally opposed to the party's core justice principles. At the same time, the Greens must remain open to coalitions that expand reach and .power, especially when the strategic context offers real leverage for advancing systemic change

.In other words: **build bridges, but know where to anchor them**

EXHIBIT B

Coalition vs. Core Principles: A Debate on Political Strategy

Across movements for social and economic justice, a perennial tension arises between two strategic orientations: **building broad coalitions** versus **holding firmly to core principles**. Both have passionate advocates, and both warn that the other approach risks dooming the movement's .mission

The Coalition-Building View

Proponents of coalition-building argue that political power comes from **unifying diverse movements around shared objectives**. They emphasize that no single organization or party can .dismantle entrenched systems like the U.S. duopoly alone

Unity across movements is essential. Imperfect allies can still help challenge the .duopoly

From this perspective, **ballot lines**—hard-won by grassroots organizing—should be seen as a **strategic resource**, potentially lent to candidates from other left-leaning groups if it advances the broader cause. A seat at the table, even with imperfect partners, is seen as better than having no .voice in major political debates

This approach accepts that coalition partners may not align perfectly on every platform plank. Instead, it seeks to build momentum on overlapping goals, delaying or downplaying disagreements .until the coalition is strong enough to address them without fracturing

The Principles-First View

Those in the principles-first camp warn that such flexibility risks **eroding the identity and mission** of the movement. For them, unity that glosses over core values—such as **support for BDS**,

reparations, decentralization, and justice-based policy—is not unity but **compromise at the expense of integrity**

Ballot lines are not bargaining chips—they are sacred tools earned through decades of organizing

Here, the concern is that chasing short-term visibility or associating with high-profile figures who reject key principles will confuse the public, alienate committed members, and reduce the party to a shadow of itself—another generic “better Democrat” option. For these advocates, the party’s distinct vision and moral clarity are its greatest assets, and must not be diluted for expedience

Underlying Philosophical Divide

:At the heart of this debate lies a classic strategic question

Is it better to compromise on some values now in order to build a bigger, more influential coalition •

Or is it better to stand unwavering, even if it means slower growth and fewer electoral wins in the short term •

The first risks assimilation; the second risks irrelevance. History offers examples of both strategies succeeding and failing, depending on the political moment and the skill of the leadership

My Analysis: The “Anchor Bridge” Approach

Pure coalitionism risks making the party indistinguishable from its allies, while rigid purism risks permanent marginalization. A **hybrid “Anchor Bridge” approach** could balance these forces

Set Non-Negotiables - Clearly identify the movement’s “anchor values” (justice principles, anti-oppression commitments) that will never be compromised

Form Conditional Alliances - Build coalitions only when allies respect those anchors, even if .2
.they diverge on secondary issues

Leverage Alliances Strategically - Use collaborations to expand reach, but ensure that .3
.public messaging consistently highlights the party's distinct identity

In this way, coalition-building becomes a tool for amplifying principles, not replacing them. The
"bridge" allows passage between movements, but the "anchor" ensures we don't drift from our
.moral and political moorings

EXHIBIT C

”Machiavelli - Pragmatism and the “Ends Justify the Means .1

(Work: *The Prince* (1532) •

View: Niccolò Machiavelli argued that political leaders should prioritize **practical outcomes** •
over strict adherence to moral codes. The survival and strength of the state (or movement)
.come first, even if it means compromising certain principles

Relevance: This aligns with the *coalition-building* approach: alliances, even with imperfect •
partners, are justified if they strengthen political power. Machiavelli would say, “Secure
”.influence first; shape ideals later

Max Weber - Ethics of Conviction vs. Ethics of Responsibility .2

(Work: *Politics as a Vocation* (1919) •

View: Weber contrasted •

Ethics of Conviction (Gesinnungsethik) - Acting consistently with one’s principles, ○
.regardless of outcomes

Ethics of Responsibility (Verantwortungsethik) - Taking responsibility for the ○
.consequences of actions, even if it requires compromising principles

Relevance: This maps almost perfectly onto the debate •

.*Principles-first advocates* embody the Ethics of Conviction ○

.Coalition-builders lean toward the Ethics of Responsibility ○

Edmund Burke - Gradualism and Tradition .3

(Work: *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790) ●

View: Burke favored **incremental reform** over radical breaks, warning that abandoning ●
.traditions for ideological purity could destabilize society

Relevance: Coalitionists might use Burkean thinking to justify working within existing ●
.political systems and alliances rather than standing apart entirely

“Lenin - Revolutionary Alliances and the “United Front .4

(Work: *Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder* (1920) ●

View: Lenin criticized ultra-leftists who refused to work with imperfect allies. He argued ●
that revolutionaries should **use every opening**—including alliances with reformists—to
.advance the cause, while maintaining ideological clarity internally

Relevance: Very similar to the coalition-builder argument: *form temporary alliances to* ●
.advance the struggle, but never forget the ultimate goal

Rosa Luxemburg - The Dangers of Compromise .5

(Work: *Reform or Revolution* (1899) ●

View: Luxemburg warned against diluting revolutionary aims for short-term reforms. While she supported participating in struggles for reforms, she insisted they must be **clearly tied to revolutionary objectives**, or else the movement risks becoming a mere reformist party

Relevance: This reflects the *principles-first* view: reforms and alliances are acceptable only if they serve long-term transformative goals

"Antonio Gramsci - Hegemony and the "War of Position .6

(**Work:** *Prison Notebooks* (1929-1935)

View: Gramsci argued that political change requires building **cultural hegemony**—winning over civil society—before seizing state power. This often involves **long-term alliances** with diverse groups

Relevance: Gramsci's strategy supports coalition-building, but he also emphasized that the leading party must shape the alliance's ideological direction

Hannah Arendt - Integrity of Political Action .7

(**Work:** *The Human Condition* (1958)

View: Arendt stressed that political action should reflect a commitment to truth and plurality, warning against sacrificing authenticity for expedience

Relevance: This aligns with the *principles-first* perspective: credibility and moral authority are undermined when leaders betray core values for short-term gain

Giovanni Sartori - Party Identity vs. Electoral Strategy .8

(Work: *Parties and Party Systems* (1976) •

View: Sartori analyzed how parties balance **programmatically identity** with the need to appeal to broader electorates. Too much compromise blurs a party's identity; too much purity .limits its electoral reach

Relevance: This framework treats coalition-vs.-principles as a balancing act, warning of •
".both "identity dilution" and "self-isolation"

Analytical Synthesis

Historically, the great divide boils down to Weber's **conviction vs. responsibility** ethics, with Machiavelli, Lenin, and Gramsci on the coalition/pragmatist side, and Luxemburg, Arendt, and the .conviction ethicists on the principles-first side

:From a political science standpoint

Coalition strategies tend to work best in *fluid, transitional political periods* when alliances •
.can shift the balance of power

Principles-first strategies work best in *long-term ideological battles* where moral clarity •
.can build a distinct base that eventually outlasts opportunistic coalitions

EXHIBIT D

Coalition-Building vs. Principles in Political Thought: A Philosophical Journey

The tension between coalition-building and strict adherence to principles is as old as politics itself. Throughout history, philosophers and political theorists have grappled with whether it is better to compromise for broader alliances or to hold the moral line even at the expense of political gains. This debate touches the core of political strategy and identity, and its echoes can be found from .Renaissance treatises to twentieth-century revolutionary manifestos

Niccolò Machiavelli offers one of the earliest and most unapologetically pragmatic takes in *The Prince* (1532). For Machiavelli, political survival and the consolidation of power were paramount. Leaders should be prepared to act immorally when necessary, if it served the stability and strength of the state. Applied to today's debate, Machiavelli would clearly side with coalitionists: if an alliance, even with imperfect partners, could advance the movement's influence or protect it from annihilation, it should be embraced. For him, the purity of ideals mattered far less than the .achievement of tangible political power

Max Weber framed the issue most directly in *Politics as a Vocation* (1919), distinguishing between the "Ethics of Conviction" (*Gesinnungsethik*) and the "Ethics of Responsibility" (*Verantwortungsethik*). The former demands unwavering adherence to one's principles regardless of consequences; the latter requires leaders to take responsibility for the real-world outcomes of their actions, even if that means compromising ideals. This dichotomy almost perfectly maps onto the coalition-versus-principles divide: conviction aligns with ideological purists, while responsibility .aligns with those willing to enter imperfect alliances to achieve partial gains

Edmund Burke, in *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790), warned against abandoning inherited traditions and established institutions for the sake of ideological purity or radical change. Burke argued for incremental reform and pragmatic adjustments over sweeping, uncompromising revolutions. In the coalition debate, Burkean gradualism offers a caution: political actors who isolate themselves in the name of principle may inadvertently pave the way for chaos or authoritarianism, whereas strategic partnerships can safeguard stability while inching toward .reform

Vladimir Lenin, in *Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder* (1920), took a sharp stance against ultra-leftists who refused to collaborate with reformist groups. Lenin argued that revolutionary forces must engage in “united front” tactics—alliances with less radical forces—to advance their strategic position. He cautioned that ideological clarity should not be abandoned, but temporary alliances could be instrumental in isolating the main enemy and expanding the movement’s base.

.This is a textbook defense of coalition-building as a revolutionary necessity

Rosa Luxemburg offered a pointed counterbalance in *Reform or Revolution* (1899). While she supported struggles for immediate reforms, she warned that such efforts must always be tied explicitly to the broader revolutionary project. Without that tether, reformist work could devolve into accommodation with the status quo, draining movements of their transformative energy. Luxemburg thus occupies a middle ground: reforms and alliances are acceptable only if they clearly serve radical, long-term objectives. Her warning resonates strongly with those who fear that

.coalition-building can easily slide into co-optation

Antonio Gramsci, writing in the *Prison Notebooks* (1929-1935), developed the concept of cultural hegemony—the idea that political change requires winning over civil society’s common sense before taking state power. This process, which he called the “war of position,” often demands broad alliances and cross-class coalitions. However, Gramsci emphasized that the leading force in such alliances must actively shape the ideological direction. For coalitionists today, his theory supports alliances as a tool for building influence, provided the movement retains intellectual

.leadership

Hannah Arendt, in *The Human Condition* (1958), brought the debate back to the realm of political integrity. For Arendt, political action is about appearing before others in a way that is authentic, truthful, and pluralistic. Sacrificing core values for expediency erodes both credibility and the moral authority necessary for meaningful political life. In this sense, Arendt warns against coalition-building that comes at the cost of the movement’s ethical identity—her stance aligns

.closely with the principles-first camp

Giovanni Sartori, in *Parties and Party Systems* (1976), approached the dilemma through the lens of political science. Sartori noted that political parties face a constant trade-off between maintaining programmatic identity and broadening appeal. Excessive compromise can blur a party’s identity, making it indistinguishable from others; excessive purity can confine it to a narrow base and marginalize it electorally. His analysis treats coalition-vs.-principles not as a binary but as a

.spectrum, where strategic calibration is key

Across these perspectives, a pattern emerges: some thinkers, like Machiavelli, Lenin, and Gramsci, prioritize coalition as a tool of power-building, accepting the risks of compromise. Others, like Luxemburg, Arendt, and the Weberian ethicists of conviction, caution that surrendering too much for the sake of unity undermines the very purpose of political action. Burke and Sartori offer frameworks for balance, warning against both reckless idealism and unprincipled pragmatism. In the end, the question may not be whether to choose coalition or principle, but how to navigate the .shifting terrain between them without losing sight of either power or purpose

EXHIBIT E

The key is **structuring coalition work so that it is mission-driven, transparent, and bound by explicit agreements**, so the party never appears to be “absorbed” by its partners or to be compromising its foundational principles. Here’s how this can be done

Formal Coalition Agreements .1

- **Written Memorandum of Understanding (MOU):** Define the scope, goals, and duration of the coalition work
- Include **non-negotiable principles** from the party’s platform (e.g., BDS support, decentralization, anti-corporate stance)
- Make it clear this is *issue-specific cooperation*, not an ideological merger

Example: The coalition is formed “to secure universal healthcare legislation at the state level,” with explicit acknowledgement that each party retains its separate identity and policy platform

Publicly Announced and Framed Alliances .2

- Announce the coalition publicly with **language that emphasizes independence:**
“We are partnering with X for this campaign because it aligns with our fight for healthcare justice, while continuing to advocate for our broader Green vision”
- This framing reassures members and the public that the party’s engagement is conditional and purpose-specific

Clear Red Lines .3

- .Establish *red lines*—issues on which the party will not compromise even within the coalition
- .If the coalition moves against these principles, the party withdraws
- .This preserves moral authority and keeps leverage in negotiations

Shared Leadership but Protected Identity .4

- .Allow joint campaign committees but **retain party-branded spokespeople**
- Ensure the party's logo, literature, and talking points are present in all coalition spaces, so
 - .the public sees the party as an equal stakeholder, not a silent partner

Alignment with Core Strategic Goals .5

- Every coalition effort should connect directly to a **strategic pillar** of the party's long-term
 - .plan—whether electoral viability, public education, or grassroots mobilization
- .If it doesn't strengthen one of those pillars, it risks being a distraction or a co-optation

Sunset Clauses and Review Mechanisms .6

- .Set a clear end date or review period for the coalition

- After each cycle, evaluate whether the cooperation advanced the party’s mission or diluted it. Continue only if the results are net-positive
-

Education & Communication with Members .7

- Keep the party base informed about why the coalition exists, what’s being done, and how it benefits the movement

- This prevents internal mistrust and reinforces that alliances are strategic tools, not ideological capitulations
-

Philosophical Basis:

This approach is similar to **Rosa Luxemburg’s “reform with revolutionary intent”**—participate in practical struggles, but always with a clear link to the larger transformative vision. It also echoes **Gramsci’s “war of position”**—working within broader alliances to expand cultural and political influence, while ensuring your own movement’s leadership and ideological direction remain intact

EXHIBIT F

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Between
The Green Party of the United States (GPUS)
and
[[Coalition Partner Name

I. Purpose

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) sets forth the terms and understanding between the Green Party of the United States (GPUS) and [Coalition Partner Name] to collaborate on [describe the coalition's specific campaign/goal] while preserving the independence, integrity, and values of each participating organization

II. Scope and Objectives

The purpose of this coalition is to work together toward [state the agreed-upon objective, e.g., passing climate justice legislation, ending corporate influence in politics, advancing ranked-choice voting, etc.] through coordinated efforts including [list types of activities: joint public statements, [.rallies, lobbying efforts, public education campaigns, etc

:The objectives of this MOU are to

- .1 Advance a shared goal that aligns with the GPUS platform and values
- .2 Maintain the independent identity and decision-making authority of each organization
- .3 Ensure mutual visibility and recognition in all public materials related to the coalition's activities

III. Roles and Responsibilities

:GPUS Will

- Contribute resources, volunteer time, or expertise as agreed in writing for specific activities
- .Maintain and promote GPUS's platform and branding in all coalition activities
- .Ensure coalition work is consistent with GPUS democratic decision-making processes

:Coalition Partner Name] Will]

- .Engage in coalition activities in good faith, consistent with shared objectives
- .Include GPUS name, logo, and positions where appropriate in coalition communications
- .Respect GPUS's independent voice, platform, and decision-making

:Both Parties Will

- .Share relevant information to achieve the coalition's goals
- .Coordinate public messaging where joint statements are made
- .Meet **[monthly/quarterly]** (or as needed) to review progress and address concerns

IV. Guiding Principles

:This collaboration is based on the following principles

- .Mutual respect for each organization's independence
 - .Commitment to grassroots democracy, social justice, ecological wisdom, and nonviolence
 - .Transparency in decision-making and communication
-

V. Decision-Making

Decisions related to coalition activities will be made by consensus of participating organizations where possible, or by a majority vote if consensus cannot be reached. Each organization retains the .right to abstain from any action that conflicts with its values or internal policies

VI. Branding and Visibility

- GPUS branding (logo, name) will be included in coalition materials for agreed-upon joint .efforts
 - .Public statements will clearly identify GPUS as an independent coalition member
-

VII. Funding

Each party is responsible for its own expenses unless otherwise agreed in writing. No coalition funds may be accepted from corporate PACs, corporate lobbyists, or any source that violates GPUS .funding principles

VIII. Duration and Review

This MOU will be effective from [start date] to [end date or "until completion of stated objective"].

The MOU will be reviewed every **[6 months/year]** to ensure continued alignment with objectives
.and values

IX. Exit Clause

Either party may withdraw from the coalition by providing **[30 days’]** written notice. Immediate withdrawal may occur if the coalition adopts actions or positions that conflict with GPUS’s core
.values or platform

X. Signatures

For the Green Party of the United States:

Name: _____
Title: _____
Signature: _____
_____ : Date

For [Coalition Partner Name]:

Name: _____
Title: _____
Signature: _____
_____ : Date

EXHIBIT G

GPUS Coalition Engagement Checklist

(To be completed before entering into any coalition agreement)

I. Alignment with GPUS Values & Platform

The coalition's goals align with GPUS's **Four Pillars**

Grassroots Democracy •

Social Justice •

Ecological Wisdom •

Nonviolence •

The coalition's objectives do not conflict with the GPUS national platform

The coalition maintains independence from corporate PACs, corporate lobbyists, or other
sources prohibited by GPUS policy

II. Clarity of Purpose

Coalition has a clearly stated and measurable objective.

Coalition's timeline for achieving the objective is realistic and defined.

Activities are clearly outlined (e.g., rallies, joint statements, lobbying, public education)

III. Structure & Decision-Making

- Decision-making process is documented (consensus, vote, etc.).
- GPUS retains full independence to abstain from actions that conflict with its platform.
- . Coalition members are identified and vetted
-

IV. Visibility & Branding

- Agreement on how GPUS name, logo, and positions will be represented.
- GPUS will be publicly recognized as an independent coalition member.
- . No co-branding that could imply GPUS is a subordinate entity
-

V. Roles & Responsibilities

- GPUS contributions (volunteers, resources, expertise) are clearly defined.
- Partner contributions are clearly defined.
- . Communication channels for coordination are established
-

VI. Funding & Resources

- Each party is responsible for its own expenses unless otherwise agreed.
- Coalition funding sources have been disclosed and approved.
- . No funding from sources that violate GPUS principles
-

VII. Risk Assessment

- No potential reputational harm to GPUS anticipated.
- No partner organization has a documented history of actions in conflict with GPUS values.
- . Coalition has a clear exit clause for GPUS
-

VIII. Final Approval

:Before signing the MOU, ensure

- .(Checklist completed and approved by relevant GPUS committee(s) •
- .Steering Committee has reviewed and authorized participation •
- .MOU has been signed by both parties •