

Minutes of the 10th Meeting of the 104th Executive Committee of the of the Socialist Party

1 September 2007

Note: These minutes are not official until amendment and adoption by the EC.

Present: White, Deutz, Carter, Stair, Helps, Chesham, Easton, Miller

Apologies: Browne

Visitors: Lawrie, M Chesham, N Deutz, Beat

The meeting was called to order at 13:11.

1. Election of Chair

Agreed at previous meeting: Browne

Motion 1 (*Chesham & Easton*) BIRT Stair be chair.

Agreed

2. Minutes of the previous meeting, business arising therefrom and the General Secretary's rising of Notices of Motion and Business from previous meetings

(a) Amendment and adoption of the 4 August 2007 meeting minutes

Motion 2 (*Miller & Easton*) BIRT in Motion 1 of the 4 August 2007 minutes, "Deutz be chair" be replaced with "Carter be chair".

Agreed

Motion 3 (*Chesham & Helps*) BIRT in §2.e.ii.A of the 4 August 2007 minutes, the voting figures for West London Branch's resolution be changed from "8-0" to "6-0 with 2 subsequently consulted in favour".

Agreed

Motion 4 (*Chesham & Helps*) BIRT in §2.e.ii.A of the 4 August 2007 minutes, "and the Party rules" be inserted after "Allen read out examples of Martin using abusive language against members".

Carried 5-1-2

Motion 5 (*Carter & Easton*) BIRT in §2.a of the 4 August 2007 minutes, "Carter objected to it being recorded that she characterised the Party Rules as 'antiquated' or 'archaic.'" be inserted.

Carried 7-0-1

Motion 6 (*Deutz & Easton*) BIRT the minutes of the 4 August 2007 meeting be adopted as amended.

Agreed

(b) Matters arising from the 2 June 2007 meeting

- i. Motion 18 (speakers' classes): The meeting read a 24 August e-mail from the Central Organiser expressing doubt that anyone had an interest in becoming an accredited speaker, but indicating that Headicar was prepared to advise interested members on speaking techniques.

Motion 7 (*Miller & Deutz*) BIRT the EC encourage those with interest in speakers' classes to contact the EC or Central Organiser by the next EC meeting.

Carried 8–0

- ii. Motion 16 (Conference resolution implementation): The logistics of the secret ballot is addressed in the Ballot Committee's report to ADM. (See §6h.)

(c) Matters arising from the 24 June 2007 special meeting

- i. Motion 13 (Smith/political views): The meeting read and noted a 12 August e-mail from West London Branch indicating that Smith did not recall the exchange with Chesham, and that he does not support the Communist Party of Iran.

(d) Matters arising from the 7 July 2007 meeting

- i. Motion 9 (Central Branch Forms F): The meeting read and noted with thanks a 26 July e-mail from the Central Branch Secretary outlining the lengthy process by which he attempts to track down members before lapsing them.

It was agreed that the Head Office Organiser would check with Treasurer about the status of the Bentleys' standing orders.

- ii. Motion 23 (Smith/personal attacks): The meeting read and noted a 12 August e-mail from West London Branch indicating that Smith had been reminded of the 1980 Conference resolution regarding personal attacks.

iii. Motion 24 (charge against Martin)

A. Correspondence

The EC considered the following correspondence:

- Report from the Assistant Secretary

The report indicated that Branch secretaries had been polled asking their members' preferences for the date of a special Party meeting in the event a poll is called. Seven branch secretaries indicated a preference for holding such a meeting at ADM, two indicated a preference for holding the meeting before ADM, and two indicated no preference. Two other branches could not be polled in this manner owing to the absence of the secretary or to the vacancy of the position.

- Poll requisition from West London Branch (8 August): "That a Poll of the Party be called in accordance with Rule 26 to revoke Resolution 9 of the meeting of the EC of 4 August charging Comrade Martin [confirmation of Resolution 24 of the 7 July EC meeting] and to refer the matter to West London Branch." (5–0, 1 subsequently consulted in favour)
- Poll requisition from Edinburgh Branch (9 August): "That a Poll of the Party be called in accordance with Rule 26 to revoke Resolution 24 of the meeting of the EC of 7 July charging Comrade Martin and to refer the matter to West London Branch." (3–0)
- Poll requisition from Manchester Branch (22 August): "That the Branch support the West London Branch motion, viz. "That a Poll of the Party be called in accordance with Rule 26 to revoke Resolution 9 of the meeting of the EC of 4 August charging Comrade Martin [confirmation of Resolution 24 of the 7 July EC meeting] and to refer the matter to West London Branch.'" (5–1–2)

- Poll requisition from Lancaster Branch (16 August): “It is clear from the August EC minutes that: a) the EC is evenly divided on the question whether Rule 31 was justly applied; b) West London Branch were not aware of Cde Martin’s online activities until the matter was raised at the EC table; c) the EC could have, but chose not to refer this matter to West London Branch. Lancaster Branch is not aware of any rule that says that once a complaint is brought to the EC, Rule 29 can no longer be applied, nor of any rule that obliges the EC to refer the matter to the Branch. Thus there is an ambiguity. However, taking note of Rule 7 (‘The Branch shall be the unit of organisation’), Lancaster views the decision not to apply Rule 29 in the first instance as abuse of process. We therefore support West London’s call for a party poll and urge other branches to do the same.” (5–0)
- Poll requisition from John Bissett for North East Branch (30 August): Bissett wrote that he had polled the 15 members of North East Branch on the requisition with a result of 4–0, and that this result was acceptable under “the recently changed Conference quoracy resolution”.
- Poll requisition from Ron Cook for Birmingham Branch (30 August): Cook wrote that he had polled 5 of 8 members of Birmingham Branch on the requisition with a result of 5–0; the remaining three members could not be contacted.

B. Discussion of requisitions from Cook and Bissett

Easton argued that the requisitions from Cook and Bissett were invalid as they did not supply the wording of the motion. Chesham argued that the requisition from Bissett was invalid as he had already resigned “effective immediately” on 5 August, and that the resolution was not debated at a Branch meeting. Miller located the 2003 Conference quoracy resolution and read it out:

On matters of urgency, where branches have no scheduled branch meeting before closing dates the secretary shall be empowered to obtain the members’ support by post, phone, or e-mail. Such actions must be ratified by the next branch meeting. (101–6)

Miller then argued that neither requisition was valid under the terms of the Conference resolution because the matter was not “urgent” (there being nearly four months to act between the laying of charges and issue of ballot papers, in which time the Branch was required by Rule 31 to summon a special meeting anyway), nor was there a “closing date” (as poll requisitions do not expire), nor were the requisitions obtained by the Branch secretaries (Coggan being the secretary for Birmingham Branch, and the position of North East Branch secretary being vacant). He also noted that these Branch polls were conducted arbitrarily, as no such Branch poll was conducted in response to the previous requisition for a Party poll in July 2006. Helps said the requisitions were unfair because the minutes and charge particulars are sent only to the Branch secretaries in anticipation of their being read at Branch meetings; members cannot make informed decisions without access to this information. White said that the 2003 Conference resolution was being misapplied because it was intended to compensate for inordinate or infrequent meetings, not moribund branches which do not meet at all.

Motion 8 (*Chesham & Easton*) BIRT members of Birmingham and North East Branches be informed that their requisitions in support of the West London Branch call for a Party poll are invalid. This EC concurs with the view expressed in the final sentence of the West London Branch letter of 8 August, *viz.* “Needless to say, such resolutions must be passed at quorate meetings and append voting figures.” For socialists, democracy is much more than a mere counting of heads. Casting the vote comes at the conclusion of a process in which is seen the marshalling of facts and the presentation of opposing arguments with the decision being reached, hopefully, on the basis of informed opinion. In the absence of the above criteria, crude canvassing

or outright lobbying are pale imitations of democracy and have no place within the Socialist Party.

Helps said that Bissett and Buick knew of Martin's activities long before the EC did, and shirked their responsibilities as Party Officers by failing to report it to her Branch. He said they have now spent a month campaigning in support of her. Deutz said that campaigning against Martin has also been going on, citing Allen as an example. Easton replied that Allen's campaigning was not done without anticipation of a forthcoming meeting, and that Birmingham and North East Branches ought to have called a meeting.

For: White, Easton, Helps, Miller, Chesham. Against: Carter. Abstaining: Deutz, Stair.

Carried 5-1-2

C. Discussion of requisition from Lancaster Branch

Miller, Deutz, and Chesham said that contrary to Lancaster Branch's point (a), the EC was not "evenly divided" on the charge, as it was carried 5-3 and subsequently reaffirmed without opposition. Miller said that contrary to the Branch's point (c), the majority of the EC did not believe it had the right to refer the matter to West London Branch. With respect to point (b), Chesham and Helps said that at least one member of West London Branch was aware of Martin's activities long before the laying of charges. Miller countered that the Branch cannot be held accountable for failing to act on information withheld from them by one of its members.

D. Discussion on calling a Party poll

White and Easton said it would be ridiculous for the EC to call a poll now, and stressed that the laying of charges does not mean that the EC is expelling Martin, nor even asking that she be expelled, but rather asking the membership to investigate, judge, and decide what to do about her activities.

Chesham said that the EC acted in good faith in laying the charge, in the manner they thought the membership expected of them, but given the response it might be best to allow the membership to abort the process, and thereby give the membership a vote of confidence in the EC. Referring the matter to the Branch, he said, would give the membership a chance to observe and judge how the Branch deals with it.

Stair and Miller expressed concern that the EC was being maligned and verbally attacked on the Party mailing lists for an action they had taken in good faith. Miller said that if the poll is called now, it should be made clear that it was not in response to bullying and abuse, as that would set a dangerous precedent.

Deutz argued that the EC shouldn't call for a poll after just having told two Branches that their requisitions were invalid, and that four requisitions isn't strong enough.

Chesham said that this is a bigger issue than Martin; the Party is more important than any individual member. He repeated that calling a poll would allow the Party to voice its view on whether this EC has acted properly.

Easton noted that a poll is problematic either way, as it will prolong things. If the poll fails, the matter will be deferred and Martin will remain suspended until Conference.

Carter said that the EC should have the courage of its convictions and should allow the charge to proceed.

Lawrie argued that the EC should call the poll.

Motion 9 (*Deutz & Easton*) BIRT next business be considered.

Agreed

iv. Motion 26 (image credits in the *Standard*)

Miller said the resolution was not yet being properly implemented. Deutz said that this was of the utmost importance, and that if the SSD can't secure and abide by image licenses, the images should not be included.

Motion 10 (*Deutz & Easton*) BIRT the EC insists that the *Socialist Standard* Department properly credit the photos used in the *Socialist Standard* in the matter specified by their authors.

Carried 7–0–1

v. Motions 33 and 35 (Campaigns Department report): See §6e.

vi. Motion 34 (Campaigns Department nominations): No nominations received. It was agreed to reissue the call.

vii. Motions 39 and 40 (Edinburgh Branch resolutions): The meeting received an 11 August e-mail from Edinburgh Branch (11 August) with the following resolution:

After a discussion on your Motion 39, at our 8 August 2007 meeting, the Branch agreed that we withdraw our second motion.

It was also agreed that the Branch request further clarification, if any, on the EC's attitude to our Motion A [That Edinburgh branch urges the EC, as a matter of priority, to purchase for the Party audio and video equipment to record Party activity—*e. g.*, business meetings and special events.]. (3–0)

Miller said that recording meetings would encourage members to think carefully before they speak, and would help resolve disputes as to what was said at previous meetings.

Motion 11 (*Deutz & Chesham*) BIRT Edinburgh Branch be thanked for their suggestion, but the EC does not consider this to be feasible at this time.

Carried 5–1–2

viii. Motion 46 (reconciliation with World Socialist Party (India)): The EC read and noted a 24 August e-mail from the Central Organiser indicating that we do not yet have the necessary information from the two Indian groups.

(e) Matters arising from the 4 August 2007 meeting

i. §2.e.ii.B (General Secretary/Central London Branch)

A. Letter from Central London Branch (28 July) containing the following motion: "BIRT Central London Branch deplores the comments made by the General Secretary regarding members of Central London Branch during the EC meeting when concluding the business regarding alleged personal abuses by party members." (5–0)

Agreed to note.

B. Circular from Central London Branch (24 August) rebutting statements by the General Secretary and others that they had caused the 6 June incident, had called the 24 June special EC meeting, and were responsible for the charge against Martin.

Deutz noted that it was three Central London Branch members who brought the information leading to the charge to the EC, even if it wasn't the Branch itself. Chesham and Easton said that the Party should deplore the Central Organiser's public remarks about members "taking over" a Branch.

Motion 12 (*Helps & Miller*) BIRT the letter be noted and that it be acknowledged that Central London Branch itself did not lay the charges.

For: Helps, Chesham, Easton, Stair, Miller, White. Against: Deutz. Abstaining: Carter.

Carried 6–1–1

C. §2.e.ii.A (Letter from West London Branch)

Referring to the vote for West London Branch's motion, Chesham said it was improper practice to include voting figures from two members consulted after the meeting, as they were not party to the discussion and could not be shown to have made a decision on the basis of the same information as the members at the properly constituted meeting.

White said that under the terms of the 2003 Conference resolution, support from absent members must be "ratified by the next branch meeting".

Easton asked why the Branch consulted Goodman and Lambert but not other members.

Motion 13 (*Chesham & Miller*) BIRT West London Branch be informed that, with respect to their letters of 27 July and 8 August, this EC regards the solicitation of support for Branch resolutions from members not present at Branch meetings (except as specified by the 2003 Conference resolution) is totally unacceptable. BIFRT the Branch be referred to the reply to Birmingham and North East Branches earlier in this meeting.

Deutz asked for clarification on why this practice should be viewed as unacceptable. Miller and Chesham said that apart from the reasons given in Motion 8, this practice allows members to effect or inflate a vote in their favour by consulting only those absent members who they expect to vote a certain way.

Carried 5-0-3

(f) Notices of Motion and Business

- i. Notice of Business 2 (Stair) from 2 June: The EC shall discuss the purchase of a hearing induction loop.

Stair reported that he had received a rough estimate of £1500 for fitting the loop, but needed to get firmer quote. It was agreed to defer the matter pending further information.

- ii. Notice of Motion 1 from 7 July

Motion 14 (*White & Chesham*) BIRT in view of the fact that the Head Office computer has been used to access and view websites of a pornographic nature, this EC affirms that the Party's infrastructure is for the propagation of socialism and the administration of the Party.

White said that some members' recreational use of the Head Office computers was completely unacceptable. Stair said that the problem is the accountability of people who claim to come to the Head Office to do Party work. Miller said that the viewing of pornography was a comparatively minor infraction compared to the disruptive activities engaged in by some other visitors.

Amendment (*Miller & Helps*) Delete "in view of the fact that the Head Office computer has been used to access and view websites of a pornographic nature,".

Carried 6-0-2

Vote on motion as amended:

Carried 8-0

- iii. Notice of Motion 2 from 7 July

Motion 15 (*Chesham & Carter*) BIRT the practice of self-nomination to subcommittees be discontinued.

Chesham and Carter noted that members sometimes put themselves forward for subcommittees and then do nothing once appointed. They argued that getting the approval of one's peers has a greater impact; nominees should be able to

convince their branch members or others that they are willing and able to do the job. Chesham noted the Central Branch Secretary's letter of 26 July expressing concern that this would make it more difficult for members of Central Branch, but said that such members could always seek the nomination of another Branch by petitioning them in writing.

Deutz said she didn't like the term "self-nomination" as what members were actually doing was volunteering.

Miller noted that the way the Motion is worded, the nomination needn't come from a Branch, but rather from any member.

White argued that the nomination should be sought from or approved by existing subcommittee members, to ensure that the new member will work well with the others.

Easton argued that a nomination should be both proposed and seconded by someone other than the nominee.

Carried 5-0-3

3. Forms A and F

(a) C. W.

The Assistant Secretary reported that he had written to the Membership Department concerning C. W.'s application, which the EC had referred to them in hopes of resolving two problematic questionnaire answers. Porter had replied that the Department had received no communication from the General Secretary advising them of this referral, so they had not contacted C. W.

The EC read a letter from C. W., dated 13 August, chastising the Party for having failed to respond to his membership application and stating that he wished to having nothing more to do with the Party. The letter made several statements indicating that he lacked a basic understanding of the Party case. Enclosed with the letter was a copy of the last letter he had received from the Membership Department, dated 29 May, which informed him that they had "no hesitation in recommending [his] acceptance" and that their decision "will be endorsed" by the Executive Committee.

Deutz asked why the Membership Department didn't query him more strongly given his dubious responses to the membership questionnaire and the ignorance of the Party case evidenced in his later letter.

White agreed that the Department acted too soon in recommending the applicant for membership. He said that this is a wider-ranging problem, as a longstanding member recently asked whether socialism would come about through revolution, and stated that we could support and join other political organisations.

Miller related a further example showing that more vigilance was needed; Porter had told him that this year the Department had received an incoherent membership questionnaire from someone. Rather than requesting clarification of his responses, they simply corrected them and asked him whether he agreed with the corrections. The applicant so affirmed, and the Department recommended him to the EC for membership on that basis.

Motion 16 (*Miller & Easton*) BIRT the EC is perturbed by C. W.'s letter and his responses to the questionnaire and asks the Membership Department why they recommended so strongly his acceptance into the Party. BIFRT the EC is concerned that the Membership Department assured the prospective member that his application would be accepted by the EC.

Carried 8-0

(b) Form F for John Bissett (North East Branch, no reason given)

Miller said he and many others had tried to dissuade Bissett from resigning but that he was adamant he wished to leave the Party.

Motion 17 (*Deutz & Easton*) BIRT Bissett's Form F be accepted with regret.

White said that Bissett resigned because he put himself in an untenable position, and that it was despicable that he was now scapegoating the EC for this. Chesham said Bissett had threatened to resign twice in the past four months (albeit over different issues) and may have been looking for an excuse to leave the Party. Chesham said Bissett got himself in a hole and wouldn't stop digging. Miller said that whatever Bissett did, or whatever any other members did to Bissett, wasn't worth resigning over.

Carried 8–0

Motion 18 (*Easton & Miller*) BIRT a call for nominations to General Secretary be made with a deadline of the next EC meeting.

Agreed

Motion 19 (*Miller & Helps*) BIRT a call for nominations to vacant EC seat be made with a deadline of the next EC meeting.

Agreed

(c) Form F for Tim Bourn (East Anglian Regional Branch, inactivity)

Miller argued that inactivity was no valid grounds for resignation. Deutz and Stair said the Branch agreed and had already tried to dissuade him but that he was adamant.

Motion 20 (*Chesham & Helps*) BIRT Bourn's Form F be accepted with regret.

Carried 8–0

(d) Form F for Gavin Sinclair (Manchester, deceased)

Motion 21 (*Miller & Easton*) BIRT Sinclair's Form F be accepted.

Carried 7–0

4. Written report of the General Purposes Committee

- None received.

5. Accounts

- None received.

6. Reports of Party Officers, Party Appointees, Subcommittees, and Departments; discussion of campaigns and *The Socialist Standard*

(a) Report from the Internet Department (30 July)

The report noted the recent surge in activity on the Party's mailing lists, and reported that Johnstone was now primarily responsible for moderation. Culbert had received the funds for the new computer. Miller was attempting liaison with M Miller of the WSPUS. Freddi was visiting Head Office and was redoing the Party's website.

Stair noted that with the advent of moderation, there is no record of abuse or attempted abuse on the mailing lists, and that members are getting a one-sided view of otherwise abusive members. Miller replied that Johnstone was keeping a record of messages which did not pass moderation, along with his responses, in case his work ever needed to come under review.

Stair said that the moderation rules were being inconsistently applied; some posters were being warned or banned for inappropriate messages while others made insults with impunity.

Carter asked how the moderation process works. Miller explained that by default, posts are immediately accepted by the mailing list software and sent out to all subscribers. However,

the moderator has the power to put any poster on moderation, which means that their posts are intercepted by the Internet Department and then approved or rejected by the moderator once he reads them. Thus there is a delay between the time the message is posted and the time it appears on the mailing list (or is rejected).

White questioned the practice of leaving everyone unmoderated by default, as this makes it too easy to post abuse. He said that by comparison, abusive letters wouldn't be automatically published in the *Standard*. Easton explained that the Internet is quite a different medium from print. Carter contrasted the mailing lists to in-person Party meetings, where abusive comrades would be asked to step away from the table.

- (b) Report on Actions Taken Pursuant to the 1995 Conference Resolution Concerning the Protection of the Party's Identity and Funds (July 2007)

The report indicated that a letter had appeared in *The Freethinker* urging readers to contact the Party, but that it provided a false address. The Assistant Secretary had written to the magazine asking them to print a correction.

It was agreed to note the report and drop the issue of the Baldwin leaflet.

- (c) Report from the Assistant Secretary

The report indicated that the sudden departure of the General Secretary had caused delays in the handling of various administrative work in August, and that this was aggravated by the General Secretary having failed to issue much of the correspondence arising from the July EC meeting. The company fixing the Head Office electronic display was giving the Party the runaround and so the manufacturer had been contacted for a replacement.

The Assistant Secretary provided an oral update on the status of the *Standard* scanning; the LSE had written on 30 August to say that the digitisation is slated to begin in September.

- (d) Report on Actions Taken Pursuant to the 1995 Conference Resolution Concerning the Protection of the Party's Identity and Funds (August 2007)

The report noted that the *Socialist Studies* Group had announced a "Socialist Party of Great Britain" autumn lecture series at Conway Hall.

Motion 22 (*White & Easton*) BIRT the Assistant Secretary contact Conway Hall to complain about the meetings.

Carried 6-0-2

- (e) Report from the Campaigns Department (four e-mails from B Johnson and P Lancaster)

The report indicated that following the loss of Bissett, Gardner was considering joining the Department and had taken over administration of University Challenge. The Department had planned the following additional activities: organisation of a London day school on the theme of capitalism and mental health, production of a Party calendar, purchasing stand-up banners and promotional material, and an open day at Head Office. They therefore revised their request from £500 to £3000, and provided a budget which accounted for £1090.50 thereof. In response to Motion 33 of the 7 July minutes, several poster designs were provided. In response to Motion 35, the Department said it currently had no time to contact other debating societies.

Chesham, Deutz, White, Miller, and Easton remarked that the Department's plans were not described in enough detail to justify such a large expenditure, and that nearly two thirds of the budget was unaccounted for. Miller expressed concern about the views to be put forward at the day school given what he believed to be wildly irrational comments on the subject recently expressed by one member of the Department. Chesham questioned whether the subject of mental health would attract enough attendees and whether there were any socialist analyses to draw upon to present a Party view.

Motion 23 (*Miller & White*) BIRT the EC ask for further details on the venue for the London day school and the views to be put forward, and that the EC ask the Campaigns Department to justify the use of the party video and buffet thereat. BIFRT the EC ask the Department to revise their budget to account for the unallocated £1909.50.

Carried 7-1

With respect to the Department's response to Motion 33, Miller noted the Department appeared to have incorporated other artists' work into their posters.

Motion 24 (*Chesham & Miller*) BIRT consideration of Campaign Department's response to Motion 33 of the 7 July meeting be deferred.

Carried 7-0-1

Motion 25 (*Chesham & Deutz*) BIRT the EC note the Campaign Department's response to Motion 35 of the 7 July meeting.

Agreed

(f) Report from the Election Department

The Department reported the possibility of a snap election and recommended that authorisation to contest such an election in Vauxhall be given.

Motion 26 (*Helps & Miller*) BIRT the EC authorises Central London Branch or South London Branch to contest a snap election in Vauxhall this year if applicable.

Agreed

(g) Oral report from the Premises Committee

Stair reported that Head Office was burgled on 8 August and again on 18 August. In the first incident, the burglar entered through the roof hatch, which a member or visitor had left unbolted, forced open the cash boxes and cabinets, and stolen cash and the digital video camera. In the second incident, the burglar entered by smashing a first-storey window and accosted Miller in his sleep. Miller rang the police, who did not show up for three hours, by which time the burglar had fled without stealing anything. Further details are provided in the Premises Committee's report to ADM. Stair outlined his plans for making the building more secure, which involved replacing the windows at a cost of some £4000. Stair also indicated that new flooring was required on the upper storeys, which have long been bare. He had sourced a quote from the same contractor who provided the downstairs flooring.

Motion 27 (*Chesham & White*) BIRT the EC approves Premises Committee's proposed expenditure on windows and also asks them to investigate securing the roof hatch and to report back to next EC meeting.

Carried 8-0

Motion 28 (*Easton & Chesham*) BIRT the EC grants the Premises Committee up to £6000 for flooring.

Carried 6-0-2

(h) Reports to ADM

The EC read the following reports:

- Report from the Advertising Department
- Report from the Audio Department
- Report from the Ballot Committee
- Report from the Campaigns Department
- Report from the Election Department

- Report from the Enquiries Department
- Report from the Head Office Organiser
- Report from the Premises Committee
- Report from the Public Access Committee
- Report from the Publications Department
- Report from the *Socialist Standard* Department
- Report from the Standing Orders Committee
- Report from the Video Production Department
- Report from the Membership Applications Department

The EC agreed to amend the Membership Applications Department report to remove the names of the unsuccessful applicants. The EC agreed to amend the Premises Committee Report such that it listed the EC, not Conference, as implementing the smoking ban, and such that the video camera was mentioned as being stolen. The EC agreed that Miller should amend the Publications Department report by adding some information which had appeared in previous Departmental reports to the EC. It was then agreed to adopt all the reports.

The following reports were yet to be received:

- Ad-hoc Committee Investigating the Circumstances Surrounding the Estate of the Late George Pooley
- Ad-hoc Committee to Construct Alternative Models of Party Decision-Making
- Archives Department
- Blog Department
- Internet Department
- Central Branch Organiser

Miller outlined the plans for the Internet Department report, and it was agreed to adopt it on spec.

- (i) Discussion of campaigns. See §6e.
- (j) Discussion of *The Socialist Standard*. See §2(d)iv.

7. Correspondence

Deutz and Carter left around this point.

- (a) Matters of urgency
- (b) Correspondence from or concerning Branches, the Party in general, and members
 - i. Letter from Central Branch Secretary (2 July)
 - A. Self-nomination to Overseas Contacts Committee. Agreed to defer.
 - B. Self-nomination to Overseas Group Secretary. Agreed to defer.
 - C. Correspondence with Zambia group

The meeting noted that the Central Branch Secretary had been sending money to the Zambia group, but his letter did not specify whether this was Party money or done in a personal capacity.

Motion 29 (*White & Miller*) BIRT the EC write to the Central Branch Secretary asking the source of payments to Zambia.

Agreed

It was agreed to defer the remainder of the correspondence.

D. Letter from P Newell re Zambia group (23 July). Agreed to defer.

ii. Letter from J Bissett regarding videos (30 August). Agreed to defer.

(c) Correspondence from Companion Parties and Groups

i. WSPNZ minutes for June 2007. Agreed to defer.

ii. SPC newsletter for July 2007. Agreed to defer.

iii. WSPNZ minutes for July 2007. Agreed to defer.

iv. SPC newsletter for August 2007. Agreed to defer.

(d) All other correspondence

i. E-mail from Martin regarding alleged conflict of interest (1 September). Agreed to note.

8. Any other business

(a) Chesham, White, and Miller reported that they had received various letters. It was agreed to defer consideration of them to next month.

(b) Stair reported he had found a letter from the Treasurer to John Briggs and believed it contained or arose from a mischaracterisation of the EC's instructions. It was agreed to defer consideration of the letter to next month.

9. Nomination of Chair for the next meeting

Motion 30 (*Miller & Helps*) BIRT Browne be chair for the October meeting.

Agreed

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 20:16.