



AMENDMENTS TO CONSTITUTION

1. Empower the Branches

What the draft does:

It recognises branches as the local level of the party, but keeps control of funding and structure in the hands of the centre.

Why this falls short:

Without resources or autonomy, branches risk becoming administrative hubs rather than living, organising communities. Central approval and arbitrary boundaries limit their ability to respond to local realities — branches built around electoral constituencies risk entrenching electoralism as the primary focus of the party.

What we propose:

Branches should be the *engine* of the party's life.

- Each branch should receive **at least 50% of membership fees generated by its members** directly and automatically.
- Branches should be formed along **real community lines**, not just electoral boundaries.
- Local members should be able to petition to form new branches wherever it makes sense for organising.

Why it matters:

This would ensure local democracy isn't symbolic — it's materially supported. A socialist party must grow from the bottom up, with members controlling resources and shaping their own organising spaces. By providing local branches with mandatory funding, it provides them with the financial resources to be meaningfully autonomous, self-governing and self-sufficient; with their own bank accounts, that are democratically controlled and subject to member oversight, and the freedom to raise additional funds from members and supporters to supplement the needs of the party's organising work.

2. A Party of the Whole Left

What the draft does:

It limits membership to people who are not in any other socialist parties and discourages organised political tendencies within the party.

Why this falls short:

These restrictions treat political difference as a threat, when it's actually the substance of democracy. Suppressing open tendencies forces debate underground, fosters distrust, and bans freedom of speech and the right to dissent.



What we propose:

Members should have full rights to:

- **Organise openly** into factions or platforms, permanent or temporary.
- **Advocate publicly** for political positions, even if they differ from the current majority.
- **Work constructively** to implement democratic decisions while campaigning to change them in future.

To remove restrictions on who can be a member:

- Any person who lives in the UK and is over the age of 14 should be able to be a party member.
- There should not be any ban on being a member of other political parties or external factions.

Why it matters:

A socialist party should not fear diversity — it should institutionalise it. Open political life makes the party stronger, more honest, and more rooted in democratic debate.

3. For a Collective Leadership

What the draft does:

It concentrates authority in a Central Executive Committee (CEC) and a Leader, with guaranteed seats for MPs and councillors whose electorate would be their fellow public officeholders, with representation of ordinary members, elected by their peers, totalling just 60% of all seats on the Central Executive Committee (CEC).

Why this falls short:

This risks reproducing the same hierarchical, personality-based model that alienates members and weakens accountability.

What we propose:

- Replace the single **Leader** with two **Co-Chairs**, elected by the membership, who are **public spokespeople** equal to the rest of the CEC.
- End automatic seats for public officeholders — **MPs and councillors should not be able to be elected** to the CEC as voting members.
- Replace the officers' structure with a **collective Steering Committee** of six equal members, elected by the CEC, plus the two Co-Chairs.
- Introduce **term limits**: CEC and Co-Chairs may serve a maximum of two consecutive years, then must stand down for two years.

Why it matters:

Democracy is when the governed govern themselves. The leadership of a democratic & socialist party must be collective, recallable, and based on the equality of all members of the leadership body - with all members of the CEC equal and no more equal than any other - and term limits to prevent democratic ossification and over reliance on the few. Power



concentrated in the hands of too few people is a recipe for the development of an unaccountable party elite, detached from the everyday demands of ordinary membership. These proposed changes ensure accountability, rotation, and shared responsibility.

4. Transparency and Openness

What the draft does:

It includes clauses on confidentiality that could restrict members' access to information and limit oversight of leadership bodies.

Why this falls short:

Democracy depends on transparency. Members cannot exercise control if decisions are hidden behind confidentiality rules.

What we propose:

- All CEC and Steering Committee meetings should be **open to members** by default, with closed sessions only for sensitive matters.
- **Minutes and decisions** must be published for members to review.
- The CEC should meet **at least six times per year**, and the Steering Committee **every two weeks**.

Why it matters:

Open meetings build trust and accountability. A party built on secrecy risks bureaucracy; one built on openness invites participation.

5. Fair and Independent Discipline

What the draft does:

It leaves disciplinary powers largely with the CEC, without clear checks or independent oversight.

Why this falls short:

Disciplinary structures without independence risk misuse — whether intentional or not — and can be perceived as tools for silencing dissent.

What we propose:

- Create a **Discipline and Grievance Commission (DGC)** of 11 members **selected by sortition (random draw)**.
- The DGC can **review all disciplinary cases** and make recommendations if a case was mishandled.

Why it matters:

Socialist democracy must protect members from arbitrary treatment. A fair, transparent process strengthens unity through justice, not conformity.



6. Accountability for Elected Representatives

What the draft does:

It outlines no mechanisms besides an ineffective recall petition for holding elected officeholders to account once in public office.

Why this falls short:

Without structured accountability throughout their entire time in office, representatives can drift from the movement that elected them.

What we propose:

- Establish **Socialists in Office (SIO) Committees** at branch and regional levels to guide and scrutinise elected representatives.
- Create a **National SIO Committee**, accountable to members, to coordinate oversight of MPs and national representatives.
- Have **Parliamentary and Council Convenors** elected by members, not appointed, with **term limits** to prevent entrenchment. These offices are **spokespeople** for elected groups, but **don't hold leadership** in the party more broadly.

Why it matters:

Elected officials must remain accountable to the membership, not the political establishment. This is how we ensure our politics stays collective and participatory, not the sole remit of individuals or atomised. The SIO Committees act as the People's Whip, allowing members the power to direct elected officials in how they behave and vote, in accordance with the principles and programme of the party.

7. A Worker's Wage and Party Equality

What the draft does:

It leaves pay for elected representatives and staff undefined.

Why this falls short:

Without limits, inequality can creep in — creating divisions between members and representatives.

What we propose:

- MPs and officeholders should take **no more than the median local wage**, with allowances only for necessary expenses.
- Staff salaries should be **capped at the national average**, with flexibility for high-cost areas or access needs.
- Any surplus from salaries should be **donated back to the local branch**.

Why it matters:

This aligns our representatives' material conditions with those they represent. It's not symbolic — it's a concrete safeguard against privilege, ensuring we practice equality inside the party as well as preach it outside.



8. Accessibility

What the draft does:

The draft political statement merely states "Your Party is committed to equality across society and opposed to all forms of prejudice, discrimination and scapegoating...". **There is no constitutionalised protection.**

Why this falls short:

- This misses the **fundamental difference between discrimination** (hostile participation) **and exclusion** (no participation possible).
- Without constitutional guarantees, **accessibility remains optional**.
- Bootstrapping problem: disabled members cannot vote on accessibility policy if they cannot access the meetings where policy is decided.
- **General equality statements don't address the infrastructural barriers** that physically prevent **20% of the working class** from even participating in democratic processes.

What we propose:

- A **constitutionally-mandated Accessibility Commission**, elected by STV, with **widespread enforcement powers**.
- The Commission Chair would sit ex-officio on the CEC, Steering Committee, and Conference Planning Committee, ensuring accessibility is considered at every level of decision-making.

Why it matters:

This isn't about special privileges—it's about creating the democratic infrastructure that makes participation possible. While other forms of discrimination can be fought from within meetings, physical, sensory and other barriers prevent attendance entirely.

Constitutionalizing accessibility ensures we bind ourselves to inclusion even when it's inconvenient, expensive, or forgotten. True democratic socialism requires that everyone can enter the room where democracy happens.



DETAILED AMENDMENTS FOR CONSTITUTION

1. Empower the branches! (section 3 D, branches)

1. Add: All Branches shall receive mandatory funding directly from national membership fees and proportional to the number of members in the respective Branch. This amount is a minimum rate of 50%.
2. Replace line 1: Branches will not follow electoral constituency boundaries, but instead follow community and geographical areas that are most effective for community organising. Branches may be established by a petition of local members wanting a particular geographical area or by the CEC.

2. For a party of the whole left! (section 4, membership)

1. Delete: "Members may not hold membership in any other national political party, except if specified by the CEC."
2. Delete: "Members may not affiliate with or participate in organisations undermining Party values."
3. Replace last two lines: Members must live in the UK or be UK residents or citizens. Members must be at least 14 years old.
4. Add: Members may form and organise open factions, both temporary or permanent, to advocate or campaign for specific political agendas, views, tactical or strategic orientations, and to carry out any associated activities. All members of the Party, whether organised as factions or acting as individuals, have the rights of freedom of speech, expression, information, dissemination, association, and dissent, whether they be exercised both publicly or privately. Members may advance views contrary to democratically made decisions and advocate for their change without interference from bureaucratic obstruction. Members may also freely seek to build an organised majority in support of those views that run contrary to democratically made decisions, provided they publicly uphold the democratic legitimacy and binding nature of decisions they disagree with. In recognising the democratic legitimacy and binding character of such decisions, members must agree to work constructively with fellow members of the Party to implement those decisions collectively.



3. For a collective leadership! (section 3 B, CEC)

1. Replace line 1: The Party's Central Executive Committee (CEC) shall be the collective leadership and the highest decision-making body of the Party between meetings of the Conference.
2. In line 2, Remove: the four guaranteed seats on the CEC for public office holders (MPs and Councillors). MPs, Councillors, and other public elected officeholders shall not be permitted to sit on the CEC, except as non-voting members (such as the Parliamentary Convenor).
3. In line 4, Replace: the National Officers with a Steering Committee of 6 equal members elected by the CEC, plus the Co-Chairs of the Party, who all share equal responsibilities.
4. Replace line 7: All ordinary CEC members should be elected by the National Conference through Single Transferable Vote under the Droop quota (Scottish STV), for one year terms.
5. Change section 3C: Remove the position of Leader, and instead have Co-Chairs elected by National Conference through Single Transferable Vote under the Droop quota (Scottish STV), who shall be the primary spokespeople of the Party, and have guaranteed seats on the CEC and SC.
6. Add: The CEC and Co-Chairs shall have a two year consecutive term limit, followed by being barred from standing to the same office for the following two years.

4. No censorship, no secrecy!

1. Delete from section 4: "Members must accordingly respect the confidentiality of internal Party matters."
2. Add to section 3B: All CEC and SC meetings shall be open to all members, unless a vote is passed to go into closed session for sensitive matters. Minutes of these meetings must be made available to all members. The CEC shall meet at least 6 times per year, and the SC at least every two weeks.

5. For a fair disciplinary process!

1. Add a section: The Discipline and Grievance Commission (DGC) sits as a permanent advisory board to the CEC. This board shall have 11 members selected by sortition, and shall have the power to review all disciplinary cases that are brought before the CEC or a Branch. This board has no executive powers but can make recommendations that the CEC reopen cases, or provide reports to National Conference or the wider membership, or any other appropriate measures, if it determines that a case has been handled wrongfully.



6. For a people's whip!

1. Add: Socialists in Office (SIO) Committees may be formed by the Branches when a member of the Party is elected to public office. They shall include democratically selected representatives from relevant branches, and elected office holders may be required to attend without voting rights. SIOs are responsible for providing political guidance and support to elected officeholders to maintain fidelity to the principles, aims, and democratic decisions of the Party. SIOs may recommend how policy positions are implemented, what campaign strategies to take, and shall monitor elected officeholders' alignment with the programme, policy, and ethics of the Party.
2. Add: A National SIO Committee may be formed by the CEC with the approval of the National Conference, with delegates from Branches able to sit on it and interact with those members elected to national-level offices, including the House of Commons.
3. Add: Any group of elected public officeholders shall have a Convenor selected by the membership, to act as spokesperson and registered leader of the group. The Parliamentary Convenor shall be elected by the National Conference. Council Convenors shall be elected by the local branches within the council area. These Convenors shall be responsible for ensuring that officeholders are aligned with the ideals, values, and policies of the Party, including enforcing the decisions of the CEC and SIO Committees. Each Convenor shall have a two year consecutive term limit, and then may not be selected again for at least two full consecutive terms afterwards.

7. For a worker's wage for MPs and staff!

1. Add: Elected MPs and all other officeholders shall not take any of their salary higher than the median wage in the area they live. Allowances can be made for reasonable expenses and any costs required by public office or to address barriers to accessing public office. Any remaining money from the salary shall be donated to the local branch of the Party.
2. Add: Staff salaries shall be capped at the average national wage, with additional allowances permitted for areas with higher cost of living, or addressing access barriers.

8. Everybody in the room!

1. Add new structure: An Accessibility Commission shall be formed, comprising 7 elected disabled members. This Commission shall have broad powers to review party events, determine and enforce accessibility standards, administer an accessibility fund, conduct audits, provide training, intervene in disputes related to accessibility, make recommendations on instructions to be given by SIOs to officeholders, and make recommendations on candidate reselection to branches, on any matters related to accessibility for disabled members. They can conduct non-binding online votes of all disabled members for consultation purposes. They



DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS

FOR A PARTY REPUBLIC!



shall elect a Chair who has an ex-officio non-voting seat on the CEC, SC, and any conference planning bodies.



ORGANISATIONAL STRATEGY

Note that this has not been formally agreed by Democratic Socialists, so should be taken only as a draft proposal at this stage

Branches

Add to section 2 B:

In areas where proto-branches exist they should be consulted on being incorporated as official branches immediately following conference, so that a re-foundation meeting can be held that includes all local members.

Inaugural Leadership and CEC

1. Elections should be concluded by 31st January 2026 to allow for a swift transfer of power from the Independent Alliance to the CEC
2. There should be Co-Chairs of the Party rather than a single Leader, who are equal to other CEC members in power, though also act as public spokespeople for the Party
3. The Leaderships shall be held collectively by the CEC, rather than in a single person or team of people. A statutory leader for legal purposes should be randomly selected from the CEC
4. The CEC shall consist of 19 ordinary members only plus the two Co-Chairs, with zero reserved positions for MPs or Councillors. There can be additional reserved positions for Scotland and Wales. There should be quotas for marginalised groups to ensure representation
5. The CEC shall elect a Steering Committee of 5 equal members plus the two Co-Chairs, with all positions equal in power, rather than Officers

Elections 2026

Replace point i:

For the unique case of local elections in 2026 Your Party will not stand any candidates

Replace point iii:

Candidates in the local elections in 2026 can seek an endorsement from Your Party if they make a written pledge signing onto the Political Statement, and secure the support of the branch where they are standing. Where no branch exists, Your Party will not endorse any candidates

Affiliates and Sections

Affiliates and Sections should not be granted any seats on the CEC or voting rights at Conference



DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS

FOR A PARTY REPUBLIC!





POLITICAL STATEMENT

Note that this has not been formally agreed by Democratic Socialists, so should be taken only as a draft proposal at this stage

Replace the Political Statement with the following points:

We recognise that the interests of the working class cannot be reliably and sustainably secured within the constraints of capitalism and instead require the development of an alternative economic model based on democratic planning and the socialisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange, alongside the abolition of the profit motive and private capital – ie, socialism.

We seek to constitute this party as a radically democratic body, rooted in the democratic traditions of the working class (which includes all those that depend on employment for survival, as well as the unemployed, disabled/long terms sick, stay-at-home carers, students and retired people) and as such we view the current constitutional order as a fundamental impediment to our democratic needs and goals.

We will campaign and stand in elections in order to raise the possibility of a democratic and socialist alternative to the authoritarian and capitalist society of today. But our party will not enter coalitions with other parties at any level of government and will not participate in any government without the explicit guarantee of the implementation of its democratic programme in full. We refuse to become responsible for the management of capitalism and continued immiseration of the working class and its allies.

This party will also take a role in organising the class beyond the present limitations of the electoral realm, i.e. in the workplace, the home, and on our streets – seeking to defend and advance the cause of the working class wherever it finds itself under threat from the onslaught of reaction, with complete solidarity and defence of the most marginalised sections of our class in particular, notably migrants and trans people, who are under daily assault, by allying with and supporting the many organisations and movements that exist to struggle against it.

We recognise however that this alone will not be enough. Capitalism is organised internationally: therefore this party must be thoroughly internationalist, anti-imperialist, and anti-racist – that means being explicitly and uncompromisingly anti-Zionist, too. The working class in Britain can only hope to advance its interests



by organising together with the working class of other countries, beginning with our nearest neighbours on the continent.

This party therefore puts forward the following immediate demands which form the minimum precondition for it to enter government:

1. Abolition of the monarchy and the House of Lords. Parliament elected by PR with MPs' salaries set to the median wage.
2. A constituent assembly to draft a constitution and democratise society from top to bottom, enshrining our fundamental rights.
3. Repeal of laws criminalising protest and expanded police powers. Police and intelligence agencies must be made to be democratically accountable.
4. A true living wage and a move to a 4 day working week to guarantee full employment and a fuller, freer, life for everyone.
5. An end to homelessness and the abolition of private rent. Housing will be decommodified and made a fundamental right for all.
6. An end to cynical austerity and privatisation, with sustained investment into the NHS and our other public services, while bringing critical public infrastructure into public ownership.
7. Comprehensive protections for the oppressed and marginalised to guarantee their empowerment and full participation in society.
8. Parliamentary inquiries to establish criminal culpability for the manifold failures and crimes of the British state and ruling class.
9. Withdrawal from NATO and all imperialist wars, withdrawal of recognition of the State of Israel and practical solidarity with the oppressed people of the world.
10. Transition of the military-industrial sector towards production for the peace rather than war and towards industry that will protect and preserve our planet.



STANDING ORDERS GUIDE

1. Conferences

a) In-Person Attendees

What choices are given:

1. Conference is attended by elected delegates (local branches, sections, and affiliates)
2. Conference is attended by randomly selected members through sortition

What we recommend:

Option 1 is preferred — however we believe that neither option is acceptable. Conference should be able to be attended by any members, however only delegates elected by local party branches should be able to vote. Organised sections and affiliates should not be given any delegates or right to vote as their organisations.

Why it matters:

We believe that guaranteeing party members an equal right of participation in the democratic process requires that participation be reserved for individual members. Groups may choose to affiliate with Your Party on the basis of acceptance of our programme, but they shouldn't be given voting rights as an organisation. We value the contributions of organised sections and affiliates, but reject their ability to 'bloc vote' on behalf of their members - rather than encouraging them to participate in the party as individual members - as this can lend itself to an imbalance in internal election and conference outcomes, alongside the general diminishment of grassroots control over the party's decision-making process.

b) Hybrid Conference:

We have no preference, but encourage consideration of both the importance of in person deliberation for reaching democratic outcomes, as well as the accessibility needs of those who would not be able to attend without hybrid options

c) Conference Voting

What choices are given:

1. Only delegates can vote
2. Only members selected to attend via sortition can vote
3. All members vote on conference decisions

What we recommend:

Option 1 is preferred — however we believe that none of the options are acceptable. Only delegates elected by local party branches should be able to vote.



We also propose that it is added that all delegate votes should be made available through the party membership portal to their local branches, so that they can be held to account if they vote against any instructions issued by the branch.

Why it matters:

It is vital that conference voting remains rooted in the direct democratic authority of local party branches. Allowing voting rights to delegates chosen by these branches ensures accountability, transparency, and a genuine link between grassroots members and national decision-making.

To guarantee members an equal right of participation in the democratic process requires that participation in that process is reserved for individual members. Organised sections and groups may choose to affiliate with the party on the basis of acceptance of our programme, but to give them voting rights as a section(s) or affiliate(s) would place them in a privileged position, and undermine the equality of all participants in the party's democratic deliberation and decision-making process.

Delegate votes being public ensures that they are truly accountable to their local branches, and that all members who participate in local branch meetings are involved in deliberation over party policy and can instruct delegates on how to vote in elections for the political leadership.

d) Voting Weightings

What choices are given:

1. One delegate one vote
2. Party wide referendum
3. Weightings based on local party size (or section or affiliate sizes)

What we recommend:

Option 1

Why it matters:

We reject weightings and would see them as anathema to a party that is aiming to engage and empower branches across the country. Weightings give privileges to certain members, effectively allowing them to hold outsized and even veto power over local branch-derived democracy.

e) Voting thresholds

What choices are given:

1. Simple majority for all business
2. Simple majority, except amendments to standing orders are by two-thirds ($\frac{2}{3}$) majority

What we recommend:

Option 2

Why it matters:



There is some need for stability in documents to ensure that the organisation's structure does not change massively each year in a way which would disrupt democratic functions, nor the party be subject to seemingly 'democratic' coups by leading factions.

f) Motions to conference

What choices are given:

1. Motions brought by local parties, sections, and affiliates
2. Motions brought by individual members with a certain number of seconders required, with most popular motions selected
3. Motions brought by online voting system

What we recommend:

Options 2 and 3 are both OK, but neither is good enough.

We support adding to the document that there should be a secure online platform for all individual members to submit and discuss motions, amendments, and related proposals, plus nomination of candidates for positions on the CEC, as well as National Co-Chairs/Leader, in advance of the National Conference.

Why it matters:

Providing a secure online platform for members to submit and discuss motions ensures openness, inclusivity, and equality of participation. It allows all members, regardless of location or resources, to engage meaningfully in shaping Party policy and nominating candidates. This approach modernises internal democracy, encourages debate and collaboration, and makes conference decision-making more representative of the membership as a whole. By supplementing traditional processes rather than replacing them, it combines accessibility with accountability and transparency.

g) Length of motions to conference

What choices are given:

1. 400 words
2. 300 words
3. 250 words

What we recommend:

No direct word limit or as much as possible (Option 1)

Why it matters:

Some motions are too important and detailed to be squeezed into a word limit. Limiting motions to just a few hundred words limits the scope of debate and discussion, and denies members the right to all the necessary information required to make democratic decisions, information that, due to the word limit, would have to be omitted.



h) Motion compositing

What choices are given:

1. Committee elected directly by party members
2. Committee appointed by executive
3. Committee composed of delegates and/or the members who proposed the motions

What we recommend:

Option 3 preferred, 1 is also preferable to 2.

Why it matters:

Compositing motions through a committee made up of delegates and motion proposers ensures that decisions about combining or adapting proposals remain in the hands of those directly involved. This approach promotes transparency, collaboration, and accountability, while respecting the intentions of members who have submitted motions. It prevents excessive central control and guarantees that compositing outcomes genuinely reflect the will of the membership. If necessary, direct election by party members is preferable to appointment by the executive, as it further strengthens democratic legitimacy.

j) Conference Motion Policy Committee

What proposals are given:

1. That motions that fall short of basic expectations can be rejected by a Conference Motion Policy Committee
2. That this Committee could be made of:
 - a. Directly elected members; b. Members of the CEC; c. Local party officers

What we recommend:

We recommend to support 2 (a), but also note that our own recommendations call for a broader Conference Planning Committee:

The Conference Planning Committee (CPC) is made up of fifteen (15) positions that are elected by National Conference delegates as an open ballot using Single Transferable Vote (STV) under the Droop quota. The newly elected CPC is responsible for organising the subsequent National Conference under a 12 month term and for up to an additional 2 months ex-officio to support handover to the new CPC. For the purposes of fulfilling administrative tasks as decided by said committee, the General Secretary shall sit ex-officio as a non-voting member with speaking rights limited to the practicalities of the running of the Conference as in line with the democratic decisions made by the Conference Planning Committee.

Why it matters:

Conference is meant to be the highest governing body of the party, and as such the decisions it makes are of the utmost importance. Without democratic control over the running of party conference(s), members cannot guarantee that they will be run democratically and free of bureaucratic interference or domination - an experience all too common for those of us who were once members of the Labour Party. Without a member-led conference, it is likely that what is meant to be a working political event - the Party's Parliament - would be transformed into a theatrical show.



k) Supporting and speaking to motions

What proposals are given:

1. Proposers must be able to speak to their motion and have 3 minutes
2. Supports or opposers of motions have 2 minutes
3. A seconder is required to speak in support or against a motion

What we recommend:

1. Accept
2. Accept
3. Reject

Why it matters:

Requiring a seconder to speak at conference reduces the scope of debate and the ability of members to engage with the motions. Any delegate who wants to speak for or against a motion should be given the opportunity to do so, to allow for proper democratic deliberation.

Additional Proposals for Conference:

What we propose:

Delegate numbers to the National Conference shall be assigned to Branches proportionally based on the fees-paying membership of each Branch. Delegate-to-member ratios shall be set by the CEC at least six months before the Conference, except in the case of Special Conferences, where such ratios shall be set by the CEC as soon as possible after the Conference is called. Each branch shall have at least one delegate and no fewer than one delegate for every 500 members.

Why it matters:

As a matter of principle we believe the number of delegates assigned to a local branch should be proportional to their membership as a whole, so as to ensure the widest, and most pluralistic representation possible. Ensuring that each branch shall have at least one delegate, and no fewer than one delegate for every 500 members they have, guarantees a minimum level of representation for local branches no matter their size.

What we propose:

Special National Conferences may be called by a two-thirds ($\frac{2}{3}$) vote of the Central Executive Committee or by petition endorsed by one-half ($\frac{1}{2}$) of the membership or by Local Party Organisations collectively representing two-thirds ($\frac{2}{3}$) of the membership.

Why it matters:

The power to call special conferences in response to changes in political and material conditions, to resolve internal disputes, to recall the executive etc; cannot simply be the right of the leadership. Centralising this power within their hands not only puts them in a privileged position in comparison to the membership, but denies the right of members independently and through their local parties to respond effectively to events and concerns.

**What we propose:**

The CEC shall provide funding to enable delegates to attend the National Conference, and ensure that all Branches are able to send their full number of delegates without financial restrictions. These funds shall cover food, travel, accommodation and subsistence needs during the conference, as well as any additional costs required by specific delegates to enable their attendance, such as childcare costs.

Why it matters:

Ensuring equal access to the National Conference strengthens democratic participation across all party branches and opens participation up to every member. By removing financial and practical barriers, every delegate can contribute fully to decision-making, regardless of personal circumstances. This funding commitment promotes fairness, inclusion, and representation within the party, irrespective of means.

What we propose:

The Accessibility Commission shall ensure that full Conference participation is possible remotely, for those who can not physically attend, via an accessible platform allowing speaking, talktype, voting and other suitable technologies. It will coordinate the financial support with CEC funding of disabled members requiring assistance. It shall ensure conference documents are available in a range of accessible media.

Why it matters:

Disability participation and access in and to our Conference is vital if we want to be truly both democratic and socialist. The Accessibility Commission will have the skill and experience to find the best methods of securing and supporting access and participation and ensuring all documents are truly accessible.



2. Local Party Meetings and Assemblies

a) i) Running meetings

What choices are given:

1. Local meetings left to local party
2. Local meeting can have common items required across all local parties

What we recommend:

Option 1

Why it matters:

Allowing local parties to run their meetings independently recognises the diversity of local contexts and priorities. It empowers members to organise in ways that work best for them, encourages participation, builds stronger grassroots engagement, and codifies meaningful autonomy for local parties. This approach also reduces unnecessary central oversight, promoting trust and flexibility across the party.

ii) Hybrid Local Party Meetings

We have no preference, but encourage consideration of both the importance of in person deliberation for reaching democratic outcomes, as well as the accessibility needs of those who would not be able to attend without hybrid options.

b) Local Assembly Meetings

i) Hybrid Local Assembly Meetings

We have no preference

Additional Proposal for Local Parties:

What we propose:

Branches must have an accessibility liaison, responsibility for providing reports to and from the Accessibility Commission. Branches must comply with guidelines on ensuring that all meetings are conducted in line with the rules established by the Accessibility Commission.

Why it matters:

Disabled members must be enabled to participate fully in the democratic life of the party at every level. The accessibility liaison will be able to give advice, disseminate good practice and ensure that we have no accessibility postcode lotteries.



DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS

FOR A PARTY REPUBLIC!

**What we propose:**

There should be a parliamentary/procedural authority for all branches to follow, such as Robert's Rules of Order. This would mean that no matter what level of the party deliberation is taking place, the same meeting procedures will be followed.

Why it matters:

This democratises party life significantly by standardising party procedures based upon easy to learn and understandable rules that are universally applied regardless of what level of party organisation they are used in. By using procedural rules based on parliamentary procedure, as used by a wide variety of public and private organisations, members have an easily referenceable framework through which party democracy can be assured, whereby majority decisions are easily made, and minority rights respected - free of factional and/or bureaucratic interference or obfuscation.



3. Conduct of Party Elections

a) Local Party Officers

What proposals are given:

There are a series of different proposals laying out exactly how branches should be internally structured, regarding candidacy for local officers, voting system, term length and recall

What we recommend:

We believe that these decisions should be up to the local branch to decide. As a matter of principle, we support Single Transferable Vote under the Droop quota (a system most commonly known as Scottish STV) so as to achieve the most pluralistic representation possible, alongside annual terms with a two consecutive term limit to ensure leadership rotation and to prevent the concentration of power, skills and responsibility in the hands of too few people.

We particularly oppose that there should be a complex process of recall for local officers. A simple majority vote of the all-members meeting should be enough to remove an officer and initiate a by-election to elect another member in their place.

Why it matters:

Supporting Single Transferable Vote promotes fairer and more representative outcomes, while annual terms and term limits encourage accountability and the regular renewal of leadership. Simplifying the process for recall reinforces democratic control, ensuring that members can respond swiftly and collectively if officers lose their confidence. Together, these measures strengthen transparency, inclusivity, and participation at every level of the organisation.

b) National Party Officers

i) Eligibility for candidacy

What choices are given:

1. Any member can stand for any position
2. Any member can stand, except for leadership, which must be an MP or publicly elected member

What we recommend:

We oppose both options. Any member in good standing should be able to run for any position in national or regional officer elections. However, MPs, Councillors, and other publicly elected party members, should be barred from standing. They can be granted ex-officio roles to allow them to attend relevant meetings, but only with speaking, not voting rights.

Why it matters:



Allowing all members in good standing to stand for national or regional office except from public officeholders ensures genuine internal democracy and prevents the concentration of power within a small group of public officeholders. Publicly elected officeholders should be barred from national or regional office to prevent the formation of a party elite. Holding public office brings privileges and personal incentives from outside the party. To take additional positions of power within the party would increase their powers to the extent that their decision making may become detached from party priorities.

By establishing a clear separation between those holding public office and those running the Party's internal structures, we strengthen accountability and safeguard against the development of an insider hierarchy. This approach promotes wider participation, diversity of experience, and a culture where leadership stems from the membership as a whole, not from institutional privilege.

ii) Seconders

What proposals are given:

A certain number of nominations should be required to stand

What we recommend:

Accept

Why it matters:

Requiring nominations helps ensure that candidates have genuine support within the Party before standing for election. It encourages engagement and discussion among members, reduces frivolous or unserious candidacies, and strengthens the legitimacy of those who are elected. This simple safeguard helps maintain fairness and confidence in the democratic process. There is a balance to be struck between a threshold so low it leads to frivolous or unserious candidacies, and too high that ordinary members without social capital within the party are effectively 'priced out' of standing in internal elections. As such, we propose that anyone standing for a position within the party's national leadership be required to have the support of two hundred (200) individual members, with nominations done via an online portal where potential candidates can publish a statement arguing for their candidature.

iii) Voting system

What choices are given:

1. First past the post
2. Single Transferable Vote
3. Open List Proportional

What we recommend:

Option 2. However, we support them being elected by conference

Why it matters:

Using the Single Transferable Vote ensures that elections reflect the broadest possible range of member preferences, producing results that are more representative and inclusive than



first past the post. Electing officers through conferences further strengthens accountability and transparency, as delegates can make informed choices through open discussion and scrutiny. Our preference is for Single Transferable Vote under the Droop quota — a system commonly known as Scottish STV — as it produces the most pluralistic outcomes, proportional to the strength of each candidature among the membership. Taken together, this approach promotes fairness, plurality, and meaningful democratic participation within the Party.

iv) Length of Term

What choices are given:

1. 24 months
2. 36 months
3. 48 months

What we recommend:

12 months, to align with the National Conference. We also support elections being limited to two consecutive terms, after which they should be barred for standing for 2 years

Why it matters:

Shorter terms ensure regular renewal of leadership and keep officers directly accountable to members. Aligning terms with the annual National Conference simplifies administration and allows members to review performance and elect representatives at a consistent point in the Party calendar. Limiting officers to two consecutive terms prevents the concentration of power, encourages fresh ideas, and helps develop a wider pool of experienced leaders across the organisation.

v) Recall Votes

What proposals are given:

40% of members by petition are able to trigger an all member vote on whether to remove an officer

What we recommend:

Reject, but instead support recall so that motions/petition from branches representing 50% of members should be able to recall, or a much lower threshold (e.g. 10%) if it is going to remain as a member petition. When a member is recalled, there should not be a by-election, but instead the votes of the STV election should be recounted with the recalled member excluded

Why it matters:

Recall is an essential democratic safeguard, but it must balance accountability with practicality. Setting thresholds that reflect genuine member consensus prevents misuse or factional recalls while still allowing members to act if confidence in an officer is lost. Recounting the original STV results rather than holding a by-election respects the original voting preferences of members, ensures efficiency, and upholds democratic integrity. This approach guarantees fairness, transparency, and continuity in Party governance.



c) Candidate Selection

i) Eligibility

What proposals are given:

Any member in good standing can be a candidate if they have been in the party for 12 months or more, except if the office holder joins from elsewhere. Elected parliamentarians can't change constituencies without good reason, and any attempt to do so must be subject to extensive scrutiny prior to approval.

What we recommend:

Accept, but argue that the CEC should be able to grant permission for candidates to move constituencies if it would be of benefit to the party and is supported by the local branch.

Why it matters:

Requiring a minimum 12-month membership period before standing as a candidate ensures that nominees are committed to the Party's values and have built trust within their local branch. This safeguard promotes consistency, fairness, and accountability in candidate selection while discouraging opportunistic or short-term candidacies. The provisions on constituency changes protect against undue influence and ensure that elected representatives remain accountable to their local members. The limited exception for new office holders maintains necessary flexibility, balancing integrity, practicality, and stability in the overall process.

ii) Seconders

We have no preference

iii) Voting System

What choices are given:

1. First past the post
2. Single Transferable Vote
3. Open List Proportional

What we recommend:

Option 2

Why it matters:

Using the Single Transferable Vote ensures that candidate selections reflect the full diversity of member preferences, producing outcomes that are more representative and inclusive than first past the post. It gives members greater choice, encourages collaboration rather than



competition among candidates, and helps achieve balanced representation across viewpoints and demographics. This system strengthens internal democracy and promotes confidence in the fairness of the selection process.

iv) Recall Votes

What proposals are given:

40% of members by petition are able to trigger an all member vote on whether to remove the whip on an elected officeholder

What we recommend:

Accept

Why it matters:

Allowing members to initiate a recall process through a significant petition threshold provides an important democratic safeguard against misconduct or loss of trust. A 40% requirement ensures that recalls reflect genuine and broad concern within the membership, rather than narrow or factional disputes, though we would not oppose reducing this threshold. This mechanism upholds accountability while preserving stability and fairness in the treatment of elected officeholders.

v) Mandatory Reselections

What proposals are given:

All incumbent elected officeholders have to stand in new selection processes before their next election

What we recommend:

Accept

Why it matters:

Mandatory reselection ensures that all elected officeholders remain accountable to the members who chose them and continue to enjoy their confidence and support. It prevents complacency, encourages ongoing engagement with local parties, and promotes renewal through open competition. This process strengthens transparency, fairness, and trust in the party's democratic structures - both by the membership and the public at-large.

Additional Proposal for Candidate Selection:

What we propose:

Members of the Party elected to public office shall be limited to serving two full consecutive terms in the same office. Upon completion of two full consecutive terms, such elected office holders shall observe a mandatory hiatus of two full consecutive terms before becoming eligible to stand for selection to the same office again. Responsibility for monitoring compliance with these term limits shall rest jointly with the Central Executive Committee and the Socialists in Office committees at the appropriate organisational level. Any breach of this provision shall be subject to disciplinary action.



DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS

FOR A PARTY REPUBLIC!



Why it matters:

Introducing term limits for elected officeholders promotes renewal, prevents the entrenchment of power, and encourages the development of new leadership across the party. Requiring a break after two consecutive terms ensures that no individual or group dominates representation, while creating opportunities for fresh perspectives and talent to emerge. Shared oversight by the Central Executive Committee and the Socialists in Office committees provides accountability and consistency in applying these rules, reinforcing fairness and good governance.

4. Policy Development

We have no position on this section

SURVEY



ONLINE VERSION

