



IDEAS FROM THE DIEMCAFE TABLES - OCTOBER 24TH, 2017

For the moderators

Please add your table's ideas below. Make sure to:

- Keep summaries short (max. 4-5 sentences)
- Double check them with all table participants to ensure consensus

Summaries round 1

Facilitator name & Comments

Group Willem: Option 2: wings to fly, But after the discussion I would like to propose an ALTERNATIVE: We call for the CC to come up with a compromise proposal, going ahead with an electoral wing, while investing more energy in creating a real creative movement wing, and assuring a bottom up and horizontal organizational structure. This would and should be in line with Option 1, Option 2, Option 3 and, maybe, depending of the vote, Option 4.

Group Benedikt:

Option 1 (Benedikt)...voted for yes because I want diem to focus on burning issues (financial industry, environment, european democracy) not our internal structure asap. I also value expertise, leadership and initiative as long as I agree with the overall lines. I do agree with concerns around the democratic process

Option 2 Apostolos is in favour of yes but proposal, because horizontal structure and democracy is a prerequisite for a party

Option 3...Emmanuel has a sui generis proposal close to Yes, but

Option 4...

Option 5...

Summary: ...

Group Apostolos:

Option 1...

Option 2...

Option 3...

Option 4...

Option 5...

Group David:

First I mentioned my doubts if Option 2 is truly an eligible option, because to me it looks like to vote for Option 1 while having a certain mindset. Can this be expressed in a voting process? After that we discussed the sunset clause for Option 3. Will that restrain a forthcoming party? Or is a sunset clause crucial to every political process? One participant agreed especially on the condition that CC members shouldn't be allowed to hold office in the party while being in the CC. I pointed out that i'm strongly in favour of the third option but I would see the applied conditions as negotiable, especially the sunset clause. Also I stated that the movement maybe isn't ready for the transformation into a party. Another participant said that he wants more time to read and reflect on the proposals. Regarding Option 4 we agreed that it would be difficult for a transnational party to solely rely on the digital realm. Offline ties are crucial to an efficient party. In the end one participant expressed an urgency to form a political party asap, due to critical developments in climate and politics.

Group Marjoline:

Substantial anxiety is felt with regard to the risks perceived of DiEM25 self-destructing if we insist on becoming - also - a party; the movement is felt to be too immature and insufficiently democratic itself. Our own DiEM25 issues need to be tackled first. It is unclear how many active members we have, information on this has been hard to get, but it seems a very small percentage.

There are enormous differences between the countries (at this table Austria - Ireland - Poland - Netherlands) which each need very different solutions. NL already has many different parties some catering to different aspects of the DiEM25 aims, Poland has one party who completely wants to introduce the DiEM25 agenda, Hungary has no parties able to do this, etc.

Advantages of becoming a party: financial, exposure in the media

Disadvantages: DiEM25 can not yet walk the talk, is seen as as yet authoritarian, and the media may have a field day breaking it down

Communication is perceived to be a problem within DiEM25. The vertical line is seen as limited to too few people and the horizontal line is seen as being obstructed.

A contribution from one of the attendees was that we are entering into a huge evolutionary leap, but we have bad communications: our rhetoric is old-fashioned marxist rhetoric, but we don't really even have a solid movement yet.

Philipp:

We all had very similar concerns

- DiEM25 should try harder to form a progressive alliance of existing parties uniting and complementing the left and under no circumstances splitting it further.

- First we should focus on developing the progressive agenda and first later on the party issue.
- DiEM25 is still immature and urgently needs better internal structures to survive being a party

Given very similar views that still all had a different standpoint on what to vote for (1 Yes-But, 1 No, 1 Undecided).

Wessel:

Option 1: time is of the essence, it is a bit of a Pandora box, but proposing something else is great. We have to take care of some important conditions though.

The movement is not very stable at the moment. There are two legs (grassroots, leadership). First municipal level (nodes; decentralised), only then towards superstructure.

DiEM should remain a movement and should focus on the grassroots.

From the first moment, DiEM was centralised.

How DiEM evolved was a problem, the wording used as well with the Vote.

Option 2...

Option 3...

Option 4...

Option 5...

Summaries round 2

Facilitator name & Comments

Group Benedikt:

Option 1 : Benedikt favors this, because we must focus on real issues (financial system, european democracy, sustainable development) asap. Since everyone has concerns on how the CC put forward the proposal, there should be a serious discussion ('yellow card':-)) next to giving green light for their proposal (benefit of the doubt). Menno Grootveld agrees with the approach, even though there concerns. This is still the best option to proceed as a political party and give the CC the credit. The Diem Movement has the obligation to work locally and make it a local success

Option 2

Option 3 : Richard brauner is in favor of this option, time is of essence but we not some 'brakes' for example a well define sunset clause. David also favors this options

Option 4

Option 5:

Summary: The group is divided between a

- yes (option 1), but giving the CC a friendly heads up on diem member concerns and taking our responsibility to develop the movement.
- yes, but (option 3) to ensure democratic principles are obeyed within the movement, specifically the sunset clause is a critical point. For the Option (3) we should have another look at all the conditions to ensure the grassroot character

Group Apostolos:

Option 1...

Option 2...

Option 3...

Option 4...

Option 5...

Group Marjoline:

Most attendees had moved from a preference for the YES vote to a preference for the NO vote after the first half of the talks

Suggested was that it would be a good idea to convince left-wing parties - who are struggling - to adopt substantial parts of the DiEM25 agenda; DiEM25 should shape the political landscape, not become one single element in it.

There is not really one DiEM25 movement in Europe, but lots of little groups of movement, with common ground, common aims, but vastly different political/geographical points of departure; our movement is not ready for everyday politics.

A way must be found to overcome the anxiety large parts of the movement feel at the push to become a party (wing). There was also concern that DiEM25 as a movement should stay radical, but that this was threatened by compromise.

In the face of the strong political push on the one hand and the wish to first develop the movement to maturity first, a desire for an option 6 was voiced: a totally separate but true political party and a totally autonomous creative movement.

Group Philipp:

Option 1 Apostolos is giving weight to horizontal and democratic structure in order to be a party, so Yes, but proposal because of the 3rd condition

Option 2... Willem ALTERNATIVE: We call for the CC to come up with a compromise proposal, going ahead with an electoral wing, while investing more energy in creating a real creative movement wing, and assuring a bottom up and horizontal organizational structure. This would and should be in line with Option 1, Option 2, Option 3 and, maybe, depending of the vote, Option 4. Let's go ahead with the vote so we know what DiEM-members prefer. I believe the CC's proposal and the Wings to Fly proposal, and others, still need be worked out more concretely anyway.

Option 3...

Option 4...

Option 5...

Group Wessel:

Option 1 People from different cultures have the same feeling about politics and have the same objectives of what they wish from their governments. A yes, but; we shouldn't create a

party that works like the usual political force. On the other hand, we have more or less the same objectives. DiEM should be positioned as a developer and implemented of ideas for the management of processes for national and global stability; attracting different parties from different countries to create a transnational alliance. We need a synthesis of 1,2 and 3. Power has a very damaging effect on value-driven behaviour; as shown in different parties already. Yes, but nothing about the party for the next couple of months.

Option 2...

Option 3...

Option 4...

Option 5...