

YOUR PARTY, NOT ENTIRELY.

The first assembly of *Your Party* was held this Sunday in Norfolk. The final draft of the documents to be discussed were released just two days before the Assembly. The genesis of *Your Party* begins in 2023 and then firms up in 2024 in the form of *Collective*, which represented most of the movers and shakers behind the eventual emergence of *Your Party* in late July 2025 which now included Sultana recently expelled from Labour and who was the main disruptive driver for the early announcement of the *Party*.

The pathway to the first Assembly was convoluted mired by hesitancy, acrimony and factionalism. As a result, many of the 800,000 who signed up to the new party ended up disillusioned and demoralised. A golden opportunity turned into a leaden opportunity. This was to be expected. Many at the top of the *Your Party* had their own agenda including several independent MPs whose full-time jobs were landlords, as well as those around Karrie Murphy who had run Corbyn's leadership team until he resigned in 2020 as leader. A couple of new books paint an unflattering picture of Murphy's team in closely mismanaging Corbyn politically, contributing to the failures of the left in the party.

Thus, the womb which gave rise to *Your Party* was already lined with a nascent bureaucracy. Operators who sought to maintain control while appearing to cede it. Operators' who wanted a top-down party while pretending it would be bottom-up. Operators' intent on a reformist party by seeking to purge the communist left in the party from the outset.

That is why it has taken so long for the four policy documents to appear. They have been in gestation for over two months, not that it shows because they are patchy. Overall, broad but shallow, with enough in it to create the appearance of participatory democracy, and, containing the obligatory nod towards socialism. The aims of *Your Party* could have been borrowed from the early Labour Party, though it is less radical because nowhere does the issue of class or state power appear. These are deliberate omissions, designed not to be modern, but to dial down the rhetoric.

The Norwich Assembly was fragmented into breakout groups of 10. This prevented collective decision making or vote taking. Thus, there were about 18 groups each tasked with discussing and advising on separate elements of the four papers. Suggestions, proposals and criticisms were recorded by facilitators, and these were to be forwarded to London presumably for consideration. Many groups provided contradictory opinions on the same subject depending on the particular composition of the group, so consensus was absent. Unfortunately, these breakout groups had the standing and authority of focus groups no more. As page 1 of the Document states, it was to collect: "*your views to create firm and clear voting options for members at our founding conference*". However, many of the proposals went beyond merely considering the available options. The status of these proposals with reference to the Conference is unknown, but are unlikely to be considered at Conference, because they are in fact amendments.

As far as amendments go, this is the province of the Portal, not the Assemblies. "*As such, we are inviting members to directly propose their amendments to the proposed texts, via the functions on the online membership portal,*" The Documents do not say whether this is the sole channel to forward amendments. If it is, then clearly it plays a pivotal role in any bottom-up party. Alas this portal appears to be elusive. No guarantee has been given that this portal will be set up sufficiently in time before Conference to be meaningful, that the personnel will be found to assimilate and collate the

amendments and that these composited amendments will be resubmitted to the membership prior to Conference to intersect with sortition. This portal remains the victim of the residual conflict between the Sultana and Corbyn wings of the leadership. Whether these legal and logistical issues are real or convenient is unknown, but without it, the hands of those seeking to regulate, even dumb down and ensure calm at the Conferences, are strengthened.

The documents themselves.

The intention of this article is not to examine the totality of these documents, there will be other analysts reporting on them, nor is the purpose of this article to correct the documents or point out their contradictory elements, rather it is to focus on the structures being proposed and how these contain trapdoors undermining membership control. The first red flag, at least for this Conference is its limited remit. It will decide *“party policy, and party structures and organisation.”* There is no opportunity for leadership elections, which includes a vote of confidence on the existing organisers, important given the torturous history leading up to Conference. These elections will come after the Conference with the vote known only four months later in March. In the meantime, the existing or interim leadership will hold sway.

The second red flag is that the CEC will *oversee staffing arrangements*. There is no mention of a lay body comprising ordinary members monitoring or intervening in these staffing arrangements. So, how we view the eventual CEC is critical. The proposal is for a 16 member CEC. 4 of these members will hold dual nationality so to speak. *“4 public office holder representatives, 2 of whom shall be Members of Parliament, and 2 of whom shall be local or regional public office holders.”* In addition, there will be up to 5 reserved seats, which members can't vote on. That makes 9 unelected members, either because they must be MPs or officers or hold seats reserved for externally organised groups (trade Union?) or national delegates. This means that OMOV (one member one vote) in its concrete form is potentially reduced to 7 members of the CEC.

There are further issues. The CEC will be in place for two years. A more democratic approach would be to elect 50% of the CEC at every Conference ensuring new blood. But the biggest problem is its expansive remit. *“In the Party's first year, the CEC shall establish two working groups, open to all CEC members, one aimed at thoroughly establishing all the Party's structures, especially its regional structures, and the other at finalising all its core documents.”* So, the CEC not Conference will have the final word on refining the structure of the party as well as all its core documents. Substitute the word amending for finalising and it appears these groups have the power to amend what has been agreed. The final say should be with the membership, but there is no mention nor provision for these finalised documents to be resubmitted back to the membership for approval. This is problematic.

It also seems that alongside the CEC there will be a leadership team, that is a team around the leader after he or she is elected. Again, there is no mention how this team and the CEC will interact, and if and when there are conflicts, how they will be resolved. Only in the second year, that is before the late 2027 Conference, will there be membership input, when the CEC initiates a review of the options to modify the leadership structures. A more minor concern appears under the section of Branches in the form of Provisional Associate Branches. Implicitly these Branches could contain members who are not members of Your Party, but being in a branch may have the authority to vote or even send delegates to Conference for the next two years.

Under the heading of staffing, senior officers must be apolitical. This is nonsense. They are supposedly to act as professionals, be agnostic. Professionals in a political party is a misnomer. It simply means if they adopt a position at odds with the CEC, regardless of how effective they are, they are acting ipso facto unprofessionally, therefore at risk of being removed. It's not a code of conduct its blackmail. Of course, the example of the LP could be introduced where officials did act factionally, that is against Corbyn. What would be better is, if in the event of factionalism, officers are proportionately representative of these factions.

Next turning to membership. The Papers does not give the option as to whether members can hold membership in another national party. They can't, end of. So, there will be no vote on this at Conference. It was one of the issues holding up the delivery of the Papers because not everyone in the Leadership Team supported this proposal. This stipulation represents victory for the more bureaucratic individuals in the Leadership Team who seek to minimise a left-wing challenge within the Party, particularly to its reformist direction. (It should be born in mind that dual membership was allowed in the Labour Party until the ruling class sought to control the internal life of the Labour Party, through for example fabricating the Zinoviev Papers in 1924, creating red-baiting and red-scaring prior to the general election at that time.)

In terms of Conference Arrangements, a number of options are provided on who can attend and the form of their vote. Elected delegates from local parties strengthens the hand of the base because it empowers decision making at the grass roots. Sortition does not because by being random it individualises and atomises the process handing power and influence to the centre. The correct approach should be limiting voting to delegates with their votes weighted based on the size of their local branches. Advisory votes only should be given to organised sections and affiliates preventing them diluting the membership vote, or on the other side, raising the danger of double counting their vote, should they include members already represented by delegates.

In terms of the key *Conference Motion Policy Committee*, it should be composed of directly elected members. But even this proposal falls short. That Committee needs to be elected at Conference or if not elected at Conference, then endorsed by Conference at the outset. No mention is made how this Committee will be elected so the assumption must be that it will be an extension of the *Motions Compositing Committee* in place before the Conference or at least share personnel with it who could have pre-formed ideas concerning the amendments.

In the section titled *Strategic Objectives (first year)* there is talk of internal elections. It appears this will be run by "*a small team consisting of a General Secretary, with limited support staff, to deliver these democratic structures, support members to form branches, and facilitate the self-organisation of the nations and sections.*" This is again problematic as the scope of these elections and their oversight by lay members is not detailed. The paragraph creates the impression that they will only be functional in nature but does not specify this.

In terms of the Leadership Elections, they are to be entrusted to a reliable third party. However, no mention is made of a lay-members scrutiny board verifying the results. When it comes to electing temporary lay member supervisors, sortition is sufficient. Then the kicker, until the new leadership is in place no earlier than March 2026, "*the party will continue to be stewarded on a strictly temporary basis by the Independent Alliance of MPs.*" In other words, the same problematic leadership which

squandered the 800,000 applicants will remain in place for at least four months after the conference, a conference which was not allowed to vote on their competence.

This concludes this short analysis of the bureaucratic and problematic elements within the proposed structures. There was no reason not to hold leadership elections at conference, there was no reason for Conference not to agree a programme of action. Everything has been purposefully left vague, allegedly to be shaped and firmed up by the membership, except that there are areas which have been left out, protected, which allows the centre to retain control for the time being obscured by the vagueness itself. The secondary purpose is to ensure a calm and uncontroversial conference styled for the TV and Podcast cameras.

The base needs to remain alert. The people at the top are accomplished at the art of manoeuvring, misdirecting and obfuscating. But through our combined efforts we can build the kind of party this crisis ridden society deserves and needs.

Brian Green, 21st October 2025.