NOTE: This Report of the 1961 Annual Delegate Meeting has been produced under unusual circumstances. Com. J. Miles, who was General Secretary at the time of the ADM, is no longer the General Secretary, and no minutes have been received from him for the 1961 ADM. As a result, we have had to make use of a tape recording of the ADM (which unfortunately only covers the second day) in order to compile a report. The report of the second day is quite comprehensive and we trust that comrades will find it informative; the report of the first day consists of a list of sub-committee reports which were considered and floor resolutions which were carried. We apologise for the fact that this is not a complete report of the ADM: a complete report of Conference 1962 should be circulated to members by June of this year.

A. Atkinson, General Secretary,
p.p. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

LIST OF REPORTS CONSIDERED AT ADM 1961:

Auditors
*Bailot Committee
*Book Department
*Canteen Committee
*Central Literature Sales Committee
*Central Branch Secretaries
*Central Organiser
*Education Committee
*Education Organiser
*Estates Management Committee
*Forms 'A' Scrutiny Committee
*Publicity Committee
*Review Journals Secretary

*Socialist Standard Subscribers’ Committee
Tapes Committee

General Secretary
Groups Organiser
Head Office Assistant
Library Committee
*Literature Account Secretary
New Pamphlets Committee
*Overseas Contacts Secretary
*Parliamentary Committee
*Premises Committee
Press Officer
Propaganda Committee
*Propaganda Information Bank
Socialist Standard Production Committee

*Standing Orders Committee
Party Funds Organiser

* denotes no written report submitted prior to preparation of EC Report to ADM 1961
/ Post not filled

FLOOR RESOLUTIONS PASSED (other than those recorded in the following minutes of the second day’s proceedings):

1. "This ADM recommends the EC to examine itself, or set up an ad-hoc committee to examine, ways in which Central Branch could be re-organised, or its members re-allocated." CARRIED 18 - 0

2. "This ADM recommends the EC to purchase or hire modern office equipment for the use of members attending H.O. to do Party work (by equipment it is meant photocopying, typewriters, etc. as appropriate)" CARRIED 18 - 2

3. "That the Library Committee be recommended to implement the recommendation in its report to 1961 ADM that library books be borrowable for 6 months." CARRIED 22 - 0
MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS OF SECOND DAY OF AM - SUNDAY, 11TH OCTOBER, 1982, 10.30 a.m.

N.W. LONDON Branch item re EC control of literature: "Does the EC have control (in relation to H.G.C. in the production of leaflets and pamphlets, i.e. power to edit and amend draft texts?)"

A. Karp (EC member) suggested that members should read the drafts of H.G.C. literature. The EC is not vetted by the SS and it regularly contains errors, e.g. wrong statements on front cover of September 82: 14 heads are better than three. There is a conflict between the 1981 Conference decision and the rule book. The old procedure enabled SS to edit texts quickly, e.g. the Polish statement which was produced in three weeks. Content more important than style.

B. Young (EC member) stated that there should be less ill feeling. If Conference said that 2 plus 2 equals 5 he would implement it or resign from the EC. Whole business started because SS got itself into a terrible tangle over editing it. Old procedure of EC editing copy with style. Suggestion: (i) set up a consultative committee to advise on literature; (ii) send all drafts to branches - this would take a long time; (iii) abolish the EC and buy a computer.

FLOOR RESOLUTION: C. Slapper (Islington) and S. McLarney (Islington)

"This ADU recommends the EC to carry out the 1981 Conference instructed resolution re the H.G.C., which is fully in line with Rule 17; (2) to carry out the H.G.C. terms of reference which state that leaflets and short pamphlets must be submitted to the EC and then edited by the H.G.C., and longer pamphlets must be submitted to the EC and then edited by the EC itself; (3) to consider all leaflets and pamphlets before they are published, in line with Rule 17, and to advise the H.G.C. by resolution at any point in the text which is considered to be in need of amendment because they are in error; (4) to bear in mind the need of the Party, as expressed by instructed resolution 1981 (2) 4.10.17.82 and by floor resolution 1980 and floor resolution at AM 1982, for regular production of leaflets and pamphlets which can help in the urgent task of increasing working class consciousness."

C. Slapper (Islington) stated that his branch was concerned that an instructed resolution was passed, but EC members refused to implement it. He referred to their reasons for this: (i) errors in H.G.C. texts. Why don't those who speak of errors be clear about them? The text on the front of the September 82 was from Marx. (ii) Alleged conflict with Rule 17. Com. Venni dealt with that yesterday. (iii) Claim that old procedure was more efficient than present one, but under old procedure leaflets for distribution in Connolly and Cowley were seriously delayed.

F. Drutz (East London) said that EC members should be allowed to justify their actions. Objected to the suggestion that EC members are unqualified to edit it. EC members are not acting as a clique. The delay was not just the fault of the EC. EC caused some delays too. Condensed terms of certain recent circulars.

V. Venni (Glasgow) said that London members were too one-sided. The six EC members had made offensive statements in their circular. Members are willfully ignoring what Rule 17 says. Conference resolution does not detract from EC control. The EC can sack the SSF and the H.G.C.

B. Davie (EC member) referred to minutes of the EC meetings since Conference. It was not only six EC members who were referring consideration of H.G.C. texts. Go back to your branches and look at the minutes; find out the truth.

R. Cook (Birmingham, N.W.) The H.G.C.'s terms of reference were only passed 6 - 5. H.G.C. is trying to provide increased rate of literature as asked for by Conference and AM. Certain EC members opposed Conference decision and EC decided terms of reference for H.G.C. Whether to copy裁 in 'Is a Third World War Inevitable?' (ITW1) is wrong is open to interpretation. Party has debated theory of crises for some time. Information given by previous speaker was correct, but partial: it made no reference to delays on unemployment leaflet.

P. Lawrence (Croydon) asked whether ITW1 was submitted to the EC in its final form.

R. Cook replied that the H.G.C. was confused about the EC's position towards it, but he did not see this draft as being the final version.

G. Marshall (Guildford) reminded delegates not to lose sight of the Party's objective. We must have literature to make members. Last Conference the Party decided to adopt a new strategy for producing pamphlets for short-term distribution. Need to be tolerant and let the EC and H.G.C. get used to the new policy.
S. Coleman (EC member, NCC) stated that he was prepared to endorse the contents of the pamphlet, although accepts now that there may have been some mistakes. He is not vouched for copy by the EC.

J. Hayes (General Secretary) stated that he had thought that ITWNI draft was final version.

K. Knight (EC member). Some good material in ITWNI which could be used in SS. Contains a number of mistakes which conflict with present "War" pamphlet. EC was uninformed about ITWNI.

C. May (EC member) gave a list of leaflets which EC had published. Resolution conflicts with Conference resolution because it allows EC to see drafts of leaflets and short pamphlets. More concerned with accuracy than style. Gave excerpts of mistakes in ITWNI.

AGENDAITEM to FLOOR RESOLUTION: C. Moss (Swansea) and R. Cook (Birmingham): "That this ADM recommends that the duty of the NCC is to adhere to the 1961 Conference instructed resolution, that it operates like the SDPC in the production of leaflets and short pamphlets, i.e. that it be under the control of the EC, but that, for reasons of speed and efficiency, it not be obliged to have its texts vetted by the EC before printing."

C. Moss (Swansea) said that the amended resolution was democratic in that it reaffirms the decision of majority at Conference 1961.

A. Kerr (Carden) said that Conference 1961 did not amend Rule 17, so this motion was not necessarily doing what the majority wanted.

E. Goodman (EC member) Rules are made by Conference resolutions and subsequent Conference resolutions supersede them. EC members should have copies of NCC texts, read them and let NCC know what they think.

A. Atkinson (EC member) stated that the rule book is clear. Party should publish and procedures if procedure does not work, change it. NCC did not come to EC with final draft of ITWNI.

J. Howell (EC member) Some of the complaints about ITWNI are based on what is not said rather than what is said. Untrue that solar energy projects make huge profits; they are miniscule in comparison with other energy industries.

G. Kerr (EC member) Untrue that clique is holding back work of EC. Cannot implement Conference resolution. ITWNI contains many errors, e.g. "War is artificially produced". Rule 17 has existed since 1904 and we should not alter it.

J. Knight (SW London) asked why ITWNI was submitted to the EC.

C. McEwan (Glasgow) objected to the discussion about ITWNI. We should be discussing procedure, not specific texts which most delegates have not read.

The vote was taken: AGENDAITEM - CARRIED 16 - 8; SUB-RES. CARRIED 17 - 7

At 1.30 p.m. the delegates adjourned for lunch.

The afternoon session commenced at 2.30 p.m. Cllr. Leeser (ACG) referred delegates to an EC resolution re the venue for the forthcoming special meeting on the Party Poll. J. Poll and J. Mitchell of the Premises Committee proposed that we hire a larger venue than R.O.

FLOOR RESOLUTION: H. Cottis (Southend) and K. Cook (Birmingham)

"That the EC be recommended to hold the special meeting at Head Office." CARRIED 20 - 3

E.C. REPORT:

PUBLICITY COMMITTEE: A. Gibb (Haringey) gave brief verbal report from the committee and asked the committee to report to ADM.

R. Cook (Birmingham) suggested that the committee should send a copy of "Questions of the Day" to enquirers, as branch had found that SS did not give a full enough picture.

A. Kerr (Carden) said SS should give enquirers a full picture.

H. Cottis (Southend) asked how soon do branches receive names/addresses of enquirers in their areas. A. Gibb said it takes a few weeks.
OVERSEAS CONTACTS SECRETARY. D. Davies (Ll. Sec.) reported that the WSP had not paid their lattice account for 2 years.

FLOOR RESOLUTION: R. Cook (Birmingham) and C. Moss (Swansea) was moved and later withdrawn in favour of another RESOLUTION: R. Mitchell (S.W. London and S. Sanum (S.W. London):

"That the lattice account of the WSP of US be waived until the end of the year."

CARRIED 20 - 1

E. Grant (Islington) suggested that the EC should send a fraternal delegate to the WSP.

FLOOR RESOLUTION: E. Grant (Islington) and P. Wilson (Southend):

"This ADM recommends the EC to send a delegate to the WSP of US to seek ways and means of helping them in their present difficulties."

E. Lawrence (Croydon) stated that it would be just as well to phone them.

RESOLUTION LOST 6 - 15

FLOOR RESOLUTION: S. Ross (S.W. London) and E. Grant (Islington):

"That the matter be referred to the EC for urgent attention. The EC be asked to also contact the Socialist Party of Canada."

CARRIED 23 - 0

FLOOR RESOLUTION: E. Grant (Islington) and C. Slapper (Islington):

"That this ADM views with favour the idea that the Party should take a stand at the Pete of the Latte Ouvriers in June 1962."

CARRIED 19 - 0

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE:

R. Cook (Birmingham) urged the committee to begin preparations for the next general election.

H. Cottis (Southend) Who are the parliamentary candidates going to be?

K. Knight (EC member) asked what preparations Bolton have made and what help the committee was able to give Croydon branch re the bye-election.

E. Grant (Islington) replied for the Parliamentary Committee. Con. Coleman had been adopted as candidate for Bolton West. Bolton has been very active in canvassing the area. Con. Howell of the Propaganda Committee has liaised with Croydon branch.

H. Cottis (Southend) stated that it is important to begin election campaign well in advance.

C. Slapper (Islington) expressed disappointment that more London members had not helped in recent GIC campaign in Islington South.

PARTY FUNDS ORGANISER; PRESS OFFICER: No discussion.

PROPAGANDA COMMITTEE: No discussion on report, but there is three items on agenda related to it:

PADDINGTON BRANCH: "The need to plan in advance for the Marx Centenary."

R. Young (EC member) was permitted to open on behalf of the branch. CT charges £10 for its Marxist universities, but we are the only people who can do justice to Marx. Need to nominate a committee of six. Monthly lecture programme to be drawn up and transcripts of lectures to be published.

R. Cox (Guildford) Party should stress where we disagree with Marx. How about a pamphlet on 'Where Marx was Wrong'?

J. Knight (S.W. London) Branch favours producing a special issue of the SS in which there will be advert for a series of four meetings on Marxism.

H. Cottis (Southend) suggested that we contact the BBC with a view to appearing on special programmes dealing with Marx.

A. Waite (Camden) informed delegates that the TES will be publishing a special issue.

R. Johnson (Central, Cardiff) said that he was ashamed of lack of interest in this idea in the Party.

S. Ross (S.W. London) favoured an outdoor meeting in Hyde Park at the time of the Centenary. We should use the event as an occasion to spread our ideas.
ISLINGTON BRANCH: "The growing popularity of CSP and the Party’s response."

C. McCann (Islington) stated that the CSPG should aim to attract people from CSP. Need for meetings, debates, pamphlets, leaflets, stating our unique case on war and CSP.

C. Cox (Guildford) CSP members are often emotionally involved in what they are doing. We should be more conciliatory instead of putting them down.

R. Cottrell (Southend) tries to contact as many ESPs as possible. They seem to get more letters in local press than we do.

A. Kerr (Camden) We must attack CSP. We have a hostility clause.

A. White (Camden) urged members to attend CSP demonstrations to sell CSP. Best not to attack them but to win them over.

ISLINGTON BRANCH: "Should the Party continue to describe exploitation of the working class as robbery and capitalism as the profit system, despite the view of certain CSP members that this should be stopped?"

C. Slapatar (Islington) Branch raised this in response to recent CSP resolution that CSP should not refer to robbery of workers until EC has decided on the matter. Islington supports position as stated in October 1951 EC, i.e. that workers are legally robbed. Many references to robbery of workers in Party pamphlets. CSP members should not use CSP to raise petty objections.

R. Cook (Birmingham) We should use free expression to state correct ideas, otherwise we will turn Party case into religious dogma.

S. Rose (NW. London) We should use the best terms available to us.

S. Kerr (EC member) This is too trivial to be on the agenda. Profit system is being referred to in recent EC, to the exclusion of wages system. Many people believe that there are countries with wages and no profits. By saying ‘profit system’ we are lining up with the CSP.

S. Coleman (EC member) The Party has adopted different styles in different periods. Party lit. in early days was bold and vigorous; some of the recent lit. is conservative and mealy-mouthed. Party should be uncompromising in its language. Crus of our propaganda should be the point that workers are robbed of the fruits of their labour; class war is inherent to capitalism. Labour power is not like other commodities because it has consciousness. Party case is watered down by those who aim to separate it from what workers are saying and doing.

K. Edbrook (EC member) pointed out that Coleman had written three circulars on the matter but he had only written two. Only two members had replied to his circular. October 1951 article was based on obscure definition of robbery. Robbery can be referred to on the outdoor platforms but not in lit. In 1975 the CSP replied to a correspondent that workers are not robbed. In 1973 in "Are the Workers Cheated?" the answer given was "No". We cannot argue that commodities sold at their value and that labour power is different from other commodities. If we accept the robbery analysis we are no longer a Marxist party.

C. McPherson (Glasgow) said that in different circumstances words have different meanings. A couple of lines of algebra could explain the exploitation process, but that would not attract the workers at Exchange Square. Use whatever expressions people will understand.

FLOOR RESOLUTION: C. Slapatar (Islington) and E. Grant (Islington): "This AIM is of the view that there is nothing wrong with the traditional Party case that profits are created as a result of the legalised robbery of the working class at the point of production: there is nothing wrong with the traditional party case that capitalism may be referred to as the profit system; that members of the EC should not attempt to alter or delete the traditional Party terminology, but should raise their objections through their branches.

A. Kerr (Camden) favoured the use of the terms referred to but wanted to delete reference to EC members raising the matter in their branches.

In summary, C. Slapatar referred to Clause 6 of the D of P which refers to the system which deprives workers of the fruits of their labours. As Socialists we should reject capitalist moralising about the meaning of robbery.

RESOLUTION CARRIED 21 - 4
General Secretary reported that no fraternal greetings had been received from Companion Parties.

**IT WAS AGREED** that fraternal greetings should be sent to our Companion Parties.

**THE B.C. REPORT TO ADM** was not completed, but it was moved:

H. Cottis (Southend) and A. Kerr (Camden) "That the BC Report to ADM be adopted."

**THIS WAS AGREED**

**FLOOR RESOLUTION:** C. Slapper (Islington) and B. Grant (Islington):

"That the Chair be thanked." **THIS WAS AGREED**

**THE ADJOURNED at 5 p.m.**