
1. C. Begley was elected Chair and P. Bennett elected Deputy Chair.
2. Permission to sit granted to delegates from North East and Clapham branches (as branches formed in the previous six months) and from Lancaster, Edinburgh and S.E. Manchester (who had come without their credentials).
3. Letters read from Bolton and Swansea branches saying they were unable to be represented.

4. “Seeing that membership of Central Branch is increasingly leaving many members outside of an integrated approach to positive Party activity, would not the following reorganisation (to Central Branch membership) be of benefit to the membership and Party growth?
   i) The Branch still maintain the office of branch secretary for central administration purposes.
   ii) The membership be reorganised into regional areas under the office of regional organisers to effectively co-ordinate the activity of the members in those areas with the Election and Advertising Departments.
   iii) That branch members be encouraged to take on mailshot activity by the Election Department and to deal with all enquiries in their area obtained by the Advertising Department with the overall aim of increasing membership and to establish branches or groups.” Carried 13-0.

5. “The Socialist Party should update certain pamphlets and increase the number of titles available” (North East).
   J. Bissett (North East): most of our pamphlets were out of date. The trade union pamphlet dated from 1980, the war pamphlet from 1982 and the Irish pamphlet from 1983; much had happened in these three fields since then.
   Most of the discussion was on whether we needed a pamphlet on ‘historical materialism’ and whether or not the previous pamphlet on this should be reprinted. No conclusion was reached.

6. “The validity of contesting election. Should we contest them? Should we contest local elections? Should we contest by-elections? Should we contest the forthcoming General Election? What is the value of election campaigns in relation to mail drops? What priority in regard to finance, effort and organisation should we place on elections? Is our aim votes, propaganda or contacts?” (Glasgow Branch).
   “The desirability of contesting of contesting by-elections” (South East London Branch).
   “The Party should contest as many Parliamentary and European elections as possible, for the purpose of distributing socialist literature, holding meetings, getting on the media, etc. And not merely to win votes” (Camden Branch).

B. Johnson (Central): a breakdown by postal area of the membership of Central Branch had identified clusters of members who should be able to cooperate to carry out socialist activity; they should be encouraged to do so.

H. Vallar (Glasgow): in order to reduce Head Office administrative costs Central Branch members should be encouraged to join a local branch where this was practicable.

M. Gill (Colchester) distributed a paper which argued that London members should perhaps be organised into a larger number of smaller branches.

B. Johnson (Central) and A. Matthews (Central) moved: “This ADM recommends that the EC implement the following re-organisation of Central branch:
   i) The Branch still maintain the office of branch secretary for central administration purposes.
   (ii) The membership be reorganised into regional areas under the office of regional organisers to effectively co-ordinate the activity of the members in those areas with the Election and Advertising Departments.
   (iii) That branch members be encouraged to take on mailshot activity by the Election Department and to deal with all enquiries in their area obtained by the Advertising Department with the overall aim of increasing membership and to establish branches or groups.” Carried 13-0.

H. Vallar (Glasgow): we should contest general elections at least.
C. Evans (S.E. London): we should also contest by-elections.
S. Parker (Camden): we should contest as many elections as we could.

P. Hart (Clapham): contesting by-elections was a waste of time as we got lumped with the loonies; other elections were okay.
   There was general agreement that, as a political party, we had to contest elections.

B. Johnson (Central) and A. Matthews (Central) moved: “This ADM notes that contesting the next general election would be of a positive advantage to
evidence—to be the most effective party literature”

Carried 12-1.

10. "The need for a logo for (a) The World Socialist Movement and (b) The Party in Britain" (Six Central Branch members).

"The adoption of the Socialist Party of Canada’s logo 'One World, One People' as the logo of the SPGB” (Glasgow)

M. Arya (Clapham): the committee set up to report on a logo should complete its work and come up with something, not necessarily the SPC logo, by Conference.

H. Vallar (Glasgow) felt the SPC logo was suitable; it had the merit of already being used by the SPC and the WSP (India).

R. Cook (Birmingham) doubted whether we would be able to agree on a logo this side of Socialism.

P. Hart (Clapham) and M. Arya (Clapham) moved: "This ADM is not in favour of adopting the Canadian logo but recommends the EC to appoint a sub-committee to provide designs for a logo for Party consideration, using the principles of the Special Committee on logos of 1967, and to report to 1996 Conference.” Carried 12-3.

11. H. Vallar (Glasgow) and S. Parker (Camden) moved “That the Report of the EC and Party Officers to ADM 1995 be adopted” Agreed.

12. "Is the Socialist Party in the business of propaganda, or education and persuasion?” (Colchester Branch).

M. Gill (North London): we were in the business of education and persuasion but not propaganda as this word had negative connotations.

A. Buick (General Secretary) pointed out that this point had been conceded as the old "Propaganda Committee" had been renamed "Campaigns Department”.


F. Simpkins (Central): it was not good enough simply to lay the blame for atrocities as in Yugoslavia and Rwanda on capitalism. We should not be afraid to blame the individual workers who carried them out for embracing nationalism and its mad logic.

A philosophical discussion on free will and determinism ensued.

14. "The need for an Internal Party discussion journal" (Six Central Branch members).

Most delegates were not opposed to the principle of a discussion journal at some time in the future, but felt that at present sufficient facilities for discussing ideas (such as this ADM and circulars and this Report) already existed. Some were implacably opposed arguing that it would lead to divisions and/or be hijacked by members with bees in their bonnets; in addition, it would divert members time, energy and money away from outwardly-directed activity.

S. Parker (Camden) added that he had written a short history of the old Forum which would be available soon.

14. "From Here to There—Recreating the Community.” (Six Central Branch members).

C. Millen (Central), introducing his discussion paper with this title, said that his basic argument was that you can’t have a better society within the present landscape of overpopulated cities alongside a deserted countryside. This landscape was the product of capitalism and had to be abandoned to achieve socialism. He envisaged a party—"the Party of Transformation"—getting power through democratic electoral means, i.e. with majority support, with the aim of getting rid of power and of enabling people to leave cities and establish self-managed communities which would be based on direct democracy, common ownership and free access to wealth without money.

Linked up into regional and global networks this could provide a framework for transforming existence and achieving what he had deliberately called, in order to widen our appeal, a "libertarian, anarcho-communist, eco-socialist" society. This was not a blueprint but something to enable us to answer the question "socialism is a nice idea, but how precisely will it come about?”. In any event, it was obvious that the Socialist movement would have to have practical plans as to how to proceed once political control had been won. Otherwise there would be a risk of chaos which could be exploited by those who might want to reintroduce class society and government. He felt that this practical proposal to create genuine communities which would overcome the isolated, atomised existence which capitalism’s landscape imposed on people would have a wide appeal, drawing in people at present involved in reformist activity within organisations like Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth or in trying to create communities and co-operatives within capitalism.

R. Cook (Birmingham): Communist communities had been proposed by Robert Owen and tried in America in the last century, but they didn’t last long. Events had proved that you couldn’t have islands of Socialism within capitalism.

T. Crowe (Clapham): were present-day urban problems really the result of cities as such or of capitalism? He could envisage people still living in cities in Socialism; indeed he thought this both desirable and likely.

R. Headicar (Islington): to talk of a "party of transformation" taking power and introducing this plan sounded a bit elitist and vanguardist.
the socialist case. It also notes that the branches willing to contest, namely: Camden, S.E. Manchester, Newcastle, Glasgow and Edinburgh are lacking the necessary physical resources as individual branches to enable us to counteract the credibility gap the socialist case faces. In view of these difficulties and to enable the party obtain the maximum amount of effort out of its limited resources, both physically and financially, this ADM adopts the following overall strategy to co-ordinate the general election campaign:

1) That the Camden campaign becomes an all London campaign involving all London branches and Central Branch members on a federated basis. With the view that a constituency, not necessarily Camden, be picked which fully utilises HO resources.

2) That S.E. Manchester branch consolidate the result of the Rochdale local election by federating with Manchester, Bolton and Lancaster branches to contest one Rochdale constituency. Thereby utilising to the full the expertise, experience and physical resources available in that area.

3) That Glasgow and Edinburgh federate their activity to concentrate contesting the Hillhead constituency. So that any physical problems are alleviated.

4) That the EC in conjunction with the Election Department encourage all branches and groups, and including Central Branch members, to participate in leaflet/mailshot activity in relation to the general election campaign.

5) That a General Election Fund be set up immediately with a minimum of target of £15,000 to finance all the above general election propaganda including the present leaflet/mailshot campaign.

This ADM also requests the EC, in conjunction with the Election Department, to report to Conference 1996 with recommendations and proposals to a credible electioneering policy, which takes into account the maximisation of our expertise, experience and physical resources.

B. Johnson (Central and Election Dept): we must plan our elections seriously and in advance.

S. Parker (Camden): asked if the motion meant that we should contest only 3 seats in the coming general election; if so, he'd be opposed to it.

B. Johnson (Central) confirmed that it did.

J. Bissett (North East): his branch were keen to contest Jarrow, but were not included in the resolution.

R. Donnelly (EC Member) and A. Buick (EC Member) said that the detailed nature of the resolution would not allow the EC to judge requests to contest on their merits. Already it deliberately excluded contesting Edinburgh as well as Jarrow.

J. Bradley (Enfield & Haringey) and J. Lee (Enfield & Haringey) moved an amendment "delete 'adopts' and insert 'gives serious consideration to'. Add at the end of 5 'or other campaigns in the light of the view of the Election Department'." Carried 8-7 but the resolution as amended was lost 8-9.

7. Socialist Standard.

A. Buick (General Secretary) reported that negotiations for commercial distribution via selected outlets in the Greater London area were nearing completion but one of the conditions was likely to be an increase in price to £1 or maybe even £1.20; this needn't necessarily apply in the rest of the country where the Standards continue to be sold at a lower price on the streets.

R. Cook (Birmingham) and H. Vallar (Glasgow) moved "If necessary to allow commercial distribution to take place this ADM authorises the EC to increase the cover price of the Socialist Standard to £1." Carried 10-0.

8. "The desirability of a Special Issue of the Socialist Standard based on the 'One World, One People' theme" (Glasgow).

Most delegates were in favour of Glasgow's suggestion.

J. Bradley (Enfield & Haringey) was opposed on the grounds that "One People" didn't translate too well into German and that "One World" which we had used extensively in advertising in the 1960s had been hijacked by others (Labourites, the Tory government and advocates of global free trade). He preferred us to talk of "One Green World Commonwealth".

S. Coleman (EC Member) said he did not stand for "One Green World", nor did he believe the Party did. We were for a society in which humans satisfied their needs, in an ecological way of course, but not for one where birds and rainforests had equal "rights" with humans.

C. Evans (S.E. London) and D. Lambert (S.E. London) moved "That this ADM recommends 'One World, One People' as a theme for a special issue of the Socialist Standard." Carried 10-3.


C. McColl (EC Member and Advertising Dept): the Dept felt that sending the glossy information pack to enquirers had proved counter-productive; second replies had fallen this year as compared with a comparable period last year when enquirers had been sent a pamphlet rather than the pack.

Some delegates questioned whether such a conclusion was valid; other factors could be involved.

S. Parker (Camden): the only way to test the matter was to distribute the pack to one group of enquirers and a pamphlet to another group over the same period.

M. Gill (Colchester) and A. Goldsmith (Colchester) moved "This delegate meeting commends the attempts made by the Advertising Dept to respond to enquirers by sending out what they judge—on the basis of the best available
S. Olsen (Clapham) welcomed the discussion paper and the discussion but still felt that cities were good places to live in. D. Flynn (Lancaster) was in favour of discussing the practical steps to Socialism, otherwise we would seem to be talking about some vague ideal future society unrelated to people's lives and problems today.

S. Parker (Camden) was also all in favour of discussing how we get from here to there, but felt that the discussion paper placed too much emphasis on leaving the city. Comrade Millen should also make it clear whether he envisaged his self-managed communities being set up before or after Socialism was established.

P. Bennett (Manchester): it was entirely possible that the division between city and countryside wouldn't be the same in socialism as under capitalism. He fully agreed with the emphasis on "community". That was what socialism was about, but we should be saying "let's achieve a human landscape both in cities and in the countryside" and not "let's do away with cities".

M. Gill (Colchester): we had to accept that we couldn't be certain as to what Socialism would be like except to say that it would transform social relationships. He felt these transformed social relationships could exist anywhere, in the city as well as in the countryside.

C. McColl (EC Member): Comrade Millen appeared to be saying that his party of transformation should get power within capitalism and try to bring about a move towards living in the countryside. Capitalist governments had tried this in the past without success.

J. Bradley (Enfield & Haringey): Socialism was not a question of transforming the built environment but about achieving human freedom. The ideas proposed in the paper were not in the mainstream of Marxist Socialism nor of the political views of the Party; they completely ignored the class struggle.

A. Buick (EC Member) felt that some contributors to the debate so far had misunderstood the paper on two key points. It was not a proposal to be implemented under capitalism, but after the winning of political power for Socialism. And he had interpreted the so-called "party of transformation" which would win power with the aim of abolishing power as being another name for the socialist party as this was what we aimed at too, wasn't it? The debate should have been about whether Comrade Millen's proposals as to what should be done after the winning of political power for Socialism were realistic, desirable or useful.

I. Corry (non-delegate) didn't see anything wrong with members having their vision of what Socialism should be like. That was how he saw the paper not as some proposal to try to reform capitalism.

P. Lawrence (non-delegate) didn't see any problem with the concept of a "party of transformation" winning power with the aim of abolishing power, but unless we accepted that Socialism would inevitably begin with the "landscape" inherited from capitalism we would be in danger of putting forward utopian schemes. We could say something about housing and what would happen immediately Socialism was established: rent and mortgage payments would be abolished, people would have security of tenure of houses which would all be commonly owned and "leased" (for want of a better word) free from the community.

F. Simpkins (non-delegate) felt it was self-evident that the Socialist movement would have to have drawn up practical plans of some sort ready to be implemented once it won political control. Comrade Millen was right to point out that otherwise there would be a danger of chaos. Comrade Millen had raised the questions: can cities be humanised? Could there be true communities in Socialism in the context of the large cities that existed today? Comrade Simpkins didn't know the answer but it should be discussed.

D. Perrin (non-delegate): the paper specifically said that Socialism could not be achieved within the existing landscape, so it was implying this landscape would have to be transformed before Socialism was established. Whether or not this was the intention, the wording did still seem to imply that this would have to take place under capitalism?

B. Johnson (Central): the paper talked about the self-managed communities that were envisaged owning in common "everything above, on and below the land, along with the land itself within a catchment area". This would not be Socialism as it still implied sectional ownership of parts of the world whereas Socialism was about the common ownership of the whole world by everybody, not separately by self-managed communities.

C. Millen (Central), replying, said he wanted to clear up some misunderstandings. He wasn't saying "abolish cities", but "slim cities down". Nor was he saying this should be done within capitalism. What he was trying to say was that the transformation of the landscape and the social revolution to Socialism should take place simultaneously; he was not saying that the one should take place before the other in two separate stages. He conceded that the way he had expressed the idea of a party of transformation winning power and then using power to bring about the transformation of the landscape was ambiguous in that it could suggest some sort of government; he was prepared to take this criticism on board but this was not what he had meant to suggest. What he envisaged was rather a socialist administration, not a government.
1. C. Begley was elected Chair and P. Bennett elected Deputy Chair.
2. Permission to sit granted to delegates from North East and Clapham branches (as branches formed in the previous six months) and from Lancaster, Edinburgh and S.E. Manchester (who had come without their credentials).
3. Letters read from Bolton and Swansea branches saying they were unable to be represented.

4. "Seeing that membership of Central Branch is increasingly leaving many members outside of an integrated approach to positive Party activity, would not the following reorganisation (to Central Branch membership) be of benefit to the membership and Party growth?
   i) The Branch still maintain the office of branch secretary for central administration purposes.
   ii) The membership be reorganised into regional areas under the office of regional organisers to effectively co-ordinate the activity of the members in those areas with the Election and Advertising Departments.
   iii) That branch members be encouraged to take on mailshot activity by the Election Department and to deal with all enquiries in their area obtained by the Advertising Department with the overall aim of increasing membership and to establish branches or groups." Carried 13-0.

5. "The Socialist Party should update certain pamphlets and increase the number of titles available" (North East).

J. Bissett (North East): most of our pamphlets were out of date. The trade union pamphlet dated from 1980, the war pamphlet from 1982 and the Irish pamphlet from 1983; much had happened in these three fields since then.

Most of the discussion was on whether we needed a pamphlet on 'historical materialism' and whether or not the previous pamphlet on this should be reprinted. No conclusion was reached.

6. "The validity of contesting election. Should we contest them? Should we contest local elections? Should we contest by-elections? Should we contest the forthcoming General Election? What is the value of election campaigns in relation to mail drops? What priority in regard to finance, effort and organisation should we place on elections? Is our aim votes, propaganda or contacts?" (Glasgow Branch).

"The desirability of contesting by-elections" (South East London Branch).

"The Party should contest as many Parliamentary and European elections as possible, for the purpose of distributing socialist literature, holding meetings, getting on the media, etc. And not merely to win votes" (Camden Branch).

H. Vallar (Glasgow): we should contest general elections at least.

C. Evans (S.E. London): we should also contest by-elections.

S. Parker (Camden): we should contest as many elections as we could.

P. Hart (Clapham): contesting by-elections was a waste of time as we got lumped with the loonies; other elections were okay.

There was general agreement that, as a political party, we had to contest elections.

B. Johnson (Central) and A. Matthews (Central) moved: "This ADM notes that contesting the next general election would be of a positive advantage to
the socialist case. It also notes that the branches willing to contest, namely: Camden, S.E. Manchester, Newcastle, Glasgow and Edinburgh are lacking the necessary physical resources as individual branches to enable us to counteract the credibility gap the socialist case faces. In view of these difficulties and to enable the party obtain the maximum amount of effort out of its limited resources, both physically and financially, this ADM adopts the following overall strategy to co-ordinate the general election campaign:

1) that the Camden campaign becomes an all London campaign involving all London branches and Central Branch members on a federated basis. With the view that a constituency, not necessarily Camden, be picked which fully utilises HO resources.

2) That S.E. Manchester branch consolidate the result of the Rochdale local election by federating with Manchester, Bolton and Lancaster branches to contest one Rochdale constituency. Thereby utilising to the full the expertise, experience and physical resources available in that area.

3) That Glasgow and Edinburgh federate their activity to concentrate contesting the Hillhead constituency. So that any physical problems are alleviated.

4) That the EC in conjunction with the Election Department encourage all branches and groups, and including Central Branch members, to participate in leaflet/mailshot activity in relation to the general election campaign.

5) That a General Election Fund be set up immediately with a minimum of a target of £15,000 to finance all the above general election propaganda including the present leaflet/mailshot campaign.

This ADM also requests the EC, in conjunction with the Election Department, to report to Conference 1996 with recommendations and proposals to a credible electioneering policy, which takes into account the maximisation of our expertise, experience and physical resources."

B. Johnson (Central and Election Dept): we must plan our elections seriously and in advance.

S. Parker (Camden): asked if the motion meant that we should contest only 3 seats in the coming general election; if so, he'd be opposed to it.

B. Johnson (Central) confirmed that it did.

J. Bissett (North East): his branch were keen to contest Jarrow, but were not included in the resolution.

R. Donnelly (EC Member) and A. Buick (EC Member) said that the detailed nature of the resolution would not allow the EC to judge requests to contest on their merits. Already it deliberately excluded contesting Edinburgh as well as Jarrow.

J. Bradley (Enfield & Haringey) and J. Lee (Enfield & Haringey) moved an amendment "delete 'adopts' and insert 'gives serious consideration to'. Add at the end of 5 'or other campaigns in the light of the view of the Election Department." Carried 8-7 but the resolution as amended was lost 8-9.

7. Socialist Standard.

A. Buick (General Secretary) reported that negotiations for commercial distribution via selected outlets in the Greater London area were nearing completion but one of the conditions was likely to be an increase in price to £1 or maybe even £1.20; this needn't necessarily apply in the rest of the country where the Standards continue to be sold at a lower price on the streets.

R. Cook (Birmingham) and H. Vallar (Glasgow) moved "If necessary to allow commercial distribution to take place this ADM authorises the EC to increase the cover price of the Socialist Standard to £1." Carried 10-0.

8. "The desirability of a Special Issue of the Socialist Standard based on the 'One World, One People' theme" (Glasgow).

Most delegates were in favour of Glasgow's suggestion.

J. Bradley (Enfield & Haringey) was opposed on the grounds that "One People" didn't translate too well into German and that "One World" which we had used extensively in advertising in the 1960s had been hijacked by others (Labourites, the Tory government and advocates of global free trade). He preferred us to talk of "One Green World Commonwealth".

S. Coleman (EC Member) said he did not stand for "One Green World", nor did he believe the Party did. We were for a society in which humans satisfied their needs, in an ecological way of course, but not for one where birds and rainforests had equal "rights" with humans.

C. Evans (S.E. London) and D. Lambert (S.E. London) moved "That this ADM recommends 'One World, One People' as a theme for a special issue of the Socialist Standard." Carried 10-3.


C. McColl (EC Member and Advertising Dept): the Dept felt that sending the glossy information pack to enquirers had proved counter-productive; second replies had fallen this year as compared with a comparable period last year when enquirers had been sent a pamphlet rather than the pack.

Some delegates questioned whether such a conclusion was valid; other factors could be involved.

S. Parker (Camden): the only way to test the matter was to distribute the pack to one group of enquirers and a pamphlet to another group over the same period.

M. Gill (Colchester) and A. Goldsmith (Colchester) moved "This delegate meeting commends the attempts made by the Advertising Dept to respond to enquirers by sending out what they judge—on the basis of the best available
evidence—to be the most effective party literature” Carried 12-1.

10. "The need for a logo for (a) The World Socialist Movement and (b) The Party in Britain" (Six Central Branch members).

"The adoption of the Socialist Party of Canada's logo 'One World, One People' as the logo of the SPGB" (Glasgow).

M. Arya (Clapham): the committee set up to report on a logo should complete its work and come up with something, not necessarily the SPC logo, by Conference.

H. Vallar (Glasgow) felt the SPC logo was suitable; it had the merit of already being used by the SPC and the WSP (India).

R. Cook (Birmingham) doubted whether we would be able to agree on a logo this side of Socialism.

P. Hart (Clapham) and M. Arya (Clapham) moved: "This ADM is not in favour of adopting the Canadian logo but recommends the EC to appoint a subcommittee to provide designs for a logo for Party consideration, using the principles of the Special Committee on logos of 1967, and to report to 1996 Conference." Carried 12-3.

11. H. Vallar (Glasgow) and S. Parker (Camden) moved "That the Report of the EC and Party Officers to ADM 1995 be adopted" Agreed.

12. "Is the Socialist Party in the business of propaganda, or education and persuasion?" (Colchester Branch).

M. Gill (Colchester): we were in the business of education and persuasion but not propaganda as this word had negative connotations.

A. Buick (General Secretary) pointed out that this point had been conceded as the old "Propaganda Committee" had been renamed "Campaigns Department".


F. Simpkins (Central): it was not good enough simply to lay the blame for atrocities as in Yugoslavia and Rwanda on capitalism. We should not be afraid to blame the individual workers who carried them out for embracing nationalism and its mad logic.

A philosophical discussion on free will and determinism ensued.

14. "The need for an Internal Party discussion journal" (Six Central Branch members).

Most delegates were not opposed to the principle of a discussion journal at some time in the future, but felt that at present sufficient facilities for discussing ideas (such as this ADM and circulars and this Report) already existed. Some were implacably opposed arguing that it would lead to divisions and/or be hijacked by members with bees in their bonnets; in addition, it would divert members time, energy and money away from outwardly-directed activity.

S. Parker (Camden) added that he had written a short history of the old Forum which would be available soon.

14. "From Here to There—Recreating the Community." (Six Central Branch members).

C. Millen (Central), introducing his discussion paper with this title, said that his basic argument was that you can't have a better society within the present landscape of overpopulated cities alongside a deserted countryside. This landscape was the product of capitalism and had to be abandoned to achieve socialism. He envisaged a party—"the Party of Transformation"—getting power through democratic electoral means, i.e. with majority support, with the aim of getting rid of power and of enabling people to leave cities and establish self-managed communities which would be based on direct democracy, common ownership and free access to wealth without money. Linked up into regional and global networks this could provide a framework for transforming existence and achieving what he had deliberately called, in order to widen our appeal, a "libertarian, anarcho-communist, eco-socialist" society. This was not a blueprint but something to enable us to answer the question "socialism is a nice idea, but how precisely will it come about?". In any event, it was obvious that the Socialist movement would have to have practical plans as to how to proceed once political control had been won. Otherwise there would be a risk of chaos which could be exploited by those who might want to reintroduce class society and government. He felt that this practical proposal to create genuine communities which would overcome the isolated, atomised existence which capitalism's landscape imposed on people would have a wide appeal, drawing in people at present involved in reformist activity within organisations like Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth or in trying to create communities and co-operatives within capitalism.

R. Cook (Birmingham): Communistic communities had been proposed by Robert Owen and tried in America in the last century, but they didn't last long. Events had proved that you couldn't have islands of Socialism within capitalism.

T. Crowe (Clapham): were present-day urban problems really the result of cities as such or of capitalism? He could envisage people still living in cities in Socialism; indeed he thought this both desirable and likely.

R. Headicar (Islington): to talk of a "party of transformation" taking power and introducing this plan sounded a bit elitist and vanguardist.
S. Olsen (Clapham) welcomed the discussion paper and the discussion but still felt that cities were good places to live in.

D. Flynn (Lancaster) was in favour of discussing the practical steps to Socialism, otherwise we would seem to be talking about some vague ideal future society unrelated to people's lives and problems today.

S. Parker (Camden) was also all in favour of discussing how we get from here to there, but felt that the discussion paper placed too much emphasis on leaving the city. Comrade Millen should also make it clear whether he envisaged his self-managed communities being set up before or after Socialism was established.

P. Bennett (Manchester): it was entirely possible that the division between city and countryside wouldn't be the same in socialism as under capitalism. He fully agreed with the emphasis on "community". That was what socialism was about, but we should be saying "let's achieve a human landscape both in cities and in the countryside" and not "let's do away with cities".

M. Gill (Colchester): we had to accept that we couldn't be certain as to what Socialism would be like except to say that it would transform social relationships. He felt these transformed social relationships could exist anywhere, in the city as well as in the countryside.

C. McColl (EC Member): Comrade Millen appeared to be saying that his party of transformation should get power within capitalism and try to bring about a move towards living in the countryside. Capitalist governments had tried this in the past without success.

J. Bradley (Enfield & Haringey): Socialism was not a question of transforming the built environment but about achieving human freedom. The ideas proposed in the paper were not in the mainstream of Marxian Socialism nor of the political views of the Party; they completely ignored the class struggle.

A. Buick (EC Member) felt that some contributors to the debate so far had misunderstood the paper on two key points. It was not a proposal to be implemented under capitalism, but after the winning of political power for Socialism. And he had interpreted the so-called "party of transformation" which would win power with the aim of abolishing power as being another name for the socialist party as this was what we aimed at too, wasn't it? The debate should have been about whether Comrade Millen's proposals as to what should be done after the winning of political power for Socialism were realistic, desirable or useful.

I. Corry (non-delegate) didn't see anything wrong with members having their vision of what Socialism should be like. That was how he saw the paper not as some proposal to try to reform capitalism.

P. Lawrence (non-delegate) didn't see any problem with the concept of a "party of transformation" winning power with the aim of abolishing power, but unless we accepted that Socialism would inevitably begin with the "landscape" inherited from capitalism we would be in danger of putting forward utopian schemes. We could say something about housing and what would happen immediately Socialism was established: rent and mortgage payments would be abolished, people would have security of tenure of houses which would all be commonly owned and "leased" (for want of a better word) free from the community.

F. Simpkins (non-delegate) felt it was self-evident that the Socialist movement would have to have drawn up practical plans of some sort ready to be implemented once it won political control. Comrade Millen was right to point out that otherwise there would be a danger of chaos. Comrade Millen had raised the questions: can cities be humanised? Could there be true communities in Socialism in the context of the large cities that existed today? Comrade Simpkins didn't know the answer but it should be discussed.

D. Perrin (non-delegate): the paper specifically said that Socialism could not be achieved within the existing landscape, so it was implying this landscape would have to be transformed before Socialism was established. Whether or not this was the intention, the wording did still seem to imply that this would have to take place under capitalism?

B. Johnson (Central): the paper talked about the self-managed communities that were envisaged owning in common "everything above, on and below the land, along with the land itself within a catchment area". This would not be Socialism as it still implied sectional ownership of parts of the world whereas Socialism was about the common ownership of the whole world by everybody, not separately by self-managed communities.

C. Millen (Central), replying, said he wanted to clear up some misunderstandings. He wasn't saying "abolish cities", but "slim cities down". Nor was he saying this should be done within capitalism. What he was trying to say was that the transformation of the landscape and the social revolution to Socialism should take place simultaneously; he was not saying that the one should take place before the other in two separate stages. He conceded that the way he had expressed the idea of a party of transformation winning power and then using power to bring about the transformation of the landscape was ambiguous in that it could suggest some sort of government; he was prepared to take this criticism on board but this was not what he had meant to suggest: what he envisaged was rather a socialist administration, not a government.