

Reflections on the effectiveness of our statutes

While it has been more than five years since the last revision of our party's statutes, we have no news of the draft amendment mentioned two years ago.

This one seems to have disappeared, contrary to the problems that motivated it.

Indeed, the party's architecture has become difficult to understand for the vast majority of the militants.

Obscure and sometimes illogical, our statutes are now ineffective.

However, a few simple and common sense measures seem to be within reach to restore their effectiveness.

Let's start with the internal regulations which, by dint of massively repeating the statutes, has lost its raison d'être: to complete them when necessary.

Result: our statutes have become obese.

Wouldn't it be logical to make them follow a diet?

Wouldn't it be more relevant to refer back to the rules of procedure the provisions that unnecessarily burden our statutes?

It would be easy to rationalize: knowing that there are three types of statutes (national, federal and section) it is enough to mention that they are available to the main governing bodies at each level (national council, federal council and administrative commission) to specify the organizational and operational points that require flexibility and pragmatism.

The process would be secured by clearly delimiting the perimeter of each, for example by mentioning in the articles where reference to the rules of procedure is allowed.

Let's tackle the big question: who leads the party?

According to our statutes, it is the congress that leads.

But since we only convene its delegates every two and a half years, this power is transferred to three bodies: the national council for the national bodies, the federal council for the departmental federations and the administrative commissions for the sections.

But since these three types of bodies do not meet permanently, between their meetings the competence is assigned to the boards .

All the more so since the First Secretary (national, federal or section), who has a secretariat (idem), always sits in these bodies.

Isn't it a bit cumbersome? Isn't there any redundancy between Council and Bureau? Or between Bureau and Secretariat?

Wouldn't it be simpler to definitively attribute the competence to lead the party to the Council, even if it means reducing the number of members to facilitate its meeting?

Moreover, why not allow them to be elected by the membership?

After all, it would be logical since our party is democratic.

Wouldn't it be more relevant to repatriate to the offices the competences of the secretariat to make it the body implementing the policy of the party?

And then why not make it accountable to the Council? Since the party's ideal is a parliamentary system, this would have a certain coherence.

Let's look at the case of control.

While our statutes formally provide for up to 4 control bodies, it must be said that this mission is the poor relation of our party.

Between the lack of candidates to sit on it and the cultural mistrust of the governing bodies towards this concept, the very idea of control has been somewhat lost.

If one of the reasons seems to lie in the incompatibility of sitting on the governing bodies at the same time, perhaps it is time to revise this arrangement.

Would it not be possible, and more economical, to replace it with a commitment on honour to deal with subjects independently of any partisan attachment?

As we can see, questions and potential projects abound.

So why not get to work to provide answers in good intelligence?

Signatories :

Dieynaba Diop, Deputy Mayor of Les Mureaux, Deputy Federal Secretary of the Yvelines Federation, National Spokesperson for the Socialist Party, National Secretary for Citizen Mobilization ;

Claude Guilbert, Member of the council of the Yvelines departmental federation ;

Jean-Marie Piduch, Member of the board of the Yvelines departmental federation ;

Pierre Smadja, Member of the board of the Yvelines departmental federation ;

Georges Terrier, Member of the board and the council of the departmental federation of Yvelines ;

Sylvain Thialon, Member of the board of the Yvelines departmental federation ;

Boris Venon, Secretary, member of the board and council of the Yvelines departmental federation.