

Protecting NCC from Politicisation and ensuring it's future

Introduction

First and foremost, I want to make something strictly apparent: I see no issue with individuals who are members of political parties joining NCC, nor would I suggest that any individual who is currently a member is here out of some desire to infiltrate the organisation. Fundamentally, the reason why I am bringing this up now is because this has been a non-issue until the last two months: while some former NCC members have joined the young greens, and one certain prominent member has joined the labor party, at the time of their involvement with NCC these individuals were not members of these political parties (or at least that is my understanding). **It is therefore my opinion that NCC must adopt some strategies which allow for members of political parties to exist in NCC.** I will note that what i have written is not necessarily some sort of policies to be adopted, but instead my ideas and recommendations. **I do flag when this is the case but some of these things are unrelated to politicisations and instead my belief in one case of**

noting how it *has* worked, and secondly how I *wished* it had worked

Why politicisation of the organisation is a negative

This comes down to two main reasons, for me: firstly the issue of keeping the organisation true to its original ideals and Two, protecting the organisation from

Point One - keeping the organisation true to itself

NCC has never been an organisation which aligned itself with a particular political party, but for particular ideals, many of which differ from the current position of political parties. For instance, in terms of the Labor party, they [support native logging](#), supports [the fracking of the Betaloo Basin, or is at least not totally opposed to the idea](#) and [supports the creation of Kurri Kurri](#). While clearly this is softer than what the coalition supports, they still support it. If NCC were to ignore, or even support, these policies, then this would be a fundamental betrayal of the ideals we have held until now. This would therefore mean that the hard work done by members over the last four years would be undone. It would also mean the trust that has been placed in us by the community, through attending our events and also through providing us with

what can only be described as significant financial aid for an organisation run by people who, at oldest, are in year 12, would be completely and utterly betrayed. There is also a third consequence; if NCC is to move away from it's previously stated values, as to align it more appropriately with the views of a political party, then this will mean that the people of nipaluna and it's surrounds will be left without what they deserve, a youth oriented organisation fighting for climate justice. This will have significant consequences for the climate movement in nipaluna. NCC cannot betray the previous work and faith that has been placed in us, we must continue to be an organisation which strides for climate justice uncompromisingly.

Point 2 - Damage to ourselves and National

In the lead up to the election, the plan is for the organisation to become more visible. SS4C as a whole is accused, with relative regularity, of being linked to Labor, the Greens, a combination or some other, in their minds, underhanded element. It would be detrimental to the organisation, both in the sense of niplauna Climate Collective, and SS4C more broadly, for it to go from conspiracy to fact.

How we can protect the organisation

A Charter

All the ideas which follow essentially are ideas of what could be put into charter. This will also give the organisation to codify what were unwritten and governed the organisation into actual statute in the organisation.

Idea Number 1 - Enshrining the core principals into the charter

A charter will give an opportunity for the unwritten rules that have governed the behaviour of the organisation to be actually codified into written rules. This would therefore act as a guide to be followed as to what the beliefs/policies of the organisation are.

Idea Number 2 - conflict of interest disclosure

There needs to be a level of transparency as so people can know whether a particular person in the organisation has a conflict of interest. This should take the form of disclosing not only if they are a member of a political party, whatever that may be, but also for individuals to disclose whether they hold special positions in the organisation. The method in which can be done is simple - people should just add it to their name in slack/messenger/whatever chat service is used.

Idea Number 3 - that there be a ban in place on individuals who are NCC members being recruited by Political Party members into their political party

it should not be allowable for individuals to recruit other members of NCC into their political party; plain and simple. If doing this, it gives the impression the individual may be using the organisation as a recruiting platform. While there is clearly no issue recruiting someone that you know through NCC if the individual has left the organisation already, if they are a current member, this should be off limits.

Idea Number 4 - an enforcement mechanism

I'm not certain what form this should take, but there might be a need for an enforcement mechanism for the charter. This could take the forms of such things as an ombudsmen, in which a former striker is given the power to investigate and make decisions, or something completely different, or there may not even be a need at all.

Idea Number 5 - A moratorium on future candidates using our branding in an

election Campaign

In 2020 there was an individual called Doha Khan who ran in a supplementary election (as they are called in SA for Council) in the central ward in Adelaide. In this campaign, she very prominently featured [SS4C Branding](#) something which caused quite a stir at the time because she had not been granted permission to use the branding. She was repeatedly requested to cease, she ignored us. We have already had one former member of NCC run for office, (to their credit this individual didn't use our branding), and this this clearly shows that there is a prospect that another member - future, current or former - may decide to run for office, and that this individual may do the same thing as Doha did. There therefore should be a mechanism that if an individual uses our logos in their campaigning that

- a. they be requested to stop
- b. that if they ignore us the following be published - "NCC would like to make it apparent that we did not endorse **INSERT NAME HERE** as an apolitical organisation we will never endorse an individual as a candidate, only policies. We have request **INSERT NAME HERE** cease using our branding, however they have declined to do so." on our social medias, and that it be commented on posts from the candidate using our branding on any social medias. The reason why this should not be some ad hoc "we will deal with it when we come to it" kind of thing is because

if that occurs it opens us up to some, admittedly silly, accusations of bias.

Idea Number 5 - Making sure convenors are not above the others

This is not an issue surrounding politicisation, but instead an attempt to codify what was unwritten into written.

While there clearly can be more lead figures in the organisation, what is critical is that the organisation does not regress into how it ran for around 6 months of 2019 and early 2020 when Toby Thorpe was still involved in the organisation, in which he essentially attempted to run the organisation by his lonesome, and would give little information to others. **Fundamentally, the role that convenors have always played has been that of equal to the other members, with their only special duties being that they get to decide whether the strike gets the go-ahead on the day.** While there is clearly some form of argument that NCC requires a unified leadership, if there is to be this sort of role it has to actually be defined, not some sort of hodge podge thing with undefined rules.

Idea Number 6 - Secrecy in Decisions

Again not based on politicisation, but instead anything that has happened in the past, but instead a personal experience. In the past there have been individuals who

have come to, what is best described as, domineering in the organisation and this therefore made it very difficult to speak up against him. There therefore should be a policy implemented around **Clearly defined** rules of when there should be secret votes held, and this should be on most, if not all decisions.

Idea number 7 - an assortment of ideas

1. make it so that there is a definition in the charter of who is considered a member