36-1

SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

88a ST. JOHN'S WOOD HIGH STREET, LONDON NW8 7SJ

Phone: 01-586 1101 Grams: INTESOCON, LONDON Telex: 261735

CONFIDENTIAL.
FOR MEMBERS ONLY

in ENGLISH ONLY

Circular No.M29/74
18 December 1974

M

MINUTES

of the

EXTRAORDINARY MEETING

of the

BUREAU OF THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

London 26 October 1974
(Bureau Meeting 5/74)

1.	Opening	Page 1
2.	Adoption of Agenda	1
3.	Policies of the Socialist International, Relations of the Socialist International with other parties	2
4.	European Security Study Group	15
5.	Council of Europe	15
6.	Next Meeting of the Bureau and of the Finance and General Purposes Committee	15
7.	Assistance to Portuguese Socialist Party.	15
8.	Invitations	16
9.	Next Meetings of the Socialist International	16
10.	EEC Socialist Party Leaders' Conference in the Hague 1-2 November 1974	17
11.	Institute of Social History	17
12.	Protest against arrest of Deputy Huepe	17
13.	Message to Bruno Kalnins	18
14.	Silver Plate of Honour	18
15.	Mission to the Middle East	18
16.	Letter from Arab League	20
17.	The Secretariat	20
18.	Trial of Spanish Socialists	20
19.	Any other Business	20
	List of Participants	21

Annex I Report by the Chairman - 'The Socialist International and Other Parties'

Annex II Statement on Trial of Spanish Socialists

MINUTES

of the
EXTRAORDINARY MEETING
of the
BUREAU OF THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

London 26 October 1974
(Bureau Meeting 5/74)

1 OPENING

The Chairman, Bruno Pittermann, opened the meeting. The Chairman gave a tribute to former President of Israel, Zalman Shazar, who had died.

2 ADOPTION OF AGENDA

On a point of order from Paavo Lipponen that the agenda be restricted to points 4a) and b) the Bureau voted as follows: Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Germany and Israel voted in favour. Great Britain, the ICSDW and Belgium voted against. Italy (PSDI), IUSY, Netherlands, Malta, Austria, France and Chile abstained.

Rodney Balcomb informed the Bureau that the Secretariat had been informed by the Socialist International's Spanish member party, the Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE) that a political trial of five Spanish socialists was to be held in Madrid on 28 October 1974; the five were accused of 'illicit association' and 'illegal propaganda' and the prison sentences being called for by the State Prosecutor were from 8 to 12 years. The PSOE, he said, had requested that the International and its member parties should send observers to attend the trial and that the Bureau should issue a Statement condemning the trial; furthermore, he said, a representative of the Executive Committee of the PSOE had just arrived in London from Spain, was at present in the Churchill Hotel where the meeting was taking place, and had requested to be allowed to address the Bureau on the subject of the trial.

Rodney Balcomb asked, therefore, that the Bureau should agree to discuss the question of sending observers to the trial and of issuing a Statement condemning the trial and that it should invite the PSOE representative to address the Bureau.

Rodney Balcomb apologised for the fact that these items had not appeared on the Provisional Agenda of the Bureau Meeting on which a vote had just been taken and said that this was because the Secretariat had learned of the trial only two days previously and had learned only a few hours previously that a PSOE representative would be coming to London.

On a proposal from the Chairman it was immediately agreed unanimously that the Bureau of the International should send an observer to the trial and that this observer should be Rodney Balcomb. The Chairman said that the question of the Bureau issuing a Statement would be discussed at the end of the meeting, if there were time.

After hearing Rodney Balcomb's report on the forthcoming trial of Spanish socialists, the Bureau finally decided to take the agenda in the order in which it had been prepared. Any item on the agenda which the Bureau did not have time to discuss would be taken at the next meeting of the Bureau.

3 POLICIES OF THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

Relations of the Socialist International with other Parties

Ian Mikardo said that the report (see Annex I) prepared by the Chairman on the item was of particular value to him as he was able see the change of mutually conflicting attitudes of the Socialist International throughout the years. He said that in his view when the Bureau had sometimes been wrong in the past it was because it had been tied up with words and definitions and the use of words which meant different things to different people. He said there was a danger of a lack of clarity for parties which were not members of the Bureau and this danger lay in looseness of definition; for example, the word 'socialist'. Many communists, Ian Mikardo said, whose ideas were far removed from those of members of the Bureau, used the word 'socialist' and abused it and traduced it. The same was true of other words, but to a lesser extent; for example, how did one define 'democracy', and the word 'communism' was even still susceptible to different definitions. In Israel, for example, there were two 'communist' parties - each claiming to be the genuine party. Ian Mikardo said it was necessary, therefore, to get away from unsatisfactory single word descriptions. If one were trying to draw a line of demarcation between the sort of parties which belong to the International, and other sorts of parties which make claims the International would not accept, then the definitions of parties and of words describing them would have to be specific and sophisticated. Ian Mikardo suggested that in the Chairman's paper on the subject under discussion, on page 3 paragraph 6, the sentence beginning, 'meanwhile parties which reject democratic pluralism ...' could be improved by the addition of the word 'genuine' before the word 'parties'. He said that the International regarded the acceptance of a party of democratic pluralism as a test for that party's application for membership of the International and yet, he said, it was not only communist parties which rejected democratic pluralism. It was not only in the countries of the Warsaw Pact that the disagreeable habit of silencing differing political views from those of the ruling regime occurred; for example, Egypt, where the only people opposing the present régime were in prison. The Arab Socialist Union (ASU) of Egypt rejected democratic pluralism and the only place one could oppose the ASU was from a prison cell. The People's Action Party of Singapore was another example of a party which rejected democratic pluralism as was the Mauritius Labour Party and yet both of these parties were members of the Socialist International.

Ian Mikardo said, therefore, that the International should be consistent in its thinking. He said that he would not want to accept that the International oppose the standard of behaviour of the one-party system, which is communist, and yet find acceptable the behaviour of others who, whilst not calling themselves communist - whether they were or were not - yet behaved just as badly. Definitions of words or phrases should be clear and meaningful, and they should be applied with impartiality. Therefore, he said, any party which did not fall within an agreed definition should not be considered for application for membership of the International.

As far as talks with other parties were concerned, Ian Mikardo said that in the Chairman's paper it was pointed out that a number of parties wanted to have talks with the International. Ian Mikardo said that he did not see why the Socialist International should not be prepared to talk to everyone if those talks furthered the causes in which the parties of the Socialist International believed. If the International were prepared to talk to parties of one sort, which were opposed to democratic pluralism, then the International should be prepared to talk to others. Whatever the decision of the Bureau

was to be on this matter it should be made taking into account the ultimate outcome.

Ian Mikardo referred to a decision taken by the Bureau in April 1972, which stated that member parties could do what they liked with regard to discussions with other parties. If the Bureau made another decision it should be universal and consistent.

Karl Czernetz said that the main point with regard to the question of talks between parties of the International and other parties was that individual parties should have the right to have connections with other parties as they saw fit. It was essential, he said, that the Socialist International did not decide on anything which could put member parties in a compromising position and which would put a political burden on their shoulders with regard to their national policies. Karl Czernetz said that if individual member parties of the International had closer relations with communist parties, as was the case with a number of the International's parties, they had the right to do that. The most discussed case with regard to this was that of the French Socialist Party and its alliance with the French Communist Party. Karl Czernetz said that if the Socialist International had official relations with communist parties or groups of parties then other parties within the International might have to bear a heavy political burden. If, on the other hand, the Socialist International through its study groups had relations with other parties, eg. the Arab Socialist Union (ASU) through the Study Group on the Middle East, this would in no way compromise the situation of other member parties within the International. Karl Czernetz repeated that the Socialist International could not have relations with communist parties or groups of parties without compromising the position of other member parties of the International, and he cited the Austrian Socialist Party as an example.

Relus ter Beek said that the Chairman's report and the subject under discussion were concerned with the question of ideology and not merely with words and their definition. He said that there was a need for another programme of principles of the Socialist International. There had been many developments and changes since the Declaration of the Socialist International had been drawn up at Frankfurt in 1951. He thought that the discussion could only lead to one conclusion and that was that there should be a new programme of principles for the International and on that basis the International could work out its relations with other parties inside and outside of Europe. He said that the discussion on the Chairman's paper should lead to the conclusion that the Bureau must make the necessary preparations for a discussion on a new programme of principles for the International.

Bernt Carlsson agreed with Relus ter Beek that the International should start thinking about a new programme of principles, but he was not convinced, he said, about the logic of the argument concerning democratic pluralism. For example, many of the Third World countries had been the victims of western imperialism; they had had western parliamentary systems foisted upon them and they had not developed politically as had been expected by the imperialist powers. Bernt Carlsson said that his party was in favour of having contacts between the Socialist International and communist parties. With regard to Third World countries he said his party thought that the Socialist International should be free to discuss this from case to case.

Hans-Eberhard Dingels said that the moment the Socialist International was prepared to contact communist parties or groups this would provoke a problem of identity of the Socialist International itself. He said that a differentiation should be made between what member parties

could do with regard to their external policies and what the Socialist International could do. He said that in his view the policies which had been adopted at the Socialist International Congress at Eastbourne in 1969, and the decision taken by the Bureau in Amsterdam in 1972, should be continued with regard to relations with other parties.

Robert Pontillon said that if it were accepted that the actions of some socialist parties should not compromise the actions of other socialist parties then the situation in countries such as France, Italy and Belgium should be taken into consideration. These countries had common problems which led to contacts with communist parties. He asked whether these contacts were going to be forbidden.

Karl Czernetz said that member parties had not been forbidden in the past to have relations with communist parties and that they should fully recognise the right of all parties to have relations with other parties and particularly with communist parties. He said that the problem about these contacts was: howfar involved ought the Socialist International to allow itself to become. It had been decided in the past, he said, that the Socialist International should not have these relations and the Austrian Socialist Party believed that this situation should continue in the future.

Paavo Lipponen said that cooperation in government in Finland between the Social Democratic Party and the Communist Party had begun in 1966. Since that time Communist electoral support had declined. The Social Democrats, he said, were prepared to cooperate with the Communist Party in local government, depending on agreements in each case. He said that his party had not entered into permanent alliances with the Communist Party nor with any other parties and that cooperation was aimed at the practical application of policies and did not imply organisational or ideological unity. The Communists had departed from the centre-left coalition and had gone into opposition in 1971. Since then, the relations between them and the Social Democrats had been cooler. Paavo Lipponen said that in 1973 the Social Democrats and the Communists had entered into talks in order to study the possibilities for future cooperation. Talks between the Social Democrats and Communists at leadership level had not brought about any concrete results. There had been great differences of opinion, mainly owing to the split in the Communist Party, and the resulting two factions had had doubts about the talks with the Social Democrats, which had had the aim of trying to clarify the purpose of cooperation as well as to the studying of future cooperation in government. Paavo Lipponen said that his party was not aiming at any kind of joint programme with the communists in a future government. He said that in principle his party would prefer a government which would include both parties of the left and of the centre. Experience of this form of government from 1966-1970 had been mainly positive, he said, but the Social Democrats would still have to see what would happen after the next elections, due at the end of 1975.

Paavo Lipponen said that as far as his party's cooperation on an international level was concerned, a policy has been adopted in 1967 of establishing contacts with ruling parties in Eastern European countries. He said that his party's relations with the Soviet Union were most important because of the bi-lateral state relations. He said that the Social Democrats had maintained contacts with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on different levels and that recently his party had received an invitation for a top-level delegation to visit the Soviet Union later this year. The last party delegation to Moscow had taken place in 1968. That delegation had been led by the Chairman of the Social Democratic Party and had had a meeting with Mr. Brezhnev. In those talks bi-lateral relations

and the problem of international peace, security and cooperation had been discussed. The same kind of questions had been discussed with other ruling parties in Eastern Europe. His party had had official party level relations with parties in Hungary, Romania and Yugoslavia and with other parties in Eastern Europe. The Prime Minister of Finland had had talks with János Kádár, of Hungary, and with Gierek, of Poland. The discussions had been fruitful and had been conducted on a practical basis. His party, said Paavo Lipponen, had been able to improve state relations through these discussions. His party did not, however, send delegations to party congresses of East European parties. Paavo Lipponen said that the development of relations between social democrats and communists was closely connected with the process of détente and that that process had been mainly concerned with state relations, whilst at party level both partners in West and East Europe had been careful to keep their images clear and had not let the process of détente obscure their respective ideologies. The process of détente, he said, had changed at the party level since 1969, when the Social Democrats had adopted their resolution on relations with communists and the communists had adopted their resolution at an international meeting. In Europe, he said, the development with regard to security and cooperation had reached a stage where it might be useful to use party level talks to solve the remaining problems. He said that the most important task was to secure the improvement of the European Security Conference. He said it would be useful in principle for social democratic and communist parties in East Europe to conduct a dialogue. Paavo Lipponen believed that the Bureau's decision, taken in Amsterdam in 1972 with regard to the International's relations with other parties, should be reinforced. The decisions of 1969, taken at Eastbourne, should be brought up to date, but he thought that this process could probably not be started before the next Congress.

Paavo Lipponen said that with regard to relations between the International and parties in Third World countries a not too strict a definition of parties should be applied. He said that it seemed that many of the parties in the Third World were realistic and did not want to join the International.

Otto Kersten gave a report on the development of his movement, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU). He said that on listening to the debate so far he could say that his movement was confronted with similar problems on several levels. He said that the ICFTU represented 52 million organised workers in 92 countries, therefore 46 per cent of the membership was in developing countries. He said that he did not want to discuss much about the trade unions in Latin America because there were only 5 democratically-elected governments there.

Otto Kersten said that his organisation was together with the World Federation of Trade Unions, the communist international trade union organisation, from 1946-1948. In 1949, in London, the ICFTU was created as a world-wide organisation of free trade unions and the motto was, 'Peace, Bread and Freedom'. He said that the ICFTU shared in principle the opinion of the Socialist International as far as basic human rights and the description of democracy were concerned, and they were also in favour of a certain political pluralism, freedom, etc. With regard to the ICFTU's basic philosophy, Otto Kersten said that they were fighting those who were violating human rights, whoever they were. Since 1969, when the United States trade union federation, AFL-CIO, left the ICFTU, the ICFTU had begun a rethinking about its practical attitudes, and of relations and contacts with other organisations in Eastern Asia and Latin America. Otto Kersten said that in 1965, in Amsterdam, the ICFTU

conference maintained that the organisation should not adopt an attitude of being against something, but of being in favour of something.

Otto Kersten said that the ICFTU had been involved in discussions with international bodies such as the ILO, UNESCO, and in these bodies they had had to deal with economic questions with communists' representatives. In Vienna in 1973, he said, the ICFTU had reiterated its view that all trade unions affiliated to the ICFTU were free to have bi-lateral contacts with other trade unions not affiliated with the ICFTU. At that meeting in Vienna the ICFTU was also in favour of the Security Conference in Europe and they stressed that the third conference should not be neglected. With regard to multi-lateral contacts, the ICFTU, he said, was not in favour of them with communist trade unions unless these trade unions were represented on international bodies in which the ICFTU also took part. For example, therefore, on the ILO there were 12 representatives of workers: one communist, one Christian, and nine representatives of the ICFTU. Otto Kersten said that the ICFTU was against the admittance, two months previously, of the CGL of Italy to the European Trade Union Congress, which was created in 1973. The condition for this admittance was that the CGL was only an associate member of WFTU and was not a full member. WFTU accepted this and therefore the CGL did not influence WFTU policy as such.

Otto Kersten said that in the developing world the ICFTU was confronted with the one-party system of government. In the Francophone area of Africa there were only two African organisations belonging to the ICFTU because all the others had been nationalised by the one-party system. He said that the ICFTU had had some contact with the Socialist party (People's Action Party) in Singapore, and with the conservative party in Malaysia. The ICFTU, he said, had good contacts with the neo-Destour party in Tunisia. but in Tunisia there had been conflict between the neo-Destour party and the trade union movement.

Otto Kersten said that there were approximately one million communist members in the ICFTU; for example, there were members from Finland, Germany, and Yugoslavia. Therefore, the situation was not the same as that for the Socialist International. He said that the ICFTU had made it clear that it did not want considered the idea that it was not prepared to talk with communists. There had been, since 1972, contacts with communists and with communist-dominated trade union organisations on the multinational and international level. This had proved to be a good experience, he said.

Johan Peanberg said there was a need to start thinking of new principles for the Socialist International and IUSY supported that. He said IUSY had cooperated with communists with regard to European security and Chile. He said that where there was a common interest, cooperation with communists had taken place. Until the present this cooperation had only related to Europe, with the exception of Chile. He said that the situation in France and Italy should be looked at taking into consideration the EEC and the communists. Johan Peanberg said that IUSY had tried to arrange a meeting with left-wing democratic youth organisations.

With regard to cooperation and contacts with national liberation movements, Johan Peanberg said that contrary to the Socialist

International, IUSY had contacts with all national liberation movements recognised by the Organisation of African Unity. IUSY also had contacts, he said, with El Fatah. He said that it was necessary for young socialists to be powerful so that communist youth would have an alternative organisation to join. He said that owing to the CIA scandal in the 1960's, which connected the CIA with IUSY, IUSY had never had a chance to get a foot-hold in the Third World. He said that IUSY believed that on the questions of relations of the Socialist International with organisations of Western and Eastern Europe it was of the utmost importance that the Socialist International took measures which would enable IUSY to have discussions with other political movements and especially with those in the Third World. This would give comrades in the Third World the reassurance that it was not the aim of the International to sit only in beautiful Europe but that the International was really engaged in their struggle for liberation.

Israel Gat proposed that in the future the Bureau should have an ideological discussion. He said the International should have a new set of aims and with these the identity of the International should be made clear. He said that the International was a political body and it had statutes adopted at Frankfurt and Oslo. In the Declarations of the International it was stated that the aim of the Socialist International was to establish democratic socialism and to strengthen relations of affiliated parties and extend relations to parties which stand in the democratic socialist tradition but which were not in association with the Socialist International. Israel Gat said that if the Bureau were going to talk about relations of the International with other parties then those parties should be identified. For example, one day the International might have relations with the United States' Democratic Party. He asked on what basis the cooperation of the International with communist parties would be. If the International reached a decision to have relations with communist parties what would that mean at a practical level, he asked. With regard to parties of the Third World, Israel Gat said that there were two categories of parties which might be acceptable for membership of the International. Some parties in the Third World might be acceptable according to the International's statutes - but most of the parties would not. The aim of establishing relations with these parties should also be decided upon, he said. For example, would the International give aid to these parties? He said that the Statutes of the International differentiated between parties such as his own and those parties which, as an internationalist organisation, the Socialist International might help in certain fields. Israel Gat also pointed to the problem of the instability of the Third World and asked what would happen when a particular régime were overthrown - could the new régime be regarded as democratic? The practical approaches to these problems should be underlined, he said. If there were an opportunity for cooperation with other parties it should be based on the merit of the problem common to both sides.

Robert Pontillon said that the discussion revealed the need for new principles of the Socialist International. In 1951, when the International was re-established & the Frankfurt Declaration drawn up there was a Cold War; in 1962, when the Oslo Declaration was drawn up de-colonisation was in process. He asked whether the International was not going to have talks with Third World parties because they operated under different political systems. Did the International intend also to ignore, he asked, and at

the European level in the parliamentary Assembly in Luxembourg, the communists who were represented there and who formed special groups within the Assembly.

Johan Peanberg said that the cooperation between the US and the USSR would not, in his view, speed up the processes of the struggles of the national liberation movements. He thought the International should support the national liberation movements and that democratic socialists should take a much bigger rôle than heretofore with regard to helping them.

Karl Czernetz said that for the sake of social democracy both super powers should try to avoid a military confrontation. Communist parties, he said, rejected any ideological coexistence and therefore they, at the same time, rejected democratic pluralism. Karl Czernetz said that he agreed fully with an alliance between the French Socialist Party and the French Communist Party. He said that the Austrian Socialist Party thought that the International should have loose contacts with various parties in Third World countries, but certainly not with communist parties. He thought that the question of the one-party system in Singapore and Mauritius, where the ruling party was a member of the International, would be raised at some future date. Singapore, Taiwan and South Korea, he said, had all achieved industrial breaksthrough. Karl Czernetz thought that the Bureau's decision, taken at Amsterdam in 1972, should stand and that therefore individual member parties of the International should be free to have relations with any party they liked.

Hans Janitschek said that the discussion showed that there was a great need for information about what was happening in the communist world as a whole. He suggested the setting up of a study programme to investigate developments and problems with regard to relations between the Socialist International and communist parties. He said the Bureau had found difficulty in trying to explain the principles of the Socialist International because there were two Declarations - the Frankfort and the Oslo Declarations. He thought that if a new Declaration of the International were adopted its terms of reference ought to be made clear. If member parties felt that a new Declaration was needed it would be necessary to set up a proper group to prepare this.

Karl Czernetz said that a Study Group as suggested by the General Secretary would be a single and very important body and that its work should not be rushed. Any decision the Bureau made that day would have to take account of different party attitudes.

Relus ter Beek said there was a difference between adopting a new set of principles for the International at the next Congress and starting the discussion on the principles before the next Congress.

Karl Czernetz said that he was in favour of starting the discussion on new principles of the Socialist International as soon as possible, but not with the aim of adopting those principles at the next Congress.

Relus ter Beek said that there was a general opinion that there should be a debate on a new programme or Declaration of principles of the Socialist International. He said that he

thought there was a necessity to raise a more concrete proposal because he did not think the Bureau could take any decisions at that meeting. He proposed:

1) that the question of discussing a new programme of principles for the International should be put on the agenda of the next Bureau meeting, it being possible in the meantime for member parties to discuss the matter;

2) that the German Social Democratic Party and the Secretariat of the International should come up with a kind of model procedure for this discussion ready for the next Bureau meeting.

These two matters could then be discussed at the same time.

Bernt Carlsson proposed the starting of preparations for a new programme of principles for the International. He did not, however, think that there was such a rush for this and added that the Secretariat was already overworked. He agreed with Karl Czernetz that such a large step as that of adopting a new set of principles was very important. The terminology of any new Declaration of principles for the International would have to be very carefully thought out because the present Declaration might only be revised.

With regard to the relations of the Socialist International with other parties he said that in Sweden this issue was almost always thought of in terms of anti-communism. When the Social Democrats in Sweden discussed relations with communist parties they ran into the internal problems of the communist parties themselves. The Social Democrats, he said, would like to propose that the Socialist International should have no contacts with communist movements because it might mean the Internatioanl becoming involved in conflicts within the Communist world. He said that it was very difficult for the International to have discussions or contacts with communist parties because there was not an equivalent international communist organisation.

His party's third objection to the International having contacts with communist parties was that it would discuss the communist proposals. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, he said, thought it was a good time and that the initiative for talks still lay with them. However, in the future, should the International decide to have talks with the communists, then the International should take the initiative.

With regard to parties in the Third World, Bernt Carlsson said that the Socialist International should have contacts with them even if they were not social democratic parties according to the International's conception of social democracy. He said the International should not close its doors on contacts with these parties. He said his party supported the decision taken by the Bureau at its meeting in Amsterdam in 1972.

Israel Gat said the Bureau should not be in a hurry to establish the group to investigate the basis for a new Declaration of the International and that the whole problem should be focussed at the next Congress. He did not think that the International was hungry for information from communist countries.

Hans-Eberhard Dingels said the problem of new principles should be dealt with in the best practical way. The problem should be dealt with whilst preserving the identity of the International.

Alberto Bemporad said that with regard to the problem of the relationship between the Socialist International as such, and communist parties, the PSDI did not see any opportunity, necessity, or suitability for this. The Socialist International had already accepted that individual member parties could have relations with communist parties in their own countries and outside their own countries when they recognised the political and economic usefulness of such relations with regard to their own responsibility as parties in government or opposition.

The opportunity for the Socialist International to send their own representatives to anti-fascist rallies or to demonstrations of solidarity with liberation movements should be measured and authorised case by case and according to circumstances. In these instances the deep and insuperable differences between the ideological position of democratic socialism and that of communism - as well as the difference between the aims of the two movements - should be made absolutely clear. Alberto Bamporad questioned the usefulness and suitability of institutionalised and permanent relationships as these could create confusion and bewilderment between the party members and the democratic state socialist electorate. It was an essential duty of the Socialist International to re-state and to keep intact the democratic socialist ideological position as defined in the fundamental Declarations of the International of Frankfort and Oslo.

The clarifying of positions ought not to prevent the development of the policy of cooperation between East and West which the democratic socialist parties intended to support within the framework of their responsibilities in their respective countries; such cooperation would then rest on a serious and responsible basis.

Democratic socialism did not approve of military interventions such as had occurred in Viet Nam and San Domingo, nor of other kinds of interventions such as that of the CIA in Chile, and maybe elsewhere, on the part of other countries including the USA.

There was, he said, a fundamental difference between the disapproving of individual political instances of behaviour of a democratic country and the condemnation of totalitarian systems which supported the theory of limited sovereignty and which kept permanently under subjection other countries by the presence of the threat of force.

With regard to political movements in the Third World which defined themselves as 'socialist', Alberto Bemporad said that a more flexible and comprehensive criterion should be adopted which favoured those movements being brought into the framework of the Socialist International. However, in no case should the Socialist International give the recognition of socialism to parties which have imposed totalitarian régimes even in the emerging countries.

As far as the up-dating of the principles of the Socialist International was concerned, it would be advisable to take into account the new economic and social problems which have emerged both in internal and external relationships. However, discussions ought not to take place on the Socialist International's concept of democracy which is rightly based on the pluralism of political forces and on the free confrontation of political and cultural ideas.

George Fernandes on behalf of the Socialist Party of India gave a report on the situation in India. He said that since the Socialist Party had joined with the Praja Socialist Party there had been no relations with the Socialist International. He said he hoped that in the near future it would be possible for the Bureau to consider an application of membership from the Socialist Party of India and that it would be favourably considered.

George Fernandes said that currently India was going through a depressing period in political and economic terms. Economically, the country was facing the worst situation ever; inflation in 1973 had been running at 24 per cent and this would probably increase to 30 per cent or more. He said there had been shortages of every consumer product and that there was a famine situation in several parts of the country, which had been often denied by official spokesmen. George Fernandes reported that the most serious political situation in India was in the State of Bihar, where Jayprakash Narayan (one of the founders of the Socialist movement in India) had, since early that year, returned to active political life in order to lead the people of Bihar. The demand the people of Bihar were making, he said, was for a Bihar Assembly and for fresh elections as the state government of Bihar had been paralysed for months. 5,000 members of the Socialist Party in that state had been imprisoned. Early in October, he said, the Socialist movement had entered a decisive phase and Jayprakash Narayan had suggested that a general strike be held from 3-5 October. He reported that there was much police repression in Bihar and the radio service was state-owned, therefore any news given was from the government's point of view. George Fernandes said that on the third day of the general strike the police opened fire on the Patna railway station and 100 people had been killed. He reported on the railwaymen's strike, held in May 1974, which the government had called a 'political strike' and which had led to 50,000 men being imprisoned; 80,000 had been dismissed from their jobs, of whom 40,000 had been reinstated, but the others had not.

George Fernandes said that his party was worried about the survival of the democratic system and of civil liberties in India. He said that 36,000 people were being held in prison without trial, under various laws. George Fernandes said that his party did not believe that there was no left-wing group within the Congress Party of India. There had been some infiltration of communists and socialists into the Congress Party. He said that the former Chairman of the Praja Socialist Party, who had joined the Congress, was no longer there and that he now led the old Congress Party, or what was now known as the 'Syndicate' and that he was now Chairman of the Syndicate.

With regard to the communists, George Fernandes said that they were better equipped ideologically than many other parties and they were making the best of the present political and economic system, which explained the close relations between India and the USSR.

He said that the Indian Government was unable, in the opinion of most people, to tackle the problems that faced the Indian people. He said that the government relied on gimmicks, which 'fed' the middle classes and aimed at satisfying them, whilst they were at the moment alienated from the ruling Congress Party.

George Fernandes said that he would like the Socialist International to apply its collective mind to the problem of the whole of the Indian sub-continent. He reported that B.P. Koirala (former Prime Minister of Nepal) had sent a message of greetings

to the Bureau. B. P. Koirala, he said, was a refugee in India and was organising a resistance movement. George Fernandes predicted an uprising in Nepal very soon. He said that the Socialist Party of India, which represented only 5 per cent of the electorate, needed the support of the Socialist International. The Socialist Party of India, he said, was engaged in a dialogue with the Marxist/Communist (not pro-Moscow) Party in India and the Socialist Party was hoping to project a viable alternative programme to put before the people in order that the parliamentary system of India might be saved.

With regard to the recent nuclear explosion carried out in India, George Fernandes said that the Indian Government had received support for its action from many Third World countries. He said that he did not agree with those who said that Europeans should not protest at the action of India. He said that he thought it was criminal for India to waste her resources on nuclear weapons, whilst her nuclear power stations were hardly in working order.

George Fernandes said that he did not take at its face value the Indian Government's statement that it did not intend to go ahead with its nuclear weapons' development. He said that Third World countries such as Nepal and Bangladesh were very angry at the Indian government's action.

George Fernandes said it was still a condition, from the Indian Socialist Party's point of view, that the International ought not to have relations with the Indian Congress Party, if the Socialist Party were to become a member of the International. He said that personal and not political reasons were the cause of some of the members of the Socialist Party joining the Congress Party as, for example, Ashok Mehta. He said that within the Congress Party there was a communist bloc with Soviet sympathies, but he said there were no 'socialists' within the Congress Party - only 'fellow-travellers'. He said he thought the relations between India and the USSR were very disturbing.

India, he said, ought to start rethinking its relations with, for example, China, which now, because of India's treaty with the USSR, says that India is, in a manner of speaking, part of the Soviet bloc. Economically, India and the USSR were involved with each other in a number of agreements which could, of course, cause difficulties at a later date because these could close any options for agreements with other countries.

George Fernandes said that India's food policy had been bad and that the necessary steps had not been taken to provide investment in the rural sector of the economy. Land reforms were needed. For example, some men still divided the land in the names of existing and non-existing people. Cattle and religion were not, therefore, the real problem, but the lack of land and the lack of a good food policy.

With regard to the Indian Socialist Party's relation with fraternal parties outside the Indian sub-continent, George Fernandes said that the Socialist conference of socialist parties in that area had disintegrated but that the Socialist Party of India was keen to develop relations with Asia parties again and hoped that the Socialist International could take the initiative and could perhaps arrange a meeting of Asian socialist parties as a starting point. A new socialist perspective could then be built up.

The Indian Socialist Party, he said, had 10 seats out of 750 in both the upper and lower houses in Parliament. In 1971, in both houses, the Socialist Party had had 60 seats. They now

had 6 seats of the 525 seats in the lower house, and 4 seats in the 25- seat upper house. The Socialist Party had been in government in 8 states in India before the 1971 election. The Socialist Party had a voting strength of 5 per cent throughout the country now. There had been many reasons for the defeat of the Socialist Party in the 1971 elections, but the most important one was the performance of the socialist and non-communist governments from 1960 to 1970. In that election campaign Mrs. Gandhi had said that she wanted to banish poverty yet during the campaign the state and government resources had been used unscrupulously; the radio service had been maintained 24 hours a day throughout the campaign. The Socialist Party, however, had been completely shut out of radio, TV and other media. Money, caste and linguistic differences had been pitted against each other during the campaign.

Bruno Pittermann said that there was a need for a Bureau discussion concerning the revision or renewal of the principles of the Socialist International. He asked member parties to report on the day's discussion to their executive bodies, after which the Bureau at a future meeting could, if parties agreed, decide if and when to put on the agenda Relus ter Beek's proposal for the setting up of a special committee to look into new principles for the International.

Karl Czernetz said that he would prefer it, as a first stage, if member parties sent their proposals for new principles not to the Secretariat but to all other parties. These could then be used as an internal discussion paper not for publication. He said that the Austrian Socialist Party only sent delegates to party congresses if those congresses were of parties belonging to the Socialist International. His party, he said, only received delegates from member parties of the International. Karl Czernetz referred to the Middle East Study Group of the International and said that its work should be continued because it did not compromise the principles of the Socialist International nor of any of its member parties. With regard to the International having relations with the Union Progréssiste of President Leopold Sédar Senghor of Senegal (the International having received an invitation from the Union progréssiste of) Senegal to attend a conference of African socialist parties) this could perhaps be taken up by the proposed special committee dealing with the new principles of the Socialist International.

Israel Gat did not think that a dialogue on the fundamentals of the Socialist International should be entered into before the next Congress. He suggested that another Congress could be devoted to establishing new principles for the International. The next Congress, he said, should concentrate on the new Statutes of the International. In the meantime, the International could continue benefitting from its Study Groups and Committees which had contacts with other parties - for example, the Middle East Study Group.

Paavo Lipponen supported Israel Gat with regard to the new principles for the International. Member parties, he said, needed time to think about the new principles. He said that the Secretariat could be asked to collect material on existing programmes of present member parties which could be put before the next Congress for its information. If there were a Congress every two years the discussion on the principles could be taken at the next ordinary Congress. He said that the adoption of a new Declaration of new principles ought not to be undertaken in a hurry if it were to be a satisfactory one. Whether the

Declaration of principles was to be new or merely amended was not that important so long as member parties every ten years or so took a good look at the world and tried to find what concensus of opinion there was among them on particular international problems.

Ejner-Hovgaard Christiansen said that member parties needed time to clear up their ideas as democratic socialists. The discussions on new principles for the Socialist International should be undertaken by the member parties of the International as Social Democrats with a view to giving a clear alternative to totalitarian régimes, whether of the left or right, and capitalist systems. He agreed that a working group of the Socialist International should study the question of a new Declaration of principles.

Michele Achilli said that the Italian Socialist Party (PSI) thought that new political forces which called themselves socialists were growing up and that the Socialist International ought not to ignore but should enter into a dialogue with them. The PSI, he said, was interested in Third World countries and those countries of the Mediterranean area. The Mediterranean was a point of international conflict and the Socialist International ought to concern itself with the area. The world situation was no longer that which prevailed in the 1950's and 1960's. The Socialist International, he said, should face the new problems which arose from present-day society. It was perhaps necessary to define the necessities which made up a good society and any new declaration of principles of the International could be based on that. Michele Achilli emphasised the necessity for the presence of a much more dynamic Socialist International. Member parties ought to study the new political and social problems which had arisen. He said that his party thought that the Socialist International ought to establish new relations with other parties, although these might not imply permanent links.

Robert Pontillon said that socialism today appeared as something resembling a Spanish king. The problem, he said, was whether socialists still had something in common in terms of ideology. There was therefore the problem of redefinition, of ideology. The International would have also to discover what it meant, for example, by socialist objectives and problems and investigate the meaning of economic democracy. Robert Pontillon said that today's young people were looking for a new definition of socialism and of its aims.

Bruno Pittermann said that at any meeting of the Bureau there was the opportunity to start talks on certain subjects. With regard to the report by the Socialist International Research Council there was the problem of how socialists ought to act towards the establishment of multinational companies in a capitalist society.

Otto Kersten thanked the Bureau for their invitation to him and said that the discussion had been very interesting firstly, because political and trade union matters were important and were very closely related and secondly, because the question was not only about with whom one had contacts, but of what one was in favour of. Otto Kersten emphasised the importance for the ICFTU of cooperation with socialist parties and said that the ICFTU, like the International, needed a common solution in order to handle most of the important issues of present-day economy.

Bruno Pittermann stressed the need for more work between the SI and the ICFTU to fight the challenge of the multinational companies.

Israel Gat suggested that there might be an opportunity to talk about relations between the International and other parties at a Party Leaders' Conference of the International. He suggested that this might have a good impact politically because it would show that party leaders were also concerned with long-run political thinking.

4 EUROPEAN SECURITY STUDY GROUP

Paavo Lipponen said that his party did not insist on having a meeting of the International's European Study Group in Helsinki, but he thought there should be a meeting of the Study Group soon. He thought a meeting within the next two months would not be possible because of the difficult problems with regard to the Geneva conference on European security and cooperation. He proposed that there should be a meeting of the Study Group in January 1975, which would secure the best participation from member parties. He said that it might be best to hold the meeting in Geneva where the meeting could have access to information from the Geneva Conference. His party, however, was prepared to host the meeting of the Study Group in Helsinki.

5 COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Karl Czernetz reported that the Turkish Republican People's Party's representatives in the Council of Europe had requested admission to the Socialist Group of the Council. This had been granted and the party had joined the Group in Strasbourg.

6 NEXT MEETING OF THE BUREAU AND OF THE FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

The Bureau noted the invitation from the Portuguese Socialist Party to hold a future Bureau meeting in Lisbon and discussed the merits of having the next Bureau meeting in Portugal to coincide with the Portuguese Socialist Party's (PSP) Congress, to be held on 13-15 December 1974.

Jenny Little proposed that if no Bureau meeting were to be held in Lisbon then a meeting of the Portugal Committee should be held before the PSP Congress.

Bernt Carlsson proposed the holding of a meeting of the Finance and General Purposes Committee on 1 December, before a possible Bureau meeting in Lisbon.

The Bureau agreed that a Finance and General Purposes Committee meeting should be held in 1 December 1974.

The Bureau agreed to discover from the PSP whether it would be convenient to hold a Bureau meeting shortly before or after the PSP Congress.

7 ASSISTANCE TO PORTUGUESE SOCIALIST PARTY

The Bureau agreed that another circular reminding parties of the requests for aid from the PSP should be sent to member parties.

8 INVITATIONS

i) Senegal Union Progréssiste
The Chairman informed the Bureau of an invitation received from President Leopold Senghor of Senegal for personal talks on the subject of the planned conference of African socialist parties to be held in 1975. The Chairman proposed that the French Socialist Party should undertake these talks.

Robert Pontillon said that he had been in Dakar the previous week. He informed the Bureau that the Union Progréssiste Senegalese (UPS) wanted the Socialist International to attend their next Congress as guests. Representatives of the UPS also wanted to be invited to the next Congress of the Socialist International. Robert Pontillon informed the Bureau that preparations for the Conference of African socialist parties were to take place in December and the Conference would be held in Tunis in April 1975.

The Bureau agreed that the French Socialist Party should take part in preparatory talks with the UPS with regard to the planned conference of African socialists in Tunis in April 1975.

ii) Cyprus Socialist Party
The General Secretary informed the Bureau of an invitation received from the Socialist Party of Cyprus (EDEK) for a study tour of Cyprus during November 1974. The invitation had been extended by the President of the EDEK, Dr Vassos Lyssarides. The Bureau agreed that Karl Czernetz, who would be leading a mission of the Council of Europe's Consultative Assembly's Working Party on Cyprus to Ankara, Athens, Nicosia and London, should meet with members of the EDEK on behalf of the Socialist International during the mission's visit to Cyprus.

iii) Singapore People's Action Party (PAP)
The General Secretary informed the Bureau of an invitation received from the PAP of Singapore for a meeting with Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew on the future of the Asia Pacific Socialist Organisation. The invitation had been extended by Lee Kuan Yew by letter, but no date had been proposed for the meeting. The Bureau agreed that the invitation should be accepted and that the meeting should be undertaking in connection with the proposed forthcoming Bureau meeting in Australia.

9 NEXT MEETINGS OF THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

i) Bureau Meeting in Australia The Bureau agreed that the invitation from the Australian Labour Party inviting the Bureau to hold a meeting in Australia in February 1975 should be submitted to the Finance & General Purposes Committee for consideration.

ii) 1975 Congress in Canada The Bureau agreed that the invitation from the New Democratic Party of Canada that the next Socialist International Congress should be held in Canada ought to be discussed further by the Finance & General Purposes Committee, which would also consider the date of the Congress and the joint ICSDW/SI Conference on "S-O-S"(Socialists on Sexes) in Canada. It was agreed that member parties should be informed that the proposed date of the next Congress was September 1975.

10 EEC SOCIALIST PARTY LEADERS' CONFERENCE IN THE HAGUE 1-2 NOVEMBER 1974

Relus ter Beek informed the Bureau of an invitation for the next Party Leaders' Conference of member parties of the Confederation of Socialist parties in the European communities to be held in the Hague on 1-2 November 1974. The invitation had been extended by Joop den Uyl, Leader of the Dutch Party of Labour, who would be hosting the Conference.

The Conference would discuss political developments in the EEC and the form of cooperation among socialist parties inside the EEC. Relus ter Beek said that his party had invited all socialist parties inside the EEC most of which had already replied and proposed sending their respective leaders: for example, Helmut Schmidt, Willy Brandt and Pietro Nenni would be attending. The socialist communities in the EEC had also been invited as had also the leader of the socialist Group in the European Parliament and the Chairman of the Socialist International.

Relus ter Beek emphasised the importance of the meeting. He reported to the Bureau that the British Labour Party would not be present at the Leaders' Conference. He said that there was full understanding of the British Labour Party's position towards the EEC and that as a result of this they would not be able to participate as a real member at the Conference. He said, however, that his party had been a little disappointed that the British Labour Party would not be attending the Conference even as observers, thereby showing some interest in their continental socialist comrades. He said that his party thought the presence of the British Labour Party as observer could contribute to the decision-making process inside the Labour Party. He stressed the regret of his party that the British Labour Party would not be attending the Conference.

Relus ter Beek said that he was informing the Bureau of the forthcoming absence of the British Labour Party in The Hague because the British Labour Party had made clear in the past their disapproval of the acceptance by the Socialist Group in the European Parliament of Dick Taverne.

Ian Mikardo thanked Relus ter Beek for his understanding of the British Labour Party's position with regard to the EEC and the forthcoming Leaders' Conference. He said that the British Labour Party had tried to keep itself informed about the thinking of its socialist comrades in Europe but he liked to think that there were methods other than the attending of talking shops for keeping his party informed of continental socialists' views. He said that a year or two ago the British Labour Party had tried to attend similar meetings but that only the French Socialist Party had talked to them.

11 INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL HISTORY

The Bureau agreed, following an invitation from the Amsterdam Institute of Social History, that Hans Janitschek should attend a Board meeting of the Institute on 14 November 1974. The Bureau further agreed that Hans Janitschek should succeed Julius Braunthal on the Board of the Institute.

12 PROTEST AGAINST ARREST OF DEPUTY HUEPE

The Bureau agreed to authorise the General Secretary to issue a statement protesting against the arrest of Chilean Christian Democrat Deputy, Claudio Huepe.

13 MESSAGE TO BRUNO KALNINS

The Bureau agreed to send a message for a quick recovery from ill health to Bruno Kalnins, Chairman of the Socialist Union of Central-Eastern Europe.

14 SILVER PLATE OF HONOUR

The Bureau agreed to award the Socialist International Silver Plate of Honour to Anna Kéthly on the occasion of her 85th birthday on 16 November. It was agreed that the Belgian Socialist Party should make the award on behalf of the Socialist International.

Karl Czernetz proposed that this presentation should be televised in order to give support to the Hungarian Social Democratic Party in exile and that the Chairman of the Socialist International should be present. This was agreed.

15 MISSION TO THE MIDDLE EAST

Hans Janitschek informed the Bureau that the report on the first stage of the Mission to the Middle East prepared by Bruno Kreisky (circular No.B32/74) had been endorsed by the German Social Democratic Party, the French Socialist Party, the Japanese Democratic Socialist Party, the Dutch Labour Party, the Italian Socialist Party and the Swedish Social Democratic Party.

Hans Janitschek reported that Bruno Kreisky had proposed the second stage of the Mission be undertaken in January 1975, and that Jordan, Tunisia, Iraq and Algeria should be among the countries to be visited. Bruno Kreisky had asked the Bureau's authority for the second stage of the Mission to take place.

Ian Mikardo said that his party had great reservations about the undertaking of the second stage of the Mission. He said that the General Secretary of the British Labour Party was not happy with the report on the Mission's first stage. Ian Mikardo reported that there had been a tendency on the part of the leader of the Mission to have individual conferences by himself with leaders of some of the countries visited in the first stage of the Mission. Ian Mikardo said that he had never come across this kind of thing before and that had he been a member of the delegation his first job would have been to have caught the next plane home, because the behaviour of the leader meant that some members of the delegation were first-class and some second-class delegates. Ian Mikardo said he wanted to ask the leader on what subjects he had had discussions other than those subjects discussed by the delegation as a whole, as there had clearly been subjects discussed in addition to those in which the delegation as a whole had taken part. Apart from this aspect, the Mission had taken up a good deal of both the Bureau's and the Secretariat's time and a great deal of money had been spent. He said that the second stage of the Mission would be long and upon completion the whole operation would have cost something like £25,000. He said that he thought the Bureau had a duty to ensure that any money spent would produce the best value. He said that on having read the report on the first stage of the Mission he was bound to say that he could have gained all the information contained in it at a cost considerably less than the £10,682 - which was the amount spent on the first stage of the Mission. Ian Mikardo said, therefore, that he did not think that the International got commensurate value out of the first stage of the Mission. He said he would

be hesitant to authorise the second stage. He asked the Bureau to consider what benefits the second stage of the Mission could bring to the Socialist International which would be commensurate with all that would be involved.

Robert Pontillon said that his party had not endorsed the report on the first stage of the Middle East Mission.

Relus ter Beek said that he wanted to inform the Bureau that it was not only the leader of the Middle East delegation who had had private contacts or talks and he said that he knew of another member of the delegation who had had a letter from his own prime minister to hand over to a head of state in the Middle East.

Johan Peanberg said that in his view the second stage of the Mission should take place. He thought the report on the first stage was unfortunate but suggested a report on the second stage of the Mission, if it took place, should be published to indicate that the Socialist International was active in that sphere.

Israel Gat said that his party was ready to talk about the problems of the Middle East, but thought that the problem was turning more towards oil and other aspects of the Middle East and that perhaps the second stage ought to visit Venezuela.

Relus ter Beek rejected the Israeli suggestion that the second stage of the Mission would be solely about oil. He said that he was in favour of the second stage of the Mission because it had been agreed that the International should not only visit Israel, Egypt and Syria but also other countries in the Middle East which were not so directly involved in the Middle East conflict as the other three countries already visited by the Mission. He said that the second stage of the Mission had been publicised and should therefore be carried out. If it were not, this might create a bad impression and image of the International.

Robert Pontillon said that his party was in favour of the second stage of the Mission taking place. The Middle East Mission had been the first time that the International had been seen as an active body. He suggested the second stage of the Mission visiting Saudi Arabia.

David Butcher said that he had had the impression that the Socialist International had not done much. The first stage of the Mission, however, had shown that the International could take some initiative. He supported Johan Peanberg's view that the second stage of the Mission ought to be publicised, indicating solutions in some areas to the impasse in the Middle East.

The Bureau voted in principle to undertake the second stage of the Mission to the Middle East. Those voting in favour: Italy (PSI), Italy (PSDI), Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Germany, IUSY, Netherlands, Austria, France, Chile, Belgium.* Those voting against: Great Britain. Abstentions: Malta, Israel.

* and the ICSDW

The Bureau agreed that those parties represented on the first stage of the Mission should participate in the second.

The Bureau further agreed that the second stage of the Mission be led by Bruno Kreisky and that it should take place in January 1975.

16 LETTER FROM ARAB LEAGUE

Hans Janitschek reported that the letter from the Arab League, which the Bureau had before it, had first been addressed to the Party Leaders' Conference of the International in June 1974; the Party Leaders' Conference, however, had decided that it ought to be put on the agenda of the next Bureau meeting. However, as there had been no discussion on the Middle East Mission report at that next Bureau meeting, which had taken place in September, the letter had not been put on the Agenda at that time.

17 THE SECRETARIAT

The Bureau agreed to discuss the question of the General Secretary, the structure of the Secretariat, and the proposed post of Senior Assistant at the Secretariat, at the next meeting of the Bureau.

18 TRIAL OF SPANISH SOCIALISTS

As recorded above (page 2) the Bureau agreed unanimously that Rodney Balcomb should represent the Socialist International as an observer at the trial of five Spanish socialists due to take place in Madrid on 28 October.

Jenny Little reported that the representative of the PSOE, who had wanted to speak to the Bureau about the forthcoming trial, had left the building and had had to go to catch his plane back to Spain. She said that the Bureau, by having not given the representative the opportunity to speak to the Bureau, had thereby shown tremendous disrespect to its Spanish member party. Jenny Little suggested that as she would be going to Spain the next day to observe the trial on behalf of the British Labour Party she could try and make amends to the PSOE.

The Bureau agreed that a statement condemning the forthcoming trial ought to be issued by the Socialist International, and after discussion a text was unanimously agreed (see Annex II)

The Bureau further agreed that a letter should be sent to the PSOE expressing the Bureau's deep regret that through a misunderstanding the PSOE's representative had not been able to speak to the Bureau.

The Bureau agreed that if there were a press conference in Madrid in connection with the trial of the Spanish socialists, Rodney Balcomb should attend, on behalf of the International.

19 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

a) PSOE Conference Jenny Little asked Bureau members that if their parties were intending to send anyone to the forthcoming party conference of the PSOE that they should inform her owing to the problem of accommodation.

b) Dutch Labour Party Campaign in aid of Portuguese Socialist Party

Relus ter Beek requested that details of the Dutch Labour Party's campaign in aid of the Portuguese Socialist Party be put on the agenda of the next Bureau meeting. This was agreed.