

SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

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

Phone: 01-586 1101

Grams: INTESOCON, LONDON

Telex: 261735

CONFIDENTIAL.**IN ENGLISH ONLY**
FOR MEMBERS ONLYCircular M.5/74

March 29, 1974.

MINUTES

of the

MEETING

of the

BUREAU OF THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONALLondon, January 6, 1974

	Page
1. Opening	1
2. Adoption of agenda	1
3. Socialist International mission to the Middle East	1
4. Israel:	
a) Prisoners-of-war in Syria	8
b) Report on General Election	8
5. Socialist International mission to Greece; meeting of Greek Committee	9
6. Spain:	
a) Situation as regards PSOE	13
b) Membership application from PSI	15
c) Establishment of Spain Committee	16
7. Situation in Britain	16
8. Membership of Socialist Group of European Parliament	16
9. Situation in Guinea-Bissau	16
10. Publication of report of mission to Chile	17
11. Task Force on Multinational Companies	17
12. Next meeting of Finance and General Purposes Committee	17
13. Time-table for Bureau meetings in 1974	17
14. Next Bureau meeting	17
15. Next meeting of Middle East Study Group	18

List of participants

Annexe: Draft Statement on Greece

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BUREAU
OF THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

London, January 6, 1974

(Bureau Meeting 1/74)

1. OPENING

The meeting was opened by Hans Janitschek, General Secretary, as the Chairman, Bruno Pittermann, was unable, because of illness, to attend the meeting and as none of the Vice-Chairmen of the International were available to chair the meeting.

The Bureau elected Ian Mikardo to chair the morning session and Victor Larock to chair the afternoon session. The General Secretary was, at the same time, requested to send a cable of good wishes to Bruno Pittermann as well as to Hans-Eberhard Dingels (German Social Democratic Party) who was also absent owing to illness.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The following revised agenda was adopted : 1) Socialist International mission to the Middle East; 2) Report by parties on action concerning the Israeli prisoners-of-war in Syria; 3) Report on mission to Greece; 4) Membership of Spanish Socialist Party; 5) Situation in Guinea-Bissau; 6) Report by parties on action concerning the position of Dick Taverne in the socialist group of the European parliament; 7) Publication of the report on the Socialist International mission to Chile; and 8) Tentative timetable for Bureau meetings in 1974.

The items 'Task Force on Multinational Companies' and 'Report of Study Group for Socialist Strategy in the Third World' which had appeared on the original provisional agenda were postponed to the next meeting of the Bureau.

3. SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL MISSION TO THE MIDDLE EAST

The meeting of the Bureau held in London on December 9, 1973, had considered a proposal made at the Party Leaders Conference on November 11, 1973, that a fact-finding body of the Socialist International should visit the Middle East. The Bureau had decided in favour of the sending of such a mission and had decided to complete the preparation of the mission at the present Bureau meeting on January 6. It had requested Karl Czernetz to act in the meantime as rapporteur and to consult with the parties to be represented in the mission in order to establish who would be the party representatives who would participate in the mission, which would be the best dates for the mission, what the general terms of reference of the mission should be and which countries should be visited. On the basis of the consultations conducted by Karl Czernetz, a paper should then be circulated to all member parties represented on the Bureau, in advance of the January 6 Bureau meeting, containing proposals by Karl Czernetz based on the replies received from parties.

Karl Czernetz had accordingly sent to the parties which were to be represented in the mission a letter containing questions on the above-mentioned aspects of the mission, and proposing terms of reference for the mission as follows :

'The fact-finding group would have to find out what the countries concerned regard : ..

- a) as conditions for a peaceful solution of the present Middle East conflict which would lead to a permanent and just peace in the area;
- b) particularly as secure and acceptable frontiers and what guarantees were felt to be necessary;
- c) as a humane solution of the problem of Palestinian refugees;
- d) as necessary conditions for a long-range economic co-operation between all Middle Eastern countries, and also co-operation between the Middle East and Europe.

'The fact-finding group will report about their findings to the Socialist International for further political decisions and action.'

Karl Czernetz had circulated to the members of the Bureau on December 22 a confidential document containing proposals concerning the terms of reference and dates of the mission and the countries to be visited by the mission, and including the views on these questions of those parties whose replies to his original letter had been received by that date (the Austrian, Belgian, British, Dutch, French, Italian Social Democratic and Luxembourg parties); the Belgian and Luxembourg parties had agreed that the Dutch party should represent them in the mission. Replies from the German party and the Swedish party (which it had been agreed should represent the Scandinavian parties) had not been received at the time when the document had been prepared and it had therefore not been possible to include them in the document.

Karl Czernetz now introduced this confidential document, saying that although there were some differences of emphasis, there appeared to be fairly general agreement as regards the terms of reference which he had proposed for the mission in his original letter (see above); there was also an additional proposal from the British party that the mission should 'study and report on the possibilities of contact between the Socialist International and various sections of Arab political opinion, particularly those who claim to be socialists'. There was, however, a major difference of opinion between those parties which wished the mission to visit only those countries most directly involved in the Arab-Israel conflict (Egypt, Israel, Jordan and Syria) and those parties which wished the mission to visit a greater number of countries; the Bureau would have to reach a decision concerning the countries to be visited by the mission, and if a substantial number of countries were to be visited, it might be necessary for the mission to make not one single trip, but two trips (it had been decided by the Bureau on December 9, 1973, that the members of the mission should all travel together, and should all visit the same countries, without which proper evaluation and comparison would be very

difficult), in order to ensure high-level participation; if two trips were to be made, a decision would also be needed as regards which countries were to be visited on each trip. Regarding the dates of the mission, Karl Czernetz proposed late February/March, instead of January, which had been envisaged by the Bureau at its December 9 meeting.

Rodney Balcomb informed the Bureau that after the document introduced by Karl Czernetz had been produced and circulated, the secretariat had been informed by the French Socialist Party that in addition to the reservations felt by the French Socialist Party as regards visiting Syria, the French Socialist Party also had certain reservations concerning a visit to Libya by the mission.

Bernt Carlsson stated that, as regards the terms of reference which had been proposed for the mission, his Party objected to the point relating to frontiers and did not want this point to be included in the terms of reference for the mission; the other points of the terms of reference, he said, were acceptable to his Party. He said that his Party supported the British proposal (see above) for political contacts with the Arabs at Party level. Regarding the question of which countries should be visited by the mission, he said that his Party saw no point in going to Israel now that the General Elections in Israel had taken place; as regards which Arab countries should be visited, his Party felt that the mission should cover a broad political spectrum, even including Saudi Arabia, and also supported the idea of having talks with the Palestinian leaders. Regarding the timing of the mission, Bernt Carlsson said that his Party did not feel that there was any hurry for the group to leave and no need for it to leave immediately; his Party felt that it should be made very clear that the mission of the International was not an alternative to the Geneva Conference, but a Party mission. He said that the expectations which might be aroused by the mission should be kept to a minimum in order to avoid any possible impression of failure.

Gerhard Kleipsties stated that his Party agreed generally with the draft proposals put forward by the Rapporteur. He said that what the Bureau now had to discuss was whether the mission should visit simply the four countries principally involved in the Arab-Israel conflict or whether Algeria, Tunisia and Libya could also be included in the mission's itinerary. He said that if it was possible to visit countries additional to the four countries principally involved in the Arab-Israel conflict, then Algeria, Tunisia, and Libya should all be visited and not just one of these latter countries. He said that his Party considered it important that the mission should discuss what could be done to improve economic and social conditions in the Arab countries visited by the mission, and he said that in the Arab world there was a wish to open a dialogue with the member parties of the Socialist International.

Karl Czernetz, referring to the views expressed by parties on the proposed terms of reference which had been circulated, said that, as Rapporteur, he had no objection to a proposal of the Dutch Party to change the phrase 'a humane solution of the problem of Palestinian refugees' contained in the proposed terms of reference to read: 'a humane and political solution of the problem of Palestinian refugees'. Regarding the countries to be visited by the mission

Karl Czernetz said that he personally thought it important to visit Libya, as Libya had some influence in Egypt; he also thought it would be useful to visit Algeria and Tunisia which were countries bordering on southern Europe; he said that Bruno Kreisky was in favour of visiting these countries. Karl Czernetz said that the Bureau must decide whether the mission should visit a small group of countries or a larger number of countries. If a smaller number of countries were to be visited then this could be Egypt, Libya, Jordan, Israel, Syria and meetings with Palestinian leaders, or the Bureau might share the view of Bruno Kreisky that a larger number of countries should be visited. If a larger number of countries were visited this would take about two weeks and in order to ensure the high-level participation originally proposed by the Party Leaders' Conference, it would therefore be necessary to make two trips of about a week instead of one single trip of two weeks. In the event of two separate trips being made, it would be necessary to decide which countries should be visited on each trip. The division of countries could be made in one of two ways : either the countries most directly involved in the war could be visited in the first trip and the remaining countries in the second trip, or the division of countries could be made on the basis of geographical convenience. Karl Czernetz proposed that, if it were decided to visit a larger number of countries, the countries should be divided into two trips on a geographical basis. He proposed that on the first trip Israel, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia and Algeria should be visited, with the remaining countries to be visited on the second trip. As regards dates he proposed that the first trip should be made at the end of February or beginning of March and that, if a second trip were to be made, this should be made at the end of March.

Gerhard Kleipsties said that, as it had been decided that the delegation should be high-level, and as it was not possible to know at this stage what the situation might be in the Middle East by March, it was perhaps preferable that the terms of reference should not be too detailed and should be as simple and as few in number as possible; in particular, the question of borders was perhaps a Pandora's box which should not be opened.

Francis Cassar said that there now appeared to be a change in the objectives and substance of the mission which had originally been proposed by the Party Leaders' conference. Instead of the high-level mission in January 1974 which had been suggested by the Party Leaders, it was now proposed to send a mission in March which would be at the level of members of Party secretariats; the Bureau was trying to wait and see what would happen at the Geneva Conference. In view of all this, Francis Cassar said that he wished to take no part in the discussions or decisions of the Bureau regarding the mission.

Paavo Lipponen stated that his Party felt that there was no need to send a mission to the Middle East very quickly; the mission should not leave until the new Israeli government had been formed and perhaps March would be the best time for the mission to go. As regards the proposed terms of reference for the mission contained in the document which had been circulated to the Bureau, his Party did not wish that any of the four points (a) (b) (c) and (d) should be dropped, but felt that point (b) relating to frontiers and point

(c) relating to the Palestinians should not in any way be made public. As regards point (c) of the proposed terms of reference, he felt that the wording should not imply any kind of partiality and proposed that the wording of section (c) (which in any case should not be made public) should be 'as a solution to guarantee the rights of the Palestinian Arabs'. Regarding the question of which countries should be visited he said he agreed that countries not directly involved in the conflict should be visited and that the mission should visit at least Algeria and Saudi Arabia and possibly also Tunisia; it would not be so useful, he thought, to visit Libya. He felt that it would be necessary to make two separate trips and felt that the mission itself should decide which countries should be visited on each trip. Paavo Lippinen drew attention to the fact that it had been decided at the Bureau meeting on December 9, that one representative of the Scandinavian member parties should participate in the mission to the Middle East; this meant, he said, that the Finnish Party by this definition would not be represented in the mission and he requested therefore that the mission to the Middle East should include not a representative of the Scandinavian parties, but a representative of the Nordic parties so that in this way the Finnish Party was represented in the mission (his Party was not asking, however, that one of the actual members of the mission should be a member of the Finnish Social Democratic Party). The Bureau agreed to this request from Paavo Lippinen.

Harry van den Bergh stated that it was the position of his Party that there should be direct contact and direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States with which she was at war in order to arrive at a just peace. Now that bilateral talks were going on at the Geneva Conference, he said, it was the view of his Party that a mission of the International to the Middle East should not in any way attempt to compete with or intervene in the Geneva talks. His Party was hoping that the Dutch representative on the mission to the Middle East would be a government minister, but they would not be prepared to send a government minister if the mission tried to compete with or gave the impression of competing with the Geneva Conference; if the mission tried to do this it would in any case make itself ridiculous. However, his Party believed that the International should have links with democratic socialist-minded parties in the Arab world insofar as there were any, and his Party felt that the International should try to deepen relations in the long-term between Israel and the Arab States and between Europe and the Arabs, including relations of economic co-operation. He felt that a mission of the International with such objectives as he had just outlined could be sent to the Middle East in March or April when the Geneva Conference was seen to be going successfully, and in such an event his Party would try to send a government minister as their representative on the mission.

Tom McNally agreed with previous speakers that the terms of reference of the mission should be as few and as simple as possible, and that the mission should not attempt to compete with or duplicate in any way the work of the Geneva Conference. He felt that a mission of the International could go to the Middle East in the spring with the general objective of investigating the possibilities of economic and political co-operation in the Middle East.

Antonio Cariglia stated that by March there might have been developments at the Geneva Conference and that this could be a good time for the mission of the International to leave. He said that his Party was in general agreement with the terms of reference which had been proposed and felt that the terms of reference should not be too detailed. He said that the International was a political organization and that the mission must therefore consider all political questions. He said that the resolutions which had been adopted by various bodies of the International could not be set aside and should be borne in mind by the mission. Questions which he felt the mission should, for example, bear in mind were : the problem of the Palestinian Arabs, the solution to which should be both humane and political; the right of Israel to exist and to have secure frontiers; the question of relations between Europe, Israel and other Middle Eastern countries in order to promote economic development in the area; and the impact on Europe and the developing world of certain decisions taken by Arab countries.

Victor Larock stated that as regards point (c) of the terms of reference, this should refer not to 'Palestinian refugees' but simply to 'Palestinians'. He said that the Bureau should today not take a final decision on the countries to be visited but he felt that Lebanon should be included in the itinerary of the mission.

Michael Harish stated that in principle his Party agreed with the idea of sending a mission to the Middle East. He said that the remarks which he was about to make were intended to try to put the mission into the context of the work of the International. The idea of sending a mission to the Middle East came up, he said, at the Party Leaders' Conference in November 1973, in the context of the October war between Israel and the Arabs. Before the October war, the International had already established the Middle East Study Group to study Arab political forces with which the International could establish contact. It was not logical now, he said, to have a mission going which would confuse these two issues; if it did, then it would be taking over the work of the Middle East Study Group and at this point the Study Group would have come to an end. He said that the Bureau should first define whether the proposed mission to the Middle East was to take place on the basis of what had been proposed at the Party Leaders' Conference. From that, he said, one came to the question of borders. The International could not and should not attempt to draw up borders; neither the Israelis nor the Arabs would wish this. However, the mission should look into the question of borders and should find out the position of the different countries on this question. Regarding the countries to be visited by the mission, Michael Harish said that there were two types of countries : firstly, the four countries directly involved in the Israel-Arab conflict and within this context there was also the Palestinian question; secondly, there were other countries such as Algeria, Libya, Tunisia, etc. The Bureau should say why the mission should visit these latter countries. He said that he was not opposed to the mission visiting Libya, because Libya had an influence upon Egypt and Syria. In this context, however, Saudi Arabia was very important because President Sadat of Egypt could not have started the October war without the agreement and financial support of King Faisal. Therefore Saudi Arabia and Libya had to be considered more or less on the same basis. Then there were other North African countries : Tunisia was different from Algeria and Libya as regards its internal

political structure; there were other countries bordering Europe which it was not proposed that the mission should visit. Returning to the proposed terms of reference for the mission Michael Harish said that he was not opposed to the formulation of the Dutch Labour Party referring to a 'humane and political' solution of the problem of Palestinian refugees. He said that he saw this question in terms of the regime where most of the Palestinians were now living, but that others might see this question differently. In his view, both the question of borders and the question of the Palestinians had to be studied by the mission.

Ian Mikardo, summing up in his capacity as chairman of the meeting, said that there was a limit to which the Bureau could tell the participants what they should discuss, and the participants also had some rights to decide exactly when they should go; he also drew attention to the practical travel difficulties of visiting a number of Middle Eastern countries within a short space of time. He said that it was now known who would be the members of the mission and it was known that the period being considered for the mission was mid-February-mid-March. He proposed therefore that a preparatory meeting should be convened of the members of the mission together with the Chairman and General Secretary. He proposed also that the secretariat of the International should make a careful and detailed note of the discussion in the Bureau, setting out all the views put forward during the discussion; this note should be circulated to the members of the mission before the preparatory meeting and the members of the mission at the preparatory meeting should reach conclusions concerning the exact dates of the mission, the countries to be visited and the terms of reference. Following the preparatory meeting, a note of the conclusions of the meeting should be circulated to the members of the Bureau, so that if any Bureau member found any of the conclusions unacceptable, a meeting of the Bureau could be convened to discuss that particular conclusion.

Michael Harish said that, as regards the countries to be visited by the mission, it was important that the first group of countries to be visited should include the four countries principally involved in the conflict, i.e., Israel, Egypt, Jordan and Syria; he wanted the Bureau to take a decision on this question, but provided that these four countries were visited he did not mind what other countries were visited by the mission.

The Bureau agreed to the proposals of Ian Mikardo regarding a preparatory meeting of members of the mission. The Bureau also agreed that Israel, Egypt, Jordan and Syria must be visited by the mission, and must be in the first group of countries to be visited, but left it to the preparatory meeting of members of the mission to decide (subject to final approval by Bureau members as proposed above by Ian Mikardo) which other countries should be visited by the mission. The Bureau reaffirmed its decision of December 9, 1973, that the first country to be visited by the mission should be Israel.

Harry van den Bergh raised the question of publicity concerning the mission and asked whether the mission would give any press conferences or interviews during or after its visit to the Middle East.

The Bureau decided that since the Middle East mission was a mission of the Bureau of the International, the report of the findings of the mission must be made to the Bureau and it would be for the Bureau to decide what should or should not be published. The mission should therefore not give any press conferences or interviews before the report of the mission had been presented to the Bureau.

Hans Janitschek asked what information the secretariat was allowed to publish concerning the mission at this stage. The Bureau agreed that it could be announced at this stage that the Bureau had decided to send a fact-finding mission to the Middle East between mid-February and mid-March which would be led by Bruno Kreisky. The parties which would be participating in the mission could be named, but no names of individuals were to be made public; no other information should be published at this stage.

The question was raised as to whether a member of the staff of the secretariat of the International should accompany the mission to the Middle East and it was agreed that the members of the mission should decide on this question at their preparatory meeting.

Harry van den Bergh drew attention to the fact that sending a party member to the Middle East on the proposed mission posed a difficult financial problem for the Dutch Labour Party. He asked whether the Bureau was prepared to find arrangements to help overcome this problem.

Ian Mikardo pointed out that a representative of the Dutch Labour Party who participated in the mission would also be representing the Belgian and Luxembourg parties, and enquired whether it might not be possible to obtain financial assistance from those two parties.

4. ISRAEL

a) Prisoners-of-war in Syria

Michael Harish renewed his request to member parties, made at the last Bureau meeting, to take some action with regard to Israeli prisoners-of-war in Syria.

It was agreed that the General Secretary should send a further letter to member parties requesting them to contact the Syrian and Soviet embassies in their respective countries with regard to Israeli prisoners-of-war in Syria.

b) Report on General Election

Paavo Lipponen requested Michael Harish to give a report to the Bureau on the Israeli general election held on December 31. This was accepted.

Michael Harish said that with 2000 votes still to come in, the Labour Alignment (Labour Party and MAPAM) had obtained 51 seats in the 120-seat Knesset, a loss of 5 seats. The right-wing Likud had obtained 39 seats, an addition of 7. The Religious Party had obtained 10 seats, a loss of 2 seats; the Communist Party (pro-Moscow) had obtained 4 seats, a gain of 1. The Citizens' Rights Party had obtained 3 seats. The Arab parties had obtained 2 seats and the other Communist Party had retained its 1 seat; the Independent Liberal Party had retained its 4 seats.

The shift to the right should not be seen as straightforward because there were two conflicting issues :

- a) the failure to be prepared for war and
- b) the question of peace in the future.

A good feature of the elections was the high participation - about 80%. He said that there might be problems in trying to form a new government because the Religious Party had moved more to the right. The problem faced by the Labour Party was whether this new parliament would last the full term - four years.

In the local elections held at the same time, he said, Labour had lost Tel Aviv to the Liberals and Independent Liberals. The Labour Party, he said, retained Haifa and forms part of the coalition in Jerusalem. He emphasised that the trend against Labour was not clear-cut. The question remained, he said, of the frictions inside the party and amongst the leadership.

Danny Koren said that there was a polarisation among the young in the Labour Party towards the left. There was a polarisation to the right among the young Likud supporters.

Ian Mikardo said that his impression from a recent visit to Israel was that the basic argument was not between Left and Right, but between doves and hawks.

5. SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL MISSION TO GREECE; MEETING OF GREEK COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Greek Committee of the Socialist International had been held in London on January 5 and had received a report from Antonio Cariglia on the Socialist International mission which had travelled to Greece on December 27, 1973 and of which he had been the leader (this was the second attempt by the mission to visit Greece; a first attempt had been abandoned at Rome airport on December 17 in view of a terrorist attack at the airport on that day); the mission had travelled to Greece, but at Athens airport had been refused entry into Greece by the authorities. The Greek Committee had also watched a film by courtesy of Spyros Mercouris (member of the Central Committee of the Greek resistance organisation 'Democratic Defence') on the student riots of November 1973 in Athens. The Committee had discussed its future programme and had put forward the following suggestions, for possible action, for consideration by the Bureau at its meeting on January 6 :

- a) the Committee recommends an immediate protest by the Bureau on the refusal of the Greek regime to admit the Socialist International mission;
- b) the Committee recommends the Bureau to make the Mission to Washington a high priority;
- c) the Bureau should consider establishing a Greek Solidarity Fund;
- d) the possibility of a Socialist International Conference on Greece should be considered;
- e) a possible meeting of member parties in NATO should be considered;

- f) member parties in the Council of Europe should brief their delegates to the January Assembly in preparation for a debate on Greece;
- g) the Red Cross should be called upon to investigate the re-opening of concentration camps in Greece and be asked to investigate the level of casualties during the November disturbances;
- h) the Committee welcomed the news that the Austrian Socialist Party was considering establishing an information centre in Vienna to monitor international action of the Greek resistance;
- i) the Committee considered the suggestion that the Italian Government be asked to establish a Greek language service to broadcast radio programmes to Greece.

Antonio Cariglia reported on the meeting of the Greek Committee and on the mission to Greece and he said that the mission must go down in history as the shortest mission of the Socialist International. He said that the mission was asked by a member of the Greek political police not to enter Greece and was invited to leave Athens on the plane with which they had arrived. The mission was told that this order had come from the Greek Prime Minister himself. Antonio Cariglia said that the mission had spent from 07.30 hrs on December 27 to 07.40 hrs on December 28 in the transit lounge of the airport. The mission had not accepted the invitation to go back on the plane that had brought them. He said that before going into the proposals submitted to the Bureau by the Greek Committee (see above), he felt he should say that it was necessary for the Bureau to allow the Greek Committee full coordinating functions as far as contacts with the Greek resistance were concerned. He said that bi-lateral talks (i.e. talks between individual parties of the Socialist International and groups inside Greece) were against the interests of the Socialist International. He said that the political situation in Greece was not very hopeful, but a united democratic movement would be in a position to win the support of the people. He said that the Socialist International should take on the leadership of such a movement. Greece was not just a political problem, it was also a problem concerning people. Antonio Cariglia said that the Greek Committee had presented to the Bureau a draft statement in which it protested against the refusal of the Greek authorities to admit the mission. He said that the Greek Committee considered it necessary that the projected mission to Washington should go. He felt that the mission to Washington should be preceded by member parties in NATO countries making representation to governments in NATO countries on this question. He agreed with Karl Czernetz that socialist parties should take a firm stand in the Council of Europe debate (see above).

He said that the Socialist International member parties should take the initiative and give the General Secretary the responsibility to ask member parties to request their governments to take the necessary steps in international organizations of which Greece is a member. The Committee also recommended, he said, that the Italian Government should be asked to establish a Greek radio service, and that the Red Cross be asked to look into the reopening of prisons for political prisoners in Greece. The Committee also recommended that a centre should be set up in Vienna for monitoring the progress of the Greek

resistance movement. Antonio Cariglia also said that he thought that the Greek Committee should establish a permanent secretariat which would have the objective of ensuring united action of Greek democratic forces. This permanent secretariat could perhaps be in Vienna since that was where the proposed information centre would be. He said that from his party's point of view the attitude of the Greek Government was deliberately provocative. Their attitude was one where they were not going to tolerate any hostile public opinion inside Greece. This attitude of the Greek Government could be used in order to mobilise world public opinion in favour of Greek democracy.

Relus ter Beek said that the mission had been composed of four people - Alex Kitson, Antonio Cariglia, Christian Laurisergues (MP, French Socialist Party), and himself. The Bureau had three purposes in mind when it decided to send the mission :

- to draw the attention of world public opinion to Greece and to show that as far as the Socialist International was concerned, it had not forgotten the problems of Greece;
- to give moral support to the democratic resistance movement inside Greece;
- to gather the latest information in order to make preparations for a Socialist International mission to Washington.

Relus ter Beek said that one should not conclude that the mission was a complete failure. The mission, he said, had not been able to get the new information which it had wanted, but because of the refusal of the Greek junta to allow the mission entry, attention had been drawn to the Greek problem and the Greek junta had shown its fascist face. He said that it was remarkable that at the airport no motivation for the refusal of entry had been given. The Greek authorities had simply said that the mission was unwelcome and that it had been a decision taken by the Government and that the decision was definite. As far as international public opinion was concerned this was not a sensible move by the junta. Only last week, he said, the Greek Minister to the Prime Minister's Office, K. Rallis, said that the Greek Government had refused the mission entry because it was interfering with internal affairs in Greece. But, Relus ter Beek said, the junta did not develop the story explaining why the mission had been refused. Therefore, one had to conclude that the junta was hardening its policy and in view of that it was not so surprising that Yaros (concentration camp) had been reopened. What was shown at Athens airport was that members of parliament of government parties in NATO countries were refused entry by the government of another NATO country. He suggested that the last paragraph of the draft statement be drawn out to include this problem. He recommended that the mission to Washington should be on the highest level.

Alex Kitson apologized for not having been able to attend the Greek Committee meeting. He agreed with the recommendations of the Greek Committee. He said that a meeting of member parties in NATO should take place to find out reactions before any representation was made to the US government. A decision would be taken by the British Labour Party as to how it could protest to the British government about the treatment the mission received at Athens airport. He said that the Bureau must act speedily on the recommendations of the Greek Committee.

Gerhard Kleipsties reiterated that Kurt Mattick (member of the Executive of the SPD) was at present in the United States and would be talking to representatives of the US Congress; he suggested that the mission to Washington should not go until Mattick's report had been discussed. He suggested that the last paragraph of the draft statement should go into the minutes, but should be left out of the press release. He did not agree that all contacts with the Greek resistance should be channelled through the Socialist International because in many countries the individual member parties had very successful bi-lateral relations with Greek resistance groups.

Karl Czernetz said that the film shown to the Greek Committee had proved that the resistance in Greece had mass support. He asked the General Secretary to investigate the setting up of an international solidarity fund for Greece together with the ICFTU. The question as to whether the Red Cross was willing and able to investigate the reopening of the concentration camps should be discussed. It was being discussed in Vienna, he said. He suggested that any money from the trade union movement should be used for an information centre in Vienna. He said that a full debate on Greece at the Council of Europe should be organized by socialist parties. With regard to the draft statement on Greece, he suggested that the last paragraph, which was an internal remark, should not be published.

Charalambos Protopapas said that for one year there had been a special agreement between Papadopoulos and the Red Cross. The Democratic Socialist Union of Greece, of which he was the Chairman, was asking for the full cooperation of all forces against the Greek junta, he said.

Alex Kitson said he did not agree that the last paragraph should be left out, but it could perhaps be re-worded.

Gerhard Kleipsties said he did not want the last paragraph to remain.

Relus ter Beek agreed with Alex Kitson that the last paragraph should be re-worded. He said the Bureau must consider the statement which the Bureau had issued in December 1973 in which it called on member parties in NATO to raise the question of Greek fascism in the NATO Council of Ministers' meetings.

Gerhard Kleipsties said that the previous statement had already included the point about raising the Greek question in NATO. He said that the present statement on party action should be withheld until the Bureau was on firmer ground.

Israel Gat said the Bureau should make a decision, but should not issue a press release.

Gerhard Kleipsties said that as the SPD representative was already in the United States, it was better to leave the last paragraph out of the press release.

Relus ter Beek suggested that it might be better simply to reaffirm the text adopted on December 9, 1973 by the Bureau.

Paavo Lipponen said that he was against reaffirming the December statement because Finland was not a member of NATO.

Antonio Cariglia said that the spirit of the last paragraph was to give practicality to the three more general earlier paragraphs. He said that the present statement did not only refer to NATO, but to other organizations, where initiatives could be taken, in which Greece takes part. For example, he said, if Greece tried to make a request to the EEC, the member parties of the Socialist International should make sure that they were there to reject any such request.

Alex Kitson moved to amend the last paragraph of the draft statement by replacing the words 'the Bureau instructs the General Secretary to call on all parties...' by the words 'the Bureau calls on all parties ...'.

Gerhard Kleipsties said that if the last paragraph remained it might indicate to the public that the member parties of the International were not working sufficiently hard to support Greek democracy because the paragraph reminds the parties to raise the question of Greece with their governments and international organizations where Greece is represented. He reminded the Bureau that it was only three weeks since the December 9 resolution of the Bureau was adopted.

Vera Matthias said that the last paragraph should be withdrawn and that a unanimous vote on the resolution should be announced to the press.

A vote on the fourth and last paragraph of the draft statement (amended as proposed by Alex Kitson) on Greece was taken - Great Britain, Netherlands, Israel, Malta, Canada, Chile, the ICSDW, Italy and Austria voted in favour of paragraph four; Finland, Norway, Sweden, Germany and Denmark abstained. The text as a whole was adopted.

The Bureau also approved in principle the proposals for action as submitted to the Bureau from the Greek Committee (see above).

6. SPAIN

i) Situation as regards PSOE

Rodney Balcomb reported on the situation with regard to the International's Spanish member party, the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party (PSOE). He recalled that developments had taken place within the PSOE which had led to a situation in which there were now two organizations, in effect two separate parties, each calling itself the Partido Socialista Obrero Espanol, each claiming to be the legitimate continuation of the historical PSOE and the only legitimate Spanish member organization of the Socialist International, each claiming to represent the majority of PSOE members and each describing the members of the other group as a 'minority of dissidents'; each group had held a Congress in 1972 - one in August 1972 and the other in December 1972 - which each described as the 12th Congress of the PSOE and each Congress had adopted a policy platform and elected an Executive Committee; the Congress held in August 1972 had decided not to elect a general secretary, and it now had a collective leadership consisting of secretaries with different responsibilities, but each with equal authority and status; the Congress held in December 1972 had, however, elected a general secretary, and the

person elected to this position was Rodolfo Llopis, who had been General Secretary of the Party for many years and had been re-elected as General Secretary by the 11th Congress of the PSOE held in August 1970. Each group had members living inside Spain and in exile and the development of this situation could not be attributed simply to either a split between generations, an ideological split or a split between members living in Spain and those living in exile.

Rodney Balcomb further recalled that the Bureau had established, in December 1972, a Special Committee on Spain, the purpose of which was to investigate the situation within the PSOE and to explore what possibilities might exist for promoting reconciliation and cooperation amongst the Spanish socialists. This Special Committee had met three times during 1973, in January, March and August 1973 and had studied a considerable quantity of documentation provided by the two PSOE groups and also by the secretariat of the International. Representatives of the two PSOE groups had attended a part of the first and third meetings of the Special Committee, at the invitation of the Special Committee, and had explained their respective positions and answered questions from the Committee.

In March 1973, the Committee had made certain interim recommendations which had been accepted by the Bureau, and which included recommendations that for the time being, the Bureau should not recognise one PSOE group in preference to the other, but that it was important to choose between one of the two PSOE groups before the Council Conference of the International then planned to take place in November 1973, if the two groups had not in the meantime managed to unite.

One incontrovertible fact, Rodney Balcomb said, was that in April 1972, the Executive Committee of the PSOE, consisting of members from both inside and outside Spain, and including Rodolfo Llopis himself, had voted unanimously to hold the Twelfth Congress of the Party in August 1972. Subsequent to that decision, however, Rodolfo Llopis, supported by a minority of the members of the Executive Committee, had refused to convene the Congress in August 1972. In the face of this refusal, the Congress was convened, in August 1972, by other members of the Executive Committee. Of the total of 16 members of the Executive Committee (9 living inside Spain and 7 living in exile), 10 members (8 from inside Spain and 2 living in exile) had adhered to the decision of the Executive Committee, taken in April 1972, to convene the Congress in August, 1 member (from inside Spain) had taken no part in the dispute, and 5 members (living in exile), including Rodolfo Llopis, had opposed the holding of the Congress in August, had refused to attend the Congress, and had convened the Congress held in December 1972.

The Special Committee had considered fully the whole situation with regard to the PSOE, and in particular the differences which there had been concerning the convening of the Twelfth Congress; it had considered the various reasons advanced by Rodolfo Llopis as to why he had not complied with the unanimous decision of the Executive Committee of the Party taken in April 1972, but had come to the unanimous conclusion, which it had reported to the Bureau on August 29, 1973, that the Twelfth Congress of the PSOE held in Toulouse in August 1972 was a proper, legitimate and legal Congress and that the

Executive Committee elected by that Congress was therefore the legitimate representative of the International's Spanish member party. The Bureau had noted this conclusion and had invited representatives of the two PSOE groups who were then in London in connection with the meeting of the Special Committee which had taken place the previous day, to address the Bureau and answer questions from the Bureau. Because of the lateness of the hour, Rodney Balcomb said, the Bureau had decided to postpone to its next meeting a report by himself on the situation in the Spanish Socialist movement, and its discussion of the conclusions of the Special Committee. The Bureau, because of lack of time, had been unable to consider this question at its meeting on December 9, and had postponed this question until its present meeting on January 6.

After discussion, the Bureau decided that it should postpone no longer a decision on this important matter, and a vote was taken on the conclusions recommended to the Bureau by the Special Committee on Spain on August 29. The Bureau voted on the following text :

'The Twelfth Congress of the PSOE held in Toulouse in August 1972 was a proper, legitimate and legal Congress, and the Executive Committee elected by that Congress is therefore the legitimate representative of the Socialist International's Spanish member party'.

The following parties voted in favour of the above text : Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Great Britain, Israel, Malta, Netherlands, Norway and Sweden. There were no opposing votes, and Austria and Italy (Social Democratic Party) abstained. The representative of the Belgian Party, Victor Larock, abstained from voting, as he was at that time acting as Chairman of the meeting.

ii) Membership application from PSI

The Bureau had before it the text of a letter from the Partido Socialista en el Interior (PSI) of Spain which contained a request for observer membership of the Socialist International. Rodney Balcomb explained that the PSI was an organization which had had informal contacts with the Socialist International for a number of years. The PSI had applied for observer membership in the spring of 1972, but, following consultation with the PSOE, the Bureau had not accepted this application. In June 1973, Rodolfo Llopis and a leading member of the PSI had visited the secretariat of the International to inform the International officially of a decision of principle which had been taken by their respective executive committees to the effect that the PSI would merge with the organization of which Rodolfo Llopis was General Secretary and would cease to be an independent and autonomous organization. At the beginning of December 1973, however, the secretariat had been informed by the PSI that the local organizations of the PSI had not endorsed the decision of principle taken by the Executive Committee of the PSI, and that the proposed merger of the PSI with the organization of which Rodolfo Llopis was General Secretary, had been broken off and would not now take place. After discussion, the Bureau decided to postpone until its next meeting consideration of the application from the PSI.

iii) Establishment of Spain Committee

It was proposed that a Spain Committee of the Socialist International should be established. The Bureau decided to postpone until its next meeting consideration of this proposal.

7. SITUATION IN BRITAIN

At the request of the Bureau, Tom McNally reported on the current economic and social situation in Britain. He said that the industrial conflict between the National Union of Mine Workers and the British Conservative Government had been created by the British government for electoral reasons, and that it was not true that there was no solution possible to the dispute; neither was it true, he said, that trade unions in Britain were communist-dominated. If ordinary British working people were to be called upon to make economic sacrifices, then this must be as part of a broader 'social package' of policies which would create greater social justice in Britain.

8. MEMBERSHIP OF SOCIALIST GROUP OF EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

At the meeting of the Bureau on December 9, 1973, the British Labour Party had raised the question of the admittance of the British member of parliament Dick Taverne to the Socialist Group of the European Parliament. The Bureau had agreed to the proposals of Relus ter Beek that the Dutch Labour Party should write in this connection to other parties represented in the Socialist Group of the European Parliament, and that this question should be put on the agenda of the next meeting of the Bureau. Accordingly the item 'Membership of the Socialist Group of the European Parliament' had been adopted as part of the agenda of the present Bureau meeting, but Gerhard Kleipsties now conveyed to the Bureau a request from Hans-Eberhard Dingels (the International Secretary of the German Social Democratic Party, who was absent because of illness) that the Bureau should discuss this question only when he (H.-E. Dingels) was present. In view of this request, the Bureau agreed to postpone discussion of this question.

9. SITUATION IN GUINEA-BISSAU

Relus ter Beek presented to the Bureau two documents : one was a report of a visit which he had paid to Guinea-Bissau in October 1973, and the other was a document produced by the Angola Comite of the Netherlands which argued in favour of recognition of Guinea-Bissau as an independent State by the Dutch government and which contained the opinions of three leading Dutch experts on international law to the effect that international law did not necessarily pose any obstacles to such recognition of Guinea-Bissau. He said that his party had stated in the Dutch parliament that in principle they believed that Guinea-Bissau should be recognised, but that the Dutch government should try to do this in agreement with other European governments. He proposed that this question should be discussed at the next meeting of the Bureau, and that member parties, particularly those in government, should let the Bureau know their views on the question of recognition and its implementation on a joint European basis. The Bureau agreed to these proposals of Relus ter Beek.

10. PUBLICATION OF REPORT OF MISSION TO CHILE

The meeting had before it a request from the Editorial Committee of 'Socialist Affairs' that the Bureau should give consideration to a proposal for the publication in full of the Report of the Socialist International Mission to Chile (Circular No.M17/73) for inclusion in the January/February issue of 'Socialist Affairs'. The Bureau agreed that the report could be published, and left it to the Editorial Committee to decide in exactly what way it should be published.

11. TASK FORCE ON MULTINATIONAL COMPANIES

As stated above, the Bureau agreed to postpone to its next meeting the question of a 'Task Force' on Multinational Companies. It was decided, that this should be the first item on the agenda of the next meeting, and that the Circular No.B35/73, which had been circulated in November 1973, and which contained proposals from the Socialist International Research Council, should serve as a basis for discussion. It was decided to ask the Finance and General Purposes Committee to discuss in the meantime, and as a high priority, the financial aspects of the establishment of a 'Task Force' on Multinational Companies. It was further decided to invite Otto Kersten, General Secretary of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (The Working Party of the ICFTU and the International Trade Secretariats on Multi-national Companies proposed in Tokyo, in October 1973, that a joint body of the ICFTU and the Socialist International should be established in connection with the question of multinational companies), Sicco Mansholt, a member of the United Nations' Group of Twenty' on multi-national Companies, and Charles Levinson, Secretary General of the International Federation of Chemical and General Workers' Unions to attend the next meeting of the Bureau so that they could participate in the discussion on this subject. Victor Larock also pointed out that the member of the Commission of the EEC who had responsibility for questions relating to multinational companies was the Belgian Socialist Henri Simonet.

12. NEXT MEETING OF FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

It was decided that the next meeting of the Finance and General Purposes Committee should be held at the end of February/beginning of March, and that the secretariat should consult with the members of the Committee in order to establish the most convenient date.

13. TIMETABLE FOR BUREAU MEETINGS IN 1974

The General Secretary had proposed that the meeting should draw up a tentative timetable for Bureau meetings in 1974. However, in view of the absence due to illness of the Chairman, Dr Bruno Pittermann, it was decided not to draw up such a timetable at that meeting.

14. NEXT BUREAU MEETING

It was decided that the next meeting of the Bureau should be a two-day meeting and that it should be held at the beginning of March; the secretariat was instructed to consult with members of the Bureau to establish the most suitable dates for the meeting.

15. NEXT MEETING OF MIDDLE EAST STUDY GROUP

The Bureau reaffirmed its decision taken at its meeting on December 9, 1973, that the next meeting of the Study Group should be a two-day meeting. It also reaffirmed its agreement that, on the first day of the meeting, the report of the Socialist International's mission to Egypt should be discussed, and only the members of the Study Group should be invited to attend; the Arab Socialist Union of Egypt should be invited to send a delegation to attend the second day of the meeting. The Bureau agreed to a request from Robert Pontillon that the next meeting of the Study Group should be held immediately before the next meeting of the Bureau.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

- Austria : Karl Czernetz (International Secretary, Austrian Socialist Party)
- Belgium : Victor Larock (Member of the Executive Committee, Belgian Socialist Party)
- Britain : Ian Mikardo (Member of the National Executive Committee, British Labour Party)
Alex Kitson (Member of the National Executive Committee, British Labour Party and Executive Officer of Transport and General Workers' Union)
- Canada : Anne Clare Park (London Representative, New Democratic Party)
- Chile : Carlos Parra (International Secretary, Radical Party of Chile)
- Denmark : Ejner Hovgaard-Christiansen (General Secretary, Danish Social Democratic Party)
- Finland : Paavo Lipponen (International Secretary, Finnish Social Democratic Party)
- Germany : Gerhard Kleipsties (Assistant Intern. Secretary of the German Social Democratic Party)
- Israel : Michael Harish (International Secretary, Israel Labour Party)
Israel Gat (European representative, Israel Labour Party)
Danny Koren (Assistant)
- Italy PSDI : Antonio Cariglia (President of Parliamentary Group of Social Democratic Party)
Giampiero Rolandi (London representative, Italian Social Democratic Party)
- Malta : Francis Cassar (London representative, Maltese Labour Party)
- Netherlands : Relus ter Beek (International Secretary, Dutch Party of Labour)
Harry van den Bergh (Assistant International Secretary)
- Norway : Bjørn Tore Godal
- Sweden : Bernt Carlsson (Intrnational Secretary, Swedish Social Democratic Party)
- ICSDW : Vera Matthias (Secretary)
- S.I. : Hans Janitschek (General Secretary)
Rodney Balcomb (Assistant General Secretary)
Caroline Soper (Editorial Assistant)
- Guest : Charalambos Protopapas (Chairman, Democratic Socialist Union of Greece.)

DRAFT STATEMENT ON GREECE

'The Bureau of the Socialist International strongly condemns the refusal of the Greek military junta to accept the fact-finding mission of the Socialist International expelled from Greece on December 27, 1973.

'Under its new military rulers Greece has experienced an intensification of the oppression practised by the late and unlamented Papadopoulos regime - concentration camps are once more filled with Greek democrats, censorship has intensified and basic human rights are denied.

'The refusal of the regime to permit the entry of freely-elected representatives of European democratic socialism is a clear indication of the nature of the regime and of the need of the Socialist International and its member parties to continue to give all possible aid to Greek democrats and to work for the end of military rule and the restoration of democracy in Greece.

'The Bureau instructs the General Secretary to call on all parties to raise this matter with their governments and the international organizations where Greece is represented.
