problem which has yet to be resolved. It is the basic question of whether a socialist youth international should be entirely independent of the socialist parties and Socialist International or should it have some form of association, and if so, what.

These concepts, of course, go beyond mere organisation. And it is here that the author is open to criticism. For whilst recognising the dynamism of this period he fails to explain the activities and actions of the socialist youth internationals in terms of ideology and political expediency, although clearly both factors must have had significant influences at any one time. Instead Mr. Luza has analysed events with brief organisational and functional explanations.

From this singular approach, for example, the author manages to dismiss the early estrangement of the SYM from that of the Communist Youth International on the simple grounds that Lenin wanted central control at a time when the SYM was seeking an independent role for itself. His analysis further forces him to over-emphasize the effect of the leading personalities at the expense of the ideological base for the movement.

The author concludes with the development of the movement in its current form (IUSY) up to 1966. Now in 1971 the organisation has recently experienced traumatic problems which it is hoped will be solved by the convening of a special congress. Whatever the outcome of this congress he shows that the need for an international socialist youth organisation is vital; because such an organisation freed as it is from hide-bound tradition can respond more quickly to the changes which result from living in a dynamic society, viz. the movement's reaction to fascism in the thirties and colonialism in the fifties.

The two major problems facing the international socialist youth movement of today are clearly those which have plagued it throughout its history. Firstly, how to resolve its relationship with established socialist parties and the Socialist International while retaining its independence. Secondly, and possibly more important, can the European experience of socialism be applied on a universal basis (i.e. the Third World or the US). If an understanding of the past will help to clarify these problems then the author will have more than justified the publication of his book.

Neil Vann

APRIL 1971

BUREAU MEETING

Council Conference Agenda Agreed

The Bureau of the Socialist International concentrated on arrangements for the forthcoming (25-27 May) Council Conference at its meeting in Zurich on 22 March, held at the invitation of the Swiss Social Democratic Party. After detailed discussion of the agenda, it was decided to arrange the debates under three headings, with introductory speakers, as follows:-

1. International Situation.
   Introductory speakers: Harold Wilson (Britain), Golda Meir (Israel), Torsten Nilsson (Sweden), Carlos Morales (Chile).

   Introductory speakers: Willy Brandt (Germany), Denis Healey (Britain), Bruno Kreisky (Austria), Vaino Leskimen (Finland), Trygve Bratteli (Norway), Andre Cools (Belgium), Jens-Otto Krag (Denmark), Alva Myrdal (Sweden).

   Introductory speakers: Olof Palme (Sweden), Jan Tinbergen (Netherlands), Andre Resampa (Madagascar), Harm Buiter (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions).

The Bureau also discussed matters relating to Greece and Luxembourg, and concluded on an optimistic note with a decision to send greetings to the new Norwegian Labour Government.

Council Conference was discussed, and the Bureau decided that the Socialist International would invite representatives of member parties only.

The Bureau also decided that the whole question of visitors, observers and speakers at Council Conferences and Congresses of the Socialist International would be referred to the Congress in 1972.

Karl Czernetz, on behalf of the Austrian Socialist Party, extended an invitation to the Bureau to hold the 1972 Congress of the Socialist International in Vienna towards the end of May next year, which was accepted.

The Bureau dealt with other matters of immediate concern. Lucien Radoux, Chairman of the Liaison Bureau of Socialist Parties of the EEC, announced that it was planned to hold the proposed Congress of the EEC Socialist Parties, in Brussels in June. Invitations would be extended not only to EEC parties but also to the parties in countries applying for membership of the EEC and to the Austrian Socialist Party. The Bureau agreed with this proposal, and also decided that the proposed conference of parties in countries belonging to EFTA and the EEC would take place in Denmark during the late summer or early autumn of this year. Because of impending general elections in Denmark at this time, the Bureau was unable to fix precise dates, but these will be arranged by the Secretariat in consultation with participants.

Lucien Radoux, as Rapporteur of the Study Group on European Security, reported to the Bureau that the group had arrived at an agreed text, with the exception of a single point. This, however, would be referred to the first meeting of the Resolutions Committee of the Council Conference.

The Bureau also dealt with longer-term matters. It discussed the proposal, agreed to by the January meeting of the Bureau, for conferences between experts who were members of parties belonging to the Socialist International. The discussion centred on matters relating to Greece and Luxembourg, and concluded on an optimistic note with a decision to send greetings to the new Norwegian Labour Government and to the Prime Minister of India, after her party's decisive election victory.

The message to Indira Gandhi was worded as follows:-

'The Bureau of the Socialist Inter-
national, on behalf of all democratic socialist parties throughout the world, extends its heartiest congratulations on your total victory in the recent general elections in India. The Indian electors, by giving their overwhelming support to you and your policies and programme, have demonstrated beyond any doubt that the only path acceptable to them is that of democratic socialism. The International sends its best wishes to you and is willing to give its whole-hearted support for all your efforts to build a new India. We hope your party will develop fraternal relations with other democratic socialist parties of the world for cooperation and exchange of ideas.

REPORTS

ISRAEL

Labour Party Conference Displays Unity and Strength

Almost three thousand delegates attended (rather than participated in) the first meeting of the first elected Conference of the re-united Israel Labour Party, held in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv on 4-6 April.

In effect, the tasks of the Conference were mainly organisational in character. It had to elect a Central Committee of 501 (Conference enlarged the number to 601) which generally acts for the Conference in between sessions, and to approve, amend or reject the draft Constitution—which it approved. Its additional task was to show confidence in the policy which had been conducted by the party representatives in the Government and the Knesset (Parliament) in matters pertaining to security and foreign affairs. This vote of confidence was very evident.

The Conference of the Israel Labour Party is the highest governing body of the party, being elected once every four years. It may be called into session at any time during that period to deal with departures from policy or any other matter that a relevant forum of members considers worthwhile. It may delegate its responsibilities to the ‘conference in miniature’ that is the Central Committee, which meets at frequent intervals.

As it was not considered feasible to have a useful debate from the floor of the Conference, which housed one delegate per hundred party members, much of the ‘in-fighting’ was done at the meetings of the preparatory committee at frequent intervals.

Israel Labour Party Conference opening in Jerusalem. Left to right: Pinhas Sapir, Bruno Pittermann, Golda Meir, President Shazar, Arie Eliav and David Ben-Gurion.
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One of the highlights of the Conference Agenda was to have been an address delivered by former Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion. Unfortunately illness prevented this event although his appearance on the platform, at the opening of the Conference, seated between the party Secretary-General, who presided, and the Knesset Speaker, who presided over the Conference at which Ben-Gurion broke away from the Israel Labour Party in 1965, was as much as anything else a symbol of the unity of the party such as it has not enjoyed for many years.

Indeed, this was a conference of unity. This does not mean that the Israel Labour Party is a monolithic structure where the word of the leader is passed through the hierarchy down to the lowest rank and file. There are important differences of approach, not only in questions of security and foreign affairs, but also on matters more connected with the internal life of a normal people in a normal society. The Conference could not allocate, at its first session, sufficient time for adequate discussion on the social problems which the Israel Labour Party is committed to solve in the light of a socialist philosophy. However, these differences of approach are not divided into sections or factions comprising former members of Rafi or Ahdut Haavoda or Mapai. There may be some who will yet try to gather support for their ideas from erstwhile comrades of this former framework or that; but the process of unity has gone too far for that to be of any significance.