

**SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL**

Maritime House  
Old Town  
Clapham  
London SW4 0JW  
United Kingdom

Telephone (44 71) 627 4449  
Telex 261735 SISEC G  
Telefax (44 71) 720 4448  
(44 71) 498 1293  
Cables INTESOCON  
LONDON SW4



**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING OF THE  
SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL**

Tokyo, Japan, 10-11 May 1994

**MINUTES OF THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL MEETING**  
**Tokyo, Japan, 10-11 May 1994**

The meeting was opened by SI President **Pierre Mauroy** who greeted the presidents of the two Japanese member parties, Tomiichi Murayama of the SDPJ, and Keigo Ouchi of the JDSP. He said the Socialist International was honoured by the presence of these two men who had taken a very active part in Japanese political life. The SI was very grateful for their joint invitation to hold its first Council meeting here in Japan where it had received the best possible welcome.

**Tomiichi Murayama** (Japan, SDPJ) warmly welcomed delegates and friends from around the world. He said that now the Cold War was over we were in a period of transition confronting many tasks: the creation of world-wide peace; environmental protection; human rights protection; the conquest of hunger and poverty; and the removal of the economic gap. At this time, the leadership role of the SI and its 111 members, advocating their basic principles of freedom, fairness and international solidarity, was especially important.

His own party, he said, was pursuing coexistence and development amid diversity. Now that there was peace in Cambodia, attention in Asia was being focused on clarification of the nuclear suspicion about the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the SDPJ was requesting inspections by the International Atomic Energy Authority and demanding denuclearisation of the Korean Peninsula. To this end they were advocating energetic dialogue, including US-North Korean talks, rather than any hasty imposition of sanctions.

The SDPJ was proud that Japan, with its peace-pursuing Constitution, had maintained the triple non-nuclear principle. There had therefore been no made-in-Japan weapons used in any regional dispute since the end of World War II. Social democrats, he said, should not be among those who preached peace on the one hand and yet exported weapons to beef up the war industry on the other. With the steady rise in world population, social progress and economic prosperity were essential for mankind to keep living healthily in the 21st century.

He saw it as the duty of this Council meeting to consider what joint international actions could be launched in order to serve that end. He hoped it would make clear the principles of peace and disarmament, transparency of military budgets, and the promotion of a system of international registration of arms transfers based on dialogue and trust.

Murayama explained the reason for the SDPJ having seceded from the previous coalition government and said that popular support for social democratic and liberal forces was growing strong in Japan, refusing to allow a revival of a power-oriented political force. He was confident that his party would soon return to the reins of government.

He concluded his welcoming address with good wishes for enthusiastic and fruitful discussions.

**Keigo Ouchi** (Japan, DSP) said his Democratic Socialist Party had been actively promoting the spirit of social justice, enhancement of living standards, liberty and world peace embodied in the SI's Frankfurt Declaration. Along with the Ostpolitik promoted by former SI President Willy Brandt and others, this spirit had contributed to the fall of communism and the ending of the Cold War.

He mentioned the SI's support for the United Nations and its peace-keeping activities and said he personally wanted Japan to participate also in these.

During this period of uncertainty in Asia and the Pacific, with the suspicion of nuclear arms development in North Korea, and the arms build-up and human rights issues in China, this Council meeting in Asia was both timely and significant.

Thirty-eight years of one-party rule having come to an end, his party was now a responsible member of the coalition government, he himself being Minister of Health and Welfare. They now had some possibility of realising their party objectives and constructing a welfare state. They were also continuing to advocate the strengthening of the UN and its peace-keeping activities. His party, he said, was doing its best to follow the example of Willy Brandt and the SPD's grand coalition with the CDU and the CSU.

He mentioned the many unresolved problems facing the world, and quoted the Japanese writer Kawabata as saying that the essence of being Japanese was the desire to share the enjoyment of nature's beauty with those one loved, and this was also the concept associated with coexistence and cooperation. Ouchi invited all the participants, in their belief in freedom, justice and friendship and their desire for peace, stability and progress, to strengthen their solidarity and mutual cooperation and work together for a better future. This Tokyo Council meeting, he concluded, was an opportunity to show the world how the SI could contribute to global peace.

**Pierre Mauroy** said the many reasons for choosing Tokyo for this Council meeting had included Japan's distinguished economic position, its increasingly important political position on the world stage, and the part played by our Japanese member parties in bringing about the first change of government in 50 years. Meeting here in Tokyo symbolised a further growth in the universality of the SI.

We were here, he continued, because we believed that the social democratic model was not just for Europe. It had successfully taken root in other continents and could offer the many Asian powers that were gradually becoming democracies a social and political perspective corresponding to a high degree of development. These countries realised that democracy actually represented an essential dimension of economic dynamism. With the majority of the world population now concentrated in Asia, an area where the Socialist International enjoyed strong support, we understood the major challenge that this represented to our ideas.

Mauroy paid tribute to a number of distinguished comrades who had died since the last Council meeting and expressed condolences to their parties, their countries and their friends.

The president said this Council meeting, as well as dealing with Asian issues, would also look generally at peace and security. He mentioned the 'Gaza-Jericho' peace accord and said he was confident that this momentum was irreversible because of the courage and determination of those involved. The SI, he continued, which in the past had acted as an effective bridge between those who were still fighting, must now mobilise the international community in favour of that region and of the new authority in Jericho in particular.

Since the collapse of the Berlin wall, and the hopes and freedoms that had signified, we had entered also an era of sudden and murderous local conflicts, of which the former Yugoslavia was perhaps the most cruel. Having always believed in negotiation, he thought the Owen and Stoltenberg mission had been useful and that a real peace conference was the only way to bring the conflict to an end. He said he intended to resume his preparations for a trip to Sarajevo and Tuzla which had been interrupted by the Gorazde crisis.

He then spoke of the criticisms levelled at the United Nations, and said we should not forget that the organisation's role was to prevent crises, and that whenever it had to resort to arms it had to rely on committed states or regional alliances. The UN suffered mainly from the absence of a new world order. In future the United States would not want to be party to regional conflicts, as could already be seen. The involvement of Russia, also, was extremely important, he said.

These observations, he continued, reinforced the urgency and relevance of our debate on security. He was convinced that the enlargement of the European Union by four new members with strong social-democratic traditions was a positive point for peace and an opportunity for increasing our influence.

He said the debate on the UN was the central issue of collective security. The SI had sent a mission to the UN headquarters and everything was falling into place for us to present firm resolutions, in particular with regard to the composition and operation of the Security Council which, like any institution, must evolve to reflect new realities.

Collective security, he continued, was also directly influenced by the economic situation and the deflationary crisis affecting the world today. Social democrats were determined to counteract the burden brought about by this crisis of liberalism. The key issue was sustainable economic growth, and the proposals the SI would table next year should be aimed at an overall economic recovery worldwide on the lines of what had been done in Japan, what was being done in the USA, and what Jacques Delors was promoting in Europe.

Mauroy welcomed the signing of the Gatt agreement and the creation of the World Trade Organisation as the only answer to the rich countries' attempts at withdrawal. He saw tremendous potential for growth resulting from the enlargement of the market to five billion people, provided we social democrats, along with the ILO and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, kept up our traditional struggle to guarantee the rights of workers.

The year 1995 would see the 50th anniversary of the most influential international institutions, he said. Ingvar Carlsson was in charge of drawing up a report on the UN, and John Smith had put forward some interesting proposals concerning the World Bank and the IMF, so this work could form the basis to debate the institutional and political future of the international community at next year's Council meeting. This would be one cornerstone in the SI's efforts towards the construction of peace.

Another, he said, must be to strengthen the major freedom movement that was developing, and he gave assurance of the SI's continuing support and attention to Nelson Mandela and the ANC of South Africa.

Speaking of the expansion of human rights, and optimism concerning the democratic process in eastern Europe, he particularly welcomed the Hungarian Socialist Party's good results in the first round of elections.

He mentioned the strengthening of the democratic process in Latin America and his recent visits to that continent. He said that democracy was a battle that had to be constantly renewed, as could be seen with the victory of the populist coalition and the extreme right in Italy despite the perfectly honourable performance of the left-wing alliance created by the Democratic Party of the Left, PDS, and the Socialist Party, PSI.

He saw the rise of Islamic fundamentalism, especially in Algeria, as a major threat to freedom and especially to women's rights, and said we must do everything possible to support the awakening of a civil society in those countries, and to protect the people who refused to accept the totalitarian diktat which lurked beneath the various forms of religious fundamentalism.

He said he could not come to Japan without mentioning China, which had five million political prisoners, a non-existent rule of law, scant freedom of communication, infringement of union freedom and escalating social inequalities. Beyond the issue of minorities, Chinese nationalism was raising increasingly worrying issues, including the intensification of nuclear tests, arms sales, and an expansionist attitude in the South China Sea. But we could not blacklist China: already overtures had been made in the 1970s, and we must repeat the combination of willingness for dialogue and the need to be firm, that had achieved so much with the USSR.

Mauroy said the SI's internal life had been involved in a two-pronged dynamic of enlargement since the Berlin Congress. Firstly there was the unprecedented number of applications for membership, coming not only from the progressive parties of the old communist bloc, but also from other new democracies, and even some traditional democracies. It might not be possible yet to recreate the unity of the Left at world level, he said, but nor could we proceed as we had when democracy had been the exception. Congress would have to make those decisions according to the SI's rules.

Secondly there was the enlargement of political ideas. Today's politics extended to economics, and to all sorts of issues inherent in society and in which the SI was rich in experience. In this context he said he was having regular informal talks with experts from SI parties and foundations. They had started work on the evaluation of the future of social protection, and would next tackle the issue of media influence on the structuring of political life. They wanted to cover as much fertile ground as possible so as not to allow the liberals to seize the initiative in putting forward ideas in major international arenas. Then there was the socialist mayor's conference which would take place in Bologna and allow mayors of major cities to share their experience and give their own accounts of their work. This meeting would also pave the way for the Socialist International to participate in the UN's Habitat conference during 1996.

Mauroy said he thought it was essential for political leaders to be able to comment on issues such as drugs, AIDS, or the despair associated with poverty which might previously have been considered beyond the realm of politics, because they in the end would have to find the answers to these problems. The SI must multiply its initiatives in order to combine this direct dialogue with world public opinion. Indeed our universality was not an end in itself, but gave us a particular dimension allowing us to go beyond the

diversity of states, peoples and civilisations, and to have the full force of our values heard.

In closing he said that the Socialist International must identify with Camus's "First Man", who was weak in that he had to invent and build his own model, but strong in that he held the keys to his own future.

**Makato Tanabe** (SI Vice-President, Japan SDPJ) having welcomed participants on behalf of both Japanese parties and their supporters, said that the world was now moving towards globalism. A new order of cooperation was being sought, and for the first time a path was opening up towards a single market common to the whole world. In this context, he said, the current development of three regional spheres achieving integration and also expansion in Europe, North America and East Asia, was of positive significance. He expressed optimism about the vitality and stable growth of the world economy as a whole.

He said a wide-ranging network had been formed centering around the 17 nations of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation conference. OECD data showed that Asia-Pacific countries accounted for approximately half of the world's production activities. Japan, with 15% of the world GNP, had been trying to contribute to the progress of the world economy and the Asia-Pacific region, but he thought his country should reflect on three particular points: Japan's policies had inclined towards national interests and protectionism; her external policy had been largely concerned with the United States; and her efforts to adapt to the new tide of globalism and regionalism appeared to have been too slow.

The social democrats of Japan, he continued, were determined to change the policy concepts that had dominated the long Liberal Democrat rule and to carry out governmental, administrative and economic reforms. They wanted to establish a free and open relationship with the people of other countries, mutual supporting each other in an order of unshakable peace.

From that understanding, he wished to express his views on some of the themes to be discussed at this meeting.

The Asia-Pacific region being very vast, there was extreme inequality, even in East Asia alone, as there was in the Americas, whereas equalisation was comparatively advanced in Europe. To quicken and expand progress, he said, further cooperation by Japan, the United States and other advanced countries was indispensable and the priority usually given to big economic projects should be redirected towards those affecting people's livelihood and welfare.

Problems of the environment were becoming increasingly serious, he said. The advanced countries must generously offer their technology and assistance to ease the strains and contribute to sustainable development, not by self-righteous imposition but through collaboration for the sake of mutual interests and the next generation.

The development of the Asia-Pacific region had so far been supported mainly by cooperation between the USA and Japan, Tanabe continued. There was now a shift towards a global system as demonstrated by the World Trade Organisation, and he thought Japan should maintain its good relations with the US while recognising the remarkable rise of China and the newly industrialising countries, and prepare a new concept of international relations that would clarify regional positions.

With the moves towards a single world market a new era was beginning. Social democrats, he said, did not simply assert that the market was everything. The coalition government in Japan, for instance, had come out with a deregulation policy favouring, among other things, free economic exchanges.

Although there were no conflicts raging in the region, there were threats of potential disputes in the Korean peninsula. His party believed that such problems should be resolved step by step through persistent dialogue, not by power-oriented logic, because globalism never denied respect for regional, racial or cultural identity.

Finally, he said, it must be made clear that peoples of the advanced countries should shoulder certain burdens and restraints so that all members of mankind could live together. In Japan it was painful to accept the liberalisation of rice and other farm products, but a national consensus was developing on the need to preserve the ecological

system, prepare for an aging society, and actively promote international cooperation. The principles of freedom, fairness and solidarity, he said, were the principles of all peoples, and he urged that we make these the very principles of human society in order to open the door to a promising 21st century.

**Gro Harlem Brundtland** (First SI Vice-President, Norwegian Labour Party) gave some figures to illustrate the increasing importance of Asia in the world economy and international relations, and said it was thus even more important that the Socialist International was meeting in Tokyo to reconfirm and reinforce the global commitment of the social democratic movement to freedom, justice and solidarity. The SI, she said, should play a leading role in convincing Asians of the need for more democracy, more equal opportunity, and the right of all people to take an active part in shaping their own societies and their own future.

The traditions and cultural roots of Asian countries, she continued, were older than those of Europe. Each country must draw on the best of these, but there were certain universal elements of democracy which she said should be respected in every case, in particular the universally recognised human rights, which belonged to the individual, not to the state, and should be the birthright of all human beings.

Social democracy, she said, with its checks and balances, its respect for the views of the opposition, its accountability, transparency and popular participation, offered the only workable framework for positive and sustainable change. Economic growth would not automatically lead to increased stability and greater social welfare but must be accompanied by economic and political change; in fact democracy was both a product and an instrument of economic and social development.

The experience of the "Asian Tigers" illustrated the need for an active interventionist state within the framework of a market-friendly approach to economic development. Recent studies showed that countries with governments that emphasised income distribution maintained high growth rates for decades and encouraged macro-economic stability and high investment in human capital. As proponents of active government, Brundtland said, we had a special responsibility to promote good governance which must aim to diffuse both political and economic power to all levels of society.

Political decisions, she continued, were needed to promote a more equal distribution of the benefits of growth and to prevent unacceptable disparities between a rich minority and a majority living in poverty. The market alone had not brought widespread prosperity and democracy to Europe. Scandinavian social democracy had succeeded in finding a workable compromise between capital and labour by humanising the market mechanism rather than overthrowing it, by extracting its huge potential for growth and job-creation while protecting crucial areas from its untrammelled impact.

She was convinced that equality could be made a productive force rather than an obstacle to prosperity since a sense of justice created a climate of trust and cooperation, whereas large disparities in wealth and opportunity contributed to violence and fear. Social democratic policy had been built on a pragmatic partnership between economic efficiency and social compassion, with the state's prime function being to guarantee certain minimum standards. The principle of charity in public policy could be replaced by that of solidarity; economic efficiency and modern industrial development could indeed be combined with a public welfare system.

For her party, prosperity signified not only economic growth and material welfare, but also employment for all, social justice and security, environmental quality, and equality between men and women. Free trade unions were an essential feature of a democratic society, she said, forming with employers' federations and governments a triangle of responsibility and cooperation ensuring that the powerful were just and the weak secure.

Prosperity also included the right to take part in shaping society through democratic political processes. Increasingly it meant freedom from fear of the future, and the assurance of leaving the next generation at least the same options that we had had.

Sustainable development, as defined by the World Commission on Environment and Development, was the greatest challenge to mankind's ability to govern, Brundtland continued. It required an inter-generational perspective and solidarity across borders and continents. Having now recognised the limits of natural resources, we must incorporate environmental concerns into our equation when charting a new course for

social and democratic development. The populations of industrialised and rich countries had a special obligation to reduce their ecological impact, she said. With the average North American consuming almost 20 times as much as an Indian or Chinese, and 60-70 times as much as a Bangladeshi, it was plainly impossible for the world as a whole to sustain a western level of consumption for everyone.

She did not believe we had to choose between economic growth and sustaining the environment. Growth was needed to alleviate the poverty which was one of the greatest threats to the environment and to human dignity. Ninety percent of population increase was taking place in developing countries, many of which were unable to feed their present population. Poverty, overpopulation and underdevelopment were all interlinked. Experience proved that investing in women was one of the most cost-effective ways of promoting development and limiting population growth: there was no better insurance policy than funding population and family-planning programmes. It was deplorable that Norway was alone among developed countries in meeting internationally agreed targets for both family planning aid and overall development assistance. Fortunately Japan was making substantial increases in its support and seemed poised to shoulder a greater share of its international responsibilities.

There was indeed such a thing as global responsibility, she concluded. As social democrats we were among the first to realise this, and she considered it our moral obligation to translate this realisation into concrete expressions of commitment.

**The chair** then turned to item 2, the main theme of the agenda: Asia and the Pacific - democracy and economic and social development.

**Hun Sen** (Cambodian People's Party, Second Prime Minister of Cambodia) expressed his party's appreciation of the invitation to the Council meeting and their gratitude to the international community for supporting the cause of peace, national reconciliation, democracy and development in Cambodia.

He reviewed the progress of the peace efforts in his country and said that, thanks to the United Nations, Cambodia had been able to hold elections and thereby establish the basis for peace and favourable conditions for its construction and development. Cambodian political parties were trying to forget the quarrels of the past and to unite for the real building of the new nation. The Cambodian People's Party had cooperated with UN Transitional Authority for Cambodia, UNTAC, and with other parties in order to achieve good progress in the Paris Peace Agreement. In the tense atmosphere following the 1993 elections, he said, his party had taken a highly responsible stance towards the interests of the people. They had firmly maintained the goal of peace and national reconciliation by compromising with the other elected parties, and especially with FUNCINPEC, in supporting the provisional national government of Prince Norodom Sihanouk so as to re-establish social stability and to solve the immediate problems of the country.

The creation of this provisional government of Cambodia had facilitated cooperation among political parties and the transfer of power to the new government, and had allowed the United Nations to end its mission in Cambodia with success and honour. Moreover the resultant stability had enabled the constituent assembly to complete the writing of a new constitution and the formation of a new legitimate government. Cambodia now had independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and was living a policy of peace, friendship and cooperation with other countries.

Several factors, he continued, had contributed to the restoration of peace in Cambodia. In addition to the substantial support of the international community, including Japan, there had been the international collaboration and cooperation with Cambodian parties, and the understanding among parties in the royal government of Prince Sihanouk and in the national assembly to solve the major problems of the nation.

The solution of the Cambodian problem had been an important lesson in that it demonstrated that it had been determined by the attitude of its people, who had learned to unite in order that peace, national rehabilitation and development might prevail. To bring this about in one of the world's poorest countries required huge resources - human, material, technological and financial - and therefore the contribution from the international community was still needed. The Khmer Rouge, despite being signatories to the Paris Peace Agreement, were continuing to actively harm security and social order and thus remained a threat to peace, stability and democracy in Cambodia, but the trend towards peace and cooperation was growing stronger.

The Second International Conference on Reconstruction of Cambodia, he said, gave a clear indication of the international community's determined support for the restoration of peace and national reconstruction in Cambodia. Future cooperation was not only in the interests of the people of Cambodia but would also be a positive contribution to the situation in the region and in the world at large. He was confident of the support of the democratic socialist movement for Cambodia's just cause. South-East Asia was in an unprecedented situation with the ending of the period of confrontation and the emergence of peace and cooperation that would benefit the development of all the countries in the region.

The democratic socialist movement, he said, had always been striving for peace, democracy and human well-being and development; it had particularly helped poor countries to climb out of their misery and internal crisis. The Cambodian People's Party, for its part, would do its best for the cause of peace and reconstruction in Cambodia by strengthening its appropriate role in Cambodian society and by actively contributing, with the international democratic and socialist movement, to building a united and prosperous role in line with the current development stage.

\* \* \*

**Gro Harlem Brundtland** (First SI Vice-President) took over the chair after the lunch break.

**Helen Clark** (New Zealand Labour Party) said the main theme was of particular relevance to her party, situated as it was in the Asia-Pacific region. In the past, the affairs of the Asia-Pacific Basin, where it had sometimes proved difficult to establish or maintain parties with social democratic tendencies, might have appeared somewhat peripheral to the work of the SI, but now the region demanded more attention. Its extraordinary economic dynamism had brought huge returns to investors, but was exacting a heavy price from the workers and the environment, she said. This was where the perspective of the SI's labour and social democratic parties was so relevant, many having been formed to give expression to the political demands of working people. One of her own party's original objectives had been to achieve a fairer distribution of wealth and opportunity throughout society.

Around the Pacific Rim, she continued, were nations in every stage of economic development. With rising labour costs among the OECD members and the so-called Asian Tigers, investment in the more basic areas of manufacturing was moving to cheaper locations such as China, Thailand, and soon Vietnam. The huge increases in GDP in Singapore, Hong Kong and Korea had been reflected in rising living standards for the people, and these were encouraging models for others to follow. But in her own country, the conservative government was trying to make New Zealand more competitive through repressive labour laws and cutting back on social provisions.

Clark said one could not fail to be impressed by what had been achieved here in Japan, where democracy and economic and social development had gone hand in hand, and where a strong commitment to the environment had also brought results. One of the major issues for Asia was the growing number of 'megacities' with populations of five million or more, in which the uneven distribution of wealth often led to poverty and environmental degradation on a large scale.

She believed that the social democratic movement embodied universal values and shared objectives, expressed in different ways. The respect for human rights was a widely shared value, irrespective of culture, and it was not only westerners who found cruel and unusual punishments to be repugnant. Inhumanity was something which social democracy must always combat.

She could not accept that a commitment to free, fair and open elections was peculiarly 'western' either, as shown by recent events in South Africa. She mentioned the debate in Hong Kong where Britain, very late in its colonial rule, was proposing to enhance democratic participation. The issue of maintaining Hong Kong's democratic institutions should be kept under review by the SI in the coming years, she said.

Clark rejected the view that global conflicts between the different civilisations were inevitable. The social democratic movement had successfully bridged the gap between

cultures and traditions and the SI's success in promoting democracy, dialogue and disarmament showed what could be achieved. We must strengthen our contacts with like-minded movements and forces also in Asia and the Pacific. She suggested that such movements should be those hostile to the participation of the military in political life, and strongly supportive of human rights, a free press, free trade unions and a fair distribution of income for all. A commitment to environmental sustainability should be emphasised in the basic creed of social democracy in the future and in this region, she said, where industrial pollution and deforestation were becoming huge issues requiring high priority in development assistance and technology transfer programmes.

It was hardly necessary to point out, she said, that democracy, economic growth and social development required a background of peace and security. There would be fresh recommendations for action by the SI from the Socialist International Peace, Security and Disarmament Council, SIPSAD. She welcomed the proposal for a delegation to North Korea to discuss the nuclear issue and for the reform and strengthening of the United Nations as a promoter of peace and security. She hoped this Council would take the initiative to urge SI member parties to support the referral of the question of the illegality of nuclear weapons to the World Court. Submissions on this important issue had to be made by mid-June and time was running out for putting the other side of the view from that of the nuclear powers.

In concluding, she hoped that this meeting in Tokyo, following on from the important meeting of the Asia-Pacific Committee in Nepal, signalled a renewed determination by the SI to seek linkages with political movements with similar objectives in the Asia Pacific region.

**Win Khet** (Burma, NLD) said 1994 was a very critical year for Burma which was poised between real political change and the consolidation of dictatorship. If the dictatorship succeeded there might be stability for a time but then a greater outbreak of violence would follow affecting not only Burma but also its neighbours and the international community. It was thus important to understand the urgency of the situation and to act now.

He mentioned the 26 years of military misrule in Burma, the nation's uprising and the repressive response, and the replacement of the ruling military party by the more repressive State Law and Order Restoration Council, SLORC. In general elections in 1990, his party had won 82% of the seats and had formed an alliance with the rest of the winners in the election who were ethnically based parties or independents, and yet SLORC continued to rule and the NLD leader, Aung San Suu Kyi, remained under house arrest.

He described the unprecedented cooperation between the NLD and the ethnic nationalist movements to bring about an end to the 45-year civil war and to restore democracy. Resolutions passed in the UN Commission for Human Rights and General Assembly, and measures taken by countries such as Japan and the USA, had pressurised SLORC to begin to change, but SLORC had abandoned Burma's longstanding non-aligned policy and had forged closer links with China, buying Chinese arms and thus causing both India and Bangladesh to appease SLORC. Thailand and Singapore had also been negatively influenced and he feared that Japan was seriously considering renewing ODA assistance in exchange for some token democratic reforms.

The question was, he said, whether the changes in Burma would lead to greater freedom, democracy and peace, or to SLORC legitimising its power, leading eventually to more violence and regional instability. His party had concluded that the changes were cosmetic. SLORC was drafting a constitution to nullify the election results, prevent the NLD leader from taking office, and put the military firmly in control of Burma's future. According to United Nations Development Programme and World Bank sources, the economic reforms would not bring real development, 'private' enterprises were controlled by SLORC, and the gap between rich and poor was widening. Moreover there was no real substance to SLORC's supposedly open attitude to the NLD leader without whose participation there could be no real economic or political change in Burma. Only she could rally both the Burmese and the ethnic people to rebuild the nation in peace.

Those who advocated constructive engagement should be constructive towards the Burmese people, and not towards the military, by acknowledging the Burmese people's right to choose their own government.

He urged friends to help bring real change to Burma by sustaining the pressure, and he called on Japan not to renew development assistance at this time. For 32 years the military had failed to develop Burma, he said, it was time they admitted this and handed over to the winners of the general election. SLORC had no right to continue in power.

**Sheikh Hasina** (Bangladesh, Awami League) said relations between her party and the SI were not only warm and cordial, but also long-standing.

The people of Bangladesh had great respect and admiration for Japan, a country whose achievements in the economic field in the last four decades were nothing short of miraculous. Japan, she continued, had become a global leader in industry, science and technology, and was now regarded as the model for developing countries of the Asia-Pacific region.

Turning to the main theme, she said some Asian nations had made great strides in institutionalising democracy, but in others this was still fragile. Bangladesh had had to fight for her democratic rights until recently, and even today was grappling with such issues as the peaceful transfer of power, free and fair elections, and a democratic, political culture free from conspiracies, assassinations and military coups. Utmost vigilance was needed to guard against pseudo-democrats who sought to deprive the people of their democratic rights. In Bangladesh, she said, the government controlled, either directly or indirectly, television, radio and the press.

Democracy, she continued, could not become an integral part of the nation's culture unless there was a sense of social justice and harmony. To be effective it needed shared growth. It could not be sustained if the vast majority of people lived in abject poverty, and this could only be alleviated by the economy as a whole moving forward and following the principle of shared growth. This could be seen in East and South East Asia, and was what the Awami League planned to achieve.

She outlined the Awami League's new economic policy package and said the welfare of workers was of paramount importance for her party. They were examining the policy options available to stimulate the stagnant economy and believed that skill development had a substantial impact on prospects for hastening economic growth and technological progress.

Bangladesh had unfortunately been unable to keep pace with the rest of Asia, and the three years of Bangladesh Nationalist Party rule had seen economic stagnation, growing poverty and rising unemployment. The common men and women of her country had fought long and hard to end the politics of conspiracy, assassination and coups. Her own father, she said, former President of Bangladesh, had been killed in 1975 and her entire family also gunned down. The killers could not be brought to justice and were in fact being rewarded by the present BNP government who were giving them diplomatic assignments and allowing them to engage in politics. She was nevertheless determined to carry through the struggle and establish the dream of a society free from exploitation and oppression, where the basic needs of the people would be met and all would enjoy civic and democratic rights regardless of caste, creed or social position.

Having herself experience imprisonment, she fully shared the anguish of Aung San Suu Kyi, and she hoped the Council would renew its appeal for the immediate release of this valiant leader.

She rejoiced at the bold steps that had begun the peace process in the Middle East and hoped that the long-suffering people of Palestine would at last achieve a durable peace.

Sheikh Hasina voiced her sympathy for the brave people of Bosnia who had suffered so much at the hands of Serbian aggressors and said she hoped the civilised world would stop the genocide and save this small nation from naked aggression.

She expressed warmest good wishes both for President Mandela and for the people of South Africa who were embarking on a bold venture to build a multi-racial state.

She concluded by wishing the Council meeting every success and hoping that the deliberations would lead to decisions that would have a significant impact on the Asia-Pacific region as a whole.

**Norberto Gonzales** (Philippines, PDSP) said that the Filipinos had lost their freedom twenty-two years previously, when the dictator Marcos was installed, promising social

justice and economic growth. But the promotion of social justice, Gonzales said, was incompatible with dictatorship, and during that period the gap between rich and poor had widened. The country had had the worst possible combination of a neo-liberal development framework, cronyism and massive plundering of the public coffers, and economic policies and practices that had left the economy in a mess that would take decades to correct.

When the dictatorship had been overthrown by peaceful uprising in 1986 the world looked at Filipinos not as illegal migrant workers, but as a great people who had shown the world a peaceful way of toppling dictatorships. But today the country was the only one in its immediate region not experiencing phenomenal economic growth and some people were claiming that the democratic political system was not suited to the imperatives of speedy economic development, that the country should follow its newly-industrialised neighbours rather than embrace western-style democracy.

In the Philippines today, he continued, there was no shortage of good economic managers. What was lacking was a national commitment to both social development and economic growth - the technology for promoting social justice. The dominant political system had so misused democracy, serving only the elite, that social democrats feared that the effective level of growth necessary to achieve total development might now be impossible in that social environment.

His party was determined to win in future elections, and was committed to govern appropriately, but they also wanted to ensure that the ship did not sink before they took over. Their preparations for government included the effort to shape the constituency with which they would establish their political partnership. They had chosen to become the party of the Filipino poor, which meant the vast majority of the labour force, the peasants, fishermen and urban poor, whose political strength could be realised only if they were effectively organised, oriented and motivated to the task of participatory governance.

They had to face the difficult task of reforming the political system, and were advocating a new election code, Gonzales said. They wanted to enshrine a law on political parties as an essential institution of democracy, and responsibility for shaping the nation's political will as an official public concern deserving all the support normally available to public institutions.

The PDSP was pushing for structures to permit the basic sectors to participate in governance, and for laws to ensure the representation of these sectors in local government. Their biggest task was in campaigning to change the political system from a presidential to a parliamentary one, so as to widen the participation of the poor and to encourage ideological parties with authentic policies rather than traditional ones based on patronage and personality.

Like other new democracies, he said, they were sometimes overwhelmed by the problems confronting them in their efforts, but for him at least one of these had now been solved: he needed to explain to the former president Corazon Aquino what social democracy was all about and what good things it could do for their country; the Norwegian prime minister's speech earlier in the meeting had provided him with the solution.

**Radnaasumberel Gonchigdorj** (Mongolia, MSDP) said that his party, since its foundation in 1990, had played a significant role in the process of democratisation in Mongolia, and in overthrowing the totalitarian communist regime. The MSDP had won several seats in the first democratic election in 1990 and had formed part of the coalition government, he himself being Vice-President of Mongolia and chairman of the parliament. In 1993 President P. Ochirbat had won reelection with the support of the opposition democratic coalition which included the MSDP.

The 1992 Constitution guaranteed basic human rights and freedoms and set the goal of a humane civil society in Mongolia. The country had chosen the market economy as the only way to secure her economic development. Thus Mongolia had joined the community of free nations, he said. The transition to democracy, however, could not be free of hardship, and the disintegration of the communist bloc had caused serious difficulties for the economy which was entirely dependent on ties with former communist countries. As other countries in transition had found, there were also difficulties in promoting democracy among people who had been brain-washed by the communist ideology for nearly 70 years.

Former ruling communist parties, he continued, were manipulating and exploiting these difficulties, and had won more than 90 percent of the seats in the last elections, creating serious problems for the promotion of democracy. The minority parties had organised hunger-strikes in protest at the worsening political situation, in which he had taken part. He pointed out the importance of the support of SI member parties for his party's struggle.

Concerning the issue of collective security, Gonchigdorj said Mongolia was eager to look for approaches that affected all the parties. The President had declared Mongolia a nuclear-free zone, and in his party's view, this was a significant action affecting not only Mongolia but also the whole of Asia and the Pacific region. They were confident that this initiative would be supported by the SI Council meeting.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union and the establishment of the new independent states, Central Asia had emerged as a new geographical entity whose nations had a lot in common, including their Altai ethnic origins. All the countries, including Mongolia and Afghanistan, had been under Russian and then Soviet dominance since the beginning of this century. The region was one of the most underdeveloped in the world, with some areas having high social indicators as a result of artificial development efforts. The economies of the countries were having to struggle hard to survive in the market economy system.

The area, he continued, had great potential for development in mineral and natural resources, and stretched for about seven thousand kilometers from the Dardanelles to the Hinggan mountains, covering territories of Turkey, Mongolia, Afghanistan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan and Kyrgyzstan. The majority everywhere except in Mongolia were Sunni Muslims and religion was on the rise having been suppressed by the communist regimes in the past.

The issues of common concern to Central Asia were security issues, geopolitical, economic and geographical interests, issues related to preserving national traditions, and ethnic interests.

In closing he said the MSDP suggested that a meeting on security and development in Central Asia be held in the first half of 1996 in Mongolia under the auspices of the SI, its Asia-Pacific Committee and its Middle East Committee.

**Ahmed Nor** (Malaysia, DAP) commended the SI for holding within a span of three years a Party Leaders' meeting in Sydney, an Asia-Pacific Committee meeting in Kathmandu, and now this Council meeting in Tokyo. He hoped the SI would continue to play a direct and positive role in the region. He apologised for the absence of party leader Lim Kit Siang who that very day had to be in parliament to help defend the country's constitution from dangerous amendments, being sought by the ruling party, that would further endanger democracy and human rights in Malaysia.

He reiterated what had been made clear at the Kathmandu meeting, that whereas numerous countries in the region were still rejecting democracy and human rights as western concepts that threatened national stability, his party clearly stated that human rights threatened only the stability of undemocratic governments. Asian countries prided themselves on their region being the most economically dynamic region in the world, and saw human rights as inimical to economic growth. In the Asian region some people were indeed becoming very rich, but many millions were becoming poorer. Rapid economic growth in Asia had been possible only upon the backs of Asian workers and through their sweat and tears. They had been exploited by their own governments and by multinational companies from developed countries seeking cheap labour, and often acting in concert to ensure that any workers' movements remained weak and disorganised. The Socialist International, he continued, with its long experience in labour support, could certainly play a very positive role in helping to restore workers' rights that had been lost and trampled on in many places.

He referred to the initiatives started at the SI meeting in Kathmandu to promote democracy and human rights - the bedrock of democratic socialism - and to refute the claims of those who were opposed to the universality of those rights. He called upon the SI to play a more assertive role in promoting not just the ideals but also the practice of democracy and human rights in the Asia-Pacific region.

In addition to expressing its concern about conditions in Burma, he proposed that the SI, through its Asia-Pacific Committee, now mount a concerted campaign to demand the

immediate restoration of democracy and human rights in that country, and the release of Aung San Suu Kyi. Burma, he continued, must not be allowed to become another East Timor, where the lack of positive international response to Indonesia's aggression was allowing the situation to become legitimised. The present position of the so-called "constructive engagement" by Asian governments on the Burma problem was totally unacceptable to his party. The DAP also noted with deep regret that the Burmese military junta was being invited to the ASEAN foreign ministers meeting in Bangkok in July.

He called on the SI Asia-Pacific Committee to adopt the Burmese problem as one of its first tasks and challenges, and to this end, to organise as soon as possible a major conference in an Asian location, focusing solely on the rape of democracy in Burma so as to clearly demonstrate to the ruling SLORC that what was taking place in Burma was wholly unacceptable to the civilised world.

**Yuzuru Shimazaki** (Japan, SDPJ) gave some figures indicating the immense significance of the economic development of East Asia in the past 30 years, and reported on predictions for the next decade when 400 million people in the region were likely to have a disposable income matching the level of those in the rich world today. He said the real GDP of South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore - the four areas that began to follow ten years later Japan's economic rise - had doubled every eight years from 1960-85. A similar economic growth was seen in Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia and China. While some countries were successful, others, he said, like Vietnam, Burma/Myanmar and the Philippines, had taken a wrong course and were now changing their wrong policies.

According to recent International Monetary Fund statistics on Gross Domestic Product, he continued, Asia, including Japan, accounted for approximately 23 per cent of the world's gross product. If the growth of the economy and the middle classes in Asia continued in this way during the next 20 years, the world's present economic balance and ways of doing business were likely to undergo major changes.

East Asia had realised its miraculous growth by ordinary means of savings and education, he said, but sustainable growth in the future would require efficiency arising from new ideas, and free trade with western countries. If there was a reduction in world trade, and especially if western countries resorted to protectionism, the flow of technology and commercial practices from advanced western countries would stop, posing the biggest obstacle to sustainable growth. Liberalisation and modernisation of the money market, to encourage foreign investment, must be speeded up.

He said that Asians, unlike westerners, were not trying to put their confidence in democracy and its values. Moves towards democratisation were spreading but the realisation of social fairness, peace and respect for human rights was still far away, and their hopes were placed on contributions from western countries and Japan.

It seemed, he said, that the Orient had to learn the values of the Occident, and the Occident had to learn from the miraculous success of the Orient. With their ancient history, Asian people were now enthusiastic to modernise. If they became rich they could then demonstrate to the West how to connect economic changes with social stability, and how to create a new era in which freedom and order were in harmony with each other.

**Ian MacLean** (Australian Labor Party) brought solidarity greetings from the leaders of the ALP, now in its fifth term of government. He said his party, the government and the economy were all in good shape and there was only one problem: over 10 per cent unemployment. The government was about to introduce a package to guarantee jobs for the long-term unemployed. The Keating government was also coming to grips with the disgraceful way the indigenous people of Australia had been dispossessed, and was working towards the restoration of the dignity of the aboriginal people.

The government, he continued, had played a major role in the establishment of the Asia and Pacific Economic Cooperation Conference. Australia recognised her future role as an independent republic in the destiny of Asia.

Maclean said the ALP wanted to play a more active and constructive role in the Socialist International, especially in supporting the developing parties. As an example of this he mentioned the ALP's experience in South Africa and their assistance to the ANC in its election campaigning. In the tradition of solidarity of our movement, his party wanted

to help with the building of party organisations in the Asian region and the development of policies that would win elections. We must seize the opportunity and act now in the practical political development work that was needed, he concluded.

**Felix Anthony** (Fiji, Labour Party) endorsed the views of the Malaysian comrade concerning Burma and East Timor: it was essential, he said, that the SI formally take concrete and concerted measures against such oppression.

He then informed the Council about Fiji's constitution - promulgated in 1990 after the military coups of 1987 - which was racist, authoritarian and feudalistic; it was based, he said, on apartheid principles because it fostered the separateness and inequality of different racial groups, and the political and administrative supremacy of one race, the indigenous Fijians. He gave details of the bi-cameral legislature and the unequal franchise set out in the constitution which ensured a permanent majority of Fijians over all other communities combined. All political power was thus vested in the Fijian members, and Indians - who formed half of the population - were denied the possibility of ever holding power or having a say in national policy-making.

Under the constitution human rights were not secure, even though much lip-service had been paid to democracy and the rule of law. The President was empowered to proclaim emergency rule on security or economic grounds and thus to derogate or suspend any human rights or other provisions of the constitution. Certain traditional institutions, he continued, were placed above the law. Legislation to promote Fijian and Rotuman interests could not be subjected to judicial review, and certain key positions such as the presidency, the prime ministership and the chairing of various government bodies were all reserved exclusively for Fijians. The Prime Minister had a crucial say in the appointment of the Chief of Justice, and also exercised influence in the appointment of magistrates, registrars and other legal officers including the solicitor general.

The Fijian military forces were not under the command of the government and were thus able to defy civilian instructions. Fiji's army, with five thousand personnel, must be the largest in the world on a *per capita* basis, and this alarming prominence was reflected in the increasing budgetary allocations it received from the nation's scarce resources, to the detriment of other more pressing medical, educational and welfare needs.

Trade union rights, he continued, had come under increasing assault since the 1987 coups partly because it was the trade unions that had launched the Labour Party in 1985, and that had been the main impetus behind the toppling of the former Alliance Party by the Labour Federation Coalition. Draconian anti-union measures in recent years had only been withdrawn after strong international pressure and the threat of national strikes. The government had then brought in a series of labour reforms which seriously curtailed trade union rights and their financial viability. The Freedom of Association Committee of the ILO had strongly condemned some of these labour reforms but the Rambuka government had really made no attempt to comply with the ILO directives, he said.

In return for support for his prime ministership, the Labour Party in 1992 had extracted from Rambuka an assurance of a review of the constitution, but this had not been delivered and in June 1993 the Labour Party had walked out of parliament. Within a week, the government announced the formation of a sub-committee to discuss the review. The Labour Party, having returned to parliament, was demanding some major changes to the terms of reference, an independent review of the constitution guided by the principles of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and some specific objectives to work towards a fair, democratic and just constitution promoting racial harmony and the economic and social advancement of all communities in Fiji.

He said there had been a steady drain of dedicated and skilled persons of both Fijian and Indo-Fijian extraction, some 37 thousand people having emigrated since the military upheavals of 1987. The interim administration and current government, taking their cue from the World Bank and the IMF, had embarked on a radical programme of right-wing economic policies featuring privatisation and deregulation of state enterprises. To encourage investment, tax-free incentives were offered to owners of factories and there were no checks to ensure the protection of workers, many of whom were badly exploited. There was little provision for the poor and needy and the social welfare department was facing acute shortage of funds. A poverty-alleviation fund, set up in 1991, had been disbanded in 1992.

There was, he continued, a problem with land ownership in that 83% of land was owned by Fijians and 8% by the State. Recent government recommendations to increase land rents by 130-300% would affect the mainly Indian cane farmers. Some government ministers were also trying to blackmail a large section of the Indian community by linking the renewal of land leases to acceptance of the present constitution.

In conclusion, Felix Anthony said his party sought the help and assistance of the SI, and urged it to send a team of observers to Fiji to examine the abuse of human and trade union rights.

**Raimon Obiols** (Spain, PSOE) said the ending of the cold war had brought immense changes. Following the division of the world between two opposing ideologies, strong new focal points of development were now emerging. With one quarter of the world's population, and more than one third of the world's commerce, the Pacific Basin's influence on the rest of the world was becoming increasingly important. Along with the growth in commerce, prosperity and dynamism had come new social, cultural and political problems.

Although our languages, history and culture might differ, millions of men and women throughout the world looked to us for answers based on our common values, he said. When the socialist movement in Japan was only just beginning to develop, in very difficult conditions, the values of fidelity to our people, freedom of expression, and sincere truth in our pronouncements had been lauded. These were needed now, he said, in this time of rapid transition to a new era of globalisation of the economy, in which it was difficult for individual nation-states to ensure that social provision for their citizens did not suffer as a consequence of economic unification. Social democrats, having worked so hard for the welfare state, were now facing the challenge of a brand new start in our programmes, especially in the transnational field. For Europe, it was clear that the renewal and reform of the social democratic model and the unification of Europe were indissolubly linked. But this was not a closed position. The aim was to construct a Europe that was politically unified but at the same time more open to cooperation with all the world as a means to create peace and the equalisation of North and South, East and West. Europe could not exist as an island of well-being in a sea of poverty, nor as an isolated and defended fortification, he said.

This politics of global cooperation was also essential for the globalisation of the social democratic model, a challenge which the SI was best placed to meet, Obiols continued. The globalisation of markets and business was very strong and most spectacular in the financial sphere, but was centred on three main areas: North America, western Europe and East Asia. There was a tendency to exclude the less developed countries. In many Asian countries in particular, economic growth had not been accompanied by social progress, and differences in income and development stage were very marked, possibly even more than in Africa or Latin America.

While the interchange of commerce and technology had initially brought about an integration of the East Asian economies which contributed to political normalisation in the region, there was a grave risk that countries developing at very different speeds were also moving in opposition directions. It was not in the interests of the most industrialised and dynamic countries to be open to the weaker economies with their low salaries and rudimentary production structures. The latter were thus, despite being mostly members of GATT, in danger from the most developed countries' joint actions.

He described the growing gap in per capita incomes and said that if one part of the world was surging ahead economically while another was losing ground, the negative consequences would be not only economic and would affect not only the poorer countries.

This dilemma could be seen in China and India, which between them contained more than a third of the world's population, and where rapid modernisation processes went alongside problems of grave poverty. The main risks and dilemmas were that the crumbling of the Soviet empire and the ending of the cold war would result in an intensification of economic exclusivity among western Europe, North America and East Asia, and the marginalisation of the rest of the world. On the other hand, these three dynamic regions could be the engine for the restructuring of a global economy able to transcend national and international imbalances and generate a better redistribution of prosperity.

This crossroads was clear, but the prognosis was not. For if the events of the last five years had been unforeseen, how could we be sure of the consequences and directions for the future, he asked. What was clear was that the call for solidarity was not sentimental, but sensible and necessary for action. In this period of transition the acute dilemma was between solidarity and barbarity. The greatest danger today came from the alliance of two barbarities, that from the past - war, aggressive nationalism, xenophobia and fanaticism - and that from current techno-industrial developments - anonymous powers that evaded democratic and humane control.

We socialists and social democrats could not pretend to predict the future, nor to provide easy answers to present problems, but we could suggest some aims, inspired by the values we shared with all decent men and women, and a method on which we were all clear, and which distinguished us from the Right. We knew that disorder, tragedy and violence were not inevitable but were the results of social, economic and political injustices that we sought to remove. We also knew that the struggle of the masses for justice had already exacted too great a price during this century, and the lesson for the Left was that priority must be given to the respect for the law and democratic principles, and the way of pacification and negotiation. Current developments in South Africa and the Middle East confirmed us in these principles, he said.

We therefore did not share the view that the objectives of democracy were contrary to those of stability. In the longer term both were mutually essential and must be fought for with prudent and realistic policies, appropriate to each situation, and by developing effective attitudes in the field of human rights.

The situation in Asia and other continents reaffirmed our conviction, he said, that a new multipolar order, more fair and more secure, required constant dialogue and analysis among the social democratic and progressive forces, to preserve pluralism of thought and culture, and prevent the barbarity of monopolistic debate. Freedom and progress were rooted in diversity of opinion and interests.

More than at any other time this century, he said in conclusion, this central work of our International, day by day to change for the better our complicated world, was a responsibility for each one of us. Without that, solidarity was impossible.

**Kalevi Sorsa** (Finland, SDP) was asked to speak at this point on **agenda item 3, Peace and security : regional and global perspectives**, as he could not attend the meeting the following day.

He said the breakdown of the bi-polarisation of the world order had facilitated major changes in Europe, but had also opened up new paths of development elsewhere. The present balance of power in Asia was both complicated and delicate, he said, and it was important that the Asian states did not engage in even fiercer disputes over economic and territorial issues than during the Cold War. The new cooperation between East and West had given Asia the opportunity to resolve conflicts through regional cooperation, but a comprehensive regional security policy might prove more difficult to achieve than in a bi-polar world, as recent events in Europe demonstrated.

He pointed to the significant role that the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe had played in the peaceful development of Europe, and in the original groundwork for resolving the issue of a divided Germany. He was convinced that the CSCE, both as a process and as a policy of moderation, contained a lesson that could benefit other regions. After the Gulf War he had spoken of the merits of a CSCE-type process being used in the Middle East, and today there was the hope for a final peace in that region. He emphasised the opportunities that a CSCE-type model held also for Asia where, despite considerable military tensions, he believed that a combined effort would find the necessary elements for positive development. In this spirit, he said, SIPSAD was planning to visit both Korean states in June.

He listed the six main challenges for Asian development from the Report of the Commission for a New Asia and said he was convinced that it was the social democratic movement that had the best prospects of achieving the kind of social development that could fulfil these objectives, and the lines of development supported by that movement were reflected in the draft resolution put forward by SIPSAD.

Referring to the tragedy in the former Yugoslavia, he said it was to the international community's shame that it had not yet coped with that situation. The international social democratic movement must do all it could to promote the development of a

democratically based and socially just market economy in the whole of Europe. This meant calling for efforts towards social security and substantial economic support from the western countries to the former communist states now taking their first steps towards democracy.

It was important, he continued, that Russia did not drift into isolation and that the confrontation so often repeated in history did not occur again. Although much had changed, nuclear disarmament had not lost its vital importance to the international community, and the time had come to abolish doctrines of nuclear deterrence and to build international peace and security on the basis of common security.

He mentioned the arms treaties already in force or being negotiated and said the challenge to get rid of nuclear weapons was urgent. The dissolution of the USSR had given rise to new concerns - including for the environment - and the experience in the Gulf War had proved that earlier safeguard systems were not sufficient. In this context, the reluctance of North Korea to allow inspections of its nuclear plants by the IAEA was a cause for concern, and the SI was ready to contribute to dialogue between the parties in the search for a peaceful and nuclear-weapon-free Korea.

Sorsa said we should support the objective of extending unconditionally the Non-Proliferation Treaty, as the best instrument for strengthening the non-proliferation regime, and should call on all governments that had not yet done so to accede to it. It was of the utmost importance that all nuclear weapons states should reach an agreement about a comprehensive nuclear-test ban, which was long overdue and would put an end to the further development of nuclear arsenals.

He said that SIPSAD recommended the draft resolution on nuclear weapons that had been put before the Council.

The changed situation in international politics, he said, also imposed greater challenges on the United Nations, and a working group of SIPSAD had started to examine the future role, actions and focuses of the UN, as it was vital that the SI be involved in helping to develop the guidelines for the new policies and framework of that organisation.

In closing, he referred to the African continent, on the one hand to the shocking situation in Rwanda, and on the other to the hard-won and welcome developments in South Africa. He extended heartfelt congratulations to the ANC and its leader, Nelson Mandela.

#### **Agenda item 2 continued:**

**Kenji Kitahashi** (Japan, JDSP) said that despite its recent relatively smooth economic development, the Asia-Pacific area still had many problems. Japan had naturally been the largest provider of aid to the other countries of the area and until now that had been mostly in material-oriented form. It was now time, he said, to give more importance to human resources and technological aspects. His party was suggesting to the nation the establishment of an overseas volunteer insurance system with a guarantee of employment on return from duty overseas. Japan, he continued, must also contribute to peace-keeping activities, as they already had in Cambodia. The success of this operation had provided reassurance to those who were worried about the re-militarisation of Japan. Japan, he stated, would never revert to militarisation for the purpose of invading any other country, or take up nuclear armaments. They were also considering reinforcing her assistance to the developing countries, with the aim of resolving the North-South issue, and were striving for the enforcement of the Overseas Development Aid Act in Japan.

The district he himself represented, Fukuoka in western Japan, had succeeded in overcoming the serious environmental pollution problems sustained in the pursuit of high economic growth rates and urbanisation, and was now carrying out a programme to train technologists who would share their experience with people in developing countries. He mentioned with pride the awards that the city had been given.

The developments in China and Korea, he said, were now the most important matters to watch in the Far East. Japan intended to support China in the promotion of its political reforms by providing assistance and cooperation, and must also stress the humanitarian issue about which the US was being so insistent. At the same time they must clearly express their opposition to any reinforcement of armaments by China.

Given the importance of peace and stability in the Korean peninsula for the entire Asia-Pacific area, it was necessary to promote the resolution of nuclear suspicions.

Japan had long been a partner to the US, but from now on, he said, should also place more emphasis on its contribution to the United Nations. With the UN's role becoming increasingly important in the post-cold-war world, his party wanted to continue supporting its activities and contribute with other SI parties to living in harmony with the rest of the world.

Kitahashi said that ever since he had participated in a IUSY event in Europe, he had cherished a dream of SI member parties in Europe, and his own Democratic Socialist Party in Japan, becoming ruling parties. It was with pride that he was speaking today for his party which was also now playing a role in the ruling coalition.

**Om Radsady** (Cambodia, FUNCINPEC) said security was not yet fully guaranteed in his country which had very recently emerged from war. Without security there could be no development, and without development there could be no lasting democracy. On behalf of his party and his country he therefore urged the international community to continue its help towards the Cambodian government to ensure further development on the path to peace and security in the whole region. He added that his country had returned to the path of democracy almost one year ago and was now one of the most liberal kingdoms in the world because the King reigned but did not rule. The principles of economic liberalism, freedom and democracy were enshrined in Cambodia's new Constitution.

As for the process of rehabilitation and reconstruction, he said Cambodia had fulfilled its obligations according to the recommendations of the international community and its large institutions. Reinforcing this process required ever more substantial assistance from donor countries. The government's priorities were for education, security and peace in democracy. His party hoped that these basic principles and priorities would permit the new development of the country after 20 years of chaos. They hoped also to be able to count on continuing international assistance.

In closing, he reminded the meeting that we were living in historic times, with the election of Nelson Mandela as President of South Africa. Having been in South Africa as an official observer of the elections, it was a double pleasure for him to thank the international community for having assisted Cambodia, and to congratulate the brother people of South Africa on their achievement. Both peoples had stood in line for many years before being able to witness these beautiful achievements: freedom and liberty in democracy.

**Sagar Rana** (Nepali Congress Party) briefly summarised the history of his party which had played a successful role leading to the restoration of democracy in 1991. Now that they had formed a government, it was imperative to translate what had been said in terms of social justice into reality. In a changed economic context, and in a new environment that was difficult to analyse, they now had to tackle what they had condemned a generation ago: the market economy, liberalisation and privatisation. They had to be able to offer the people a new concept, and develop and apply it successfully.

Nepal was now facing unforeseen challenges in its efforts to consolidate democracy and uplift people's lives. The peace dividend that might have flowed from the ending of the Cold War for support to the developing and least developed nations, was being drawn upon for other humanitarian causes. In real terms the flow of aid to many of the least developed countries had actually declined.

The opportunities for multinational companies and local entrepreneurs, while very useful at national and macro levels, were not necessarily of benefit to the most needy, the most deprived. The conditionalities imposed on the reduced funds were weakening the social support and the infrastructures for equal opportunities and equitable growth. He was sure this was happening in other countries too. His government was promising that the withdrawal of subsidies and support systems would eventually give rise to a more prosperous future, but if they were to meet these commitments, then the global community as a whole would need to fulfil the promises for the eradication of poverty through concrete contributions and programmes specifically designed towards that end.

While agreeing on the importance of social services such as free education and health services, he considered the most essential factor to be an increase in the income of the poorest of the poor, and the provision of more gainful employment and increased

productivity in whatever their field of activity. He pointed out that even free education cost money in terms of loss of labour.

He stressed that the transfer of technology was as important as monetary aid and of more lasting assistance. By this he meant such areas of technology as agricultural and hydro-electric technology which could be transferred without any loss to the donor nation and could be of more direct benefit to those in need than the transfer of funds.

In closing he thanked the Socialist International for its gesture of equality in listening to the views of a small country like his own.

**Pradip Bose** (Indian Centre for Democratic Socialism) said that serious re-thinking was going on in India in the hope that the Indian Socialist Party might once again become a real presence in the international brotherhood of socialism.

He reminded participants that while the fall of communism in the Soviet Union and eastern Europe had brought about a radical change in Europe, there were parties in Asia still committed to Leninism, to Maoism and to Stalinism. Those in power in North Korea, Laos, China and Vietnam believed in the hegemony and dictatorship of their respective parties. They might be adopting economic liberalisation policies, but as far as the politics was concerned, there was complete control and even despotism. In his own country, functioning within the democratic parliamentary system, communists continued to rule in one area, praising and believing in Stalinism. Therefore it seemed to him that in re-defining the ideological position of Asia, we should not underestimate the strength of communism both in thought and in political power. In Asia, our ideological battle had still to be continued and won.

The other main ideological factor to bear in mind was to what extent the remarkable economic achievements of the newly industrialised countries in East Asia could be suited to democratic socialist values and principles. What would be the economic, social, cultural, human and environmental fall-out from these rapid economic developments, he asked. This was one of the formidable ideological challenges now faced by democratic socialists in Asia.

He wished to endorse the view that there could be a joint action programme of the Asia-Pacific area on the restoration of democracy in Burma. He agreed with the friends from Burma that this was a very crucial time to have international pressure on the Burmese military junta. Although they had been in power for the last 30 years, there were signs of contradictions developing within the junta and therefore powerful international pressure might have greater success now than in the past. This would also bring together socialists across the Asia-Pacific area and this interaction would strengthen the future development of democratic socialism in the region.

**Araz Alizadeh** (Azerbaijan, SDPA) said the problems being discussed at this meeting were very important for Azerbaijan where there was a war going on. His country, a member of the United Nations, was the victim of aggression from Armenia and from Russia, 20 per cent of its territory was occupied and Russia was openly demanding to create military bases on its territory. The representative of Yeltsin argued that there was a threat of Armenia occupying two districts of Azerbaijan. His country could fight off the aggression of Armenia, he said, but was too weak to fight Russian aggression. His party was hoping for help from the SI, and from all peace-loving people.

Azerbaijan, he said, was ready to grant self-determination and all rights to national minorities, rights which were guaranteed by the UN Charter, but they could not accept the splitting up of their motherland. Blood was being shed, there were one and a half million refugees, and hundreds of children were dying of hunger and disease, but the world was silent. The Socialist International, their brothers and sisters, could not be silent, he said. His party was asking the SI for solidarity and help and was inviting the SI to come and see the situation in Azerbaijan. There had already been three coups d'état in Azerbaijan; after a possible fourth coup a more severe dictatorship would be established, as happened in countries where there was poverty and war. The Azerbaijani Social Democrats would be among the first victims, he said, and he again pleaded for help for his country and his party, appealing to the SI to adopt a resolution on the situation in Azerbaijan.

**Chansamone Voravong** (Organisation of the Laotian Communities for Refugees and National Accord, OLREC) said that in 1994 there were 63 armed conflicts in the world, and many of these were considered by the United Nations to be wars. Terrorism was

prevalent throughout the world and was a drain on resources for the industrialised countries and the developing countries alike. It also went hand-in-hand with the degradation of the environment. He felt that the SI, thanks to its dynamic pillars of ethical values and democracy, could play a very important part in preventing the bankruptcy and inequality that would prevail if the world economy was left to market forces.

Education must be improved at world level, he continued, with men and women seeing themselves not as citizens of a particular country but rather as world citizens, and their interests as those of all humanity.

At this time, he said, the realisation of peace and national reconciliation in Laos remained an urgent necessity. The pre-conditions were there, but without the participation of all Laotians and the understanding and support of the international community, this chance might fade.

With the dissolution of the Soviet empire, the Laotian government had abandoned some radical objectives, a number of policy measures had been adopted, and the first democratic constitution had been promulgated. But Laos remained essentially a Marxist-Leninist dictatorship, where all kinds of violations of human rights occurred, and where the majority of the population - particularly the young - were still powerless spectators under a repressive regime.

Voravong said Laos now had to face extremely difficult and complicated challenges that would determine not only its future but its very survival as a viable member of the international community of nations. It was generally agreed that the failure of the democratisation of Laos was due to the incompetence of high-level administrators who did not know how to make the most of the available human resources during this first decade of development. Another 20 years would be needed to train future generations of leaders, economists, professors and politicians, but without coordination with foreign countries this would not be possible and all their efforts in education and training would be wasted.

Many gifted Laotians had left the country in 1975, he said, and they constituted a valuable network of resources for technical assistance. They were calling for freedom and democracy through peaceful political reform in Laos and improved economic conditions, but people living in Laos could not express these aspirations without danger. His organisation, with its Laotian Democratic Initiatives Project, had therefore been serving as a bridge to link the impulses from the hearts of Laotians overseas towards actions to be taken on behalf of and by those inside Laos. These activities concerned civic education to improve the understanding of and commitment to democratic values, so as to avoid the errors of eastern Europe. They did this with great faith, he continued, knowing the tradition of peace and solidarity of the Laotian people, and strengthened by the daily practice of Buddhism. Their "live-and-let-live" attitude towards one another was unique to the Laotian people whose existence had been known 2,000 years B.C.

Whatever their political differences, contacts and good relations between Laotians inside and outside the country had never been interrupted. They had tried consistently to live together and sometimes to form coalition governments even in the midst of the Cold War. Only divergent international interests had set them apart.

There was real human potential especially among the expatriate Laotians, and together with Laotians within the country they had helped create good pre-conditions for a democratic government, he said.

The international community was now beginning to know OLREC and to support the case of Laos. Concrete actions had already been taken and this had helped to bring about a rapprochement between Laotians inside and outside the country. He thanked the Socialist International once again for its helpful invitation.

If the Laotian process of peace, conciliation and development was to be discussed, the Laotian government could be assured of finding authentic reciprocity in the expatriate Laotian community. The government was in a position to use appropriate means to initiate the atmosphere of trust and to instill new hope in the Laotian people. The time was right: any delay might have catastrophic consequences for Laos and the region. The tremendous human resources within and outside Laos would have to come together to succeed in turning Laos into a democratic and prosperous nation, he said.

History had shown that a divided and impoverished nation could be a threat to stability for a whole region. Laos could be a focus of general prosperity in the region, or a source of regional conflict if serious long-term measures were not taken immediately to ensure peace and stability. A new effort for reconciliation and harmonious economic and social development in Laos would be beneficial for the stability of the region and for peace and mutual understanding in the world at large.

It was cheaper, more noble, and definitely less tragic to build peace than to try to extinguish the flames of war later, he said. The Laotians had no alternative but to reconcile and unite to meet the challenge of this decade. His organisation strongly believed that the ideal of social democracy embraced by the SI would ultimately be the base for that reconciliation and for Laotian democracy.

**Jean-Pierre Cot** (Group of the Party of European Socialists of the European Parliament) said that the conditions of collective security in Asia had changed fundamentally. Cambodia was a case of international peace-keeping at an unprecedented level, with an important Japanese participation, and until now was a success. On the other hand there was the drama in Afghanistan which the UN was choosing to ignore, possibly with reason because a peace-keeping effort there now might well be of no use and a waste of scarce resources.

He noted the absence of a regional structure capable of organising collective security in Asia, and said that in this respect the South-East Asian Forum was an interesting development. Japan's role was crucial, he said, and he understood the hesitations of some Japanese comrades whose pacifist traditions must be a positive contribution to our reflections.

He said that notions of pacifism and neutrality had undergone a fundamental change, as the Austrian and Scandinavian friends had demonstrated in joining the European Union and accepting all their obligations in the field of foreign and security policy. With the collapse of communism we had entered a new phase in collective security, in which the UN was needed more than ever, and its activities were much greater and more diverse. UN Secretary General Boutros-Ghali, a former SI Vice-President, had described its role in his Agenda for Peace.

Cot said it was time for the SI to voice our support for the UN, and to make a preliminary and critical assessment of the Agenda in order to propose fresh answers. He paid tribute to all those involved in the UN's peace-keeping operations but said that our duty was to underline the limitations to those activities and to the UN's capacity to be responsible for collective security. We could not ignore Somalia, Bosnia and Rwanda. Collective security was too often selective security, he said. We must look at the reasons why peace-enforcement by troops under UN command was an ambition beyond reach.

Firstly it was because peace-keeping forces inevitably became hostages, as was seen in Bosnia. Secondly - and this was certainly not a criticism - because the basic philosophy of the UN secretariat was one of peace, it therefore had no capacity to wage war, it had no structure of military command, and peace-enforcement - or the restoration of peace - meant waging war on war. Thirdly, Cot continued, it was because the organisation's peace-keeping operations would require adequate financing and to achieve this the scale for assessing contributions must be changed.

The major cause of the UN's paralysis, however, lay with the member states who did not want the organisation to take direct and operational responsibility for collective security beyond the traditional peace-keeping operations, he said. The major powers wanted to retain their monopoly on security, and others feared that a powerful UN would interfere in their domestic policies.

Cot said it was best to recognise these facts, and reinforce the present mechanisms of collective security. From this perspective the draft resolution seemed wise. Obviously it did not address the more fundamental issue of collective security - or rather the lack of it - nor did it try to offer the new concepts needed to address this issue. That would be the concern of the Carlsson Committee on Global Governance, whose report was eagerly awaited, he concluded.

**Luis Ayala** referred to the very important event taking place that day in South Africa and he proceeded to read out a proposed text for the SI Council to send to President Nelson Mandela congratulating him on his inauguration.

**The chair** requested approval for the text and this was given unanimously.

**Luis Ayala** then informed delegates that a set of resolutions which had been tabled by the Asia-Pacific Committee would be dealt with by the Council the following morning. Some other resolutions concerning the second political theme, and other draft texts submitted by other committees, were also available and would likewise be dealt with the following morning.

**The chair** then brought the first day's session to a close with announcements about the evening's reception offered by the Prime Minister of Japan.

\* \* \*

SI President **Pierre Mauroy**, in the chair, welcomed participants to the second day of the Council meeting.

**Akira Yamagishi** (President, Japan Trade Union Confederation, RENGO) extended greetings on behalf of the members of the Japan Trade Union Confederation. He said Japanese politics had gone through an upheaval the previous August when, after 38 years, the Liberal Democrats' rule had come to an end. With the present coalition government, Japan was now experiencing a major political realignment. No one could be sure what would emerge, but he had confidence in the present situation.

The JTUC, he said, was willing to do its utmost to establish the two-party system which could bring about the change of power and build a nation where diligent workers would see the fruits of their labours. He hoped the two host parties would play an essential role in this political reform, while learning from the experiences of European countries.

He said he firmly believed that social democracy, having established welfare states in the developed countries, would now also in the international community play a more significant role towards meeting the challenges facing mankind, such as peace, human rights, development, and the environment.

The JTUC, as a member of the International Confederation of Free Trade Union, had strengthened the international solidarity of labour unions. From this viewpoint he wished the Socialist International, and the global social democratic forces it represented, an enhanced international coordination and further development.

**Pierre Mauroy** emphasised how happy he was that there had been a change of ruling party in Japan.

He said he had received a letter from the secretary general of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, ICFTU, which was a part of our larger family, which expressed their wish for a meeting with the SI in the near future. He asked if there was any objection to such a meeting, and as there appeared to be none, he said there would be a report on the preparations for the meeting to the next Council which would also debate this matter.

Coming back to the main theme of this meeting - Asia and the Pacific - he introduced the draft resolutions on Afghanistan, on a mission to Fiji, on Burma, and the statement on Bangladesh, all of which were adopted unanimously.

He opened the floor to discussion of the draft resolution on Democracy, economic and social development of the Asia-Pacific region.

**Chansamone Voravong** (OLREC) proposed adding Laos to the list of countries mentioned; and in the sentence about Aung San Suu Kyi he proposed an addition about other countries also re-establishing respect for human rights.

These proposals were agreed.

After further amendments suggested by IUSY, the resolution on Democracy, economic and social development of the Asia-Pacific region was adopted.

**Abraham Hatzamri** (Israel Labour Party) said that there was agreement in the world today on the importance of democracy for the socio-economic development of countries

and people, and yet there remained countries where the minimum human rights still had to be fought for. Although countries under authoritarian regimes might have made advances in the economic sphere, their people paid a high price in social terms, he said, and when democracy finally arrived, the transition was not easy. Those who expected instant solutions were prone to disillusionment and the desire for the "strong man" who would resolve the major problems.

We democrats with our socialist vision of a more just world, he continued, knew what a long path it was for people to become confident in their government and able to contribute to the hoped-for socio-economic development. In today's changing world, things were becoming clearer, and communism's failure to allow people their own democratic expression had led to its downfall. The former communist parties of eastern Europe were seeking to adapt their ideological convictions in line with the Socialist International and we must respond appropriately for the benefit of the people.

We who saw democracy and socialism as the two sides of one coin could be satisfied with the course that events had taken. But that was no reason to cease our work: on the contrary it should inspire new struggles and new achievements, he said.

Meeting here in Asia - fast becoming the economic centre of the world and thus also the political centre - we found one great country that was giving up communism but still could not guarantee freedom of thought and expression, and another great country, a model of democracy, some of whose population lived under such economic conditions that it was hard to say their lives were human. In both cases, Hatzamri said, we must play our part in convincing the one that freedom would contribute to faster socio-economic development, and in helping the other with assistance and collaboration to organise cooperatively and prove that democracy and a good standard of living could indeed go hand-in-hand.

His own country, he continued, was not rich, yet in spite of the years lived in a climate of war since its creation in 1948, it had never fallen for the illusion that the "strong hand" would solve all its problems. Even with its security problems, and the need to absorb large numbers of immigrants - who often had scant experience of democracy - his country had never accepted the postponement of democratic government. Israel had continued its democratic life, allowing freedom of thought and expression, respecting people's true value, and trusting their capacity to take part in the common task as exemplified by the Kibbutz.

What they had created in Israel, he wanted to share here in Asia. He said their workers' federation, the Histadrut, had a long-established institute specialising in Asian affairs which had trained thousands of people in the field of cooperativism and trade-unionism and his party was offering this collaboration. They believed that the empowering of people was an essential and fruitful part of the democratisation process, and that sustained education for democracy would lead to the socio-economic development we were seeking. The SI, through its Asia-Pacific Committee, could do this, he said, and his party was offering to do its share.

At this point **the chair** said he would like to modify the agenda and tackle **African questions** now, as the moderator of the SI Africa Committee had to leave the meeting soon.

**António Guterres** (Portuguese Socialist Party), reporting on the SI Africa Committee, described their feelings as primarily of hope because of the amazing success of the South African elections and the transition to full multi-racial democracy there. He reported on the meeting of the Africa Committee in Johannesburg and the strengthening of relations between the SI and the ANC. He said the SI now had a new role regarding South Africa and that was to exert pressure on international institutions to give strong support to the new government there in order to ensure the stability and permanence of its democracy.

Guterres said the meeting in Johannesburg had also provided an opportunity to meet about 30 different African parties. Common grounds of action had been established, mainly in three different areas: first, to have a working group about the economic situation in Africa; second, a political training programme should be prepared with the support of SI parties, for African friends; and third, a special warning system would be prepared to allow the SI to react quickly to processes in Africa, and even in the prevention of crises.

There were also, he acknowledged, feelings of despair at the political, economic and social situation in the great majority of African countries. Rwanda stood out as a symbol of shame for the international community as a whole; we had also to remember the failures in Angola and Somalia. In many African countries the state itself was disappearing or crumbling, and international support was needed not only in financial terms but also in building up institutions. Many changes were needed in the approach to these problems. On the other hand, the failures in peace and democracy in Africa were often the result of international economic relations that gave African countries no chance to succeed, he said, and in this connection he mentioned the devaluation of the CFA franc. He thought the SI could not stay silent about this; we should clearly denounce the cynical approach of those on the Right who preached democracy for Africa but through their economic conceptions denied the peoples any hope of future development. Obviously we must press for strong changes in the present pattern of international economic and financial relations, he concluded.

**Pierre Mauroy** supposed all member parties would agree to assist President Mandela in his extremely difficult task, and that no one would object to the Working Group suggested by Guterres. There were no objections.

He read out the draft declaration on Rwanda which was adopted unanimously.

The chair then turned to **agenda item 3. Peace and security: regional and global perspectives.**

**Lasse Budtz** (Denmark, SDP, chair of SIPSAD working group on UN reform) said that in its 50 years the United Nations had increased its membership from 51 to 184 countries, and with the increasing number of crises around the world, it was not surprising that it was necessary to reconstruct and modernise the UN system. The SI Peace, Security and Disarmament Council had decided to establish a small working group to discuss and propose a resolution on these matters. The UN itself was discussing different suggestions concerning the establishment of a new Security Council. And there was a Commission headed by Swedish Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson and Sonny Ramphal which had asked the SI to put forward some proposals and these were in the draft resolution on the UN. He acknowledged the great help the working group had received from various member parties.

Introducing the draft resolution on the Future of the United Nations and global security, he said if the Charter was going to be changed, the new concept of security must be explained in clear and incisive terms because the world had changed and security was no longer only about weapons and armies, but also about social affairs. He explained the other considerations behind the wording of the resolution and said it was a kind of synthesis in which they were trying to describe the new Security Council, crisis prevention, decentralisation of crisis management, the extension of the Security Council and a bigger role for the regional organisations. He considered the UN to be absolutely essential, an organisation where all could meet and work together to solve crises, and he appealed to participants to accept the draft resolution.

**Gérard Fuchs** (France, PS) said he agreed that the UN was still not playing its role to the full, and with the aim of furthering the SI's role within the UN framework, he wanted to highlight four problems in particular. There was not unanimity about the potential modification of the UN Charter whose purpose was to settle relations between states. He pointed out that most recent conflicts were ethnic and nationalistic conflicts within rather than between countries. Therefore we should be in favour of modifying Article 27 of the Charter so that the UN could be more interventionist when human rights were at stake.

On the limitations of the Security Council, he said Germany and Japan must become members and they must commit themselves to participate in UN operations.

As for the participation of other members in the Security Council, the Organisation for African Unity and other regional organisations must also play a part when it came to choosing the permanent or semi-permanent members.

He considered that the General Assembly should be able - at least temporarily - to oppose decisions of the Security Council, and that very clear rules should be established as to when it could do so.

He thought it would also be useful to explore the possibility of the participation of the European Union.

In his view some crises were more serious than others, and the UN Security Council must establish priorities on the basis of its own judgment and the available means. He thought it important to look into the case of the former Yugoslavia, with "ethnic cleansing" right at the top of the priority list.

Perhaps the most difficult problem was the re-establishment of peace. He thought the UN must re-establish a new world order and should then act as a world police force to ensure the enforcement of peace. He, like many in the SI, would prefer a peaceful approach, but what was happening in Bosnia-Herzegovina should not be allowed to go by without a forceful response. The ideal role of the UN must be a very prudent and cautious one, but he thought the SI should support the assistance from military alliances that already partially helped the United Nations in its policing role,

He recognised that he had highlighted some very difficult problems. He was convinced that humanity must be able to govern itself, and if the SI was not going to be an advocate for global governance he could not be very optimistic about the next decade.

**Mervat Tellawy** (Egypt, NDP) said that since the ending of the Cold War the definition of peace and security - and the causes that threatened them - had changed drastically. The victims of those threats were now civilians, women and children, the sick and the old, refugees and displaced people. This new challenge required reconsideration of the priorities of the global institutions, particularly of the UN whose resources, she said, had to be increased. She agreed that the Security Council must be made more representative, and that its members' powers of veto should be curtailed. The link between the UN and the regional inter-governmental institutions should be strengthened. For instance the conflict-solving mechanism that the Organisation of African Unity had decided to establish, would need the help of the UN. In this context she thanked the Japanese government for their help towards this initiative. She was in complete agreement about the link between the miseries and problems of Africa and irregularities in the international institutions and in the international economic and financial systems.

Concerning disarmament, she continued, the non-proliferation regime should be strengthened, and financial resources freed up from military budgets should be used to tackle such global issues as environment, population, narcotics and HIV. Now that the market economy prevailed and at the same time the problems of hunger, poverty, housing and disease were pressing, the Bretton Woods institutions should change their priorities and give more emphasis to social problems and the needs of the poorest sectors of society. Rather than concentrate on the United Nations, the SI should lead the way in demanding a drastic change in the Bretton Woods institutions which had a greater impact on the lives of poorer people. She was confident that the SI - which was needed today more than ever - was moving on the correct path.

She paid tribute to the victory of the South African people and expressed gratitude to all who had contributed to this great achievement.

Tellawy mentioned the important role played by her country in the signing of the historic accord between the Palestinian and Israeli leaders. She commended the proposal for an SI delegation to visit the Middle East. The SI's support was needed to mobilise the international community's help for that peace agreement and to assist the whole region to recover from the wars of the last four decades.

Peace and security were indivisible, she said, and the breakdown of peace in one region had its impact on other regions, especially in the Middle East. Egypt's policy in an inter-dependent world was to help the Middle East to be stable, secure, prosperous and nuclear-free. This coincided with the objectives of the SI, she concluded, therefore the SI through all its members should help in reinforcing this policy.

**Anne-Marie Lizin** (SI Women) said women had a lot to say on the topic of peace. The events at the start of the decade had raised the hope that we might achieve a world without conflict and a concentration of forces towards the positive development of humankind. Clearly this had not happened and we had to face new and unforeseen difficulties. The hatred we had thought to be a thing of the past was still rampant in a large part of Europe, but we must not focus on one country or region alone concerning the respect of international rights.

Having visited Tunisia during the recent elections she wanted to speak about another

danger, that of religious fundamentalism. SIW did not consider Islam to be a negative religion - it was a very positive religion - but it sometimes went hand-in-hand with very militant groups which represented a clear danger for women and for the stability of some governments. She pointed out that if we sought global peace and security, then we must not consider the equality of women as just a women's issue but as an important issue in its own right. She said she would be attending a summit of Mediterranean women including delegations from Israel and Palestine, which would be perhaps the first sign for them that the Middle East peace agreement was not just a local one, but one that had a direct impact on Europe in general.

She said her country, Belgium, had a very special feeling towards Africa and especially Rwanda, and she reiterated an appeal for Tanzania and Kenya, saying the SI had much to say to them in order to help them overcome the possibility of being drawn into that conflict.

SIW agreed on the importance of reinforcing the UN structure and thought the SI must be totally behind this effort. We must analyse the original causes of conflicts which were deeply rooted in poverty and the illiteracy, demographic explosion and malnutrition associated with it. These three were of direct concern to women but this was often forgotten. The world discriminated between men and women, yet it paid the price of women's illiteracy in terms of insecurity. She therefore felt that the SI in its entirety should put out the message that it wished to reinforce the UN but that this struggle should start with a struggle against illiteracy among women.

SIW, Lizin continued, approved of the conclusions the SI had reached in respect of non-proliferation. They also wished to raise the topic of civil security and the importance of the closure of Chernobyl for the future of our environment.

In her view the SI should express its confidence in the United Nations regardless of the specific aspects in the UN that needed to be reviewed. We needed to get across the positive message that the UN continued to be the hope for the world. Obviously much more money should be available to the UN and also to ensure that military forces were available to it, but she stressed that aggression was a non-positive way of managing relations and we must all strive for the settlement of disputes between neighbouring countries through negotiation rather than military means.

The policy of non-proliferation and the abolition of biological and chemical weapons must be pursued, but also the policy of deterrence. We had seen in the case of Yugoslavia that only military force had been able to obtain any results.

For women the peace factor had more than one aspect: we must make sure that women played a role in politics, for instance by insisting that all electoral lists and all elections should have no more than two-thirds of candidates from the same gender. This would bring about equality. The second large factor was education, especially of girls. The UN was planning three large conferences on topics that would underscore this particular issue, the role of women and our failure to invest in their education. Socialism, she stressed, must really understand these two dimensions: women active in politics, and active politics in favour of women. The SI must support these two, not as a feminist demand but as a profound strategic demand on the path towards peace and security in the world of tomorrow.

**Pierre Mauroy** expressed the SI's total solidarity with SIW.

**Roger Hällhag** (IUSY) said that unfortunately today's young generation did not have full confidence in the UN and the institutions for global governance. In IUSY meetings he found a lot of scepticism about the UN and he was often having to defend and explain the organisation. Although he was happy to do this he thought we should take this solid scepticism very seriously.

He considered it necessary to discuss how to reinforce the representativeness and legitimacy of the UN institutions: the UN should work on the basis of consensus rather than majority decision-making. The institutions must represent the will of the people rather than that of the prevailing powers, and be concerned about the needs of all suffering people.

The rule of law, and equality before the law, must be respected as a principle, Hällhag said. Today there was much cynicism about the arbitrary application of international law. The fact that, for the first time, the majority of UN members had democratically

elected governments presented an opportunity to promote fundamental democratic principles and human rights. In his view we should move towards a situation where democratic governments were consistently given higher status than dictatorships. He thought we should discuss how this could be done.

Certainly we must support the United Nations, he concluded, but to defend basic principles of international cooperation might sometimes mean calling for fundamental and radical reform.

The resolution on the future of the United Nations and global security was adopted.

**Maj-Britt Theorin** (Sweden, SAP) reported that her party had now decided on 50% women in all their lists of candidates for parliament, and county and city councils, so in the forthcoming elections half the candidates would be women.

Introducing the draft resolution on nuclear weapons proposed by SIPSAD, she quoted a poem by Pentti Saarikoski and expressed the optimism inspired by the ending of the Cold War and the dismantling of nuclear weapons. But we were all aware of the many problems confronting us, she said, the spread of nuclear technologies, new nuclear weapon states, the risk of proliferation of plutonium and highly enriched uranium, and the spread of former Soviet nuclear weapons, experts and technologies. There were also the concerns regarding the possible production of red mercury, and in North Korea the disturbing refusal to allow IAEA inspection of its suspected nuclear weapons facilities.

The draft resolution, she said, reflected the initiative to ask the International Court of Justice whether the use of nuclear weapons had in fact been illegal in international law since the Geneva conventions, and the fact that the use of nuclear weapons breached the principles of moderation, discrimination, and humanity. The draft resolution, with the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons, demanded six specific points in a comprehensive programme, she concluded.

**Glyn Ford** (British Labour Party) referring back to the debate on the resolution just adopted, said he disagreed slightly with Gérard Fuchs, and considered that Japan, at least initially, might need an opt-out from involvement in peace-keeping operations.

His party also believed that the SI must emphasise the need for a coordinated plan at the global level to deal with arms conversions and arms exports. In Europe, three events had coincided to make this an urgent matter: the end of the Cold War, industrial integration in a single European market with mass production in the arms industry and the consequent reduction in labour demand, and the experience in the Gulf war of facing our own weapons across the sands. Even the military establishment were now less enthusiastic about selling weapons abroad.

There was also the problem of the large quantities of sophisticated weapons, including nuclear ones, coming on to the grey market after the collapse of the Soviet empire. A solution to the problem of arms sales and arms conversion could only be achieved globally and for this a reform of the United Nations was ultimately the only route. The SI and its member parties and governments should take a lead in this regard, he said.

**Gérard Fuchs** expressed doubts about the paragraphs in the draft resolution concerning red mercury. He said his party would accept the remainder of the draft because their objective was a world without nuclear weapons, a world of peace.

**Maj-Britt Theorin** said she understood the remarks about red mercury but thought it important that the loophole should be stopped and that tritium and the possible production of red mercury should be brought into the NPT safeguards.

**The chair** suggested using the conditional tense concerning the possible production of red mercury and with this amendment the draft resolution was adopted.

**Luis Ayala** said delegates already had the secretary general's written report. He said that the SI - with its Asia-Pacific meeting in Kathmandu and now the Council meeting in Tokyo - had truly gone east, not just geographically but also in its commitment and solidarity with this part of the world. Not only was this the largest ever SI meeting in Asia, there had also been consultations with other parties representing the progressive forces of the region and the Asia-Pacific Committee had now put forward the proposal to hold its next meeting in Manila following the kind invitation of the Philippine Democratic Socialist Party.

He also called on SI member parties to share in carrying forward the work of the emerging social democratic parties in this region and to assist these forces to grow and develop, saying that identifying needs and forging common strategies was an essential part of this task. This important process would be further advanced at the next meeting of the SI Asia-Pacific Committee.

Among the events covered by his report he mentioned the historic first-ever meeting in South Africa of the SI Africa Committee; the work of other SI Committees; and election monitoring in South Africa, in Russia, in Honduras and in the Dominican Republic.

He said another important development was that the SI was now integrating the agendas of its various committees. We were also collaborating, as the largest and strongest political International, with the United Nations, and were involved with the preparations for all the UN summits - the Social Summit, the Women's Conference and the summit on population.

Ayala said he was convinced that the SI was effectively translating its principles and values into very concrete actions all over the world. We had organised our presence and our forces in all regions, and with the establishing of the Asia-Pacific Committee, the Socialist International was fully active in all areas of the world.

**Pierre Mauroy** expressed his gratitude to the secretary general for his work in managing the many activities of the SI on such modest and insufficient means. He said he and the secretary general had an excellent and friendly relationship which made life and the work much easier, and he hoped the SI would continue progressing.

**Helen Clark** (New Zealand Labour Party) expressed thanks to the secretary general for stressing the need for concrete action in the Asia-Pacific region, to discuss and share strategies and to identify needs, which reflected exactly the discussions that had been held informally among the parties of the region.

An **SDPJ** delegate asked about the Asia Pacific Socialist Organisation of the SI now that the Asia-Pacific Committee had been set up. APSO appeared to have done nothing for several years, she said.

**Luis Ayala** thought it was up to APSO members to register what they wanted to do with the organisation. All the members of the Asia-Pacific Committee had agreed about the basis on which the committee would continue its work and that it was a very good and useful forum.

**Pierre Mauroy**, in the absence of the chair of the SI Committee on Human Rights, introduced the draft resolution on Women's Human Rights which, with minor amendments, was adopted.

**Nikos Dimadis** (Greece, PASOK) spoke of the resurgence of fascism which in many countries sadly recalled the period between the two world wars. He felt strongly that the SI should tackle this problem in a number of ways. The concern was certainly present in all the SI's committees but he thought it might be time to designate a specific forum within the SI where this phenomenon could be fought.

**Dick Gupwell** (Group of the PES) endorsed these views, saying his Group was gravely concerned at the activities of one of the Italian member parties of the SI, namely the PSDI, who had aligned themselves in the last elections with the neo-fascists. He asked for assurance that this issue would be on the agenda of a future meeting.

**Pierre Mauroy**, on Dimadis's suggestion of a new committee to examine neo-fascism, considered it might be best for SICOHR, under Peter Jankowitsch, to take up this whole issue and report back to a future meeting.

**Elena Flores** (Spain, PSOE) reported on the first meeting of the SI Committee for the Mediterranean at a time when many factors and events in the area were of the utmost importance, politically, socio-economically, strategically and demographically. With different cultures and religions in the area there was always the possibility of conflict, and the Committee had precisely the task of grappling with these challenges. It was important, she said, while not losing sight of the global vision, to have a committee for the specific problems of the region. She stressed that the Committee had worked with a very open spirit and would welcome the participation of all European parties, and not only those on the rim of the Mediterranean which shared a common heritage.

At its meeting the previous December, Flores continued, the Committee had underlined the need to eliminate misconceptions about relations between the Arab world and the so-called western world, especially in the media. We must not replace the former "common enemy" of the East with perceptions of a new enemy of the South, she warned. It had been agreed to analyse the political situations in all their members' countries and there had been a fertile exchange of views and opinions. A number of topics overlapped with those being discussed at worldwide level, including the reinforcement of democracy, the revitalisation of democratic institutions, and the strengthening of socialist parties against threats from anti-socialist media campaigns.

Other topics that had needed analysis in depth had to do with economic phenomena: illiteracy, the demographic explosion, unemployment and the consequent migratory movements; the security and stability of the area; and lastly, cooperation. She said we needed to come to grips with the enormous potential for cooperation that was still untouched. She suggested that all these topics should be discussed in an SI Leaders' Conference in Spain which could add to the excellent work and activities of the SI. Recalling the events that had just taken place in South Africa, she hoped that the Mediterranean region would also be able to solve its problems very soon.

**Pierre Mauroy** said there appeared to be approval for the adoption of the report.

Turning to the report of the SI Committee for Central and Eastern Europe, he welcomed the results of the first round of elections in Hungary and hoped the second round would be equally successful. He said there were two resolutions relating to the region.

**László Kovács** (Hungary, MSzP) gave details of his party's success in the first round of parliamentary elections. He said the only bitter element of the elections was the poor performance of their social democratic friends who had failed to reach the 5% threshold and therefore none of their candidates had any chance in the individual constituencies in the second round. He said it was his party's moral obligation to find appropriate ways to aid the social democrats.

He explained his party's success despite the very dirty and negative campaign waged by the right-wing coalition led by the Democratic Forum. His party had based its policies on the SI's Stockholm Declaration and through quietly concentrating on the party's programme and the social democratic alternative it offered, the prejudice against the Socialist Party had faded. People were now aware that the Socialists, who had paved the way for peaceful transition to multiparty democracy and a market economy in Hungary, would never return to the former communist system.

He acknowledged the role of the SI in his party's success, the decision to grant observer status to the MSzP, the support their representatives had received in the Council of Europe, the recent visit to Hungary by Pierre Mauroy, and the support and solidarity of many SI member parties.

He said they needed further support and clear signals that the international family of social democracy was with them. They saw the SICEE meeting in Budapest just three days before the second round of elections as a positive development. They hoped the next Council meeting would be held in Budapest and that their status within the SI would soon be that of full membership. He was sure that what was happening in Hungary would have an impact across the country's borders by proving that the social democratic alternative had a good chance in Central and Eastern Europe and could bring about a society with more equality, more solidarity and more social and international stability in the region.

**The chair** said the resolution on the Hungarian elections was adopted and turned to the resolution on the former Yugoslavia.

**Nikos Dimadis** (Greece, PASOK) said the text contained a paragraph concerning the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, a country with which Greece and PASOK - being in government - had an important dispute. As that paragraph now stood he could accept it, but if it was amended and was no longer as balanced as it was now, he would personally be in a very difficult situation, having not had sufficient preparation to debate this issue, and without the relevant Committee having had the time to attempt to find a generally acceptable solution.

He therefore suggested that if no agreement was reached on the text it should be sent to SICEE which would meet again on May 26 so that it could be debated in depth, and a

position found that would be as balanced as possible, and also take into account the position of his party and his government.

**Gérard Fuchs** said the draft resolution in its present form was not acceptable to his party because it described the situation without mentioning the responsibilities on both sides, especially in the light of recent events in the area. He proposed four amendments.

**Pierre Mauroy** said SICEE had indeed not been able to meet before this Council meeting, and it could not have been known that the whole issue of FYROM would be so topical, hence this text drafted by the Committee chair.

Some amendments were discussed and agreed, and the resolution was adopted.

**Juan Somavía** (chair of the Preparatory Committee for the UN World Summit on Social Development) said he wanted to invite participants to become a part of what was probably one of the most political processes which the UN had ever engaged upon, the World Summit for Social Development. The Summit would deal with three basic issues: the question of reducing and eliminating poverty, the reduction of unemployment and generation of productive employment, and the promotion of social integration. These were the issues at the heart of politics, he said, the issues on which governments won or lost elections, and on which major political shifts took place. The object of the Summit was to up-grade the political importance of social issues that had been seen by many as soft issues, not of course by the SI, but in the actual practice of politics and governing. There was in fact no harder issue than that to be dealt with by the Summit - the increase in poverty, unemployment and social tensions. The Summit would be on social issues and the political decisions needed to solve the problems of security, but not on the mechanics of social development.

Security could no longer be thought of in terms of each state's internal and external security, he continued. We needed to look at the concept of the security of the individual, in fact people's security, and this was the function not of the Security Council but of the rest of the United Nations. He agreed with Anne-Marie Lizin's view concerning the feminisation of poverty, of unemployment and of violence. The whole question of gender equity was at the heart of the Social Summit.

He stressed that it was not a North-South summit, but a global summit, because no society could declare itself free from the problems of poverty, unemployment and social integration. If these problems were not solved, we would be moving into a very unstable world in the 21st century, for social problems in one country affected other countries too, as we had all seen.

Another concept behind the Summit, he said, was about finding a consensus on social issues, as we had consensus about human rights and democracy, about open economies, and about a sustainable environmental development. For him the answer was investment in people, which of course was nothing new for the SI.

Concerning the integrated approach to economics, social issues, culture and politics, he felt that in the last 15 years decisions had been increasingly based on economic logic, and he believed it was the responsibility of institutions like the SI to re-establish an equilibrium: of course we needed economic efficiency, but we also needed social efficiency. These things that were obvious to us in the SI, being a part of our credo, were the very things that needed to be re-established today, and what the Summit wanted to deal with.

There was also the global realisation that there must be ethical and political limits to poverty and exclusion, which was a very large issue. In his view the important political question concerning structural adjustment policies was why the accounts were being balanced at the expense of the weak in society: why could it not be the strong who made the effort of structural adjustment, he asked.

With all these sorts of problems, Somavía said, the question was whether the UN could do anything. It was becoming increasingly evident that there were no national solutions to these problems; in a globalised economy they were all interlinked, as each elected government soon discovered when facing the problem of putting its promises into practice. But the UN could focus on the issue and define priorities. Certain priorities did clearly emerge: extreme poverty and extreme exclusion; youth unemployment and long-term unemployment; violence in all our societies and a weakening of values. Then there were the issues such as gender which cut across all the others; there were the particular

regions like Africa that needed to be given priority. The problem was how to generate the political momentum to do what was necessary, and experience had shown that the big UN meetings did generate such momentum.

So this Summit, he said, would be a first step in putting the issue on the table at the international level. The UN, as a structure, had to be able to respond as an integrated instrument, or else it would disintegrate. It could not continue as it was today. It had to be given a political push in the direction that was relevant to the people.

In concluding, Somavía said he believed these things were successful when people were committed, and he was inviting everyone to be committed - in their parties, in their countries, in government or in opposition - to ensure an active participation that would help the momentum, because these issues of security and the values of the Socialist International were probably the most important issues that we faced. If we missed the boat, if we were incapable of finding international orientations, it would be very much a free-for-all.

**Pierre Mauroy** said we would heed this advice and do our best to be at the Social Summit in Copenhagen.

**Maurice Deveen** (Labour Sports International, CSIT) gave a brief history of the Labour Sports International since its foundation in 1913 in reaction to an era which denied the right to regular sport to workers, day labourers and farmers. The CSIT was now a part of the Olympic movement and of the Committee of Sports for All. He outlined the structure of the organisation and its 32-member executive.

His wish was that there might be a group, made up of two or three members of the SI Council and two or three members of the CSIT, to reflect on sports for all. Since 1981 they had been members of the larger SI family and he was grateful for this first opportunity to express themselves at Council. They were convinced that through regular sports activities the individual was better equipped to deal with daily problems.

**Pierre Mauroy** said this suggestion would be looked into.

He then introduced the remaining resolution on Chernobyl, which was adopted, and announced that the SI would be convening a Conference of Socialist Mayors, which the Council agreed.

Mauroy then reported that, following events in Italy and in the Socialist Party of Italy, PSI, Bettino Craxi had informed him that he had no objections to ceasing to be a vice-president of the SI, and the next SI Congress would have to fill that post.

In drawing the meeting to its conclusion he said he shared António Guterres's hopes following the election of Nelson Mandela as President of South Africa, which seemed to him to be one of the most symbolic events of the century - possibly more even than the ending of apartheid - with social, cultural and political repercussions for the whole world. The SI had always stated and re-stated the principle of equality of human beings, whatever their race.

He was also hopeful regarding the elections in Hungary. He would have liked to accept as members a number of former communist parties who had evolved in their ideology, as had been recognised by public opinion, and who were asking to join the SI. This was a considerable development. After 70 years of schism between communists and socialists, there was now an opening to re-structure the unity of international socialism. There was still a lot to be done, and it would probably be one of the issues of our next Congress, but this unity and re-grouping would have many repercussions.

There was naturally rejoicing, he continued, over the peace process in the Middle East. He reminded participants that the only time that Palestinians and Israelis in the past had met was during the Socialist International's meetings.

There were hopes and apprehensions with regard to Asia. This was the first time there had been so many countries from the Asian region represented at an SI Council, and the contributions had been very interesting and sometimes very moving. It had been a very positive contribution, like the in-depth changes that were going on in Japan.

He commended the report from India and welcomed the idea that it might be possible to re-construct a socialist movement there.

Mauroy acknowledged also some feelings of helplessness concerning events in Bangladesh, and the difficulties in Burma. Democracy was of course the best asset of economic development and it was obvious that a certain emphasis had now to be laid on social rights in Asia.

The desire for a joint initiative between the SI and the ICFTU showed that while the political and trade union paths were totally independent, a certain number of actions might now be agreed on in order to impress on public opinion what was common to our movements.

Although the approach was different in different continents, such as Asia or Latin America, it was the same struggle for the same values that we were engaged in.

With regard to security, he said feelings went from hope to despair. It was necessary to reflect in depth on this problem. Concerning disarmament, the initiative taken by the French President to stop nuclear tests was going to be generalised, and this was welcome. With regard to the United Nations, we had made some headway and would be celebrating the 50th anniversary of the UN and its specialised agencies next year.

The Council, Mauroy said, had adopted many resolutions and had a lot of work ahead. There would be missions to South Africa, the Middle East and other countries; the Conference of Socialist Mayors, and the next Council meeting, probably in Budapest, where we would obviously talk largely of the problems that had shaken up Central and Eastern Europe. What was happening in Hungary and other countries might also happen in Russia and we would like to help them there.

He said he spoke for all in giving hearty thanks to our Japanese friends, to our Japanese Vice-President Makato Tanabe, to the presidents of the two Japanese member parties, to the Prime Minister who had given such a good reception, and to all the Japanese socialists. This was greeted with applause.

Mauroy then wished all delegates a safe return home, and courage in pursuing their work and the follow-up of what had been started. Hoping to meet again probably in Budapest, he thanked all the speakers, interpreters and staff. Thanking once again the Japanese friends for all their work in preparing the event, he declared the Council meeting closed.

-----