

Regional or Global? Political Networks of Socialist Parties in European Community Development Policy¹

Christian Salm

RESÜMEE

Der Aufsatz untersucht die transnationalen politischen Netzwerke der europäischen sozialdemokratischen/sozialistischen Parteien im Bereich der Entwicklungshilfepolitik der Europäischen Gemeinschaft zu Beginn der 1970er Jahre. Hierzu werden zunächst jene netzwerkartigen Verbindungen und Überlappungen der europäischen Sozialdemokraten / Sozialisten rekonstruiert, die sich im Rahmen des transnational institutionalisierten Netzwerkes der Sozialistischen Internationale (SI) herausbildeten. In einem zweiten Schritt werden am Beispiel der Debatte über ein regional oder global konzipiertes EG-Entwicklungshilfesystem die von den Netzwerken entwickelten Funktionen, Strategien und Aktivitäten für eine Einflussnahme auf den politischen Entscheidungsfindungsprozess der EG herausgearbeitet. Zum Schluss erfolgt eine Bewertung des Einflusses der transnationalen politischen Netzwerke der europäischen sozialdemokratischen / sozialistischen Parteien auf die EG-Entwicklungshilfepolitik.

In the beginning of the 1970s the wealth gap between the developed and the developing countries began to widen. The global increase in poverty and the only partially successful development programmes such as the strategy for the first United Nations (UN) Economic Development Decade (1961–1970) put development issues on the political agenda. The first television reports on starving children in the so-called Third World and television-led fund-raising campaigns for developing countries strengthened demands for improved development aid, with the churches and left-wing student groups in particular giving a voice to these demands.² As Richard T. Griffiths has pointed out, the growing

1 The research for this article has partly been financed by the Fonds National de la Recherche Luxembourg.

2 See Bastian Hein, *Die Westdeutschen und die Dritte Welt. Entwicklungsdienst und Entwicklungspolitik zwischen Reform und Revolte 1959–1974*, Munich 2006, p. 135 ff.

public awareness of the problem of poverty in the beginning of the 1970s mobilized public opinion in the western European countries in favour of more concerted efforts by their governments in the field of development policy –³ this at a time when systems of development aid were still largely based on national policy competences and structures and a shared European Community (EC) approach was only beginning to emerge.

In fact, the question of what relationship the EC should have with the developing countries can be traced back to the origins of the European Economic Community (EEC) in the 1950s.⁴ When discussions on the later EEC Treaty started in 1955, two camps advocating distinct concepts of development policy formed. One camp, mainly consisting of the governments of France and Belgium, demanded a regional focus on development aid directed at their colonies. The other camp, mainly consisting of the governments of Germany and the Netherlands, clearly had wider trading interests. Indeed, because the economies of its colonies were so closely tied to France, for political and economic reasons the French government made an association of the overseas territories a precondition for signing the EEC Treaty.⁵ Germany and the Netherlands eventually accepted the French government's demand in order to facilitate the successful conclusion of the negotiations.⁶

About 15 years later, development policy was again a major point on the EC's agenda. By then changes in the global political economy had called into question the narrowly-based EC development policy. By 1970, eighteen of the former colonies associated with the EC had become independent, and had negotiated new agreements with the EEC/EC: the Yaoundé Convention I in 1963 and the Yaoundé Convention II and the Arusha Convention in 1969. Furthermore, the EC had become the largest and fastest expanding market for products from developing countries. In addition, the accession of Great Britain to the EC was to transform the Commonwealth system and make the Community even more important to the developing countries.⁷ Against this background, the negotiations on the Lomé Convention of 1975 marked an important step towards a more coherent EC policy vis-à-vis at least a part of the Third World.⁸

3 Richard T. Griffiths, Development Aid. Some References for Historical Research, in: Helge Ø. Pharo/Monika Pohle Fraser (eds.), *The Aid Rush. Aid regimes in Northern Europe during the Cold War*, vol. 1, Oslo 2008, pp. 17–49, here p. 29.

4 Ronald Marwood, *The European Community and the Third World: A Global or a Regional Development Policy?*, in: *Millennium – Journal of International Studies* 3 (1974) 3, pp. 208–224, here p. 208.

5 On the negotiation of the association of the overseas territories with the EEC see especially Urban Vahsen, *Eurafrikanische Entwicklungspolitik. Die Assoziierungspolitik der EWG gegenüber dem subsaharischen Afrika in den 1960er Jahren*, Stuttgart 2010, pp. 55ff.

6 See, for example, Desmond Dinan, *Europe Recast: A History of European Union*, London 2004, p. 74; Gerhardt Brunn, *Die Europäische Einigung von 1945 bis heute*, Stuttgart 2002, pp. 114f.; Hans Küsters, *Die Gründung der Europäischen Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft*, Baden-Baden 1982, pp. 379ff.

7 Marwood, *The European Community and the Third World* (note 4), p. 208.

8 See Carol Cosgrove Twitchett, *Europe and Africa: From Association to Partnership*, Westmead/Farnborough, 1978, p. 148; Lotte Drieghe/Jan Orbie, *Revolution in Time of Eurosclerosis. The Case of the First Lomé Convention*, in: *L'Europe en formation*, 2009, 353–354, pp. 167–181, here p. 169.

In the 1970s the growing wealth gap across the world strengthened the moral case for more equitable global institutional arrangements. At the same time, the increased international bargaining power of the developing countries as producers of crucial raw materials and their position in the Cold War competition between the superpowers gave them some leverage on the Lomé negotiations and on the broader international economic policy debate as part of the North-South Dialogue.⁹ The new power of the developing countries was also reflected in the Group of 77 (G-77), the largest intergovernmental organization of developing states in the UN, established during the 1960s with the aim of articulating and promoting the collective economic interests of the countries of the South. The G-77 demanded a New International Economic Order (NEIO) in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) deliberations and the implementation of the International Strategy for the Second UN International Development Decade (1971–1980).¹⁰

The International Strategy for the Second UN Development Decade was proclaimed by the UN General Assembly in November 1970. The concept included a comprehensive global policy strategy for development aid and provided an indicative framework for extending and coordinating the international community's contribution to economic and social progress in the Third World.¹¹ The general objective of the strategy was 'to seek a better and more effective system of international cooperation whereby the prevailing disparities in the world may be banished and prosperity secured for all'.¹² The strategy called for a global development approach based on joint concerted action by developed and developing countries in all spheres of economic and social life.¹³ Moreover, the strategy contained one of the most frequently discussed policy targets concerning international development aid, namely that 'each economically advanced country will progressively increase its official development assistance to the developing countries and will exert its best to reach a minimum net amount of 0.7 per cent of its Gross National Product ... by the middle of the Decade'.¹⁴

At the EC level, France still advocated limiting a policy of association to the former colonies whereas Germany and the Netherlands wanted to replace the association policy with global development aid.¹⁵ However, both camps essentially agreed on the further

9 See Giuliano Garavani, *The Colonies Strike Back: The Impact of the Third World on Western Europe, 1968–1975*, in: *Contemporary European History* 16 (2007) 3, pp. 299–319, here p. 313ff.

10 See, for example, Thorsten B. Olesen, *Between Words and Deeds. Denmark and the NIEO Agenda, 1974–1982*, in: Helge Ø. Pharo/Monika Pohle Fraser (eds.), *The Aid Rush. Aid Regimes in Northern Europe during the Cold War*, vol. 1, Oslo 2008, pp. 145–182, here p. 146f.

11 Jörg-Udo Meyer/Dieter Seul/Karl Heinz Klinger, *Die zweite Entwicklungsddekade der Vereinten Nationen. Konzept und Kritiken einer globalen Entwicklungsstrategie*, Düsseldorf/Gütersloh 1971, p. 14.

12 UN General Assembly Resolution 2626 (XXV), Paragraph 6, 19 November 1970.

13 UN General Assembly Resolution 2626 (XXV), Paragraph 7, 19 November 1970.

14 UN General Assembly Resolution 2626 (XXV), Paragraph 43, 19 November 1970.

15 See Dieter Frisch, *The European Union's Development Policy, Policy Management Report 15 of European Centre for Development Policy Management*, Maastricht 2008, p. 7; Enzo R. Grilli, *The European Community and the Developing Countries*, Cambridge / New York 1993, pp. 65–71.

Europeanization of development policy.¹⁶ To achieve this goal, two different systems of development aid had to be integrated into one single system: the individual development policies of the EC member states as well as the already existing EC policy system of regional development aid in the form of the association conventions.¹⁷ This integration could only be achieved if EC development policy was formulated in global terms for relations with all developing countries. It was at this point that the European socialist parties became engaged in EC development policy.

In line with their internationalist origins and traditions, European socialists tended to feel a special responsibility for the situation in developing countries.¹⁸ Such sentiments were clearly reflected in the development policies of many European socialist parties and organizations. For example, from its creation in 1951, the partly-institutionalized meta-network of the Socialist International (SI) defined development aid as one of the most important policy fields on its agenda.¹⁹ Holding its Council meeting in Haifa in Israel in 1960, the SI for the first time met outside of Europe. In his study of the internationalization of party cooperation, Peter van Kemseke has interpreted this decision for Haifa as signalling that development issues had become a top priority for the SI.²⁰ Hence, it is not surprising that in the beginning of the 1970s European socialists were deeply involved in the ongoing debates on the future of development policy at the international, European and national levels. Using transnational political networks, the European socialists sought to reframe the debate on the future of EC development policy by pushing for the full integration of the proposals of the Second International UN Development Strategy into the EC development system and promoting a global concept of EC development aid.

Drawing upon the definition of Wolfram Kaiser, Brigitte Leucht and Michael Gehler, I understand the term 'transnational political networks' as the mainly informal and non-hierarchical cooperation of state and non-state actors linked across national borders. Unlike in the case of policy networks, their cooperation is not necessarily geared or limited to influencing policy-making in one policy sector only.²¹ This definition has one particular heuristic advantage. The categorization of actors within networks as state and non-state

16 Eppler hofft immer noch auf eine gemeinsame Entwicklungspolitik, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 27 September 1972.

17 See Klaus Billerbeck, *Europäisierung der Entwicklungspolitik II. Gemeinschaftliche Entwicklungspolitik für den Mittelmeerraum, Asien und Lateinamerika*, Berlin 1972, p. 2.

18 See, for example, Grilli, *The European Community and the Developing Countries* (note 15), p. 3.

19 Karl Ludwig Günsche/Klaus Lantermann, *Kleine Geschichte der Sozialistischen Internationale*, Bonn 1977, p. 128. For a short overview on the reactivation of the SI after World War II see Wilfried Loth, *The Socialist International*, in: Walter Lipgens/Wilfried Loth (eds.), *Documents on the History of European Integration*, vol. 4, *Transnational Organizations of Political Parties and Pressure Groups in the Struggle for European Union, 1945-1950*, Berlin/New York 1991, pp. 436-442.

20 Peter van Kemseke, *Towards an Era of Development. The Globalization of Socialism and Christian Democracy*, Leuven 2006, p. 256.

21 Wolfram Kaiser/Brigitte Leucht/Michael Gehler, *Transnational Networks in European Integration Governance: Historical Perspectives on an Elusive Phenomenon*, in: Wolfram Kaiser/Brigitte Leucht/Michael Gehler (eds.), *Transnational Networks in Regional Integration. Governing Europe 1945-1983*, Basingstoke 2010, pp. 1-17.

actors is less rigid than the distinction often used in social science between public and private actors. On the assumption that political parties formulate and advance general public interests, this latter definition treats them as public actors comparable to governments. Despite the fact that political party actors often also hold government posts, political parties are clearly non-state actors. Thus, leading socialist politicians played a role as state actors in their governments and in inter-state negotiations, and as non-state actors in their parties, where they were involved in the transnational networks of the European socialists.

The aim of this article is to reconstruct these transnational political networks of the European socialists, their activities and their relations with state and other non-state actors including experts and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the field of EC development policy. The two central research questions are: first, what transnational political networks did the socialists establish and use? Secondly, to what extent was the ongoing debate on the future of EC development policy shaped by the transnational cooperation of the European socialists? The article is thus structured in two main sections. In the first section I map the transnational political networks of the European socialists engaged in development policy, explain why they were constituted, describe their degree of formal integration, highlight and evaluate any overlap among the various networks, and assess the informal dimension of their cooperation. I discuss those political networks of the European socialists that formed around the SI, the Liaison Bureau of the Socialist Parties in the EC, as well as the German Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FEF) and the Vienna Institute for Development. In the second section I discuss the functions, strategies and activities of these transnational networks in EC development policy. In the conclusion I provide a preliminary assessment of the impact of the European socialist parties on EC development policy.

Mapping socialist networks in development policy

When the SI attempted to reconstitute itself as a global network of socialist and social democratic parties at its congress in Frankfurt in June 1951, it adopted two documents: a draft of new statutes and a declaration on the principles of democratic socialism. The declaration envisaged *inter alia* a 'world plan' for international institutions and policy measures to be used for economic assistance for underdeveloped countries. Furthermore, the declaration stipulated that a socialist policy for economically underdeveloped countries should be formulated. In order to frame such a socialist development policy, a conference of economic experts was held in Vienna in November 1951. Only ten west European parties participated in this conference.²²

22 See Günsche/Lantermann, *Kleine Geschichte der Sozialistischen Internationale* (note 19), p. 236 ff.

Although the organization had started to intensify contacts with socialist parties in Asia and elsewhere since the early 1950s²³, about twenty years later, the main SI actors were still the west European member parties. For instance, all important members of the bureau of the organization were west European socialists. Members of the Socialist Party of Austria (SPÖ) filled the position of president (Bruno Pittermann), and the position of secretary-general (Hans Janitschek, who succeeded Albert Carthy, a member of the British Labour Party, in April 1969).²⁴ Furthermore, with the exception of Tokyo in 1977, throughout the 1960s and 1970s all SI party leaders' conferences were held in west European countries. These party leaders' conferences were attended by high ranking west European socialists, including socialists in high positions in the European Commission, with the purpose of enabling discussions and exchanges of views.²⁵ Even though the SI defined itself as a global network of socialist parties, the organization still had a strongly Eurocentric character in the beginning of the 1970s.

The cooperation of the socialist parties in the EC was first institutionalized in the Liaison Bureau of the Socialist Parties in the European Community in 1957. As the resolution of the second congress of the socialist parties in the EC stated in June of that year, the aim of the Liaison Bureau was to strengthen relations between the parties and to reach agreement in particular on EC political issues.²⁶ The Liaison Bureau consisted of one delegate of each member party and met every six months.²⁷ In spite of this institutional organization, the cooperation of the socialist parties in the EC remained very weakly developed throughout the 1960s. Only the decision of the summit of The Hague in 1969 in favour of direct elections for the European Parliament (EP) provided an impetus for strengthening their transnational cooperation through further institutionalization.²⁸ The socialist parties reacted to this decision by founding the Confederation of the Socialist Parties in the EC in April 1974. However, as Simon Hix and Urs Lesse have demonstrated, the institutional structures of the former Liaison Bureau were largely maintained, with some small changes.²⁹ Due to only marginal institutional improvements, as well as a lack of funding and staff, the formal cooperation of the socialist parties in the EC remained

23 Kemseke, *Towards an Era of Development* (note 20), 53 ff.

24 Bruno Pittermann was SI president from 1964–1976. Hans Janitschek held the position of the SI secretary-general from 1969–1976. Albert Carthy was SI secretary-general from 1957–1969.

25 Rodney Balcomb (SI assistant secretary) to Hans Janitschek, 9 November 1973, International Institute for Social History (IISH) Amsterdam, Socialist International Archives (SIA), box 337.

26 See Simon Hix/Urs Lesse, *Shaping a Vision. A History of the Party of European Socialists*, Brussels 2002, pp. 11 ff. Six parties were represented: Parti Socialiste Belge/Belgische Socialistische Partij (PS/SP); Section Française Internationale Ouvrière (SFIO); Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD); Partito Socialista Democratico Italiano (PSDI); Parti Ouvrier Socialiste Luxembourgeois/Letzburger Sozialistische Arbeiter Partei (POS/L/LSAP); and the Dutch Partij van de Arbeid (PvdA).

27 See, for example, Andreas van Gehlen, *Europäische Parteiendemokratie? Institutionelle Voraussetzungen und Funktionsbedingungen der europäischen Parteien zur Minderung des Legitimationsdefizits der EU*, <http://www.gehlen.net/diss/> [last accessed 4 May 2010], p. 192.

28 See, for example, Oskar Niedermayer, *Europäische Parteien? Zur grenzüberschreitenden Interaktion politischer Parteien im Rahmen der Europäischen Gemeinschaft*, Frankfurt a.M. 1983, p. 60; Norbert Gresch, *Transnationale Parteienzusammenarbeit in der EG*, Baden-Baden 1979, p. 109.

29 Hix/Lesse, *Shaping a Vision* (note 26), p. 22.

weak throughout the 1970s. Thus, although the Confederation considered itself to be the independent section of the SI in the EC,³⁰ the partly-institutionalized structures of the SI remained the most important network for the west European socialist parties for defining socialist policies in and for Europe and the EC.

In fact, due to the prospect of enlargement and new impulses for further integration after the summit of The Hague such as the plan for a common monetary policy, various SI study groups became more concerned with EC politics in the beginning of the 1970s. The topic of European integration was also high on the agenda of the SI congress in Vienna in June 1972. In order to elaborate a European socialist policy, influential representatives of the European socialist parties spoke at this congress. They included Willy Brandt, the west German chancellor; Sicco Mansholt, the president of the European Commission; Pietro Nenni, the leader of the Italian Socialist Party; Harold Wilson, the leader of the British Labour Party; Walter Behrendt, the president of the EP; François Mitterrand, the leader of the French Socialist Party; Ivar Nørgaard, the Danish minister for foreign trade and EC affairs; and Olof Palme, prime minister and leader of the Swedish Social Democratic Labour Party. Highlighting the close relationship of the SI with the socialist parties in the EC, the congress resolution on EC politics stated that the SI 'supports the socialist parties of the EC which decided to take the lead in pressing both at national and Community level for effective assistance to the developing countries'.³¹

Alongside the SI and the Liaison Bureau – subsequently transformed into the Confederation of the Socialist Parties in the EC –, in the 1970s the FEF, a political foundation closely linked to the German Social Democratic Party (SPD), fulfilled a special role as what might be termed a political network organization for the European socialist parties, becoming an engine of transnational socialist party cooperation.³² As early as the early 1960s the foundation began to develop far-reaching transnational relations in order to shape development policy.³³ Since its original foundation in 1925, international cooperation had been one of the foundation's main activities. Before 1933 it developed close relations in particular to officials of the international organizations at the time such as the League of Nations and the International Labour Organization. FEF activists maintained these contacts to some extent while in exile during World War II. This in turn made it easier for the reconstituted FEF (1946) to continue and expand its international cooperation in the 1950s and 1960s.³⁴

30 Interview des Parlamentarischen Pressedienstes mit dem Präsidenten des Bundes der sozialdemokratischen Parteien in der EG Wilhelm Dröschner, IISH, Archief Sicco L. Mansholt (ASM), box 274.

31 Report of the 12th Congress of the SI held in Vienna, 26-29 June 1972, IISH, SIA, box 263.

32 On the role of the FEF as political network organization in another context see also Wolfram Kaiser/Christian Salm, *Transition und Europäisierung in Spanien und Portugal. Sozial- und christdemokratische Netzwerke im Übergang von der Diktatur zur parlamentarischen Demokratie*, in: *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, Bd. 49, Bonn 2009, pp. 259-282, here pp. 264 ff.

33 Alfred Nau (president of the FEF) to Helmut Schmidt (then interior minister of the city-state of Hamburg and later West German chancellor), 6 September 1962, Archiv der sozialen Demokratie (AdSD) Bonn, Helmut Schmidt Archiv (HSA), 1/HSAAA007503.

34 The most important of these organizations are: International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, various Eu-

European integration played a prominent role in the foundation's political activities. The FEF developed contacts with the Council of Europe, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the EEC/EC.³⁵ Together with the Directorate-General for development aid (DG VIII) of the European Commission, the FEF organized training programmes for qualified individuals from developing countries associated with the EEC from the mid-1960s onwards.³⁶ To intensify its contacts with the European Commission, the FEF's research institute offered DG VIII at the end of the 1960s to produce various research reports on development policy.³⁷ In fact, the Commission agreed that the foundation's research institute should prepare a report on the economic development of two African states, Togo and Dahomé (renamed Benin in 1975), which were associated with the EC.³⁸ In 1973, the foundation opened an office in Brussels to operate in the field of EC development policy.³⁹ In the light of the Yaoundé Convention II and the future Lomé Convention, the FEF considered development policy as a suitable policy field for networking at the European level.⁴⁰ Using the example of EC development policy, the foundation's office in Brussels invited political actors to familiarize themselves with the political system of the EC. These activities were complemented by a variety of international seminars and conferences, which the foundation organized in cooperation with EC institutions in Luxembourg, Strasbourg and Paris. International seminars were not only held in EC member states but also in other European states such as the Scandinavian countries, the United Kingdom and Austria.⁴¹ Additionally, the foundation's research centre maintained contacts with the most relevant institutions for development policy in these countries such as, for example, the Vienna Institute for Development.

Based on the idea of the former Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru that an international institute free from the influence of governments should be set up to promote development policy, the Vienna Institute was founded in 1962 by Foreign Minister Bruno Kreisky, who later became chancellor of Austria from 1970 to 1983. It was one of the first NGOs to discuss problems of development policy and promote new forms of development aid. The main function of the institute in the 1970s was to influence

European and non-European governments, Rockefeller-Foundation, Ford-Foundation, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Lieber-Foundation and institutions from Asia, Africa, Latin America and the United States working in the field of development policy.

35 Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Die partnerschaftlichen Beziehungen der FES zu den Entwicklungsländern – Bericht 1962, AdSD, HSA, 1/HSAAA007503.

36 Aktenvermerk Generaldirektion Entwicklungshilfe VIII, 22 July 1969, European Commission Historical Archives (ECHA) Brussels, Bac 25 1980 146.

37 Dr. Horst Heidermann (director of the FEF research centre) to Henrie Rochereau (member of the European Commission), 17 July 1969, ECHA, Bac 25 1980 146.

38 Johannes Westhoff (director general DG VIII) to Dr. Horst Heidermann, 7 October 1969, and Johannes Westhoff to Dr. Horst Heidermann, 24 November 1969, ECHA, Bac 25 1980 146.

39 Patrik von zur Mühlen, Die internationale Arbeit der Friedrich Ebert Stiftung. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Ost-West-Konflikts, Bonn 2007, p. 194.

40 Interview Hermann Büntz (former member of staff of FEF office, Brussels), 24 February 2009.

41 Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Die partnerschaftlichen Beziehungen der FES zu den Entwicklungsländern – Bericht 1962, AdSD, HSA, 1/HSAAA007503.

public opinion in industrialized countries in favour of international development by disseminating information about the developing world and the role of industrialized countries in the development process. The institute's board included important decision-makers from national and international institutions and NGOs from the West and the South.⁴² With its predominantly social democratic shape, the board also included American Democrats such like Paul G. Hoffman, the administrator of the UN Development Programme. European socialists involved in the board's informal meetings and activities included Kreisky, Brandt, Erhard Eppler, the SPD minister for development cooperation, and Ernst Michanek, a member of the Swedish Social Democratic Party (SAP) and director general of the Swedish International Development Authority.⁴³ The Vienna Institute and the FEF were linked to each other not least through the close relationship between Kreisky and Brandt. In the 1970s, both organizations sought to extend their relations.⁴⁴ They mainly cooperated by organizing joint seminars for a wide range of different actors to discuss various aspects of international development policy. A representative of the FEF or the SPD usually attended the board meetings of the Vienna Institute. In 1969 the board meeting was even held in the FEF headquarters in Bonn.⁴⁵ Furthermore, the board meeting invitations for delegates of European socialist parties closely connected with the SPD and the SPÖ were prepared by the international secretary of the SPD party executive, Hans Eberhard Dingels.⁴⁶ Dingels' list of invited participants largely covered the members of a tight network of international secretaries and secretary-generals of the European socialist parties.⁴⁷ The members of this network regularly exchanged information on new developments in European and international politics.⁴⁸ Furthermore, the executive committees of the European socialist parties were continuously informed of the political activities of their sister parties. By deputizing for the party leaders at formal and informal meetings at the international and European level, the international secretaries played an important role

42 Peter Jankowitsch, Österreich und die dritte Welt. Ein neues Kapitel Außenpolitik, in: Erich Bielka/Peter Jankowitsch/Hans Thalberg (eds.), *Die Ära Kreisky: Schwerpunkte der österreichischen Außenpolitik*, Wien 1983, pp. 257-292, here p. 267.

43 Composition of Board, 28 October 1973, Bruno Kreisky Archive (BKA) Vienna, III. 8. Wiener Institut für Entwicklungspolitik, box 10.

44 Alfred Nau to Bruno Kreisky, 29 October 1970, BKA, III. 8. Wiener Institut für Entwicklungspolitik, box 10.

45 Minutes of the Vienna Institute Board Meeting, 7 June 1969, BKA, III. 8. Wiener Institut für Entwicklungspolitik, box 9.

46 Hans Eberhard Dingels to Dr. Günter Grunwald (executive director of the FEF), 3 April 1969, AdsD, Willy Brandt Archiv (WPA), A11.4, 50.

47 Karl Czernetz (international secretary of the SPÖ), Tom McNally (overseas secretary of the Labour Party), Pieter Dankert (international secretary of the PvdA), Alberto Bemporad (international secretary of the Partito Socialista Italiano, PSI), Piero Schori (international secretary of the SAP), Jan Luyton (general secretary of the Belge PS), Niels Mathiasen (general secretary of the Danish Social Democratic Party), Anssi Karkkinen (secretary of the Social Democratic Party of Finland), Richard Müller (secretary of the Social Democratic Party of Switzerland), Reulf Steen (vice-chairman of the Norwegian Labour Party), Fernand Georges (secretary-general of the Liaison Bureau of the Socialist Parties in the EC) and Albert Carthy (secretary-general of the SI).

48 Interview Hans Eberhard Dingels, 7 July 2009.

in the socialist networks. Occasionally they chaired transnational working groups established in the frameworks of the SI or the EC Bureau.

For instance, after UNCTAD II in New Delhi in 1968 the SI formed a working group on development cooperation. Dingels was appointed chair of this group, later renamed Working Party on Socialist Priorities in the Second Development Decade. Again, most of the members of this informal group belonged to the network of the international secretaries of the European socialist parties.⁴⁹ The group's objective was to make the SI more visible in development cooperation and guarantee that it would be a main factor in making the upcoming Second UN Development Decade a success. After the first meeting in January 1969, the working group proposed to the SI Bureau that experts from other institutions in the field of development cooperation should be invited to assist the group in their further deliberations.⁵⁰ Thus, the secretary-general of the SI at the time, Carthy, transmitted a request to Kreisky to send an expert on development policy from the Vienna Institute to the next meeting of the working group.⁵¹ Dingels himself made sure that a representative of the FEF research centre was involved in the deliberations, too.⁵² The next group meeting was already attended by the director of the Vienna Institute, Peter Jankowitsch who was a close assistant of Kreisky and later his chief of cabinet, and the director of the FEF research centre, Horst Heidermann.⁵³ Given the SI's Euro-centric character in the 1970s, the working group discussed not only socialist policies and strategies related to the International Strategy of the Second UN Development Decade, but also how proposals from this strategy could be inserted into EC development policy.⁵⁴ Motivated by the same political objectives, Jan Tinbergen (a member of the Dutch Labour Party, chair of the UN Development Planning Committee and winner of the Nobel Prize for economics in 1969) proposed the establishment of an informal network in the framework of the SI to coordinate socialist activities in development policy. At the eleventh SI congress in Eastbourne in Britain in April 1969, Tinbergen presented unpublished documents of several UN agencies on the International Strategy for the Second UN Development Decade highlighting that these proposals were clearly in line with socialist policy. Tinbergen called on the socialist parties to commit themselves to two targets of international development policy in particular: first, the spending of one per cent of the gross domestic product (GNP) of industrialized countries on development aid; and secondly, tariff-free imports of products from developing countries.⁵⁵ Further-

49 The working party was composed of members from Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain, Israel, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden.

50 SI Circular No. 6/69, 7 February 1969, The Danish Labour Movement's Library and Archives (ABA) Copenhagen, Socialist International (SI), box 566.

51 Albert Carthy to Bruno Kreisky, 13 February 1969, IISH, SIA, box 909.

52 Hans Eberhard Dingels to Alfred Nau, 12 February 1969, AdsD, WBA, A11.4, 50.

53 Albert Carthy to Peter Jankowitsch, 12 March 1969, and Albert Carthy to Dr. Horst Heidermann, 12 March 1979, IISH, SIA, box 909.

54 Interview Hans Eberhard Dingels, 27 January 2010.

55 The 0.7 per cent figure was first mentioned in a UN document with the declaration of the Second UN Development Decade in November 1970. From then on the SI took on the 0.7 per cent target. On the origins of the 0.7

more, he stressed the need for socialist parties to strengthen their cooperation vis-à-vis the UN Development Strategy.⁵⁶ Following Tinbergen's speech, the congress adopted a resolution that demanded that SI member parties assume a uniform position vis-à-vis the UN Development Strategy for the 1970s.⁵⁷

A short while later, Tinbergen considered the election of the SPD-led government of Brandt in the Federal Republic in September 1969 – at a time when the Labour Party was still in power in Britain – to be a unique chance for socialist parties to contribute to the future of development policy.⁵⁸ In November 1969, at a meeting with the recently elected new SI secretary-general, Janitschek, and the overseas secretary of the Labour Party, Tom McNally, Tinbergen discussed how the SI could foster cooperation among socialist development ministers. Besides the German and the British ministers, Tinbergen also wanted to involve the Swedish development minister, stressing that socialist governments and parties should develop a long-term plan for development policy. Tinbergen proposed the establishment of an informal network, to be called World Plan Council of the SI, which would bring together leading members of socialist parties throughout the world with experts in the field of development aid.⁵⁹ The major objective of this network would be to channel the transnational cooperation of the socialist parties to prepare for the new tasks in the field of development policy.

In March 1970, at the SI party leaders' conference in Brussels, Tinbergen again drew attention to the International Strategy for the Second UN Development Decade and presented his proposal for a World Plan Council of the SI. According to the Dutch professor, the socialists faced a dilemma: they considered it essential to eliminate poverty in the world but the very policies of development and industrial growth pursued to eliminate poverty led to the destruction of the environment and a population increase. For Tinbergen this meant that if the twin goals of eliminating poverty and protecting the environment were to be maintained, then it was necessary not only to coordinate the two policies, but to re-examine and possibly alter them. His proposal for a World Plan Council was to facilitate the preparation of a comprehensive socialist policy for development and environmental protection in a transnational framework. The lack of proper socialist planning for such policy issues at an international level motivated the party leaders' decision to establish a socialist network for development policy. The World Plan Council of the SI was intended to fill a lacuna in socialist policy, namely to take a leading position in international development policy and to support the proposals of the UN strategy

per cent target see Michael A. Clemens/Todd J. Moss, *Ghost of 0.7%: Origins and Relevance of the International Aid target*, Center for Global Development, Working paper No. 68, 2005, <http://www.cgdev.org/content/publications/detail/3822/> [last accessed 7 June 2010].

56 Socialist Priorities for the Second Development Decade. Speech by Jan Tinbergen at the 11th SI Congress in Eastbourne, 16–20 June 1969, IISH, SIA, box 414.

57 Resolution of the 11th SI congress reiterated in the resolution on the Second Development Decade adopted by the Council conference of the SI, 25–27 May 1971, Circular No. 10/72, 9 June 1971, ABA, SI, box 751.

58 Jan Tinbergen to Judith Hart, 27 October 1969, IISH, SIA, box 909.

59 Minutes of the meeting with Jan Tinbergen at the SI Secretariat, 7 November 1969, IISH, SIA, box 414.

for the Second Development Decade.⁶⁰ To underline the ambitions of the World Plan Council as well as to provide detailed information on the issues of the UN Development Strategy, the SI Bureau circulated to its member parties a report prepared by Tinbergen's UN Development Planning Committee.⁶¹ Additionally, to raise the awareness of the UN in respect of this initiative and to discuss further which part the SI could play in the Second UN Development Decade, the secretary-general of the SI, Janitschek, met the administrator of the UN Development Programme, Hoffmann.⁶²

As a first step, in the beginning of the 1970s, a small working group of experts from SI member parties was set up under the chairmanship of Tinbergen.⁶³ This working group's task was to prepare a detailed plan of the structure of the World Plan Council and its role in international development policy. In order to retain a close link between the work of the group and policy-making in development policy, Tinbergen drew up a list of prospective participants in the informal meetings of the working group. It contained persons whom he considered crucial for the core of the network of the World Plan Council: Kreisky or a representative of the Vienna Institute; Eppler or a representative of the FEF; Judith Hart, former and future British minister for overseas development; Nikolas Kaldor, an economist from the University of Cambridge and political advisor of the Labour Party; Paul Lambert, an economist from the University of Liège in Belgium; Mohammed Hoda, the London Representative of the All-Indian Praja Socialist Party; and, in order to create a link to EC policy-making, Robert Marjolin, who had led the French delegation in the negotiations on the formation of the EEC and had been a member of the European Commission until 1967.⁶⁴

A first meeting of the working group was held in London in June 1971. The participants were Tinbergen, Hart, Kaldor, Hoda, Jankowitsch; Winfried Böll, an official from the German development ministry attending on behalf of Eppler; and the SI assistant secretary, Rodney Balcomb.⁶⁵ It was agreed that the role of the World Plan Council should be to draw up specifically socialist development aid proposals for the Second UN Development Decade, proposals that could be recommended to socialist parties and governments. The working group suggested to the SI Bureau that the structure of the World Plan Council should consist of a small, 'inner group' of about a dozen development experts. There should also be an 'outer group' of a considerably larger number of development experts and leading members of socialist parties from developed and developing countries with an interest in development problems whose advice and expertise could be used by the 'inner group'.⁶⁶ The 'inner group' should meet sporadically to plan the work

60 SI Circular No. 47/70, 18 September 1970, IISH, SIA, box 414.

61 SI Circular No. W.5/73, 15 June 1973, ABA, SI, box 584.

62 SI Information, Press Release. Hans Janitschek meets Paul G. Hoffman, 10 April 1970, ABA, SI, box 566.

63 Rodney Balcomb to Judith Hart, 9 June 1971, Labour History Archive and Study Centre (LHASC) Manchester, Judith Hart papers, box Hart/8/96.

64 Jan Tinbergen to Hans Janitschek, 14 May 1971, IISH, SIA, box 414.

65 Minutes of Experts' Meeting called to draw up Proposals for Council for World Development Policies (World Plan Council) of the SI, London, 11 June 1971, IISH, SIA, box 414.

66 SI Circular No. W.A/71, 29 October 1971, ABA, SI, box 566.

of the World Plan Council, to discuss questions of development policy and to make suggestions for, and help to draft, various statements and reports.⁶⁷ In contrast, the 'outer group' was not to hold meetings. It would instead have a consultative role and submit ideas or papers to the 'inner group'. The members of the 'outer group' would consist of a wide range of socialist politicians and experts, who would not be necessarily members of socialist parties, from all over the world. Members from European socialist parties involved in this loose network would include Kreisky, Eppler, Marjolin, Mansholt and Antonio Giolitti, member of the Central Committee of the Italian Socialist Party and minister for budget and planning.

The SI Bureau generally agreed to these proposals for the structure of the World Plan Council. It additionally set up two study groups, however: one to study questions of development policy and another to study questions of environmental protection. Both groups were to hold joint meetings from time to time.⁶⁸ The tasks of the study groups was to draw up socialist policy strategies which could be adopted by the SI and recommended to parties, governments and international organizations. More generally, the tasks of the World Plan Council were defined as acting as a high-level pressure group in relations with governments; making suggestions on future development aid; and creating publicity for the problem of development aid.⁶⁹ The World Plan Council would be a consultative body in relation to the SI Bureau.⁷⁰

Functions, strategies and activities

These partly overlapping networks had three main functions related to EC development policy: raising public awareness and increasing support for development aid; setting the agenda in this policy field; and coordinating the policies of the socialist parties.

The first function was to influence public opinion in favour of increased EC development aid. Indeed, beside agreement on the need to foster and improve their transnational cooperation, there was broad consensus among the European socialist parties that public opinion would play an important role in realizing socialist policy objectives for the Second UN Development Decade. The socialist parties assumed that their influence on public opinion would help legitimize increased international development aid. Moreover, as Eppler stated at the board meeting of the Vienna Institute in 1969, support for development aid limited to the national level had to become extended to the European and the international levels.⁷¹ The existing networks were supposed to promote socialist

67 Minutes of Experts' Meeting called to draw up Proposals for Council for World Development Policies (World Plan Council) of the SI, London, 11 June 1971, IISH, SIA, box 414.

68 SI Circular No. B. 13/72, 3 March 1972, IISH, SIA, box 414.

69 SI Circular No. M. 13/73, 18 May 1973, ABA, SI, box 583.

70 SI Circular No. M. 13/73, 18 May 1973, ABA, SI, box 583.

71 Minutes of the Vienna Institute board meeting, 7 June 1969, BKA, III. 8. Wiener Institut für Entwicklungspolitik, box 9.

proposals at these levels, including greater public participation in formulating the aims of development aid and mobilizing new groups, particularly the youth, as argued in a paper on the role of public opinion in development policy-making by the SI Working Group on Socialist Priorities in the Second Development Decade.⁷²

Achieving such mobilization of the public and greater engagement with new groups at the European level was also one of the main objectives of the Vienna Institute for the 1970s. Thus, projects with this objective were high on the agenda of the institute. At the board meeting in 1969 Kreisky declared the organization of a European youth conference to be one of the most important tasks to be realized. The idea for such a conference was both to enable young Europeans to understand the importance of development policy and to convince them of constructive approaches to it.⁷³ Also involving young delegates from Third World countries, this conference was held in Salzburg in 1970.⁷⁴ In 1975 the Vienna Institute organized a conference to bring together for the first time all European institutes of development research to accelerate the founding of a European umbrella organization called European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI).⁷⁵ The initiative for this Europe-wide organization came after a conference of the OECD in early 1973, in which delegates from development research institutes of Third World countries argued that it would simplify their work if they could deal with a single contact organization of all European public and private development research institutes. By organizing this conference in 1975, the Vienna Institute not only helped to launch the EADI, but it also hosted its office until 1981.⁷⁶ Another initiative of the Vienna Institute to mobilize new platforms in order to support discussions among development experts on the European level was the organization of the Second European Conference of the Society of International Development (SID).⁷⁷ The first such conference had taken place in 1973, when the Director of the Vienna Institute at the time, Arne Haselbach, a member of the SPÖ, was elected chair of the SID European Regional Committee.⁷⁸ In the 1970s, the SID supported calls for more equitable global institutional arrangements as also proposed by the UN Strategy for the Second UN Development Decade. The second European SID Conference was held in Linz in 1975.⁷⁹

72 SI Circular xlvii/69, 16 April 1969, Working Party on Socialist Priorities in the Second Development Decade, The role of public opinion, IISH, SIA, box 414.

73 Minutes of the Vienna Institute board meeting, 7 June 1969, BKA, III. 8. Wiener Institut für Entwicklungspolitik, box 9.

74 Interview Arne Haselbach (former director of the Vienna Institute), 19 March 2010.

75 The EADI today is a leading network for development research in Europe. The most important members are the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) in London, the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) in Sussex, the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) in Maastricht, and the German Institute for Development Policy (DIE).

76 Interview Arne Haselbach, 26 March 2010.

77 The Society for International Development (SID) was founded in Washington, DC in 1957 with the aim of exchanging information and experience among development professionals.

78 Projektvorschlag: Europäische Regionalkonferenz der Gesellschaft für internationale Entwicklung, BKA, III. 8. Wiener Institut für Entwicklungspolitik, box 10.

79 Interview Haselbach (note 76).

To realize such initiatives, however, the Vienna Institute occasionally had to rely on bilateral cooperation, especially with the FEF.⁸⁰ At times the FEF supported the Vienna Institute financially as well.⁸¹

A further strategy of the transnational socialist networks to influence public opinion was the publishing of reports on development policy. In order to participate effectively in the policy-making-process at the international and the European levels, the socialist networks considered it essential to disseminate their ideas and proposals on development policy to member parties, governments and international organizations.⁸² For example, in order to interest the Council of Europe in matters of development policy, the Vienna Institute sent reports and information documents to the parliamentarians of the Consultative Assembly.⁸³ In the 1970s, the board members of the Vienna Institute believed that the Council of Europe was actually in a position to influence European governance in subtle ways despite the fact that it had no legislative competences at all. Additionally, in order to achieve more publicity for the International UN Development Strategy, the Vienna Institute translated UN documents into different European languages.⁸⁴ The FEF also widely disseminated its research on development policy widely.⁸⁵ As it was in contact with many international development institutions and research institutes, the FEF also published reports and articles on problems of development aid by other European researchers, including Tinbergen's development reports. After the World Plan Council was set up, together with the Bureau of the SI the FEF intended to have articles published on the work of the two study groups chaired by Tinbergen.⁸⁶ However, this particular project was never realized.

In fact, the work of the SI World Plan Council was never published, as the two study groups rarely met and produced few notable results. The mere setting up of the World Plan Council did help the SI Bureau to achieve publicity for socialist proposals of the Second UN Development Decade of the SI, however. The various resolutions adopted by the SI to endorse the goals and policy measures of the International UN Development Strategy were also part of the SI's public campaigning to put political pressure on governments and international organizations to attach importance to the International UN Development Strategy.⁸⁷

The second function of the European socialist networks in the field of EC development policy was agenda-setting. Following the example of the UN Development Strategy,

80 Bruno Kreisky to Alfred Nau, 4. September, BKA, III. 8. Wiener Institut für Entwicklungspolitik, box 10.

81 Interview Haselbach (note 76).

82 SI Circular No. 47/70, 18 September 1970, IISH, SIA, box 414.

83 Minutes of the Vienna Institute board meeting, 7 June 1969, BKA, III. 8. Wiener Institut für Entwicklungspolitik, box 9.

84 Interview Haselbach (note 76).

85 Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Die partnerschaftlichen Beziehungen der FES zu den Entwicklungsländern - Bericht 1962, AdSD, HSA, 1/HSAAA007503.

86 Winfried Böll to Hans Janitschek, 17 March 1972, IISH, SIA, box 414.

87 Resolution on the Second Development Decade adopted by the Council conference of the SI, 25-27 May 1971, Circular No. 10/72, 9 June 1971, ABA, SI, box 751.

the European socialist parties contributed to the placing of the question on the future concept of EC development policy on the agenda of the Community. The Second UN Development Strategy was a trigger for the European socialists to call for a global policy of EC development aid.⁸⁸ This was also supported by leading individual European socialists.

In May 1971, Brandt commented on the results of the talks of the EC foreign ministers on development policies, insisting that the Community should increase its efforts to achieve the aims of the Second UN Development Decade.⁸⁹ In line with the SI, the EC socialist parties emphasized at their eighth congress in June 1971 that European development aid had to be carried out according to the International UN Development Strategy. Moreover, they stressed that EC commercial policy had to be designed in particular to increase imports of manufactured and semi-manufactured products from the developing countries by reducing import duties on such products.⁹⁰ The EC socialist parties argued that the Community's existing regional cooperation in the form of the association agreements of Yaoundé and Arusha only served a useful purpose as long as no effective global policy of development aid was yet in place. Likewise, as a representative of the EC at the plenary meeting of UNCTAD III in April 1972, Mansholt noted that the Community should increase its development assistance in accordance with the UN Development Strategy.⁹¹ EC development policy was also an important issue at the congress of the SI in Vienna in June 1972. Taking the Second UN Development Strategy as a blue-print, Hans-Jürgen Wischniewski, a member of the executive of the SPD, reminded his audience of prominent socialist party leaders and members of EC member state governments that the Community 'cannot adopt such different attitudes towards the countries of the Third World'⁹² as was still the case at the time. Judith Hart called on the SI and the delegates who played a role in socialist or socialist-led governments in west European countries to realize the target of the Second UN Development Strategy, namely, that every industrialized country should devote 0.7 per cent of its GNP to development aid.⁹³ Moreover, this objective was also re-stated in the resolution of the congress on international development policy.⁹⁴ Before the EC summit of heads of states or governments in October 1972, the Bureau of the Socialist Parties in the EC adopted another resolution emphasizing that the EC must give priority to its development policy. The resolution called on the EC heads of state or governments to pursue such a policy

88 Interview Erhard Eppler, 25 January 2010.

89 Stellungnahme Willy Brandt zu den außenpolitischen Konsultationen der Außenminister der Sechs am 13./14. Mai 1971 in Paris, AdsD, WBA, A8, 20.

90 Resolutions of the 8th Congress of the Socialist Parties in the European Community, Historical Archives of EU (HAEU) Florence, Groupe socialiste du Parlement européen (GSPE), GSPE-000006.

91 Statement of Sicco Mansholt, President of the EC, in the plenary meeting of UNCTAD III, 17 April 1972, IISH, ASLM, box 213.

92 Speech of Hans-Jürgen Wischniewski, Report of the 12th Congress of the SI held in Vienna, 26-29 June 1972, IISH, SIA, box 263.

93 Speech of Judith Hart, Report of the 12th Congress of the SI held in Vienna, 26-29 June 1972, IISH, SIA, box 263.

94 Report of the 12th Congress of the SI held in Vienna, 26-29 June 1972, IISH, SIA, box 263.

on the global level, thus overcoming the traditional focus on the former colonies of EC member states.⁹⁵

Indeed, the European Commission had already recognized this objective in its Memorandum on development policy in July 1971.⁹⁶ The EC leaders then took initial modest steps in this direction at the EC summit in Paris in October 1972. In paragraph 11 of the summit's official declaration the EC leaders stated:

*... in the light of the results of the UNCTAD Conference and in the context of the Development Strategy adopted by the United Nations, the Institutions of the Community and Member States are invited progressively to adopt an overall policy of development cooperation on a world-wide scale, comprising, in particular, the following elements: the promotion in appropriate cases of agreements concerning the primary products of the developing countries with a view to arriving at market stabilization and an increase in their exports; the improvement of generalized preferences with the aim of achieving a steady increase in imports of manufactures from the developing countries.*⁹⁷

Despite this declaration, however, the conflict between the two camps in EC development policy remained virulent. In the following years, the French Gaullist government effectively blocked the implementation of the Paris summit's declared objective of extending EC development policy to non-associated developing countries.⁹⁸ Nevertheless, the European socialist parties contributed to keeping the topic on the agenda of the Community by continuously campaigning for a global policy of EC development aid.

In this context, the socialist press played an important role. For instance, the Bureau of the Socialist Parties in the EC organized a cooperation of all socialist journals in the Community. Articles on various topics of EC politics written by leading European socialist politicians⁹⁹ sought to address a transnational European socialist public sphere.¹⁰⁰ They were simultaneously published in the British *Socialist Commentary*, the German *Die Neue Gesellschaft*, the French *Revue socialiste*, the Italian *Mondo Operario*, the Danish *Nypolitik*, the Luxembourg *Le Pharo*, the Belgian Francophone *Socialisme*, the Flemish Belgian *Sozialistische Standpunten* and the Dutch *Socialisme en Democratie*.¹⁰¹ The article on the relations of the EC with the Third World by the German development minister Eppler underlined that a regionally-limited EC development aid policy had to be overcome and replaced by a global concept guaranteeing development aid also for non-associated

95 Resolution addressed by the Bureau of the Socialist Parties in the European Community to the Heads of States or Governments, HAEU, GSPE-000006.

96 Grilli, The European Community and the Developing Countries (note 15), p. 66.

97 Paragraph 11 Statement from the EC Paris Summit, 19-21 October 1972.

98 Zwei Auffassungen von Entwicklungspolitik, *Die Welt*, 27 June 1973.

99 Among them, for example, Sicco Mansholt, Bruno Kreisky, François Mitterrand, Roy Jenkins, Jens Otto Krag, Joop den Uyl and Altiero Spinelli.

100 On a European public sphere see, for example, Jan-Henrik Meyer, *The European Public Sphere. Media and Transnational Communication in European Integration 1969-1991*, Stuttgart 2010.

101 Sozialismus in Europa. Europa in der Welt, Gemeinsame Veröffentlichung der sozialistischen Zeitschriften, 17 Februar 1973, Archiv Nationales Luxembourg (ANL), Fonds Lydie Schmit (FLS), Fonds Divers (FD) 141/12.

developing countries, which should be designed and coordinated as a supplement to UN development aid. Eppler also claimed that different forms of development aid including financial and technical aid, trade preferences as well as agricultural and industrial policies had to be incorporated into the EC development concept. Crucially, Eppler argued that the EC could develop a significant role vis-à-vis the Third World only if all EC member states raised their development aid to 0.7 per cent of their GNP in accordance with the Second UN Development Strategy.

The third function of the transnational party networks was to help coordinate socialist development policies on the EC level. Circulated regularly within the network of the SI and beyond, the SI resolutions reminded the member parties to assume a uniform position vis-à-vis the proposals of the Second UN Development Decade. However, the SI did not have any formal instruments to force the member parties to adopt a particular political option or strategy. Nevertheless, political proposals that were discussed in the network of the SI occasionally influenced the decision and policy-making of leading European socialist politicians. Thus, having debated development policy for years at various meetings in the framework of the transnational political networks, in particular of the SI, the European socialist parties in fact created a platform to coordinate policy-making in this field.

By involving socialist politicians who were in power in Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom in the 1970s, the political networks of the European socialist parties were able to influence EC intergovernmental decision-making. Indeed, their close cooperation gave Eppler, Hart and Jan Pronk, the Dutch minister of development co-operation and a former student of Tinbergen, a strong position in the EC Council of development ministers.¹⁰² At the meeting of the EC Council of development ministers in July 1974 they succeeded in convincing the French-led camp to accept a resolution to provide financial and technical aid to non-associated developing countries.¹⁰³ Furthermore, the ministers adopted a resolution on the volume of official development aid, stating that the EC member states should 'make efforts to attain as soon as possible the target for official assistance of 0.7 per cent of the GNP mentioned in the International Development Strategy for the Second Decade, as adopted by the UN'.¹⁰⁴

Conclusion

Precisely measuring the concrete impact of the European socialist parties on EC development policy is difficult for two reasons: first, the European socialist parties did not establish one cohesive network with the exclusive purpose of influencing EC development

¹⁰² Interview Erhard Eppler, 26 January 2010.

¹⁰³ EC, The Council, Development Co-operation – Resolutions and recommendations adopted by the Council, Financial and Technical help to non-associated developing countries (Resolution), Brussels 29 July 1974, Archive of the Council of Ministers (ACM), Brussels.

¹⁰⁴ EC, The Council, Development Co-operation - Resolutions and recommendations adopted by the Council, Volume on Official Development Assistance (Resolution), Brussels 29 July 1974, ACM, Brussels.

policy, as in the case of European environmental NGOs and EC environmental policy as discussed by Jan-Henrik Meyer in this issue. Secondly, following the international impulse for the Second UN Development Decade, the political activities of the most important network of the European socialist parties, the SI, were predominately directed at the international level of development policy.

Nevertheless, the example of the SI World Plan Council illustrates very well how non-state actors became more organized in a European-centric transnational form in the 1970s. The example of the SI and its initiative for the World Plan Council involving representatives from the FEF and the Vienna Institute also shows how socialist party networks often functioned as top-down mediators for introducing the proposals of the International Strategy for the Second UN Development Decade into EC agenda-setting and policy-making. The UN Development Strategy served as a blue-print for the European socialist parties. They inserted and enshrined the UN's 0.7 per cent target in EC development policy and pushed strongly for a global concept for EC development aid. To achieve these goals, the socialist parties drew upon their evolving and partly overlapping networks with their particular activities, strategies and functions. First, their public campaigning for the proposals of the UN development strategy gave the debate on the EC relationship with the developing countries a new impulse. Their campaigning helped to raise public awareness of the need for more effective development aid, with the discourses and activities of the churches and left-wing student groups providing a useful sounding board for their demands. Secondly, by continuously debating and commenting on EC development policy in various forums, socialist networks succeeded in putting their demands for a new concept of development policy on the EC agenda. Thirdly, by repeatedly emphasizing the need to globalize EC development aid, the European socialists were able to solidify their position in this debate. Socialist politicians active in the networks and as state actors played a crucial role in pushing socialist ideas at the highest level of EC policy-making. Thus, the close cooperation of the socialist development ministers Eppler, Hart and Pronk paved the way for the adoption of the resolutions on a globalization of EC development policy at the EC Council meeting of development ministers in July 1974.

Nonetheless, the adoption of the Lomé Convention in 1975 instead reinforced the EC's traditional regional development concept.¹⁰⁵ In fact, despite their cooperation in the G-77, the developing countries themselves had diverging interests and many former colonies expected major benefits from the continuation of a privileged relationship with the EC at the expense of non-associated countries. The conflict in the World Trade Organization (WTO) in the 1990s over the EU's banana import regime illustrates this conflict especially well. Thus, the debate between the two camps and their opposed ideas

105 See Jean-Marie Palayret, *Mondialisme contre régionalisme: CEE et ACP dans les négociations de la convention de Lomé 1970-75*, in: Antonio Varsori (ed.), *Inside the European Community. Actors and Policies in the European Integration 1957-1972*, Baden-Baden 2006, pp. 369-397, here p. 396; Grilli, *The European Community and the Developing Countries* (note 15), p. 68.

and preferences continued. At the same time, the G-77 strongly promoted the idea of a NEIO at the ordinary and extraordinary UN General Assembly, particularly from 1974-75 until the end of the 1970s.¹⁰⁶ As early as 1971, the SI had called on governments and international organizations to examine the demands of the G-77.¹⁰⁷ In the debate on the NEIO, as in the parallel discussions about the EC's development policy, transnational political networks of European socialist parties may well have played an important role as top-down mediators in the transfer of ideas, arguments and demands from the international level to the EC level. To test this hypothesis, however, further research on the role of European socialist parties and their networks as non-state actors in EC policy-making would clearly be necessary.

106 See, for example, Olesen, *Between Words and Deeds*, Denmark and the NIEO agenda (note 10) p. 145.

107 Resolution on the Second Development Decade adopted by the Council conference of the SI, 25-27 May 1971, Circular No. 10/72, 9 June 1971, ABA, SI, box 751.