

INFORMATION

SERVICE

OF THE SOCIALIST

UNITY PARTY


OF GERMANY

HX
632
A1
W9
No. 1325



MAIN RLIN

2/1970



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/thirteenthplenum00sozi>

**Thirteenth Plenum
of the Central Committee
of the Socialist
Unity Party
of Germany**

Berlin, 9 and 10 June 1970

Contents

Communique on the Thirteenth Plenum of the Central Committee	5
Remarks on the Relations between the GDR and the FRG	
Speech by Walter Ulbricht, First Secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic	7
West German Freedom for Revanchists and Neo-nazis	11
The Policy of Discrimination Disrupts International Cooperation	13
The GDR Is Inviolable for the Revanchists	17
What Would Be the Results of Membership of the Two German States in the United Nations?	18
Peaceful Coexistence and the Interests of West Germans	20
On People's Feelings, Tourism and Difficulties	22
Showdown with the Reactionary Forces Unavoidable	25
A Few More Remarks on Principles	26

The GDR Is in Accord With the Course of History

Speech by Comrade Willi Stoph, Member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the German Democratic Republic	31
He Who Strengthens the GDR Strengthens Peace and Socialism	32
Real Democracy Makes the Political Power of the Working People Necessary	33
What We Demand Is the Necessary Minimum of Realism	34
Bonn is Striving for Hegemony in Europe	36
We Do Not Allow Ourselves to Be Misled by Demagogic Talk	37
On Herr Brandt's 20 Points	39
Bonn's Acts of Sabotage Against the GDR	40
Provocations in Kassel Characterize the Bonn State of Injustice	43
World Echo Shows Growing Prestige of Our Policy	44

Communiqué of the Thirteenth Plenum of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED)

The Plenum of the Central Committee of the SED met on 9 and 10 June for its thirteenth session under the chairmanship of Comrade Walter Ulbricht, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the SED.

Comrade Günter Mittag, member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the Central Committee, reported on "The Implementation of the 1970 National Economic Plan".

Comrade Albert Norden, member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the Central Committee, gave the report of the Political Bureau.

Thirteen comrades spoke in the discussion.

Comrade Walter Ulbricht gave the concluding speech.

The Central Committee unanimously approved the report "The Implementation of the 1970 National Economic Plan" and the report of the Political Bureau.

Remarks on the Relations between the GDR and the FRG

Speech by Walter Ulbricht, First Secretary of the Socialist Unity Party
of Germany and Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic
Republic

Dear Comrades,

The assessment of the status of relations between the German Democratic Republic and the West German Federal Republic given by Comrade Albert Norden in the report of the Political Bureau is clear and realistic. Comrades Willi Stoph and Max Reimann also mentioned additional points that substantiated the correctness of this assessment at our Plenary Session.

The talks in Erfurt and Kassel were held on our initiative. In the interest of peace, European security and relations of peaceful coexistence between the GDR and the FRG based on equality we have offered the Brandt government the chance unequivocally to part from the CDU/CSU policy of cold war and from the pretension to be the sole representative of the German nation. *We have offered the Brandt government the opportunity to develop a new policy of peaceful coexistence between the two states on a basis of equality under international law and without discrimination of any kind.* We did not just make verbal statements but submitted a concrete *draft treaty* approved by the Council of State. It corresponds to the demands that have to be made at the present time on any regulation of relations by treaty between the GDR and the FRG—taking into consideration those experiences, of course, which we have had with Bonn policy in the last twenty years.

Unfortunately, I stress the word “unfortunately”, Herr Brandt has up to now made no use of the possibility offered him to make a realistic contribution to peace and security *between the FRG and the GDR* in Europe. Possibly that is also caused by his yielding to the pressure of the CDU/CSU and other extreme revanchist forces. But more speaks for the view that he is only seeking to attain the old political goals with changed methods which in his opinion are more effective. Out of this there repeatedly arises a deep contradiction between words and deeds.

In the Bonn Bundestag Herr Brandt, for example, rejected the reproach of the CDU/CSU that he had “invented a two-state theory”. He correctly and

realistically noted that here it was not a question of a theory, but of a "reality of two states". His government had only "based itself on the facts". *During the two decades of CDU/CSU governments, Herr Brandt said further, the division of Germany had become deeper and the importance of the GDR had grown.*

But if Herr Brandt has understood all that why does he then shrink from shifting to a genuinely realistic policy based on realities, a policy which takes account of the reality in international law and the constantly growing importance of the GDR as an irrevocable magnitude, so that the revanchist underbrush can finally be uprooted from the road to relations between the two states on a basis of international law? It should also become clear to the Bonn government that the growing international authority of the GDR rests on its peace policy, on a policy of peace consistently pursued over the decades, a policy which the peoples greatly miss with regard to the West German Federal Republic.

Very important for European security is the initiative of the Warsaw Treaty states, proposing at their meeting in Budapest to call a conference on European security and submitting the basic conception for an understanding among the European states and for the preparation of such a conference.

The initiative of the Soviet Union for the conclusion of agreements on the renunciation of the use of force among the European states and for the preparation of a conference on European security has met with the sympathetic support of the peoples throughout Europe.

Under these conditions the Bonn government declared its readiness to start talks with the representative of the Soviet government, Foreign Minister Comrade Gromyko, on an agreement on the renunciation of the use of force between the Soviet Union and the West German Federal Republic.

I go into this question because the Bonn government, at a special meeting on 7 June, adopted guiding lines for taking up negotiations with the USSR on a treaty on the renunciation of force.

According to statements by the Bonn government and by the Bonn government representative, State Secretary Bahr, as quoted in the press, the basic concept for a treaty renouncing force was agreed upon in the talks between Foreign Minister Comrade Gromyko and Herr Bahr. It is said to confirm the inviolability of the European frontiers and to affirm that neither of the two sides will now or in future ever raise any territorial demands. Herr Bahr stated that such a treaty on the renunciation of force would guarantee the inviolability of present frontiers, including the Oder-Neisse frontier as the western

border of the Polish People's Republic and including the border between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany. In the talks the question of a European security conference had also been discussed. Herr Bahr stated that Bonn viewed preparations for such a conference positively and that the Federal Republic wished to be guided in its policy by the Charter of the United Nations. The guiding lines adopted by the Bonn government on 7 June state that the government is willing to begin negotiations with the Soviet Union on a treaty renouncing force. However, the government in Bonn reserved its prerogative of insisting upon the "right of self-determination" for all Germans.

If the Bonn government finally desired to respect and implement the right of self-determination for its own population, within the borders of the West German Federal Republic, then certainly no one would have any objections. However, the Bonn government has absolutely no right to say or demand anything beyond the borders of the West German Federal Republic. That means that its statements or declarations extending beyond the borders of the West German Federal Republic have no legal significance whatsoever. It is completely immaterial whether the press, official government declarations, or written documents of some kind are used for the purpose. If, in its guiding lines for negotiations on the renunciation of force, the Bonn government refers to "self-determination" in the sense of the Bonn Basic Law (constitution) then this is self-contradictory, because the Bonn Basic Law was simply handed over to the representatives of the western occupation zones by representatives of the American occupation authorities. No one can claim that either the democratic forces or the population of West Germany ever had the opportunity to exert an influence on the contents of this Basic Law. The principle of the presumptuous claim of the West German Federal Republic to be the sole representative of the German people which is formulated in the Basic Law, therefore, has neither legal nor practical significance. And this policy of sole representation has become completely bankrupt, after all. Anyone who had not realized that previously was forced to take note of it on 13 August 1961.

Now how can the position of the Brandt-Scheel government on this question be assessed? The fact that talks on the subject mentioned are taking place with the Soviet Union is undoubtedly to be valued positively. We hope for a successful course of the coming negotiations on a treaty on the renunciation of force between the USSR and the FRG. That can also have good favourable

effects in future on relations between the GDR and the FRG. It corresponds to the interests of bringing about European security. The initiative seized at the consultation of Warsaw Treaty states in Budapest has thus fallen on fertile ground in Europe. The relation of forces in Europe has developed so that the government of the West German Federal Republic finds it necessary to conduct these talks on the renunciation of force with representatives of the Soviet Union.

I read in a weekly periodical of the GDR that after Kassel it is often stated that Herr Brandt further persists in the sole representation pretension, that there has therefore been no change in his policy. But it is not as simple as that. The readiness to take up negotiations on the renunciation of force shows that something has, in fact, changed. As far as the GDR is concerned we seized the initiative for talks about a treaty on relations with the FRG based on equality and international law in good time.

The most important thing is for us to carry on consistently with our long-term economic policy of Socialism and our structural policy in the 1971–1975 five-year plan as we began it in the present five-year plan. Consistent further pursuit of this policy on the broadest possible basis will enable us not only to reach but also to share in determining world peak standards in the fields especially important for us—on the basis of the organization of science and the working out of new methods of scientific research and new technological process lines. That is the main task. That will make possible a stable economic, political and cultural development of the GDR.

The Bonn government's policy gives the impression that a number of roles have been distributed in it. Herr Brandt is trying to get the GDR under the control of the Bonn government by means of so-called "inner-German relations". For this purpose he brought to Kassel the Minister of "Inner-German Questions", who carries about with him the five Grey Plans for organizing counter-revolution in the GDR. But events in Kassel showed that it would have been better if Herr Brandt had a minister in his government to organize the struggle against fascism and revanchism in the Federal Republic. Such a minister could have done useful work in Kassel. Economics Minister Schiller has specialized in the Brandt government in preventing the co-determination of the working people in West Germany. And Defence Minister Schmidt is concerning himself, jointly with Hitlerite generals, with militarization and armament. Although all this corresponds to the resolutions of the Saarbrücken

Congress of the SPD it does not serve relaxation and a policy of peace towards the GDR.

The fact is that the Brandt government declared under the pressure of the CDU that it has not parted from the revanchist Adenauer policy. *Under CDU/CSU pressure the Bonn government persists in unrealistic aims which are concealed behind a curtain of national demagoguery.*

West German Freedom for Revanchists and Neo-nazis

In Kassel the Bonn government demonstrated West German "freedom", or what it considers to be freedom. Representatives of the Bonn delegation have expressly confirmed that the terror of the neo-nazis and fascists gangs is an integral part of this West German "freedom"—along with the Springer press, the Thadden party and their activities against peace. (Interruption by Comrade Stoph: Bonn press chief Ahlers called the activities of the fascists "imaginative"!)

It cannot be said that that was "imaginative". After all, the Storm Troopers set the example back in the Weimar Republic. There is nothing new or original about it. The only new thing is that these gangs have procured American uniforms for themselves.

As for the peoples of Europe, who have experienced two frightful world wars, they are troubled to witness the growth of such brown "realities" as manifested in Kassel, Bonn and other places in West Germany in the activities of the neo-nazis and the ultra-reactionary forces of the CDU/CSU. And Herr Strauss—unhindered by the Social Democratic leadership—is allowed publicly to call on all these reactionary and neo-nazi forces to rally; he is allowed to let himself be announced, at revanchist meetings, as the saviour of West Germany. And when a Social Democratic minister voices the view that the activities of the fascists are in keeping with the West German "liberal order", it reminds one of the behaviour and the failure of Prussian Social Democratic Minister Severing in his dealings with the SA in 1931–32.

In words, Herr Brandt has adopted our principle that a war should never again be allowed to start from German soil. In addition, he declared that his government will not—and I cite verbatim—"allow anybody to surpass it in its desire for peace and security in Europe".

However, words are not enough. What is lacking here is primarily the sub-

stance of a genuine peace policy. How can Bonn's allegedly insurpassable desire for peace and security be reconciled with the excessive armament and with the maintenance of a Bundeswehr of 470,000 soldiers and 170,000 auxiliary personnel, i.e., a total of 640,000 men, headed by nazi officers? As is known the Weimar Republic, which was more than double the size of the Federal Republic of Germany—made do with 100,000 troops.

Or are we supposed to take it as an expression of a specially peaceable mind that the Brandt government is supporting the imperialist wars of aggression of the United States in Vietnam and Cambodia, and Israel's aggression against the Arab states? Or that it considers its own "eastern policy" as part of the NATO policy and of the US global strategy?

Can the West German Federal Chancellor not understand that there are simply too *many* contradictions here? Can he not understand that the support of the policy of aggression of US imperialism is incompatible with good friendly relations with those peace-loving peoples who have liberated themselves from capitalism and imperialism? Does he not see that he himself is discrediting his own political statements in the eyes of the peace-loving peoples?

In the debate in the West German Bundestag Herr Barzel, chairman of the CDU/CSU parliamentary group, accused the Bonn head of government among other things of having gone beyond the "limits agreed on" between the leaders of the Social Democratic Party and the CDU/CSU parliamentary group in his talks with Socialist countries on a mutual renunciation of the use of force. For his part Brandt energetically denied having gone beyond the "limits agreed on".

What the policy of the CDU/CSU is like, however, and what the common platform should be like in their view, was clearly expressed by CDU politician Baron von Guttenberg. On behalf of the CDU/CSU this spokesman of the right-wing front preached undisguised revanchism, emphatically rejecting the formula employed in earlier diplomatic notes of the Bonn government to the Soviet Union and in other official governmental statements, that the Federal Republic had no territorial claims in Europe. These were his words: "We, the CDU/CSU, are not prepared to respect or even recognize so-called realities..." In this connection Guttenberg stressed his continued adherence to Bonn's presumptuous claim to be the sole representative of Germany.

The communiqué of the NATO conference in Rome at the end of May (where a plot was agreed upon on the prevention or at least postponement of an all-European security conference) also shows that the policy of the Bonn government vis-à-vis the GDR has been brought into agreement with NATO policy.

This is not to say that there is full agreement on these questions among all NATO countries. There is a tendency in a number of NATO countries to get rid of the influence of the US global strategy and develop a somewhat more independent policy vis-à-vis West German imperialism.

In an editorial on 7 June the West Berlin Social Democratic daily *Telegraf* wrote that "an atmosphere of mutual confidence" had to be created, "in which eventually the solution of major political questions will also be possible". Europe, the author goes on, must go its own road. On the one hand it has to get rid of *dependence on American capital* and on the other of an alleged Soviet "doctrine". The author thinks that the bilateral relations with the United States have to be reconsidered. The United States should not be accepted permanently as a factor of order and security. The author then commented on the March 1968 proposal of the Budapest conference of the Warsaw Treaty states on the convocation of a European security conference. We see that the policy of the Social Democratic leaders has a coat of many colours.

Irrespective of the many tactical nuances in the policy of the Social Democratic leaders there remains *one fundamental question which is of interest to all European peoples*. This is the muzzling of the neo-nazi forces and the curbing of the forces of revanchism by the progressive democratic forces in West Germany.

The Policy of Discrimination Disrupts International Cooperation

International cooperation is disrupted particularly by the continuing Bonn policy of discriminating against the GDR in the international sphere, a policy which is in line with the concept of NATO. The common platform with NATO and with the CDU/CSU is also expressed in the continuing Bonn policy of discriminating against the GDR. This policy is based on a number of threadbare justifications:

1. Recognition of the equality of the GDR by the FRG on the basis of international law, it is claimed, would seal the division of Germany.

In reply, it must be pointed out that the division of Germany which was carried out and cemented by the imperialist western powers with the aid of successive Bonn governments cannot be sealed any more than it already is. That took place—and very thoroughly—two decades ago. For more than twenty years, the GDR and the FRG, both subjects of international law,

have existed side by side on an equal basis. Neither of the two states has either a higher or a lower status in international law than the other. Anyone who does not respect this equality in international law is himself violating international law. However, the refusal to recognize the equal status of the GDR in international law and the continuation of a policy of discrimination against the GDR and its citizens by the Bonn governments prevents the establishment of equal relations, without any discrimination and based, of course, upon international law, which is desired by both the GDR and the majority of the citizens of the FRG and represents the foundation for everything else.

2. The establishment and cultivation of normal diplomatic relations between third states and the GDR—it is also claimed by the Brandt government—prevents the bringing about of any contractual regulation of "inner-German relations" and must therefore be viewed as an unfriendly act towards the West German Federal Republic.

I must point out in this connection that, as has already been proved quite sufficiently, there can never be and will never be any "*inner-German relations*" of the kind meant by Bonn between an FRG ruled by monopoly capital and the Socialist GDR. This will not occur even if some country dependent upon West Germany or the USA does not dare or does not yet dare to establish normal diplomatic relations with the GDR. I should like to state quite frankly: in our view, this is a question of sovereignty and of freedom of action of the particular country involved. The thesis about the alleged prevention of any contractual regulation of "inner-German relations" is really only an attempt by Bonn to misuse other countries, which for one reason or another consider themselves more or less dependent on the good will of the USA or the West German Federal Republic, as accomplices in Bonn's policy of blackmailing manipulations against the GDR. Such methods represent a constant intervention by the West German government in the affairs of sovereign countries.

It would certainly be unrealistic to think that this continued misuse of international commitments on the part of Bonn has been seen through by all politicians yet. However, it is a fact, and it will remain a fact, that neither the relations between the GDR and FRG nor the cause of peace and security in Europa are promoted in any way by intentional or unintentional support of Bonn's discriminatory policy towards the GDR. On the contrary, the relations between the GDR and the FRG and the cause of peace and security

in Europe have been harmed in the past and will continue to be harmed, as a result of other states supporting Bonn's policy and submitting to Bonn's directives on good behaviour in the field of foreign policy. In doing so they display a regrettable lack of neutrality in the controversy between the FRG and the GDR.

Kassel once more made the world realize very clearly that the two social systems of the German Democratic Republic and the West German Federal Republic are incompatible. Kassel has clearly proved that in future, too, no "special relations" are conceivable. So it is absurd and only serves to hamper international cooperation and international exchange if governments of third countries want to wait for an agreement between the GDR and the FRG on "inner-German relations" before taking up and cultivating normal diplomatic relations with the GDR, too. Because they would have to wait till doomsday in that case.

3. Bonn further claims that membership of the GDR and the FRG in the United Nations on a basis of equality would mean a "juridical perpetuation of the division of Germany" and was, moreover, a "violation of the right to self-determination".

I have already pointed out that the division of Germany was effected more than two decades ago and was juridically sealed with the foundation of the West German separatist state and the conclusion of the Paris Treaties. Membership of the GDR and the FRG in the UN on a basis of equality would not change this state of affairs in the least. It would neither create it—because it has been existing for twenty years—nor would it be able to undo it.

Membership of the GDR in the UN on a basis of equality would correspond to the spirit of the United Nations Charter.

The United Nations Organization was founded after the Second World War to prevent a big war from being unleashed for the third time. The UN can fulfil this mission only if all states are members on a basis of equality. This is especially true for the German Democratic Republic and the FRG.

4. Now some people in West Germany try to arrange relations between the FRG and the GDR like those between the FRG and Austria. That is not realistic. For one thing, because the Federal Republic is an imperialist state. The FRG pursues a policy of infiltration and economic undermining vis-à-vis Austria. Nobody can assume that the Socialist GDR would tolerate a similar policy being pursued by Bonn vis-à-vis the GDR.

Moreover, one has to proceed from the real conditions of development and the foreign relations of the GDR and the FRG. *There have been two roads of German history ever since the foundation of the German Reich*, the anti-democratic, semi-feudal and imperialist road and the road of democratic transformation and consistent peace policy advocated by Marx, Engels, Bebel and Liebknecht. Bonn has embarked on the old road of imperialism. We have embarked on the new road of peace, democracy and Socialism.

Even the one-time identity of *language* is being dissolved. There is a world of a difference between the traditional German language of Goethe, Schiller, Lessing, Marx and Engels, which is imbued with the spirit of humanism, and the language of certain circles in the West German Federal Republic, which is polluted by imperialism and manipulated by the capitalist monopoly publishers. Even the same words frequently do not have the same meaning any longer. For example, when we are speaking of equality and non-discrimination, we mean genuine equality and non-discrimination. However, when certain political leaders in Bonn are speaking of equality, they mean the subjugation of the GDR. And when they are preaching non-discrimination, they mean perpetuation of the discrimination against the GDR and its citizens. But above all, we have to state that the language of Hitler's generals, of the neo-nazis, and revanchist politicians does not belong to our German language, to the language of the peace-loving citizens of the German Democratic Republic, which we love and develop.

The situation is similar in the cultural field. Whereas in the GDR the humanistic Socialist national culture is being promoted and developed, there is a struggle in West Germany between the humanistic cultural interests of the democratic forces and the monopoly capitalist forces who are falsifying the essence of German culture with their reactionary policy of manipulation.

5. In recent times—and I pointed this out earlier—the *question of "self-determination"* has played an important role in the debates of the Bonn government and the West German Bundestag. The representatives of the Bonn government try to voice their right to "self-determination" on all occasions, appropriate or inappropriate. But that can of course only refer to self-determination inside the West German Federal Republic. Nobody disputes the right to self-determination of the population of the West German Federal Republic except the ruling circles in West Germany themselves, who until the

present day have refused to grant the West German working people any genuine co-determination. *Our attitude to this is that the people of the FRG can make use of their right to self-determination if and when they want to*, in the same way as the people of the German Democratic Republic have the inalienable right to self-determination and have made use of this right unequivocally *in the plebiscite on the Constitution of the Socialist German Democratic Republic*. So the question of the right to self-determination of the West German population should in no case be mixed up with the question of the right to self-determination of the people of the German Democratic Republic. *We most resolutely reject any attempt on the part of Bonn to do so and camouflage the desired annexation of the GDR with phrases about self-determination*. If the Bonn government thinks it absolutely necessary, let it refer to the right to self-determination of the population of the FRG in agreements with third states in one form or another. However, it is solely and exclusively the people of the sovereign German Democratic Republic, its People's Chamber and its government that are responsible for the right to self-determination of the citizens of the German Democratic Republic.

The GDR Is Inviolable for the Revanchists

Every realistically minded politician knows that a new relation of forces was created in Europe by the victory of the anti-Hitler coalition over Hitler Germany, and especially by the conquest of Berlin by the troops of the Soviet Union. In the postwar period the Soviet Union has consistently pursued its policy of collective security in Europe. The community of the Soviet Union and the Peoples' Democracies has developed into a reliable force for safeguarding peace in Europe. The government of the West German Federal Republic must realize that the revanchist policy propagated by Adenauer and Dulles has failed. *The frontier on the Elbe and the Werra is the western frontier of the Socialist community of states*. The Soviet Union and the other Socialist countries will never permit this peace frontier to be changed or the Socialist German Democratic Republic to be threatened. The glorious Soviet people and the anti-fascist forces in the countries of Europe and beyond did not make their tremendous sacrifices in the struggle against German fascism in

order, twenty-five years later, to permit preparations for a new imperialist aggression.

In my article, "A Quarter of a Century After Liberation", published in *Kommunist*, the theoretical journal of the Central Committee of the CPSU, No. 7/1970, and in *Neues Deutschland* on 21 May 1970, I analyzed the actual situation. It accords with the Soviet Union's policy of peaceful coexistence when it now tries to conclude an agreement with the West German Federal Republic on the renunciation of the use of force which includes recognition of the existing frontiers, renunciation of the use of force, non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries and other measures to bring about a relaxation of tension.

The German Democratic Republic was guided by the same principles as those which guided the Soviet Union in its talks with the Federal Republic when it proposed to the FRG the establishment of equal, non-discriminatory relations based on international law. *Since the talks in Erfurt and Kassel revealed that the West German Federal Republic was not yet prepared for such a treaty and did not yet recognize political realities with full consistency, the GDR proposed that the GDR and the FRG should first agree to apply for membership in the UN and to an exchange of diplomatic representatives at ambassadorial level.*

What Would Be the Results of Membership of the Two German States in the United Nations?

The results would be useful for all. The German Democratic Republic and the West German Federal Republic would participate on an equal footing with all other UN members in the work of this world organization. They could make their full contribution to the solution of the problems with which the United Nations has to deal. This step towards the universality of the UN would without doubt be of service to this organization and would give it more weight in clarifying complicated international problems.

The simultaneous presence in the United Nations of an ambassador of the German Democratic Republic *and* an ambassador of the FRG, on an equal footing, would also differ in no way from the simultaneous presence on an equal footing of two accredited ambassadors of the GDR and the FRG in Moscow or

Belgrade. It is impossible to discover how this can be a "violation of the right of self-determination" of the population of the GDR or of the FRG.

There is also no stipulation in the UN Charter which forbids sovereign member states to regulate their bilateral relations by treaty and in free agreement in the way which they consider right. The simultaneous membership in the UN on an equal footing thus has nothing whatsoever to do with the shaping of bilateral relations between the GDR and the FRG.

What has been said about the United Nations applies even more forcefully to the really despicable attempts by Bonn to prevent the membership on a basis of equality of the GDR in economic, humanitarian or other specialized agencies of the United Nations such as the ECE or the World Health Organization by means of intrigues, blackmail and other machinations.

Thus, if one seriously investigates Bonn's statements the fact emerges that there is no justification corresponding to the valid norms of international law or to morality in international life for Bonn's continued policy of international discrimination against the GDR and its citizens. This Bonn policy of discrimination against the GDR and its citizens in the field of international cooperation, too, has—as we all know—set up a barrier of enmity between the two states, the GDR and the FRG. This was, so to speak, the cement which helped to harden the division.

There are some foreign politicians and publicists who wanted to have the first official meetings and talks in Erfurt and Kassel between the heads of government of the GDR and the FRG, achieved in the third decade of their existence in international law, evaluated internationally as a manifestation and sealing of mutual *de facto* recognition. Of course, in the relations between the GDR and the FRG, neighbouring states in the heart of Europe which have a considerable number of complicated problems to regulate by treaty, mutual *de facto* recognition carried out in the sense of international law is also not enough. But it could in fact—supplemented by the knowledge gained in the course of the talks in Erfurt and Kassel—have a certain influence on some governments and make it easier for them to undertake the necessary reexamination of their attitude to the question of equal relations with the GDR and the FRG. It should now be easier for some governments to understand that their good will is being misused by Bonn and that it is in fact the position of neutrality and non-interference in the conflicts between the Socialist German Democratic Republic and the West German Federal Republic dominated by monopoly capital which calls for normal diplomatic relations on an equal level with both

German states. The one-sided orientation on the political demands and wishes of the FRG does not in any case correspond to the interests of peace nor to the interests of international security.

Peaceful Coexistence and the Interests of West Germans

In Kassel Herr Brandt again rejected peaceful coexistence between the FRG and the German Democratic Republic. Should he not seriously consider whether *peaceful coexistence with the GDR on an equal footing under international law would not be the best possible solution for the population of West Germany and also for the majority of the West German bourgeoisie?* The policy of the armaments monopolies and the most reactionary forces around Herr Strauss is, after all, dangerous and a matter for concern to the majority of the West German bourgeoisie. The high expenditure on armaments also prevent the solution of current internal problems. This has given rise to internal conflicts.

When, about six months ago, in a talk with the Honorary President of the Association of West German Industries, I asked: What are your intentions? What are your strategic aims? Do you want peace or do you want war?—he replied: No, we don't want war. I replied: But the policy pursued in Bonn will in the end lead to war. What are you rearming for otherwise? Why are you trying to gain the right of co-control over atomic weapons? Why are you preparing an atomic mine belt on the frontier of the GDR? It was clear from our talk that there are many very varied ideas within the West German big bourgeoisie.

The right-wing reactionary bloc, with Strauss as leader and supported by the NPD—the nazi party, which demonstrated its political concepts so unmistakably at Kassel—is not identical in its policy and views with the *policy and views of a part of the West German bourgeoisie, including a part of the big bourgeoisie.* These circles do not feel the need of taking a course leading to a third world war and thereby risking everything all over again.

It was partly due to the influence of these circles that Brandt agreed to discussions with the Prime Minister of the German Democratic Republic. We should not believe that the majority of bourgeois or petty bourgeois circles in West Germany backs the noisy right-wing extremist group of Strauss, the NPD, etc.

Only the conflict which has now arisen on the choice between a peaceful

path or a path towards war, that is, a revanchist policy, will show who takes what position.

We shall also see in the various *Landmannschaften* (country associations of people from former German territories, the translator) and in the refugee organizations who consciously support the course of Strauss and the NPD. We shall see who has been misled by the manipulations of the Springer press and others into taking a false path but now finds it necessary to think over again where he really wants to go. That is the great significance of the current discussion now going on in West Germany.

Finally, we cannot overlook the fact that there is an irreconcilable contradiction between the armament policy and the reforms promised by the Brandt government. If 20 thousand million marks are spent annually for war preparations, the same 20 thousand million marks cannot be spent at the same time for an educational system and other reforms which were mentioned in Herr Brandt's government policy statement.

We cannot overlook the fact that the policy of the armaments concerns and of War Minister Schmidt makes it extremely difficult for the Brandt government to take really effective measures aimed at ending the educational catastrophe and solving other domestic tasks, so that it can be brought into opposition to broad circles of the West German population.

The West German armaments policy is one of the reasons why the FRG has been left considerably behind by the GDR in important matters of social development. West Germany may have more commodities to offer in the sphere of luxury goods. But in the long run, that is not decisive for a people. What is decisive is that the basic problems of mastering the future are solved, that society's tasks in the fields of schools and universities, public health, etc., are solved early enough and well enough to guarantee a full and proper life for all, with truly human relationships in both the present and the future.

The policy of showy shop-windows filled with advertising—used as an argument against the GDR for years—has meant that Bonn finally has to pay for its falling behind the GDR in a number of spheres which are vital for society. This is being seen more and more clearly, especially by the younger citizens of the FRG, who are the ones who will suffer in the end if their future is poorly prepared for. They draw their own conclusions and think about the years ahead. So, should it not be possible for Herr Brandt to realize that his own best interests require his abandonment of the illusion that the West German

Federal Republic can negotiate with the GDR from a position of some kind of superiority?

Herr Brandt has repeatedly stated that future negotiations between the two states must not be burdened by any prior conditions. But—caught up in the illusion of some kind of superiority—he is the one who blocks negotiations with the precondition that the GDR should not have an equal status and should submit to Bonn's tutelage in its international relations.

I wish to leave no doubt on this point: the idea that the Bonn government wishes to play a part in determining the GDR's international relations and makes any extension of the GDR's international relations dependent upon its subordination to Bonn guardianship is reprehensible arrogance and an insult to the GDR and all its citizens. Is this, perhaps, what is meant by the recently formulated "active coexistence" which is to be opposed to peaceful coexistence?

On People's Feelings, Tourism and Difficulties

The West German Federal chancellor connected the affirmation that he will continue the policy of discriminating against the GDR and its citizens with an appeal to the *people's feelings* that they belong to an allegedly still united German nation whose unity, however, was really buried back in 1945, a second time by the division in 1949 and for the third time by the Paris Treaties.

Let us speak about various feelings, therefore. To be sure, there are good or bad feelings between relatives and sometimes there are certain things held in common. *But the German Democratic Republic and the West German Federal Republic and its social system are not related to one another.* The citizens of the West German Federal Republic represent as a whole the population of a monopoly capitalist state and are bound by the Paris Treaties to the imperialist western powers. In the German Democratic Republic, the people of this Socialist German nation-state has built up a Socialist homeland. It is clear, therefore that the feelings between relatives are not of decisive significance. It is other feelings, rather, which do have decisive significance—the feelings of hatred by the people of the GDR for those imperialist, militarist and neo-nazi forces which share responsibility for the Hitler war and which today hold the key positions in the army and the administration in West Germany. *The feelings and interests of the working class in the German Democratic Republic towards the big West German capitalists, the militarists and the neo-nazis are free of all common*

ground. They are feelings of repudiation, of irreconcilable class antagonism, of contempt and hatred towards the exploiters and political adventurers who launched two world wars in the pursuit of their inhuman profit interests.

The feelings of the cooperative farmers and agricultural workers of the GDR towards the West German big landowners and those Junkers who would like only too well to play "master and servant" once again on the territory of the German Democratic Republic are not bound by any national common ground, either. They, too, are feelings of contempt and hatred towards those forces in the FRG which split Germany and damaged the GDR wherever they could and which would like to take the land away from the cooperative farmers and restore the inhuman ruling methods of the big landowners and the monopolies.

Nor does it seem to me that the feelings of the West German big capitalists, big landowners, old nazis and neo-nazis, the Hitler generals and the hanging judges towards the working people of the GDR have the slightest thing to do with national common interests. They are feelings of hatred and of lust for the riches built up by the people in the GDR, for an expansion of their rule to the territory of the Socialist German Democratic Republic and for the eradication of all the achievements of the working people here.

The workers, farmers and other working people in the German Democratic Republic, on the other hand, entertain good feelings of contact, sympathy, friendship and solidarity with their West German class brothers and all other peaceloving and democratic citizens of the West German Federal Republic. The events in and around Kassel have again shown clearly that it is the class conflicts which put their stamp on the feelings of the people here and over there. No nationalist demagogy can alter this.

The West German Chancellor claims not to know what positive results "would result from establishing diplomatic relations based on equality between the FRG and the GDR" for the people in the two states.

Does the government in Bonn then regard peace and security in Europe, which would be considerably promoted by the establishment of relations based on equality and international law, as of no consequence and of minor importance for the people? Or does it perhaps think that it is of no consequence and of minor importance for the citizens of the GDR and the FRG if, through the establishment of relations of equality safeguarded in international law, the most elementary conditions for valid treaty settlements in various fields of peaceful coexistence of the two states were created?

Kassel also demonstrated in a drastic way the absolute necessity of creating

the most elementary conditions under international law for peaceful coexistence. *Without safeguards for mutual relations in international law—and this was demonstrated in Kassel—the dignity and the interests of the GDR, its citizens, its state emblems and so on are outside the law in the Federal Republic.*

If diplomatic relations between the GDR and the West German Federal Republic were established on the basis of equality and international law it would be possible for the GDR government to advance to an examination of other questions. There is also talk in Bonn about developing tourism with the GDR. But the Bonn war ministry sends balloons with hostile propaganda into the GDR obviously for this purpose, and is preparing to set up a belt of atomic mines on our western frontier. It seems to me that these are extremely peculiar phenomena accompanying West German "tourism".

It is further claimed that in Kassel we did not dwell upon the difficulties which have arisen as a result of the division for many citizens of both states. But does Herr Brandt really give so much thought to the various difficulties under which many people are suffering here and over there? We doubt it. For after all, he is the representative of the Bonn government which, together with the governments of the imperialist western powers, split Germany and only recently stated that it is continuing Adenauer's policy, and is therefore responsible not only for the division but also for people's difficulties. All this lamentation is simply not genuine.

At that time the imperialist occupation forces and the Bonn government put into office by them split the country without any regard whatsoever for the people and have continued to deepen it through two decades. In this way it was intended to gain time for the restoration of German imperialism and militarism.

It is generally known that Adenauer assumed Bonn and NATO would succeed in conquering the GDR in 1960–61. After that failed and even the Grand Coalition government got stuck in the self-created swamp of revanchist policy, Herr Brandt's government is now supposed to find a way out.

Is this way out, in his view, to start with abrogating the state security measures of the GDR which have proved themselves since 1961? In that case there is no question of "small steps" being aimed at and propagated. In that case a big step is intended, and its purpose is to undermine the workers' and farmers' power in the GDR.

Showdown with the Reactionary Forces Unavoidable

Obviously the process of clarification in the West German Federal Republic, which has already involved a considerable proportion of the population, is only in its first stages. It will take quite a while. It is clear, however, that without a fundamental showdown with neo-fascist and other reactionary forces in the CDU/CSU, the government of the West German Federal Republic cannot arrive at the basic policy revision that is necessary in the interests of the people, of peace, and of the security of the world.

If some Social Democratic leaders imagine that they can worm out of this showdown,

if they permit old and neo-nazis from Thadden to Strauss to do as they please,

if they continue to give in to the pressure of incorrigible rightists and play about with a policy of halfmeasures and foggy formulations that could mean anything,

then they had better recall, before it is too late, the fate and the role of the bourgeois democratic and Social Democratic governments in the Weimar Republic.

Are the Social Democratic leaders and the Brandt government really clear about the danger facing them and the bourgeois parliamentary system in West Germany from the right? Are the Social Democratic leaders clear about the fact that this danger will continue to increase if it is not checked in the West German Federal Republic?

The events in Kassel and the mob action of rightwing elements in Bonn should be recognized as the signal to embark upon an energetic struggle against the neo-nazi forces before another "seizure of power" is staged.

Of course, a different historical situation exists today. In particular, the relation of forces in Europe and in the world has changed fundamentally in favour of Socialism. Imperialism, it was noted at the International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties in June 1969, has become more aggressive, but not stronger. Nevertheless, many aspects of internal developments in West Germany bear a fatal resemblance to developments which preceded the collapse of the Weimar Republic.

At a meeting in Saarbrücken, Herr Brandt announced that a change was coming in the policy of the West German Federal Republic. We should like to take that to mean that he wishes to draw the unavoidable conclusions

from the talks of State Secretary Bahr with the representatives of the Soviet Union in Moscow and between *Willi Stoph*, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the GDR, and Chancellor *Brandt* in Erfurt and Kassel. *We would welcome this very much.*

As far as an assessment of the position of the Social Democratic Party goes, it was stated in the decisions of the party congress at Godesberg that the SPD takes its stand on the foundation of state monopoly capitalism and declares itself to be in agreement with the imperialist policy of NATO. We believe that, nevertheless, the Social Democratic members do not want a war. In contrast to the insane militarist policy of Herr Schmidt they want a relaxation of tension, an understanding with the Soviet Union and an understanding with the GDR on the basis of equal rights and normal relations in conformity with international law. And although the executive leadership of the Social Democratic Party has forbidden discussions between West German Social Democrats and Communists, the common struggle of the GDR and Social Democratic and other friends of peace in West Germany against the US war policy and against neo-nazism and revanchism will continue to develop.

A Few More Remarks on Principles

In view of the dimensions of the conflict between the world of Socialism, democracy and peace with the forces of imperialism, capitalism and war, we cannot avoid the calculation that the other side is going to stage large-scale verbal diversions. Certain elements in the policy of the Brandt government seem to indicate somewhat more realistic assessments. But up to now there have been no facts of any importance which would confirm this insofar as relations with the GDR are concerned .

A few Social Democratic functionaries have now conceived the idea of changing the name of West Germany's state monopoly capitalism to "democratic Socialism". But regardless of what new phraseology may be employed in West Germany, I must state as a general principle that worlds separate Socialism from West German late capitalism, and they have nothing in common. If Social Democratic functionaries desire democracy and Socialism, then they must carry through a democratic, and after that a Socialist revolu-

tion. We do not have the impression that this is the intention of the Social Democratic leadership.

The Social Democratic leadership and the Bonn government should at least recognize that all their deceptive manoeuvres are bound to fail. Judging by the experience of two world wars and their previous history and the many decades of psychological warfare of the USA and the Bonn government against the German Democratic Republic it is hopeless for the SPD leaders and the Bonn government to cling to the aims fixed by the West German Bundestag on 30 June 1960 and in the grey plans, and to try to camouflage this fact with nice-sounding words.

In view of the aims of West German imperialism, which are comparable in more than one respect to the revanchist aims of the period of the Weimar Republic, the generations bearing responsibility in our time do not have the right in the interest of the peaceful life of the peoples to help obliterate all recollection of the events of the past. Especially, nobody must forget that the forces responsible for two world wars are again in control in West Germany. This has again been proved by the activities of the rightwing forces in the Bonn Bundestag, in particular by the speech of Baron von Guttenberg.

It is fortunate for the European peoples, their peace and security that the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic and other Socialist countries are wary not only in political terms but also in military ones, and that they devote much attention to the tactical manoeuvres of the representatives of the West German imperialist policy of revanchism, and that they are capable of correctly assessing and thwarting it in all its phases in time.

The Bonn government should also recognize that a policy along the lines of Stresemann is absolutely unrealistic today. It would be advantageous even to the West German bourgeoisie if the FRG would cease to be unilaterally tied to the United States. After all, the United States is not only the main competitor of West Germany but would also benefit most from a disastrous military policy pursued by Bonn, all the more so since it is well known that the strategic plans of the USA provide for the bombing of West German towns and even for the destruction of West Germany as a tactical variant in case of war. From the point of view of the interests of the West German bourgeoisie it would undoubtedly be wiser to follow the example of Rathenau, who certainly knew how best to represent the interests of German monopoly capital, and normalize and improve West Germany's relations with the Soviet Union. In the long run it cannot be beneficial for West Germany, either, if its government fails to clearly dissociate

itself from the barbarous policy of the USA against the Vietnamese people and against the peoples of Laos and Cambodia, from racial discrimination in the USA itself and from the support for Israel's aggression against the Arab peoples.

So the West German bourgeoisie and its Bonn government will have to think up a really new policy. Most important, they have clearly to abandon the old imperialist concepts, the old imperialist strategy and tactics, if they want to be considered sincere 25 years after the liberation of the peoples from Hitler fascism.

A regulation by treaty of relations between the German Democratic Republic and the West German Federal Republic along the lines of peaceful coexistence cannot be achieved in any other way than by the mutual recognition under international law without reservations and establishing nondiscriminatory relations based on equality and international law. We believe that the establishment of relations of peaceful coexistence on the basis of *diplomatic relations between the GDR and the FRG* will be a big step forward and will in every respect correspond to the interests of the security and peace of all European states and peoples. All European peoples, among them the members of NATO, will agree to this. So the Brandt government should no longer harbour the illusion that the peoples of the NATO countries will indefinitely tolerate the rejection of peaceful coexistence with the German Democratic Republic by the Bonn government.

When the question is being asked in West Germany what is going to happen, we reply that we hope the pause for thought will be used in West Germany to put an end to the activities of the fascist elements who disturbed the contacts in Kassel and to curb the rightwing group that is directed against peace.

We hope that a third round of talks between the heads of government of the GDR and the FRG will result in concrete negotiations on the establishment of diplomatic relations between the GDR and the FRG.

Dear Comrades,

The question remains of how things are to go on. One thing is clear: sooner or later diplomatic relations will be established between the GDR and the FRG under international law and on an equal footing. Probably the two states will have joined the United Nations and its specialized agencies as members with equal rights even prior to that. Even if the Bonn government does not yet recognize this, because it cannot bring itself to part with some kind of revanchist backstairs romanticism or because it is afraid of the pressure of the CDU/

CSU or foreign imperialists, reality will force peaceful coexistence between the GDR and the FRG and the implementation of their full international equality in all fields, if not tomorrow, then the day after tomorrow.

The working people of the GDR will speed up this process by strengthening the GDR in all fields and mastering the tasks of creating the developed social system of Socialism.

The GDR Is in Accord With the Course of History

Speech by Comrade Willi Stoph, Member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic

Dear Comrades,

The domestic and foreign policy line of the German Democratic Republic, adopted by the 12th session of the Central Committee of our party, proved to be correct and resulted in the further strengthening of our Socialist state of peace and its international positions. I fully agree with the assessments and conclusions drawn in the report of the Political Bureau.

If one asks about the reasons of our successes and the key to the road to be taken in the future the answer will be found in the central strategic tasks decided by the Seventh Party Congress to make a determined and all-out effort for the all-round strengthening of our Socialist German Democratic Republic. The working people in town and countryside themselves are the beneficiaries of any progress made in the strengthening of our republic. It is an advantage of the Socialist system and an essential expression of its superiority over late capitalism that in this country where under the leadership of the working class the people hold power and own the means of production the values created belong to the people and are enjoyed by them.

The beginning of a new phase of emulation and the great readiness of the working people in industry and agriculture and in other branches of the economy to eliminate all arrears occasioned by the hard winter are an eloquent proof at this very moment that millions of working people have become conscious of the harmony between social and personal interests, inspiring them to great performances at work and pioneering achievements. The great efforts that are currently being made for the fulfilment of the 1970 national economic plan not only serve the goals of the current year but at the same time create the starting position for tackling the tasks of the next five years on a solid basis and ensuring a high rate of economic development.

He Who Strengthens the GDR Strengthens Peace and Socialism

Dear Comrades,

All of us who meet representatives of imperialist countries in the sphere of foreign policy realize that the confidence of our working people and the strength of our Socialist power are a great help. Comrade Walter Ulbricht once coined the phrase that the working people who by their daily work create the conditions for strengthening the GDR, for its international prestige and its growing influence were the best foreign policy makers. In this country the people and the government are striving for the same goals. That is the reason why our cause can be represented so well and effectively. This was also clearly shown by the meeting in Kassel. Now I should like to deal with some problems and the background of our political struggle.

Perhaps it is appropriate to deal in detail with the question of why in international policy there is a growing interest in the problem of relations with the GDR, why, for example, the head of government of the West German Federal Republic was ready to meet the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Socialist GDR. The underlying reason, however, must not be sought in the fact that the Bonn government has dropped its strategic aim, for like the former governments the present government has clearly identified itself with the monopoly capitalist state and aggressive NATO. Hence there are other reasons and one must look deeper. It is a question of the effects of the changed relation of forces in the world in favour of Socialism and peace. As a result of the successes achieved in the construction of Communism, in the constant strengthening of the defence potential and a policy consistently oriented on peace and security the influence of the Soviet Union is growing steadily as is shown by many international events. The prestige and power of the Socialist community of states and of the world-wide anti-imperialist movement are growing. Without giving up its aggressive goals imperialism tries to adapt its tactics to these changes. The growth and continuous strengthening of the German Democratic Republic is an important factor for safeguarding peace and bringing about European security.

What will be strengthened if we make an all-out effort to consolidate the GDR, the Socialist German nation-state? It is the cause of the peaceful future of our people and of the other peoples of Europe. It is the policy the GDR has consistently pursued since the very first days of its foundation and by which it will always be guided in the future. Everyone knows of our struggle for the

implementation of the Potsdam Agreement, against the revival of imperialism and militarism in West Germany, against the revanchist policy of revising the results of the Second World War. Everyone knows of our struggle for the unqualified application of international law in the relations among all European countries and in this connection for relations between the GDR and the FRG based on equal rights and international law. Everyone knows that this struggle is carried out in full agreement with the Soviet Union, our Socialist neighbours, Poland and Czechoslovakia, and with other Socialist countries and with all of them together.

Our work also strengthens the community of Socialist states, an integral part of which is the German Democratic Republic. In firm loyalty to the principles of proletarian internationalism and to the alliance of the Warsaw Treaty, being a fraternal friend of the Soviet Union we unswervingly carry out the common political program of the Socialist community of states. It is a program of close cooperation in the development of the Socialist system in all our countries, of the joint defence of the borders of the Socialist camp and of the struggle for peace and international security. The solidarity of the Socialist countries is a decisive source of strength for us. The firm alliance with the Soviet Union and the other countries of the Warsaw Treaty was, is and remains the foundation of our policy.

The decisions of the CMEA on the economic integration of our countries, of which we fully approve and in which we take an active part, are of great importance for the development of our national economies.

By strengthening the GDR we strengthen Socialism, thus proving the superiority of the new social order over the reactionary system of imperialism. The GDR is a living proof that in our epoch of the world-wide transition from capitalism to Socialism social progress is only possible on the basis of the social ownership of the means of production.

Real Democracy Makes the Political Power of the Working People Necessary

This historical truth cannot even be camouflaged by people such as Herr Schiller by juggling with words. The GDR shows that real democracy makes the power of the working people necessary. This cannot be changed by demagogic speeches on "social democracy" held at the party congresses of the SPD in the Federal Republic. There monopoly capital has unlimited power. The workers

and salaried employees do not even have the right to co-determination. There is no equality for the millions of workers in social life, ranging from the educational system to tax legislation. There the right of the working people to self-determination is not implemented. In this state of late capitalism political and social injustice rule. There monopoly capital has the decisive say and neozarism is rampant to an alarming degree.

The GDR and its successes are an irrefutable proof of the revolutionary power and the creative role of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the Marxist-Leninist party of the working class. Not only did it interpret the world in the Marxist sense, but also in accordance with the lessons of history and in the vital interests of the people it was at the head of two revolutions which changed the state and society on the territory of the GDR.

That is a balance different from that of those people in West Germany who after 1945 spoke of Socialism as a daily task, but who gave monopoly capital the chance to restore its power by splitting the working class, who became completely integrated in this system and whom we must face today as the administrator of West German imperialism and of the policy developed by the CDU/CSU—however it may be paraphrased. When in connection with the peace initiatives of the GDR political observers note that we—in full agreement with the Soviet Union and other fraternal Socialist countries—carry out our program with remarkable consistency and tenacity of purpose this is not astonishing. We advocate a just cause, a promising cause. The GDR is in accord with the course of history, it is part of that world-wide movement struggling for a lasting peace and social progress in the interest of the peoples. Therefore, time was on our side in the last few years. We took time by the forelock and we shall continue to do this in the future, too. Anyone who wants to have lasting success must keep abreast of social progress. Anyone who opposes social progress will be defeated in the long run.

What We Demand Is the Necessary Minimum of Realism

Dear Comrades,

The current situation is that the GDR and the FRG are facing each other not only as two mutually independent states, but moreover and what is most important they are two states with different social systems which are incompatible with each other. Although it is very dangerous to European peace that under

the leadership of the CDU/CSU the imperialist past was restored in West Germany and that by their policy of revenge the ruling forces made the FRG the chief trouble-maker in Europe it is good for all European peoples that the Socialist GDR exists which has overcome the past, which yields not an inch to revanchism and which is an active factor of peace.

As is the case between all states with different social systems there can be only relations of peaceful coexistence between the GDR and the FRG under international law—that is, normal diplomatic relations. Time and again our point of view was put forward in detail in implementing the decisions of the Central Committee in the draft treaty of the GDR, at the international press conference held by Comrade Walter Ulbricht and in statements when I met the West German Federal Chancellor in Erfurt and Kassel.

What is at stake? It is high time for the government of the Federal Republic to take full account of the historical facts and to draw political conclusions from them. If it continues to ignore them it will hopelessly bog down like all its predecessors. To be sure, anyone who manoeuvres himself into a blind alley should not reproach us with being responsible for it. But this is the very point of the thesis, released in Bonn every day, that the GDR's demand for relations based on international law were a position of "all or nothing". This is not true and at the same time pure demagoguery. To take a position of "all or nothing" would mean to discuss today Socialism as the present-day task for West Germany. The establishment of relations of peaceful coexistence based on international law between the GDR and the FRG is so-to-say the necessary minimum of realism.

Well-known West German publicists have long since taken such a realistic position and say that anyone who refuses to recognize a neighbouring state under international law gives it to understand that he wants to abolish it. Nobody should be astonished, these commentators go on to say, if this is met with the refusal and resistance of the state concerned. Such statements should be thought over much more earnestly than before in Bonn. The advice of those who say that anyone who is in a blind alley and wants to get out has only one way, namely, to return, should be heeded.

The report of the Political Bureau clearly assesses the attitude of the Bonn government towards the GDR. It still refuses to establish relations with the GDR on the basis of equal rights and international law. Instead, the formula of "special inner-German relations" is put out which is just a slightly paraphrased variant of the policy of claiming to speak for the entire German people. In a nationalistic spirit the unity of the nation forfeited by the ruling circles in West

Germany is conjured up. They continually talk about the equality of rights, but at the same time one act of discrimination against the GDR follows another. A War Law of 1917, signed by the former German Kaiser who was driven out a year later, including the former territory of the Reich is declared to be still valid in the Bonn state. In another legal regulation, released by the federal government on 25 May 1970, that is, four days after the meeting in Kassel, the GDR is called "Bonn Inland" and "Soviet occupation zone". This is impertinent, pretentious and in violation of international law.

These and many other gross violations of international law will not go unanswered. We are fully entitled to demand that the federal government eliminate old discriminatory measures and refrain from new ones.

In the last few days Bonn ministers such as Foreign Minister Scheel alleged that we were continuing to carry out polemics and they complained that the political climate between the GDR and the FRG had not improved. But the reasons for this are passed over in silence. We are not only for an improvement of the climate, but for the early normalization of relations. Those who continue their policy of discrimination against the GDR are to blame for the continued abnormal state of affairs. In view of the twenty years of experience we do not allow ourselves to be lulled by fine phrases and ask the Bonn government to end once and for all its old policy of the sole representation pretension, to recognize the political status quo in Europe and the present frontiers.

Bonn is Striving for Hegemony in Europe

What are possibly the reasons for the presumptuous attitude of the Bonn state? The reason behind it is that the West German Bundestag—above all the reactionary forces of the CDU and CSU, but also the present SPD/FDP government in Bonn—does not realistically assess the situation in Europe and in the world. There are different nuances in its tactics. The die-hards, such as multi-millionaire Freiherr von und zu Guttenberg—for whom, now as before, there are only bosses, servants and labourers—the Strauss', Kiesingers and Barzels—recently proclaimed once again their revanchist program of conquest and thus of war. They are not willing to recognize the results of the Second World War, they do not even want to respect the political realities in Europe as Guttenberg said in the Bundestag. If these people were only a handful of uninfluential megalomaniac adventurists we could ignore them with a smile. But they are the

incorrigible leaders of the CDU/CSU who, owing to their connections with monopoly capital, are also influential in the opposition. They are carrying out a savage anti-Communist hate campaign and do not want to see that the policy of cold war was even doomed to failure under Adenauer.

To be sure, the present federal government is prepared to enter into talks and negotiations, because it had to realize that it was not possible to roll over the GDR as the CDU/CSU wants to do. This must be seen in connection with the new relation of forces. Therefore a new tactics is used.

But also those who—like certain SPD leaders—want to make the borders permeable, invade the GDR and other Socialist countries, and undermine them have refused so far to draw the irrevocable and final lessons from history. As a Social Democratic newspaper openly admitted some days ago they speculate on a so-called change in the system in the Socialist countries and on the implementation of the convergence theory.

Behind the talk of self-determination, unity of the nation and a European order of peace there is the aim of ensuring the supremacy of federal German state monopoly capitalism in Europe. That is the heart of the problem.

Bonn is still harbouring the illusion that some time and somehow the course of history will be reversed, the march forward of Socialism in the GDR will be halted and the sphere of influence of West German imperialism extended to the East. This is not to say that the plans based on this have the slightest chance of succeeding! But such a policy jeopardizes European peace and definitely rules out normal relations based on equal rights between the GDR and the FRG. Answering the question about the strategic goal of the policy of his government repeatedly put to him Brandt told me that he expressly recognized the full validity of the Paris Treaties and thus of Article 7 of the so-called Treaty on Germany. But anyone who declares this Article 7 to be valid without any change declares as valid the political aim of extending the imperialist system of the Federal Republic to the GDR and of integrating the GDR into the aggressive NATO Pact.

We Do Not Allow Ourselves to Be Misled by Demagogic Talk

What in the light of this is the meaning of Bonn's demand that both sides should "give in a bit"? Are we supposed to give in to the aggressive conception of revenge advanced against the GDR in a tone of sharpened hostility by CDU/

CSU politicians like Strauss, Barzel and Guttenberg in the Bonn Bundestag some days ago. Are we supposed to "give in" to Article 7 of the Paris Treaties whose aim is to swallow up the GDR? Are we supposed "to give in a bit" on the basis of demagogic talks, while the Bonn government does not give up the old legal regulations based on the sole representation pretension which is contrary to international law, but goes on to practise them and continuously perpetrates new acts of injustice? Are we supposed to give in and be silent about this permanent interference in the domestic affairs of the GDR and the continued discrimination against our state and people? What an absurd question! No, gentlemen, that will not do! It is not just a question of giving in, it is not a question of prices or of prestige. It is rather a question of quite a normal thing, of relations based on equal rights between the GDR and the FRG valid in international law, making possible relations of peaceful coexistence between the two states. This would benefit all European peoples.

Now Herr Brandt has officially declared—and West German propaganda does not get tired of repeating it—the GDR draft treaty and especially the application of international law in relations between the GDR and the FRG would only be a formal matter without content. First it sounds very strange to hear a head of government say that international law is a formula without content. Was it not just the disregard of international law by the German imperialists that inflicted on their own people and the peoples of the whole of Europe endless suffering and distress, that destroyed the property and lives of so many peoples? The most human content conceivable for a policy is to establish guarantees that this will not be repeated. All the articles of our draft treaty are full of such a content.

I should like quite openly to ask the question of what is better for European peace, for the people: for the norms of international law to be valid in the relations between the GDR and the FRG as proposed by us or for the adventurist policy of revenge of the Strauss', Barzels and Guttenbergs and all their followers to be continued? Would it be better if the GDR and the FRG became members of the UN as was proposed by us or if the Federal Republic continues the policy of the Hallstein doctrine against the GDR by blackmailing methods in the international arena? Would it be better if the Federal Republic would also recognize the results of the Second World War, especially the borders of the GDR with the FRG and the Oder-Neisse frontier as was proposed by us or if, by fighting against the territorial status quo in Europe, by continuing a policy of

border revision, the danger of conflicts on the border between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO were sharpened and thus peace were jeopardized.

To ask these questions is also to answer them. Thus we are not dealing with formulas without content, but with a human policy for peace and with an inhuman policy against peace about which one has to decide. We have to deal with the problem of whether the basic question about a secure future of mankind will be solved or whether by raising secondary problems the solution of basic questions is to be avoided.

On Herr Brandt's 20 Points

Now we come to the program of 20 points presented by Herr Brandt in Kassel. First it does not matter whether 60 or 120 points are proposed. But if the decisive point concerning the relations between two states with different social systems, that is, the establishment of relations based on international law, is excluded, then the other points are of no use whatsoever.

But even that is only half the truth. On closer examination the 20 points presented by Herr Brandt are a closed program directed against the establishment of relations between the GDR and the FRG on the basis of equality and international law. That is also not altered by the fact that in Bonn great efforts were made to include some basic formulations put forward by the GDR in the text of the 20 points. I am thinking, for example, of the principle, about which we are very serious, that a war shall never again start from German soil. But why this formulation in view of the fact that the entire text is directed at refusing to establish the guarantees for this aim?

Thus Herr Brandt's project could be considered point by point. Let us take the thesis of the "unity of the nation", with which the text begins. This thesis falsifies history and is only meant to mislead people. The intention to base a concept on this thesis is in any case unrealistic and illusionary, because this "unity of the nation" has not been in existence since the splitting off of the West German Federal Republic from the German national union and the ratification of the Paris Treaties by which West Germany made itself foreign to the GDR, even if one were to go along with the bourgeois theories. But behind the blatant use of this thesis there is obviously more than just a lack of realism. Its sense probably is to justify the formula of "special inner-German relations"

with the help of which they hope finally to bring the GDR under the tutelage of the West German Federal Republic.

I do not have to repeat here what I told Herr Brandt point-blank several times, namely, why all these plans are built on sand.

Bonn's Acts of Sabotage Against the GDR

Dear Comrades,

We have made a very simple and logical statement which was once again underlined in the report of the Political Bureau. Anyone who is against the application of international law in the relations between the GDR and the FRG must be pursuing aims which are contrary to international law. It is up to the federal government finally to give up this destructive position endangering European peace. How else can one make the world believe that one pursues a policy of peace, relaxation and equality of rights?

Obviously some people have lost sight of the fact that in the past 20 years the FRG has consciously exploited the completely abnormal situation in the relations between the GDR and the FRG, that is, the lack of relations based on international law, systematically to create disadvantages for the GDR and inflict considerable material damage on it.

Fully integrated in the strategic objectives of West German imperialism to liquidate the GDR a whole system of measures was set up by the government of the FRG and the Bundestag to sabotage the national economy of the GDR and to enrich the FRG. This system of measures is highly varied and was modified according to circumstances and is used in many fields.

Thus the FRG has deliberately obstructed the foreign trade relations between the GDR and the FRG since the foundation of the West German separatist state by acts of discrimination, embargo regulations, breaches of contract, by discriminating against GDR products and enterprises and in other forms and took advantage of them to the detriment of the GDR.

Great damage by the FRG was also inflicted on the GDR through the systematic obstruction of the economic relations of the GDR with third states in violation of international law.

But this is not the whole picture of the damage done to the GDR in the past twenty years. It extends from cases of open disruption and diversive acts to the non-payment for services rendered by the GDR, retention or withdrawal of GDR

property, the theft of patents, trade marks and marks of origin by passing invalid laws, court decisions and the practice of West German officials. A list which would be anywhere near complete of the damage caused the GDR by the FRG, the cases of refusal to hand over property, unjustified enrichment, etc. which justify a demand by the GDR for more than 100 thousand million marks from the FRG is not possible here.

Not included in these financial demands, for example, is the GDR's claim for the return of cultural goods valued at several thousand million marks which are GDR property, including many of an inestimable cultural and historical value, some of which were stolen or stored in West Germany during the war and retained there to this day, contrary to all recognized principles of international law. Exact figures on all GDR claims on the FRG are available here and we shall return to this on a suitable occasion.

After I demanded in Erfurt payment of the FRG's debts and reparations obligations totalling more than 100 thousand million marks, the West German side brought into play the so-called burdens resulting from the war in the FRG. This can only be called an unsuccessful attempt to evade the GDR's justified demands. Behind the payments listed by the FRG under burdens resulting from the war are concealed thousands of millions of marks which were paid out to nazi activists, SS-men and militarists or which flowed into the hands of those forces who, as big industrialists and landowners, were among those who were mainly responsible for the Second World War and pocketed huge war profits. Among the alleged reparations paid by the FRG the thousands of millions of marks and the weapons delivered to Israel to support it in its aggression against the Arab states are also included. It is simply absurd to compare these so-called results of the war presented by the FRG with the correct, legally and morally convincing nature of the GDR's demands.

The debts and reparations obligations of the FRG to the GDR are not connected in any way with the so-called payments resulting from the war and reparations payments of the FRG. These have nothing whatever to do with our demands. The calculation and billing of reparations payments is also not included in the debts and reparations obligations of the FRG to the GDR.

After thousands of millions of marks worth of damage has been inflicted on the GDR in more than twenty years, as a result of disregarding the fact that the GDR is a subject of international law and as a result of the massive political and economic intervention in the GDR's internal affairs, the people who have so far not been in the habit of it are now becoming so touchingly concerned

about the GDR for fear it might suffer damage through the establishment of diplomatic relations between the GDR and the FRG. Let us call things by their right names. Where in the world can you find capitalists trading—and moreover, with a Socialist country—without an eye to their own profit? Capitalists of this kind, and here I am certainly not treading on anyone's toes, have yet to be invented. In our foreign trade with capitalist countries, including the FRG, we act upon the principle of mutual advantage, and this is certainly quite legitimate.

If on occasion the impression is given by pointed published statements and remarks that the GDR gets some special advantages from trade with the FRG, this does not accord with the facts. It is clear that those who prophesied economic disadvantages for the GDR in the event of the establishment of relations based on international law between the GDR and the FRG have not considered the entire complexity of the matter sufficiently thoroughly. We are somewhat ahead here and are also prepared to speak about this at a suitable time.

It should suffice today to say that the close and growing economic and trade relations between the GDR and the Soviet Union and the other Socialist countries are well known and need no special mention. The GDR's foreign trade was mainly orientated in this direction in the past and this will continue in the future. Everyone knows, too, that with regard to trade with capitalist countries, we consider all countries which are prepared to trade with the GDR on a basis of mutual advantage.

With regard to our foreign trade with the FRG, we take the view that the establishment of relations between the GDR and the FRG on the basis of equality and international law could only be advantageous for it. We cannot imagine that the government of the FRG is aiming at a reduction in foreign trade relations with the GDR.

With regard to concrete questions asked about this, the same export and import prices are valid for both sides, for example. The same regulations in regard to customs also apply to both sides.

It may be added that the FRG did 24 thousand million marks' worth of trade with the independent political entity of West Berlin in 1969, using the GDR's transport routes. This sum will give cause for some thought here and there when the advantages or disadvantages in the field of customs is under discussion.

As I said, we are in a position at any time to present the problem in detail, and it would be better for the initiators to put a stop as quickly as possible to a certain kind of propaganda and deliberately false information.

Provocations in Kassel Characterize the Bonn State of Injustice

All in all, dear Comrades, the course and the accompanying circumstances of the talks in Kassel have again proved that two completely opposite political systems, two worlds, confront each other in the form of the GDR and the FRG. I need here only recall the insulting and shameful incidents of disgracing the flag, impeding the previously agreed upon laying of a wreath at the memorial to the victims of fascism, the theft of the ribbon of the wreath, in order to establish that a state in which such things can happen has spoken judgment on itself. Neo-nazism showed itself openly and brutally in Kassel. Together with the CDU/CSU and other revanchist organizations the NPD could commit unheard of provocations unhindered by the state organs.

Characteristically the pogrom instigation and murder threats and the attempt at violent attacks was directed not only against us, against the delegation of the GDR, but in part also against Federal Chancellor Brandt. But even in this scandalous infringement the police did not intervene. It is regrettable that despite all these incidents Herr Brandt took Strauss and Barzel in his protection in his official speech in Kassel. If these arch-reactionary neo-nazi forces nevertheless did not dominate the field in Kassel it is thanks to the anti-fascists, the Communists and other democrats and especially democratic youth who, through their courageous acts made it possible for our delegation to honour the victims of fascism by laying a wreath at the memorial.

The Bonn government did not provide what Federal Chancellor Brandt had previously promised in his letter, that the GDR delegation would receive the same treatment and have the same rights as the delegation of the FRG had in Erfurt. The organs of the FRG were either not in a position or did not want to guarantee security and order against the fascist provocations for a meeting of two heads of government.

If we did not immediately leave Kassel after the first provocations, we announced thereby our firm determination and readiness to do everything at all possible to contribute to safeguarding peace in Europe and to the establishment of normal relations between the GDR and FRG on a basis of equality and international law. We made use of our right to present the point of view of the GDR in the Federal Republic and thereby at the same time acted in the interest of the peaceful and democratic forces in the Federal Republic. But we most emphatically state: The provocateurs and instigators to murder must not remain unpunished. Up to now not one single case has become known where desecra-

tors of the flag and other violators of law have been called to account. This is contrary to all international usage. The incidents in Kassel demonstrate to the whole world that the Bonn state is a state of injustice in which the machinations of reaction and neo-nazis are tolerated and promoted, in which there can be no talk of democratic liberties and in which the existing laws are one-sidedly applied against the progressive forces and for the protection of reaction.

The extremist rightwing forces in the CDU/CSU and in other organizations in the Federal Republic, the grim opponents of relations between the GDR and the FRG based on equality and international law answered our successful appearance in Kassel with a new wave of nationalist and revanchist outbreaks of hatred and meetings devoted to instigation. They are mobilizing everything against a development which will nevertheless frustrate their aggressive plans in the long run.

In this connection it must be emphasized that my declaration as Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the GDR on entering the Federal Republic and the declaration at the beginning of the talks with the Federal Chancellor have a basic importance going beyond the meeting in Kassel. We again announced unequivocally to all the world that the Bonn laws and norms illegal in international law directed against the GDR and its citizens at no time had the force of law and will never have it. All consequences arising out of such unjust actions in the spirit of the sole representation pretension and about which the final word has not yet been spoken must be borne by the Bonn rulers themselves.

World Echo Shows Growing Prestige of Our Policy

Dear Comrades,

In our appearance in Kassel we consistently implemented the directive of the Central Committee, the decision of the People's Chamber and the stipulation of the Council of Ministers. The overwhelming majority of the people actively announced their agreement with the constructive policy of the party and state leadership. We acted in full agreement with our friends in the Soviet Union and the other Socialist countries. The positive echo throughout the world shows that the policy of the GDR directed at peace and security enjoys ever greater prestige. The demand for the recognition of the GDR on the basis of international law is being raised more loudly than ever. During our stay in the Federal Republic we received many thousands of letters, statements, resolutions and lists of

signatures from West German citizens professing their sympathy for our workers' and farmers' state. This free expression of will shows the growing understanding on the part of broad circles of the people of the Federal Republic of the fact that the normalization of relations with the GDR also corresponds to their basic interests for a life in peace and security. They encouraged us in the effort to employ all forces for this aim. The root of the foreign policy successes of the GDR is the all-sided strengthening of our Socialist state and social system, is the fulfilment and overfulfilment of our national economic plans thanks to the exemplary work of millions of working people. That is and remains the main task for every citizen of our state. In this, in fulfilling our plans well, further strengthening the GDR and organizing the cooperation with the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries still more effectively lies the guarantee that we shall reach our common just goals and safeguard peace in Europe.

SM-IN-THE-20TH-CENTURY---0172047A

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



HX 632 A1 W9 no.1325
World communism in the 20th
century.

0172047A MAIN

