

Speech by the Head of Delegation of the German Democratic Republic, Walter Ulbricht, at the Meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty States on March 17, 1969 in Budapest

Dear Comrades!

The urgency of the measures we have adopted to improve our states' military cooperation and increase our armed forces' combat readiness has been further confirmed by NATO's most recent politico-military and military activities, such as the provocative transfer of American army and air force troops within the framework of the Reforger I maneuver and the follow-up exercise in the immediate vicinity of the state border of the GDR and the ČSSR, as well as the Hylex 3 exercise, in which so-called crisis teams from NATO countries are testing their ability to react to crisis situations provoked by the most diverse means and methods. The special activities of the NATO command to block the outlets of the Baltic Sea also merit our attention.

A clear example of the aggressiveness of NATO's general strategy was provided by the command staff exercise "Fallex 68" carried out in October 1968, about which we have authentic reports.

In the NATO exercise "Fallex 68," which – as explicitly stated – was supposed to follow NATO's actual war plans, military actions were preceded by ideological subversion and psychological warfare prepared and directed by the military staff, aimed at undermining the socialist commonwealth.

The military actions in the exercise were based on the concrete assumption that:

- the collective defense of the Warsaw Treaty states had been softened;
- individual socialist states had been pried away from the socialist commonwealth;
- the unity of party and nation in the socialist countries had been destroyed.

All NATO staff, including division staff, were briefed to the effect that their military operations would occur on politically prepared ground. The “Fallex 68” exercise trained them for a war characterized by a very flexible approach that takes into account the political and military conditions of the different geographical regions of Europe. The following were tested in a successive, closely-linked and overlapping manner: the policy of softening and subversion, psychological warfare, covert warfare, limited warfare, the tactical use of nuclear weapons and, finally, the launching of general nuclear war.

Given this state of affairs, we will in the future have no choice but to consider every form of ideological subversion and psychological warfare against our countries as a part of NATO’s war plans. We will also have to draw conclusions from the fact that West German imperialism, in addition to striving for nuclear weapons, is also directly commissioning work on bacteriological and chemical weapons and is testing their use.

In the current stage of development, NATO is focusing on psychological warfare, on attempting to subvert the socialist countries and at the same time preparing active measures of covert warfare.

In the military sphere, we have taken measures to raise the effectiveness and fighting strength of our alliance. We are of the view that we should now work more

forcefully also in the political, ideological and economic spheres to develop and consolidate our socialist community of struggle so that we are able to successfully counter NATO's psychological warfare against us.

We accord great importance to strengthening and expanding the political cooperation and solidarity of our countries. We consider it necessary to do a much better job of presenting the great historical achievements of the socialist order, of which all our lands can boast, as successes of the social system of socialism and of making the younger generation aware of them.

We all know that the imperialists are making great efforts to win influence, especially among the youth of our countries. Our experience has been that young people are responsive whenever we actively engage them in solving the new problems of socialist transformation, whenever – especially in post-secondary schools and universities – we work together with them to draw conclusions in a socialist spirit from the scientific-technological revolution. This is also the goal of the third university reform currently underway in the GDR. We must constantly keep up the fight against bourgeois ideologies and cannot be content with the fact that together we brought about a defeat of the so-called “New Ostpolitik” of the West German imperialists last year.

We also consider it necessary to determine and secure cooperation based on regular political consultations between the Secretaries of the Central Committees of our parties responsible for ideological work in order to coordinate an effective joint struggle against psychological warfare.

I would also like to draw all the comrades' attention to the necessity of making joint, coordinated efforts to overcome our existing gap in the field of material and scientific-technical means in the struggle against the psychological warfare of the imperialists, especially in terms of the mass media, radio, television, and the press. As soon as possible, we must be in a position to take just as strong a stand against aggressive imperialism in this field as in the military sphere.

The conditions are such in the current stage of the conflict between socialism and imperialism in Europe that it can be decided in our favor.

Overall, we see a stable and favorable development in our national economies, the consolidation of the military strength of our defensive alliance and the growth of democratic forces and the peace movement in many European capitalist states.

If several factors tipping the correlation of forces internationally in favor of socialism cannot take full effect now, it is the reckless, splitting policy of the Mao Zedong group that bears great responsibility for this. Its aggressive policy – including military provocations – against the Soviet Union, the main power and main pillar of the socialist commonwealth of nations, constitutes direct and apparently intentional support for U.S. imperialism and West German imperialism in their fight against socialism. We cannot consider it an accident that the most recent Chinese military provocation against the Soviet Union took place precisely at that point when the West German imperialists, with the support of the U.S. imperialists, carried out their serious West Berlin provocation against the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union.

The growing economic and political antagonisms and contradictions between the capitalist countries of Europe and within these countries themselves have become particularly obvious in connection with the crisis of the imperialist monetary system during the final months of last year. However, despite the growing contradictions between the NATO countries, we cannot ignore the fact that Bonn was able to take a step forward in its striving for greater influence in NATO and hegemony over Western Europe at the last meeting of the NATO Ministerial Council in Brussels.

Not only the NATO Ministerial Meeting but also the behavior of the Bonn government with regard to the monetary crisis has shown that we are not dealing with the same West German imperialism as we knew in the Adenauer era, for example. West German imperialism has allied itself closely with the leading imperialist power, the USA, and its global strategy. The massive economic and scientific-technological penetration of U.S. concerns inside West Germany and their growing intertwining with West German monopoly capitalism play a significant role here.

On the basis of an extreme concentration of the greatest amount of capital, West German imperialism has developed a new offensive of economic expansion and neo-colonialism. The magnitude of the concentration is reflected in the fact that not only small- and medium-sized enterprises are being sucked up by large concerns, but the large concerns are merging or cooperating, and new giant concerns are being established under the command of West German monopoly capitalism. About 80 per cent of all coal mining in the Ruhr has been concentrated in one giant concern with around 200,000 workers and employees. In the electrical industry, there are joint ventures and cooperation agreements between the old competitors, the Siemens concern and the AEG concern, which have together more than 350,000 workers and employees. The same process is underway in the

fields of chemistry and fuel, in the auto industry, etc. These concentration processes, which are being energetically pushed forward by the government of the West German Federal Republic and its Social Democratic economics minister, are particularly extensive in the armaments industry.

Against the background of this move toward concentration, the attempts by the West German government and its Social Democratic foreign minister to advise the socialist countries to decentralize their industry and their entire economies in the interests of an allegedly “democratic Socialism” seem particularly odd.

West German monopoly capital is undertaking this new movement toward concentration in order to create capital-intensive, colossal concerns – so-called global corporations – that can also compete with U.S. concerns in world markets, and also in order to push forward West German imperialism’s offensive for economic expansion, its striving for hegemony over Western Europe, and its neo-colonial forays. Major West German concerns are establishing large-scale chemical enterprises, etc. at an increasing rate outside West German territory, inside other EEC states. Remarkably, the French government has found it necessary already to object to the inflation in the establishment of West-German companies in Eastern France (former Elsaß-Lothringen).¹

In the first half of 1968, West German capital exports exceeded capital imports by 6.1 billion marks.

Among the goals of the West German offensive for economic expansion, which – as we know – is coupled with political objectives, is to economically penetrate the

¹ Transl. Note: Alsace-Lorraine.

socialist countries and to weaken them economically. We definitely need to pay more attention to these efforts and their motives. This is all the more necessary as this offensive for expansion by West German imperialism has been accompanied by the Bonn government's honing of its revanchist policy and a hardening of its revanchist positions.

In this connection, we cannot ignore the fact that Bonn has largely succeeded in harnessing NATO for its revanchist policy. This is also evident in the December resolutions of the NATO Ministerial Council. They clearly show the increased aggressiveness and the anti-Soviet objectives of the NATO bloc and are aimed at an arms buildup and a rise in international tensions. These resolutions seek to expand NATO's sphere of action and the commitments of the NATO-bloc's members to states and regions that belong neither to NATO nor its region.

A particularly eager proponent of these provisions, which are increasing tensions in Europe, was the Bonn government and its Foreign Minister Brandt. The proclamation of some kind of right by NATO to interfere in countries that do not belong to NATO; the intensification of NATO's aggressiveness toward the socialist countries; the NATO declaration on an "alliance of unlimited duration"; the development of the so-called flank concept of NATO – in particular, the expansion of NATO's positions in the eastern Mediterranean and in the Baltic Sea; the attempt to dispute the Soviet Union's right to a presence in the Mediterranean – all these are also elements that characterize the changes have occurred in the European situation. Finally, NATO declared in its Brussels communiqué that it – I quote verbatim – “could not remain indifferent to any development which endangers their security. Clearly, any Soviet intervention directly or

indirectly affecting the situation in Europe or in the Mediterranean would create an international crisis with grave consequences” – end of quote.²

We can only imagine the kind of political-psychological and material pressure that was exerted on the smaller NATO states, which clearly are not interested in a conflict, to make them agree to such a declaration. However, I would not like to assume that the smaller NATO states – or even France and England – would be prepared without further ado to put this proclaimed, high-risk and aggressive policy of NATO into practice.

With regard to the so-called German question and the West Berlin situation, NATO claimed competencies for itself at its last Ministerial meeting for which there is no basis in international law and which constitute instead a direct violation of post-war agreements. NATO, an aggressive military pact directed against the Potsdam Agreement and against the socialist countries, has never had a say regarding the implementation of the Potsdam Agreement and the relations between the German Democratic Republic and the West German Federal Republic. As sovereign states, the GDR and the West German Federal Republic can regulate their relations only themselves by means of treaties valid in international law.

NATO speaks of alleged obstacles to a “rapprochement” between West Germany and the German Democratic Republic created by the Warsaw Treaty states. We all know, however, that Bonn has been blocking all initiatives for talks on relations between the GDR and West Germany by insisting upon its revanchist preconditions.

² Transl. Note: from the Final Communiqué of the NATO Ministerial Council, 16 November 1968. See North Atlantic Treaty Organization, e-Library, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_26736.htm.

If the West German Federal Republic wants talks, then it is imperative that Bonn recognize the German Democratic Republic's existence in international law with equality of rights, along with the status quo in Europe – above all else the existing borders; that it give up its pretension to sole representation and its efforts to have it legitimized by the GDR or the other socialist countries by maneuvers to “leave out” its revanchist policy. It is obvious that the Bonn Government's maintaining the Hallstein Doctrine is also directed against the normalization of relations between the two German states.

Regarding the interference of the Bonn government and NATO in the affairs of West Berlin, we can only say that this is to the detriment of the interests of the citizens of this city and also to European peace and security. By holding the elections for the new Federal President in West Berlin, the Bonn government wanted to achieve a change in the status quo and further harden its pretension to sole representation. The annexation of West Berlin is supposed to be the first step in implementing the program conceived by Strauß³ for an imperialist “New Order in Europe” based on Bonn's conceptions. At the same time, by invoking Berlin's status as former “capital of the Reich” as a reason to elect the President there, it is underscoring its claim to the reestablishment of the imperialist German Reich. From Strauß's plans it is clear that this is not just the Reich in its 1937 borders.

In its measures against the Bonn government's revanchist provocation, the German Democratic Republic, in full agreement with the USSR, has proceeded from the legal basis that West Berlin, which lies on the territory of the German Democratic Republic, is an independent political entity and at no time was, is, or ever will be part of

³ West German Finance Minister Franz-Josef Strauß of the Christian Social Union (CSU).

the West German state. All of the measures taken by the GDR up to now fully comply with the postwar agreements. We have strictly held to our common policy for European security and the reduction of tensions, to the agreements at Karlovy Vary and the Warsaw conference of foreign ministers. In this connection, in the name of the Politburo of the SED and the government of the GDR, I would like to thank the party leaders and the governments of the fraternal countries for their rapid, generous and effective support, also in this phase of our confrontation with West German imperialism and revanchism.

I would like to use this opportunity to underscore that there is a West Berlin problem, but no such thing as a Berlin question. Berlin is the capital city of the sovereign German Democratic Republic, which regulates its own affairs without the participation of the imperialist Western powers. The anomalous situation in West Berlin, however, which is being misused as a bridgehead of subversion and Cold War against the GDR and other socialist countries, is raising tensions in Europe and constitutes a serious threat to peace and security.

Since 1955, the German Democratic Republic, by virtue of the state treaty concluded with the USSR, a signatory to the Potsdam Agreement, has been a sovereign state under international law and, according to its constitution, shares responsibility for the implementation of the Potsdam Agreement. One consequence of this, among other things, is that the use of the GDR's traffic routes by the organs of other states (or the special political entity of West Berlin) requires state agreements with the GDR. An agreement based on a peace treaty, which was proposed by the governments of the USSR and the GDR on many occasions and upon whose basis these matters might have possibly been resolved, has failed due to the resistance of the Bonn government and the three Western powers. Contrary to the claims of the Bonn government and the Senate of West

Berlin, there is no contractual regulation for civilian traffic from and to West Berlin by land, water or air through the territory of the GDR. Immediately after 1945, there were alleged agreements – and merely verbal agreements – about the use of certain traffic routes in what was the Soviet occupation zone at the time, in order to permit the passage of supplies to the military units of the USA, England and France stationed in West Berlin. The civil air traffic from and to West Berlin, in particular, is illegal and represents a violation of the sovereign rights of the German Democratic Republic. For example, the illegal transport of revanchist Bonn politicians, including several dozen neo-Nazi members of parliament, across the territory of the GDR to West Berlin, where a crass provocation was carried out, can hardly be reconciled with the agreements of the anti-Hitler coalition and the spirit of the Potsdam Agreement.

The events in this regard have proved that the West German CDU/CSU and the Social Democratic leadership are still not prepared to move toward a reduction of tensions. By provocatively holding their presidential election outside the territory of the West German Federal Republic, they and their Bonn government have raised tensions and endangered peace. The further international isolation of the West German coalition government as a result is something that they have had to accept.

If Bonn continues to push its policy of annexation, further measures may become necessary in order to create guarantees to ensure the security of the GDR and the socialist commonwealth. Precisely for this reason we must follow developments very carefully and resolutely and effectively present the position of the socialist states and the Political Consultative Committee internationally.

In order to ensure a peaceful development of the situation in West Berlin, the city must, in keeping with the principles of the Potsdam Agreement and other four power agreements, be respected as an independent political entity that does not belong to the West German Federal Republic, also by the three Western powers and by West Germany. No activity by the West German state, no revanchist and militarist propaganda, no neo-Nazism or arms production for West German militarism may be permitted in West Berlin, and West Berlin must not be allowed to become a bridgehead of the Cold War against the GDR and the other socialist countries.

The reduction of tensions and the normalization of relations between the German Democratic Republic and the West German Federal Republic will of course only be possible if Bonn renounces its claim to sole representation and respects the resolutions and the interests of the states of the Warsaw Treaty.

Dear Comrades!

There is a close connection between the aggressive course being pursued by NATO and the West German CDU's 1968 action program adopted at the CDU Party Congress, also provocatively held in West Berlin. With its new action program, the main party of West German monopoly capitalism has partially reformulated revanchist policy and defined it as a guideline for the 1970s.

The core element of the action program is the proclamation of a program for expansion, conceived by Strauß, aiming at an imperialist "New Order in Europe" under West German dominance. The West German Federal Chancellor Kiesinger declared the

fundamental tenet of the party congress to be that the results of the Second World War are an injustice that cannot be recognized as just.

This thesis – along with the other revanchist part of the action program – is in almost complete agreement with the ideas of West German neo-Nazism. In other words, this CDU party congress clearly shows that the neo-Nazi development in West Germany is not just limited to the neo-Nazi party and its activities. Rather, it is founded on and embodied in the declared and programmatically determined revanchist policy of the ruling party of the West German high bourgeoisie.

At the party congress, Federal Chancellor Kiesinger called the USA the “born leading power in NATO.” At the same time, he insisted that the USA should lead but not dominate the alliance; he thus announced the West German imperialists’ demand for a stronger role.

Acknowledging the leadership of the imperialist USA, the CDU Party Congress endorsed the strategic goal of taking advantage of the political, economic and military unification of Western Europe to create the preconditions, in terms of power politics, for an imperialist Europe dominated by West Germany up to the Bug [River]. The purpose of the “New Ostpolitik” proclaimed by the SPD is to penetrate the people’s democracies politically, ideologically and economically, in order to prepare the ground for the achievement of this strategic goal.

In order to complete the picture, I would like to point out that first of all West German imperialism wants to share in the British and French nuclear-weapons potential

and have a right to “co-decision” in the use of U.S. nuclear weapons stockpiled in Europe, through the creation of a “European core within NATO.”

Recently, the Bonn government published a “White Book on Defense Policy.” I recommend this “White Book” to your attention.

The *Bundeswehr*⁴ are being numerically strengthened. They are being restructured to create a command structure designed especially for conducting limited wars. The command structure in force as of 1 February 1969 makes it easier to carry out military actions, even without agreement within NATO.

West Germany is increasing its direct military expenditures, which exceeds 20 billion marks annually, by approximately an additional 4.77 billion marks from 1969 to 1972. West German arms production is thus being expanded, and West Germany is increasingly evolving into a weapons exporter. Thus, the West European NATO states are being brought into a position of dependence upon Bonn in terms of armaments technology and politics. This is also demonstrated by the fact that, on the basis of a British-Dutch-West German agreement, Bonn is participating in the planned construction of a gas centrifuge for the production of enriched uranium, which can be used for atomic and hydrogen bombs.

Immediately after the CDU’s adoption of its action program, more detailed explanations by Strauß on the “new order of Europe” were published in the West German journal *Deutschland Archiv*. Strauß lists as belonging to Europe – in terms of the hegemonic claims of West German imperialism – I quote verbatim – “Poland,

⁴ Transl. Note: The West German Armed Forces.

Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania etc. just as much as Switzerland, the Netherlands and Belgium.” Strauss continues by saying that the European policy of Bonn and of the other states subordinating themselves to its policy must be shaped in such a way – again I quote verbatim – “that the influences of Soviet policy upon the fate of our peoples is rolled back and loses its efficacy” – end of quote.

This conception leaves no room for the assumption that West Germany desires relations with socialist countries on the basis of equal rights and true mutual benefit and respect for each other’s points of view and interests. Rather, Bonn is trying to push through its policy of hegemony over Europe, the policy that proclaims as its goal the destruction of the Warsaw Treaty group of states.

Moreover, representatives of West German imperialism such as Strauß and Schröder are directing their efforts toward making the West German state first and foremost a “model for a reunified Germany” and concentrating on the confrontation with socialism in the GDR.

This development makes the confrontation between the two systems on German soil all the more significant as part of the confrontation between the two world systems, as the cardinal problem confronting the entire socialist commonwealth and all the forces of peace. If the West German monopoly-capitalist state is being proclaimed as the model for a reunified Germany, then it is all the more necessary that we in the German Democratic Republic prove the superiority of socialism. The German Democratic Republic must and will prepare itself for this confrontation, which is of the greatest importance to the entire socialist commonwealth. This is the common concern of the commonwealth of the Warsaw Treaty states.

Honored Comrades!

Any illusions that there is any politically significant difference between the policy of the parties of West German monopoly capitalism described here and the policy of the Social Democratic ministers in the Bonn government have been dispelled by the Social Democratic Party leadership itself, through its overall behavior in the coalition. Without the active support of the Social-Democrat leaders, it would not have been possible to pass the Emergency Laws or the finance laws, which have brought about a further redistribution of wealth to the benefit of the large monopolies and concerns.

Brandt and other Social Democratic Ministers strongly defend the view that the status quo in Europe must be overcome in favor of West German imperialism. Brandt was and is a defender of the so-called “New Ostpolitik,” by means of which West German imperialism wants to penetrate the socialist states and to play them off against each other.

Brandt and Wehner are striving to split the GDR and the other socialist states away from the Soviet Union and to transform them into petit bourgeois states, which would inevitably fall victim to West German imperialism’s policy of expansion. For this reason, they are also ruthlessly opposing all attempts in the Social Democratic Party to develop a more realistic policy.

In light of this, it is no surprise that Brandt declared at the NATO Council meeting in Brussels that his intentions – I quote verbatim – “correspond seamlessly with

those of the Federal Minister of Defense Schröder”⁵ – (end of quote) By way of explanation, I would like to add that Schröder had pleaded for stepping up preparations for a nuclear war and demanded decision-making rights for Bonn regarding the use of nuclear weapons, a further increase in Bonn’s armaments budget, etc.

Lenin observed that in the First World War the right-wing leaders of Social Democracy had gone over to the camp of imperialism. This observation can be applied today in an analogous fashion to the right-wing leaders of the Social Democratic Party in West Germany.

How are we to explain this “seamless correspondence” between the intentions of the Social Democratic leadership and West German monopoly capital’s program for internal and external expansion?

In contrast to other Social Democratic parties, the leadership of the West German Social-Democrats has not been able to develop an alternative to the policy of the haute bourgeoisie, to the policy of the CDU/CSU, because it persists in holding on to the positions of revanchism and anti-communism. Ever since the SPD leadership rejected the peace treaty proposal of the Soviet Union in 1952 in mutual agreement with Adenauer, and then, in 1960, also officially went over to the CDU/CSU’s revanchist policy, it sees its main task as opposing the socialist GDR and struggling to turn back the socialist development in the people’s democracies.

The transition to revanchist positions on the part of the Social Democratic ministers and the majority of Social Democratic leaders also logically entails their

⁵ Gerhard Schröder of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU).

lending political and economic policy support to the ruling system of monopoly capitalism. The Social Democratic ministers and right-wing party leaders are particularly assiduous, also in their own interest, in their efforts to dissimulate the growing contradictions inherent to this system and to stabilize the state-monopoly rule. Recent talk by Brandt and others about creating a “coalition of reformers” means nothing else than that the Social Democratic ministers consider their task in a coalition government to consist in removing all bureaucratic or other obstacles blocking the exploitation of the scientific-technological revolution to increase the power of West German monopoly capital.

West German Social Democracy is providing the CDU/CSU’s authoritarian conception of the state, i.e. the established rule of monopoly capital and militarism, with a little bourgeois-democratic cloak. With their harmless-sounding enterprise of a “New Ostpolitik,” in which their main ideological weapon is the convergence theory, the right-wing Social Democratic leaders are supporting the expansionist policy of West German imperialism.

In a certain sense, the election of the Social-Democrat Justice Minister Heinemann as Federal President is an internal political setback for the CDU/CSU. It is the expression of a certain discrediting of former active Nazis and extreme militarists and revanchists. We will, of course, take this carefully into account in our further policy. However, in order to avoid illusions about Heinemann, we must not close our eyes to the fact that the Heinemann of today is no longer the Heinemann of 1952. Today, as a minister in Bonn’s coalition government, he supports West German imperialism’s policy of armament and expansion.

In 1952, Heinemann distanced himself from Adenauer's foreign policy. In the meantime, this policy of Adenauer, the policy of frontally attacking the GDR, has long since failed. It has been replaced with the equally hopeless but refined policy of the SPD and the CDU, which – under the label “New Ostpolitik” – proclaims to differentiate between the socialist states and to undermine them. So, while Heinemann at one time rightly distanced himself from Adenauer's policy, he has, as a minister in the coalition government under Kiesinger, jumped from the frying pan into the fire, so to speak, by supporting the foreign policy of this coalition government.

The election of Heinemann as Federal President, which was promoted by a strong grouping of West German big business, is meant to bind the Social Democratic movement even more tightly to the system of state-monopoly capitalism. Heinemann – this is the idea – is supposed to exercise a kind of integrating function to ensure a broad basis among the masses for the established rule of monopoly capital, something that can no longer be ensured by the CDU/CSU alone. – That is our assessment of the role foreseen for Heinemann.

I would like to remind you here of the following: the Socialist Unity Party of Germany has over many years attempted to come to an agreement with the Social Democratic Party about détente and the bringing about of peaceful co-existence, under the condition, of course, that the Social Democratic Party support the recognition of the GDR and the existing borders. We repeated our proposals when the Erhard regime was bankrupt, and declared that we would view the forming of an SPD-FDP coalition government favorably, since this could open up possibilities for an agreement.

But even as the Social Democratic leadership was still talking with us and speaking about the possibility of an SPD-FDP government, Mr. Wehner was already consulting with Strauß and Kiesinger about the creation of a CDU/CSU-SPD coalition government. The contacts that the Social Democrat leadership had to us then turned out to be a maneuver of deception to mask politically the negotiations of the heads of the Social Democratic Party with the representatives of the CDU, the party of monopoly capitalism.

What is the explanation for this? The right-wing Social Democrat leaders are trying to talk the workers into believing that the scientific-technological revolution has done away with class antagonisms and that the future belongs to state-monopoly capitalism. This West German state, they say, needs a broader basis in Europe for its policy of expansion. Hence, the “New Ostpolitik,” which aims to influence the people’s democracies and to annex the GDR. The right-wing SPD leaders are saying that this policy of expansion and “spreading the wealth” will also provide crumbs from the table for West German workers. In reality, the SPD policy is promoting increased profits and political power for monopoly capitalism.

The SED has repeatedly tried to persuade the SPD leadership to desist from this fateful path and to win it for cooperation in the interest of détente and European security.

When we approached the SPD leadership with a proposal for détente in connection with the most recent events, Brandt responded with a blunt refusal.

It is thus impossible to differentiate between the CDU/CSU’s policy of revanche and the policy of the Social Democratic ministers. However, a difference is developing

between many functionaries and organizations of the Social Democratic Party on the one hand and neo-Nazism and the CDU/CSU on the other. It is of great importance that Social Democratic organizations and functionaries demand of the Social Democratic ministers a complete change in policy toward the GDR and the socialist commonwealth. At the same time, we must not underestimate the fact that also among these Social Democratic functionaries, illusions about the role of the Social Democratic ministers and the Social Democratic leadership still persist.

Precisely because of this, it is necessary to make the greatest efforts, through contacts and cooperation with the organizations and functionaries of the Social Democratic Party as well as with trade union and youth organizations, to win the working class over for the recognition of the German Democratic Republic, against neo-Nazism, for disarmament and European security – i.e. for the proposals and resolutions contained in the Bucharest Declaration and in the document from the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties in Karlovy Vary.

I would like to stress that the political developments of the past months have fully confirmed the correctness of the resolutions of Bucharest and Karlovy Vary.

Mr. Brandt has hinted at a certain interest in talks on an agreed renunciation of the use of force.

I would like to stress that we are in favor of the conclusion of a treaty on the renunciation of the use of force. Such a treaty cannot, however, be built on sand, on the Bonn hypothesis that the present situation, the status quo in Europe, is a provisional one that can be changed as soon as imperialism sees such a possibility. A treaty on

renunciation of force, if it is to be a solid building block for the house of European security, must proceed first of all from recognition of the status quo. That means it must rest upon the clear foundation stipulated in the documents of Bucharest and Karlovy Vary. Following the political events of the past months, it is obvious that a peaceful settlement with both German states will be possible only within the framework of a system of European security, in whose establishment the German Democratic Republic must participate on the basis of equal rights.

Our central task is and remains the strengthening of the commonwealth of the Warsaw Treaty. The further development of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance must help us make progress with respect to the problems of socialist development in connection with the tasks of the scientific-technological revolution.

It is necessary to activate our policy for European security, as determined at our Bucharest meeting. This includes waging a joint struggle against the so-called “New Ostpolitik” and against the West German Social Democratic leadership’s convergence swindle. In this regard, the policy of the states of the Warsaw Treaty has been stipulated in the resolutions of Karlovy Vary and the Warsaw foreign ministers’ conference. Also in this connection, I would like to emphasize that normalization of relations between the German Democratic Republic and the West German Federal Republic will only be possible if West Germany renounces its claim to sole representation and its policy of revanche and recognizes the status quo in Europe.

What conclusions should we draw from these developments and our assessment of the situation, and on which tasks should we primarily concentrate?

We all seem to agree that the Warsaw Treaty states will continue as heretofore to support in every respect the heroically fighting Vietnamese people and its efforts to end U.S. aggression and to achieve a political solution to the problem through negotiations.

Similarly, we will not relent in our efforts for the unconditional implementation of the UN Security Council resolutions for a peaceful solution to the Middle East conflict and for overcoming the consequences of the Israeli aggression against the Arab countries.

An urgent task of the commonwealth of states of the Warsaw Treaty is to support the immediate signing and ratification of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty by as many states as possible. We will also support with all our might the initiatives of the Soviet Union to limit nuclear armament and to prevent the West German Federal Republic from co-disposal over nuclear weapons in any form.

We are in favor of an agreement by the Communist and Workers' parties and governments of the member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance on further developing our socialist economic community, with the goal of mastering the tasks of the scientific-technological revolution. This will strengthen our system and raise the standard of living of our population and thus make the socialist social system attractive and popular beyond the borders of our states.

We also consider it necessary that we coordinate our political and economic relations with the democratic and national states, and agree on which states we want to make the primary object of our attention, e.g. the UAR⁶ and other Arab states and African states.

⁶ Transl. Note: United Arab Republic.

We would greatly welcome a concerted effort by all the states of the Warsaw Treaty – and also other friendly states – to win over a majority of the UN member-states for the GDR's admission to the special organizations of the UN and to the UN itself.

Our delegation welcomes the fact that in the communiqué of this meeting of the Political Consultative Committee, an assessment of the situation is provided and the attention of the states and peoples are drawn to the main tasks ahead. In particular, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic values highly the initiative of the Political Consultative Committee to achieve European security, as expressed in the Appeal to all European States and Peoples.

The government of the German Democratic Republic and our people are particularly interested in achieving European security by means of an all-European conference. For only an agreement among all the states of Europe can bring about and strengthen détente and at the same time create a political atmosphere conducive to the normalization of relations between the German Democratic Republic and the West German Federal Republic in a spirit of peaceful coexistence.

We hope that the all-European security conference, already proposed by the Political Consultative Committee three years ago, will now enter the stage of concrete preparations as soon as possible. We – like the other fraternal states of the Warsaw Treaty – consider it our duty to continue to do everything in our power to protect Europe from the danger of new military conflicts and to develop cooperation between all European countries, regardless of their social order.

We are convinced that, on the basis of the resolutions of Bucharest and Karlovy Vary, we should continue to join our efforts with those of all peace-loving forces, peoples and governments to convene, in the foreseeable future, the conference of all European states on ensuring peace and security in Europe.

At the same time, we never lose sight of the fact that the fundamental precondition for guaranteeing peace and security in Europe has been and remains the strength of the Warsaw Treaty countries and the constant strengthening and expansion of the political, economic and military solidarity of our countries.

Thank you for your attention.

[Translation from the German by Ursula Froese]