

Speech by the GDR's Head of Delegation at the Meeting of the  
Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Member-States on  
17-18 April 1974 in Warsaw

Dear Comrades!

In the name of the party and state leadership of the German Democratic Republic, I would like to begin by welcoming the initiative of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government in convening this meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-states.

[. . .]

We have followed the course of our meeting so far with great attentiveness. The speech of the Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, constitutes an excellent basis for the further activities of our socialist community. We fully concur in his analysis of the international situation and the conclusions that he has drawn. The documents that were prepared for our discussion also meet with our approval.

[. . .]

At the meeting of the leaders of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries in the Crimea in July 1973, we concluded that we had successfully set into motion a shift away from the "Cold War" toward détente and peaceful coexistence. We recognized that this process would move forward in a complicated and contradictory fashion. This makes it all the more significant that the changes we achieved were subsequently consolidated and extended. The trend toward détente is, at the present time, the dominant feature of developments on the continent of Europe and in the world. Proof of this includes, for example, the initiation of the second phase of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the initiation of negotiations on the reduction of troops and armaments in Central Europe; the signing of the Prague Treaty between the ČSSR and the FRG, the final annulment of the shameful Munich *Diktat*, the establishment of diplomatic relations by the Hungarian People's Republic and the People's Republic of Bulgaria with the FRG, the GDR's admission to the UN, the agreed exchange of Permanent Missions between the GDR and the FRG, the positive changes in the political situation on the Indian subcontinent and the formation of the Government of National Unity in Laos. The fourth armed conflict between Israel and the Arab States ended relatively quickly, thanks to the actions of the party and state leadership of the Soviet Union, which were as decisive as they were measured; the Geneva peace conference was convened with the Soviet Union's participation; and thus, new possibilities were created for a political settlement of the Middle East conflict. A number of

measures to promote peace have activated and expanded the mobilization of a broad range of social forces, including the World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow, the 10<sup>th</sup> World Festival of Youth and Students in Berlin and the World Trade Union Congress in Varna. Also, there can be no doubt that our foreign policy's clear stand in the fight against colonialism and neo-colonialism has had a positive influence upon the contents and the course of the Fourth Conference of Non-Aligned States in Algiers.

Most of these changes, to which one could add yet several others, are directly connected with the growing attainment of relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. Especially in the current situation, when there is no shortage of serious efforts on the part of the proponents of Cold War to dash the peoples' hopes for the continuation of the détente process, we see anew the great importance of further consolidating the unity and solidarity of the Warsaw Treaty member-states. Once again, we see proof of the great importance of political consultations with the statesmen and politicians of various imperialist states, especially those conducted by the Soviet Union, in order to further carry out our policies and to initiate new steps that serve the peoples' fundamental interests.

[. . .]

#### On the second phase of the European Security Conference

We agree with the assessment given here regarding the course to date of the second phase of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. It, too, reflects the two class lines in the struggle for peaceful coexistence. Thanks to our common, steadfast and constructive efforts, the NATO states can no longer deny the necessity of firmly anchoring the principles of security and cooperation on our continent, formulated in the Prague Declaration of the Political Consultative Committee, into the appropriate concluding documents of the conference.

It is a fact that the draft documents on individual agenda items that were mutually agreed upon and submitted by our states are decisively influencing the work of the conference in Geneva and are ensuring that we maintain the initiative. The NATO states' representatives, on the other hand, have been doing everything they can to delay negotiations during this second phase and have constantly tried to push through positions opposed to the principles of the inviolability of frontiers and the sovereignty of states. The aim of their tactics is to put us under time pressure and to extort fundamental concessions from us.

We fully and completely support the proposals presented here by Comrade Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev regarding how we should further proceed in order to bring the security conference

to a successful conclusion as soon as possible. We also approve the proposals regarding the continuation of the negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Vienna.

We could deal with the delaying and stalling tactics of the representatives of the capitalist states both in Geneva and in Vienna much more easily if all the member-states of our alliance would proceed in a unified and unanimous fashion and did not provide our opponents with any opportunity to speculate regarding differences within our ranks. We would like to ask the Romanian comrades, in the interest of the necessary solidarity among our countries, to refrain from all steps in the future that deviate from our common positions on fundamental issues. It is no secret that the proposals made by the Socialist Republic of Romania regarding the so-called confidence-building measures and the principle of renunciation of force have assisted the efforts of the NATO states to complicate and further delay the negotiations. As far as the negotiations in Vienna are concerned, we have already expressed our opinion regarding Romania's proposals.

#### On the development of relations between the GDR and the FRG

Since the last meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-states, the German Democratic Republic has, thanks to the coordinated policy of our socialist community, once and for all broken through NATO's political and diplomatic blockade and assumed its equal place among states. During this same time, we have achieved significant successes in normalizing relations between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany as two sovereign states, independent from each other. Undoubtedly, this has also been having a positive effect on the development of the mutually beneficial cooperation between all states for which we have been striving.

In view of this, we should not take all too seriously the attempt of the FRG's governing circles to dream up some kind of "peculiarities" in the relations between the GDR and the FRG. The facts alone will decide, and they speak clearly— all the more so now that the German Democratic Republic has become a member of the United Nations Organization and 104 states already maintain diplomatic relations with it.

As for the Permanent Missions, the Vienna Convention of 1961 applies to their activities without any limitations. According to the latest agreements, the GDR's diplomats will assume their duties in Bonn, the capital of the Federal Republic, at the beginning of May. That will mark a further step forward -- in accordance with our coordinated policy— toward the normalization of relations between the GDR and the FRG.

The aim of our policies is to comply with the Treaty Concerning the Basis of Relations between the GDR and the FRG both in letter and in spirit. This means vehemently rejecting any attempts to convert treaties valid under international law into "inner-German"

agreements after the fact, in order to undermine the socialist foundations of the German Democratic Republic. The solidarity that the Social-Liberal government in Bonn has been demonstrating in response to such useless attempts naturally leads one to question the sincerity of its *Ostpolitik*. Therefore, it would be only beneficial to our common cause if the Bonn coalition came to recognize not only the possibilities but also the limitations within which relations between the GDR and the Federal Republic can develop. That is, relations between the GDR as a socialist state and the FRG can develop further only on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence.

This, along with our intensive contacts to the Bonn government and the multifaceted official relations between the social organizations of the GDR and the FRG – for example, between the unions and the youth organizations –, will help contribute to overcoming the current low voter support in the Federal Republic for the Brandt Government – albeit only if the Social-Liberal coalition changes its domestic policies by carrying out the reforms that it promised. This would create the necessary preconditions for ensuring that the current opposition continues to occupy the opposition benches after the elections to the Federal Parliament in 1976. How unpopular an excessively hostile policy towards the GDR is among large sections of the Federal Republic's population is demonstrated, among other things, by the fact that recently in the Federal Council, the states governed by the CDU also voted in favor of the law granting privileges, immunities and exemptions to the Permanent Mission of the GDR in accordance with the Vienna Convention of 1961, and even the emissary of Strauss and his CSU merely abstained.

As we have already told our fraternal parties and states, we are also conducting negotiations about the conclusion of further agreements with the FRG, as foreseen in the Basic Treaty. In some areas, such as payments and remittances, postal and telephone systems and the public health system, these agreements are either ready for signature or the negotiations are nearing conclusion. By contrast, the negotiations in the areas of culture and legal transactions are proving extremely complicated because the government of the FRG is insisting upon its unacceptable, revanchist positions— among other things, regarding the issue of citizenship. We will take our time in these areas.

### Regarding West Berlin

It has also been possible for the GDR to conclude individual arrangements and agreements in its relations with the West Berlin Senate. On the whole, however, both the government of the FRG and the West Berlin Senate are continuing their attempts to circumvent the Quadripartite Agreement, to build up the FRG's presence [in West Berlin] and quietly realized the FRG's claims to West Berlin. A glaring example of this is the FRG government's establishment of its Federal Environmental Agency in West Berlin, which, of course, constitutes an open violation of the Quadripartite Agreement.

We thank the parties and governments of the fraternal countries for the possibility of consulting regularly with them regarding our coordinated policy toward West Berlin. This is particularly necessary for ensuring that the main provision of the Quadripartite Agreement – that West Berlin does not belong to the FRG and cannot be governed by it – is made inviolable. Only if our states follow a coordinated policy line toward West Berlin will the FRG government finally have to respect the Quadripartite Agreement, act accordingly and give up all its attempts to the contrary.

#### On the situation in the FRG

In this connection, I would like to make several short remarks regarding the current situation in the FRG. In the most recent state and municipal elections there, the SPD, as you know, suffered severe losses. The CDU, by contrast, was able to register considerable gains and the FDP was also able to improve its position. We think that this development is primarily due to the fact that the government led by Brandt is shifting the burden of the crisis onto the masses and is positioning itself ever more openly on the side of the monopolies. While the arms buildup continues, the reforms that Brandt proclaimed in a giant propaganda campaign in the fields of education, co-determination,<sup>1</sup> tax policies, etc., have not been carried out. All of this has led many voters to turn away from the Social Democrats. Last but not least, the fact that the FRG government is disparaging its own foreign policy toward the socialist countries has probably also played a role. The CDU/CSU is profiting from this.

Certainly, it would be premature to draw conclusions regarding the possible outcome of the 1976 parliamentary elections from the current election results. From the standpoint of our foreign-policy interests, we would welcome a reverse in the trend that has emerged during the most recent elections in the FRG, something that the SPD now very much hopes to do. The treaties that have been concluded can be more easily implemented with those who signed them. In any case, Brandt and his government would be well-advised to make use of the opportunity provided by the positive course of the most recent negotiations with our countries to argue their positions against the reactionary forces hostile to détente. Naturally, with regard to their domestic policies, they must help themselves.

[. . .]

#### Regarding the policies of the Chinese leaders

Recent experiences have fully and completely confirmed and corroborated our assessment that the Peking leaders – with their policies of great-power chauvinism directed against the

---

<sup>1</sup> Transl. note: Formal worker participation through unions in decision-making at West German firms.

USSR, the socialist commonwealth and the international Communist movement – are causing the greatest damage to the interests of socialism and peace. Significantly, they are providing assistance to the worst imperialist enemies of détente and have become particularly active wherever the latter are attempting to complicate and exacerbate the situation.

The most recent events in China, especially the mass campaign against the alleged followers of Confucius and Lin Biao, confirm that the sharpening of the contradictions between the policies of Maoism and the objective requirements for China's domestic and international political development has increased the regime's instability and contributed to a growth in power struggles all the way up to the highest leadership. Clearly, the main concern of the Maoist group is to consolidate its power and its long-term course of action.

Thus, the Maoists are stepping up their anti-Sovietism and trying more intensively than ever to defame the Soviet Union as "enemy number one"; to this end, they have also invented the alleged danger of a surprise attack from the north.

Intensifying its confrontation with world socialism, forming a bloc together with the imperialist and reactionary forces, attempting to thrust the world back into the times of the "Cold War" and misusing the developing countries for its own hegemonic interests – these are the main trends that Maoism's foreign policy line has been following since the 10<sup>th</sup> Party Congress. Lately, China has even been denying the existence of the socialist world system and has been calling itself a developing country. It has ostentatiously cut itself off from the socialist states and is trying at the same time to get the countries of the "third world" to recognize its "claim to leadership."

There can be no question regarding our willingness in principle to normalize our inter-state relations with the PRC; we have stressed this often enough. The only possible measure for assessing steps in this direction would be the extent to which they contribute to the consolidation of the unity and solidarity of our socialist community, unified around the Soviet Union. In our opinion, however, this cannot be achieved by adopting a neutralist position in the confrontation with Maoism.

It is our duty to make it abundantly clear to the entire communist and revolutionary movement that Maoism today represents a total break with Marxism-Leninism and an open betrayal of the international communist movement and the socialist community. The Maoist leadership has ended up in the camp of the enemies of socialism.

If further proof is needed, allow me to quote NATO's Secretary General, Luns.<sup>2</sup> In the *London Times* on April 4 of this year, he explained that the Chinese government at least is

---

<sup>2</sup> Transl. note: Joseph Luns.



“very much aware” of NATO’s usefulness. NATO, too, is aware of China’s position on the eastern flanks of the Soviet Union. “Although there are no concrete plans, it stands to reason that at the back of the minds of NATO governments, the position of China in times of crisis is being positively judged.”<sup>3</sup> We also cannot ignore the fact that the Chinese leaders have been supporting for quite some time and ever more openly the revanchist positions of the FRG’s most reactionary circles.

All unilateral attempts to bring about a reconciliation with Maoism under the banner of alleged unity are illusory and damaging.

The facts have shown time and again that the ideological and political unmasking and destruction of Maoism must be an essential component in our fight for peace and social progress in the world. The struggle to consolidate the unity of the socialist countries and to strengthen their influence upon international developments as a whole, on the one hand, and the rejection of Maoism, on the other, are two sides of the same coin. An offensive debate with Maoism also serves the interests of the struggle for socialism’s prospects in China.

[. . .]

*[Translation from the German by Ursula Froese]*

---

<sup>3</sup> Transl. note: See Roger Berthoud, “NATO Ends First 25 Years in Disarray,” *Times* (London), 4 April 1974, p. 5.