
Schriftenreihe

Nº 7

**Zu den brennenden Fragen
der Arbeiterbewegung**

PROLETARIER ALLER LÄNDER UND UNTERDRÜCKTE VÖLKER VEREINIGT EUCH!

**SELECTED
DOCUMENTS OF
CENTRAL COMMITTEE**

1993 and 1997–2000

ARBEITERBUND FÜR DEN WIEDERAUFBAU DER KPD

Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD
Zentralkomitee
München 2000

Printed in the Federal Republic of Germany
Druck und Verlag
Verlag Das Freie Buch GmbH
Tulbeckstraße 4 · 80339 München

Towards a Peoples' Alliance Against Germany	5
<i>Statement of the Executive Committee of Central Committee Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD at the Euro-Stop – counter-summit, Brussels, 12-11-1993</i>	
“Globalisation” and “Neo-Liberalism”	
Capitalism does not see another spring. Capitalism is bound to die.	11
<i>Intervention of Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD at the “International Workers' Meeting against Neo-liberalism and Globalisation” Havana, Cuba, August 1997</i>	
The Last Stadium of European Economic and Monetary Union and the Starting of European Common Currency (Euro).	16
<i>Document of Central Committee, Plenary session, May 1998</i>	
War Against Yugoslavia – or: A German Peace	27
<i>Declaration of Central Committee, Plenary session, May 1999</i>	
Take the Chance, Before it Might be Too Late	33
<i>Document of the Central Committee, published June 10, 1999</i>	
The Pillaging of the Working People – or: The National Debt.	39
<i>Document of Central Committee, Plenary session, August 1999</i>	
Balkans' Conferences and Protectorate Declarations.	47
<i>Document of Central Committee, Plenary session, August 1999</i>	
I Even Would Not Like to be Buried Here	50
<i>Declaration of Central Committee, Plenary session, August 1999</i>	
A Request to the Peoples of Europe	
Does Troja lie under the Kurfürstendamm?	51
<i>Document of Central Committee, Plenary session, August 1999</i>	
Ho Chi Minh, born May 18, 1890.	55
<i>Message of greeting to Central Committee of CP Vietnam, April 2000</i>	
Militarisation of State and Society	57
<i>Document of Central Committee, Plenary session, July 2000</i>	

towards a peoples' alliance against germany

*Statement of the Executive Committee of Central Committee
Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD
at the Euro-Stop – counter-summit, Brussels, 12-11-1993*

“Finally we are back in the family.”

I am not the one to state this. “Finally we are back in the family!” The Commander-in-Chief of the German troops stated this. He said it when coming to Mogadichou at the head of a gang of legalized, voluntary, and well paid murderers. He said it when arriving there to commit himself, right within the family circle, to the fight against the people of Somalia, to the war lead by the imperialistic competitors, a war lead for the sake of finding out who their champion is.

So now they are back in the circle of the family: the German generals, the monopolists, the big money, and the tanks. What about us? Where are we? What are the precise position and the attitude of our class rather than those of our family? What is the place and what are the common internationalist tasks of the working class against the imperialist “family”?

These tasks are easily identified:

In history we often saw things looking different after the meal than before. Actually, we experienced such a situation within the last five years. The imperialism of the country I come from (– a country where builders of concentration camps become President –) is certainly one of the fathers of Maastricht. But: this was before the meal. This was, to be exact, before 1989. Yesterday, German imperialism would do everything to get Maastricht signed. Today, Maastricht is thrown into the waste-paper basket. German imperialism urged its Supreme Court to pronounce a judgement about Maastricht. And this is what this verdict is all about: As long as in-

ternational treaties safeguard and improve Germany's dominance in Europe, Bonn is prepared to observe those treaties. As soon as international treaties do not serve this aim any longer, Bonn will not feel to be bound by them any longer and will tear these treaties to pieces.

What happened between 1989 when Bonn so eagerly operated for the treaty of Maastricht and the days of the judgement of the Supreme Court? When Bonn was wanting to have the Maastricht treaty signed, FRG still was the FRG and nobody spoke about German imperialism annexing the German Democratic Republic. Between the Maastricht of yesterday and the Maastricht of today there was the year 1989, there was the annexation of GDR. When German imperialism was talking about getting the German Democratic Republic, GDR, when it was talking about that quite bluntly, Maastricht became the hope especially of France. France hoped "to tie" this more powerful Greater Germany. France hoped to tame Germany by the means of an international mechanism of voting. She hoped to take away from that Germany some freedom of action. It was the chairman of the social democrat parliamentary group who told the audience in a debate about the remarks of the Bavarian Prime Minister Stoiber (a very fair-haired opponent of Maastricht), that "Maastricht has been the price for the admittance of the German re-unification", and he told that the western powers had agreed to the German "re-unification" only because the new Greater Germany had accepted closer ties to Western Europe. From this point of view, which might reflect the illusions of the ruling classes in France and Great Britain, from this point of view Maastricht is perhaps the last attempt to maintain the post-war order. And we must not forget that for maintaining this order quite a number of international organisations have been created:

- The United Nations to prevent the danger of a new world war initiated by the German and Japanese imperialism;
- The European Coal and Steel Community, the EEC or, finally, the NATO which was founded, as it is well known, "to keep the Russians out and the Germans down".

Bonn wanted Maastricht – at all events before the annexation of the GDR – because with Maastricht it wanted to safeguard, to legalize and to make official its dominance in Western Europe.

If Bonn wanted to annex the GDR, then it had to pay a decent price for that. The price for the annexation of the GDR was Maastricht. The price was to get embedded into an international voting mechanism in which the Federal Republic still should only have one vote among many and, if necessary, could be outvoted by a majority.

For the price of Maastricht the follow-up state of Hitlerdeutschland (and the jurisdiction in our country is proud of this continuity) got a second Munich agreement from the victorious powers of France and England. It got the consent of these powers to the destruction of an independent European state: the GDR.

After the annexation of GDR we are after the meal. Now Germany takes her usual attitude: 'Why care about my gossip of yesterday!'

Suddenly the ground on which an agreement between France, England and the other European countries with Greater Germany was made has changed. Therefore Greater Germany declares with the voice of her Supreme Court literally: "Germany is one of the *masters of the treaty* (of Maastricht)."

And therefore the Supreme Court declares that never all this stuff of majority decisions tying Greater Germany could be taken serious. The Court explains:

The principle of majority decisions can not mean that definite decisions are made with majority. It can only mean that "within certain margins differences of assessments and forecasts or opinions may be put on vote". In other words: We may vote on a forecast (perhaps the weather forecast) or on a difference of opinions. Otherwise there will be no voting. And if there is a voting nevertheless, and if national interests of Greater Germany should come off badly in all that, the Supreme Court has fixed that decisions like that "do not have any effects for Germany". In other words: Greater Germany tells anyone that she will wipe her arse with the treaty of Maastricht.

(I don't consider it too far reaching to compare this behaviour with the behaviour when Germany terminated the voting mechanism of the League of Nations. Germany owed a lot to this League of Nations as far as the reproduction of her power after World War I was concerned. We all know how glad Germany has been to become member of the League of Nations with Stresemann. And we all know that Hitler left the League of Nations

tearing to pieces all the international contracts that could bind and impede him.)

The peoples of Western Europe won't make fall Maastricht simply because Maastricht has already been made fall. Because one of the fathers of Maastricht, namely Bonn, declared or let the Supreme Court declare that Maastricht has died. And that Maastricht was allowed to die because Bonn has no need of it any longer. At the same time German imperialism has made clear that the treaty of Maastricht is not a means to tame German imperialism.

This is what the European peoples must understand. Their governments absolutely see a need for action against a Germany that is easily recognized by everybody since it is as provocative, arrogant, and aggressive, as she has always been whenever she could afford it. This is one of the main reasons that they want Maastricht. The peoples of Europe must understand, however, that, when relying on Maastricht against Bonn, their masters rely on nothing. In reality they delivered themselves to the German imperialism. German imperialism got the GDR but is not willing to pay the price for that, i.e. to let bind and satisfy itself by the means of Maastricht. The peoples of Europe must recognize that we really are in acute danger. This danger has a name and an address. It is Greater Germany.

We are traitors to our country. We do want that the peoples understand the danger emanating from our country, it is a danger for all peoples, including ours. We are telling you: Look how our masters destroyed the GDR, without any gunshot, without one single drop of blood. It was in a completely peaceful manner that a state has been destroyed, and together with this state everything has been destroyed that the working people there had achieved. And there is no end to humiliation up to now.

Look what they are instigating in Poland, in Hungary. Look at how they took care of the destruction of Czechoslovakia.

Look at what they do in Yugoslavia and how they are eyeing up Ukraine.

Remember how your mothers and fathers learned the German language. They learned that language twice in their life, and they had to learn it under the boots of the German conquerors. Their own bourgeoisie has always been too weak to force the Germans to accept international treaties (for example concerning Belgian neutrality).

Remember all this and decide: Is there anything new in our days? Useless to hope that the same masters and forces would act differently this time!

The peoples of Western Europe must fight their own governments with the aim to replace Maastricht by a real alliance of England, France, and Belgium against this aggressive Greater Germany. An alliance of all the Western European states, an alliance of all who do not want to see Lidice, Auschwitz, Oradour, and Guernica once again. Cast this Germany out of Maastricht. Don't forget that it was Germany herself to declare that Maastricht may be valid for everyone but for Greater Germany. Take all efforts to hinder your masters and your governments to sign one Munich agreement after the other with this FRG.

A simple No to Maastricht is nationalistic. A Yes to Maastricht does not solve a single problem – it would precisely agree with the point of view of the bourgeois class. Rather, Maastricht must be replaced by an alliance against Greater Germany. This is the only internationalist point of view. This is the one and only point of view that distinguishes our No from the No to Maastricht as it is outspoken by the fascists. We know and you know that the French, the British, and the Belgian bourgeoisies are cowards today, as they were cowards in 1938. In 1938 they were too timid to stop the German aggressor when this was quite possible. And today? Today the bourgeoisie sees no reasons for a truly effective alliance against Greater Germany – we live in peace anyway, as they say!

An alliance against the FRG, against a country that never has been our's – this is what we suggest. For the sake of all of us.

A No of the peoples against Maastricht, a No especially of the peoples of France, of England, of Belgium, only makes sense if Maastricht is replaced by something different. If it is replaced by an alliance against Greater Germany. Of this alliance your governments would be afraid of, much more than they are afraid of Bonn today. But this would be an alliance, too, which will come into being only against the European governments and their masters. This is what brings all of us together: a European alliance of the peoples, a popular front against Germany. Against a Germany bringing England, France, Belgium, and all the others closer and closer to war, a war which will be called World War III by those who will survive it. This is a proposal we all should work for.

I do not claim that last World War will be simply repeated. I am neither a fatalist nor a prophet. I simply state what everyone can see: The mistakes made before the last World War are being made again. This is not a fatalistic statement, it is a realistic one. It is a statement about how things can be made different – and better.

I came here to tell you that. This is what we suggest. Please – consider it!

*Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD
Executive Committee
of Central Committee*

“globalisation” and “neo-liberalism”
capitalism does not see another spring.
capitalism is bound to die.

*Intervention of Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD
at the “International Workers’ Meeting against Neo-liberalism and Globalisation”
Havanna, Cuba, August 1997*

Dear colleagues, friends, and comrades:

the Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD sends warm greetings to your congress which is so badly needed. The workers, the working people all over the world have to consult each other on common activities; we must unite against the monopolists and imperialists, which despite being an insignificant minority have become the real curse of our world. As long as they are free, we are not free, as long as they are our masters, we remain slaves.

I

Half of the global wealth and one third of the global means of production are owned by just a handful multi-millionaires. Under the flag of “neo-liberalism” and “globalism” they have embarked to new victories – at least: they think they have.

Liberalism is deemed to be: their unlimited freedom, the triumph of the market over the plan, the “retreat of the state from economy” and privatisation, the entire freedom for the flow of capital and labour, the victory of the competitive forces of market over brutal violence, the victory of freedom over protectionism and restriction.

Our main enemy, the German imperialism, has conclusively shown what liberalism really means. He annexated a sovereign state, the Democratic Republic of Germany (DDR). Between 1949 and 1990 the people of this country had endeavoured to leave the control of the German monopolists and their state. In the biggest action of privatisation history has ever seen, according to German imperialism, freedom was brought back to

this people in 1990. In fact what was brought back to them was the freedom of violence and robbery.

This privatisation was performed by using the state machinery of the German imperialism applying pure violence to seize the wealth of the working people of the DDR. For the profit of the German banks the collectives of the working people of the former DDR were submitted to a new system of landlordship, millions of working people were fired, three quarters of the industrial capacity of the former DDR were demolished within a few years only, which destroyed the real base of freedom. This is what is meant by liberalism, this is their kind of freedom in full action. This is how liberalism works day by day against the people of Eastern Europe whose life is not victim of free competition, rather the life and the economy of these people is victim of political and military violence including primitive piracy, hunger blockade as well as the destruction of entire states.

“Market is the great regulating force, market will make it” – this is what the monopolists, having originated from free competition, usually say. “The market” was something great at the time when medieval workmen left their dark stables and became capitalists on a nation-wide scale looking around to find appropriate space to sell their products. At the end of this era this limited and narrow space is not good enough for the people of the world and the big bosses themselves do no longer believe in it: They have replaced the market by nude violence.

More freedom, more market and less state? The monopolists struggle for another sharing of the world. Their competition is effective world-wide – which their instruments of power are not. The development of the productive forces during the imperialist époque have broken the limits of nation-states since long. Concentration and centralisation of capital has come to such an extent that the biggest monopolists are strong enough to submit even those sectors of society to their law of maximum profit which until now had been taken care of by their common governmental committee: the means of mass transportation, the telecommunication, the postal services. The capitalist state continues to justify his existence, however. It is actually reduced to its hard core: to a mechanism owned and run by the monopolists to apply violence both internally and externally. The bourgeois nation-state is the vehicle of this kind of political and military power. The private owners of the means of production have access to this

power and use it in their world-wide battle to destroy the corresponding military and political base of their competitioners. This is the source of war. War is prepared by organising regional blocks of imperialist states and there is a hot and brutal competition for the leading position of such a block. Thus the new freedom in Europe means: The strongest imperialist power, which is the German imperialism, attacks the sovereignty not only of the smaller people, he even attacks the medium-sized imperialist powers in Europe intending to destroy them. That is the German way of “neo-liberalism”. In the past this ended up with an “unification” of Europe: it’s unification with utter violence and under the army boots of the nazis. (It is not by coincidence that after the defeat of the German imperialism in the second world war part of the old nazis organised themselves in a party named “Freiheitlich Demokratische Partei (FDP)” which used the label of liberalism to sell their outdated goods.

In the battle to organise and form such blocks and the fight between those blocks there is no freedom, nor free competition or flow of capital and labour. There is protectionism and cutting oneself off the rest of the world. The end result is, according to the OECD, that there are only four capitalist countries which at the end of this decade practise less protectionism and governmental interference with external economy than 10 years earlier, not to mention “free movement” of the respective working people. At the beginning of this century workers could much more easily leave their country and sell their labour at the other side of the border than they can at the end of this century. Free movement of millions of people during imperialism only exists as a constantly moving stream of refugees who, in fact, are free of any means of existence.

II

At the very end of her historical existence the bourgeoisie works against her own lifework. She has previously organised the global market, now she atomises it. She breaks this market into regional markets within the frame of imperialist blocks (a growing part of the global commerce is trade within these big regional blocks). A growing part of the world population is totally excluded: In the beginning of this century Africa and Latin America held a bigger share in the global trade than they do today. One third of

the population living under capitalist conditions can no longer be submitted to imperialist exploitation – the unemployed of the 24 OECD-members are so numerous that they could form a human chain around the globe – which is also a form of globalisation. World-wide it has become a characteristic phenomenon: Bourgeoisie can no longer ascertain the existence of her slaves. It is a world-wide phenomenon that bourgeoisie has become bankrupt and is no longer necessary at all, the capitalist way of producing and exchanging is born to die.

This is the background for the hunting of maximum profit and the fight against the fall of the rate of profit which makes the big monopolists run like rats around the world. They try to exploit the workers of all countries, they try to get hold of those countries and sectors in which exploitation is still functioning, they infiltrate countries wherever this is possible. (One third of the global trade consists of the flow of goods within the big companies). The way these big “transnational” companies function demonstrates that today the export of capital is more important than the export of goods. The poor effectiveness of the measures that the big companies have at hand is astonishing. How ineffective is the export of capital when it comes, for example, to the submission of states like the former Soviet Union to capitalist exploitation at the end of the 20th century! How far away from being truly global is the export of capital: firstly it includes only a few branches (chemical and electrical products, cars) and secondly most of this stays within the frontiers of the imperialist centres which protect themselves from competition increasingly. The end of this story is the concentration of capitalist wealth in very few regions of the world.

Few monopolists of this world get increasingly rich and an increasing part of their wealth is money. But they are like the legendary king Midas: Whatever he touched became gold until, in the end, he starved. What can be discovered under the form of the billions of dollars that these “genius of financial machinations” (Lenin) have at their disposal is the control of social working time – no longer can the capitalist way of producing make any use of this wealth of time. Capitalism consumes this wealth in speculation, financial blackmailing, strangulation of people by loans and credit institutions. Using the national debt as a lever they grab the future labour of the working people as well as the present and past. That works until the whole thing explodes and everything plunges into the next crisis and the labour

of millions is once more destroyed.

III

What happens under our eyes is not a fresh blooming of capitalism. Rather it is its lethal fight, its final and last rotting. Like advertising show masters the capitalists coin new terms: Neoliberalism is one of those, globalisation is another. We prefer to label reality with a term that, in an attack of love of truth, has been coined by bourgeoisie herself: we call it imperialism. And we complete this description by the findings of historical materialism: imperialism is a dying, rotting capitalism.

Our masters would prefer us, the people of the world, to react on this reality with nationalism, with a alliance with our masters. Imperialist cosmopolitanism – that is what globalisation is all about – always means: violence, suppression, and reaction. Our answer is: internationalism. Workers of the world and oppressed people unite! That is what we are going to answer! This is why we welcome this congress and want it to be a great success.

The people of Europe will have to organise a people’s alliance against Germany in order to meet the danger coming from the most aggressive European imperialism, which is the German imperialism. Accordingly the answer which the people of Latin America will give the US-imperialism is of the same kind and nature. People have to fight and to defeat their own masters. They are certainly able to and they will win this fight. Because it is their enemy who himself has prepared their victory. The wealth of the world is concentrated within few hands only, the governmental commission of the capitalists prepares plans of productions for whole continents (like the Japanese MITI) – this is the ground which since long is prepared for the working people of the world to take over the power and the economy – for the global socialist republic.

*Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD
Department of CC
for International Relations*

the last stadium
of european economic and monetary union
and the starting of
european common currency (euro)

Document of Central Committee, Plenary session, May 1998

Looking onto European Economic and Monetary Union and the “Euro” and onto the impact all this will have for the life and the future of the working classes and the peoples of Europe and all over the world, we strictly have to distinguish between two things: what does the “Euro” pretend to be; and what will it really be?

We are told that the “Euro” is an economic answer to latest economic developments of capitalism and of capitalist world economy.

That’s what the “Euro” pretends to be. In reality it is a *political* answer to the degeneracy of capitalism. It is an attempt to cope with the deep contradictions of dying capitalism. To cope with all that at the level of money and of circulation. It is an attempt to postpone the eruption of imperialist war. It is an attempt to achieve for the time being without war what finally can only be achieved by means of war. So “Euro” and “European Economic and Monetary Union” are some sort of imperialist agreements, deeply undermined from the very beginning by a lot of contradictions. They are of that sort of agreements that are pregnant with their own destruction.

“Monetary Union is a historically unique project.” This was claimed by the German “Bundesbank” on March 26, 1998.

As far as some of its manifestations are concerned that’s true. The “Euro” and EEMU are the most developed attempts of European finance capital to regulate economic relations at the level of currencies and to regulate the circulations of goods and capital. The “Euro” is the first at-

tempt to create a supra-national currency not being the currency of a single state and also not being derived from world money, i.e. from gold.

But if we take the real nature of that attempt we see that this is not a “historically unique project” at all.

What is the very nature of all this? It is an attempt of parts of international finance capital to use European nation states to cope with the degeneracy of capitalism, at least for some time and in some parts. Imperialist economy really has the tendency to destroy itself by its own means, and “Euro” and EEMU are an attempt to prevent it from doing so. For that purpose the most powerful parts of finance capital try to shove the problems and contradictions onto the peoples, onto the non-monopolistic bourgeoisie and onto the imperialists of other countries or continents. The background of all these attempts is the destruction of social labour in the interest of ongoing capitalist reproduction for the biggest and most powerful groups of capital.

These sharpening imperialist contradictions are the mother of “Euro” and “EEMU”. Among the fathers we see: German capital’s plans for the European continent; its aspirations to get at the head of all those attempts to overcome the described contradictions and to benefit most from that; the attempts of all the other imperialist powers in Europe to hinder German imperialism by agreements and treaties to achieve its aims; and last but not least the attempts of the smaller capitalist powers of the continent to remain at least on the stage of capitalist exploitation and to achieve this by collaboration and subjugation.

“The *real barrier* of capitalist production is *capital itself*. ... The capitalist mode of production is, for this reason, a historical means of developing the material forces of production and creating an appropriate worldmarket and is, at the same time, a continual conflict between this its historical task and its own corresponding relations of special production.” (Karl Marx, *Capital*, Volume III, London 1959, p. 250.) Capitalism had reached its final stage and the world is shared out among the monopolistic groups and powers. This is why this conflict can no longer be solved by subjugating more and more parts of the world to capitalist exploitation. (Late imperialism is even not capable to exploit the fact that in many countries of the world his historical enemy has been defeated for the time being; and this demonstrates the deepness of the general crisis of capitalism. We will

speak about that later on.) This conflict may only be solved for some time. That is why capitalist wealth has to be destroyed again and again. The normal economic crises are not sufficient to do this job. Not sufficient the enormous destruction of social wealth in the former socialist countries of Eastern and Southeastern Europe and in former Soviet Union. Not sufficient the actually ongoing destruction of that kind of wealth in great parts of Asia. The deepest possible crisis of imperialism, the war, rises its head within imperialist society. All those political and economic agreements and alliances between imperialists are trying to regulate these destructions or to turn them away to others. They are, and they only can be, temporary agreements on dominance, on subjugation, on achieving or postponing interests – until economic and political power will have changed again. The real barrier of my own capitalist production is the capital of the others – that's how the conflict Marx spoke about is seen by the imperialists.

The German-British agreements concerning the sharing up of colonies and of the East in the times before 1914, the imperialist blocks of power in the time between the two world wars, the establishment and also the destruction of a world-wide economic and monetary system dominated by US-imperialism after 1944, the establishment of "European Monetary System" (EMS) in 1979 and its failure partly because of the annexation of German Democratic Republic by the Western German state in 1992/1993 – all these events show how the imperialists by establishing those alliances and agreements are in a situation as Oedipus was: the more they struggle to escape their destiny the more they are condemned to fulfill it.

It is because of imperialism itself that agreements and alliances have to be extended beyond the regulation of the turnover of goods on the world market. They have to be extended to regulations on the monetary and currency level. This is because of the dominance of capital export over the export of goods. It is because of the development of the productive forces and because of the difficulties to keep these productive forces within the narrow barriers of capitalist exploitation. It is because of those parts of the profits that are working as borrowed capital.

In the end we see here how close to communism all this is bringing us. The development of the productive forces has driven that theft of some-

one else's working time which is the basis of the actual wealth (as Marx claimed) to such an extent, that the production based on exchange value is being threatened by collapse. And it collapses indeed in part now and then. However, as long as there is private ownership of the means of production these collapses always happen in the capitalist form of destruction and devastation.

The stolen working time is not able to break the chains of the form of value, of value dedicated to further exploitation. More and more this value is tending to adopt its purest form of “money – more money”, i.e. the form of borrowed capital. It is remaining in the form of money, and this money does not serve its employer to start new production or to accumulate more productive capital; it is only a leverage to accumulate surplus value stemming from relatively diminishing living work force. But even more: an ever increasing part of it turns into fictitious capital (mainly fed by the national debt of *all* capitalist states). According to this the role and the form of money changes: more and more it turns to be credit money which is not based on real relations of exchanging goods but on the ability we spoke about: the ability to serve as a leverage to get an ever increasing part of the surplus stemming from exploitation.

In the long run, however, economy doesn't take place in the realm of “swaps” and “futures”, of shares and of national debt. All economy may be reduced to economy of time. An economy based on the given and permanently developing state of dealing with nature by men. The time disposable for a given society is divided into working time and leisure. The working time again has to be divided according the production of the very material life of society, how ever that society may be organised. “The ultimate reason for all real crises always remains the poverty and restricted consumption of the masses as opposed to the drive of capitalist production to develop the productive forces as though only the absolute consuming power of society constituted their limit.” (Karl Marx, *Capital*, Volume III, London 1959, p. 484) These real crises catch hold of all the relations of capitalist production and reproduction: production itself, the relations of money and credit, the relations of currencies. In capitalist societies the credit is “in the one hand, an immanent form of the capitalist mode of production, and on the other, a driving force in its development to its

highest and ultimate form". (Karl Marx, *Capital*, Volume III, London 1959, p. 606) In the late imperialism not only the means of production of single capitalists and the working power of some hundred thousand or even millions of workers are sacrificed to this credit; the means of production and the lives of the populations of continents are sacrificed. (See Latin America in the eighties, called the "lost period of the continent"; see the latest crisis emanating from South East Asia; see the fate of former socialist countries sacrificed to the credit when the dictatorship of the working class has been betrayed.)

In this way the crises become more and more devastating. The general crisis of capitalism is sharpening, and in this same process "surplus profits" are produced on the one hand, and "surplus people" on the other. It is infantile to imagine that you only have to find methods to bring these two "surpluses" together and everything will be okay.

There is clear evidence for the fact that modern productive forces are able to produce so much wealth that these productive forces can only be run by the whole of society. Life and work of mankind can be run according to a world-wide plan of an association of productive workers. There is no need any longer to run them by the ridiculous means of money and market. (You can see every day that these means have already come to their end; see the fact that one third of the world's trade is done inside the big monopolistic firms.)

This is what happens in the world of rotten capitalism. There is no strange "globalisation" or any thoughtless "liberalisation" of the markets for goods and capital. Correspondingly the agreements on economy and currency mean: not to prevent the destructions of materialised labour, emanating from that deep and general crisis. (This is impossible!) But to regulate it according to the interests of imperialism and to canalize it by agreements and domination without further steps – for the time being – to open military conflicts concerning the spheres of capitalist investment and concerning the conditions of capitalist exploitation. To shift that destruction onto the concurrents and onto the weaker participants in capitalist world economy. European Economic and Monetary Union is such an attempt. For different reasons (especially for reasons found in the history

since 1945) this attempt shows some characteristics of an open conflict between the European imperialists and US-Imperialism. But it would be misleading to limit it to these characteristics. (In the range of other imperialist agreements and alliances – for example in the fight about “Multilateral Agreement on Investment” – European imperialists were collaborating with US-imperialism or fighting each other; see the contradictions between German and French imperialism in all that.) European Economic and Monetary Union is only one, albeit the actually most spectacular imperialist agreement. And this does not rule out but rather includes the fact that this agreement is a battle ground, too.

Since the time of the “Roman Treaties” there have been attempts to install agreements, and there have been agreements to improve and save capitalist conditions of exploitation. (These attempts have again and again been disturbed time by time when the capitalists of Europe fought against each others to save their own skin.) The contradiction between the German and the French imperialism always has been formative for that process. This contradiction was to be seen partly in a very sharp concurrence (e. g. when the so-called “Werner-Plan”, a blueprint of the treaty of Maastricht, was rejected in the 1970ies), partly in collaboration (e. g. when the governments of Helmut Schmidt and Giscard d’Estaing installed the “European Monetary System” in 1979). On the background of the deep general crisis of capitalism already described the most monopolised parts of European financial capital now try to realise their aims. Among the most important are:

- They try to create a European “Großraum” where no obstacles there to the exploitation of capital should be left. And this is intended to take place on a continent dominated on the one hand by the most important imperialist robbers (the others are the United States and Japan), but split on the other hand into a great number of national states.

- By a multitude of regulations the imperialists are trying to take into account the fact that in the sphere of mere economy imperialism already has blown up the borders of national state by installing the biggest conglomerates of financial capital. (Among the 100 biggest economic subjects in the world we find 51 firms and only 49 national states.) To achieve this

they are trying to establish the freedom of dealing with goods, services, capital and working force.

– Especially all those barriers und dangers for the free movement of borrowed capital shall be excluded that emanate from the existence of various currencies and from the speculations in currencies executed by financial capital itself.

– They are trying to take profit from the fact that the “Euro” will be a real “world currency”. No other imperialism in Europe (excluded to some extent the German one) is able to take those advantages alone by itself: The advantages that allow it to borrow in its own currency and to get credit from all over the world in the form of currency reserves. For the credit has to save the credit. There must always be new credits to pay the old ones. In that way it is supposed that the capitalists can postpone the moment when exploitation of value is cut down to its real roots: the more and more ridiculous theft of anyone else’s working time.

– And last: Monopoly capital is trying to limit the risk emanating from the ongoing transformation of profits into fictitious capital (national debts). (As we see in parts of Latin America, of Eastern Europe, and of South-East-Asia nobody may rule out the possibility of capital being destroyed by national bankrupt.)

All this is an attempt to heal the diseases of capitalism by unsuitable means. The roots of these diseases are lying in capitalist property, in the sharpening of the contradictions between productive forces and the means of production. They are intended to be healed by means within the sphere of circulation, within the sphere of trade and of currencies. The imperialists know very well that the content of agreements like this at least *can* be the destruction of productive forces, of over-accumulated capital and of credit. And they heavily argue about the place where this destruction shall take place. They fight for the power to decide about the place of destruction. This is shown by the words of Mr. Nölling, a leading manager of Deutsche Bundesbank. He also demonstrates the “love” and “brotherhood” among the imperialists when he claims: “Look at the social problems in France. Monetary Union will bring with it the necessity of great processes of adaptation. What does France expect from this game with Germany? Does she expect to have her fingers on German money? There will be a

price for that: i.e. unstrained competition with German industry. Do you know what that means for French or Italian automobile industry? You may forget about it!”

It was shown at the latest with the annexation of the GDR by German imperialism that there must be heavy fights among the imperialists when European Economic and Monetary Union would be built. Instead of the European Economic and Monetary Union there was just another one: the *German* one. Some time after that annexation and because of that annexation the European Monetary System was to explode (1992/1993). In Maastricht the European imperialists did not only make the last steps to realize the European plan we already spoke about. They also made the last steps towards a new battlefield.

It has been proved that the finance capitalists of Europe may blow up the national state, but they can not do away with it. They really need it to fight for better conditions for the exploitation of capital. They really need it to suppress the people. And above all, they need it to wage war. This is a contradiction, and that contradiction is shown through all the agreements of Maastricht and the following agreements. Some parts of national sovereignty are intended to be abolished (e.g. an own currency for every state) or to be reduced (like free disposal of national debt). Other parts, like the state apparatus, organized on the level of national states, are even intended to get stronger.

What is confirmed in all this is what Lenin claimed: Even under *these* economic conditions of imperialism the United States of Europe will be either reactionary or impossible. This is even more valid the more imperialism is proving to be dying capitalism. It is even more valid under the conditions of a more and more sharpening international concurrence, under the conditions of sharpening contradictions within the general crisis of capitalism.

It was openly declared by German imperialism by the annexation of GDR that the most reactionary form of all that would be a German dominated Europe from Barcelona to Odessa. This is why the agreements of Maastricht also carry with them the signs of a struggle against German

hegemony. "Maastricht, that is Versailles without a war" – this was a French position. We can have a look at these struggles on all levels, not only at the beginning of the process, when German imperialism had to give up its illusions of a combination of economic and monetary union with a political union. We see these struggles when they argue about the "Stabilitätspakt", when they argue about the central positions of the European Central Bank, when they argue about how surpluses of national budgets in Europe should be used.

At all these battlefields German imperialism is the most aggressive one. Obviously it is the only imperialism that is prepared to pursue by its own means those aims of the Economic and Monetary Union held to be useful in common interest by all the European imperialists. Its drafts for that are not merely of military nature or of the nature of political alliances, as has been shown by the so-called Schäuble-paper in 1995. Economically the German imperialism is the strongest one in Europe, and so German imperialism has the options to work for the building of a DM-block in Europe. We can already see the structure of such a block: Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands, most of the Eastern European countries. Former French prime minister, Giscard d'Estaing, recently said in the French Parliament: In the case of a failure of the monetary union "we will not only see strong vibrations on the finance markets. We will see something rather embarrassing: The international markets will detect that already there really is a European currency: the Deutschmark."

So German imperialism has different options for the future development in Europe. On the other hand, the other imperialists lack any options more and more. (There will be a lot of struggles during the construction of European Economic and Monetary Union; there will be a lot of quarrels about the agreements settled in Maastricht. In all those struggles it seems to be a useful position for us to declare: we will not defend Maastricht against the other imperialists. But we will defend Maastricht against the German imperialism which has – by the voice of its Supreme Court – openly declared that under certain circumstances it will deal with the treaty of Maastricht as one deals with a sheet of paper: it will tear it to pieces. And if the other imperialists in Europe will tear the treaty of Maastricht to pieces we must not allow German imperialism to take that as a reason of war, as a reason to fight against the peoples of Europe.)

It is not our job to predict who will be right in all these calculations. There is no imperialist economic solution of all the contradictions put on the agenda by Euro and European Economic and Monetary Union. The German Bundesbank is right: in the long run these questions aren't at all economic questions; they are political questions. There is a big crisis of the system based on private property of the means of production. There is no solution for that crisis at the level of money and circulation. This will not give any breathing time for the peoples and for the working classes. There can only be some breathing time in the struggle against imperialist war if the working people will destabilize the ruling classes in Europe. If they are working for the only possible solution: To give the means of production to the whole of the society, to the working people. For the workers, there is no simple Yes or No to Euro or European Economic and Monetary Union. As long as they are not taking their own position, that is: a position of preparing revolution, the workers will always be at the tail end of bourgeoisie.

It would be no good advice to look at all this from the point of view of wages, of piggy banks or of Sunday trousers. Why for god's sake should workers defend the Deutschmark, a currency that had come out of the twofold destruction of the basis of workers' livelihood? Do they really believe that the ruling classes would not deflate the Deutschmark once again if necessary? They did already twice in this century! It is really nationalist to hope on the Deutschmark. Under the rule of the system as it is, workers will end by defending the “Standort Deutschland”. And that means: by nationalism. Perhaps German workers will get some advantages if their masters will triumph over their enemies. The receipt for that would be presented to them when they will have to go to war. (Something similar is valid for the workers of other European countries. When currencies in an European “Großraum” will be abolished, there may be some advantages for example for Spanish or Portuguese capitalism, if they are willing to let German imperialism produce on high tech level and confine themselves to the role of suppliers for German industry.)

The place of the workers in FRG and in the annexed GDR will not be on the side of the fighters for European Economic and Monetary Union nor on the side of the nationalists defending the Deutschmark. We have to

fight against the imagination of “defending our fatherland” that will be back on stage very soon when the struggles in Europe get sharper. (It may simply start with: “Our Deutschmark is strong, but their Peseta is weak.” Or: “Lets defend our independent Bundesbank against the politically dominated French Central Bank.” The end will anyway be: Who will be guilty if all these projects are smashed by reality, and who will have to be punished for that failure?)

It is not the task for German communists to point out the imperialistic aims of the competitors of German imperialism. It is not their task to speculate about the chances of other imperialists to hinder German imperialism from further expansion. All this would be, as Lenin claimed, an imperialistic conspiracy. German communists have to fight for the defeat of their own imperialism and they have to wish that this German imperialism will be defeated. They have to give advice to the workers and peoples of Europe to fight for an alliance against Germany. (There is much evidence that we will have to give that advice also to the governments of Europe.)

It is *not* money that reigns the world. The “Euro” will not change the world nor our enemy. Our main task will not change: that the working class has to overthrow the capitalist class, to build its dictatorship, and to give the means of production into the hands that are capable to deal with them – into the hands of the whole of society.

*Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD
Central Committee*

war against yugoslavia
or:
a german peace

Declaration of Central Committee, Plenary session, May 1999

I.

German imperialism's "policy of peace" in reality is a policy of war. In reality it is a policy of war to prevent other aggressors to rob parts of Yugoslavia which was smashed to pieces by German imperialism. The policy of peace is meant to be the pivot leg of FRG's policy of war. It is meant to safeguard the hegemony of German imperialism over the neighbouring countries. The policy of peace is a policy of war especially against the USA. This is a contradiction between imperialists. German imperialism is the main aggressor not only by this war but in the whole of Europe, too. German imperialism is trying to produce an appearance to be the one to manage its aggressions without war, the one to secure peace. The imperialism who throws the bombs and shells shall be branded as an aggressor. The result of a peace policy of that kind is continuation of war by different means. This is the German continuation of the war against Yugoslavia. In the best case this may lead to a temporary peace, a disgraceful peace, a peace of misery leading to the next slaughtering of workers and peoples. The occupation of Yugoslavia is a very German peace.

The USA are the chief enemy of German imperialism within that war. By their own means of warfare the USA are urging German imperialism into a situation where it is demonstrated to it who the masters of the imperialistic camp are. This real contradiction is of big importance for us. The way it is coming to the forefront (US-imperialism as the more aggressive one, the more violent one, German imperialism as the one to con-

stantly look for a peace-keeping German way) is covering up the fact that first of all German imperialism is to be blamed for the war against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The very nationalistic orientated and pacifistic friends of peace and opponents of war in our country, coming from the petty bourgeoisie always ask when they look for the aggressor: who stroke the first blow in a war? Who is using most of the bombs and shells? Of course they should ask themselves: Who has been beating and cracking and dividing and disarming the people and the working class of a certain country – by peaceful means or by means of war? But by asking the wrong questions those people weaken the anti-war-position even more. They help German imperialism to weaken the anti-war-positions by the means of a German special way within the war against Yugoslavia. In the long run those people will end up standing side by side with German imperialism looking so peacefully and trying to do everything to bring the war to an end.

Beside this there are more contradictions within the ranks of the imperialistic powers. For example: the contradiction with Greek capitalism which is not any longer willing to make available its bases for air strikes, a fact that certainly results from the militance of the Greek working class. There are contradictions with countries not belonging to the belligerent ones. The warmongers in Germany, England, France, and the USA are not only violating Austrian neutrality by using Austrian sovereign territory day by day, by using Austrian airspace and by breaking in this way international law. They are also endangering the sovereignty of Bulgaria, Romania, of the Czech Republic and so on.

We have to face the fact that in spite of (and perhaps even because of) these contradictions it may last a rather long time before the bombs will stop falling down on Yugoslavia. Or, even if the bombs will have stopped falling, there may be a long period during which the tanks and hundreds of thousands of foreign soldiers and aggression armies will be staying on the soil of the Yugoslavian republic of Kosovo. Yugoslavian sovereignty will be disregarded by a rule of occupation.

As far as the attitude of the working classes is concerned Greek workers are in the forefront of the struggle against their own government, against their own ruling class. More and more we get good news from Italy speaking about big and militant demonstrations against war. We do not

see any protests in the ranks of the British working class and of the French working class (which delivered a lot of inspiring deeds in economic questions during the recent years). Those working classes do not fight against war and against their chief enemy. They are following their bourgeois classes along the path to war in the same way as is acting the German working class.

There is one German exception: obviously the workers as well as big factions of the people in GDR are opposing to the war. At the moment this does not mean necessarily an attitude against the chief enemy in their own country. In many regards the historical situation of this class is being reflected – that for many years GDR has been the better Germany. But from that very period stems an idea within the ranks of the opponents to war in GDR that always and in every case US-imperialism must be the main aggressor in every action against the workers and the peoples of the world.

II.

The CC discussed the question of the economic interests behind a so-called “stability pact” or a “Wiederaufbauplan” (a plan for reconstruction). The peoples may not expect to achieve anything from it. Yugoslavia isn’t the Federal Republic of Germany 1945 and after. The Federal Republic after its 2nd imperialistic World War has been stabilized economically by the reversion plan of the U.S. imperialism specifically and consciously to be orientated against the socialist countries, as an aggressor, as a bulwark against the dictatorship of the proletariat, against the dictatorship of the people. Economic “help” for FRG has not been for free. From the very beginning FRG was fulfilling this political task: to keep in bay socialism at its borders. To isolate socialism in the fifties and sixties, to destabilise it in the seventies, and to help to destroy it in the eighties. Yugoslavia may not play a role like this for the imperialists, neither for FRG nor for the USA. The war against Yugoslavia is a war against the working class and the people. It is intended to suppress working class and the Yugoslavian people. Is it intended to wipe Yugoslavia from the map and to use her territory as a mere parade area against the neighbouring countries and especially against the former socialist countries. To achieve this there is no need of

any economic reconstruction. Such a reconstruction would just strengthen the working class. What is required – in the best case – is to reconstruct some bridges, to reconstruct some railway lines, and to reconstruct parts of the energy supply. This is what is required for a war against the other peoples of the former community of socialist states. Even if we just discuss about, and if we set aside policy in economical questions, destroyed Yugoslavia is a country of no economic interest for FRG and for US-imperialism. Its economic resources are too tiny for imperialism. The surplus capacities of the imperialists are too huge, and therefore Yugoslavia will not live to see what even the annexed GDR lived to see: to be a country of the chains of retail shops. Indeed, we speak about destruction. We speak about the destruction of the Yugoslavian working class as well as of the country's national bourgeoisie.

III.

For the question of any international court of justice of which kind ever: Of course international law has been violated by this war. It has been violated especially concerning those parts of international law emanating from the victory of Anti-Hitler-Coalition and of the working class in power. The working of UN could go on well, too, as long as UN were the battlefield and the result of peaceful coexistence. When socialism had been defeated temporarily this basis had been destroyed. In the consequence the imperialists are using all those means that are left to them in the last stadium of capitalism: blood, war, and destruction. Under these circumstances an international court of justice would be nothing else than a farce of Nuremberg (which has also been the result of a very special historical constellation of the two main fighting classes). The fact that the Federal Republic of Germany rejects up to now any charge against the war criminals and against the governments of the belligerent countries brought by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is a proof that there is no court of justice like that one of Nuremberg, when the victorious proletariat helped to condemn the aggressor and its war criminals. In the best case such a court of justice would act according to bourgeois law, a law that might even be a fascist law as well, i.e. a law that allows to wage war. (The right to wage war has been removed from the sovereign rights of states after 1945.) This

would not condemn but rather confirm what has been done to Yugoslavia by imperialism.

IV.

It is the working class that create peace. It is the people that create peace. To expect peace to come by the suppressors and the exploiting classes means: peace will never come. There will be no peace emanating from German soil towards Yugoslavia as long as the working class of Western Germany will not resist and fight against their chief enemy. There will be no peace without the resistance of our class. Without that resistance of the working classes and the peoples of the belligerent countries the workers of Yugoslavia will pay an even higher price for their liberation, for their achievements so bloodily won by the revolutionary struggle against German Hitler fascism and against the new aggression. This will inevitably happen if the workers of the belligerent countries will not fulfil their proletarian duty to a higher degree than they do so up to now. We, the communists, we have to enlighten and to organise our own class every day: "Proletarians, fight against your own class enemy! Join our actions and our demonstrations!" Because to lament the conditions in our class is no answer to war.

The genocide emanating from German soil is an immediate consequence of the annexation of the sovereign German Democratic Republic in 1989/1990. An annexation which took place with the acceptance of all today's belligerent powers. The state unity of Germany means war in Europe and war against Yugoslavia. The people and the working class of GDR have profoundly realised that the annexation of their sovereign state had as a result their own deep misery, and that to bring misery to other peoples and classes is nothing but the result of their own suppression. Their struggle for the peace for other peoples is very different from the struggle of workers who were living to see their suppression in a continuity from fascism up to now. It is different in nature, in dimension, and in militance. The annexation of GDR has led to war the workers in the Federal Republic as well as the workers in GDR. "Was this border lifted so that we might wage war against other peoples?" The working classes of FRG and of GDR

just can answer: "Yes, indeed!". As long as this border stays lifted war is a daily danger to threaten our classes. To weaken German imperialism is the aim of the communists and of the proletarians in East and West. This means: the annexed country should have the possibility and the freedom to follow its own path of independence from the Federal Republic, and to defend its democratic and peaceful aims against the Federal Republic. So that this country may start to follow that path by establishing a confederation with the Federal Republic as a means to strive forward a democratic revolution of its own and the separation from German imperialism. Our common manifestations May 8th as well as May 23rd along the former border between German Democratic Republic and Federal Republic of Germany may be the first demonstrations of such a common will.

Weaken German imperialism, not only on the occasion of the war against Yugoslavia! Weaken Greater Germany, the follow-up state of the German empire!

*Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD
Central Committee*

take the chance before it might be too late ...

Document of the Central Committee, published June 10, 1999

Berlin, May 23, 1999: “Simultaneously to the president’s election in the Reichstag, up to 1,000 peace activists formed a human chain along the former border between the GDR and West Berlin. On their banners they asked: ‘Was this border eliminated so that we go to war against other peoples together?’”¹

I.

Two weeks before, the following paper had been completed:

As stated before: We don’t know if this (the attack on Yugoslavia) was the beginning of a third world war. However, we know that the end of a third world war might also be the end of Central Europe or the part of it that is called “Germany”.

Facing this (and facing the condition of the workers’ movement in the world), it might be a little comforting to remember that the end of the

¹ *Neues Deutschland*, 05/25/1999: “Those who wanted to pass the gate needed a permit. It was available without problems and informally, however with some ‘Brecht-like restrictions’ on the back. 1. Complete freedom of the book, with one restriction. 2. Complete freedom of the theater, with one restriction. 3. Complete freedom of the fine arts, with one restriction. 4. Complete freedom of music, with one restriction. 5. Complete freedom of film, with one restriction. The restriction: no freedom for documents and works of art that glorify war or make it seem unavoidable, and for those that promote hatred among peoples.’ At times, more than 1,000 people participated in the peace action that lasted for seven hours. Hand in hand, they formed a ‘wall’, some hundreds of meters long, along the former ‘protective wall’ on the western front of the Brandenburger Tor. ‘Was this border eliminated so that we go to war against other peoples together?’, many participants asked on banners. ‘Would a federal German participation in the war of aggression against Yugoslavia also have been possible if the GDR still existed’, they [the banners] could have read as well...” A fortnight before, in *Junge Welt*, about the central demonstration in Berlin commemorating May 8: “‘If the GDR existed there would not be an attack on Yugoslavia’, thus the inscription of the most prominent banner on Gendarmenmarkt.”

First World War also meant the overthrow of the imperialist war mongers. Not everywhere, but in one country. (Russia left the war because the Bolsheviks' unceasing endeavor to transform the imperialist war into a revolutionary civil war had been successful through the October Revolution.) However, this note is not to be comforting. But it is to ask you to get conscious of the prerequisites for the German involvement in the present war. Whoever says, "Yes, we know that, that's the power of the capital, and so on," is generally right but forgets one thing. And the truth is always concrete. In the existing case, it is possible to express it in a very simple sentence: If the GDR still existed there would not be a German attack on Yugoslavia.²

A truth remains true, even if people do not act according to it. But if something has been recognized as being true: What remains for us but to at least try to act according to it. The idea that was banned to the realm of the "impossible" until now, to fight for the reversal of the GDR's annexation, has gotten another dimension by the present war – as "unpleasant" this is for everyone involved.³

First, the truth has to be stated, i.e. that with the GDR there would not be a German attack on Yugoslavia, and the truth has to be stated immediately, as long as the majority of people on the annexed GDR's territory still disapproves of this war and has not given in to the FRG's government, etc.! Each form of this opinion not majorably organizable by the different West German opinion is to be checked. From committees to suggestions that have been made in times of peace (as, for example, a separate House for the citizens on the territory of the annexed GDR), but always under the premise that they are suitable instruments against this war, and that

² This is an establishment of facts! But certainly this has to be taken up if opinion polls subjectively confirm it, e.g. in *Stern* (No. 16/1999), "East Germans Against This War", in which it is claimed that 70 % of the West Germans approve of the Bundeswehr's participation in the intervention against Yugoslavia, and only 25 % disapprove of it, while on GDR-territory disapproval is dominant (48 % "No" to 41 % "Yes", 11 % replied "I don't know").

³ The question whether one would have agreed to "join" the FRG if one had known that the thus "unified Germany" would be part of a war of aggression ten years later is neither solely moralistic nor "turned backwards". But the thus resulting breach of the "2+4"-treaty poses the question if the treaty about the GDR's "joining" is still valid. But also apart from questions of international law: History offers many lessons about how even an implemented annexation may be fought step by step, and that you do not have to wait for it being eliminated by the next great war's victorious powers. Only mentioned here: formation of a provisional (revolutionary) government and/or a confederation (so to speak: unroll Kohl's Ten-point program from the last point, the plan that in 1989 made possible the "unthinkable").

they refuse to be obedient to the federal government at least in this respect!

Who objects that this would only result in deserting due to being afraid of the war, may do so. Deserting an imperialist war was always not only much better (and also more honorable) than participating in it, and it weakened the main enemy, namely the one in your own country! However: The revolution was not made to leave the war, but the wish to leave it was a step on the way to revolution.

“Dirt your war! Thus make it on your own!” If the people of the former GDR did translate their rejection of the present war into action in such a way, the West German workers would doubly, i.e. not only by their own class status but also by an example, be called to consider whether they do not go over to having the capitalists wage their war on their own – with which waging the war were over!

* * *

Does the truth that with the GDR there would not be a German attack on Yugoslavia exclude joint actions from East and West? To the contrary! Just imagine a human chain that is positioned exactly along the former border – and be it only in Berlin at first (and/or other selected spots, as for example Herrnburg!) – and carries signs saying: This border was not eliminated so that we go to war against other peoples together!⁴ Or as a question:

Was this border eliminated so that we go to war against other peoples together?

There are certainly many other forms of action, big and small. Thus, it could also be written on the remains of the border: This border prevented that we go to war against other peoples together. (GDR citizens may insert an “also” before “prevented”. And another GDR-specific slogan could for example be: No freedom of movement into war. Etc., etc.)

⁴ Other suggestions made:

Let's resurrect the “antifascist wall of protection” against the war together.
Let's build the wall against war together.

II.

Many of those who participated in the May 23 action, to which a number of more or less well-known personalities from East and West had mobilized, may at first well have seen in this action one of many antiwar activities and may have seen its difference in the president's election going on simultaneously. (Among the mobilizers also was Uta Ranke-Heinemann who, by her candidacy, gave the opportunity to elect somebody for president who was for the immediate ending of the war against Yugoslavia.) At the same time, one could notice that the question which was asked with this action was "up in the air". You can leave it at that, or tell yourself: Now it were some thousands who were confronted over a short period of time with the question whether this border was eliminated so that we go to war against other peoples together; now it is crucial to confront as many people as possible with this question. And be it by being present on small stickers, on signs stuck into the ground, by letters in the streets,⁵ everywhere where the border between the GDR and the FRG ran ... Also as a very large sign as they can be seen at construction sites (certainly more frequently in Berlin than elsewhere). – Another possibility could be that, in a sort of "travelling exhibition", one segment of "the Wall" is installed (as a work of art) at one busy spot after the other, with a medium-sized metal plaque on both sides, on which embossed letters read (embossed, so that graffiti do not matter): "Did this border have to exist so that we do not go to war against other peoples together?" (Or: "Did this border have to exist so that we" – it could also read: "the Germans" – "live in peace with other peoples?") Etc., etc.

III.

You may label it paradoxical, but you have to note (and this was also confirmed by the May 23 action): The same people, a majority of whom is against going to war against other peoples together, are right now also against a separation from the West, i.e. a secession of the more antiwar East from the more bellicose West. Although the impact would be more

⁵ Which can in case be applied quickly and precise with stencils and other technical arrangements (and which marcate the border by their position); and whatever is done at times, the well received banner of May 8 and 23, with the data mentioned in footnote 2, should not be absent.

severe than to leave the war against other peoples: In any case, the FRG, in her limits of 1989, would fall back into her (appropriate) status of a secondary power, at least in the eyes of her western partners. (And for them there probably would not be that need, whose satisfaction seems to be one of the present war aims, namely to not only bomb Yugoslavia back into the stone age but to also bomb the advancing German imperialism back into the second row.)⁶

However, and herein could also be a dissolution of the above mentioned contradiction: Even if the East had seceded it would again need what has never been attempted seriously in the West, namely a radical democratic change which tries to immunize somewhat against fascism, racism, and militarism.⁷ The rejection of the German participation in the war against Yugoslavia is just a little substitute for that, as was the broad rejection of war after World War II was lost.⁸ But the latter was, and the first is a link to radical democratic change. And in order to proceed with it in the East you do not have to wait for a secession! What you would have to do would be: not to wait for what the people in the West are prepared to do. But proceed slowly to initiate again such a radical democratic change with all the political and cultural means available in the East. That might be more difficult than a secession, but this is a path that more are ready to take, and one which is worth to be taken.

*Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD
Central Committee*

⁶ One may think it exaggerated to imply a connection between the German debate about the Holocaust Memorial and a need to bomb the FRG back into the second row. Fact is that the same group of people disapproves of both, the memorial and the present German involvement in the war, because Germany's national sovereignty and pride would be hurt. (Compare the replication of Rudolf Augstein's related comments in the flyer of the Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD for this year's May Day.)

⁷ "Facing the reactionary development in the western zones, it is of importance for all of the German people to secure and consolidate the achievements of the radical democratic, antifascist change." (translated from: *Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung*, III, Berlin: 1967, p. 128; on the SED's 2nd party convention of September 20-24, 1947.)

⁸ One should not submit to illusions: The reasons for antiwar sentiment in the East in 1999 probably are varied partly, among them those that would be in favor of an (imperialist) "Defense of Fatherland", just as the reasons for antiwar sentiment after 1945 varied a lot, and the task of an antimilitaristic education was still to be tackled.

the pillaging of the working people or the national debt

Document of Central Committee, Plenary session, August 1999

I.

Large parts of the proletariat and of the working people are impressed by the creaming of the ruling social democracy that the state of the Federal Republic of Germany is indebted by trillions of Deutschmarks and that the state bankruptcy is not far – if not forceful measures are seized now in this country. The class character of the state of the bourgeoisie is perceived by them only very occasionally, and so their readiness to resist to the organ of the exploiter class and to the renewed pillaging in the amount of 30 Billion Marks is severely weakened.

The national budget is a tool with which a part of the national income is distributed in the interest of the exploiting class. Taxes and loans are the source of the national budget. Marx claimed that the national budget of a capitalist state is “nothing else than a class budget, a budget for the bourgeoisie”. In capitalism the taxes are a form of additional exploitation of the working people, since a part of their earnings is distributed once again in favour of the bourgeoisie by means of the national budget. The policy of the bourgeois state aims at imposing as little taxes as possible to the exploiting class. So the working masses, the workers, the farmers, the employees, they are carrying the biggest part of the tax burden. Additionally: the expenses of the capitalist state are unproductive in their vast majority. Besides the taxes there are loans as an important item of receipt for the capitalist state. With an important part of the money found by loans first and foremost military expenditures are paid, and the state pays for deliveries which bring the industrialists an enormous profit. Loans to other states are spent bringing with them a horrendous payment of

states are spent bringing with them a horrendous payment of interests. It is an other feature of the state monopolistic capitalism to turn into fictitious capital of the monopolists the capital withdrawn from the production, i.e. into loans, into national debt. By this means an increased redistribution of the national income in favour of the monopolists is made possible. The loans are bringing with them another raise of the taxes of the working people and a reduction of the social expenditure for the people; for the loans must pay interest and in the long run they have to be paid back. The national debts comes to enormous heights in bourgeois imperialistic countries. The pillaging of the working people and the money-making for the monopolists are coming to an unseen extent. All this increases the unproductive and parasitical character of the waste of national income.

*The cause of the national debt of FRG
is the source of her wealth*

At the surface of the appearances of capitalist society we see the incomes and their sources in a distorted way. We see them in the form of a fetish. So it happens to the national debt of FRG, too. The national debt of FRG gives the impression as if the state, the ideational capitalist is on the way to be ruined, to be broke, deep in debt. This is the impression. This fetish finds its correspondence or reflection within the masses of the people who fear the ruin of the state and who are believing that it is in their very own interest that the state indebtedness is reduced. The appearances deceive. The opposite is the case. It is the immense wealth which the proletariat has created by its hands' work that has made possible and created the state indebtedness of the FRG. It is the enormous national income of the workers and other working people on the one hand, and the petty and restricted possibility for the finance capital to change that wealth into productive capital on the other hand which show to the finance capital the only profitable way out: the purchase of government bonds. This is a gigantic redistribution of the national income under the name of national debt. The state gets into debt with the big banks to secure the biggest possible profit, the biggest possible share of the national income for the big banks. Any Deutschmark of interest the state repays to the banks is a

Deutschmark coming from the workers. A Deutschmark with which the national income is redistributed in favour of the finance oligarchy. So, with the national debt inside the country growing, the wealth of the creditors is also growing. In most of the cases the loans borrowed by the state are not used as capital, i.e. for the production of surplus value, but are used in an unproductive way (state apparatus of violence, militarism, privileges of the rich). So they exist as a fictitious capital. The creditors of the national debt are covered with interest and compound interest year for year and enjoy an ever growing wealth. Finance capital is ruling. It is ruling over state monopolistic capitalism and its state. It exploits the working people with the help of the loans they grant to the state. Therefore the working class are not only exploited by the industrial capitalist but also to an increasing extent by the finance capital in the form of fictitious state indebtedness.

Half of the national debts of FRG of almost 2400 billion Marks belong to the big banks which have lent about 1200 billions to the state. Taken the usual interest rates for national debts of 8 per cent the big banks get 1200 billion of Marks of interest within only 9 years. In this way their money doubles within 9 years and increases to 2400 billions of Marks. What has the state paid the 1200 billion Marks of? The state paid it from the taxes to pay by the working classes. And it pays by another part of the national income of the society, by new loans of the banks. The Federal Bank of Germany wrote 1997 (monthly reports 3/97): "As a warning sign particularly must be regarded that the increase of the debt quota within the last few years is fundamentally connected with the high interest charges. With that the indebtedness is reproducing itself." This way the national debt at the banks will double within 9 years and with it the payment of interest. These 1200 billions of Marks of interest are corresponding approximately the sum of 3 federal budgets with all payment positions. Or the other way round: 3 out of 9 federal budgets will flow directly into the safes of the big banks. One also can say that the 1200 billion Marks of interest of 9 years are corresponding to 40 economizing packages of Mr. Eichel at 30 billion Marks each. This is done only by interest payment of the state, which does not mean a single Mark to be spent for the reduction of the debt itself.

The wealth expressed in the state indebtedness appears in the sales of

the big banks at the same time, too. Deutsche Bank presents a balance of 1500 billion Deutschmarks which equal 3.5 federal budgets.

These facts are confirming what Lenin proved and what is expressed in our programme, i.e. the role of the big banks getting more and more powerful.

The state indebtedness within the country is not real but fictitious as pointed above. But those national debts stemming from foreign capitalists to an actual amount of 770 billion Marks are real ones. The foreign capitalists will collect them, and they have to be paid. These debts result for the most part from the annexation of the German Democratic Republic. On the one hand there is more of destruction of social wealth in the annexed area than has been left for production and reproduction. It was and is destroyed more than one can produce there. This also led to the borrowing abroad and to real debts particularly at British and French banks. On the other hand the debts of the annexed area, of the GDR, are fictitious or, in other words, are pure fictitious bookings within the national budget of FRG. This is because a part of the so-called debts of the GDR are fictitious debts, taken from the account of the existing GDR. When that state was annexed these debts should have been deleted.

At the same time the FRG is creditor of other states which are indebted to the Federal Republican state, for example Austria, Hungary, Poland etc. These are states which actually to a certain amount already belong to the German state. The journalist Paul C. Martin expressed that fact a little more popularly for the newspaper "Die Welt" in 1981. Asked how Poland should pay her gigantic debts to the German state he answered: "Then we should take over Silesia."

The world-wide indebtedness of the little und weak states leads to the fact that they have to pay more interest, and they have to pay it in the currency of the bigger imperialists. So they have to try everything to get Deutschmarks, to trade and pay with Deutschmarks and to hand the central banks over to the imperialists. Their own currencies not only get weaker by that. The decline of their currencies has as a result that they

have to pay even more interest. That they have to give even more of their national income to the imperialists, to the FRG. It comes to a situation that their national currencies get null and void and that the foreign currency in their countries determines the whole of the society's economy. These states deep in debt are forced to liquidate their national wealth, to privatise their national wealth. These countries can not longer come to terms with social tasks. In former times colonialism still developed production places and a proletariat by building highways, mines, factories etc. Imperialism now is smashing to pieces all this. So these countries find themselves set back economically to early feudalism and politically to patronage. This is managed not by cannons but by currencies, by means of indebtedness. Revolution and the set-up of socialism becomes more and more difficult for these peoples.

The inner state indebtedness consists of fictitious capital which isn't used for production but permanently bears interest and compound interest by which the people is impoverished day by day. What is the result of the fact that about $\frac{1}{4}$ of the national budget in the FRG is flowing as interest into the safes of the banks? The state complies with its social tasks within capitalism in still lower and still smaller measure. The exploitation of the productive capital is thus made more difficult. The sewage system in the cities is getting rotten. The railroads work worse and worse. House building by the state does not take place any longer. Etc. etc. The state indebtedness is a point for the privatisation of the railroad and the mail and the garbage collection and so on.

II.

The tax payer, the proletariat, the farmers, and the employees – they don't have any interest of their own in demanding the existing national debt to be paid off or reduced. Because every reduction of the debts already accumulated by the state enriches the finance capital even more by the appropriation of an even larger part of national income. The attitude of the proletariat and its trade unions can only be: the finance capitalists shall be left with their government bonds. No further payment on the part of the state to the creditors, the banks. Denial of the payment of interest to the

banks. There is no other advice we can give to the small and bled debtor nations of the FRG. No further pillaging of the people in the FRG, no further pillaging of the oppressed peoples of other countries by the FRG. May this state go bankrupt – this will only bother the rich. It will bother the rich if the working classes start to fight against the renewed and extended redistribution, if they fight to the disadvantage of the monopolists and to the advantage of the people. What does it bother the working class if the state owes billions to the banks? It is the state of the banks and the other monopoly capitalists! Why should the proletariat be happy if the monopoly bourgeoisie gets 30 billions in the form of interest from the national income created by the proletariat? Why should the proletariat, the farmers, and the employees further get impoverished just to help the banks getting even more billions into their safes? Billions they use to force them as additional loans to the state, loans, for which the working people will have to pay once more?

This must be the battle cry of the proletariat:

No further penny for debts and interest amortization!

Immediate stop of payment of interest to the creditor banks by the state!

No more money for the redistribution of the national income into the safes of the creditors!

Just to freeze the interest for the robbers will bring about thousand billions into the register of the state. The attitude of the trade unions should at least be to lower the rates of interest for the national debt from now about 6 or 8 percent down to the rates paid on a savings book, i.e. 2 or 3 percent. Thus we could achieve that the compound interest for the 1200 billion Marks of bank credits could be diminished to an amount of 1550 billion Marks instead of rising to an amount of 2400 billion Marks. This is a saving of 90 billion Marks a year, the sum of 3 economizing packages a year.

It is not at all unimportant for the proletariat and the trade unions that the state gets more and more indebted with the banks. The rise of the sum of loans makes the banks rich and this leads to further reduction of the expenses for social tasks by the state. It is indeed very important for the working class if railroads are built or not, if privatisation is made un-

done or not, for example with the railroad or with the mail. A class which does not fight against the robbery by a small part of monopoly bourgeoisie taking away a growing part of the national income by the means of the national debt – such a class will hardly be able to make revolution. For the struggle of working class is better to fight against one capitalist in the form of the capitalist state than against some hundreds of capitalists. This struggle is better to fight with a huge workers' army at a national railroad than with small staffs in a lot of small enterprises. Moreover it is of great importance what this country looks like economically the day after revolution. It is an important question if the dictatorship of the proletariat starts under the worst economic or social conditions, for this would aggravate the construction of socialism very severely; or if the working class approaching the revolution fights against the national debt made at the expense of the proletariat and to the disadvantage of the economy.

Immediate reduction of the direct and indirect taxes paid by the working people! The proletariat has to fight against the national debt and against the payment of interest for the welfare of some monopoly capitalists. It is good advice for the proletariat like in the old days not to give to the bourgeoisie the capital taxes and the wealth taxes either. Not to give them especially to a bourgeois class which pays the lowest rates of taxes of all the capitalists in the highly industrialised countries. This does not soothe the national debts and the payment of interest. But the national income of the society would not be exclusively carried by the people as it is today. It is an answer to social democracy with its 30-billion economizing package: That the workers fight against the payment of interest, against the national debt, and against the redistribution of national income to the favour of the monopoly bourgeoisie. This struggle is an answer, too, to the question how to fight for the 7 most needed demands today.* Under today's conditions within the proletariat we can say: who understands that

* Demands of the trade unions: "To do what can be done. Laws in favour of the workers – now. These are our demands: revocation of all amendments in public health care since 1982 / revocation of all worsening concerning pensions / revocation of all worsening concerning unemployment benefits since 1982 / continued payment of wages: 100 % / 35-hours'-week by law – full wage adjustment / workers' insurances back into workers' hands / obligatory offered citizenship for all those who live in this country. Abolish German blood-based citizenship."

this state is rich and in no way indebted will stand up and fight. It is a fight against the state which we have to concentrate on in our every day's work in the trade unions and in the factories. This will be a better basis for the fight for the 7 urgent demands, too.

The local branches of our organisation will have to discuss once more at their plenary sessions the questions of the national debt and the organisation of the working class around the question of the state. They have to decide about the tasks of the daily struggle and to work within the trade unions and the factories. They will have to use the programme of our organisation to point out the necessity of the expropriation of the banks. To point out the necessity to overthrow the capitalist state and to install the proletarian state. They will have to agitate and to inform about the necessity to socialise the wealth and the national income in the interest of the working people.

*Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD
Central Committee*

balkans' conferences and protectorate declarations

Document of Central Committee, Plenary session, August 1999

The “Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe” on the basis of the “Declaration of the Summit of Sarajewo” is the continuation of a policy of undermining the national states in South-Eastern Europe. The aerial warfare against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia tremendously weakened the surrounding countries, too. After the breaking away of their main trading partners, the Soviet Union and the GDR, and after the decomposition of Yugoslavia during the last years and months these countries are now facing another fiasco. One third of their foreign trade had been done with Yugoslavia that has been bombed away overnight. Indeed, the dictate of the stability pact robs them of their very own currencies, and their national currencies are more and more turning into fictitious ones. This dictate keeps their central banks from financing the national budget, and the very weak national bourgeoisies won't control the national banks any longer. E.g. the “Handelsblatt” (a newspaper of the finance bourgeoisie in FRG) wrote 5-8-99: *“The central banks refused to finance the national budget ... in the strict version of a currency board... A strict currency regime may also soothe the abuse of power and corruption, if the political class is no longer allowed to control the central bank... For the countries in the Balkans the fastest way to get a stable currency would be to immediately adopt the Euro or a participant currency (for example the Deutschmark).”* These countries are finding themselves in the situation GDR found herself in July 1990 when the FRG robbed GDR's own currency by means of a “currency union”. It was “the most radical way to take over Eastern Germany”, as Philipp Zelikow stated.

The states of South-Eastern Europe will have to subjugate their political system to the dictate of the two great imperialistic powers, of the USA

and of the FRG, and in a certain sense to the dictate of France and Great Britain as well. All this concerns even the sphere of management. They have to subjugate their national state apparatus to an extent that the imperialists dictate how "responsibility in government" has to look like. These countries will have to put the imperialistic groups in charge of their national economies. They will have to privatise their economies in a profitable manner, and if their factories will be a competitor to those imperialistic groups they will have to liquidate those factories. Their state apparatus, the police, their judiciary, and their armies will be newly arranged by the imperialists and will be subjugated to the state apparatus of the imperialistic powers. At the same time the administrators of the protectorates will decide on the foreign policy of these countries. The national frontiers and international law dealing with the intactness of the borders will no longer protect these states, for these borders are thought to no longer mean "separations". The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia lives under the threat of war. A part of her country is already listed as an independent "republic", a fact that signals further smashing and dismemberment of Yugoslavia. There have been no contracts with the South-Eastern European states let alone have they been offered contracts obligatory to international law. They were simply informed about the declaration of the "Sarajewo Summit". The states concerned had to welcome this dictate and to subject themselves. That they did so is pointing out once more how great an impact the demolitions caused by the destruction of socialism by revisionism have had in these countries, and how weak and how helpless the new and small national bourgeoisie is indeed.

The pact on the Balkans is not only attacking the listed states like Bulgaria, Romania, Albania or the detached Macedonia etc and submitting them under the rule of a protectorate. Even Greece or Italy might be some day be subjugated under these rules since the "area of South-East Europe" consciously isn't defined or delimited. As a governmental official in the foreign ministry in FRG stated: this fact just demonstrates the "charm of the package".

The pact on the Balkans is now sanctioning all attacks on the sovereignty of the Eastern-European states carried out up to now illegally by the Federal Republic of Germany. It is violating international law und continuing a practice started by the annexation of GDR.

German imperialism undergoes a weakening by the fact that the USA now are present within an area FRG thought to be her very domain. An area she was permanently attacking and undermining without any fear of an intervention of an other imperialistic power.

*Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD
Central Committee*

i even would not like
to be buried here

Declaration of Central Committee, Plenary session, August 1999

If he would not have done anything else than this: That like a man he did not get up when the ruling scum of this state sprang up from their chairs at Paulskirche and cheered Walser, who just had declared Auschwitz null and void, forgiven and forgotten – if Ignatz Bubis would not have done anything else than this in his life he would have deserved to be called a just of the peoples. One has not to do anything great in this country to be a great person. But to do the normal deeds, the decent deeds, the small deeds, to do all this one needs a lot of courage in this country. Ignatz Bubis demonstrated this to all of us. He had carried out reconciliation, and at the end of his life he had the soberness to declare that he has been left among us without reconciliation. He even did not want to be buried here. We say goodbye to Ignatz Bubis. We cannot pray a “Kaddish” for the just one, we have never been taught to pray it. But we can sing for him the song of the bog soldiers.

*Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD
Executive Committee
of Central Committee*

A Request to the Peoples of Europe does troja lie under the kurfürstendamm?

Document of Central Committee, Plenary session, August 1999

In the year 1873 Heinrich Schliemann at a place he regarded as the ancient Troja looted some graves which presumably are older than four thousand years. The stolen gold Mr. Schliemann in his enthusiastic greed thought to be the “treasure of Priamos” was smuggled to Wilhelminian Berlin. Schliemann solemnly bequeathed his theft “to the German people”. Heinrich Schliemann became the intellectual leading figure of an epoch which happily unites solid smattering of knowledge, presumptuous nationalism and business cunning.

“To write for a single nation is a miserable and petty ideal”
(Schiller in a letter to Körner)

Schliemann showed a sovereign appreciation of the fact that it is quite unimportant whether the great Troja is buried under a Turkish stone heap or under the swanky Kurfürstendamm. The great works of the culture don't have any national owners, they belong to the peoples of the world, they are the inheritance of our future. The large works of culture need guardians to look after them, to protect them, and to make them accessible for everyone, though.

Has Beethoven been a Pole?

In 1941, after the first bomb attacks to Berlin, the fragments of the original copy of Beethoven's 8th symphony have been brought to the abbey of Grüssau in Silesia and with it about 20 000 hand-written notes of Bach, Mozart, Mendelssohn-Bartholdy and Schubert, letters and estates among

others of Goethe, Herder, Hoffmann von Fallersleben, Humboldt, Kleist, Kant, Lessing, and Schiller. In 1945 Grüssau became Krzeszów and the preciousnesses lay – without any Polish assistance – on Polish soil now. Since years Poland's government is signalling their readiness to hand them over back to the Germans. However they do not make any secret of the fact that they regard the valuable handwritings as a security in the quarrel about the return of Polish art treasures stolen by the Nazis or as a compensation for destroyed treasures. Poland has indeed suffered enormous losses in this regard. Two thirds of the complete library stock haven't survived in the war. Handwritings and estates of greatest Polish writers like Mickiewicz, Slowacki, Sienkiewicz, Norwid, Wyspianski, Chopin ended at the stake after the Warsaw rebellion. The Warsaw cartographical collections have seen a similar fate, so that the Berlin national library owns a richer inventory of historical Polish maps as all Polish archives today together. ("Die Zeit" No. 32/98, p. 9)

"To take possession of cultural goods which are suitable for investigations about the activities of the opponents of national socialism and suitable for national socialist research" (Directive of Reichsleiter Rosenberg for the removal of countless tons of books and other cultural possessions from the Soviet Union to Nazi Germany)

When Soviet soldiers in June 1945 packed the "treasure of Priamos" into wooden boxes and took it away to Moscow the peoples of the world just draw the consequences from the fact that German imperialism had proved himself unsuitable to protect the cultural inheritance of mankind, as far it was in his hands, and to make it accessible for everyone. "Fascism burns books. So it is." (Heinrich Mann) In our days the greater Germany wants to get back from the former Soviet Union and from other Eastern European countries what she calls with Schliemann's way of talking and thinking "Beutekunst" (spoils art). With no other right than with the right of solid smattering of knowledge, of presumptuous nationalism, and of business cunning, increased in the meantime by Auschwitz and Buchenwald.

What once has been burned is wound up in our days.

With the annexation of the GDR German imperialism has shown how much it had purified itself. This time the books were not burned. They were ploughed under. This time no Albert Einstein was driven away because of un-German physics. Culture and science have just been “wound up” and so have been the scientists.

“We reckon that till the end of 1991 more than 50 % of the former landscape of sciences and research of former GDR have been liquidated institutionally or personally. That includes industrial research. Just 20 000 of the former 80 000 industrial researchers are still working in the eastern economy. This is a process which is without example in the history of European life of arts.” 70 000 scientists of the GDR have been made superfluous getting pensions under the welfare aid standard. Arts subject are out of business. Not only are they out of business. There have been wound up:

- The field of education for universities and universities for applied sciences and the institute for the education of engineer educationists at the university of Chemnitz;
- The field of ethic and social sciences of the educational university of Leipzig;
- The complete German university for physical culture;
- The institute for social hygiene, the department of epidemiology and the department of pathological anatomy of Friedrich Schiller university at Jena;
- The department for plasma technology Meiningen, the college of precision engineering/optics/electronics Suhl of the technical university Ilmenau;
- The institute for educational psychology of the university of Greifswald;
- The institute for social hygiene and health information in Cottbus;
- The institute for veterinarian food hygiene Dahwitz/Hoppegarten;
- The central institute for pharmacy and medicine technology Frankfurt/Oder;
- The meteorological institute (environmental meteorology) Lindenberg/Potsdam;
- The institute for economy of resource protection, Potsdam;

- The state institute for epizytology and epidemic control, Wusterhausen;
- The institute for applied animal hygiene;
- The research centre for crop fertility, Müncheberg;
- The university for engineering Berlin-Wartenberg ...

“Here”, as the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* stated at that time, “a complete university landscape is crushed to ruins by cool gesture. This is the only term we may use if 10 universities are made of 52, and 20 universities for applied sciences or engineering are made out of 270.” (*Süddeutsche Zeitung*, July 13/14, 1991)

„The Germans have burnt our libraries. We cared and looked for their’s.”
(The director of the Jagiellonen library in Cracow, where Beethoven’s handwriting of the 8th symphony is kept)

No “treasure of Priamos”, no handwriting of Beethoven is safe from the German raiders. As long as this is going on, as long as we are not able to change this, we just can ask the other peoples: Keep your museums locked, barricade your archives, nail your castles and churches against the grave robbers and book burners from Berlin. Keep and protect what your soldiers were able to snatch from German fascism. Don’t deliver to the fourth Reich what you saved from the third one. As long as this country is not able to remember its disgrace, as long it is a bad guardian of the 8th symphony.

*Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD
Central Committee*

*Message of greeting
to Central Committee of CP Vietnam*

ho chi minh, born may 18, 1890

The habitable earth is a sphere but it is only since recently that mankind is aware of this reality and acts accordingly. Those who were the first to pronounce the simple truth were burnt to death for doing so. Five hundred years later mankind starts to understand, although slowly and fighting against powerful opposing forces, that there is more to recognize than the simple truth that earth is a sphere. There are some more simple issues to be understood if we want to make earth a place where to live in a reasonable way. In this century now ending the lessons for the people bear the names of their victories. Many of them are bearing the names of victories of the Vietnamese people: Dien Bien Phu, for example, or Saigon, April 24, 1975. The teachers are men like Ho Chi Minh. They teach us to see and recognize the obvious, the simple that is hard to achieve:

“No matter what difficulties and hardships lie ahead, our people are sure of total victory. The U.S. imperialists will certainly have to quit. Our Fatherland will certainly be reunified. Our fellowcountrymen in the South and in the North will certainly be reunited under the same roof. We, a small nation, will have earned the signal honour of defeating, through heroic struggle, two big imperialists – the French and the American – and of making a worthy contribution to the world national-liberation movement.”

The Vietnamese people is in the happy situation to have victories serving as lectures:

“Our mountains will always be, our rivers will always be, our people will always be; The American invaders defeated, we will rebuild our land ten times more beautiful.”

We, by contrast, have to learn from our defeats. After the annexation of the DDR the German imperialism is dragging Europe towards another World War. It is uncertain whether Europe will be left still habitable if we are unable to prevent him from doing so.

Comrades and brothers: The best of luck for you and for us, let us follow Ho Chi Minhs way!

*29. April 2000
Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD
Executive Committee
of Central Committee*

militarisation of state and society

Document of the Central Committee, plenary session, July 2000

German government, led by social democrats, just published a comprehensive programme of militarisation of state and society. Essentials have recently been published in a brochure called “Bundeswehr and Economy – Strategic Partnership on the Road to a Modern State”, published by the defence ministry. These plans are widely unknown within the ranks of the people although parts of the plans have already been carried out and other parts are on the way to be carried out. These plans are not being recognised even within the trade unions, or they are seen in a completely wrong manner. They are regarded as some sort of “civilizing” the army. They are not seen as a militarisation, where the state apparatus, the economy, and the society are used to carry out German imperialism’s plans of war and armament.

To regard these plans as plans to civilize the army is completely wrong. But exactly this view is deliberately produced by the authors of these plans. They are speaking about “modern methods of management”, of “fruitful cooperation” between the Bundeswehr (the German army) and “Länder”, departments, municipalities, and companies. The superintendent for the medical service of the army drivels on “the melting of the medical service of the army with the civil medical service”, which might lead to a civilization of the military forces. The contrary is the truth. As things are all these agreements (already carried out or on the way to be carried out) confirm what Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD is stressing in its programme: “Monopolies are subordinating state apparatus using it to interfere into economy, to plunder the working people by means of taxes, to redistribute the wealth of society in the interests of the monopolies and to militarise society.”

War minister Rudolf Scharping talks about checking of social wastefulness by the beneficial effects of market economy and competition. This is a lie, too. It was in 1991, at a meeting of representatives of German monopolists with the leaders of the army at Fürstenfeldbruck, when Mr. Roy, a civil servant from the war ministry, seduced those capitalists fearing about their profits coming from the armament. He explained to them that research and development within the weapons' industries would go on being pushed forward by the means of defence ministry in the future. Private economy, he stressed, would not be able to provide by its own means what the weapons' industries require. So he did not speak about market economy. He spoke about capitalist planned economy.

Indeed – if you look at the plans to militarise state and society you have to go far back to the Kohl government. Those plans have been elaborated shortly after the annexation of GDR when Kohl spoke about Germany having finished with her history and being able to take her role as a world power. Demands were made at Fürstenfeldbruck (see above) that Germany should “become normal” again and that the people be made ready for war. What was meant is: *Volksgemeinschaft*. (A very German word which means: a sense of community between the people and their oppressors.)

There were and there are many stages to produce this “*Volksgemeinschaft*”. There was the intervention of Martin Walser in Paul's Church at Frankfurt, when Walser tried the waste disposal of German past. There is the so-called “*Zwangsarbeiterentschädigung*” (financial compensation for the slave workers in Germany during World War II), which in fact is a law to make vanish the victims of German forced labour during the rule of the Nazis. All this leads to very direct effects on every day's life of German people. A governmental commission working on the future of the German army knows very well that a working class which is kept quiet is absolutely necessary for a new war. This commission claims that “settled social structures are a precondition for sustained security”.

Those plans were prepared by the Kohl government and are now executed by Schröder. (For example: all those plans to melt the military and the civil medical services have been prepared by the Kohl government from 1997 on.) So you can see again the validity of the sentences of our

programme: “Social democracy – that means hypocritical pacifism – that means active support of militarism, of imperialist wars, and rearmament of our country.”

“A Strategic Partnership on the Way to a Modern State” – that title of war ministry’s brochure is representing a whole programme. It might be surprising to use the military terms of strategy to describe the way leading to a “modern state”. But that is well said. Indeed this is a plan of the allocation of means and forces towards the next war. In these plans all the experiences of German bourgeoisie and of its state in the history of war are reflected. German bourgeois class remembers very well World War I when they carried out their plans for the direct grip of the capitalist state apparatus onto economy not before the midst of wartime. They tried to avoid that mistake before World War II by the means of the fascist four-years’-plans. The modern state they are announcing nowadays will be the attempt to produce without dictatorship what could be done only by the means of fascism in the thirties of this century. That will be a state in which “Volksgemeinschaft” comes out of the shadows of ideology, becoming reality of every day’s life, having great impact on the life and the work of the working class.

Indeed all this means the deepest militarisation of German society since the rearmament of Western Germany, a fact that is seen very clearly for example by the former German ambassador in Italy and the Netherlands who indeed compares the new plans – in an ethical, a political and in a military sense – to German rearmament in the fifties of this century. (But remember well: the rearmament of the fifties could only be achieved against militant class struggle: 9 119 667 signatures against that rearmament have been collected then, there was a big strike especially led by workers and miners on Ruhr river. There have been 35 189 proceedings against the fighters against militarism, 425 trials which resulted in 1012 years of prison. Workers should remember well these facts instead of betraying silently their comrades of the fifties!)

The underlying fact behind these plans of militarisation is that in imperialism development of the productive forces means development of the means for destruction and war. The above mentioned brochure of the war

ministry stresses, that “German industries have worldwide acknowledged industrial and management capacities. In the ongoing process of European structural policy (!) and globalisation of economy it is important to keep these capacities, supported by investment by the army.” This is, as the “agreement on innovation, investment and economicalness” is telling us, the only way to secure important industrial capacities.

There will be a series of “pilot projects” to prepare for the close connection of army and economy:

There will be an agreement on questions of traffic and transport between the big business and the army. It is intended to “use civil and military capacities of transport as efficiently as possible”, as it is claimed in the brochure of the war ministry.

There will be “a general and effective network for communication and data in blanket coverage by using industry’s and economy’s capacities”. (And they call for “interoperability” of this network with modern technology of mobile networks as used in Kosovo.)

There will be cooperation between the army and private companies to supply the army with goods and ammunition even in times of peace.

The use of the German Mail for the needs of the army has already reached a high degree. German Mail will provide the Bundeswehr with clothes by using its capacities of transport and its experiences in close cooperation with industrial textile companies in providing uniforms for the German Mail employees. There will be postmen and warriors fitted out by the same textile companies – German reality of the next years.

Despite all that the most important impact of militarism for the whole of the society will be the impact on working class itself. The free worker who is selling his working force voluntarily (“only” restricted by economic necessities like the necessity to survive by selling this working force); the freedom of the choice of profession – all those freedoms are lifted in tendency.

The war ministry tells the truth: imperialism does not need a lot of workers any longer, and this part of our class is growing. Imperialism produces a superfluous army of workers, an army only to be used in war and by war. According to this we are told that the army “as an important employer and place of training will contribute to solve the problems of

the market of labour force". So soldiers, that means murderers, will be recruited by the job centres. For that sake there will be an agreement between the central office of the job centres and the army. What will happen if the unemployed are not prepared to become murderers? Will they loose their earnings-related benefits? (We will have to find that out! Perhaps we can organise the possibilities for a class conscious worker to go to the Supreme Court in that question.)

Militarism is acquiring by all means. "Civil training places will be acquired on regional level" – as the war ministry tells us. The young worker who thought to sell his working force to a capitalist will then have two masters: the capitalist and the army. For "during their training the trainees will be in the care of Bundeswehr" (brochure of the ministry for defence). Of course it will not be only the young worker who will suffer from this continued presence of the armed forces within the factories. The job stewards will be concerned, too. They are obliged by law to work for the welfare of the company. Does this mean: for the welfare of the army, too? There are more than 1000 companies which joined the agreement between the army and economy. The job stewards of these companies are made lackeys of the militarisation of the rights of workers and employees, because they will have to agree with these agreements – for the welfare of the company. Even if they refuse to cooperate, which is their class duty, they are involved in these acts of militarisation. All that is a very malign trick to destroy the rights of the workers' movement and its job stewards.

It is the fear of unemployment by which young workers shall be lured to join the army. But unemployment, as we all know, can be produced rather easily. So the army stresses that they will concentrate on those young workers who will not be employed after their training. How many workers will that be? And who will be part of that number? This will be decided "in cooperation" by big business and the army. In this way the suppressed and their job stewards are drawn into the apparatus of the state. In this way the freedom of the choice of profession will be made a farce. Voluntariness (which, of course, is very limited by capitalism itself) will be substituted by force. And all that takes place without any fascist dictatorship. It takes place because the "Volksgemeinschaft" becomes material re-

ality within the factories. When capitalism is dying, as it is, workers may call for "labour at any price". It will be the call for production of war, for preparation of war, for service of war, and finally for war.

Militarism is not only acquiring places of training for future soldiers. It is acquiring such places for former soldiers, too. The job centres will help to bring former soldiers, now unemployed, to working places in factories and offices. Therefore "we will acquire vacant working places and offer them to soldiers if the soldiers want to be informed about them" (as the brochure "Bundeswehr and Economy" tell us). Some of these soldiers will even have the possibility for a future as petit bourgeoisie. The representatives of craftsmanship in several cities in Germany will coordinate the efforts to solve the problems of craftsmanship to find successors for their small plants. Parts of these representatives are very proud for a long lasting cooperation between them and the army. (We remember: in ancient Rome former soldiers got a small piece of land, in most cases a piece they had helped to conquer during their service in the army.)

So the choice of profession is vanishing. And so is the right for refusal to fight in a war, because training in factories and requisition for the army are melting completely. Of course: class conscious workers always have known that individual denying or pacifism are no solution for imperialism and militarism. There is only one way out: to fight imperialism as a whole, to fight against the system of labour. Just and only in doing so the workers can avoid to die in the wars or to become murderers of other peoples.

There is a special branch of public life which militarism is subjugating at the moment in a way that will have the most dangerous consequences for life and health of the whole of the people. (It is kept quite secret but has been brought to the public by members of the trade union of the public health workers – not even the parliament do know everything about that.) There are agreements between the army and public hospitals to bring the civil medical service under the control of the army. There are some pilot agreements. According to these agreements hospitals will merge with sick bays of the army. In this way the army wants to raise the number of beds in its hospitals by about 56 000. (This is a figure that

demonstrates a lot about the kind of wars they intend to wage in the next future! There will be no comparison with the war they waged against Yugoslavia.)

The private hospitals, if they agree, will get medical equipment of the army for free. But the price is high!

They will have to train medical doctors for the army. They will have to train first-aid attendants for the army. In the case of war these people might be withdrawn from the hospitals within six hours' time. Private health care will not be allowed to employ them any longer.

The hospitals will have to agree in taking care for up to 1000 hurt soldiers each in case of war. If the sick bays of the army will be under too great a strain the private hospitals will have to send nurses and medical doctors into these sick bays of the army. And that means: they will have to wear uniform, and they will have to go abroad if this is required! As the trade union for public health employees informed the public the army is trying to get agreements according to which nurses or medical doctors will have no possibility to protest against that or to refuse that kind of service.

The trade unions in Germany are not prepared to fight against that militaristic penetration of the whole of society. On the contrary. They agreed to become part of that. This is another step on the way that leads trade unions downhill. Beginning with neutrality towards militarism they went on to tolerating militarism. Now they finish with cooperation with militarism. The next step would and could only be: To call for the defence of the fatherland and for war.

Some leaders of trade unions have already signed an "agreement about the principles of cooperation between the trade unions and the ministry for defence". With that agreement it is said that there should be a close and trustful cooperation. That the trade unions will be involved in creating a modern structure for the management of the army.

Instead of the old slogan: War to the war! our trade unions now raise the flag of war services for the ruling class. Workers will have to remember our old slogans. For example: young workers of the German Mail, postmen and postwomen will go to work with tinhats on their heads in the next weeks to protest against the cooperation of German Mail with Bundeswehr.

We will have to collect signatures in the factories against this programme of militarisation. It is not important at the moment if these signatures represent a majority of the workers. Important is that with methods like that there will be information for and mobilisation of the colleagues.

And last but not least, and not to be forgotten: In the framework of the 2+4-treaty about German unity the Federal Republic of Germany has obliged herself to a maximum of armed forces of 370 000 men. In the meantime the war ministry speaks about 680 000 to 700 000 men in the case of war. With those measures as we explained in that article more and more the whole of the working people will be subjugated under German militarism, even if they are working in the “private sector”. They are subjugated under a Joint Staff (Generalstab) which has been banned by Potsdam agreement against German imperialism. And all that is not only valid for the soil of the Federal Republic of Germany. German imperialism thus creates instruments for the infiltration of other countries, an infiltration that has been sufficiently prepared by recent years’ “agreements of cooperation”.

*Arbeiterbund für den Wiederaufbau der KPD
Central Committee*