

FOUNDING MEETING

London, 24th June 1983

AGENDA

Private Session

[1100 hrs]

1. Appointment of Chairman of the Meeting
2. Notification by Parties proposing to sign the IDU Declaration of Principles [for the purposes of establishing the decision-making basis of the meeting]
3. Adoption of the Agenda
4. Formal Approval for the Draft IDU Declaration of Principles [Document Number IDU/1983/003]
5. Formal Approval for the Draft IDU Statutes [Document Number IDU/1983/004]
6. Election of IDU Officers:
 - a] Chairman
 - b] Vice-Chairmen
 - c] Treasurer
7. Appointment of IDU Executive Secretary
8. Admission of Associate Members
9. Work Programme 1983-4 [Document Number IDU/1983/005]
 - a] Adoption of Programme
 - b] Establishment of Standing Committees
 - c] Appointment of Standing Committee Chairmen
10. Any other business

EDU/1983/896

1st June 1983

EDU/IDU PARTY LEADERS' MEETING 1983

Programme

Wednesday, 22nd June 1983

Morning

EDU/IDU Offices open in London,
Hotel Intercontinental, Tel. 409 3131

Afternoon:

Meeting of the Standing Committee of the Interparty Group -
open to all interested of the EDU and PDU Steering Committee

Thursday, 23rd June 1983

- 18.00 Press Briefing (Tony Eggleton, Scott Hamilton, Andreas Khol)
19.00 Diplomatic Reception
20.30 Dinner for Party Leaders (or their personal representatives)
and the Chairmen of the EDU Committees and Expert Groups
20.30 Meeting of the Steering Committee of EDU (Press-Release)

Friday, 24th June 1983

- 9.00 Conference opens
-Opening and Admission of New Members
-State of the Union (Alois Mock)
-Any other formal business
9.45 European-American Relations
(Introduced by Prime Minister Bernhard Vogel)
11.30 IDU Meeting begins:
Adoption of Principles, Statutes, Finances, Election of
Officers
12.00 Session adjourns

- 12.30 for 13.00 Lunch
(Party Leaders and Heads of Government: Downing Street 10
Senior Delegates: Carlton Club
Buffet Lunch for all the other Delegates)
- 15.00 Formal launch of the International Democrat Union
-Signing Ceremony
-Formal Statements by elected Officers
- 17.30 Press Photo-Call of IDU-Leaders
- 17.45 First Press Conference:
Participants all IDU Party Leaders.
- 19.30 for 20.00 Formal Dinner in Grand Ballroom
Statement by Vice-President Bush

Saturday, 25th June 1983

- 9.00 EDU Meeting continues
Economic Questions
(Introduced by Prof. Staffan Buremstam-Linder
First Statement: Kare Willoch
- 10.30 Central America
(Introduced by Jean de Lipkowski)
- 11.30 Election Campaign Management
Report by the Chairman of the Expert Group (no.3.)
Dr. Lars Tobisson
- 12.00 Any other Business
- 12.30 EDU Press Conference
- 12.00 Buffet Lunch,
Departure of Delegates
- 15.00 First Meeting of the IDU Executive Committee
- 18.00 End of Meeting

June 1983

AD ITEM 5 OF THE AGENDA EDU/1983/895

FORMAL BUSINESS

During their meeting in Oslo on May 27th and 28th, 1983, the Steering Committee decided by unanimity to propose for formal adoption by the Party Leaders Conference (in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Rules of Procedure) the following items:

- 1) Adoption of the report of the Committee No. 1, "European Structures - European Policy" (chaired by Prime Minister Dr. Bernhard Vogel, CDU) on the European - American Relations (EDU/1983/812 rev.)
- 2) Adoption of the report of the Committee No. 2, "Economic Policy" (chaired by Prof. Staffan Burenstam Linder, Moderata Samlingspartiet) on the Principles of Economic Policy (EDU/1983/851)
- 3) Adoption of the report of the Expert Group No. 3, "Election Campaign Techniques" (chaired by Dr. Lars Tobisson, Moderata Samlingspartiet) on election campaign techniques (EDU/1983/883)
- 4) Adoption of the statement of expenditures compared with the Budget for the Financial Period 1st April 1982 to 31st March 1983 (EDU/1983/899) and of the Budget for the Financial Period 1st April 1983 to 31st March 1984 (EDU/1983/841 and 839)
- 5) Amendments of the EDU Rules of Procedure as follows:
"All decisions to be taken on the international level should be first discussed at the European Democrat Union's Steering Committee level. The representatives of the European Democrat Union in the various bodies of the International Democrat Union were bound by the Steering Committee's decision in this regard. This concerns the chairman, the executive secretary and all the other eventual representatives of EDU parties in IDU bodies."
- 6) The EDU work program for the year 1983/84 provides the following committees and expert groups:

Work Programme 1983/84

The Steering Committee decided to work in 1983/84 with the following committees and expert groups:

Committee no.1. "European Structures- European Policy"

chaired by Prime Minister Dr. Bernhard Vogel.

Mandate:

a. European Policy

The committee should make an analysis of the most important problems facing Europe on its way to unity and should formulate the major challenges to which Europe has to respond. It should also give the answers to these challenges in order to motivate a closer cooperation amongst the European Community, and an essential participation in the European elections, and in order to motivate also a closer cooperation with the governments outside the Community.

b. Democracy in Europe

The committee is also instructed to carefully follow developments and to become active in any case where it thinks that democracy is threatened in Europe and to report thereupon to the Steering Committee. Special attention was in this respect drawn to Turkey, Greece and eventually also Malta (cf. below).

c. Coordination of EDU Parties within the European Institutions

The committee should also try to establish a close cooperation of EDU parties within the parliamentary assembly within the Council of Europe and European parliament. In order to achieve this it should make special efforts, including meetings of the responsible group leaders.

Committee no.2. "Transnational Questions regarding the Protection of the Environment."

This committee will be chaired by the Austrian People's Party (Mr. Sixtus Lanner). The mandate of this committee was to make an analysis of the transnational environmental problems and in particular of the question of air pollution and water pollution (acid rain). It should also establish the facts behind these problems and make proposals for their solution in accordance with the basic principles of EDU.

Committee no.3. "Satellite Broadcast"

This committee will be chaired by Høyre (Norway). It should follow up the recommendations from the EDU New Media Committee (para.7. of the recommendations). The committee should discuss the problems mentioned therein and make further steps in order to foster international agreement.

Expert Group no.1. "Campaign Management"

The programme for the Campaign Management Group, including the seminar in the Political Academy in Vienna was unanimously agreed (cf. Doc. EDU/1983/883). The expert group will continue to be managed by Lars Tobisson, Moderata Samlingspartiet.

Air Transport Conference

The steering committee decided to call a conference, to be hosted by Høyre, Norway, on the question of air transport policy.

This conference should deal with the EDU parties' attitudes to the national airlines and competition from abroad, concession policy, the airlines and JATA price policy.

The conference will be hosted by Høyre, and will be organised in close cooperation between Moderata (Sweden), Høyre (Norway) (primarily responsible) and will be assisted by the EDU secretariat. This will be an EDU conference. It should be held in September in Norway since the question was urgent.

The committee discussed the proposal made by the committee on economy which suggested to organise, around an OECD ministerial conference, a conference of EDU finance ministers in order to prepare steps along the lines of the EDU economic principles. After a long discussion a consensus could not be reached, the chairman, however, said to the representative of Moderata that he will find a solution and that he will remain in touch with Moderata and he thought that he may find an answer to the wish of the above committee.

Expert Group on the European Left Expert Group on Central America

In view of the limited interest of member-parties with regard to the expert group on the European Left, the secretary proposed to discontinue this work. This was unanimously adopted.

In view of the fact that the question of Central America would henceforth be dealt with in the framework of IDU, the relevant expert group was dissolved. The committee on economy had anyway fulfilled its task and is therefore, according to established EDU principles, dissolved.

General remarks with regard to the work programme

There was a consensus that international problems should henceforth be discussed in the framework of IDU and that EDU should concentrate on European problems, and in particular not only on foreign policy, but also on issues of domestic policy which were similar in several European countries.

It was also agreed to limit EDU activities in view of the forthcoming activity of IDU to the essential. It was therefore decided to have one group less than last year. However, this number of activities should now be considered as the absolute minimum.

The Steering Committee was aware that in view of the enlargement of international activities it was difficult for all the parties to follow all the different international groups and cooperate effectively everywhere.

- 7) The Steering Committee proposed that the Party Leaders Conference takes note of the report of the Expert Group on Central America, chaired by the Former Minister Jean de Lipkowski, M.P., and to suggest to the IDU to include this subject on their workprogram.

EDU/1983/812 rev.
31.5.1983

COMMITTEE Nr. 1

EUROPEAN STRUCTURES - EUROPEAN POLICY

European - American Relations

Draft report submitted by the Committee nr. 1 under the
chairmanship of Prime Minister Dr. Bernhard Vogel, CDU, Germany

Collaborators of the committee (alphabetic):

- Allen Richard, RNC, USA
Bainbridge Timothy, EDG
Bischof Daniel, EDS
Björck Anders, Moderata Samlingspartiet, S
Blenk Wolfgang, ÖVP, A
Bokanowski Gérard, R.P.R., F
Bonnici Ugo, PN, Malta
Buttigieg-Scicluna Noel, PN, Malta
Camilleri John, PN, Malta
Collet Bernt Johan, Konservative Folkeparti, DK
Donnelly Brendan, EDG
Fenech-Adami Edward, PN, Malta
Gomis Pedro, UCD, E
Hamilton Scott, Conservative Party, GB
Hartmann Peter, CDU, D
Henrikson Ole Bernt, Konservative Folkeparti, DK
Huck Bernd, DEMYC
Huyn Hans, CSU, D
Knudsen Thor, Hoyre, N
*1 Kockberg Mats, Kansallinen Kokoomus, SF
König Fritz, ÖVP, A
Korisis H., Nea Demokratia, GR
*2 Kosciusko-Morizet, R.P.R., F
Lenz Marlene, EUW
Lied Harald, Hoyre, N
*2 Lipkowski Jean de, R.P.R., F
Nesse Knut Olav, EDS
Ninn-Hansen Erik, Konservative Folkeparti, DK
Ocker Matthias, EMSU
Quadros Fausto, CDS, P
Rühe Volker, CDU, D
Schnebel Ehrenfried, CDU, D
Steiner Ludwig, ÖVP, A
Tabone Vincent, PN, Malta
Vogel Bernhard, CDU, D
Zahorka Hans-Jürgen, DEMYC

*1 Kansallinen Kokoomus, Finland, does not adhere to the report due to the party's concept of neutrality and its support to the Finnish policy of staying outside the conflicts of the super powers. The party stresses the need of dialogue and cooperation between the East and the West.

*2 R.P.R., France, stresses that France is not a member of NATO and that there is no intention to change this position.

EUROPEAN - AMERICAN RELATIONS

PREAMBLE

The crucial question for our foreign and security policy is whether we will succeed in averting the danger of war without risking our freedom. The European Democrat Union is firmly convinced that this is only possible by actively pursuing, in alliance with the United States of America and Canada, a policy to safeguard peace.

Europe and the United States are the cornerstones of the western political and economic system, and the European-American alliance is a guarantor of peace. It is not least for this reason that the United States have constantly supported and encouraged European unification.

At a time when the political elites on both sides of the Atlantic are increasingly composed of a younger, postwar generation, when Europe - once economically weak and politically divided - is becoming a stronger and united partner for the United States; and when the political and economic forces in the United States itself are starting to shift, political responsibility requires intensive efforts to prevent a far-reaching crisis in transatlantic relations. All possible action must, therefore, be taken to avoid deliberate anti-Americanism, fostered by the Soviet Union, from undermining European-American partnership.

EDU-parties coming from neutral states are conscious of the fact that the security of their countries depends on the balance of power in Europe and in the world as a whole. This balance of power, of course, is not only a matter of military and technical factors, but has also its ideological and economic aspects. In this view European-American relations are an essential element of global stability, for which all states have their specific responsibility, be it as members of a military alliance like NATO, be it as neutrals which defend their independence.

Section 1: Common values and principles

It is important to underline that European-American relations are based on common values and convictions, a spirit of friendship, and not only on common interests. We share the belief that only democracy and the rule of law can guarantee such basic values as liberty of the individual and social justice. We agree on the need to defend human rights everywhere in the world. We recognize the right of all peoples to self-determination. For these basic principles stand all Western European countries, no matter whether they are member of the Atlantic Alliance or whether they are neutral.

There can be no genuine and lasting peace as long as these basic principles are violated or called into question by totalitarian political forces. In our view, peace means not only the renunciation of force, but also the recognition of the sovereignty of all states and their right to self-determination, unrestricted respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the rejection of all aggressive ideologies. Peace is thus a state in which freedom, democracy and the rule of law can be achieved, made secure and preserved. Recent European history has taught us that peace in this sense can be secured only through the close alliance of Europe and America.

Europe and America such constitute a community of peace and freedom which is simultaneously a sign of hope for all those in this world who are still deprived of freedom. Socialist dictatorship is incompatible with the values of free democracy. It is vital that this basic fact, which is the real cause of the East-West conflict, be more firmly implanted in the consciousness of our peoples. If, on the other hand, Europeans and Americans would appreciate more the common values and principles they share, the substance of the transatlantic partnership would be less affected by varying interests and differences of opinion.

Section 2: Intensification of Transatlantic Relations

Transatlantic relations will always contain elements of both competition and partnership. The political, economic and security interests of both sides are not identical in every respect, but they are in fact identical with regard to the fundamental questions concerning Western security. Diverging viewpoints on specific policy matters are natural and mutually reconcilable in an alliance of sovereign democratic states. That we are united in many more matters than those which divide us is of immediate and lasting significance. We can deal with any problems as long as we remember that we stand for the same basic values and share the same basic goals.

The European-American community is an association of equal partners. Europe cannot be limited - nor must it permit itself to be limited - to a merely regional role, especially since given the international situation neither America nor Europe alone can meet the challenges of the 1980s. European interests require a European-American partnership on equal terms, a relationship that is balanced. This in turn calls for a readiness by the Europeans to accept burden-sharing, not least in defence matters. To strengthen European-American relations, we must also make convincing progress in European unification.

The future of the transatlantic partnership will be determined largely by whether the Western Europeans are prepared to match their call for mutual consultation while simultaneously assuming a growing share of responsibility. In this respect, greater efforts towards European integration and the further development of European political cooperation will be of the utmost importance in order to secure an Atlantic partnership on equal terms. The member countries of the European Community must therefore overcome their instinctive nationalism and organize their cooperation on a more permanent basis, especially in the fields of foreign and security policy, so that they can speak with a single voice on these matters. Only as a political union, Europe will finally be able to meet the challenges of the future and perform the tasks of partnership with the United States.

Section 3: Challenges posed by the Soviet Union

As long as the Soviet Union continues to apply force or to use its military potential to back up its political objectives, this threat to peace, remains the greatest challenge for the transatlantic partnership. It is regrettable that many of our fellow citizens - particularly among the younger generation - seem to underestimate this threat. At the same time the many violations of human rights committed by communists throughout the world are often not seen for what they are. This may be a consequence of a wrong concept of detente.

As a matter of fact, while proclaiming detente, the Soviet Union has successfully promoted its hegemony over Eastern Europe further still and has expanded its

sphere of influence in the world as a whole. It clearly regards "peaceful co-existence" as merely a process to avoid military conflict while pursuing its overall objectives for socialism and, ultimately, Soviet-style communism. For the democracies of the West there can be no intellectual compromise with the Soviet Union's claim for dominance and hegemony. In the battle of ideas with the Soviet Union, the West must go on the offensive both morally and intellectually.

Together with the democracies of North America, the parties of the European Democrat Union resolutely oppose the further spread of oppression. As long as the Soviet Union continues to suppress others, the Soviet people cannot liberate themselves. Today, the Soviet Union suppresses the Polish people, and in particular, the Polish workers in their search for self-determination. The inability to tolerate reform within its sphere of hegemony is a major feature of repressive Soviet socialism.

We shall therefore strive, through peaceful competition, to bring human rights and freedom to bear throughout the world and to meet the decisive challenges in the future development of East-West relations that are:

- to protect our free and democratic order against military or political pressure;
- to defend jointly the common political, security and economic interests of the West;
- to induce the Soviet Union to abandon its policy of the use or threat of military force to attain political objectives in peacetime;
- to end the arms race by eliminating the political causes of arms production; and conclude reliable, balanced and verifiable agreements on disarmament; and
- to counter any attempts to transfer the East-West conflict to developing and less developed countries.

Section 4: Joint Security Policy and Disarmament

The Soviet Union's expansionary aims, backed by military power, must be countered by Western Europe and North America through the provision of adequate military forces. Europe must not be allowed to drift out of fear of Soviet military superiority into an attitude of preventive benevolence and compliance vis-à-vis the Soviet Union. It is therefore imperative to strengthen the partnership with the United States and transatlantic cooperation. The assumption that Europe could, through unilateral concessions in the field of disarmament and gradual moves towards neutrality, opt out of the East-West conflict is not only politically naive but also suicidal.

Europeans must assume a greater share of responsibility and jointly exercise their right to have a say in matters concerning security policy. Security policy must be incorporated into the framework of European political cooperation. In the long run, Europe cannot and must not confine itself to a secondary role in the Atlantic Alliance. In the further process of European political integration, our aim must be to develop further Europe's own contribution in the field of defence, so that NATO can properly stand on two pillars. Those European countries which for historical or other reasons have chosen a status of neutrality contribute to the security of all by defending their territories and such preventing them from becoming a vacuum.

For the European Democrat Union, the security partnership with our Atlantic allies and the indivisibility of European-American security does not preclude us from stabilising our relations with the Soviet Union and the other countries of the Warsaw Pact. On this basis we shall strive, in a committed and responsible manner, for a just and lasting peaceful order in Europe based on appropriate guarantees which, at the same time, could end the division of Europe and of Germany. The European Democrat Union, as well as its American partners, holds the view that such a just and lasting peaceful order can only be attained and preserved by peaceful means, renouncing the use of force - principles that are also laid down in the CSCE Final Act. For us, the right of self-determination and the renunciation of the use of force are the political elements of security policy that embrace both capacity for defence and a readiness for genuine detente.

In our technical and nuclear age, political reason and ethics call for disarmament and arms control. They are not, however, ends in themselves but must at all times be related to the long-term goals of enhancing East-West security and stability. The arms control process should serve to strengthen political and security relations in the Atlantic Alliance. The elements of this process must be closely coordinated in NATO and be supported by all allies. Individual arms control projects must be seen in their overall context, in other words, in the perspective of ensuring undiminished military and political security.

During the last ten years, the Warsaw Pact has dramatically increased its military potential. As a result of the constant arms build-up, especially by the Soviet Union, the military balance of power has shifted further to the advantage of the Warsaw Pact. This applies not only to the growing superiority in conventional weapons but, to an even greater extent, to intermediate-range nuclear missiles.

It is now up to the Soviet Union and its satellites, in accordance with their repeated assurances, to demonstrate their willingness to enter into serious dialogue on disarmament by responding positively to the comprehensive disarmament proposals submitted by the West.

Section 5:

Contributing to Peace and Stability in Developing and less Developed Countries

Together with its American friends the European Democrat Union strongly supports the non-alignment of countries in the Third world, which render a major contribution to preserving national independence and the right to self-determination, and thus to safeguarding peace. Every effort must be made to counter any attempt to subvert the objectives of the non-aligned movement and exploit it for the purpose of Soviet expansionism.

The Soviet Union's expansionism into the Third world necessitates a comprehensive and united strategy by the democracies of Western Europe and North America, enabling threatened countries to protect themselves against attacks, as well as against subversion and external support for rebels, thereby helping them to preserve their non-aligned status.

In the longer term, the industrialised nations and the developing countries must both commit themselves to gradually set free, within the framework of a comprehensive arms control programme, the resources hitherto spent on armaments so that they can be used for promoting economic and social stability throughout the world. Hunger, misery and social injustice - as the important

causes of crises in the southern hemisphere - can be eventually only effectively overcome if human, technological and financial resources are steadily transferred from arms production to economic cooperation. This requires partnership between industrialised and developing nations, as well as cooperation between developing countries themselves.

The obligation to contribute, in accordance with economic capacity, to securing more human conditions world-wide and thus to divert resources from the field of arms supplies to non-military development aid must also be met by the Soviet Union and the Eastern European statetrading countries. They must be urged to provide a much larger share of development aid to the countries of the third and fourth worlds and, at the same time, to afford them proper access to their markets instead of largely confining themselves to military assistance, as they have hitherto done. The Soviet Union and its allies must also respect the independence and non-aligned status of developing countries.

Section 6: Economic Policy

There is a close inter-relationship between the political challenges of the 1980s and the economic problems common to all countries of the transatlantic partnership, namely how to fight unemployment, combat protectionism, secure monetary stability, balance imports and exports and generally ensure a return to economic growth. The economic and social stability of our countries is an essential prerequisite to our security.

It is therefore vital to intensify cooperation in economic and monetary matters between Europe and America. In the first instance this requires more convergent economic and financial policies as well as the readiness to accept joint responsibility for achieving greater stability in the international monetary system.

As a result of radical structural changes in the world economic system, the United States and Europe will face further problems of adjustment in the years ahead. Economic recovery and the restoration of growth in Europe and North America will depend to a large extent on European-American cooperation in which other industrial nations, in particular Japan, should also be included. In this way, advantage should also be taken of the great opportunities afforded by joint scientific and technological development.

European and American exports together account for over half the total world trade. We are each other's largest markets. The substantial trade between North America and the European Community must continue unhampered and expand as far as possible. Despite the growing economic difficulties on either side of the Atlantic, our joint goals and interests do not permit a return to protectionism. Any trade war, for instance in the steel or food sectors, will ultimately hurt us all. Both sides must also oppose any future protectionist pressure because all protectionism, be it in principle in the form of open or concealed trade restrictions or subsidies in support of ailing industries, not only undermines the dynamic development of the economies involved but also eventually increases inflation and unemployment.

In both Europe and the United States, energy supplies remain a potential obstacle to renewed economic growth. Consequently both sides must, therefore, expedite the development and use of all sources of energy, both conventional and new, continue energy saving measures, encourage the replacement of oil by other resources and seek improved cooperation with energy-exporting countries.

Particular attention should be paid to future cooperation in the field of nuclear energy. Reliable supplies of fissile material are of paramount importance for European countries. Differences of opinion on vital questions as the peaceful use of nuclear energy and the policy of non-proliferation are in the long run unacceptable for both sides. This is all the more true since a mutually recognized settlement of the outstanding questions between the European Community and the United States is the prerequisite for an effective international non-proliferation policy for the western world.

The field of economic relations with the Soviet Union and the other state-trading countries has in the past been the subject of unnecessary controversies, e.g. on the question of the gas-pipe-line. In the meantime the Atlantic Alliance has made considerable efforts to elaborate a more comprehensive strategy in this field. In principle, our aim should be geared to economic cooperation - also in order to improve the lot of the people in those countries and to secure for them more rights and liberties. But, if necessary, it should also permit the withholding of goods, credits and technology from the Soviet Union, if these can be used against vital western interests, and the Soviet Union is not willing to exercise political and military restraint. This calls for a common policy on the part of the transatlantic partners. They should, therefore, establish a permanent body for mutual information, consultations and joint action to verify economic relations with the East.

Section 7: Cultural Relations and Youth Exchange

People on both sides of the Atlantic must be made more aware of the common cultural background and identical fundamental values which are the basis of political cooperation between Europe and the United States. It is of paramount importance for the future of the Alliance and of the western world that the young generation on both sides of the Atlantic learns to appreciate this dimension of our relations. EDU parties, therefore, call for an intensification of cultural and youth exchange programs. This intensification of cultural relations can also promote the concept of a "European identity" in the United States. This identity, firmly rooted in the minds of young people in Europe, will help to strengthen the European pillar of the Atlantic Alliance and give young people greater hope for the future.

EDU/1983/851 rev.
31.5.1983

COMMITTEE NR. 2

ECONOMY

PRINCIPLES OF ECONOMIC POLICY

Report submitted by Committee Nr.2,
chaired by Prof. Burenstam-Linder, M.P., Moderata Samlingspartiet, Sweden

Members of the committee no.2 (in alphabetic order)

BISCHOF Daniel, EDS
BJÖRHN Arne, Moderata Samlingspartiet, S
BÖCKSTRÖM Urban, Moderata Samlingspartiet, S
BURENSTAM LINDER Staffan, Moderata Samlingspartiet, S
BUTTIGIEG-SCICLUNA Noel, PN, Malta
GAMELGAARD Lars, Konservative Folkeparti, DK
GOODLAD Alistair, Conservative Party, GB
GREBINE T., RPR, F
HOWADT Walter, ÖVP, A
HÖKMARK Gunnar, DEMYC
MAURITZEN Sverrer, Hoyre, N
MERAUD Daniel, RPR, F
MOOREHOUSE James, EDG
OCKER Matthias, EMSU
OLSEN Henning, DEMYC
PEREIRA Marques, CDS, P
PUOLANNE Ulla, Kansallinen Kokoomus, SF
SCHAUMAYER Maria, EUW
SCHMIDHUBER Peter, CSU, D
SYSE Jan, Hoyre, N
WARTENBERG Ludolf Georg, CDU, D
ZUMSCHLINGE Konrad, CSU, D

PRINCIPLES OF ECONOMIC POLICY

I. The background

1. Prosperity, consensus and freedom have been the rule in socially-orientated market economies. They depend for their existence on private and widely distributed ownership, freedom of enterprise and competition, efficient labour and capital markets, international economic cooperation - in keeping with the principles of free trade, government promotion of equality of opportunity, justice - and help for those in need; and a social framework which does not concentrate power in the hands of any group.
2. Growth in the established industrial countries reflects this experience. The same lessons can be learned from the developing countries too, where progress varies greatly, depending on the development strategy adopted by the individual country. The most successful countries, i.e. the East Asian "newly industrialized countries" (NICs) have market-based economies.
3. By way of contrast it is clear how badly the socialist countries in Eastern Europe and the Third World have failed. Wherever socialism has been systematically applied, it has led to tragic situations which can never be concealed even by all the rhetoric expounded by its advocates; and such economic successes as they have achieved have been enormously costly in terms of misallocated resources and suppressed freedoms.
4. During the 1970s and the early 1980s, however, the OECD countries have experienced economic disruptions, unemployment, inflation, the growth of public sector deficits and international payment imbalances. Many traditional economic policy instruments have been over-exploited or become ineffective. This has created considerable uncertainty and political problems which have not been confined to the sphere of economics.
5. These difficulties are due only partly to the strains imposed by the sudden rise in oil prices, as is indicated by the fact that some OECD countries without domestic energy resources have been far more successful than others in coping with these shocks, and have adapted their economies accordingly.
6. Under the pressure of our economic problems, the course of economic policy and of economic thinking has changed in many countries. Renewed recognition has been given to economic principles lost through decades of increasing interventionism; namely:
 - (a) markets must be viable and must not be destroyed by over regulation;
 - (b) where there are market failures, government regulations to correct them often lead in turn to unforeseen distortions, with more damaging political failures substituted for market failures;
 - (c) economic policy cannot aspire to take charge of everything and to control everything by "fine tuning" but should rather provide a general framework;
 - (d) expansionist policies, pursued over long periods, become increasingly inflationary and are no longer capable, even in the short term, of favourable influencing employment and the rate of investment;

(e) public spending has to be held in line with what the productive sector of the economy can afford to support;

(f) the supply side must be stimulated - through increased profitability, incentives, deregulation and a social recognition of entrepreneurship - to create a momentum needed for growth and for manoeuvrability in demand management.

7. These ideas, now given a widening support in the economic debate, are in line with the basic approach of the EDU parties.
8. Translated into political action, these ideas have sometimes been accompanied by unrealistic expectations concerning the speed with which results can be attained. To change economic and social processes and attitudes takes time. Business and union leaders have, for instance, become accustomed to the idea that accommodating economic policies - monetary expansion, devaluations, subsidies and nowadays also protectionist measures - will eliminate for them the consequences of inflationary agreements on the labour market. When government recognises its long-term inability to assume these responsibilities, and changes its policies accordingly, it nonetheless takes time for others to respond in their practical behaviour to more realistic but demanding signals.
9. Socialist economic ideas of ever-increasing taxes, public spending and government regulation are obsolete and should be a thing of the past. They are conducive to deeper economic imbalances and to a reduction in individual liberty. The prevailing crisis is most of all one of socialism and government interventionism.
10. The EDU parties can and must therefore frame their economic policy in great self-confidence, and present it to the electorate with firm conviction. The prevailing crisis is, surely, not one of capitalism.

II. A socially-orientated market economy for liberty and efficiency

1. A market economy implies decentralized decision-making by households and firms. Decentralization improves individual freedom and economic performance.
2. Decentralization is promoted by market mechanisms, as free market transactions are made freely and are to mutual benefit. Critics refer to market forces as "anonymous". But this anonymity is an advantage, because it reflects the fact that the forces influencing the economy are numerous. Were market mechanisms to consist of a few politicians and bureaucrats, the economy would work badly. Liberty too would then be restricted. Decentralized decision-making means many people deciding. Pluralism in an open society is a guarantee for liberty and individual influence. Democracy and the market economy are close relatives. In market systems, as in democracies, the individual has a freedom of choice. Indeed, in the economic sphere, the market system implies an even more decentralized decision making process than does democracy in political life, where much of the decision-making must be unavoidably left to representatives. Thus democratic freedom is not improved by more and more things being determined politically. Economic liberty means more decisions being made by the individual and fewer by officials.

Exploitation is not a characteristic of free markets but of socialist systems, where extensive government power easily leads to an abuse of individuals. In a socially-orientated market economy government intervenes not to widen its own powers but to stimulate markets, encourage competition, safeguard the public interest and fulfil proper social objectives.

3. Decentralized decision-making on free markets means effective avenues for influence and participation. In collectivist organizations and government monopolies, ordinary individuals can exert influence only through a laborious and frustrating process of trying to make their voices heard in bureaucracies, and through such political machinery as is open to them. The more pervasive government operations and collectivist arrangements are, the greater are the risks of a growth of a feeling of resignation and frustration among individuals. The tendency to drag more and more into the government sphere, thereby abusing democracy, must be resisted.
4. In free markets, the price mechanism provides and propagates an enormous wealth of information about personal preferences and production opportunities. This information is required for efficiency in the economic system. Politicians and planners can never possess the same information as the market. Centralized decision-making thus frequently implies waste and negligence, whereas competitors in free markets have to try hard to be of service. Government policies must not be allowed to distort supply and demand relationships, so that the price system cannot play its important role of processing relevant economic information. Where services are provided by government, at a low or zero price, there is a certain recipe for regulation and excessive taxation.
5. Over the years, in some countries, government itself has become a threat to competition, innovation, enterprise and new investment through excessive regulations. It has also increasingly monopolized production by expanding the public sector and nationalization. Private monopolies have their faults; but at least they are constantly exposed to the risk of losing their position to innovators and producers of substitutes, as well as generally being subject to a degree of public regulation. Government monopolies can, through coercion and subsidization be given a position which removes the need to be efficient and to provide a service. This position of privilege of government monopolies also lends itself more easily to abuse by organized labour.
6. Stabilization policies can also be hurt by far-reaching political interference in markets and in the price system. The economy works less efficiently and displays growing inertia. As a consequence monetary and fiscal policy measures become less effective. In the end macro-economic policies to influence the economy must work their way through a multitude of markets. If signals are blocked, adjustment will not occur.
7. Through decentralization within a market economy the "agenda problem" can be relieved, and government can concentrate on those important matters which, indeed, can be handled only through the political process. The administration would become more efficient. There would be fewer inconsistencies, contradictions and unforeseen repercussions which have come to mar some government operations in a complex system, which has been made unnecessarily complicated through excessive intervention. Rights of the individual and the transparency of existing legislation would in this way be improved.

III. An open economy for development, prosperity and peace

1. The prosperity of the industrialised countries has been won through free trade, enabling these countries to enjoy a wider division of labour, economies of scale and healthy competition. But free trade - like charity - begins at home. Only well functioning market economies coexist harmoniously on the international market.
2. International trade gives wider opportunities but requires greater capacity for adjustment. A new competitor is a new customer - provided that the vitality to exploit new possibilities exists.
3. Domestic policy in many countries has increasingly been geared to protect firms and individuals from change. There has been a centralisation and politicisation of the responsibility for adjustment, all the more so when production is concentrated in large state-owned firms. But this new dimension of the welfare state has not been well executed. The established industrialised countries have, in the process, lost much of the capacity to adapt. Yet, it is impossible to shield from change without allowing stagnation. To use the fruits of growth to buy protection from adjustment is to threaten existing standards of living. People with an eye for nothing but security will soon find ruin staring them in the face.
4. For these reasons it is not possible to opt out of the process of international competition, just because of the hardships of competition or of coolness to foreigners. A country trying to avoid adjustment will be forced to go through the painful process of adjusting to dramatically lower standards of living.
5. Unemployment and balance of payments crises are fertile ground from which protectionism can spring, but the costs of protectionism make the disequilibria even harder to correct. Current economic difficulties should not be permitted to ruin the world trade system. Protectionism means higher prices for consumers and frequently higher costs of production. Trade obstacles on semi-manufactures reduces competitiveness for those industries which use the inputs. Markets abroad cannot be preserved through protectionism. Protectionist measures in one country will trigger counter-measures in other countries. In the end all will suffer.
6. Growing protectionism has increasingly taken the form of subsidies in the name of industrial policy or other non tariff trade barriers. The disadvantages of such policies are less known and less recognized than those of standard trade obstacles. This presents special dangers. Industrial policy contains such a multiplicity of interventions that the effects are even more difficult to assess. Yet, in the end, resources have too often been taken from the future to preserve the past.
7. Nor can competitive devaluations contribute to economic stability. They harm the world economy as well as the countries which engage in such policies.
8. As long as low prices reflect competitive power and superior efficiency, and not just political decisions, it is possible to build on the principles of free trade. These principles can gain respect because they provide straight forward rules of the game and their application leads to greater prosperity. The chaotic state of trade within the Eastern bloc provides a cautionary example of the results of political pricing and disfigurings of markets. Market

economies can coexist harmoniously because they are not exposed to excessive political interference. How these advantages can be lost through far-reaching government intervention can be seen in the difficulties presently besetting international trade in textiles, steel and agriculture.

9. Open markets in the industrial countries serve the interests of these countries but contribute also to the development of the 'South'. Growing and accessible markets are more important for the developing countries, and give more lasting effects than outright aid, important as generous resource transfers may be. The successfully developing countries of the South rely on a development strategy which in the past has proved effective in our countries. This is being noted in a growing number of countries in the South, having long and unsuccessfully experimented with socialism. Although the newly industrializing countries in certain sectors have become formidable competitors, it must be recognized that most OECD countries have export surpluses to these countries. Protectionist measures against them would backfire against us. And even more important: they would block development policies built on the principles of the market economy, with which we must have sympathy and the success of which is important for us. The alternative is to reduce the 'South' to the gloom of socialism. However, we must ensure that in order to secure the continued support of our electorates for open trade, countries which have reached an advanced state of development in some sectors, gradually assume the same obligations in trade policy as ourselves.
10. Economic cooperation within international organizations - IMF, the World Bank, GATT and OECD being the most prominent ones - is needed to facilitate a free flow of goods and services, capital and entrepreneurship and to promote economic stability. European integration gives additional strength to the economic system. Coordination of policies, adherence to rules and mutual cooperation in these bodies is even more important in periods of great strains and financial turbulence. The alternative to law and mutual understanding is the language of power and the bitterness of conflict.
11. To work for peace is to work to eliminate sources of conflict. This is a more demanding and laborious task than mass demonstrations and the formulation of slogans. It requires an understanding of the long-term implications, and not just of the short-term effects. It means taking the interest of other nations into account. It rules out expediency. It necessitates economic policies which harmonize with those of other countries. It is an important task. Disagreements tend to multiply. Trade wars are not just trade wars.

IV. Full employment under responsibility

1. Full employment must be established. For demand expansion not to become a threat, however, supply factors must respond better. Markets must function. Structural adjustment must be accepted and facilitated. Adequate incentives are needed to encourage effort. Tax policies must be devised accordingly. Relative and real wage structures should be more flexible. Investment must be promoted through profitability levels sufficient to reward risk taking. There should be deregulation and stable rules of the game. Fiscal stability is important to keep rates of interest low and avoid "crowding-out" effects. Demand should expand, but not artificially through everincreasing government expenditure and widening budget deficits. Demand expansion should be based on improvements in efficiency and productivity.

2. Government has an important role in creating conditions for full employment. But in a free society, governments do not decide everything. For that reason, governments cannot and should not take responsibility for everything.
3. Freedom for social partners in the labour market is one important characteristic of a free society. This freedom must be exercised with a great sense of responsibility, as agreements in this market have crucial importance for the functioning of the economy. Labour market partners must be held accountable for their decisions. The negative effects of bad agreements which raise costs excessively cannot be removed through government policies. Cost increases will lead to inflation, unemployment, balance of payments deficits and to a decline in investment.
4. Policies such as devaluations, monetary expansion, government subsidies, and government take-over of ailing industries, may relieve any one of these imbalances; but the effects are only temporary and stimulate other distorting symptoms. All carry a price, and yet are all too often seen as an easy way out. They also suggest that government rather than the social partners are responsible for these economic dislocations. In this way unrealistic behaviour on the labour market may be encouraged in the future.
5. Another aspect of exaggerated government aspirations is the effort to fine-tune counter-cyclical policies. However, in response to pressures in the political process, instead of fine-tuning, government in some countries has itself become a cause of long-term economic disequilibria. In particular, worsening public sector deficits are a threat to stability. In the name of Keynesianism, there has been considerable abuse of fiscal policy doctrines. Deficit spending has been an instrument, in general practice, for political convenience rather than for economic stability in special cases.
6. With fiscal and monetary policies geared to strict principles, inflationary pressures can be reduced. Wage contracts will stay better in line with productivity gains. To cut back inflation, it is necessary in many countries also to reduce marginal income tax rates and taxes on industry and commerce. Much inflation has come from tax-push. Lower interest rates as a result of fiscal balance will reduce costs. Competition must be encouraged through deregulation. Growth will make it possible to absorb cost increases without price rises, permitting increases in real wages.
7. Among socialists who do not wish to recognize the importance of well-functioning markets and macro-economic responsibility, it has been fashionable to seek the causes of unemployment in the automation of production processes. But, viewed in the medium term, jobs are saved rather than destroyed through automation, in the same way that jobs have been saved by mechanization through decades of growth and full employment. This mechanization has been the source of growth, innovation and increased welfare. It has permitted higher incomes which have been translated into new demand and thus into the creation of new jobs, particularly, in recent years in the service sector. Mechanization does indeed cause strains and unemployment in the short-term, as adaptation for many cannot be immediate and painless. These very real problems must cause concern. In order for them not to lead to reactions which in the end prove inimical to long-term employment goals, programmes must be established to meet these challenges. Positive adjustment policies can facilitate change. Retraining and other manpower policies are

important, but must not lead to rigidity and inertia. Adaptation is imperative. To choose not to adapt and innovate is to choose a decline in international competitiveness, and unemployment will inevitably be the result.

8. There is no given stock of jobs to be shared one way or another by the labour force. Long-term employment opportunities depend on competitiveness, the profitability of investment, and economic stability. Although job-sharing cannot of itself bring about full employment, freedom of choice should be expanded through the adoption of labour practices and social policies which do not discriminate against part-time work and early retirement.
9. The employment of young people and women will expand through an improvement in the general employment situation. Newcomers on the labour market are hurt most when there is a general decline in economic activity, and vice-versa. The employment opportunities available for young people should be expanded through 'on the job' training and apprenticeship. They might also benefit from a relaxation of various labour market rules on minimum wages and employment protection. Some of those rules fail to recognize that inexperienced manpower does not have the same productivity, and that the hiring of people with unproven capacity is more risky. Such rules, introduced with the best of intentions, often have cruel effects.
10. Research and development stimulate growth and employment. But quality in education and good working habits in schools are also important, at an individual level, to equip young people to survive and succeed on the labour market. Advanced technology has, to some extent, relieved us from the pressures of hard physical work, but not from the necessity of hard intellectual work.
11. For vitality and growth small business and entrepreneurial enterprise are of strategic importance. So often big business makes the news and small firms the innovations. Big business can handle the regulations, apply for the subsidies and visit the ministries; entrepreneurs and innovators cannot. Small business, and within them the economy as a whole, will flourish in an environment permitting and encouraging individual effort. There is no difference as great as the difference between a human-being who tries and one who does not.

V. A welfare society - better than a welfare state

1. In many countries there are dangerously high budget deficits. These are the result of rapidly rising public expenditure combined with stagnating public income in spite of, or as a result of, rapidly rising tax rates. It is necessary to reduce public expenditure to establish a better balance and to make room for lower tax rates to stimulate the economy.

In some countries, expenditure on welfare state programmes has increased dramatically. It has become such a large share of total public outlay that savings must be also made in some of these programmes before they become a threat to welfare itself.

2. We need economic balance, because the disadvantaged will suffer most if resources dwindle. Beset on all sides by regulations and queries, people without well-connected friends and without strings to pull, will be less well-placed to fend for themselves than they are in a free market.

3. Nonetheless, the restoration of public finances and of markets may appear to come into conflict with social considerations. The political obstacles to an economic policy for balance and growth would then be formidable. To enable EDU parties to pursue their economic policy goals vigorously, it is necessary to devise a social policy superior to that of the socialists. Instead it should be well understood, and widely known, that it is socialist policies that in the end hurt the weak. If government tries to help everywhere, government will be unable to give sufficient help where help is most needed.
4. We must distinguish between a welfare state and a welfare society. The welfare society stimulates the development of many complementary safety nets. Public measures only provide one source of support. The welfare society represents a pluralistic approach to welfare. Within a welfare society, it is possible to achieve an improvement in both social security and the performance of the economy. There is no conflict between these two goals.
5. Excesses of the welfare state, on the other hand, may become a threat, not only to the economy but to social security itself. The socialist welfare state sees the public sector as the chief organiser and dominant source of welfare. Other safety nets are neglected and may even be dismantled. Heavy taxation and subsidisation disrupt the functioning of economy and reduce opportunities for individuals to manage without public help. Bureaucratic systems do not reach into these corners where distress is greatest .
6. Among the supplementary safety nets of the welfare society, the family and mutual support among family members is the most important. No taxation revenue can buy the human compassion given freely within reasonably well functioning families. Modern life imposes many strains on the family. Public policy must aim to reduce these strains, not to replace the functions of the family.
7. Personal savings give a safety net in times of emergency. Household savings and private insurance should be encouraged to make individuals more independent. Taxes should be reduced to promote saving opportunities as well as the means of meeting unforeseen expenditure out of current income. There is a vicious circle of high taxes, low household savings, growing social expenditure and dependence among individuals on the authorities. The welfare society can break that circle. It does not need the increasing number of comprehensive and enormously expensive general subsidy systems, which are often inefficient and sometimes abused.
8. Other safety nets of the welfare society include: voluntary work, philanthropy and charity; norms and moral rules, often religiously inspired, of respect for other human beings; stable enterprises which can maintain employment even in difficult times; and trade unions which recognize the importance of their policies for sustaining employment, and use their power wisely as a means of contributing to the welfare of their members.
9. The growth of the welfare state at the expense of the welfare society serves to explain why, in so many countries, economic growth and heavy increases in social expenditure have been accompanied by a deterioration in the social situation, as measured by various societal indicators. Socialist theory, forcibly implemented in public finance, constitutes an unsustainable system, when it erodes the individual's responsibility for himself and others. Solidarity or

human compassion must arise between individuals, on a voluntary basis, as it does naturally within the family. Otherwise it degenerates into an empty slogan, harmful to human relationship.

10. The better the alternative nets of the welfare society function, the easier it will be for the public sector, even at much lower tax rates, to execute its important tasks in welfare policy, and to concentrate ample resources on helping those in genuine distress. The social policy of the EDU parties is far superior to that of the socialist parties, and is compatible with an economic policy attuned to economic and political realities.

VI. Concluding remarks

In the fields of welfare, taxation, enterprise, education and indeed in society in general, the EDU parties want to shape systems whereby the efforts of ordinary individuals - their preferences, aspirations, skills, creativity and thirst for freedom - provide the motive forces for a better society.

Liberty and prosperity - through economic stability, full employment and growth - cannot be established through more regulations and restrictions. They will be generated by the release of individual vigour and vitality in an open society.

EDU/1983/904
15.Juni 1983

Expert Group no. 2

CENTRAL AMERICA

Recommendations for the Policy to be pursued with
regard to the problem of Central America

submitted by Jean de Lipkowski, R.P.R.,
chairman of the expert group

Members of the expert group no. 2 (in alphabetic order):

Blenk Wolfgang, ÖVP, A
da Costa Macedo Maria, EUW, CDS, P
Cruz Ivo, CDS, P
Demblin Alexander, DEMYC
Douro Charles, EDG, CP, GB
Foss Per Kristian, Høyre
Hennig Ottfried, CDU, D
Klein Hans, CSU, D
Lipkowski Jean de, RPR, F
Lennmarker Göran, Moderata Samlingspartiet, S
Salolainen Pertti, Kansallinen Kokoomus, SF
Schmidt Dieter, CSU, D

RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE GROUP OF EXPERTS
OF THE E.D.U.
FOR THE POLICY TO BE PURSUED WITH REGARD
TO THE PROBLEM OF CENTRAL AMERICA

INTRODUCTION:

In many countries of CENTRAL AMERICA, the economic and social structures have always been utterly unsound.

A privileged minority much too often refuses to promote the reforms which are indispensable in order to put an end to intolerable social injustice. An agricultural and urban proletariat is thus being kept in a state of poverty and inadmissible underdevelopment.

Under these circumstances the peasants have kept calling for a land reform. This demand has provoked innumerable rebellions, often smothered in blood and marking the history of this region.

For a long time, Communist and/or Soviet influence played no role whatsoever in these turmoils caused by structures so inegalitarian that the underprivileged masses have had no other choice but to resort to violence.

The EDU member parties are perfectly aware of these historical facts.

They are alarmed as they notice the serious deterioration of the situation, throughout the zone, under the harmful influence of the world crisis. Economic and social disparities have taken another turn for the worse. The living conditions of the masses are affected by this in a cruel way.

Such a situation has necessarily engendered armed conflicts which, in some cases, have assumed such a scale that the civil wars are escalating into conflicts pitting countries of the region against each other.

Moreover, the support given from abroad to all these revolutionary activities constitutes a new and redoubtable element. These local crises have assumed an international dimension of the first magnitude, having been aggravated by the assistance extended by CUBA as well as by the USSR and other Warsaw Pact countries.

These countries think that the existent conditions can be exploited for trying to accomplish a systematic destabilization of the region.

This operation is designed to make the countries concerned fall under Eastern control, one after the other.

The ultimate aim of this scheme is to menace MEXICO bordering on the UNITED STATES. This means that there is the danger of the guerrilla movements spreading throughout the region.

CENTRAL AMERICA, the same way as the CARIBBEAN, is thus of vital importance to both NORTH and SOUTH AMERICA.

Half of the foreign trade of the UNITED STATES passes through the PANAMA CANAL and the Gulf of Mexico. It is a fact that the maritime route, which most quickly links the American East Coast with the West Coast, goes through this canal.

Also the WINDWARD PASSAGE between CUBA and the Republic of HAITI is a major strategic route. It, too, is thus of vital importance to the UNITED STATES. Half of America's seaborne commerce, two thirds of the energy imported into the UNITED STATES and more than half of the strategic minerals required by its industries pass through that channel.

The Europeans are above all interested in free maritime transit through this zone. Also a substantial part of NATO's seaborne supplies takes this route.

It also needs stressing that the establishment of a Soviet air and naval base on the island of GRENADA, only one flying hour away from Florida, has necessarily disquietened the UNITED STATES.

In view of these strategic conditions, it is no exaggeration to say that the defence of the whole free world is affected by the development in this region.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The EDU solemnly emphasizes its advocacy of a peaceful settlement of conflicts. Advantage ought to be taken of peace for encouraging, whenever an opportunity presents itself, the democratic process accompanied by fundamental social reforms.

In this spirit, Europe ought to come forward with a programme for substantial economic aid, combined with thorough modification of the structures in existence and, in the first place, championing the land reform. The aid from Europe could also include educational programmes by means of courses and seminars. The Konrad Adenauer Institute already plays an exemplary role in this respect.

The EDU is also convinced that it should give political and material aid to the democratic trade unions, co-operative associations and to those of the media which champion the freedom of information.

This European assistance programme ought to be co-ordinated, in a general way, with the U.S. Caribbean Basin Plan.

It is certainly difficult to work out programmes for economic aid as long as the armed conflicts endure. Nevertheless, the EDU member parties regard it as an imperative duty to provide support to the populations who are the victims of this violence. They also think that a programme for economic assistance can contribute to consolidating democracy, as it did in the case of COSTA RICA.

In the same spirit and aware of the opportunity for a democratic evolution on the occasion of the forthcoming presidential elections in EL SALVADOR, the EDU regards it as necessary to provide economic aid to that country. EL SALVADOR'S transformation into a truly democratic country must continue. The EDU member parties are of the opinion that the elections for a Constituent Assembly, held in March 1982, already signalled the first step in this direction.

In EL SALVADOR, the same way as elsewhere, the EDU will thus give its support to all efforts designed to lead to democratic elections which alone can permit the implementation of a policy of social progress, made in freedom.

This is the only alternative to a confrontation between rightist and leftist extremists. It is for this reason that the EDU welcomes the presidential election scheduled in EL SALVADOR this year. Mr. Napoleon Duarte, the candidate of the Christian Democratic Party, represents a political group which deserves full support by the EDU, bearing in mind the ideals of social justice and freedom by which it is guided.

The EDU member parties with very serious concern have been watching the evolution of the regime in NICARAGUA toward a Marxist system. In this situation, economic aid für Nicaragua must be made dependent on progress in restoring the democratic process. In particular, the EDU will have to make it quite clear to the authorities of NICARAGUA that it attaches much importance to free elections and to the establishment of a system assuring political pluralism.

NICARAGUA'S drifting toward a Communist-type system must not cause the EDU, however, not to give any humanitarian aid to that country and not to aid non-governmental organisations trying to establish real democracy based above all on free elections.

Convinced that the war will not resolve anything, the EDU ought to support all serious peace initiatives.

The EDU must avoid, however, making loud and emotional statements which, in these countries, might be regarded as interference with their international affairs.

The restoration of peace presupposes, first of all, the discontinuation of arms sales to that region.

EUROPE must therefore refrain from any sales of weapons to this region which is already armed too heavily.

In EDU opinion, CENTRAL AMERICA ought to become a zone of armaments the level of which would be controlled by observers from the Organisation of American States.

The EDU furthermore supports the proposals made by the "CONTADORA" Group (Mexico, Venezuela, Panama and Colombia) including the five states of CENTRAL AMERICA (Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua and Costa Rica).

The EDU particularly supports the idea of a verifiable regional agreement which would lead to the withdrawal of all foreign troops and to the non-import of offensive weapons.

The EDU also supports the principles expressed by the Forum for Peace and Democracy which includes the United States, Costa Rica, Honduras, El Salvador, Belize and Colombia. This group advocates the peaceful settlement of conflicts by means of a regional approach within a Peace Forum. This Forum should, for instance, persuade GUATEMALA to drop its territorial claims affecting BELIZE. If this were done, GREAT BRITAIN would be able to withdraw its troops now stationed there.

It is the firm conviction of the EDU that the real solutions in CENTRAL AMERICA cannot be achieved by war, but by dialogue, negotiations and free elections in order to establish, in each of the countries concerned, a pluralistic democracy guided by a spirit of social justice.

EDU/1983/883
May 1983

Expert Group no. 3.

"CAMPAIGN MANAGEMENT"

Recent activities and future work

Final report submitted by the chairman
Dr.Lars Tobisson, Moderate Party of Sweden

Members of the workshop (in alphabetic order)

KAILA Aarno, Kansallinen Kokoomus, SF
KOCKBERG Mats, Kansallinen Kokoomus, SF
RADUNSKI Peter, CDU, D
TOBISSON Lars, Moderata Samlingspartiet, S
VEEN Hans-Joachim, CDU, D

1. Background

The expert group was originally set up through a decision by the 3rd Party Leaders' Conference in Salzburg, Austria, in July 1980. Its aim was to improve the planning and the execution of election campaigns. All EDU parties were invited to attend the conferences that were organized on different subjects within the area of interest. The task of the group was completed by the spring of 1982, and its findings and recommendations were reported to the 5th Party Leaders' Conference in Paris, France, in July of the same year (EDU/1982/745).

At the suggestion of the expert group the party leaders decided to reorganize it into a permanent group of 3-4 campaign managers. They were given the task to follow the evolution of ideas and practices in the field of campaign techniques and to report this to their colleagues.

During the EDU work year 1982/83 the group has consisted of Dr. Lars Tobisson, Moderate Party (chairman), Mr. Pester Radunski, CDU, and Mr. Roger Boaden, Conservative Party. Dr. Andreas Khol of the EDU office has assisted as secretary.

2. Workshop on opinion research

With the help of the Konrad Adenauer Foundation a workshop on opinion research was organized near Bonn, Germany, on December 2-3, 1982. It brought together professional pollsters from research institutes and campaign managers from political parties in Austria, Germany, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

The results of the deliberations are summarized in a report from the chairman (EDU/1983/815). The opportunity to exchange views on opinion research in different countries was very much appreciated by both the party people and the representatives of the research institutes. The idea was born to make the workshop into an annual event, where recent developments in political opinion research can be discussed.

3. Workshop on information work in campaigns

This workshop was organized in Helsinki on March 21, 1983, which was also the day of the parliamentary elections in Finland. Mr. Aarno Kaila of the Kokoomus Party gave a detailed account of the planning of information activities in the recent campaign, where many of the earlier findings of the expert group had been put into practice. Mr. Lars G. Johansson of the Swedish advertising agency Kreab presented his views on the use of the written message in campaigns. The highlights of these two interventions have been transmitted to the EDU office.

4. Work program for 1983/84

The following activities have already been planned for the EDU work year 1983/84:

A. Study trip to the U.S. on direct mail

This new technique has revolutionized political communication and fund-raising on the American scene, and it has been tried out on a smaller scale in several European countries. The study trip will take place in the summer of 1983. It is open to all interested EDU parties.

B. Seminar in Vienna on campaign techniques

This weeklong event will bring together campaign managers from all EDU parties for discussions on the findings of the preceding workshops and study trip. The experiences of the recent election campaigns will also be analysed. The seminar will be held around September 15 at the Political Academy in Vienna.

Moreover, the following events have been tentatively planned for 1983/84:

C. Second workshop on opinion research

At the first workshop in December 1982 the possibility was discussed to make it into an annual affair. It should then be organized by the Konrad Adenauer Foundation in Germany during the winter 1983/84.

D. Workshop on personal contacts and canvassing

The traditions and practices when it comes to personal calls in the homes of the voters differ very much among EDU parties. This type of work is very important for the broadening of the appeal of our parties. A workshop could be organized during the spring of 1984, preferably in the United Kingdom.

A further subject for a workshop is the role and use of TV and radio in campaigns. It is doubtful, however, whether it can be organized before the next party leaders' conference in 1984.

EDU/1983/898

June 1983

EXPERT GROUP NR. 1

THE EUROPEAN LEFT

Attitudes of socialists and the peace movements on defence

Report submitted by

Piers Wooley,
Conservative Party, United Kingdom

EDU Expert Group on the European Left.

REPORT ON THE ATTITUDES OF
SOCIALISTS AND THE PEACE
MOVEMENTS ON DEFENCE.

By Piers Wooley;
Conservative Party.

30th May 1983

SOCIALIST ATTITUDES TOWARDS DEFENCE

A. Introduction

The last four years have proved to be a watershed in the debate on defence. What started principally as concern by groups of radical non-aligned anti-nuclear groups, has evolved into a debate not just concerned with nuclear affairs, but also with the entire notion of defence and the relationship between the power blocs of the East and the West. Although disarmament, as a major political issue, has developed in the USA, the spotlight shines on events in Europe and in particular Northern Europe.

The anti-nuclear lobby that faces us now, emerged in an active form as a consequence of the NATO decision to counter the threat posed by the Soviet's SS20s with a new generation of intermediate range weapons comprising Pershing II and Cruise. Although observers interpret the nuclear issue as the progenitor of the unilateralists, this is perhaps an over-simplification. The legacy of the U.S. involvement was a loosening of the ties within the Western Alliance; post-Watergate introspection added to this phenomenon. However from 1977 onwards Europe's unease about the U.S.S.R., and the collapse of "Ostpolitik" led to a re-examination of the interdependence. Europe perceived that only by redeveloping the concept of "coupling" could an adequate NATO stance be presented. The most important part of this, though only a part, was the "counter-force" strategy. Thus the two sides of the Atlantic drew closer together. At the same time confidence in the U.S.A. fell, partly because of statements on defence such as P.D. 59 on the possibility of a limited nuclear war, and partly because of a lack of faith in American foreign policy. Although disassociated from the European Theatre, events in Iran, Afghanistan, Central America and the Middle East should not be discounted as catalysts for the Anti-Nuclear Movement.

Another important independent variable that must be taken into account is the world recession. As unemployment has risen - now 35 million in the OECD - there has been a gradual rejection by the inheritors of 1968 of traditional values. The Greens in West Germany have exploited this better than any other member of the anti-establishment. Their unilateralism, however forthright, should not be taken as anything more than a symptom of their *raison d'etre*. To a greater or lesser degree this is true of all the European Peace groups, although as we shall see there is a large degree of heterogeneity in their morphology.

The Socialist parties themselves are even more clearly divided, and muddled. Some are opposed to nuclear weapons and strong conventional forces, and pursue a policy of what they euphemistically call neutrality but what is essentially neutralism. In a number of cases the "old-guard" of the Left, which supported the Western alliance and nuclear weapons, has been replaced by much more hard left young socialists who are aggressively anti-American and closer to the Eurocommunists. This evolution will continue as the mainline parties of the Left seek to absorb supporters of the "Greens" and other radical parties in order to bolster their support. The striking exception to these developments is the Socialist Government of France.

B. Peace Group Logistics

The very nature of the "anti-nuke" movement tends to preclude any unified planning. Shades of opinion run from pacifists through ecologists, feminists, clergymen, gay rights to Communists. A number of attempts have been made to co-ordinate a strategy.

The creation of E.N.D. (European Nuclear Disarmament) the British based group was one such attempt. However, they have failed so far to adopt a common policy approach. More than a year ago, a more formal co-ordinating channel emerged. In a little publicized move, Holland's Inter-Church Peace Council (I.K.V.) - the model for many of Europe's peace groups - agreed to administer an International Peace Co-ordination Centre from its Hague headquarters. The centre facilitates the exchange of information among the European Peace Groups, the co-ordination of protests and the organisation of special conferences to coincide with major official disarmament talks. Whatever the differences of opinion, there have been numerous examples of synchronised actions such as large-scale demonstrations on the same weekend.

One thorny issue has been the possibility that the Soviet Union has given support to the "peace-movement". It is the case that three Russians - one journalist and two diplomats - have been expelled from Holland, Denmark and Norway after having been discovered giving money to "peace" organisations in those countries.

At the moment the Soviet Union is actively promoting new "peace" organisations based outside Eastern Europe, reasoning that a Communist-backed group in Western Europe would look more acceptable than one with its headquarters in Moscow. This has been one lesson learnt by the failure of the Moscow-based W.P.C. (World Peace Council) and International Committee for Security and Cooperation in Europe. A meeting held by the latter decided to convert its organising committee into a permanent one based in Brussels and to set up a "peace information centre" in the Belgian capital.

As these organs of the W.P.C. spring up, it will become increasingly difficult to monitor the "trade" between the "legitimate" peace groups and the Soviet front organisations. It is the case that many Western groups would shy away from Soviet interference, but a concerted attempt to fund them covertly would be difficult to stop. This could become their Achilles heel, as the peace groups have already played into the hands of the Soviet Union without having the slur of 'Soviet-funding'.

C. The Left's Defence Stance in Each Country (Ed: EDU Members' Reports)

Austria

Neutrality: in the 1950s and 60s the Austrian Socialist Party was strongly opposed to Soviet expansionism, today the old socialist establishment still shares this attitude but among the young socialists neutrality is gaining ground.

As Austria is forbidden by the State-Treaty to possess nuclear weapons, this is not a direct issue. The young socialists adhering to the peace-movement, certainly come out against nuclear weapons. With regard to the NATO double-track decision, Chancellor Kreisky recently spoke out in favour of it, while other socialists have strongly opposed it. As far as the peace movement is concerned, there are strong links between the young socialists and this movement. When the largest peace demonstration took place a few months

ago, approximately 50,000 people participated.

Denmark

The Social Democrats are pro-NATO, and it was a Social Democratic Prime Minister who lead Denmark into the alliance, but at the same time the party wants a minimal involvement, which can be seen by their attitude to the defence budget and also by their wish to reserve the right to depart from the majority view in NATO. They are very negative towards nuclear arms in principle, and regarding the Pershing II and Cruise-missile decision the party now favours a delay in deployment of these NATO-weapons as long as the Geneva-negotiations are going on with the Soviet Union, irrespective of the advantage this will give the Russians.

The Social Democratic attitude towards the peace movement has been mixed: on the one hand expressed in the wish to join the evident popularity of the peace issue, on the other hand the unwillingness to be exploited by the part of the peace-movement dominated by the Communists (the local branch of the World Peace Council). The party has in a cautious way warned against "communist front organizations" within the peace movement. Mostly, the party has tried to circumvent the issue by adopting "peace" as an important party platform.

Finland

The Social Democrats are for the neutral status of Finland, especially now, when they have the president's post. The Communists are divided, but many or most of them are pro-Soviet. After all, the Communists have for many years been in coalition governments under Kekkonen and with him pursued the neutral foreign policy.

Even here there are differences between the Communists and the Social Democrats. The latter are against nuclear weapons. They support the nuclear free zone in the Nordic countries. Among the Communists there are different opinions. Many of them are for the nuclear free zone in the Nordic countries, but in many other respects they are Moscow orientated. When in the government, they have supported the government's official policy, that is for nuclear arms reduction and a nuclear free zone.

The Social Democrats, the leading governmental party, supports moderate expenditure on conventional weapons in order to preserve Finland's capacity to defend itself. President Koivisto has maintained this. The Communists behave differently. In the recent governmental crisis they were against budget funds for conventional arms, and therefore after a loss, they left the government.

The peace-movement in Finland has been and still is very quiet and non-political, although it includes the hard core of the old peace movement, which was pro-Soviet and supported unilateralism. That faction is so small, that it has not really affected the whole peace movement.

France

With regard to defence, the government speaks of "continuity", but its own financial difficulties make it difficult for it to continue in real terms with the defence policy which has been followed for the last 25 years.

President Mitterrand himself has taken a stronger line against the U.S.S.R. than almost any other Western leader. His words have been backed up with the decision to build a seventh S.S.B.N. and to push ahead with the modernisation of its land-based systems. In many ways his position on defence is stronger than any other leader of a major power. His position on the Left has enabled him to draw support from the Right, while at the same time being able to disregard largely the opposition from the Communists and the radicals thus he can claim to have a natural consensus for his policies. Foreign policy has been carried out with equal strength and this was amply demonstrated by the largest expulsion of Soviet diplomats since the departure of more than a hundred from Britain over ten years ago.

West Germany

The S.P.D. fought against the admission of the Federal Republic into the Western Alliance and the country's re-armament. In a swing in June 1960 the S.P.D. then declared itself in favour of NATO and the Western Alliance. The NATO "double-track decision" is based on an initiative of the former Federal Chancellor, Helmut Schmidt. However the neutralist forces are gaining the upper hand to an ever greater extent. The most important exponents of foreign policy, the Party Chairman Willy Brandt, the former Secretary of State in the Chancellor's Office, Hans-Jurgen Wischnewski, the negotiator of the East treaties, Egon Bahr, and the foreign policy spokesman of the S.P.D. parliamentary party Carsten Voigt are beginning to move in a direction which must end in neutralism. Egon Bahr has spoken of a so-called "security partnership" with the Soviet Union. The S.P.D.'s candidate for Chancellor in the elections in March, Jochen Vogel, was a strong supporter of disarmament and has made far-reaching Soviet proposals for the Geneva talks his own. In particular, nuclear weapons are a subject of great controversy within the S.P.D. Ever since the Vietnam war anti-Americanism has been on the increase in the S.P.D., and this has become even stronger since Reagan's election as President of the U.S.A. Today there is no doubt that the NATO "double-track decision" in its original form will no longer be fulfilled by the S.P.D.

The peace movement in the Federal Republic is clearly Communist in origin. Meanwhile, however, the most different groups, especially those from the churches, have gained considerable influence, although the financing and organisation of the movement, albeit on a "long lead", continues to come from Communist sources. The most important of those who are pulling the strings of the peace movement are the same people who agitated against the Federal Republic's entry into the Western Alliance and against the armed forces back in the '50s.

Norway

The Labour Party wants Norway to be a part of the Western Alliance, NATO, and in the early seventies also wanted Norway to join the European Community. Neutralism was left as an acceptable policy after World War II.

It has accepted nuclear weapons as a part of NATO defence strategy but, as with all other Norwegian parties, Høyre included, it does not want nuclear weapons in Norway in peacetime. It has also accepted nuclear deterrence as a strategy. Labour supports conventional re-armament, although not at the same speed as Høyre. The Labour Party was in government at the time the NATO "double-track-decision" was made, and supported it as the government had been active in drafting it.

During the last year this has changed. The Labour Party has in fact left the "double-track-decision", and is voting against preparations

to deploy new NATO missiles if the I.N.F. negotiations should fail. They support a "freeze" proposal, want to make the missiles held by Britain and France a part of the negotiations in Geneva and have made favourable comments on the proposals made by Andropov. They have also advocated a nuclear-free-zone in Northern Europe.

The Labour Party has moved towards positions held by the peace movements, although not accepting these views totally. They have no formal, organised links with the peace movements. The Socialist Left Party wants Norway to leave NATO and take a neutral position. It rejects nuclear weapons on principle, and does not believe in nuclear deterrence as an acceptable means to peace. The Socialist Left Party believes, in general, that the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. are alike, and both unacceptable as partners.

Portugal

The Socialist Party favours a system of Security and Co-operation in Europe and negotiations towards a progressive disarmament, especially in the areas of nuclear, bacteriological and chemical weapons.

The attitude of the Socialist Party towards the armed forces is based mainly on the principle of the "essential unity of objectives between the people and the Socialist State" and this implies their subordination to the political power and the elimination of the classical army. Instead they propose a limited standing army, supported by a popular militia, and a proportional reduction of the defence budget. Being in favour of general disarmament while rejecting the use of Portuguese territory for the deployment of foreign military bases, one can assume that the Socialist Party will not support the nuclear re-armament or the NATO "double-track-decision". The Portuguese peace movement has limited strength: Conselho Portugues Para a Paz e Cooperacao (Portuguese Council for Peace and Cooperation) is connected with the World Peace Council of Helsinki. This movement has "branches" in several parts of the country, and has organised a number of demonstrations.

United Kingdom

Officially the policy of the Labour Party favours the continued membership of NATO: however, the number in favour of withdrawing is increasing. The 1982 Labour Party Conference adopted unilateral nuclear disarmament as official party policy; it rejected the deployment of Cruise missiles; the modernisation of Britain's nuclear deterrent; the continuation of servicing facilities for U.S. Poseidon submarines; and the continuation of all nuclear weapons establishments in Britain. Within the party there is a group on the 'right wing' led by Mr. Denis Healey, the Front Bench spokesman on Foreign Affairs, that favours multilateral disarmament.

The Labour Party is pledged to increase conventional spending on the one hand, yet reduce the proportion of GDP spent on defence to the average of the major European powers. This is contradictory since the latter would mean that £4½ billion would have to be cut from the defence budget each year. The outcome would be a halving of the British Army on the Rhine (BAOR); a halving of the RAF's strength; a halving of the destroyer/frigate force; and the scrapping of the air element of the Royal Navy.

The CND has approximately 40,000 national members and claims to have a quarter of a million more in local groups. Its Chairman is Mrs. Joan Ruddock, a former Labour parliamentary candidate, and its General Secretary is a Roman Catholic priest, Monsignor Bruce Kent. Its principal aim is "the unilateral abandonment by Britain of

nuclear weapons, nuclear bases and nuclear alliances".

CND is supported by people of varying beliefs: pacifists, ecologists, churchmen and a wide range of political opinion, but heavily biased towards the extreme Left. The CND National Council includes members of the Communist Party. However, CND's influence is most politically significant in the Labour Party, since the main opposition party is now committed to complete unilateral nuclear disarmament.

On 27th and 28th November 1982, the CND held its annual conference at which they voted by an over-whelming majority to adopt tactics of civil disobedience and non-violent direct action as part of the campaign against the stationing of Cruise missiles in Britain and the purchase of Trident missiles.

The conference also decided by a narrow majority in favour of campaigning for Britain to leave NATO, under the slogan "NATO out of Britain, Britain out of NATO" in a move which demonstrates the predominance of the extreme Left in the CND.

D. The Future of the 'Peace Groups' and the Socialists

It is not possible to forecast with any degree of certainty the strategy that either will follow. Although a number of Socialist Parties claim, in opposition, that they would pursue policies aimed at creating non-nuclear defences, there must be some doubt as to whether this would be the case if they came to power. Some of that doubt is based upon their previous actions on gaining power in the past. However, the 'young Turks' who are beginning to dominate the parties of the Left, may hold sway over the more conservative (with a small 'c') elder statesmen. Another uncertainty must be how homogeneous the parties of the Left are as a whole. Possible schisms already exist both nationally and internationally. The development of their policies when in government cannot take place in the isolation that exists in opposition. Such matters as Vienna, Madrid and Geneva will and do have a bearing. Despite this, members of the E.D.U. will be able to debate against the Left on the basis of what the Left says now, and not what it did in the past. However, at the same time we must recognise that however compelling intellectually our arguments might be, our success will always be undermined by the emotion stirred up by the unilateralists and by the statements that occasionally emanate from the U.S.A. A single mention of a possible "limited nuclear war" can do as much, if not more damage than a weekend of "anti-nuke" demonstrations.

The 'peace' groups themselves pose an even bigger questionmark. If, as seems likely, Cruise and Pershing II are deployed late this year, how will the disarmers react? One possibility is that they will continue much as they are now. Another is that they will fade away having in effect lost their battle. The final possibility is much more dangerous. As mentioned in the opening passage the psychology of the peace groups is anti-establishment. Such a psychology might lead to a move within the movement for much harder direct action. The obvious tactic would be passive and consist of an increase in intensity of the present policy. They would aim to inconvenience any defence facility by picketing or by interfering directly with the services of the establishments. Allied to this would be an escalation of the demonstrations that have taken place. However, there is the possibility that having lost their fight against the missiles, support for the cause would evaporate. In Britain, CND leaders have said that they will, if necessary, pack the prisons.

The less obvious direction they could take is towards terrorism. The type of person who demonstrates in 1983 is not dissimilar to those who joined the early student movement in the 1960s. When frustration set-in, splinter groups such as the Baader-Meinhof (later the RAF), and the Red Brigades were formed. If this were to happen the first attacks, would in all probability be 'hard targets' such as military bases. After that we could have a return to full-scale terrorism with a resurrection of 'Terrorist International'.

All these are only possibilities. But one thing is certain. From 1984 onwards the peace movement will evolve from its present state.

EDU/1983/900

9th June 1983

EXPERT GROUP NO: 1

THE EUROPEAN LEFT

Paper on
The Socialists and the Green Movement

from

Dr. Hans-Joachim Veen
Christian Democratic Union
Federal Republic of Germany,
prepared for EDU Meeting, June 13, 1983

The Socialists and the Green Movement

A country-by-country comparison reveals strikingly great differences in the relationships of the ecological or environment-protection movements and/or the Greens with the European parties of the left. We find that these movements' programmes and ideological emphases are almost as diverse as are the countries in which the groups are operative.

Only in some of the countries are these movements organized as autonomous political parties. This is the case in the Federal Republic of Germany, in Austria, in Portugal, with qualifications in Great Britain (where the movement is active only in certain southern regions), and in France.

With one major exception - the Federal Republic of Germany - even where these movements have become parties, up to now they have remained politically insignificant splinter groups, with no foreseeable prospect of getting into national parliaments.

To the extent that the Greens are organized as parties, their political and ideological orientation is diffusely left-extremist, radical Socialist or Marxist-Communist. This generalization applies to Norway, Portugal, Great Britain and France.

By contrast, ecological movements and corresponding citizens' initiatives are to be found as single-issue crusades in practically all the countries of Western Europe. Some of them are ideologically and sociologically quite heterogeneous. Some of their promoters - depending on individual involvement or personal conviction - are of bourgeois origin.

However, even those citizens' initiatives that have been founded by members of the so-called Establishment are the constant targets of influence from leftist Socialists and Communists. These left-wingers often manage to re-programme the movements, via demonstrations and rallies, as instruments of radical social protest.

This leftist tactic of destabilizing and redirecting a movement is the more successful the more the ecological initiatives expand beyond their original local and pluralistic structures within a community, going on to attain supraregional, country-wide scope. Once an environmental-protection movement becomes centralized, its officialdom is often dominated by ideologists of the left.

Some of the Green movements began, especially in Great Britain and Portugal, as offshoots of the relatively old Friends of the Earth movement. Others, particularly in the Federal Republic of Germany, in France, in Austria and in Denmark, trace their roots to the more recent anti-nuclear-power movement.

It is especially this anti-nuclear-power movement that has fostered the recently close connection of the Greens with the peace movement.

Especially in the Federal Republic of Germany, this inter-relationship now amounts to an extensive sociological and ideological common identity of Greens and peace-movement activists. At present this alliance provides the most highly combustible political mixture, and gives the Greens the best chance to survive.

Nowhere else are the Greens displaying this political potential more strikingly just now than in the Federal Republic of Germany. In the federal election of March 6, 1983, they won 5.6 percent of the votes, and, with 27 seats, got into the Bundestag for the first time. This entry into Bonn's parliament climaxed a drive in which they had recently won seats in almost all West German state legislatures.

Nowhere else in Western Europa are the Greens equipped with so variegated a political platform and fortified by such leftist ideological cohesion as they have achieved in the Federal Republic of Germany.

What they have done in West German politics is to develop into a comprehensive "alternative" movement; more precisely,

into a comprehensive "anti-movement". For they are against parliamentary democracy, against the "capitalistic" economic system, against technological progress, against economic growth, against the Western alliance - and especially against NATO; in fact, they are against military defence in general.

And they exhibit a pervasive anti-Americanism. It is the United States, as the Greens and their adherents see it, that, more than the Soviet Union, is a danger to the peace of the world.

Ideologically, the Greens on the West German scene have combined old-fashioned political romanticism with Socialist and anarchistic, pacifistic and Marxist elements.

The Greens have become the anti-Western Opposition as a matter of principle. Justifiably, in various states of the Federal Republic of Germany, they call themselves Green/Alternative.

Who are these Greens? In the West German party spectrum, they are farthest to the left. Their leadership counts relatively many former Communists. Their voters generally speak of themselves as being to the left of the Social Democratic Party. Often these voters are disappointed former SPD supporters, who now press for the Greens to enter into a loose partnership with the SPD politically and in parliament. The leaning toward the SPD also applies to many of those at the Greens' leadership level.

This standing of the Greens in the Federal Republic of Germany is due to a special set of historical and political circumstances in that country. It may be illuminating to look briefly at three of these.

First is the fact that, in contrast to most West European countries, the political choices in the Federal Republic of Germany up to now have included practically no leftist Socialist or Communist alternatives. The Greens have succeeded in giving various radical protest movements a common platform. And the Greens of the Federal Republic have done more: With German

ideological thoroughness and fondness for concepts, they have constructed a comprehensive alternative political ideology, using as their building materials diffuse "anti" attitudes, assorted protests, diverse dissatisfactions. The Greens' platform contains all these planks: a radical concept of democracy* that includes anti-parliamentarianism; an ambiguous attitude toward the use of violence if the end is felt to justify the means; a rejection in principle of everything "modern". Via this ideological mix, the Greens manage to incorporate two extremes - the anti-parliamentary right of the past and the radical left of today in Germany - by making them seem to coincide.

The second special circumstance behind the Greens' status on the West German political scene is that the Federal Republic is relatively highly industrialized and densely populated. As a result, the damage done to the natural environment by technological and industrial developments is known, is directly experienced. The damage can be seen, felt, smelled, tasted. Reflecting public concern, the media are sensitive to the topic of the ecology. Sour rain, the dying-out of the forests, the pollution of water and air - these phenomena are constantly on the front pages, in the television news, on the radio.

A third situation peculiar to the Federal Republic of Germany that accounts for the Greens' political status is this: The former Government in Bonn - and for that matter, up to now all the established parties - have not shown sufficient sensitivity to the theme of the environment. By comparison with West Germany, in other countries - it is so in Denmark, Austria, Great Britain and Norway - the parties of the left, in particular, have demonstrated awareness of the ecological problem. So have Britain's Liberals, and, in Norway, both the Liberals and the conservative HØYRE. In this conjunction, France is unique:

* A faith in "direct democracy": rule by the people as a whole, not through elected representatives. Hence the anti-parliamentary stance - which of course collides with the fact that now the Greens are in Bonn's and several state parliaments.

There, even though neither the Government nor the Socialists nor the Communists have shown much interest in the environment, nevertheless protest - notably, the Greenpeace movement - has not yet managed to develop much political thrust.

Looking at the over-all picture, we can conclude that the Greens have been relatively strong and politically the most effective, or can be so in the future, where one or more of these situations prevails:

- Where the Greens ally themselves with the peace movement, and thus have established, or are establishing, the prerequisite for a more complex political programme than the one-issue ecological appeal; a programmatic alternative to the older parties' range of approaches to domestic and foreign affairs.
- Where the other parties, especially those of the left, up to now have not been active in the sphere of environment protection.
- Where - as in the Federal Republic of Germany - there has been no left-radical political alternative at all.

Contrarily, the Greens up to now have remained the weakest where the parties of the left, especially the Socialist and Social Democratic parties, to a large extent have identified themselves with the goals of the peace movement - more precisely, with uncoupling a country from the upgrading-of-armament programme, from NATO and from the Western alliance, while also embracing the ecological aims of the Green movement. This identification has taken place in Denmark, Great Britain and Austria.

In the Federal Republic of Germany, the Social Democrats are moving in the same direction. Now that the SPD is no longer burdened by Helmut Schmidt, and is back in the Opposition,

the party is attempting a sharply defined programmatic approach to the platforms of the peace movement and of the Green / Alternative party. The two groups are regarded - in the words of Opposition leader Hans-Jochen Vogel - as "critical partners of the SPD". It may be that here the SPD has medium-term intentions in mind: that it plans by this tactic to absorb the electoral potential of the Green / Alternative. The price being paid for the SPD's manoeuvre is a definite skid to the left. And the price of that ideological shift is defeat: In the foreseeable future the Social Democratic Party of Germany will not be able to gain a majority in an election.

But beyond these changes in political patterns, there is an important shift underway in voters' thinking. The concern for preserving the natural conditions of life, the worry about destruction of the environment is by no means confined to those who vote for the parties of the left. Far from it: Demoscopic surveys show that the supporters of conservative and Christian Democratic parties have become increasingly more sensitive to issues of environment protection.

This tendency is especially clear in the Federal Republic of Germany. There many citizens, although they have been refraining from voting for the Green / Alternative because they have not accepted the over-all programme of this radical-left movement, are acutely aware of environmental issues.

In fact, the destruction of the natural environment meanwhile has become a primary worry about the future in the minds of people in all West European countries. The table on the next page, giving the results of a recent (June 1982) survey, is striking evidence of this development.

THE WEST EUROPEANS' FEARS FOR THE WORLD IN THE COMING 15 YEARS (1)

	B	D	G	F	IRE	I	L	NL	UK	GR	EC
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Increase in criminality and terrorism	61	60	57	72	89	83	74	68	77	72	71
Increase in unemployment	76	68	75	65	73	60	77	64	61	60	66
Destruction of nature	50	65	77	48	48	55	65	65	39	69	57
Constantly more artificial living conditions	43	23	62	29	35	52	31	27	19	48	41
Increase of social tensions	47	32	46	29	49	32	45	40	46	20	38
Critical worsening of international relations	32	44	51	24	25	32	32	25	28	53	35
Serious effects on people of new medical and pharmaceutical discoveries	26	28	40	24	32	30	35	26	20	30	29
Longer-ranged interruptions of oil and gas deliveries	27	22	40	16	21	19	29	13	18	29	23
Importation of cheap goods from Asia	23	13	19	27	23	14	22	11	27	12	20
Loss of my country's influence in Europe	12	17	23	8	9	9	20	6	16	16	14
Decrease in Western Europe's influence in the world	14	11	19	6	6	7	15	9	8	10	10
No reply	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	4	1
Totals (2)	412	384	509	348	410	393	445	355	360	424	405

(1) The worries - based on replies from persons with the European Community - are tabulated here in declining percentagewise order. B = Belgium, D = Denmark, G = Federal Republic of Germany, F = France, IRE = Ireland, I = Italy, L = Luxembourg, NL = the Netherlands, UK = Great Britain, GR = Greece, EC = European Community (median).

(2) Totals exceed 100 % because of multiple replies.

Source: Euro-Barometer, June 1982

What are we to conclude politically from the preceding page's reflection of the public's growing anxiety about the destruction of the natural conditions of life? In my view, this fear is more of a long-range political factor than even the fear of war. For the fear of war is closely related to moods and outlooks in the media, and can hardly be incited ceaselessly. By contrast, the fear of the destruction of nature as we know it on our planet needs no dramatization by the media to make it clear. This fear about the ecology is virulent because it is direct: Our environment and what is happening to it are matters of every-day personal experience.

So both the objective situation and political considerations suggest to me that the parties of the centre and the governments based on them are called upon to reinforce their efforts to protect the natural conditions of life; and to do this without abandoning economic growth. In other words, I am recommending political platforms that consider simultaneously the ecology and the economy.

After all, by definition the preservation of the natural environment is a genuinely conservative mission. The challenge posed by this campaign of conservation transcends our national party patterns and our borders. In the long run we can only preserve our natural environment here in Europe by joint efforts at the level of Europe.

EDU/1983/897

June 1983

E X P E R T G R O U P N R . 1

THE EUROPEAN LEFT

Developments within the Socialist International

Report submitted by Wendelin Ettmayer, ÖVP, Austria

WENDELIN ETTMAYER

DEVELOPMENTS WITHIN THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

I. DEVELOPMENTS

1. Anti-Americanism

Anti-Americanism has become a major ideological basis of the Socialist International (SI). This attitude finds its strong expression in the attacks on the "neoconservative-reactionary" Reagan Administration. In various contexts this "conservative" policy is blamed for international tensions as well as for the economic crisis. At times the US is even represented as the actual threat to world peace.

While the SI continually distances itself from key points of the American foreign policy, it mentions the spread of Soviet expansionist policy to Asia, Africa or Central America only rarely and deferentially.

2. The SI has opened up its left flank

The SI declaration of principle of 1951, adopted on the occasion of its re-establishment, states clearly: "International communism is the instrument of a new imperialism. Wherever it has come to power it has rooted out freedom or destroyed any opportunity of establishing it," but recently there have been increasingly discussions between SI and Marxists, and Marxist groups have been accorded observer status and participating rights.

In recent years, the border line to communism has become rather blurred. The SI may have acted in good faith by associating with seemingly democratic socialists in the fight against Somoza, but support for the regime in Nicaragua con-

tinued even after its totalitarian-Marxist tendencies were openly visible. Frequently it is felt that the overwhelming support of revolutionary groups in Central America may be the compensation for a class struggle that is no longer respectable in Central Europe. So the SI attacks authoritarian military regimes in Latin America with a continuous shower of protest resolutions while Fidel Castro's communist dictatorship remains untouched of any criticism.

In Moscow, the SI agreed with Brezhnev on a joint statement on disarmament, and the SI invites representatives of organizations to meetings and conferences who do not have a democratic leg to stand on, such as the Namibian Liberation Organization (SWAPO), Frelimo from Mozambique or Polisario from Eastern Africa. It should also be mentioned that the national-revolutionary movement MNR from El Salvador was accepted as a member party although its Chairman Guillermo Ungo has definite Marxist-Leninist leanings. And SI President Willy Brandt keeps condemning the "terror of the right" in Central America but has hardly anything to say about terrorist acts perpetrated by the Marxists.

As already said, the one-sided defense of Marxist groups in Central America, the one-sided criticism of violations of human rights such as in Turkey diverges strongly from the former attitudes of the SI where in the 1962 "declaration of principle" it was stated that "the totalitarian communist claim of power over human individuals, nations and societal development is incompatible with human nature."

3. Detente is kept up as a myth

The result of detente and the continued efforts towards detente between East and West are seen separated from political reality and almost glorified by many SI declarations. Detente has been elevated almost to the ranks of a creed or a dogma.

Consequently, Brandt's statements on the imposition of martial law in Poland were extremely weak, and violations of human rights in Eastern Europe are not mentioned in order not to threaten the (supposed) chances for detente.

At the SI congress in Albufeira in April 1983, Brandt declared openly that the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan had given influential circles in the US a welcome opportunity to convert existing fears of the Soviet Union into accelerated armament and to cultivate the cold war. Thus it was the duty of the SI to do everything in its power to continue the process of detente.

Similarly, an SI delegation to Moscow had already found in February 1982 that "both sides support a policy of detente to which there is no reasonable alternative."

This position of the SI again is in obvious contrast to its former attitude towards the Soviet Union. So it was outlined in the 1962 declaration of principle: "The leaders of the Soviet Union pretend that their foreign policy follows the principle of peaceful existence. In practice this means only a change in tactics: The fight against the non-communist world is carried on in a different form." Here again the SI has made a key change in its attitude.

co-existence
?

4. Disarmament

Within the SI there are strong groups that demand unilateral disarmament at all costs. In Albufeira, Michael Foot, Head of the Labour Party, maintained that a unilateral disarmament initiative of NATO would not endanger the security of Western Europe. At the same meeting, Egon Bahr proposed a one-year deferment on the deployment of new missiles in Europe even if the Geneva negotiations should fail.

However, Jospin, leader of the French socialists, later scoffed in his address that he sometimes felt he was attending a pacifist meeting. He represents an attitude that characterizes the Portuguese, French and Italian socialist parties who see the threat to the balance of power stemming mainly from the Soviet Union.

The resolution adopted in Albufeira calls for the USA and the USSR to take immediate and practical steps for nuclear disarmament. The delegates blamed both superpowers equally for the stalemate in the arms control talks. In addition, disarmament was linked closely to economy. The resources set free by disarmament were to be used for modernizing the developing countries.

An SI study group on arms control, discussing the issues in Washington and Moscow in 1982, assured Moscow that the Soviet proposal for a partial reduction of forces in Europe could serve as a basis for further negotiations. Simultaneously representatives of the SI demanded "withdrawal of all plans providing for a renewal or expansion of nuclear weapons deployed in Europe," which is obviously directed against NATO's double-track decision. Representatives of the SI and the Soviet communist party voiced their intention of continuing mutual contacts and exchange of opinions in the interest of a solution to the disarmament issue.

Brandt keeps stressing that "security is based on Partnership" and that the SI was aiming to establish closer contacts with the various peace movements within the context of its efforts for disarmament and detente - a fundamental difference to former positions. The 1962 declaration of principle still stated: "Most Western democracies belong to NATO. The democratic-socialist parties of the NATO countries consider this alliance to be a strong bulwark of peace and firmly desire to maintain it."

5. Peace policy

While the 1951 document of establishment of the SI provided that "the fight for maintaining peace is inseparately linked with the fight for freedom" there is a growing impression today that the SI would accept peace at any price.

Brandt considers the peace movements mainly as allies "on the way leading to the same goal." He stresses that he is not frightened by a "neutralistic or pacifist threat" (in the context of advocating an international agreement whereby the states would pledge to reduce their military budgets by five percent and spend the money for economic development).

The peace movements should be given full support even when they do not necessarily belong to the socialist family (Sorza in May 1982), as otherwise the majority of sympathizers of these movements would be disappointed.

Here too the SI has executed a U-turn. The declaration of principle had expanded on the subject of "Socialism and Peace": "We democratic socialists desire nothing more than lasting peace, but we shall firmly defend our liberty. We thus reject unilateral disarmament of the democratic countries. The defensive force must be maintained as a deterrence in the event of an attack."

6. The Middle East

Recently, the SI's Middle East policy has undergone a formal change: For a long time the delegation of the Israeli Labour Party was able to prevent the formal recognition by the SI of the right of self-determination of the Palestinians and the people's right to a home country. The congress of April 1983 recognized this right and stated simultaneously that it was the task not of the SI but of the Palestinians themselves to decide whether the PLO be the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

In fact, several SI member parties have already recognized the PLO. In 1982 the Austrian delegate to the SI proposed to exclude from the SI the Israeli Labour Party (Mapai) led by Shimon Peres. This proposal was supported by the delegates from Finland, Denmark and Spain, and the leftist socialist Mapam party was envisaged as a replacement for Mapai.

II. CONSEQUENCES OF THE SI POLICIES

The above comments show that the SI policies affected certain political fields considerably by initiating trends and influencing tendencies. Without the SI's strong leftist trend anti-Americanism certainly would not have spread to such an extent, and recognition of the PLO is to a large extent due to the SI policy and to Ex-chancellor Kreisky. But the SI has failed in key areas, and has shown fissures in other fields that are hard to cover up.

1. Failed projects of the SI

a) Central America: Although the SI has invested heavily into Central America, also financially, it has failed in its policy of moderating radical groups by intensive support. The SI obviously made a mistake by believing that Marxist groups could be won over to a democratic procedure by fraternizing with them. The SI support for the Nicaraguan Sandinistas as the pioneers for a "third way between capitalism and communism" has not prevent them from keeping up close ties to Cuba and Moscow.

Condemning the elections in El Salvador (March 1982) as a farce was another mistake that proved profitable to totalitarian groups.

b) The North-South Dialogue: Although the Brandt Report on the North-South issue comprises 300 pages and was announced as a "program for survival," it has not yet provided

much of a contribution towards the discussion or solution of the problem. The report's key thesis that the East-West struggle should not spread to Third World countries is unrealistic wishful thinking. It is especially the Third World from Angola to Ethiopia and from Afghanistan to Nicaragua, that is the preferred battlefield for the communists. Furthermore, the report submitted by Brandt does not discuss the internal problems of the developing countries. An aggressive moralism towards "capitalistic exploitation practices of the colonial age" certainly does not solve existing problems.

Ex-chancellor Kreisky's "Marshall Plan for the Third World" also has not progressed beyond headlines.

2. Splitting tendencies within the SI

As outlined above, the issues of disarmament and the Middle East conflict have produced different attitudes within the SI. It should also be mentioned that SI member parties from the Caribbean region view the Central American policy of the European socialists as being too friendly towards communists and that the blind identification with the Nicaraguan Sandinistas has met with resistance.

Different views of the Latin American and European socialists were also voiced on the occasion of the Falkland war and found their clear expression at the SI office meeting in May 1982. As to the Middle East policy, it has already been said that the Israeli Labour Party wanted to accept only the "recognition of the legitimate efforts of the Palestinian people," while the SI actually recognized their right of self-determination.