



At the congress Pierre Mauroy, the newly elected president of the Socialist International, looked to the future

GIVING FORM TO DREAMS

As newly elected president of the Socialist International, I send my greetings to you, your parties, and those millions of men and women who share our hope of changing the world. I pay tribute to our common hope, which binds us together irrespective of colour, race, continent or condition of life.

Dear Willy, we are in your city, Berlin. This congress, from which your illness has kept you away, is coming to its end. It is your congress. I would have liked to say what I have to say in your presence, as a sign of friendship and honour to someone who for sixteen years has been at the head of our socialist family.

Over these sixteen years, our fortunes have varied. We have lived through times of promise and hope, times when we were put to the test and found helpless. In the middle of the seventies, we had the feeling of being in a long waiting period, not knowing what would be the outcome of a cold war marked both by crises and by periods of detente. How could we halt the spread of a communism which was at the

height of its powers and which seemed at that time to represent the aspirations of peoples born in a time of de-colonisation? How could we face up to the economic and social crisis coming to pass in the most industrialised countries of the world?

In 1976 when everything conspired to discourage socialists, Willy Brandt spoke to us of a new departure for our International, and did so with all his conviction and experience as a statesman.

By so doing, he breathed into the International that sense of challenge which characterises his career as a human being and as an active politician. In politics, there are few indeed who are able to look beyond the horizon and accept the idea that we cannot yet foresee what is possible. Willy Brandt is among that number. Willy Brandt has always made his own that best sort of idealism. He made it his own from the time of his youth when he refused, as many other Germans did, to have any truck with nazism. When peace came, it was that refusal which made it impossible to identify the German people with the Nazi leadership. That refusal allowed a generation of young people, of whom I was one, to embrace the cause of Franco-German cooperation and thus contribute to the foundation of the European Community.

More than that, he challenged the possible by refusing to believe that a state of affairs based on a division of Europe could persist and by rejecting the idea of a permanent division between the two Germanies, and by never accepting the terrible reality of the Wall which, a few steps from here, made Berlin a symbol of historical absurdity.

As mayor of Berlin, Willy Brandt took steps that no action should become irreparable. In 1989, when Gorbachev's policies were yielding their first-fruits, he would say to us, 'I was not sure that this generation would see the end of the Wall. I only wanted to make it easier to live with it'. But he was never tolerant of the unacceptable. And the sheer force

of his message turned John Kennedy's famous words into actions. For 25 years we all felt we were Berliners - in great part thanks to Willy Brandt.

Ostpolitik stands as the enduring symbol of this deliberate challenge. The breadth of his strategic view, the pragmatism of his methods, his tenacity in tackling obstacles - even the most difficult and painful obstacles - bear witness to his political vision. As Chancellor, Willy Brandt put into practice his own strategy. On its own, firmness towards the East would not have achieved anything but an exacerbation of the cold war, pregnant with risks for peace. The opposing strategy, dialogue with no firmness, would inevitably have been seen by Moscow as a sign of weakness. *Ostpolitik* was able to bring together firmness without provocation and a desire for dialogue without appeasement. No one who came after him changed the plan. History will say that without the shift that took place in those years our friend Gorbachev would not in his turn have been able to take his part in the work of liberation for which we are all so grateful.

It is in this context that in 1976 Willy Brandt brought the renown of a Nobel Peace Prize to the Socialist International - the renown, but also the inspiration. And in particular a will to take the message of our Socialist International to the whole world, when it had till then been almost exclusively confined to Europe. That work of rapprochement - or synthesis, to use an expression dear to Jean Jaurès - could not have been achieved if it had not sprung from a high aim. Just as the West could not ignore the East, so it had to carry on a dialogue with the South. It had to demonstrate that there was a common interest in simultaneous development in North and South, that the development of the non-aligned countries in the teeth of the developed countries was inconceivable, and the developed countries could not keep their wealth away from two thirds of the planet's inhabitants. This analysis led socialism to find once more its original strength and an impetus to go forward, first of all in Europe - in Spain and Portugal, in France - then also in Latin America and in Africa.

That global reach which is the strength and pride of our movement we owe to Willy Brandt, who throughout these long years has been able to share with us his dream, which we know today to be if not already realised at least within our grasp.

Such is the inspiration which I want to motivate my presidency of the International. I am fully conscious of the honour of being the first Frenchman to be given this responsibility and I want to respectfully acknowledge those who have preceded me in this office. When looking with satisfaction on our 111 parties and organisations, I must pay homage to the first socialist organisations, whose story we know. In more modern times, I must recall the outstanding work of the British Labour Party and the social democratic parties of Germany, Austria and Sweden who played such an active role. If I cannot list the names of all those who have played their part in the Socialist International, I want particularly to recall today Bruno Kreisky and Olof Palme.

I am conscious of the symbolism of receiving the presidency of the Socialist International here in Berlin where the SPD has in its welcome to us combined faultless organisation with that human warmth which is its hallmark. I am conscious too, after hearing such powerful speeches, of the size of the task we have to tackle together. This decision was taken by the presidium of the Socialist International in Madrid and I want to assure Felipe González of my gratitude and support.

Over the past two days, many speakers have underlined their worry with regard to the future. It is indeed difficult to do justice to hope. I cast my mind back to the disappointment of those who in the 1920s believed that there was at last a chance of peace and who were so cruelly disappointed by events. We will only overcome our difficulties by making plain our confidence and our optimism. For we know that it is urgent to take action.

It is urgent to take action first of all in favour of democratic socialism. History has cut short the debate which pitted us against communism. That dispute has been settled by events. The error of communism was to have believed that equality could be put above freedom; it was to have ignored the fact that a command economy must become dictatorship; it is to have thought that only capitalism led to imperialism. Until this historical analysis is brought to its conclusion - and we as socialists are the only ones who can do that - a conclusion will not be found where it is most needed, in the minds of men and women. It is nevertheless essential that we demonstrate the rightness of our argument. There exists still, particularly in eastern Europe, a regrettable confusion between democratic socialism and communism. That confusion is not aided by the confused nature of developments in the East. Is it not unbearable to see that Mr Milosevic's party has the effrontery to call itself the Serbian Socialist Party! But confusion is everywhere compounded by the Right, which sees in it a way of avoiding the necessary critique of capitalism as put into practice by the Right.

That is why it is so necessary to work on the identity and topicality of social democracy

SOCIALIST AFFAIRS

Issue 3/1992

within each member party, and of course within the Socialist International itself. The world we live in leads us to reflect on our identity, not because we want to deny what we stand for, but by our conscious choice to become ever more ourselves. By that I mean an organisation at work to a greater or lesser degree on every continent, bringing hope to people in the most diverse conditions of life. An attentive observer will have been able to sense in all the speeches from this platform how deep and real is our identity. Being ourselves means defining a socialism bent on continuing beyond the year 2000, on committing itself to the new century not as an exercise in pure opportunism but as a set of beliefs faithful to the fundamental and timeless values of peace, solidarity and democracy.

Much has been said about the end of ideology - but what if the decisive battle of the next century is the battle of ideologies? Surely the best way to combat the rise of racism, anti-semitism and all forms of extremism is to put in their place tolerance, respect for one another, freedom and individual development? Such is our response to all forms of extremism, all forms of reaction and even to those who in the name of so-called moral values insidiously put in question the freedom of the individual.

Short of any geo-strategic consideration, there are ideological choices to be made if we want to have shared clear perspectives. Several parties have felt the need to reach a better common definition of their identity and to adapt their ideology. We ourselves in Stockholm brought up to date our Declaration of Principles, and here today we are sitting down to reflect on the theme of Social Democracy in a Changing World.

We must not pause on our journey. The Socialist International must continue to deepen its reflection, with the help of its members. When the time is ripe, we will make known the essence of this work and thus respond to those who have thought they were able to say that social democracy was an old-fashioned model. That is how we want to throw out to the world the challenge of our ideas and analyses in order the better to commit ourselves to the fray. It is urgent to take action. It is urgent also, and perhaps particularly, to take action for a new world order. The world as it evolves is not without its doubts, its threats and its tragedies. But it is not my purpose to indulge in alarmism. What we have to preserve, and if possible broaden, is the admirable advance made by democracy over the last three years. It is on the basis of that unquestionable success that we must plan our future actions. And that is of course the sense of the General Congress Resolution that we have just adopted.

Our first commitment is to peace. The question of peace has very recently taken a more pressing topical and decisive turn. As has been said here, some among us hold in their hands the chance of world peace.

Despite the difficulties and the evident risks, I feel that the cause of peace has advanced in these past three years more rapidly than at any other period of contemporary history. It is always the case that the path of negotiation is a long and difficult one and our responsibility is to make sure progress is achieved.

The positions we adopted on the Middle East are well known and have not changed. Something new is developing in the Middle East with the return to power of our Labour Party comrades in Israel. Yitzhak Rabin has shown us that with much conviction and emotion; peace is no longer a dream. Peace is possible provided that on both sides confidence takes root, the will for peace is affirmed and courageous steps are taken. 'Let me begin', he has asked us.

We know how much patience and perseverance is required. And I speak for everyone here when I assure his government of our confidence and say to him as well, 'you have started, we hope that you will persevere. We hope that you will succeed in bringing about those developments we are waiting for'.

Alongside our ever-present concern with disarmament, there remain the threats linked to the very difficult question of nationalities. In this debate we are finding once more the question marks which hung above the newly born Second International. But it is clear that in the new international context ushered in by the decay of the Soviet empire the concepts that we forged over the years seem contradictory.

It is true, we do not confuse nationalism with nationalities. It is true there can be no question of muzzling demands for sovereignty when they are upheld by an entire people. It is true also that the UN Charter guarantees every nation its full and complete sovereignty.

But let us acknowledge that these rights to sovereignty, to self-determination and to national identity may become heavy with menace when they are expressed in an international context of instability. The world, as François Mitterrand himself has said, cannot be a world of tribes. Progress, the only progress that we are today able to effect, is the establishment of a recognised international authority which is both strong and

organised. The United Nations today represents the most advanced form of this universal legitimacy, even if it is not the world government which utopian socialists dreamed of.

I want here to salute the work accomplished by Boutros Boutros-Ghali and assure him of our support in his drive to reinforce the authority of the UN.

That strengthened authority will be the only one empowered to determine who is responsible for aggression, to set the terms of the debate and the eventual resort to force when the ways of negotiation have been exhausted.

I in fact profoundly believe that the natural way of resolving conflicts is through international negotiation. It is of course true that we are living through the Yugoslav tragedy, a flat contradiction to the notion of civilisation, a sort of anachronism. Everything points to strong action, the suffering of the victims - children, women, civilians - the methods employed, the camps, the deportations, the ideology in the last instance, that disgraceful doctrine of 'ethnic cleansing'. Nevertheless, just think what the uncontrolled intervention of the great powers would have triggered off at some other period of history. There is no solution other than the organisation of international society.

Without doubt, in the methods we adopt we must exhibit greater imagination than ever before. Some people talk of arming the world's conscience. It is something to be considered. Others, myself included, have long hoped for the creation of an international court of human rights. Doubtless progress has to be made in this direction. We will have to work on these questions and others with Ingvar Carlsson, to whom Boutros-Ghali has entrusted the task of thinking about the UN in the twenty-first century.

I am conscious that the generations in power at the end of this century have one essential responsibility - that of preventing the return to dominance of the nation states which brought the world to the tragedy of the First World War. There is no alternative to organising international society. There is no alternative to seeking new legal frameworks to prevent every demand of a minority necessarily bringing about the creation of a new state. The construction of Europe points the way to a possible solution. Whatever the circumstances of history, the new states created today must find ways to cooperate.

Our second undertaking is the fight against poverty. It is poverty that could bring about a reverse for democracy. It is solidarity that favours its progress. Would it ever be acceptable to build a little island of prosperity for the benefit of a mere fifth of humanity who consume four-fifths of the planet's resources? Would it ever be acceptable that this little island be mostly preoccupied with defending itself against the massive immigration which will be the incontrovertible reality of the twenty-first century, and not only in Europe? Would it ever be acceptable for democracy to be the preserve of the rich countries alone? The reply to these three questions must be no. But we have to accept that democracy must be extended to the poor world. We must all agree that the crucial question from now on is the link between democracy and poverty. Moreover, democracy is a stimulus to development. In the seventies the dictatorships of Latin America pocketed billions of dollars from loans theoretically earmarked for investment in their countries. And still today the tragedy of Somalia demonstrates how day after day a-thousand-and-one ways can be found to syphon off development aid. The democratic model is the only model which backs a fair division of wealth. For even the poor countries have their rich citizens. Democracy itself imposes a social control on transfers of resources and makes them more efficient.

Can democracy survive people's despair? How long will the former countries of the East, drawn into a model badly adapted to the circumstances of their development, impose drastic restrictions on their populations? How long will democracy in Latin America remain compatible with the sacrifices demanded by the adjustment policies imposed by those international organisations whose approach is still too much that of a financier or, as John Smith has said, of an accountant? How long will unemployment rates of 60 per cent be tolerated by populations who throughout their history have known only the most extreme indigence? Questions of aid, its nature, the means it employs and the political conditions for its efficiency have been posed for a long time past. We know what situations cry out for humanitarian aid. We control the means of international solidarity and we must draw inspiration from the example of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

We appeal to the industrialised nations to fulfil their commitment and in particular to raise the level of development aid to 0.7 per cent of GNP and to one per cent before the year 2000, a goal long announced but never achieved. It is not an unreasonable hope because in recent years great efforts have been made, particularly on the limiting of the debt burden on the poorest countries. But we must now go from a defensive role, which limits itself to keeping economies afloat, to a more offensive one, that is to say one which

SOCIALIST AFFAIRS

Issue 3/1992

allows them to secure the means of their own development and build their own future.

A great step forward will be taken when the industrialised countries make the link between the difficulties they encounter from low growth rates and high unemployment, and the extraordinary boost that their economies could be given if a new effort in favour of the developing countries were undertaken.

We have talked in detail from this platform this morning of the globalisation of the economy. We are at one. From now on it is only at the international level that we can find new room for manoeuvre. Such is the sense that socialists give to the treaty of Maastricht on European Union. It is a question of building a political space which permits the definition of coordinated policies favouring greater growth. The beneficial effects will be felt in Europe. They will be felt too beyond Europe, I am sure. Because it would be absurd to believe that the growth of rich countries was not an indispensable condition for the economic take-off of poor countries. It is because the importance of this move is not limited to France, or even to the European Community, that you have in the past few days been so keen to express your feelings on the political results of the French referendum.

Furthermore, Gro Harlem Brundtland's report has raised at the Rio Conference the question of sustainable development. The environment cannot serve as a pretext for the rich countries to limit the development of poor countries. But the constraints imposed by ecology call on us to intensify our policies of solidarity. It is our responsibility as social democrats, who have always linked the effort for the protection of the environment to the defence of North-South solidarity and the reinforcement of democracy, to take up this new challenge. We must, in the happy phrase of Björn Engholm, 'make peace with nature, otherwise nature will make war on us'.

Comrades, each one of us understands that the wide implications of these options force our International to carry on the work of Willy Brandt while at the same time they oblige us to develop our methods and our organisation.

I now turn to our secretary general. I interpret your wishes when I sincerely congratu-



late Luis Ayala on his re-election and above all on the remarkable work that he has accomplished day by day. I associate all the staff with his success.

18 You will understand that as newly elected president I am not in a position to respond straight away to the very numerous proposals and suggestions which have been made in the course of this congress or in private conversations. It seems to me also opportune to ask our secretary general to put questions of organisation as an essential item on the agenda of our next Council. It goes without saying that any changes to be adopted - if there are any - stem from the increasingly global nature, that is to say the success, of our International.

We are honoured to have among us our fraternal organisations, including the Socialist International Women. I would like to express to their new president, Anne-Marie Lizin, our warm congratulations, our intention of helping her to take up the challenge of strengthening the role of women within our respective parties and to work throughout the world for women to see their condition bettered and to take their future into their own hands. Our good wishes also go to our young comrades in IUSY, whose energy I salute, and to the Falcons.

Our very success makes our discussion on new members more complex. Our duty is to welcome political organisations occupying a particular place at an extraordinary juncture in history. But we must give the highest meaning to membership of our International, that of membership of a political project, of respect for a collective will, of stamping on the future the fundamental values which for two centuries have made up the heritage of democratic socialism. It is also necessary to show great care and realism in the admission of new members. That makes us all the more proud to welcome today so many new members, to whom I send my good wishes for their activity within our community.

I feel I am expressing the general feeling when I say to Bettino Craxi that he hit exactly the right note when he talked of the indispensable role of our organisation in the convergence of the democratic forces in Italy. I realise that such an opening means the end of a long and difficult history. This opening necessarily calls in return for an evolution of the PDS, for concrete commitments which must be entered into and kept, and a firm plan for the historic march towards the unity of our three Italian member parties.

Thus for the first time we record the new socialist commitment of a great former communist party which, it must be said, had since the 1970s trodden its own path. That evolution is naturally full of symbolism. But it already raises new questions about the way in which we assist the evolution of parties no longer associated with communism. It seems to me that we have found a balanced solution for Hungary. But there are so many other parties knocking on our door that this will obviously be a topic for debate for a long time to come.

In his message to us, Willy Brandt said that it was necessary to move the International forward in time with historical change. That is what we have started to do in this debate on membership. Our Socialist International must be careful to favour rapprochement and political evolution. It is what we want for the peoples of the East, whom we assure of our solidarity and friendship. It is what we want everywhere in the world where we must give our support to those who are working day by day in a social democratic way for freedom and human rights.

In the period to come, we will have the opportunity of giving form to the dreams of the pioneering founders of our International and of all those who, down the years, in the name of democratic socialism, have had the responsibility of the future of humanity.

They were also conscious, without doubt, of the fragility of their efforts. But it is because they did not give up that we are here, that we in our turn are today capable of undertaking the same collective task.

Léon Blum said, 'the pessimists condemn themselves to be no more than spectators'. Socialists, for their part, aspire to action.

We know it is urgent to take action.

Let us work together for our ideals and our values of freedom and justice, which transcend our actions.

Our greetings to you, Willy Brandt.

Long live the Socialist International.