

CONFIDENTIAL

Working Paper No. 11 a

ANNEXE B

D.D.R.
-----Introduction

This paper deals mainly with suggestions made by the German branch concerning the continuation of our work in the DDR.

General

This is the second year that we have had a camp in the DDR in cooperation with FDJ. The camp took place in Halle from July 9th to August 8th. The work was to assist in the building of a new town for workers in the chemical industry - roads, houses, schools, etc. Misgivings have been expressed in Germany at several levels, concerning our cooperation with the FDJ, which is, of course, a politically inspired organisation. Lutz Caspers, member of the German Committee, went to East Berlin to discuss the arrangements for the Halle camp, after the agreement between FDJ and ES, and also touched upon various other questions. In the same month (June, 1964) members of the German branch met representatives of the German government to discuss the camp.

Report on Halle campParticipants :

SCI 10 (5 m, 5 f), FDJ 16 (14 m, 2 f), BITEJ 12 (10 m, 2 f).

The FDJ volunteers were mostly 17-years old students from polytechnical schools whose participation in the camp had been arranged by their schools. Their work in the camp will be counted as practical work which is part of their school programme. They lacked experience and were hardly able, because of their youth, to make any valuable contribution in discussions. They did not elect a leader for their group.

The BITEJ participants came from 6 different countries and from different youth organisations, which made it difficult for them to form a united group. They did not choose a leader for their group either.

The SCI volunteers were experienced, but the leader (Denise Laguens) complained that she had not been adequately briefed on the camp arrangements and the agreement with FDJ. In future the SCI leader should be appointed earlier, and special provision for briefing should be made

Work :

In the words of FDJ, a big part of this project "has been entrusted to the young people in order to show the confidence of the DDR in youth, whose help is essential to the construction of socialism". In fact, the skilled work is done by professional workmen and the volunteers are under close supervision. The volunteers were divided into groups working in different places, and the enormous size of the project made it impossible for them to judge the rate of progress they were making, particularly as they were not responsible for any single part of the work. For these reasons, some volunteers felt that the work (despite the ideological value of the project as a whole) was not worthwhile in itself.

Food, lodging, and leisure time activities :

Accommodation, in a FDJ pioneer school, was very comfortable. This school, however, was shared at the same time with 200 FDJ leaders attending a course, which meant that no meeting room could be reserved for camp participants. On the other hand, the presence of the FDJ leaders offered opportunities for contacts and discussions. Food was good and there was too much of it (because of regulations concerning per capita expenditure); some food was wasted as result. The proportion of organised leisure time in relation to free time was well balanced. All common activities were arranged between and in agreement with the different groups. Everybody was completely free to do what they wanted and to participate in activities as they wanted. Contrary to the suggestion of the ES to FDJ, however, it appears that no alternative outing was arranged at the same time as the visit to the concentration camp, although participation in this visit was not compulsory.

Contacts :

Establishment of good contacts and interesting discussions among the volunteers were the main achievement of the camp. The atmosphere was friendly and there was little tension - in fact, some participants appeared to be indifferent on political questions. Contacts on the building site with the workmen were easy to make, very good, and extremely interesting. Little contact was made with the population of Halle.

Conclusions :

Reports of volunteers indicate that they were glad to have taken part in the camp and despite their criticisms consider the camp to have been worthwhile and valuable. The two detailed written reports (from Hermann Spirik, Austria, and Siegmund Giesecke, Germany), from which much of the above criticism and following suggestions are drawn, indicate that further camps in the DDR are worthwhile. One other point made repeatedly is that the seminar before the camp was valuable (the question of seminar organisation is raised again below).

Proposals of German Branch and of SCI volunteers

These proposals, made before and after this year's camp, relate to general questions concerning principles, and to practical camp arrangements.

Negotiations

It is agreed that the ES should continue to negotiate for SCI, rather than the German branch; however, the German branch would like to send an informal observer to take part in preliminary discussions before formal agreement is made with East German authorities concerning camps (Due to miscomprehension regarding FDJ's relationship with BITEJ, it was proposed that agreement might be between SCI and BITEJ : this is impossible because BITEJ is a coordinating body, and does not itself organise workcamps).

Volunteers

The German branch would prefer the camp to be composed 50% BITEJ volunteers and 50% SCI volunteers, the total number of volunteers being reduced to 30. The IS has no comment to make on this proposal, except to point out that SCI has not suffered in the past from sending one third of the participants, and, it might be difficult to recruit 15 SCI volunteers for future camps, as this year's experience has shown. Further, the increase in number of East-West camps which is quite possible may not be matched by an increase in the number of suitable SCI volunteers applying for East-West camps. FDJ did not object to the German branch proposal when put forward informally in June. Whichever formula is used, the Socialist volunteers should have a leader or spokesmen, preferably speaking a language known to the SCI leader and the FDJ organiser. The Socialist volunteers should be older and more mature than this year's FDJ volunteers.

The German branch emphasises the importance of exchange of volunteers (not only regarding the DDR, but also regarding other Socialist countries). In the case of the DDR, certain difficulties exist concerning visas and currency exchange, and FDJ's position on this matter should be noted (see below).

Project

The disadvantages of the type of project chosen this year are evident. Clearly, practical arrangements must be improved (see FDJ's opinion below).

Date and length of project

The German branch recommends, as before, that the project should take place in August to match German students' holiday periods. This can be proposed to FDJ again, but the Committee should bear in mind that FDJ organises many activities other than workcamps and is inclined to try to spread its work - in 1965 they will be heavily committed to the Youth Festival in Algeria during August. Three weeks is a more suitable period than four, because of the difficulty of finding SCI volunteers able and willing to serve four weeks.

Pocket money

The German branch objects to the arrangement by which SCI volunteers deposit money with SCI and receive an equivalent sum as pocket money in East Germany. The ES points out that the money deposited with SCI is used to provide pocket money (and possibly travel assistance) for volunteers from Socialist countries who cannot obtain the necessary currency for Western Europe.

Preparatory Seminar

The volunteers agreed that the 1964 seminar was of great value not only because it was a very good introduction and provided the volunteers with the necessary information about the DDR and the camp, but also because it is a means for the volunteers to get to know each other before the camp has started, and form an integrated group. The seminar also provides an opportunity for briefing the leader on all agreements made with FDJ, which is essential. The only criticism is that the seminar was too short for proper discussion on all subjects, and that it is unnecessarily far for volunteers to travel to Paris. The German branch suggested tentatively that the seminar might be held in Germany or Belgium in future, or further northeast in France. If in Germany, the German branch could not take responsibility alone for the seminar.

Consultation between the German branch and the ES

Bearing in mind the IC's desire for greater consultation between the ES and the German branch, the German branch proposes that this can only be useful if a member of IZD can take part in a consultative capacity in the decisive meetings with FDJ. The ES agrees, provided that such participation takes the form outlined in the paragraph on Negotiations above. The ES very much appreciated the suggestions of the German branch made this year, and the visit of Lutz Caspers to East Berlin and his very full report on informal discussions with FDJ. Some of the points raised by the German branch with the ES, and by Lutz Caspers in East Berlin, have already been considered by FDJ, and a summary of their position is given below.

Report on some points discussed between Rumpel (FDJ) and the ES in Moscow, September 1964

Camp projects

Herr Rumpel accepted the criticisms made of this year's camp and agreed that a smaller project would probably favour a project at the LPG (agricultural production cooperative), of medium size.

Cooperation with other organisations in the DDR

Herr Rumpel's attitude on this question seemed to indicate that FDJ has discussed the matter and made a decision in principle, possibly as a general policy and not related to SCI as such. He would have no objection to our contacting other organisations such as the Quakers. The ES assumes that the success of such approaches would depend on DDR policy at the time of any workcamp planned, for example regarding the granting of visas. The ES also considers it very likely that FDJ's permissive attitude would change if our cooperation with them were unsuccessful.

West Berlin Participants in DDR camps

Herr Rumpel was very glad to be able to tell the ES that West Berlin participants would probably be accepted next year in DDR camps provided it was specified that they came from West Berlin, and were listed as "member(s) of SCI from West Berlin" without mentioning their nationality.

DDR volunteers in SCI camps in Western Europe

He Rumpel would be delighted to send volunteers to France, England, and one or two other countries in Western Europe. In practical terms, this could not be done without a change of policy concerning visas. It is quite possible, however, to insist that FDJ volunteers attend SCI camps in Austria. The IC might consider the possibility of intervening with governments, officially, to request visas for East German volunteers to France, England, etc.

64 10 17 - 3 04

DDR volunteers outside Europe

The question of the FDJ volunteers who were diverted to a Jeunesse FLN camp before reaching Tlemcen was not discussed in Moscow. FDJ expressed interest in sending one or two shortterm volunteers to workcamps in India next year.

The attitude of Herr Rumpel was friendly and cooperative.

General Conclusion

Besides the practical arrangements mentioned above, the German branch has raised questions of principle which, taken together, reflect doubt as to the value of continuing our cooperation with FDJ. Other working papers which should be borne in mind when considering this one are the ES Report (W.P. No. 11), especially the Conclusion, and W.P. 11a.

17. 10. 64

Fay Nowacki
Janet Goodricke

Working Paper No. 11a

ANNEXE C

Yugoslavia

During 1964 three workcamps were held in Yugoslavia. One was organised by AFSC with a certain amount of assistance from the Yugoslav Youth Alliance, and six SCI volunteers were recruited for it. The other two camps were organised by SCI and the Esperantist group at the Observatory in Zagreb.

The AFSC camp, at Bohinj, was similar to last year's as far as work and living arrangements were concerned. The chief disadvantage of work at Bohinj is that it is a tourist centre, and volunteers are not convinced of the value of the work. Lack of technical instructions, and shortage of tools, accentuated this problem. The leaders this year, however, considered that the camp was successful on the whole, and it seems quite likely that AFSC may hold more such camps in future.

The other two camps, at Primosten, were arranged after a visit by Walter Schenkel to Yugoslavia early this year. The first camp's output of work was small, because of illnesses. The second Camp's output was better. Difficulties arose from bad work organisation, and tourist-type board and lodging, and poor language qualifications. The Leaders' report for Primosten II indicates that the second camp was, however, reasonably successful and that relations with the authorities and people in Primosten are sufficiently good to make future camps possible. There is a good possibility that the Esperantist group will continue and increase their cooperation. It is clear that the Esperantists are in a better position than the YYA to find projects of the type to suit SCI, and can give us very valuable assistance in organising and carrying out workcamps. Moreover, an active group of SCI supporters in Yugoslavia is highly desirable for its own sake.