

# The *Mittleuropa* delusion that is sweeping West Germany

by Rainer Apel

The coming "hot anti-missile autumn" will place a great political challenge before the Federal Republic of Germany. The "peace movement" is no longer concerned simply with the stationing of U.S. Pershing II and cruise missiles in Western Europe, but is demanding the political restructuring of the continent, the redrawing of the map of Europe. Leftists in the "peace movement" are now talking about "specifically European security interests," about "a neutral, disarmed Europe between the blocs." And the concept of *Mittleuropa*, long buried in the drawer of German history, is experiencing a revival. Celebrated along with *Mittleuropa* is the rediscovered "German national question"; a "new German patriotism" is suddenly in vogue, and "left" as well as "right," including the Green Party, are chopping away together at the Western-oriented identity of postwar Germany.

The campaign on the "German national question" has nothing to do with any eventual German reunification in a republican-humanist mode, whereby the postwar occupation would be terminated and a revitalized sovereign German nation-state would become possible. The "re-education" and "denazification" campaigns immediately after World War II, in particular such programs as Britain's Wilton Park brainwashing school for the German elite, made it practically impossible for a real understanding of the Nazi period or a healthy national consciousness to develop in Germany. The British insistence that all Germans were collectively guilty for Hitler's crimes was dinned into the heads of Germans by the news media and the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church. A political vacuum was created into which charlatans and demagogues of all shades could move, especially now, as the political and economic crisis in the country intensifies.

## The new German identity: brainwashing

It is the essentially pro-American identity of postwar West Germany that is now being blamed for the current political and economic disasters, while a new, continental European identity is counterposed to it. This new identity is to involve the same countries that Friedrich Naumann, about whom more will be said below, described in 1915 in his book *Mittleuropa*: a Europe "between the blocs," extending from North Cape to the borders of Persia, from the Rhine to the

Urals. How similar to the countries and regions that the Palme Commission today—of which West German "peace" ideologue Egon Bahr is a member—wants to develop into a "nuclear-free zone of Europe"!

In Naumann's time, the conception of a strong central European territorial power, with an industrially expansive and progress-oriented Germany at its political and economic center, at least partly corresponded to the power-political realities of Europe. But today this is a dangerous chimera, because of Russia's vastly increased military power compared to 1915, and because those who are most strongly propagating the new *Mittleuropa* include the leftist ecologists, the Greens, and the "solidarist" Christian Democrats, as well as the old rightists of the "blood and soil" perspective. This "new *Mittleuropa*" would in truth be not only a militarily—but particularly also an economically—dismantled Europe, a manipulable buffer zone for the Russian Orthodox "Third Rome," a neo-Muscovite empire which, as the strongest power in continental Europe, would dominate the scene.

A *Mittleuropa* without U.S. backing or opposed to America would be neither viable nor independent. The so-called "central powers" found this out during World War I, and the Nazis, the followers of Friedrich Naumann's theses, discovered it during the Third Reich. The British oligarchy, the majority of which had supported the *Mittleuropa* aspirations of the Nazis until 1938-39, were the victims of their own misestimation of the inevitable consequences of their energetic help in building up the Third Rome strategists as well as the Third Reich. The conclusion of the 1939 Hitler-Stalin Pact only demonstrated the essential similarity of both monsters, whose violence would be turned, not against one another as England had hoped, but against the West: the Benelux countries, France, Great Britain, Scandinavia, as well as the Mediterranean and Asiatic holdings of the British and French empires.

Churchill's reluctance to see Britain's flight into the arms of the Americans as more than a tactical, temporary policy, dictated by the dire necessity of 1940, demonstrates how little prepared the British oligarchy was to break with its own cultish, essentially pro-*Mittleuropa* insanity. The anti-American activities which Lord Peter Carrington, standard-

bearer of today's *Mitteleuropa* movement, is carrying out, in tandem with Yuri Andropov and Russian Orthodox Patriarch Pimen, shows that certain members of the British oligarchy have learned nothing since Churchill's time.

The Third Reich, installed at the behest of the British oligarchy, was, at the time of its greatest military expansion, a thoroughly autarkic *Mitteleuropa*, decoupled from the rest of the world, which could only exist to the extent that America kept itself in "splendid isolation" from European quarrels.

## Blood and soil

The idea of *Mitteleuropa*, which first took shape among the German nobility after the Vienna Congress of 1815, was by its very nature a full-blooded child of the oligarchy. The idea of a "special historical mission" the Germans were to fulfill in continental Europe was based on "German Romanticism" after 1815, and first gained ground after the republican, bourgeois-industrial revolutionary ferment of the German population was destroyed in 1813. "German Romanticism" was originally inspired by Scottish Freemasons like Sir Walter Scott, who propagated "nature philosophy," the mystique of the "German forest," and of neo-Germanism.

Through the networks of Scott and of the Swiss operative Madame de Staël, came all the artificial worldviews that became the motor of the first German youth movement at the end of the last century. This irrational mass movement, which has become part of history under the name *Wandervogel*, carried forward its ideological and political hallmarks in the origins of the National Socialist mass movement. The rising German industrialists and the rest of the middle classes, which after 1813 had been unable to counter the oligarchy politically, meanwhile became itself the instrument of the oligarchic concept of *Mitteleuropa*.

The so-called "Pan-German Movement," the grouping of expansionist currents of the German Reich, founded in 1871, was oriented to the idea of a greater Germany. The essential idea of the Pan-Germans, the "Second Reich," envisioned the consolidation of all German-speaking and German-origin parts of Europe. Although first drawn up in the nominally Catholic house of the Thurn und Taxis family in the Regensburg "national-liberal circle," the conception of *Mitteleuropa* was to be realized with the help of the economic and political power of the Lutheran house of Hohenzollern, whose industrial weight was greater than that of the agrarian Hapsburg Empire. Realization of *Mitteleuropa* had meant that a central European power bloc would take shape, in which the landed nobility would have absolute political predominance.

The basic dissimilarity between the driving industrial forces of the north German Hohenzollern Reich and the landed oligarchs of the Hapsburg monarchy were certainly the main obstacle to the establishment of this pan-Germanic concept of *Mitteleuropa* up to the outbreak of the First World War. Now, during the war, the second political advance of the *Mitteleuropäer* took place. Reichschancellor Bethmann-Hollweg and the Pan-Germans around the National-Liberal

Friedrich Naumann revived the cause. As Naumann wrote in the foreword to his 1915 book *Mitteleuropa*, the war offered a great opportunity to create *Mitteleuropa*, since "only the war would open people's minds to new, great ideas." The hope that the political exigencies of war would ease the tensions between the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs proved illusory, however: *Mitteleuropa* did not become a reality. What was carried over to the post-1918 period was the panoply of pan-German ideas, and the movement of the Conservative Revolution, which was based primarily on Naumann's "national socialist working group" of the pre-war period, and whose ideological successor was the national socialist Thule Society of 1918. After the overthrow of both German monarchies, the *Mitteleuropa* concept stood a better chance.

*Mitteleuropa* was geopolitics, a concept defined from the political interests of "blood and soil." The Nazis who based themselves on this concept were necessarily racialists, since they recognized only the Germanic and Slavic races. The German-racist *Mitteleuropa* and the Pan-Slavic racist East Europe/Asia were, according to the National Socialist worldview, the "natural" poles and antitheses of all politics on the Eurasian continent. The policy of the Nazis had of necessity to lead to the destruction of Europe, either by the Nazis themselves or by the Pan-Slavs of the Third Rome.

Thus, when voices like that of Social Democratic Party theoretician Egon Bahr, the Lutheran-dominated "peace movement" and the Greens now talk about "special European interests," and see the Americans as the main threat and offer Yuri Andropov a nebulous "security partnership" (against and without the Americans), they are perpetrating a shameless brainwashing of those naive Germans who tag along behind them. The role of the Lutheran church in this is particularly pernicious.

## The role of the EKD

The little-understood role of the Evangelische Kirche Deutschlands (EKD—the Lutheran Church Federation), which is so active in building the so-called peace movement and in providing basic ideas for the current "peace debate," is to serve as a transmission belt for the spread of irrationalism and pre-Christian, cultist conceptions.

The significance of the most recent EKD conferences in Hamburg in 1981 and in Hanover this June 8-11 was described recently by one of the EKD magnets for youth, Stuttgart pastor Jörg Zink: the current influx of youth into the church shows, he stated, that the 300-year era of technology and reason is coming to an end. Youth sees that man is not the master of nature—the ecological crisis proves it. True belief, the truly human life, life in general, is profoundly irrational and cannot be explained by rational concepts, he said.

This gives an idea of what the slogan of the Hanover EKD church conference, "Return to Life," is intended to convey: the turn from rationality to irrationality.



This Lutheran banner reads "Disarm yourselves."

The organizational framework of the past mass demonstrations against nuclear energy plants and against the Euro-missiles, aside from the role of the German Communist Party, has been provided by the EKD and its affiliated Action/Reconciliation group. Pastor Jörg Zink, environmentalist pastor Kurt Oeser, EKD church conference president Erhard Eppler (leader of the Social Democratic Party's left wing), Lutheran theologians Helmut Gollwitzer and Heinrich Albertz, have for years been the leading lights of the "new social movements." Even the Lutheran Helmut Schmidt was compelled, at the high point of increasingly violent conflicts over nuclear energy, to refer to the EKD as "pre-democratic" and hostile to the state.

After 1945, the EKD was the key transmission belt for the so-called "collective guilt thesis" of the Anglican British and the Soviets, the vehicle for the ensuing "re-education of the Germans." The church was truly expert at the manipulation of the Lutheran soul.

This was why the Hanover church conference on June 8-11 became the principal forum for unprecedentedly harsh attacks on the American President. A widely known West German conservative analyst, Prof. Michael Stürmer, recently characterized this phenomenon: "What is behind the present anti-Americanism," he said, "is the old hatred of the Lutheran Church for the West and capitalism in general." Hatred for the United States, the strongest power of the West and also of the industrial capitalist system, derives from that.

The EKD and the Russian Orthodox operatives in the Soviet Union share this hatred for the modern and for the United States. And this is not the first time that the Lutherans and the Orthodox have ended up in tandem: in the first half of this century this "unholy alliance" was in effect!

### The Lutheran *Mittleuropäer*

Friedrich Naumann, who wrote the book *Mittleuropa* in 1915, was the founder of the German Democratic Party, predecessor to today's "liberal" Free Democratic Party. He

came from a devout Evangelical family that belonged to a current in the Church known as "Lutheran-Orthodox." Naumann, whose activities in the church began in Protestant Hamburg, founded the National Liberal Circle at the end of the 19th century, around Lutheran professors Max and Alfred Weber. Their "Prussian Socialism" movement saw itself as Pan-German and "anti-Western." The anti-American tendency in political Protestantism comes from this Weberian tradition, about whose tendencies much more could be said.

After World War II, the chief EKD apostle of the "collective guilt" thesis, theologian Martin Niemöller, as well as the former functionary of the Weimar German national youth movement, Helmut Gollwitzer, came from this tendency, as did Egon Bahr.

Niemöller was from 1961 to 1968 president of the World Council of Churches, and in the 1950s a leading advocate of a reunified, neutralized, demilitarized Germany. In a 1949 interview with the New York *Herald Tribune*, Niemöller stated that he would prefer a Russian dictatorship over a reunified Germany to the continued division of his country. In 1951 he visited Moscow at the invitation of the Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox church to discuss the re-establishment of relations between the Russian church and the World Council of Churches, which had been broken off in 1948.

Also from this current of the EKD came theologian Karl Barth, a leading postwar advocate of a European "third way" independent of the superpowers. "Europe today is being ground between two millstones," he declared in 1946. "It has become the country of a people seriously threatened from the West and from the East. . . . Must we then really pay for our sins by ceasing to be ourselves in our own home, but have our way of life determined for us by others?" Barth called on Christians to play no part in the growing East-West conflict: "It is not our conflict at all. It is not a genuine, not a necessary, not an interesting conflict." Asked Barth: "Will not the way of the community of Jesus Christ have to be another, a *third way*, its *own way*?"

Theologian Helmut Gollwitzer, one of Barth's disciples, is today a leading figure in the peace movement, and supporter of the "house occupiers" movement and outright terrorists in the Federal Republic.

It is notable that the first complete editions of the works of the main apostles of the Third Rome, Tolstoy and Dostoevsky, appeared first not in Russian, but in German translation—in Lutheran Berlin! The author of the concept of the Third Reich, Lutheran cultural pessimist Arthur Moeller van den Bruck, issued in 1921 a widely read book with the title *The Third Reich*, inspired by Dostoevsky's thesis of a "Second Byzantium" or "Third Rome." Moeller van den Bruck was the translator and editor of the first collected works of Dostoevsky.

Moeller van den Bruck conducted public debates in 1921 at the prestigious Berliner Herrenklub, gathering-ground for the "conservative revolutionaries," with Oswald Spengler, author of *The Decline of the West*. The ideological kinship

between Third Rome and Third Reich, the "cultural matrix" of Byzantine-Russian irrationality, penetrated the heads of German conservatives through these Berlin debates.

The ideological basis for the Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939, which was really a Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact, is to be found here. Ribbentrop and Molotov kept up their special diplomacy to the end of 1943, although their two states had long been at war.

The majority of German conservatives were perhaps not pro-Russian, but were certainly anti-American. Nevertheless, the Nazis would not have been able to come to power so easily had the Prussian Lutheran Church not given them a helping hand; it was in predominantly Lutheran election districts that the National Socialist Party gained its biggest votes in 1933, the year Hitler became chancellor.

Ribbentrop's state secretary was Ernst von Weizsäcker, father of Carl-Friedrich von Weizsäcker, a present-day Lutheran leader of the peace movement. The latter found himself, after 1945, at the center of the EKD's "Anti-Militarism Campaign," then in the "Campaign against Atomic Death," and later in the "peace research" circuit. The so-called Federal German Peace Research was officially established by the newly elected President Gustav Heinemann after 1969-70 in the form of the German Society for Peace and Conflict Research. During the same period Carl-Friedrich von Weizsäcker founded his Max Planck Institute for Exploration of the Conditions of Life in the Scientific-Technical World—an institution which promoted the "post-industrial society" and the peace movement. Such prominent leaders of the peace movement as Heinz Afheldt and Alfred Mechttersheimer came out of this institute.

Another source of ideas for the "peace movement" is the Heidelberg Research Department of the Evangelical Study Society (FEST), set up by Carl-Friedrich von Weizsäcker and Georg Picht. FEST, which recently put forward a widely circulated paper on the construction of a "specifically European security consciousness," has for the past 10 years, according to one of its representatives, been the chief source of Egon Bahr's ideas on disarmament. FEST is promoting the revival of the idea of *Mittleuropa*, in cooperation with such prominent East German Lutherans as Erfurth Provost Heino Falcke, considered the father of the ecology and peace movement in the German Democratic Republic.

The leader of the FEST working group which published this paper, Klaus von Schubert, plans to popularize the idea of *Mittleuropa* in the EKD's peace movement by using more innocuous-sounding concepts like "disengagement," "denuclearized Europe," or "European Disarmament Zone."

Once in possession of full political and ideological control over Western Europe, the Third Rome strategists, who are no better than their predecessors of the "Third Reich," will drop their masks of tolerance and cooperation. The Third Rome, unholy heir to the cultist first Roman Empire and its successor the Byzantine Empire, hates Christianity just as much as it hates the West.

## Spanish defense debate focuses on technology

by Mary Goldstein

When Spanish Prime Minister Felipe González visits Washington during his June 20-23 state visit for talks with President Reagan, Vice-President George Bush and Secretary of State George Shultz. Defense policy, as well as economic bilateral relations and Central America, will be top agenda items.

It is no secret that the U.S. administration would like to see Spain fully integrated into NATO. While doubtless pleased with González's statement in Bonn last May of support for the stationing of the Euromissiles, in case negotiations fail, despite Spain's repeated declarations of commitment to Western defense, the U.S. and NATO hierarchy are not eager to see Spain follow the "French example" of independent defense policy. Spain is a member of the Atlantic Alliance, but has frozen decision on whether to integrate its military into NATO.

The government intends to conduct a popular referendum on the question of Spain's relationship to NATO, but not in this year of "international tension" surrounding the stationing of Euromissiles, as Foreign Minister Fernando Moran put it. Deputy Prime Minister Alfonso Guerra has stated repeatedly that the referendum is, in any case, a foregone conclusion: opinion polls indicate that most of the Spanish population opposes Spain's membership in NATO, including the voting base of the pro-NATO opposition party, Alianza Popular.

There are signs of policy divergence within the government on the defense/NATO question. Defense Minister Narcis Serra, after the June 1 Brussels NATO Planning Group session, told the press that Spain's future relationship to NATO is definitely "linked" to whether Spain's entry into the European Community (EC) is facilitated. Foreign Minister Moran, a proponent of French-style independent support of the Atlantic Alliance, has recently declared that there should not be such a NATO-EC linkage.

### Defense, technology, and jobs

The defense debate is inextricably tied to the questions of technology and economic policy, as the recent case of the air force modernization program indicates. It was long evident that the Spanish Air Force preferred the McDonnell-Douglas F-18A over the rival Tornado, yet the official decision was delayed, in large part a bargaining ploy to try to force McDonnell-Douglas to come up with "sweeteners." (As it turned out, the purchase was cut back from 84 to 72 planes, a money-