

social worker imposed on the family by the State.

New laws in taxation are special targets for the government today. We have such high taxes that we have developed a classic confiscatory taxation system. We have many laws against tax fraud. If you do not commit a crime deliberately, but only do not understand the complex tax law, you can still go to prison. . . .

There is also another important law, the *Mitbestimmung* law in German, or employee self-determination. *Mitbestimmung* is another sociological, rather than legal, word. Under this law employees can come into the office of the president of the company and accuse him of misuse of funds if he sees, for example, your magazine on his desk. The law also controls politicians, including in Parliament. Their staff can demand the "right to have influence in their decisions." I think this law is a copy of the Soviet system of "rolling controls"—everybody watches everybody.

**EIR:** Who is behind this legal transformation in Sweden?

**Hane:** I think it is the Soviet Union, the Soviet Embassy in Sweden, and the KGB. I think that [Prime Minister] Palme is a "jumping jack," a demagogue. He himself is not intelligent enough for this. He only talks and shouts invective. One of the more intelligent is Karl Lidbom, a close friend of Palme. Lidbom is currently ambassador to Paris, a former trade minister who was involved behind-the-scenes in all these new laws as a consultative force. We have in Sweden a name for these new, awful laws. We refer to them with the invective, "Lidbommir," Lidbom's Work. . . .

Previously in Sweden we had clear lines between political power and private areas. Political power was defined clearly and was strongly limited to the field of civil rights under the courts. Now, this is taken away, and political power has entered many new fields formerly protected from political influence, to the extent that it reaches practically every individual life and situation. This is a very big difference between Sweden and the United States that I can see. One freedom that you have is that of giving money to an association, with a tax deduction, so that the person can have institutional guarantees to protect his rights. This is not possible in Sweden. The Swedish people have been disarmed by taxation.

**EIR:** Where will you take the fight next?

**Hane:** I will fight to spread information regarding the situation in Sweden to make other nations aware of the danger of this method. If others publicize these conditions outside Sweden, it can influence the situation inside Sweden. We must also find new methods to force discussion of this enormous power of the media, and how to regulate it. I have watched your news on the TV every morning. It is very good . . . if you like the Soviet system of propaganda. Very effective. They know how to ask leading questions, use innuendo. This television media is a very effective form of political power which is not recognized as political power. And that is the tragedy.

## The geopolitics of conservative neutralism

by Edith Vitali

In Germany, an alarming phenomenon is spreading which various political analysts are commonly referring to as "conservative neutralism." Not only old Nazis such as SS-Maj. Gen. Otto-Ernst Remer, who achieved dubious fame for having arrested the leaders of the July 20, 1944 coup attempt against Hitler, are involved. Today Remer heads a movement, called "The Bismarck Germans," whose manifesto is openly calling for an alliance between Germany and Russia, against the "evil" West.

It's unlikely, because of Remer's Brown past, that the "Bismarck Germans" will ever become a mass movement. But recently, West German Defense Minister Manfred Wörner wittingly or unwittingly adopted one of the key demands in the Bismarck Germans' manifesto: Wörner, a self-proclaimed lover of Fyodor Dostoevsky's blood-and-soil-novels, called for the creation of a German-Soviet Youth Exchange program.

Remer's group is only part of a whole spectrum of "conservative neutralists" looking toward the East to rediscover "German identity." The same ferment is rampant in the so-called student dueling societies and inside the established conservative parties. "It's only a question of time until these people organize themselves in a new party," a political observer in Munich recently said.

He pointed out that at any "conservative" meeting or conference these days, somebody will always get up and describe West Germany as an "American colony" not worth defending. "We never bothered to ask the Soviet Union under which conditions she would agree to German reunification. Now is the time to do so," these people will argue.

The leading light of this German "New Right" is the "respectable" Erlangen historian Hellmut Diwald whose latest book, *Courage for History*, is tormenting the German reader with such sophistries as: "Shouldn't an East German communist be closer to your heart than an American democrat? Above all, he's German, too."

The phenomenon of "conservative neutralism" is spreading on *both* sides of the Atlantic. The unifying feature is the belief in the cult of geopolitics.

Franz Kadell, a French-born German professor living in Washington, D.C., put out a special report called *Europe:*

*Status Quo in Flux* for the Western Goals Endowment Fund. In the introduction, Kadell claims that the status quo in Europe can no longer be defended:

"One must ask at this point whether the 'gains' of World War II are really worth what it costs to maintain them. Is the price of maintaining the division in Germany and Europe worth it to either superpower? In short, whether either power cares to admit it or not, the status quo in Europe cannot continue as it is." This assertion strikes one, to say the least, as very strange. With President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, for the first time in postwar history the defense of Western Europe against the growing Soviet military threat has become realistic, because laser weapons can defend Europe without destroying it. And even more important, does not the West have to defend those republican values which make it different from the East?

### A 'new order' in Europe

Kadell, however, finds confirmation of his thesis in the political ideas of the peace movement: "Leftists in Europe and liberals in the United States are already working together to design a completely new order in Europe. Only conservatives lack a strategy for shaping the inevitable change. They seem to prefer merely defending the intolerable status quo."

Curiously enough, the first six chapters of his study depict a Soviet Union armed to the teeth which is about to swallow Western Europe and incorporate it into the Soviet empire. As Kadell compassionately shows in the first chapter, it can't be otherwise, because Russia's geography leaves her with no choice but to take over the Eurasian continent! "Many misconceptions in the West result from the disregard of the influence of geography on politics, which usually is much more lasting than influences of ideology or economics." Geography cannot be changed, and "Russia is the most disadvantaged geopolitically."

Kadell proceeds to present the strange arithmetic equation of Sir Robert Sealy that "a country's freedom is inversely proportional to the pressure on its borders. On the basis of this, a military draft is not absolutely necessary for the United States, but for the Soviet Union it could be a requirement. It might also hold that a regime in power other than the Communist Party could not allow the same freedom to its citizens as the United States does. It is the historical mission of Russia to overcome this geographical disadvantage."

Another "expert" in geopolitics, the Austrian Heinrich Jordis Lohausen, is quoted with the following ominous forecast: "Not until Russia rules the thoroughfare from Gibraltar to Aden equally reliably as the U.S. rules the one through the Panama Canal; not until the Russians are sitting as firmly in Norway, in France, in the Netherlands one day as the Americans in their own New England states; and as firmly in Korea as those in California; and when Great Britain and Japan no longer serve the United States as aircraft carriers; only then is the demanded equality reached; then they have the freedom of action on the land and the oceans like their opponents.

Then only, their prospects are geo-strategically equal."

Kadell does not tell his readers that Mr. Lohausen from his hometown Graz actively organizes for a united Eurasian continent, co-ruled by Russia and the Central European oligarchy.

The chapters which follow serve to strengthen the image of an invincible Soviet might, ideologically and militarily armed to storm ahead and conquer the few remaining kilometers separating it from the Atlantic coast. So what's the choice? Beam weapons? No! "A new strategy must be found" from the standpoint of geopolitics, Kadell writes in the last chapter. He starts out by quoting none other than U.S. Ambassador to Bonn Arthur Burns, who told the *New York Times* on Jan. 4, 1984 that the division of Europe cannot last. "Eventually, the German nation will be reunified within a very different Europe than we have now."

As a result of World War II, Germany was divided and each part occupied by the respective superpower. "The United States had to fulfill Germany's former geopolitical function. As a result, the superpowers were facing each other. Neither could move back or forward without leaving a vacuum of power." But didn't the United States fight in Europe to defend Western civilization against fascist barbarism? Aren't U.S. troops still in Europe today to defend Western values against the East, which a majority of West Germans abhor? No word of that is mentioned.

### How to 'unify' Germany

It is no problem at all, if you believe the geopolitician Kadell, to restore a united Germany which would fill the "vacuum of power." You only need to hold free elections! As a result, the Communist government in East Germany would fall, and everything would be fine. A united Germany would never again be a military threat: "It would be held in check by the Soviet Union." Such a solution, says Kadell, would be in the interest of both superpowers. "Why should 230 million Americans eternally defend 300 million Europeans, while watching NATO drift steadily apart? Why should the American taxpayers forever finance such a questionable status quo?"

The Soviet Union, too, will be relieved of a burden. From the menacing empire pushing to the Atlantic coast, the U.S.S.R. has suddenly changed to a teddy bear, ready to lick the feet of the Central European oligarchy. In the words of Kadell: "Facing growing internal problems, the insecurity of the Eastern corridor and the increasing incalculability of strategic developments, the Soviet Union might well view the restoration of an independent Germany as a price to pay for relieving the strain on its western borders. The Soviet Union would stand to gain more than it would lose. For both superpowers it would solve more problems than it would create."

Kadell assures us that his strategy is neither fantastic nor utopian, that Moscow would "respect" a new Reich in Central Europe as an equal partner. Some believe it. Some don't, and they are the realists.